OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FIRST SESSION—ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT

---

9 EDWARD VII., 1909

VOL. LXXXIX

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTIETH DAY OF JANUARY TO THE FOURTH DAY OF MARCH, INCLUSIVE.

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

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR WILFRID LAURIER

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

AT THE OPENING OF THE

FIRST SESSION OF THE ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT

1909

CABINET FORMED JULY 13, 1896

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

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

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

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

OFFICIAL REPORTERS.

ALBERT HORTON.....Chief Reporter.

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

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

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

FIRST SESSION, ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT.

1909.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

JAMESON, CLARENCE—Digby.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SUTHERLAND, HON. ROBT. FRANKLIN—Essex, N.R.

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

VERVILLE, A.—Maisonneuve.

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

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

CONSTITUENCIES OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

FIRST SESSION, ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT.

1909.

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

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

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

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

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

FRONTENAC—John Wesley Edwards.

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

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

INVERNESS—Alexander W. Chisholm.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ontario, N. Riding—Samuel S. Sharpe.
Ontario, S. Riding—Frederic Luther Fowke.
Ottawa City { Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfred Laurier, P.C., G.C.M.G.
Harold Buchanan McGiverin.
Oxford, N. Riding—Edward Walter Nesbitt.
Oxford, S. Riding—Malcolm S. Schell.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

House of Commons Debates

FIRST SESSION—ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, January 20, 1909.

To-day being the first day of the meeting of the First Session of the Eleventh Parliament for the despatch of business,—Thomas Barnard Flint, Esquire, M.A., LL.B., D.C.L., Clerk of the House of Commons, Lieut.-Col. Henry Robert Smith, Sergeant-at-Arms, Jean Baptiste Réné Laplante, Esq., Assistant Clerk, and Arthur Henry O'Brien, M.A., Law Clerk, Commissioners appointed by Dedimus Potestatem for administering the oath to members of the House of Commons, all attending according to their duty, James G. Foley, Esquire, Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, delivered to the said Thomas Barnard Flint a roll containing a list of the names of such members as had been returned to serve in this parliament.

The aforesaid commissioners did administer the oath to the members who were present, which being done, and the members having subscribed the roll containing the oath, they repaired to their seats.

The clerk of the House said: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following communication from the secretary of His Excellency the Governor General:—

Ottawa, January 19, 1909.

Sir,—I am commanded by His Excellency the Governor General to inform you that the Chief Justice of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber to open the session of the Dominion parliament on Wednesday, the 20th inst., at three o'clock.

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

The Clerk of the House of Commons.

A message was delivered by Captain Ernest John Chambers, Esquire, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:—

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

His Honour the Chief Justice of Canada, Deputy Governor General, desires the immediate attendance of this Honourable House in the chamber of the Honourable the Senate.

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate, when the Speaker of the Senate said:—

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I have it in command to let you know that His Excellency the Governor General does not see fit to declare the cause of his summoning the present parliament of Canada until the Speaker of the House of Commons shall have been chosen according to law; but, tomorrow, at the hour of three o'clock in the afternoon, His Excellency will declare the causes of calling this parliament.

And the House being returned.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Flint, I have the honour to invite the House to the performance of its initial duty at this, its first meeting for this parliament. Of the importance of the duties which attach to the high office of Speaker it is superfluous to say a single word; of the qualities which that office demands from its occupant it is superfluous also to speak. The fact that the member chosen to fill that responsible office has already had experience in the discharge of similar duties, gives us an additional security that integrity, dignity, fairness and impartiality will distinguish his tenure of the Speaker's chair. In the British Parliament, which is the mother and model of all parliaments, there is an unwritten law, unwritten, but absolute and certain, and never varying, that once a Speaker always a Speaker, and so the Speaker of the House of Commons is re-elected again and again until his removal by death, or his incapacitation through illness or advancing age. This custom is well calculated to produce, and it has produced in the British House of Commons, the highest measure of efficiency in Mr. Speaker. For my part I have often regretted that we have not adopted such a rule in Canada. I remember when in the commencement of my career as leader of the Liberal party, I suggested to Sir John Macdonald, then Prime Minister, that such a practice would be expedient, but my suggestion was not accepted. In the same line of thought, shortly after the general elections, I consulted with the hon. member for

North Essex (Mr. Sutherland), who during the last parliament had discharged the duties of Speaker with signal ability and success and to the satisfaction of all parties in this House, as to whether or not it would be advisable for us to adopt the British practice. My hon. friend from North Essex represented to me that unless radical changes were made in our method of procedure and in the manner in which we treated the Speaker, whilst the honour was great the sacrifices which the incumbent of the office had to make were still greater. The assiduity which is expected of the Speaker in the discharge of his duties, especially when we consider the increasing length of the sessions of parliament in later years, has made it impossible for the Speaker of this House to attend to his private affairs and has forced him to practically disassociate himself from all other avocations. Again, reverting to the English practice, I may observe that it has been the practice of the House of Commons in England, not only by a long series of precedents, but by actual statute, to, in many ways, make the office of Speaker equal to a judicial office. In fact, the Speaker of the English House of Commons is treated as a judge of the land. He is expected to devote himself entirely to his office; he is the recipient of the large salary of £5,000 per annum, and should he resign office he is given a pension of £4,000 a year, with a peerage added. Of course we cannot give a peerage to our late speaker; we might perhaps give him a senatorship, but that has not been the practice up to the present time. We certainly cannot give Mr. Speaker a very large salary, and as to a pension I have a very vivid memory that pensions are not popular in this country. It is, therefore, not a tradition of the House of Commons of Canada to re-elect Mr. Speaker for a second term, but it is a tradition of our Houses and it is the fitness of things that the member of the Houses who ranks next to the Speaker in the previous parliament should be called to the chair. We are fortunate that in the Deputy Speaker during last parliament, the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Charles Marcil) we have available a gentleman of the highest character, and who discharged the duties of Deputy Speaker to the satisfaction of all of us who were here last parliament. I, therefore, have great pleasure in proposing to the House the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Charles Marcil) as Speaker. At the opening of the first session of last parliament the hon. gentleman was elected to the deputy speakership, and as chairman of Committees of the Whole, and as occupying the chair itself on frequent occasions, I think I can appeal to the judgment of hon. gentlemen who were members of the last parliament that Mr. Marcil discharged those duties with grace, with dignity, with fairness, with impartiality and with marked ability. Hon. gentlemen who were members of this House during last parliament will agree with me that my hon. friend (Mr. Charles Marcil) has been eminently endowed by nature for the high position. We know that by experience he has accumulated a vast store of parliamentary knowledge, and we have every reason, therefore, to believe that in the discharge of the duties of the office, to which I hope he will be called by the unanimous voice of this House, he will give satisfaction to both sides, holding even the scales of justice between contending parties without favour to any and with fear of none. I move, seconded by Mr. Paterson:

That Charles Marcil, Esq., member representing the electoral district of Bonaventure do take the chair of this House as Speaker.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Flint: The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has described very fully and very accurately the position of the First Commoner in the Imperial House at London. I am inclined to share the regret he has expressed that the traditions which have surrounded the office of Speaker in that House have not in all respects been adhered to in this House. I refer to the continuance of the Speaker in office from one parliament to another. I recollect very well being in Great Britain in 1895, when there was a great deal of discussion in the British press as to whether or not Sir William Court Gully, who had been elected as Speaker in a previous parliament, should be continued in that office under the Conservative administration which had come into power in 1895. There were a great many arguments pro and con. Mr. Gully had held the Speakership only a very short time. But, in the end, the immemorial traditions prevailed, and he was re-elected without any opposition whatever. I, of course, realize that, in this country, our conditions are somewhat different in many respects to which I need not further allude. And, possibly, it has been in view of these that it has not been regarded as practicable to carry out in every way the traditions of the Imperial House. But I trust that in another respect, in respect of the dignity which surrounds the office, and the impartiality which must be observed by any Speaker if he is to retain the respect and maintain control of the House, I trust that in all these we have not at any time been behind—at least, not very much behind—the traditions of the Imperial House.

The Prime Minister has referred to the nature of the office of Speaker. It has been described in a recent very elaborate historical account of the British House of Commons and the procedure therein as predominantly a judicial office. And it is a judicial office. The Speaker must have re-

gard to the rules, must interpret the rules; he must interpret the rules, not as a member of the political party with which he has been associated in the past, but as representing, not only the majority, but the minority in this House.

So far as the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) is concerned, I can only say that in the course of my experience of him as Chairman of Committees, and, on occasion, in the exercise of the functions of the office of Speaker during the absence of the Speaker, he has conducted himself with dignity and impartiality; and, upon more than one occasion, of a rather trying character, I observed him to use a great deal of tact.

Now, there has been a subject brought to the attention of the public of this country in connection with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Marcil). I refer to what is well known to every member of this House—the allusions that have been made to his methods of campaigning. I do not propose, this afternoon, to affirm or deny any statements which have been made in the press; I have not the evidence at my command which would enable me to do so. But, so far as the system itself is concerned, I say that the system of offering bribes to constituencies in this country is a vicious one, and that, so far as I am concerned, I lifted up my voice during the last parliament in favour of the prohibition by statute of such acts; and I hope some day to see this wrong righted in Canada by statute. But, so far as that is concerned, the whole subject will undoubtedly be discussed later on in this House from a very much wider and more comprehensive standpoint than would be possible to-day. I do not consider it fitting that I should say more on that subject at this moment.

It would perhaps be permitted to me to say, without in the slightest degree desiring to be disrespectful, or to be understood in any offensive sense, that the very judicial quality with which the Speaker of this House is invested would negative any idea in the mind of any one of us, and I am sure in the mind of the hon. gentleman himself, that the person filling such a position could be a suppliant for favours from the administration from day to day in respect of his constituency. I take that for granted. To take any other view would be derogatory to the dignity of parliament and would lead inevitably to the decadence of our parliamentary institutions. I trust that I shall be understood in these remarks as laying down a principle which ought not to be gainsaid by any hon. member of this House. And, having said so much, I dismiss that part of the subject with the assurance that the whole question, so far as it deserves discussion, will be brought forward before the end of this parliament. I have nothing further to say at this moment.

The motion being put to the House,

The Clerk of the House (Mr. T. B. Flint) declared the motion carried in the affirmative, nemine contradicente, and Charles Marcil, Esquire, member for the electoral division of Bonaventure, duly elected to the Chair of the House.

Mr. Marcil was conducted from his seat in the House to the Speaker's chair by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Hon. Wm. Paterson.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Speaker-elect). I beg to tender to this House my sincere and hearty thanks for the high honour it has conferred upon me by electing me as its Speaker. It will be my pleasure, as well as my duty, to endeavour to deserve that high honour by dealing with all questions which come before me in my official character with firmness and impartiality. I am fully sensible of my unfitness for the position, but I rely confidently upon the co-operation of hon. members on both sides of the House to assist me in maintaining our rules and regulations, in vindicating our rights and privileges, and in preserving the freedom and dignity of debate, according to ancient usages.

(Translation.) I beg to tender to this House my most sincere thanks for the high honour it has conferred upon me by electing me to the high office of Speaker.

It is my most ardent wish to deserve that high mark of confidence by discharging with fairness and impartiality the duties of the office entrusted to me.

I rely confidently on your co-operation to assist me in my endeavours to uphold our rights and privileges and also in safeguarding the freedom and the dignity of our debates, according to our established rules and parliamentary traditions.

This House could have called to the Speaker's Chair a member more deserving of such a favour.

I am fully confident, however, that my colleagues will continue to favour me, as in the past, with their kind co-operation and allow me to rely on their indulgence.

The Sergeant at Arms then placed the Mace on the Table of the House.

ADJOURNMENT—INQUIRIES FOR PAPERS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the House adjourns, might I inquire of the Prime Minister whether or not the report of Mr. Justice Cassels in respect of the matters entrusted to him by order in council during last session has been presented? I would like also to inquire what is the cause of the delay in the printing and distribution

of the second instalment of evidence taken before Mr. Justice Cassels? The first instalment of that evidence was received early in October last in printed form. The resolution passed by this House last session provided that the evidence should be printed from day to day for the use of the members, but we have not received a second instalment of the evidence. I have made inquiry of the proper officers, but I cannot obtain any very satisfactory explanation except that the delay is due to some difficulty in the Printing Bureau. I would like to know when it is anticipated the balance of the evidence will be placed before the House in printed form.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am informed that the report of Mr. Justice Cassels has not yet been received, but is expected either to-morrow or the day after. I have this information only at second-hand, but I believe it can be relied upon. I shall have to make inquires before I can satisfy my hon. friend as to why the balance of the evidence has not been printed. I understand that no evidence has been printed since the early part of October. It so happened that in October we were all so busy that we would not have had time to read that evidence, but that busy time is now over and we will be able to read it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That busy time was over some weeks ago. When do the government propose to lay on the table of the House the treaties of which we have had some notice through the public press? Have those treaties been signed and will they be presented at an early date?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. All treaties which have been signed, except the last treaty, were laid before the House last session, I think in July. The last treaty which has been signed, relating to the international waters, will be laid before the House as soon as we have received an official copy.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Only one treaty has been signed recently?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Only one, with regard to the boundary waters.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 3.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

THURSDAY, January 21, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a communication from the secretary of His Excellency the Governor General, as follows:

Ottawa, January 20, 1909.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber to formally open the session of the Dominion Parliament on Thursday the 21st instant at three o'clock p.m.

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

The Honourable
The Speaker of the House of Commons.

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

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

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

Then the Hon. CHARLES MARCIL, Speaker-elect, said:

May it please Your Excellency:

The House of Commons has elected me their Speaker though I am but little able to fulfil the important duties thus assigned to me. If, in the performance of those duties, I should at any time fall into error, I pray that the fault may be imputed to me, and not to the Commons, whose servant I am, and who, through me, the better to enable them to discharge their duty to their King and country, humbly claim all their undoubted rights and privileges, especially that they may have freedom of speech in their debates, access to your Excellency's person at all seasonable times, and that their proceedings may receive from Your Excellency the most favourable consideration.

The Hon. the Speaker of the Senate then said:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded by His Excellency the Governor General to declare to you that he freely confides in the duty and attachment of the House of Commons to His Majesty's person and government, and, not doubting that their proceedings will be conducted with wisdom, temper and prudence, he grants and upon all occasions will recognize and allow their constitutional privileges.

I am commanded also to assure you that the Commons shall have ready access to His Excellency upon all seasonable occasions, and that their proceedings, as well as your words and actions, will constantly receive from him the most favourable construction.

Then His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to open parliament by a speech from the Throne.

And the House being returned to the Commons Chamber:

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to state that the House, having attended on

His Excellency the Governor General in the Senate Chamber, I informed His Excellency that the choice of Speaker had fallen on me, and, in your names, and on your behalf, I made the usual claim for your privileges, which His Excellency was pleased to confirm to you.

FIRST READING.

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

THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

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

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

In welcoming you to the performance of your duties at the first Session of a new Parliament, I desire to acknowledge with devout thankfulness the abundant harvest with which Divine Providence has again blessed us.

The Quebec Tercentenary festivities in July, which were honoured by the gracious presence of His Royal Highness The Prince of Wales, as representing His Majesty, marked an epoch in the history of the Dominion. The generous support given to this National Celebration by the Federal Parliament and Provincial Legislatures, and by the peoples of Canada, of the other Dominions and of the United Kingdom, emphasized the community of sympathy which binds the various parts of the British Empire to each other, and to the Throne and Person of His Majesty the King. The presence of representatives from the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Newfoundland, and from the great and friendly Republics of France and the United States, with the ships of war of the three nations, served not only to add lustre to the occasion, but to provide an assurance of increasing amity and peace.

I have much pleasure in announcing that a Treaty relating to the Great Lakes and other International Waterways has been agreed upon between His Majesty and the Government of the United States of America and is now awaiting ratification. Both countries are to be congratulated on having arrived at an amicable settlement which I trust will remove during the lifetime of the Treaty many vexed questions from the field of controversy. The Treaty and papers relating thereto will be laid before you in due course.

A little more than a year ago, the whole civilized world entered into a period of commercial, industrial and financial depression, which may not yet have completely spent its force; signs there are, however, that it is gradually passing away. Whilst it is hardly disputable that owing to the abundance and elasticity of her resources Canada has suffered less than other nations, this depression has seriously affected our trade, producing an appreciable shrinkage in the public revenue, and calling for exceptional caution in the administration of our national affairs.

The rapid settlement of the new provinces calls for new lines of transportation. The construction of the Transcontinental Railway has been vigorously pressed forward during the last year. The line was open for the carrying of the crops from Winnipeg to the Battle river, a distance of 675 miles.

Exploratory surveys for a railway from the western wheat fields to Hudson's bay are being pushed energetically. Four parties have been at work since August last. Upon their report it will be possible to reach a decision as to both the route to be followed and the approximate cost. The provision of the Dominion Lands Act of last session for the sale of pre-emptions and purchased homesteads has created a new source of revenue that will be sufficient to bear the cost of the railway to Hudson's bay without burdening the ordinary revenue. From September 1, when the Act came into force, until January 1, sales of pre-emptions and purchased homesteads have amounted to over two million acres, all subject to homestead settlement conditions.

The total volume of immigration has not reached the high figure of previous years, but the number of those seeking homes on our unoccupied lands has been fully maintained during the last season, and, owing to the ever closer supervision of the immigration branch of the public service, the character of these new inhabitants of Canada seems to be of the highest, and promises no small addition to the wealth of the country.

The government of the United Kingdom having expressed its willingness to include a representative of Canada among its delegates to the conference, held at Shanghai, to investigate the opium trade, my Government has been pleased to welcome an offer so significant of Canada's growing importance, and on its recommendation the government of the United Kingdom has accordingly appointed a member of the Dominion Parliament to be a member of the commission.

Representatives of Canada participated lately in the permanent establishment and organization of the International Institute of Agriculture, with its headquarters at Rome, an event of interest to our country in whose economic system agriculture plays so great a part. It is gratifying to note that among the forty-eight States adhering to the Institute recognition of Canada's agricultural importance was shown by election of our representatives to some of the highest offices of the Institute.

The appalling calamity which has befallen Sicily and Southern Italy and caused a total destruction of life and property absolutely unprecedented and unequalled in the long series of historic disasters, has induced my government to offer assistance for the immediate relief of the hundreds of thousands of sufferers who were helpless against famine and all its consequent horrors. I confidently hope that you will approve its action.

In pursuance of an announcement made during the concluding session of last parliament, a commission was appointed to examine the various lines of railway connected with the Intercolonial Railway and which might become valuable feeders thereto. The report of this commission has been received and will be placed before you.

The commissioner appointed for investigating the conduct of officers in the Department of Marine and Fisheries has concluded his labour, but has not yet reported. His report, however, is expected at an early date and when received will be placed in your hands.

A measure will be submitted to you, based upon similar legislation enacted in 1906 by the parliament of the United Kingdom, aiming at the repression of the payment of secret commissions and gratuities both in public and private business.

You will be asked to consider measures relative to insurance, the civil service, immigration, naturalization and other subjects.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

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

The estimates for the coming year will be submitted at an early date; they have been prepared with a due regard for economy consistent with the requirements of the public service.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I pray the Divine Providence that it may guide your deliberations, and that they may tend to a further increase in the prosperity of our country and the well-being of our people.

Mr SPEAKER.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

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

He said: It was our intention to proceed to-morrow with the speech, but several members have suggested to me that Monday would be preferable. We are in the hands of the House and if there is no objection I will say Monday.

Mr. FOSTER. Why delay?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Very good—to-morrow.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

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

Report of the Auditor General for fiscal year ended March 31, 1908, Vols. 1 and 3; Public Accounts for the year ended March 31, 1908; Trade and Navigation returns for the year ended March 31, 1908; Report of the Department of Inland Revenue for the year ended March 31, 1908, part 1, relating to excise; Report of the Department Inland Revenue for the year ended March 31, 1908, relating to the Inspection of Weights and Measures; Report of the Minister of Justice for the year ended March 31, 1908.—Mr. Paterson.

Report of the Minister of Agriculture for the year ended March 31, 1908, first appendix thereto, being report of the Dairy and Cold Storage Commission.—Mr. Fisher.

Report of the Postmaster General for the year ended March 31, 1908; Report of the Department of Labour for the year ended March 31, 1908.—Mr. Lemieux.

ADJOURNMENT—GRAND TRUNK HOTEL SITE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax.) Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns I would

like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he would be good enough to give to the House at some early opportunity, if he cannot do so to-day, information as to the present condition of the negotiations, if there be any negotiations, for the erection of an hotel on a portion of the grounds of parliament. The Prime Minister will recollect that an order in council was passed some weeks before the commencement of last session by which a portion of Major's Hill park was proposed to be conveyed to the Grand Trunk Railway Company for the purpose of the erection of an hotel thereupon. The matter seemed to be of some urgency because the consent of parliament was not asked in the first instance and a Bill had to be passed afterwards for the purpose of ratifying what the government had done. According to the present conditions there would not seem to have been any great urgency for dealing with the matter before parliament assembled, because, so far as I can see, the only thing since accomplished has been the construction of a fence, no doubt of a very artistic and beautiful design on the land. I presume that is not intended as the hotel. If it were, I should be inclined to suggest that it should at least be roofed in. I most sincerely hope there will never be a hotel erected there, but inasmuch as the matter was regarded as one of urgency, we should have some explanation why that particular step was taken as nothing whatever has been done since. I am not aware that the conveyance of the property has ever been laid on the table. If any such conveyance has been made, it should be laid on the table at the earliest possible moment together with a statement of all the conditions, if any, imposed by the government on the corporation, whether in the terms of the conveyance itself or otherwise, so that the House should be made acquainted at the earliest possible moment with the actual conditions as the matter now stands.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think I can gratify the curiosity of my hon. friend. Nothing has been done since last session when the Bill was passed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Where, then, was the urgency?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It was the need of a hotel.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yet nothing has been done.

THE MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE.

Mr. FOSTER. Is my right hon. friend in a position to give us any information as to when the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) is likely to take his seat in the House?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. On this point I cannot gratify the curiosity of my hon. friend. He is much more inquisitive than his neighbour and upon a more delicate subject. The Minister of Inland Revenue has had a misfortune which has happened to other members of former governments to which I think my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is not a stranger. My hon. friend is not as sympathetic as he should be.

Mr. FOSTER. One more question. Would my right hon. friend be able at all to satisfy the laudable curiosity of the House as to whether the commercial negotiations in that regard are progressing favourably?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know what my hon. friend means. If he means anything which is in his line of thought, it is not in our line of thought at all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. More likely in your line of action.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 4 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, January 22, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

RESIGNATION OF WILLIAM SLOAN, ESQ., M.P.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from William Sloan, Esq., his resignation as member for the Electoral District of Comox-Atlin. I accordingly issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said Electoral District.

REPORTS PRESENTED,.

Final Report of the Survey of the Georgian Bay Ship Canal, with plans, estimates of cost and 56 plates.—Hon. Wm. Pugsley.

The report was ordered to be printed forthwith.

Annual Report of the Department of Indian Affairs for 1907-8.—Hon. Frank Oliver.

Report of the investigation by Mr. Justice Cassels concerning the Department of Marine and Fisheries.—Hon. L. P. Brodeur.

The report was ordered to be printed forthwith.

Report of the Secretary of State for 1907; also, Civil Service List of Canada for 1908.—Hon. Chas. Murphy.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. WM. F. TODD (Charlotte, N.B.). Mr. Speaker, in rising to move the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne, I think it is befitting in me first to ask for the time-honoured indulgence of this House to a new member. I have heard, since I have arrived here, of the kind courtesy and consideration which is always extended to new members who address this House for the first time, and I trust that I may receive to-day from both sides of the House consideration and patience in the few remarks that I have to make. I am deeply conscious of the honour that has been conferred upon me and the county that I have the pleasure to represent in moving this address, and I hope that I shall make a speech that will be satisfactory to the members of this side of the House at least; for I feel that I come here to take my part as one of the young workers of this House. My desire is, Mr. Speaker, that in all my course in this House, I shall always bear with me the feeling that I have ever been courteous and gentlemanly to my fellow-members on both sides. I have come here to take part with my friends on the Government side in endeavouring to solve the great problems that will come up in our effort to make of this Canada of ours such a nation as she is destined to be, and to march forward with them in that progress as a nation which we and those who follow us during the years of the century to come, have to undertake.

The first clause in the speech from the Throne refers to the abundant harvest which a kind Providence has granted us. Mr. Speaker, a kind Providence will always grant us a bountiful harvest, because the agricultural industry of this country, as of any large country, is the one that represents the largest population and the largest business interest in the country. It is the only creative industry that Canada or any other country possesses, because, as we are well aware, while the manufacturing industries transform raw materials into the manufactured products, there is in agriculture that divine impress upon the soil which nourishes the seed from which grows the immense crops which are so gratifying to us, and which add so much to the wealth of the country.

In giving agriculture the first place among our national interests, we are only following the natural order and giving to that great industry the rank to which it is entitled. Among our great interests that of agriculture comes first in importance, the lumbering second, then the mining and then the fisheries. When I speak of agriculture as the only creative industry, what other industry, I would ask, is there which as in agriculture out of itself, out of the mere seed that is put in the ground and out of the four elements added to the soil, gives a return of ten for one? When we consider that ninety-three per cent of what goes into these crops is given by the air and the sun, when we consider that the immense power thus given, is estimated at 2,000 horse-power per acre, and when we consider further that the creative power thus given, equal to ninety-three parts out of the hundred, will ever be at our hands to furnish those countless crops, we can well say that Canada may look to the reaping of countless wealth from the cultivation of her soil. It is estimated that we have in the Northwest Territories 171,000,000 acres well adapted for agriculture, and, according to the reports during the past year, nearly 100,000,000 bushels of wheat were grown in the Dominion, most of it in the western country. The great wealth which is in store for this Dominion we know will spring in a great measure from the virgin soil of the west. It is by means of the wealth which we expect to derive from these western prairie lands that we hope to enlarge our transportation facilities and thus give impetus to all our commercial interests. When we consider that the great west of Canada, with a population estimated at 6,500,000 for the whole Dominion, raised nearly one hundred million bushels of wheat last year, we can well feel proud and assured of our future. The great republic to the south, with its population of 90,000,000, and which claims to be the richest country under the sun, only raised last year a crop of 660,000,000 bushels, small in comparison with ours, when we consider the difference in population. With her soil in the western states largely depleted, her farmers are travelling over to our country and taking up lands in our territory, which is the best tribute possible to our superiority as a storehouse of agricultural wealth.

I come from the far east, from a country bordering upon the sea, I come from New Brunswick, where we have also rich farming lands, still we know that the immigrants from the old world are more likely to be attracted by these western prairie lands, which have lain fallow for centuries, and which will give the farmer the maximum of profit without subjecting him to the expense of adding to that soil the fertilizers which are found necessary in the east. But no doubt the day will come when the immigrants from the mother country will see in the eastern provinces lands which, scientifically cultivated, will give a handsome return on the investment besides enjoying the advantages of being nearer the central market and having cheaper transportation facilities. From the

agricultural production of this country comes a large part of the revenue which we enjoy, through our tariff, the larger part of that revenue is no doubt due to the immense wheat production of the west, and it is only due to the agricultural interests that we should furnish, out of that revenue, the needed railway and water facilities to get their crops to the markets of the world.

The next paragraph in the speech has reference to the Quebec Tercentenary. I had not the pleasure of visiting during that celebration that historic city which, by the years of her great struggles has given us zest to work for the building up of this empire. I refer to this subject with special interest because in my own province, and close to my own home, in the summer of 1603, in July—the very month in which the Quebec celebration took place—Champlain with some of his followers from old France sailed up our river, named by them, and still called the St. Croix, to the island of St. Croix, where they essayed to establish the new France. In this hope they settled upon that island in our river, believing that to that settlement they could bring many from old France to join with them in building up France's new empire in the west. I am sorry to say, Mr. Speaker, though, in the end, it has resulted in that which is a matter of pride to your race and of gain to lower Canada, that the struggles of these colonists did not win success. Their ships sailed back, leaving seventy-nine of these people on the island of St. Croix, people who had no idea of the winter and its frightful intensity. In the hardship of that winter and the struggles against their surroundings, thirty-five of these French settlers died and were buried on that island of St. Croix, and twenty others nearly met their death. When the ships came back next summer with supplies for the little colony, the remnant of the colonists hailed them with delight. Those that were living were put aboard the vessels and were carried away from this island which since then has been largely washed away. And now it is our pride and glory that, four years later, this same intrepid discoverer, Champlain, sailed up the St. Lawrence river and on the third of July founded the historic city of Quebec. It is with pleasure that we read the account of the splendid celebration of the three hundredth anniversary of that event, attended by the representatives of so many nations and reenacting the trials, the war, the struggles of the early days in pageants that were watched with delight by vast assemblages of people. It is with pride we realize that, after three hundred years, this strong race that established the gateway of its new empire at the mouth of the St. Lawrence, and that was so long hostile to the British race, showed clearly in these celebrations their loyalty to the British Crown, showed that they were ready to march forward shoulder to shoulder with the English-speaking race in the upbuilding of this new nation.

Another subject mentioned in the speech from the Throne is the arrangement of a treaty concerning the great lakes and international waterways. In a part of that treaty, we of my own county are especially interested. I can only say that it is pleasant to know that Canada, so young as she is, has now the right to make treaties, and that the friction which has existed between the United States and Canada over these fishery matters is now about to be cleared away. We have every reason to hope that, in relation to our immense fisheries, covering in the great lakes 140,000 miles, and in the workable fisheries of the coast 200,000 miles, the frictions and troubles that have existed in the past will be wiped away and that this treaty will settle these matters at least for a number of years to come.

We are also reminded by the speech from the Throne of the commercial, industrial and financial depression which has existed. On all sides in the American community near to which I live, it has been a subject of wonder that during the great financial depression which so disastrously affected the United States, Canada was so little affected. They see that Canada's resources and her banking system are such that, in the eyes of the world at large, Canada seemed hardly to feel this crisis. I believe, as is intimated in the speech from the Throne, that we have now tided over the worst of the financial depression and that, through bountiful crops and through the prosperity of our manufacturers, we shall now see the early return of financial prosperity.

The transportation question, which is also referered to in the speech, is a burning question. And, as I said a moment or two ago, our contribution to the settling of these problems depends upon our revenue. While, as I have already said, the agricultural interests, lumbering and the fisheries do not need any tariff, yet, if in times of prosperity the people of these interests see fit to make large contributions to the treasury of this country, I feel sure that when prosperity returns this government will spend for the benefit of these interests the sums necessary for obtaining for them larger markets. Our fishermen need more protection through harbour lights, lighthouses, breakwaters and wharfs. And I feel confident that, as rapidly as possible, appropriations will be given for these works, and that this House will approve expenditures for the benefit of our great industries.

There is a clause relating to immigration. It is with great pleasure that we read the official returns from the Depart-

ment of Immigration, and learn that there is coming into our further west, our middle west and portions of the east, so fine a class of settlers. Especially are we pleased to see so many coming in from the neighbouring republic, bringing with them the skill and knowledge they have acquired in the pursuit of agriculture in their own country, and the energy and means of their own which they will contribute to the development of the resources of this new country. Each settler brings with him a boundless faith in this new country of his adoption, and fairly realizes that he is making of Canada a competitor with all countries in the markets of the world, he is surprised to find when he comes here natural resources of a richness that he never dreamed of in his own country.

Reference is also made in the address to the disastrous earthquake which recently occurred in Sicily and Southern Italy; and I am sure that all Canadians were glad to hear that the government had made so generous a grant to the sufferers from that great calamity. We do not know why such things happen, we do not know what may be the inscrutable designs of divine Providence in permitting such disasters to take place; we only know and are happy to see that this great calamity has evoked feelings of sympathy from all nations, which are a credit to human nature itself. Not only Canada but many other countries have contributed many thousands of dollars for the relief of the sufferers from that earthquake.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a great pleasure to me to be able to join with hon. members on this side of the House in congratulating ourselves and the country on the magnificent heritage which we possess in this Canada of ours. You may call her My Lady of the Snows, if you will. Though now robed in white, she will soon be clothed in robes of emerald green and a little later clad in the golden vestments of a bounteous harvest. Certainly we have reason to be proud of this country; we are glad to feel, as I have said before, that we control the largest fisheries in the world; we have in our possession millions of acres of arable and fertile soil, and many other resources of wealth which can never be taken from us. We are already reaping the benefits of science in the various arts employed in the development of this country, and we feel how necessary it is that we should not fritter away our natural resources, but husband them to as full an extent as possible, in order to make of Canada as great and as wealthy a country as the republic to the south of us.

Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in moving that a humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to the speech from the Throne.

Mr. TODD.

Mr. JOSEPH P. TURCOTTE (Quebec County). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I wish to second the motion made by the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. F. Todd). My pleasure in doing so is further intensified at the though that in each case, has a county been wrested from Her Majesty's loyal oposition and added to the realm of this government.

The county of Charlotte, along the coast of the Atlantic, and bathed by that historical river St. Croix, the witness of Champlain's first attempt at colonization within our bounds, and that glorious county of Quebec, wherein lie our great battlefields and are enshrined the purest traditions of the Dominion's French province, have in that way both asserted their confidence in the liberal and progressive policy followed by our statesmen for the last twelve years. The trend of popular feeling thus evidenced throughout the country regardless of local, religious or national differences, is sure proof that the government are working in the interest of the country at large.

It is now incumbent upon us, Mr. Speaker, to consider the speech from the Throne, and to voice the feeling of the House in regard to it. I am in sympathy with the hon. member for Charlotte when he suggests that we should extend our thanks to His Excellency for the courtesy shown towards the House, and at the same time our congratulations regarding the general policy followed by his government. Judging from what has taken place at our first sitting, it would seem to me that such was the unanimous feeling of the House.

It was not without some misgivings that I came to take my seat in this House, having surmised from what appeared in the papers, that this was a place for everlasting discussions and downright obstruction. Those misgivings no longer exist. At the opening of the session, I heard from the mouth of the Prime Minister, a proposal of the greatest import: we were called upon to decide who should preside over the debates in this House as long as this parliament lasts. The proposal was made, the House agreed to it without discussion, and to-day we have at our head a man of experience, whose past services are the best assurance that the dignity of this House will be duly safeguarded. I am thus led to believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is customary with the government to introduce none but commendable measures. The opposition being deprived thereby of all occasion for criticism. In fact, it would have been impossible to open this first session of parliament under more auspicious circumstances.

Now, if we pass on to a consideration of the speech from the Throne, I may say it appears to me as comprising two parts quite distinct from one another. The first shows how friendly is the intercourse between the representative of the Crown and the representatives of the people. Such

good nature evidenced by the head of the executive is not the mere outcome of parliamentary usage. We are aware that His Excellency is in sympathy with the Canadian people, a fresh proof of which is to be found in the celebration of the Quebec tercentenary, to which His Excellency makes a telling reference in the speech from the Throne.

In listening to the utterances of the representative of the Crown, the splendours of the tercentenary celebration were vividly brought back to our minds. Old Quebec was seen once more amidst fairylike surroundings ; the august heir of our sovereign resting in yonder citadel, under the protection of the guns ; surrounding him, the official representatives of the various provinces of the Dominion, besides those of sister colonies and of several powerful nations ; friendly fleets flying over the expanse of the finest port in the world, the colours of Great Britain, of France, of the United States, and covering the fields, crowds of people who had hastened from all parts of Canada and foreign countries to pay homage to the immortal founder of the Canadian nation.

As we all know, His Excellency was, within constitutional bounds, the leading and inspiring mind of that national celebration. To my mind, we should be mindful of it, and grateful for it, and that part of the speech from the Throne is worthy of our full approval.

The second part has reference to measures which are submitted to us. I do not propose pointing them out seriatim. On the whole, they give the impression that the diplomatic work of the government is constantly expanding. It was diplomacy, and diplomacy of a high class, which inspired that tercentenary celebration, the result being to cause the axis of the British empire to oscillate, as it were, and to make us believe that the entente cordiale between two great nations must in truth be finally concluded on the very battlefields which have been the witnesses of their heroic and glorious deeds. It was also the part of diplomacy to negotiate, through the intervention of our ministers, that treaty of commerce with France, which will soon be, let us hope so, an accomplished fact. It was diplomacy again, which prompted that extraordinary peace-making mission to Japan, a mission which put in such strong light the great capabilities of one of the youngest and most brilliant members of this government. It was diplomacy also which brought about the official participation of the Canadian government in the establishment of a permanent international bureau of agriculture, one of our ministers, the representative of our farming community being elected to fill one of the highest offices on the board of management. There are also diplomatic doings in prospect with a view to the settlement of great international differences having reference to our business intercourse with the United States, China, Germany, Australia, the West Indies, &c. It seems as though Canada, under its present government, and owing to its geographical position and to its marvellous development, were bound to become an important factor in the world's political activity.

Surely, it would be incongruous on our part, as members of the House of Commons and representatives of the people, to complain of a state of things which is of a nature to enhance the reputation and prosperity of our country. We should congratulate on that account His Excellency and the government. Neither should we stop at that, for our mandate imposes certain duties upon us, and particularly that of putting into shape and enacting governmental measures and of voting the sums required for the carrying out of such measures.

The outcome of the general elections has shown that the people have confidence in the administration. We are here as representatives of the people to see to it that their mandate is complied with.

The programme which is submitted to us contains nothing that is not a continuation or a conformation of the policy followed by the administration since 1896. The government are concerning themselves more and more with the task of increasing and extending the network of our railway system. They are carrying on with economy and caution, but at the same time with a comprehensive grasp of the whole question, the building of public works considered of interest to the country as a whole. I understand that the improvement of the port of Quebec, which towards the north is bounded in part by the verdant shores of my own county, will be one of the matters to be submitted to the judgment of this House.

As regards that gigantic undertaking, the National Transcontinental railway, it is with pleasure that we learn of its early completion. The work is being pushed through with tremendous activity. The whole line is now under contract, and we have been given to understand that by the time the next crop is harvested, Alberta wheat may be shipped by the new route, from Edmonton to Winnipeg, and thence to the Great Lakes. That means a closer bond between the provinces, and greater wealth for the country as a whole, pending the time when it will be the shortest route from ocean to ocean, and the most direct means of communication between Europe and the Far East, in accordance with the hopes conceived in early times by the discoverer of America and the founder of Quebec.

I remember having, twenty years ago, in 1889, visited the Paris world's fair, and having gone through the building which contained an immense globe representing our

planet reduced a million times. On my own account, I discovered thereon America, and within America, the Dominion of Canada, and within Canada, the province of Quebec. But it was only with a good deal of difficulty that I succeeded in finding within the limits of the latter province, the city of Quebec, which was hidden under a ring of gold encircling the whole of Canada, and which, according to charts hanging on the wall, represented the ideal short route between Europe and Asia. Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian, lost as he was in the great city of Paris, felt his heart throb at that moment, and was dreaming of things which will shortly have come to pass. Such was also the dream of the statesman who, to-day, has in his hands the future of the Canadian nation and whom we have the honour to have as our leader in this House. Thanks to him and to his government, steel rails will soon have taken the place of the golden ring, and that painful catastrophe, the wreck of the Quebec bridge, will cause delay, but not a break in the carrying out of the undertaking. We have, to strengthen us in that belief, the stand taken by the government heretofore; we have also the solemn pledge given, on behalf of his party, by the hon. leader of the opposition, the very night that unspeakable catastrophe occurred. 'The Quebec bridge,' did he say, 'must and shall be rebuilt.' It was a compliment paid, unwillingly perhaps, but truthfully, to the grand liberal policy; it was also a wish worthy of a great patriot.

All these circumstances, the outcome of the general elections, your unanimous choice, Sir, as Speaker, of this House, the conciliatory stand taken by the hon. leader of the opposition, all these circumstances, I say are indications that the request of the hon. Prime Minister ('Allow me to complete my work') having been agreed to by the people, will presently be approved of by parliament.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I desire to extend my congratulations to both the mover and seconder of the address on the very satisfactory manner in which they have discharged the duties imposed upon them. They have gone with great particularity into various paragraphs of the speech which has been delivered to us by His Excellency. I do not propose to go into those paragraphs in the same detail or with equal thoroughness; nor do I find very much in the remarks of either hon. gentleman which calls for any criticism from myself. The hon. member for Quebec county (Mr. J. P. Turcotte), who spoke, as all our fellow countrymen of the French race do speak, with very great eloquence, referred to the confidence which has been again reposed in this administration by the people of the country. It might perhaps be not amiss to call attention to the fact that if a system of proportional representation, such as is being advocated in very high quarters in Great Britain at the present time and which is practised, I believe, in some countries, had been adopted in Canada, the government would have rejoiced in a majority of less than 5, or to be exact 4·4. After the election of the Speaker they would have been able to command the confidence of the House and the country by a majority of 3·4.

My right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) declared some years ago that there had been an infamous gerrymander in the province of Ontario, for which the preceding Conservative administration wa reponsible. On that occasion he demonstrated very much to his own satisfaction, at least, that such was the case by taking two groups of constituencies in the province of Ontario. Each one of these groups had between 86,000 and 88,000 of a voting population. One group elected nineteen members more than the other group, and that was ample evidence for my right hon. friend and for all his followers, of course, that the conditions in Ontario at that time required radical and imperative amendment.

But, I would like to point out to him that the returns of the last general election indicate that a most infamous gerrymander has been perpetrated upon the Dominion of Canada by himself according to his own logic. I find that 563,547 votes elected 85 Conservative members and that 587,664 votes elected 133 Liberal members; in other words that each Conservative member of the House represents 6,630 of a voting population, that each Liberal member of the House represents 4,411 of a voting population, and that the average voting population for each member of the House, taking the whole vote, will be 5,280. I have no doubt that with that sense of justice which the right hon. gentleman undoubtedly possesses and which certainly he at all times is ready to claim, he will redress this evil, this injustice to the people of Canada and give us such a redistribution as will accomplish the results that should have been accomplished according to the standpoint which he took only a few years ago in this House.

But, in reply to certain statements which have been made not only by my hon. friend from Quebec county, but by the Liberal press of this country as to the expression of confidence which the government obtained from the electorate during the last contest, I would like to point out one significant fact; that is that if the government has received the confidence and endorsation of the country, my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) has tenfold more received the endorsation of the electorate. Elected in the maritime provinces by a majority of 1,400, three

times the majority which the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) was able to command, there is a situation before this country generally and before the Prime Minister which demands attention. We know that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works was the counsel of the hon. member for Westmoreland upon a memorable occasion to which I will not further allude, and I would ask him now to redress the injury of his much wronged client, to give up his portfolio, to restore the hon. member for Westmoreland to his own and to do that which would only be fair and right if we are to conclude that the verdict of the electorate has established that confidence in the government which has been claimed by the Liberal press and by hon. gentlemen.

Now, I do not desire to go very much over the issues of the late campaign, but there is one matter upon which I do propose to say a word, and only a word, in justice to myself and to the Liberal-Conservative party of this country. I became aware on the 21st day of October, when I landed in the county of Pictou from the province of Prince Edward Island, from some information given to me by my friends in that county, that a certain pamphlet was being circulated by the Liberal organization in the county of Pictou among the electors of the county of a certain religious belief. I had not even seen the original of the pamphlet before, I had not known that it had been put by any person into pamphlet form, but upon my arrival on the next day, the 22nd of October, in the city of Halifax, or within twenty-four hours after my arrival, I learned that a despatch had been sent from certain Liberal quarters in the city of Halifax to certain Liberal journals in the city of Montreal that that pamphlet had made its appearance in the city of Halifax contemporaneously with my arrival in that city. The innuendo, to use the words of my right hon. friend on another occasion, was unmistakable. I learned more about the distribution of that pamphlet afterwards and I have in my hand a specimen copy to which I will venture to refer at least to the extent of pointing out the use of this pamphlet which was made in some parts of the maritime provinces and to the statement made in regard to it by the Liberal organization in the province of Prince Edward Island. I have here, in my hand, one of these pamphlets containing in connection with it this fly-leaf. I have not read it, but I take it for granted that the pamphlet is reproduced here as it originally appeared in a certain newspaper in the province of Ontario. Attached to it is this fly-leaf:

This is a sample of the literature circulated by the Conservative party in Orange and Protestant settlements. Sir Wilfrid Laurier is a Catholic leader and because he is a Catholic must be defeated so says this pamphlet.

Some Hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (reading):

Will you stand for this? Read and decide for yourself.

I want to say to those gentlemen who have cried, hear, hear——

Some Hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That the statement that that was circulated by the Conservative party or by any Conservative organization is an absolute, a malicious and a deliberate falsehood. That is all I have to say about it, and if any hon. gentleman has any information to the contrary I can only say that I have made the most careful inquiry and I cannot find that that pamphlet was ever circulated in any constituency in Canada by the Conservative party or by any Conservative organization. In my own county of Halifax I believe that pamphlet wrought an effect exactly the opposite of that which was intended.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Because although the pamphlet was distributed by the Liberal organization in certain portions of the country where it was hoped it would have a certain effect, I believe that I obtained in the last election in the county of Halifax a larger number of the votes of the Roman Catholic electorate than on any previous occasion.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Would my hon. friend inform me whether he knows that that pamphlet was circulated by Conservatives who did not happen to belong to the official Conservative organization in the county ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If any such thing took place I never heard of it, and with all resepect to my hon. friend I may say that I have no reason to believe and do not believe that it was circulated by the Conservative organization of the county or by any person having any official connection with the Conservative party.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I have in my possession copies of the pamphlet entitled 'The Duty of the Hour' circulated in the county of Pictou by Conservatives in that county.

Mr. CARVEL. How many did you circulate ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What individual Conservatives may have done I do not know. I shall read again this fly-leaf in order that its language may be emphasized and that the false and misleading character of the statement made may again attract the attention of the House :

This is a sample of the literature circulated by the Conservative party in Orange and Protestant settlements.

Mr. DEVLIN. That is correct.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My friend from Wright (Mr. Devlin) is usually wrong, so I think we may take it for granted that he does not depart from his accustomed usage on this occasion.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. member stated that this was published in a newspaper in Ontario. Would he be good enough to give the name of the paper ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted for once to take upon myself your functions and to appoint the hon. member a committee of one to give that information to the House.

I desire at this early stage in the session to deal briefly with certain matters of comment in the press of the country during recent weeks respecting the length of sessions of parliament. I have heard and read a great deal of criticism upon the length of sessions, and I am not disposed to disagree that the sessions have some times been perhaps unduly long. It may be that there is a certain misapprehension in the minds of the public that a session is expensive in proportion to its length. As a matter of fact the indemnity of members of the Senate and House of Commons and the salaries of permanent officials of the House do not increase with the length of the session and therefore, so far as they are concerned, the expense to the public is precisely the same whether the session be long or short. Of course in other respects the expense is increased by a lengthy session.

I desire to again point out to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in no censorious or partisan spirit, who I think will agree in my statement, that the date at which a government brings down its important measures in any session has a great deal to do with the length of that session, and I pause to express the very sincere hope that this session, called as it is on a very late day, will find the government prepared and that we will have all important government measures down at a very early date.

Let us look at the sessions of the last five years. The session of 1903 opened on the 12th of March and closed on October 23. The Bill respecting the National Transcontinental Railway was introduced on July 30, after the House had been in session 141 days ; the necessary resolution was not moved until the 11th of August after the session had lasted 153 days. The Railway Subsidies were not brought down until October 10, when the House had been in session 212 days and they were not moved until October 22, when the House had been in session 224 days. A very important measure respecting the Quebec bridge was brought to the attention of the House for the first time on October 21, when the House had been in session 223 days, and moved on October 22, when the House had been in session 224 days.

With regard to these measures and to all the others which I shall venture to bring to the attention of the House, the government is face to face with one of two alternatives, either that they were not ready with these measures and purposely held them back in order that discussion might be restricted in respect to some of them at least, or that the session was not too long for the necessary measures which the government thought it was its duty to bring before the attention of parliament in the interests of the country.

In 1904 the session opened on the 10th of March and closed on August 10. Notice was given of the Customs Act on June 28, after the House had been in session 110 days and the Bill was moved on August 8, after the House had been in session 151 days. The Railway Subsidies were moved on August 8, when the House had been in session 151 days.

In 1905 the session opened on January 11 and closed July 20. The Autonomy Bills were given their first reading on February 21. The House had then been in session 41 days. The second reading of one of these Bills was moved on March 22, when the House had been in session 70 days. The second reading of the other was moved on July 4, when the House had been in session 174 days. It would perhaps be unfair to criticise the late reading of the second of these measures as the whole subject was thoroughly threshed out in the debate on the first Bill.

The session of 1906 opened March 8 and closed July 13. The amendment to the Act respecting the National Transcontinental Railway received its first reading June 27. The House had then been in session 110 days. It was given its second reading on July 3 when the House had been in session 116 days. The railway subsidies were brought down on June 25, when the House had been in session 108 days and they were moved on the following day.

In 1907 the session opened on the 2nd of November and closed on the 26th of April. The railway subsidies were brought down on the 19th of April ; the House had then been in session 148 days. They were moved on the 25th of April, when the House had been in session 154 days. The bounties on iron and steel were brought down on the 5th of April, when the House had been in session 134 days. They were moved on the 23rd of April, when the House had been in session 152 days. The bounties on binder twine were brought down on the same dates. The Quebec Bridge and Railway Company loan was brought down on the 17th of April, 146 days after the House had opened, and it was moved on the 19th

of April, 148 days after the session had opened.

Then the session of 1908 opened on the 28th of November and closed on the 20th of July. The Bill to amend the Railway Act had its first reading on the 10th of March, when the House had been in session 102 days, and its second reading on the 16th of June, when the House had been in session 200 days. The Election Act had its first reading on the 9th of March, when the House had been in session 101 days, and its second reading on the 5th of May, when the House had been in session 158 days. The railway subsidies were brought down on the 15th of July, when the House had been in session 229 days, and were moved on the 16th of July, when the House had been 230 days in session. A very important resolution, regarded as such not only by the House, but by the country at large, respecting what is called the All-Red Line, was not moved by the right hon. gentleman until the 9th of July, when the House had been in session 223 days.

I point out to the House the great delays which occurred through the government's own remissness in bringing down important matters, and I express once more the sincere hope that this session will be an exception to the rule. Indeed, I for one would not be unwilling that some rule of the House should be adopted prescribing a date beyond which no railway subsidy, no estimate, no important government measure should be brought down unless with the consent of two-thirds or three-fourths of all the members of this House. It strikes me that that would tend to facilitate and expedite business and conduce as much as any other amendment to the rules to bring about shorter sessions; for I thoroughly agree that we should do everything possible, that would be fair to the government and to the members on this side of the House, to make the sessions shorter in future than they have been in the past; because there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that the length of our sessions has a certain tendency to keep out of public life men whom we should be glad to welcome to this parliament, and whose presence here would be of great advantage to both political parties and to the interests of the people of this country as a whole.

Now, there are one or two paragraphs of the Address to which I desire to devote a little attention. The hon. member for Quebec County has referred in very eloquent terms to the celebration of the tercentenary at Quebec. I had the good fortune to be present. I saw there very imposing pageants of great historic interest. I saw many thousands of the sturdy yeomanry of Canada pass in review before some of the greatest soldiers of the world. I saw official representatives of the great republic of France and the United States and many distinguished men from Great Britain, including the illustrious heir to the Throne, who were present to lend importance and dignity to the occasion. But what perhaps impressed me most of all in connection with that celebration was to see the two great nationalities of the country, the English and French races, vying with each other in generous emulation to make the celebration worthy of the occasion. And it was worthy of the occasion, an event which cannot fail to bring about a better spirit and feeling, if that be possible, between the two great national races of this country.

I thoroughly endorse the proposal of the government with respect to aid to the people of Italy in the very great calamity which has befallen them. This is only a tangible expression of that deep and heartfelt sympathy which is extended by all the people of Canada to the people of Italy in this awful calamity.

Coming for a moment to that portion of the speech which deals with trade conditions, I may be permitted to notice once more how extremely solicitous the government are to point out that the depression which has been felt in Canada during the past twelve or fifteen months is world wide. There is a marked distinction in the language of the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches when referring to prosperity or to depression. Let us look at what they said in 1906:

> On the opening of the third session of the tenth parliament of Canada I avail myself on the opportunity to offer you my congratulations on the unparalleled prosperity prevailing in all parts of the Dominion. The harvest has been abundant, and the trade with both British and foreign nations continues to expand in annually increasing volume, with every prospect of continued growth for many years to come.

There is a somewhat different song sung at the present time, and it is this:

> A little more than a year ago, the whole civilized world entered into a period of commercial, industrial and financial depression, which may not yet have completely spent its force; signs there are, however, that it is gradually passing away. Whilst it is hardly disputable that owing to the abundance and elasticity of her resources Canada has suffered less than other nations, this depression has seriously affected our trade, producing an appreciable shrinkage in the public revenue, and calling for exceptional caution in the administration of our national affairs.

You will observe that the prophecy put into the mouth of His Excellency the Governor General two years ago was that 'the trade with both British and foreign nations would continue to expand in annually increasing volume, with every prospect of continued growth for many years to come.' While the prosperity of Canada in 1906 was

apparently confined to Canada alone, the depression in 1908 is world wide. In other words, the prosperity is due apparently—by innuendo at least—to the presence of these gentlemen on the Treasury benches, while the depression is world wide, or, in other words, is due to Providence. Well, I trust that the depression will be of very short continuance, and it may have one very beneficial effect at least. The people of the country have entrusted the administration of affairs to these hon. gentlemen for three or four years more. The government needed some lesson in caution; they needed some pause in the wild career of extravagance, and perhaps worse than extravagance, upon which they had embarked, and they seem to have taken the lesson to heart to some extent, and the depression in Canada will be well worth the price it costs the country if it simply teaches these gentlemen more caution, more economy and better administration of public affairs in the few brief years during which they shall yet continue to sit on the Treasury benches.

I observe that our good old friend the Insurance Bill is to visit us once more. It is two years since the report of the Insurance Commission was received, and during that time the ills which were to be redressed have remained unredressed, and the patient people of this country have been suffering in silence. I trust that this important measure will be brought down at the very earliest opportunity, and that we shall know this session, as we did not know last session, what the mind of the government is with regard to their proposals, and that a measure in the public interest may be passed by parliament and placed on the statute book.

A measure is promised having for its object the repression of the payment of secret commissions and gratuities, both in public and private business. I assume, although I do not know, that this measure is based to some extent upon the evidence, not at present before the House, which has been taken before the Hon. Mr. Justice Cassels in the inquiry which he has been recently carrying on. I have no doubt that it is essential, but how far will it go? We raised the point last session that the inquiry was too restricted, that it dealt with only one paragraph of the report, concerning only one department, and we asked that the inquiry should go further and be extended to every one of the spending departments of the Government. Events have proved that point to have been well taken. There has been, I believe, a fairly thorough inquiry, so far as the officials are concerned; but when, according to the newspaper reports, the question was put to a certain witness whether or not the percentage of overcharge had any relation whatever to contributions to the political party now dominant, the objection was at once taken that no such inquiry came within the terms of the reference. I am not finding fault with the commissioner in that regard. He was restricted by the terms of his commission; but I say that when that question was put and the actual conditions revealed, the government should have taken the earliest possible opportunity to pass an order in council extending the scope of the inquiry and giving Mr. Justice Cassels the amplest opportunity of ascertaining whether or not the people of this country have been paying prices far in excess of those which should have been charged, and whether or not that was done in order to swell the political contributions to the Liberal election fund. The system followed is very plain and simple in the light of the revelations which have been made. The ordinary citizen put upon the patronage list will sell his goods to the government at a fair rate. He will perhaps seek to obtain from the Government a little higher price than from his ordinary customers, although I do not know that that will always be the case. But when he expects to be called upon for political contributions, when he knows that the same influence which procured for him the patronage of the Government will afterwards demand from him political contributions out of his private purse, what will be the natural course for him to pursue if he be a man not specially scrupulous in matters of this kind. He will no doubt put an increased price upon his goods and in that respect reap some personal advantage to himself, the coffers of the Liberal party will also reap an additional and perhaps greater advantage, and both profits will come out of the people of this country. It is they who, out of their taxes, will pay the shot. That is what it amounts to. How far will this Bill which we are promised go? If it should go so far as to make criminally responsible those who see these things being done under their very eyes, who know that this system is being carried on, we may perhaps have, out of this legislation, conditions better than those which have prevailed within recent years. I see no difference in principle, or rather lack of principle, between the system to which I have alluded and that of offering open bribes to a constituency by saying: 'If you support the party now in power, certain public works, which are justly your due, will be constructed in your riding; but if you see fit to support a candidate not in sympathy with the government, no such works will be carried on and you will not receive your due.' Further, I can see no difference between that and the bribery of a single elector, except that the bribery by wholesale is tenfold more iniquitous and demoralizing and

deserves tenfold more punishment at the hands of the law than ordinary bribery.

So far as the waterways treaties is concerned, we cannot discuss its terms until it is laid on the table. It is undoubtedly very important and I trust that the interests of Canada will be found adequately safeguarded when that instrument is before the House. We shall give any measure submitted by the government our fair consideration. I trust that the government measures will be brought down promptly, and that we may be able to complete the labours of this session at so early a date as to make some compensation for the long session of nearly eight months through which we passed just before the general election.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). My hon. friend who has just addressed the House (Mr. Borden), and who still keeps the seat which he has adorned for some years past, who has been confirmed in it, as I understand, by a recent expression of the confidence—the well-deserved confidence—of his friends, and in which he has been likewise confirmed by the expression of the non-confidence—the well deserved non-confidence of the people of Canada,—my honourable friend has paid a very grateful compliment to the mover and seconder of the Address, in which I altogether agree. My hon. friend did not travel very far, however, with those whose efforts he thus appreciated. He has something on his mind which came out almost immediately after he began, and that something had to do with the result of the late elections. These hon. members who were here last session—and there are still quite a number, though their ranks have been thinned—will remember that we were frequently taunted by our hon. friend opposite with having lost the confidence of the country and were challenged to appeal to the people. Well, we accepted that challenge, and my hon. friend is not satisfied with the result. He says that if we had a different system of representation, the numbers on both sides would be different, and he argues that we should in consequence bring down a new measure of redistribution. I have heard that before. The present system is, perhaps, not perfect, but at all events, it is the same today as in the old days. My hon. friend said that in the old days, we on this side, complained of the gerrymander. That is very true. We said we thought that the redistribution then was a gerrymander and we complained of it incessantly, in parliament and out of it, and especially during the elections; but I have yet to learn that in the last election there ever was a word of complaint from the hon. gentleman opposite as regards the redistribution.

My hon. friend also brought to the attention of the House the famous pamphlet called 'The Duty of the Hour', and he asked by whom it had been distributed. I am surprised he does not know and will tell him at once. It was distributed surreptitiously and clandestinely by the Conservative party and broadly and openly by the Liberal party. I have not had the pleasure of seeing a copy of the pamphlet, but I understand the injunction upon it was to pass it from neighbour to neighbour, not to do it publicly, but pass it quietly among the people, so that they can see all the iniquities of the Laurier government. When we found that, sir, as I understand, some of our friends openly got a supply of 'The Duty of the Hour' to be circulated, so that friends and foes might know what was contended and what were the appeals that were being made on behalf of hon. gentlemen opposite.

We come back, after accepting the challenge of our friends on the other side, very much as we were during the last session of the last parliament, so far as numerical strength is concerned. In the maritime provinces there has been a displacement of forces, but no change in numbers; we come back as strong from the maritime provinces as during last session. In Quebec, there has been hardly any change whatever. And in Ontario—Ontario upon which such hopes were centred, Ontario in which there was to have been a landslide—we are exactly as we were last session. There is, however, one part of the country where we suffered; we suffered in the west—in Manitoba and British Columbia. As to Manitoba, if I may give credence—as I do not doubt I may—to the statements made by my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton,) it is no credit at all to the opposition, and no discredit to the government that we have suffered in the province of Manitoba. My hon. friend who, generally, is well informed, who knows the province of Manitoba as well as any man can know it, whose vision is as clear as that of any man living, and who is generally accurate in his statements, has stated that, if the opposition gained the advantage over us in Manitoba, if there was a reversal of strength in the parties, it was due to the fact that the lists upon which the elections took place had been outrageously made up. I am bound to say that this statement has been denied, and stoutly denied. I am not here to pass any opinion at this moment on the statement or the counter-statement. The matter can be investigated to see whether or not the fact is as stated, and if it be as stated, what measures can be taken to prevent such things in the future. At present, I pass by the subject.

In British Columbia we suffered. We had the whole province on our side before the last election; this time, we come with diminished numbers. But I say without hesitation, and I say especially to my hon.

friend (R. L. Borden) opposite me, that the causes which led to our defeat in British Columbia are not to the discredit of the government, and still less are they to the credit of the opposition. The province of British Columbia is the only province in which the election was fought upon something like principle. In the other provinces the election was fought upon no principle; the campaign against us was simply an appeal to certain prejudices. In British Columbia, we had an open fight. I have no fault to find with that, on the contrary. In British Columbia we were assailed upon our policy. It was our policy in regard to Asiatic immigration which was in issue. And, now that the battle has been fought, I have to say that the policy brought forward by our opponents against our own policy was a policy very shortsighted, a policy which sacrificed—no, I will not use so strong a word, but imperilled and jeopardized—the best interests not only of Canada but of British Columbia itself. Sir, in British Columbia, the problem of Asiatic immigration is the one question that interests all sections of public opinion; and all classes of the people in British Columbia, to whatever party they may belong, unite in the opinion which is expressed in the words now current in the politics of that province, 'A white British Columbia; a white Canada,' meaning that British Columbia should be preserved as a home of the white race. To this opinion, to this fact, we on this side of the House have no opposition to offer, and to it we take no exception whatever. But, Sir, we differ altogether as to the means by which this end is to be attained. The policy advocated by the opposition in British Columbia, advocated with greater emphasis last election than ever, and forced upon the leader of the party opposed to us and by that leader at last reluctantly accepted, is to prevent the immigration of Asiatics into British Columbia by hostile legislation. The policy which we have adopted, and upon which the issue was fought in British Columbia, was that we should not seek to reach that end by hostile legislation, especially against a friendly nation, but should endeavour to reach that object by negotiation and diplomatic action. There, Sir, is the issue. And now, I ask: what is the policy that is conducive to the best interests of Canada and of the British empire to which we belong? Sir, to put the question is to answer it: our policy is the policy which ought to impress everybody who pretends to be a Canadian or pretends to be British as the one best calculated for the weal of both Canada and the empire. But, before I go further, let me say that I find no fault with the view maintained in British Columbia that that province should be maintained as a country for the white race. I have no hesitation in saying also that I do not attribute the attitude of British Columbia in its passionate desire for a white man's country to anything like prejudice—prejudice of colour or of anything else. No; I recognize that the origin and cause for the feeling which prevails and predominates in British Columbia is to be found in economic laws which would produce the same result in any other place in which the conditions were similar to those of British Columbia. The races of Asia, whether they be Japanese or Chinese, East Indian, have been for many generations, as we know, subjected to despotism which has reduced them to a condition of penury. In their lodgings, in their food, in their garments, they are content with the most simple necessaries of life which can be supplied with only a fraction of the wages necessary to maintain a workingman in respectability in this country. So, when these races come to this country in such large numbers as to compete with white labour, they accept wages so low that they create at once an economic disturbance. And all economic disturbances are far-reaching in their consequences. Sir, if that were the only aspect of the question, it would be easy of solution according to our friends from British Columbia. But there is another aspect of the question which, unfortunately, is too often forgotten, and to this aspect of the question I would especially ask the attention of our friends from British Columbia. Our neighbours on the Pacific coast are next door, so to speak, to those very Asiatics whom we are now asked to treat with so much contempt. The Asiatics have lain dormant for ages in respect to civilization, but they are now awakening from their lethargy and adopting western methods and western modes of living. They offer immense facilities for trade, and we see the greatest commercial nations of the world, England, Germany and the United States, vieing with each other in order to obtain a share of that commercial abundance.

Now, Sir, what should be our attitude in regard to that matter? Should we not seek to obtain a share of that abundance? Should we not take every possible advantage that our propinquity gives us over our less favoured competitors? It is sufficient to put the question for the answer to suggest itself. I may say that in this duty we have not been remiss. Shortly, or immediately, before the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, we took measures to extend it across the continent to the Pacific Ocean in order to reach the Asiatic trade. This parliament acting in conjunction with the mother country, subsidized a line of steamers in order to engage in that trade with Asia. That service has been well performed during the last twenty years by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Their steamers have been ploughing the ocean during all these years between British Columbia and Japan and China, and from those countries back to

British Columbia. Well, Sir, some five years ago Japan invited the nations of the earth to a world's fair. We were urged to take part in that fair, and we did so. Just before the fair was concluded we were deluged with petitions coming from all parts of Canada asking us to make a treaty with Japan in order to obtain, if possible, a share of the immense trade that would develop with that country in the future. We negotiated a treaty and laid it before parliament. It was received in this House without a word of dissent or criticism. Our friends opposite were eager for it. But we knew there was a difficulty, and that difficulty was with respect to Japanese immigration. At that time we had an understanding with the Japanese government, accomplished through the Japanese consulate here, to the effect that the Japanese government themselves would undertake to restrict their own immigrants. Unfortunately, after the treaty had been ratified there was an influx of Japanese immigration into British Columbia, as if the treaty had superseded the understanding. We sent one of our colleagues to Japan to protest. He had no difficulty in getting the Japanese authorities to agree that they would respect the understanding we had entered into with them, and that they themselves would restrict immigration from Japan to this country. The matter came up for review in this House. We presented our policy to the House, and it was not accepted by the opposition. The opposition held, on the contrary, that instead of having a treaty we should take the matter into our own hands and restrict all Asiatic immigration. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition moved this resolution :

That this House, whilst expressing its profound appreciation of the friendly intentions and courteous assurance of the Japanese government, and whilst declaring its sincere desire for the most cordial relations with the Japanese people, desires, nevertheless to record its strong protest against a policy under which our wage earning population cannot be protected from destructive invading competition, except by entreating the forbearance and aid of a foreign government.

We did not endorse these views, for the obvious reason that if the object were to restrict Japanese immigration to Canada, and if that could be done either by legislative enactment in this parliament or by friendly action on the part of the Japanese government themselves, we would prefer that it should be done by the voluntary action of the Japanese government. I would ask the leader of the opposition, Why should we—I will not put it on the ground of international comity but on the ground of our own self interest—Why should we hurt the feelings of a friendly nation when that nation was willing to do what we wanted her to do ? Sir, this was the position we took, and the position was so strong that I was not at all surprised when I saw my hon. friend the leader of the opposition accept that position, both for himself and for his party, at the opening of the last general elections. At that time I was not surprised to see that the opposition had come to our way of thinking. In that debate I used these words, speaking of the Japanese government :

If they fail to carry out this understanding that we have with them, then we shall have the power ourselves to put an end to the treaty. But that will be done only in the last resort, only when every method of conciliation has been exhausted, only when every other means has been tried and failed.

This was so reasonable a proposition that I was not at all surprised that my hon. friend, at the opening of the campaign, practically accepted it. I do not say that my hon. friend announced his acceptance to the people. But he had an ambassador to the people of British Columbia who spoke for himself and the party to which he belongs. One of the candidates in British Columbia was a gentleman whom I am very glad to see in this House—as the constituency has to be represented by a Tory, though I would much prefer to see it represented by a Grit—I mean the constituency of Vancouver. The gentleman who now represents the city of Vancouver, and whom I see before me, accepted the nomination, but accepted it with some compunction, some hesitation. In order to be absolutely sure of his ground, and before finally committing himself, he came east to interview the leader of the opposition, and obtain from him certain pledges in respect to this question and another one. In a speech delivered in the city of Vancouver by Mr. Cowan, the Conservative candidate, on the 1st of October last, as I find it reported in the 'News-Advertiser,' he used this language :

I went east and have returned, and I speak with the authority, not only of the leader but of that party that will, after October, control the destinies of Canada.

My hon. friend referred to my own attitude upon the question, with which he could not agree. But still, after having blamed myself and the government for the policy we had pursued in respect to Asiatic immigration, he went on to define what was the policy of the Conservative party :

But I have this message of my leader to impart to you, and it is made not only on his behalf but on behalf of the great Conservative party throughout Canada, that if that *modus vivendi* spoken by Mr. Lemieux is not lived up to by Japan, that circumstance will oblige that great party to abrogate the Japanese treaty.

Well, I fail to see what difference there is between the policy of my hon. friend and the policy of this government as de-

fined by me in the speech a portion of which I have read. Let me read again what I said on the floor of the House :

If they fail to carry out this understanding that we have with them, then we shall have the power ourselves to put an end to the treaty. But that will be done only in the last resource, only when every method of conciliation has been exhausted, only when every other means has been tried and failed.

Let me now give the policy of the Conservative party on the 1st October, 1908, not in the very words of my hon. friend, but in the words of his ambassador, as a message to the people of British Columbia.

But I have this message from my leader to impart to you, 'said Mr. Cowan,' and it is made not only on his behalf but on behalf of the great Conservative party throughout Canada, that if that *modus vivendi* spoken by Mr. Lemieux is not lived up to by Japan, that circumstance will oblige that great party to abrogate the Japanese treaty.

Well, sir, I cannot but say that I feel flattered and that the government feels flattered that the hon. leader of the opposition has come exactly to the position which he had at last to accept. My hon. friend had some references and protests made to him to which I will refer immediately. He had some references and protests made to him; I do not know what the protests were, but it is quite easy to surmise what they were. There were no votes in the attitude taken by the leader of the opposition. He was told: Your policy is no better than the policy of the government, and if that is all you have to fight the government on we cannot win upon that; you must give us something better. And I must say to my hon. friend that he was equal to the mischief that was expected of him. An answer came on the 24th October. On the 24th October my hon. friend sent a telegram which was read in the city of Victoria by my hon. friend the present member for Victoria (Mr. Barnard) to the assembled faithful:

Your message received. The Conservative party stands for a white Canada, the protection of white labour and the absolute exclusion of Asiatics.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The right hon. gentleman has taken upon himself to state to this House that I sent that telegram. I beg to state that I did not send that telegram.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I accept altogether the explanation of my hon. friend.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, the right hon. gentleman should not have asserted unqualifiedly that I had sent it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, if I have done an injustice to my hon. friend I have good warrant for saying what I have said, because that telegram was read by his friend who has been elected since to support him, by the hon. member for Victoria city, it was published in the 'Colonist' the following day and approved to the echo. Perhaps my hon. friend is not conversant with the history of his own party. I have only this to say, that if he did not send that telegram, then he has obtained and his party has obtained the seat for Victoria city through false pretenses. Here is a fac simile of the telegram published in the 'Daily Colonist' of the 25th of October. It was a lie, so my hon. friend says. I am sorry, not for myself, but for my hon. friend that that party in British Columbia had to resort to lies in order to carry an election.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If my right hon. friend will permit me; I sent a telegram but the concluding portion of it was not as my hon. friend has read it. I will produce the telegram which I did send.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I put upon the table the fac simile of the telegram which was printed in the 'Colonist' on the 25th October.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My right hon. friend may put it on the table or under the table; I am making a personal explanation. I say I did not send a telegram in those words, and I say it was not addressed to the hon. member for Victoria.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not say that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The right hon. gentleman has put it to the House as if that were the case.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, I beg my hon. friend's pardon.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, I misunderstood my hon. friend.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I said it was read by the hon. member for Victoria.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will produce the telegram. The right hon. gentleman, if I am not mistaken, knew that I did not send a telegram in those words.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not understand what my hon. friend means.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, I intimated to one of his late colleagues very much the same thing.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not understand what my hon. friend means, but it was conveyed to me that this telegram had been sent. This is the telegram. It is a fac simile. However, I accept the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know what the right hon. gentleman means by a fac simile; this is a typewritten copy of a telegram.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friends are satisfied with that I have no fault to find. I found this telegram in the opposition organ, the 'Daily Colonist,' on the 25th October last and everybody can see it there.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What does my right hon. friend mean by a fac simile?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is not in the ordinary print of the newspaper. This pretends to be a fac simile copy of a telegram as we receive it. That is what I mean by fac simile. But, let me go on. I will give some comment upon my hon. friend by the Victoria 'Colonist' on the 26th October:

Their stand upon Asiatic question.—The standpoint of the Liberals as opposed to that of Conservatives.—Duncan Ross at Victoria Theatre.

This is to be put in juxtaposition with certain words of my hon. friend which I have just quoted.

We are not in favour of abrogating Imperial treaties. We are in favour of restricting immigration.

And next, these are the words attributed to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition:

R. L. Borden's stand.

The Conservative party stands for a white Canada, the protection of white labour, and the absolute exclusion of Asiatics.

And the comment of the newspaper, upon which the electors voted on the following day, was in these words:

These are the latest and most definite statements of the two great political parties on the all-important question of whether we are to have a white or a yellow population in Western Canada. Mr. Borden's telegram was sent on Saturday night, and was being read at the Conservative smoker about the same time that Duncan Ross was making the other announcement on behalf of Mr. Templeman at the Victoria theatre.

The Liberals do not believe in 'abrogating Imperial treaties, although the text of the treaty in question contains a clause expressly providing for abrogation. They believe in restricting immigration by going down on their knees to the Mikado and begging him to keep his people at home until after the general election, when the time will come for the Liberal administration, if returned to pay its debts to the Grand Trunk Pacific.

I have this to say, that the issue has been settled, we have fought the battle, we have won, the treaty is in force, the understanding is being carried out, and we have no debt to pay to the Grand Trunk Pacific. So far upon this subject.

My hon. friend, in the course of his observations, has referred again to the statements which he had made in the last elections on purity. The last elections were fought upon the purity cry, and one of the worst forms, my hon. friend says, of political corruption is what he calls the bribery of constituencies. I have to say to my hon. friend that in this respect he is the most inveterate sinner in this House. He does not bribe constituencies, but he bribes provinces, and in the last election he attempted to bribe the province of British Columbia. The question is not new; we had it last year, but we had it in a worse form than last year and that was bad enough Heaven knows.

My hon. friend is aware and so informed the House last session, that for years the people of British Columbia have claimed an increased subsidy. That is true, the people of British Columbia have had a claim for an increased subsidy. On that question my hon. friend in 1904 addressed the people of British Columbia in these terms:

Let me say that I have given much thought to the conditions in British Columbia which in your opinion, call for special attention in considering the financial relations between the Dominion and that province. You claim not only that these conditions are exceptional and peculiar to the situation and physical character of your province, but also that they are permanent in their nature. In my opinion they are such as to command immediate inquiry and investigation to the end that any injustice clearly established may be immediately relieved.

That was in 1904. In 1906 a conference of all the provinces was held in order to readjust the subsidies of the provinces. The Premier of British Columbia attended that conference and presented a claim on behalf of British Columbia. That claim was not admitted by the other provincial premiers. After having presented it, Mr. McBride wanted to have an arbitration upon it, but the premiers there assembled declared against the arbitration, passing a resolution in these terms:

That in the opinion of the conference it is unadvisable that the claim in the way of subsidies, of any province be referred to arbitration.

The premiers there assembled, without any consideration of politics and unanimously, except for the Premier of British Columbia, determined that the matter should be then and there decided and in addition to the general subsidies which were adopted in favour of all the provinces, British Columbia was given a special subsidy of $100,000 a year for ten years. This matter was brought before the House; in the session of 1907 an address was passed praying the imperial parliament to so amend the British North America Act as to give these increased subsidies to the provinces. Not one word against that petition was then uttered by my hon. friend. It seems to me that if in 1904 the claim of

British Columbia for an increase of subsidy was to be considered and if it was of such a nature that it should be arbitrated upon in a special manner, the proper time to raise the question was in 1907, when we asked for imperial legislation to give to British Columbia more subsidy. If the treatment which we then gave to British Columbia was not sufficiently generous, in the opinion of my hon. friend, that was the time to say: British Columbia does not receive enough, you should do something more for British Columbia. But my hon. friend did not say a word, he was satisfied with the settlement which had been made and which was accepted by all the premiers assembled in conference.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I correct my right hon. friend in one respect? When that motion went through the House in the session to which he has alluded I was not in the House; I was absent through indisposition and I certainly understood and I still understand that protest was made on behalf of British Columbia by hon. gentlemen who were present here.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend may not have been present when the resolution was finally passed, but he was cognizant of it; it came before the House not once but on two different occasions and on one occasion he certainly was present after I had left for Great Britain, and, as I understand, he never raised a word of protest. That was the time to protest, but if a protest was made it was very mild. I never understood it to take the form of a protest at all. I know that my hon. friend, during the whole session when the question was before us, never raised a word against the settlement we had offered to British Columbia. But he went to British Columbia in the summer following that session and then he fell under the magnetic influence of a very astute politician in the person of Mr. Richard McBride, the premier of British Columbia.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Sir, I have nothing to say against Mr. McBride; on the contrary I say he is a very astute politician; I give him every credit for that, but I say to my hon. friend, the tempter came to him in the form of the Hon. Richard McBride. The tempter took him up to the top of a very high mountain and showed him the province of British Columbia and all the glory in it and said to him: If you will fall down and worship me, all this I will give to you. My hon. friend did not say: Get thee behind me Satan. On the contrary, he fell down and worshipped him. He informed Mr. McBride that if he were returned to power he would have the question re-opened. There came on an election—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon friend has not quoted me correctly. I said that I had made a certain pledge to the people of British Columbia in 1904 and nothing which had since taken place relieved me from the obligation of that promise.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What had taken place since that time was a petition adopted unanimously by this House in favour of British Columbia granting her $100,000 more per annum for ten years.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And without the consent of British Columbia.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Without the consent of British Columbia.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But the province has taken the money since and that is all. Then the question came up again during the elections and as I stated a moment ago they had the pledge given by my hon. friend to the people of British Columbia, notwithstanding the legislation passed by this House. Again my friend from Vancouver (Mr. Cowan) was not satisfied with that pledge; he thought he would have something more and in the speech to which I have already alluded, delivered on October 1, 1908, he first spoke of the pledge given by the leader of the opposition and then went on to say:

> For my part I had every reason, when that pledge was given by Mr. Borden, to expect that it would be carried and when the Conservatives of the city honoured me with the nomination I felt I must accept it on conditions. I tell you exactly what was in my mind. I did not think that Mr. Borden would refer it again to the conference of premiers but I felt that it might be referred to a select committee of the House of Commons.

He felt that it might be referred to a select committee of the House of Commons and that was not suitable to the hon. gentleman who was the Conservative candidate in Vancouver. He went on to say:

> I feared the eastern majority that would come on a committee of that kind, biased as they must be by eastern interests, and I wanted to know the mind of that great statesman, the first in Canada, who said he would bestow justice on the west. I went to the east and have returned and I speak with the authority, not only of that leader, but of that party, that will, after October 26, control the destinies of Canada; that the moment that party is returned to power the just claims of British Columbia will be referred to an absolutely impartial tribunal, and the report of that tribunal will be binding on this province only when it has been accepted by this province.

As a matter of fact then this gentleman would not trust a committee of the House of Commons where he would fear there would be eastern interests. Sir, if Tories of one province cannot trust Tories of the

other provinces, it is no wonder that the people at large will not trust them.

In the same speech Mr. Cowan said:

Our claim is this: We have a claim of three-quarters of a million in perpetuity against the Dominion and Mr. Borden authorizes me to says: 'Your claim will not be referred to a committee of the House of Commons, but to an independent tribunal and its report will not be binding on you till it is accepted by this province.

In other words, the claim will be referred to an impartial tribunal in which both parties will be represented, the Dominion of Canada and the province of British Columbia, but the report of the tribunal will not be binding upon British Columbia unless British Columbia is fully satisfied with it. You will have it referred to arbitration and you will have everything you want provided you accept it, but if you are not satisfied with the judgment you need not accept it, it shall be binding on us but not binding on you. Sir, this is the policy of the purists, this is the policy of the reformers, this is the policy of the gentlemen who find fault with promises being made to a constituency. My hon. friend has told us he will bring that subject to the attention of the House; he is welcome to do so, and when he does he shall have more to say in defence of himself than in accusation of others. My hon. friend is not altogether sure of the legislation which we are to bring to prevent secret commissions. I have only this to say to my hon. friend, that the Bill which we intend to bring is based altogether upon a similar measure which was passed by the British parliament in 1906. It may be sufficient or it may not be sufficient; but if it is not sufficient, it will be open to my hon. friend to make it as ample and as severe as he thinks it ought to be.

I do not know that I have much more to add. I think I have traversed the whole of the ground covered by my hon. friend's speech. I may say in conclusion that although it is not our good fortune always to agree, I am happy to endorse everything he has said in regard to the Quebec Tercentenary Celebration. It was a very important and happy event in our history. I do not know that I need say anything more about it than this, because everything has been said already. There is one thing, however, which I think I should say, and which will receive the approbation of both sides of this House, that is, to pay this tribute to His Excellency Earl Grey. It was Earl Grey who conceived the idea, and it was largely through his zeal, energy and all-pervading enthusiasm that the idea was carried out on such a grand scale and so successfully and triumphantly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a word of personal explanation. The message which I sent to the 'Colonist' Victoria, B. C., on the 24th of October, 1908, reads as follows:

Your message received. The Conservative party stands for a white Canada and the absolute protection of white labour.

R. L. BORDEN.

I desire to say that the telegram as it appeared was first brought to my attention by Mr. Templeman, the Minister of Inland Revenue. I asked him for a little delay until I could make inquiries as to how the mistake had been made. I received certain explanations which I may take occasion to give to the House on another day. So far as my friend the member for Victoria is concerned, if he read the telegram, as the Prime Minister says he did, on the evening of the 24th or 25th, I have not the slightest doubt—in fact, he has so informed me—that it was sent to him from the office of the newspaper, and it was not a telegram addressed to himself in any way. That is the whole explanation of the matter so far as I am concerned. I did not know of the mistake at all until after I had returned from the south in the month of December, and upon its being brought to my attention I at once made the inquiries to which I have alluded.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, one thing, I think, is quite apparent from the address which has been made by the right hon. gentleman who leads the government, namely, that he is very sore on two points—on the failure of the province of British Columbia to respond to his repeated efforts, and secondly, on the purity question. In devoting a large proportion of his time to these two points he has deftly covered up what he might have developed some of his extraordinary powers upon to a great deal better advantage to the House and to the country; but it is often the case with my right hon. friend that he makes a terrible clatter and noise about something which is of very little importance in order to divert public attention from something that he wants to conceal. That may be good party tactics or it may not. However, I think that was apparent in the excursion, the long and somewhat tedious excursion, which my right hon. friend took this afternoon to the Asiatic coasts, the Asiatic countries and the Asiatic question. I am going to leave the larger part of the Asiatic question and the British Columbia question to be discussed by my hon. friends from British Columbia who are here, and who I have no doubt are well capable of taking care of it. I want, however, to say one or two things with reference to that. The right hon. gentleman beat a retreat from a very bad and very false position which he let himself and his government into in the treaty with Japan by the laboured argument which he made this afternoon. What was the initial error,

what was the lack of care and statesmanship, what was the lack of common prudence and common straight, right representation in the matter, was where my right hon. gentleman failed in the initiation of the proceedings. The opposition in this House stood for the treaty between Japan and Great Britain. True, as my right hon. friend said, they urged that that matter should be taken up, that it should be no longer delayed, and that if there were any commercial possibilities in trade between this country and Japan in that treaty, we should have the benefit of that trade, as the United States have the benefit of trade with Japan from the treaty which they have made with that country. But where the right hon. gentleman made his mistake was in two ways : first, that he absolutely neglected the admonition of the British government, and the mandates of prudence as well, in refusing the lead which the British Government gave him, to have the immigrant rights and position of Canada defined in the treaty itself. Not once or twice or thrice, but repeatedly, the British government, through its high officers, brought to the attention of the right hon. gentleman a way by which Canada could enjoy all the benefits of the trade arrangement with Japan under that treaty by adhering to it and at the same time keep Canada's sovereignty and maintain the position of the white labourer on the Pacific coast of Canada. My right hon. friend refused to take that lead, and by what was not straight representation of himself and his Minister of Agriculture, he induced this House to give its adhesion to the treaty, in the first place, in ignorance of what was really the state of the conditions between Japan and ourselves. My right hon. friend knows the circumstances. He knows that his Minister of Agriculture for three years stood up in the House and declared that he had a letter from the Japanese government itself, which made all these sureties certain, that he himself declared to this House that the Japanese government had an arrangement with this government by which only a few from each of the different provinces of Japan would be allowed to come into this country; and when in the long end we came down to the kernel of the matter, the Minister of Agriculture had to acknowledge in this House that he must have been wrong, that he never had such a letter, and my right hon. friend had to acknowledge that he was mistaken in the position he took. Sir, this Dominion will never give continued adherence to a policy which takes from it the sovereign power of standing at the front door of Canada, either on its Atlantic or its Pacific side, and saying who shall be admited to its home and its home privileges. We do not intend to say to the Emperor of Germany, 'Sir, we are a small people and we deprecate treaties; we deal in another way, and if you will pass us your kingly word that you will protect our interests, we will have no treaty obligations between you and us as to German immigration to our country. We will leave it all in your hands.' We do not subscribe to that, but the right hon. gentleman does. We stand on the coast of the Pacific to-day with the key of the front door in the hands of a foreign government, who may open that door when they please, to whom they please and as they please. After all that had been done and my right hon. friend had found out the mistakes which had been made, he said: Well, the thing is done, we believe the Japanese government will carry out their pledge to us, and we will give them an opportunity of doing so. But if they will not, we shall still have the recourse of the abrogation of the treaty. That is all that my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, said. So much with reference to that treaty, and I shall not say anything more on that point.

Then my hon. friend waxed very eloquent regarding the advantage, and indeed the almost necessity, of trade with China and Japan. Well, we on this side are alive to those advantages and opportunities, and to the nature of the treaty which exists between Japan and the British government, and our duties in that connection. But, at the same time, when there was an open way laid out before the view of my right hon. friend, by which the trade with these countries and the control of immigration to this country could have been secured and maintained at the same time, as was done by the United States, my right hon. friend forgot to take the advantage of that course and consequently was led into the trouble which now confronts him. True, my right hon. friend became reminiscent and spoke of what had been done to open up the trade between Canada and those countries. We have, he said, put transports on the Pacific, and now for ten or fifteen years these transports, some of a very high class, have been plying between the Dominion and those countries. But where was my right hon. friend when the proposal was made to put these steamers on the Pacific Ocean? When I brought down the subsidies necessary to be paid in order to obtain those steamers, where was my right hon. friend and those supporting him? They were fighting these subsidies by every possible objection. They were asserting on every occasion their emphatic disapproval of using the people's money to subsidize transports on the Pacific coast and open up trade with the Orient. Yet my right hon. friend, with that singular lapse of memory which afflicts him at times and causes him to take credit to himself for everything which has been done, even those things he most opposed, rises up in

the dim, misty dawn and really believes that he himself is the first man who ever saw the sun rise. That hallucination is no doubt the cause of the declaration he made some years ago, when on the other side of the Atlantic, that one morning he woke up and discovered Canada. It was that same hallucination which caused him, after the All Red Route had been in existence some ten or twelve years, to become seized with the idea at the Imperial conference that he himself it was who was the minister of destiny and had discovered it. I would advise my right hon. friend to read over once in a while the history of Canada in order that he may not forget that there are in that history other administrations than his own. It is difficult for him no doubt to realize this. The adulation of his followers, constant, indefatigable and fantastic in many cases, takes absolute possession of his mind, and impels him to indulge in all sorts of vainglorious statements.

At Sorel, where he made his first appearance before the people who were such strangers to him, who had not heard the name of Laurier, who did not know that he belonged to their race, who had forgotten his birthplace, and to whom consequently he had to say : 'In my veins, the same blood runs as in yours.' It was absolutely necessary that he should recall that fact to their minds. 'The Duty of the Hour' was not to be compared to the necessity of informing these people that he was one of themselves. Did my right hon. friend listen to the adulations addressed to him on that occasion? No doubt he did, and became impressed with the conviction that he was the possessor of all earthly power, so far as Canada was concerned. Was it that which caused him to indulge in the ebulitions he did at Sorel, and afterwards at Cornwall, and to a certain extent at Niagara? What was Canada, he asked, when we came into power? An atmospheric star in the far nebulae, of inferior dimensions. What is it to-day? A sun that rises and sets for the whole world. Where was Canada, he exclaimed, when we came into power? Forgotten by France, which cradled our infancy, unknown to the great metropolis of the empire whose colony we are, ignored by Europe, and a negligible quantity with the United States, our great neighbours. But where is Canada to-day? I, he said, went to the British metropolis and vindicated our rights to autonomy in commerce as well as in politics. And to-day, on the banks of Loire and the Thames, the Neva and the Dneister, the Volga and the Don, the Danube and the Po, the name of Canada is in every home, and the sun of Canada is that to which every inhabitant in these distant countries turns his eyes for peace, progress and prosperity. My right hon. friend should take himself seriously to task once in a while to prevent these bad attacks of megalomania.

My right hon. friend thought it was his duty to attack the leader of the opposition on the ground of purity. He did that all through the campaign, but during all that time he uttered no strong note with reference to the necessity for a cleaner public life. Not once, however, did he omit the opportunity of holding up my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) to ridicule for his professions regarding a higher moral tone of public life. Down at Niagara, what did the right hon. gentleman say? Mr. Borden, he said, cannot possibly be as virtuous as he looks, and even Mr. Foster cannot be as virtuous as he talks. Then my right hon. friend raised his face towards heaven, and in front of the assembled thousands at Niagara said : 'Thank God I am no Purist.' And he utters the same thing to-night. And every scalawag who has been taking his ten, twenty or fifty per cent echoed the sentiment with a very unctious and hearty Amen !

Now, sir, of all the small attempts to turn an argument, that which my right hon. friend has used with reference to the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) in his statement concerning the British Columbia case, is about the smallest I have known him to be driven to in this House. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) declared, with reference to a province that he was of opinion that their financial grievance was well based, and that, if it were well based, he believed it ought to have a fair and reasonable arbitrament and judgment. Can my right hon. friend say that that was at all comparable with the kinds of bribery and corruption practised by himself and his ministers? Does he mean to say that if a member argues for the rights of a province as he sees them, and declares that he will vindicate them to the extent of seeing to it that they have a fair and reasonable arbitrament he is guilty of bribery? If he does, he will not find one impartial man in this country to share his views. Suppose that a great transportation line is needed to run through this country and that I believe in building it and go out and argue for it before the people, can any man say that I am bribing the constituencies? Is it not a germane and proper thing for a man to establish if he can, and argue for if he will? But my right hon. friend takes a different method. He does it by piecemeal and in detail—although he sometimes takes up large sections. Does he remember when he asserted: The politics of Mr. Mercier are my politics and my politics are the politics of Mr. Mercier? Does he remember when he made that compact with Mercier of the province of Quebec: You give me a majority and I will give you what you demand? If he did not do so, then the words uttered by Mr. Mercier, and which are on record to-day,

must have been a misrepresentation of the facts—but I do not believe they were. Why, even with reference to British Columbia, since when has the Prime Minister changed faith? Talking about telegrams, does he remember a certain telegram he sent to British Columbia in the crisis of an election in which he stated: What you want I want, so far as British Columbia is concerned; your politics are my politics; your views upon this Oriental question are my views? Another telegram of his was to Maxwell concerning the mint. Maxwell was in extremis; he was fighting a contested election and wanted a mint for Victoria. He was telegraphed to by the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier): You shall have the mint. Is there a parallel between that and the statement made by my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) the leader of the opposition? This whole campaign, which has been alluded to by the right hon. leader of the government as a great triumph for himself and his friends, was, he stated, not fought out on principle. I agree with him. Leaving for the moment what the right hon. gentleman said as to British Columbia, certainly, so far as the rest of the country is concerned, the election was not fought out on principle by his party—I agree with the right hon. gentleman there. Since when has the right hon. gentleman had a principle which he has stuck to over night? The election was fought on opportunism, it was fought on the negation of popular rights; it was fought on a system of bribery in detail by himself and those who surround him. What a spectacle it was we saw in Berlin, when the right hon. gentleman stood up a young man before the constituents there, and said to them virtually: I will make this young man a minister if you will elect him. That was not bribery and corruption; that was the work of the man who thanked God that he was not a purist. And what are we to think of his Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) who called the attention of the dear electors in Berlin to the fact that he had been there before and had said something which had come true—he had promised them a clock and they had the clock ; he had promised them postal delivery in the town, and they had postal delivery in the town or, if it was not quite completed, he would see that it was completed. And what else did he promise? Rural free mail delivery. And then, in insulting fashion, he said, either at Berlin or at Niagara: Behold the bounty of the Liberal government to the farmers of Canada. By that we can gauge the principle of hon. gentlemen opposite. My right hon. friend was rather testy last night when I asked him about certain commercial negotiations and how they were progressing. He intimated that if there were any commercial negotiations they might be in my mind, they certainly had never entered his.

Mr. FOSTER.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Never in the wide world. And yet, to-day the Speaker read from the chair the culmination of the commercial negotiations.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No commercial negotiations there.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the right hon. gentleman tell me that he did not say the same thing when the present Senator Derbyshire was got out of the way of the present Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham)? The intimation went through the length and breadth of this country that a senatorship was to be the price, but the right hon. gentleman said that there was no such thing, hurling back the accusation with infinite disdain. And yet, within six weeks, Mr. Derbyshire was a senator.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have told my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) before, and I repeat now, that I made no promise whatever to Mr. Derbyshire. And I say that I made no promise whatever to Mr. Sloan.

Mr. FOSTER. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is somewhat of the calibre he ascribes to Hon. Richard McBride—he is astute. He denies such a promise. But I will put one thing to him that he will not deny. In 1896 when the right hon. gentleman wanted to get into power, speaking at Sohmer park, Montreal, on the 25th of April of that year, and dealing with the question of the wholesale bribery of constituencies, he said:

It need hardly be said that the doctrine is not only corrupt but unjust. The taxes are paid by supporters and opponents of the government alike, and all have a right to share in the expenditure according to the public necessity that may exist. It is an outrage to tell an elector that he must vote as he is told, or abandon his right to the public service for which he pays.

How many times has the right hon. gentleman told that, not only to electors, but to members of this House ?

There are other questions to be considered, there are other abuses which the Liberal party want to make away with. We want to reduce the public expenditure. It has increased by over sixty per cent, while the population has only increased by twelve per cent.

Is that a fair proportion? The taxes are altogether to high. Those who say that the taxes are never too high are not the ones who pay them; they are the men who spend your money at Ottawa. There is still another very important and more vital reform which the Liberal party intends to make, and that is to introduce 'honesty' in the administration of your public affairs. I contend that the public treasury is as sacred as any private safe. I believe that the money which is in the public treasury is as sacred as the money which is in your own pocket. If you elect

me to power I promise you to inaugurate an honest and economical administration.

And yet these words were hardly off the tongue of my hon. friend before he sat down and wrote a letter to Mr. François Langelier, in which he sent him a promissory note, guaranteeing either a judgeship or the governorship of Quebec if he would go into the election in support of his party. From that time up to the present the bargain-counter has never been closed, the auction block has never been out of action in this country.

The last great picture presented to us was that deal with Senator Scott. My right hon. friend wanted young blood. I do not blame him. He had two old men in the Senate, he wanted their places for two young men. They were both members of his cabinet. Sir Richard Cartwright was one and Mr. Scott was the other. I understand that my right hon. friend made a proposition to Sir Richard Cartwright, but I understand that he got a tremendous rejoinder from him.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Pardon me. I desire to give the most emphatic denial to any statement that I ever asked Sir Richard Cartwright for his portfolio. Quite the reverse. I was glad to have him in the cabinet, and am still glad.

Mr. FOSTER. I accept my right hon. friend's word. We cannot get all the correspondence, I suppose it is private. But it would be spicy reading if we could get it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No. My hon. friend will pardon me. He and I are old friends, and I say here upon my word that I never, by correspondence or otherwise, mentioned to Sir Richard Cartwright that I wanted his portfolio, never.

Mr. FOSTER. I gladly accept his words. Of course it might have been done in some other way. But will he deny that he entered into negotiations with Mr. Scott? Mr. Scott seems to have been born under a lucky star. At no time in the history of this country, while Mr. Scott has been living and there has been a Liberal party in this country, has he not been an official drawing high emoluments from that government. But the period came when something had to be done, and my hon. friend consummated a deal which is as bad as any that was ever consummated in the time of the Georges. What did he do? He wanted the portfolio of Senator Scott. Senator Scott held two positions, one was a portfolio and the other a Senatorship. He hung on to the Senatorship, and he would not give up the portfolio until—what? A son of Senator Scott, an estimable young man of medium ability, was hoisted into a brand new office at the rate of some $9,000 a year, as vice-president of a commission. Senator Scott keeps the life senatorship, and his son gets a new office for life. worth to him on the ordinary expectancy of life not less than $270,000. The country pays the money. The party deal is completed. That is the deal by which he has been able to inject some new blood into his cabinet. I am not finding fault with the new blood, I have nothing to say against the old blood. I say that this transaction swells to Heaven, and reeks with everything which is opposed to good administration in this or any other constitutionally governed country.

Now what else has happened? A gentleman from British Columbia fails to get the support of his constituency, fails to get the support of his province. He remains in office as administrator. We find no fault, for a fair time. But the time comes when parliament has to meet, and when the Minister ought to be in his seat. Then what happens? Then, under pressure from the Prime Minister, a constituency in the province of British Columbia is voided of its trustee, and a seat is purchased for the gentleman who was defeated in his own constituency and in his own province. Well, that may be high politics, but I am doubtful if the country will look upon it as such. But my right hon. friend, from the time when he wrote that letter to François Langelier up to the present time, has never paused in his career of publicly bribing and privately influencing the politics of this country in that peculiar way. I might mention some other things if I had time. On July 16, 1904, I had the pleasure of moving the following resolution:

> That the Bill be not now read a third time, but be referred back to Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of amending the said Bill so as to provide punishment by fine or imprisonment for any minister of the Crown or other person who as an inducement to any voters or class of voters in any electoral district to vote for any candidate promises to procure or threatens to withhold the expenditure of any public moneys of Canada or the undertaking of any public works within such electoral district.

The right hon. gentleman opposed it, and his party opposed it. They would not accede to it, because it would have been a prohibition to do those things which they wished to do. I have been led into this discursion with reference to the purity side of the question. There are two other points upon which I would like to touch briefly before six o'clock. The right hon. gentleman has suddenly grown cautious. He puts into the mouth of the Governor General a statement that it is now necessary to be exceptionally cautious with reference to the finances of the country. There has been a fall in the revenue, there has been a fall in trade, and we must now be exceptionally cautious. When did this take place? The speech from the Throne says more than a year ago. It seems to me that the time for the right hon. gentleman to have exercised

caution was that year and moreover when all the signals of distress were out and flying in this and other countries. But what was the right hon. gentleman doing then? Pushing up the expenditure until he had authorized an expenditure of $141,000,000 for the current year upon which we are now about to enter. That was the time when my right hon. friend should have been cautious. But the elections were coming on, and he did not wish to put on the curb at that time. But after all that tremendous appropriation has been made, after the elections are over, my right hon. friend comes down, about twelve months after the danger signals are up, after the time for action has passed, and says that we must exercise exceptional caution. I can tell my right hon. friend that the financial condition of this country is not a thing which can be faced with equanimity by men who are serious and have any idea of the gravity of the situation, and that it has been largely brought about by my hon. friend himself and his uncurbed expenditures and appropriations.

There is one other point, and that is with reference to the commission of Judge Cassels. I would ask my right hon. friend how he can refuse, immediately and consecutively, to extend the probe of examination, fearless and full, into the other spending departments of this government? Here I wish to call my right hon. friend's attention to something which occurred in the course of the campaign. The right hon. gentleman was meeting the charge of corruption, meeting the charge of extravagance in departmental administration and, down at Niagara, what did he say? I want the House to listen. He said:

Let me go one step farther. We are charged with having been corrupt. In the session of eight months duration which was drawn to a close a few weeks ago was there any charge made against the government such as was made against the Conservative government in the days of the Pacific scandal?

And so on.

No, sir, no charge of that kind was made, but charges were made against whom?

He goes on to say against the officials of the departments. Here is the point:

What was our conduct? We did, sir, what any honest man would have done, what any honest government would have done, what Hon. Alex. Mackenzie would have done; we appointed a commission to investigate.

What was he talking about? About the extravagance and corruption in the administration of the departments. We did what any other government would have done; we appointed a commission to investigate.

The commission sat and reported having gone through the whole matter they brought in a report in which they state that there were irregularities. There were no names given. It simply confirmed our suspicions, and, our suspicions being aroused, we appointed another commission. Something more was done. We took one of the judges of the land, a man whose honour was beyond reproach—Justice Cassels,—to carry out the investigation. Sir, could we do anything more?

There was but one impression to be taken from that, namely, that the Prime Minister of Canada said to the electorate: We appointed a commission in 1907 to investigate mal-administration in the departments. The right hon. gentleman stated that more than once. What are the facts of the case? He himself knows well. He appointed no commission to examine into the mal-administration of the departments. His own Minister of Justice says that he did not. His own Minister of Marine and Fisheries says that he did not. The commission itself declares that he did not and yet my right hon. friend was content to make the statement to the people of Canada that these charges were being pressed home, that the government did not wait for charges, that they appointed a commission in order to investigate these matters and they were going to find out and punish the guilty. The right hon. gentleman has taken up one part and a very small part of the body of the departments of this country. He has found it gangrened from the point at which the knife entered to the place where the knife was taken out again—gangrened in every respect. He has had witnesses state on oath that what was being done in the Department of Marine and Fisheries was being done in every other department. Does my right hon. friend propose to go farther? Does he propose to examine into other departments and appoint a full and free commission with power to examine into all the points in the case? Does he or does he not propose to probe the other spending departments or is he willing to allow the impression to go broadcast that all the other departments are just as bad as the Department of Marine and Fisheries? There is one thing that surprises me. It is that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) still occupies his seat—a man who, for three years, nearly, has been in that department, who has opportunities and has had opportunities for obtaining a full knowledge of his department, who has been aided by the press, aided by the committees, aided by gentlemen on this side of the House, who has had all the distinctive blotches pointed out to him and who has not only not tried to deal with them, but who has absolutely refused to do it. With such a record as has been shown in that hon. gentleman's department, not only at the centre here but in every branch where the investigation has proceeded, after it has been proved that it has been absolutely untrustworthy and unreliable that hon.

gentleman still stands before this House as the minister of that department. How often has my right hon. friend the Prime Minister said : I go by the English model. Does my right hon. friend think that any minister of Great Britain would occupy his seat if such gross negligence, or gross incapacity, or worse were brought home to him as the head of the department ? Does he not know that even in France, where they may be a little less rigid than in Great Britain, a minister left his office not long ago, simply because suspicions were thrown upon his department of mal-administration of which he himself personally had no knowledge. It is the duty of the head of a department, acting in trust for the country, to see that his department is properly managed. If he is incapable, or indifferent, or stupid, or whatever it may be, his is the responsibility and he it is who ought to take that responsibility. I am surprised that he remains still after all that record of gross incapacity and worse as a member of the present government.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. G. H. COWAN (Vancouver). Mr. Speaker, had it not been for the references made to me and to my conduct of the election in the city of Vancouver by the right hon. First Minister I would not have ventured to-night, unprepared, to take part in this debate. But some men, like the right hon. the Prime Minister, are born great; some, like the hon. gentleman who has just resigned from Comox-Atlin (Mr. Sloan), achieve greatness, and some, like myself by the references of the right hon. the First Minister, have greatness thrust upon them. Let me say that I have never in my public utterances mentioned the name of the right hon. the Prime Minister without the tribute of praise that I believed to be his due. But, Sir, I had not then heard the right hon. the First Minister in superficial and, may I say, in specious debate; I had not heard him on the question of immigration, on the question of Asiatic exclusion; and like every young heart who believes in the greatness of public men, I was prepared to hear drop from the lips of the First Minister of Canada words and arguments befitting the occasion and befitting this House of Commons. When I heard that First Minister say that in British Columbia and in British Columbia alone, of all the great provinces that form this confederation, the campaign had been conducted on principle and that he could not understand the results that had been brought about in British Columbia and in my constituency, I felt that it was due to myself and to this House that I should offer some explanation of those results. Sir, I know and you know that it is due to no merits of mine that a majority of 858 for the Liberal party in the constiuency of Vancouver was converted into a majority for myself of 1,582, the largest turnover, let me say it in all humility, because I take no credit to myself, in the whole Dominion of Canada. Let me explain to the right hon. the First Minister what that majority means. That majority means that the people of British Columbia, who are confronted with a condition with which no other part of Canada is confronted, who are face to face with a condition and not with a theory, do not believe in the policy of the government of to-day. Why have the people of British Columbia exercised their own individual and inalienable right of judgment in this matter, and converted a solid phalanx of Liberal members into the representation we now see from British Columbia? I shall attempt to tell you why. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his government have entered into a treaty with Japan that does not conserve the interests of the workingmen of Canada and Canadian citizenship. As I said I have never on a public platform used the name of Sir Wilfrid Laurier without at the same time attributing to him the highest qualities of a politician and a statesman.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear, that is right.

Mr. COWAN. Never; but, Sir, that was before I listened to his specious arguments. I wish from the bottom of my heart I had never heard that speech of Sir Wilfrid Laurier to-day. I wish it because I cannot reconcile myself to the feeling that my idols have been shattered. I cannot reconcile myself to the feeling that a leader of public thought in Canada has so far failed to grasp and to understand the feeling and the conditions that will make of Canada a great nation. I say, Sir, that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the First Minister of Canada, in declaring that we in British Columbia have fought the battle in the recent campaign on principle, has paid, unconsciously no doubt, a compliment to British Columbia. I can see that he is perturbed and cannot understand why when we conducted the campaign on principle the result has been to give me a larger turnover than he dared hope to have in his own constituency. I can tell him the reason to-night. It was because without reason and without any request from Japan he abandoned the sacred duty and transferred to Japan the power to keep Canadian citizenship untainted by Japanese immigration. I can tell him that it was because the hon. the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) on the floor of this House has declared in so many words that he is not in favour of a white British Columbia. I can tell him that it is because the hon. Minister of Agriculture has de-

clared in so many words on the floor of this House that we believe that it would be in the interest of Canada if hundreds of thousands of Asiatics were poured into our country. I can tell him that it is because on the 3rd of December, 1907, he stood on a public platform in this very city of Ottawa and declared that he would not apply the law of exclusion to Asiatics. I can tell him that it is because almost every minister in his Cabinet and every man in his following who speaks with authority has declared in unmistakable terms that he is not in favour of reserving to this country of ours the citzenship of Canadians. I can tell him, and I am delighted to have this opportunity of telling him now and here, that when he said—distinguished and great politician and statesman as he is—that he did not share the sentiments of British Columbia, that we were making a mistake we, as befitted citizens of the great empire to which we belong, we said in our hearts, thank God, we have our own individual judgment still left to us. I can tell him that it is because he has not studied conditions, but has only studied theories. And, Sir, not only is it a great compliment to us in British Columbia that we conducted our campaign on principle, but Sir, in explanation of the peculiar fact that we have converted a solid following of seven Liberals at the back of Sir Wilfrid Laurier into a majority of five in support of Mr. R. L. Borden, my honoured leader, I can tell him that I stood on a public platform in British Columbia and said that Mr. R. L. Borden had declared that if the modus vivendi alleged—and I use the word advisedly—to have been entered into by the Hon. Mr. Lemieux with the Japanese government were not lived up to, that circumstance would oblige the Conservative party to abrogate that treaty. I can tell him why my word and my message to the people of British Columbia was accepted : it was because it was from Mr. R. L. Borden, my honoured leader. And why, Mr. Speaker, do the people of British Columbia accept the message of Mr. R. L. Borden, and do not accept the message of Sir Wilfrid Laurier ? It is because Sir Wilfrid Laurier and every member of his Cabinet have put themselves on record as saying in precise terms that they do not believe in a white Canada and a white British Columbia. And I want to say here that while we are prepared to stand steadfast to the men and to the government who will protect the sacred interests of Canada—because the interests of Canada are not different from those of British Columbia—we have in British Columbia the power of discrimination ; and while we find that Sir Wilfrid Laurier says that if this modus vivendi is not lived up to, he will abrogate the treaty, we read into that statement the statement of himself and every member of his Cabinet that he does not believe in protecting the Canadian workingman and thus protecting Canadian citizenship against the importation into British Columbia and into Canada of alien hordes that will always remain aliens. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I enter into this discussion unprepared as I am, in no partisan spirit. I want to say that I enter into this discussion with the highest appreciation of the distinguished qualities that mark the leader of the government of Canada. I want to say that we in British Columbia are not entering into the political life of Canada ; we are not taking this side or that especially because of the general questions that differentiate the two parties in Canada. We take part in this discussion—and I am standing on the floor of the House of Commons to-day at a great sacrifice to myself—not because I am a hidebound partisan, but because I believe that British Columbian interests and Canadian interests—yes, and imperial interests—demand that the blunder of January, 1907, shall be remedied and removed from the treaty laws of Canada. I say this, Sir, in all sincerity ; I believe that I am right, and whether I am right or wrong, I am acting from conviction. I am acting thus because I believe that the interests of Canada, the interests of the empire, and the interests of British Columbia in particular, demand that the treaty which allows every man-jack of the forty-seven millions of people who make up the citizenship of Japan, whether they be deaf, dumb or blind, whether thev be paupers or criminals, to enter Canada without let or hindrance, shall be amended, at least in accordance with the will of Japan herself. Ever since the 6th of October, 1896, Japan has been willing that Canada should retain to herself the power to control the immigration from Japan into Canada. That is a right which no self-respecting country should relinquish. There has not been a minute of time, since October, 1896, to the present, when Japan has not been perfectly willing that Canada should retain her own self respect and exercise the powers given her under section 95 of the British North America Act. Every speech delivered in this House and on the hustings throughout Canada has been an attempt to justify and palliate the blunder of the government in not reserving to Canada, in our treaty with Japan, the right to control or prohibit, if necessary, the immigration of Japanese labourers and artisans. The whole discussion to-day centres around that blunder in treaty-making committed by this government. There is nothing else in question. In 1895 the government then in power stipulated, as a preliminary to our consenting to any treaty, that Canada should retain the right to restrict or prohibit the immi-

gration of Japanese labourers and artisans. That was the stand which the Conservative government of that day took. Again, in October of the following year, after the Conservative government had been defeated, the Japanese government agreed that Canada might adhere to the treaty and reserve to herself the right to prohibit or restrict immigration. Yet notwithstanding this fact and notwithstanding the fact that petition after petition was sent from British Columbia and memorials from the British Columbia government, notwithstanding every thing that a sane and intelligent citizenship could represent to the Ottawa government—notwithstanding all this, on the 25th of September, 1906, this government declared: 'We are willing to transfer to an alien government, whose citizens, when they come to Canada, remain aliens and will continue aliens to the end of time—we are willing to hand over to that alien government the right to say who shall and who shall not enter Canada from Japan.' I have said on the public platform throughout British Columbia that the 25th of September,—1906, when that news was flashed by cable from Ottawa to London, was a black letter day for this Dominion, and I now appeal to the power and majority of the government to reconsider this matter in the interests of Canadian citizenship, and recover to Canada the right she has under her constitution and which she should never have relinquished, namely, the right to control immigration. In saying that I have practically done with this question for the present, because I know it is the intention of the representatives of British Columbia to go into it on a future occasion with greater particularity and more details than I can hope to do unprepared at this moment. Let me add that this is not, as the right hon. the First Minister seems to think, a mere economic question. I yield to no man in admiration of the great empire of Japan. Let me take you back to 1852, when Commodore Perry negotiated the first commercial treaty with Japan. Since then that great country has been acquiring with peculiar rapidity and facility and form of western government and the methods of western commerce and civilization. But these people are still exercising the peculiar domestic traditions and habits of their race. I yield to no man in my admiration of the Japanese as a nation and as individuals, but the danger to Canada lies in that very fact that we have to accord them our admiration in many respects. They are aliens and will remain so. In 1894 they entered into commercial treaties with the United States, Great Britain and almost every western civilized nation. When they entered into that treaty with Great Britain in 1894, the British government in 1895 cabled the government of Canada to ascertain whether Canada wished to become a party to that treaty. I am delighted to be able to declare that the Conservative government, which was then in power, replied: No, unless Canada shall retain her right to restrict or prohibit the immigration from Japan, not only of Japanese labour, but also of Japanese artisans. These people, you know, can transform themselves from artisans into labourers with the rapidity of lightning artists.

And our government of that day had the wisdom and foresight and prevision of statesmen to say that they must add the words 'and artisans.' The United States did not adopt that precaution, and they are paying the penalty to-day. Now, when that government, in 1895, declared in no unmistakable way the policy of Canada, it was the duty of statesmanship, in the sacred interest of the Canadian workingman, to carry out that policy, whatever government happened to be in power in Canada. You must remember that this great nation, Japan, as I have said, is taking on the form of western government and adopting the methods of western commerce and you must remember that the result will be that these people will produce in the near future a new form of civilization which it will be the duty of Canada and of the United States to cope with, and which, if not coped with, will affect and taint the citizenship of Canada and therefore of the great empire to which we belong. Now, I venture to think, that this House, regardless of party affiliations, will give this matter the serious consideration to which it is entitled, and will realize that in this question of immigration we are face to face with a greater problem than any with which Canada has yet been confronted. I take part in the discussion of that problem, and I desire to take part in the solution of that problem, in no partisan spirit. I desire to take part in the discussion and solution of that problem from the standpoint of the interest not only of British Columbia, but of Canada, and of the great and glorious empire of which Canada is so important a part.

Now, leaving that subject as one with which I intended to deal to-night only briefly, I desire to refer to another subject to which the right hon. Prime Minister has seen fit to refer, the subject of better terms for British Columbia. The Prime Minister referred, as it seemed to me, though I hope I am mistaken, in sneering tones to the fact that my leader has said—as he has consistently said since 1904—that British Columbia has such a claim upon the Dominion as ought to be referred to an independent and impartial tribunal. When the right hon. gentleman sneers at that position, he sneers at the very fountain of justice itself. And when any man in Canada lacks the spirit of fair-play and justice to such an extent that he is unwilling to let the claim of British Columbia or any other province

or section or individual be submitted to an independent and impartial tribunal for arbitrament, if he be a man whom I held in lofty appreciation, my ideals concerning him must suffer a serious fall. All we want is justice: dare to give us that justice. If we cannot prove our claim, we will take our medicine with equanimity. The time for expediency in this Canada of ours, has passed; the time for opportunism has passed. Give us justice and we are satisfied. Dare to submit our claims to an independent and impartial tribunal: dare to be a man. If we are wrong, we will take our medicine; if we are right, like men you will pay us our claim. The Prime Minister has told you that this question of British Columbia's claim has been submitted, if you please, to the representatives of the other provinces. It may be that I would be delighted if the money claims against myself were submitted to me for arbitrament. You can see that if we of British Columbia are right, the other provinces of Canada will foot the bill just as, if my creditors are right, I must foot the bill. Could you, with justice, put me in a position to judge of the claims of my creditors against myself? Be fair. Be just. Be honourable. Submit our claims to an independent and impartial tribunal. You will find that the splendid western spirit of manliness and fair-play will take the result and the consequences with equanimity. I have only this further to say, that I think the hon. the First Minister is quite right when he says the campaign in British Columbia was conducted on principle. It was conducted on principle, and I believe that if and when an election campaign is conducted throughout the whole of Canada on principle, men of principle will be elected and will govern this country.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). It was not my intention to take part in this debate, but after the extraordinary speech of the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and his personal reference to myself, I think it my duty to say a few words in my own defence. I do not intend to follow that hon. gentleman on the ground of personalities in which he has indulged, I do not think that style of debate is calculated to raise or even to maintain the dignity of this House. This country has before it enough weighty problems to discuss without members of this House wasting our time in discussing personal matters. For that reason I cannot follow the hon. gentleman on the ground he has chosen, I will leave him to follow alone that line of debate. But I will say this to the hon. gentleman, that I am not afraid to compare my personal record with his own. So far as integrity and honour are concerned, I think my record will compare favourably with his: consequently if I do not choose to follow him in personal attacks, it is not because I do not feel quite able to defend myself on that ground. As to my public career as Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I am not afraid, either, to compare my record with the record of the hon. member for North Toronto. He was for a number of years Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and what did he do to reform that department? Let him point to one single action of his when Minister where he tried to reform the department. He did nothing, he let things drag on as they had been doing for years, He allowed the same abuses to continue that had been existing before he took hold of the department, and he never had the courage to effect a single reform in that department, as I have done. Sir, I have effected considerable reforms in that department, and if to-day I am attacked by some of the Tory newspapers and by the hon. member for North Toronto, it is because I have reformed the administration of that department. In the first place, we had a bad system of keeping accounts. That system existed when my hon. friend was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and what did he do to remove it? Nothing at all. I have reformed that, and to-day the abuses which existed under my hon. friend's administration have disappeared, and we have now a clear and straight administration of that department.

But why are these attacks levelled against me now? We have just passed through a general election contest, and my hon. friend knows the result. He knows what he and his friends essayed to do before the elections. He spent the whole session last year in attacking me, by all means and under all circumstances, by saying the most abusive things against me personally. When the elections came on he gathered together those abuses and reproduced them in pamphlet form and scattered them over Canada. Sir, what has been the result of that campaign of slander inaugurated by the hon. member for North Toronto? He and his party were hopelessly defeated, that was the result. There is not a county throughout Canada where my name was not mentioned by the Tory speakers, but it was all to no purpose, and this government has been triumphantly returned. Why, Sir, my opponents were not able to put a candidate against me in my own county, they were not able even to find twenty-five electors to sign a nomination paper for a candidate against me. True, they sent an organizer from Montreal into my county, instructing him by no means to allow me to be elected by acclamation. That gentleman went around the county to get signatures, not in favour of any man who was known in the county, but in favour of a man from Montreal who did not know ten electors in the county. This organizer succeeded in getting 25 names, but just as he was about

to deposit his nomination paper, two of the men who had signed it came up and said, 'We do not want our names on that nomination paper, we want Mr. Brodeur to be elected by acclamation. I was elected by acclamation, and that is my answer to the hon. gentleman and his friends. Not only Liberals of my county, but many Conservatives were in favour of my election by acclamation, as they told me themselves, in order to rebuke the hon. member for North Toronto for his abusive personalities. Let him continue that policy if he likes. To-night he seems desirous of continuing it. Let him go on. I do not care, I will be re-elected as long as he continues that policy. I shall not be obliged, as my hon. friend was, to desert my own constituency and my own province, but I shall continue to be elected in my own constituency and my own province, because my electors have confidence in me.

The Department of Marine and Fisheries has been attacked. I would have thought that my hon. friend would at least have waited until he had had an opportunity of reading the report of Mr. Justice Cassels. I do not want to discuss that report now because I suppose that my hon. friends opposite have not had the opportunity of reading over the report, but probably we will have occasion later on to discuss it. But, I am glad to see that some of the attacks which have been made by my hon. friends opposite, and especially by the hon. member for North Toronto, have been proved to be absolutely false as far as they concern myself. I will give the House one instance. Hon. gentlemen who were then members of the House will remember the hon. member for North Toronto last session referring time and again to Merwin and Brooks and to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who, he said, was still doing business with Merwin and Brooks. I was attacked and attacked by the hon. member for North Toronto on that ground. Let him read the report of Mr. Justice Cassels and he will find that the charge which was made against me in that connection is absolutely groundless; in fact, it is stated that the purchases which had been made from Merwin and Brooks were made contrary to and in disobedience of the instructions that I had given by an officer of the department appointed by my hon. friend for North Toronto. If there is anybody who is at fault it is not myself, but it is the hon. member for North Toronto who has placed in the service men who will not fulfil the instructions of their ministers, men who have been disobeying the instructions of their ministers.

My aim upon going into the department was to reform that department and put it on a proper basis. Abuses of the worst kind have crept in, I admit, abuses which had existed since confederation, which had existed under the Tory governments and which had existed under the Liberal government. Take the question of purchases for example. You have heard a great deal lately with regard to purchases and how scandalous it was that we had a patronage list or that we were purchasing from some particular personal. Let us read some extracts from a document which was placed before the House last year, because I do not want to refer to the report of Mr. Justice Cassels. We will discuss that later on, and we will draw from it the arguments which I venture to say will vindicate absolutely what I have done. But, let us quote from a report which was laid before the House last year. Take for example a letter of the 28th March, 1894, addressed by Mr. Art. J. Turcotte, member for Montmorency, to Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, who was then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and which is as follows:

Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, K.C.M.G.,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—For the supplies of groceries at the Department of Marine of Quebec, I would much recommend you Napoleon Moffet. Hoping that you will do me that favour.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) ART. J. TURCOTTE.

Then Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper replies as follows:

Dear Mr. Turcotte,—Your letter of the 28th, recommending that groceries be purchased from Mr. Napoleon Moffet, was received by me.

Mr. Moffet has been asked, through the agent at Quebec, for his prices.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) C. H. TUPPER.

Here is a letter dated the 7th June, 1894, addressed to Mr. Gregory:

In reply to your letter of May 2, 1894, informing me that you had no correspondence with the department, regarding the purchase of groceries from Mr. O. A. Larose, I have to request you to inform me whether Mr. O. A. Larose was recommended by any one. Inform me also whether you purchased groceries from any other grocer than Mr. Larose.

The deputy minister writes that to Mr. Gregory.

It appears from the accounts, that nearly all the groceries purchased for steamers' use were obtained from Mr. Larose. I have to request you to report whether this is the case.

No competition was required in any way, shape or form. Here is an extract from a memo.:

January 14, 1905.

Re purchasing of supplies, for lighthouses. Small supplies.

With regard to what are called small supplies, such as towelling, ticking, gray cotton, &c., the agents are allowed to purchase these without tender at the lowest possible prices for good articles from merchants who have

been recommended by the M. P.'s of the several cities.

Recommending by the M.P.'s, members of the several cities! That is very clear. Here is another:

April 5, 1895.

Sir,—Mr. Turcotte, M.P., has written to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries asking that crockery and smallwares be obtained from Mr. Omer Lecomte, when required, the same as supplied by his predecessor Mr. Bruneau.

I have to request you to report on the matter for the information of the department.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) JOHN HARDIE,
Acting Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

J. U. Gregory, Esq.,
Agent Department of Marine and Fisheries,
Quebec

Here is another letter:

Quebec, April 9, 1895.

Sir,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 5th instant (No. 10729), requesting me to report upon the application of Mr. Turcotte, M.P., for crockery and smallwares to be obtained from Mr. O. Lecomte, successor to Mr. Bruneau.

Mr. Louis Bruneau was recommended for this patronage by the late Hon. Jno. Hearn, Sir A. P. Caron and others; it amounted to very little. He has gone entirely out of the business and is succeeded by Mr. Omer Lecomte, who appears to have as many good friends as Mr. Bruneau; and his getting the supplying of the few articles which may be wanted in his line will not injure Mr. Bruneau nor any one else that I know of. Please inform me if approved of.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) JOHN U. GREGORY,
Agent Department of Marine and Fisheries.

The Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

And it was approved of. These are some of the things which happened in Quebec. Now, take St. John, N.B. I see that during the elections a gentleman in that province went out of his way to work against the Liberal party. This gentleman seemed to be very much scandalized in regard to patronage. What do I find? —a letter from the Hon. John Douglas Hazen, Premier of New Brunswick, written to Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, as follows:

Dear Sir,—Last year, acting on my recommendation, you decided that the dry goods, required to be obtained at St. John for your department, be purchased from James Hamilton.

No objection there.

I believe the price was thoroughly satisfactory, and I will be obliged if you will give similar instructions to your agent at St. John for this year's supplies. Mr. Hamilton is one of our very best political workers, and his party services entitle him to anything that can fairly be given to him.

Your faithfully,
(Sgd.) J. DOUGLAS HAZEN.

Here is the Premier of New Brunswick who is not asking even that a purchase list be made, that prices be obtained from some friends of the government, but that purchases be made direct from Mr. James Hamilton.

We find on May 8, 1894, another letter from Mr. Hazen reading as follows:

My dear Sir Charles,—I beg once more to call your attention to my recommendation of some time ago that the dry goods required in your department in St. John be purchased from James Hamilton. I judge from your reply at the time this recommendation would be acted upon and I will feel very much obliged if you will now instruct Mr. Harding to purchase from Hamilton if his prices are satisfactory.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) J. DOUGLAS HAZEN.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. A little different.

Mr. BRODEUR. A little different, just to purchase from one man. My hon. friend says it is another thing, but what competition is there?

We have the same thing from Halifax, and there I declare it to be one of the most scandalous matters which has been brought before this parliament. There tenders had been asked for, but before those tenders were passed upon by the Governor in Council they were submitted to outsiders to see whether the tenders would please them or not. I shall read the letter to my hon. friend.

Ottawa, April 19, 1892.

The Hon. C. H. Tupper,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

My dear Tupper,—Referring to our conversation yesterday morning respecting tenders for the supplies for the steamers of your department at Halifax, I have to ask that before the contracts are awarded you will kindly allow me an opportunity to call at your office and learn who are likely to receive them.

Your faithfully,
(Sgd.) JOHN F. STAIRS.

Before these tenders were submitted to council, when they should be a matter of secrecy between the members of the government, an outsider comes in and asks to see the tenders. What is the answer? It should have been that the tenders were private and that no one had the right to see them, but that is not what we see under Conservative administration. I have here Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper's letter.

In reply to yours of the 19th instant, requesting an opportunity to call at my department, and ascertain who is likely to receive the contract for supplying the steamers of the department at Halifax, I may say that

any time after to-morrow you may call, and information will be given respecting the tenders.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

John F. Stairs, Esq., M.P.,
The House of Commons.

Could there be any more scandalous conduct than that of the late ministers in permitting outsiders to inspect the tenders before they were accepted by the Governor in Council? I brand it as most disgraceful conduct. That is one of the evils with which we had to cope. When I entered the department what did I do?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh, hear, hear.

Mr. BRODEUR. I changed entirely the system which had been in existence before. One man was no longer permitted the exclusive right to sell dry goods to the department, as had been done at St. John; we asked prices from a large number of people and lately I have gone further, I have abolished entirely the patronage list and now we are purchasing by calling for public tenders, open to everybody. The other day we had occasion to ask for tenders in Halifax, and I understand that a contract has been given to a person who is not friendly to the government. But I do not care; I want to reform the system that has been in existence since 1867, I do not wish to have any more of that patronage system. The Liberal party, unlike the Conservative party, believe in doing without that patronage system. The system does not work to the interest of the Liberal party, for we are not like the Conservative party; the Conservative party wants to make millionaires or to give favour; we want to distribute the wealth and to give to every person the advantage of an opportunity of tendering and of carrying out contracts and we wish in making purchases to obtain substantial goods at reasonable prices. These reforms I understand have not been very well received by my hon. friends opposite; they would like to see continued the same system that existed before. I am not in favour of that policy; I have decided that in my department things shall be done in an upright and honourable way. I do not wish to follow the course of my hon. friends opposite; I want to do better than they have done; I want to institute reforms and those reforms are now being carried out in the best way possible. How are these reforms being carried out? I have told you that we have made investigations, we ordered the civil service investigation, and following that the investigation by Mr. Justice Cassels. That shows that we are not afraid of making investigations.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am glad to see the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) laughing at that. How did the former government proceed? How did he proceed himself? In 1891 and 1892, when officers were charged with being derelict in their duty, what did he do? Of course he was not Minister of Marine, but he was minister of another department in which some officers were also charged. Did he appoint a judge to investigate the conduct of those officers and of the ministers who might be reproached as to their conduct? No, my hon. friend was too cautious for that, he did not do what I did, he simply appointed himself a commission in order to investigate the conduct of those officers.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be well done.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) who could be charged with being responsible for the conduct of these officers who were under his control, instead of appointing an independent judge to make the investigation said: I shall appoint myself—that will be better and less dangerous. He appointed himself and afterwards dismissed some of those officers and retained others in the public service. The course we have followed is much more courageous; we were not afraid to have an outsider go into the accounts of the Department of Marine, we were not afraid of investigation and we appointed a judge to conduct the investigation and lawyers to assist him. We have had examined everything connected with the administration of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and all of the evidence taken during the investigation can be found in the reports which have been laid before parliament. Did my hon. friend bring down to parliament the evidence which he took when he appointed himself a commissioner? No, he kept it for himself, he kept everything for himself, and now because a minister tries to do the right thing he is branded as a stupid and foolish man. I followed the course which I took because I was not afraid; my hon. friend perhaps would not have followed the same course, it might have been stupid on his part. I made it my duty to have an investigation by an independent judge and the result is as satisfactory as can be expected in the circumstances. For my part I am satisfied with the result of the investigation. I come out clear from that investigation and in spite of the insinuations of my hon. friend, in spite of his calling me stupid, I say that I stand justified before the country, having done my duty fearlessly, having done my duty to my friends, my duty to my party and my duty to the country which I have the honour to serve.

Mr. GEO. H. BARNARD (Victoria, B.C.). Mr. Speaker, I take it that if the result of the recent elections in British Columbia re-

quires any justification, it has received it at the hands of the right hon. the Prime Minister to-day, for I think I am right in saying that the right hon. gentleman has paid more attention to the needs and wants of that province this afternoon than he has ever done since he has had the honour of leading the government. I do not propose to-night to discuss the questions on which the elections in the province of British Columbia were decided. The British Columbia members will, I think, if opportunity is afforded to them, and if it is not they will try to create it, discuss fairly, fully and freely those questions before this House, and I think the right hon. gentleman will find that the members from the province of British Columbia will be prepared to take up the gauntlet which he has thrown down to-day.

The right hon. gentleman did me the honour to refer with some particularity to the election in Victoria and to a certain telegram which had been sent by the hon. leader of the opposition to the 'Colonist' newspaper in that city; and, as I hope to stand in the estimation of the members of this House, not only on this side, but on the other side as well, as a man of honour and integrity, I deem it proper to make a statement with regard to that telegram. As a matter of fact, the telegram was handed to me when I was speaking on a platform at a public meeting in the city of Victoria on the evening of Saturday, the 24th of October, by an emissary of the 'Colonist' newspaper, a man on the reportorial staff of that paper. I read the telegram as it was handed to me, and it appeared the next morning in the 'Colonist' newspaper in the form in which it was handed to me. That is all that I knew about that telegram at that time. I heard afterwards that there was some alteration made in the telegram, but I want to say that so far as my inquiries gave me any information, it was not made either with any knowledge of mine or with the consent or connivance of any of the gentlemen who did me the honour of assisting me in any way in my election in Victoria.

The right hon. gentleman had a good deal to say this afternoon about the reasons for the result of the elections in British Columbia. I think I can fairly tell the right hon. gentleman that he did not lose those British Columbia elections on the 26th of October, 1908, but he lost them when he made a certain speech in the Russell Theatre in the city of Ottawa on the 3rd of December, 1907. The right hon. gentleman is reported in a paper which I believe is a Liberal paper, the 'Ottawa Free Press', as having on that occasion used the following words:

Japan is an ally of ours, declared Sir Wilfrid, and if there was a war in the Pacific in which Great Britain might be engaged we would have the Japanese fleet by the side of the British fleet. We would not apply the law of exclusion to the Japanese, but we recognize that there is a strong prejudice in the province of British Columbia amongst the white population against all kinds of Oriental population. I say prejudice, and I speak advisedly. I do not want to speak offensively. I know my words will be reported in British Columbia, but I speak here the same language I would speak there if it were my privilege to be there. Perhaps my words will be unwelcome there, but I tell them: You may have your views upon the question, and you are hostile to the immigration of the Oriental race. I do not care for your sentiments, and I believe you are making a mistake.

With regard to the last sentence, I understand that the right hon. gentleman made a correction, stating that it should have read: 'I do not share your sentiments.' That sentence, I may tell the right hon. gentleman, was quoted time and again in the province of British Columbia and was never contradicted, and I assume it to be a correct report. That was one of the inducing causes which made a majority of the electors of British Columbia supporters of the Conservative party. The right hon. gentleman appeared to be especially surprised at the result in the city of Victoria, and seemed to consider it necessary to impute fraud to the party to which I belong in the conduct of the election; but I think he could have found other reasons, if he had gone a little deeper, why the electors of Victoria did not care to return the gentleman who was contesting the seat in his interest. That gentleman had contested the seat four times previously, and had been defeated three times out of the four, and it was only when he came to British Columbia and dazzled the eyes of the electors with a Windsor uniform as a minister of the Crown, and that at a by-election, that he managed to get a seat at all. Now, the right hon. gentleman might, in fairness to a new member of this House at least, have taken the House into his confidence in reading that telegram this afternoon, and might have told Hon. members that it was not addressed to myself, but to the 'Colonist' newspaper and was published in that newspaper. I may say, in conclusion, that I hope my own reputation in my own community is as free as is his in his community from imputations of fraud.

Mr. MARTIN BURRELL (Yale-Cariboo). Mr. Speaker, I have no intention at this late hour of the night of taking up the time of the House on the motion for the adoption of the address; but the remarks of the right hon. the Prime Minister have made it impossible for any British Columbian member to remain silent. Two questions of supreme importance to the province from which I come entered very largely into the recent campaign, namely, Japanese immigration and better terms. The Prime Min-

ister has referred to the fact that in the province of British Columbia the elections were fought largely on a question of principle, and, if I understand him aright, he expressed his gratification at that fact, a gratification in which we can all share. I do not know whether I can infer from his remarks that in the other provinces the elections were not conducted on questions of principle. If so, I assume that the right hon. gentleman referred to the Liberal conduct of the campaign as well as the Conservative. At one time the right hon. the Prime Minister stated that he would be guided on the great question of Oriental immigration by the sentiments of the west; but, if I remember aright, he said he would be guided by the views of the Liberals of the west. I think that is a rather narrow view He should have said that he would be guided by the views of the people of British Columbia, not the Liberals only.

In regard to the hon. gentlemen who moved and seconded the address, I can join with my leader in complimenting those hon. gentlemen. I admit that I was not able to follow the seconder of the motion, although I recognized his grace and eloquence as a speaker. The mover of the address spoke at great length, and in the course of his speech stated that he was an agriculturist, but having been myself an agriculturist for about a quarter of a century, I may be pardoned for saying that his remarks did not smack very much of the soil.

There are four matters which were prominent in the elections that took place recently. They are essential matters of principle, and I propose to touch on them very briefly. In saying that they are essentially questions of principle, I am citing the words of the right hon. the First Minister himself ; and I may add that this description of them has been proved accurate, especially in my own case and in my own constituency, where I had the difficult task of contesting a deferred election with the government well in power. And I think I am warranted in saying that the result of that election was a very clear illustration of the triumph of principle over expediency. The four questions which were chiefly debated in the province of British Columbia—and I refer especially to my own campaign, representing as I do, by far the largest constituency in the whole Dominion—were the so-called Election Act, Bill No. 115, known out west as the Aylesworth Bill ; the question of better terms ; the question of the Oriental or Japanese immigration ; and the administration of public affairs, especially in connection with the civil service.

As regards the Election Bill, which was prominently discussed in our campaign, and which to some extent defeated our opponent because of the attitude he took on that measure last session—with regard to that Bill I shall not say anything because the members of this House who sat here during months while that measure was under discussion, must have had a surfeit of it. I shall only say that proof has since been given in a very marked way that the election laws of British Columbia are absolutely fair to both Liberals and Conservatives. The attenpt to abolish our provincial franchise excited very strong feeling in our province ; and I am glad to have this opportunity of expressing to my honoured leader and the rest of the Conservative party my appreciation of the gallant fight they put up to retain to the province of British Columbia its own franchise. In connection with this Election Bill, we have had some debate on the question of the deferred elections in Yale and Cariboo and Comox-Atlin and Kootenay. Let me say most emphatically, speaking from personal knowledge of the large constituency of Cariboo, that there was absolutely no justification for the postponement of that election, and that it was generally known, throughout the length and breadth of my constituency, to have been postponed for the sole purpose of getting a seat in this House for a man who had not the slightest chance of obtaining it without the advantage of insidious appeals to public patronage.

The question of better terms has been dealt with to some extent by my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Cowan) and I shall merely touch on it briefly. In 1904 the question of better terms to British Columbia was the subject matter, to a large extent, of the campaign at that time. We were favoured with various expositions of that subject, and one of the most extraordinary was given by a gentleman who, I believe, is about to speed westward in the hope of representing a constituency which a member of this House has gratefully relinquished. I refer to the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman). On one occasion, when speaking on the question of better terms, Mr. Templeman expressed the view that one large sample of better terms would be given British Columbia when a Liberal administration was restored to power. Well, I fear the better terms will come very late in the day if it is to come in that shape.

Referring to the Prime Minister of British Columbia, (Mr. McBride), the right hon. the First Minister said he was a very astute man. Well, he is not only astute but something very much stronger and bigger. On the question of better terms, he took a broad, sane view ; and in handling the matter as he did he impressed his view, not only on the Conservatives but on the majority of the Liberals of British Columbia. When dealing as I hope to do, at length with this question later on, I propose to endeavour to impress on this

House that, in bringing up this question, we are not impelled by any spirit of antagonism to the other provinces, but simply because we believe that there can be no possible sympathetic co-operation among the different provinces until equal justice is meeted out to all. All we intend ever asking this House and pressing on the government is simply that the contention submitted by my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Cowan) namely, that an impartial tribunal should decide whether we have a case or not, should be acted upon.

Leaving that matter, I propose to say a few words on the Oriental question. Some time ago the right hon. First Minister differentiated between the various races which confront each other on the Pacific coast. He drew broad lines of distinction between the Japanese, the Chinese and the Hindoos. To-night, however, he includes them in the one common expression ; but there is this distinction to be noticed, and it is one which I have always endeavoured to appreciate. I am no hide bound partisan, I am quite ready to acknowledge that we are all working for the good of Canada in our various ways, although we cannot all see alike, and I do not take the ground that nothing hon. gentlemen on the opposite side can do can possibly be otherwise than wrong. We must admit that there must be many measures entitled to approval, no matter from what side they may come. As regards the Hindoo phase of this question, I believe that the action of the government was the only right and practical one, namely, to send their accredited representative to the imperial authorities in order to arrive at a solution of that question, which was different from the others in this important respect that it affected British subjects. That is a difference which is fundamental, and I trust on some future occasion to try and convince the House, that the only possible solution of this question will be found in convincing thoughtful and earnest men on both sides that the stand we take is not a narrow or provincial one but one eminently just and in the national interest. I know the opinion exists that out in the west we are a little hot tempered and not so judicial as we should be in our discussions on this matter, and we shall have to convince hon. gentlemen by logical appeal to their reason, that the views of the west are sound. You must not think, Mr. Speaker, that because we come from British Columbia and have to face conditions there which are rather acute, we are necessarily local or provincial in our views. We claim—and I think rightly—that we are not only British Columbian to the bottom of our hearts but also Canadians in the broadest sense of the word and Imperialists in the truest significance. May I add that in my own personal experience, speaking to men in the old land and following the more recent articles in the leading papers and reviews of Great Britain, the thoughtful opinions of the mother country have become fundamentally changed on the question of the influx of the Oriental race.

The day is coming, even if it has not come already, when, as it is put by one of their prominent men, it is recognized more and more every day to be the duty of the home government and the imperial authorities, no matter what conditions they have to face in other parts of the world, to stand by even the most distant and smallest portions of the British empire to build up a nation that should be Anglo-Saxon in race and tradition. I would like to add a word, because the Prime Minister seemed to imply that in one riding at least—I do not know whether he intended to include them all—the telegram in reference to the problem of exclusion by the leader of the opposition was one of the reasons why British Columbia had gone Conservative, as it were coming in under a false promise or a piece of hypocrisy. Let me assure him in the most emphatic way that, speaking for myself, not once did I say—though I expressed my sympathy with the exclusion movement as I do now—that the leader of the opposition had pledged himself to that policy, although it may be my view that not only he but other members of the House will come to that opinion. I treated the case on its merits, and the contest resulted, as I knew it would, against the former member for Yale-Cariboo, because he, in common with other members who represented—or rather misrepresented—British Columbian constituencies had ratified that treaty without a word of protest in regard to it. I can quite understand that some hon. members opposed will retort—in fact I knew this retort was made—that our leader and other members of the Conservative party also supported the ratification of that treaty, and did not lift up their voices in protest against it. I recognize that. It is perfectly true, and it may possibly be that there are two reasons for it. I am not imputing bad motives or casting slurs when I say that it is certain that the Conservative party were misled by hon. gentlemen opposed as to assurances from Japan with regard to this matter, and also by the exaggerated ideas of the importance of the trade with Japan, which, I believe, is not going to be as large as some people seem to think. Then, again, with regard to the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and Conservative members generally, I can quite understand that no man who has lived altogether in the east and has not come into daily contact with the conditions that face the people of the west, can possibly grasp the true significance of this oriental question to the people of the Pacific coast. I am sorry to add also that hon. gentleman opposite, and eastern members, generally do not avail themselves of their

privileges, as they ought to do, to gain a more intimate acquaintance at first hand with the great western country which, after all, is going to be the backbone of Canada. There is this to be said, however, that the leader of the opposition and the Conservative party, when they did begin to realize what the sentiment and feeling in British Columbia was on this great question, adjusted their position to meet the sentiment of British Columbia, which, after all, gentlemen on the opposite side did not do. It is all very well to say that this was done for party purposes, but we have no right to judge people in that way. We have a right to assume, and we may assume, that the leader of the opposition felt from the bottom of his heart that he ought to do as he has done, that he recognized the importance of this question, and, when he understood the sentiment of the people of the west, he adjusted his position and took a different stand, possibly, from that which he took a year or two ago. We recognize that this question has got to be divested of all bitterness, that it has got to be put on the soundest kind of basis. I hope that some time it will be the privilege of British Columbia members on this side to put up an argument on this question, and I hope that it will be an argument of sufficient strength and fairness to practically revolutionize the sentiments with regard to the matter of the members from the east, who, perhaps, have not grasped the importance of the question.

Now, I desire, in closing, to deal for a moment with another question—the character of the administration of public affairs in this country, more especially in relation to the Civil Service. This is a live matter, for it is referred to in the speech from the Throne, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Brodeur) had occasion to deal with it in a somewhat lengthy way. One of that hon. gentleman's remarks was quite pathetic, it seems to me. He intimated that he would not deal with the campaign of the opposition on this subject, because these questions formed a very undignified theme. I think that is the way he put it. Well, not referring to the personal aspect of the matter, when charges are brought against individuals or against a government, that corruption and wrongdoing exist, it is certainly extremely undignified for some people to have it found out. But these people have to be dealt with. And here again, I may refer to the remarks of the Prime Minister on the matter of principle. I say that the character of the administration of our public affairs must essentially be a matter of great significance and vital importance to every man who values the welfare of Canada—it must be so for any man who is trying to make Canada a better nation that it is. Charges were made, and I find that the Prime Minister, in his campaign, underwent a series of changes in his attitude toward these charges as the discussion proceeded. I think I quote him accurately when I say that his first statement was that these matters were of trifling magnitude, and he would dismiss them. His second position was that our charges would be probed to the bottom and the guilty parties punished. And, his third position was that he refused to discuss the matter at all. Well, in regard to his first suggestion, I can only say that any matter that affects the character of the administration of public affairs in Canada cannot be a matter of trifling moment. As to his second suggestion, that these things would be probed to the bottom and the guilty parties punished, I feel that our experience in the west, so far as we have followed public affairs—and we try to follow them intelligently — is that, the present regime is not very successful in such probing; they have not gone very far. Judging from what they found at the top, if they were to go to the bottom, there would be a bad mess. We felt some distrust as to their probing of these matters. And then, as I say, the Prime Minister declared that he would not discuss this subject. But, unfortunately for the Liberal cause, so far as British Columbia is concerned, the people went on discussing it. They thought these were important matters, matters the discussion of which was necessary. I know that in my own campaign I did discuss them. I see one or two gentlemen on the other side who followed me very closely in the campaign amongst whom I may mention the Hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver.).

Now the gentleman who did follow me, whether closely or at a distance, will admit that I was not guilty of making any unfair attacks in regard to the administration of public affairs in the country. My own course was simply this. I left on one side the Liberal and Conservative papers, and I went to the source and took up the report of the Civil Service Commission appointed by the right hon. gentleman's government. I simply showed what this report was, and what it said, and the result was that those people who could not be influenced by the party press were perfectly willing to be influenced by an independent authority such as that commission. I would even go further and say that I can hardly understand how it is that in eastern Canada that report did not have a greater effect than it appears to have had. Of course I can understand that all moral reform is of slow growth. I am glad to have the hon. gentleman's assurance that he is reforming his own department, and although it may take some time, I trust that the reform will ultimately take place. I may add that I believe that if a similar report had been published in Great Britain on any department of the public service there, it would have driven any

government from office in twenty-four hours.

Now, Mr. Speaker, allow me to refer to one other matter which concerns my own constituency, as I think it has some bearing on the question of principle to which the prime minister has referred. I refer to the question of patronage. I think that political patronage has been one of the great curses of this country, and has done more than anything else to retard the growth of a healthy public sentiment. Some remarks have been made here tonight in connection with the bribery of constituencies. I will not debate that question at any length now, but I may remark that it played a considerable part in my constituency at the last election. It is the opinion of the people in the west that the great natural resources of Canada are being too largely used and disposed of for party and political advantage. The Prime Minister, in his remarks, referred to my late opponent, Mr. Duncan Ross. Well, Mr. Duncan Ross is not regarded in British Columbia as a very high authority on political matters, particularly since November 12. But as some hon. gentlemen opposite seem to regard him as an authority, I will quote a few lines from a speech which he made subsequently to his defeat.

> Keeping a seat warm in parliament is a mere incident compared with the labour and thought required in acting as an agent of the people of Yale-Cariboo, transacting their business with the government in power. Any advice received from the member elected from this district will be immediately treated as hostile advice coming from a man elected to do his utmost to defeat that government, and any advice that will be acceptable to that government must necessarily come from one who fought the battles of the government in this district, and who went down fighting in defence of the policies and the records of the government.

Well, I do not think there is any doubt that the former representative of Yale-Cariboo did go down to defeat, considering the size of the majority against him. Now I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman and the members of his government whether that is the principle which is going to guide them in treating all advice tendered them by opposition members, viz., —as hostile advice to be neglected by the government. I would be sorry to believe, and I will not believe until I am convinced to the contrary, that any minister of this government will take so narrow a view of his responsibilities. For my own part I consider myself as representative, not only of the Conservatives of Yale-Cariboo, but of the Liberals as well. I understand that the duty of a member of parliament is to represent his own constituency, and a man would be recreant to his duty if he did not, regardless of party ties and affiliations, keep steadily in view the interest of all his constituents, whether Liberal or Conservative.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General. I do not intend to detain the House at any length. I merely wish to refer to some remarks made by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in his very interesting, and I may say very bitter speech. The hon. gentleman said that when during the last campaign, I was in the city of Berlin, I dangled before the eyes of the electors some promises which I think the hon. gentleman termed petty bribes. Sir, I resent the statement made by that hon. gentleman, and I do not think that my hon. friend from York will corroborate that statement after the explanations I propose to give.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (S. York). Your friend from York made no remark.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. Speaker, what are the facts? During the summer of 1907 I was invited as Minister of Labour to a dinner given by the citizens of Berlin, irrespective of politics, to Mr. Mackenzie King. It was indeed a pretty sight to see the Conservatives of Berlin uniting with the Liberals to testify to the high character and great ability of the young Deputy Minister of Labour. I was present as his chief on that occasion. On that visit I was requested by the mayor of Berlin, whose politics I do not know, and by many of the citizens, to complete a work which had been undertaken by a former Conservative government twenty years ago. There was standing in the centre of that very interesting and beautiful city of Berlin, what I would call an eyesore. Under the government of Sir John Macdonald they had erected there a splendid post office with a tower, but that tower, as I noticed, was clockless and the citizens of Berlin begged of me to represent their views to the Minister of Public Works at Ottawa so as to secure the completion of that tower by the addition of a clock. I promised the gentlemen who approached me, Conservatives and Liberals alike, that certainly I would do my best to make their representations to the minister and that I hoped that within a very short time the tower would have its clock. I was asked at the same time to give to the city of Berlin, a very enterprising city of the province of Ontario, the system of free letter delivery within its limits. I said that if the city of Berlin had reached the population fixed by the regulations of the Post Office Department, that is to say, 12,000, and if the revenue of the city justified it, that is to say $20,000 a year, it would not be a pleasure but it would be a duty for me as Postmaster General to give to the city of Berlin free letter delivery. I came back to Ottawa. I made representations to the then Minister of Public Works. I

think that my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley), who is now the incumbent of the office, had not yet been sworn in, but at a later period, after he had been sworn in as a cabinet minister and after he had taken charge of the Public Works Department, I approached him with a delegation sent from Berlin to implement the promise I had made in the summer of 1907. My hon. friend yielded to the request of the citizens of Berlin, irrespective of politics, and forthwith the clock was sent to Berlin and the eyesore disappeared. As to the free mail delivery, it was granted at once; in fact, a few days after my visit in June, 1907, it was granted to the citizens of Berlin. When I appeared before the electors a year afterwards, accompanied by a gentleman who was no more the deputy minister of the Department of Labour, I jocularly remarked, upon presenting myself before the vast audience that was present, that I had had the pleasure of meeting the citizens of Berlin a year before, that I had been asked two things from them, a clock for the tower and free letter delivery and that these two things had been granted. These could not be offered as an inducement to the electors to vote for my friend Mackenzie King. They had already been granted them. Everybody could see what time it was at the tower and everybody was receiving his letters at his door in the morning. It was simply a jocular remark, it was taken in that spirit by the crowd which listened to me and I believe that my hon. friend from North Toronto who knows the two constituencies of Waterloo in Ontario, who knows the peculiar honesty, thrift and integrity of the inhabitants of these two ridings, will not for a moment believe that for a clock in the tower or a free letter delivery, two things to which the electors of those divisions were entitled, they would be influenced one way or the other, or that they would be influenced on that occasion by the remark I made.

Now, I shall not dwell at any length on the question of graft and corruption. That question has been decided by the electors of the Dominion. I for one as a public man do not believe that the hon. gentleman who leads the opposition is a corrupt statesman. I believe he is an honest man and I believe that every man in this country thinks that the hon. leader of the government is also an honest man and one who would not stand for graft or corruption. There was no issue in the last general election but the issue of graft and of corruption. which was not one worthy of the Canadian people. The Canadian people pronounced themselves in favour of the government because they believe that our policy had been wise, honest and truly Canadian.

I have listened with much pleasure and with very great interest indeed to the speeches delivered by the hon. gentlemen who now represent the fair province of British Columbia. I have listened to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Burrell) who has just spoken, and I must commend the tone of his speech. I will speak only of two features which were specially put forward during the last political campaign in British Columbia. He says that there were four features. I will speak only of two because I happen to know a little more about these. He spoke of the question of better terms and of oriental immigration. As regard better terms, let me say to the hon. gentleman that I had the great honour to sit on the special committee of the Privy Council which listened to the demands made by the united provinces of the Dominion three years ago in the Senate chamber. I listened with great interest to the requests that were made, because, as hon. gentlemen know, as the leader of the opposition fully knows, we in the province of Quebec, since 1887, have taken a very deep interest in the question. In fact, the province of Quebec, under the leadership of the Hon. Mr. Flynn, premier of that province, under the leadership later of the Hon. Mr. Mousseau, and still later under the leadership of the Hon. Mr. Mercier, had been very insistent at Ottawa upon the settlement of the question of the readjustment of the provincial subsidies. Fortunately for the province of Quebec we had won to our cause the great province of Ontario under the leadership of Sir Oliver Mowat, later on under that of Mr. Ross and later on under that of Hon. Mr. Whitney. The question came up before that committee of the Privy Council. It was there stated by the Finance Minister of Canada, by the Prime Minister, by the Minister of Justice—not by myself—I was the junior member of the committee—I simply listened and I learned a great deal—but there and then it was stated and it was stipulated that the agreement to settle the readjustment of the provincial subsidies would be a final—final one. Let me say this to you, Mr. Speaker, that no man fought with more zeal, that no man put up such a sturdy fight for what he considered to be in the best interests of his province, than Mr. McBride, but Mr. McBride was alone in his minority. He was defeated not only by a majority vote, but he was defeated by the unanimous vote at that convention of premiers. The Hon. Mr. Whitney was against Mr. McBride, the Hon. Mr. Roblin was against Mr. McBride, the Hon. Mr. Murray, the Hon. Mr. Pugsley, now the Minister of Public Works, but who then represented the province of New Brunswick, the premier of Prince Edward Island, and the premiers of the two new provinces of the far west were against Mr. McBride. He however obtained some concession. He was not satisfied, but parliament took up the question at the ensuing session and the

resolutions of the conference were embodied in the legislation which was carried, I believe, unanimously, by the House. Our legislation was brought before the imperial authorities and embodied in an instrument, and is there standing forever as the expression of the will of the Canadian people. Mr. McBride went to Great Britain. He repeated his request without success. Sir, I say that the attitude taken by the Liberal party on this particular question in the province of British Columbia was far more patriotic than that taken by the Hon. Mr. McBride and his political friends. I do not blame them, it was their right. but I say that the attitude of the government should not be condemned because it was that of a government representing public opinion, and more especially that of the prime ministers of the several provinces assembled here at Ottawa.

The hon. gentleman has referred to the question of oriental immigration. The great French statesman, M. Thiers, who could coin very happy phrases, once said that on every question he preferred to take 'le juste milieu.' I would translate that freely as the statement that on every question there is a happy medium which should be adopted. He was against extremes. I also am against extremes. Every intelligent citizen is against extremes. I am against any large influx of Japanese into British Columbia; I believe, with the hon. gentleman, that it would not be fair to the labour market of British Columbia that aliens should take the place of our own people, but I am also against that other extreme of total exclusion, of a foreign race indeed but belonging to a friendly power. This government, which has been taken to task by my hon. friends representing British Columbia on this question of Japanese immigration, has nothing to fear, it seems to me, from public opinion in the province which they ably represent. The Liberal government was the first one to deal with the question of oriental immigration some years ago. At that time, there was a capitation tax of only $50 on every Chinese entering Canada. I well remember the able representative of the constituency of Burrard, the late Mr. Maxwell, in a speech which to my mind is a classical speech in our parliamentary records, requesting the government to increase the capitation tax on the Chinese coming to British Columbia. The Liberal government yielded to his request; they were anxious to meet the legitimate demands of that fairest of the fair provinces of the Dominion and increased the capitation tax from $50 to $100. The agitation continued in British Columbia, the people wished to have that capitation tax further increased. The government appointed a commission, which made a report recommending that in order to protect labour in British Columbia, the government should increase the capitation tax from $100 to $500. The government adopted the conclusions of that report.

But Sir, I shall be asked, did not that commission report also on the Japanese question? There were Japanese in large numbers in British Columbia five and ten years ago; indeed the Canadian census return show that at least 4,000 or 5,000 Japanese had settled in some of the valleys of British Columbia. The commissioners, as the right hon. the leader of the government, (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) well said this afternoon, differentiated between the Chinese and the Japanese. We all know that the Chinese are satisfied with menial work while the Japanese are a higher type of men. The commissioners reported that if the Japanese government remained faithful to the pledge that had been given by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, through the Japanese consul at Vancouver, they saw no reason why there should be any exclusion against the Japanese coming to Canada provided they would not exceed the number fixed by that agreement. Will my hon. friend who has so eloquently spoken this afternoon deny that there was more than a tacit understanding, that there was a written pledge taken by the Japanese government to restrict the number of Japanese coming to Canada to 600 a year? I read that agreement last year in the House when I came back from Japan. There was, therefore, a written understanding taken by the Japanese Minister of Foreign Affairs. Time went on and we had more agitation in British Columbia and in other places.

I am always surprised to hear fair-minded people speak of the Japanese as an inferior race. I have been in Japan, the hon. gentlemen have not. I know that from the rumours that come from the province of British Columbia, from what we read in the press, that people are sometimes apt to consider the Japanese as an inferior race; but all those who have been students of Japanese history will bear witness to the fact that the Japanese are a rising race, a rising people, indeed the greatest race today in far Asia. Sir, the Japanese are not an inferior race. They have started in their march towards nationhood with the Dominion of Canada. Indeed they had an ancient and valuable civilization 2,000 or 3,000 years old, but in 1867 a revolution took place and the first act of the Japanese Emperor was to grant freedom of speech, freedom of thought, freedom of religious belief, not only to the Japanese, but to the foreigners as well. With respect to religion, let me say to those who are so anxious to exclude the Japanese from this country the few there are—because, indeed there are very few—that they are forgetting that from the United States, from Canada, indeed from the particular province of British Col-

umbia, missionaries are leaving every year to preach the Gospel of Christ to the pagan races of Japan. They preach a religion of toleration; they preach principles of liberty and principles of charity, and the first thing the Japanese hear on the other side is that those who send missionaries to Japan—missionaries well received, well treated, and highly respected—are demanding their expulsion from the ports of Canada. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that in Japan they have liberty of the press and religious liberty; they have high schools and great universities. Besides they adopted in 1867 the same system of government that we enjoy ourselves, the British system. It was not until the war with China that the name of Japan became great in the civilized world, and soon afterwards the mother country, through the diplomacy of Lord Lansdowne, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, made a treaty of alliance with the empire of Japan. Sir, I am always amazed to find hon. gentlemen opposite opposed to our friendly relations with Japan. I always thought that the Conservative party in Canada was a party of imperialists—in words if not in deeds, Mr. Speaker. Let me say that the hon. gentlemen who are so anxious to break all relations with Japan——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. LEMIEUX.—do not represent the view of Canada, not only Liberal Canada, but also Conservative Canada. I remember that just after the riots of Vancouver the leader of the government was invited to address the Manufacturers' Association of Canada in Toronto. Did the hon. gentleman dilly-dally with the question? No; he boldly and resolutely said that on that question, as on every other great question, he would not be panicky, but he would do his duty by Canada and the empire. And, sir, the citizens of Toronto, the citizens of Ontario, the citizens of Canada generally, sided with him on that question. Now, my hon. friend knows that Japan is the ally par excellence of Great Britain in the far east. In a few days, Canada will be invited by my hon. friend from North Toronto to contribute to imperial defence, if I have read rightly the Orders of the Day. Is that the time, Mr. Speaker, for this country to break off all relations with Japan, the great ally of the mother country? Is that the time for us to expel the Japanese from our shores and to get into trouble with that great empire? We know that there exists in Asia to-day a feeling of unrest. It may perhaps appear somewhat vain on my part to speak of British politics at large. I admit that I am not conversant with every detail of British politics; but there are things which even to a simple mind like my own appear very vivid and very true. Sir, in England to-day, every morning, the press—the 'Times,' the 'Standard,' the 'Post,' the 'Chronicle'—repeat dolefully the sentiments which are moving through that immense continent of Asia. We hear every morning of the unrest in India, and yet we are called upon by some hon. gentlemen to expel the Hindoos from Canada. Well, there are Hindu agitators who say to the British authorities: 'What right have you to govern us? We claim to be British citizens, and yet when we go to a British colony, we who have served in the British army and are still clad in British garments, we are threatened with expulsion from that colony.' Is that a proper spirit a true imperial spirit to maintain in this country? Is not the government's policy of the happy medium the better policy? Did not the government do its duty in sending the Deputy Minister of Labour to London last year to discuss with Lord Morley what steps should be taken to prevent that immigration coming to Canada? Do you suppose, Mr. Speaker, that if the government had complied with the request made by hon. gentlemen opposite, it would have served the interests of the British empire? For my part I believe not. I think the government pursued a wise policy, a patriotic policy, a truly imperial policy. As regards the Japanese, we are told that we have nothing to lose by excluding them, that they are a danger to white labour in British Columbia. I will explain in a few minutes why they can no longer be a danger to white labour in British Columbia. But I say, from the point of view of our commercial relations with Japan, that the existence of the treaty, without the blot which hon. gentlemen opposite would like to put upon it, is in the best interests of this Dominion. Why, sir, the right hon. leader of the government explained this afternoon that a natural sequence of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was the establishment of a line of steamers plying between Vancouver, Victoria, Yokohama and Hong Kong; and we have a right to expect from that direction a large trade for British Columbia and other provinces of the west. According to recent reports, the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, is not satisfied with the steamers that were subsidized for that route fifteen or seventeen years ago by my hon. friend the member for North Toronto, the 'Empress of China' and the 'Empress of Japan.' He intends to remove them and to replace them with the 'Empress of Britain' and the 'Empress of Ireland.' But there is something more which should appeal to us in maintaining friendly relations with the empire of Japan. We are in the process of building a great transcontinental railroad. When that railway

reaches Prince Rupert we shall have the shortest route between Asia and Europe. I believe the distance is something like 400 miles shorter from Prince Rupert than from Vancouver. At all events the route will be by far the shortest between Europe and Asia. Do you not then believe that the existence of this treaty is an advantage to Canada, and we may perhaps have a more favourable one later on, if we act as civilized people and friends of the empire.

I referred a moment ago to the written understanding given at the time that commission sat in the province of British Columbia—I think in the year 1900. I said that the Japanese Minister of Foreign Affairs had signed that pledge by which he promised to restrict Japanese immigration into Canada to a figure supposed at the time to be 600 a year. Did this government act blindly in 1907 when Japan was negotiating for a treaty with Canada? First of all, let us remember that when Japan revised her treaties in 1893, she was not so much concerned with the commercial advantages that might accrue to her through those treaties as with establishing the fact that she had attained the status of a great power and was anxious that her subjects should be treated in every part of the civilized world on the same level as white people. Were we not therefore justified in following the example of the mother country, of Germany, of France and of the United States in our dealings with Japan? All these countries agreed that the people of Japan should be treated on a footing of equality with their own people. In 1907, when the treaty was negotiated with Canada, the understanding given in 1900, through the channel of the Japanese consul at Vancouver was supplemented, not by one, but by ten or twenty written understandings by the Japanese Consul General at Ottawa. The agreement thus arrived at was that the Japanese immigration would be restricted to certain figures, and it was subject to that specific condition that the treaty was signed by the Canadian and Japanese representatives jointly. Two years ago riots took place in British Columbia and the contention was made that Japan had broken faith with Canada. But as the result of the investigation which I made in Japan and that made last year by the Deputy Minister of Labour in British Columbia, it was very plainly proven that the influx complained of was not to be assigned to the Japanese authorities, but to some private corporations in the city of Vancouver. The report of that investigation was laid on the table of the House last year. I reported myself the result of my investigation in Japan. I had the assurance of the Japanese Minister of Foreign Affairs that his government could be trusted to live up to the agreement signed first by the then Minister of Foreign Affairs in the year 1900, and later on by the Japanese consul at Ottawa and that we could depend on the Japanese government living up to the restrictions mentioned in those letters. The result of my investigation dovetailed, so to speak, with that conducted at Vancouver by the Deputy Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackenzie King). There, it was shown that private corporations in British Columbia—perhaps friendly to hon. gentlemen opposite—interested in getting cheap labour, had brought in from Hawaii an influx of Japanese labour. The Japanese authorities, I submit, were not responsible for that sudden large influx of 10,000 to the shores of British Columbia a year or so ago, because it has been clearly shown that they were contract labourers who came from Hawaii and were brought in under false representations made by some private concerns in the province of British Columbia. The agreement arrived at, not last year but many years ago with the Japanese consul has been lived up to, and there is not now in the province of British Columbia any undue influx of Japanese labourers. In fact, no contract labourer can be imported or filtered into British Columbia, as in the past, without the written consent of the Canadian government. That is one of the features in the agreement existing between Japan and Canada. So that no fear need be entertained of any influx of undesirables—as hon. gentleman opposite called them—to the shores of British Columbia. The Japanese authorities will respect their agreement. They will not allow the immigration of contract labourers without the consent of the Canadian government; and labourers coming from Hawaii are excluded by the order in council passed last year. We need, therefore, fear no invasion from Hawaii any more than from Japan itself.

I heard my eloquent friend this evening argue that by that treaty we have given a foreign country the key to our door and were bound to admit any alien, whether desirable or undesirable, be they blind, deaf or dumb. I can only say to the hon. gentleman that this is a very rash statement. He did not mean it, I am sure—it was a slip of the tongue. If he will read the immigration law of the Dominion, if he will read the regulations, the very stringent regulations, of the department over which the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) presides, he will see that no blind, no deaf, no dumb, can be admitted to this country. He will see that the department has gone even further and that last year an order in council was passed by which we can prevent any immigrant from coming into this country if he does not come from the country of his birth or citizenship. The effect of that order in council is to prevent immigrants coming from Hawaii. I said a moment ago that contract labour cannot

come from Japan. What, then, remains? Are hon. gentlemen opposite objecting to students, to tourists, to merchants? If they are, I say their objections are not well founded. I have lived for a few months in Japan, and can assure them that the Japanese are a highly civilized people. They need not be afraid of the merchants, the bankers, and especially of the students in Japan, for these represent the higher class of their own country and the best type of citizenship in this world.

I have already spoken too long, but I wish to repeat, in conclusion, that the Japanese authorities have lived up to the agreement arrived at with this government, that no contract labourers can come from Hawaii, and also that the order in Council passed last year prevents for the future the possibility of undesirable immigration. And let me say that with the declaration made by the Minister of Foreign Affairs last year, there is no fear that there will be any breach of faith on the part of the Japanese government. The Japanese authorities have no interest in promoting the emigration of their people to America. My hon. friend (Mr. Burrell) seems to know too much. Let me make good the statement I have made that the Japanese authorities have no earthly interest in promoting the emigration of their people to America. Last year, when I saw the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Japan, Count Hayashi, he stated to me that when this agreement would be divulged he might not long retain a Cabinet position, as it would make him very unpopular. They have no interest in promoting the emigration of Japanese to America, for they have a different civilization, and when their people come back from that country they come with different ideas. In the far east there is a great respect, if not a great reverence, for monarchial institutions, and, when Japanese subjects come back from America, they return with views and ideals different from those of the masses of their people and so they soon become an element that is not desirable in Japan. They have stopped subsidizing any emigration company doing work of transport between Japan and America. And, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Burrell), who seems to be so conversant with the facts, ought to know, Count Hayashi declared, when giving his explanations in the House of Representatives in Japan, shortly after my return to Canada, and in an interview with the representatives of these large emigration companies which I read to this House last year, that he would stop subsidizing such companies as were sending emigrants to America. I am told that they are now giving subsidies to companies sending emigrants to Korea and Manchuria, which, as we know, are the two new spheres of influence of the empire of Japan.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the hon. minister will allow me, I would like to ask him a question purely for the purpose of information, and because I want to understand the conditions. The Japanese Foreign Minister, in proposing that policy, believed that it would make him so unpopular that he would cease to be minister. Does not that indicate, on the part of the people of Japan, a very strong desire to come to America, including Canada?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then, I misunderstood the position.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The position was declared in the interview to which I have referred, and which I will find among my papers and send to my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden). I explained a moment ago that the revision of the treaty of Japan with the foreign powers was not so much to establish commercial relations, though that was the object to a certain extent; but as my hon. friend will see, as a student of modern Japanese history—and we are all students of that wonderful history—the object was to have the Japanese admitted and recognized in the civilized world on a footing of equality with the white races. For, Japan, after the wars with China and Russia, had admittedly become a great power. I may remind my hon. friend that the first nation that gave effect to that treaty—and the treaties with all the nations had practically the same wording with, perhaps, a slight difference in that signed with the United States—the first nation to sign that treaty was Great Britain herself. And, for the first time in many years, perhaps during a century, Great Britain signed a treaty of alliance with a foreign power and that treaty was with Japan. Is not that an object lesson?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But what I wanted to understand, and what the minister has not made me understand yet, is this: The Japanese Minister of Foreign Affairs expected that his statement in favour of the restrictions of emigration to the United States and Canada would make him so unpopular that he would be obliged to resign. It struck me that that must mean that there must be a popular sentiment in Japan against any such restriction. That is the point on which I desired information.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am afraid that is a catch question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is not a catch question.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That may be. Public men in Japan, and especially the statesman to whom I alluded a moment ago, were somewhat afraid of public opinion, because the Japanese have a strong national pride, as is quite natural in a great people; and

if the people had come to believe that Japanese emigration was restricted, the government would have fallen from grace in the eyes of her own people. But the Minister of Foreign Affairs said that although he would not subscribe to any such written exclusion in a treaty, yet, as he states in his letter to myself:

'Although the existing treaty between Japan and Canada absolutely guarantees Japanese subjects full liberty to enter, travel and reside in any part of the Dominion of Canada, yet it is not the intention of the Imperial government to insist upon the complete enjoyment of the rights and privileges guaranteed by those stipulations when that would involve a disregard of the special conditions which may prevail in Canada from time to time.

And he added:

Acting in this spirit, and having regard to the circumstances of recent occurrence in British Columbia, the Imperial government have decided to take efficient means to restrict emigration to Canada. In carrying out this purpose the Imperial government, in pursuance of the policy I have stated, will give careful consideration to local conditions prevailing in Canada, with a view to meeting the desires of the government of the Dominion so far as compatible with the spirit of the treaty and the dignity of the state.

There, Mr. Speaker, you have the whole story in that statement supplemented as it is by an agreement arrived at between the two governments, which I must say has been sincerely and faithfully lived up to so far by Japan.

Mr. RALPH SMITH moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I move:

That the order for consideration of the address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, have precedence over all other business except the introduction of Bills, until disposed of.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, January 25, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 2) to amend the Passenger Tickets Act.—Mr. Reid (Grenville).

RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. R. BICKERDIKE (Montreal, St. Lawrence) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 3) to amend the Railway Act. He said: The Bill is largely on the lines of the one introduced during the last two or three sessions by my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), and which passed this House last session but was defeated in the Senate. Public opinion is aroused to that extent that something on those lines will have to be done this session, and I hope that the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) will give the Bill his attention and possibly take charge of it and put it into proper shape.

Mr. LENNOX. And on the right side.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. There is no doubt that what is often called the deadly level crossing has become so subject to accidents, especially during the past few months, that it is opportune to introduce some measure which will meet the approval of both Houses.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does it differ from the Bill passed by this House three or four times?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. It is a little milder. I do not wish to impose on the railways any more burdens than we can help. In the cities, towns and villages we should have gates at the level crossings. Outside in the country districts and prairies, I was at a loss to frame an amendment which would meet all cases, because while on the prairie a man can see a train ten miles either way, in the woods he cannot see it until he is right on the track. Possibly the municipalities may contribute to the expense. For instance, in New York state the cities contribute 25 per cent and the state 25 per cent towards paying for the lowering or elevating of the tracks, as the case may be.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman make any proviso in his Bill to protect life on level crossings on the prairies?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Yes, I do, but I leave that largely to the Railway Commission, because it is very difficult to frame an amendment which will cover every case. If my hon. friend has one, I shall be pleased to accept it. The Railway Commission, which has done such good work, more especially during the past few weeks, may be trusted to deal with this, and a clause to that effect is the only one I can think of at the moment which will meet the case.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CRIMINAL CODE—AMENDMENT.

Mr. BICKERDIKE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 4) to amend the Criminal Code. He said: We have in all our large cities, probably to a greater extent in Montreal than elsewhere, a class of men who will, on the slightest provocation, draw

a dagger or stiletto or pistol. We have had highway robberies to a great extent, and a class of men who will beat their wives in the fall in order to get six months comfortable lodgings in jail during the winter. That class of men should get the lash, and plenty of it. Instead of giving such a man six months in jail for beating his wife, I would give him thirty days and thirty lashes. If that is done, he will never beat his wife again. That class of criminal is more afraid of the lash than even of the rope, and I think that if more of them got the lash we should have less need of the rope.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron). What is the difference between this Bill and the one introduced by myself last session?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I do not know what the difference is. But I know that the Bill proposed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lewis) did not carry, and I did not know whether he had got tired of it or not.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

NATURALIZATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 5) to amend the Naturalization Act. He said: The proposed amendment is based upon a similar provision in the British Naturalization Act. It provides that, in addition to the safeguards contained in the present Act, the alien applying for naturalization shall furnish evidence, under the oath or affirmation of two British-born subjects, electors residing within the territorial jurisdiction of the court to which the application is made, — and neither of whom is to be the agent or solicitor of the applicant—that the applicant is of good character. This amendment, I may say, has been asked for by some judges in the west who have met with practical difficulties in administering the Act, and is designed to overcome these difficulties and to provide a safeguard similar to that provided in England for admission to citizenship.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 6) to amend the Railway Act. He said: This Bill is exactly the same as that which has been passed by this House each year during the last three years, but has been rejected by the Senate. It is to protect the lives of people at level crossings in cities, towns and villages. I do not think it could be made any milder than it is and do injustice to the people of the country. As the House has unanimously passed it three times, I hope it will do so again, and that the Senate will think better of its previous action and adopt what is evidently the will of the people.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE (South Essex) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 7) to amend the Railway Act. He said: The object of the Bill is to remove an anomaly in the present Railway Act as to the liability of railway companies for fires caused by defective locomotives. The Bill was introduced last year by Mr. Kennedy, then representing New Westminster. I think it passed the Railway Committee, but did not become law. But as I believe it to be a Bill that ought to become law, I ask leave to introduce it now.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 8) to amend the Dominion Lands Act. He said. The Bill is to correct a displacement of some three or four paragraphs which was inadvertently made in the passage of the Bill through the House or in the printing of it. There is no proposition in any way to effectively amend or change the provisions of the Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

VACANCY OF CARLETON.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the orders of the day are called, I desire to say that I have had the honour of being returned for two constituencies, namely the electoral division of Halifax and the electoral division of Carleton (Ont.). It becomes necessary that I should elect for which of these two constituencies I sit; and I accordingly now declare my election to sit for the electoral division of Halifax, and, for that reason, I resign my seat as member for the electoral division of Carleton.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Todd for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Nanaimo). Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to have a word to say on the resolution before the House. After a long, hard, and tedious campaign in British Columbia, and after having been in the House seven or eight sessions, and having some good friends who

should have their initiation in parliamentary work, I had made up my mind to sit quiet awaiting a later occasion to say or do something. However, matters appertaining to important interests of British Columbia have been involved in the discussion of this subject, and some of my friends from British Columbia have thought fit,—very properly—to take this opportunity to make some explanation with regard to matters affecting the representation in this parliament as compared with the last. The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) took advantage of the occasion to give some explanation with regard to matters connected with the campaign in British Columbia, and tried to account for a very radical change made in the representation of that province, and my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Cowan), and especially my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell), and, to some extent, the hon. gentleman for Victoria City (Mr. Barnard), sought to present what they thought to give to the House the impression that the reasons given by the Prime Minister for the change in British Columbia were not the good reasons and sought to present what they thought were the good reasons for that change. The two great issues they represented to this House as being the cause of the change in British Columbia, were better terms and oriental immigration. My hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Cowan) sought to impress the people in the province with the belief that the salvation of British Columbia rendered it absolutely necessary that it should be represented by Conservatives instead of Liberals in this House. I do not intend to follow that argument at great length, because my hon. friends have intimated that they intend to bring up these questions in another form, at a future time. But it is my conviction that, whilst my hon. friends have been sent to this House to seek to promote legislation that will settle these two great issues satisfactorily to British Columbia, at the same time those issues were not presented fairly and justly to the people of British Columbia by my hon. friends. That is my conviction, and I am going to try and show that it is well founded.

What are the processes through which the issue of better terms has gone? How has it been considered and represented? How was it considered and represented to the electorate of British Columbia? The issue of better terms, in point of fact, was absolutely settled by the united provincial conference. The provinces, and especially British Columbia, had been agitating this question for a considerable time, and they appealed to the Premier of the Dominion to call a conference of the provinces to take into consideration the question of a readjustment of the terms of union between the provinces and the Dominion. The whole question of better terms, so far as British Columbia is concerned, was presented and finally determined by a tribunal comprised of the representatives of all the provinces. Sir Wilfrid Laurier asked this parliament to consent, not to what his government thought was right or reasonable, but what these several provincial premiers at that conference had decided was the proper thing. That, Sir, was the foundation of the case. Whatever be its merits or demerits whether the conclusions reached were reasonable or not, the one thing certain is that the conclusions were reached by the unanimous opinion of the several representatives of the provinces. My hon. friend from Vancouver shakes his head. Does he dispute the fact that the documents are on record? Does he dispute the fact that a request was made to the Premier of Canada to call a conference? Does he dispute the fact that the Premier of British Columbia accepted the proposal to represent the province in that conference? Does he dispute the fact that the representatives at that conference stated what they thought was right and reasonable for British Columbia?

Mr. COWAN. British Columbia was not a consenting party to that proceeding.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. My hon. friend says that the decision was not unanimous. I am dealing with the fact that the action of this government was based upon the conference of the provincial premiers, and was not dictated by this parliament. I am trying to impress that fact upon the House, because the issue of better terms in British Columbia, which had served a good purpose in the provincial election of 1907, and contributed largely to the success of our hon. friends in 1908, was not presented on that basis; on the contrary, it was presented as involving an act of injustice on the part of the premier of this country. Read the speeches of the hon. member for Vancouver, read the speeches of the leader of the Conservative party in British Columbia, read the letters sent out by these gentlemen as representatives of that party, and what was their grievance? Was it their grievance that the united provinces had refused to give them everything they thought they ought to have? Not by any means; their grievance was that it was Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Liberal party who had refused. Their grievance was not against the decision of the united provinces, because the moment they admitted that fact, it eliminated the possibility of their success in the political struggle. The only possibility of making the issue a successful one politically, was to attribute their grievance to the Liberal party at Ottawa.

Now I am ready to make this statement, that in my opinion British Columbia has a grievance. My hon. friend from Vancou-

ver on Friday last took the lofty ground, in theory, that if these great issues were to be settled they must be settled by eliminating the political factor, that political partisanship must be eliminated if these questions were to be decided. But my hon. friend does not practise what he preaches. He sought to prove that the Oriental question in British Columbia, if it was ever successfully settled, must be determined by every member of this House ; that this great issue provincial, national and imperial, would have to be approached by the serious consideration of every political factor involved in it. But my good friend does not practise what he preaches. I do not hesitate therefore to state my opinion that the question of better terms in British Columbia has been used in that province entirely and absolutely as a political football. I give my hon. friends credit for doing it well. Their course in taking the complaints to the foot of the Throne and coming back to the federal parliament, and their repeated statement that the Prime Minister of this country has no regard, for the administration of justice in British Columbia, had a wonderful effect. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Whitney, who was the representative in that conference from Ontario, that Mr. Roblin, who was the representative in that conference from Manitoba, that all the provincial leaders, Liberals as well as Conservatives, in that conference, unanimously decided on the terms that they considered fair to the provinces ; and the Prime Minister of Canada laid aside the conclusions of that conference before this parliament exactly as they had been stated at the conference, and requested parliament to give British Columbia what that conference had unanimously agreed upon. I am stating the case in this House, because I want to have it reported to the people of British Columbia generally ; I had no opportunity of doing it during the election, and I am stating the case in this House as I stated it in my own constituency. I contend that the statement of the case made by my hon. friends opposite the other night was neither fair nor just. I wish to read to this House a statement for the benefit of my hon. friend from Vancouver, written by a member of the McBride government, the president of his council, a Conservative member in the local legislature, sole proprietor and manager of the most independent and respectable Conservative newspaper in British Columbia. I want to read from the 'News Advertiser,' the leading Conservative newspaper in British Columbia, for an endorsation of the position I have taken in this House and what it thought of our hon. friends opposite and the position they took in the province :

There is one other matter in connection with the subject that seems to require some reference. If the provincial interests are to be served in the most effective way, the question must be dealt with as one entirely outside of party politics. It was so regarded in the provincial legislature, in the interprovincial conference and in the Dominion parliament. To be consistent in holding that view, Conservatives must refrain from charging that Sir Wilfrid Laurier has been the cause of the provincial's failure to obtain what it sought. If any one can be held responsible it must be the interprovincial conference, which decided what the extra sum granted to British Columbia should be. It is not difficult to understand why the various provincial premiers were not willing to give more liberal recognition of our claims. They had to consider what would be the attitude of their respective legislatures, and electorates to the subject. If the matter was referred to them at all, we do not see how Sir Wilfrid Laurier could refuse to abide by their decision. From what passed in the Dominion parliament, we must assume that Mr. Borden would have acted as Sir Wilfrid has done, had he been in power. It cannot be wise, therefore, if we hope to succeed ultimately in our claim, to attack Sir Wilfrid Laurier and throw the matter into the arena of party politics. Nor, although we are opposed to him do we think such a course is fair to Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

That is an important statement coming from the source that it does. That is from the most independent and intellectual Conservative newspaper in British Columbia, and I am glad to have the opportunity of presenting that editorial, because I know that my hon. friends will accept the rebuke of that paper. One thing is certain, that if the question is to be amicably and reasonably settled, it must be settled by the influence and the co-operation of every province of this Dominion.

Now, I come back again to my good friend the member from Vancouver (Mr. Cowan), who came here on a special commission to see the leader of his party. This was a burning question in the provincial election, and he was anxious to do what he could to restore its influence in the Dominion election. So he wanted to have a statement on the question from the leader of his party. I do not know whether the hon. leader of the opposition will endorse my hon. friend's statement of the proposal for the settlement of the question, but this is what he said to his friends in Vancouver:

To-night I speak with the authority of our honoured leader, whose party will on the 26th control the destinies of Canada, that the just claims of British Columbia, the moment of the party's return to power, shall be referred to an absolutely independent and impartial tribunal. The report of that tribunal will become binding upon British Columbia only when accepted by the people of this province.

I do not know whether the hon. leader of the opposition will be prepared to accept that as the statement that was given to my hon. friend ; but one thing is certain—it

was a good vote catcher. He said to the people of British Columbia: You have nothing to lose; the expenses of the inquiry will be met for you, and if you do not like the result, you do not need to take it, for somebody else will pay the cost.' I do not think that is a position that any responsible diplomatic influence of this country would endorse. Neither do I think that any leader of any great party in this country would get the endorsation of the representatives of the various provinces of this Dominion to a proposition of that kind. The question went to the conference of provincial premiers, and if there is to be special consideration by this absolutely independent tribunal, that independent tribunal itself must be created by the representatives of the provinces themselves ; and if they are not going to stand by the decision of that absolutely independent tribunal, then I want my hon. friend to say what will be the next tribunal to which he will refer the case, if the people of British Columbia refused to agree to their recommendations.

Now, as I have said, I believe there is need of consideration in changing the terms of union with British Columbia. It is a question that must be settled with the agreement of the different provincial factors of this Dominion. The Premier of the Dominion said to the provinces: 'Decide what you think is right and reasonable and whatever you decide I will bring before parliament and seek to have put into operation in your interests.' I submit, Sir, that that position was never put before the people of British Columbia. The whole contention was : You need not look for the adjustment of your rights to the representatives of eastern Canada. Our friends opposite sought by innuendo and insinuation, to convey the impression that the representatives of the interests of British Columbia were not to be found in eastern Canada—an impression that in my opinion is disloyal to the interests of British Columbia, and an impression which, after the people of British Columbia have time to think, will not redound to the security of our hon. friends in the position they occupy to-day. The people of British Columbia are suffering a kind of temporary inactivity in the consideration of political questions, and they accepted the statements of our hon. friends on that question without proof. The question has to come up for consideration later on, when I shall have an opportunity, as the one member from British Columbia on this side of the House, to discuss it further.

Now, I want to deal with the oriental question. The Conservative representatives from British Columbia have been sent to this House to save the province from an influx of hordes of orientals. I consider that the facts connected with the legislation on that question give to the people of British Columbia no reason for looking to their Conservative representatives in this House for the settlement of the question. In order to prove my case it is necessary for me to look a little at the history of this question. Let me ask, who created the oriental question in British Columbia ? Was it the Liberal party or the Tory party ? The oriental question in British Columbia was created twenty-five or thirty-five years ago, when the Conservative government of that day appointed their own commission, and their own commission reported that oriental labour in British Columbia was a necessity to the development of that province.

Mr. Speaker, the real evil of orientalism in British Columbia to-day is not, as our friends opposite would try to make it out, the recent influx of certain classes of orientals ; the foundation of the oriental evil in British Columbia was laid by the Conservative government 25 years ago when, instead of inaugurating a system of white immigration into British Columbia, they adopted the report of their own commission which said that oriental immigration was absolutely necessary to develop the resources of that province. But the gentlemen opposite never tell the people of British Columbia anything about that; they consider the whole question at the present day in connection with the Japanese immigration. For 15, and 16, and 17 years after that date representations were constantly made by the people of that province to the Conservative party in power to redress the wrongs which they had inflicted on the province in connection with their immigration policy. Let us look for a minute on the other side of the picture, and, Sir, I placed these facts before my constituents just as I am placing them before this House now. I had not the honour or the privilege of submitting my views to the good people of Vancouver, but I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) who represents that constituency will not gainsay the facts as I now state them. The Liberal party came into power in 1896 and the first parliament thereafter the tax was increased to $100. The commission which had been demanded by the people of British Columbia was granted by the Liberal government, and two and a half years from the date of the report of that commission everything that British Columbia had ever asked in regard to the regulation of orientalism in British Columbia was passed into law. Let hon. gentlemen look back at the petitions and the resolutions presented by the different organizations in that province and they will find that the demand prior to that time always was that there should be a tax of $500 upon the Chinese. There was no Hindu question then and practically there was no Japanese question. True, the Japanese question came for consideration before that commission,

and the commission reported to parliament that at that time it was not a serious matter and that it would be unwise to pass restrictive legislation since the representatives of Japan had promised that it was not their desire or intention to send Japanese immigrants into Canada. And from the year 1903 up to the time these special contracts were made to bring in this large number of Japanese there was no intelligent agitation, and no representations made to this parliament by petition or otherwise in any strong way whatever, in favour of special restrictive legislation against the Japanese. It is important that the members of this House should not forget that the legislation which the people of British Columbia had been demanding for 16 years prior to 1896 had been entirely refused by the Conservative government. On the other hand, it should not be forgotten that all the legislation asked for by the people of British Columbia was conceded absolutely, within five or six years of the advent of the Liberal party to power.

Now Sir, I come to the question of the Japanese treaty, and I shall consider what our friends opposite say as to the effect of passing that treaty—or rather of our agreeing to the British treaty—on the interests of British Columbia and of Canada. Unfortunately, after the passing of this treaty certain employers of labour in British Columbia organized to bring in large numbers of Japanese. Let me first remind this House that whatever responsibility there is associated with the concluding of this treaty, it is a responsibility which is equally shared in by every member of this House on both sides. I want to say also that my hon. friends opposite had absolutely no authority—according to the statement made by the leader of the opposition himself the other day—they had absolutely no authority to state to the electors of British Columbia that if the Conservative party were put in power the Conservative party would do more than had been done by the Liberal government. All through the campaign in British Columbia the one impression sought to be made was that there would be an absolute guarantee that the Conservative party would readjust the oriental question and would do more than the Liberal government had ever done in that direction.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I am very glad to hear my hon. friends opposite endorse that statement, but I would like to ask any one of these gentlemen from British Columbia what evidence he has that the leader of the Conservative party would, if he had the power, do more for British Columbia in connection with the oriental question than the Liberal government has done up to the present time. The forged telegram which was read in the city of Victoria purported to be a declaration of the leader of the opposition that he would stand for absolute and entire exclusion, but when that telegram was forced on the attention of the leader of the opposition in this House the other day he renounced any responsibility for it. Can any of these gentlemen opposite give any tangible evidence? Can they quote from a statement made by any of the leaders of the Conservative party at any time, that more would be done by them in the settlement of the existing difficulty than has been done by the Liberal government?

Now, Sir, what is the present condition of the oriental question in British Columbia? Perhaps hon. gentlemen opposite have not looked carefully into that matter. True, they depreciate the importance of the Lemieux settlement, but I have looked up the record and I have official figures in my possession which I think will surprise many hon. gentlemen in this House. I make the statement on my responsibility as a member of this House, that whatever could have been accomplished by inserting in that treaty restrictive powers, has been accomplished by the settlement made between the Postmaster General and the Japanese authorities. That arrangement has been honourably carried out to the letter. I will concede that however important and satisfactory that settlement may be, the people of British Columbia have not confidence that the Japanese authorities will carry it out. I will make that admission frankly. The complaint in British Columbia was not against the settlement itself, but it originated in the lack of confidence which the people had in the integrity of the Japanese authorities to carry the settlement out in the spirit in which it was made. However that may be, we have to take things as we find them and when the practical people of British Columbia realize that the Japanese are not coming into that province since the date of the settlement, they will, I believe, admit that it has been effective. The direct effect of that settlement came into operation in June, 1908, and I must confess that I was myself surprised at what the public records show since then. I believe in having the facts as they are whether they are for us or whether they are against us. If this question is to be settled it must be settled on the facts and not on any political feelings which may be introduced, and I have every confidence in the intelligence and judgment of the people of British Columbia that when the facts are made known to them they will gladly admit that the settlement has been effective. As I have said, the practical effect of that settlement came into operation in June, 1908. Only 51 Japanese came into British Columbia in June,

1908. Of these 51, 22 were women and children, so that as a matter of fact only 29 Japanese labourers entered British Columbia in June, 1908. In July, 1908, 39 Japanese entered British Columbia, and of that number 16 were women and children, leaving only 23 Japanese labourers coming into the province in the second month after the settlement. In August, 1908, only 27 Japanese entered that province, and of this number 19 were women and children, leaving only eight Japanese labourers. In September, 1908, only 21 Japanese entered the province and of these seven were women and children, leaving 14 Japanese labourers entering in September. In October, 31 Japanese came to British Columbia, and of these eight were women and children, leaving 23 labourers entering the province in October, 1908. In November, only 12 Japanese came into British Columbia, and in December only 16. Thus in the whole period of six months since the settlement, only 198 Japanese have come into the province of British Columbia.

Let me remind my hon. friends from British Columbia of another thing. During the same period of six months the immigration of Chinese was extraordinary. In June, against 51 Japanese, there were 154 Chinese; in July, against 39 Japanese, there were 418 Chinese. What is the conclusion? That the successful enforcement of the Lemieux settlement drove the employers of British Columbia who always want orientals, to pay the $500 head tax on every oriental labourer coming into British Columbia. Thus it seems to me that the settlement of the question of Japanese immigration has been very successful in attaining the object which the people desire, that is that the Japanese should be kept out. If they are kept out by the settlement of my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) there can be no complaint. Our hon. friends received the political advantage of the suspicion of the people of British Columbia that the Japanese would not adhere to their contract, but these figures demonstrate clearly that the Japanese government have lived up to their contract. What are the conditions of that contract? There are two or three important conditions that perhaps may not be known to all the members of this House. One is that Japanese coming into Canada must come directly with passports from Japan, cutting off absolutely the immigration from the American islands where the principal immigration used to come from. The next is the definite provision that no contract Japanese labour may be brought into British Columbia without the consent of this government. I cannot imagine that any restrictive legislation connected with the treaty itself could accomplish that purpose in a more direct and practical way than it has been accomplished by the settlement of my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux). As I say it is what the people want, they want to keep the Japanese out and the settlement has kept them out successfully.

Is there any evidence of the operation of that provision? Yes. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company some time ago wanted to put 300 Japanese on their irrigated lands in the district of Calgary. The company made an application to this government to suspend the provisions of that agreement and let them bring these men in under contract, but the government refused to do so and the 300 Japanese labourers could not be brought in and placed upon the irrigated lands, contrary to the terms of that agreement. Thus the agreement has been successful and that is exactly what the people want. I think I am right in the statement that that agreement, that is the treaty between Britain and Japan, expires about 1911. My opinion is, and I say it boldly, that if the present condition of Japanese immigration can be strongly maintained for the next two years, by the operation of the settlement which the government has with Japan, then in the renewal of the treaty necessary to meet the sentiment of British Columbia absolutely, may be inserted and that will give absolute satisfaction to the people of British Columbia.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. My hon. friend is excited at the position I take, that this thing ought to be remedied according to his own judgment. If this suggestion is wrong my hon. friend's leader was wrong. Not a single man on the other side of the House said a word with regard to the matter, no one made any complaint, every one said that this was in the best interests of Canada, and there was no suspicion that the understanding that was arrived at with Japan would be interfered with in any way. The intention of every man in this House was to accomplish a principle of commercial interest that was good for British Columbia, and we did not know until we had passed the law that some other precaution might have been taken. Of course my hon. friend lays great stress on the necessity of taking that precaution. He goes further and on Friday night made the statement that the treaty with Japan made it impossible for this parliament to regulate Japanese immigration under any circumstances. He said that the 40,000,000 Japanese, the blind, the halt, the lame and the undesirable, could all come into this country and according to the terms of that treaty nothing could prevent them. I looked up the record and disputed that opinion last session very strongly. Of course my hon. friend is a lawyer and I am not; all I do is to apply common sense and I am convinced that in many cases that will get ahead of the lawyer. What I said last year and say again is that my hon. friend's reck-

less statement that the ordinary general laws of this country regulating immigration into this country do not apply to Japanese because we have a treaty is an entirely false position, and yet it is a position that was presented repeatedly by these gentlemen to the people of British Columbia. They said that the ordinary immigration law against undesirable immigrants to Canada could not be invoked against Japanese because of the treaty with Japan. I looked up the record and what do I find? Since the treaty was passed 48 Japanese have been deported to Japan direct, for physical reasons. Under the operation of the system of medical inspection under the medical superintendent of immigration in Vancouver, in my hon. friend's own city, 40 Japanese have been deported under the general law and regulations of this country, disproving the very wild position taken by the hon. member the other night and taken by every one of these hon. gentlemen before the electors of British Columbia. I venture the statement that the general electorate of British Columbia, from the discussion in this House and from the general argument on this question in British Columbia in the last campaign, believe that the Japanese had a privilege in entering this country not enjoyed by an Englishman, an Irishman, a Welshman or a Scotchman. My hon. friend still adheres to that position, he believes that yet and takes the responsibility of saying it. Why, the favoured nation clause in the treaty could not give the Japanese more than we gave British subjects. Surely no one can conceive that legislation would be passed by this House which would make possible the conferring of privileges on Japanese greater than those extended to British subjects. What we did was to give the Japanese the rights given to British subjects and no more. But if the hon. gentleman's contention means anything, it means that by that provision we gave the Japanese more extensive rights in this country than we granted our own people and other British subjects. Does the hon. gentleman still take that position? That is one of the beautiful delusions which will soon be shattered in British Columbia, and our hon. friends opposite will pay dearly for having caused them.

Mr. BURRELL. Did the hon. gentleman find that in the campaign against me in my constituency that view was presented? Did he not find that his own advocacy resulted in an overwhelming defeat of the gentleman he supported on that question?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I just happened to speak in two places in my hon. friend's constituency. That of course accounts for my hon. friend's election. If I had taken a greater part, the result would probably have been different.

Mr. BARNARD. The hon. gentleman could not get a majority of the votes in his own riding.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barnard) says I could not get a majority of the votes in my riding. But, Mr. Speaker, if I had forged telegrams, I might have got a good deal more.

Mr. BARNARD. Is the hon. gentleman not prepared to accept the statement I made in the House yesterday?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I am going to deal with this forged telegram now.

Mr. CAMPBELL. May I be permitted to ask a question. I understand that the hon. gentleman is a representative of labour. I would like to ask him if he is here as a representative of white or yellow labour?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. My hon. friend is a new member and he will of course learn by experience. I am surprised that my hon. friend for Victoria (Mr. Barnard) should insist in butting in and out at this serious part of the debate. He stands in this House to-day as the consequence of a forged telegram, and I say that telegram was forged on the authority of the leader of the opposition. When I discussed the question in Kootenay, not in the presence of the hon. gentleman but in the presence of an intelligent representative of his, it was stated by that representative, two weeks after that telegram was published, that the leader of the Conservative party had committed himself to the entire exclusion of Asiatics from British Columbia. I then gave the leader of the opposition this credit. I stated on the platform at Nelson that I did not believe he would take the responsibility of sending any such telegram. I brought down here my files for the purpose of asking my hon. friend the straight question, but that was rendered unnecessary by his disavowal of the telegram. But in the 'Colonist' of the 25th of October last that telegram appeared on the front page. It appeared in the 'Colonist' on the 25th of October, the day before the election, and was distributed in every coast city and elsewhere throughout British Columbia. For the three weeks following the by-election, that telegram appeared dated from Halifax the 24th of October, 1908, and it read as follows:—

> Your message received. The Conservative party stand for a white Canada, the protection of white labour and the absolute exclusion of Asiatics.

My hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, has stated in this House that he never sent any such telegram; and yet for three weeks that telegram was distributed throughout the length and breadth of British Columbia and was never repudiated.

Mr. COWAN. May I say that the hon. gentleman is mistaken. That telegram was

never distributed or printed, or read in the constituency of Victoria. I never heard of that telegram until Friday afternoon last in this House.

Mr. SMITH. My hon. friend is committing himself to an enormous responsibility when he says that telegram was not distributed or read in the constituency of Vancouver. Do the electors of Vancouver not read the 'Daily Colonist'? Is that newspaper not sent over by the steamer on Sunday morning?

Mr. COWAN. The hon. gentleman knows well that the 'Victoria Colonist' does not get distribution in the city of Vancouver. He knows perfectly well that the statement I have made is correct. That telegram was not printed in Vancouver, it was never read by me in Vancouver, it was never heard of by me until I came to this House.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I accept of course my hon. friend's present statement, but that statement rather intensifies the responsibility taken by the friends of the leader of the opposition in Victoria. My hon. friend says that the people of Vancouver did not read the telegram, but the people of Vancouver read the 'Daily Colonist', and in the 'Daily Colonist' you have what purports to be an exact copy of a telegram from the leader of the opposition in Halifax, and that was distributed in every coast city the day before the elections. A special sheet was distributed in Nanaimo on the day of the election stating 'For White, British Columbia'. My leader, said the Conservative candidate on the day of the election, stands for the entire exclusion of Asiatics, and this information was sent broadcast throughout British Columbia, because everybody in British Columbia reads the 'Daily Colonist.' My hon. friend himself must be affected by the rivalry which Vancouver has against Victoria if he refuses even to read the newspaper of the latter city. But that does not exonerate my hon. friend from the responsibility for this telegram. The point I make is this, here is a telegram signed by the leader of the Conservative party which promised the people of British Columbia what they wanted on this question.

This telegram had its influence. It was distributed widely. I met it on the platform in the Kootenay district, as I have stated. And to my hon. friend who is to follow me, I may say for his information, that on the platform I gave the leader of the Conservative opposition credit by saying that I did not believe he had said such a thing. But the fact remains that a principle materially affecting the interests of British Columbia was announced over the signature of the leader of the Conservative party, that he himself, since the gathering of this House, has declared was absolutely untrue, but which, in my opinion, affected very materially the result of our elections. And the last man I would have credited with this was the hon member who got a dozen majority in the city of Victoria, and that same hon. gentleman read this telegram, not as it was sent by the leader of the opposition, but as it is found in the 'Colonist' to-day, and as it was distributed throughout the province of British Columbia. The hon. gentleman said on Friday last that it was an emissary of the 'Colonist' office who brought the telegram to him. But he will not say that it was not a political adversary who brought him that telegram. He knew that the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Cowan), just a few weeks before, had taken a mandate from the leader of the opposition on this question. That hon. gentleman announced plainly in the press of Vancouver that the leader of the opposition and the Conservative party were prepared to abrogate the treaty with Japan if the conditions of the new settlement were not adhered to. I am sure that my hon. friend from Vancouver will endorse my statement. The hon. member for Victoria, when he read the forged telegram in Victoria, had read repeatedly the mandate stated by the hon. member for Vancouver on an entirely contrary principle. I say that my hon. friend is not absolutely free from the responsibility for reading that telegram.

There are two ways of settling this oriental question in British Columbia. I will join my friends opposite in any reasonable method of settlement; but it can never be settled by forging telegrams; it can never be settled by approaching the question exclusively from a partisan point of view. The attitude of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Cowan) in this debate was absolutely a partisan position. Sir Wilfrid Laurier was his great cause of complaint. 'I wish,' he said, 'that I had never heard his speech.' Well, after we got the information about the forged telegram, we were not surprised that he wished he had never heard that speech. For more reasons than one, we shared the hon. gentleman's wish. I have said that there are two ways of settling this oriental question. One way is for employers of labour in British Columbia not to employ orientals. The second way is by reasonable legislation. I am not sure that any one of the hon. gentlemen I have referred to can subscribe to the first principle. They stand for a 'white Canada.' Their whole programme was for a 'white Canada.' But I question whether one of the five men can stand up in this House and say that he never employed an oriental in British Columbia. 'He that is without sin, let him cast the first stone.' Don't all speak at once. We stand for a white Canada for everybody in British Columbia, but the five Tory representatives.

My hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) stated the other night that he appreciated the settlement of the Hindu part of this question by the Dominion government. There are two things I appreciated in my hon. friend's statement. I appreciate very highly his generosity in admitting that that question had been settled in a broad and statesman-like way, and I appreciate his kindness as an employer to his own workmen.

Mr. BURRELL. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ralph Smith) a question? I think he will admit that in all my campaign the whole of this matter brought before the House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. That is not a question.

Mr. BURRELL. I would ask if he heard me discuss any phase of the question except that of the Japanese? And did I not differentiate between the Japanese and the Hindus?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. My position in this House is that I do not differentiate between the Chinaman the Japanese and the Hindu. And I say that that is the position of the average man in British Columbia.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Prime Minister does.

Some hon. MEMBERS. The government does.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I did not need to be reminded of that. But I say that I do not differentiate, and if the government does, then, of course, on that point, I am at variance with the government. But what I am pointing out is that, so long as the employers of labour in British Columbia employ orientals, the demand for orientals will be encouraged, but the moment you destroy the demand the supply will look after itself. And I want to make this statement—for I think this is a time to put the case plainly—that these hon. gentlemen who stand for a 'white Canada' do employ yellow men. And so long as these gentlemen come to this House with crocodile tears, bemoaning the depressed condition of British Columbia and declaring their desire to defend the white labour of British Columbia against the yellow races, yet spend their own money in encouraging the presence of these orientals in British Columbia, the people of that province will not believe for very long that they are true advocates. The subterfuge may be successful on election day for once. But 'chickens come home to roost,' and when the electors' facts become known, the permanency that these hon. gentlemen expect in their political lives will be absolutely destroyed. I have preached against orientalism——

Mr. COWAN. Good.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. What does my hon. friend (Mr. Cowan) say?

Mr. COWAN. I say that 'preached' is good.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I have preached against orientalism strongly, and I do so yet. But I have practised what I preached, for I have never spent a dollar in the employment of an oriental. And it is my business to put it up to these hon. gentlemen that they are not consistent advocates on this burning question for British Columbia. They must clean their own doorstep. If their influence is to be of importance in this House, they must give a guarantee that they do not encourage with their money and through their business that class in British Columbia of which they complain and over whose presence they pretend to be broken-hearted.

I believe the effect of the settlement of this question has been reasonable and fair. I believe that when the facts are presented to the people of British Columbia the government will get credit for its position. When the contract with Japan expires, two years from now, if, in the judgment of the people of this country, it is absolutely necessary to have restrictive legislation associated with the treaty, that is the time to put it through. But I submit that, according to the figures before this House, Japanese immigration has been reduced by the settlement, and yet encouragement has been given to oriental trade which is entirely in the interests of the great undeveloped province of British Columbia. I venture to think that that is the position that the people of British Columbia will stand for when they realize the meaning and importance of what has been accomplished, and the government must see that this exclusion must continue.

I have spoken longer than I intended to do, but it is important I should speak long. I am the only representative on this side, and I have to reply to all my hon. friends opposite. I am in earnest on this question, because I am a believer in a white British Columbia, and I am glad to say that I put that belief into practice. I think this government ought to go as far as possible to exclude these people, and that we ought to encourage white people instead to come to British Columbia and assist us in developing that great province. As long as you have 30,000 orientals in that province, you make it impossible for white labour to come in from the British Isles. I repeat that while our Tory friends have made the province of British Columbia an oriental country, and never did a thing when they were in control to restrict oriental immigration, the Liberal party have taken vigorous steps against Chinese im-

migration, and have entered into a reasonable agreement with the Japanese government to restrict immigration from that country. They have successfully reduced the emigration of these people to British Columbia in the last six months, down to 18 persons in the month of December last, and this must continue. If this government compelled the government of Japan to stand to the integrity of that agreement, the people of British Columbia themselves, four years hence will support this government in their Japanese policy.

Mr. A. S. GOODEVE (Kootenay). As a representative of British Columbia, I desire to say a few words on the issues that have been raised by the First Minister with regard to this question, and I also propose to deal with the arguments advanced by the Postmaster General. I wish to say with regard to the question raised by the First Minister, that if this government was so signally defeated in our province, it was due to the four factors mentioned by my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell). In my constituency at least the question of the deferred election and the presence of the Minister of the Interior in that riding, had a great deal to do with the majority I obtained. The sense of justice and fairplay so eminently characteristic of the west, resented the deferred election. Our people felt that they were being unfairly and unjustly treated, and they showed their resentment. In regard to the second issue, there were certain districts in my constituency in which we conceded a Liberal majority ; but after the Minister of the Interior had come in and spoken on behalf of the Liberal candidate, and explained the policy of the government, as we considered, authoritatively, he found the sentiment in those districts altogether hostile, and the result was that in those Liberal districts I received a very large majority.

Now, Sir, in dealing with the issues raised by the Postmaster General, I desire to say here that I was delighted, on this the occasion of my first appearance in the House, to hear the eloquent language of the minister, but I regret to have to say that, while admiring his eloquence, I cannot also admire his logic. I regret to say that I can neither agree with his logic nor with his conclusions. I also desire to thank the hon. gentleman for the compliments he paid to our splendid province and its representatives. He has argued, as most of the speakers on the government side have argued, up to a certain point in agreement with the position taken by the people of British Columbia. I think I can say that as regards the economic phase of the question, we are in accord. The First Minister himself has stated much more eloquently than I could hope to do, the exact economic changes involved in bringing these Asiatics and orientals into the province of British Columbia. He has explained that owing to their environment in their native country, to the fact that for generations they have lived in poverty and distress, the presence of any considerable number of them in that portion of Canada creates a disturbance in the economic conditions. We are at one on that part of the question. But it seems to me that when hon. gentlemen opposite reach a crucial point in their argument, they fail to follow it out to a logical conclusion ; they point in a more or less distracted way to the old flag and in various ways endeavour to avoid the logical conclusion of their argument. That has been the case with all the speeches from the other side that I have listened to so far. They say that if it was only the economical question that was in dispute, that could be easily settled.

But they have gone on and told us that there was danger to the empire at large. Sir, what are the arguments they have advanced in support of their attitude in that respect ? Not only during the last campaign, but during the last eight years, I have failed to find a single argument advanced by any member of this government to support their contention that the people of British Columbia are guilty of any disloyalty to the empire in the attitude they have taken on this question. Both the Prime Minister and the Postmaster General have told us that if we push the policy we have taken with regard to this question to a conclusion, we are likely to disturb the friendly relations existing between the empire and Japan. Now let us look at this question from a non-partisan standpoint, as one appealing to the whole Canadian people. My good friend the Postmaster General says that the people of British Columbia do not understand this question, that they do not understand the people of Japan. He says, they have not visited Japan, as I have done. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is true, we have not been so fortunate as to be able to visit that beautiful country he describes, at the expense of the Canadian people. But I venture to say that if we were sent over to Japan as delegates from the province of British Columbia, or from the Dominion of Canada, we would not come back and recommend to this parliament that they should place the control of immigration into Canada in the hands of the Japanese government. I will go further and say that if the Postmaster General himself would visit that great province of Manitoba, that was so eloquently referred to by the mover of the address as the granary of the world, if he would go farther and visit the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta and observe their flocks of cattle on a thousand hills or if he would go still further west and stand on the summit of the Rock-

ies and look over that sea of mountains, to quote the words of a Liberal leader of former days, if he would take note of the splendid natural resources of that great province, of her lakes and rivers, of her immense wealth in minerals, fisheries and timber ; if he would look over this vast heritage and realize that the men who are called upon to develop these immense resources are of the Canadian race, descendants of the great Anglo-Saxon race that has done so much for the civilization of the world, I venture to say that even the Postmaster General, however much he may admire our little brown friends in Japan, would not say that we should give up to them the task of peopling and developing that province.

I venture to say that even the hon. Postmaster General would hesitate to hand over this vast Dominion to these people, as he is advocating at this time. The answer of the hon. Postmaster General is that we have the assurance of the Japanese government, both by word of mouth and in writing, from the year 1900, and that assurance has been repeated in ten or twenty communications from that government since that time, that there would be no immigration from that country to Canada exceeding 600 a year, and yet I find in Hansard, in a speech of the Minister of Agriculture delivered in this House seven years afterwards, the statement that in ten months 8,125 Japanese had come into Canada. What explanation does the Minister of Agriculture make of that fact ? He said : It is true, 8,125 Japanese came into Canada from January to September, but of that number some 4,000 come from the islands of Hawaii and some 900 came in under contract for certain immigration agencies or bureaus, and a certain number passed through to the United States, leaving something like 3,000 remaining in Canada according to the minister's own figures. But when we go behind the statement of the Minister of Agriculture, we find that every one of those immigrants had a passport direct from the Japanese government, as was brought out at the investigation in Victoria. This shows that there is nothing in the spoken or written promise of the Japanese government. What difference does it make to the labourers or artisans of British Columbia whether these men are brought in under contract or as free labourers? If you bring 900 or 9,000 Japanese into the labour market, under contract, you are doing the very thing that we in the west and the whole of Canada are fighting against. We want this country for our own Canadian people. But we find that the wages of our labourers and artisans are being cut down by the influx of these people into our country. We are told that this is more or less a local question. When it comes up for discussion, as it will later on, we shall be able to bring forward such facts and arguments as will convince both sides of this House that it is not merely a provincial question affecting the province of British Columbia alone, but a question affecting gravely the whole Dominion of Canada, and affecting the whole British empire.

There is a side of this question that has never yet been touched upon, so far as I have seen, on reference to Hansard, or heard in any of the speeches I have listened to from time to time. The hon. Postmaster General has referred to the fact that the Japanese are aggressive and intelligent, and he afterwards took credit to the government that by increasing the head tax on the Chinese from $50 to $500, they had done much to shut out the Chinese. He did not agree with the hon. member for Nanaimo, but said: 'I make a clear distinction between the Chinese and the Japanese'; and he went on to explain what the distinction was. He said that the Chinese engaged in more menial occupations than the Japanese, that they were not so advanced in western civilization. I want to point out that that is the very thing that makes them all the more dangerous. On this point I will call the attention of the government to the report of their own royal commission, consisting of three Liberals, appointed to investigate this question some years ago, when the various boards of trade and labour organizations throughout British Columbia and the other western provinces were bringing the question to the attention of the country. That commission consisted of Mr. Clute, who has since become a judge, Mr. Foley and Mr. Munn. That commission investigated the question with a good deal of care, and the gist of their report was that the admission of the Japanese into the Dominion, and particularly the province of British Columbia, was more dangerous and more inimical to the interests of the people of Canada than an influx of even the Chinese. But, Sir, notwithstanding the finding of their own royal commission, notwithstanding that they sent one minister twice and another minister once to Japan to study the question, the government of Canada have done practically nothing other than to get the personal assurance of the Japanese government that they themselves would restrict this immigration. The hon. member for Nanaimo tells us this afternoon that under the agreement made by the Japanese government with the Postmaster General the immigration of these people has been restricted to such an extent that in certain months of the year not more than twenty-three or twenty-four come in. But the agreement the Postmaster General made could not possibly restrict immigration from Japan. I find from a stenographic report received by the Japanese newspapers on the discussion that took place in the Diet of Tokio, the minister with whom he had the correspondence spoke as follows :

Japanese newspapers received in yesterday's mails give stenographic reports of the discussion in the Diet at Tokio regarding the question of Japanese immigration to Canada. Count Hayashi, Foreign Minister, in the course of a long speech is reported as having declared that after the Vancouver riots Canada asked Japan to negotiate a treaty differentiating labour immigration from her shores and that the Japanese government had replied that it could not possibly negotiate any treaty differentiating injuriously against its own nationalists, and that all negotiations having that object must be futile.

Nevertheless, Canada has sent Hon. Mr. Lemieux to this country last November, with instructions to negotiate such a convention if possible. In that respect the envoy's mission had failed, but he had received assurances from the Japanese government that would continue to exercise to the full all the functions delegated to it by law in this matter.

Notwithstanding that at that particular time the Postmaster General was negotiating this very treaty, this minister of the Japanese government claims that the only treaty that could possibly be made must be carefully defined within these lines. Such a treaty is certainly not such a treaty as was described by the Postmaster General in his speech on Friday last. I quote further from the remarks of this Japanese minister:

Mr. Lemieux had asked for an interchange of documents in that sense, and despatches were given which have already been published. The question then arose as to exactly what immigrants were to be vetoed, and it had been agreed that no restriction whatever should be imposed with regard to the following, namely:

This is the gist of the whole matter:

first, travellers, merchants and students; secondly, Japanese subjects who, although belonging to the labouring class, had their wives and families in Canada; thirdly, labourers who had returned to Japan from Canada and who contemplated going back to Canada; fourthly, contract labourers, that is to say, men having fixed employment; fifthly, Japanese subjects discharging the duties of domestic servants and accompanying their employers; and, sixthly agricultural labourers Obviously the only labourers not included in this category were those who drifted to Canada without any resources of their own and on the chance of finding employment.

In other words, this is a distinct declaration that the Japanese government would enter into no negotiations with the Postmaster General for a treaty which would debar these particular classes from free entry into Canada. It was not argued by any member from British Columbia—at any rate it was not argued in my constituency—that the treaty gave any special privileges to the Japanese outside of the Immigration Act, but what I do say is that the Japanese government distinctly stated that they would not be restricted further than our Immigration Act restricted other nationalities. The fact is that the Japanese government have simply given an assurance to the Canadian government that in so far as it is reasonable or in so far as they themselves are satisfied they will restrict immigration, while at the same time they hold themselves free at any time to allow the immigration of all these classes which I have enumerated and which include the very labourers and artisans about whom we have been speaking.

We grant that the Japanese are a people who are rapidly taking up with western ideas. They have a territory of over one million square miles and a population of over forty million people. The Postmaster General argued on Friday last that we are constantly increasing our intercourse with these eastern nations, and he suggested that when the time came, and it was rapidly approaching he said, that we would have an 'all red route,' intercommunication between us and oriental nations would increase more and more. Therefore, Sir, the danger will be getting greater as the years roll by. The Japanese people with their enormous population crowded into such a small area are naturally casting their eyes around to see wherein their surplus population may find a home. And, if we have the same great influx of these people into the fair lands of our western shores that we have had in the past, let me ask this House what would be the result? In British Columbia we have a large territory and a sparse population, and if the influx of orientals were to continue the time is not far distant when the alien and foreign population would exceed the native population. There is this difference between oriental and European immigration, that the orientals cannot and will not assimilate with our people. We never look to the time when by marriage and inter-marriage with the Chinese and Japanese these orientals shall become assimilated with the people of our race. Every man in this House knows that is an impossible thing. I ask you then, in what position will Canada be when we have several hundred thousand of these orientals, remaining loyal to their own flag and unassimilated with us. Do hon. gentlemen think what the result might be in case of war? There is not a single Japanese who leaves his native land who is not enlisted and who does not report every three years to his home government. What would such men do in the case of a call to arms for the defence of Canada? Hon. gentlemen opposite may perhaps say that I am raising a bugaboo, but is it not well that in the government of a nation we should look to the future? We trust, Sir, that the alliance between the British empire and the Japanese empire may long continue, we believe it will, but when we are dealing with such a question as this we must look at it in all its aspects. It is only ordinary prudence that we should

endeavour to see what may occur in the future, and what effect our policy of to-day may in the years to come have upon our country and our empire. Only to-day I read a despatch in the newspapers— I may say, however, that I have no confidence in that despatch—only to-day I read in the newspapers that one of the leaders of the people to the south has declared that if the United States should continue in their policy of withdrawing their warships from the Pacific ocean it will mean war. I mention that merely to show what the trend of public opinion is and how the people of the United States realize that the great Pacific slope is looked at with longing eyes by these oriental races. It is therefore necessary that every Canadian, no matter what his politics, should realize that this is no longer a question for British Columbia alone. It is a question that concerns every man, woman and child, not only in the Dominion of Canada, but in every part of this great empire of ours. We should view it from that broad standpoint, we should realize that any action we may take now should be taken for the benefit of the whole empire. When the question of this treaty with Japan first arose it was submitted to the government then in power in Canada, and they suggested to the Colonial Secretary that Canada could only accept that treaty if there was a clause in it giving us control of our own immigration. The question remained in abeyance for several years, and although the present government of Canada had all the information concerning it before them, although they had sent their ministers three times to Japan to study the question, although the British government itself had called the attention of the Canadian government especially to the matter and asked if they wanted any restriction, this government said: no, and they deliberately signed that treaty without any provision whatever for the restriction of immigration into Canada. We in British Columbia are meanwhile the sufferers from the economic disturbance caused by the results of this treaty, and so we realized more than did the people of eastern Canada what this disturbance means, and we took up the issue. When the question comes up later on we shall endeavour to place our arguments in such light before this House that I think the House will agree that some steps must be taken to restrict the Japanese in their free ingress and egress to this country. That is the whole question. We are just as loyal to the empire as are the gentlemen who sit on the government benches; we admire as much as they do the progressiveness of the Japanese people, but we say that in considering this question we have got to view it in the light of a business proposition. Why, as the Postmaster General argued should they feel any offence, why should their feelings be hurt because we make laws in regard to the restriction of the entrance of their people into this country? Would it not have been a reasonable proposition? Do we not impose similar restrictions in regard to our own people? We know that under the Immigration Act we restrict the entrance of even our own people into the country. Then is there any reason why we should not in the same way restrict the immigration of Japanese?

The hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) has made much of the fact of a certain telegram having been sent to Victoria in regard to this question. Speaking for my district, I never saw that telegram, I never heard of it, I never heard it read or knew anything about it until I heard of it in this House on Friday afternoon. It had little bearing in my district of Kootenay. Some one may have read it, and I accept the word of the hon. member (Mr. Ralph Smith) that it was read in his presence, but as he stated I was not present at the time and I repeat that I never heard of it and know that it had nothing whatever to do with the question. I was surprised that the hon. member (Mr. Ralph Smith) seemed to think the whole crux of the question rested on that telegram. Yet what was the real argument in regard to it? Simply that if he was correct, if his arguments were correct, then the people of British Columbia are very much in earnest on this question. If that telegram swayed votes in favour of the opposition as against the government, there is only one conclusion to be drawn and that is that they are very much in earnest in regard to this question and want it settled along lines that will preserve to them the good heritage of this Dominion of ours.

In regard to the question of better terms, the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) said that the Hon. Mr. McBride's mission at the conference of the premiers in regard to this question was a failure. I venture to differ from him in regard to that. When the province of British Columbia applied for an independent tribunal to try their case, they were refused, and instead of giving them an independent tribunal the government called for a conference of the premiers of the various provinces to go into this whole question. There was nothing wrong in that, but I appeal to your sense and judgment whether or not that was an independent tribunal as putting the claim of one province against the claim of another province. Every member, every school boy, knows that if any one of those premiers had given more to one province than he obtained for his own, the first question asked of him on returning to his constituents would be: Why did you not get as much as the other provinces? That is natural, that is right and that is fair and yet I can prove to you that our claim was so just that even the biassed

and I say advisedly, prejudiced tribunal admitted the right of the province of British Columbia to special consideration and so the Hon. Richard McBride did not fail in his mission here at that conference. I have here the resolution adopted by that conference, a tribunal composed of premiers, every one fighting for his own province. Yet they felt that our position was so just that they passed this resolution :

That in view of the large area, geographical position and very exceptional physical features of the province of British Columbia, it is the opinion of this conference that the said province should receive a reasonable additional allowance for the purposes of civil government in excess of the provisions made in the Quebec resolutions of 1902, and that such additional allowance should be to the extent of $100,000 annually for ten years.

I rather regret to say—I may be wrong—but I thought I detected certain sarcasm beneath the words of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) when he said that the province accepted the $100,000 for ten years, or $1,000,000, although they said it was not enough. Is there anything wrong in the province having accepted that concession ? Would you have them act as children and when they asked for a cake and get only half a cake throw it down and say : I will not take it ? I venture to say there was nothing wrong in the province of British Columbia accepting the $1,000,000 that was offered them, at the same time entering their protest that it was not a fair or adequate amount under the conditions. Mr. McBride's mission was not a failure.

Then the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) said that Mr. McBride went to the foot of the Throne and again was not successful. I intend to prove from the resolution that Mr. McBride was successful. After having obtained an admission from a prejudiced tribunal that the province was entitled to special and exceptional terms to the extent of $1,000,000, Mr. McBride went to London. We had from the First Minister himself a statement that that was a final and unalterable settlement, that it had been settled by the conference of premiers of the provinces and was final. But, Sir, the premier of the province of British Columbia did not so regard it and I am glad to say that in this he was supported by the leader of the opposition in the British Columbia House at Victoria, Mr. J. A. Macdonald, who himself moved a resolution in which he said that the amount was inadequate and that therefore they did not want this to be a final and unalterable settlement. The result of that was that the legislature unanimously, Liberals and Conservatives alike, agreed to send the premier of the province to the foot of the Throne to argue that the rights of the province were denied by the Liberal government at Ottawa. I venture to say again that they were successful because I find that when the premier of the province of British Columbia went home and placed this matter before the British government he obtained this communication :

Downing Street, June 5, 1907.

To the Hon. Richard McBride,
Hotel Victoria, London.

I am directed by the Earl of Elgin to inform you that His Lordship has given the most careful consideration to the documents which you presented to him and to the views advanced against the proposed amendment of the British North America Act fixing the scale of payments be made by the Dominion of Canada to the several provinces.

2. Lord Elgin fully appreciates the force of the opinion expressed that the British North America Act was the result of terms of union agreed upon by the contracting provinces and that its terms cannot be altered merely at the wish of the Dominion government.

I am to add that no mention will be made in the imperial act of the settlement being final and unalterable, such terms being obviously unappropriate in a legislative enactment.

I venture to say that the hon. the Postmaster General was incorrect in both the assertions he made. Mr. McBride was both successful in the conference and successful with the home government. He had these words struck out so that in the future we can easily obtain justice and fair-play for our province.

Mr. JAMES DAVIS TAYLOR (New Westminster). Although the ground has been very fully covered by other members from British Columbia, I consider it my duty to rise and add my quota to the explanations which have been made regarding the special case of the province of British Columbia. Let me say at the outset that I appreciate the compliment paid to the members on the Conservative side from British Columbia by the right hon. the leader of the government when he said that in our province this election was fought on principle, and I wish to congratulate the Conservative members generally on his further statement that in the other provinces the test was not so much of principle as an appeal to sectional feeling and prejudices. I would like to point out that the result of the appeal to principle in British Columbia was a substantial Conservative majority, and that the result of the sectional appeals throughout the rest of Canada was a Liberal majority. We have the admission of the right hon. gentleman himself to this effect, when he told us that his party had adopted a pamphlet issued against it by a certain organization in this Dominion, but intended only as an address to those interested in the principles of that organization. Well, we have the First Minister admitting that his

party had circulated that same appeal in quarters hostile to the organization which issued it, and had done this for the purpose of injuring the Conservative party.

It seems to me that this debate has taken a most extraordinary turn, and that we have reached a new era in parliamentary affairs when we find the leader of the House, in his speech on the address, making no mention of the legislation promised and giving no explanation of any of the measures outlined in the speech from the Throne, but instead making theatrical production of shoddy in the shape of a disputed telegram and laying a copy of it on the table, although it was well known to his associates at least that that telegram had been repudiated by the hon. gentleman whose name was signed to it. It certainly was a most unusual experience for a new member to be taunted, as the hon. member for Victoria was taunted the other night by the leader of this House, with having secured his seat by false pretenses and with occupying a seat which by right should belong to another. I think we should have further explanation as to the origin of that telegram. I think we should have heard something on that point from the hon. member from Nanaimo (Mr. Smith), who took up a good deal of time this afternoon. We should have heard something from him regarding the control of the 'Colonist,' in which that telegram appeared It would certainly have come with very good grace from him to tell the House that the 'Colonist' is not in any sense of the word a concern in which the Conservative party has any proprietary control. The 'Colonist,' so far as its ownership is concerned, is a thoroughly independent newspaper, and its editor is one of the most pronounced and prominent Liberals in all British Columbia, and a close personal friend, if I am not very much mistaken, of the hon. member from Nanaimo, who this afternoon sought to make the House believe that this telegram had emanated from sources entirely favourable to the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barnard), and that the Conservative party should be held responsible for the use made of it. I would like to add that the facts I have mentioned regarding the control of the 'Colonist' are very well known to the members of this government. It seems to me—and I say it with all the humility which becomes a young member making his first appearance that it is not in accord with parliamentary traditions that stigma should be cast on a whole party because of a document as to which that party cannot be held responsible. I wish to add that I do not impute any wilful wrong to the 'Colonist' newspaper or its editor. In justice to one of the great newspapers of British Columbia—and with which I had at one time a pretty long connection—I can say that, so far as I know, that newspaper is conducted now, as ever, on the most honourable lines. I would like to have an explanation as to how this telegram came to be distorted, but I would not for a moment attribute any wilful distortion to the 'Colonist.' But when you examine the words substituted, namely, 'The absolute exclusion of Asiatic labour,' and contrast them with the words said by the leader of the opposition to have been in the telegram signed by him, namely, 'the absolute protection of white labour,' when you contrast these and get your mind away, for the moment, from the enormity of making any alteration whatever in a telegram published with the signature of the author, you will find that, after all, there is very little difference between them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. You will find, I say, Mr. Speaker, that there is very little difference between them. I would like to impress that particularly upon the hon. member for Nainaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith), and ask him, as the representative par excellence of the labour interest, what difference he sees between the absolute protection of white labour in British Columbia and the exclusion of Asiatics from British Columbia. To my mind, the terms, in meaning are identical. But I can well see the point which the right hon. gentleman who introduced this matter before the House might have made against the leader of the opposition if he could have fastened upon him the responsibility of sending the telegram as it appeared. It is quite plain to any one who considers the matter that in the face of the Japanese treaty, in the face of the possibility that the sender of that telegram might, within a short time, have had to assume the responsibility of leading the government of this country, it would have been a very undignified position for him to take to send a message which might have been interpreted as a message of defiance to the Japanese people with whom we had a treaty. Under the treaty, and the agreement in connection with it, the condition of affairs in British Columbia with respect to the Japanese would have been very much better than it had been in the past, especially the then recent past. While we can well understand the caution which would move the leader of the opposition in sending the telegram, I say, as a member of the Conservative party in British Columbia and in this House, that, whether or not our leader sent the telegram, that our policy was one of absolute exclusion of Asiatics from British Columbia, I do believe that that is the policy of the Conservative party of Canada, and I do maintain that, so far as the members from British Columbia can be influential in shaping the policy of the Conservative party, they will stand to a man in fa-

vour of the exclusion of Asiatics from our magnificent province.

Another reason suggests itself to my mind —and probably will suggest itself to the minds of others—for the extraordinary heat shown by the leader of this government in connection with this Japanese question. It occurs to me that this Japanese treaty was of the nature of a personally-conducted excursion into the realm of legislation, and that it followed the appearance of the siren within the precincts of the Privy Council. It appears to me that the fatality attending upon these personally-conducted excursions has had an irritating effect upon the right hon. gentleman. When we see the latest excursion of this kind followed by the disappearance of the Minister of Inland Revenue, and when we recall that a previous essay of this nature was followed by the disappearance of a Minister of the Interior, and when we remember certain negotiations from which the Minister of Railways was excluded, followed by the disappearance of that Minister of Railways, we can understand the heat with which the subject is approached by the Prime Minister, and his natural annoyance that a third should have been added to the cabinet fatalities, and that he should be held, in a measure, responsible for the disappearance of his unfortunate colleague.

Now, we heard the right hon. gentleman challenge the patriotism of the members from British Columbia when he said—I speak from recollection—that our attitude with regard to Asiatic immigration was a menace not only to the interests of Canada but of the whole British empire. Sir, we are not a peculiar people in British Columbia. The most of us are Canadians from the eastern provinces who have been attracted by the greater opportunities of the west, but who, in our progress westward, have not had our vision narrowed. We have not lost anything of our affection for Canada or for the British empire because we have removed from Quebec or Ontario to British Columbia. But we think we can claim that we see this Asiatic problem with clearer vision than that of our fellow countrymen who have remained in the east. We do not want to see the Japanese planted in our fields. We do not want to hand over our fisheries, as has been the case with the Fraser river, to the swarm of their boats. Emphatically we do not want to surrender our anchorage in the harbour of Esquimalt or the harbour of Vancouver to the warships of the Japanese nation. The Prime Minister suggested that these ships would be likely to ride at anchor there at a future date to protect us from molestations by enemies of our Empire. I may say that no man in British Columbia that I ever heard indicated that he looked for foreign molestation from any quarter which would cause us to welcome the protection of the Japanese fleet. I do not know that any person in British Columbia has ever feared that the time would come when the power of the British navy would be insufficient to protect our shores. If I have heard criticism in that respect, it has been of the policy of the Canadian government, which policy has dismantled our only naval station in British Columbia and has made of the great naval yard at Esquimalt little but a wreck and has left us, indeed, at the mercy of any hostile vessels that might have come there. I say, we are not apprehensive of hostilities from any quarter. But when we think of these matters, we remember that a few years ago we had a naval base and that to-day there are no ships of war there. And when we look for the cause, we find it largely in the refusal of the government of Canada to contribute to the cost of imperial naval defence or to take any part in negotiations said to have been set afoot by the British authorities with the view of a businesslike arrangement to that effect.

Before I leave this subject of oriental immigration I would like to say that the position in British Columbia is very much aggravated by the attitude of this government towards the Japanese who have come to our province and are naturalized there. It is bad enough to have these people monopolizing our industries, especially to have them take possession of the sockeye fishery of the Fraser, but when we find the government proposing to put these orientals by thousands upon the voters' list in British Columbia and so place them in a position to swamp the white vote, then the electors of a riding such as New Westminster, which I have the honour to represent, believe that it is time for a pause, believe that it is time to take most resolute action to arouse public opinion to the danger to which we are exposed, the danger of humiliation in an electoral sense brought upon us by the most peculiar attitude of this government in relation to the Japanese. We find on the records of three or four years ago a most indignant remonstrance by the then Minister of Justice of Canada against an Act of the legislature of British Columbia denying to Asiatics, the right to be registered on the voters' list of that province.

The Minister of Justice of that day, endorsed by his colleagues, declared that the province of British Columbia should not be allowed to deny the privilege of the franchise to naturalized subjects of His Majesty; and that representation should be made to that province to the effect that naturalized Asiatics should go upon the voters' lists. Now when this proposition came to be discussed by this government they knew the extent to which the Japanese had been naturalized in British Columbia, and in New West

minster particularly. It is part of the Dominion fishery laws that no man can obtain a fishing license for the salmon fishery unless he is a naturalized British subject. We had at that time close upon 3,000 naturalized Japanese holding fishing licenses, and the proposition of the government virtually was to put that whole 3,000 on the voters' list in British Columbia, mainly in the riding of New Westminster. I appeal to any person who can understand the meaning of an Act of that kind, I appeal to his sense of fair play, whether any community would be true to itself that remained inactive, and did not strain every nerve to resist such a proposition, that did not do as we have done, and form Asiatic Exclusion leagues, which have done so much to educate the people of British Columbia and to make possible the emphatic answer we returned to the policy of this government.

Now a few words on the subject of better terms. It seems to me that the case has not been so fully stated by the members of the government as it might have been, seeing that they are so much more conversant with the facts than the average men can be. This is a matter of first importance in British Columbia. Our application for an increase, which we call better terms, had been before the government of Canada for about six years. We were able to show by the most detailed calculations that we were paying into the federal exchequer a sum in excess of the other provinces proportionately, and that we were not getting back what was rightly due us. We were exasperated that the government, year after year, made no reply to our appeal for redress, and virtually ignored us. Finally the premier of British Columbia received an invitation from the Prime Minister of Canada to come down to Ottawa, not to discuss the matter with the other provincial premiers alone, but to discuss it also with His Majesty's ministers, with a view to a solution of a long standing problem. Mr. McBride's grievance began when he arrived at Ottawa and proposed to discuss with His Majesty's ministers the special claim of British Columbia, that did not involve the other provinces at all. We had a claim that was not shared by the other provinces, and we addressed that claim solely to the government of Canada. I say that when he came to Ottawa, and when His Majesty's ministers refused to discuss that claim, and told him that he must take it before a conference of provincial premiers, that the federal government would not consider any representations at all except such as came from that conference, then of course Mr. McBride was forced to take his case before those premiers, and according to all the reports we have received he presented his case in a most heroic manner. I say that he achieved a signal triumph when he obtained from the conference of provincial premiers a verdict that in consideration of the special disabilities of the province, we were entitled to a 'reasonable compensation' in addition to what we received from all other sources. Now, Mr. Speaker, those were the terms of the resolution passed by the provincial premiers, namely, that we were entitled to reasonable compensation. And what we hold now, what we have been pressing on our constituents during the recent campaign, is that the government of Canada, as at present constituted and then constituted, distinctly refused to enter into any calculation to ascertain what was a reasonable compensation. We were told that we must accept the frivolous sum awarded by that conference, and the government refused to make any calculations to ascertain whether it was reasonable or unreasonable. On the other hand, we have received from the leader of the Conservative party a distinct pledge that if he were placed in power he would refer our case to an independent tribunal to ascertain the amount to which we were entitled, and I appeal to any fair-minded man whether the leader of the Conservative party can be accused of bribing the province of British Columbia, whether he has not acted fairly towards the province and whether we would not have been unworthy of the support of our constituents if, having been turned down by the present government, we had not made the appeal of the leader of the opposition to put himself on record. Can any person in this House or out of it hold for one moment that a fair and distinct promise publicly made by the leader of a party upon a great public question like that, can be regarded as a bribe? I wish to refer for a moment to the extraordinary attitude taken by the minister representing British Columbia in the Cabinet. We were told by Mr. Templeman that the question of better terms was as dead as Julius Ceasar. Well Sir, our reply is the empty seat of the Minister of Inland Revenue. He it is who perhaps is as dead as Julius Ceasar, and were it not for the esteem in which the late member for Comox-Atlin is held bv his constituents, and deservedly held, as a gentleman who has been most diligent in looking after the affairs of his riding, the Minister of Inland Revenue would remain as dead as Julius Caesar. Whether or not he will have opposition, I have no information, but I say that if the Minister of Inland Revenue is resurrected, it will be solely because of the compassion of the electors of Comox-Atlin for that hon. gentleman, because they will not desire to see the undoubted sacrifice made in vain, which has been made by Mr. Sloan in retiring from this House.

Now I desire to say a few words bearing more directly upon some of the subjects

mentioned in the speech from the Throne. I dissent from the position laid down by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that because he has been re-elected by his constituents, and because this government has been returned to power, he has a right to regard the charges made against himself and this government as having been disposed of. To my mind the minister and the rest of the members of the government still stand arraigned at the bar of public opinion, and must be judged by their action upon the report of Mr. Justice Cassels. In regard to the reference in the address to this report, I would remind you that in 1891 we had a similar condition of affairs in this House. We had a serious arraignment of the government of that day. We had a report presented exonerating a minister of guilty knowledge of irregularities in his department. But he resigned his portfolio, because he felt that he had not been sufficiently conversant with the operations of his department, and had not discovered the irregularities that the commission found to exist in it. We had an amendment to the Criminal Code at that day, introduced by the then Minister of Justice, Sir John Thompson, providing certain punishment for offences of that nature. It seems curious that no steps have ever been taken, under the special clauses inserted in the Criminal Code by Sir John Thompson, to deal with offences by employees of the government against the government. I for one would have liked to have heard on this occasion how it is that there have been no prosecutions under these provisions, whether it is because Sir John Thompson was so poor a draftsman that he was not able to draft a section covering cases of this kind, a supposition which I do not think any one in this House will admit for a moment—or whether it is the benevolent intention of the government to absolve all the persons shown to be guilty of having used the money of this country for their private benefit, by passing an Act which shall not be retroactive but apply only to offences committed subsequent to its adoption. I think we should have some explanation why there have been no prosecutions, why matters in this respect have been allowed to drift.

Mr. Speaker, I have no more to add. I have to thank the House for the patience with which they have listened to me on this occasion, and to join in the hope expressed by my colleagues from British Columbia that on a more fitting occasion we shall have the subjects of more particular importance to our province brought before this House and discussed at greater length, so that we may have a thorough understanding as to the attitude of the government and as to what we may expect to be done for the advantage of British Columbia during the term of this parliament.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron). Mr. Speaker, owing to indisposition I was unable to hear the first part of this debate. I have, however, read the speeches delivered on Friday and have heard the hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House to-day, and I wish to congratulate the province of British Columbia on the contingent which it has sent to represent it in this House. The hon. gentlemen who have preceded me have been discussing the yellow labour question. I wish for about ten minutes to discuss a white labour question, one which is very material to the interests of Canada and is of special personal interest to the members of this House. It is a question affecting labourers who, most of them will claim, are harder worked and less paid than any others on this continent; I refer to the labourers for the Dominion of Canada whom I see around me. I wish, Sir, to bring to your notice—and I do so without any political animus whatsoever, but simply for the good of Canada—the question of the length of the session. For eight long months, mostly within a year from now, the parliament of Canada was in session here. The question which I wish to ask is this: To what end did the legislation of those eight months tend? Did it tend to benefit the Dominion of Canada for the time spent? The opposition and the government were like two hostile fleets reconnoitering and manœuvering for one purpose only—to influence the impending general election; they were trying to get the weather gauge on each other; and I contend that if that session had lasted but three months, it would have served the general good of Canada quite as well as it did. I do not mean to say for one moment that one side is more obstructionist than the other. In what I am about to say I do not mean to reflect on the members from British Columbia who have spoken in this debate, because so far as I have heard or read their speeches, they have not conflicted with each other; there has been no tautology or reiteration in them. But the habit has been growing in this parliament that when a member from one of the smaller provinces makes a speech on a subject pertaining to that province, every other member from the province gets up and goes over the same ground. There should be some changes in our practice. We have drifted into a system of managing the public business that is very detrimental to the interests of the country. We take longer to do the business of the country than any other parliament on the face of the earth. I have looked into the matter, and I find that during the eight months this parliament

was in session last year we passed 157 Bills. In the province of Quebec the legislature was in session one month and twenty-two days and passed 218 Bills. In the province of Ontario the legislature was in session two months and twenty days and passed 146 Bills. The imperial parliament at Westminster passes on an average between 200 and 300 Bills in a session shorter than ours. In the United States there are introduced into congress upwards of 15,000 Bills on the average every session, and upwards of 2,000 are passed. The sessions last an average of five months. I contend that we in this parliament have drifted unconsciously into a system of carrying on our parliamentary business which is not suitable to this country. We have adopted the poor rules and not the good rules of the parliament of Great Britain. Now, I do not for one moment advocate what is known as the closure and there is a misconception in the public mind that the Speaker in the British parliament has the power of closure. However, we must remember that the Speaker of the English House of Commons is an entirely different official from our Speaker here. In England the Speaker of the House of Commons is like a judge of the land, appointed for life, but here he is elected each parliament.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So he is in Great Britain.

Mr. LEWIS. Yes, but in the British House the same Speaker is re-elected.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, the election is a mere convention.

Mr. LEWIS. The same gentleman is elected from parliament to parliament in England. Now, power could be given our Speaker to see that all reiterations were omitted, and as is done in England all questions could be answered in writing and published in 'Hansard,' and if there is anything objectionable in the answers it could be referred to later. Another thing that would tend to lessen the length of the sessions would be to insist that all speeches delivered in the House should be of original matter and in the hon. member's own words.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LEWIS. If he found it necessary to refer to documents the quotations could be handed into the 'Hansard' and the Deputy Speaker could act as reviser and strike out anything that might be objectionable in these quotations. That would materially shorten the session. As to the length of speeches, the hon. member who introduces a Bill should be allowed one hour and the gentleman who follows him should be allowed one hour also; the remaining speeches could be curtailed.

Mr. STAPLES. How are you going to justify the three and a half hour speech you made yourself.

Mr. LEWIS. I have seen the error of my ways and have reformed. And with reference to that particular speech, had I been allowed to hand in my quotations to 'Hansard' instead of reading them—and I may say that these quotations are being used to-day and were used last session by the government to found legislation upon—had I been allowed to publish them without reading them my speech on the transportation question would not have lasted over twenty minutes. There is an old proverb in the oil regions which might be applied to the speeches in this House, and that is that if a man who is making a speech cannot strike oil in 30 minutes he either has a very bad auger or he is boring in the wrong hole.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LEWIS. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not only expressing my own opinion, but I am expressing the opinions of a great many people throughout this country. The greatest movements in the history of nations have arisen, not in the parliament itself but around the smithy fires, in the hotel waiting rooms, in the railway cars, and in the corner stores. I have a letter here which was written to me at the end of last session by a gentleman who lives at Snowflake, Manitoba, and who left my native town 15 years ago to seek fortune in the west. He is a strong Liberal and he wrote me that a bunch of them were gathered around the big stove in the store the other evening discussing the federal parliament, and the merchants, the commercial travellers, and the farmers there assembled had come to the conclusion that there was too much talk and ballyragging in the House of Commons and that if there was more common sense displayed there would be a better administration of the laws.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LEWIS. Another matter of considerable importance is the question of the health of the members of this House. I do not now refer to gentlemen who have been a number of years here and who have grown up on the foul atmosphere, but the figures which I have compiled show that the average number of deaths in the Canadian House of Commons is greater than in that pestilential climate where they are building the Panama canal. During the last ten years 39 members of this House of Commons have died in harness, which shows a higher average than the preceding 10 year period when the sessions were shorter. I leave it to hon. gentlemen who were here

last parliament to agree with me that with the exception of some old veteran war horses, there is not a man who has sat for four years here who is not ten years older than he was four years ago.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LEWIS. Now, Mr. Speaker, we should certainly get through this session in three months. I had no intention when I rose to speak for more than ten minutes, but some of the hon. gentlemen who desire to come after me are anxious that I should continue until six o'clock.

Some Hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LEWIS. I wish to say, Sir, that the greatest speeches that the world has ever known lasted under one hour.

Mr. LENNOX. With the exception of yours.

Mr. LEWIS. Patrick Henry's famous oration lasted 22 minutes; Sir Wilfrid Laurier's speech on the South African question lasted 32 minutes; Sir John A. Macdonald's speech on Confederation lasted 35 minutes; Burke's great speech on the impeachment of Warren Hastings was 90 minutes; and Thomas D'Arcy McGee's famous address on 'the land we live in' only lasted eight minutes. The speech which gave Bryan the nomination for President of the United States, a speech which is described as the speech of 'the cross of gold,' lasted only 12 minutes. Last parliament I brought forward a number of Bills with reference to criminal matters, which I am glad to see the government have adopted in principle this session, and are about to crystallize into legislation This year I shall have the honour to submit to the House a Bill with reference to immigration, which I believe will be in the interests of Canada and the Empire. I notice a newspaper paragraph to the effect that the Salvation Army are bringing out to Canada this spring 8,000 immigrants. The army officials say that, owing to the fact of these immigrants all going to positions that have been secured for them they need not have the £5 demanded of ordinary immigrants.

I observe also a statement that the first batch of refugees from the awful calamity in Italy have left for New York and that 200,000 of them are coming to Canada. While we are willing to help these unfortunate people in their distress so far as lies in our power, we must not relax the vigilance with which we guard immigration into this country. I have in my possession a map prepared by the Immigration Department of the United States showing where the undesirables come from to that country, and it is exactly the spot where this awful calamity occurred. I object, from my place in this House, to the importation of men of that class or men of any class who are not able to go on the land and to pay their way to this Canada of ours.

While the town and the district from which I come have felt less than any other locality in Canada the distress of the last year, for every factory in my district has been working full time, and we have handled in my own town of Goderich ten million bushels of the 28,000,000 bushels of grain that passed through Canada and have to-day a manufacturing output second only to that of the city of London in Western Ontario, still we have ten times more paupers to care for, as they have in every town and city in Canada, than we had five years ago. It is time to stop such a condition and these men who come here ought to be in a position to go on the land.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. GLEN CAMPBELL (Dauphin). Okemas, apitchi ne minuentum chi wabiminan ka abiun. I have, Mr. Speaker, congratulated you in the language of the aborigines of this country and I wish to follow that with my personal congratulations in the English language which you so well understand. I congratulate you on your election to be the first commoner of this great Dominion, and I believe that the Conservative party agree with me in that congratulation. They might have had some fault to find, Sir, with the method adopted by your government to elect you to be a representative on the floor of this House, but seeing that you were elected there is no man on that side of the House whom the Conservatives would sooner see fill the seat that you now occupy with so much grace. And while we congratulate you, I feel that we should also congratulate the First Minister on his choice of you for the position. He owed it as a matter of courtesy to the French race for the manner in which the French people of all Canada supported him. It is only to be expected from a politician such as the First Minister is, that he should have sufficient politesse to recognize what he owes to the people of his own race. And while I say that, I want to take exception to the charges that have been made by the Liberals throughout Canada, that the Conservative party has been raising the race cry. Speaking as a member from the west that is certainly a charge that does not lie against our people because we of the west have read and studied the history of Canada, and we have the same admiration for the men of the French race who have helped to build up our country that French Canadians have for them. We look on Champlain and Jacques Cartier and de la Verandrye and le Gardeur St. Pierre with as much

veneration as any Frenchman can. We do not forget that the first missionary, the Rev. Father Messager was a Frenchman. We reverence him; we do not forget that in 1731 he sacrificed his life for his Christ and his religion in the western wilds. We do not forget these things; we venerate these Frenchmen as highly as men of their own race could. I deprecate the charges that are thrown in the teeth of the Conservative party, that we raise the race cry. I deplore it. But, Sir, the raising of this race cry is due to the fact that the Liberals, guided by their honoured leader, get out and say on the hustings at election times—more particularly in the west, I presume, because it is the west I know best —I deplore that the Liberals in the French parts of the different constituencies do not say: vote for the Liberal party, but their cry is: vote for Laurier because he is a Frenchman. That is the kind of thing that raises the race cry, and that is the kind of thing I deprecate. I am on my feet to-night, Mr. Speaker, not because I had any desire as a new member to speak, but because the right hon. the Prime Minister cast a slur on the Conservative government of my little province with regard to the preparation of the voters' lists in that province. I am speaking to-night for much the same reason as the hon. gentlemen from British Columbia have spoken, and spoken so well. These hon. gentlemen from the Pacific province have delivered a message to this House which must not be disregarded. I want to say, Sir, that I am absolutely in sympathy with them, and I am in sympathy with them for the reason that I am a protectionist. I believe in protecting our own people; I believe in protecting the white labourers and the white artisans, and more particularly the farmers because I am a farmer myself. I believe in creating such a condition of affairs in the west as well as in the east, that white labourers will get proper remuneration for the work they do. I believe in building up the Dominion and every province in the Dominion with white labour so that the white labourers and the white artisans who earn the money and who are generous spenders will create a local market in the populous centres for the produce of the farmers, from whose efforts results the wealth of this country. I am not going to follow that phase of the debate very much longer, further than to say that my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) was perhaps right when he told the House that he was not an employer of labour, but he might have gone further and told the House that he was a representative of labour, that he was an employee of labour when he came to this House, and that he sold them and sold them for a price.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I would like to ask my hon. friend if I understood him to say that I sold the labour men for a price; is that what the hon. gentlemen said?

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is exactly what I said.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is going beyond parliamentary language.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If you decide that I should withdraw that expression——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it is an imputation that should not be made against any hon. member of the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I should be very pleased to comply with anything you say, Sir. And perhaps, Sir, at this stage of the game, coming, as I do, from the wild and woolly west, bred and born there and not up to the ways of the effete east, I shall have to put myself in your charge. I can promise you that as far as I can, I will conform to the ways of civilization, and will try not to make it necessary for you to call me to order, if you will promise me that you will not call me to order any oftener than you can help.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member (Mr. Campbell) will understand that the expression referred to ought to be withdrawn.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I will withdraw the expression at your order, Mr. Speaker. Now, the matter which particularly brought me to my feet was the reference made by the Prime Minister to the fact that the Manitoba elections had gone against him and his government. I regret exceedingly that the Prime Minister is not in his seat, because I would like to have said what I have to say in his presence and in the presence of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) whom he designated as his authority for the statement he made to this House. The Prime Minister said that the reason, and the sole reason why the Manitoba elections had gone against his government was that the lists were most outrageous, and he quoted as his authority the hon. member for Brandon. But he qualified his quotation of that member as a reliable authority by saying that he thought he could give credence to the hon. member for Brandon. Were the Prime Minister in his seat, I would tell him that he has another thought coming, and I will explain to you, Mr. Speaker, why I say so. The Prime Minister said the lists were most outrageous. Were he here, I would ask him if he had ever read the Franchise Act of Manitoba. Had he read that Act, marked, learned and inwardly digested it, he could not have failed to see that, if lived up to, it was the fairest election law on the statute-book of any

province of this Dominion. It is absolutely impartial. No appointee of the government has the right to put any name on the list, with the exception of the judges of Manitoba, who I understand, are appointed by the Dominion government. Any man, twenty-one years of age, a British subject, whether by naturalization or by birth, who has lived one year in the province of Manitoba and has lived three months in the constituency, can and must get his name on the list, if he goes and makes personal application. And there is no case—and I state this advisedly—that can be shown of any man, whether Grit or Tory, Independent, Socialist or anything else, who had the right to get his name on that list and who has taken the oath to that effect being kept off the list. These are the absolute facts, as I call all men to witness, and I defy even the hon. member for Brandon himself, and the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Molloy) who comes from Brandon, to deny what I am stating. I will prove it in this way. The 'Telegram,' which is supposedly a paper in the interest of the Conservative party in Manitoba, came out with a challenge. Let me read that part that pertains to this subject :

> Firm in this confidence, the 'Telegram' will pay $25 to any qualified elector, who, not being on the voters' list and applying in the regular manner, was refused the right to register in the last revision of the Manitoba voters' lists.

I am not calling any Conservative to prove this case, but I call on every Liberal in the province of Manitoba. I call on every Liberal member who sits here. For, had any Grit in the province of Manitoba known of any case, do you think he would not have tried to earn that $25 ? Would not the hon. member for Provencher, who had an election staring him in the face, have tried to earn that $25 to assist in paying his election expenses ? Even the hon. member for Brandon, who is reported to be a millionaire,—why, $25 would have gone a long way, I feel sure, to save his personal pocket in the cost of his election. And not only that, but it would have justified the stand that the Prime Minister took the other day when he said that he had been defeated by a list which was outrageous. If 'outrageous' in the dictionary of my right hon. friend means right, and proper, and honest, I agree with him. But if it means, what ordinary English dictionaries tell us it means, I cannot agree with him. If he said the lists were outré from the Liberal point of view, or from the point of view of the Liberal party heelers of Manitoba, I would agree with him, because from their experience, a straight list is something that they cannot comprehend.

May I digress to the extent of going back to the system followed by the Greenway government, the former Liberal government of Manitoba ? When the Greenway government were in power, they brought out one list which one of the most prominent Liberals in Manitoba characterized as a monstrosity of monstrosities. No Liberal can say that of our lists. I venture to say that in the little constituency that I have the honour to represent, where there are between 8,000 and 9,000 voters, not more than ten names had been left off the list that should have been put on, and these, I fancy, were left off by a typographical or clerical error. Besides, of the men whose names were so left off, the majority were supporters of mine. How different from the time of the Greenway government.

They had a Franchise Act and they appointed a partisan registration clerk. He took in the names that were handed to him by any Liberal, and the names that were handed to him by a Conservative were quietly shelved. They had petty lawyers as a rule—I say rule, because it was the rule that obtained in Dauphin—they had a petty lawyer from Winnipeg appointed as judge. I went to him with over 240 names—I am speaking from my own experience—names of my own supporters. I took them to the court of revision for the constituency of Dauphin, and Dauphin, remember, is one-third of the whole province of Manitoba, extending from one side of the province to the other. I went with him over that constituency and gave evidence, and got Liberals to give evidence. I did everything legitimate in the power of man to do to get these men on the list, and out of those 240 there was so few put on the list that it didn't matter much one way or the other. At every court of revision when I gave evidence or procured evidence in regard to any name I wanted on the list, this petty lawyer from Winnipeg who was appointed as a judge, this partisan Grit who was appointed by the Greenway government, would say: I will take this name to Avisandum. He took the list to Avisandum, and that person took it down to Winnipeg. I thought I had sufficient education to understand what Avisandum was, but I did not understand till afterwards that Avisandum meant Theodore Burrows in the city of Winnipeg, the Greenway candidate. That is the way things were manipulated under a Liberal government in our province, and I defy any man in all Canada to controvert successfully what I am saying. The result was that I went out into the election, a by-election at that—because the gentleman I have just mentioned never ran an election in his life till this last time—I went into that election and was counted out by two. And how was that majority of two procured? It was procured by stuffing the ballot box at Fisher river, where only eight men voted. Four of them voted for me, four voted for my opponent, and the others were found in the ballot box. Some of the men whose

ballots were found in the box were visiting in England; two of them were visiting in the happy hunting grounds, above or below. Those were the methods, that was the style of education I had to learn in regard to politics. I have already mentioned the fact that I could call every Liberal in Manitoba as a witness to the truth of what I say with regard to the Manitoba Franchise Act. I have already mentioned the fact that I could call upon the ex-Minister of the Interior, the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), to deny the truth of what I say. He cannot deny it, because he knows it is true. The other members from Manitoba cannot deny it, because they know it is true. If any Liberal was disfranchised in Manitoba through the fault of the Conservative party in that province, he had a right to be. The challenge came out in the Conservative organ of Manitoba to get out like men and say: That is false and here is the evidence. And when they did not do that, it was time for them to sit down and for ever hold their peace.

I am glad, Sir, to see some reference in the speech from the Throne about the building of the Hudson Bay Railway, and I hope that the right hon. the First Minister, in sending out his survey parties, will carry out the promises made to the people of my constituency by the ex-Minister of the Interior, the member for Brandon, and the promises made by my opponent in the late election. Both of them had the Hudson Bay road surveyed to the house and doorstep of every farmer in my constituency, and I hope that the Prime Minister will see that his survey parties will carry out the promises made by these gentlemen on the public platform in Dauphin.

There is another matter I wish briefly to refer to, and that is the timber regulations that prevail in my locality and in the province of Manitoba. This is not a matter of national interest, but it is a matter that concerns deeply every man in the district I have the honour to represent. That is not a prairie country like most of the territory of Manitoba, it is a scrub country. A change was made some years ago in the inducements that had drawn most settlers into that country. These inducements were free timber in unlimited quantities. Settlers were induced to come in for the reason that timber was there in unlimited quantities, and it could be cut and used freely, and in any quantity desired by the settlers. Those were the regulations that obtained when settlement first came into Dauphin. Those regulations were changed lately, regulations that had been in force since 1896. At present a farmer can only take from the forest reserve to the amount of 10,000 feet per year, and the amount the farmer has to pay for that 10,000 feet is exactly double what he had to pay under the former regulations. Now, Sir, if a petition were sent round to the people of that district, there is not a man there who would not sign to have the regulations changed back to what they were before. I might go into this subject at greater length, but I do not wish to detain the House. I may add that when the new regulations went into force the reeve of the new municipality of Dauphin was a Liberal. He is now president of the Liberal Association of Dauphin. Two of the councillors moved a resolution praying that the regulations be changed back to what they were before. Copies of that resolution and that prayer were sent to the various municipalities throughout the province, and over 50 municipalities responded by signing that petition to the government of Canada to change back the regulations. Before I came here I had the pleasure of speaking to the Minister of the Interior on this matter. I told him that I did not desire to make political capital out of it, because I represent the great proportion of the honest Liberals of my constituency as well as all the Conservatives in my constituency. All I desire is fair play to the people in the locality from which I come. All I ask of the hon. Minister of the Interior is the privilege of discussing this matter with him for half an hour, and I know he will grant all I am asking. I have passed over—and I regret that I have—the reason that I might have given the right hon. the First Minister for the defeat of his party in the province from which I come. In the words of a dead language, they are 'multum in parvo.' One word very nearly describes the whole situation from the Manitoba point of view; that word is 'Siftonism.' It is a word that we had to coin. We were compelled to coin a word to describe properly the whole situation. It could perhaps be described in the words of the commission who made inquiry into the Department of Marine and Fisheries—found conscienceless, ineffective and without any regard for the public weal. That is what defeated in Manitoba the government of the right hon. the First Minister.

Before I sit down I want to refer for a moment to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Brodeur). He was like the rest of the ministers, in that when fault was found with the administration of his department, he laid the blame on some poor old Conservative hack. He did not blame himself for want of horse sense; he blamed some poor Conservative employee. That has been the history of the Department of the Interior. Some years ago the whole law of Canada was changed in the matter of the regulations with regard to the giving of timber to applicants—changed for a few months—changed by the then hon. Minister of the Interior, the present member for Brandon

(Mr. Sifton)—changed long enough to give fifty square miles of the best timber in the riding that I come from to his brother-in-law for a nominal sum—giving it away without any tender, simply as a gift from the people of Canada; a gift that lasts not for a few years only, but just as long as he likes to keep it; a gift which evidently, in the experience of the poor Ruthenian farmers who live in that neighbourhood, includes not only the timber, but the little hay which grows in the swamps; because last year the employees of this gentleman seized three or four tons of hay which had been put up within the bounds of that limit by a poor Ruthenian farmer who was trying to eke out a living in that neighbourhood. It is shameful, when you think of it, for the brother-in-law of the Minister of the Interior to get anything he asks in the way of timber at a dollar a thousand, and to have the law of Canada changed so that he can get it, and the farmers, who by the labour of their hands and the sweat of their brows are building up that western country, obliged to pay $3 a thousand and to take not more than 10,000 feet, and with no redress if any one else comes in and takes their stuff, while the Mounted Police of the Northwest Territories are brought down at public expense to conserve the interests of my late opponent, Mr. Burrows. Isn't it rotten, Mr. Speaker? There is no other word that I know of that can properly describe it.

I was speaking of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. His speech was very similar to the speeches made by my opponent in the campaign through which I passed lately. They were a whine from beginning to end. He was excusing himself all the way. The French axiom, 'Qui s'excuse s'accuse,' describes his position. I would give the hon. minister a pointer. I understand that he, or his department through him, has been spending during the past year public money on musical instruments in the way of fog-horns. These fog-horns, I understand, do not benefit any of the members on either side of the House with the exception perhaps of one. I would suggest, Sir, that he buy musical instruments that will be a benefit to most of the members of this House, such as megaphones and ear trumpets, so that the members on the back seats can hear what is said.

Motion (Mr. Todd) agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

Mr. CAMPBELL.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have a motion to present to the House which I hope will receive its unanimous assent. I move:

That Gilbert H. McIntyre, Esq., member for the electoral district of South Perth, be appointed Chairman of Committees of the Whole House.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) moved :

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

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When does the House anticipate that the estimates will be brought down and when may we expect the remaining volume of the Auditor General's Report ?

Mr. PATERSON. It is intended that the estimates will be brought down this week.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I understand that the Auditor General's Report is in the hands of the printer and will be ready in a few days.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Mr. PATERSON moved :

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

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to know whether or not there is any truth in the announcement in the press that a supplementary convention has been signed between Great Britain and France in respect to the confirming or modifying the convention which was drafted last year and ratified by us.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The rumour is correct. I have had communication from Mr. Fielding to the effect that a new arrangement has been entered into with the French government; the only substantial change from the old treaty being as regards fat cattle and conditions for slaughter.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

NEW WING OF HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Taylor (Leeds)—asked :

1. What is the cost to date of construction and furnishing respectively, of the new wing of the House of Commons; how many new

rooms and with what floor space have been provided how many old rooms and with what floor space have been eliminated in the process of construction; what number of employees have been provided in the new rooms and what number have been ousted from the eliminated rooms?

2. What is the estimated cost to complete in construction and furnishing respectively?

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

1. (a) Paid to date on construction, $247,495.08. Nothing paid on furnishing.

(b) 43 new rooms in new building, 270,926 cubic feet; 13 new rooms in old building, 67,344 cubic feet; total 56 new rooms, 338,270 cubic feet.

(c) 7 rooms eliminated, 22,980 cubic feet.

(d) and (e) To be answered by the Speaker of the House of Commons.

2. Construction, say.. .. .. ..$90,000
Furnishing, say.. 15,000

The answer to the last paragraph of the first question furnished by Mr. Speaker, and is as follows:

Mr. L. Dubé, housekeeper, has lost three rooms by the erection of the new building; Mr. C. George, the Speaker's steward, has been given one room in said building.

There have been no other changes affecting the employees of the House of Commons, except that Mr. O'Brien, law clerk, Mr. Foran, assistant law clerk, Mr. Laplant, assistant clerk, Mr. Loucks and Mr. Throop, law branch, have been moved to other rooms in old building in lieu of their respective offices.

SUPPLIES—DEPARTMENTS OF MARINE AND FISHERIES AND PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Taylor (Leeds)—asked:

Are all supplies for the Marine and Fisheries Department and for the Public Works Department now being purchased on the basis of public tender, advertised for in newspapers, irrespective of party leanings, and upon contracts made with the lowest tenderer in each case?

Mr. PUGSLEY. All supplies for Department of Public Works are now being purchased, whenever reasonably possible, on the basis of public tender by public advertisement.

OLD AGE ANNUITIES ACT.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Taylor (Leeds)—asked:

1. What persons are employed, and in what capacity, at what salary and expenses in each case, in looking after and operating the Old Age Annuities Act?

2. How many persons have availed themselves of the provisions of this Act, and what is the total amount of annuities sold to date?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. On the inside service a superintendent at $4,000 per annum one French and German translator, who is also a stenographer and typewriter, at $750 per annum; five temporary assistants (one of whom is a stenographer and typewriter) engaged in distributing literature.

On the outside service: one lecturer-in-chief, at a salary of $1,000 per annum with an allowance of $15 for each lecture delivered, besides actual travelling expenses; one assistant lecturer at $500 per annum, and an allowance of $10 for each lecture delivered, besides actual travelling expenses; and two agents at $1,500 each, besides actual travelling expenses.

2. As regards this question, a full report will be made in the manner provided for in the statute. Meantime, it may be observed that owing to the complicated character of the calculations required to be made and the difficulty in obtaining books and pamphlets in sufficient number, it has not been possible to commence active operations until within a very few days.

APPOINTMENTS TO CIVIL SERVICE SINCE 1908.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Taylor (Leeds)—asked:

1. What persons have been appointed, transferred or promoted, respectively, since July 1, 1908, in the various departments, coming under the operation of the Civil Service Act of 1908?

2. What were the positions and salaries of such persons as have been transferred and promoted at the time of the change?

3. What are the positions and salaries at present of all who have been so appointed, transferred or promoted, and which of these appointments, transfers or promotions were made in accordance with the present Civil Service Act?

Hon. CHAS. MURPHY (Secretary of State). As this motion calls for considerable detail, I would ask to let the question stand as a notice for motion for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question will stand as a notice of motion for a return.

CIVIL SERVICE REORGANIZATION.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Taylor (Leeds)—asked:

1. What departments of the civil service have been reorganized under section 8 of the Civil Service Act?

2. What temporary clerks formerly paid out of civil government contingencies have been classified under section 7 of the Civil Service Act, in what position and at what salaries?

Hon. CHAS. MURPHY (Secretary of State):

1. Agriculture, Auditor General, Customs, Finance, Mines, Governor General's Secretary, Library of Parliament, Indian

Affairs, Inland Revenue, Insurance, Justice, Labour, Marine and Fisheries, Militia and Defence, Northwest Mounted Police, Post Office Department, Printing and Stationery, Privy Council, Public Works, Railways and Canals, Secretary of State, Trade and Commerce.

2. Eighty-five temporary clerks, formerly paid out of Civil Government Contingencies, have been classified under section 7 of the Civil Service Act from the 1st of September, 1908, and have been placed in the 3rd division, subdivision B of the Civil Service Act at the following salaries: 1 at $800, 27 at $700, 19 at $650, 6 at $600, 9 at $550, 23 at $500. Total, 85.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Taylor (Leeds)—asked :

1. What appointments have been made since September, 1908, under section 21, Civil Service Act?

2. What sum of money not voted by parliament for civil service salaries has been paid up to date under section 47, Civil Service Act?

Hon. CHAS. MURPHY (Secretary of State) :

1. None.

2. $8,875.

LANDS SOLD FOR GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC STATIONS, &c.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Taylor (Leeds)—asked :

What lands, at what price, and to what persons or corporations have been sold along the route of the Grand Trunk Pacific for station, terminal or town site purposes?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). As the reply will be somewhat voluminous, I would ask that this question stand as a notice of motion for return.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question will stand as a notice of motion for a return.

SOUTH AFRICAN VOLUNTEERS SCRIP.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

1. What number of scrip have been so far issued on account of South African Veterans' land grants, and what area of land do they cover?

2. Have any employees in any of the departments been, to the knowledge of the Government dealing in this scrip? If so, who, in what departments, and what action has been taken by the government in relation thereto?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. 3,767 South African bounty land certificates have been issued, covering an area of 1,205,440 acres.

2. Two officials of the Interior Department, Messrs. J. N. Ferguson and J. Anderson, were reported on the 11th November last to have entered into negotiations with certain volunteers to purchase their volunteer land certificates on behalf of friends. On inquiry being made it was found that in the case of Mr. Anderson he had undertaken to procure the certificate of Mr. George Morse, of Montreal, and in that of Mr. Ferguson the certificates of Mr. Frank H. Prior, of Toronto, and Mr. B. K. Snider, of Montreal. In explanation of their action they represented that they were not aware that in so doing they were violating the provisions of the law. The Dominion Lands Act provides that employees of the Department shall not locate scrip, but makes no provision against their purchasing bounty warrants. While the action of the officials was in fact within the letter of the law, it was considered to be so contrary to its spirit that both men were suspended for a month without pay, and notice was issued to all officials and employees that dealing in volunteer bounty warrants would be followed by instant dismissal.

SEED GRAIN EXPENDITURE.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

What disposition has been made in detail of the vote of $25,000 under miscellaneous, for seed grain in Alberta and Saskatchewan?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior): As the answer to this question would be very voluminous, I would ask to have it stand as notice of motion for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a motion for a return.

STEAMER 'LADY EVELYN.'

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

1. What was the cost of the steamer 'Lady Evelyn' at place of purchase?

2. What repairs and improvements and at what cost have been since made?

3. What was the cost of delivering her in Canada?

4. Under what system are the men provisioned?

5. When did this steamer arrive in Canada, when was she ready for service, and what actual service has she since performed?

6. What is her full complement of officers and crew?

7. What has the operation of the vessel cost up to December 31, 1908?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. £12,500.

2. The engines and machinery were thorougly overhauled, and certain other interior structural arrangements made in order to meet the requirements of the service in which the vessel was to be engaged. These expenditures, including repairs made from time to time, have amounted to $27,086.58.

3. £760.

4. The captain furnishes provisions for the crew, being allowed payment at the rate of 60 cents a day for board of officers and 50 cents a day for the remainder of the crew.

5. The steamer reached Quebec in May, 1907, but, owing to changes and repairs requiring to be made, she was not used for the performance of the work of transferring the transatlantic mails at Rimouski until 1st September, 1907, and was engaged in such work until the close of navigation on the St. Lawrence in 1907. Thereafter, during the early part of the season of 1908, she was assigned to the work of transferring the transatlantic mails at North Sydney, and the balance of the season at Rimouski.

6. Twenty-five men.

7. $26,584.12.

PURCHASE OF DREDGES—PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

1. (a) When was the dredge 'Industry' bought by the Department of Public Works; (b) at what price; (c) and out of what appropriation was payment made?

2. (a) Were any scows or parts purchased with or for the dredge?. If so, what were they; (b) from whom purchased; (c) at what price, (d) and out of what appropriation were the payments therefor made?

3. Were the dredge and scows in good order and fully equipped for work at the time of purchase?

4. If not, what addition and repairs, and at what cost in respect to the dredge and scows, respectively, have since been made or contracted for, and with whom?

5. (a) Where was the 'Industry' when purchased; (b) and by what vessel was she taken to the place of repair, and from what place did this vessel start on her mission of transfer?

6. From whom was this last named vessel purchased, at what price, and whether by tender or otherwise?

7. (a) When; (b) and by whom was the 'Industry' built; (c) where, (d) and in what kind of work had she been employed up to the time of her sale to the department; (e) and for what special district was she designed?

8. (a) On whose special and expert examination and report was the purchase made; (b) where is the dredge now; (c) when will she be ready for work; (d) and what then will be her total cost to the government?

9. Were tenders called or any offers made to the department for supplying dredges of the capacity required from builders or owners of dredges in connection with the above purchase? If so, who made the tenders or offers, and at what prices?

10. Will the Minister lay on the table of the House the order in council authorizing the purchase and also the reports of the examining experts on which the purchase was based?

11. Have any other dredges been purchased since the end of the last session of parliament by the Department of Public Works? If so, from whom, at what price, whether by tender or otherwise, on whose special report, and what additions and repairs made since, and at what cost?

12. Will the Minister lay on the table of the House the orders in council in each case, and the special report on which purchase was based?

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

1. (a) 3rd September, 1908; (b) $157,378.78, including plant; (c) 'New dredging plant, maritime provinces.'

2. (a) One 500 cubic yard scow purchased at the same time; (b) St. Lawrence River Power Company; (c) $10,000; (d) 'New dredging plant, maritime provinces.'

3. No, but dredge was in working condition.

4. No repairs to dredge, excepting new boiler to be installed by the Polson Iron Works Company, Limited, at a cost of $9,300. Contract, in the sum of $3,500, has been entered into with John Inglis Company for repairs to scow.

5. (a) Massena, N.Y.; (b) Delivered by the owners at Cornwall; from Cornwall she was taken by the government steamers 'Hercules' and 'Speedy' to Toronto.

6. 'Speedy' purchased from Gardner & Cox for $36,750 in 1904; 'Hercules,' from Polson Iron Works Company for $62,500 in 1908.

7. (a) In 1906; (b) Duluth Superior Dredging Company; (c) Superior, Mich.; (d) Employed by St. Lawrence River Power Company, dredging their waterway; (e) Great lakes.

7. (a) Messrs. Thompson, Laurie and Howden; (b) Toronto; (c) 1st of May, 1909; (d) About $175,000, including plant, but not including $39,351.85 duty.

9. No.

10. Yes.

11 and 12. No.

I assume this question not to refer to any dredges which are in process of being purchased, the purchase of which has not yet been completed. I mention this so there should not be any misunderstanding. My department has arranged for the purchase of a Fruhling dredge. The Fruhling dredge is manufactured in Germany and is peculiarly adapted for the dredging of silt, but the purchase is not to be made and no money is to be paid until the dredge is delivered in British Columbia, set up ready to work and after it has been tested for such time as shall be satisfactory to the engineers of my department. I therefore do not consider it to come within the question asked.

CANADIAN MINT—COST AND OPERATION

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

1. What is the total cost of the Royal Mint to 31st December, 1908?

2. What were the total expenses of the Royal Mint for the calendar year 1908, (a) for additions and improvements, (b) for maintenance, (c) for salaries, (d) for bullion copper, silver and gold respectively?

3. What amount of copper, silver and gold coinage was struck during that time?
4. What was the net profit on each kind of coinage?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (for Minister of Finance). The Finance Department would like that to stand as a notice of motion for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion for a return.

DISPOSITION OF LOAN.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

What disposition was made of the loan of $21,900,000 falling due in London on November 1, 1908?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (for Minister of Finance):

Held on account of 1878-9 loan Sinking Fund and cancelled...£	770,876	1	11
Held on account Intercolonial Railway Sinking Fund (matured 1st April 1908) and cancelled..	80,619	15	3
Extended as 3¾ per cent bonds.	1,427,342	4	7
Converted into 3½ per cent stock (October issue 1908)..	490,449	16	6
Amount redeemed..	1,730,711	17	9
	£4,500,000	0	0

MAJOR'S HILL PARK.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

1. Has the title to the land purchased by the Grand Trunk Railway Company for hotel purposes in Major's Hill Park been completed? If so, when?
2. Has the $100,000 purchase money been paid over? If so, to what account?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):
1 & 2. No.

DEPORTATION FROM MONCTON.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR asked:

1. Has a boy by the name of Higgs been deported from Moncton to the United States or elsewhere?
2. What steps have been taken in connection with the deportation of such boy?
3. What are the circumstances or ground upon which deportation has been decided upon?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):
1. No. The Immigration Department has no knowledge of the case.

NET DEBT OF CANADA.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked:

1. What is the present amount of the net debt of Canada?
2. What was the increase in the net debt during the twelve months ending 31st December, 1908?

Mr. FOSTER.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (for Minister of Finance):
1. Net debt 31st December, 1908 (the latest date on which the books were balanced), $291,573,767.02.
2. $37,830,314.65.

FREE MAIL DELIVERY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked:

What principle or policy has been adopted by the government or by the Post Office Department in respect of free mail delivery, (a) in towns, (b) in villages, (c) in rural communities?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). A system of delivery of mail matter by letter carrier is provided whenever the population of a municipality reaches 12,000 and the gross postal revenue $20,000.

The department also provides for the delivery and collection of mail matter to persons residing in rural districts along and contiguous to the line of travel of any existing stage route of one mile and upwards in length, provided that such persons do not reside within one-quarter of a mile of the corporate limits of any city, town or village, and that they shall erect a box (approved of by the department) upon the roadside, to be located in such a manner as to be reached by the courier without dismounting from his vehicle or horse.

THE ALL RED LINE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked:

1. What steps has the government taken and what negotiations have been entered into in pursuance of or in connection with the resolution passed by this House on the ninth day of July, 1908, relative to the All-Red Line, so called, therein referred to?
2. What progress, if any, has been made in the matter?
3. To what engagements, if any, has the government committed or agreed to commit Canada in connection with this project?
4. What is the present position of the matter?
5. Has any definite plan or arrangement been agreed to or arrived at?
6. Has the government in pursuance of the said resolution suggested or submitted any definite plan or arrangement to the government of Australia and New Zealand, respectively, or to the Imperial government? If so, what is such plan or arrangement?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). No steps have been taken except to send a delegate to Australia to present the scheme to the Australian government and have a report upon the same. No report has yet been received.

THE FRENCH TREATY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked:

1. Has the convention of September 19, 1907, with the French Republic come into force? If not, what has occasioned the delay?

2. Is it anticipated that this convention will soon come into force? If so, when?

3. For what reason has France failed to approve the convention?

4. Is the delay or failure to approve the convention on the part of France due to any alleged inaccuracy or inexactitude of statement or representation on the part of Canadian representatives during the negotiations thereof?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). As I have just stated the convention will be modified and as soon as received the treaty will be laid on the table of the House.

MISCELLANEOUS REVENUE FOR DECEMBER, 1908.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked:

What are the particulars of the following item of the revenue for December, 1908, it is shown at page 1938 of the issue of the 'Canada Gazette,' published on January 16, 1908, namely, 'Miscellaneous, $699,235.52'?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

Interest on investments..	$ 68,915 31
Patent fees..	16,425 00
Casual..	33,939 29
Ordnance lands..	608 72
Fines and forfeitures..	962 05
Premium, discount and exchange	23,594 01
Mariners' fund..	48 52
Electric light inspection..	4,345 50
Steamboat inspection..	52 00
Gas inspection..	4,300 00
Weights and measures..	5,903 52
Cullers' fees..	360 93
Law stamps..	398 95
Penitentiaries..	1,870 39
Insurance inspection..	21,633 77
Fisheries..	2,918 40
Modus vivendi..	121 50
'Canada Gazette'..	481 73
Superannuation fund..	162 53
Dominion steamers..	725 09
Military college..	596 78
Militia..	1,213 45
Sup. and Exch. court reports..	4 00
Dominion lands..	501,836 01
Militia pensions rev..	1,679 88
Inspection of staples rev..	7,571 54
M. police officers' pensions rev....	589 79
	$699,235 52

RAW WOOL IMPORTED.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

1. What quantity of raw wool was imported into Canada in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1907?

2. What duty was it subject to?

3. Was this duty collected, and to what did it amount?

4. What quantity of raw wool, similar to wool produced in Canada, was imported into Canada during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1907?

5. What duty was it subject to?

6. Was this duty collected, and to what did it amount?

7. Was the duty to which raw wool imported into Canada is subject under the Act *bona fide*, imposed and collected in the fiscal year 1907?

8. The same information as above is asked as to the fiscal year 1908?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. The raw wool imported in the fiscal years ending March 31, 1907 and 1908, is as follows:

Combing or lustre wools, dutiable—	9 months ending 1907.	12 months 1908.
Value..	None.	None.
Duty collected. .	None.	None.
Wool n.o.p., free of duty—		
Quantity.	3,928,271 lbs.	6,129,216 lbs.
Value..	$853,152	$1,407,274

2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. According to the classification of imports by customs officers at ports of entry, there was no raw wool imported subject to customs duty for the fiscal periods ending March 31, 1907, and March 31, 1908.

The raw wool which is subject to customs duty is described in the tariff as follows:

Wool, viz.: Leicester, Cotswold, Lincolnshire, Southdown combing wools known as lustre wools and other like combing wools, such as are grown in Canada, per pound:

British preferential tariff..	2 cents.
Intermediate tariff..	2½ "
General tariff..	3 "

THE WOOLLEN INDUSTRY.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

1. How many woollen mills were there in Canada at the end of the fiscal year ending in 1896, and at the end of each subsequent year, and what was the annual output?

2. What quantity of Canadian wool was used by Canadian woollen mills in each of those years, and what was its value?

3. What quantities of foreign wool, similar to Canadian-grown wool, and what quantities of other foreign wool, tops, noils, waste, rags, and other raw material were imported into Canada for manufacturing purposes in each of these years, and their values?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). With reference to the first question, the government have not got that information. The nearest I can give it to the hon. gentleman is what the Census Department have furnished me with from the census of 1901.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the hon. gentleman mean that that information is probably correct; I understand it is not.

Mr. PATERSON. I can only give what the official documents show. The hon. gentleman asks for each year, and of course that is not within our knowledge. The

nearest I can give is the census of 1901. and then there was an intermediate census of the manufacturing industries of 1906. This is the information I have:

	Census 1901.	Census 1906.
1.	218	227
	$11,307,440	$12,676,642

With reference to the third question——

Mr. LENNOX. What about the second question as to the quantity of Canadian wool used by Canadian woollen mills in each of these years and its value?

Mr. PATERSON. We have no means of ascertaining that. We could not tell that unless we had a return which would have to be voluntary on the part of the mill owners themselves and all we have to go by is the census. The answer to the third question is as follows:

—	Wool, combing or lustre wool, such as are grown in Canada, and worsted tops from such wool.		Wool, not further prepared than washed, N.O.P.		Noils and worsted tops, N.O.P.	Rags, all kinds, and waste except mineral.	
	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.	Value.	Cwt.	Value.
1896.	2,571	346	8,992,244	1,215,584	31,945	370,224	241,822
1897.	.....	.....	5,704,194	878,339	30,790	105,741	191,697
1898.	201	19	11,785,899	1,885,489	103,216	504,988	335,926
1890.	6	6	9,413,739	1,335,096	148,194	404,976	298,561
1900.	.....	.....	8,054,699	1,574,834	151,510	1,551,557	306,843
1901.	.....	.....	8,574,605	1,292,895	89,847	390,028	225,924
1902.	.....	.....	10,360,738	1,374,054	204,995	367,373	167,902
1903.	.....	.....	7,994,712	1,239,998	187,835	241,286	295,120
1904.	.....	.....	7,339,369	1,319,735	206,914	254,484	333,815
1905.	69	43	7,617,211	1,553,431	302,219	1,116,215	324,747
1906.	.....	.....	6,311,837	1,489,268	291,127	1,697,801	361,722
1907 (9 mos.)	.....	6	3,928,791	853,152	331,199	156,102	314,690
1908.	.....	405	6,129,216	1,407,274	496,859	323,453	760,797

The Customs Returns do not indicate whether these imports are all used for manufacturing purposes or not.

THE AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

1. What is the number of farmers in Canada?
2. What is the estimated number of persons who are dependent upon farming operation for their support?
3. What is the amount invested in agriculture in Canada?
4. What is the annual value of farm products?
5. What is the annual value of the exports of farm products ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (for the Minister of Agriculture):

1. Census 1901, 471,833; estimate, 1908, 575,000.
2. Census 1901, 3,349,516; estimate 1908, 3,788,000.
3. Census 1901, $1,761,486,180; estimate, 1908, $2,440,000,000.
4. (Field crop) census 1901, $208,417,821; estimate, 1908, $432,534,000.
5. Values of exports of field crops, animals and animal products in calendar years:

1901	$ 84,719,292
1902	108,788,748
1903	112,085,222
1904	95,611,109
1905	109,684,506
1906	117,727,860
1907	113,157,793
1908	128,903,794

Mr. PATERSON.

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

1. What is the number of manufacturers and manufacturing firms and companies in Canada?
2. What is the number they employ, (a) males, (b) females?
3. What is the amount invested, exclusive of working capital?
4. What is the amount of working capital?
5. What is the value of the raw material consumed in manufacturing?
6. What is the annual value of the output?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (for the Minister of Agriculture):

	Census 1901.	Census 1906.
1.	14,650	15,796
2. m.	262,943	319,578
f.	76,230	72,952
3.	$209,378,638	$467,274,905
4.	237,537,849	379,310,118
5.	266,527,858	.....
6.	481,053,375	718,352,603

JUDGE CASSELS' COMMISSION.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

1. Has the government instituted criminal proceedings against the persons shown by the Cassels commission to have defrauded the government? If not, why not?
2. Does the government propose to prosecute these persons? If so, when?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The government has not instituted criminal proceedings. The matter could not be looked into by the government until the report of Mr. Justice Cassels had been received.

DREDGING CONTRACT—ST. JOHN, N.B.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

1. Has the government recovered or taken action to recover $39,933, of which the country was defrauded by the action of George McAvittie and C. S. Mayes in connection with a dredging contract? If not, why not?
2. Has the repayment of this money been demanded? If so, when and from whom? If not, why not?
3. Does the government propose to take action for recovery of this money? If so, when? If not, why not?
4. Has the government consulted with or taken the opinion of the Department of Justice as to its rights in the premises, and particularly as to the right of action for recovery of said money?

Mr. SPEAKER. The words in the second line which reads 'of which the country was defrauded,' appear in the question by an oversight and should not have been allowed. These words contain an allegation of fact. With these words stricken out the question may be put.

Mr. LENNOX. I will insert the word 'alleged' so that the question will read 'alleged to have been defrauded.'

Mr. SPEAKER. I have not the word 'alleged' in the question.

Mr. LENNOX. It can be considered as inserted.

Mr. SPEAKER. If these words are stricken out the question can be put.

Mr. LENNOX. Then the question would not have any meaning. If the question says 'alleged to have been defrauded' we would comply with your honour's suggestion.

Mr. SPEAKER. Perhaps the question may be allowed to stand until it has been drafted.

Mr. LENNOX. Let it stand.

TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

1. What were the total expenses incurred in connection with the telegraph and the telephone investigation conducted by the special committee of this House, appointed during the session of 1905?
2. Were the proceedings of the committee and its finding and recommendations reported to the House?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. $10,619.35.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

1904-5, 0.16..	$6,199 15
1905-6, 0.16..	3,960 20
1906-7, 0.16..	460 00
	$10,619 35

2. On the 15th July, 1905, the select committee appointed to inquire into and report regarding the various telephone systems in Canada, presented a report submitting to the House the minutes of their proceedings with all evidence taken by them. Owing, however, to the voluminous nature of the evidence and the late period of the session the committee felt it impossible for them to come to any conclusions or make any recommendations to the House on the subject referred to them.

EX-CHIEF JUSTICE TUCK.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

Referring to the report in the press that ex-Chief Justice Tuck, of New Brunswick, is said to have stated that he was offered a knighthood two or three years ago upon condition of retiring from the bench.

1. Has the government any knowledge of this?
2. Was the offer made?
3. Was Chief Justice Tuck requested to retire? If so, by whom, and with what object?
4. Was it the desire of the government or of the Department of Justice at about the time referred to that Chief Justice Tuck should retire from the bench?
5. Was the government or department at about the time referred to seeking to appoint another person in his place if Chief Justice Tuck could be induced to retire?
6. Has the ex-Chief Justice denied the statement attributed to him by the press, or has his attention been called to the press statements by the government or the department?

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

1. The government have no such knowledge.
2. No such offer was made to Chief Justice Tuck.
3. Chief Justice Tuck was not requested by the government to retire.
4. The government had no such desire. If they had had such desire, they would have put it into action.
5. The government was not seeking to appoint any person in Chief Justice Tuck's place.
6. The government is not aware whether ex-Chief Justice Tuck has denied or has not denied the statement attributed to him. His attention has not been called to the matter by the government or, so far as I know, by the Department of Justice.

STATISTICS OF INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES INVESTIGATION ACT.

Mr. MACDONELL asked:

1. When did the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907, commonly known as the Lemieux Act, come into force?

2. What was (a) the number of strikes; (b) the number of employees involved; and (c) the amount of time lost through strikes in Canada for each of the calendar years 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907, 1908 respectively, giving separately and in addition the above deferred information for such part of the calendar year 1907 as the said Lemieux Act was in force?

3. (a) How many boards were constituted under the Act; (b) how many boards reported under the Act; and (c) how many settlements were effected under the Act during each of the calendar years 1907-8 respectively?

4. How many reports made under the Act were not accepted or were disregarded during the calendar years 1907 and 1908 respectively?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Minister of Labour):

1. March 22, 1907.

2. (a) Number of strikes (according to calendar year):

In 1903	160
1904	103
1905	87
1906	138
1907	146
1908	65

Number of strikes subsequent to date of passage of Industrial Disputes Investigation Act during the year 1907, 118.

(b) Number of employees involved:

In 1903	49,513
1904	15,665
1905	16,329
1906	26,014
1907	34,972
1908	26,232

Number of employees involved in strikes subsequent to date of passage of Industrial Disputes Investigation Act during 1907, 31,740.

(c) Amount of time lost to employees in working days:

In 1903	752,181	working days.
1904	278,956	"
1905	284,140	"
1906	489,775	"
1907	613,986	"
1908	708,191	"

Amount of time lost to employees in working days on account of strikes subsequent to date of passage of Industrial Disputes Investigation Act during 1907, 575,182.

3. (a) Number of Boards constituted in 1907 20
Number of Boards constituted in 1908 25
Total 45
(b) Number of Boards reporting in 1907 17
Number of Boards reporting in 1908 26
Total 43

One board established during 1908 reported since the close of the year and one Board established on December 31, 1908, had not reported on January 25, 1909.

Mr. MACDONELL.

(c) Number of settlements effected in 1907 .... 23*
Number of settlements effected in 1908 22

* This figure includes several settlements effected under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907, without the establishment of a Board.

4. One case was reported to the department in each of the years 1907 and 1908, in which a strike occurred in connection with a dispute which had been referred for adjustment under the terms of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. In each case the findings of the Board were ultimately accepted.

MEAT AND CANNED FOODS ACT.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE asked:

1. What establishments have applied for exemption under the Meat and Canned Foods Act?

2. What establishments have been exempted from the operation of sections 3 and 4 and sections 6 and 10, inclusive?

3. What directions have been given by the government to railways or other carriers relating to the transportation of dressed hogs?

4. Have such directions been given respecting the transportation of dressed hogs to consignees other than 'establishments' as defined by the said Act? If so, by what authority?

5. At what points in the counties of Essex and Kent has provision been made for inspection of dressed hogs, and what is the nature of such provision?

6. Why has not similar provision been made for inspection at the other shipping points in the said counties?

7. Why were the service of qualified local inspectors dispensed with?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (for the Minister of Agriculture):

1 and 2. Nil.

3. Directions have been given by the department to railways and other carriers to comply with the provisions of the Meat and Canned Foods Act and the regulations thereunder.

4. Yes. Under the authority of the Act and regulations thereunder.

5. Chatham, Amherstburg, Harrow, Essex, Oldcastle railway freight sheds have been declared establishments and placed in charge of inspectors regularly appointed under the Act.

6. The volume of trade at other points did not warrant such action.

7. No local inspectors were dispensed with, none were employed as the services of members of the regular inspection staff were available.

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS AND AGRICULTURAL STATIONS.

Mr. PAQUET asked:

1. Has the government established any experimental farms, or experimental agricul-

tural stations, since the 1st of January, 1908? If so, where are they established?

2. Is it the intention of the government to have voted at this session the necessary amount for the establishment of an experimental farm or any experimental agricultural station in Quebec district ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (for the Minister of Agriculture) :

1. During the year 1908 land was secured for an experimental station at Rosthern, in Northern Saskatchewan, and the establishment is now being organized.

Arrangements were made during the year of 1908 with Mr. E. W. Calhoun, of Kamloops, B.C., for the use of ten acres of his farm on which he is to conduct a series of experiments in dry farming under the instructions of the Director of Experimental Farms.

2. It is not customary for the government to give any information regarding the estimates before they have been brought down.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing all armouries built since July 1, 1896, giving situation, cost, capacity, officials employed in each, with yearly expenses of each armoury, distributed under the head of maintenance, improvements, extensions and salaries, with the number of troops actually making use of the same, and to what extent each year.—Mr. Foster.

For a return showing the various statistical and special information publications issued by the several departments of the government, the number and pages of each, the number and cost of each for the year 1908, the number of persons employed in their preparation, the salaries paid to each person so employed, the number of special employees for engraving or illustrating these publications, and the salaries and expenses of the same, including work and apparatus, the firm or printing company publishing the same, and the amount paid in each case for printing and binding.

The above return is not to include the regular reports of the departments, but to be so presented as to show the name of each statistical or special publication, the number of such printed, and the number of pages in each, the number of officials employed in the preparation of the publication, the total cost of each, and the total cost of all such publications for the year 1908.—Mr. Foster.

For a copy of all orders in council, despatches, correspondence, reports, documents and papers, not already brought down, touching or relating to the convention of 19th day of September, 1907, entered into by plenipotentiaries appointed by His Majesty and the President of the French Republic.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a return showing all free mail deliveries established or authorized since the 30th of June, 1908, in towns or villages, all free rural mail deliveries established or authorized since said date, the number of persons served by each such free mail delivery in the community or route for which it has been so established, and the cost in each instance.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

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

For a copy of all orders in council, departmental orders, rules and regulations, and schemes of reorganization adopted in the several departments, rules and regulations made by the Civil Service Commissioners, and all other orders, steps and proceedings made, had or taken under or pursuant to the Civil Service Amendment Act, 1908.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a copy of all orders in council, correspondence, reports and other documents and papers, not already brought down, touching or relating to the All-Red Line, so-called, as referred to in the resolution passed by this House on the 9th day of July, 1908, or touching or relating to any similar or substituted proposal for the like purpose.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a return showing : 1. The number of accidents which occured at level railway crossings in Canada during the period of five years prior to the 31st day of March, 1908.

2. The time where and the places at which these accidents occurred.

3. The alleged cause of the accident in each case.

4. The number of persons killed in each case.

5. The number of persons injured and the nature of the injury in each case.

6. A statement in each case as to whether the crossing was protected or not, and if protected, by what means.—Mr. Lennox.

For a return showing in detail the items comprised in the amount $699,235.52, given as miscellaneous revenue for the month of December, 1908.—Mr. Ames.

For a return showing in detail what expenditures, chargeable to capital, have been made in connection with the Department of Militia and Defence since 1895.—Mr. Ames.

For a copy of all correspondence during the last three months with reference to Lachute Mills post office.—Mr. Perley.

ADJOURNMENT—INTERNATIONAL WATERWAYS TREATY.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the House adjourns, I would ask the Prime Minister whether he can inform us when we may expect that the recent treaty negotiated with the United States will be laid before us. As I understand, it is already before the Senate of the United States; if that is so, there seems to be no reason why it should not be laid on the table of this

House. I recollect that last session we had rather a long delay during which a treaty was accessible to members of the Senate of the United States, but was not accessible to members of this parliament. I must confess that I do not understand why that should be the case. It may be that there is good reason for it, and I would like to know what the reason is.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand the reason is this: Under the American constitution, the treaty making power is vested in the President and Senate of the United States, and no treaty can come into force unless it has been ratified by the Senate and by the President. Under our constitution, the treaty comes into force on its ratification by His Majesty the King. The treaty is now on the ocean for the ratification of His Majesty, and perhaps I may be able to inform my hon. friend later whether we can lay it before the House before it has been ratified by His Majesty.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 9.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, January 26, 1909.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPRESENTATION OF CARLETON, ONTARIO.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that Robert Laird Borden, Esquire, member for the electoral districts of Halifax, Nova Scotia, and Carleton, Ontario, respectively, having declared in his place in this House that he elected to sit for the electoral district of Halifax, therefore causing a vacancy in the electoral district of Carleton, Ontario, I have, in accordance with chapter 11, section 5, of the Revised Statutes of Canada, issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district of Carleton, Ontario.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 9) respecting the Brandon Transfer Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 10) respecting the Brazilian Electro-Steel and Smelting Company, Limited.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 11) to incorporate the Canadian Western Railway Company.—Mr. McCraney.

Bill (No. 12) respecting the Collingwood Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 13) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 14) respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 15) respecting the Mexican Land and Irrigation Company.—Mr. Pardee.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 16) to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: This Bill is designed to accomplish two reforms in the Election law: first, to repeal the section providing that a deposit of $200 shall be made by a candidate; and second, to provide that the day appointed for the holding of a general election for the Dominion shall be a public holiday.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION.

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

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

GREY:

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons an approved minute of council appointing the Honourable William Stevens Fielding, Minister of Finance, the Honourable Louis Philippe Brodeur, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Honourable Wm. Paterson, Minister of Customs and the Honourable Wm. Pugsley, Minister of Public Works, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons as commissioners for the purposes and under the provisions of the 11th Chap. of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, intituled 'An Act respecting the House of Commons.'

Government House,
Ottawa, Jan. 21, 1909.

CIVIL SERVICE SALARIES.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I give notice that on Friday next, the first government day, I will move the following motion which stands in my name. I wish also to announce to the House that I have the authority of His Excellency the Governor General for this motion.

That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council, upon the recommendation of the head of a department, based upon a report of the deputy head, may grant to any officer, clerk or employee under the deputy heads in the inside service as defined by the Civil Service Amendment Act,, 1908, who was in the public service at the time of the coming into force of that Act, an increase of salary of $150 a year, subject to the provisions hereinafter contained; that in the case of any officer, clerk or employee who has re-

ceived an increase of salary upon organization and classification under the said Act, such increase shall be offset against the increase which such person might otherwise receive under any Act to be founded on this resolution; that no increase under any Act to be founded on this resolution to any officer, clerk or employee shall exceed the difference between his present salary and the maximum salary of the subdivision in which he has been placed upon organization and classification under the said Act of 1908; that all increases provided for hereunder shall take effect from the first day of September, 1908; that all sums of money voted by parliament for the financial year ending on March 31, 1909, and applicable to the payment of salaries or increase of salaries of persons in the inside service shall be applicable to the payment of increases of salary granted under the Act to be founded in this resolution, so far as such sums are not required for the specific purposes for which they were granted; and during the said financial year there may be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada such moneys required for the payment of increases of salary hereunder as have not been voted by parliament.

QUESTIONS.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY AND PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY—EARNINGS AND WORKING EXPENSES.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

What have been the earnings and working expenses of the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Branch respectively, for each month after the current fiscal year, as compared with those of the year 1907?

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

COMPARATIVE Statement of the Earnings and Expenditure, 1907-1908

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Month.	Earnings, 1907.	Earnings, 1908.	Expenditure, 1907.	Expenditure, 1908.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
April	817,952 34	740,576 43	669,380 90	740,851 01
May	799,095 95	689,736 62	715,888 88	781,086 18
June	754,141 27	703,251 85	751,472 47	841,442 32
July	836,452 37	803,143 53	811,019 17	819,139 12
August	866,808 56	789,765 10	868,569 20	787,003 43
September	807,566 14	793,541 67	762,319 92	796,301 04
October	803,017 13	759,521 09	751,754 78	801,582 62
November	754,140 62	696,897 56	730,602 38	746,326 74
December	.....	.....	.....	.....
	6,439,174 38	5,976,433 85	6,061,007 70	6,313,732 46

* December not yet available.

COMPARATIVE Statement of the Revenue and Expenditure, 1907-1908.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

Month.	Earnings, 1907.	Earnings, 1908.	Expenditure, 1907.	Expenditure, 1908.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
April	23,229 44	20,220 38	30,108 28	30,193 09
May	25,715 49	26,04[illegible] 12	32,977 82	30,376 93
June	23,956 86	26,365 84	30,743 10	33,097 68
July	33,630 31	33,328 19	38,824 54	33,676 99
August	30,993 81	32,350 59	35,369 52	34,806 53
September	26,401 31	30,777 40	37,893 58	37,251 96
October	27,659 60	30,566 50	36,511 38	39,555 24
November	30,641 62	29,655 98	33,236 36	34,120 25
December	22,876 49	24,519 75	30,546 03	35,509 99
	245,104 93	253,829 75	306,210 61	308,588 66

QUEBEC BRIDGE COMPANY, PAYMENTS TO STOCKHOLDERS.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What sums of money have been paid to each of the several holders of stock in the Quebec Bridge Company on account of stock, bonus and interest, respectively?
2. What amount remains to be paid and to whom?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will see that the answer to this question is so voluminous that it can hardly be given in this way. If he will change it to a motion for a return, there will be no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as notice of motion for return.

LOANS OR ADVANCES TO THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What temporary loans or advances to the government were current on December 31, 1908, at which banks and at what rates?
2. What amount has been borrowed since March 31, 1908, by way of temporary and permanent loans respectively, from what banks and on what conditions?
3. For what purposes has the amount borrowed been used?
4. What was the increase in the total amount owned in Canada and outside of Canada, respectively, on December 31, as compared with March 31, 1908?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. Bank of Montreal, London :
   £1,000,000 at 4¼ per cent ; £1,000,000 at 3½ per cent.
   Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien, Montreal :
   $1,000,000 at 4 per cent.
   Banque de Paris et Pays Bas, Montreal: $1,000,000 at 4 per cent.; 10,000,000 francs at 3¼ per cent., Paris.
   Banque de Paris et Pays Bas (payable at Le Credit Lyonnais, Paris) 10,000,000 francs at 3¼ per cent.
2. Temporary Loans :
   £1,000,000 (Bank of Montreal, London) 1 year, discounted at 3½ per cent.; 20,000,000 francs for one year as set forth in answer to question No. 1 ; $5,000,000 (Bank of Montreal, Ottawa, one month from 2nd January, 1909, at 4 per cent.
   Long Term Loans. (Through Bank of Montreal, London, as financial agents):
   £5,000,000 at 3¾ per cent. redeemable at par 1st May, 1912, raised to meet outstanding 4 per cent. Bonds and Stock due 1st November, 1908, (holders of which were offered an extension until 1st May, 1912, at 3¾ per cent.), and for the construction of public works. Price of issue 100 per cent, payable as follows :
   £ 5 per cent on application
   £25 " " " 10th July, 1908.
   £35 " " " 5th August, 1908.
   £35 " " " 4th September, 1908.
   £5,000,000 (October issue) 3½ per cent. stock, redeemable at par 1st July, 1950, with option to the government to redeem at par on or after 1st July, 1930, on giving six months' notice. Loan raised for the purpose of providing for obligations in connection with the construction of the National Transcontinental Railway and for other purposes. Holders of outstanding 4 per cent Bonds and Stock maturing 1st November, 1908, to receive preferential allotment of this stock for an equivalent nominal amount of Bonds and Stock maturing 1st November, 1908. Price of issue 100 per cent, payable as folows:
   £ 5 per cent on application.
   £25 " " " 16th October, 1908.
   £35 " " " 3rd November, 1908.
   £35 " " " 1st December, 1908.
3. Answered by No. 2.
4.

	Public Accounts 31st March, 1908.	Canada Gazette 31st December, 1908.
Liabilities in Canada..	$177,097,590 81	$253,804,538 58
Liabilities outside Canada	231,109,567 44	195,253,154 61
Total	$408,207,158 25	$449,057,693 19

PROPOSED LEASE OF THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked :

1. Has the government under consideration any offer or proposal, informal or otherwise, for the sale or leasing of the Intercolonial railway?
2. Has any such offer or proposal been made to the government, or to any member of the government?
3. If so, what is the nature of such offer or proposal, and by whom was it made?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). A proposition was received by the Minister of Railways ; but it was marked 'Private,' and was not considered by the government.

Mr. EMMERSON asked :

1. Has the government or any member thereof, or any department of the government, since the last session of parliament, received from any party or parties, corporation or corporations, any application, communication or proposal, verbal or in writing, relating to the granting by the government, or by any de-

partment thereof, of any haulage or running rights or privileges to any railway corporation, upon or over the Intercolonial railway, between St. John and Halifax, or between any other points on the said railway?

2. If so, what was the nature and character of such application or applications, communication or communications, proposal or proposals, and at what date were they respectively made or received, and if any such were in writing, will the government place a copy of the same respectively, upon the table of this House?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The same answer would apply to this question as to the question of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition.

REBUILDING QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked :

1. What has the government done with respect to the rebuilding of the Quebec bridge?

2. In what respect does the present position of that matter differ from the situation as it was on the 20th day of July, 1908?

3. What progress does the government anticipate during the present year towards the rebuilding of the bridge?

4. At what date does the government expect the completion of the bridge?

5. Has the government made any estimate of the total cost to the country, including the loss occasioned by the falling of the bridge?

6. What is the amount of said estimated cost?

7. If no such estimate has been made, when will it be prepared and presented to parliament?

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

1. A board of engineers consisting of Henri Vautelet, member of the Canadian Society of Civil Engineers, chairman and chief engineer. Maurice Fitzmaurice, C. M.G., chief engineer, of the London county council, and Ralph Modjeski, member of American Society Engineers, consulting engineer, Chicago, Illinois, have been appointed for the purpose of designing the bridge. They have gathered together a corps of expert designers, calculators and draughtsmen, and are busily engaged upon the work. So far they have not advanced to such an extent as will admit of an estimate being made.

2. Answered by above.

3. It is expected that the plans and specifications will be completed and tenders will be ready for letting the work.

4. No estimate yet received.

5. No, for the reason above explained.

6. Answered by above.

7. Answered by above.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The last question is not answered. It asks when we may expect that the estimate will be ready. I understand that one is not yet ready.

Mr. GRAHAM. An estimate cannot be ready until the engineers get their plans practically prepared, and that will not be for some time before the end of the year probably.

THE FRENCH TREATY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked :

1. Has the convention of the 19th September, 1907, with the French Republic come into force ? If not, what has occasioned the delay ?

2. Is it anticipated that this convention will soon come into force? If so, when?

3. For what reason has France failed to approve the convention?

4. Is the delay or failure to approve the convention on the part of France due to any alleged inaccuracy or inexactitude of statement or representation on the part of Canadian representatives during the negotiations thereof ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The French Treaty has not yet come into force, it has not yet secured the ratification of France. Negotiations have been going on for some changes, which, I may inform the House, have been accepted.

DREDGING CONTRACT WITH G. S. MAYES.

Mr. LENNOX—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Has the government recovered or taken action to recover $39,933 from George McAvity and G. S. Mayes in connection with a dredging contract? If not, why not?

2. Has the repayment of this money been demanded? If so, when and from whom? If not, why not?

3. Does the government propose to take action for recovery of this money? If so, when? If not, why not?

4. Has the government consulted with or taken the opinion of the Department of Justice as to its rights in the premises, and particularly as to the right of action for recovery of said money?

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

1. No. The government is not aware that it has a claim against the parties referred to for the amount mentioned or any amount. The records of the Department of Public Works show that tenders for the dredging referred to were called for by public advertisement and that the contract was awarded in a regular and proper manner to the lowest tenderer.

2, 3 and 4. Answered by the reply to No. 1.

ALIEN LABOUR ACT.

Mr. LENNOX—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Does the government propose, during the present session, to pass an Act amending the Alien Labour Act?

2. Is there any reason why the provisions of the Act should not be made as drastic as the American law?

Hon. R. LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. The government is not of the opinion that any necessity exists for the amendment of the Alien Labour Act during the present session.

2. The government does not find it necessary to change the policy adopted a few years ago as regards this question.

CREW OF THE 'MONTCALM.'

Mr. PAQUET asked:

1. How many officers and sailors at present compose the crew of the 'Montcalm'?

2. How much does the daily service of this icebreaker cost at present?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Marine):

1. 13 officers; 65 men.

2. The daily service of the 'Montcalm' costs $263.07, based on the total cost for the last nine months.

DRAWBACK ON SHIPPING.

Mr. SINCLAIR asked:

On how many tons of shipping was a drawback paid each year from 1898 to 1908, inclusive, and what was the amount of such drawback so paid in each of said years?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

DRAWBACK ON SHIPS.

Year.	Tonnage.	Drawback.
1897-8	7,152 94	$ 5,477 22
1898-9	8,744 28	5,909 24
1899-0	13,056 30	8,670 57
1900-1	18,251 09	14,958 97
1901-2	25,488 05	20,739 53
1902-3	25,037 63	19,358 65
1903-4	21,667 67	19,350 93
1904-5	12,734 13	11,315 90
1905-6	9,934 76	7,366 94
1906-7	9,750 47 9 months	8,564 62
1907-8	24,728 24	23,499 30

MARINE DEPARTMENT INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What has been the cost of the Cassels' Commission investigation to date?

2. What amount of this has been paid for legal expenses, and to whom?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Marine):

1. $14,997.41.

2. R. T. MacIlreith	$ 114.75
E. H. McAlpine	39 65
(Taschereau, Roy, Cannon & Co.)	25.00
E. J. Daly	98.06
J. L. Perron (adv.)	4,000.00
G. H. Watson (adv.)	4,000.00
(Registrar Exchequer Court)	2,800.00
	$11,077.46

Mr. LENNOX.

STEAMER 'MONTCALM.'

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. At what date was the 'Montcalm' placed under repairs after the late collision, how many days was she in dry dock, and what was the total cost of said repairs?

2. What has been the cost of this vessel to date, (a) for construction, (b) for repairs, (c) maintenance?

3. When was she first placed in commission?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Marine):

1. 'Montcalm' placed under repairs after the late collision, 21st May.

She was in dry dock fifteen days.

The total cost of said repairs was $21,857.65.

2. Cost of 'Montcalm' to date (31st. Dec. 1908) $762,538.01.

For construction, $301,233.25.

For repairs, $144,669.42.

For maintenance, $316,635.34.

3. 12th December, 1904.

DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—PURCHASE OF SUPPLIES

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. Are all supplies for the Marine and Fisheries Department and for the Public Works Department now being purchased on the basis of public tender, and advertised for in newspapers, irrespective of party leanings, and upon contracts made with the lowest tenderer in each case?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Marine):

1. All material and supplies required for the Department of Marine and Fisheries are now purchased through the purchasing agent, who was appointed in May, 1908, without regard to the lists known as the patronage lists which were formally abolished on November 4.

With regard to the supplies required by the different agencies of the department for the present year, I may state that lists of all supplies have been prepared and tenders are being asked by public advertisement in the press. Tenders have been received for the supplies required for British Columbia, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and are now being considered.

For all such other articles required which exceed in value the sum of $5,000, advertisements are placed in the public press calling for tenders and the contract awarded to the tenderer offering the best terms.

Where the value of the articles does not exceed $5,000, the leading recognized dealers and merchants are supplied with a list of the department's requirements and requested to quote, and the order is paced with the firm offering the best terms.

This is the method adopted by all large railroad and industrial concerns.

The purchasing agent who was appointed in May has had a free hand to purchase all

supplies not obtained by tender at the lowest obtainable prices.

Mr. FOSTER.—May I call my right hon. friend's attention to the fact that one portion of the question does not appear to have been answered—as to whether these public advertisements were inserted generally or specially. Are they inserted in newspapers irrespective of party leanings? Otherwise, it does not seem to me a perfectly public advertisement.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER—I cannot answer as to that. I give the answer as it is given to me from the Minister.

FISHING SEASONS AND LEASES.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What extensions of fishing seasons were made in October, 1908, and what was the nature, locality and period of each?

2. What fishing leases of more than one year's duration are now in force, what area and time is covered by each, who was the original grantee and what price, who is the present operator, and what was the output of each fishery for the last year?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Marine):

1. One, an extension of one week in the whitefish and salmon-trout fishing season in Ontario.

2. Coffey & Merritt. Certain fishing privileges in Cedar, Moose, Cormorant and Atikaneg lakes. Five years from the 1st April, 1905. Coffey & Merritt. $100 per annum. Coffee & Merritt.

Capital City Canning & Packing Company, Ltd. In that part of the tidal waters of Cowichan river and bay, within the imaginary line running from Serpentine Point to Cowichan Head, at entrance to the bay. Nine years from 1st May, 1907. Capital City Canning & Packing Company, Ltd. $50 per annum. Capital City Canning & Packing Company, Ltd.

Farrell & Tregent. In St. of Georgia, from Northwest bay to and including a point opposite Grantham, northwest of Cape Lazo, on the east shore of Vancouver Island. Nine years from 1st May, 1902. Farrell & Tregent. $50 per annum. Farrell & Tregent.

Judson L. Guptill. Dark harbour, Grand Manan, N.B. Nine years from 1st January, 1905. Judson L. Guptill. $200 per annum. Judson L. Guptill.

James J. Hill. Estuary of River St. John, Quebec. Nine years from 15th August, 1904. James J. Hill.

Robert Kelly. In tidal waters of Quashela creek, British Columbia, from its mouth where it empties into Smith inlet, to and including the narrows or rapids at head of creek. Also the waters of the small inlet to northwest of Quashela creek, up to the mouth of a canyon. Nine years from 1st April, 1903. Robert Kelly. $25 per year. Wm. Hickey Company, Ltd.

F. H. Markey. Nelson river and tributaries, from West river to mouth. Estuary of Nelson river from Cape Tatnam to Owl river. Also Hayes and Pigeon rivers and tributaries. Also Great Slave lake. Twenty-one years from 19th April, 1904. F. H. Markey. $10 per annum. British American Fish Corporation, Ltd.

J. McKenzie. Lake Athabaska and Lesser Slave Lakes. Nine years from 1st May, 1904. J. K. McKenzie. $10 per annum. Athabaska Fish Company, Ltd.

Archd. McNee. James bay, from North Bluff, around Hannah and Rupert bays, to the northern point of Moer's island, opposite the island known as Solomon's Temple, extending three miles seaward, and shoreward in tidal waters of all rivers. Twenty-one years from 1st January, 1903. Archd. McNee. $10 per annum. Archd. McNee. Steps are being taken towards the cancellation of these last three leases.

Stephen A. Spencer. Tidal waters of Nimpkish river and Alert bay for one and one-half miles in all directions from centre of mouth of said river. Nine years from 1st May, 1902. Stephen A. Spencer. $50 per annum. British Columbia Packers' Association.

A. H. Simard. To fish for ground sharks with baited hooks or set-lines, night-lines, or trawls from Point des Monts to Point St. Charles, Quebec. Nine years from October 1903. A. H. Simard. $1 per annum. A. H. Simard.

Reports of catches in 1908 not yet received at department.

NEW WING OF HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. FOSTER. In reference to a question asked by me yesterday two portions of which were stated to have been answered by Mr. Speaker, one portion does not appear to have been answered. I would like to call the attention of the minister and Speaker to it. I wanted to know the number of employees that had been provided for in the new rooms.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that information was handed in in the answer which I gave, and I think it appears in 'Hansard.' Has my hon. friend looked at 'Hansard'?

Mr. FOSTER. I was looking at 'Hansard.' If I find it I will let the minister know.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the hon. gentleman will find it there; if not I will get it for him.

RECEPTION AND OPENING OF PUBLIC TENDERS.

Mr. J. D. REID moved:

That in the opinion of this House tenders received in any department of government

should be immediately placed in safe custody under seal so as to prevent any possibility or suspicion of tampering; and should be opened in public at the time and place mentioned in the advertisement and in the presence of at least three principal officials of the department; and the persons so tendering or their duly authorized agents should be at liberty to attend at the said time and place and see such tenders opened and recorded, if they so desire.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I was going to suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. Reid) that perhaps he will allow this motion to stand over, and, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, and that of the hon. member, I will read to the House a regulation which has been passed by His Excellency the Governor General in Council, and which, I think, my hon. friend will see, upon consideration, completely meets the case. I may say that the regulation which has been passed is in accordance with what has been the rule in a number of departments, but it has been thought well to place it in the form of a regulation so that it will be applicable to all departments. I will read it to the House, it will appear in 'Hansard' and then it will be considered by my hon. friend and other members before the motion comes up for consideration. The regulation is as follows:

At the Government House at Ottawa,

Monday, January 18, 1909.

Present.

His Excellency
The Governor General in Council.

His Excellency the Governor General in Council is pleased to approve and doth hereby approve the following regulation in regard to the reception and opening of tenders for government works and supplies:

Where tenders are called for by any department of the government they shall be addressed to the officer of the department specified in the notice calling for tenders. In the notice it shall be specified that the tenders shall be under seal and endorsed 'Tender for .....,' specifying the work or supplies for which tenders are called. When received they shall be stamped by the official to whom addressed, with the day and hour of their receipt, and placed under lock and key until such time as it shall be found convenient for opening them.

They shall be opened in the presence of the minister of the department calling for tenders and one of the principal officials of the department, designated by the minister, or, in the absence of the minister, or in cases where it is not convenient for him to be present they shall be opened by two officials of the department to be designated by the minister. When opened each tender shall be initialled by both officials opening them.

Mr. J. D. REID. This had better stand for consideration.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Very well.

Mr. J. D. REID.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

A return showing the names of all persons appointed to office or employment by the Intercolonial Railway Commission since its creation, showing the county or city from which such person came, the office or employment to which he was appointed, the date of appointment, the salary and allowances attached thereto, the place or district where the work of each employee is done, and the total amount paid each year for all such services up to the end of December, 1908.—Mr. Foster.

A return of all correspondence, papers and reports of engineers or others, relating to the authorization and construction of a canal from Lake Simcoe to Newmarket, including all contracts entered into, the amount of money so far paid, and the estimated cost of the completed work, with plans showing the capacity of the canal, and for all statements and estimates of the commercial reasons for the work. —Mr. Foster.

A return showing the amount and conditions of each permanent loan made by the government since July 1, 1896, the bank or corporation through which it was made, the cost of each in (a) brokerage and commission, (b) stamps, &c., (c) legal or other services, and (d) discounts, the net result of each loan and per cent of interest upon the same.—Mr. Foster.

A return showing the number and amount of temporary loans made by the government since July 1, 1896, the bank or corporation with which each was made, the conditions and cost of the same.—Mr. Foster.

A return showing the names and places of registry of the several American fishing vessels seized by the Dominion fishery cruisers for illegal fishing in Canadian waters since 1900, and of the courts in which actions for penalties or forfeitures were instituted, the mode of service of the writs or other process on such foreign fishing vessels, and in what court tried; and a statement of the fines imposed, or proceeds of sale realized, and how such fines or proceeds of forfeiture were appropriated. Also a copy of the judgment of the High Court of Justice for Ontario in the case of Rex vs. American Gasoline Fishing Boat.—Mr. Macdonell.

A return showing in respect of the sinking fund in connection with each outstanding loan forming on March 31, 1908, part of the funded public debt: (a) term of loan; (b) the sinking fund rate; (c) the amount that has been each year set aside, including earnings of interest reinvested; (d) the aggregate amount of credit of sinking fund of that particular loan on March 31 1908; (e) the aggregate amount which may be reasonably expected to stand to credit of sinking fund on date when loan shall fall due, and if extended at the end of final period; (f) percentage which accrued sinking fund and its earnings will bear to the nominal amount of loan on date of expiry.—Mr. Ames.

A return showing in detail the assets amounting to $157,483,926.17 in the balance sheet of Canada on December 31, 1908.—Mr. Ames.

A return showing the total amount of liability in the form of temporary loans on the last day of each month during the period between the 1st of April, 1907, and the 31st of Decem-

ber, 1908, together with, in each case, the rate of interest paid upon said amount during the same month.—Mr. Ames.

A return showing in respect of the following items which appear in the public accounts :—
Intercolonial railway, open account..$965,418 00
Windsor branch, open account... .. 180 34
Prince Edward Island railway, open account.. .. .. 19,687 00
(a) what proportion of these amounts represents moneys due the government since a date prior to the end of the fiscal year 1906-7; (b) what part of the amount thus overdue was incurred in each fiscal year prior to 1906-7; (c) a list of the items included in (a) which represent an amount exceeding one hundred dollars, with name in each case of debtor, date and nature of services.—Mr. Ames.

A return showing approximately the total amount of available cash on deposit to the credit of the government on the last day of each month during the period between the 1st of April, 1907, and the 31st of December, 1908. —Mr. Ames.

A return showing in detail the contingent or nominal liabilities of the Dominion government on the 1st of January, 1909; that is to say, a statement of all amounts which might under existing legislation become exigible, such as earnable railway subsidies, government guaranteed loans, deficiencies which might require to be made good, &c.—Mr. Ames.

A return showing to date the statement found on page 15 of the budget speech of 1898. —Mr. Ames.

A return showing, year by year, since 1881, the expenditures charged annually to capital under the caption of Dominion lands, together with a similar statement of the total receipts from sale of lands, town sites, &c., where public domain has been permanently alienated.—Mr. Ames.

PUBLIC WORKS, BONAVENTURE.

Mr. LENNOX moved for a return showing:

1. The total amount expended on public works by this government in the riding of Bonaventure prior to the general elections of 1900.

2. The total amount expended by the government in this riding, (a) on public works, and (b) in aid of railways and other undertakings since said general election, and the estimated additional amount required, (a) to complete these public works, and (b) to meet the subsidies or grants in aid of railways or other undertakings.

3. The various public works undertaken by the government in this riding between the general election of 1896 and the general election of 1900, the dates when the several works were undertaken, whether they were let by public advertisement, tender, and contract, or how otherwise, and the sums of money, stated separately, expended upon these works prior to the election of 1900.

4. Which of these several works were completed and which of them remained uncompleted at the date of the election in 1900.

5. The sums of money, stated separately, expended in or towards completing these works since the said election of 1900, and the dates of expenditure.

6. The various public works undertaken and carried on by the government since the general election of 1900, the dates when the several works were inaugurated or commenced, the sums of money, stated separately, expended upon these works, and the estimated amount required to complete such of these works as have not been completed; and showing whether these works were done by tender or contract, or how otherwise.

7. The moneys granted by the government by way of subsidy and to railways or other undertakings in said riding since the general election of 1900, the sums of money paid under these grants and the estimated amount required to meet future payments.

8. And showing any other special financial benefits conferred upon Bonaventure within the time commencing as aforesaid.

He said: If that is unopposed I will move it.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I would call attention to the general nature of the question. It says: prior to the general election of 1900, and of course that would embrace a great number of years. What does it mean?

Mr. LENNOX. It means from 1896.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is a very long period.

Mr. LENNOX. It will confine it to 1896.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think you can find it in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not think so.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Better let the question stand.

ADJOURNMENT—TREATY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. With reference to the matter which I brought up yesterday, namely, the communication to this House of the treaty between His Majesty and the United States of America, I am perfectly familiar with what the Prime Minister stated, that treaties made by the United States government must have the ratification of the Senate. It was not in connection with that I desired to make my point. So far as I understand, a treaty made by the United States government becomes to all intents and purposes public property when it goes to the Senate. I may be mistaken in that. The Senate, I believe, does sometimes deal with treaties in secret session, when of course they are not matters of public property. I do not know how it may be in the present instance. What I object to is that the terms of this treaty should have been made the property of the people of the United States and of their legislature and should not at the same time have

been made the property of the people of Canada and of this parliament. There may be diplomatic difficulties in the way, I do not know about that. All I desire to do is to emphasize, subect to any superior knowledge of those difficulties which the Prime Minister may have, my belief that that treaty, when placed before the Congress and the people of the United States, ought at the same time to be placed before the parliament and the people of Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know that I have any other knowledge on this subject than is common to everybody. I am not prepared to controvert the statement made by my hon. friend, that the moment a treaty is submitted to the American Senate it becomes public property in the United States. My impression is—I speak subject to correction, and I would like to have the point cleared up between now and to-morrow—that the treaty is communicated to the Senate, but not to the House of Representatives. As to that, I will make inquiries. So far as we are concerned, my hon. friend knows that a treaty is not communicated to parliament unless and until it is ratified by the King. That is the etiquette of our system, and that is the only reason why this treaty has not been communicated to parliament. I know that there is a good deal of inconvenience felt on this side of the Atlantic for the very reason stated by my hon. friend. I believe that in the United States a treaty may be given to the press some time before it is given to the Senate. We do not admit anything of that kind in this country, as my hon. friend knows, and it is simply because in this matter we follow the traditions of British diplomacy, under which parliament does not receive the treaty until it has been signed by His Majesty the King. But I quite agree with my hon. friend that it is inconvenient that we should not have the matter made public in this country as soon as it is in the United States.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, we are all quite familiar with the doctrine which the Prime Minister has laid down very correctly, that the treaty-making power under our constitutional usage resides in the King. But he may exercise that power by entering into a convention subject to the consent of the Imperial Parliament or the parliament of any great dependency of the empire. I think that course was pursued, if my memory serves me correctly, in the case of the French treaty. No doubt in that case another reason prevailed, namely, that the treaty could not become operative without an enactment of this parliament. But apart from that altogether, it might perhaps be desirable to consider whether or not a treaty such as that recently negotiated should not be framed in the same terms, especially when it is a treaty concluded between His Majesty on behalf of the Dominion of Canada and the people of the United States, whose treaties do not become valid and binding upon them until they have been ratified by the Senate. I do not know whether I make myself clear to my hon. friend. A treaty which we make with the United States is not valid or binding upon them until it is ratified by their Senate. It might be worth considering whether or not our treaties dealing with important subjects should not have a clause to the effect that they should not become binding on His Majesty until they have been ratified by the parliament of Canada. I hope my right hon. friend will take that into consideration. It seems to me that it might very well be taken into consideration, and it might possibly lead to a different mode of conducting these treaties than that which has prevailed in the past.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no exception to take to the suggestion made by my hon. friend. On the contrary, I am quite disposed to agree with everything he says. I would go further. Even admitting that the King alone has the treaty-making power, I see no reason why, the moment a treaty is signed by the parties who negotiated it, it should not be given to the public even before it is ratified by His Majesty. Although the present treaty has been signed, I may say we have not yet received an official copy of it.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, January 27, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Part I of report of Department of Trade and Commerce for fiscal year ending March 31, 1909.—Mr. Paterson.

QUESTIONS.

PAYMENTS TO CANADIAN ECONOMIC LUBRICANT COMPANY.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What amount of money has been paid out to the Canadian Economic Lubricant Company each year since 1906?
2. Who is the manager of this company?
3. Is the oil supplied under contract after public advertisement for tenders?

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

1. By Department of Public Works :

In 1903-4..	$795 55
1907-8..	11 25
1908-9..	14 82
Total..	$821 62

2. Has been answered by Department of Marine and Fisheries.
3. No.

MARCONI STATIONS.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What is the amount paid to March 31, 1907, for Marconi stations under the heads of construction, maintenance and other expenses?
2. What was paid under same heads during fiscal year 1907-8?
3. How many stations are there and what number of messages were sent for and received by the government during 1907-8?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Construction, $132,641.65, maintenance, $67,556.83. Total, $200,198.48.
2. Maintenance, $56,232.56.
3. 15 stations: total messages, 4,886, total words, 57,583.

ROOMS IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR asked :

1. Outside of the Chamber of the House of Commons, the reading room and library, how many rooms are available in the parliament buildings for members of the House of Commons, including members of the administration and the staff of the House of Commons?
2. What is the total floor space of the said rooms?
3. By whom are the said rooms occupied, to whom have they been allotted, and what is the floor space of the rooms in question in each case?
4. Under whose direction has such allotment or arrangement been made, and when was it last made or revised?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I would ask that this question might be allowed to stand. But while upon my feet, with the permission of the House, and with the permission of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), I would like to call attention to an answer to a similar question which he complained was not sufficient. I would say to my hon. friend that I have now the information which he desires ; and in doing so, I would point out to him that the question of which notice was given, asked how many cubic feet of space there were.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will read the question which immediately preceded his answer he will find that it was floor space. The mistake was made in the first insertion. I suppose my writing was so good that the clerk could not read it well.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was put cubic space in both cases, and that is what misled the officials of my department. I thought the question had been answered. But if my hon. friend says it was owing to his handwriting, which I thought was very good, I will cheerfully accept his statement. But the answer was in accordance with the question of which notice had been given. I have now the answer to the second part of the question :

b. 43 new rooms added in new building containing 18,320 sup. feet.

13 new rooms in old building containing 4,722 sup. feet.

c. 7 rooms eliminated containing 1,617 sup. feet.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—ALLEGED OVER-CLASSIFICATION.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

1. What action has been taken by the government, the Transcontinental Railway Commission, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, since April 28, 1908, to determine the questions then at issue between the company and the commission as to alleged over-classification, or to ascertain whether there had been over-classification upon the eastern division of the Transcontinental Railway, and the extent of such over-classification, if any, and with what result?
2. Have all differences between the company and the commission been adjusted? If so, how?
3. Who acted for the government or commission, and who for the company, in investigating and determining the matters aforesaid or in endeavouring to do so?
4. Under what provision of the contract, or statute relating to it was action taken?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) :

1 and 3. Early in the month of May last the question of alleged over classification was submitted to the chief engineer of the Transcontinental Railway, and the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, arbitrators. They completed their work in the month of July and failed to agree. Whereupon the said engineers determined to choose a third arbitrator, and after several names had been submitted, no decision was reached until November, when Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, general consulting engineer to the government was chosen. Mr. Schreiber on the 21st of November consented to act, and the matter will be taken up as soon as conditions will permit.

2. No.

4. Under clause seven of the agreement of the 29th of July, 1903, between His Majesty the King and the Grand Trunk Pacific, chapter 71, 3 Edward VII.

RURAL MAIL DELIVERY.

Mr. ARMSTRONG — by Mr. Taylor — asked :

1. How many mail boxes for the rural districts has the government purchased and how many of said boxes have been delivered to the government?
2. Where were the rural mail boxes manufactured, and was the contract for them let by tender or private arrangement?
3. If let by tender, how many tenders were received, and what are the names of the tenderers and the price quoted in each?
4. Were any boxes for rural mail purposes manufactured in Canada? If so, how many, and what is the name of the manufacturer?
5. Did the government pay any duty on the boxes purchased in the United States? If so, how much duty was paid on each box, and when was the duty paid?
6. What is the price charged patrons for mail boxes in rural districts, and does said price cover cost paid by government to manufacturer and include duty, freight and delivery?
7. Have many boxes been paid for by patrons to January 1, 1909?
8. How many mail delivery routes are in operation which supply mail to individual box holders under the regulation covering rural mail delivery issued in September, 1908, and what is the extra cost to the department of operating each route over the amount paid for carrying the mails previous to September, 1908?
9. How many rural mail boxes have been placed on routes, and the name of each route, with the number of miles covered on each, and the number of boxes placed in position and receiving mail on each route?
10. What was the estimated increased cost to the government of the adoption of the Postmaster General's proposal, of September last, in which he agreed to furnish free mail delivery to people living on established mail and stage route?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. 6,000 boxes.

2, 3 and 4. The boxes were obtained under an official arrangement from the International Mail Equipment Company, New York City.

5. The department has been advised by the Customs Department that the duty on these boxes and fittings will be at the rate of thirty per cent, but the Customs account for the same was only received at the department on 25th of January, and has not yet been paid.

6. $3, which covers cost paid to manufacturer, but does not include duty, freight and delivery.

7. 134.

8 and 9. See statement.

10. 25 per cent increase over present contract prices.

STATEMENT of Rural Delivery Mail Services Established on Existing Mail Routes to December 31, 1908.

Postal Division.	Mail Route Between.		No. of R.D. boxes erected.	Rate paid for service of each box per annum.	Cost of regular mail service per annum.	Additional cost for R. delivery per annum.	Length of route one way, miles.
				$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
Edmonton	Agricola	Strathcona	15	0 75	525 00	11 25	20½
P. E. Island	Albany	Tryon	19	1 00	203 45	19 00	6
Toronto	Ancaster	Hamilton	40	1 00	600 00	40 00	7
Ottawa	Aultsville	Bush Glen	6	0 75	183 44	4 50	11
P. E. Island	Arlington	Richmond	9	0 75	80 00	6 75	7¼
Kingston	*Brighton	Campbellford	9	1 00	365 00	9 00	20
"	Bewdley	Port Hope	30	1 00	500 00	30 00	†29¼
Manitoba	Birtle	Miniota	1	0 75	450 00	0 75	23
"	Bru	Cypress River	3	0 75	275 00	2 25	11½
Victoria	Colquitz	Victoria	4	1 00	200 00	4 00	5
London	*Cross Hill	Waterloo	49	1 00	300 00	49 00	13¼
"	Cotswold	Palmerston	24	1 00	250 00	24 00	7
Quebec	Candiac	St. Foye	1	1 00	175 00	1 00	4
New Brunswick	Centreville	Knoxford	5	0 75	69 09	3 75	4
Manitoba	Carberry	Montrose	9	0 75	250 00	6 75	†36
Calgary	Calgary	Freshfield	11	0 75	312 00	8 15	17
"	"	Jumping Pond	15	0 75	526 40	11 25	28
"	"	Millarville	12	0 75	724 00	9 00	36

* The contractors for the mail services between Brighton and Campbellford, and Cross Hill and Waterloo, having refused to accept the amount authorized by the department for the service of Rural Delivery boxes, tenders are now being invited for new contracts.

† Round trip.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

STATEMENT of Rural Delivery Mail Service—*Concluded.*

Postal Division.	Mail Route Between.		No. of R. D. boxes erected.	Rait paid for service of each box per annum.	Cost of regular mail service per annum.	Additional cost for R. delivery per annum.	Length of route one way, miles.
				$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
Manitoba	Creeford	Douglas Station	16	0 75	234 00	12 00	†40¼
Edmonton	Eckville	Red Deer	8	0 75	780 00	6 00	34
Moosejaw	Eastview	Pasqua	11	0 75	160 00	8 25	9½
"	Ellisboro	Wolseley	3	0 75	312 00	2 25	9
Toronto	Erin	Guelph	44	1 00	380 00	44 00	20
P. E. Island	Ellis River	Miscouche	11	0 75	145 00	8 25	11½
New Brunswick	Florenceville	Summerfield	24	0 75	172 00	18 00	13
Manitoba	Franklin	Murchison	3	0 50	156 00	1 50	†33½
Edmonton	Highland Park	Rosenroll	14	0 75	674 00	10 50	†43
London	Hagersville	Springvale	8	1 00	170 00	8 00	4
Saskatoon	Kelvington	Wadena	5	0 75	605 00	3 75	29
New Brunswick	Knoxford	Upper Knoxford	24	0 75	96 00	18 00	4
Edmonton	Lacombe	Rimbey	9	0 75	750 00	6 75	36
Saskatoon	Loganton	Saskatoon	8	0 75	840 00	6 00	35
Moosejaw	Macoun	Slager	1	0 50	550 00	0 50	56
Toronto	Milton West	Mount Nebo	55	1 00	298 50	55 00	10½
Victoria	North Saanich	Sydney Ry. Stn.	2	1 00	120 00	2 00	3
Toronto	Newmarket	Sutton West	75	1 00	1,000 00	75 00	22
London	Peebles	Woodstock	12	1 00	556 00	12 00	11½
Victoria	Rocky Point	Victoria	2	0 75	330 00	1 50	25
London	Simcoe	Waterford	29	1 00	265 00	29 00	7
New Brunswick	St. John	St. Martins	9	1 00	779 00	9 00	30
Manitoba	Selkirk	Winnipeg	5	1 00	1,300 00	5 00	25¾
Vancouver	Terra Nova	Vancouver	31	1 00	312 00	31 00	13½
Manitoba	Underhill	West Hall	1	0 75	210 00	0 75	8
Toronto	Woburn	Scarboro Junction	49	1 00	395 00	49 00	†18½

Total number of routes in operation, 44. Total additional cost per annum, $663.50.

UXBRIDGE POST OFFICE.

Mr. S. SHARPE (North Ontario) asked:

1. Were any options for post office sites secured from property owners in the town of Uxbridge?
2. If so, from whom, on what dates and what are the other particulars?
3. Have all the options been allowed to lapse? If so, why?
4. Is it the intention of the government to obtain new options?
5. Is it the intention of the government to have inserted in the estimates for the present year an appropriation for a new post office in the town of Uxbridge? If not, why not?

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

1. Yes.
2. (a) L. L. Hutchinson, dated 22nd September, 1908, for 60 days, on a corner lot 60 by 90 feet, at $1,200; (b) Michael O'Neil, dated 6th October, 1908, for 60 days, on a corner lot about 32 by 181 feet, at $2,700; (c) Thos. Boyd, on a corner lot 42 by 100 feet, at $1,200; A. Jackel, on next lot, 24 by 100 feet, at $850; total on a corner lot, 66 by 100 feet, at $2,050; both dated 22nd September, 1908, for 60 days.
3. Yes; unable to complete arrangements for transfer within time limit of the option.
4. It is expected the option on the site selected can be renewed.
5. The estimates, when submitted, will show the intention of the government.

GARRISON COMMON—TORONTO.

Mr. MACDONELL asked:

1. When did the government agree to convey or transfer the property known as the Garrison Common Toronto, to the city of Toronto, or to the National Industrial Exhibition Association, Toronto?
2. What is the cause of the delay in making the said transfer?
3. Through what departments of the government has the matter to pass and in what department is the matter now delayed?
4. Have not repeated requests been received by the government from the city for the transfer?

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

1. An order in council was passed on the 16th May, 1904, authorizing the sale of the Garrison Common property to the city of Toronto, under certain conditions. This

was ratified by legislation passed during the last session of parliament.

2. The delay has been caused by the negotiations between the government and the city of Toronto as to the meaning of certain conditions of the order in council referred to and several other points connected with the sale. Negotiations are proceeding with the prospect of a satisfactory termination at an early date.

3. Through the Departments of Interior and Militia and Defence, which departments are acting in accord in the matter.

4. The city authorities have, on several occasions recently, requested the conveyance to be made.

TORONTO NEW BARRACKS.

Mr. MACDONELL asked:

1. When was the site for the erection of the new barracks on the Humber river, Toronto, purchased, or agreed to be purchased by the government?

2. What is the cause of the delay in commencing and proceeding with the erection?

3. When does the government intend to commence the said work and will the estimates to be brought down this session contain any appropriation therefor? If so, how much?

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

1. Under the terms of the order in council of May 16, 1904, authorizing the sale of the Garrison Common to the city of Toronto, it was stipulated that the city should convey to the Crown, in part payment of the purchase price, a property known as the Baby Farm, as a site for the new barracks.

The city of Toronto has not as yet conveyed this property to the Crown pending the completion of the negotiations for the transfer to the city of the Garrison Common property.

2. The delay is in part caused by the fact that the exchange has not been made.

3. I am unable to answer.

PRINTING OF SESSIONAL STATUTES.

Mr. MACDONELL asked:

1. On what day did the last parliament prorogue?

2. On what day were the statutes of the last session of parliament printed for distribution to the public?

3. What is the reason for the great delay that usually intervenes between the end of each session, and the public distribution of the Acts passed thereat?

4. Is the government aware that the public, and more particularly the legal profession is greatly inconvenienced thereby?

5. Has the government received any complaints because of such delays?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State):

1. July 20, 1908.

2. Both volumes of the statutes were delivered to the members of the government on December 14, 1908, and to the public on January 14, 1909. Separate copies of the Public Acts were issued on August 20, 1908, and of the Private Acts on September 20, 1908.

3. The statutes are yearly increasing in volume. Last year there were about twelve hundred pages or two hundred and sixty-eight pages more than the previous year.

4. No.

5. No.

NORTHWEST REBELLION, 1885—ROYAL NORTHWEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. MACDONELL asked:

1. Has the government under its consideration the matter of making grants of veteran's land to the members of the Northwest Mounted Police force who took part in the Riel or Northwest rebellion of 1885?

2. Did the members of the regular or permanent forces, who participated in the rebellion, receive veteran's grants? If so, what were the corps or forces, and what, approximately, was the number of such grants?

3. What would be the approximate number of grants now required to be made to members of the police force, if those who served in the rebellion were accorded the right to receive veteran grants?

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

1. When the subjects of rewards for services during the Rebellion of 1885 was under consideration of the government of the day, a distinction was made between the Mounted Police, whose ordinary duties of maintaining law and order were within the limits of the disturbed districts, and the militia, who were called upon to leave their homes and occupations, at great personal inconvenience, resulting in many cases in serious embarrassment to themselves and families.

This distinction was marked by excluding the police from participation in the issue of scrip.

In 1893 the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories passed a resolution praying that the Dominion government would grant scrip to the Mounted Police, and on several occasions members have asked questions in the House. The reply has always been adverse to reconsideration.

2. We have no information, but probably about 700. The Minister of Militia will answer the second part of this question.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). The answer to the second question is:

2. (a) Yes.

(b) 'A' Battery Regt. of Canadian Artillery.. 113
'B' Battery Regt. of Canadian Artillery.. 114
'A' Troop Cavalry School Corps.. 43
'C' Company Infantry School Corps.. 91

Total.. 366

THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. On what date did the Hon. R. W. Scott resign the office of Secretary of State for Canada?

2. What duties or functions was Mr. Scott performing in the Secretary of State department since the date of his resignation, and up to what date did Mr. Scott perform such duties?

3. When was the Hon. Charles Murphy appointed Secretary of State and sworn of the Privy Council? When did he actually assume the duties of the office?

4. Who was in charge of the Department of the Secretary of State during the general elections 1908?

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

1. Mr. Scott offered his resignation on the 16th September, 1908, but at my request he continued to administer the affairs of the Department of the Secretary of State until his successor took charge.

2. (a) The duties appertaining to the office of the Secretary of State ; (b) The 24th October, 1908.

3. (a) Mr.Murphy was sworn of the Privy Council on the 5th October, 1908, and appointed Secretary of State on the 10th of the same month ; (b) October 24, 1908.

4. The reply to this question is contained in the answer to numbers 1 and 2, above.

TATAMAGOUCHE BAY WHARF.

Mr. STANFIELD asked :

1. By whom was the expenditure made at Tatamagouche Bay wharf in Colchester county, during the months of October and November, 1907?

2. For what purpose was the money expended?

3. What depth of water is there at this wharf at low and high tide?

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

1 and 2. The sum of $533.01 was expended, in October, 1907, by the Department of Public Works in constructing an approach to the site of the proposed wharf, petitioned for by the inhabitants to serve as a landing for sea manure and to aid them in the industry of gathering oysters, which are abundant in this bay.

3. The wharf will carry a depth of 5 feet at high water and will be dry at low water.

TRURO ARMOURY.

Mr. STANFIELD asked :

Has a caretaker been appointed for the Truro armoury at Truro, Nova Scotia? If not, when does the government intend to appoint said official?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). It is expected the armoury at Truro, N.S., will be ready to be taken over from the Department of Public Works at an early date, when the question of the appointment of a caretaker will be considered.

LEVIS GRAVING DOCK.

Mr. PAQUET asked :

1. Is the government aware that the present graving dock at St Joseph de Lévis is said to be insufficient for all the requirements of navigation?

2. Is the government aware that it is asserted the large ships of the Canadian Pacific company cannot be repaired in this graving dock?

3. Does the government not think that the legislation respecting graving docks may retard the progress of the City of Quebec?

4. Is it the intention of the government to build at Lévis or Quebec a new graving dock or a large floating dry dock, of dimensions sufficiently large to receive not only our largest ships now afloat, but also the largest ships which may soon come to Quebec?

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

1 and 2. Yes.

3. No. On the contrary, it was expected that the amending legislation passed at the last session to encourage the construction of dry docks would be sufficient to enable a company to procure the necessary capital to construct a large graving dock upon the St. Lawrence.

4. Sufficiently answered by the reply to No. 3.

MINISTER OF LABOUR.

Mr. PAQUET asked :

Is it the intention of the government to add, during this session to the present portfolios that of Minister of Labour, as a separate and distinct branch of the admisistration?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). It is the intention of the government during the present session to introduce legislation to that end.

MR. W. T. R. PRESTON.

Mr. J. D. REID asked:

1. Has the Kehoe foreign board of trade of Japan forwarded a memorial to the government protesting against the actions of W. T. R. Preston?

2. Is the government aware that the Japan 'Weekly Chronicle' in its articles declares,

Mr. Preston is really outrageous in his statements and insinuations against foreign merchants,' and further states, 'it would be well perhaps if his government recalls him before he does any further harm to his reputation,' and it further states. 'Mr. Preston is again busily at work endeavouring to foment a feeling of animosity amongst Japanese against the resident foreigner'?

3. Has the government taken any action? If so, what?

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

1. The department has received a communication from the Kobe Board of Trade, but not from the Kehoe Board of Trade.

Mr. J. D. REID. It was Kobe in my question.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. 2. No.

3. No.

PURCHASE OF STEAMERS 'FALCON AND 'RESTLESS.'

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. Has the Department of Marine and Fisheries, now in its service the steamers 'Falcon' and 'Fearless'?

2. If so, when were the boats purchased, from whom and at what price?

3. What is the capacity of each, and how have they been employed since their purchase?

4. On whose expert request were they bought, and will the minister lay these requests on the table of the House?

Hon. R. LEMIEUX (for the Minister of Marine):

1. It has the 'Falcon'; the 'Fearless' is probably intended for the 'Restless.'

2. 'Falcon,' then called 'Ruth,' from Atlin Transportation Company, Ltd. Price, $9,000; 2nd May, 1904.

'Restless,' 31st August, 1908, from the Westminster Towing and Fish Company, Ltd., of New Westminster; price, $18,000.

3. 'Falcon'—registered tonnage 32.70; gross tonnage 51·88.

'Restless'—registered tonnage 52·50; gross tonnage 76·08.

'Falcon'—during the salmon fishing season, employed in enforcement of Fishery Laws and Regulations, in the northern inspectoral district of British Columbia, and in the winter season, in assisting the 'Kestrel' in patrolling Canadian waters against foreign fishing vessels.

'Restless'—in similar service in the southern district of British Columbia, and in the winter similarly assisting the 'Kestrel.'

4. 'Falcon'—purchased at request of Inspector of Fisheries, after examination by Steamboat Inspector.

'Restless'—was bought on the recommendation of the Inspector of Fisheries, after examination by Steamboat Inspector, to replace the 'Georgia,' which vessel was utilized to replace, lost river steamer 'Swan.' Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID.

PAYMENTS TO CANADIAN ECONOMIC LUBRICANT COMPANY.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What amount of money has been paid out to the Canadian Economic Lubricant company?

2. Who is the manager of this company?

3. Is the oil supplied under contract after public advertisement for tenders?

Hon. R. LEMIEUX (for the Minister of Marine):

1. 1905-6	$3,933 23
1906-7	2,471 86
1907-8	3,642 33
1908-9	4,034 89

2. Mr. James Domville, Montreal.

3. The cylinder oil which constitutes the bulk of these orders is supplied under contract after tenders were invited from oil manufacturers by letter. Small quantities of other lubricating oil were supplied at different times.

PAYMENTS TO NEW YORK LUBRICANT COMPANY.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What amount of money has been paid out to the New York Lubricant company?

2. Who is the manager of this company?

3. Is the oil supplied under contract after public advertisement for tenders?

Hon. R. LEMIEUX (for the Minister of Marine):

1.

	Illuminating oil.	Lubricating oil.
1905-6	$ 562 50	$ 4,127 08
1906-7	4,896 10	3,705 00
1907-8	6,403 75	4,553 59
1908-9	3,767 05	4,945 28
	$15,629 40	$17,330 95

Total amount $32,960.35.

2. Mr. Philip Harrison.

3. The lubricating oil is supplied under contract; circular letters were sent out inviting tenders to manufacturers.

The above illuminating oil is a special kind not manufactured in Canada, and was made to order according to the specification of the Washington Lighthouse Board and is for dioptric lights. It is used only in lighthouses in the United States and Canada.

OPENING OF GOVERNMENT TENDERS.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville) moved:

That in the opinion of this House tenders received in any department of government should be immediately placed in safe custody under seal so as to prevent any possibility or suspicion of tampering; and should be opened in public at the time and place mentioned in the advertisement and in the presence of at least three principal officials of the department; and the persons so tendering or their duly authorized agents should be at liberty

to attend at the said time and place and see such tenders opened and recorded, if they so desire.

He said : Mr. Speaker, before I proceed with this notice of motion, let me say that I believe it is the desire of every member of this House that this session should be got through with at as early a date as it reasonably can be. I believe that will depend entirely on the way the government proceed with their business. Yesterday I felt very badly indeed that this House was compelled to adjourn at 3.50 p.m. I believe that if the government had brought down some of those measures that are mentioned in the speech from the Throne, or if they had had some of their business ready and had proceeded immediately after we were through with the notices of motion, it would have helped to shorten the session. But, I find that in the speech from the Throne there are some measures mentioned that we have not yet had notice of on the Order Paper, amongst them being Bills that are really not party measures, but which will require careful examination. I refer more particularly to the Insurance Bill. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister Sir Wilfrid Laurier may say that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is away from this country, and that we may have to wait until he returns. But, this Bill must be printed and ready to be submitted to the House, and I cannot see any reason why it should not have been introduced the day following the opening of the session, printed and distributed among the members in order that we might be in a position to discuss it at the proper time. Again, to-day, I find on the Order Paper, five or six Bills that the government are introducing; yet they are not prepared to move their introduction today in order to get them printed and distributed among the members. I hope and trust that the government will proceed with these Bills, and that instead of adjourning, as we did yesterday when the House had been in session only forty or fifty minutes, they will be prepared to go on with these Bills, so that we may get through with the government measures at the earliest possible moment, and try, if possible, to get away before the warm weather sets in.

This is exactly the same motion that I put on the Order Paper last year. I have not changed it in any respect. Last year the Prime Minister objected to the last part of my motion, which reads as follows:

And—

The tenders

—should be opened in public at the time and place mentioned in the advertisement and in the presence of at least three principal officials of the departments, and the persons so tendering or their duly authorized agents should be at liberty to attend at the said time and place and see such tenders opened and recorded, if they so desire.

The Prime Minister wished to consult with some of the officials and see how this would work, the result of that investigation, in so far as I understand, is embodied in this regulation that has been approved by the Governor in Council and was submitted to the House by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) yesterday. As far as I can see there is no difference between this regulation and the practice that has been carried on by the government for a number of years. In the first place I do not see that there is any difference in the first part of this regulation, in which it states that all tenders are to be addressed to the official of the department who signs the call for tenders, and that they are to be kept by him in a safe place until opened.

In addition to that, the Minister of Public Works has now made it a regulation for all the departments that tenders must be opened in the presence of the minister of the department calling for tenders and one of the principal officials of the department designated by the minister, or, in the absence of the minister, or in cases where it it not convenient for him to be present, they shall be opened by two officials of the department to be designated by the minister. So far as that is concerned, it would be convenient for the minister, if he desired to help any of his friends, not to be present when the tenders were opened. We had a case before the Public Accounts Committee in which there was a grave doubt as to whether the tenders produced were the genuine tenders as sent in. They may have been all right, yet it turned out that the tenders were opened by the commissioner and his stenographer. The minister may designate his private secretary and the private secretary's stenographer to open the tenders, which practically leaves the matter in the hands of one individual. According to this regulation, it seems that the government are bound to adhere to the system of the minister and any one of his officials that he desires opening the tenders. I do not wish to throw any doubt on the minister in charge, but I feel that it would be much more satisfactory, and in the interest of the minister, if he were to have the tenders opened by three of his principal officials without himself being mixed up in the matter at all. For some reason or other the government will not accept that part of my motion ; perhaps they will say why. I cannot understand either why the government object to the tenders being opened in public. For the benefit of the new members I may say that last year I gave instances of the way tenders are opened in, I believe, the majority of cases in the United States. As samples, I will read from two advertise-

ments which I have taken from a United States paper. Here is one :

Notice to Contractors.—Sealed proposals indorsed 'Proposals for Switchboard and Feeder Cables, Motors and Interior Wiring for Four Staff Residences,' at the New York State Agricultural Experiment Station, Geneva, New York, will be received by L. P. Haviland, Chairman of the Building Committee, New York State Agricultural Experiment Station, Geneva, New York, up to ten o'clock a.m. on the 18th day of January, 1908, when the bids will be opened and read publicly. Proposal shall be accompanied by certified cheque in the sum of $200, and the contractor to whom the award is made will be required to furnish surety company's bond in the sum of $1,500. The right is reserved to reject any and all bids.

Here is another :

Sealed bids or proposals will be received by the Acqueduct Commissioners on Tuesday, January 12, 1909, at which place and hour the bids will be publicly opened and read.

After the tenders have been opened, any member of this House can obtain them on a motion for papers, and therefore I cannot see why the officials who open them should not open them in public or read out the names of the tenders and their prices. This does not oblige the government to accept the lowest tender, if good and sufficient reasons can be given for not doing so. As the tenders are for public works in which the whole public are interested, I think it is the duty of any government to give the public all the information it can to show that it is doing what is right and proper and in the interest of the people. I have no desire to make this a party matter. I am making this suggestion entirely in the interest of the public. For years it has been the policy of the government—I do not say this government or its predecessors—to ask for tenders in two different ways. For large amounts they have advertised for tenders in the newspapers, and for smaller amounts they have simply written letters to half a dozen of their friends throughout the country, asking for prices for what they require. I claim that that is unfair to the people. I contend that everything over a certain amount, say $2,000, should be made a matter of public tender, by advertisement in the newspapers ; and if the tenders are opened in public, I am satisfied that an enormous amount of money will be saved to the people. Moreover, that will give the people of this country confidence in the ministers administering their departments. I simply appeal again to the government this year to accept this resolution. Also because we have a new House. We have now 80 or 90 members who were not here last year, and I ask them to consider this matter, not in a party spirit, but in the public interest. My proposition that the tender should be opened in the presence of the persons tendering, should they desire to be present, is a fair one. It acts well on the other side of the line and there is no reason why it should not act well on this side. At all events there can be no harm in giving it a trial for a year or so and see the results. For those reasons I beg leave to move the resolution which, Mr. Speaker, I have put, in your hands.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I am sure that no member on this side of the House can yield anything to my hon. friend in his desire that, in the opening of tenders, every possible precaution should be taken to safeguard the public interest. As my hon. friend has said, the practice in the past has been to put tenders under lock and key, as soon as received, so that there could be no reasonable possibility of their being tampered with. The practice also has been to have the tenders opened by officials of the department and the contract awarded to the lowest tenderer unless there were some good reasons—such as his failure to give satisfaction in previous contracts or his financial inability—for submitting the matter to the Governor in Council for consideration as to whether or not the lowest tender was the best offer. As there has been some consideration given the question of the reception of tenders, both on the part of members of the opposition and members supporting the government, as well as by the government themselves, it was thought well to frame a new regulation which would lay down a rule applicable to all the departments. In doing this the government had to take into consideration the circumstances, more especially in regard to the Intercolonial Railway, whose head working office is at Moncton where tenders for supplies of various kinds are necessarily received. Had it not been for the fact that in the past it has always been considered desirable that tenders for supplies for the Intercolonial Railway should be received at Moncton, the rule would have been adopted that in every case tenders should be opened in the presence of the minister and his deputy or, in case of the unavoidable absence of the minister, then by the principal official of his department; but in the case of tenders received at Moncton it would not be possible for the minister to be present.

Mr. J. D. REID. They could be opened by the officials.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, they could be opened by three officials if there be any magic in having three instead of two. Had the regulation said three, by hon. friend would have said four.

Mr. J. D. REID. Two could open them at Moncton even according to your regulation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Let me read the regulations and ask hon. members if they do not think it is sufficient to safeguard the public interest;—

Where tenders are called for by any department of the government, they shall be addressed to the officer of the department specified in the notice calling for tenders. The notice should say specially that the tenders shall be under seal and indorsed: 'tender for such and such work and supplies.' When received the tenders shall be stamped by the official to whom addressed, with the date and hour of receipt, and placed under lock and key until the day appointed for opening them. They shall be opened in the presence of the minister of the department calling for tenders and one of the principal officers of the department designated by the minister or, in the absence of the minister, in cases where it is not convenient for him to be present they shall be opened by two officials of the department designated by the minister. When opened they shall be initialled by both officers opening them. In all cases where the minister can reasonably be present, he must take part in the opening of the tenders and there must be one of the principal officers of the department present. And in every case the tenders, when opened, must be initialled both by the minister and his deputy. In cases where the minister cannot be present then it will be necessary for him to provide some official to take his place and he shall designate the official.

Mr. LANCASTER. What virtue is there in the minister being present ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The minister has the responsibility of his department and it is his duty to see what the tenders are when they are opened. I would hesitate to cast off the responsibility which the duties of my office place upon me, and throw that entirely upon one of my officials. It does seem to me that in providing that the minister shall be present and that the deputy minister—who occupies a position of great responsibility and almost complete independence—should take part in the opening of the tenders, we have a reasonable safeguard.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the minister think that my hon. friend's resolution would do away with the reception of tenders at Moncton for Intercolonial Railway supplies?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No; it does not, and that is the reason why the regulation provides that, where it is not convenient for this course to be adopted, the minister may designate two officials, and that provision is intended to apply to tenders received at Moncton. It seems to me that the only material provision in the motion which is not in the regulation is that all tenders shall be opened in the presence of the persons tendering. In other words that before the tenders are opened, notice shall be given all contractors so that they shall be present.

Mr. J. D. REID. I say that they may be present if they so desire.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then they must be notified of the time and place for opening the tenders.

Mr. J. D. REID. You can put that in the advertisement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The advertisement states that tenders will be received up to a certain day and hour.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. And opened on a certain day and at a certain hour.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the notice does not say that.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR (New Westminster). It could say it and ought to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The motion provides that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of course I understand that in order to carry out the idea of my hon. friend it would be necessary to give to the tenderers some notice so that they could be present when the tenders were opened. Apart from the inconvenience of that course, it is not desirable in the public interest that the public or the contractors should be present at the opening of tenders. My hon. friend has said that this course is adopted in the United States. His argument would have been stronger if he had been able to show that in any British country, in Great Britain or in any province of Canada, such a course had been adopted. My hon. friend knows that the course which has been pursued during the last ten years is the course which has been pursued during the whole 41 years of confederation.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend must be aware that the public have never been asked to be present at the opening of tenders in connection with any of the departments of this government since confederation.

Mr. J. D. REID. From the investigations that have taken place it would seem to be necessary.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will discuss that in a few moments with my hon. friend. My hon. friend has not been able to show that in Canada or in any province of Canada which has been under the control of either Liberals or Conservatives, it has ever been found desirable to adopt the course which he suggests, and it is a fair argument to raise before we entirely change the policy established in respect to both Dominion and provincial contracts, that my hon. friend has not been able to show either in the very full investigations which have taken place before the Public Accounts Committee or in

any other place that any minister of the Crown or any official of the Crown who has taken part with him in the opening of tenders has been untrue to the trust reposed in him by tampering with the tenders.

Mr. SPROULE. What about the timber limits ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has not been shown either in respect to tenders for timber limits or for lands of any kind or in respect to contracts for public works, that a minister or an official selected by him to be present at the opening of tenders has ever acted except in the public interest in the awarding of contracts. Take my own department. I shall take no credit for what I am about to say, but the rule is, and so far as I am able to learn it has always been strictly adhered to, that the tenders are received by the proper official, kept under seal, opened at the proper time and the contract awarded to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. By whom ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. By the minister and the deputy minister. Of course the minister does the actual awarding of the contracts and then the matter goes to council in the ordinary way. I do not pretend to say that in that respect we are any better than our predecessors, but I have never heard that under Conservative or Liberal rule anything has been done under the present system of receiving tenders by which the public has suffered and it would be a reflection it seems to me, and a very severe reflection upon the members of the government if the House were to hesitate to express its approval of the regulation which has been adopted. Before passing this regulation, very careful consideration was given to the matter, more especially by the Prime Minister and by the heads of the departments receiving the greater number of tenders and we were of the opinion that it would not be in the public interest to have the contractors present. It very often happens that there are two tenders for nearly equal amounts, and the next tender might be for an amount considerably greater than the amount of the two lowest tenders. If the tenders were opened in the presence of these contractors, they would see what the lowest tenders were and they would see that the next highest tender was perhaps a good many thousand dollars higher. They might easily put their heads together, have the lowest tenders withdraw, forfeiting their deposits, and thereby the minister would be compelled either to award the contract to the next lowest tenderer or to call for new tenders. Since I have been a minister I have seen some surprising differences in the amounts of tenders submitted for various public works. There was one case not long ago in which tenders were called for the erection of a public building in a western city in which one of the tenders was very nearly 100 per cent higher than the lowest.

Mr. HUGHES. Issued by the same man?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, not issued by the same man but by independent tenderers, who apparently had nothing whatever to do with each other, and if I had the tenders here I could cite numerous instances in which there has been a difference of many thousands of dollars between one or two of the lowest tenderers and some of those who might be called the higher tenderers. I have not sufficient faith in human nature not to believe that when such a convenient opportunity was presented the contractors would in many instances combine together, have the lowest tenders withdrawn and thus compel the department to accept a very much higher tender or else invite new tenders, which would not be in the public interest. I think it much better to allow the officers of the department to deal with the tenders as it is ordinarily done, awarding the contract to the lowest tenderer, issuing an acceptance of the tender and taking the necessary steps for the entering into the contract so as to have the lowest tenderer bound before the public and the other contractors are made acquainted with the different tenders which have been received.

It does not seem to me that my hon. friend has shown to the House any good reason for making such a radical departure from the practice which has been so long pursued without any objection, without any loss to the public, without any wrongdoing, so far as the public records show, or so far as my hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Reid) has been able to inform the House. I think the onus is upon my hon. friend of showing reasons which he has not adduced to the House before he asks us to enter upon such a radical departure. Therefore I feel it my duty to oppose the motion which my hon. friend has submitted.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker. The principle which we are called upon to consecrate, appears to me to be a very important one, and I was surprised to hear the defence which has just fallen from the lips of my hon, friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) in regard to the regulation adopted by the government. That regulation, so far as I can see, does not meet the exigencies of the case at all. There is one thing absolutely certain, and that is a very general impression throughout the country, that there is something unfair in the manner in which tenders for contracts with the government are dealt with. There is not a man in any province of the Dominion, outside perhaps a limited circle of active politicians, who, if he were asked if public works in Canada were tendered for in a regular manner and

awarded to the lowest tenderer, circumstances being equal, would not burst out laughing in your face. That is the general impression. That general impression, I would add, prevents a great number of the very best class of contractors from tendering. There are men who are eminently capable of executing our public works at a reasonable price, and would be content with a fair and just profit, who abstain from tendering because they share that general impression that it is absolutely useless to tender unless you have some pull with those who dispose of the contracts. There is no doubt about that whatever. There is not a member of this House who has not been able to satisfy himself of the existence of that widespread impression. Is it not necessary that we should dispel that impression? Does not this proposed resolution have for its purpose to dispel that impression, and to provide for the tendering and awarding of contracts under the safest possible circumstances, without in any way interfering with the exercise of the judgment of the responsible minister? I say it does. What does the regulation provide for? It says that when tenders are received they will be put under lock and key. But that is not a safeguard of much importance. The very worst frauds perpetrated in regard to tenders have been effected when the tenders were put under lock and key. This resolution provides for something totally different. Tenders have to be sealed and put away; the moment they are sealed and put away they cannot be touched until the authority who has to decide who will get the contract, is in a position to pronounce. It seems to me there is a great deal of difference between the two provisions.

My hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), twice, three times, more than four times, repeated the assertion that since confederation, neither in the federal or the provincial sphere, had anybody every heard of any contract or any tender being improperly handled. Now that was the statement of my hon. friend; and coming from a gentleman of his vast experience, four times repeated, I must say it surprised me not a little. While I do not attempt to give instances, I appeal to the experience of those who have been in politics for some time, no matter which party ruled, whether they have not heard of irregularities in the awarding of contracts and the handling of tenders. There is no doubt that there has been in this country, federally, provincially and municipally, a crying abuse in this respect. That abuse exists to-day. In order to dispel the general impression I refer to, and to convince the public at large that that system is going to be done away with, so far as we can do it, seems to me this resolution is necessary, and would cure a very grave situation indeed. Then again, Mr. Speaker, is it not inportant, does it not carry out the idea that we hear expressed every day on the street, that the tenderers themselves, more than that, the public, but particularly the tenderers, should be able to be present when the tenders are opened? They have not a voice in the decision, that is done privately on the responsibility of the minister. But what could contribute to make the opening of tenders, the recording of these tenders, more effective, more authentic, so that no doubt could exist, than the right of the public, convened under the advertisement which invited tenderers, to be present, and for the tenderers themselves, whose interests after all deserve some consideration, who have gone to some trouble in making calculations and financial arrangements, to be present when these tenders are opened, in order that all may know what those tenders are? My hon. friend has supposed an extreme case, where there may be some low tenderers and some higher, and the lower ones might be eliminated, and, if you please, their deposit forfeited, in order that the highest tenderer should remain. I would be prepared to say that for my part I would take the risk, and we are all prepared to take the risk, of such an improbable possibility. As regards Great Britain, the mover of this resolution has shown that the custom is carried out. It is very generally carried out in the United States. But every one knows that in England the greatest publicity surrounds the opening of tenders for all public works. In England, as I have stated time and again, in this House, all supplies wanted by the government are invited by tender, the greatest publicity is given to the tenders received, and I am perfectly convinced that if we refer to the regulations which govern the awarding of tenders followed by the government in England, we will see that there is just the same publicity that we advocate here.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think not.

Mr. MONK. I believe so. At any rate. I am prepared to establish that there is a very different publicity in England surrounding the giving of contracts than what we find here. But we are not dealing with England, we are dealing with our own country, and with conditions that we know to exist here; we are dealing with an impression firmly established in the entire nation that irregularities exist in regard to tenders and contracts. You cannot meet a contractor on the street, you cannot meet a man who takes any interest in public matters, who, if you put to him the question, will not answer : Why, everybody knows that this is a matter of favour. That is the impression. How can we efface it? By providing such a rule as this, and I have shown why I think it is important that such a rule should be adopted. We are

endeavouring to reform our public service, we are endeavouring to improve the administration generally. This is a crucial matter, and I have great pleasure in supporting the proposed resolution.

Mr. H. GUTHRIE (South Wellington). If I might offer a word or two on the resolution, I would say that, judging from the remarks of the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Monk), his complaint, if he has one, against the regulation which has just been made by order in council in respect to the opening of tenders, is that greater publicity is not given in the first place, and in the second place, that there is some suspicion throughout the country of wrong-doing in regard to the system of dealing with tenders. I point out in the first place that whether sufficient publicity is given or not by way of advertisement, the motion of my hon. friend does not deal with that question. His motion deals only with the question of opening tenders. The only distinction, as far as I can see, between the regulation passed by order in council and the motion of my hon. friend is that the latter requires the presence of one more person when the tenders are opened than is called for in the regulation, and he gives to the tenderer the opportunity of being present when the tenders are opened. I deny that there is any very general misunderstanding or any very great suspicion throughout the country in regard to the manner in which the government deals with tenders, but I say that if any suspicion does exist it exists solely and only on account of the charges which were made in this House during the last two or three sessions, by hon. members opposite and in each case disapproved. Time and time again charges were made that tenders, in regard to timber in particular, were not fairly dealt with.

An hon. MEMBER. Insinuations.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Insinuations were made from day to day, investigation took place and in some of the investigations which did take place hon. members opposite, seeing the position in which they had landed themselves, had not even the courtesy or grace to continue the investigations to the conclusion to give officials against whom they had made insinuations an opportunity of clearing themselves. No charge has been established, though many charges were made, and if hon. gentlemen have induced the public to believe that there is wrong-doing in regard to the tendering system of Canada they should go the whole length and establish some of the wrong-doing. I am satisfied for my part that the regulation which has been passed in regard to tenders meets the case fairly and very fully. It provides for the presence of the minister and of one other chief official of the department when tenders are opened. My hon. friend's motion provides for another man. If two are not sufficient, would three be any better? Why not four; why not five? Surely we must trust somebody in the conduct of public business, and if two high officials, or the minister and another high official of any department are entrusted with the duty of opening tenders, this House and, I think, this country will have confidence in their doing right on each occasion. There has never, in so far as I know, been a charge made that any tender has been tampered with. Tenders, when received, have been kept secretly and sacredly and the order in council provides that they shall be addressed to the proper officer of the department and that they shall be marked tenders for such and such work or for such and such supplies and that:

When received they shall be stamped by the official to whom addressed with the day and hour of their receipt, and placed under lock and key until such time as it shall be found convenient for opening them.

I do not see any greater safeguard you can have unless there is so great a suspicion in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite that they will not trust two high officials of the department. For my part I think that the end will be served by the provision as contained in the order in council, and without discussing the question which has been so well answered by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, as to whether or not the parties tendering should be present when tenders are opened, I beg to move as an amendment to the motion:

That all the words after 'that' be eliminated from the proposed motion and that the following be substituted therefor: The method of inviting, opening and considering tenders, as embodied in the order in council of January 18, 1909, is in the opinion of this House, a proper safeguard of the public interests.

Hon. JOHN G. HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, the question of opening tenders is a moot one in this House and has been again and again brought up for discussion. The objection to the plan of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) as embodied in the order in council, I intend to deal with, and I also propose to say something with regard to some of the remarks of the hon. mover of the amendment to the resolution. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) seems to think that we ought to make a statement of some wrongs or frauds that have been perpetrated and prove them before we can introduce a resolution. Is it not sufficient to show that it is possible that a wrong may be done under the present system and if a remedy can be applied, is it not our duty to apply it? The minister proposes in the regulations that these tenders shall be opened by the minister and one of the officials of the department. It may be his private secretary. To my mind it is a most objectionable system for the minister to open tenders at all.

Under the constitution he has a right to superintend his department and if the regulations provide that a couple of officials shall open tenders, he can be there if he likes to see that the work is properly performed without an order in council or anything of the kind. What has been the system hitherto with regard to the opening of tenders? I presided over the Department of Railways and Canals for a number of years. The tenders were received, sealed and put into the safe. A certain time was provided at which they should be opened. They were opened by two of the officials named in the department for that purpose; that is to-day, the deputy head and the secretary of the department. If there was anything wrong in reference to the tenders, as to the time of their having been received, as to the amounts not totalling up, as to there being mistakes made or anything else, it was the duty of these two officials to report in writing to the minister and the minister was to be guided by the facts in reference to whether one tender or another should be accepted. In reference to the tenders down at Moncton, as my hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Reid) has stated, the system adopted by the British government is similar to that which we had in Moncton. There was a book provided in which the name of everything required from a box of tacks to a paint brush or an anchor was mentioned. This was sent broadcast from one end of the British empire to the other, and tenders were invited for the supply of these particular articles. These tenders were received and were awarded in every case to the lowest tenderer. If there was a difference as to the quality of the article which it was proposed to supply it was left to an outside technical department to determine whether one article was better than the other. A number of parties were asked to tender for a particular kind of work or a particular article. There was a list prepared. There was no difficulty at all about getting on the list; anybody could get on the list. Any responsible party who had the selling of these particular goods in the maritime provinces or in the province of Quebec could be put on the list. He tendered for a particular article. If one party was the lowest and the contract was awarded to that party by the officials at Moncton the officials had to give the reason for their action to the department here, the awarding of the contract had to be approved by the head of the department and a contract never was given until a sample of the article was sent to the technical branch of McGill College in Montreal for examination. In this way, for instance, we would determine the quality of oil, or of steel. Then, on the report of the technical branch of McGill College the contract was awarded. In no case, when I was at the head of the department, was a contract awarded in any other way, and in no case were tenders received privately for any work or orders given privately for any material. Everything was done by contract. The minister (Mr. Pugsley) objects to the public being parties to this——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend let me ask him a question ? I have been very much interested in the course which he says was pursued in the Railway Department, and unless the hon. gentleman informs me to the contrary I presume the same course is being pursued up to the present time, but will my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) tell me, if, during his day, the contractors were ever notified to be present at the opening of the tenders.

Mr. HAGGART. I shall deal with that. I do not know what the system is at the present day, but I know what it was in my day and I can state that except for a few trivial works on the St. Lawrence canals where it was impossible to give the work by contract, everything even to a paint brush was purchased by open competition while I was minister.

Mr. J. D. REID. It was done on the canals then too.

Mr. HAGGART. That is the only course that should be pursued, and it is the course which the law requires this government to pursue but they evade what is embodied in the law. The Minister of Public Works says there has been no reason shown for a change in the system. Does he completely ignore the statements which have been made in this parliament during the last two or three sessions with reference to the granting of timber limits and the awarding of contracts ? Why the very fact that it is possible that such charges could be made is sufficient to call upon the government to ensure that nothing of the kind shall occur in the future. Did any one ever hear of any person objecting to publicity in the opening of tenders in Great Britain? Everything is above board there, except of course in certain cases where the specifications for a new type of torpedo boat or a new implement of warfare may be kept secret, but in regard to general matters such as the building of war ships and the building of everything else required by the British government, fancy a minister of the Crown there interfering in the awarding of contracts or thinking it was necessary for him to be present for the purpose of guaranteeing fair play. Why, Sir, in Great Britain there is not a suspicion of fraud or a suspicion of anything but the fairest of play in the awarding of contracts. The Minister of Public Works deprecates adopting the American system and he says we should look to other places for example. Well, the American system was adopted because a suspicion had got abroad that there had not been fair play in the awarding of contracts and so the tenders were opened when the

tenderers were present. But, says the Minister of Public Works, the government may suffer ; two or three of those who are awarded contracts may combine, forfeit the securities deposited and get a higher price. Well, every contractor gives two securities and if the government find that a contractor deliberately refuses to perform his contract the remedy is in their own hands.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman misunderstood what I said. I did not say they might combine together after they had entered into the contract, I said they might do so before the contract was actually signed.

Mr. HAGGART. How could they combine after they had entered into the contract ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That, is exactly what my hon. friend said.

Mr. HAGGART. I could mean nothing else than that they might combine before entering into the contract. Will that satisfy my hon. friend ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did not the hon. gentleman say that in addition to the deposit there would be a guarantee in the security that would have to be given when they entered into the contract ?

Mr. HAGGART. What I referred to was the deposit made by the party who was tendering for the contract. He could be made to forfeit that and not only that but he has to give the names of two securities who are satisfactory to the government for the due performance of his contract. But, independent of all this, suppose he does not forfeit his deposit or suppose the government does not proceed against the securities, cannot the minister say to that man who defaults : You had a chance, you contracted to do that work within a certain time, you refuse to fulfil it, I will have nothing to do with you and I will never give you a contract again. Therefore, there is a responsibility on the contractor greater even than his deposit and greater than the two securities which he gives. Any idea of combination before entering into the contract is something the minister need not consider at all because there is no probability of it. In order to secure honest dealing, at least what the contractors consider honest dealing with the department, it is but fair to them that they should have an opportunity to be present when the contract is opened and there can be no possible objection to that on any grounds. The minister says there is no necessity for it. Is he unaware that from one end of the country to the other this government is under suspicion. So far as I am concerned I state from my place in this House that while I was a member of the Conservative government I never knew of any wrong-doing being perpetrated in reference to the awarding of contracts. I state from my place that such a thing cannot be charged against any government of which I was a member. But, from one end of the country to the other that is not the opinion to-day.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It seems to be.

Mr. HAGGART. Your majority does not prove it, because there may be other things than the dealings of this government with contractors which affected the result. There is nevertheless a feeling throughout Canada that contracts have been awarded by this government to political hacks through favouritism or worse. What we ask is that there should be applied the remedy which is provided in most civilized countries. We ask that as is done by the American government there shall be the additional security of honesty in awarding contracts that the parties who tender shall be present. To that there can be no honest objection.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, what amused me was the position taken by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). He says there has been no charge made of wrong-doing in handling tenders or awarding contracts, and therefore there is no reason for a change. But the hon. Minister of Public Works proposes a change himself. Therefore if the logic of the hon. member for South Wellington applied to the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid), it applied with equal force to the hon. Minister of Public Works. Why did the minister propose a change ? Why did the Governor in Council make a change? For better safety, presumably. Why for better safety ? Because there is either a suspicion or knowledge that tenders have not been properly opened, and contracts have not been properly awarded in the past. Therefore it does not look very well for the hon. member for South Wellington to play the part of a handy man and address such an argument to the House, because it is not in consonance with the argument of the minister himself. What did the minister say in reference to this matter yesterday ?

I was going to suggest to my hon. friend that perhaps he will allow this motion to stand over, and, with your permission Mr. Speaker, and that of the hon. member, I will read to the House a regulation which has been passed by His Excellency the Governor General in Council, and which I think my hon. friend will see, upon consideration, completely meets the case.

The hon. minister is prepared to meet the case himself. What case ? The case the hon. member for Grenville desires to provide for. There is either a suspicion or knowledge of wrong-doing, and who proposes the change ? The government themselves, who are behind the scenes, and know whether there is or is not wrong-doing. This makes the case ten times strong-

er against them, because, if there was no wrong-doing or suspicion of wrong-doing, and if it was incapable of being established that there was wrong-doing, they would fight it out like men, and stand by what has been the practice and refuse to make a change. But is it a fact, as the hon. member for South Wellington says, that there have been no charges ? No charges ? Were not charges made over and over again in this House last session in connection with the awarding of timber limits ? No charges ? Circumstantial evidence, which in a murder case would be strong enough to hang a man ten times over, will not be accepted by the government. I venture to say that there is not amongst the hon. gentleman's own friends one in a hundred but honestly believes to-day that there was wrong-doing in connection with the awarding of those timber limits. Then we come to ordinary public contracts. Take the tenders for dredging. Why is it that all the dredging plant is to-day practically in the hands of reformers ? Why is it that the plant which was owned by Conservatives when the present government came to power, lay idle year after year until it was sold or transferred to reformers ? Because the owners of this plant had no opportunity of an honest deal to get a contract for dredging and were obliged to dispose of their plant.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my hon. friend know that ?

Mr. SPROULE. I was just about to say that I have been told it by the very men who had the plant. But after they sold it or went into an arrangement with a reformer, they had no difficulty in getting contracts. Will the Minister of Public Works pretend to tell the House that there was no collusion in that case in which it is alleged that a tender for dredging was changed from 50 cents to 55 cents a yard in order that there might be a rake-off of $35,000 ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What case was that ?

Mr. SPROULE. The McAvity case.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend desires an answer, I will say that so far as I have been able to ascertain, so far as the records of the department show, and to the best of my knowledge and belief there was no alteration of the tender. There were two tenders put in, in answer to public advertisement, and the lowest tender was accepted.

Mr. SPROULE. How does the hon. minister reconcile that statement with the statement of the contractor, who says he was willing to tender at 50 cents a yard, but by getting a friend to interfere on his behalf he got 55 cents a yard ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will answer that. I will say to my hon. friend that there appeared one morning in St. John what purported to be a certain solemn declaration which had been read by Mr. Hazen, the leader of the Conservative party, at a great political meeting in St. John, and that declaration did not purport to be signed by the party who professed to have made it. I know myself that it contained statements which were absolutely false, absolutely without foundation, and immediately an application was made to Mr. Hazen, who was the Attorney General of New Brunswick, to have the original of that declaration filed. Mr. Hazen replied that he had returned it to Mr. Mayes, and, although repeated requests have been made from time to time to have it produced so that it may be seen what was in the original, they have refused to produce it, and it has been concealed ever since the election.

Mr. SPROULE. That seems to me to be all beside the case. This man went to a certain individual who was known to be friendly to the government, and he got the contract at the larger figure. Who advised him to do so ? The minister himself who was awarding the contract. Is that creditable either to the minister or to the government ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my hon. friend say that the Minister of Public Works gave the advice ? Will the hon. member be good enough to repeat what he said ? I did not quite hear him.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to make a correction in that respect.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. It is rather amusing to hear the laugh come from the source it does. There is a good deal behind it that would be worth bringing out.

Mr. TALBOT. Make the correction.

Mr. SPROULE. I have as much right at any time to make a correction, as much right as any other member of this House. I was only mixing up two ministers ; but is it not a fact that the recommendation came from the very source that had the power to give the contract ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What does that mean ?

Mr. SPROULE. According to the information disclosed in the public press, it did come from that source.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If I understand what my hon. friend means, I will say that he is entirely and absolutely in error.

Mr. SPROULE. In connection with that very case, there is the undeniable fact that the man who was willing to put in a tender at 50 cents a yard, got it increased to 55 cents a yard, and got it increased by virtue of the advice of the very individuals who had an opportunity to handle the tenders.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my hon. friend make the assertion that a tender was put in at 50 cents a yard and was subsequently changed to 55 cents? In cases of this kind it is desirable that we should be accurate and that those who make statements should know what they are talking about. There have been falsehoods without number circulated with regard to the matter to which my hon. friend refers. They were scattered broadcast throughout Canada at the time of the election, and had not the shadow of a foundation of truth. So far as the records show, so far as I know, and so far as any statement has yet been made, no tender was altered from 50 cents to 55 cents a yard; but there were two tenders put in, in answer to public advertisement, and one of those tenders was for 55 cents a yard.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the minister say that the same man who tendered for 50 cents did not afterward get 55 cents?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will repeat what I have said. I have said that the man who tendered at 50 cents did not get 55 cents. The hon. gentleman is referring to entirely different tenders. In answer to a call by public advertisement, there were only two tenders submitted to the department—one for 55 cents and the other for either one dollar or one dollar and twenty five cents per cubic yard.

Mr. LENNOX. Was not that the same work that the same man tendered at 50 cents before?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On a previous occasion?

Mr. LENNOX. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it was.

Mr. SPROULE. I have what I regard as good ground because I saw the statement in the public press, and it was not denied by the minister. But who gave the advice to Mr. McAvity to put in a higher tender? It was Mr. Pugsley himself.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Again the hon. gentleman is absolutely and entirely mistaken. I gave no such advice, and I venture to say that my hon. friend did not see in the newspapers that I gave any such advice.

Mr. SPROULE. I say emphatically, if my memory is correct, and I believe it is, that I did.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Your memory is mistaken.

Mr. SPROULE. My recollection is that the newspapers said that Mr. Pugsley advised Mr. Mayes as his solicitor.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend makes a statement that it was I who gave the advice to Mr. Mayes to raise his tender from 50 cents to 55 cents. That statement is absolutely without foundation.

Mr. LANCASTER. He did not say that. He said he saw it in the papers.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister is indulging in a great deal of unnecessary special pleading and improper interference with my right to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has the floor, but it is customary to allow a minister to make a personal explanation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I rise to correct the statement made by my hon. friend. He said, if I heard him correctly, that he had seen it stated in a newspaper that I had advised Mr. Mayes to raise his tender from 50 cents to 55 cents.

Mr. SPROULE. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What did the hon. gentleman say?

Mr. SPROULE. What I intended to convey, and what I think I did say, was that the minister advised him to put in a tender at 55 cents per cubic yard for work which he had tendered to do the year before at 50 cents per cubic yard.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Let me say that I never gave any such advice and I defy the hon. gentleman to produce any newspaper in which he saw that statement made.

Mr. CROCKET. Did not the Minister of Public Works see the solemn declaration of Mr. Mayes, and will he say that Mr. Mayes does not there allege that the minister referred him to Mr. McAvity, and that Mr. McAvity advised him to increase the tender.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a very different matter. Settle one thing at a time. What does my hon. friend from Grey say to my correction?

Mr. SPROULE. I did not hear what the minister said the last time. I do not agree in the contention that there is no need of a change unless a case of wrong-doing is proven. I think it is quite sufficient to have a well-grounded suspicion of wrong-doing to justify the government or parliament in providing some remedy. But in this case there is more than suspicion because in case after case, submitted to this House last session, the facts were established over and over again. I am now referring to the dredging contracts. It is well known, at least in Ontario, that Conservatives who own dredging plants cannot get a government contract unless they pass their plant over to reformers or join in with reformers. But once they take in some prominent Reformer or friend of the government, they can get contracts and make

lots of money. How is it that the dredging business is so remunerative to-day, compared with ten or twelve years ago, if there be no wrong-doing? No one who knows anything, can fail to reach the conclusion that the reason the business is so remunerative to-day is because of wrong-doing and not because of the carrying out of a proper system of tender and contract. That is the impression all over the west, and it is well grounded, and it is high time we should have a change. Surely there can be no objection to those who tender being present when the tenders are opened. I can see strong reasons for some change that will inspire and restore public confidence and give the public some assurance that when a man tenders for timber limits or dredging or public works or anything else, he will be fairly and honestly dealt with.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). When I heard the motion proposed by my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid) I was not surprised to find that it did not receive much sympathy from the government and I could appreciate the uneasiness of the members of the government over this attempt on the part of the opposition to take away from them what is practically their life's blood, by means of which they have been able to secure a majority of seats in this House. This resolution is in principle one of the most important ever submitted to Parliament. It aims at the very crux of the corruption which is eating out the heart of the country and has done so much to lower public morality. Well may the cabinet ministers from the first minister down to the Minister of Public Works, look grave and concerned over this matter. It was certainly in very poor taste for the Minister of Public Works to defy public opinion as he has done, and to deny that there is in this motion a principle of public morality which it is the bounden duty of every minister, as well as every member of parliament and every honest, loyal Canadian citizen, to maintain and uphold to the best of his ability.

I do not propose to repeat what has been said, but there are two questions to be dealt with in connection with the opening of tenders. There are two evils, with which the government is very familiar, which the right hon. the leader of the government knows right well are rampant, and which have led to the worst corruption and government mismanagement. What are they? One is the lack of protection against absolute secrecy from the time the tender leaves the hands of the party tendering until opened in the presence of some responsible minister or officer. I need not refer at length to the debate of last session upon the notorious timber deals, where tenders were opened by an officer now sitting in this House, opened in secret and in a manner which did not give confidence to the people who were tendering or to the people of this country and which did not work out for the conservation of the national assets of this country.

The next principle involved is that of the publicity and consequently the security of the dealings with the tender. I was surprised at the speciousness with which the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) attempted to evade that question. I can see no objection to tenders being opened in public. Surely the public moneys ought to be conserved, and surely when the public moneys have to be expended it is to the public interest that the lowest tenderer should get the work provided he is competent and that his and all other tenders are honestly and fairly dealt with. There is an aspect of this debate which is ludicrous in its incongruity and inconsistency. In the last election we saw an hon. gentleman from New Brunswick parading around the country promising works here, there and everywhere to anybody and everybody in order to obtain the support of that province for the government of which he was a minister. Is there any significance in the attitude taken by the Minister of Public Works now? Does he see in this measure some means by which he will be less able to deliver the goods which he promised at that time? The speech of the hon. minister conveys the impression to my mind, and I am sure to the minds of the people generally, that what he desires is not the security of the tender not the secrecy of the tender until it shall be opened in public, but a laxity of procedure and secrecy from the time the tender leaves the hands of the tenderer until it is proclaimed absolutely in the hands of a politician, a member of this House. I understand that the hon. gentleman did in a burst of righteous zeal, when his mind was in that state of exaltation from which we sometimes get the evanescence in this House, state that he had dispensed with the patronage system in his department. His speech in opposition to this motion possibly evidences the manner in which he proposes to dispense with the patronage system in the Public Works Department, and I suppose that is about all the sincerity one can attach to the words of the Minister of Public Works, especially when he is on the stump.

The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) objected very seriously to any suspicion being cast with reference to political interference with tenders. May I recount to the First Minister an incident which occurred during the last election with which he may be familiar as it has been brought to his attention? The works of the Algoma Steel Company were closed down for lack of orders. Tenders were invited by

the National Transcontinental Railway Commission for some 40,000 tons of steel rails and the Algoma Steel Company, the Dominion Steel Company and the United States Steel Company were rival tenderers for this order. The tenders were in, supposedly sealed and secret, and they were to be opened on the first of September. The government candidate in West Algoma came to Ottawa, brazenly announcing that he was coming here to secure for the Algoma Steel Company as large an amount of that contract as they should receive. He was a new candidate and so was not as cautious as some of the others. The tenders were opened and the Algoma Company, most unjustly as we thought, got only one-third of the order. But that gentleman paraded all through the county boasting if he had not come to Ottawa and exercised his influence in respect to these secret tenders not a pound of these rails would have been awarded to the Algoma Company. The Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Graham) visited Sault Ste. Marie and when he appeared on the public platform I addressed an open letter to him asking him to give to the people of that county an affirmation or denial of these statements. The hon. gentleman said that he had not time to attend to it at that time. Are there other similar instances? Yes, Sir. I have in my possession now a letter from a gentleman now occupying a seat on that side of the House asking in reference to vested interests in Northwest timber lands, whether the man who had the vested interests, namely, a license, was a Liberal or a Conservative, because that might make a great deal of difference, and if he was an active Conservative worker he might be able to get the land away from him. Hon. gentlemen opposite say there are no charges or suspicion of charges of political influence in the awarding of tenders. The administration of every department as revealed in the last two sessions reeks with it, and if the Minister of Public Works were to travel for a thousand years from end to end of this country he would not be able to satisfy the people of Canada that there is honesty, probity, secrecy and propriety in the opening of and dealing with tenders. It is just as the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) says, the mercantile world bursts out laughing at you if you allege that this government deals honestly with tenders for public works. I come now to the question of the interest of members on the government side of this House in tenders. Two sessions ago I asked a question of the Prime Minister with reference to a member of his party who I believe as a member of parliament obtained contracts, which if he had obtained in his own name would have constituted a breach of the law, but to avoid that he incorporated himself, his wife, his cousins and his aunts into a corporation called by his own name with the word 'limited' after it. The right hon. gentleman when asked the question simply said that he was not aware whether the hon. gentleman referred to had any connection with the corporation to which I referred. That is another affair. You have the matter of the dredging contracts, to which my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has referred, and there you have a state of things most revolting. You have practically a state of things where certain dredging firms, in which members of parliament are largely interested, members, and ex-members and defeated candidates of the Liberal party, have formed a nice little ring by which they might know when tenders are to be asked for dredging; and that one man writes out a tender for two, one man signs for another, the same tenders go in the envelope of another firm, and so on. Where is secrecy, and where is competition there? The Minister of Public Works has had that brought to his attention, and he sneers at it.

Now just a word in regard to the principle involved in this motion. If the Minister of Public Works desires in any way to pose as being sincere, I see no reason whatever why he should not accept the principle of the motion. I see no reason why the right hon. the Prime Minister, who has secured the confidence of the country for another parliament, should not see in this motion a means of effecting the reform which I understand he has promised in this very matter of departmental administration. My right hon. friend said at Niagara Falls, when confronted with this state of things, that he himself was no saint. I sincerely hope that my right hon. friend, knowing the condition of affairs, as he must know it, will see in the acceptance of this motion by himself something which will redound to his credit, and something which he can claim as a fulfilment of the promise he made on the hustings. If such a resolution were carried and put into effect, what great sums of money would be saved to this country. But I fancy there is no danger of this resolution going into force, for the reason that this resolution is aimed at the very life of this government. What would become of the party heeler? What would become of the hanger-on? What would become of the man who is waiting for a tip, who provides the money for election campaigns, the man whose interest must be protected at all costs? What would become of him if all the tenders had to be kept sealed? Why, Sir, the principle of secrecy is as abhorrent to the members of this government, apparently, as it was to the Department of the Interior at the time of this nefarious timber limit deal that was exposed last session. Mr. Speaker, I unhesitatingly support this motion because I think that the principle of it is one which

will work excellent results for the stability of Canadian institutions.

Mr. W. S. MIDDLEBRO (North Grey). Being one of the new members from the province of Ontario, I would not have ventured to address you to-day were it not that some reference has been made to dredging contracts. I come from a riding which is the home of a dredging and construction company, and perhaps you will pardon me if I say a few words with respect to this motion. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) has said that if there was a feeling of insecurity in this country with reference to the opening of tenders, it was a feeling which had been engendered by the action of the Conservative party, especially during the last session. Now, if that is so, there must be some reason for the change in the manner of opening tenders. If a change has been made in the manner of opening tenders by the Minister of Public Works, it must be because he, from an inward consciousness, believes it is necessary to do so, or because he believes that the Conservative party was justified in making the accusations they did. I desire to say from my seat in this House that I believe the Conservative party were justified in making the accusations they did last session. It has come to pass in this country that people believe that it is necessary to be a member of the Reform party, to be of the same political faith as this government, before you can secure a dredging contract from this government. In my own constituency, the North riding of Grey, as you all know, we have representing us in the local house the Hon. A. G. MacKay, leader of the Liberal opposition in the province of Ontario. It may be a coincidence, but it is so, that that gentleman is also president of the Owen Sound Dredging and Construction Company; it may be a coincidence that, although the assets of that company are worth anywhere from $100,000 to $200,000, he and the relatives of a late Liberal member in this House, own all the stock of that company except three shares of $300, and that these 3 shares consisting of $100 each are distributed nominally among three other persons for the sole purpose of constituting the necessary five in order to be incorporated as a dredging and construction company. That is the company about which there was so much examination in the Public Accounts Committee. We find that that company had obtained contracts from this government practically without any competition whatever; they obtained contracts from this government, as you know, by one consulting with the other, and the tenders, as you know, went into the envelope of one tenderer, and in that manner they were able to get these contracts. Then the Minister of Public Works, in order to alleviate somewhat the pressure of public opinion against this government, changed that system to a system of letting contracts by tender. I understand that when contracts were subsequently let by tender, the figures were higher than they were during the time that contracts were let without tender.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend allow me to correct him?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I wish to correct my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. Order. He ought not to be interrupted.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is customary for an hon. member having the floor to allow a minister of the Crown to put a question, or to give an explanation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do this in all kindness. The hon. gentleman stated that contracts for dredging were let without tender. The hon. gentleman is in error. The evidence is that they were all let after public advertisement and receipt of tenders, and let to the lowest bidder.

Mr. LENNOX. Renewed without tender.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, they were not renewed without tender.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I accept the statement of the Minister of Public Works. But if I understand the matter it is this, that there was a time when the Minister of Public Works adopted the system of letting contracts without tender; that there came a time subsequently when he adopted the principle of letting contracts by tender; that when he let these contracts without tender the work was done for a certain price, but that after he let the contracts by tender the price went up.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman has been misinformed.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. That is the statement made in my riding, and it was made by members of the Liberal party for the purpose of proving that the system which was in force previously, of this administration letting dredging contracts without tender, worked better than the system now in force of letting contracts by tender. But that only goes to prove our argument and contention that the affairs of this country have got into such a state because of the patronage system adopted by this government that there is not a Conservative probably in the whole Dominion of Canada who owns any interest in dredging or construction companies or in any company which has to do with public affairs. They have practically abolished the principle of competition to such an extent that even when contracts are let by public tender there is nobody to tender but the friends of

the administration and there is really no competition. I say to the Minister of Public Works that it is just such a condition that has produced amongst the people of Canada a feeling of distrust and a belief that no man will tender for public works unless he has some political pull with hon. gentlemen occupying the treasury benches. So, I say that it behooves hon. gentlemen opposite to take advantage of every opportunity that is offered to them for the purpose of restoring the confidence of the people which they, by their actions, have displaced during the last twelve years. If there be some little objection made to the principle of allowing tenderers to be present when tenders are opened, the objections are comparatively insignificant as compared with the benefit to be derived from allowing them to be present. That is the position I take. I do not know that I can say more than that, but I desired to give expression of my emphatic approval of the original motion made by my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid) and to say that it will receive my hearty support and that I have always been in favour of the principle of letting contracts by public tender in a bona fide, upright and conscientious manner.

Mr. A. B. CROSBY (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I have to ask the indulgence of the House while I say a few words in regard to the question before us this evening. I would not have undertaken to say anything had it not been that the question of tender and contract came up in the constituency which I have the honour to represent in this House. Therefore, I feel that I am compelled to say a word on this matter. I was somewhat amused to hear the arguments that were put before us as to why we should not have this motion passed. One of these arguments was that set up by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) in which he said that if we give you three members you will ask for four. I say let us have four if we need them and if four are not enough let us have five ; and if five are not enough let us have six, I say that we will ask for the whole House of Commons if it be necessary in order to have this work done in an honest and business-like way. If we cannot have it properly done in the Department of Public Works, or in any other department, we will then move to have these tenders opened on the table of the House and before every member in order that it may be honestly and properly done. Therefore, I say that it was to my mind a very unreasonable and unfair argument for the Minister of Public Works to make in opposition to the motion of my hon. friend. The question is : Are three better than two ? Is there anything wrong with the third man in these departments or is there any reason why he should not call them in ? What is the matter with him ? What is the reason ? Is he too busy? I am informed that the departments are well equipped with officials ; in fact, all the evidence that we have in the country is to that effect. Have you no confidence in the third man ? If you have confidence in him, what is the reason for saying he should not be there ? Is there any reason why the tenderer should not be there ? As the Minister of Public Works said we will have to give him notice. Tell him that the tenders will be opened on a certain particular day and if he is not there it will be his fault and not yours. That is the position I take. In the constituency that I have the honour to represent we have had a great deal of difficulty over tenders. It has not been between Conservatives and Liberals but between Liberals and Liberals, because we have Liberals and Liberals in our constituency. What has been the condition ? The hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) knows very well that in that particular constituency we have a gentleman who supplies ham and bacon to the Militia Department there. What is the result ? A good Liberal sent in a tender for those supplies at the same time as the successful tender was sent in, and he proved to the satisfaction of the public at least, whether he proved to the satisfaction of the department or not, that his tender was lower than that of the man who now has the contract. Moreover, the gentleman who put in that tender is now supplying the gentleman who received the contract to supply the department, and if anybody desires the name of this gentleman I will give it to him. I have risen because in the constituency which I have the honour to represent as the junior member this matter has been brought up and dealt with at very great length. Therefore, diffident as I feel about getting up upon this, almost my first day in the House, I could not forego the opportunity of placing myself on record upon the question. To my mind no argument has been presented to convince this House that the resolution of my hon. friend for Grenville (Mr. Reid) should not be adopted. On the contrary, every argument which has been advanced from the other side of the House indicates very strongly to me at least that I should support this motion. We should not treat this as a party question, are we not here representing the people ? Have we not been sent here by the people ? Should we keep any information away from them ? Should we not give them all the information we can ? Should we let them be part and parcel of the government of the country or should we, having got their votes to place us in this parliament, say to them that we do not want to let them know anything more, until perhaps four or five years from now when we may go back to them and again seek their support, in the meantime

forgetting all about them? Would anybody say to the people in his constituency that he would oppose such a resolution as this? Would any member from any constituency in the Dominion of Canada stand face to face before his electors and say that he would refuse to support any measure that would give information to the people with regard to tenders and contracts? Would he say: We are going to award these contracts as secretly as we possibly can? He would not dare to say that but he would say: If there is anything wrong, if you think there is any better way in which these contracts can be awarded we will be glad to adopt it and to give to the people all the information that they may require in order to satisfy them as to the manner in which this business is done. We are here for the purpose of dealing with these matters. I do not consider it a party question. It should not be a party question. It is a question that involves the security of the people of Canada.

I was somewhat surprised at the conversational argument which took place between the Minister of Public Works and one hon. gentleman on this side of the House. What was the argument? To my mind it was an effort to try and persuade those who were listening that something had not happened that had happened, simply by saying: I did not say that particular thing at that particular time or date, and I am not going to tell you what I did say or at what particular time I said it; you must guess it. The question was asked why it was that some gentleman in St. John was enabled to secure $35,000 or $36,000 out of the contract for which amount he had performed no service. We in our part of the country have not been informed as to how this was brought about. I do not know how he got this money, whether the contractor put his contract in for fifty cents and was told to increase it to fifty-five, and to give five cents to some one else, the fact remains that some one got $35,000 or $36,000 to which he had no right and for which he has never given a day's work to this country. That is how it appears to me. In the city of Halifax we have had a great deal of the patronage evil, so much so that it is almost a wonder to see my colleague and myself here.

My colleague and I have been returned to this House because the good Liberals of the city of Halifax are beginning to realize that public men in offices of public trust must deal properly with the money of the people of Canada. The people of Halifax believed that in order to bring about that desired end they could no longer return to parliament the two former members, and they were two very good men in private life; no better men ever came to this House in their capacity as private citizens. But the people of Halifax came to the conclusion that supporting as they did the government of the day in all its transactions, they were useless as members of parliament, and they told them: You must stay at home. Of course, Sir, it may happen that my constituents will at some future date lose confidence in me, but if they do it will not be because during my career in this House I have not stood up under all circumstances for an economic and honest expenditure of the money of the people. It is not necessary that I should cite as examples contracts that have been awarded in my own city, but let me ask, what better security for square dealing can a minister of the Crown have than that when he calls in his first man and his second man to be present with him, there should also be present the men who have tendered. In what more honest way can the rights of the public be guarded. The Minister of Public Works has told us that the tenderers might conspire to secure a higher price, but cannot the same thing occur to-day under the present system. Will we be in any worse position in that regard, if the resolution is adopted than we are now. I say no. I say that the collusion between tenderers which the Minister of Public Works seems so much afraid of is far easier of accomplishment to-day than it could possibly be under the system which the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Reid) proposes. I shall support the principle of the resolution before the House, and I shall support it because it is a resolution that the people of my constituency sent me here to support. I take it for granted that there is not a man in this House who can go before any intelligent audience in the Dominion of Canada and defend any other principle than that which is embodied in the resolution which I shall be most happy to vote for.

Mr. ALEXANDER B. WARBURTON (Queens, P.E.I.). Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the statement made by the hon. member (Mr. Crosby) that no intelligent man can go before an intelligent audience in this country and defend the principle of the regulation which has been suggested by the Minister of Public Works, I feel that I could go before such an audience and successfully uphold what the hon. minister (Mr. Pugsley) proposes. I represent constituents who are just as intelligent, I think more so, than those represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Crosby), and I would not be at all alarmed to go before my people and defend the regulations passed by the Governor in Council and to-day submitted for our consideration. I therefore have much satisfaction in supporting the amendment of my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), which I believe meets all the requirements of the case. I am a new member and therefore not acquainted with the procedure of this parlia-

ment, but was under the impression that a discussion such as this was more likely to take place during the last session of a parliament than at the first session of a new parliament. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have heard practically the same kind of talk as we have heard to-day, on thirty-five public platforms during the last campaign. We had charges brought against the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), but we found in every case that those who made the charges were utterly incapable of proving them. The hon. gentleman from Assiniboia, next to the hon. member for Brandon, was, during the last campaign probably the most abused man in this Dominion. He can have no idea of the manner in which his name was bandied about the country, and if he had had a thousand ears they would all have been burning. But, in every instance where charges were made against that hon. gentleman and against others with reference to the procedure in connection with the opening of tenders, the accusers invariably stopped before they got to the end. We were told that when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) was in office the tenders for timber limits were opened in the secrecy of a dark room. But those who made the charges never told all that happened; they never told the people that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) waited in the Public Accounts committee room day after day to get a chance to prove the falsity of these charges. They did not tell the people that the Conservatives tried to close up the proceedings in the Public Accounts Committee before the hon. gentleman could have had an opportunity to vindicate his own reputation. When the campaign opened I was not so well informed as to the proceedings in this parliament as I hope to be in the future, but I had with me the report of the Public Accounts Committee and the evidence taken before it, and I was able to show to the people that the hon. member (Mr. Turriff) gave his evidence fairly and squarely before the committee, and that his secretary gave her evidence clearly and well, and that that evidence proved beyond a shadow of doubt that it was false to state that the tenders had been opened in any fraudulent manner whatever. It occurs to me as rather peculiar also that the hon. gentlemen who to-day have addressed the House from the Conservative benches have also neglected any reference to that phase of the question But, Sir, I may say that the people of Prince Edward Island took no stock in the charges which were made, and that Conservatives and Liberals alike came to the conclusion that this was but a repetition of the same old story which they had heard repeated so often by our Conservative friends and that there was no foundation for the charges, and so my colleague and I redeemed our constituency for the Liberal party, and placed it with the other constituencies which have returned members here to work for the good government of Canada. In not a single instance, Sir, did the Conservatives succeed in proving the correctness of any of their charges against any member or supporter of the government or against the government as a whole. These charges of general wrongdoing are very easy to make, but they are not so easy to prove. There was ample opportunity last session, if I read correctly the reports of the Public Accounts Committee, to prove this or any other charge that might be made, and to prove it up to the hilt; and what I am surprised at is that if these charges were so notorious and glaring, they were not then proved up to the hilt.

I listened with much pleasure and satisfaction to the certificate of good character given by the Minister of Railways of the former Conservative governments to the various governments of which he was a member. His statement of the good character of those governments and of every member of them was somewhat of a surprise to me, because it rather clashed with the ideas I had formed of the political history of this country for a good many years. The earliest knowledge I acquired of the political history of Canada after confederation was that during the rule of the Conservative party we were always hearing of something notorious and corrupt, and that redounded to the disgrace of Canada, beginning with the Pacific scandal of 1873, and ending with such performances as that in connection with the Curran bridge.

A good deal of the discussion this afternoon seems to have taken the form of an attack on the Minister of Public Works. It is not necessary for me to say anything in defence of that hon. gentleman, for I know of no man better able to defend himself. But the fact seems to have been overlooked that the matter referred to was brought before the minister's own province of New Brunswick in the shape of an affidavit, and that the gentlemen who made use of that affidavit were compelled to withdraw it, and withdrew it in shame.

Mr. LENNOX. To change the date only.

Mr. WARBURTON. I am aware that it is alleged that there was an error in the date; but in making affidavits which attack the character of a public man, no lawyer has any excuse for making errors even in dates. If any hon. member of this House had been concerned in making that affidavit, and stated that that was an honest mistake, I would be compelled, under the rules of the House, to accept this statement; but when the men in St. John, who made these statements deliberately, and read them before a public meeting,

say that that was an honest mistake, I for one refuse to believe them. However, that matter has been judged by the people of this country. The changes were rung on these charges on every platform throughout the length and breadth of the land, and the people of New Brunswick, the province from which the Minister of Public Works comes, gave a decided verdict in his favour, sending him back to this House with a representation of eleven out of thirteen which it seems to me is a remarkably good certificate of character

We have head references to dredging contracts. In the part of the country from which I come I have herd no complaints on that score; the dredging contracts have been carried on satisfactorily, and at no very great expense. I did hear that the Minister of Public Works was badgered in this House last session for extending contracts for dredging purposes which had already been let, and that there was such an outcry that he gave way and called for new tenders, with the result that the new prices were considerably higher than those for which he could have renewed the old contracts, and the Dominion of Canada consequently lost a large sum of money, I think over **$100,000 a year.**

The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Crosby), spoke of the good work done in Halifax by the good Liberals and Conservatives of that city. Well, Halifax is a very fine place, but it has had a peculiar record in Dominion politics. Some years ago it was represented by my good friend the late Hon. A. G. Jones; but there seems to be a lack of stability about it, for it frequently changes from one party to the other. It seems to be something like the monster which is always crying for more, more, and looking for something new. It has always been looking to the government to do something more for it, whether building elevators or something else, though it is a very wealthy city. I suppose in doing this it is consulting its own interests. I expect that four years hence it will change its representation back again to the Liberal party, and eight years hence it will perhaps change again. In the county I represent we have also good Liberals and Conservatives. They took the record of the present government into favourable consideration, with the result that they enabled my colleague and myself to bring that county back to what is and should be its natural home, and unless things change very materially, we propose to keep it there.

The hon. members of the opposition seem to be suspicious of everything. I suppose oppositions are born suspicious—it comes natural to them. Our hon. friends opposite are very often suspicious. A few months ago they were even suspicious that the country was going to turn out the present government and put them in office. But the results of the general election have shown most conclusively and satisfactorily that that suspicion was absolutely unfounded. I do not propose to take up any more time of the House in discussing this matter. I think it has been fairly well thrashed out, and being a new member I shall not trespass any more, Mr. Speaker, on your attention.

Mr. ERNEST ROY (Dorchester). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the present debate having hitherto been carried on in the English language, it would not appear amiss that I should add a few words in French.

The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Crosby) stated a moment ago that the principle at stake being one in which everybody must concur, no intelligent man in Canada could reasonably vote against it.

I am well aware that in a large number of Canadian constituencies, this argument was used for the purpose of injuring the Liberal government in public opinion and more particularly of discrediting the administration of the departments of government as regards the awarding of contracts. It must be conceded that, in the majority of constituencies, the people pronounced very clearly upon the issue thus placed before them by the Conservative candidates. What was the principal question submitted to the people during the last general election? Our opponents accused the government of being corrupt and of spreading corruption by awarding contracts, not for the general advantage of Canada, but in the interest of the friends of the Liberal party and to the detriment of the national treasury. Such were the charges made by our opponents. Were those charges substantiated? They were repeated in the constituency where I had the honour of running and the Liberal candidate was returned. When asked: Have you any means of proving the truth of such charges, have they been investigated and with what result? they were constrained to admit that no proof had been adduced, and the people understood the situation. They felt that groundless charges should not be considered. It was sought to create the impression that all public contracts were granted by favour. It was said and repeated that the government could not be acting in the public interest, but that they considered only the return of the Liberal party and the private advantage of their friends.

The resolution now submitted by the member for Grenville is but a continuation of the same policy. It seems to me that the majority in this House should therefore reject it. Our opponents were either right or wrong. The people by their recent verdict have declared them wrong.

The people having thus given judgment, should we go any further? If, as the hon. member who preceded me remarked, the

investigation had established that contracts were being granted contrary to the interests of Canada, not one member, I am sure, would have opposed the new method now suggested for putting a stop to all further abuses in that respect.

I have no desire to prolong this debate, but I consider it my duty to explain why I shall presently vote against the resolution submitted by the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid).

It is a question of principle, says he. It is true. It is a question of principle, more especially as regards ministerial responsibility. It is the minister's duty to award contracts and to do so in the public interest. In such cases the lowest tender is not always the best, and each case should be considered on its merits. Does it not frequently happen that a tenderer is not in a position to properly carry out the contract? The tender may frequently be made by a man who, with the support of a few friends, is entering into an enterprise the nature of which he knows nothing, a man of small experience and perhaps over confident. In such cases should not the minister use his own judgment? Ministerial responsibility comes in here and it is the fundamental principle over our system of government. The responsible minister decides in what manner contracts shall be awarded.

What is the subject of the resolution now submitted to the House? Does it not tend gradually to deprive the ministers of that responsibility? Is it not natural that the head of a department should consider not only the amount of a tender, but also the qualifications of the tenderer? This appears to me to be the true principle that should guide us, the maintenance of ministerial responsibility. If the minister were bound by hard and fast rules, what would become of the principle? The head of a department would become a mere machine, moving in obedience to rigid and inflexible rules. He would be nothing, his initiative would be gone and the system of responsible government would give place to one of independent commissions. That, I believe, would not be going forward, but backward.

I will say no more. In former parliaments, my county of Dorchester was represented by a Conservative, and this fact confirms me in my intention of opposing the resolution. Since 1896, that riding had constantly favoured the Conservative policy, but this time it has returned a supporter of the government, although every argument which has been adduced here to-day was used during the campaign.

Mr. P. E. BLONDIN (Champlain). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I am a new comer in this House and I think it incumbent upon me to say something on the question now submitted. I do not consider it, as have done some of the members who have spoken before me, an attack directed against the government. It is, to my mind, the enunciation of the principle that we should constantly seek more perfect methods in the awarding of public contracts, and I cannot understand why we should oppose such a resolution.

Has it been shown by any of the previous speakers that the resolution is not of a nature to further safeguard public interest in the granting of contracts? It matters little whether the government view this proposal as a reflection upon themselves. That is not the standpoint from which I consider the question. Conditions are never so perfect as to preclude improvement. The object of this proposal is to give further security and thereby fuller satisfaction to the public in connection with the granting of contracts. It has not been contended as yet that, under our present system, public interest is as fully safeguarded as it would be under the system advocated by the member for Grenville, and no argument has been made so far on that point of a nature to induce to vote against the motion, which accordingly I shall support.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). Mr. Speaker, what has taken place this afternoon shows that there is some unrest in the country with reference to the awarding of contracts. I think it would be a great misfortune if the amendment proposed by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) should carry. That amendment, as I understand it, states that the regulation which has been laid before the House by the Minister of Public Works forms a sufficient and a complete safeguard of the public interest in regard to the opening of tenders. The fact that there is a great lack of confidence throughout the country in regard to this question should itself warrant very strong measures in regard to the care of tenders for the future, even if it were possible that the measures proposed by the government were under ordinary circumstances sufficient. I do not, however, think that they are sufficient; they fall very short of what they should be.

It has been stated that the precautions which it is proposed to take are just as great as those which are taken in Great Britain. I have some knowledge of the precautions that were taken in some of the departments in Great Britain some years ago and have no reason to suppose that they have been relaxed. In Great Britain they take a great deal more care of the tenders themselves. In the departments of which I have knowledge the tenders are sealed on receipt, by the department itself. The regulations now proposed contain no such provision. After the tender has been sealed in Great Britain it is placed under lock and key, and in some departments it is further safeguarded by the use of duplicate locks with keys in possession of different officers.

I know that in at least one department the tenders were opened in the presence of at last three of the senior officers of the department, and further that in one department it was the custom not to allow the junior clerks to serve too long a term in a position in which the tenders actually passed through their hands, so that every precaution is taken to prevent any possibility of tampering with the tenders. I do not think it will be alleged that these precautions have been taken there because of charges of maladministration in regard to the tenders; they have been taken in order to provide against any possibility of any suspicion being cast, and in order to give confidence to persons putting in tenders for public works or buildings or for the supply of articles to the public authorities in Great Britain.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend seems to have a good knowledge of the practice in at least some of the departments in Great Britain. Does he know that the contractors or the public have been invited to be present at the opening of tenders?

Mr. LAKE. Of course I am speaking from recollection, and I was not present when the tenders were opened, but in the particular department of which I have knowledge I do not think the public were invited to be present and I do not think they were present, but I am not quite certain upon that point. Anyway the logical sequence of what I have said is that it is advisable in this country, at least in the present state of public feeling, that we should have every possible safeguard, and I think the government would be making no mistake if they added to the safeguard which they have proposed, and I feel it would be a great pity if the House should adopt the amendment proposed. The proposals of the government are open to criticism. Personally I do not like the idea of having the minister as one of the officers to open the tenders. No doubt in most cases the matter will ultimately have to go to the minister, but the opening of tenders should be left to the senior permanent, non-partisan officials; the presence of the minister is introducing the political side into the detailed workings of the department. I hope the government will not allow the amendment to pass, but will give further consideration to the matter and that the House will not put itself on record as endorsing a regulation which does not go far enough and does not sufficiently guard the interests of the country.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (North Oxford). Mr. Speaker, it is more on account of the spirit of the motion of my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) and of the speeches by which it has been supported than of the motion itself, that I personally refuse to accept it, because I cannot see that it makes any great difference whether one, two or three persons are present when a tender is opened. The motion and the speeches in support of it have been inclined to cast a reflection on the ministers of this government which personally I do not believe is deserved. It has struck me as peculiar in listening to the speeches this afternoon that there should be such an amount of suspicion in the parts of the country from which our Conservative friends come, because this is the first time in my life that I have heard of any suspicion that the tenders were not properly opened or that contracts were not properly awarded by this government. I very well remember a tender for a public building during the time of my friend the late Hon. James Sutherland, when Mr. Sutherland as Minister of Pubic Works went so far as to put up the money for the deposit for one of the tenderers, a friend of his and of mine, at the same time telling him most distinctly that although he was a very strong personal friend of his, and although he thought a great deal of him his tender would have to be the lowest or he would have no chance of getting a contract. It was only this afternoon that I heard that our ministers are so dishonest that the contracts are not properly awarded. I am sure that the suggestion cannot be well founded, that it is entirely a matter of imagination. I have in my private and semi-public life often heard people accused of graft or of having some hidden reason for doing certain things, although I knew personally and absolutely that there was no ground for the charge except the mean suspicion of the mind of the person who originated it.

I can see nothing in the argument that the minister himself should not be one of those present at the opening of tenders, because under the constitution, so far as I have read it, the matter has to go to the minister eventually and he might just as well open the tender as have his secretary or some other subordinate official do so. After the receiving of tenders, the mere sealing and locking up of the document is of little importance, although I have no doubt they are sealed when they are put away. After all it is a matter of trust. If the minister and one of his subordinates wanted to be dishonest, the presence of the minister at the opening of the tenders would not greatly increase their opportunities of doing so. No matter what safeguard we adopt the tenders will have to be sent to some one. Perhaps they might be sent in some conspicuous manner, by a balloon or something of that kind so that every one could see them, but as it is essentially a matter of trust, I do not see what advantage would be gained by that.

What difference does it make whether there are one or two or three of the minister's assistants present at the opening of tenders? If the minister were dishonest he

could keep any wrong-doing as secret with two or three subordinates as with one. But what reason have we to suppose the minister will be dishonest, that he will not do what is absolutely fair? Is it not the privilege of every member on either side of the House to ask the minister what the tenders have been and all particulars?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. NESBITT. If that is the case, would not the minister be a green fellow and a very innocent fellow who would vary a tender? A man in any part of the country, in my constituency or any other, who tendered for any contract would certainly find out the amounts of the other tenders and if he could not find it out himself, would he not ask some member of this House to find out for him. Now you might say that after the tender is let there is no recourse. But at the same time, is it not asking too much of our credulity to believe that any minister would be so innocent as to confirm a tender that was not the lowest unless he had some very good reason to believe that it was in the public interest to confirm it, especially in view of the fact that he might have to tell this House at any moment what the tender was, and all the particulars concerning it? Looking at all the circumstances surrounding this motion, it seems to me that it has been moved for the sole purpose of casting a reflection on the minister of this government, and for that reason I shall vote for the amendment.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I have listened with a good deal of interest to the remarks of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Nesbitt), and I have only to say that if his theory is carried out to its logical fulfilment, we would do away with all safeguards, and make everything a matter of trust in all the departments of the government, as well as in all corporations, leaving everything as a mere matter of confidence in a person's integrity. I think that would not be a very successful way of conducting departmental business. I do not think my hon. friend the Postmaster General would let it go that way in his large department. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island seemed to feel as if it were altogether out of place to say anything more in criticism of departmental uprightness and the like of that, because the matter had been brought up in the general elections and the government had been returned to power. Well, that is a rough and ready, but not the most thorough, vindication of the acts of the government on the ground that they carried a majority of the constituencies.

But I wish to make a little more clear what I am afraid the Minister of Public Works left a little hazy with reference to the McAvity affair. It is important that we should have a proper conception of the facts, so far as we can get them. Now what are the facts? If we go by affidavits, and if we place alongside the facts of the affidavit of Mr. Mayes the affidavit of Mr. McAvity, and what he met in Mr. Mayes' affidavit, and what he did not meet that is what he denies and what he practically admits.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. FOSTER. No, I must make my statement now. I have known my hon. friend a long time pretty well, and I know he would like to break in and make a speech of about fifteen minutes every ten minutes of the time which is allowed me, and I do not propose to let him do it. By and by, if I see there is a good opening for my hon. friend, I will let him in. Now there was a man by the name of Mayes, who lived in the city of St. John. Mayes was a contractor, and owned dredging plant and apparatus, or hired dredging plant and apparatus—that was his business. There was a man in the city of St. John by the name of McAvity, who was not a dredger and did not own a dredging plant, and had not up to that time, or since so far as I know, had anything to do as a part owner, or whole owner, or in any other capacity in reference to dredging. But Mr. McAvity was high in the councils of the Liberal party; he was the high chief muck-a-muck in the city of St. John; he was the great head of the patronage distribution in the city of St. John. There was a man in the city of St. John by the name of Wm. Pugsley, at that time Attorney General of the province. Now Mr. Mayes, the dredger and contractor, put in a tender for dredging at the rate, I think, of 50 cents per cubic yard. That tender was not accepted. It is immaterial whether there were other tenders or not. Mr. Mayes went to Mr. Pugsley, who was at that time the Attorney General of the province, and recounted his difficulties. Mr. Pugsley, according to Mr. Mayes' affidavit, told Mr. Mayes to go and talk it over with Mr. McAvity. Well, we can each take what each one wishes as to what was the significance of talking it over with McAvity. Mayes took the advice, according to the affidavit, and talked it over with McAvity. McAvity, who was not a contractor, is not a dredge owner, said to Mayes, I am going to Ottawa, meet me at Ottawa on a certain date. Mayes went to Ottawa, found McAvity there, met him on that same day. McAvity says to Mayes, What are you willing to do this for?—according to the affidavit—and Mayes says, I tendered for it at 50 cents per cubic yard, I can do it for that, and I am willing to take it now for that. McAvity says to Mayes: Why not make it 55 cents, and give the other five cents to me? Mayes says to McAvity, What will you do? Will you join me in capital in buying a dredge, or hiring a dredge, and help me out in that way? If

you will, we will go in together and share the profits. McAvity said to Mayes, I am not in that business, but if you get the contract you can easily raise the money at the banks. They went to the minister of the department, the minister being the hon. Charles Hyman. Mr. Mayes sat down outside, and McAvity went inside to the holy of holies, or the holiest of the holy, whichever you prefer. After having been in there for a certain time, McAvity came back and said to Mayes, I want you to go in and see the minister, and explain to him how it would be better to get a contract for 400,000 cubic yards—they had been talking about the expense—and tell him that if you went to the expense of getting large machinery you ought to have a heavy contract in order to make your profits. Mayes agreed, the affidavit went on, and explained the whole matter thoroughly to Mr. Hyman, and came back. Then Mayes and McAvity talked about the matter, and Mayes said to McAvity: Well, we will think about it, and see about the agreement, and the like of that. McAvity, according to the affidavit, drew out an agreement ready for signature, and said, I have an agreement here, why not sign it now and get the thing arranged? Then the two talked with reference to the part McAvity was to take, and it ended in this, according to the affidavit, that McAvity promised nothing more than that he would use his influence to get a large contract of 400,000, or so, yards, but he would not take part in hiring the dredge or in going into the business on the partnership plan. Then, according to the affidavit, Mayes said to McAvity: Well, what is your part in this? Oh, well, said McAvity, write whatever you please, write something and I will sign it. And here is the regular agreement, written by Mr. Mayes and signed by Mr. George McAvity:

And whereas the said George McAvity is to receive moneys out of the performance of the said contract, he agrees and promises to use his influence and endeavours with the Minister of Public Works or office of the government at Ottawa, to increase the number of yards to be dredged at the aforesaid site of contract.

(Sgd.) GEORGE A. McAVITY.

I am not reading the whole affidavit; that, I think, is about the essence of the affidavit. The hon. Minister of Public Works places a great deal of weight upon the fact that there was a mistake in the affidavit, that it was incorrect.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question? Does my hon. friend vouch for that being an affidavit that has been sworn to?

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose I shall have to read it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not the question.

Mr. FOSTER. (reading)

I, Gershon S. Mayes, of the parish of Lancaster, in the city and county of St. John, in the province of New Brunswick, contractor, do solemnly declare that on the first day of September, 1905, on the advice of Hon. William Pugsley, who was then Attorney General of the province of New Brunswick and is now Minister of Public Works of Canada, I had a conversation with George McAvity of the city of St. John, in said province, merchant, relative to tenders for dredging which was then to be done in the harbour of St. John by the Public Works Department of Canada of which Hon. C. S. Hyman was then minister.

Then continues a recital of the whole matter and finally:

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act.

Declared before me at the city of St. John, in the city and county of St. John, this 12th day of October, A.D. 1908.

W. H. HARRISON.

A commissioner for taking affidavits to be read in the Supreme Court.

That is all I have to read; let it be interpreted as it may. But the Minister of Public Works says: Do you not see there is an absolute error. On October 15, 1907, said the original document, I received a telephone message from Dr. Pugsley asking me to call in and see him next day. The Minister of Public Works says that is an error. The very evening that the statement is made Mr. Mayes comes out and says:

St. John, October 13, 1908.

Hon. Wm. Pugsley,
Minister of Public Works,
St. John, N.B.

I notice by this evening's papers that you comment on my affidavit stating that you obtained $2,000 from me on October 16, 1907. The date should be October 16, 1905, and the error is entirely a typographical one which I regret and have taken the proper steps to have corrected.

I remain yours, &c.,
G. S. MAYES.

It was unfortunate that a mistake should have been made, but we are all mortal and we all make mistakes; that is, nearly all of us make mistakes and it does not cast a reflection upon Mr. Mayes or derogate one single iota from the real gist of the statement that he made a typographical error, which, as soon as it came to his notice, he immediately made good and gave the right date. Now, Sir, what is the statement? It is that Mr. McAvity received from Mr. Mayes $35,933 of the public money of Canada. Mayes had tendered to do the work at fifty cents. He came to Ottawa prepared to tender at fifty cents. The man that Mr. William Pugsley had told him to go and

talk it over with met him at Ottawa and said to this man Mayes, according to the affidavit: Why not make it fifty-five cents? The work is not worth more than fifty cents, you can do it for fifty cents, but where do I come in if you only get fifty cents for it? Make it fifty-five cents, do exactly the same work and no more and let me have the five cents. The addition was made and he got it. Now, Sir, what happens? Mr. McAvity makes an affidavit. I have it here. Mr. McAvity takes good care, neither in his affidavit nor anywhere else to dispute in any way the fact that he had received five cents additional and that he had put it into his own pocket, but in his affidavit he tries to justify it by saying that he had a good many conferences and a good deal of trouble and bother about it and therefore he felt justified in taking that amount of money. These are the plain facts of the case. It is not true that Mr. William Pugsley was exactly in the same official position in 1905 that he occupied in 1907, but Mr. Gershon Mayes asseverates in the statement he makes that Mr. William Pugsley, the Minister of Public Works, when he came into office, knew that an arrangement of this kind was being carried on between Mayes and McAvity and that he endeavoured in various ways to facilitate McAvity's interest. Now, Mr. William Pugsley, the Minister of Public Works, may deny that and he has a perfect right to the denial, but this vital statement made by Mayes, and the great main truth is that a middleman comes in and takes $35,993 of the people's money for which he made no return of service to the public, it is sworn that he did, it is not denied and it is in fact admitted. The Minister of Public Works, the guardian of the department, the Minister of Justice, and the Prime Minister himself all know it, and yet when they were asked by a member of parliament representing the people whose money had thus been wrongly taken as to whether they have done anything or intend to do anything what was the minister's answer yesterday? No action has been taken by the government. Here is the minister's answer:

The government is not aware that it has a claim against the parties referred to for the amount mentioned or any amount. The records of the Department of Public Works show that tenders for the dredging referred to were called for by public advertisement and that the contract was awarded in a regular and proper manner to the lowest tenderer.

Two, 3 and 4 answered by the reply to No. 1.

The questions asked in Nos. 2, 3 and 4 are these:

2. Has the repayment of this money been demanded?

3. Does the government propose to take action for the recovery of this money?

Mr. FOSTER.

4. Has the government consulted with or taken the opinion of the Department of Justice as to its rights?

These were the questions asked and the minister's reply is that the government is not aware and that the government does not propose to ask anybody to make it aware. What I put up to the Minister of Public Works and the First Minister is that here is $35,900 of the people's money gone astray. If the affidavit is true, if it be true that McAvity has not gainsaid it by affidavit and he has not and would not, if it is true that he has practically acknowledged that he has got it and there is no doubt in the minds of the people generally that he has, what does this government propose to do about it? It may declare that it has no responsibility, and make no move, but as long as there is a shred of conscience or an ounce of consistent thinking and of principle in the people of Canada the position will be taken, the position will be forced, and the position will make way for itself that these are not the proper guardians of the people's money.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that a question which simply deals with the best mode of treating public tenders cannot be discussed without dragging in what seem to me to be irrelevant matters, and without making statements which are calculated to draw the House away from the real issue which is involved in the motion and in the amendment before the House. What the amendment proposes to do is to provide for everything which I think has been suggested this afternoon as being really necessary to safeguard the public interest. It has been urged, and properly urged, that it is desirable that when the tenders are received that they shall be under seal; that they shall be addressed to the proper officer of the department, and that when received they shall be placed under lock and key until the time shall come to open them. All that has been provided for by the regulation which has been passed by the Governor in Council and of which the House has been informed. We cannot of course guard in every way against the dishonesty on the part of an official, because if an official should desire to be dishonest he might by some mysterious means have the envelopes opened and after examining the tenders have one substituted for another, but it has never been suggested that this has been done or is likely to be done. The regulation provides that those tenders shall be kept under lock and key; that they shall be kept secret until the time comes for their being opened by the minister and the deputy, or by two of the principal officials of the department in case the minister may happen to be absent. It does seem to me that my hon. friends opposite have not

shown that the public interest can be any better safeguarded by having present when the tenders are opened, three officials of the department instead of the minister and the deputy minister as is provided for in the regulation. The only other question which seems to be involved as a matter of principle in the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Reid) is as to whether or not it is desirable that the contractors who have put in tenders shall all be invited to be present at the opening of the tenders. My hon. friend (Mr. Lake) who dealt with the subject very fairly, stated he had a knowledge of the course which is pursued by the British Government in such matters and he says that so far as he knows it has never been customary in England to have the contractors present at the opening of tenders. I have shown to this House that never since confederation has it been suggested that it was desirable that the contractors should be invited to be present, and never has that course been considered advisable by any provincial government in Canada. I ventured to suggest reasons why such a course should not be followed, and notwithstanding all that has been said by hon. members opposite I affirm that in my opinion no good purpose would be served, but on the contrary that it would give an opportunity to contractors to collude together to withdraw their tenders if they saw fit, and to force the department either to accept a higher tender to the disadvantage of the country, or to reject all the tenders and invite new ones. My hon. friend from North Lanark (Mr. Haggart) told the House that there never had been any wrong-doing or any suggestion of wrong-doing in connection with the Intercolonial Railway when he was a minister. I do not question the accuracy of the statement which the hon. gentleman makes, but I do say that the very course which was pursued by him is the course which is being pursued to-day. In the case of all supplies which are required for the Intercolonial railway every opportunity is given to obtain them at the lowest market price; the tenders are opened by responsible officers of the department and if any question arises which requires expert advice that expert advice is obtained. Now, let me ask my hon. friend—and I think he will answer with that spirit of fairness which he is always disposed to manifest, let me ask him why he wants that course departed from so far as the Intercolonial is concerned? The hon. gentleman said it is because there is a feeling in the public mind that there is something wrong in the way that tenders are now opened, but let me tell the hon. gentleman that if there is any such suspicion in the public mind it has been created by the disposition on the part of gentlemen opposite to make insinuations without any evidence to support them, and to make charges of graft and wrong-doing without having the slightest tittle of evidence to support such reckless statements. During the last campaign these insinuations were pressed from every platform in Canada, and the result of the election shows that the majority of the people believe that this government and the various members of it are endeavouring honestly and conscientiously and to the best of their ability to discharge the important duties they have been called upon to discharge. Now, let me say to my hon. friends opposite, and I say it with all sincerity, that although a great deal has been insinuated against my department, it is open to any member of this House to make a motion for the bringing down of the orders in council awarding contracts for Public Works in this country, and they shall be readily brought down. Since I have been a minister, contracts have been awarded involving the expenditure of a good many millions of dollars, and if a motion is made I am quite willing they shall all be submitted to the closest scrutiny of this House or of any member of a committee of this House. I have pursued the course followed by my predecessors in office since this government came into power, and public tenders are called for by public advertisement for all works which involve an expenditure of over $5,000, except of course in cases of emergency where there has not been time to call for public tenders, and in these cases the special circumstances must be submitted to His Excellency in Council and must be passed upon. Now, Liberals and Conservatives alike have put in tenders for these works, and when hon. gentlemen opposite say that Conservatives will not tender for Public Works at the present time they are stating that which they have no knowledge of and which the facts will prove to be untrue. Conservative contractors do tender equally with Liberal contractors and if the Conservative contractor happens to put in the lowest tender and if he is a responsible contractor certified to by the officers of my department as capable of carrying out the work, he is given the contract in every instance. If hon. gentlemen desire to have the records brought down they will be able to see that the statement which I now make is true, I believe the same applies all through the departments of government. Hon. gentlemen opposite have given as one reason why the tenderers should be notified to be present when the tenders are opened, that there was no more danger of collusion and no more danger of the withdrawing of tenders than there is at present. But there is this difference. Under the present system the tenderers do not know until the contract is awarded what is the bid of the other tenderers, whereas if they were present they would know. Under

the present system they do not know, unless the other tenderers choose to tell them, and so they cannot say what would be the result of withdrawing their tender and refusing to enter into the contract. But if they knew that one or two tenders were for small amounts, and others were for larger amounts, it would be the easiest thing in the world for them to collude together.

Mr. HAGGART. Does it not strike the minister that they might ask one another and find out after the tenders were in?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is true, but contractors are not in the habit of asking each other after the tenders are in. They do not know what to do, and it is in the public interest that they should not know what to do, until the lowest tenderer is notified and is invited to enter into the contract. That makes the bargain, and when the contract is once entered into there is the security to the Crown for the performance of the contract.

Now, having dealt thus with the resolution which is before the House, let me refer briefly to some matters which have been brought up by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and by some other gentlemen. I had supposed, Sir, that, with the recollection of what took place in the province of New Brunswick in the recent election, my hon. friend from North Toronto would have been the last man to want to refer to the matters which were discussed during that election, and upon which the people, to the best of their ability, passed their judgment and rendered their verdict. The hon. gentleman has referred to what he is pleased to call an affidavit made by Mr. Gershon S. Mayes. Let me ask my hon. friend if he can vouch for the paper from which he has read having been an affidavit and having been actually sworn to or declared to?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Mayes vouched for it himself.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was to my hon. friend from North Toronto that I addressed the question.

Mr. FOSTER. I have read what I have read, and my hon. friend may take whatever he chooses out of it. After he makes his speech he will get his answer.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend declines to answer my question. Let me say that I and others are deeply interested in knowing whether this alleged affidavit was actually sworn to, and, in case it was, we are anxious to know in whose possession it is to-day, so that it may be available for use in the courts of justice. Let me say to you, Sir, that in the city of St. John during the recent election it was whispered to me that upon a certain night, when a great Conservative meeting was to be held in St. John, a meeting which was to be graced with the presence of Sir James Whitney, the premier of Ontario, and I think the Hon. Mr. Roblin, the premier of Manitoba, as well as other distinguished gentlemen, a bombshell was to be exploded which would drive me as Minister of Public Works out of public life. Well, I was curious to know what was this bombshell that was to drive me out of public life, because I may say to my hon. friend from North Toronto that though a good many things have been said against me by himself and by gentlemen who have been associated with him, it has always been a sort of protection to me in the public mind that I had many early and pleasant associations with my hon. friend. We happened to have gone from the same county, almost from the same settlement, in one of the country districts of New Brunswick, to the university when we were boys. We went in the same year and entered the same class, and it was always my pride that I was able to follow my hon. friend, even at some little distance, along the lines of good conduct.

Mr. FOSTER. You were safe there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and when these charges were made against me from time to time, particularly in the last election, my friends and the people generally would say: 'Oh, well, you can't be so bad as they say you are, because we never thought you would be as good as Mr. Foster, and think of the horrible things they say about him.' Well, Mr. Speaker, you will pardon the digression, but on this occasion I was curious to know what was to be said about me, and I had a friend go to this great meeting and see what was this terrible bombshell that was to be exploded. I found that it was in what purported to be an affidavit or declaration, which was read by the Hon. Mr. Hazen, the premier of New Brunswick, and the leader of the Liberal-Conservative party of that province; and among other things it stated that in the month of October, 1907, after I had become Minister of Public Works, and was charged with the duty of administering the affairs of that department and deciding as to contracts which might or might not be let by the department, Mr. Gershon S. Mayes, a contractor, had an interview with me or had been interviewed by me, and that I had intimated to him that it would be very desirable for him to have a friend at Ottawa to watch his interests, and that he gave to me at that time, when I was Minister of Public Works, the sum of $2,000. That alleged affidavit, as I have said, was read by Mr. Hazen at this great Conservative meeting, it appeared in the papers the next morning, it was telegraphed that night throughout Canada and I believe appeared in every Conservative paper from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what my friends in the

various sections of this country thought; I do not know what my honoured leader thought; but I know what I thought. I realized that if my leader thought there was a shadow of foundation of truth in that statement, I should not have been able to remain a member of this cabinet for a single day. The charge was made against me by the premier of New Brunswick that in October, 1907, after I had become the Minister of Public Works, charged with protecting the interests of the people of this country, I had been so recreant to my duty that I had received a large sum of money from a contractor who was seeking for business with the department over which I have the honour to preside. Sir, a more infamous charge was never made against a public man. On the following morning I called up the secretary of the Liberal-Conservative Association, Mr. Harrison, before whom the affidavit purported to have been signed; for, as it appeared in the morning paper it did not purport to have been signed by Mr. Mayes. I asked Mr. Harrison about this alleged affidavit and said: 'Surely there must be some mistake about it, because I had no transactions of any kind or description with Mr. Mayes after I ceased to practise my profession in St. John and entered the Dominion parliament.' He said he did not know that there was any mistake about it, but he would look the matter up. Later on I ascertained that the date when I had received moneys from Mr. Mayes, instead of being 1907, should have been 1905, two years before, at a time when I was not a member of parliament, not Minister of Public Works, but was acting as solicitor and counsel for Mr. Mayes in important matters.

It is said that Mr. Mayes corrected the statement he had made, but let me say this, that neither Mr. Hazen, the leader of the Conservative party in New Brunswick, nor, as far as I was able to observe, any leading member of the Conservative party or any leading Conservative newspaper, which had been the means of circulating this vile slander regarding myself and spreading is from the Atlantic to the Pacific —not one of these parties ever took any effective step to correct the mistake they had made, to express regret for it and set me right before the people of Canada, and it remained for me, as best I could, to vindicate myself and make the truth known. But, Mr. Speaker, you know that a lie travels very fast and it takes the truth a long time to overtake it; and throughout this Dominion, there are no doubt many people who, even to the day of the election, believed that I was guilty of the crime charged against me by the leader of the Conservative party in New Brunswick.

Regarding the answer I made to the question of my hon. friend, I do not see how any other answer could have been given. Assuming the statement he made to-day to be true, what does it prove? All that it proves is that, upon the advice of Mr. McAvity, Mr. Mayes put in a tender at a larger figure than he thought, before he left St. John, he could have tendered to do the work for. The tenders which had been called for previously had been called for a good many weeks before that time and were subject to conditions which Mr. Mayes was not able to comply with. One of the conditions was that parties tendering should have a dredge in Canada at the time of filing the tender with which they could perform the work. What Mr. Mayes wanted Mr. McAvity to do, so I understood, was to endeavour to get that disability removed because there was no suitable dredge in the maritime provinces capable of doing the work, and thus enable him to bring in a dredge from the United States. True, Mr. Mayes came to me as his solicitor, who had been his legal adviser in important matters for a number of years, and asked me could I suggest any business man in the city of St. John with whom he might associate in his dredging operations. I mentioned Mr. McAvity as one of the leading business men in the city of St John.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will those hon. gentlemen who are good enough to applaud my remarks tell me why I should not name Mr. McAvity? Mr. McAvity was then, as he is now, a prominent business man in the city of St. John. More than that, I had known Mr. McAvity as a man whose integrity had never been questioned and with whom it was an advantage for any one to be associated in the carrying on of any undertaking involving financial strength, the exercise of judgment, and qualities of that character. I recommended Mr. Mayes to see Mr. McAvity. I supposed that Mr. McAvity was joining in the undertaking by putting up a part of the capital; but as to what the arrangements were, I never had any knowledge until certain statements were made by Mr. Mayes during the recent election contest in the city of St. John. What do the records show? They show that when the tenders were previously called, there were two or three—two if I remember rightly. One was by Haney & Miller from Toronto at one dollar and thirty-five per cubic yard. The other, that of Mr. Mayes, was for fifty cents per cubic yard.

Mr. FOSTER. 55 cents.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, 50 cents; but one of the conditions was that the tenderer must have a dredge in Canada, at the time of filing the tender, prepared to undertake the work. Mr. Mayes could not comply with that condition. Several weeks

after new tenders were called for; and upon representations made to the then Minister of Public Works, and in the exercise of his judgment as minister, being convinced, I presume, that there were no dredges in the maritime provinces capable of doing the work, he omitted that condition and tenders were called for without that stipulation.

An hon. MEMBER. Who was then Minister of Public Works?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Hyman was then the Minister of Public Works and the records of my department show that there were only two tenders sent in—one from Haney and Miller of Toronto, who tendered again, and their tender, if I remember rightly, was at $1.25 per yard; and the other was from G. S. Mayes at 55 cents, being a difference of 70 cents between the two. Let me ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether—even supposing that my hon. friend from North Toronto has any ground for entertaining so poor an opinion of the late Minister of Public Works as to suppose he would inform Mr. McAvity of what was in the other tender—let me ask you whether it is at all likely that such a wide difference would have been left between the two tenders as the very big one of 70 cents per cubic yard?

Mr. FOSTER. Did I insinuate anything of that kind?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman said that it is the duty of the government to proceed against Messrs. McAvity and Mayes for the recovery of the sum of $35,000; and that statement, if based at all, must be based on the allegation that the late Minister of Public Works was in collusion with these gentlemen to defraud the treasury. Let me tell my hon. friend—and I tell him as one who has some little knowledge of law and what any respectable barrister will tell him—unless the late Minister of Public Works was in collusion with these gentlemen to defraud the treasury, the government has no claim against either one of them, because the tender of Mr. Mayes was the lowest and was accepted, being the lowest, by the then Minister of Public Works. No claim could therefore be made by the Crown to-day against Mr. McAvity or Mr. Mayes.

Let me say something further with regard to this matter, and I shall be glad at any time to have it fully discussed. The affair did not end there. This affidavit, or alleged affidavit, which was read at this public meeting, was not all there was to this matter, because, although Mr. Mayes has said in it that he was willing to do the work at 50 cents per cubic yard, it is to my knowledge, as Minister of Public Works, that Mr. Mayes was persistent in his demand that I should increase the contract price to 90 cents per cubic yard. Let me to say to my hon. friend that the statement I made in the city of St. John during that campaign, after the matter had been referred to—which statement is borne out by the records of the department—was that from time to time after the contract was entered into and after I became minister, Mr. Mayes was persistent in the demand that I should increase the contract price to 90 cents, that being the price he was charging for doing other work. The hon. gentleman says that Mr. Mayes was willing to do the work for 50 cents, yet we find him afterwards contending that it was worth 90 cents; and the principal reason why this attempt was made by Mr. Mayes to destroy me politically was my refusal to yield to the solicitations of himself and Mr. McAvity. I held them to their bargain. They claimed that they were losing money, but I forced them to carry out their contract—and I believe that, under my management of the department, so far as this contract is concerned, the government got good service and value.

At six o'clock the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, January 28, 1909.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 17) to amend and revise the Immigration Act—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 22) respecting the hours of labour on public works—Mr. Verville.

ANIMALS' CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 18) to amend the Animals' Contagious Diseases Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the hon. gentleman make a brief explanation?

Mr. FISHER. This is but a short Bill for the purpose of remedying a misarrangement of this Act in the revised statutes and to restore the provisions as they were in the old Act before the statutes came into force.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Were they changed in any important particular in the revised statutes ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, there was a transposition from one clause to another of the limit of the valuation of where compensation should be paid in case of slaughter, thus changing the amount fixed. This re-

stores the amount to that provided for in the old Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 19) to amend the Post Office Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the hon. gentleman explain ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The object of this Bill is to amend the Post Office Act as regards lost registered letters or parcels. There are two kinds of registered letters in the postal service. We have an international registered letter and a domestic registered letter. At the last congress of the International Postal Union held at Rome, three years ago, it was decided that when a registered letter or parcel sent from abroad was lost in the country to which it was addressed, the postal authorities of the country should compensate the sender or, at the request of the sender, the addressee, to the extent of fifty francs. England and Canada have adhered to that regulation and therefore we are bound to compensate for the loss of any registered letter or parcel coming from any foreign country whenever it is lost in Canada. What we are doing towards compensating foreigners to the extent of fifty francs we intend to do for our own people. This regulation exists in the United States and also in Great Britain. In Great Britain, if a registered letter or parcel is lost, the sender, or the addressee, at the request of the sender, must be compensated to the extent of £5. If the loss is less than £5 the amount of the loss is paid. In the United States the sender, or the addressee of a lost parcel or letter is also compensated to the extent of $25. The Canadian postal authorities intend to do for Canada what they now do for foreigners.

Mr. HENDERSON. May I ask the minister if he proposes to make any reduction in the postage on drop letters in rural districts which was referred to last session?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Well I have just explained the objects of this Bill. We may have occasion to discuss later on the question which my hon. friend is raising now.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS ACT.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 20) to amend the Government Railways Act.

Mr. HAGGART. Explain.

Mr. GRAHAM. It will be remembered by those who were present during last session that an amendment was made to the Government Railways Act to make the procedure for the collection of damages for loss of any kind more in conformity with that provided for by the General Railway Act. I find that two or three clauses were left out of that amendment last year that should have been embodied in it in order to make it more in harmony with the General Railway Act. This is to remedy that difficulty.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the Bill give the Exchequer court jurisdiction to deal with such cases against the railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. The old Act gave the Exchequer court full power in that regard.

Mr. CROCKET. What I meant to ask was, if the Bill gave the courts of the provinces jurisdiction in such cases?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a large question and one that involves the principle of whether the Crown shall forfeit its right to have certain cases tried before the Exchequer court. We are not dealing with that in this Bill; we are simply trying to make the Act of last year clearer.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals), moved for leave to introduce (Bill No. 21) to amend the Railway Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Please explain.

Mr. GRAHAM. This Bill is intended to place the water-powers, the development of which is being largely increased, particularly along the Trent Valley canal, under government control in respect to rates to be paid by the public to the lessees of the government. There is a clause in the Bill providing that any disputes as to these rates shall be settled by the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is not government control.

Mr. LENNOX. Is that confined to the Trent canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. I mentioned the Trent Valley canal because the situation there was the special reason for introducing the Bill.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is it to apply to all government canals?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Bill is general in its terms.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked :

1. What was the number of (a) permanent employees, and (b) temporary employees respectively in the service or employment of the government upon or in connection with (a) the Intercolonial railway, and (b) the Prince Edward Island railway upon (a) the first day of each month, (b) the 15th day of each month, and (c) the 31st day of December, all in the year 1908?

2. What was the total amount of the pay-roll of each of the said railways for each of the said months?

3. Were salaries or wages raised or lowered for either permanent or temporary employees during the said year upon the said railways or either of them?

4. If so, on what occasions and to what extent on each occasion?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways). This is a large question and we have to get our information from Moncton which takes a little time. We have asked for the information.

THE INSURANCE COMMISSION

Mr. MACDONELL asked :

1. Why was not the evidence of British actuaries taken by Mr. Shepley in England in the Insurance Commission not included in the printed evidence of the commission?

2. What did this evidence cost the country?

3. Why was not the evidence or the report of Mr. Dawson, actuary of the commission, included in the printed evidence?

4. Was the evidence above mentioned placed on the table of the House last year together with the printed volumes of evidence? If not, why not?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (for Minister of Marine).

1. No evidence of British actuaries was taken by Mr. Shepley in England in connection with the Royal Commission on Life Insurance. During the adjournment of the Commission in August, 1906, Mr. Shepley, then in London, invited with the approval of the Commisioners British actuaries to give expressions of opinion on matters relevant to the inquiry. A shorthand report of these verbal opinions, not given under oath, was taken, and the extended notes, together with a written memorandum subsequently submitted by one of these actuaries, constitutes exhibit No. 668, in the record of the evidence returned to Parliament. Exhibit No. 668 is now in the possession of the Clerk of the House of Commons. These opinions were read before the Commissioners and were made an exhibit (Volume 4, p. 3211 of the printed evidence). The practice adopted by the Commission in this case of incorporating expert opinion in the record by exhibit had previously been followed in at least one somewhat similar instance.

2. The cost of obtaining these opinions was $62.85. This is exclusive of any charge made by Mr. Shepley for his services in eliciting these views. Inasmuch as Mr. Shepley was paid a general fee for all services it is not possible to state what sum, if any, is applicable to this particular service.

3. Mr. Dawson, actuary to the Commission gave no evidence before the Commission. He acted altogether in an advisory capacity, and gave the Commission information and advice on such actuarial matters as were referred to him. Such information and advice formed no part of the records of the Commission.

4. Answered by the foregoing.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY EMPLOYEES AT TRURO.

Mr. STANFIELD asked:

How many men, not on the regular staff, were employed at Truro on the Intercolonial Railway during the months of September, October, November and December, 1908, respectively?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). We have to send to Moncton for the information to enable us to answer such a question as this, and often the officials at Moncton have to send to the outside stations, all of which requires certain time. When I ask any of these questions to stand it does not mean that we have not taken steps to get a reply.

Question to stand.

ROYAL MINT.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. What is the amount of gold, silver and copper coins manufactured by the branch of the Royal Mint in Canada and the amount of said coin not disposed of since it commenced operation up to January 1, 1909?

2. How much silver in its crude state has been offered for sale to the management of the Royal Mint from Canadian mines to the year 1908, and what quantity has been accepted?

3. What reason does the government give for not purchasing all the silver in its crude state that is offered?

4. What is the system used in deciding from whom to make purchases?

5. How many Canadian mines have sold silver to the government and what are the names of said mines and the quantity purchased from each?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). I have been asked by the Finance Department to ask my hon. friend to allow this question to stand as a notice of motion.

Question to stand as notice of motion.

THE ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. NORTHRUP asked:

1. How many Ross rifles were accepted by the Militia Department in the year 1908?
2. How many were returned to the Ross Rifle Company in that year?
3. How many Ross rifles have been accepted up to date?
4. How many have been issued to the (a) permanent corps, (b) militia, (c) mounted police?
5. How many Ross rifles are there now in store?
6. How many of these have never been issued?
7. What is the total amount of the payment to the Ross Rifle Company to date?
8. What claims for damages have been sent in for injuries received through the use of the Ross rifle?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). I have had to send to Quebec for the information; I think I will have it on Monday.

Question to stand.

G.T.R.—MADOC AND ELDORADO BRANCH.

Mr. NORTHRUP asked:

1. Has the government taken any steps to secure the re-opening and operation of the railroad between Madoc and Eldorado and that it should be completed and continuously operated?
2. Has the government taken any steps to recover from the Grand Trunk Railway the bonus of over $2,000 paid to it on condition that the line of railway between Madoc and Eldorado should be completed and continuously operated?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). 1 and 2. No.

WIRE FENCING.

Mr. TAYLOR asked:

1. Did the Department of Railways and Canals call for tenders for 144 miles, more or less, of wire fencing during the summer or fall of 1908? If so, were the tenders asked for by public advertisement or by circular?
2. How many tenders were received and from whom?
3. Was the contract let, and at what price and to whom?
4. What quantity of wire fencing was purchased by the Department of Railways and Canals during 1908, either by tender or otherwise, and what were the prices paid per mile?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). This is somewhat a large question; there is no objection whatever to answering it, but I would ask my hon. friend to let it stand as notice of motion for a return.

Question to stand as notice of motion.

GOVERNMENT DEPOSITS IN BANKS.

Mr. MACDONELL asked:

1. In what bank or banks in Canada does the government deposit its moneys?
2. If the government deposits in one bank, or in a limited number of banks only, what is the reason for such discrimination, and what advantage does the country derive from such preference to such bank or banks?
3. Have all the chartered banks doing business in Canada, an opportunity of receiving government deposits, and doing business with the government, on the same terms as the bank or banks with whom the government deposits and does business aforesaid?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (for the Minister of Finance):

1. Montreal, British North America, City and District Savings, Commerce, Dominion, Eastern Townships, Hamilton, Hochelaga, Imperial, Merchants, Molson's, Nationale, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Ottawa, Provinciale, Quebec, Royal, Standard, St. Stephens, Toronto, Union of Canada, Union of Halifax.

2 and 3. By order in council of the 27th October, 1885, it was declared not desirable that the number of banking accounts should be extended. Since that time no new accounts have been opened with any bank.

DRY DOCK SUBSIDIES ACTS.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

1. Have any new subsidies been arranged for under section 3 of the Dry Dock Subsidies Act of 1908? If so, to what companies and where are docks to be constructed?
2. Have any additional subsidies been arranged for under section 4 of said Act? If so, with what companies and at what points?
3. What will be the annual expenditure under each head?

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

1, 2 and 3. No.

PROHIBITION OF CIGARETTES.

Mr. BLAIN asked:

Will the government at this session pass legislation to prohibit or restrict the sale of cigarettes?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is not the intention of the government to introduce this session any legislation in amendment of the legislation of last session on this subject.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—STATION FREIGHT CLERKS.

Mr. MACDONELL asked:

1. Has the award of the board of investigation appointed under the provisions of the Lemieux Act to determine upon the disputes between the station freight clerks and the Intercolonial railway ever been accepted by the government or the management of the Intercolonial railway? If so, when? If not, why not?
2. If accepted, what has been done to enforce the terms of the award with respect to the classification of employees, wages, &c?

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

1. Yes. On October 10, 1908.

2. As the award implies a reduction in the staff, instructions were forwarded to the general manager, asking him to submit list of names with full particulars as to date of employment, salary now paid, date of last increase and amount of same, and record of capacity of each man. The general manager is engaged in preparing the same.

SECURITIES OF CORPORATIONS.

Mr. SIFTON—by Mr. Turriff—asked :

1. What is the total amount of valuable securities held in the custody of the government through the Finance Department, of any branch thereof, which are deposited under any statutes or regulations for the purpose of furnishing security in respect of the operations in Canada of institutions and corporations incorporated by Canadian, British or foreign authority?

2. What is the amount of such securities which are issued by a government in Canada or municipal or other corporations domiciled in Canada?

3. What is the amount of such securities which are British?

4. What is the amount of such securities which are issued by a government in the United States or municipal or other corporations domiciled in the United States?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (for the Minister of Finance) :

1. $46,241,635.71.
2 $42,412,475.43.
3. $2,275,653.33.
4. $1,480,000.

OWEN SOUND POST OFFICE.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO asked :

1. What was (a) the original, (b) the present estimated cost of the Owen Sound post office building, (c) what was the cost of the site, (d) from whom was it purchased?

2. What are the names of the contractors for the various trades in connection, the nature of the work to be performed by them and the contract price therefor, respectively?

3. Which, if any, of such contracts were let by public tender, and in what manner were same advertised?

4. (a) By whom were the plans and specifications for said building prepared, (b) who is now in charge of construction thereof, (c) and what is the remuneration being paid such person therefor?

5. Has any change been made with respect to the position of architect or person at Owen Sound in charge of the construction of said building? If so, what and why was such change made?

6. (a) Have alterations been made in the plans and specifications or the size of the said building since the contracts were let? If so, (c) what, (d) the contract price thereof, (e) the reason for such change, (f) whether tenders were called for such alterations?

Mr. MACDONELL.

7. If so, what is the name of the successful tenderer, and the amount of his and other tenderers, and the names? If no tenders were called for, why not?

8. Whas extras, if any, have been ordered or allowed, and the cost thereof?

9. Is there any provision in the contract or specifications, and what, prohibiting the use of foreign material thereon? If so, has any complaint been made to the government or its officers in regard thereto, and has any breach of said prohibition taken place?

10. What amount of money has been paid on account of said building to date?

11. Has any caretaker for said building been appointed or recommended? If so, at what salary?

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

1. (a) Original estimated cost : $80,000, exclusive of site and additional storey; (b) present estimated cost : $90,000, exclusive of site; (c) $10,150; (d) Kilburn Real Estate Company.

2. Contractors for building, Nagle and Mills, original contract, $63,424, additional storey, $8,950 ; contractors for heating, J. H. McCorkindale, $2,515 ; contractors for electric wiring and fixtures, W. J. McLinden, $735.

3 .Original contract for building, $63,424; by public advertisement.

4. (a) Department of Public Works ; (b) Forster & Clark, architects, Owen Sound ; (c) 2 per cent commission.

5. Not that I am aware of.

6. (a) Yes, to the plans ; the specification for building holds for addition ; (b) mansard roof has been added giving an additional storey ; (c) $8,950 ; (d) to improve the appearance of the building ; to give additional office accommodation, and to provide quarters for caretaker ; (e) contractors were asked to submit a tender.

7. Nagle & Mills, $8,950 for building. Owing to the nature of the contract, the work was such that public tenders could not be invited.

8. None.

9. Yes. The specifications are prepared to suit local conditions, and cement, stone and hardware are specially specified to be Canadian, Indiana limestone was used in the cornice. No complaint has been made to the department.

10. Total amount paid to date, including site, $74,585.89.

11. Yes ; to take charge when his services are required ; salary, $450 per annum with quarters.

GEORGE ANSON AYLESWORTH.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds) asked :

1. Is Mr. George Anson Aylesworth employed by the government at the present time in any capacity?

2. What was the date of his appointment?

3. Has he been employed continuously since that time, and what are his duties?

4. What salary does he receive from the government, is he paid yearly, and is he paid on the basis of salary and expenses?

5. What is the total amount paid him up to the present time in, (a) salary, (b) expenses?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes.
2. 19th April, 1907.
3. Yes, inspector of employment agents, but from 12th December, 1907, to 28th March, 1908, he was engaged to deliver a series of lectures in England.
4. $100 per month, paid monthly, yes.
5. (a) $2,040; (b) $734.53.

THE FRENCH LANGUAGE.

Mr. PAQUET asked :

1. Has the government taken into consideration the petition with 450,000 signatures, with reference to the employment of Frenchmen equally with Englishmen in the province of Quebec, on works of public utility, under the direct or indirect control of the government?

2. Have the representatives of the railway, telegraph and telephone companies and others' been consulted as to the provisions of the Lavergne Bill (No. 85) brought before parliament on the 28th day of January, 1908? If so, do they favour this legislation?

3. Is it the intention of the government to introduce during this session, the Lavergne Bill or a similar one?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes; the railway companies have been consulted, and they have agreed to issue bills of lading in French and otherwise to accommodate the French speaking public making use of the railways.
3. It is not the intention of the government.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES.

Mr. SIFTON—by Mr. Turriff—asked :

1. What is the total number of employees upon the operating staff of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway above the ranks of brakesmen?

2. Of the total number how many are British subjects, and how many are citizens of the United States?

3. What is the total number of employees upon the engineering staff of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, exclusive of labourers?

4. Of the total number, how many are British subjects, and how many are citizens of the United States?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways). The reply to this question is not in the hands of the government, neither is the information available to the government itself. We have asked the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to give us the information.

REGULATION OF IMMIGRATION.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

1. Is the order in council passed in the session of parliament of 1907-8 pursuant to chapter 33 of the Acts of that session, still in force?

2. Does the order in council apply generally to all Canada?

3. Will the hon. Minister of the Interior bring down the order and any subsequent orders dealing with the same question and lay them on the table of the House?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Yes. There have been no subsequent orders dealing with the same question. Order herewith :

PRIVY COUNCIL, CANADA.

At the Government House at Ottawa,
Wednesday, the 27th day of May, 1908.
Present.

His Excellency
In Council;:

Whereas during the present session of parliament an Act has been passed repealing subsection 1, of section 30 of the Immigration Act, chapter 93 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, and substituting the following provision therefor:

'30. The Governor in Council may, by proclamation or order, whenever he considers it necessary or expedient, prohibit the landing in Canada of any specified class of immigrants or of any immigrants who have come to Canada otherwise than by continuous journey from the country of which they are natives or citizens and upon through tickets purchased in that country.'

And whereas it is considered expedient forthwith to prohibit the landing in Canada of immigrants who have come to Canada otherwise than as set forth in the said provision;

Therefore His Excellency in Council is pleased to order that from and after the date hereof the landing in Canada shall be and the same is hereby prohibited of any immigrants who have come to Canada otherwise than by continuous journey from the country of which they are natives or citizens, and upon through tickets purchased in that country.

(Sgd.) RODOLPHE BOUDREAU,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

1. Was there an order in council passed during the session of 1907-8 by which certain immigrants are required to have $200 on entering Canada?

2. Will the hon. the Minister of the Interior bring down this order and lay it on the table of the House?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes.
2. Yes. Order herewith :

PRIVY COUNCIL, CANADA.

At the Government House at Ottawa,
Wednesday, the 3rd day of June, 1908.

Present.

His Excellency
The Governor General in Council :

Whereas by the order in council of the 18th January, 1908, it is provided that in accordance with section 20 of the Immigration Act the Immigration agent at any port shall require every immigrant, male or female, eighteen years of age or over, to have in his or her possession money to a minimum amount of twenty-five dollars, in addition to a ticket to his or her destination in Canada, unless satisfactory evidence is furnished that the immigrant is going to some definite employment or to relatives or friends already settled in Canada, who will take care of such immigrant, and by a further order in council of the 27th March, 1908, this arrangement is continued in force.

And whereas Canada is looking primarily for immigrants of an agricultural class to occupy vacant lands, and as immigrants from Asia belong as a rule to labouring classes, and their language and mode of life render them unsuited for settlement in Canada where there are no colonies of their own people to ensure their maintenance in case of their inability to secure employment, it is necessary that provision be made so that such immigrants may be possessed of sufficient money to make them temporarily independent of unfavourable industrial conditions when coming into Canada.

Therefore His Excellency the Governor General in Council is pleased to order that the amount of money required to be in possession of each immigrant as a condition to his being permitted to enter Canada shall be and the same is hereby increased to two hundred dollars in the case of all Asiatic immigrants other than those with whose countries the government of Canada has special arrangements or those concerning whose countries special statutory regulations exist on the part of Canada, the conditions as to tickets to destination to retain as at present.

(Sgd.) RODOLPHE BOUDREAU,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

The Honourable
The Minister of the Interior.

LEVEL RAILWAY CROSSINGS.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac). Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I desire to ask the hon. Minister of Railways if his attention has been called to an accident which occurred at a level crossing near Kingston on the 26th inst., by which two people lost their lives and a third was seriously injured; also if he is aware that some five or six years ago an award was made by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council respecting this crossing, with a view to having a subway constructed; and, if he is aware of such an order, will he call the attention of the Board of Railway Commissioners to it, with a view to having it carried into effect. I would also like to ask if, in view of the increasing number of fatalities such as those mentioned in the papers of the 26th inst., it is the intention of the government to bring down legislation at this session effectually to safeguard the lives and property of the people of this country at level crossings.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways). In reply to the very important question of my hon. friend, I might say that this question of level crossings is one of great interest, not only in this country, but in every country where there is rapid transportation by railway. It is becoming even more important in countries where there is rapid transportation not only by steam railways, but by a network of electric railways. In reply to my hon. friend's first question, my attention has not been called to the accident referred to other than by the report in the newspapers. I know the locality very well, and I understand, as my hon. friend says, that some years ago, perhaps earlier than he suggests, a decision was arrived at by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, before we had a Board of Railway Commissioners, ordering a subway to be constructed at that point. The cost was to be divided between the county, the railway company and I think the city of Kingston. The city of Kingston objected, as the crossing is outside the city, and the county took the position that it could not afford to bear its share of the cost. The matter has been in abeyance ever since. I know from experience, and from having passed over frequently the locality, that it is a dangerous spot. There are five or six tracks, then there is the local train from Kingston together with the trains coming over the Grand Trunk Railway, and it forms part of the railway yard, thus making the crossing a very dangerous one.

My hon. friend asked the larger question, namely, how we propose to deal with the level crossings.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the nature of the privy council order ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not heard the particulars of it. It was the division of cost that attracted my attention more than anything else and the obtaining of information as to why the order was not carried out. This large question of level crossings is one that must be dealt with. There are level crossings of course where there is practically no danger, being in long stretches of level country where every one can see for miles, or at any rate for a sufficient distance in each direction to protect himself against an on-coming train. But the situation has become somewhat changed from what it was some years ago. During the past ten years at least, the speed of trains has been increased to meet the public demand for rapid transportation, not only the express but other trains as well, and the

driver in any ordinary carriage is very easily deceived in judging the time it takes for an approaching train to reach him. Many a driver is apt to misjudge the time a running train takes to reach a crossing. A running train takes a very small period to cover a quarter of a mile, when it is running at a mile a minute ; and in this connection the public are not always blameless. We grow careless in crossing railway tracks, but this other question arises that in this as in many other cases, the public ought to be protected against themselves. It does not relieve the situation at all if we say that a man was killed on account of his own carelessness. If some provision could have been made to protect his life even against his own rashness, such protection certainly ought to have been afforded ?

This question has been engaging my attention to some extent because, being familiar by travel with almost every spot in Ontario where these accidents have occurred, my interest has been excited to a greater degree than it would be if they occurred in some remote locality. I have in my mind some crossings which are very dangerous. In driving, myself, I have stopped as much as one hundred yards from the track to listen if a train were coming because I could not see it at any distance. I have had communications in a confidential way and many conversations with the Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners, who, for a year or more, has been gathering data in this matter. The board have asked the different railways of Canada to give a map showing the various crossings on their line, laying particular stress on the dangerous ones, and also marking out specially these where people have actually lost their lives. But after we know all that, what is to be done ? That is what my hon. friend would like to know. He would like to know what is the position of the government in the matter. Well, I am not absolutely in a position to say what the government intends doing ; but perhaps the House will permit me just to say a word on the question without at all intimating that we have arrived at any decision.

The question of level crossings is one that involves five parties. The one most interested of course is the family to which death has come by an accident. The general public is deeply interested in having some protection at the dangerous level crossings. Then there are the municipalities, the provincial government and the federal government, and then there are the railways. In point of liability, perhaps we had better commence the other way. There are the railways, the Dominion and Provincial governments, the municipalities and the public.

Mr. LENNOX. And the railways.

Mr. GRAHAM. Of course, they are the first on the list. The opinion of the Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners is that, in a great many instances, the cost should not all be borne by the railways; and the commission has the power, under the Act, to provide, and has provided in some cases, that the municipality interested shall bear some of the cost. This much ought to be borne in mind with regard to the municipality, and I am speaking without having given that phase a great deal of consideration but only casually. The municipalities have erred possibly in having allowed the railways to establish a certain right within these municipalities themselves. One right which they have allowed to be established in many instances, and which never should have been given is the right to the water front. That having been done, the Board of Railway Commissioners have held, and not without some justice, that the municipalities which have done this ought to bear a portion of the cost. The municipalities are bound to be benefited, to a certain extent, by having the danger, which they allowed to be created, removed. Then why should the provincial government give any aid or assistance to the removal of the difficulty ? I am not trying to force the hand of any provincial government, but am merely pointing out these considerations to the House which may help us in dealing with the question when the time comes. Many of our steam railways have been constructed under provincial charters. Even when they have been taken over by the federal authorities, the beginning of the trouble was created by rights given them by provincial governments ; but outside of that, the provincial governments have the same deep interest in this matter that we all have. It will be asked why should the Dominion government assist? I am not saying that the Dominion or provincial government or municipalities ought to assist. I am merely pointing out some arguments which have been placed before me and which I think worthy of consideration. If it be held by the board, and with some reason, that the railways should not bear all the cost, somebody has to bear the balance of it. Would it not then be wise to consider carefully whether, in working out a scheme—if we want to make it a success, and not merely with the object of gaining a victory over the railway companies, and municipalities, or of their gaining a victory over us, but having for our sole object the remedying of the evil and the protection of the lives of the people—would it not be wise for us to consider the situation of the federal authority—not the government but the whole parliament—in this matter ? Would it not be worth our while to consider whether we ought not to join hands with the provinces and municipalities and create some fund out of which the expenses might be apportioned, so as to avoid quarrelling or

cavilling, or having a municipality refuse because the crossing was not in a city or because it could not bear that portion of the expense. We would then be in the position that when the Board of Railway Commissioners gave a decision ordering that so much be paid by the railways and so much by the province or municipality or Dominion, that order would be binding, and we would have this menace to public safety removed in a manner that would be satisfactory and not involve any great burden. This matter has been brought before me very hurriedly, and it is a very large question of which I am merely giving an expression of opinion in the hope that before the session closes we may come to a conclusion which will be satisfactory to all concerned.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the minister have any objection to bringing down the order that has been referred to, with any information available as to the respect, if any, in which it has not been carried out, and the reasons why it has not been carried out ?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is, the order of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will make a note of that and have it brought down.

Mr. BARKER. I would suggest, also, that the minister should bring down not only that particular case. but all similar cases, in which the order has been made and not complied with.

INQUIRY FOR PAPERS.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I would ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) if he will bring down the order in council in reference to the dredging. In answer to a question the minister said he would bring that down. I understood that he would be willing to do it without a motion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, without a motion.

OPENING OF GOVERNMENT TENDERS.

House resumed adjourned debate on motion of Mr. J. D. Reid (Grenville):

That in the opinion of this House tenders received in any department of government should be immediately placed in safe custody under seal so as to prevent any possibility or suspicion of tampering; and should be opened in public at the time and place mentioned in the advertisement and in the presence of at least three principal officials of the department; and the persons so tendering or their duly authorized agents should be at liberty to attend at the said time and place and see such tenders opened and recorded, if they so desire.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). At the hour of adjournment yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I was speaking of the affidavit, or alleged affidavit, to which my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) had referred, and which had been read by the leader of the New Brunswick government in a meeting held in the city of St. John. I stated to the House that that affidavit contained false statements of a most outrageous character, and statements which no public man ought to have read at a public meeting, reflecting upon the character of another person, whether that person were in public life or whether he were simply a private individual, without first having seen the person to whom the affidavit referred, inquired of him as to the fact and ascertained whether the statements were true or false. In a court of law, as every lawyer knows, even where matters of small moment are involved, before a party is allowed to read an affidavit, in ordinary cases, he is compelled by the rules to furnish a copy to the opposite party, so that that party may have an opportunity of answering.

Mr. LANCASTER. Not unless it is demanded.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Whether it is demanded or not, the rules of the court provide that an affidavit should be served and notice given, so that the party concerned may have the opportunity to answer. But at this meeting to which I refer, Mr. Hazen, who is the leader of the Conservative party in New Brunswick, and who appeared at that meeting as leader—so that the Conservative party cannot shirk responsibility for his action—without notice to me and without having made any inquiry into the truth or falsehood of the statements, read, upon the eve of the election, this affidavit involving a charge which, if it were true, would have damned me for ever in the eyes of the people of Canada, and, as I have said, would have driven me at once from public life. But, as I have said, the statements were absolutely false. The statement was that a public contractor, Mr. Gershon S. Mayes had, in October, 1907, after I had become Minister of Public Works, made a payment to me of $2,000, and coupled with the payment was the intimation on my part that it would be beneficial to Mr. Mayes to have a friend at Ottawa to look after his interests in connection with his contracts with the Public Works Department. Fortunately, the nature of this statement came to my knowledge almost at once, and I was able to show that, so far from my having received any money from Mr. Mayes, or having had any transactions with him at the time stated, the last money I had received from him was at a time two years before that, and long before I had become a member of this

House. It was at a time when I was acting as solicitor and counsel for Mr. Mayes, —and let me say that I had been his solicitor and counsel, advising him in important matters for a number of years before I received this payment from him. Well, as I stated yesterday, although I corrected this statement against me, and did what I could to have that correction sent broadcast over Canada (for I wished to put myself and the party to which I have the honour to belong right before the people of this country), yet—and I say this to the disgrace of the man who read that false affidavit and sought to do me that irreparable injury—he has never had the manliness to express regret for what he did; and the Conservative papers which published that false affidavit have never had the grace to express their regret for the false information they had given to the people. The reason why I asked my hon. frined (Mr. Foster)—who, let me say, has, in my opinion, done himself no credit by fathering this false affidavit and presenting it to the House—the reason, I say, why I was anxious to know whether he was aware whether an affidavit of the character he read is in existence or not is that I desired to know whether that affidavit was sworn to by the gentleman by whom it purports to be sworn to. I wanted to know whether that affidavit is in existence or not, for, if it is, it will be possible to found certain proceedings upon it, and if it is not in existence or has never been sworn to, this will not be possible. Through my solicitors, Messrs. Barnhill, Ewing & Sanford, I have made repeated applications for that affidavit. Application has been made to Mr. Hazen, who read it at the public meeting to which I have referred. He is, and was then, Attorney General of New Brunswick, and the Crown officer whose duty it would be to take action, if there had been any defrauding of the treasury of this Dominion, or any criminal offence committed, as has been suggested, by Messrs, Mayes and McAvity, or if I, as Minister of Public Works, had committed the crime so great as that charged in this affidavit. And what does Mr. Hazen say with regard to it? He says that after reading the affidavit and making these serious charges, he surrendered the affidavit back to Mr. Gershon S. Mayes. But, though my solicitors have applied to Mr. Mayes he has declined to give it and has refused to answer letters addressed to him.

There is something further to which I wish to direct the attention of the House. For hon. members opposite have gone out of their way in this discussion, and have not confined themselves to the question whether it is or is not desirable to pass the resolution, but have dragged into this discussion matters relating to these dredging transactions in the city of St. John, and also matters relating to other contracts which have been entered into by the Department of Public Works. And, that being so, it is desirable that I should deal somewhat more fully with this question than I would otherwise have felt warranted in doing. For, let me say, when the hon. members on the other side have read in this House the charges they have recklessly made throughout this country, when they insinuate that there has been graft in the conduct of affairs of the various departments of government, when they insinuate that the members of this government have not honestly and faithfully discharged their duties but have given favours to their friends, we are not only prepared to answer their charges but are prepared to carry on an aggressive campaign against them for their conduct in the elections through which this country has recently passed.

Now, Sir, what will be said of these extraordinary and outrageous affidavits? My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has stated that Mr. Mayes had entered into a contract with the Department of Public Works to perform dredging work in the harbour of St. John at 55 cents per cubic yard, which he intimated was more than it was really worth and more than Mr. Mayes would have been willing to do the work for. Upon that question let me invite the consideration of the House to this fact that later on public tenders were invited for work in the harbour of St. John of no more difficult character than that which had been previously awarded to Mr. Mayes and instead of tendering under public competition at 55 cents per cubic yard, which my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) intimates was too high a price, Mr. Mayes tendered at 90 cents and was the lowest tenderer, and was awarded the contract, with regard to which I understand no complaint has been made. After I had become Minister of Public Works, Mr. Mayes and Mr. McAvity requested me from time to time to relieve them from their 55 cent contract, claiming that the work was very hard and urging that as work had been given in the harbour of St. John to the Dominion Dredging Company also at 90 cents per cubic yard, the same price as Mr. Mayes had last tendered for in public competition, I should at least be willing to pay him for work which he claimed to be more difficult the sum of 90 cents per cubic yard. I refused to do that. I said to Mr. Mayes: You have entered into a contract and whether you gain or lose by it it is my duty to hold you to your bargain and I propose to hold you to your contract. Mr. Mayes also urged that, in addition to getting 90 cents instead of 55 cents per cubic yard, as under this contract he was getting only $5.60 per cubic yard for rock while under the new tenders, both he and the Dominion Dredging Company were getting $19.60 per cubic yard, which was claimed to be a reasonable

price, he should at least be allowed $19.60 per cubic yard for the many large boulders which were being excavated at great expense. I refused his request and he became, as the correspondence which I produced before the electors will show, considerably annoyed, because he thought I was treating him harshly and not showing him that leniency he had a right to expect in view of the fact that contracts on easier terms had been let under public tender afterwards.

Later on Mr. Mayes came to the conclusion that he would like to get out of the dredging business and he made a proposal to me that if I would buy his dredge for my department at the price of $150,000 he would be perfectly satisfied and would abandon any claim. Associated with Mr. Mayes in this desire that my department should purchase his dredge was another gentleman very prominently connected with the Conservative party. I may say that Mr. Mayes is entitled to the credit of the virtue, if it be a virtue, of also being and having been for many years a prominent member of the Conservative party. Associated with him in this desire was his counsel, Ald. Baxter, of the city of St. John, who is vice-president of the Liberal-Conservative Association of the city of St. John.

Mr. CROCKET. Is the hon. minister not aware that Mr. Baxter, to whom he referred, made a solemn declaration in which he denied emphatically that he had any pecuniary interest or any interest of any kind in connection with the dredge.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. And that he had no interest in Mr. Mayes whatever, except his interest as his solicitor and counsel.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is entirely consistent with what I said. I said that associated with him in the desire that my department should purchase the dredge was Ald. Baxter, vice-president of the Liberal-Conservative Association of St. John. Upon one occasion, shortly before the election, I received a telegram which has also been made public, signed by Mr. Baxter, stating that his client was getting very impatient and urging me to close at once for the dredge, otherwise intimating that Mr. Mayes would make it unpleasant for me. I have forgotten the exact wording of the telegram, but that is its purport. That was followed by statements which were made to me by different friends, among them by Mr. Osman, a very prominent citizen of New Brunswick, formerly Speaker of that province, who came to me one day in a state of considerable excitement, because he is a true, a warm friend of mine, and has been so for many years, informing me that Mr. Mayes had told him of his desire to sell the dredge to the department, and that unless I purchased his dredge, disclosures would very soon be made which would be of a most unpleasant character and would do great harm to the Liberal party and to the Minister of Public Works. Among other things Mr. Osman told me that he had been shown a photograph of a cheque which Mr. Mayes had given in payment of this note to which I have referred, and Mr. Osman had been led to believe that this payment had been made to me after I became Minister of Public Works. When Mr. Osman told me what Mr. Mayes had said, I replied to him: Mr. Osman, did Mr. Mayes tell you that instead of getting this money after I became Minister of Public Works, I had received it from him for legal services when I was solicitor and counsel, and two years before I became a member of the parliament of Canada? He said: No, and I said: Tell Mayes to go ahead as fast as he pleases. I have nothing to fear and nothing to conceal.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. What was the year in which the minister received the payment?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In 1905, nearly two years before I had become a member of the government.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. You said two years before the party swore you had received it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is right, the party swore I had received it on the 15th of October, 1907, after I had become a member of the government and when I was Minister of Public Works and at a time when it would have been a crime, not merely a political crime but an actual crime of the worst character for me to have received money from a contractor having dealings with my department, but as a matter of fact the money had been received in October, 1905. I refused, as I said, to purchase the dredge, and the next thing which took place was that this affidavit was handed to the leader of the Conservative party in New Brunswick, who made himself the instrument of seeking to obtain vengeance for Mr. Mayes because I had declined to accede to his improper requests, and in the hope, as I have said, that he might do me irreparable injury. It has been said by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) that it was explained that this was a typographical error. By a typographical error I understand is meant a printer's error. Would it not strike you, Mr. Speaker, as it struck the people of my own constituency and the people of New Brunswick, as an extraordinary thing that every Tory newspaper in Canada should have committed the same typographical error and that this affidavit, as it was published in all the Conservative papers throughout Canada, declared that I had received this money in 1907 after I had become Minister of Public Works. If you look at the news-

papers of that party you will find that it was discussed editorially all over Canada, and that it was intimated that the political days of the Minister of Public Works were about coming to an end. Afterwards it was stated not to have been a typographical error but an error of the typewriter. But, as I have said, the most material part of this matter is that the Conservative party, through their leaders in New Brunswick, lent themselves to this unholy operation of seeking to destroy the character of a public man, and, put it in the best way you can, they were utterly reckless as to whether the allegation was true or false, and when it became known to them that they had done this great wrong to me, a wrong as great as ever was done a public man in this country before, they had not the manliness to express their regret for the conduct of which they had been guilty.

Mr. EMMERSON. They did not even correct it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, as my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) says, they did not even correct it. But, fortunately if there is one characteristic of the people of New Brunswick which stands out more prominently than any other, it is that they love truth, they love justice and they love fair play. When the people realized what a despicable attempt was being made to win victory for the Conservative party they resented the course of hon. members opposite, or rather the associates of hon members opposite, in the province of New Brunswick, and by their verdict they showed that they did not approve of tactics of that kind.

I am not here to say that I had anything of great importance to do with the result in New Brunswick. I recognize, as our friends in this House must recognize, that it was the strong personality and splendid statesmanship of the gentleman whom we are all proud to follow that did so much in New Brunswick as it did all over Canada to ensure the success of the party. But, to me who had been made the representative of the province of New Brunswick, it was a great satisfaction that we were able to come back with eleven seats out of the thirteen to which New Brunswick is entitled in this parliament. It is a great satisfaction to me that we shall no longer be able to see our friend here who formerly represented the constituency of Kings and Albert, that our friend who formerly represented the constituency of Charlotte is also absent from the place which he occupied in this House and that our esteemed friend who formerly occupied the constituency of Queens and Sunbury is absent. The result in the province of New Brunswick not only bears testimony to the confidence which the people of that province have in our great leader, but it is also an evidence of the fact that they admire truth, justice and fair play.

Now, Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen upon the other side of the House have also, as a pretended reason for passing this resolution which has been moved by the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) alleged that there has been graft and wrong-doing in connection with the receipt of tenders. I endeavoured to show to the House yesterday why I think it is not in the public interest that tenderers should be invited to be present at the opening of tenders. I think I satisfied the House that there is no good reason for departing from the course which it is admitted is pursued in the mother country, has been pursued ever since confederation in this country and has been pursued and is pursued to-day by the governments of the various provinces of Canada. I believe that every right thinking man in this House will agree that I am right in the view that if a public man, or a representative of the people, does not take the course which the people have the right to expect of their representatives, when they make insinuations such as were made here yesterday, if he does not avail himself of the opportunity of making and proving his charges before the committees of this House his allegations must be regarded as having no foundation. In this instance hon. gentlemen opposite have utterly failed to prove the insinuations which they have made. In so far as the opening of tenders for timber limits is concerned, the men who, of all others, could give the truth in regard to these tenders, proved before the committee last session that there was no irregularity in regard to them, that the tenders were received in a regular and proper manner and that the timber limits were awarded to the highest tenderers in every case. I say without hesitation, and I say it emphatically that it was proved before the committee at the last session of parliament, that it was stated in this House and that it was not denied. As far as the tenders which are received by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, by the Department of Public Works and by other departments of the government are concerned, it has not been shown that in any case there had been tampering with tenders, that any tender had been substituted for another, or that the lowest tenderers had been passed over except in special circumstances where the tenderers had been unable to carry out their contract or where they had previously failed to give satisfaction, and, as I stated yesterday, in every such case, the circumstances have to be submitted to His Excellency the Governor General in Council and must be passed upon in council before the lowest tender can be passed over. Let me say to my hon. friends opposite that in every case where this course is adopted the reasons are set forth in the recommenda-

tion to council and it is open to the committees of this House and to any member of this House to have placed before either a committee of the House or the House itself the recommendation to council in which will be found stated the circumstances under which such a course is adopted. There is no secrecy about it ; every thing is open after the contract is once awarded and every paper can be brought down which any hon. member may desire to have brought down.

Now, my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middleboro) made a statement to this House yesterday and if he, with his eloquence, his fluency of speech and his apparent sincerity, repeated that statement from platform to platform in his own constituency, I cannot wonder why he is here as the representative of that constituency to-day because if the facts which he stated yesterday were true he would be able to make a strong appeal to the people of his constituency to withdraw their support from the government. What did the hon. gentleman say ? He said yesterday that very important dredging contracts involving large amounts had been let without tender, and that subsequently, upon complaint being made in this House, I had, instead of continuing these contracts, put them up to tender, and it had been claimed that a certain amount of money had been lost to the government by reason of doing it. That was the statement which my hon. friend made and it was an important statement. But let me say to my hon. friend that one very important matter in connection with it is that it lacks the essential element of truth.

Mr. MIDDLEBORO. The statement I made was that that was the statement which was made by the Liberals of that riding, and if it lacked the essential element of truth it was because they had made it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I venture to say that my hon. friend's memory does not serve him as well as I would like it to, because I cannot conceive it possible that any Liberal member could have made that statement. I have no doubt that what the Liberal members stated was this: that there were certain dredging contracts which I as Minister of Public Works had the power to renew and which I had proposed renewing, but which by reason of protests made by gentlemen on the other side, Mr. Bennett among others, and after I had given the matter consideration and remarked that the forms of the previous advertisements rendered it somewhat doubtful as to whether the tenders were not limited to one season, I declined to renew them and again called for public tenders. I have no doubt that these Liberal members stated that as a result of calling for public tenders, in this way the country was put to an expense of two or three hundred thousand dollars which it would not have been put to had I extended the original contracts. That, I assume, is the only statement which Liberal members made and that is the only statement they would be warranted in making. I cannot conceive it possible that any other statement was made by Liberal members in the constituency which my hon friend represents. These contracts which I was proposing to extend, I may say, had all of them been obtained after public tender in the first place and after keen competition. These were the facts which were before the Public Accounts committee. The tenders were produced before that committee and it appeared in every instance that the contracts had been awarded to the lowest tenderers, and that of course is a very different state of facts from that which my hon. friend (Mr. Middleboro) has presented to the House. Some gentlemen upon the other side of the House stated that Conservatives will not tender for dredging work because they feel they will not get fair play. Sir, I have yet to learn of any Conservative contractors in this country who hesitate to put in a tender to the Public Works Department. I have yet to learn the name of a single Conservative in this Dominion who claims he has been unfairly treated in connection with any tenders he may have put in to that department. I would ask my hon. friends opposite that instead of indulging in these insinuations—which do themselves an injustice as they do injustice to the members of the government; I would ask these hon. gentlemen to do me the fairness and to do the government the fairness of giving the name of a single Conservative contractor in Canada who says that his tender was improperly passed over or that he was improperly dealt with in the awarding of contracts under tender. In the most sincere way I invite hon. gentlemen opposite to do that. In the eyes of the people of Canada they must do it before they can expect the people to take any stock in the insinuations they make. Sir, it has been my pride since I have been a member of this government and in charge of one of the great spending departments, and I believe that it has been the pride of every member of this administration, so to conduct the affairs of his department as to do justice to every Canadian irrespective of his political leanings. The records of my department, and, I believe, the records of all the departments of the government, will show that this is the course we have pursued from the day we took office.

Mr. SPROULE. The commission did not say so.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The commission says nothing to the contrary so far as I remember, and if the commission does say anything to the contrary it can give no fact

upon which such a statement could be based.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I must ask the pardon of the House for having taken up so much time in the discussion of this matter. I have said all I think it is necessary to say, but I do just want to make a reference to what has sometimes struck me as a most extraordinary thing, namely, that gentlemen in the Conservative party should think it so important that they should get possession of the reins of government as to deem it justifiable to resort to such tactics as I have described. Those of us who are charged with the duties of government have at best a hard task. Our work is not easy; our responsibilities are great; and while it is a great source of pride to be able to serve the public, yet it does seem to me that there is nothing in the position of a minister of the Crown, which should induce people to become lost to every sense of honour and of decency in order to reach that position. I have often wondered; I wondered in St. John when that false affidavit was read; I wondered the other day when the House learned that upon the eve of the election a forged telegram had been sent to British Columbia purporting to be signed by the leader of the opposition for the purpose of influencing the electors there to render a false verdict upon the issues on which the government was appealing to the country, what reason there could be to induce men to stoop to such things. It does seem that following the example of the leaders of the Conservative party in this House (and by that I mean all the members of the opposition), in indulging in insinuations and making reckless and unfounded charges of graft, their followers throughout the country were so desirous that the Liberal government should be ousted and the Conservative party come to power, that they seemed to feel that they were justified in resorting to any tactics, even to the reading of false affidavits and the forging of telegrams, to achieve their aim.

Mr. O. S. CROCKET (York, N.B.). Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to take part in this debate and I would not have trespassed on the time of the House had it not been for the references which have been made by the Minister of Public Works to the so-called Mayes charges in connection with a dredging contract in the province of New Brunswick, and his further reference to the result of the elections in that province as a vindication of himself. It was to be expected that the Minister of Public Works would attempt to plume himself upon the success of the Liberal candidates in New Brunswick, but I am convinced that if the conduct of that campaign by the Liberals were fully exposed to this House and to the public of Canada, the very unbecoming plumage with which the Minister of Public Works has adorned himself would rapidly vanish. The great boasting of the Minister of Public Works about the results of the elections in New Brunswick would, I am satisfied, give place to chagrin and dismay if the truth were known in connection with the conduct of that campaign by the Liberal party. The fact is that the campaign as conducted by the Liberal party in the province of New Brunswick was one of the most discreditable that has ever occurred in that province. One of the first moves in that campaign was the purchase of two of the daily papers in the city of St. John, the Daily 'Telegraph' and the Daily 'Times' and the muzzling by that means of the entire press of the metropolis of New Brunswick. That consummation, I may add, was accomplished, I understand, by Mr. George McAvity and Mr. John E. Moore, two bosom friends of the Minister of Public Works, Mr. George McAvity being the very gentleman who got away with the $36,000 rake-off in connection with the contract that has been discussed on this motion. Mr. John E. Moore, I may say, is also now a contractor with the Public Works Department, and is, I understand, receiving under his contract fabulous prices for dredging in the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him what are the prices which he says are fabulous?

Mr. CROCKET. The Minister of Public Works knows what the prices are.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I know they are not fabulous; I know they are reasonable.

Mr. CROCKET. There is no doubt that these gentlemen acquired the St. John 'Telegraph' on behalf of the Minister of Public Works. Perhaps the hon. minister will deny that he himself was associated with both of these gentlemen in the purchase of that newspaper property.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will say that they are very excellent newspapers.

Mr. CROCKET. That was, as I have said, one of the first moves of the Liberal party in connection with the campaign in the province of New Brunswick. Then, we had the Minister of Public Works himself making the most reckless promises that were ever made by a Minister of Public Works throughout the province of New Brunswick. He promised, as I understand, in one speech in the city of St. John, to dredge out practically the whole of Courtenay Bay at a cost to this country, as was shown, of $5,000,000. That was only one of the promises which the Minister of Public Works made to the city and county of St. John. We had also the race and religion cry worked in the province to an extent that was unknown in the previous political history of that province, and in connection with the circulation by the Liberal party of

the pamphlet which has already been referred to in this House, entitled, 'The Duty of the Hour.' There were also employed in several, I will not say all, of the constituencies of the province of New Brunswick, the hugest corruption and bribery funds that were ever used in the constituencies of that province. In view of these facts, there is very little for the Minister of Public Works to boast of in connection with the result of the voting in New Brunswick. But, aside from the facts that I have mentioned, can that result be accepted by this House as a vindication of the Minister of Public Works with respect to this charge, or the many other serious charges which have been made against him in that province? What does he say as to the result of the voting in the city of St. John, where this affidavit and the counter affidavits were read?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would you allow me to answer ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the Minister of Public Works deny that his colleague upon the ticket in St. John, Mr. Pender, was defeated, and that the seat for the city of St. John in this House is now occupied by our honoured friend Dr. Daniel ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. With a reduced majority of about 800.

Mr. CROCKET. But a majority nevertheless of the electors of the city of St. John, and notwithstanding the fact that the Conservative party had not one single newspaper in that city to put before the electors the issues of the day, and notwithstanding the promises which I have already mentioned of huge appropriations for public works in such a constituency, which we all know has for years been looking for such appropriations for the development of its winter port.

Mr. EMMERSON. Where was the 'Daily Standard' ?

Mr. CROCKET. My hon. friend knows very well what the 'Daily Standard' was—a little poster that was published by the Liberal Conservative party, printed in a job office, and distributed throughout the city —a paper which of course could not get its matter before the electors as effectively as the old established newspapers. Now, Mr. Speaker, if there is anything in the remarks of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works with respect to the significance of the voting in New Brunswick, I think it is up to him to account for the verdict of the city of St. John, which went unmistakably against him.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the city of St. John I obtained a majority of something like 300 or 350.

Mr. CROCKET. I am not able to speak as to that, because I have not examined the returns particularly ; but I do know that the Minister of Public Works appealed to the electors of the city of St. John to elect Mr. Pender, his colleague, and on one occasion he said that his vindication would not be complete if Mr. Pender were not elected with him. Mr. Pender was defeated, and the inference is that the verdict of the city of St. John was against the Minister of Public Works. Now, that is all that I think it is necessary for me to say in connection with the result of the elections in the province of New Brunswick.

With respect to the charges themselves, I do not intend at this time to go fully into them, because it seemed to me that this matter was rather suddenly precipitated into this debate, and perhaps rather irrelevantly. Such a matter cannot obtain in a debate of this kind the attention which its importance demands. It seems to me, however, that with such serious charges, characterized as serious by the Minister of Public Works himself, hanging over the hon. gentleman, it is the duty of this parliament to institute some sort of an investigation ; and when that investigation is had, the details can be discussed more profitably than at the present time. I want, however, to refer to the manner in which the Minister of Public Works has treated the question. It seems to me that he has passed over entirely the gravamen of the accusations which have been made in Mr. Mayes' affidavit. He has devoted practically the whole burden of his speech to an error in date which appeared in that affidavit. I wish now to call the attention of the House to the paragraph in the affidavit or solemn declaration of Mr. Mayes in which that error appeared, and I take this from the columns of the St. John ' Globe ' a Liberal newspaper.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A what ?

Mr. CROCKET. Does the Minister of Public Works say it is not a Liberal newspaper ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not say any thing about it, I am asking you ?

Mr. CROCKET. I notice at all events that it figures in the Auditor General's Report for quite a respectable sum. Here is what Mr. Mayes says in his affidavit :

> On October 15, 1907, I received a telephone message from Dr. Pugsley, asking me to call and see him the next day, which I did. He said: Mr Mayes, I am in need of money, and it would be nice if you could help me.

I do not know whether that allegation is true or untrue.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I say it is absolutely false.

Mr. CROCKET. It has however a very characteristic sound :

I said, doctor, what for? You know that I have paid you some $1,300 in my second case against Conolly which you have in a way offered to pay me back because you have said that Mr. Emmerson was so slow in bringing up the matter, and I have not the funds. I am carrying a big load and am paying large amounts to the Bank of Montreal for overdrawals. Just then Mr. Geo. McAvity came in, and Dr. Pugsley said that Mr. Mayes' business was getting on so well that a little money would be very acceptable. I again said I was carrying a big back load and that I could not see why Dr. Pugsley should ask me for money. I said: what do you want it for—a loan? Well said Dr. Pugsley, you see it will be nice to have some one who could do something for you in Ottawa, there was always something to be done, and if I could not give him a cheque, that I could give him a note for three or four months. I asked him how much, and he said: Oh, about $2,000 or $2,300. I said, that is too much, but I suppose I will let you have a note for four months for $2,000. Dr. Pugsley then made the note and I signed it. He said he felt sure he would give me good return for it or pay it back?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the date of that ?

Mr. CROCKET. As printed, the date is October 15, 1907.

Mr. PUGSLEY. After I was a minister. What is the actual time, do you say ?

Mr. CROCKET. I intend dealing with that. I have read the declaration with respect to the giving by Mr. Mayes of his note for $2,000, and I have read it as the declaration is printed. Mr. Mayes did not state in that declaration, as the Minister of Public Works endeavoured to lead this House to believe, that it was given to him when Dr. Pugsley was Minister of Public Works ; but there is no doubt in the minds of any one in the province of New Brunswick that the date was an innocent mistake. I want, in this connection, to call attention to a subsequent declaration which Mr. Mayes made on the 14th of October, and which was widely published in the press, with respect to this alleged mistake, the House will then be able to judge what justification there was for the attack the hon. minister has seen fit to make on the honoured premier of New Brunswick. In a second declaration, sworn to before Mr. Beverly, R. Armstrong, signed by Mr. Mayes on the 14th of October last, Mr. Mayes says with reference to the date of this alleged interview :

I further say that up to four o'clock in the afternoon of the 12th instant, I had not given, or caused to be given, to any member of the Conservative party, any intimation that I was about to make the declaration I did. During the afternoon I obtained an appointment with Mr. J. D. Hazen, to whom I submitted the matter, I further say that when Mr. Hazen read my declaration at the Queens rink, on the evening of the 13th, he turned towards me, when reading the date '16th October' and hesitated at '1907,' I called out '1905,' and he read '1905.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question ? If it be true that Mr. Hazen's attention was called to the error in the date, how does my hon. friend reconcile that statement with the fact that Mr. Hazen read in public this affidavit, which appeared in the morning paper and was spread broadcast throughout Canada, with a false date in it ?

Mr. CROCKET. Does my hon. friend hold Mr. Hazen responsible for the printing of the declaration in the minister's own party papers ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do under these circumstances.

Mr. CROCKET. The hon. minister makes the statement that Mr. Hazen read that declaration with respect to this interview, in which the interview is stated to have taken place on the 16th of October, 1907, but surely Mr. Hazen, when he, in his reading, corrected the error, is not to be held accountable for the error which appeared in the papers the following morning. I think that the House will be able to judge pretty well as to the value of the whole statement of the Minister of Public Works, with reference to the matter of these charges, by the manner in which he has dealt with this error in the date. He attacked the Premier of New Brunswick and the whole Conservative party for having entered into a heinous conspiracy to make this charge against him, as of a date when he was Minister of Public Works, and he said yesterday that there was not a Conservative newspaper in New Brunswick which had corrected that error. Let me say that there was not a Conservative newspaper in New Brunswick which I have read with reference to this matter, in which I did not see, the very day after the declaration was read, mention of the error which had been made, I also saw that it was corrected in the Toronto 'News', the 'Montreal Star' and 'The Mail and Empire'. In every paper which I saw. I read of the mistake in the date which had been made, so that it looks very much to me as if the Minister of Public Works were endeavouring to draw the proverbial red herring across the trail. What I ask the House to bear in mind is the statement I have read as applying to the month of October, 1905. The Minister of Public Works says that this is the most infamous charge ever made against a public man in Canada. Perhaps in that statement he is correct, but does he say that the charge is very much less infamous as applied to him in October, 1905 ? He was then the Attorney

General of New Brunswick; and if the statement of Mr. Mayes was correct, the Minister of Public Works was getting a rake off from a contract with the department of which he subsequently became a minister. That charge having been made —and I am not here to say whether the charge is true or not—as a member of this House and a citizen of this country, I am very much astonished that the Minister of Public Works should be content to rest under the accusation for four or five months without having instituted proceedings of any kind for the punishment of Mr. Mayes, who, he says, has done him such a grievous wrong and whose charge, the minister himself says, if proved, would damn him for ever and drive him out of public life.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not wish to be misunderstood. I said that if it were true that I, after having become Minister of Public Works——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, that is what I said. If after having become Minister of Public Works and at the date given, October, 1907, I received moneys from a contractor having business with my department, I should be at once driven from public life—I should not be worthy to remain.

Mr. CROCKET. And I would ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), and I would ask also the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), if these charges made in this affidavit with the date corrected are true, is it proper that the Minister of Public Works should be retained in his position? This charge has never been retracted, with the exception of the correction of the date, it stands un-withdrawn; Mr. Mayes still insists upon it. And surely the Minister of Public Works who is one of the best lawyers in the maritime provinces and perhaps in the Dominion of Canada, ought to know that if Mr. Mayes, made a false statement in a solemn declaration, he is liable to prosecution for perjury.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, if you can get at his declaration; if you can find that which he has concealed and refuses to produce.

Mr. CROCKET. I am aware that the Minister of Public Works endeavoured to give the House the impression that the reason he took no steps in the prosecution of Mr. Mayes was that this declaration, as published in the St. John press, did not appear to have been signed. But has the minister the slightest doubt that Mr. Mayes signed that declaration? Was there not read in this House, yesterday afternoon, a letter by Mr. Mayes, addressed to the minister speaking of this solemn declaration as his affidavit? Yet with such a letter in his hand the Minister of Public Works would still endeavour to create the impression that he was unable to follow Mr. Mayes with a criminal prosecution. Furthermore as an able lawyer,—one of the ablest, as I have said, in the Dominion—he knows that Mr. Hazen, having read this declaration in a public meeting, if that statement were false, if any of these statements were false, he not only has an action against Mr. Mayes for perjury, but he has an action against Mr. Hazen for libel. Yet we have not heard, down to the present time, of any steps having been taken by the Minister of Public Works, or by anybody on his behalf, looking to the punishment of these gentlemen who have done him what he has characterized as the most grievous wrong ever done to a public man in the Dominion of Canada. The minister's course in this matter is in marked contrast with the course which he is alleged to have advised his predecessor in the cabinet from the province of New Brunswick to take in relation to certain other charges which did not involve that hon. gentleman's conduct in the administration of his department. Perhaps the Minister of Public Works has profited by the lesson which he taught his predecessor on that occasion.

Now, this allegation with reference to the giving of a note to the Minister of Public Works, when he was Attorney General of New Brunswick, in connection with this contract, is not the only serious allegation in that declaration. There is, to my mind, a more serious allegation than that, an allegation that more directly involves him as Minister of Public Works. The declaration states that, after the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) had become Minister of Public Works, after he had assumed control of this and all other contracts of the department, he sought to, and did, hold up Mr. Mayes in the interests of Mr. McAvity and the payment of this graft.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I desire to say to my hon. friend (Mr. Crockett)—and I say it in the strongest manner possible—and I am going to ask him now to accept my statement as a member of this House—that that is absolutely untrue, that I never held up Mr. Mayes, but that just as soon as the estimates of the engineer were put into the department in the ordinary course, and after the ordinary delays, the payment due to Mr. Mayes was made. The only exception was an amount of some $4,000 or $5,000, held back because Mr. Mayes had not performed his contract for cleaning out certain berths in the city of St. John which he had agreed to do in the contract with the city and for which my department had agreed to be responsible. With that exception, there was no holding back of Mr. Mayes' money. I will ask my hon. friend to accept my statement and not to read what I say is a false affidavit or persist in his statement.

Mr. CROCKET. I hope the hon. minister has not understood me as stating that this statement is true——

Mr. PUGSLEY. But, Mr. Speaker, an hon. member of this House cannot read a statement concerning another member which that member says is false.

Mr. SPEAKER. The statement of the Minister of Public Works, as a member of this House, must be accepted.

Mr. CROCKET. I understand that. And I do accept it. I have no wish to do otherwise. But the question before the House is——

Mr. SPEAKER. As to that, I may say that I have allowed considerable latitude. I allowed the minister to speak a second time on a point of personal explanation. I do not wish to interrupt the hon member (Mr. Crocket) but I hope he will not go too far from the question before the House.

Mr. CROCKET. As I stated, I rose simply to refer to certain statements which the Minister of Public Works had made in connection with this matter, and would not have risen had it not been for the speech that the hon. gentleman was permitted to make in this behalf. I have no hesitation in saying that I do accept—I must accept as a member of this House—the statement he has made. I do not wish any hon. member to suppose that I am reading this declaration as vouching for the truth of it. I am answering the statement and argument which the minister has made with reference to the whole transaction, and especially the excuse which he sought to make for not taking the proceedings, which I think that he, as a member of this House and minister of the Crown, should have taken for the punishment of those who were guilty of what he has characterized as a malicious and scoundrelly —I think that was one of the words he used—falsehoods.

But when the Minister of Public Works sought to create the impression in the House that the whole gist of the charge with reference to himself related to this question of the date, October, 1907, he was considerably in error. I was about to point out what is to my mind more serious and what directly involves him as a minister of the Crown, the statements that I referred to and which the Minister of Public Works has denied. The Minister gave as a reason for not taking the proceedings which he would have the House believe he was so keen to take the fact that he was not satisfied that the affidavit was sworn to, for the reason that, as published in the papers, it did not purport to be signed by Mr. Mayes. I have already referred to the fact that the Minister has in his possession a letter from Mr. Mayes admitting that he had signed it. More than that, I have here a copy of a solemn declaration as publicly made by Mr. Mayes in which he reiterates with greater detail the charges made in the first declaration and which does bear his signature and which was sworn to before a Commissioner for taking affidavits, to be read in the Supreme Court of New Brunswick.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon.friend tell me, because I do not remember, does what purports to be the second declaration contain any reference to myself?

Mr. CROCKET. Reference to yourself?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. It is full of them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the second affidavit repeat the statements about payment to me of moneys? I have not seen it.

Mr. CROCKET. I will read some statements contained in the second declaration. Among the statements that are contained in it and that I think involve the Minister of Public Works in a corrupt transaction, assuming they are true, are these: This is a conversation which Mayes alleges he had with the Minister of Public Works and these are the words of the Minister as alleged by Mr. Mayes:

> Now Mr. Mayes, I want you to settle up with Mr. McAvity and when that is done I will give you the balance.

That is one statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I want to state to my hon. friend that that statement is entirely untrue. My hon. friend cannot read here an affidavit which a member of this House says is false unless he makes it his own, and he must be responsible for it. He cannot bring false affidavits and spread them on the records when a member of the House states the allegation is untrue.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not permissible under the rules of the House to contradict a statement of a member of the House by an affidavit from another party.

Mr. CROCKET. You heard the minister ask me if the affidavit contained statements in reference to him?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. minister (Mr. Pugsley) said it was false and the hon. member (Mr. Crocket) must accept his statement, and cannot contradict it.

Mr. CROCKET. I do. I am not discussing the question of the truth or falsity of the charge, I am discussing the minister's pretext for not prosecuting Mayes for uttering that false statement. If that statement is not true, as the minister has alleged, why has he not proceeded against Mr. Mayes for making it? That was the very point I was discussing. Furthermore, if the minister would like any other ex-

tracts from the affidavit I would be glad to read them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I would say is that I do not think it is right, I do not think it is conducive to the dignity of the House or to good feeling in the House, that a member should read statements the truth of which he knows nothing about, particularly when another member makes the statement that what he has read is not true and I do unhesitatingly make the statement that what my hon. friend has read is absolutely untrue. It does seem to me my hon. friend should accept the statement.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. He has accepted it for that, but there are others.

Mr. FOSTER. You had better read the other statements and get the minister's denial of them.

Mr. CROCKET. I accept the minister's statement, and the emphatic denial he has given this afternoon is the very reason why he cannot excuse himself for lying down under such serious accusations for six months and then attempting to convince the parliament of Canada that the reason he did not take the proceedings he should have taken was that there was no affidavit that purported to be signed. The affidavit from which I am quoting does purport to be signed, and the minister saw it published in the papers in St. John. He was fully aware of all the statements made in all these declarations. I do not think that this is the time to enter into a discussion of all the details of this transaction and it is not my purpose to go over them, but I would like the House to bear in mind the very concise statement which was made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) yesterday afternoon, setting out the salient points of Mr. Mayes' charges, points which have not only been so solemnly affirmed by Mr. Mayes but which have never been denied down to the present time. Leaving out any question of error in the date of these affidavits, I ask the members of this House if they think it is in the interest of Canada that public business should be allowed to continue on such a basis as that exposed by Mr. Mayes' statement. Mr. McAvity has himself made a solemn declaration in connection with these matters and notwithstanding that there is no denial of the gist of the charges which have been preferred by Mr. Mayes,—and indeed I may call attention to the agreement which is in existence and a copy of which was annexed to this declaration, and which was signed by Mr. McAvity :

And whereas, the said George McAvity is to receive moneys out of the performance——

Mr. EMMERSON. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the matter with that?

Mr. CROCKET.

Mr. EMMERSON. If no one else takes the point of order, I think it is time we got back to the resolution. I am within my rights in raising the point of order and I think there should be some recognition of the dignity of the House with respect to the discussion of a resolution.

Mr. CROCKET. I think, with great deference to the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), that he is rather late in rising to a point of order. He sat there following with the greatest interest and I thought with admiration—

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) started it.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no, he didn't ; it had quite a long run before I got at it.

Mr. CROCKET. I will not be much longer.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member insists on the point of order, it will suffice to read the motion to indicate what the subject is. I allowed considerable latitude because it was a subsidiary question. The Minister of Public Works was allowed to speak a second time on the score of personal explanations and I hope that the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) will go back to the subject before the House.

Mr. CROCKET. I must bow to your decision but it is hard to reply to the hon. gentleman without being able to deal with the very question raised by the hon. gentleman opposite.

Mr. FOSTER. Does it not strike Mr. Speaker and the members as well that if the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) is to be allowed to make those very strong assertions with reference to the hon. Mr. Hazen, Mr. Mayes and others, that it is rather hard, when the other side of the case is put, as it is being well put by my friend from York (Mr. Crocket), that he should be cut off? We ought I think to have some little thought for people who do not have places on the floor of this House. I would not object if the very strong assertions had not been made by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley).

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was defending myself.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman accused Mr. Hazen and Mr. Mayes of conspiracy, which is even worse than the accusation that was made against him,—certainly quite as bad. Now, when it is attempted to show the other side of the case in the interest of Mr. Mayes and Mr. Hazen it seems a little unfair that the person who is doing it should be cut off. I think that Mr. Speaker might allow the hon. member for York, N.B., to present this side of the case and then rule straight down on anybody else following afterwards.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It would rather seem to me that the position is this: The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in his speech, introduced this utterly irrelevant matter personal to the minister, and the minister ought in reason to have the opportunity, which he was allowed, to reply to that. But the whole irrelevancy was largely introduced by the hon. member for North Toronto, and if it is irrelevant I think it should be cut off here.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, you have had an ex-Speaker of the House, a gentleman who is not now the Speaker, make a statement before you to-night, which statement, I am bound to say, is not in accordance with the facts.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am in the judgment of the House as to that.

Mr. FOSTER. The member for North Toronto did not start this question. I leave that to you, Mr. Speaker; I leave it to 'Hansard.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. Who did?

Mr. FOSTER. I would like the late Speaker of the House to take back that statement.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This question was introduced upon a motion made by the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid).

Mr. FOSTER. We all know that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We all know that and we all know also that it was the hon. member for North Toronto who introduced this affidavit, if my memory serves me aright.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. It may be true, as my hon. friend says, that I introduced the affidavit, but why was the affidavit introduced? Because the matter had been started beforehand and discussed and it was necessary for the affidavit to be introduced.

Mr. EMMERSON. With the indulgence of the House, I will explain why my point of order is taken.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member spoke to the point of order and we will have to settle it first.

Mr. EMMERSON. I want to make a personal explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER. The point of order has to be settled first. Rule 19 provides that:

No member shall . . . speak beside the question in debate.

The question in debate is contained in the motion and in the amendment thereto. I have allowed considerable latitude, and I think we have had a fair statement of both sides of this case. There is another way of bringing up this Mayes matter before the House, there is another procedure which can be adopted, and in the meantime I think we should adhere to the question before the House.

Mr. CROCKET. Mr. Speaker, I must, of course, bow to your ruling, but as I stated before I rose to discuss the statements that were made by the hon. Minister of Public Works in connection with this matter and to discuss them alone. It is somewhat surprising that the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) should have sat through the speech of the hon. Minister of Public Works, to which he listened with such intense interest and admiration, without this point of order occurring to him, and that he should first be heard from in connection with points of order when I sought to rebutt some of the arguments which were addressed to this House by the Minister last evening and this afternoon. I must say, however, Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, that I thought this matter was somewhat irrelevantly precipitated into this debate and as you have decided that it is not relevant to the motion which is before the House, any further observation I have to make I must, of course, confine to the question of the motion. I do not think it is necessary for me to say that I will very heartily support the resolution that has been moved by my hon. friend from Grenville. I think that instances have been given in this House, instances have been proved in the various committees which show the absolute necessity of some further safeguard being thrown around the reception of tenders and awarding of contracts. I have been somewhat surprised at some of the statements which have been made by some new members who were not of these committees and by some old members who were of these committees, to the effect that there had been no instances in which there was any ground for suspicion in connection with the awarding of public contracts. But, it is not necessary now to rehash those instances. I am firmly convinced that the experience of the last eight or ten years has shown that there is an absolute necessity for greater care being exercised along the lines that are proposed in the resolution of my hon. friend from Grenville. I shall therefore have very great pleasure in recording my vote in favour of the resolution, and I know it is a vote that will be cordially approved by the people whom I have the honour to represent.

Mr. W. O. SEALEY (Wentworth). Mr. Speaker, in connection with the matter of doing public business it seems necessary to trust somebody to a moderate extent, and it would seem that the people of Canada have decided on the 26th October last to trust the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and

the able cabinet by which he is surounded. The amendment to the motion would seem to imply and provide for the least possible trust that could be imagined. That trust should be placed in the ministers in charge of the various departments, who are directly responsible to the department and who have been elected for the express purpose of assuming charge of public affairs. To entrust this duty to the minister and the chief officers of his department would seem to be as safe a plan as we could possibly adopt. It would seem to be a practice along the line of British institutions generally as well as being in accordance with our system in Canada. But the motion, if I understand it aright, is intended to substitute the United States method of dealing with tenders whereby three officers of the department are present together with bidders or their representatives, or as many of them as care to be present. While the proposition of the hon. member who moved the resolution and of the other hon. gentlemen who support it may have the appearance of fairness, in actual practice what do we find? There is no place on the face of the earth where there is more newspaper or verbal complaint against the unfairness of the system and the generally unsatisfactory conditions of things that exist in the United States. It is true that in the United States tenders are opened by three officials of the department and as many bidders or their representatives as care to be present. But one of the officials generally attending is an office boy who cuts the paper envelope with a knife, another is an office boy who removes the bid from the envelope and another is a higher official who reads and announces the bid. After this is done the business generally lies in abeyance for about ten days. During that time the bidders are cognizant of whom their opponents are, and in many cases there are several bids in the same interest.

At the back of every bid there are about fifty conditions as to formality and if the powers that be should not award the contract to the lowest bidder it is returned to him marked 'informal.' I am satisfied that if the supporters of this motion could realize the millions of dollars that this system is costing the United States they would not be so enthusiastically in favour of it. So many are the conditions that there is scarcely any bid that cannot be thrown out by reason of informality, and if thrown out for informality, the securities are released and the bidders are relieved from the loss of their deposit or of their security to carry out the substance of their bid. The supporters of this motion are therefore trying to substitute for the British method which has worked so satisfactorily in this country, a system which has proved so iniquitous in the United States and which has been very costly to the government of that country.

Mr. SEALEY.

I might say that the United States system encourages the practice of the bidders being represented by what are termed bidders' agents or bidders' brokers who earn their livelihood by that means, and whose conduct has led to grave irregularities. If the motion before the House were calculated to safeguard the public interest in any way it would be worthy of our support, but as the experience in the United States has proven that it is the very reverse I feel it is in the best interests of the country that I should support the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie).

Mr. DUNCAN H. McALLISTER (Kings and Albert). Little did I expect that I should address the House so early in my first session here, and necessarily I am but little acquainted with the procedure of parliament; but as the representative of Kings and Albert in the province of New Brunswick I must strongly resent the statements made here to-day by my hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket). I tell you, Sir, I was ashamed of him—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McALLISTER. Yes, I was actually ashamed of him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McALLISTER. I tell you, Sir, that when he referred to the last campaign—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Some indulgence must be given to a new member.

Mr. BOYCE. When he says he is ashamed of another member.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think we must adhere to the rule which Mr. Speaker has already laid down in the case of my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket).

Mr. McALLISTER. I was about to say—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will my hon friend (Mr. McAllister) be good enough to take his seat for a moment. I did not protest against your rule, Mr. Speaker, because undoubtedly the debate had strayed from the point, although perhaps it might have been better to have allowed my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) to have continued his remarks. However, I do not dissent for a moment from your judgment, but that rule having been laid down it must be adhered to and the rest of this debate must conform to the motion before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I had intended calling the hon. member (Mr. McAllister) to order, but he had not exactly reached that stage when it was necessary for me to interfere. The hon. member will have to confine himself to the motion and the amendment before the House.

Mr. McALLISTER. If I have made any error I apologize for it and I will take it back; but I do say that if I heard that remark made outside the House I would be ashamed of my hon. friend from York. I have been quite accustomed to that sort of campaign—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I beg to invite your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the hon. gentleman is not speaking to the question before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have ruled that hon. members cannot discuss anything outside the motion and the amendment before the House. A discussion on the recent elections is irrelevant.

Mr. McALLISTER. Well, Sir, I will have to postpone the remarks I intended to make, but I shall never rest easy until I have that question discussed in the House. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am not at all in favour of the resolution of the hon. member (Mr. Reid), for I do not think it would improve matters in any shape or form. I believe that the manner in which tenders are opened at the present time is good enough for Canada and that the people are well satisfied with it. On the 26th day of October last, when that affidavit was brought up against—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PATERSON. How do know what affidavit he is going to speak about?

Mr. McALLISTER. When that affidavit was brought up against the Minister of Public Works—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a shame to interrupt a new man.

Mr. McALLISTER. I hope those gentlemen over there won't get excited; their colleague got pretty well excited all through the campaign. I am not accustomed to parliamentary procedure, but the hon. gentleman from York (Mr. Crocket) had made certain statements and I thought it my duty to answer him. I think that when we have a man as worthy as the Hon. Wm. Pugsley——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PATERSON. That is not out of order.

Mr. McALLISTER. When we have a man as worthy as the Hon. Wm. Pugsley in the position of the Minister of Public Works I do not think we can have any better guarantee that the department will be well conducted. I am sure he will take the responsibility and whatever responsibility he takes is good enough for any of us. I seem to be affording hon. gentlemen opposite a certain amount of amusement, and as I have not come here for that purpose I shall resume my seat.

Mr. W. S. LOGGIE (Northumberland, N.B.) Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to take up more than a very few moments of the time of the House. It seems to me that the real difference between the resolution and the amendment is whether the minister of a department is to be one of a number to open the tenders for the great works of this country. If any great corporation had a great work to be done and called for tenders, it seems to me that it would be reasonable that the president or managing director of that corporation should be present and see the tenders opened. Upon him is the responsibility for the proper management of the corporation's business. In the same way it is the duty of the minister, who is the responsible head of the department, and in whom the confidence of the people has been placed, to be present and see that the tenders are opened in the regular way. Let me ask the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution: Do the Conservative Premiers of the Dominion of Canada ask that their representative heads of the several departments shall not be present as one of a number to see the tenders opened? Does Mr. Hazen in the province of New Brunswick say that the Commissioner of Board of Works shall not be one of a number to be present when tenders are opened? Does Mr. Roblin, does Mr. Whitney, does Mr. McBride, ask the legislatures of their several provinces to pass legislation that the minister, the head of the department, forsooth, shall not be present when tenders for works in his department are opened? It seems to me that the motion of my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid) is simply a motion of want of confidence in the government of the day; and surely, before he makes such a motion, he should ask his friends who lead the Conservative party in the several provinces what they are doing in this regard. It does seem to me that our affairs are quite as safe in the hands of the re-responsible heads of the different departments. My hon. friend said that there were not safeguards. Does he name a case? Is it insinuated that in the case of the Mayes contract, for example, there was tampering with the tenders? Such an insinuation, I understand, is not made, and therefore that particular case is not relevant to the matter before the House, and cannot be pointed to as a reason for passing the original resolution instead of the amendment. In fact, had the original resolution been effective when that tender of 55 cents of Mr. Mayes and another for $1.25 from a firm in Ontario had been considered, no other result could have happened than did happen, namely, that the contract should be awarded to the lowest tenderer.

Now, I want to say only a word about the second clause of the resolution, namely, that the public should be present, or, if you like, those who tender should be invited to be present, when the tenders are opened. There may be something to be said in favour of that; yet there is another side to the story, and I think the Minister of Public Works was quite right when he said that it was possible that collusion might occur and that the interests of the public would not be safeguarded if that were done.

I have heard much to-day about the expenditure on public works in the city and county of St. John; but let me say for my own county that all contracts for public works there have been awarded to the lowest tenderer. Not only has this been the case with contracts for great public works; but not one mail contract, during the four years that I have represented the county, has been awarded except to the lowest tenderer. I have a case in my mind of a tenderer for a mail contract who came to me and said, 'Can you tell me who has put in the next tender to mine, which is the lowest?' As I was not familiar with the ruling of the department, I asked the question on behalf of my friend. What reply did I receive? This, Mr. Speaker: 'It is against the rules of the department to announce the tenders until the contract is entered into.' My friend, I suppose, had an object. He and his brother had put in two tenders, and he was anxious to know whether his brother's came next to his or not. If it had and he had known of it ahead, would the lowest tender have been effective? No; he would have withdrawn it, and the contract would have gone to the next tenderer. There are cases of that kind, and, as the Minister of Public Works has stated, sometimes the next tender is a hundred per cent above the lowest one. I have in mind another case in which a wharf was built recently in my county, and in which a gentleman not from my county was the lowest tenderer at $19,000 in round numbers, and a gentleman from my county tendered at $34,000 in round numbers, nearly a hundred per cent difference. But, as I have said, in this as in every other case the lowest tender has been accepted. This is an evidence that the interests of the people are safeguarded under the rule embodied in the order in council.

An hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House has said that the fact that this order in council has been passed is an evidence that something was wrong, but that is not necessarily so. I am aware that hon. gentlemen on the floor of this House during the last session did, by insinuation, by innuendo, declare that there were irregularities, but they failed to substantiate their charges in the Public Accounts Committee. So far as I am concerned, I want to say that I am perfectly satisfied that the interests of the public are fully safeguarded if we leave the matter in the hands of the ministers of the several departments and an official, or, in the case of the absence of the minister, two high officials. It seems to me that the resolution is simply a motion of want of confidence in the ministers who have just come from the people with an overwhelming majority.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (Leeds). I merely want to ask my hon. friend a question for the purpose of removing a rumour which may or may not be correct. My hon. friend has advocated very strongly the continuance of the present system. I would ask him if since he became a member of this House, he and other members of his family have become an incorporated company, and if he has, in the name of that company, tendered for contracts in the Department of Militia or the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and been given contracts——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. My ruling of a moment ago applies to anything outside this motion or amendment.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey). I merely propose making but a few short remarks, as I do not wish to take up the time of the House. The hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) suggested, in his opening remarks yesterday, that some method ought to be adopted to shorten the sessions of this House. In that I quite agree with him. I do think that some method might properly be adopted which will get us away from here in less than seven or eight months, but I do not think it was consistent with this suggestion that the gentleman should immediately have proceeded to take up the time of the House in discussing a suggested remedy for an evil which is purely imaginary. In my opinion the mode of letting contracts by tender is much the same to-day as it has been since confederation. The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart), who was formerly a cabinet minister himself, says that when the Conservative party were in power, no evil resulted from the method then followed. The Minister of Public Works tells us with equal earnestness that no evil exists and no wrong has resulted from the continuance of just the same method by the party now in power. It seems to me that we are bound to accept the statements of these two gentlemen until some proof be brought forward that they are not well founded. If there were that measure of evil resulting which is complained of by our hon. friends opposite, if the allegation of the hon. member from North Grey (Mr. Middleboro) be true that no Conservative contractor or

business man will tender to-day for government work, surely we would have heard of many complaints from them on that score. I observed, however, this afternoon that when the Minister of Public Works challenged our friends opposite to mention a single instance in which a Conservative had ceased tendering or abandoned what had been his business formerly, not one accepted the challenge. It may be true that there are complaints but from whom do they come? They come entirely, Mr. Speaker, from Conservative politicians, and not from business men. True my hon. friend from Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Boyce) gave one instance of a Liberal candidate having returned to his riding and told his people during an election campaign that he had been influential in getting for a local firm a certain portion of a public contract in that constituency, the member for Sault Ste. Marie stating, by the way, that it had not got as large a portion as it was entitled to. Surely we cannot, in all fairness, accept that as sufficient evidence in support of this motion. It is no doubt natural that political candidates should endeavour to secure all the credit they can for public works done in their constituency, and perhaps have, in some instances, an exaggerated, if not an erroneous, idea of the credit to which they are entitled. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), in support of his contention that evil exists and that bad results flow from the present system, which is a continuation of the old system, cited the case of the Mayes contract. Well, I shall not refer in any objectionable way to the declaration of Mr. Mayes, which has been discussed in this House, but I do not understand that in the declaration or any of the correspondence it has been shown——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MILLER. I am simply referring to the question of tenders and to what might have happened had other methods been in vogue. I say that no attempt has been made to show that Mr. Mayes received any advantage.

Mr. STAPLES. The hon. gentleman is out of order. You, Mr. Speaker, are generally fair to both sides, and I ask your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER. My ruling would apply to any hon. member when he goes beyond the limits of the motion and amendment.

Mr. MILLER. I bow, Mr. Speaker, to your ruling. I say that no case has been brought forward to show that any contractor has ever had any favour given him in the matter of tendering in any case. The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has said that statements will be made and suspicions will exist. No doubt statements will be made. The hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) made the statement that newspapers had been purchased, which is probably true, but surely no crime. We have had the statement made by him that a supporter of the government has received a contract from the Public Works Department at fabulous prices, but there was no evidence adduced to support it. And when asked at what prices the contract was let, he could not tell, and I presume did not know. Nevertheless the statement was made. He also made the statement that an enormous bribery fund had been used by this government in the province of New Brunswick, and that statement was equally made without any evidence to support it. We are told that suspicions exist. Well, if this House is to provide a remedy which will remove suspicion from the minds of all the people, we shall be here twelve months out of every year, and then not have accomplished our task. People will be suspicious, do what we will or can. If my hon. friend the leader of the opposition were in power, there would likewise be suspicions. My hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) would not be suspicious, nor would my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid), or Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Boyce), but there would still be even then suspicious people. Were the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in charge of a department, suspicion would be a million times greater.

Under the present system it is provided that two persons should be present when tenders are opened. It is suggested that it would be better if three persons were present. I do not know upon what principle that contention is made unless it be upon the principle that there is luck in odd numbers. I fancy that, if the present regulations provided that three should be present, our friends opposite would ask that four be present. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) whom I respect very highly and who always speaks very fairly, believes, as he has the right to believe, that the minister at the head of the department ought not to be present when tenders are opened. I quite agree with the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) that, surely, if there is any one who ought to be entrusted with any important work in connection with a department, it is the gentleman at the head of the department who, in the first place, has been elected by his own constituents to represent them, and in the next place has been selected by the Prime Minister to assume the responsible position as head of the department.

It has been urged—and there is more contention upon that ground than any other—that the tenderers themselves should be present when tenders are opened. I think the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) has given very good reasons why the tenderers ought not to be present. May I be permitted to suggest one or two additional reasons in support of the same view? I can easily imagine a case in which it may

be necessary for the minister in charge of a department to make further inquiry as to the ability of a given tenderer to carry out the contract. Oftentimes it would not be wise or proper, in fact, it would be most unbusinesslike, to award the contract to the man who puts in the lowest tender. The very fact that his tender is exceedingly or absurdly low would, of itself, be sufficient evidence that he would not be able to carry out and properly complete the contract. I remember a case in which tenders were called for a certain work. There were two tenders. But one of these tenders was so ambiguously worded that it was not certain whether the price did, or did not, include the heating for the building that was to be erected. If it included the heating, it was the lowest tender, but if it did not it was not the lowest tender. In such a case, I consider that the proper thing to do—and the thing that was done in the case I have referred to—was to get in touch with the man who put in the tender that was not understood and ascertain whether his tender did or did not include the heating. And, in fairness to all the parties who tendered, it was very important that the figures of the different tenderers should not, in the meantime, be made known to any one.

It will be remembered that the hon member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) said that all business must rest upon the trust that men have in men. But the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said that he was afraid that if we had such abundant faith in men, we would not, in the ordinary affairs of life, do our business very successfully, but would have to use a greater degree of caution. That, perhaps, is reasonable. I think that the hon. member for North Toronto may well set it as a gauge—that each of us may set it as a gauge—what would a man do in such a case if he were engaged not in public business, but in his own private affairs? A trustee, as I understand it, is expected to act as a prudent, intelligent, and honest business man would act if the circumstances were the same and he was handling his own affairs. Applying that to the matter before us, I would ask whether there are not many members of this House who have been members, it may be, of a church trustee board, of a school board, of an hospital board—and has any member of this House ever known any such case where tenders were called for and the tenderers were admitted when the tenders were opened? I have never known it to be so; and I do not think it is the custom for a man, in his own private business, when he has asked for tenders, to ask the tenderers to be present when tenders are openeed.

Some one has mentioned dredging. I had thought that, after the objections made by an hon. member in this House last session, to the matter of dredging, our friends on the other side would not again have mentioned the subject. But I find that my hon friend from North Grey (Mr. Middleboro) a gentleman for whom I have a great deal of esteem, refers to a certain dredging company in the north part of my own county and within his own riding. According to yesterday's 'Hansard,' the hon. gentleman said :

In my own constituency, the north riding of Grey, as you know, we have representing us in the local house the hon. A. G. MacKay, leader of the Liberal opposition in the province of Ontario. It may be a coincidence, but it is so, that that gentleman is also president of the Owen Sound Dredging and Construction company; it may be a coincidence that, although the assets of that company are worth anywhere from $200,000 to $300,000, he and the relatives of the late Liberal member in this House, own all the stock of that company except three shares of $300, and that these three shares consisting of $100 each are distributed nominally among three other persons for the sole purpose of constituting the necessary five in order to be incorporated as a dredging and construction company. That is the company about which there was so much examination in the Public Accounts Committee.

Now, I do not think that my hon. friend added anything to the debate in these remarks, or that he proved anything by his statement. Does it prove that the present method of letting contracts by tender is a bad method, that a man who happens to be engaged in political life, and happens to be a Liberal member of a provincial legislature in this Dominion, may get a contract? Do our friends suggest that some method of letting contracts should be adopted under which no man who is a Liberal could obtain a contract? If they do, the resolution of my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) does not go sufficiently far. If my hon. friend from North Grey endeavoured to injure the reputation of Hon. A. G. MacKay by this reference, I think he has failed in that also. I do not think it is right, or fair, or kind, to introduce into this House unnecessarily the private business of other persons. I maintain that Hon. A. G. MacKay has just as good a right as any other man in Canada to own an interest in a dredge, and to put in tenders for dredging contracts, provided that he does it honestly, openly and above board, and that contracts are given to him only if he puts in the lowest tender.

The name of a lady is dragged into the debate, the widow of the late Dr. Horsey, who in his day was a member of this House.

Mr. MIDDLEBORO. Who dragged it in?

Mr. MILLER. The hon. member for North Grey Mr. Middleboro).

Mr. HENDERSON. Not at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read the 'Hansard.'

Mr. MILLER. I am asked to read the 'Hansard.' I will:

In my own constituency, the north riding of Grey, as you all know, we have representing us in the local House the Hon. A. G. MacKay, leader of the opposition in the province of Ontario. It may be a coincidence, but it is so, that that gentleman is also president of the Owen Sound Dredging and Construction Company; it may be a coincidence that, although the assets of that company are worth anywhere from $200,000 to $300,000, he and the relatives of the late Liberal member in this House, own all the stock of that company except three shares of $300.

Mr. MIDDLEBORO. Where is the name? Who brought the name in first? The hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. MILLER. The hon. gentleman might just as well have mentioned the name as to say: the relatives of the late member.

On motion of Mr. Miller, the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the House adjourned at six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, January 29, 1909.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Report of the Transcontinental Railway Commission.—Mr. Graham.

Report of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.—Mr. Graham.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Hon. G. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). May I ask the Minister of Railways if the report of the commission appointed to look into the wages of employees on the Intercolonial has been presented to the House; I have seen it referred to in the papers.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways). I have no recollection of a commission being appointed for that purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. I remember reading copious extracts from the report of some commission; the minister ought to know if he appointed one. There was a report that the employees were too numerous and that if they were fewer the money thus saved could be devoted to raising the wages of other employees who are necessary.

Mr. GRAHAM. That was the finding of the board under the Lemieux Act with reference to the claims of freight clerks.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the Minister of Labour might bring down the report to the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is contained in the report of the Department of Labour presented on the first day of the session.

THE RESTAURANT COMMITTEE.

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

That the second report of the joint restaurant committee be adopted and that the following be the members of the House of Commons on the permanent joint restaurant committee, namely, Messrs. Sutherland, Barker, Monk and Harris.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That had better stand until to-morrow.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 23) respecting the Alberta Central Railway Co.—Mr. W. McIntyre (Strathcona).

Bill (No. 24) respecting the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Co.—Mr. W. McIntyre (Strathcona.)

Bill (No. 25) respecting the joint section of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company at Fort William, Ontario.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 26) respecting the Kootenay Central Railway Company.—Mr. Goodeve.

Bill (No. 27) to incorporate the London and Lancashire Plate Glass and Indemnity Company of Canada.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill (No. 28) respecting the Union Station and other joint facilities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Midland Railway of Manitoba at Portage la Prairie.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 29) respecting the Winnipeg and Northwestern Railway Company.—Mr. McCraney.

Bill (No. 30) respecting the subsidy from the Ontario Government to Lake Superior Branch of the Grand Trunk Pacific.—Mr. Turriff.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—JAPANESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I rise, Mr. Speaker, to a question of privilege. I observe in the Toronto 'Globe' two recent editorials with regard to a telegram which I sent to 'The Colonist' on the 24th October last. The portion of the editorials to which I desire to call attention is this:

Mr. Borden has supplied the public with the information that in a private statement to Mr. Templeman he repudiated the garbled despatch. He admits therefore that he was, immediately after its use, well aware of its existence. Why then did he not make his disclaimer public? The change in the text of the message was sufficiently great to make the Act of the garbler one of virtual forgery,

and yet Mr. Borden has allowed three months to pass without, so far as the public know, taking a single step to put himself right in the matter.

I stated in the House, when the matter was referred to before, and I again state, that it was not until after I had returned from the south in the month of December that I became aware that any change had been made in the telegram. I also stated, and I again state, that I then immediately called upon the management of the paper foran explanation. I had no reason to believe until after the middle of December that any change had been made in the telegram. I then wrote immediately and received a certain report with regard to it from the management, in which it is stated most distinctly that no person connected with the management had been responsible for it, and bringing to my attention certain matters which I will not now detail to the House until I receive from the management of the newspaper certain further reports which they have promised, because they have made investigation and are still making further investigation into the matter. So far as the newspaper is concerned, I have not the slightest control over it, editorially or otherwise, and I am no more responsible for the change in the telegram than I am for the mis-statements in the editorial columns of the 'Globe' with regard to it. I only regret that gentlemen in British Columbia who say they suspected I had not sent a telegram in these terms, did not, during the course of the by-election, bring the matter to my attention by telegram when I would of course have put it right at once.

LEVEL RAILWAY CROSSINGS.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to a statement in the press that a letter was sent by him this week to the chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners and that the latter had replied. In view of the importance of the subject and the deep interest of the public in it, I would ask the hon. minister if he would bring down a copy of his letter and of the reply and lay them on the table of the House.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Under the circumstances, the matter has become largely public, but it was not intended at all that the correspondence should be published. I would prefer not to be asked to bring it down until I have thoroughly gone into the matter. The question is still in abeyance, and I may have some proposals to make later in the matter, and therefore think it advisable not to bring down this correspondence just yet.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Mr. LENNOX. I am quite willing to accept the minister's opinion as to what is best to do, but the matter has been referred to in a great many papers. However, I am quite willing to take the view of the hon. gentleman in that regard. An extract of the letter was published in the papers.

Mr. GRAHAM. It was not intended that it should.

INTERNATIONAL WATERWAYS TREATY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would ask the right hon. First Minister whether or not he has any further information to give to the House as to when we may expect the production of the treaty recently signed with the United States relating to the waterways. Also whether any convention or treaty has been signed touching the adjudication by the Hague Tribunal of matters relating to the Fisheries, and, if so, whether that will also be laid before the House at an early date, and whether the convention has the assent and approval of the Imperial authorities and the Colony of Newfoundland.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). With reference to the waterways treaty, His Excellency the Governor-General communicated yesterday or the day before with the Colonial Office, and through it with the Foreign Office, for the purpose of having the treaty sent us at the earliest possible moment consistent with the rules of the service. With regard to the second treaty, it has been agreed to by Newfoundland and Great Britain that the question of the Newfoundland fisheries and all the matters in dispute should be referred to the Hague Tribunal. In a treaty of this kind, as the hon. gentleman knows, the most important feature is the settlement of the questions to be referred. The matter has been discussed by the Minister of Justice and the Secretary of State at Washington and is now under the consideration of the Newfoundland colony.

CIVIL SERVICE SALARIES.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following resolution:—

Resolved, that it is expedient that the Governor in Council, upon the recommendation of the head of a department, based upon a report of the deputy head, may grant to any officer, clerk or employee under the deputy heads in the inside service as defined by the Civil Service Amendment Act, 1908, who was in the public service at the time of the coming into force of that Act, an increase of salary of $150 a year, subject to the provisions hereinafter contained ; that in the case of any officer, clerk or employee who has received an increase of salary upon organization and classification under the said Act, such

increase shall be offset against the increase which such person might otherwise receive under any Act to be founded on this resolution; that no increase under any Act to be founded on this resolution to any officer, clerk or employee shall exceed the difference between his present salary and the maximum salary of the subdivision in which he has been placed upon organization and classification under the said Act of 1908; that all increases provided for hereunder shall take effect from the first day of September, 1908; that all sums of money voted by parliament for the financial year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, and applicable to the payment of salaries or increase of salaries of persons in the inside service shall be applicable to the payment of increases of salary granted under the Act to be founded in this resolution, so far as such sums are not required for the specific purposes for which they were granted; and during the said financial year there may be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada such moneys required for the payment of increases of salary hereunder as have not been voted by parliament.—Mr. Fisher.

He said: This resolution is the complement of the action of last session when the government introduced an amendment to the Civil Service Act, which amendment was founded on the report of the Civil Service Commission in 1908. That report largely confirmed and somewhat amplified the report of a previous Civil Service Commission in 1892. Speaking of the general terms, the reports of the two commissions coincide in a marked degree. The government of the day had no hesitation in believing that the judgment of two such important bodies, appointed some years apart and composed largely of different individuals, one appointed by a Conservative government and the other appointed by a Liberal government, deserved every consideration and action upon it. The government which appointed the commission of 1892, and which remained in power for some four years afterwards, did not see its way clear or was not able to act upon the report of that commission. We thought, however, that we were not only justified but called upon to act upon the report of the commission of 1907. Speaking in general terms and as shortly as possible, I may say that these reports, the last one at all events, embodied five principal recommendations: (1) that the entry into the Civil Service should in future be through a competitive examination instead of, as had been the case up to that time, through a qualifying examination; (2) that the service should be reorganized and classified on a somewhat different basis, the classification dealing rather with the duties than the personnel of the offices; (3) that an independent and non-political body of the Civil Service Commissioners should be appointed who would have charge of the competitive examinations and generally of the administration of the Civil Service under the government; (4) that the salaries of the Civil Service should be increased in consequence of the largely increased cost of living during the many years in which the salaries generally had not been greatly increased; (5) that a system of superannuation should be worked out and adopted for the benefit of those retiring from the service. The Bill of last session covered three of these recommendations. We introduced the system of competitive examinations for entering into the service; we established a non-partisan and independent commission under whose authority those examinations should be held, and who would have other powers in connection with the administration and development of the service under the government; and we adopted a scheme for a reorganization of the departments on the basis of the duties of the offices rather than their personnel. We left over the question of a special increase of salaries due to the increased cost of living, and we left aside for the moment the question of superannuation. The resolution which I now have the honour to propose to the House covers the fourth of these recommendations; and let me say a word or two in regard to the reason for carrying out this recommendation of the Civil Service Commission of 1907. That commission had before them an elaborate calculation of the cost of living, which showed that it had increased in a very great degree during the last few years, and also showed clearly and conclusively that the salaries of civil servants had not been increased proportionately, while men in private employments in Canada and men otherwise earning a living for themselves had an increase of revenue perhaps commensurate with or fully equal to the increased cost of living. I may point out that since then the Association of the Civil Service have submitted to the government another memorandum in confirmation of what the Civil Service Commission said in that respect, and I am informed by persons who live in Ottawa that even this year, when there has been somewhat of a check in the general progress of industry and commerce in the country, the actual cost of the necessities of life has not come down in accordance with that check of general business. I would also point out that the change in the scale of salaries of civil servants has been very slight ever since the original fixing of those salaries in 1857. I have under my hand a statement which shows that those who entered the service at that time entered it at $500 a year, just as they did two years ago. That was in the fourth class, where they were expected to remain only two years, when they went into the third class as a matter of course and received a salary ranging from $600 to $800 a year. In the second class the salaries ranged from $900 to $1,100 a year, and in

the first class from $1,200 to $1,400 a year. This was in 1857, 51 years ago. I need not point out that the cost of living has immeasurably increased since that time, that the work and responsibilities imposed upon the Civil Service of Canada have greatly increased, and that their relationship to and standing in the community has become so enlarged as to require that they shall have greater consideration in this year of grace 1909 than they had when Canada was a small, inconsiderable and cheap country in 1857. Some increases were made in 1903 by the present government. The third-class clerks were left at the same salary, but they largely took the work and the position of the former temporary clerks who entered at $400 and went up to $600 a year. The third-class clerks were made to go from $500 to $700, a slight increase for those who were doing the same kind of work. The junior second-class clerks, who in 1902 and before that had from $600 to $1,000 were raised to from $800 to $1,100. The second-class clerks, who before that had been from $1,100 to $1,400 were raised to from $1,200 to $1,500. The first-class clerks, who before that had been from $1,400 to $1,800, were raised to from $1,500 to $1,900.

The Bill of last session, by its reorganization of the service, and its new classification, added to the salaries of the various divisions, and I will now go over these divisions and the salaries attached to them. The Bill of last session divided the service into three general classes, under the deputy heads, and each of these classes was further divided into two subdivisions. Beginning at the bottom and working upwards : The clerks under subdivision B of the third division get from $500 to $800. These correspond, as nearly as possible, to the third class clerks of the old classification, whose salaries were from $500 to $700. The third-division, subdivision A of the new classification, corresponding to the junior second-class clerks of the old classification, had their salaries fixed at from $900 to $1,200, instead of $800 to $1,100 as formerly. In the second division, subdivision B which corresponded to the senior second-class clerks, the salaries were to be from $800 to $1,600. Under the old classification, these salaries were from $1,200 to $1,500. I would like to explain that the low commencement in that division is due to the fact that those from the outside passing the examination of the specially high character required for that division may be put straight into that division instead of going through the other divisions, and they have to go in at a lower rate proportionately than would otherwise be expected. Subdivision A of the second division which corresponded to the first-class clerk of the former classification, are given salaries of from $1,600 to $2,100. The first-class clerks of the old classification had salaries of from $1,500 to $1,900.

Mr. FISHER.

Subdivision B of the first division have salaries of from $2,100 to $2,800. Under the old classification, the chief clerks corresponding as nearly as may be to this class, had salaries of from $1,900 to $2,500. Then, we established a new subdivision, subdivision A of the first division, consisting of the higher officials, such as assistant deputy heads, chief clerks in charge of branches and other more important officers, who, under the old classification, ranged generally from $2,400 to $4,000 and who, in the new subdivision, range from $2,800 to $4,000. Last session, when this was done we had applications from the Civil Service for further consideration in the way of salary increases. We believed that this change of the classification and general raising of the limit of the classes as to salary would effect a very considerable advantage immediately to the members of the Civil Service. We believed that, in consequence of the increase of the maximums of the classes, we would give a pecuniary advantage, although not immediate, to those who thereby would be able to rise to a higher salary eventually than, under the old classification, they could attain to. We could not tell at that time, until the classification was worked out, just to what extent this would affect the civil service generally here in Ottawa. I confess that, personally, I believed it would accomplish more than it seems to have done. I was confident that a very large number of clerks would get immediate relief. I believed that the future relief by the raising of the increases to a higher maximum would be a pecuniary advantage to them which would satisfy them, although I understood and realized that that would not give them the relief in consequence of the present and pressing increase of the cost of living. It was not, however, until the classification of the different departments was worked out that we had details and knowledge which could prove to us—and did prove to us—that the immediate benefit to the Civil Service here in Ottawa, which we hoped and expected would come to them by this Act of last year, would not accrue. Having discovered this, and having had the representations of the Civil Service and the report of the commission, urging a general increase, we decided that we must take the matter up and deal with it now at the earliest occasion possible when we had the information at our disposal, and grant the relief to the Civil Service which the commission recommended and which their services to the country and their condition in regard to the cost of living seemed to completely justify.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the minister state at what time that was come to ?

Mr. FISHER. Since the facts of the reorganizations were before us so that we could see the condition of affairs.

Mr. FOSTER. And at what period could that come to be the fact ?

Mr. FISHER. Within the last month. the reorganization orders in council were only passed within a week or two. We had them before us and had the information in detail, not in all respects complete, but sufficient to show us that what we had expected was not going to come about. We waited, however, until the detail was amply before us, confirming us in an impression which had been coming home to us by the knowledge of the working of the classification by each minister in his own department, and which had come home to the Civil Service themselves and which they had represented to us as the basis for the further insistence and demand that this further relief should be given. I am reminded of what is perfectly obvious—that the principle of the relief was adopted last session. The measure of it we hoped would be greater under the Bill which we introduced and passed last session. When we found that the measure of it was not sufficient to meet the demands and necessities of the case, it was our duty, having adopted that principle, to carry that principle to its legitimate conclusion and to introduce this resolution which I am satisfied meets the whole necessities of the case.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the minister state when that principle was avowed last session ?

Mr. FISHER. It was avowed when the report of the commissioners was endorsed, in the debate which occurred last session declaring that relief was required. And in my explanations of the details of the measure last session, I pointed out that the measure which we were then proposing would, I believed, to a very large extent, meet the necessities of the case. My hon. friend can refer to the report of the discussion in 'Hansard,' and he will find that stated there in no equivocal terms.

Let me say a word or two with regard to the recommendations of the commission. I find that their recommendation is in general terms, and as follows :

Your commissioners are of opinion that, somehow or other, the immediate question of salaries should be dealt with. They cannot recommend general increases, but they would suggest to your Excellency in Council the advisability of at least taking votes for granting increases to deserving officials, and that for eastern Canada, both in the inside and outside service, such increase might be at the rate of 15 per cent for officials whose salaries are under $1,500, and 12½ per cent for salaries above that rate; and for the western provinces, where, no doubt, a greater need prevails, these scales should be 25 and 20 per cent to the same proportion of incomes and all provisional allowances should cease.

Your commissioners suggest that such increases should only be granted on rigid examination, but as time goes on, if the suggestions of your commissioners are carried into effect, the special increases should be abolished and a scale of salaries laid down suitable to each department and office in the public service.

The Bill of last session provided for laying down a scale of salaries suited to each department and office of the public service, but it did not provide for immediate relief in consequence of increased cost of living. We believed that the arrangement of salaries and reorganization of the service would bring such a measure of relief to so large a number of individuals in the service that it would be sufficient to meet that demand. But we have found since we had our classification completed that that expectation was not borne out, and we now propose to remedy that defect.

Mr. LALOR. Does this only apply to the inside service, or to the outside service as well?

Mr. FISHER. The Bill of last session applied only to the inside service, and this Bill, being the complement of that one, applies at the present time to the inside service alone, the inside service as defined in the Act of last session. Now, I wish to explain why the government has departed from that portion of the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission regarding a percentage increase.

Mr. LALOR. I would ask the minister what he calls the inside service?

Mr. FISHER. The Act of last session defines it. Let me say first that the salaries of the classes and of the officers generally in the service are almost all round figures of hundreds, and hundred and fifties, and so on. If we took the proposition of the Civil Service Commission and gave increases of 12½ and 15 per cent on the various salaries we found there would be a great many odd figures in the salaries of the officers. Anybody can see how inconvenient that would be in the estimates, and in working out the monthly pay in the accountant's office and in the Auditor General's office. We therefore dismissed the idea of absolutely adhering to a percentage basis in every detail. Then the question came up as to what groups of salaries we could deal with in round figures, and we found that 12½ per cent for the higher officers and 15 per cent for the lower, adopting the percentages recommended would work out in groups ranging several hundred dollars of difference in the salaries. Giving $100 increase to all those between $500 and $800, and $150 to all those between $800 and $1,200, and so on, we found there would be a result which we did not think was in harmony with the views of the Civil Service Commission, and which we did not think so equitable as the decision which we have arrived at as final. In working out

groups or schedules of salaries with the approximate percentage of increase, we found also that lower officials would get very much lower increases, and the higher ones, especially those with very high salaries, very much greater increases. We had representations from the civil servants themselves, we had formed our own ideas; and from the fact that the Civil Service Commission recommended a higher percentage for those lower down in the service than they did for those higher in the service, we came to the conclusion that it was the lower officers in the service that needed help in greater degree than the higher officers. I have had made up for me tables of various kinds. I have studied various plans, and after considering the question with careful attention, and on the recommendations embodied in a memorial which was sent by the Civil Service Association proposing different alternatives, one of which we accepted, we have adopted the principle of giving a flat increase to everybody in the service.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. To every person in the service. I do not think the resolution provides for those at the maximum of their class.

Mr. FISHER. I will point out the exception in a moment. The general principle is a flat rate of increase to everybody in the service, and after careful consideration and after counting the cost, we decided that $150 would be a fair treatment. I am glad to say that the delegation of the Civil Service Association which interviewed the Prime Minister and myself, afterwards agreed to that; and I am glad to say that since that agreement they have placed the matter before a special meeting of the Civil Service Association, which passed a resolution thanking them and thanking the government for the decision which has been taken. My hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) asks about some details. If he will notice the resolution he will see that there are exceptions. First, in the case of an officer who has received an increased salary upon classification and organization, that increase shall be offset against the increase provided here. As I said to begin with, this Act is the complement or continuation and fulfilment of what was designed in the Act of last session. By the classification and reorganization certain increases did accrue. Those men had, therefore, under the action we took last session, received their increases, and it would not be right for them to receive an additional increase. If their increase is $150 or more they will receive no increase under this Act; if their increase is less than $150, it will be subtracted from the sum of $150 which otherwise they would get under this Act. There is another exception. By the Act of last session we deliberately laid down the principle, with the unanimous concurrence of parliament, that certain classes of work were worth certain salaries, that men in certain subdivisions doing the work which pertained to those subdivisions, should get so much a year, going on to the maximum. In such a proposition as this, if we made no exception to the rule, there would be a considerable number of people who, being close to the maximum of the subdivision in which their work is placed by the reorganization, would be raised above the maximum of that subdivision. One of two things would result: Either we would have to promote them into a higher class, disarranging the reorganization, and give them a standing in the department which their work did not justify; or we would have to give them the whole of the increase, and they would be paid a sum higher than that which the Act of last session decided was a just and fair payment for the class of work they were doing. We therefore made the second exception, which is that no increase under this Act shall go beyond the maximum of the class in which the individual is.

Now, let me say a word or two as to what results from that. I will have to recall the memory of the House to the fact that last session we raised, in a general way, the maximum of the classes generally by $100 and, in some cases, by $200. Anybody who came into a particular class, with very rare exceptions, when the Act of last session came into force on the 1st of September, came in $100 below the maximum of his class. He is there still. He was there on the 1st of September. This Act will come into force and be applied as from the 1st of September last. Therefore, there are very few cases in which the individual will not get at least $100. There are a few and there even a few—a very few—only 35 in the whole service out of over 2,700—who will get no increase at all under this Act and who, under the reorganization of last session, got no increase. The number who will get less than $150 is inconsiderable, speaking from memory, something under 300. All the rest will get $150 or more.

Mr. LENNOX. Will these 35 that the minister mentioned be absolutely without any remedy at all, or is there going to be any provision for them ?

Mr. FISHER. There is no provision for them.

Mr. LENNOX. The fewer the greater the hardship.

Mr. FISHER. They are already in the enjoyment of the highest salaries paid for the class of work which they are doing in the departments.

Mr. LENNOX. Do I understand there is no grievance in these cases ?

Mr. FISHER. Well, I will not say that some of these individuals will not feel a

grievance but they are at the maximum of their classes. Parliament has decided that that maximum is the salary which ought to be paid for work of that class. If there are among them clerks who will justify promotion to another class they will then be able to reap the advantage of that promotion, but they have had the advantage already of being paid the utmost that the class in which they are is declared to be fairly paid, and therefore I do not think that they have a very serious grievance in not getting anything to-day. When you come to find, as is the case here, that of 2,700 odd of those employed in the city of Ottawa there are only 35 who are in that category, it will be admitted that the details of this Act have been worked out in such a way as to give an exceptionally large measure of remedy to the Civil Service.

I think that these explanations pretty completely cover the reasons for the introduction of this Act. They will render the Act quite comprehensible to members of parliament. I have felt that I was bound to explain somewhat the Act of last session, partly because, as I said at the beginning, this Act is complementary to that Act and partly from the fact that there are a large number of members in the House who were not present when the Act was passed and when it was discussed in all the fulness of its details. Therefore, I have thought it well to take the two together as I have done. At this stage of the debate I do not think it is necessary for me to go into further details. The result is such as to cover fully, entirely and, I think I may say, in an extraordinary degree, the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission. There is one more figure that I would like to give to the House. It is in regard to the percentage of increase. I spoke a few minutes ago of the fact that not a large amount of remedy was given by the classification. The actual amount was $36,238 added to the salaries in Ottawa. Under this Act $347,145 will be added and the total under both Acts will be $383,383. The average percentage rate of the whole increase is 13·12—very close to the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission, worked out without any idea when we actually went into the details of just how it would come out. This is, to my mind, in an extraordinary degree, a complete carrying out of the recommendations of the commission. The average rate of the special increase is 11·88 per cent, and under the classification and this special increase together it is 13·12 per cent. The number receiving the special increase under this Act is 2,605, the number who received the increase under the classification alone, which, I confess, was a great surprise to me, when I found it out, was only 59. So that the classification which we had hoped and expected would give a very large number an increase and a very considerable amount in dollars and cents added to their salaries only gave an increase to 59 and only added $36,238. Now, we are going to give everybody in the service, except 35, some measure of increase and the whole average of increase is 13·12 per cent.

I would just add that the Act of last session came into force on the 1st of September. This Act being a complement to that Act, we believe it is only fair and just that the Act should take effect as from the first September last, it being altogether in this fiscal year, and we therefore think it proper that the Act should take effect on the salaries and that we should start payment from the 1st of September. I would just add, in addition to the details that I have given, that there is a clause at the end similar to the clause at the end of the Civil Service Act of last session and similar to the clause at the end of the Civil Service Act of 1903, providing the necessary machinery to carry out the provisions of this Act. Later on I will have much more detail to give when the House goes into committee on the Bill, and if required I will only be too glad to answer all questions when we go into Committee of the Whole.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. When you talk of organization according to the duties of the different departments, what we used to call the theoretical organization, who prepares that—the commission or the departments themselves ?

Mr. FISHER. I will have to give you an explanation of that point. Section 6 of the Act of last session defined how a clerk under the classification in the old service was to come under the new Act. It seems to be rather mechanical in its operation. When we came to discuss classification and reorganization—and I may take my hon. friend into my confidence and tell him that we had to do that after the assiduous task of carrying the elections in the country and the prior work of preparing for them—when we came then to discuss the matter the consequence was that my colleagues and myself had not a very great opportunity of going into the theoretical organizations of our departments. However the Act defines that we should make a reorganization. The Department of Justice informed us that clerks with fixed salaries must come, without any deviation whatever, into the subdivision which their salary entitled them to. The classifications therefore which have already been adopted and passed under section 8 are largely the mechanical transfer of the old service into the new classification. In some of the departments we have made changes; I myself have made some changes in the reorganization. I would be sorry to think that the reorganization was final and conclusive. I do not think that with the short time at our disposal, and in view of the duties which have

devolved upon us during the last few months, we have been able to really thoroughly consider and discuss and come to final conclusions upon the proper organization of our departments. As I said to a Civil Service delegate not long ago, I think that work will have to be done more completely and more thoroughly in the near future, and possibly from time to time as events and circumstances and knowledge arise. That, however, is the classification which we passed not very long ago, and in that classification the clerks in the old service are transferred into the new classification under the operation of the new Act, partly mechanically, partly automatically, and partly in consideration of the duties discharged and the theory of the organization of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not quite understand what the minister means by that; can he give us some particular instances?

Mr. FISHER. I will have to think that out. I have not charged my mind with particular instances.

Mr. FOSTER. You say partly mechanically and partly automatically.

Mr. FISHER. I mean that some of the ministers have been able to proceed at once. For instance, I believe that the Minister of Inland Revenue, when the Mines Branch staff was brought into the inside service found there were some officials whose duties and qualifications from the technical and scientific standpoint would require them to be put in a higher classification than their salaries in the outside service would allow, and the Department of Justice declared that they should be put into that subdivision in the new classification which their salaries would indicate. The Minister of Inland Revenue thinks they ought to be in a higher subdivision in consequence of their duties and their qualification and we will have to make a change so as to provide an opening for them in the higher division. I am not sure whether the Minister of Inland Revenue has done that in the classification or not, but he spoke to me about it. That is one instance I can give to my hon. friend on the spur of the moment.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the minister would bring down the orders in council which would show the House exactly what departments have been reorganized and to what extent there was reorganization.

Mr. FISHER. Certainly; the orders in council will be laid on the table. I may say that I do not think that any of the departments look upon their organization under these orders in council as complete.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). In the debate of last session we pointed out to the minister that there seemed to be some inconsistency between sections 5, and 6, and 8, and that it was not very clear how the ministers could proceed to harmonize the provisions of these sections. Before this resolution can be properly discussed it is very necessary that we should understand the reorganization of the various departments and that we should have these orders in council laid before us so that we may properly consider what has been done. I would suggest also that we should have the Act of last year in pamphlet form. My hon. friend from North Toronto has made application for a copy in that form and he has been unable to procure it.

Mr. FISHER. I have a copy here in pamphlet form and I thought there were hundreds of them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as the increase to the Civil Service is concerned I do not know of any good reason why it should be confined to the inside service alone and why the outside service should not be included as well. The Civil Service Commission pointed out that the salaries of some civil servants in different parts of the country were so low that not only hardship but even cruelty was involved, and during the debate on the Bill last year I strongly urged upon the government that this should be taken into consideration. I would like to tell the minister that every argument he has adduced here this afternoon in favour of this increase to the inside service is equally an argument for the consideration of the outside service. Section 3 of the Act of last year defines the inside service to be:—

3. The Civil Service shall be divided into two divisions, namely, the inside service, which shall consist of that part of the public service in or under the several departments of the executive government of Canada and in the offices of the Auditor General, the Clerk of the Privy Council, and the Governor General's secretary, employed at the city of Ottawa, or at the Experimental farm station or the Dominion Astronomical Observatory near Ottawa, but not including the officers, clerks and employees employed at Ottawa in the second or outside departmental division as defined by paragraph (b) of section 4 of the Civil Service Act, or in any office of a purely local character; and

The outside service, which shall consist of the rest of the public service.

The statute of course makes a clear distinction between the two branches of the service, but the increased cost of living does not make any discrimination between them, and the remarks of the Civil Service Commission of 1907 with respect to the increased cost of living have general application to the whole of Canada and not to the city of Ottawa alone. Therefore, when the government are proposing what may be regarded as a very proper measure of justice to the Civil Service at Ottawa they are apparently leaving out of consideration altogether

the numerous officials in the outside service throughout the country who are receiving no increase of salary and who have no consideration in the terms of the resolution which the hon. gentleman has placed before us now. I think we ought to have a pretty full and pretty frank statement of the reasons which induced the government to deal with only one branch of the service and to leave absolutely without any consideration or regard this other branch. Does not the hon. gentleman know that the terms of the Civil Service Commission of 1907 apply to these outside officials? Does he not know that the report of Mr. Justice Cassels, laid on the table of this House within a week, refers to officers of the outside service, who administer funds sometimes to the extent of $1,000,000, and who, in the opinion of Mr. Justice Cassels, have been without sufficient consideration, considering the importance of their duties, for many years past? Why should all these be put out of consideration, and why has my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture said not one word to-day indicating the reasons why the same considerations which have induced him to bring this motion before the House should not have induced him also to pay attention to the legitimate claims of those who are embraced within the outside service?

Then, there is another matter upon which I think we ought to have some information. I think the Minister of Agriculture or the Prime Minister ought to lay before the House the terms of a famous circular which was distributed among the members of the Civil Service at Ottawa during the last election campaign, bearing the imprimatur of my hon. friend the junior member for Ottawa (Mr. McGiverin) and endorsed in a very emphatic way by the right hon. the Prime Minister himself. It is refreshing indeed to hear that right hon. gentleman laying before this House the idea that my suggestion of an inquiry into the claims of the province of British Columbia was a direct bribe to the people of that province, when we have his own signature to this circular distributed among the civil servants of Ottawa when he was a candidate asking for their votes at a general election. That circular is ten thousand times worse than the worst possible construction which could be put upon my pledge to the people of British Columbia in 1904. I think the right hon. gentleman is the last man in this country to talk about bribes to constituencies or to any one else. His whole record, since he has been the leader of this government, ought to induce him to refrain from uttering one word on that subject, either in parliament or on the public platform of this country. The circular was undoubtedly issued, and my right hon. friend can produce a copy of it. His letter appeared in the public press, and why should we not have that laid before us, so that we can see whether the promises then made are being implemented by the resolution before the House? I am surprised under the circumstances that the Minister of Agriculture should not have laid it before the House before we are called upon to discuss the resolution. No doubt my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture would be thoroughly ashamed of it, so that he may perhaps be excused upon that ground. We are, however, undoubtedly entitled to the orders in council setting out the reorganization of the service, so that we may know whether the reorganization has been mechanical, or whether in any cases it has been discretionary, and if so upon what principles that discretion has been discretionary, and if so upon what principles that discretion has been exercised. I will not deal with the subject further at this stage. In committee we shall have an opportunity for a full discussion, and I would like to know from my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture when it would be practicable for him to lay on the table of the House the information to which I have referred.

Mr. FISHER. I have no doubt that I can give it to the House before the next government day, that is, next Tuesday.

Mr. GEO. H. COWAN (Vancouver). Mr. Speaker, I could heartily agree with the resolution of the hon. Minister of Agriculture were it based on a principle, the application of which would be as wide as the causes which occasioned it. I understand that this increase is to be given to the inside service because the cost of living has increased in the district in which the members of this inside service reside. Now, I can tell the hon. minister that the cost of living has increased in a much greater ratio in other parts of Canada; and, as the hon. leader of the opposition has said, if you are basing the increase on a principle, let that principle apply wherever the causes of increase are in existence. In British Columbia, I am prepared to show, the increase in the cost of living in the last four years has been 47 per cent; I am prepared to show that in detail; and, as a result of that great increase in the cost of living, the wages and salaries of other trades and professions in British Columbia have increased, not to the extent of 47 per cent, but to a very great extent indeed. In that province, however, where we have only members of the outside civil service, there has been no increase in salaries to meet this extra cost of living. Not only has the cost of food and other necessaries of life increased, but the taxes of British Columbia have been greatly increased. I do not know whether this House is aware of the reasons why the taxes of British Col-

umbia have gone up by leaps and bounds. I do not know whether the minister is aware that British Columbia is obliged, in order to make revenue meet expenditure, to impose a real property tax of 1 per cent, a wild land tax of 5 per cent, a personal property tax of 1 per cent and an income tax of from 1½ to 4 per cent. Rentals and taxes in British Columbia have gone up, to be absolutely accurate, the one 60 per cent and the other 45 per cent in the last four years. Yet that portion of the Civil Service resident in British Columbia is entirely ignored by this resolution. It is so not only in British Columbia ; it is so everywhere outside of the confines of this city of Ottawa. I had to come here to learn that the cost of living had increased in this city, but that the moment you get beyond the limits of this city the conditions as to the cost of living remain as they were in 1857. I had to hear this resolution of the hon. Minister of Agriculture before I could realize that fact. In British Columbia it is not a fact, and if the hon. minister wishes to apply a principle and not merely to implement a pledge given in an election campaign, it will be his duty to apply that principle wherever the cost of living in Canada has so increased that it demands, for the support and maintenance of civil servants and their families and households, an increased salary.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I do not find fault at all with my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Cowan) for the vehemence of his observation nor with my hon. friend the leader of the opposition for the warmth of his argument. I think I can successfully answer both. First of all let me say that this resolution is introduced to carry out a principle which is very easily understood the moment you reflect upon it. Last year we undertook to reform the Civil Service, which comprises two branches, the outside and the inside. We undertook last session to reform the inside, but took the power to also, at a later date, operate a similar reform in the outside service, I may say to those hon. gentlemen, who were not here last session, that it was then shown that, as a matter of history, wherever Civil Service reform has been operated, whether in Great Britain, the United States or elsewhere, it was introduced and made effective by gradual stages. No government has ever yet undertaken, so far as I know, such a task as to reform at once both the outside and the inside service. In the United States and Great Britain they proceeded by stages, and we are doing the same thing. We have undertaken to reform the inside service, reserving the power to do the same with the outside, which we intend doing as soon as possible after we have got through with the inside departments. As my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture has explained, the present measure applies to the increases of salaries and in this we are carrying out the suggestion of the Civil Service Commission in their report. My. hon. colleague the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has quoted the very paragraph of the report upon which we base our present action, but it can bear repetition :

> Your commissioners are of opinion that somehow or other the immediate question of salary should be dealt with. They cannot recommend general increase, but they would suggest your Excellency in Council the advisability of at least taking votes for granting increases to deserving officials, and that for eastern Canada, both in the inside and outside service, such increase might be at the rate of 15 per cent for officials whose salaries are under $1,500 and 12½ per cent for salaries above that rate: as for the western provinces, where no doubt a greater need prevails these scales should be 25 per cent and 20 per cent to the same proportion of incomes and all provisional allowances should cease. Your commissioners suggest that such increases should only be granted on rigid examination, but as time goes on, if the suggestions of your commissioners are carried into effect, these special increases should be abolished and a scale of salaries laid down suitable to each department and office in the public service.

Mr. SPROULE. Does that apply to the outside service ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, to the inside and the outside. I would say to my hon. friend that London, Rome or Paris was not built in a day. Last year he knows we undertook to deal with the inside service and at the same time took power to deal with the outside service when we had completed the job in the first instance. One of the consequences of a reform in the inside service was the increase of salaries. The suggestion made by the commissioners was that this increase should vary from 12½ to 15 per cent ; but after having discussed the matter with the Civil Service Association and after having given it the best consideration we could, we came to the conclusion that we would meet the suggestion of the commissioners, if we gave a general and flat increase of $150. The principle which we ask the House to carry out is to give the increase of 15 per cent recommended by the commission, and we proposed that by giving a flat increase of $150 to all the members of the service. We are providing that if any official has received an increment of $150 in his salary, he shall not get the increase because he has received it already. That is a principle very simple and easy to understand, and I think it will appeal to members of the House. This Bill makes provision also that the increase shall date from the first of September. Why did we do that ? We did it because the Bill of last year came into force on the first of September, and this is intended to be a complement of the legislation then adopted.

My hon. friend (Mr. Borden), in rather hot language, has said that this was a bribe which I offered the city of Ottawa for the Civil Service vote. I have only this to say to my hon. friend. If the matter had come up for the first time, when my young colleague from this city made the suggestion in one of his addresses, there might be something in the charge of my hon. friend. When my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) was in Ottawa supporting his candidate, he charged the government with having acted cruelly—that was the very expression he used—towards the service in not having increased their salaries long ago, and if then I had given the first intimation that the government proposed increasing their salaries, there might be something in what he says. But what were the conditions ? During last session when we had under discussion the Civil Service Bill, or at all events the report of the commissioners, I expressed the very same idea. That was reported in the press of this city, and never did I hear that report challenged. This is what appeared in the Citizen of the 18th of April last :

Sir Wilfrid Laurier has been waited upon by a deputation representing the Civil Service Association, headed by the president, Mr. Kingston. The delegates submitted to the Prime Minister the necessity of giving effect this session to the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission in the matter of increase of salaries. The commissioners suggested for eastern Canada, both in the inside and the outside service, increases at the rate of 15 per cent for officials whose salaries are under $1,500, and 12½ per cent for salaries above that rate. The reply of the Prime Minister is said to have been encouraging. It is understood that the government had already decided to grant the increases, and that the necessary resolutions are in course of preparation for presentation to parliament at an early date.

This was published in this city while parliament was in session. The Bill was introduced shortly after and never was any objection taken to the statement I there made that we were favourable to the increase suggested by the commission. And if we had last year introduced the resolutions which were then in course of preparation, I understand, from the language of my hon. friend opposite, that he would not have objected because it was due to the Civil Service that their salaries should be increased. If we had introduced those resolutions last session, we would then have met with the approval of my hon. friend. We stated that it should be done right away. The Civil Service Commissioners had said in their report that it should be done and that no time should be lost. But the resolutions were not introduced, and why not? Everybody knows the reason; we had not time to do it. The Civil Service Bill was introduced as soon as we had received the report of the Civil Service Commissioners. But it was not until the 8th of July that the Civil Service Bill passed its third reading. And parliament prorogued on the 20th of July. After the Civil Service Bill had passed, everybody knows, parliament had no time to take up the resolution we have now introduced. But we were committed; we had pledged ourselves to it; our friends of the opposition, if I remember well, were pressing us to do it, and so was the press of the country. Was it extraordinary that we should say, in the course of the elections, that we would introduce this resolution, that we would increase these salaries, and that the increase should date from September 1, the date when the Act came into force? It was contemplated at the time the Bill was introduced, and the only fault found with us by my hon. friend opposite was that we had not introduced this legislation before. But the reason was obvious—we had not the time to do it last year. Anybody can see the wisdom and reasonableness of the course we said we would take, that this legislation should date from the time the Civil Service Bill came into force, the 1st of September.

My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) says that this was a bribe to the electors of Ottawa. It took him a long time to make that discovery. It is very strange, if this was such an outrageous proceeding as he now says, that he did not discover it during the elections. He and his friends were upbraiding us and accusing us of bribery and all sorts of wrong-doing; why, then, did he not mention this among the many sins which he attributed to us? I can understand it well. My hon. friend thought it would not be safe to make such a statement at that time,—it was safer to wait until after the elections were over. And now, in a fit of virtue, he says that this was a very extravagant and corrupt proposition to make to the civil servants of Ottawa.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the date when it was made?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. About the 20th of October.

Mr. FOSTER. And when were the elections?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. On the 26th of October. If my hon. friend has forgotten the date, I have not forgotten it. But I do not see that the date has anything to do with the question, for I will do my hon. friend the justice to say that in five days he could have done a great deal of mischief had he so desired. But I know not only what he could do, but what he could refrain from doing. I know that he could await the opportune moment for bringing this matter before the country. That is the explanation, and I think it will be accepted as fair and the proposition as reasonable and perfectly legitimate. It will be seen

that we have done the very thing that should have been done under the circumstances.

So far as the outside service is concerned, it must come under this system of reform, of course. But we are doing one thing at a time; we are completing the reform of the inside service, and when that is done we will apply ourselves to the reform of the outside service also. But let me say to my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Cowan), and also to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), that it is possible to give a large measure of relief to the outside service without legislation of this kind. We can do it in the estimates by providing for it year by year. My hon friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) has already done it, having given the officials in his department increases two years ago. I do not remember the figures, but they were substantial increases. And this applies to British Columbia as well as to other parts of the country. I think that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) has done the same. But, though we have, to a certain extent, improved the condition of the outside service, we equally recognize that the measure is not final, but that the question will have to be taken up at the earliest possible moment.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I listened with interest to the explanation of the resolution made by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). I may say at once that, so far as concerns the principle of giving this measure of relief to the civil servants that were affected by the new Act, there has been no disagreement in this House for a considerable period. I think the government was pretty well forced last year to bring in a Bill for the amelioration of the Civil Service and organizing it upon new lines. They were forced to this by public opinion outside, and the effect which was given to that public opinion by the opposition in this House. My hon. friend will remember that, early in last session, I introduced a resolution in this House affirming the feasibility and advisability of having the Civil Service of Canada put on a basis of merit and examination as regards both entrance and promotion. He will remember also that, at that time, the government thought it its duty—certainly it pursued the course—to vote down that resolution. The members of the government voted that way themselves, and their followers obediently followed them, as is usual, and solemnly declared that the principle of applying to the Civil Service examinations for entrance and promotion was not a proper principle or an advisable one to follow But, though they voted down that principle, and the proposed action, at a later period of the session they brought in a measure of Civil Service reform embodied in the Act which was passed. The Prime Minister has just now declared that they had not time to bring in this resolution last year. He gave the date—I do not recollect now what it was, but it was toward the close of the session—when the Civil Service Act was passed. But he was careful not to give the date when that Bill was first submitted to the House, nor did he explain why so long a time was allowed to elapse between the introduction of that Bill and the time it was pressed forward to completion.

Well, he says, they were not prepared at that time. No they were not prepared, they had not time to give to this legislation. What is this legislation ? What does it require ? Not a great deal of thought, not a great deal of analysis. They are simply passing a piece of legislation which says, we will add $150 to every employee, with the exception of 35. Now it does not seem to me that it takes much thought to bring down a measure like that before the House, or much time to pass it through the House. If it were a complex matter of grading salaries according to merit, and of giving a proper increase on the ground of merit, and that therefore you had to go through the record of 2,700 employees at Ottawa and make proper revisions and proper grading, then the hon. gentleman's plea would have something in it. They had not time to do it ! But this is an absolute rule-of-thumb application. No matter whether the man has been in the service one day before the 1st of September or ten years before the 1st of September, the man who is only one day in gets the flat increase, and the man who has been in ten years gets nothing more than that same flat increase.

Had not time! and that is the reason it was not brought in last year. My right hon. friend and the minister who introduced the Bill say they bring it down in order to carry out the recommendation of the commission They do! What is the report of the commission? The report of the commission is absolutely opposed to the flat rate business, and I think the report of the commission is much to be preferred to the slap-dash method which has been adopted by the minister who introduced the Bill. What do they say:

> Your commissioners cannot recommend general increases; but they would suggest to Your Excellency in Council the advisability of at least taking votes or granting increases to deserving officers, and that for eastern Canada, both in the outside and inside services, such increases might be at the rate of—

And so on. So the Civil Service Commission, men who had gone into the question, men who had devoted time to it, men who were considered able and adepts, after having spent a year in the examination, gave their conclusion, and it recommended an in-

crease to the outside and inside services, an increase, not on the horizontal principle, but an increase to deserving officials. After your commission have gone into the question and made an examination, does the First Minister say that he has followed, even a long way off, the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission? He has absolutely negatived the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission, and he has done it without investigation, simply to be able, in a trice, to pass a horizontal addition of $150 flat rate to every individual in the service, no matter whether he was put in a day before the 1st of September, or was put in and did good service for 10 years before. So I think that inconsistency is absolutely shown. These gentlemen are not looking at the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission, they are not anxious to carry it out. They slap the Civil Service Commissioners in the face, and say, away with your recommendation! We do not intend to give this increase according to merit and desert, which is the principal of this Bill, if it has any principle—we do not intend to take the trouble to look into that, we intend to give every man in the service, high or low, deserving or undeserving, competent or incompetent, the eleven-year-man or the one-day man, a flat increase of $150; and thereby, says the First Minister, he shows an absorbing desire to carry out the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission which he appointed. I say this method is one which is not only unscientific, but absolutely unjust from start to finish; and the ministers adopt this method because they either do not want to take the trouble themselves of making a discerning examination, or hand it over to their Civil Service Commissioners who, in conjunction with the deputies of each department, might be very well competent to do it, they do not intend to adopt either of those plans, but they adopt this method of an easy, ready, flat increase of $150 for each one.

Well, my right hon. friend excused himself from the gentle admonition given to him by the leader of the opposition, and contended that if he had probably transgressed the spirit of the laws governing elections in this country, at least he had proved himself a much lesser transgressor than had my hon friend who was charged early in the session by the Prime Minister of attempting to bribe the province of British Columbia by declaring himself to be in favour of a just arbitrament of any grievances that might be shown to exist in that province, in certain lines. My right hon. friend not only introduced this legislation last year from a very well conceived idea that it might be useful to him in the course of the elections, but deftly and very ingeniously he used it to the utmost advantage, and in doing so made an exhibition of a Prime Minister of Canada in an election in the city of Ottawa, in the Dominion of Canada, such as I am bound to say will not find a parallel in the history of any prime minister of any constitutionally governed country. Now my right hon. friend is fond of saying: I am a Liberal of the old English school, I take John Bright and William Gladstone as my exemplars. Does the right hon. gentleman, in the wildest flight of his imagination, suppose such a thing as John Bright, if he had been Prime Minister of Great Britain, or Mr. Gladstone, who was Prime Minister, or Lord Rosebery, or Mr. Asquith, or any other British premier, going to the city of London, to a constituency in which he himself was standing, and making an absolute promise such as he made to this constituency, which was interpreted in no other way, and could be interpreted in no other way, than a deliberate bribe to a very large and deserving class of the population? How smoothly the right hon. gentleman tried to get out of that. Why, he says, the opposition last winter in parliament were willing that these increases should be given. I myself, he says, somewhere in Ottawa, said that I was favourable to an increase. What is the difference, he says, between the position of the opposition and my position carried out during the elections. There is every difference, and nobody knows it better than the right hon. gentleman himself. If he had put that increase through last year, your Civil Service would have been placed on the level of independent men, with their rights defined by statute, that is where they would have been.

Left as it was,—and for that very purpose, one may I believe,—many of them were in dire want, many of them were pressed by the necessities of every day household economy, many of them were pressed by maturing bills which went beyond the income that they had given to them. They had come two years ago and a year ago and put their plea and their case before the government, they had had their plea and their case practically approved and yet they had been denied their increases. The Minister of Finance of the government of last year made it plain that he could not vote for it because it involved too great a strain upon the finances. That was the state of things. Then, why, he asks, did not my hon. friend raise the hue and cry before the elections were over. Why did not my right hon. friend make his bribe in time to let the country know what he had done and raise the hue and cry? This letter is dated the 19th day of October. When it was published I do not know, but certainly not before the 19th. It would take some days to get it out and circulate it. You will not be wrong if you say that the right hon. gentleman calculated it so that

it should come at the very crucial moment, a few hours before the election, do its work and be heard of outside as little as possible. Is that clean politics? The poor devil who does not know to-day where he will get enough to put him through to-morrow and who succumbs to the dollar bill that is offered to him as the price of a day's labour if he will go and vote for a man must be visited with pains and penalties, he must be reprobated as a man guilty of taking a bribe. This gentleman, the leader of the government, the Liberal of the old English school, goes and offers $347,000 a few days before the election to the electors to vote for him. Yet, he sneers at purity. Why should he not? He has earned the right to do so. He could not pass this simple debate through without sneering at the virtue of the hon. gentleman who leads this party. He has established his right to sneer at every political and public virtue in this country.

Now it may be well just to see what this circular is, to see whether it is simply a suggestion, to see whether it is simply just an idea that it might be reasonable to do something. The hon. the junior member for Ottawa (Mr. McGiverin) makes the following statement. But, before we go to that let me say another thing which I had almost forgotten. There was a special reason why a bribe of $347,000, as figured out by the minister who brought down the Bill to-day, should be held out within a few hours of the vote in the city of Ottawa. What was the special reason? The right hon. gentleman had last session and the session before declared that everything was right in the timber limit and land leases and under the mellowing influence of argument and logic like that, one of the chief recipients of the bounty in the practically unpaid franchises from this country was, by his party, nominated to contest the city of Ottawa. They nominated him and he passed into the contest.

An hon. MEMBER. What has that to do with this?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I am not responsible for the election of the hon. gentleman. He will have to ask his constituents if he cannot see what this has to do with it. That gentleman was the nominee of the party in this city, and his canvass went on. But, the word that came to the right hon. gentleman's ear was more doleful and more hopeless each day until the Macedonian cry came to come over and help us or we are lost. The right hon. gentleman, with the loss of the constituency staring him in the face, with the fact patent before him that he would lose in the metropolis and capital of this country, by a peculiarly Liberal method of action, ousted the choice of the party in this city and placed himself in the gap with the present junior member for Ottawa. Then came the opportune time and to make the election sure the promise was made of $347,000 if the Civil Service would do the right thing. The Civil Service trembled, many a man voted honestly—I am not going to say that any one did not vote honestly—but they were between their necessities and the insidious, relentless canvass which went on every hour, day and night;—'Remember that the premier is going to represent this city; remember that he is all-powerful; what he wants done will be done; if you want your salaries raised be careful to be on the right side with the premier, who holds it in the hollow of his hand.' So he does and so he promised them. The statement of the hon. junior member for Ottawa (Mr. McGiverin) is as follows, and that was, I find, given out in the Ottawa Free Press on October 13, not long before the election:

> Despite what the government had previously done in its endeavour to put the service into proper shape, it was felt, some two years ago, that a civil service commission should be appointed. That commission made certain recommendations, one of which was that the Civil Service should be taken out of politics. The government passed an Act last session to carry out that recommendation, and it went into force on September 1.

One note of comment on that would be that if such a thing did take place it took place simply for the service in Ottawa, but it did not do anything for the service of the Dominion.

> I want to say quite frankly, as a man who has had something to do with legislation, that you cannot expect any Act, or any great change such as this, to be put in force and carried out in a few weeks. It takes time to accomplish any great change, and when the civil servants look into that point and see what these changes mean to them, they will not complain. In every class, the minimum and maximum of salaries is raised $200.
>
> The Act is meant as a permanent benefit to the civil servants of Canada,—

The civil servants of Canada! The Civil Service in the city of Ottawa—

> —and is not fair to criticise it after looking at it for only three or four weeks.
>
> What has the government done? The deputy ministers have taken hold of this Act and started to reclassify the members of the Civil Service.

And yet the minister to-day, in introducing his Bill, said that they had not done a blessed thing until after they had got back from their elections, and then they were so tired out that they could not do anything; hence the flat increase.

> To reclassify such a large body of men, so many different considerations being concerned, is bound to take some time.

Who in the world has attempted to reclassify them? The minister says that they are not going to attempt to reclassify them. Instead of reclassifying them to find

out the merit and desert of each, they adopt a horizontal, flat increase, which requires no classification.

Those gentlemen who have gone into the matter are, however, I understood nearly ready to make their report of the reclassification, which shows that they have taken it up earnestly. Then it has to go to the cabinet council. During the last few weeks of course, ministers have been busy with elections, for they, like we, have to see that a good government is returned.

That's good :—

They are engaged in different sections of the country assisting various candidates.

Assisting various candidates ; that's good:—

They are engaged in various sections of the country assisting varions candidates who are going to make up the parliament of Canada and the defenders of the Liberal policy. But the civil servants will be looked after on their return after the 26th.

That's a full promise.

What I want to say with regard to reclassification is that the large number of civil servants will actually receive a cash benefit.

The minister to-day declares that under the reclassification they would only receive a benefit of $59,000, but that under this horizontal increase the total will come up to $387,000.

They do not have to wait until next session for their money. The money under the Act comes out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada and it is there for the civil servants as soon as the classification goes through.

Now comes the gist.

The Civil Service Commissioners also recommended, for the inside and outside service, a general increase based on merit of 15 per cent under $1,500, 12½ per cent over $1,500 and 25 per cent to those in the west. I want to pledge my word here and now that I will do all in my power to see that that recommendation is absolutely carried out as soon as this reclassification is settled and the Civil Service is put on a proper basis.

I want to remind the hon. junior member for Ottawa (Mr. McGiverin) that he has some work cut out for him; he was honest in making that promise, he intends to implement it now.

I want to say further that in all cases not only the increases through the reclassification but also the increases to be given under the recommendation of the commission will date back to the 1st of September, the date on which this Act came into force.

Here is the Bill; here is the minister explaining it, here is the Prime Minister supporting it, and they absolutely do not intend for one moment or in any degree to go into the matter of merit so that the junior member for Ottawa must go to work and convert his Prime Minister and his Minister of Agriculture who is bringing this Bill down. It is not 'ought to date back,' not that it is my opinion that they should date back, not that I will strive to have them date back. Now, this is submitted to the Prime Minister who is a candidate in the city of Ottawa where there are 2,700 civil servants, a large proportion of whom have votes, and the Prime Minister on the 19th of October writes:—

Ottawa, 19th October, 1908.

My dear McGiverin,—I have read with care the statement which you made in your speech reported in the 'Ottawa Free Press" of Tuesday, October 13, with regard to the Civil Service. The opinion which you therein express seems to be fair and reasonable, and I am prepared to endorse it, and you can say so.

I may add that the Civil Service Commission was appointed to advise the government, and that after due consideration the suggestions which they have made seem to me, as they seem to you, reasonable, fair and equitable.

I have no authority at this moment to pledge the government. I only express my personal opinion, and the course which I will recommend to my colleagues.

Believe me as ever,

Yours very sincerely,

(Sgd.) WILFRID LAURIER.

H. B. McGiverin, Esq.,
Ottawa.

Well, does not that carry the whole thing? The Prime Minister who creates his colleagues, out of indifferent material often—the matter that went into Adam as necessary and proper for the creation was scant enough but it was pretty good material. My right hon. friend is also a creator ; he creates his colleagues, he sustains his colleagues, he dismisses his colleagues when they don't please him; as the man in the Scripture of old he says to one of them: Do this, and he doeth it; and to another: come, and he cometh; and to another: go, and he goeth—but he does not go with exactly the same equable temperament as when he was told to come. And the right hon. gentleman, a candidate for the city of Ottawa where there are 2,700 civil servants whose plea for years he has absolutely denied, and to whom he has neglected to give redress, this right hon. gentleman says: Here am I the all powerful; here am I the creator of the Cabinet and what I tell you is that I will recommend this to my colleagues if I get in—and he couldn't get in except by their votes. It was a straight out-and-out bid in the form of a promise and in the form of a menace, and in the whole history of parliament and of the public life of Canada I doubt if a similar specific and glaring instance can be found. Well may my right hon. friend raise his hand to Heaven and say: Thank

God I am a purist; he has earned the right to say so.

Mr. H. B. McGIVERIN (Ottawa). Mr. Speaker; in rising to discuss the resolution which has been so fully and completely presented by the Minister of Agriculture I do not wish to occupy the time of the House at any great length. But there have been certain statements made here which I shall discuss just as soon as I have expressed my feeling in regard to the resolution. This resolution, as has been stated, is to implement the Civil Service Act passed last session. That Act was passed during the last few weeks of the session and it is universally admitted that it was a great step in advance towards Civil Service reform. It was expected that the recommendations made by the Royal Commission on the Civil Service appointed two years ago would be fully given effect to by that Act. While the resolution to-day simply deals with the question of salaries, the Act of last session dealt with salaries to this extent, that it increased considerably the minimum and the maximum of each class. An arrangement was also provided for, so that the re-defining of the duties of each class should be attended to, in the first place, by the deputy minister, and, after the first reclassification and re-definition of duties, by the Civil Service Commission.

Now, a great deal has been said of the statements which I made to the electors of this city, and a great deal has been attempted to be made of a letter which the right hon. leader of the government wrote to me. I fail to see anything wrong in what I stated to the people of this city. I fail to see one statement that was made by me that can properly be claimed to have been in any way a bribe. I stated that I believed that the recommendations of a Royal Commission, which had been placed before parliament, and which had to all intents and purposes received the sanction of parliament, should be carried out as soon as possible; and I said that I would do all that lay in my power—and I am proud to repeat that statement now—to carry out a measure of reform in the Civil Service, which I believe to be not only in the interests of the citizens of Ottawa, but in the interests of the people of this country. In regard to statements made before the electors of this city, I might refer my hon. friend, the member for North Toronto, to a statement that was published in the Ottawa 'Citizen,' the senior Conservative organ in this city, on the 23rd of October, from our opponents, Mr. Birkett and Dr. Chabot, as follows :

> If given the trust by the electors of Ottawa, we will use our utmost endeavours to see that the recommendations made by the Civil Service Commissioners to parliament last session shall be carried out, and at once, and we have the assurance of our leader that this will be done.

That may not have been a bribe, because it was too much of a bluff. It was well known that the electors of this city would honour themselves in electing the right hon. leader of the government, the leading citizen of this country, and the leading citizen of the capital. I made no promises during that election. I made statements to the people of what I would do, and I will endeavour in the future, as I have done in the past, to live up to what I said. I do not think that the hon. member for North Toronto has proved anything by reading from that circular, and I am satisfied that the citizens of this city know that no promises were made to them except that what was fair and right, in the interest of the city, should be done.

In regard to the question of a flat increase as against the percentage of increase which was recommended by the Royal Commission, I see very little difference except in this respect, which is to me a very important one. Any one who examines the report of the commissioners on the subject of a percentage increase will see that their remarks are based wholly on the increased cost of living, which must necessarily affect the smaller salaried men of the Civil Service to a greater extent than those of the higher classes. Therefore I am more in favour of the flat increase than I am of the percentage proposition. The $150 increase will be more of a godsend to those receiving lower salaries than any percentage of increase would be to the men receiving higher salaries.

I trust, Sir, that this resolution will soon become law, because the men who are doing the work of the country in the Civil Service cannot too soon be put upon a fair basis of recompense. I am sure that the new members of this House will soon learn, from their intercourse with them, that the Civil Service of Canada is second to none—that the members of the service are obliging, intelligent, and only too ready to assist in any way the government of this country; and anything that the parliament of Canada can do to improve the Civil Service is not only of benefit to the Civil Service itself, but in the interest of the good government of this country.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright). Mr. Speaker, I just wish to say a word on the resolution. I was in some doubt as to just how far the government would go in this matter; but after hearing the right hon. the Prime Minister, I feel convinced that the government will take up at a very early day the question of the outside service, and at the same time include in their consideration a very large class of men who do not exactly come within the scope of the Civil Service Act; I refer to the large number of mechanics and labouring men, who are engaged by the government to do day labour. I heartily sympathize with this in-

crease which is given to the inside service; I believe they are well deserving of it; and I think the time has come when those who are working for the government should not be the worst paid men in this country. It seems unfortunate that men who are devoting their time and talents to the service of this country should be underpaid, as I feel that they are. I heartily sympathize with this resolution, and I trust that before very long something will be done for the outside service and for other classes of people who are working for the government.

Mr. JOHN BARR (Dufferin.) I wish to enter my protest against this Bill. No doubt it will be a surprise to the Civil Service throughout the Dominion, and I venture to say that the promise given by the First Minister to give the outside service relief at some future date will not by any means satisfy them. No doubt there is reason why those living in Ottawa should receive additional compensation, but there is no reason why those living outside Ottawa are not entitled to similar treatment. It cannot be proved that living in Ottawa is more expensive than in any other city of the same size even in the province of Ontario, and when we go to the far west we find conditions existing there which considerably enhance the cost of living. It seems to me a most extraordinary argument that while we shall give an increase of salary to those residing in Ottawa, we will not do so to those living outside, and the reason given us is that the government has not had time to take their case into consideration. Notwithstanding the fact that this Civil Service Bill was brought down over a year ago, the government has not had time to consider the outside branches. But they have had time to consider the claims of the inside service in Ottawa, and no doubt that is due to the fact that in their case the political exigencies were much greater, because in Ottawa there are some 2,700 employees who have the right to vote and it was necessary to secure their vote in order to elect the government candidates. That, I believe, is the only true reason why they have been given greater consideration than those outside. Take, for instance, the customs officials throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion. Many of them live in towns where the cost of living is much greater than in Ottawa. I submit that in this respect there is no difference between Ottawa and Toronto, and in many of the outside cities and localities the government officials have to work longer hours than those in Ottawa. The outside Civil Service officials have, in many cases, more work and greater responsibility than the inside, yet they are not given the consideration which they were entitled to expect. That consideration was promised by the First Minister to the Civil Service as a whole without distinction; and both the inside and the outside should receive the increases promised. It is well known that we have civil servants who work probably as hard as any other class, but it is equally well known that we have in the service many officials who are simply kept here because of political pull. It is in the best interests of the country that all should be treated on a par without regard to politics but solely to merit. The country demands a better service, and the man who does good service should receive better consideration than the one who does not, yet the reverse is often the case. If the recommendation of the commission in this respect had been carried out, we would have a better service. I do not believe that we would have the graft which has been going on for the past few years. I again enter my protest against the outside service being treated differently from those who live in Ottawa. I protest against this procrastination in giving justice to our officials who are not resident in the Capital. This measure ought to include all classes of civil servants, and hon. gentlemen opposite will find that the country will not endorse their unfair treatment of one class of public officials as compared with the other.

Mr. SPROULE. We are told by the government that there is some principle in this Bill. I would like to know what it is. It only applies to those officials who are fortunate enough to reside in this city and who consequently had something to say in determining the results of an election in which the right hon. the First Minister was a candidate. These people are to get consideration whereas those residing elsewhere are not to be considered at all. If it be a principle that we are only to take one city at a time and work a reform in that city, I wonder how long it will take the government to go through every locality in the Dominion and make a complete civil service reform. The junior member for Ottawa (Mr. McGiverin) has said that there is a principle in this Bill which is embodied in that introduced last session. What was the principle in the Bill of last session? It was to take the Civil Service out of politics. Bringing my judgment to bear on the statement of the junior member for Ottawa and that of the First Minister, in his reply to the letter from that hon. gentleman, I would say that the principle adopted is to put the service under political influence instead of taking it away from that influence, especially when their votes are apt to turn the scale. But all civil servants should get the advantages of the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission, even though they happen to live in a locality where these votes were not specially needed. Was that taking it out of politics? I think it was putting it into politics. If there is a

grosser example of bringing the Canadian Civil Service into politics, I do not know where it is to be found.

In the statement of the junior member for Ottawa to the Civil Service, it is pointed out that they do not have to wait nor be under any uncertainty as to parliament voting the money, because it is to be taken out of the consolidated revenue fund. Who had the authority to make that promise? The hon. gentleman was then only an aspirant for parliament, and had neither the authority to make that promise nor the power to carry it out. It was given an appearance of authority by the Prime Minister that such a resolution as we have here would be passed. Had it not been supported by the high authority of the Prime Minister, it would have been of no value. But this is a binding promise, and means something. I have not before me the Act for the punishment of bribery at elections but it clearly provides that the person making certain promises comes under the penalty of the law. If a more flagrant violation of that Act occurred in the last election than that committed by the Prime Minister and his colleague in the city of Ottawa, I do not know of it.

The junior member for Ottawa declared that he would do his utmost to have the recommendations of the commission carried out in toto. But those recommendations did not apply to the civil servants in Ottawa alone. It is quite proper, I presume, that the civil servants in Ottawa should get this increase, we raise no objection to it. But why does no proposition appear in this resolution to implement the promise that was made so far as the Civil Service outside of Ottawa are concerned? Not only does the junior member for Ottawa not carry out the pledge given in his circular, but he has not even said a word with regard to it.

Another feature is this: The government last session introduced a Bill which was duly enacted into law. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) tells us that the increases under that Act, when figured out, would give an increase in the public expenditure of about $59,000. That is my recollection of the figure, and if I am wrong I hope he will correct me. But the same hon. gentleman tells us that to carry out the promises made under the Bill to be founded on this resolution will involve an increase of $343,000 of expenditure. And, just as this increase is greater, it was a more potent lever to get votes for the persons requiring them at the time, the Prime Minister and the junior member for Ottawa.

Another thing that seems very strange to me is this: The resolution before us provides that these sums may be paid out of any unexpended moneys for the Civil Service voted last year. In other words, money voted by parliament for one purpose is diverted to another purpose. Every dollar voted last year was voted for some specified service. But now we are told that any moneys voted for the Civil Service and unexpended can be paid, under this Bill, to the civil servants in Ottawa. If this is to be done, it is hardly to be wondered at that the government, the year before last, took the money voted for one purpose and applied it for another. Money that was voted for an exposition in a foreign country was taken to pay the travelling expenses of a minister. Even that minister himself practically admitted to this House that he did not regard this as exactly right, though he was not prepared to admit that it was altogether wrong. The government has no right to take money voted last year for a special purpose and use it for the purpose of paying the Civil Service at Ottawa an amount beyond what was voted to them in the estimates. Such a procedure is only introducing the thin end of the wedge of a practice which may be very embarrassing for the government in the future. They are not trying to live up to the spirit and letter of the votes of parliament. When it goes before the Auditor General, I would like to have his opinion whether it would be in strict compliance with the vote that was given last year to use it as it is proposed to use it by this Bill.

Mr. SPROULE.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee on the resolution.

Mr. FISHER. I would suggest that as this resolution differs little from the Bill which will be founded upon it, we should pass the resolution and permit the Bill to be introduced, the details of which can be discussed better when the Bill itself comes before the committee—if the leader of the opposition agrees to that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would prefer not to do that. Any discussion that takes place upon this resolution in committee will not be repeated when the Bill is introduced, therefore I do not think any time will be lost. If my hon. friend finds it convenient to have the information brought down on Tuesday, we may go on with the Bill then.

Mr. FISHER. I am quite ready to adopt the suggestion of my hon. friend. I think I will be able to bring down those things which have been asked for, on Tuesday. I have given instructions to have them prepared; and no doubt other information will be asked for from time to time. I propose therefore that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 5.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 1, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier presented the report of the special committee appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed lists of members to compose the select standing committees of the House, which was, on motion, concurred in.

CIVIL SERVICE CLASSIFICATION.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER laid on the table the classification of certain departments of the inside Civil Service.

ILLICIT OR SECRET COMMISSIONS.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 31) to prevent the payment or acceptance of illicit or secret commissions and other like practices. He said the object of this legislation is fairly well indicated by the title. It is proposed to enact that the payment or acceptance of illicit or secret commissions and practices of that nature shall be an offence punishable either by indictment or upon summary conviction, according to the gravity of the circumstances. The measure is one of general application. We have already upon the statute book, in the shape of sections in the Criminal Code, enactments against the receiving of secret commissions by agents in the employ of any Government in Canada or of any municipal corporation. But this legislation proposes to go further and make it criminal on the part of any employee to accept any secret commission in consideration of favours to be given at the expense of his employer. This legislation is in substance the enactment adopted on the subject by the Imperial Parliament two years ago. The Bill as drafted is an adaptation of that legislation and simply proposes to adopt, for the purposes of this country the legislation which, in that respect is now on the Statute Book of Great Britain. The clauses of the Criminal Code, to which I have referred, will none the less have their application to transactions within their scope and which may have already taken place. The enactment now proposed will to some extent cover the same ground, and it is proposed to increase the incidence of punishment and to make offences of the general character I have described fall within the provisions of the Act. The Bill consists simply of a clause defining the terms used in the proposed legislation and one declaring that every one who falls within the description of the proposed statute is guilty of an offence and liable, either upon indictment or summary conviction, to the penalties proposed.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. JOHN BARR (Dufferin) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 32) to amend the Railway Act. He said this Bill is somewhat similar to the one introduced last session. Its object is to facilitate the crossing of railways by telephones, telegraphs, watermains, viaducts, and so on. The difficulty under the present law is that permission must be asked from the railway company before any such crossing can be made. In the rural districts, the railway companies demand $5 for each crossing. In my opinion this is most unjust. If the parties refuse to pay the $5, they must apply to the railway board. This involves the drawing and filing of plans and the employment of legal counsel and necessitates considerable delay and expense. We know that the railway commission is overworked, and the result is months' delay before the sanction of the board is obtained to any application of the kind. At present telephone companies, small and great, are being built throughout the length and breadth of the country, and are accomplishing considerable good by bringing the rural districts in close communication with the towns and villages; and it is unfortunate that they should be frequently hampered and delayed in their efforts by reason of difficulties and delays in crossing the railway tracks, besides being put to a great deal of expense through having to make application to the railway commission. By adopting this Bill, which provides that the railways cannot demand or receive any compensation from telegraph and telephone companies for the right to cross a railway track, we will relieve the railway board of a good deal of work. Another provision in this Bill is that application may be made to the station master within the jurisdiction, or of the most convenient station master; and if no action be taken by the railway company during fifteen days, the applicants may go on and cross the railway tracks. So far as watermains and viaducts are concerned, they must give fifteen days' notice and pay the expenses of the engineer who will examine the work. If this Bill be carried, it will lessen the work of the railway commission, and relieve the telegraph and telephone and watermain companies from the long delay and expense now unavoidable.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—MAIN ESTIMATES.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (for the Minister of Finance) delivered a message from the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows:

Government House,
Ottawa, February 1, 1909.

GREY.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 31st March, 1910, and in accordance with the provisions of The British North America Act, 1867, the Governor Genaral recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

On motion of Mr. Paterson, the message of His Excellency, together with the estimates, were referred to Committee of Supply.

WRITS FOR COMOX-ATLIN AND CARLETON.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the orders of the day are called, I desire to ask the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) whether or not the writs of election for Comox-Atlin and Carleton have been issued.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think they have, but I will give my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) a definite answer to-morrow.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 9) respecting the Brandon Transfer Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 10) respecting Brazilian Electro Steel and Smelting Company, Limited.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 11) to incorporate the Canadian Western Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 12) respecting the Collingwood Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 13) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 14) respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.

QUESTIONS.

THE FISHERIES—SETTLEMENT WITH PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked:

1. What progress has been made towards arriving at a settlement with the provincial governments with respect to the fisheries?
2. Has Mr. Bastedo made any report upon the matters with respect to which he was appointed?

3. If so, what is the nature of his report and when will it be brought down?

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

1. Not much material progress has been made.
2. Previous to accepting another position Mr. Bastedo made some reports regarding provinces visited.
3. The reports were of a tentative nature, and under conditions obtaining in respect thereof, the present moment would not seem to be opportune for bringing them down.

LOBSTER-PACKING LICENSES IN NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. SINCLAIR asked:

1. How many licenses to pack lobsters were granted by the Department of Marine and Fisheries in Nova Scotia for the year ending December 31, 1908?
2. Referring to the returns received by the department on or before September 1, 1908, under the provisions of section 39 of the Fisheries Act, how many of said licensees failed to pack any lobsters during the said year?
3. What is the name and address of each of the said licensees who failed to pack any lobsters during the said year; and the locality where the factory is situated?
4. Did any of the said parties holding such licenses fail to pack lobsters for more than one year prior to September 1, 1908?

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

1. Two hundred and forty-two canneries were licensed.

2, 3 and 4. To fully answer these questions it will be necessary to correspond with the district inspector of fisheries, which is being done.

ICE-BREAKER 'MONTCALM.'

Mr. PAQUET—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Has the Minister of Marine taken into consideration a resolution of the Council of the Quebec Chamber of Commerce respecting the work of the ice-breaker 'Montcalm' at Cap Rouge?
2. Is it the intention of the hon. Minister of Marine to have the work of the 'Montcalm' at Cap Rouge stopped?

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

1. Yes.
2. Under consideration.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—MEN EMPLOYED AT TRURO.

Mr. STANFIELD—by Mr. Herron—asked:

How many men, not on the regular staff, were employed at Truro on the Intercolonial railway during the months of September, October, November and December, 1908, respectively?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). September, 107 men, 1,977 days, under Mr. Burpee; 1 man, 26 days, freight porter.

October, 164 men, 1,774 days, under Mr. Burpee; 1 man, 27 days, freight porter; 8 men, 8 days, erecting bridges in new yard under Mr. MacKenzie.

November, 130 men, 2,209 days, under Mr. Burpee; 3 men, 75 3-10 days, painter, car cleaner and carpenter under Mr. Joughins; 1 man, 25 days, freight porter.

December, 95 men, 1,590 days, under Mr. Burpee; men 110 2-10 days, painter car cleaner, carpenter and locomotive cleaner under Mr. Joughins; 1 man, 23 days, freight porter; 3 men, 27 days, reinforcing roof of engine house under Mr. MacKenzie.

THE ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. NORTHRUP asked:

1. How many Ross rifles were accepted by the Militia Department in the year 1908?
2. How many were returned to the Ross Rifle Company in that year?
3. How many Ross rifles have been accepted up to date?
4. How many have been issued to the (a) permanent corps, (b) militia, (c) mounted police?
5. How many Ross rifles are there now in store?
6. How many of these have never been issued?
7. What is the total amount of the payments to the Ross Rifle Company to date?
8. What claims for damages have been sent in for injuries received through the use of the Ross rifle?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia):

1. 18,000.
2. No rifles have been rejected as a whole during 1908. When a rifle did not pass inspection when first presented it was returned for correction, and then again presented for inspection.
3. 51,000.
4. (a) 2,830. (b) 6,574. (c) 1,000.

In addition 3,861 rifles have been issued to rifle associations.

It may be noted that all target practice in the different camps of instruction, where service ammunition was used, was done with Mark II. rifle with Mark III. sights.

The exact number of these rifles used in each camp has not been stated in the camp reports, with the exception that at Charlottetown 100 were used for musketry training; Niagara, 500 were used for musketry training; Sussex, 600 were used for musketry training; Three Rivers, 200 were used for musketry training; Calgary, 100 were used for musketry training.

In these camps and in all others, excepting Kingston and London, arrangements were made to supply Ross rifles for target purposes to the different units as they reported at the firing point. All preliminary instruction in rifle shooting was given with the Ross Rifle.

At London and Kingston, where ranges were not available for service shooting, practice was carried on with gallery ammunition and the Lee-Enfield rifle used for the purpose. In these camps rifle exercises and instructions in musketry were given with the Ross rifle.

5. 38,719.
6. 28,661.
7. $1,487,932.79. This does not include the sum of $3,931.25 progress payment on account of the manufacture of bayonets.
8. Three claims for compensation have been received, viz.:

(a) J. T. Seale, Eastman, Que., transport, $9.20; compensation, $15; total, $24.20.

The accident in this case was due to the rifle bursting, owing to an abnormal pressure of gas, the cause of which is not known. The rifle had also been tampered with, the 'bent' of the cocking piece having been filed away considerably.

(b) Sidney A. Fletcher, New Westminster, B.C., $500. This accident was caused by the rifle bursting, due to a defective cartridge.

(c) D. St. Dennis, Slocan, B.C., $114.55. The accident was caused by the rifle bursting, due to a double bulleted cartridge.

Accidents have also occurred with the Lee-Enfield, notably at London, where the firer of the rifle was injured and the man next to him at the firing point killed. In this case the department paid the funeral expenses and also the bills incurred for medical attendance.

EMPLOYEES OF INTERCOLONIAL AT MONCTON.

Mr. EMMERSON—by Mr. Ralph Smith—asked:

1. Was Thomas Williams, formerly treasurer and accountant of the Intercolonial Railway at Moncton, superannuated? If so, at what date did same take effect?
2. What is the amount paid to him monthly or yearly as his superannuation allowance?
3. Is he still continued in the employ of the said railway, and in what department; or if not now in the employ, up to what date was he so employed, if at all?
4. What amount, if any, has been paid him monthly, or yearly during such employment, in addition to his superannuation allowance, and under what authority were such payments made, and were the payments made by vouchers? If so, what was the total amount of such payments to date?
5. How many permanent employees or clerks on the Intercolonial at Moncton or elsewhere are paid by vouchers, what are their names and the amounts respectively, paid them during each month since the last session of parliament to the present date?
6. When was the system of paying salaried or wage officers or employees sums in addition to their agreed and authorized salaries

or wage by means of so-called voucher, first adopted by the Intercolonial Railway?

7. At what date was J. R. Bruce, traffic auditor of the Intercolonial Railway superannuated, when did his superannuation take effect, and what is his allowance per month or per year?

8. Is he still employed in the railway service? If so, is it proposed to continue him in the employ, for what period and upon what terms, how will he be paid and on what authority, and is it proposed to use the voucher method in his case?

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

1. Yes, by order in council dated 31st August, 1908, to take effect 1st September, 1908.

2. His superannuation allowance is $1,782 per year.

3. No; although he has been employed to January 18, 1909, by the general manager as special clerk, closing up certain matters in connection with the Grand Trunk arbitration proceedings. The preparation of a statement showing proportion paid by the railway companies, for the use of the Intercolonial stations, and in the conducting of one or two special investigations which required the services of a trained accountant.

4. $76.50 per month, under authority of the general manager, by voucher, amounted to $338.08.

5. Two; R. W. Chipman and N. H. Morton. Chipman was paid in July $100, August $100, September $100, October $100, November and December $100. Morton was paid July and August $79.84, September $75.43, October $80.04, November $75.52, December $79.46.

6. Ever since the Intercolonial has existed it has been the custom to pay such amounts by voucher.

7. Superannuated from the 1st January, 1909. Allowance, $884 per year.

8. Upon representation made to the Minister, that Mr. Bruce would be placed in an unfortunate condition financially, his wife having broken her leg and numerous other difficulties, which a few months more would terminate; it was felt that fairly full value would be secured from him in aiding his successor to clear up arrears of work, permission was granted to the general manager to continue him for a few months. He, of course, will be paid by voucher, the usual way in which superannuated men are paid, i.e., the amount included in the superannuation, payment is deducted from the salary, the balance paid by voucher. The authority for such payment by voucher is section 24, chapter 17, Revised Statutes of Canada.

ASSOCIATED PRESS DESPATCHES.

Mr. LENNOX—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. How many newspapers in Canada are contributing to the expense of the Associated Press despatches under the terms 7-8 Edward VII, Chapter 12?

2. What will be the amount of their contribution between 1st of July, 1908, and 1st of March, 1909?

3. What amount will be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund during that period?

4. Has the government assigned to any person the duty of keeping track of these despatches, with a view of ascertaining if they are of a character financially beneficial to Canada, and particularly to the industrial and producing classes?

5. Are the despatches generally satisfactory to the government?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. Twenty-three newspapers.

2. The estimated amount of the contribution of the newspapers for the period July 1, 1908, to March 31, 1909, will be about $7,312.50.

3. There will be paid out of Consolidated Revenue Fund for the same period, pursuant to the statute, an amount equal to the actual contribution of the newspapers.

4 and 5. The action referred to has not been considered necessary. The position taken for the government in parliament, when the Bill resulting in this enactment was under consideration, was that the government should have nothing to do with the management of the service, and did not desire to say what should be the nature of the service. The government then preferred to leave to the leading journalists of Canada to form their organization, select their correspondents, adopt their own regulations and make their own arrangements. That policy has since been adhered to.

R. S. FALCONER, STELLARTON, N.S.

Mr. RHODES asked:

1. What offices or positions, if any, in the service of the Department of Railways and Canals, or in any other department, have been held during the calendar years 1907 and 1908 by R. S. Falconer, of Stellarton, N.S.?

2. What position does the said Falconer hold at the present time?

3. Between what dates and for what length of time did he hold such offices or positions, and what were his duties in respect of the same?

4. What is the rate and amount of salary and what were the allowances paid or to be paid to him?

5. What is the total amount paid to him prior to the 1st of January, 1909?

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

1. Inspector of Glengarry water supply. Inspector of construction of agent's dwelling, Riversdale. Inspector of construction of sand house, Stellarton.

2. None.

3. Inspector of Glengarry water supply and construction of agent's dwelling, Riversdale, from 25th May, 1907, to 30th No-

vember, 1907. Six months and five days. Inspector of sand house at Stellarton from 23rd April, 1908, to 31st October, 1908. Six months and seven days. His duties were looking after inspection of these works to see that they were carried out according to the plans and specifications.

4. $3 per day.

5. $981.

DREDGING THE NAPANEE RIVER.

Mr. URIAH WILSON—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. How many times has the Napanee river in the County of Lennox and Addington, been dredged since the year 1867?

2. What were the respective years in which the said dredging was done, and what was the cost in each case?

3. What proportion of the said cost was paid by the Dominion Government, and what proportion by the municipalities interested?

4. What was the date of the last survey made with a view to having the said river dredged?

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. Five times.

2. In 1873-74, $4,999.73 ; in 1875-76, $12,-527.39; in 1877-78, $1,499.68; in 1884-85-86, $10,721.12 ; in 1892-93, $757.04.

3. Of the expenditure in 1875-76, the town of Napanee contributed $3,000 and the united counties of Lennox and Addington $2,-000. The balance of the total expenditure was borne by the Dominion government.

4. 30th July, 1907.

DAILY MAIL ROUTE—SILLSVILLE AND THE PINES.

Mr. URIAH WILSON—by Mr. Henderson—asked:

1. When was the daily mail route started between Sillsville and the Pines, in the County of Lennox and Addington?

2. Who is the mail carrier on the said route, and what remuneration does he receive?

3. Who is the postmaster at Sillsville, and what salary does he receive per year?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. On 16th November, 1908.

2. Jonas Garrison; $180 per annum.

3. The postmaster is Arthur W. Melow, the revenue of whose office for the year ending the 31st March, 1908, entitles him to a salary at the rate of $35 per annum, in addition to which, since 11th November last, he is being paid a forward allowance at the rate of $6 per annum.

DAILY MAIL ROUTE—ROBLIN AND FOREST MILLS.

Mr. URIAH WILSON—by Mr. Henderson—asked:

1. When was the daily mail route started between Roblin and Forest Mills, in the County of Lennox and Addington?

2. Who is the mail carrier on the said route, and what remuneration does he receive per year?

3. Who is the postmaster at Forest Mills, and what salary does he receive per year?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1 and 2. Prior to 1st May last Forest Mills post office was served tri-weekly by Mr. John Schamehorn, contractor for carrying the mails between Leinster and Overton, the contract price for the whole service being $88 per annum. On 1st May Forest Mills was granted an additional tri-weekly service from Overton by the same contractor at a cost of $62 per annum.

3. The postmaster is Theophilus Jones, the revenue of whose office for the year ending 31st March, 1908, entitles him to a salary at the rate of $42 per annum.

DAILY MAIL ROUTE—DORLAND AND U. E. LOYALIST.

Mr. URIAH WILSON—by Mr. Henderson—asked:

1. When was the daily mail route started between Dorland and U. E. Loyalist Post Office?

2. Who is the mail carrier on the said route, and what remuneration does he receive?

3. Who is the postmaster at U. E. Loyalist Post Office, and what salary does he receive per year?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1 and 2. The United Empire Loyalist post office was established on 1st October. 1908, and is served daily by Mr. S. E. Gallagher, contractor for carrying the mails between Adolphustown and Napanee, at an additional cost of $100 per annum.

3. Mark Trumpour, $35 per annum.

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE.

Mr. ROBB asked:

1. Has the government any information regarding the present condition of the foot and mouth disease in New York and other States?

2. Has the embargo on horses coming from New York State to Canada been so amended as not to interfere with the daily interchange of traffic along the frontier?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (for Minister of Agriculture):

1. The last information received from Dr. Melvin, chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, was on the 2nd inst., when he stated that they had reason to believe that foot and mouth disease had been eradicated in the United States, but that they were continuing inspection in the infected regions and taking precautions against the possibility of any infection remaining, the last diseased herd having been slaughtered on December 19. On or about the 18th of

January, however, according to press reports, the disease was detected in a number of cattle in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, one of the quarantined counties. A suspected outbreak in a herd of cattle in Plymouth, Mich., was also reported through the press on January 25, this being also in a quarantined county. As far as I have knowledge there has been no new outbreak of this disease outside of the previously quarantined territory.

2. Yes.

WINNIPEG BEACH PROTECTION PIER.

Mr. BRADBURY asked :

1. What has the Government done regarding protection pier at Winnipeg Beach?
2. Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the construction of the pier at once? If not, when?
3. Is it the intention of the government to remove the obstruction in the Manitou Rapids, Winnipeg river, if so, when?

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

1 and 2. Plans and specifications have been prepared contingent upon certain work being performed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and Boundary Park Realty Company. It has not yet been decided to go on with the work, but a decision will be come to before very long after we hear what the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Boundary Park Realty Company are prepared to do.

3. The sum of $2,500 was voted last year for the purpose of removing obstructions in Manitou rapids; but so far no work has been done owing to the exceptionally high water in Winnipeg river.

TELEPHONE LINES ACROSS RAILWAYS.

Mr. BARR asked:

1. What is the number of applications made to the Board of Railway Commissioners for the privilege to cross railway tracks with telephone wires?
2. What was the number of applications granted?
3. What was the number of applications refused?
4. What was the cause for said refusal?
5. What was the date of each application?
6. What date were the said applications granted?
7. What was the length of time from date of said application to the granting of same?

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

1. 2,411.
2. 2,328.
3. None.
4. Answered by number three.
5. As the number of applications is very large (over 2,000) and all the fyles would have to be gone over, it would take some time to obtain the specific details and would have to be given in the form of a return to the House.
6. Answered by number five.
7. See answers to numbers five and six.

NEW POST OFFICE, TORONTO.

Mr. MACDONELL—by Mr. Blain—asked:

What is the cause of the delay in proceeding with the erection of the new post office long promised to the city of Toronto?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Until a definite decision has been come to regarding the location of the new Union Station at Toronto, it is impossible to provide the postal facilities there which were in contemplation.

RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE INCREASES.

Mr. MACDONELL—by Mr. Blain—asked:

Is it the intention of the government to grant increases of pay to the transfer agents and other employees of the railway mail service, as recommended by the Civil Service Commission? If so when, and upon what basis?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). The matter is under consideration.

ALGOMA STEEL COMPANY—RAIL CONTRACTS.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Lake—asked :

1. What contracts for the making and delivery of steel rails, have been let by the government or the National Transcontinental Railway Commission, to the Algoma Steel Company, during the year ending January 26, 1909?
2. What were the quantities, price and terms of deliveries, and for what railways respectively, were the rails ordered?
3. Has the government or the National Transcontinental Railway Commission, under consideration at the present time the granting of any further contracts to the Algoma Steel Company, for the manufacture and delivery of steel rails, either for the National Transcontinental Railway, or for the Intercolonial Railway?

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

1 and 2. Contract dated September 17, 1908, for 15,752 gross tons, of which 13,741 tons is for delivery at the junction of the Toronto and Northern Ontario Railway with the National Transcontinental Railway at $38.50 per ton, and 2,041 tons for delivery at West Fort William at $33.50 per ton.

3. No; neither for the National Transcontinental or the Intercolonial Railways.

UPPER LAKE LIGHTHOUSE KEEPERS.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Lake—asked :

1. Were any increases of salaries paid to the lighthouse keepers on Lakes Huron and Superior during the year 1908?

2. If so, what was the ratio of increase, what lighthouse keepers participated in it, and when did the increase go into fore?
3. During what month were the cheques containing the increase sent out to the lighthouse keepers?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):
1. Yes.
2. The increases were not made as a percentage of previous salary. All the light stations in the Dominion were classified, and a certain salary attached to each class. Several keepers benefited in varying degree, depending on the amount of salary they were previously receiving.
3. September and December, 1908.

FISH HATCHERY AT SAULT STE. MARIE.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Lake—asked :

1. What, if any, representations have been made to the government as to the necessity or expediency of establishing a fish hatchery at Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, or its vicinity, and when were such representations made?
2. Has any action been taken upon such representations, and is it the intention of the government to establish a fish hatchery on Lakes Huron and Superior at Sault Ste. Marie, or in the vicinity thereof? If so, when will work be proceeded with?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):
1. A resolution has been received from the Sault Ste. Marie branch of the Ontario Fish and Game Protective Association, endorsed by the Town Council and Board of Trade of Sault Ste. Marie. Resolution received May 22, 1908.
2. No definite action has been taken, but the question of establishing fish hatcheries at suitable points on Lakes Huron and Superior is receiving consideration. Work will proceed when final decision is arrived at.

ST. JOSEPH'S ISLAND WHARFS.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Lake—asked:

1. What was the amount appropriated for improvement, alteration or extension of wharfs at Marksville and Richards landing, on St. Joseph's Island, Ontario?
2. What were the amounts actually expended on these two works, respectively?
3. Was the work done by contract? If so, who was the contractor in each case, and what was the contract price?
4. If done by day labour, who was the superintendent appointed in each case, and at what remuneration?
5. What were the dates of commencement and termination of the work in each case?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):
Marksville.
1. $2,000.
2. $1,691.09.
3. By day's labour.
4. E. Stubbs, $3 per day.
5. Work commenced 23rd September, completed 31st October, 1908.
Richard's Landing.
1. $3,000.00.
2. $1,398.46.
3. By day's labour.
4. Kenneth Robertson, $3 per day.
5. Commenced 12th October, 1908, and still in progress.

WHARF AT MICHIPICOTEN RIVER.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Lake—asked:

1. What, if any, part of the appropriation for the construction of a wharf at Michipicoten river, in the electoral district of West Algoma, has been expended, in what manner, and under whose direction or supervision?
2. What is the estimated cost of the proposed wharf at that point?
3. What are the proposed dimensions of the wharf?
4. During what period was work proceeded with last year?
5. Is it the intention of the government to advertise for tenders and proceed with the construction of this work by contract?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):
1. Appropriation, $3,000. No expenditure.
2. Estimated cost, $19,000.
3. 207 feet long outer fence, 22 feet wide and having a height of 20 feet.
4. No work done last year.
5. Tenders have been advertised for and received, but no contract has yet been let. Matter at present under consideration.

WHARF AT SEA GULL.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Lake—asked:

1. What amount has been expended by the government in the construction of a wharf at Sea Gull, on St. Joseph's Island, in the province of Ontario?
2. Between what dates was the said work proceeded with?
3. Was the work done by contract, or by day labour? If by contract, who was the contractor, and what was the contract price? If by day labour, who was the superintendent and what was his remuneration?
4. When did the work cease during the fall of 1908?
5. Is the wharf now completed?
6. What was the amount of the estimated cost of the work and the appropriation therefor?
7. What are the proposed dimensions of the wharf when completed, and what depth of water will there be at the end of the wharf?
8. What and by whom were representations first made to the government as to the necessity for the construction of this work?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):
1. $646.93.
2. October, November and December, 1908.

3. Day's labour: T. A. Armstrong; $3 per day.

4. Work still in progress.

5. No.

6. Work estimated to cost $5,000. If an 'L' is added, additional cost would be $1,500.

7. Wharf to be 350 feet long by 20 feet wide, when completed. Should it be decided to add an 'L,' dimensions of same would be 80 feet by 30 feet at the outer end.

8. By petition of residents of St. Joseph's island addressed to the Minister of Public Works.

SAULT STE. MARIE IMPORTS.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Lake—asked:

1. What quantities of hay and other farm and garden produce were entered at the port of Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, for home consumption during the fiscal year ended 31st of March, 1908?

2. What was the value thereof, respectively, and what amount of duty was paid upon the same according to different classification?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

Statement showing the imports at the port of Sault Ste. Marie during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1908, of hay, potatoes, and other farm and garden produce, showing also the duty collected thereon.

Articles.	Unit of Quantity.	Quantity.	Value.	Duty.
			$	$ cts.
Hay	tons.	3,837	56,516	7,674 00
Beans	bush.	57	92	14 25
Pease	"	1	13	1 00
Eggs	doz.	12,304	2,558	369 12
Apples	brls.	43	207	17 20
Berries	lbs.	2,224	284	44 48
Cranberries	bush.	76	219	54 75
Grapes	lbs.	4,653	444	93 06
Plums	bush.	77	441	23 10
Peaches	lbs.	15,290	1,065	152 90
Fruits, green, n.o.p.	"	8,535	493	42 67
Cheese	"	4,588	990	137 64
Melons	No.	2,852	560	85 56
Potatoes	bush.	13,814	8,739	2,762 20
Tomatoes, fresh	"	278	479	143 70
Vegetables, fresh	"	.....	5,077	1,523 10

WHARF AT TENBY BAY.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Lake—asked:

1. Were any public moneys of Canada appropriated for the erection of a warehouse upon the wharf at Tenby Bay, on St. Joseph's Island, in the province of Ontario? If so, when and to what amount?

Mr. PUGSLEY.

2. Was a warehouse constructed during last year upon the wharf at Tenby Bay? If so, when and at what cost, by whose order and under whose superintendence?

3. When was the said warehouse commenced, and when was it completed?

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

1. The expenditure at Tenby bay was defrayed from the general vote for harbour and river improvements in Ontario.

2. Warehouse was constructed by the department in autumn of 1908 at a cost of $399.58, under the superintendence of Foreman John Gibbs.

3. Pay-lists show work to have commenced 23rd October and closed 14th November, 1908.

COST OF VOTERS' LISTS.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Lake—asked:

1. What was the total cost of making up and revising the Dominion voters' lists for purposes of the last general election in the electoral district of (*a*) Thunder Bay and Rainy River, (*b*) West Algoma, (*c*) East Algoma, (*d*) Nipissing, (*e*) Muskoka, (*f*) Parry Sound?

2. When was the work of registration commenced and when was it reported to be finished?

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State):

1. The accounts for the above boards of registration are incomplete. All the claims are not yet in, and a number of these submitted are in suspense, awaiting further information before final settlement can be made.

The following amounts have been paid:

Electoral district of—

(a) Thunder Bay and Rainy River	$ 4,478 11
(b & c) East and West Algoma	3,367 43
(d) Nipissing	1,888 14
(f) Parry Sound	751 41
	$10,485 09

2. The only date at present available in connection with the work of registration is that of its completion, viz.: 23rd October, 1908.

LAKE WINNIPEG WHITE FISH.

Mr. BRADBURY asked:

Is it the intention of the government to extend the close season for taking whitefish now in force on Lake Winnipeg, to include all the waters of Playgreen lake?

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

CANCELLING OF FISHING LEASES.

Mr. BRADBURY asked:

1. Is it the intention of the government to cancel the fishing leases granted to F. H.

Markey, of Montreal, on the Nelson, Hays and Ripon Pigeon rivers and their tributaries, and the Great Slave lake?

2. Is it the intention of the government to cancel the fishing lease granted to J. K. McKenzie, of Selkirk, Manitoba, on Lesser Slave lake and Lake Athabaska?

3. Is it the intention of the government to cancel the fishing lease granted to Archie McNee, of Windsor, on James Bay?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Yes, as intimated in reply to a previous question. See 'Hansard' of January 26, 1909, page 180.

RURAL MAIL BOXES.

Mr. BARR asked :

How many rural mail boxes were delivered in the county of Dufferin, how many were put up for use, and when does the government intend to deliver mail in said boxes?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). 31 boxes were erected on the Mono Centre and Orangeville route, county of Dufferin, but the contractor, having refused to accept the amount offered by the department for making collections and deliveries therefrom, in addition to the payment to which he is entitled by reason of his contract for the carriage of the mails between these two points, the department has been obliged to notify the contractor of the department's intention to terminate his contract, and to invite tenders for a new contract which will include collections and deliveries from the rural mail boxes which have been established on this route, or which may hereafter be established.

TOWERS IN DUFFERIN COUNTY.

Mr. BARR asked :

What purpose does the government intend to make of the towers partially built in the townships of Amaranth and Mono, in the county of Dufferin, Ontario, and when do they intend to complete said structures?

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State):

1. The towers built in the townships of Amaranth and Mono, Dufferin county, are observing towers (triangular stations) for the purpose of the Geodetic survey of Canada.

2. The said towers are completed.

COUNTY COURT JUDGE—MANITOBA.

Mr. ROCHE asked :

1. Is the government aware that a new judicial district has been proclaimed in the province of Manitoba?

2. Is it the intention of the government in the near future to appoint a county court judge for this new district?

3. Is it the policy of the government not to appoint a lawyer who has been practising in the district to a judgeship in the same district?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) :

1. Yes.

2. The subject is under consideration.

3. That course has some advantages, but there is no fixed rule in the matter to be laid down as established.

BACON CURING INDUSTRY.

Mr. BEATTIE asked :

1. How many hogs have been killed during each month from the 1st of November, 1907, to 1st of November, 1908 inclusive, by the following packing companies?

The Laing Pack. and Prov. Co., Ltd., Montreal.

The Collingwood Pack. Co., Ltd., Collingwood.

The Williams Davis Co., Ltd., Harriston.

The George Matthews Co., Ltd., Hull.

The George Matthews Co., Ltd., Brantford.

The George Matthews Co., Ltd., Peterboro'.

The Whyte Packing Co., Ltd., Brantford.

The Canadian Packing Co., Ltd., London.

2. What was the number of hogs condemned, including intestines, during the same period?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The department would like that question to stand as notice of motion for a return.

To stand as notice of motion.

PORT STANLEY PIER.

Mr. MARSHALL asked :

What is the latest date up to which the men doing work on the Port Stanley pier have been paid?

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). 31st December, 1908.

FUNDED DEBT.

Mr. AMES asked :

Assuming that the funded debt redeemable in London on or before the 1st October, 1913, will amount to $106,027,216.70, or thereabouts, what will be the total of sinking fund applicable to the reduction of the debt?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (for Minister of Finance). Approximately $35,564,000.

TIMBER LIMIT REGULATIONS.

Mr. LALOR—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Are the regulations regulating sale, advertisement, cutting of timber, erecting saw mills, &c., the same as the regulations in the year 1896 and prior to that time?

3. Were these regulations ever suspended? If so, for what period, and at what dates?

3. During the time of the suspension of the regulations, how many acres of timber was disposed of by the government, to whom, and what was the average price per acre?

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State):

1. No.
2. No.
3. Answered by '2.'

MILITIA—ANNUAL TRAINING.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to discontinue during the present year any part of the annual training of the active militia, either in the usual camps of instruction or at Petawawa? If so, how many men would be affected thereby?

2. Are any payments in arrears for 1908 for drill, instruction, maintenance of arms or other claims? If so, why?

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

1. It is expected that camps of instruction will be held this year at all the places where such camps are usually held, including Petawawa. The details have not been prepared, but will be prepared and published in due course as usual.

2. All claims received for command pay and drill instruction, care of arms, and other allowances to the active militia received to date have been paid.

There are, however, many claims for current financial year which have not yet been received and are delayed pending completion of inspection of arms, equipment, &c., and the settlement of any deficiencies found to exist. It is anticipated that all these claims will be ready for payment by end of current financial year.

There are no outstanding claims for annual drill.

EASTERN TOWNSHIPS MILITIA CAMPS.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked:

1. Has a site been selected as a camp ground for annual training in the Eastern Townships?

2. Will the Eastern Townships cavalry brigade or other regiments or artillery or infantry do their annual training during the coming summer?

3. If so, has it been decided at what point the annual training will take place?

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

1. No.

2 and 3. Details of the camps have not yet been prepared, and in any case it would be undesirable to publish them piecemeal.

ROSS RIFLE AT BISLEY.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked :

1. Was the Ross rifle, Mark I., Mark II., or any other description of Ross rifle, used by the Canadian rifle team at Bisley last year in the regular team competitions? If not, why was it not used?

2. Was a Ross rifle of any description used in the Bisley competitions, regular or extra series matches, by any member of the Canadian team, or any Canadian marksman engaging in such matches? If so, what was the name of the individual, and was he in the employ of the Ross Rifle Company?

3. If so, what was the description of the rifle, and in what way does it differ from the Ross rifle, Mark I. and Mark II. both as to length of barrel and such expert accessories as wind gauges, globe or ring sites, spirit levels, &c.?

4. Is this rifle a target rifle or a service rifle and will it be adopted by the government for the militia?

5. Was this rifle manufactured in toto in the Ross rifle factory at Quebec?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). The government has no official information with regard to the matters referred to in this question, but if the hon. gentleman will let this stand as a notice of motion, I will endeavour to procure the information.

To stand as notice of motion.

THE ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked :

1. Have any of the bayonets contracted for by the government with the Ross Rifle Company been manufactured?

2. If not, when will the first delivery be made?

3. Does the price mentioned in the contract include bayonets and scabbard?

4. If so, what is the respective cost of each?

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

1. Yes.
2. Answered by 1.
3. Yes.
4. The contract gives no separate price for bayonets and scabbard. For the purposes of the contract, a bayonet is not complete without scabbard.

WINTER NAVIGATION, TADOUSAC.

Mr. GAUVREAU—by Mr. Lavergne—asked :

1. Is it the intention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to give orders that the steamer 'Montcalm' be removed towards the Rivière du Loup, Fraserville wharf, in order to establish communication with Tadousac, for the purpose of winter navigation between the north and south shores below Quebec?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). 1. The government having established a ferry service between the north and south shore from Rivière Ouelle to Murray Bay, it is not considered expedient to establish another winter ferry service a short distance below the present one.

G.T.P.—RESIGNATION OF MR. MORSE.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. What action, if any, has the government taken to bring about the resignation of Mr.

Morse, vice-president of the Grand Trunk Pacific?

2. Is there any truth in the following statements made in the Toronto 'Daily Star,' of January 23, 1909, which reads as follows:—

'It is said every contractor in the country was an open enemy of Morse. The manner of his departure was exceedingly dramatic. It is stated by some well-informed railway men that the government notified Mr. Hays that they could not get on with Mr. Morse and that he was *persona non grata* to them'?

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

1. None whatever.

2. (a) The government has no knowledge of such being the case; (b) expression of opinion on this point is beyond the purview of the government; (c) the government is not aware that any well informed railwaymen made such a statement, but if they did it was wholly unwarranted.

EXPORTATION OF ELECTRIC POWER.

Mr. MACDONELL asked:

1. What are the names and addresses of the persons or corporations at Niagara Falls, who were exporting power or fluid immediately prior to the time the Electricity and Fluid Exportation Act (1907) came into force, and who have subsequently been brought under the operation of the Act by license thereunder, giving the quantity or amount of power or fluid, exported per year or per month (whichever is the most convenient form in which to make the answer), since receiving license under the Act?

2. The names and addresses of all persons and corporations at Niagara Falls who have commenced the exportation of power or fluid since the said Act came into force, and who have been licensed thereunder, giving the amount or quantity exported, according to convenience aforesaid?

3. The names and addresses of the persons or corporations to whom all such power or fluid referred to in questions 1 and 2 is consigned, supplied or exported giving quantity to each?

4. Is there any person or corporation at present exporting power or fluid, at Niagara Falls, without a license, under the said Act?

5. For what period or periods of time are such licenses issued, and are they all uniform in this respect?

6. Are such licenses, or any of them, renewable? If so, for how long, and on what terms?

7. What system of inspection, if any, has the government provided, to ascertain that the said Act 6 and 7 Edward VII., Chapter 16, is being lived up to and complied with, by the persons or corporations who should properly come thereunder?

8. Do all such licenses provide that the quantity of power or fluid exported shall be limited to the surplus, after the licensee has supplied for distribution to customers for use in Canada, power or fluid, equal to the demand in Canada?

9. What means does the government adopt to ascertain that the Canadian demand for power or fluid, as aforesaid, is fully supplied, before licensing the export of any power, or fluid to the United States?

10. What revenue does the government derive from export duties on such power or fluid so exported, and what, if any, exemptions therefrom, has the government granted under subsection 3 of section 10 of the said Act?

11. Does the government of the province of Ontario impose any tax on such power or fluid? If so, what does it amount to?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (for Minister of Finance):

1. 'The Canadian Niagara Power Company,' Niagara Falls, Ont.

'The Electrical Development Company of Ontario, Limited,' Niagara Falls, Ont.

'The Ontario Power Company of Niagara Falls,' Niagara Falls, Ont.

The total quantity of electrical energy exported by these companies since the coming into force of the Electricity and Fluid Exportation Act until the 31st December, 1908, is 381 million kilowatt hours.

2. No persons or corporations at Niagara Falls have commenced the exportation of power or fluid since the said Act came into force.

3. 'The Niagara, Lockport and Ontario Power Co.,' Buffalo, N.Y. A continuous supply of 18,000 horse-power.

'The Cataract Power Conduit Company,' Buffalo, N.Y., a continuous supply of 33,000 horse-power.

4. No.

5. For one year. Yes.

6. All such licenses are renewable for one year, provided the licensees have complied with the requirements of the Act and regulations, and provided, also, that the Canadian demands for power are such as to admit of the export being continued.

7. The regulations established by the Governor in Council provide that any officer authorized by the minister may have free access to any premises in which electrical energy is generated to inspect the contractors' books for the purpose of ascertaining the quantities and prices of the commodities sold and such other information as may be deemed necessary for the proper administration of the Act.

The Chief Electrical Engineer of the department has visited all the plants referred to within the last twelve months.

8. No. A fixed quantity is stated in the license, but it is expressly provided therein that said license shall be subject to the regulations established by the Governor General in Council. These regulations provide that 'Any license issued hereunder shall be revocable at will by the Governor in Council if the licensee refuses or neglects to comply with any of the conditions from time to time imposed by the Governor in Council with regard to the supply and distribution of electrical energy, gas or fluid in Canada and, moreover, whenever such electrical energy, gas or fluid is required for

use of purchasers in Canada any such license shall be revocable upon such notice to the licensee as the Governor in Council deems reasonable in each case.'

9. By informing itself, through the beforementioned officer, of the conditions of supply and demand.

10. No export duties have been imposed by the Federal Government.

11. The department has no information as respects the tax imposed by the government of the province of Ontario.

RURAL MAIL ROUTES.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. How many established rural mail routes have boxes placed on them from which mail is not being collected, and the date when boxes were delivered on said routes?

2. Where are said routes located, and what is the cause of delay in making arrangements on said routes?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1 and 2. Rural mail boxes were established on the dates mentioned on the following routes:

October 28. Mono Centre and Orangeville.

October 22. Picton and West Lake.

About November 15. Croton and Thamesville.

The contractors in each case refused to accept the amount offered by the department for serving these boxes in addition to the payment made to them under their contracts for conveying the mails between the points mentioned, and therefore the department has been obliged to give them the usual notice for cancellation of their contracts, so that new tenders may be invited to include not only the conveyance of the mails between the terminal points, but also the collections and deliveries from the mail boxes which have been erected, or which may hereafter be erected.

ICELANDER RIVER DREDGING.

Mr. BRADBURY asked:

1. What was the total cost of dredging done at Icelander river last fall?

2. What was the total cost of work done at Gimli for the protection of the bank, and is the work completed?

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

1. $3,632.26.

2. $4,017.46; work completed.

SELKIRK POST OFFICE.

Mr. BRADBURY asked:

1. What was the estimated cost of post office at Selkirk, Manitoba?

2. How many tenders were received, and what is the name and amount of each tender?

3. Did the lowest tenderer get the contract?

Mr. PATERSON.

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

1. $25,000 for building alone.

2. (a) Two.

(b) A. S. Brown and W. Garson..$24,000
Gudjon Imgimundson and Stefan Bjornson.. 25,283

3. Yes.

EXPENDITURE ON WHARFS.

Mr. BARNARD asked:

What amount has been expended by the government since 1896 in construction and maintenance, respectively, of wharfs in (a) New Brunswick, (b) Nova Scotia, (c) British Columbia?

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). The details are as follows:

NOVA SCOTIA.

	Construction.	Repairs.	Total.
1896..	$ 10,496 73	$ 10,753 36	$ 27,250 09
1897..	22,989 52	21,086 51	44,076 03
1898..	37,858 83	35,634 47	73,493 30
1899..	61,526 34	33,197 99	94,724 33
1900.. ..	80,003 85	44,667 25	124,671 10
1901..	151,445 44	60,410 72	211,856 16
1902..	74,709 10	6,746 58	81,455 68
1903..	83,351 19	11,910 92	95,262 11
1904..	183,847 88	71,103 46	254,951 34
1905..	314,335 15	68,450 19	382,785 34
1906..	342,535 49	36,265 20	378,800 69
1907..	194,832 57	42,797 67	237,630 24
1908..	245,997 90	65,874 21	311,872 11
Total.. ..	$809,929 99	$508,898 53	$2,318,828 52

NEW BRUNSWICK.

	Construction.	Repairs.	Total.
1896..	$ 4,706 67	$ 10,113 07	$ 14,819 74
1897..	7,284 08	15,817 60	23,101 68
1898..	15,621 51	7,698 96	23,320 47
1899..	10,459 81	25,272 23	35,732 04
1900..	6,981 44	39,030 82	46,012 26
1901..	46,446 15	53,855 33	100,301 48
1902..	44,710 90	16,005 19	60,716 09
1903..	30,900 68	7,620 51	38,521 19
1904..	88,908 10	33,604 87	122,512 97
1905..	165,812 58	19,832 96	185,645 54
1906..	240,444 97	4,946 48	245,391 45
1907..	140,533 19	9,791 68	150,324 87
1908..	110,557 35	21,562 55	132,119 90
Total.. ..	$913,367,43	$265,152 25	$1,178,519 68

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

	Construction.	Repairs.	Total.
1896..	$ 24,697 17	.....	24,697 17
1897..	19,423 16	3,558 92	22,982 08
1898..	89,664 72	.....	89,664 72
1899..	60,604 62	10,284 04	70,888 66
1900..	53,931 27	1,687 60	55,618 87
1901..	89,058 13	3,850 17	92,908 30
1902..	173,113 69	7,831 42	180,945 11
1903..	71,822 99	26,725 49	98,548 48
1904..	63,922 41	30,663 92	94,586 33
1905..	95,020 64	9,892 71	104,915 35
1906..	97,596 34	.....	97,596 34
1907..	74,666 05	7,425 61	82,091 66
1908..	173,793 55	11,418 47	185,212 02
Total....	$1,087,314 74	$113,338 35	$1,200,653 09

ESQUIMALT NAVAL STATION.

Mr. BARNARD asked:—

1. Did the government use its influence, as provided for in article 9 of the terms of union with British Columbia, in any way to secure the continued maintenance by the imperial government of the naval station at Esquimalt, either before, after, or at the time the said naval station was abandoned?

2. If the answer to the above question be in the affirmative, in what way was such influence used?

3. Has the naval station at Esquimalt been taken over by Canada.

4. Has any arrangement been made for the taking over of such station?

5. Has any expenditure in connection with the said naval station been authorized by the government of Canada, or to the knowledge of the government of Canada, by the imperial government? If so, to what amount, and for what purpose?

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

(1, 2, 3, and 4) Negotiations are in progress with the Imperial Government for the transfer of the Naval Station at Esquimalt to the Canadian Government.

(5) No.

HUNGRY BAY DIKE.

Mr. ROBB asked:

Is it the intention of the government to make such repairs and improvements to the dike along Hungry Bay, Lake St. Francis, as will insure the prevention of floods on farm lands adjoining the lake?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). It is the intention of the Government to perform the further work on the dike at Hungry Bay, which, it is hoped, will bring about the desired result.

MUTILATION OF ENVELOPES.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. What means have been taken by the Post Office Department during the past year to remedy the constant mutilation of envelopes passing through the mail?

2. Has the government received complaints regarding the management of the post office at MacKay, Ontario, and the condition and delivery of mail at that place? If so, what is the nature of said complaints and what action has been taken to improve the condition found there?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. No evidence has been submitted in this department to indicate that there is any constant mutilation of envelopes passing through the mails, nor is there any reason to believe that such cases are at all frequent. Complaints are occasionally received as to the damaged condition of mail matter, but upon investigation it is generally found that the damage is due to the fact that the paper used in the manufacture of the covers in which such matter is inclosed is of inferior quality, and not sufficiently strong to resist the ordinary friction and pressure which it must sustain by coming in contact with other mail matter during course of post.

2. There is no post office in the Dominion known as 'Mackay.'

BRITISH COLUMBIA PENITENTIARY—ESCAPE OF CONVICTS.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Has the government been made aware of the escape of a convict known as Bill Miner, together with three companions, from the British Columbia Penitentiary? If so, what was the date of such escape?

2. Was the report of such escape made to and received by the Department of Justice?

3. When and how was the report, if received, acknowledged?

4. If such report was received, was any reward offered for the recapture of these convicts? If so, what was the amount and the date of publication of the offer in British Columbia?

5. Had the department any knowledge or communication from outside the penitentiary with the convict Miner prior to his escape? If so, was such communication by authority granted any officer of the department at Ottawa?

6. Has the attention of the Minister of Justice been drawn to statements in the press that the officer in charge of the British Columbia Penitentiary at the time of the escape has it in his power and has the inclination to make sensational disclosures in this connection?

7. If so, is it the intention of the government to take steps to bring out any disclosures in the power of the former deputy warden to make?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

1. Yes; 8th August, 1907.

2. Yes.

3. Report was made by telegram, received on 9th August, stating that 'Four convicts had escaped,' and by a further telegram, received at the department 12th August, stating that 'Bill Miner was among those gone.' On 17th August, a telegram was sent to the warden that detailed reports were anxiously awaited. Report by letter was received on 19th August and acknowledged by letter of 21st August.

4. Yes. On 12th August the minister instructed that a reward of $500 should be offered for Miner's recapture, and printed notices of such reward were issued from the office of the Commissioner of Dominion Police on 14th August. When such notices first reached British Columbia the department is not able to say.

5. No.

6 & 7. Only by an item which appeared in several newspapers published on 29th

January, 1909, stating that the officer who was in charge of the penitentiary at the time of the escape was in a position to make disclosures with regard to the matter. The Inspector of Penitentiaries at once wrote to to the former deputy warden asking him for a statement of any information in his possession which he had not already made known to the department.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—RUNNING RIGHTS.

Mr. EMMERSON—by Mr. Ralph Smith—asked:

1. Has the government or any member thereof, or any department of the government, since the last session of parliament, received from any party or parties, corporation or corporations, any application, communication or proposal, verbal or in writing, relating to the granting by the government, or by any department thereof, of any haulage or running rights or privileges to any railway corporation, upon or over the Intercolonial Railway, between St. John and Halifax, or between any other points on the said railway?

2. If so, what was the nature and character of such application or applications, communication or communications, proposal or proposals, and at what date were they respectively made or received, and if any such were in writing, will the government place a copy of the same respectively, upon the table of this House?

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

1. Yes.

2. The government has no objection to placing a copy on the table.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—BRANCH LINES.

Mr. EMMERSON—by Mr. Ralph Smith—asked:

Has the government or any member thereof, or the Department of Railways and Canals, at any time received from the government of New Brunswick, a copy of a report or reports of the commissioners appointed by that government under the authority of the legislature of that province, to examine and inquire into the conditions and circumstances relating to the so-called branch lines of railways in that province connecting the Intercolonial Railway, and to report thereupon? If so, will the government have a copy of same placed upon the table of the House?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). There is in the department a copy of such a report. There is no objection to laying it on the table.

MEASUREMENT OF POTATOES.

Mr. MACDONELL asked:

1. Is there any statutory or other governmental requirement as to the quantity, either by measure or by weight, of potatoes per bag, when sold by the bag to the public?

Mr. AYLESWORTH.

2. If so, what means does the government take by inspection or otherwise to ensure the carrying out of the law?

3. Is the government aware that potatoes are sold to the public throughout the country by the bag varying anywhere from 65 to 80 pounds to the bag?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for Minister of Trade and Commerce):

1. By chapter 85 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, section 337, potatoes in contracts for the sale and delivery—a bushel shall be determined by weighing unless a bushel by measure is specially agreed upon, and the weight equivalent to a bushel of potatoes shall be 60 pounds.

By section 338, in the province of Quebec, when potatoes are sold or offered for sale by the bag, the bag shall contain at least 80 pounds.

2. The law is intended to be carried out by municipal market inspectors.

3. No, but dealers evading the Act are liable to prosecution.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all orders in council, reports, correspondence, deeds, conveyances, regulations, conditions and other documents relating to (a) the grant or conveyance to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada of a portion of Major Hill Park, so called, for the site of an hotel, or touching the use or purpose for which the said conveyance was made or proposed; (b) the grant or conveyance to the said company or to the Ottawa Railway Terminals Company or to any other person or corporation of any lands in or adjoining the city of Ottawa for the purpose of or in connection with the building of a station at Ottawa or for other railway purposes. —Mr. Borden.

For a return showing what persons have been appointed, transferred or promoted, respectively, since July 1, 1908, in the various departments, coming under the operation of the Civil Service Act of 1908; the positions and salaries of such persons as have been transferred and promoted at the time of the change; the positions and salaries at present of all who have been so appointed, transferred or promoted, and which of these appointments, transfers or promotions were made in accordance with the present Civil Service Act.—Mr. Foster.

For a return showing what lands, at what price, and to what persons or corporations have been sold along the route of the Grand Trunk Pacific for station, terminal or town site purposes.—Mr. Foster.

For a return showing what disposition has been made in detail of the vote of $25,000 under Miscellaneous, for seed grain in Alberta and Saskatchewan.—Mr. Foster.

For a return showing the total cost of the Royal Mint to December 31, 1908; the total expenses of Royal Mint for the calendar year 1908, (a) for additions and improvements, (b) for maintenance, (c) for salaries, (d) for bullion copper, silver and gold respectively;

the amount of copper, silver and gold coinage that was struck during that time; and the net profit on each kind of coinage.—Mr. Foster.

For a return showing what sums of money have been paid to each of the several holders of stock in the Quebec Bridge Company on account of stock, bonus and interest, respectively; and what amount remains to be paid and to whom.—Mr. Foster.

For a return showing the number of applications made to the Board of Railway Commissioners for the privilege of crossing railway tracks with telephone and telegraph wires and with water mains, each, over the said period from February 1, 1904, to the 1st January, 1908; the total number of applications granted over said period; the total number of applications refused; the date of each application; the date each application was granted; the length of time from the application to the granting of same; and what time should elapse before the board should give its decision.—Mr. Barr.

For the production of all original applications and tenders filed in the Department of the Interior in respect of timber berth No. 1122, and that the same be laid on the table of the House, said papers not to be part of the archives of this House, but to be returned by the Clerk to the Department of the Interior after inspection.—Mr. Campbell.

For a return showing:

1. The total amount expended on public works by this government in the riding of Bonaventure prior to the general elections of 1900.

2. The total amount expended by the government in this riding; (a) on public works; and (b) in aid of railways and other undertakings since said general election, and the estimated additional amount required; (a) to complete these public works; and (b) to meet the subsidies or grants in aid of railways or other undertakings.

3. The various public works undertaken by the government in this riding between the general election of 1896 and the general election of 1900, the dates when the several works were undertaken, whether they were let by public advertisement, tender, and contract, or how otherwise, and the sums of money, stated separately, expended upon these works prior to the election of 1900.

4. Which of these works were completed and which of them remained uncompleted at the date of the election in 1900.

5. The sums of money, stated, separately, expended in or towards completing these works since the said election of 1900, and the dates of expenditure.

6. The various public works undertaken and carried on by the government since the general election of 1900, the dates when the several works were inaugurated or commenced. the sums of money, stated separately, expended upon these works, and the estimated amount required to complete such of these works as have not been completed: and showing whether these works were done by tender or contract, or how otherwise.

7. The moneys granted by the government by way of subsidy aid to railways or other undertakings in said riding since the general election of 1900, the sums of money paid under these grants and the estimated amount required to meet future payments.

8. The public works commenced and the money obligations incurred and moneys expended for public works within said riding of Bonaventure during the month of October last.—Mr. Lennox by Mr. Sproule.

A copy of all correspondence between the Surveyor General's Department or Department of Indian Affairs and the late Mr. Vaughn, D.L.S., covering his instructions to survey the parish of St. Peters, St. Clements and St. Peters Indian Reserve; together with Mr. Vaughn's correspondence, &c.; of all correspondence between the Department of the Interior and Mr. H. M. Howell, commissioner to investigate Indian claims on said reserve; of the report of Mr. Rothwell, law clerk of the Department of the Interior, on the St. Peter's land claim; of the itemized account of Fred. Heap, for services rendered during the investigation, and instruction to him from the departments of the Interior and Indian Affairs.—Mr. Bradbury.

For a return showing the amount of gold, silver and copper coins manufactured by the branch of the Royal Mint in Canada, and the amount of said coin not disposed of since it commenced operation up to January 1, 1909.

2. How much silver in its crude state has been offered for sale to the management of the Royal Mint from Canadian mines in the year 1908, and what quantity has been accepted.

3. What reason the government gives for not purchasing all the silver in its crude state that is offered?

4. The system used in deciding from whom to make purchases?

5. How many Canadian mines have sold silver to the government, the names of said mines, and the quantity purchased from each. —Mr. Armstrong.

For a return showing the tenders called for by the Department of Railways and Canals for 144 miles, more or less, of wire fencing during the summer or fall of 1908, and the advertisements or circulars calling for same; how many tenders were received and from whom; how the contract was let, at what price and to whom; the quantity of wire fencing purchased by the Department of Railways and Canals during 1908, by tender or otherwise, and the prices paid per mile.—Mr. Geo. Taylor.

For a return showing the total amount received by the Winnipeg 'Free Press' from all the departments of the government from July, 1906, to January 1, 1909, specifying amount each year.—Mr. Herron.

For a return showing what operations, including all expenditures, were carried on last year under the fishing leases granted to F. H. Markey, of Montreal, for Great Slave lake, Nelson and other rivers; J. K. McKenzie, of Selkirk, for Lesser Slave and Arthabaska lakes; Archibald McNee, for parts of James bay; Coffey and Merritt, Cedar lake; the Capital City Packing Company, limited, and the William Hickey Company, limited.—Mr. Bradbury.

For a return showing the names of the 85 temporary clerks formerly paid out of civil government contingencies who have been classified under section 7 of the Civil Service

Act since September 1, 1908, and placed in the third division, subdivision B; the position filled by each at the time of classification and the salary paid, the length of service, the age and what examination has been passed; the position to which assigned under the classification and the salary attached; the names of the persons appointed to the Civil Service since September 1, 1908, under section 47 of the Civil Service Act, the positions to which appointed, the date of appointment, and the salary attached.—Mr. Foster.

STEEL CORPORATIONS.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma) moved:

For a return showing all importations of steel bars, steel ingots, rolled iron and steel, steel rails and structural steel, into the Dominion of Canada, by months, since the 31st day of March, 1908, and up to the 31st January, 1909, showing (a the quantity imported; (b) the country from which imported; (c) port of entry; (d) the value of the imports; and (e) the amount of duty paid thereupon.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). My commissioner informs me that this will be a very much longer return than the hon. gentleman can possibly desire. I do not know whether it would be better for him to drop it and take another return that would be available. He could not get this return before the end of the session.

Mr. BOYCE. There was a memorandum brought down which gave what I wanted down to 31st March, 1908. All I ask is that it should be extended down to the 31st January, 1909. The statement is a very short one, containing only two pages. It was handed the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Stanfield) by the hon. minister, and all I ask is that it should be extended to date.

Mr. PATERSON. Was that return as comprehensive as this motion? Do you want me to take in all these steel bars, steel ingots, rolled iron, &c.?

Mr. BOYCE. No, not if they were not in that return. All I want is that return extended.

Motion agreed to.

NATURAL RESOURCES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN moved:

That in the opinion of this House it is advisable to appoint a select standing committee on natural resources who shall have authority to inquire into and consider and report upon all matters appertaining to the conservation and development of the natural resources of Canada, including fisheries, forests, mines, minerals, waterways and water powers, and to whom may be referred from time to time any report, document or matter touching the subject which they are appointed to consider.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no objection to my hon. friend going on with his motion, but I do not think the government can close the debate on it to-day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My remarks will not be very lengthy. So far as the exact wording of this resolution is concerned, I shall be very glad indeed to accept any suggestion from the government or any hon. member of this House. My object is to point out that public interest in the conservation and development of the great natural resources of this country might be stimulated by action of parliament. We have at present a committee on agriculture. That committee has engaged for the most part in thoroughly non-partisan work and work which has been of great advantage to the people. We thoroughly realize that agriculture must be the principal basis upon which the future wealth of this country depends; but that consideration should not blind us to the further fact that we have, outside of agriculture, in the fisheries, forests, mines, minerals, waterways and waterpowers of this country, very great resources, the extent of which we do not at present realize, and the development and conservation of these are of very great importance to the people.

Now, in speaking of 'development' and 'conservation' I believe that these two words should be the watchwords of the country with regard to its natural resources. Conservation does not mean non-user; on the contrary, it is consistent with that reasonable user of these great resources which is absolutely necessary for their development. And, on the other hand, development does not imply destruction or waste; it ought not to imply destruction or waste, but these great resources should be both developed and conserved, so that they may be of the greatest possible advantage to the present generation and may also be handed down as a continuing heritage to those who come after us in the work of upbuilding this Dominion and the British empire.

We have had a great many stimulating addresses throughout the country on the importance of these great resources. One might expect that the parliament of Canada would be one of the great forces in awakening public interest in our resources, and the consideration of means by which the development and conservation of these resources should be carried out. But owing, I believe, to some extent at least, to the fact that we have had no committee of parliament specially charged with the consideration of our natural resources, parliament has not taken the initiative to any very considerable degree, and the stimulus of public interest and public attention in respect of these matters has come to us almost altogether from outside sources. I

do not desire to put out of sight the most excellent work which the Canadian Forestry Association has done in awakening public interest in our forests. Nor do I desire for a moment to put aside consideration of the forestry congress or conference called by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) some three years ago, which I had the privilege of attending, and which, I think, did very good work in awakening public interest in this matter. I think the Prime Minister, at that time, announced that at some future date a further conference or congress of the same character would be called. I have no doubt that the effect of that meeting was to stimulate public interest and to educate the public in appreciation of these great resources, and in that way to assist the object which we are all interested in accomplishing. Nor do I put to one side the work which has been accomplished by the forestry branch of the Department of the Interior. I know that that branch has been established only a short time ; I know that it has not yet had an opportunity to accomplish the very great work which has been accomplished in the United States of America by the forestry service presided over by Dr. Pinchot. I have had, during the past three or four years, the privilege of receiving from the forestry service of the United States a number of the publications which they issue from time to time. If I brought them all here and laid them on the table of the House—and I do not suppose that I have a complete set—they would make a pile a foot or a foot and a half high. I have brought a few, which will show that these publications are of a most practical, interesting and varied character. An example is one published in 1908, called 'The Use Book,' containing almost a complete manual of the work which the Forestry Service of the United States accomplishes, giving directions of an extremely interesting and useful character to the people who may desire to solicit the co-operation of the United States Forestry Bureau. There are a number of pamphlets of a thoroughly practical character issued to the farmers and others throughout the country. For instance, 'Practical Assistance in Tree Planting,' 'How to Grow Young Trees for Forest Planting,' 'How to Transplant Forest Trees,' 'Progress of Forestry, 1905,' 'Forest Planting Leaflet'—these are issued in very great numbers, instructing farmers and others interested how transplanting should be done—'Consumption of Pulpwood in the United States,' 'Lumber Cut of the United States, 1906,' 'Wood Used for Pulp, 1905,' and so on in great variety and giving a vast amount of useful information. I desire it to be thoroughly understood that I refer to this not as casting any reflection on the work of the forestry branch of the Department of the Interior. I believe that the officials engaged in that branch are doing the best they can. They have been engaged in the work only a short time, and, while it is not practicable to go to the Forestry Branch of Canada and obtain all the information that is available to one who consults the publications of the Forest Service of the United States, I have no doubt that that condition is being remedied as rapidly as possible, and that we shall have in Canada, in the near future, a Forestry Bureau which will give the same information, the same evidence of active and aggressive work in this connection as is given by the Forestry Service of the United States under the very able presidency of Dr. Pinchot, who spoke in this city not long ago upon these subjects.

I would say, in that connection, that the attention of the people of the United States has been called very thoroughly to the importance not only of the development but of the conservation of their natural resources. I do not know that I can do better, in order to call the attention and awaken the interest of our own people in this matter, than to quote a few words from the very able and interesting address which Dr. Pinchot delivered in this city on the occasion of his last visit. He came, as I understand it, to bear a message from the President of the United States to His Excellency the Governor General and the right hon. leader of the government inviting the co-operation of this government in a conference or congress to be held in the capital of the United States, the delegates to include not only representatives of the United States, but also representatives of Canada and Mexico, in order that the people of the entire continent, through their accredited representatives, might consider methods of co-operation in this work of conservation of the natural resources of the continent. I do not know when that convention is to be held, but the announcement was made, on behalf of this government on that occasion, that the government of Canada proposed to send representatives to the meeting. I was very glad indeed to hear that announcement, and I am sure that the right hon. Prime Minister and his colleagues may count upon the co-operation of the members on this side in this work which has already been attended with such beneficial effects in the United States. Now, going back to Dr. Pinchot's address, I desire to quote a few words from it. Speaking of the steps taken in the United States towards the conservation and development of their great natural resources, he said:

> The appointment of a waterways commission was the first step. The second was the great convention of governors of States in Washington last May, at which all the States were represented, at which for the first time the attention of the nations was called to the waste going on. The next step was a meeting

of the National Conservation Commission at which the governors of half the States were present and delegates from other States, and at which both the outgoing president and the incoming president attended, and spoke, the latter being the chairman, and committing the new administration thoroughy and confidently to the policy of conservation left by the old administration; so that we know that in the United States, for four years more at least, this attempt to carry over for our children some of the things we received from our forefathers is going to continue. The first piece of work the National Conservation Commission did was to prepare an inventory of the national resources of the country, a somewhat rough and ready one, but so far as I know this is the first time that any nation has toted up its balance sheet and attempted to get an approximate knowledge of its supplies of natural resources. In other words, we have taken stock in the ordinary way in which any prudent man takes stock of what he has, so that we may inform ourselves of what we have, because we are to depend mainly upon ourselves for our supply hereafter. We are beginning to realize that; and, like a man cast away in a boat at sea, we are beginning to find out how long our water and food will last, and what we ought to do to save them. We learned a great many very striking facts. For example, we discovered that a preventable waste in our coal supplies amounts to some $300,000,000 every year; that if we go on increasing the use of them at the present rate, they will probably be gone by the middle of the next century—a long time perhaps, and yet not long in the life of a nation; that our iron supplies, which are just as necessary as our coal—the high grade ores—will be gone by the middle of this century; and that our oil and gas supplies will probably be gone by the middle of this century. We found that our lands are being washed into the sea at the rate of 800 million cubic tons per year—that our farmers have been losing over $500,000,000 a year from easily preventable soil erosion, $130,000,000 a year from injurious animals, and two or three times that amount from injurious insects and other forms of preventable waste; that some of our public lands were being disposed of in such ways that the number of homes on the lands were not being increased, which is the real test; that we are cutting our forests three and a half times faster than they are being produced; and that our forests are only growing at the rate of twelve cubic feet per acre per annum when they might easily grow at the rate of forty,—which shows the great loss of wood material that might be made but that is not being made. We found that of every thousand feet of lumber standing in the forests only a little over 300 feet gets into use; that the waste in logging, in milling, in seasoning, in working up afterwards, used up from the standing trees all but about 310 board feet for every thousand board feet standing in the woods. And a very large part of that waste is preventable. We found that the reasonably available water-powers in the country at the present time would move every railroad train, every trolley car, every wheel and every spindle, light every house, and answer every use of power in the country. That is to say, if our vast supplies of coal were burned up, they might easily to a great extent be replaced by the use of our water-powers which are at present largely going to waste. We found that our water-powers were in process of being monopolized by two or three great companies—that our water-powers, east and west, south and north, were being acquired as rapidly as those wise and far seeing men could get hold of them, and were thus in danger of being monopolized when our coal supplies were either exhausted or so depleted as to have greatly risen in price, in the hands of one of the most far reaching and oppressive monopolies that has ever existed on the face of the earth. In any country where fuel is scarce, as in California after the oil is gone, every source of power, so far as men of science know at present must come from the streams; and when that time comes, every railway train and trolley car will be run by electric power from water, every house lighted and heated, every gallon of water pumped for irrigation, every bit of manufacture, every bit of printing will be done by electric power from water. At every point the average citizen will come into daily contact with the monopoly that controls the water-power if it is allowed to pass beyond the position of government regulation. So that we feel it strongly that one of the great problems of conservation, with us as with you, is to see that our water-powers are kept in a position where they will serve the public and not the great corporations first and the public afterwards. We learned that our navigable streams cover about 26,000 square miles. We spend $500,000,000 on our rivers and harbours and about half of that on our streams; and yet our navigation has declined in spite of this enormous expenditure, and our streams are less navigable than they were fifty years ago because the soil is being washed into the streams faster than the government is able to dip it out in order to keep the streams in their original condition. How long the present conditions may be expected to continue, and what ought to be done about them, is the question we have to consider.

Now every one of these pregnant statements of Dr. Pinchot seem to have considerable application to Canada as well as to the United States. I would like to say in this connection that in a recent message addressed to Congress by the President of the United States, this language is used in referring to the work done by the National Conservation Commission which has recently met in the city of Washington:

The principle of the community of interest among all our people in the great natural resources runs through the report of the National Conservation Commission and the proceedings of the joint conference. These resources, which form the common basis of our welfare, can be wisely developed, rightly used, and prudently conserved only by the common action of all the people, acting through their representatives in state and nation. Hence the fundamental necessity for co-operation. Without it we shall accomplish but little, and that little badly.

Then he quotes the words of the resolution, which are as follows:

We also especially urge on the Congress of the United States the high desirability of maintaining a national commission on the conservation of the resources of the country, empowered to co-operate with state commissions to the end that every sovereign commonwealth and every section of the country may attain the high degree of prosperity and the sureness of perpetuity naturally arising in the abundant resources and the vigour, intelligence, and patriotism of our people.

Now having touched upon these inspiring utterances of Dr. Pinchot, which were listened to with the greatest attention and interest by every person present, let me, before dealing very briefly with the various resources such as forests, mines, etc., with which we are endowed in Canada, refer to a very patriotic work which has been done in the province of British Columbia by Mr. A. C. Flumerfelt, who has offered, during the past two or three years, prizes in that province for the best essays upon the potential resources of the province of British Columbia. I daresay that every hon. gentleman in this House has received a copy of the essays, embodied in pamphlet form, which are the results of Mr. Flumerfelt's patriotic endeavours. They contain a vast amount of information with regard to the natural resources of British Columbia, and I do not doubt that when our Canadian forestry bureau gets to work, when possibly some conservation commission is established in this country, we may have pamphlets of this kind with regard to all the natural resources of Canada, for we need them very badly at the present time.

Now, I would like to say to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister of Canada, and I am saying it without casting any discredit upon the government, without casting any discredit upon the forestry bureau which has been recently established, that I have spent, during the last year a great deal of time, first and last, endeavouring to find out only a few things regarding the various resources of Canada. I wanted to find out, in the first place, whether the forest resources of Canada are enormously greater, as, I thought at one time, than the forest resources of the United States; I wanted to find out what is the total acreage of the land in Canada which we can regard as properly available for the purpose of producing merchantable timber for export or for use at home; I wanted to ascertain how rapidly we are cutting that every year; I desired to ascertain how rapidly it is being replaced by the natural growth of the forest; and I am bound to say that, at the present time, there does not exist in Canada any official information whatever on these points, so far as I am aware, taking the country as a whole. Some information may exist in respect to one of two of the provinces, but taking the Dominion of Canada at the present time, there is absolutely no official information on those heads. I am not saying this in criticism of the present government or of any previous government, but I am saying it for the purpose of indicating to the Prime Minister, and to my colleagues in parliament, and to the people of this country, the urgent need of thorough and systematic work for the purpose of obtaining this information and placing it before the Canadian people.

I shall not this afternoon attempt any lengthy dissertation upon the natural resources of Canada. The greatness of the subject itself would be appalling to any man who would attempt to deal with it exhaustively. Let me speak first of the fisheries. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) brought to the attention of parliament last year the importance of having a select standing committee of this House upon the fisheries. At that time I concurred entirely with the view expressed by my hon. friend upon the importance of the fisheries and the necessity of some action by parliament for the purpose of stimulating interest and also bringing about a more efficient operation of the fisheries in this country and better preservation of them for those who are to come after us. The fisheries of the Atlantic and the Pacific coast as well are of very great importance to the people of Canada. I do not believe they are carried on as thoroughly and effectively at present as they might be. I believe that we have on both the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts many species of fish which are not now sought, but which will some day be utilized for food, and I believe also that the fisheries of the Atlantic coast might be made to supply the needs of the people of Quebec and Ontario to a very much greater extent than at present. This must depend to some extent upon means of transportation and upon better methods by the fishermen and better co-operation among them. I am glad to say that there is to-day more co-operation among the fishermen of the maritime provinces, especially of Nova Scotia than there has been in the past. All these things might be encouraged and stimulated by a committee upon natural resources, because I would suggest that if such a committee be appointed, there should be sub-committees on fisheries, forests, and mines and minerals, each taking up the particular subject assigned to it; in that way such a committee could do a very great deal of work along a line that I believe to be in the public interest, the development and conservation of every one of these great industries.

Coming for a moment to our forests, one realizes that the forests of this country should be and are one of the greatest sources of our national wealth. The subject of forestry has been studied and developed upon scientific and common-sense principles in Europe. Many parts of our own country are unsuitable for agriculture but are eminently suitable for forestry.

Those who are interested in this subject would do well to consult an article of Dr. Fernow in the 'Forest Quarterly' of December, 1908, from which I propose to quote a little later. Dr. Fernow points out that a very large area indeed, of several of the provinces of Canada can be usefully employed for forestry purposes and for no other purpose.

I shall take but one illustration of many that could be given of the use that is made of mountainous lands in other countries. Saxony has under state control 430,000 acres of rough mountain land—an area not larger than an average county in Canada. From this she has taken two hundred million dollars in the past fifty years. During that time the cut has been doubled and is of infinitely better quality than it was fifty years ago. Then, only 17 per cent of the cut was serviceable, now 79 per cent is serviceable and the standing wood in the state forests has increased by no less than 16 per cent. The gross revenue per acre has increased from $1.75 to $6.67, and the net revenue per acre from 95 cents to $4.37. Canada possesses a forest area at least a thousand times greater than that of Saxony. While I am not advocating a policy of expropriation for the forest lands, nevertheless Canada and the several provinces of Canada do retain under state control an enormous amount of land which can be usefully employed for no other purpose.

There has been an enormous denudation of forest lands in the United States and the people of that country are beginning to realize that the true principle to be applied to forests is the principle of harvest and not that of destruction of the resources from which the harvest comes. It is estimated that the United States have at the present time 500,000,000 acres of forest lands. The estimates in regard to Canada vary greatly, from 800,000,000 acres to 1,700,000,000 acres. After consultation with a person who has studied the subject and who possesses an official status in this country, I am convinced that the actual area in the United States as well as in Canada available for the purpose of producing merchantable lumber whether for export or for use at home would not exceed 250,000,000 acres in the one country or the other, and I am also convinced notwithstanding the enormous denudation of the forests in the United States that the United States to-day possesses, contrary to what is generally believed, forest reserves slightly greater than those of Canada; and it must further be borne in mind that the forest resources of the United States are being renewed probably more rapidly than those of Canada. because in the southern parts of the United States, where a very considerable portion of their forest area still remains, the growth is probably more rapid than it is in any part of Canada with the possible exception of the maritime provinces. I make this exception because a gentleman who is now engaged in lumbering in Nova Scotia, who has had experience in Sweden, in Scotland, in Newfoundland, in Ontario and in Nova Scotia, tells me that the spruce forests of Nova Scotia are renewed more rapidly by natural growth than those of any other country in the world.

The paucity of our information in Canada is amazing both as to the extent of resources, area cut, waste and destruction and as to the period for which forests will last under present conditions. Of course when I refer to the present conditions I do not wish to put out of sight the enormous destruction by fire every year. Lumbermen will tell you that if you look over the history of forestry in Canada, an infinitely larger amount of lumber is destroyed by fire than is cut by lumbermen and this very important consideration should engage the attention with the provincial governments to the end that this enormous loss and destruction may be checked, so far as possible, in the future. Very valuable work has been done in the United States by forest patrols. Any one who will examine the reports of Dr. Pinchot, as to what has been done in the United States, particularly in the western portion of the United States, towards guarding against fires will realize that a very great work in this same connection can be carried on in this country, and I believe has been carried to some extent already, so far as our western forests are concerned by the Forestry Branch of the Department of the Interior. I do not, in the slightest, desire to minimize the good work which has been done by that Branch.

A word as to the lumber cut of the United States as compared with that of Canada The lumber cut of the United States, so far as I can obtain any information or details amounts to about 40,000,000,000 every year in merchantable lumber. If you add to that the railway ties, the pulpwood, the cordwood, the fence poles and the other wood that is cut from the forests of the United States, I am informed by Dr. Pinchot, to whom I applied for information on this subject, that the total annual lumber cut of the United States would amount to the equivalent of one hundred thousand million (100,000,000,000) of board measure. Now, how much are we cutting in Canada at present? I am unable to inform the House as to that with any degree of accuracy, but we have the following figures in the census of 1900 :

Our total cut, 1900—	—	Value.
Sawn lumber M. feet.....	3,657,000	$29,800,000
Other descriptions, fence posts, railway ties number	25,418,000	2,460,000
Cordwood pulp, &c., cords..	9,615,000	17,156,500
Timber, cubic feet.....	11,727,000	1,500,000

We have then to inquire what is the annual destruction of our forests by fire, and what are the total resources of timber in Canada to which we must look if we are concerned as to whether or not the supply will equal the demand in years to come. The best information I have been able to get on this subject is contained in an article by Dr. Fernow, published in the Forestry Quarterly for December, 1908. I wish I could read the whole of this article to the House, but I am afraid it would be too much for me to attempt to place it all on 'Hansard.' I will, however, ask to be allowed to quote two pages of the article because they contain very interesting information and statistics as to what the total forest resources of Canada amount to and where they are situated. Dr. Fernow was at one time head of the Forestry Department of the state of New York, and he is now professor of forestry in the University of Toronto; that university being, I believe, the first in Canada to take the highly commendable step of establishing a school of forestry. Dr. Fernow is reputed to be one of the most reliable authorities on this continent as to the timber resources of Canada and the United States. He has gone into this subject very thoroughly and exhaustively in this article, and if the House will bear with me I will quote a little from it. Speaking of British Columbia and of the western forests generally, he says :

In the mountain mills the average log sawed at the mill is 12 inches, of this description some 15,000,000 acres may be found in the southern Rocky Mountain type, which figured at 5,000,000 feet, gives another 75 billion feet, or altogether for the western Canada forest 300 billion feet. One might easily double these estimates without finding the supply inexhaustible. Every effort is being made to get rid of this valuable limited asset of the province.

Then Dr. Fernow continues:

Taking Ontario alone with a total land area of 126 million acres, of which 80,000,000 are still unsurveyed, we find that the distribution of these lands among three types of forest country occupied by the province gives 30 million acres to the southern hardwood type, 50 million acres to the central southern Laurentian type, and 46 million acres to the northern forest. Not quite 25 million acres are disposed of to private owners. From the assessment lists we learn, that of these, 14 million acres are cleared, of which 12·4 millions are in the peninsula, Lake Ontario and in St. Lawrence valley, and 1·7 millions in the southern Laurentian plateau. The wood lots on these farms are assessed at 5·5 million acres, nearly 2 million acres are reported as slash, and 2·8 million as swamp and waste 2·4, 2, and 1 million of the latter respectively in the three sections.

Applying a general experience figure for waste land incapable of recuperation, we would come to the conclusion that 85 million acres or two-thirds of the province will always remain in woods, except so far as it may be turned into grazing lands.

Mr. Whitson of the Crown Lands Department, one of the best informed men on these matters, places the figure as at best 70 million acres productive forest area, and the stand of pine outside of the licensed lands (12·5 million acres are licensed, and were some time ago estimated to contain 24 billion feet, the annual cut being around 800 million feet) and of forest reserves (10 million acres) at 10 billion feet B. M. and the pulpwood at 288 million cords. He also states that of the jackpine not 10 per cent is fit even for railroad ties.

For Quebec the distribution of land areas may be made as follows :—

Of the 218 million acres (342,000 square miles) around 144 million acres belong to the northern forest. 50 million the same amount as for Ontario, to the southern Laurentian; the St. Lawrence valley with 5 million acres represents mostly farm area, and the balance of 19 million acres may be accredited to the Acadian region. There are about 9 million acres in farms, of which 7·5 millions are in crops, and 1·5 millions is waste land, hence the total forest and waste land area is over 210 million acres. An estimate by Langelier, superintendent of forest rangers, places the standing lumber of the white and red pine at less than 40 billion feet, and spruce sawlogs at over 100 billion, all other saw material (including jackpine) at about 18 billion feet or altogether less than 160 billion feet.

The maritime provinces with somewhat over 57,000 square miles, together with the eastern townships of Quebec, south of the river (30,000 square miles) belong to the Appalachian or Acadian forest type. This area is practically cut out as far as pine is concerned, and relies now mainly on spruce for saw timber.

In New Brunswick 12 million acres are estimated to be under wood, the composition of which, by good authorities, is figured at 60 per cent spruce, 10 per cent pine, 5 per cent hemlock, 5 per cent cedar, 20 per cent hardwoods. Here the larger portion is owned privately, some 10·5 million acres. Of the 7·25 acres of crown lands all but about one million acres is under licenses, the latter area being barrens or burnt.

The small remaining area of timber land on Prince Edward Island is in calculations like these entirely negligible. New Brunswick together with Nova Scotia which represents an area of some 14 million acres, may round off the total stand of saw timber in the eastern provinces to 300 billion feet and for the whole of Canada to 600 billion feet. We might readily double these estimates and still remain within reasonable limits of the truth, if a closer utilization, especially on

the Pacific coast, and more careful lumbering generally were practised, and if the fires running with tolerable regularity through the slash did not destroy much of the growing timber besides the young growth.

I invite the special attention of the House to what he says in conclusion:

Considering that the above estimated stand of saw timber, which others have considerably reduced, would not suffice to supply the present annual consumption of coniferous material in the United States for more than 15 to 20 years, and the import into Great Britain of this class of material for more than 60 to 80 years, the need of securing better knowledge of the conditions of this resource and of employing conservative methods in its use are apparent.

I think every member of this House who has given the subject the slightest consideration will agree with the latter conclusion at which Dr. Fernow has arrived.

Having spoken at this length with regard to the forests, let me say one or two words about the waterways. I regard these as a natural resource. They constituted at one time the only means of communication through the country. At the present time they constitute the cheapest means of communication and of transportation for the carriage of the great products of the country. In so far as the resources of the country will reasonably permit their development, they should be developed—not as political expediency or purely local demands may require, but upon a comprehensive and carefully prepared system based upon the probable future needs of the entire country.

Then, with respect to the water-powers, I am sure that every hon. gentleman who has heard this afternoon the words of Dr. Pinchot with regard to the importance of the water-powers of the United States must be impressed with similar considerations as applied to Canada. If the water-powers of the United States are so important as he says they are to the people of the United States, I believe that the water-powers of Canada are of infinitely more importance to the people of this country. I believe that their permanence under fair conditions can be assured, and I have not much doubt that if properly conserved, these water-powers will prove a more valuable asset to the people of Canada in the future than all our coal and other minerals, all our iron, all our gold and silver combined. They should be investigated, estimated and scheduled. They should not be subject to exploitation for purely individual profit, but should be conserved as an asset held in trust by the state for the benefit of the whole people. I realize that the committee on agriculture and also a committee of the Senate have made some investigation into matters touching the waterways of Canada. I believe that a committee such as I suggest could do a splendid work along the same lines. That committee could investigate also another subject to which attention has been called by Dr. Pinchot in the portion of his remarks which I quoted this afternoon the destruction of our forests and the consequent denudation of our hills and mountains, which converts our streams into torrents in the spring and dry beds in the summer and early autumn. A great authority in the United States, Professor Shaler, estimated that up to 1896 in the upland regions of the states south of Pennsylvania 3,000 square miles of soil had been destroyed as the result of forest denudation, and that the destruction was then going on at the rate of 100 square miles of fertile soil every year. There cannot be the slightest doubt that the equivalent of hundreds of fertile farms is being washed into the sea every year as the result of our neglect of the proper conservation of our forests.

Our mines are subject to different considerations from the forests and the waterways. The mines must, in the very process of development, eventually become exhausted. But there is good reason, it seems to me, for adopting the view that they should be administered under such a policy as will prevent waste and speculative exploitation, and that, so far as they are not required for immediate operation, the state should retain ownership and control ; and it may be that later on in the history of this country, the state will have to take a step even in advance of what I am now suggesting in that regard.

The question is, what are our resources? At what rate are they being dissipated or wasted ? How can they be developed in the interest of the whole nation ? In view of these considerations, Mr. Speaker, I thought it only right to place upon the Order Paper the motion which is now in your hands. I suggest a committee on natural resources. The work of such a committee could be distributed among subcommittees, and might be made of great service in many ways both to the government and the people. We hear a great deal, both in the United States and in Canada, of the decadence of our legislative institutions, the decadence of the influence of parliament, in these latter days, when almost all the work of government is confined to the members of the Cabinet. I know that that process has gone on in Great Britain, and it is curious to observe that exactly the same development in that respect is to be seen in Canada—that is, the continued decline of the influence of parliament as a parliament, and the continued increase of the power of the Cabinet. I do not know that that development is a very healthy development, and I suggest to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister that we might perhaps assist in restoring to parliament as a parliament—not as a partisan parliament,

but as a parliament earnestly striving to do some work of value in the public interest—some of its influence. If we could have committees such as the one I suggest, to take into consideration matters of great public interest, matters which perhaps for the time being, in the exigencies of the political situation, could not be taken in hand by the government itself, they might serve a very useful public purpose. The reports of such committees need not be acted upon immediately by the government of the day. For example, I believe that public attention should be directed to the pulpwood of this country. I realize what the conditions are in Quebec, the maritime provinces and other parts of the country. The people of this country do not understand that at the present time, while our producers are receiving for their pulpwood about $6 or $7 a cord labour bestowed upon it in the United States, when that pulpwood goes across the borders, make it worth $50 or $60 or $70. I realize that the subject is not free from difficulty ; but it seems to me that a committee of this House, taking up such a matter as that, and bringing before the committee the men who are most strongly opposed to taking any step towards utilizing our pulpwood in our own country, and inviting them to state their reasons and to argue the matter out, could do a work for the conservation of the national resources of this country which could not be done by the government of the day. So, while men everywhere in Canada are lifting up their voices for the conservation and development of our natural resources, it seems to me that some initiative should come from parliament, and that the members of parliament, without regard to party, sinking for this purpose all partisan considerations, should take up this work and endeavour to accomplish something for the good of the country. It is purely in that spirit that I have brought this matter to the attention of the right hon. leader of the government and of this House. I am not concerned about the verbiage of the resolution, or whether the committee shall be appointed on the motion of an hon. member on this side of the House or an hon. member on the other side. But I would like to see something done, and I trust that the suggestion that I have taken the liberty of submitting to the consideration of the House will receive the favourable consideration of the Prime Minister and his colleagues and of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and that in some manner it will be acted upon during the present session.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Lunenburg). I shall not, Mr. Speaker, take up much of the time of the House discussing this resolution. By the expression 'conservation and development of the natural resources of Canada,' one is led in these days to consider mainly our water-powers and timber resources, and I listened with great interest to the remarks of the hon. the leader of the opposition in that connection. Though I have not given these two matters sufficient personal attention to hope to contribute anything of interest to the debate, there are a couple of points to which I wish very briefly to refer. My hon. friend referred to the fact that last session the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) proposed that a select committee should be named to deal with matters relating to Marine and Fisheries, and I notice by the Order Paper that that hon. gentleman has given notice of his intention to renew his resolution of last year. In my judgment there is a considerable contrast between matters which come within the purview of the Department of Marine and Fisheries and those which are generally understood to come within the meaning of the term 'natural resources,' and I trust therefore that when the House comes to determine what shall be the scope of the proposed committee, it will eliminate anything relating to Marine and Fisheries. However, I am sure that there will be no great difficulty on that score, and that the hon. leader of the opposition will concur in my suggestion. There is just one other matter which is recalled to my mind by the mention by my hon. friend of a lumber operator in Nova Scotia, Mr. Miller, who does a large business in the county of Halifax. Mr. Miller has carried on lumber operations in many European countries and takes a deep interest in the conservation of our Canadian forest resources. I remember his telling me personally, not so very long ago, that he imported from Scotland spruce tree seeds for the purpose of seeding a certain number of acres of his holdings in the county of Halifax each year. For the last three years, he has made it a practice to seed about fifty acres each year of the land he cut over the preceding year. Some two or three years ago he imported from Scotland a quantity of these spruce seeds, naturally thinking he was doing some good to the country as well as advancing his own private interests, and being under the impression that these seeds were free of duty. You may imagine, Mr. Speaker, that he was rather mortified to find he was compelled to pay duty. The only suggestion I have to make is that the Minister of Customs should reduce his revenue tariff just a little bit by putting spruce seeds on the free list.

Mr. PATERSON. Parliament makes the law, and I only carry it out.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I would like to make a few observations regarding one matter which has attracted my attention for some years past. Whether the committee asked for, could, if appointed, do

the work or not—and I do not think they could—it is very desirable to determine, at the earliest date, to whom these water-powers belong. Of late years a great many people are coming to this parliament to get incorporated for the purpose of controlling water-powers all over the country. We have had a Bill read the first time to-day for that purpose, and that is the same Bill which was thrown out last session by the Senate. It is quite clear to me that the desire of the incorporators is to get control of the water-powers of three important streams in the province of Ontario. Five or six years ago, I asked if the question had yet been determined as to whether these water-powers belonged to the provinces or to the Dominion. I can understand that the Dominion may control navigable streams, but many of these streams are not navigable, and on some of the latter the most valuable water-powers are found. It is for the purpose of getting control of these water-powers and streams that these companies are being incorporated. Some four or five years ago I brought this matter up and asked the government to have the question determined by some tribunal so that we might know whether the control lay within the provinces or the Dominion. If the water-powers belong to the provinces, the provinces ought to have control, because these powers will be one of the most valuable provincial assets. If they belong to the federal authorities, let the federal authorities determine how they shall be controlled. But if there be a joint interest, let it be determined what belongs to the provinces and what to the federal authorities. But the question ought to be determined at the earliest possible moment. It is absolutely necessary that it should be in order to stop the efforts of individuals or corporations to get control. I hope the government will not forget this phase of the matter and endeavour to have the question settled at the earliest possible moment.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I am happy to say that I have no word of dissent to express regarding the principle involved in my hon. friend's motion. The government is prepared to accept it and indeed would be prepared at once to grant this motion but for a consideration which I shall present later on to my hon. friend. He has said that the tendency of the present age is towards the decadence of parliament. I am not prepared to agree with him on that point, though I admit that the tendency is rather to put more and more responsibility on the government. Formerly members of this House would take the responsibility of certain legislation, but it is now felt better to draw the attention to, or the government to, certain subjects and expect the government to take them up and carry them to a successful issue. This motion is somewhat at variance with the principles of parliamentary government as they came to us in 1867. We have several committees in this House, but all are intended for the one purpose only, namely, to aid legislation. We have the Committee on Railways to which all questions affecting railways are referred. We have the Committee on Banking and Commerce to which commercial questions are referred. We have the Committee on Private Bills to which is referred measures that do not affect railways or public works or banking. We have also the Committee on Agriculture, but that is a departure from the accepted doctrine which prevailed in 1867 when we got our constitution. That committee is not an aid towards legislation.

It is a committee of general information. And the work which has been done by that committee cannot be too highly praised. It has, almost every year, brought valuable suggestions to the attention of the House, and it has been the leader in legislation which has been most useful to the country. It has not initiated legislation itself—it could not do that,—but it has brought to the attention of the House from time to time important suggestions which the country demanded. The suggestion of my hon. friend for a committee on natural resources is in the line, as he has said, of the Committee on Agriculture. It is not, as I have said, according to my reading of parliamentary institutions, as they have been. But parliamentary institutions must move with the times. I think the suggestion of my hon. friend is a good one. But I have one observation to offer, and one which I will ask him to consider between now and the time when this debate is resumed—as I intend to propose in a moment that it should be adjourned for the present. He has included in the work of his proposed committee a very wide sphere of action. He proposes that this committee should deal with fisheries, forests, mines, minerals, waterways and water-powers. A committee of that kind, it seems to me, would be cumbrous. He has suggested that the committee might divide itself into sub-committees. I would suggest that it would be more in accordance even with the object he has in mind to make, not one committee only, but several committees. Exception has been taken by my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to the inclusion of fisheries in the work of this committee; he suggests that a committee should be appointed to deal with this subject alone. I agree with my hon. friend from Lunenburg, and also with my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) who moved a resolution last year, and has repeated it this year, that the fisheries should be the subject of a committee by itself. We might deal with the subject of fisheries as we have dealt with the subject of agricul-

ture. Next, mines might very well be made the subject of one committee's operations, as agriculture has been and fisheries would be. I think we might also have a special committee for forests. Possibly, there might be another for waterways. But forests and waterways are so intimately connected that, perhaps, they might be made the subject of one committee. I think we will all agree in what has been shown by the expert opinion quoted by my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) in his very interesting speech that, if we wish to preserve our waterways, we must preserve our forests. If our land is denuded of its forest cover the country must pay the penalty of ruined waterways. As these two naturally go together, we might give one committee charge of forests and waterways.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And water-powers.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And water-powers. I would observe that it might be better for the general convenience of the House if we had more committees with less numerous membership. Our committees, at present, are unwieldy. The activity of members seeks exercise in some way, and all desire to be on committees. If, instead of six or seven committees, we have more, we might reduce the membership of the committees and engage the activity of members dealing with important subjects of which those committees would have charge. So, as I have suggested, we might have a committee on fisheries, a committee—already established—on agriculture, a committee on mines, a committee on forests and waterways—or, possibly, one on forests and one on waterways; as to that, I would not give a definite opinion, but we invite the opinion of the House. If these views are in accord with the general object which my hon. friend wishes to attain, I think I would be prepared to agree with him altogether. My only suggestion, as I have said, is that, instead of having one committee as is proposed by my hon. friend, we should appoint several committees. I will not press the matter, but will move the adjournment of the debate so that my hon. friend may consider the suggestions I have made.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as I am concerned, I would be prepared to fall in with the suggestions of the Prime Minister I can see no possible objection to the appointment of several committees; in fact, I might have made the motion in that way, but one naturally felt that it would be a rather startling proposal that four or five new committees should be appointed, and that it would be better to begin by proposing one. No doubt, the work would be better done in the way the Prime Minister has suggested.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT—LEVEL CROSSINGS.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 6) to amend the Railway Act. He said: Perhaps the Prime Minister would like a word or two of explanation, but he will hardly desire more, as this is a well-known Bill. It has been discussed in this House for five years. After three years' discussion, it was passed by the House unanimously exactly in the form in which it is now, and for the last three sessions it has been passed by this House in that form and rejected by the Senate. The Bill is designed to provide for the protection of the public at railway level crossings in cities, towns and villages. I should think it would suffice to point out, as I have already done, that the Bill exactly as it is now, and after a full consideration, has been passed by this House. I may say that it was amended to its present form when the present member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) was Minister of Railways and Canals. It was the subject of consideration by a special committee, where it was discussed for days and days, and where all that the railways had to say upon it—which was a great deal—was heard and voluminous evidence taken. The Bill was reported to the House unanimously by the special committee, and was unanimously passed by this House and sent to the Senate. Towards the end of the session of 1906 it went to the Senate, and naturally, one would think, without my making that remark, that it might have had some attention when it went there. I wish to point out to the House that it went to the Senate very late, because a committee of this chamber had spent a good deal of time during the session in getting it into that form, and it was not considered possible by the Senate to deal with it then. But the next session previous to the last session, when the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) was Minister of Railways and Canals, it was passed unanimously by this House, and again last session. Therefore I think I can well ask this House, without going into a long discussion of the Bill, and in view of the great number of accidents that are happening at this time, to confirm the action of this parliament the last two sessions, and send this Bill, which is exactly in the same form, again to the Senate for their consideration this session.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The last House has expressed its opinion of this Bill of my hon. friend, and I do not think that the old members would be inclined to revise their opinion. Therefore, unless some of the new members find it unsatisfactory, and unless we hear from them, I think the motion ought to be carried.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time, considered in committee, and reported.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I thought this was one of those cases that should be referred to the Railway Commission.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman was not on the special committee that dealt with that subject. We dealt with the suggestion of the then Minister of Railways, and I fell in with it. The railways complained that they would be put to an unnecessary expense if they had to deal with a lot of crossings which years ago had been ordered to be protected by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. The court is extinct, but the judgments remain, that is, the court has ceased to exist—I call it a court, to use simpler language. The Railway Committee of the Privy Council, years ago, gave orders in regard to certain of these crossings, and the railways contended before the committee that or if we referred this question only to the Railway Commission they would be obliged to go to elaborate expenses, to call witnesses, to take levels by engineering experts, and so on, and that a great many of these protections already ordered might well stand until the commission saw fit, for some reason, to change them. Therefore, the Bill is drawn so that they are not required to do anything else as long as they comply either with the orders of the Railway Committee, that is, the orders of the Privy Council, or of the present commission, the authority of which might apply to the crossings in question. It was at the request of the railways, to save them expense.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT—FIRE CAUSED BY LOCOMOTIVES.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE (South Essex) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 7) to amend the Railway Act. He said: The object of the amendment which I propose is to enlarge the classes of property for which a railway company shall be liable in case of fire communicated by a railway locomotive. In 1903, section 298, as it is at present in the Revised Statutes of Canada, was enacted. That provided that whenever damage should be caused to crops, lands, fences, plantations, or buildings and their contents, by a fire started by a railway locomotive, the company should be liable for damage so caused, with a provision limiting the amount of such damage in case the railway company could show that it was not guilty of any negligence. The object of the present amendment is to strike out the words which specify the kinds of property to which damage may be caused and for which the railway company is responsible. You will notice by section 298 that it is confined to crops, lands, fences, plantations, or buildings and their contents. Now, it has been found in the experience of people owning property adjacent to railways, that there are other classes of property which are not enumerated in this section; for instance, building material. If a house is set on fire a railway company is liable under this section; if the house is not erected, the lumber, shingles and other materials upon the ground are not covered by this section. Another class of property which frequently suffers, in my constituency particularly, is cordwood and bolts for staves ; if they are destroyed, they do not come within this section.

Mr. LANCASTER. And fence rails not yet put up into fences.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. A case has arisen in the courts of Ontario in regard to marsh hay which has been baled. The contention has already been set up that this does not come within the definition of crops, and the courts held that it does. But the case is still subject to appeal, the words are capable of some misconstruction. I therefore move that these words be struck out, and that the section as amended shall read as follows:

> Whenever damage is caused by a fire started by a railway locomotive, the company making use of such locomotive, whether guilty of negligence or not, shall be liable to such damage.

So whatever property is damaged, the company will be liable for such damage. The section was introduced last year by the then member for New Westminster and was referred to the Railway Committee, and passed in almost the very words of the Bill I am now proposing. The only difference was that instead of leaving the question of liability entirely at large the Railway Committee inserted words making it read 'damage to any property.' I have no particular objection if the House thinks it proper to add these words, but I would prefer to have them omitted. For instance, damage might be caused to a human being, a house might be set on fire and the inmates injured. But if it were limited to property there would be no liability in that case. It seems to me there is as much reason to make it apply to injury to human beings or, say, to live stock, as to property, and, as it has been fully considered by the Railway Committee, I think the House might pass it through the Committee of the Whole without sending it to the Railway Committee.

Mr. LANCASTER. My recollection is that the railways, before the Railway Committee, said that they would be content to have the Bill in its present form or with the word 'property' in. I am entirely in accord with the Bill as my hon. friend introduced it. In my part of the country we

have had many of these cases where the result of the present law was almost ridiculous. Men had fences burned and piles of very valuable timber ready to build other fences with; they could recover for the old fence, but not for the piles of material because the Act did not mention rails of that kind. We had one case of piles of lumber ready on the ground to repair a driving house which was partly pulled down and the extraordinary condition existed that the man could recover for the partly dismantled building but not for the new material which was brought there to replace it and which was a total loss. We had also a case where a man was very seriously injured in rescuing his family and his furniture from a burning house. He was injured by reason of the fire but he could not recover anything from the railway, not even his medical attendance. I do not think the House can do better than pass the Bill as presented by the hon. member for Essex (Mr. A. H. Clarke). It was well considered in the Railway Committee last year, and I think it was unanimously approved by that committee.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia). I consider this amendment absolutely necessary. I know that in my constituency a man spent a considerable amount of money in planting out trees around his farm. A railway set fire to the prairie and destroyed the trees to the value of a couple of hundred dollars, and he had no redress whatever. If this Bill is passed it should cover any such cases.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Would the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) state why this was limited by the introduction of the word 'property' in the Railway Committee?

Mr. LANCASTER. As I remember it, Mr. Kennedy, then member for New Westminster, inserted the word 'property,' thinking it would make better reading, and the railways agreed to that change; but the Bill as introduced by him was very much in its present form. The only suggestion brought forward by the railways was that they should be subrogated if there was insurance, just as when they pay off a mortgage. But that was considered to be impracticable by the committee and finally that objection was withdrawn by the railways and I understood they had no further objection to the Bill.

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris). I wish to express my very great appreciation of this Bill. Any one who has lived in the west, where the railways are becoming very thick, knows that every fall, during the cutting of hay and of grain there, great losses are sustained by farmers from this cause, and it is a question which every member from the west has had brought to his attention. I am exceedingly pleased that the Bill is receiving the unanimous support of both sides.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). This Bill, while not lengthy, is very wide in its scope. I know that last session, even before it got before the committee, it was the subject of private consultation, and it was agreed by every person that the Act as it now stands is not satisfactory, that it is too circumscribed, and that when any damage occurs it is a matter of practice at least that the railways take the exception that the property destroyed does not come within the terms of the Act. The railways urged that when they have to pay damages the amount of insurance the party received should be deducted. However, the committee practically passed the Bill unanimously, with the condition that the word 'property' wiping out all restrictions, should be added. If my hon. friend who has introduced the Bill wishes to put it into the form of last year I have no objection to proceeding with it; if not, we should send it to the Railway Committee. I would not care to change it materially and rush it through without referring it to the Railway Committee.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE (South Essex). I would rather have it as it is now. It seems to me we are only inviting disputes. The question may come up what 'property' means. I would very much prefer leaving it at large so that if any damage occurs they should be liable for that damage whatever it is. It would perhaps not be as good a Bill for the lawyers, but it would save confusion. If the House wishes to add the word 'property' I will acquiesce.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

THE RESTAURANT COMMITTEE.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received a message from the Senate announcing the appointment of the Hon. Senators Campbell, Landry, Lougheed and Watson a committee to assist the Hon. the Speaker in so far as the interests of the Senate in the restaurant are concerned.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

NATURALIZATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY moved that the order for the second reading of (Bill No. 5), to amend the Naturalization Act, be discharged. He said : The suggestions on

which this Bill is based came to the Department of the Secretary of State from the Department of Justice. My attention has been drawn to certain errors and omissions in the Bill as introduced, and I therefore desire, with the leave of the House, to withdraw it, in order that I may discuss with the Minister of Justice the representations that have been made with a view to redrafting and re-introducing the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and order discharged.

DOMINION LANDS' ACT—AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 8), to amend the Dominion Lands' Act—Mr. Oliver—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The explanatory note states :

The above clauses are practically the same as the corresponding ones in the Act; they are not intended to change the law. The necessity for re-enacting these clauses is that they are not in their proper order in the Act. They are now placed in the order originally intended.

What are the corresponding clauses in the law at present ?

Mr. OLIVER. Clause 5 of the Bill is clause 7 of the Act, clause 6 of the Bill is clause 6 of the Act, clause 7 of the Bill is clause 5 of the Act, and clause 8 of the Bill is clause 8 of the Act, but the words under subsection 7 of this section, are inserted in order to make the proper connection. In explanation of the Bill I may say that inadvertently, at some stage of the passage of the Bill through the House, three subsections of section 15 became misplaced, thereby altering their sense as they are read in the Act ; and this Bill is merely for the purpose of putting them in the places which will give them their proper reading and meaning according to the original intent. It was what might be called a clerical error, and I desire to have it corrected at the earliest possible moment. I wish to say to the House that it is not intended to make any other amendment to the Dominion Lands Act at this session. Though it might be found desirable in some points to amend the Act, yet it having been in force only a short time, I do not think it advisable to make any changes at such an early date.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the Bill really does not affect any change in the law, why is it necessary to make the change at all ?

Mr. OLIVER. Because the paragraphs, having been misplaced, do not read to give their true meaning. These are subsections, one relating to another, and when they are out of their proper places the proper relation is broken. All we want is simply to put them in their proper places, so that they will mean what they were intended to mean, and really did mean as first drafted.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In subsection 8 of the Act as passed last session, providing for compensation to be fixed by arbitration, are the words, 'in the manner hereinafter provided.' I do not know whether the minister attaches any importance to the words or not.

Mr. OLIVER. There is provision in the latter part of the Act for arbitration, and whether the words are there or not, the effect is the same.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. At all events, that is what is intended ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Privy Council Department salaries, $32,825, contingencies, $7,400.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The salary of the clerk of the Privy Council has been raised from $3,575 to $5,000 under the Act of last session.

Then there is the assistant clerk of the Privy Council, whose salary was $2,100 and who is now receiving $2,850 under the last Act. All the other increases are simply statutory. There have been five messengers for the last twenty years, but three were paid out of contingencies and have now been transferred to the Civil Service list. The contingencies for printing and stationery have been increased $400. We have dropped altogether the clerical and other assistants. The messenger's estimate, which was paid out of the regular items, were formally paid out of this vote for contingencies. There is a decrease there of $3,000.

Department of Marine and Fisheries—Salaries, Professor E. E. Prince at $4,000, $228,640.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The reasons for the increase are these: There were several officers who were not included in the inside service, but in view of the change of the law last session they have been transferred to the inside service. The deputy minister has had his salary increased from $4,000 to $5,000 by the law of last session. Professor Prince has been appointed Canadian commissioner under the treaty passed with the United States. His salary before was $2,500 and in view of his appointment as treaty commissioner we have raised his salary to $4,000 in order to put him on the same footing as the American commissioner. By the treaty it is provided that two commissioners

have to be appointed for the purpose of drafting regulations. One is appointed by the American authorities and the other by the Canadian or British authorities.

Mr. DANIEL. For what term is he appointed?

Mr. BRODEUR. For four years, if I remember right. The regulations which have to be made will have to be made for four years.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will this commission have any jurisdiction over our inland fisheries, say, on Lake Ontario?

Mr. BRODEUR. The treaty covers Passamaquoddy bay, the St. Croix river and two lakes in the province of Quebec, also the River St. Lawrence where it forms the boundry line and the great lakes. Lake Ontario is included.

Mr. HENDERSON. The western end of Lake Ontario from the Niagara river, is not a boundary line, but is Canadian on both sides, and the people there are much alarmed lest this treaty may destroy the fishing industry entirely. What have the Americans to do with regulating the fisheries in a section such as that?

Mr. BRODEUR. The situation is absolutely the same as in the case of Lake Superior. Although the western part is entirely within American territory it has been found advisable that the whole lake should be included. This treaty will not have the effect of destroying the fisheries, but quite the reverse. Those who have studied the subject claim that for years the fisheries were more or less destroyed owing to the fact that there were no regulations or that the regulations were not similar. On the American side there were three or four authorities making regulations on the same lake, which were all dissimilar and it was found advisable that they should be uniform. And the result will be, certainly, instead of destroying the fisheries, to protect the fisheries. That is the object that both British and American representatives had in view when the treaty was passed.

Mr. HENDERSON. I see that the minister is more familiar with the facts than I am, but I am informed that in the western portion of Lake Ontario, which has Canada for its southern as well as its northern boundary,—I mean that portion of the lake opposite the county I have the honour to represent,—there is an important fishery, the cisco herring fishery. I am informed that the licenses, this year, will have a condition compelling the fishermen to use nets with a mesh of 2¾ inches. For the last fourteen years, they have been fishing with a mesh of 2⅜ inches. If they are compelled to use a larger mesh, the effect will be to prohibit them from fishing, for they cannot catch these fish with this class of net. What they fear is that this regulation which has been given out will be confirmed by this new commission or under this new treaty, and they are seriously alarmed for their industry. I trust the minister will bear in mind the peculiarity of the fishery of that section of the lake. I may tell him that the officer whose salary we are now discussing is quite familiar with the cisco fishery and with the class of fish found in that part of the lake. All I ask is that these people should be protected. Their all is bound up in this fishing industry. There is no use of saying that the fishing is being destroyed. The fish there were as abundant last year as they ever were. That is the information I have. I was there during the autumn, and there is no complaint that the fish are being depleted, in fact, the fishing last season was excellent. But if the fishermen are compelled to use the larger mesh, it will make no difference whether the fish are plentiful or scarce. The fish do not grow large, but those that would be caught with the larger nets would be the mother fish, the breeders. I understand that a petition has been sent to the minister very recently. On inquiry on Saturday, I learned that it had not reached him then, but when it does reach him, I hope he will give it his serious consideration and will not allow the larger mesh to be made obligatory under the regulations.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am under the impression that no change has been made in the regulations governing the fisheries in that part of Lake Ontario. Had any such regulations been passed, I should certainly have had knowledge of the fact, and I think I should have remembered it, but I have no recollection of any such change. The other regulations are not in force, they are not even drafted. But the two commissioners have been appointed under the treaty, as I have said, to draft these regulations. I will bring the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) to the attention of Prof. Prince, and will see to it that the fishermen are properly treated.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am under obligation to the hon. minister for what he has said. My information comes direct from men engaged in the fisheries, and I understand they get their information from Mr. Tinsley, of Toronto, who, I presume, does not speak without the authority of the minister, for he knows perfectly well that, while he has to do with the licensing of the fishermen, no change in the regulations can be made without the consent of the minister. I hope the minister will stand firm in the interest of the fishermen, and that he will consult his officers and any one else who can give him information on the subject. I feel sure that if he does this he will not permit any change in the regulations that have been in existence during the last fourteen or fifteen years.

Mr. BRODEUR. Of course, I am speaking subject to correction on this subject. But I have been giving the matter great consideration and study recently, and I feel sure that any such change in the regulations would have been impressed upon my memory. I certainly have no recollection of such a change having been made.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. I would suggest that this item be allowed to stand. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is not here, neither is the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). This item is increased this year from about $115,000 to about $228,000, a very large increase and one that calls for explanation. There are a number of items that are non-contentious, such as items 10, 11, 12, 21, 23, 25 and 26. These, I think, we might dispose of.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have no objection to allowing the item to stand, but I would not like these figures to be considered as representing an increase in the export on the fisheries. There have been a few increases, but the figures just read do not explain the situation. The hon. gentleman will see that the figure for last year, $115,250, represents the salaries voted under Civil Government last year. But by virtue of the law passed last session, all the officers in the fisheries branch in Ottawa, some of whom were paid out of the different votes, are now to be paid out of the Civil Government vote.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. I understand that. But I find, at page 24, that the number of officers last year was 78 temporary and 77 permanent, a total of 155. Now, there are 171, a very considerable increase. I am sure that the number now is double what it was in 1896, though the work is practically the same.

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, no.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. I would ask that this item be allowed to stand until the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr Foster), who was at one time Minister of Marine and Fisheries, is present.

Office of the Auditor General—Contingencies $6,500.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. There is a decrease here of $11,500, but I see that $11,000 is transferred to salaries.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Exactly.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Chairman must take into consideration the fact that we only had these estimates placed in our hands a short time before the House rose at six o'clock. We have had no opportunity of looking at them, and I trust he will not cry 'Carried' too soon. We are handling a good deal of money.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is really not much money handled under this item

The regular service last year was $71,000, this year it is $88,000. The contingencies were $18,000 last year, and $6,500 this year. The figures total about the same as last year.

Department of Finance and Treasury Board —Salaries, $107,812.50; Contingencies, $11,000.

Mr. DANIEL. I notice in this item that a third division, subdivision B, appears to be added this year that was not on before, and apparently 43 persons are taken in from the outside service. Is the cost increased?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes. The regular vote for contingencies last year was, in round numbers, $70,000, this year it is $107,000. This increase is explained by the fact that some 43 employees were taken from the outside service and put in the inside service.

Mr. DANIEL. I presume there will be 43 fewer people in the outside service than there were before?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the object of bringing them in from the outside service?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As provided by the Act of last year.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It appears that a great many of these men are to have their salary increased by $150; is that in addition to this vote?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. So that what we are voting now as salaries to these men is not what they are to be paid. A considerable number of them are to be paid $150 each more than is put in the estimates.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is a serious matter to take into consideration. The salaries here are very much the same as they were last year.

Mr. PATERSON. With the statutory allowances.

Mr. HENDERSON. What about them? Are we ever to hear anything more about them? Are they to drop out of sight?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There will be statutory increases every year until a civil servant reaches the maximum of his class. The allowance increases from year to year by $50 until he has reached the maximum of the class he belongs to.

Mr. HENDERSON. I was in hopes that we had got this Civil Service matter about where we could comprehend it. It seems to me the First Minister has not simplified the matter at all. He is going to add $150 to the salaries of a certain number of men, not all the men. Then some men, we do not know how many, we do not know who

they are, are to have their salaries increased year by year by $50. Now, if the Prime Minister could appoint a committee of this House to make the matter a little more obtuse than it is, I would like to see them at work.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am quite willing to take the suggestion of my hon. friend. I have been some thirty years in the House, and I cannot say that I understand the Civil Service Act yet.

Mr. ROCHE. How many civil servants are now at the maximum of their various classes?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot say.

Mr. HENDERSON. There is another question. A civil servant will get his $150 added this year, for I suppose the government intends to put that Bill through. Will that do in lieu of three years of statutory increase, or is the statutory increase to be over and above the $150.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is a big lump. That means that each one will get $200 this year of an increase, at least a great many of the men. The impression has gone abroad in the country that all they were getting was $150 each, and that that was a settlement of the whole account. I do not know whether the First Minister, during the election promised more than that or not, I think it was only $150 each that was promised. But now it seems it is getting worse and worse; the increase is more than he promised.

Department of Trade and Commerce—Salaries, $38,837.50; contingencies, $19,350.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am satisfied there are no increases except those authorized last year by the Civil Service Act, except the annuities branch, which is a new branch altogether.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. Does the Prime Minister think it necessary to continue this branch or has he any thought of abolishing it as recommended by the minister who presided over it a few years ago ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Far from it, it is more useful than ever.

Office of the High Commissioner for Canada in London, salaries, $10,600.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no increase there except what is authorized by the statute of last year.

Mr. HENDERSON. Who is the secretary referred to there ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Griffith.

Mr. HENDERSON. That increase of $200 to the assistant secretary has no relation to the $150 or the statutory increase, that is only an additional sum given to him ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. The next one has an increase of $100. I find there are a great many increases outside the statutory increases of $150. There seems to be an increase all along the line.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. These increases were authorized by the statute of last session.

High commissioner's office, London, contingencies, $19,775.

Mr. HENDERSON. Would the minister say how that compares with say 15 years ago ? Away back in the 90's we heard a good deal about the expenses of the London office. Are we doing the work there as reasonably as it was done then or are we getting a little more extravagant in England as we are in Canada ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I was in the House at that time, 15 years ago and I never heard my hon. friend complain that we were extravagant in those days.

Mr. HENDERSON. I never complain, but I heard the right hon. the Prime Minister and his friends complain by the hour, denouncing the extravagance of the London office. I am afraid they have forgotten their virtue of those days. I do not know that we have any better service than we had 15 years ago.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have a very good service.

Mr. HENDERSON. I called at the London office about two years ago and I tell you I would not give Mr. Griffith $5,000 for his services. I have not a very high estimate of the way he treats strangers, much less members of parliament. I do not care if he reads that in 'Hansard.'

Mr. C. JAMESON (Digby). Has the Prime Minister any information as to the amount of the income tax on the salary of the High Commissioner?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall obtain the information at a later date.

Office of general consulting engineer to Dominion government, salaries, $7,250.

Mr. AMES. When Mr. Schreiber acts as arbitrator as I understand he is doing on the present occasion to settle differences between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government, is he paid extra ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think so, it is not so intended.

Civil Service Commission, salaries, $19,075.

Mr. AMES. When did the Civil Service Commissioners definitely take office and commence work ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think they were appointed on the 1st of September. I cannot say exactly when they took office but about that time, in September.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. Who are the commissioners ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Professor Shortt and Mr. Larochelle of Montreal.

Mr. HENDERSON. Would the Prime Minister be good enough to state in very brief detail what the duties of these men are ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It would be difficult to put their duties into brief words. The duties of the commissioners are being defined by themselves now, they are establishing rules for the carrying on of their work. As my hon. friend knows, their chiet duty is to select officers for the recruiting of the Civil Service. We have no power at the present time to appoint anybody to the service. For instance, the Minister of Customs would have to write to the Civil Service Commissioners that there is a vacancy of a certain character in his department and asking the commissioners to supply an officer, and the commissioners would appoint the successful competitor in the examination.

Mr. DANIEL. Do the commissioners select the man who has the highest marks?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think so. I cannot say they do it mechanically, but the theory of the Act is that the successful competitor shall be appointed.

Mr. HENDERSON. And would the Civil Service Commissioners have a right to reply to the Minister of Customs, saying: You have a sufficient staff already; you do not need another man and we will not let you appoint one. I for one am desirous that the inside and outside service should be well paid. I much prefer they should be well paid than that they should be underpaid. I have said before, and I say again, that in the Civil Service we have a great many educated men, men of ability, and men who are most accommodating and obliging when you meet them, but I do believe that the inside service is overmanned. I have the idea, I may be wrong, that you could dismiss from the service 500 officials and still have enough to do the work. I do not ask that any of these officials should be dismissed, because it would be a hardship, but I do think that when a vacancy occurs that vacancy should not be filled until there is a most careful inquiry as to whether there are not already sufficient employees to discharge the duties of any given department. I would have the officials work longer hours; I do not think there is any difficulty in an able-bodied man, or woman either, working six hours a day. Why, in my youth I used to work twelve and fifteen hours a day and think nothing of it, but now a man gets fatigued after five or six hours work and he has to get out and play lawn tennis to recuperate his health, and we provide him with grounds for that purpose. I do not find fault with that, because that is probably as good a way as any other to occupy one's leisure time. But I do press on the government that a general opinion prevails in this House and outside of it that the service in Ottawa is overmanned. I am told that there are men in the service today whose time is largely taken up in simply revising the work of others who have not acquired a competent knowledge of their duties, and that these men who do know their business would be quite sufficient to do all the work that the service calls for. I would not advise the government to do any wholesale weeding out, because, as I have said, it would be a hardship to dismiss these employees, but if vacancies were not filled except in cases where it was absolutely necessary to do so, in eight or ten years you would be astonished to find how much fewer officials you could get along with. Then I would be in favour of the principle that those who remain in the service should get increased pay so as to encourage them in an energetic discharge of their duties. I am sure the work of the departments could be better done under such a system than by bringing in new men every six months, or every month or every day for that matter and schooling them in their duties. I do not look for so very much from this new system of appointing civil servants. The First Minister may knit his eyebrows; perhaps he realizes that the old system of pull would be better. By this competitive examination system you may get a man well up in algebra or Euclid or English grammar, or he may be a university graduate, but he may not be worth a button when he comes to perform some minor duty in the department. I understand that the examination will only be along the ordinary lines as a test of education.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, no.

Mr. HENDERSON. Suppose you want an officer for the Customs Department, will he undergo an examination calculated to test his knowledge of the difference between cotton goods and woollen goods so that he may be able to determine the duty which should be paid? If that were so, then you would want to have as many commissioners as there are departments; you would want a man for the Fishery Department who would be able to conduct an examination as to the quality of the nets and the size of the mesh that would catch a big fish or a small fish, and you would want another for the Militia Department which would be

able to decide on what were the qualifications for a soldier. I have no hope that this commission is going to accomplish what we anticipate for it. I believe we will find that in the end pull will have as much to do with it as anything else. At all events I would urge on the government that vacancies should not be filled unless it is absolutely necessary to fill them, and if you have $347,000 additional to give to the civil servants I would divide part of that amongst the officers who remain in the service, weeding out the surplusage as vacancies occur and paying better the men who remain. If this were done, I am sure ycu would have more satisfaction amongst the civil servants of the country. Then when I and others go to the different departments we shall find the officials thoroughly posted in their work and prepared to give us the information we desire instead of meeting a young man who, from no fault of his own, is utterly unacquainted with the business he is assuming, and will perhaps be out of the office again in six months or a year and a new man put in his place. I trust the government will take up my idea and think over it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am very much disappointed at the remarks of my hon. friend. I thought he would give us some encomium for what we have done, but instead of that he gives us a lot of blame. My hon. friend, after paying a graceful compliment to the Civil Service, went on to say that it was largely composed of men who could not do their work and whose work had to be supervised by other officers; and he suggests that when vacancies occur we should not fill them. Well, if vacancies occurred in the offices of some of the good men who do the supervising, and the service were left to the incompetent ones, what would become of it? My hon. friend will see that the best course is to go on and apply the law as we have it, making appointments by competition and not by pull, as my hon. friend thinks is the case now. That is one of the prejudices of the other side. In order to satisfy the fastidiousness of my hon. friend we passed the present law, under which we have no pull. All the pull is with the commissioners, who I am sure are impartial; and I am sure that under the operation of the law we shall have a good service, every man doing good work without his work requiring to be supervised by any other man.

Mr. HENDERSON. Of course, my remarks could not apply to every one in the Civil Service. No civil servant will take exception to them in that respect, because no one could expect a man who has been in the service only six months to be as competent as those who have been there for six years. You find in the service a great many men who are well up in their work and always accommodating and obliging. These are deserving men whom I want to see well paid. The First Minister asks what we would do when one of these good men drops out. I think the best thing would be to promote the next man below him. In that way you will fill the bill better than by appointing a raw recruit.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Who determines the appointments in the different departments—the minister or the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. PATERSON. The Act provides that officers requiring technical or professional knowledge may be appointed otherwise, but the great bulk of the appointments to the Civil Service are by competitive examination. For example, a clerk in the cheque branch of the Customs Department dies, and the Commissioner of Customs reported to me that it was necessary to fill the vacancy. Thereupon, as the Act provided, the Commissioner drew up a requisition to the Civil Service Commissioners to furnish us with an officer, and I as minister wrote 'approved' upon it. That requisition goes to the Civil Service Commission. They hold an examination, and we know nothing of the man they send us. I think they are using the old Civil Service examinations in a measure, but no doubt they will have new examinations before long. The young man who is sent to us was not known before either to my deputy or to myself, and he takes the position—not the position or the salary of the officer who died; but we said to him, 'We have a vacancy in the cheque department, and we require one who writes a good hand, is good at figures and mathematics, and has a retentive memory.' We put him into the class in which the officer who died was placed in the reorganization of the service, not at $1,300, which I think he received, but at the minimum of the class.

Mr. AMES. Suppose there is a vacancy in the first class, do you make a new appointment to that class, or do you move one from the second class to the first and one from the third class to the second, and make a new appointment to the third class?

Mr. PATERSON. In this case it is done by placing the new officer at the minimum of the class to which he is appointed.

Mr. AMES. And all the others are passed up one grade accordingly?

Mr. PATERSON. No; their salaries remain as they were. They receive the statutory increase year by year, but a new man goes in at the minimum of the class.

Mr. AMES. Who fills the place of the first-class man who drops out? Is there a promotion made?

Mr. PATERSON. No, there is no promotion made in that case.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Who determines whether the department is over-manned or not —the minister or the commission?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If a new appointment is to be made, the government must come to parliament for an appropriation, and then the appointment is made in the way stated by my hon. friend.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to make a few observations in regard to the inconvenience to which members of parliament are frequently put in trying to do business with the departments. The present custom is for a portion of the service to leave their offices for lunch from twelve to one o'clock, and another portion from one to two o'clock. We usually come here between nine and ten in the morning to get our mail, and after we get through with that there may or may not be committee work, and then it is pretty near twelve o'clock. If we go to the departments to-day to do any business, as a general thing, we are met with the answer that the clerk in charge of that branch is away at lunch and will not be back until one and we cannot very well get the papers ? We go back after one o'clock and we find that the head of the branch is at lunch and will not be back until two. There are thus two hours in which we cannot do any work. It would be a much better system for all officers to leave for lunch at twelve and be back at one or leave at one and be back at two. You go there at two o'clock and often they are not back and you have to wait until nearly three when you have to go to the House, and by the time the routine business of the House is done the offices are closed. Then on Saturday, these members who do not leave the city make an effort to overtake their accumulated work, the morning is usually taken up with routine work of mails, until it is noon, then at one o'clock the departments are closed and the whole afternoon you can do nothing. That is the experience of most members who have been here any length of time. Some change should be made.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sure that there has been no change in the service in my experience but I shall speak to my colleagues about my hon. friend's suggestion.

Mr. SPROULE. A few years ago this question was brought up and it was then intimated that a large number of the junior clerks might have their lunch hour from twelve to one or from one to two, and the senior officers either from twelve to one or from one to two. At present it happens that just when you want to do business, you cannot get any one to do it.

Mr. AMES.

Mr. AMES. Under what department or minister does this Civil Service Commission fall ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is like the Auditor General absolutely independent of the ministers.

Mr. AMES. Will there be a detailed report each year ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not want to find fault, but in any industry in this country the employees generally work from at least eight in the morning until six in the evening, I do not know what the particular hours are for the civil servants, but at the very best they are no longer than from 9.30 a.m. until 4 p.m. I have gone to the offices and have found that even at 10 a.m. the officials are often not there. I do not think it would be a great hardship upon the officials if they went to work a little earlier in the morning and quit work a little later in the afternoon. If that were done, we could dispense with a good many of them. Any man in this country should be able to work from 8 a.m. until noon and then from one until 5 p.m. Let the right hon. the Prime Minister inquire of any manufacturer whether his employees do not work from 8 a.m. until 6 p.m.; I believe that the ministers themselves and their deputies are there from at least 9 a.m. until 6 p.m.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And later.

Mr. J. D. REID. Yes later. I honestly believe that an employee in the service at Ottawa should work from 9 a.m. until 5 or 5.30 p.m. And if they did we could dispense with quite a number. I agree with what my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has said, that it was almost impossible to do anything in the departments for this reason. You go there at ten a.m. and find a lot of people waiting to do business before you, and by the time your turn has come, the officials go to lunch. Then by the time you can get back after lunch, the office is closed. Is it unreasonable to ask that these men should be on duty from nine till twelve and from one till five, or seven hours per day. I have been told by an ex-official, and one of the best, that as a rule the officers only get there about ten o'cleck, then they go away at twelve or one, and at four o'clock they are gone again. This man was always there at nine sharp and worked until six and was glad to do it, as he could get through his work more satisfactorily in that way. I do not wish to impose any hardships, but I believe that any man who accepts a position in a government department should be there at nine a.m., take an hour for his lunch, and then remain until 5.30. If that were done, we could do with a good many less officials.

Mr. GERMAN. It is rather interesting to listen to my hon. friends. For years when the Conservatives were in power, exactly the same conditions existed and we never heard from them a word of protest.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. GERMAN. I would like the member from East Grey to point to me one utterance of his criticising the civil servants for not being in their departments during every hour of the day, while the Conservatives were in power.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not wonder that my hon. friend did not hear me because he was so seldom here, but I have made the same criticism on numerous occasions and can turn to 'Hansard' to prove my words.

Mr. GERMAN. I could not possibly keep track of everything the hon. gentleman has said because he has so much to say on everything. But I have had as much to do with the civil servants, in at any rate three of the departments, as any other member of parliament for the last twenty years, and I will say this. Take the Department of Railways and Canals and the Public Works Department and the Department of Marine and Fisheries, which has been so much talked about, there has not been an hour in the day from ten a.m. until six p.m. when you could not find one of the leading officers there to do business with.

Mr. J. D. REID. You are an exception; they favour you.

Mr. GERMAN. I believe I am not an exception. They were there when the Conservatives were in power, and they are there now. The chief officers of this department are in their offices from ten in the morning to six at night, with an hour for lunch.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is what I admitted.

Mr. GERMAN. Then I cannot see what the hon. gentleman has to complain of. Surely, with these hours, they are performing their duties. Most of these officers having been appointed years ago are probably Conservatives in politics. But I believe that the public servants of this government are as fine a body as can be found in this or any other country. They are attentive and faithful in the performance of the services for which they are paid. They are intelligent and accommodating, and will grant any favour that is in their power. Why any hon. member of this House should complain of them I cannot understand, unless it is that my hon. friends opposite want to get some of their own friends into office. I am not sure that I am in favour of the Civil Service Commission. If I were a minister of the Crown I would appoint my own officers, and would not want the Civil Service Commission to appoint them for me. I would select them myself, and I would select good ones, and I would have a body of officers that, I am sure, would satisfy even my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid).

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. gentleman (Mr. German) tries to censure me because I did not complain of the hours of the Civil Service when the Conservatives were in power. I was then, of course, a new member. In the remarks I made I was not censuring this government in particular, Even though the hours are the same now as when the Conservatives were in power, is that any reason why, if I should think the hours should be longer so as to reduce the number of employees, I should not mention it at this time? The hon. member for Welland states that the deputies, or a few of the leading officials, are in their departments until six o'clock at night. I admit that you can go there at that hour and find, probably, the deputy minister and his secretary, or the minister and his secretary, and perhaps the chief clerk. But 95 per cent of the officials have gone, having left as soon as the clock struck four. If the deputy and private secretary and the minister can work, as I believe many of them do, from nine o'clock until six every day, and probably long after that, why should not the other officials do the same? A clerk in the Civil Service should perform as many hours as he would in any manufacturing concern. I may be wrong in that opinion, but I hold that opinion until I am proven wrong. I contend that the officials here would not be overworked if their hours were from 9 o'clock in the morning until 5 or 5.30 in the afternoon. I believe that such a rule would help the minister and the deputy. When these leaders in the department remain late, they must require papers from the different rooms, and if officials were there they could supply them. And, if the hours were extended, is it not reasonable to expect that fewer clerks would be required to do the work? I am not finding the slightest fault with the members of the Civil Service. I admit that we have a good service; the officers are accommodating and willing to do anything they can to assist one who has to do business with them. All I say is that if the hours were made what seems to me reasonable hours, fewer clerks would be required to do the work. But so long as the law is that the officers can go at four o'clock——

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no law to that effect. The clerks of the Public Works Department do not leave until 4.30.

Mr. J. D. REID. Well, even admitting that it is 4.30 o'clock, it strikes me that that is rather early in the day for the officials to leave. I venture to say that

there are many men in this House who employ large staffs of clerks, and I would like any one of these to say if he makes the hours for his staff from 9 to 4 or 4.30. You will find that, as a rule, the hours are from 8 in the morning till 6 at night, and many of them even come back after six o'clock. I believe that if the departments were open from 9 a.m. to 5 or 5.30, one-third of the civil servants would not be required. I say that without any disrespect to the members of the Civil Service.

Mr. TURRIFF. The hon. member (Mr. J. D. Reid) is not altogether right as to the number of hours civil servants work. I have had some experience in the Department of the Interior. The clerks of that department must be in attendance by 9.30 in the morning. They have to sign a book. At 9.30 a line is drawn and the book is taken into the deputy minister's office and any who arrive after that time are noted as being late. They get an hour and a half, not two hours, for lunch, and they sign the book when they go out and when they return as well. In the Department of the Interior the clerks work until 4.30 p.m. in the summer and during the winter until 5 o'clock. I know that is not the rule in some of the departments, but in the Department of the Interior these are the hours. As pointed out by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) the deputy ministers and many of the chief clerks are at work at 9 a.m. and remain in their office until half past five or six p.m. I agree with some of the remarks that have been made on this subject, that those clerks who reach the office at half past nine o'clock and scarcely get to work before ten, and leave at four in the afternoon, are not doing a proper day's work. I think there ought to be a uniform regulation made by which the hours of service in all the departments at Ottawa should be of the same length, and it would do no harm if they were made to last till five in the afternoon the year round.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It seems to me the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) has put up a few straw men for the sake of knocking them down. I am sure he defended a great many things which have not been attacked. The hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) spoke of appointing fewer men and giving them longer hours. I have felt ever since I have been a member of this House, while not wishing by any means to ask anything unreasonable from the civil servants, that the hours they work are too short. Whatever the law may be, it is the practice that we have to deal with; and the practice is, notwithstanding the remarks of my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), that the great proportion of the civil servants leave their offices at four o'clock in the afternoon. I may mention an illustration that came to my notice yesterday, showing the effect of short hours. A young man told me that he was formerly in the Civil Service and I asked him why he left it. One reason he gave me was this: he said, because, when my duties are over at four o'clock in the afternoon, I have too much time on my hands. I believe there is a good deal in that. The young man and the young woman who get out at four o'clock have too much time for mischief.

Mr. SPROULE. In view of the observations of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) I wish to say that I neither intended to, nor did I reflect in any way on the civil servants. I do not hold them responsible for this arrangement, because I understood it was made by the deputy ministers in concurrence with the ministers, that a proportion of the employees should go away between 12 and 1 for lunch, and another portion between 1 and 2. I do not blame them at all, nor do I insinuate that they were wanting in intelligence, in courtesy or in diligence. I said nothing about that at all, because I found them to be the reverse, in my experience. I was speaking about the inconvenience of the present system.

Mr. McGIVERIN. I would like to say a few words on this subject, as one who for many years has had a good deal to do with the various departments of the government. I am glad to hear my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) speaking for the Interior Department. In my experience, while the hours named have been from 9.30 to 4.30, if you enter a department at any time before 6 o'clock, you will find in it a number of clerks still at work. While it may be said that from 9.30 to 4.30 are not long hours, it will be found throughout the country generally, if you take the practice in insurance companies, banking concerns, and others of a like nature, that the hours are no longer than from 9 until 4 o'clock, and in many cases until 3 o'clock. In my experience I have never known of any inconvenience or delay occurring in the different departments by reason of the hours of work ceasing at 4.30 in the afternoon. If there was work to be done after that hour, it was always done by a senior official or by a junior official. While a good deal has been said throughout the country about the duties of the civil servants, and some fun has been made of their short hours, I want to say now that this opinion is altogether unfounded. As I said the other day, any one acquainted with the different departments and the work as done in them will find, if he takes the trouble to ascertain, that the work is thoroughly well done during the present hours. We must not forget that long hours do not necessarily mean good work. When the work is being done as

satisfactorily as it is at present, I do not think the civil servants deserve some of the criticism that has been levelled against them.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Nobody has said the work was not well done.

Mr. J. D. REID. I was glad to hear the honourable the junior member for Ottawa (Mr. McGiverin). I did not know that he had so much experience with the departments as to know how the work was being done. This is the first time I have heard that he was inspecting the departments to see what work was being done. We have never heard any of the ministers get up and make a statement such as we have just heard from the member for Ottawa, namely, that he knew that all the work was done at 4 o'clock or 4.30, and that if it was not, the officials stayed there longer. Now, I have it from an official, a gentleman who was high up in one of the departments, that the clerks do not get there until just before 9.30 in the morning, and at 4 o'clock in the afternoon 95 per cent of them walk out the minute the clock strikes 4, whether the work is done or not. If it is not done, they leave it until the next morning. This gentleman was high up in the department, he gave me this version of the case, and I would prefer to accept his opinion to the opinion of the hon. member. The hon. gentleman suggests that in banks and other institutions the clerks do not work any longer. But it is a well known fact that when a bank closes at 3 o'clock in the afternoon the clerks have to remain at least two hours afterwards to balance up their books, to write letters, and get things into shape. They go to work before 9 o'clock in the morning, and I have heard from managers of banks that it takes them two hours after the bank closes to finish up their work. They have only one hour for lunch. The hon. member for Assiniboia says that the hours in the departments are from 9.30 in the morning. They work for two hours and a half until 12 o'clock, then they have an hour and a half until 1.30 for lunch, then they work until 4.30 in the afternoon.

Mr. TURRIFF. In summer, till 5 in the winter.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is five hours and a half a day. Will any man in the Dominion contend that five hours and a half is a day's work for any man in an office? The hon. member for Welland knows well enough, because I believe he is interested in some manufacturing industries, that if the clerks were not there at 8 o'clock in the morning and did not work till 6, he would dismiss them promptly. Here in Ottawa I think myself that the officials should commence at 9 o'clock and work till 5 or 5.30. I am not blaming this government any more than their predecessors. It has been the rule probably ever since confederation. I claim that if the government would make the hours from 9 a.m. to 5.30 p.m. they would not require as many officials. People arriving here at 3.30 or 4 o'clock in the afternoon would be able to get work done and return home on the night trains. They cannot do this now on account of the short hours of the service.

Item allowed to stand.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The discussion recently has not been relevant to the question which is the Civil Service Commission; they have no power whatever over the hours of the Civil Service.

Mr. C. A. WILSON (Laval). Are we to understand that the Commissioners have jurisdiction over or anything to do with the discipline of the employees of this House or are they simply appointed to ascertain the qualifications of the different candidates who apply for the Civil Service? Then what is understood by the distinction between the inside and the outside service? Are the officials of the Customs Department or the Militia or Public Works Department in Montreal or Toronto paid out of the appropriation for the inside service?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. C. A. WILSON. What about the discipline then?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have suggested that this item stand. A good deal of information has been asked for and can be given next time.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Before we leave the vote for Civil Government, would the Prime Minister explain whether the bringing in of the outside service to the inside service will account for the increase from $2,061,000 to $3,933,000? If you add to that the increase from $347,000, the increase being granted to the Civil Service you considerably more than double the amount of money that was given to them in 1908-9.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The outside service in Ottawa has been taken into the inside service and the salaries are now voted by parliament, whereas formerly they were voted in a lump sum in many departments. It is only a transferring of figures.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would that be sufficient to double the amount?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is my impression, but I will have it looked into.

Governor General's secretary's office, salaries $20,125.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the increase there?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is in consequence of the Act of last year. The only

large increase is that given to Sir John Hanbury-Williams. The intention was to bring his salary to the rank of subdivision A.

Mr. SPROULE. Would all that increase of nearly $9,000 be taken up by the increases of the three names mentioned here?

Mr. PATERSON. Five are brought in from the outside service.

Mr. SPROULE. What are the names ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will get them later on.

Charges of management $303,200.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The only increases are from the outside service.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. How do you make the large decrease?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot answer that.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a decrease of $16,250.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. I presume the explanation is that the $24,000 put in last year for the printing of Dominion notes is not in this year. Against that there are some increases amounting to some $8,000 altogether. One is an increase in the amount for the removal of foreign coin from circulation and about $2,000 in salaries at Charlottetown, Winnipeg and Halifax.

Mr. AMES. There is an item, 'Commission for payment of interest on public debt, purchase of sinking funds.' To whom is that commission paid?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot give the explanation to my hon. friend this evening; I shall give it to-morrow.

Mr. AMES. Do I understand the First Minister will give a statement on that to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Carried.

Mr. HENDERSON. We have asked the item to stand on the promise of the First Minister that he would give us an explanation. We want to know all about this commission before the item passes. We do not expect that the right hon. gentleman would be in a position to answer the question to-night but the item should stand until we get the information.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My understanding was that the item should pass on the promise that I would give the explanation to-morrow.

Mr. HENDERSON. My experience in this House is that when we let items go in this way they are never called again and we never get the explanation. The surest way is to allow it to stand.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Very good.

Mr. HENDERSON. That will be the rule for this session.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Oh, not this session ; just this time.

Item allowed to stand.

Some resolutions reported.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business does the government purpose taking up to-morrow ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The resolution of Mr. Fisher about the Civil Service ; then the estimates.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, February 2, 1909.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

COMMISSION TO BANK OF MONTREAL.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I promised yesterday to my hon. friend from St. Antoine Division of Montreal that I would give him an explanation of the item in the estimates 'Commission for payment of interest on public debt and purchase of Sinking Funds.' The explanation is this. The amount is payable to the Bank of Montreal Financial Agents of the Dominion under agreement entered into by Order in Council of the 7th November 1892, and the 11th November, 1902. Under this agreement the Bank receives for the management of loan, including payment of interest and dividends, transfer and inscription of stock, investments for and management of the Sinking Fund (except brokerages and stamp duties, £150 per £1,000,000 per annum). With regard to the brokerage it is just the amount of commission to be paid by the trustees for the investment of securities for the Sinking Fund.

Another hon. gentleman opposite asked me the amount charged in the office of the High Commissioner for payment of the income tax. The income tax is paid by the High Commissioner, and the amount last year was $685.83. The item will be found in the Auditor General's Report, Volume I, under letter G. I hope my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) will revise his bad opinion of the government and realize that we are true to our word.

THE RESTAURANT COMMITTEE.

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) moved that the second and final report of the joint restaurant committee be adopted.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What are the functions of the committee?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are set out in the report which was made by the joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons, and which was appointed last session. The motion is that their report be adopted, and that these four gentlemen be appointed members of the joint committee. Their duties will be to take charge of the operations of the restaurant, and will be those of the ordinary club committee.

Mr. FOSTER. The House would like to have a little information as to these operations. What is it that is going to be established and how is it going to be paid for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall have to get the report of the committee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the report been printed ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think not. It was submitted by Mr. Sutherland, and he asked me to make this motion. I regret that Mr. Sutherland is not here as he presented the report, and was on the joint committee of last year when he was Speaker of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is no very urgent haste in the matter. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will take some means of having that report made available to members in printed or some other form. I appreciate very much what has been done in connection with the placing of the restaurant on a better basis, but at the same time it would be well to know what we are doing before taking these steps.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the report been printed in the Votes and Proceedings ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, a few days ago.

Motion withdrawn.

BY-ELECTIONS CARLETON AND COMOX-ATLIN.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yesterday my hon. friend asked me if the writ had been issued for the Comox-Atlin election.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And Carleton.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The writ was issued yesterday for Comox-Atlin, and will be issued to-day for Carleton. The nominations will take place on the 22nd of February. Mr. Tierney is the returning officer.

THE MARINE DEPARTMENT INVESTIGATION

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When will the balance of the evidence taken before Mr. Justice Cassels be printed. There is a very considerable amount of evidence yet to be printed, and it would expedite business if it were placed before the House at an early date so that we might come to a conclusion whether a debate is necessary.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State). When a similar inquiry was made a short time ago, I sent to the Printing Bureau and found that the work was in progress and that considerable time was involved in getting the remaining volumes printed. I have asked for a definite statement to-night as to the time it will take to complete them and will try and have definite information for to-morrow.

THE INTERNATIONAL WATERWAYS TREATY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there any further information as to when we may expect to have presented to the House the terms of the recent treaty with the United States regulating the waterways ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say I have no information to give to my hon. friend; but I am in daily expectation of receiving a despatch on that subject which I will be glad to communicate to him.

Mr. FOSTER. Turning to page 74 of the Votes and Proceedings, I find the information is chiefly remarkable for what it does not give. We shall have to have something more than a line or two stating that we have appointed a committee in the interim. What the House would like is some knowledge of what it is proposed to do, how it is proposed to do it, and what is to be the outcome.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will endeavour to get the information.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 8) to amend the Dominion Lands Act.—Mr. Oliver.

CIVIL SERVICE SALARIES.

On the order for House again in committee on the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council, upon the recommendation of the head of a department based upon a report of the deputy head, may grant to any officer, clerk or employee under the deputy heads in the inside service as defined by the Civil Service Amendment Act, 1908, who was in the public service at the time of the coming into force of that Act, an increase of salary of $150 a year, subject to the provisions hereinafter contained: that in the case of any officer,

clerk or employee who has received an increase of salary upon organization and classification under the said Act, such increase shall be offset against the increase which such person might otherwise receive under any Act to be founded on this resolution; that no increase under any Act to be founded on this resolution to any officer, clerk or employee shall exceed the difference between his present salary and the maximum salary of the subdivision in which he has been placed upon organization and classification under the said Act of 1908; that all increases provided for hereunder shall take effect from the first day of September, 1908; that all sums of money voted by the parliament for the financial year ending on March 31, 1909, and applicable to the payment of salaries or increase of salaries of persons in the inside service shall be applicable to the payment of increases of salary granted under the Act to be founded in this resolution, so far as such sums are not required for the specific purposes for which they were granted; and during the said financial year there may be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada such moneys required for the payment of increases of salary hereunder as have not been voted by parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Speaker leaves the Chair, I would like to ask the minister a question. I have in my hands a classification of people in the inside service, by Order in Council, 25th of January, 1909, as on the 1st of September, 1908. I find a long list of names with the divisions, and evidently the positions of the different persons, with former salary and proposed salary. Is that all that is contained in the order in council respecting a reclassification of the departments?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). So far as I know, it is. I have not looked at this, but I think it is an exact transcription of the order in council. Possibly with slight exceptions, that is all. There may be others. In one case, the Justice Department says, a certain gentleman who had been in the outside service in receipt of $3,000 a year, must go into subdivision A of the first division. that seems to be absolute under the law. That is an office which, when it ceases to be occupied by the present incumbent, I think ought to be in subdivision B of the first division, and I directed that an addendum should be made to the order in council declaring that. There may be others, I do not know.

House went into committee on the resolution.

Mr. FOSTER. I find a great deal of difficulty in proceeding with this resolution at the present time, on account of lack of information, and I will frankly explain to my hon. friend where I find the difficulty. This makes provision for adding $150 to each member of the Civil Service who, since the 1st of September, has been upon the establishment books, as I understand it, and who has not, having been at the head of the class, received already an increase by virtue of classification—that is in brief. Well, of course I dissent from the principle of making a flat increase without any discrimination as to merit or services. But let that go for the moment. There are other difficulties. For instance, suppose that a gentleman or lady has been appointed to the service on, we will say, the 29th of August; is that person to get the $150 flat increase as well? That is one question which may do for a time. Again, suppose that on or about that time, or not long before, some person in the department received an increase of $100, $200, $300, $400, $500, and then on the next day, the 1st of September, went into the new classification in his proper place; does that person also get the $150 increase? That stands for another type. Suppose another instance. Suppose that some one who was on the contingency list in one of the departments of the inside service at a very small salary, has desired to get into the classified service at a larger salary, and thereupon resigned his position in the inside service and was appointed a few days before the 1st of September to a position in the inside service at an increased salary, and was then transferred from the outside into the inside service after the 1st day of September; does that person also get an increase? Also, how many of these different categories are there? Unless we get a straight statement from the minister that none of these three classes, or at least neither of the two classes I mentioned last, are to receive $150 increase under this resolution, I do not know that we are in a position to go on with this Bill. We may be doing a great injustice to certain persons. That information I have asked for by way of question, and by way of a resolution which has already passed the House. It is impossible in a few days to bring this down; but none of these returns with this information ought to take more than two or three days to be put into shape so that we can have it before the House. I do not like to decide a question like this, with so much involved, on the basis of so little information. I am not trying to block the resolution or the legislation, but it will take a little time any way.

Mr. FISHER. In reply to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), I recognize the importance of the information for which he has asked, and I think it is quite right that the hon. member and the House should have that information. It will take a few days to get it, perhaps a week, I do not know until I get at it. But I may say now in general terms that the resolution provides for dealing with the service as on the 1st of September. Whether the individual may have been in the position which he occupied on the 1st of

September, one week, or one year, or ten years, there is no provision in this Bill and no intention to go back of the 1st of September. I may say to my hon. friend that I do not wish to enter into the merits of the various questions he has brought up until the information he has asked for is before the House. But I will just say in general terms that after considerable discussion and investigation it was decided to make this Bill a complement of the Bill of last year. That Bill made a change in the Civil Service to take place on the 1st of September; we believe therefore that this Bill should deal with the Civil Service as on the 1st of September. I dare say that there may be a few instances, I could not tell how many, where people may have come into the service, we will say, within a month of the 1st of September; there may be others where they came in within three months, others within a longer time. We did not consider that any other date than the 1st of September would be as proper, or on the whole as just, a date to take. And if we undertook to deal with it at all, we had to fix a date, arbitrarily—if my hon. friend chooses to use that term—for the Act to begin to apply. I think I have answered almost all the suggestions that the hon. gentleman has made of contingencies that might arise. I do not mean to say that this Act is going to give absolutely the same treatment to everybody in the service. I think that every Act that is framed must necessarily have some slight inequalities in its incidence upon individual members of the service. We have discussed the various ways of doing it, and have concluded that this is, perhaps, the manner in which the least inequality will arise, and one which is just and fair. If my hon. friend desires it, I can only ask that the committee wait before concluding this matter. But I would suggest to my hon. friend, and other hon. members, that if there are other points on which they would like to have information, they might make them known now, so that I could be prepared to give all the information desired when the matter is taken up for discussion again.

Mr. FOSTER. That is perfectly right. So far as I am concerned, I have gone over the matter carefully, and have put the points on which I wished information, and other members can do the same. There is one other point that I would call to the attention of the minister. He proposes to take general power to withdraw from the consolidated revenue fund whatever is required for the payment of these salaries without taking any special vote. I would deprecate that. Last year, when the House passed the Civil Service Bill and passed the estimates also, the session was about to close. It was absolutely impossible, at that time, to tell how much money would be required for the purposes of this Act. Therefore, we gave general power to the government to take from the consolidated revenue fund whatever might be necessary for the purposes of the Act. But you are in a different position now. The session is only beginning, and you are not face to face with an unknown computation, but can find out exactly what you will need. Therefore, instead of trying to avail itself of this general power, which should only be given in an emergency, the government should bring down an estimate of what is necessary to pay the Bill and have that estimate passed by the House. The minister, I am sure, quite understands that he had better have as few of these anomalies and exceptions as possible, especially in relation to the appropriation of money.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister be good enough to bring down a statement showing the number of employees brought in from the outside service and placed on the staff under this Act? My reason for asking is to be found in the figures of the estimates. In 1908, the Civil Government estimates amounted to something over $2,060,000. This year the amount is over $3,960,000. In addition, there will be this $347,000 granted to the civil servants under this proposal for a flat increase of $150 each. It is very confusing when you look over the different departments, and have no means of knowing the number of men brought in under this arrangement.

Mr. FISHER. I should be glad to bring that information down.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister object to having the names given as well?

Mr. FISHER. No objection.

Mr. TURRIFF. Has the government come to any conclusion or worked out any plan to put all the service on an equal footing? At present it is most unsatisfactory. One department lets its clerks out at four o'clock, and in the adjoining office the clerks work until five o'clock. This has been a source of annoyance in the service for many years past. We are now granting an annual increase to the civil servants amounting to nearly half a million dollars. I do not object to that; I wish to see the civil servants well paid. But when we are doing this, I think it is up to this House to see that the country gets something in return for this large increase. That can be brought about without doing any injustice to any of the civil servants. I claim that the civil servants who go to work at 9.30 a.m.,—and in some of the departments they go at ten o'clock, for I meet them as I am coming up town—and leave at four o'clock, with an hour and a half in the middle of the day, are not giving an honest day's work, and are not giving value for the money we are paying them. I think the service should be put on an equal footing. And, in view of the increased salary we are giving,

if the government insisted that the civil servants should be in their offices at nine o'clock, and work until five in the afternoon, with an hour and a half off in the middle of the day, that would not be asking too much. And I want to tell the House that the best officers in the different departments are doing that to-day. The best officers are at work at nine o'clock in the morning, and stay there until five, and many of them until half past five or six o'clock, and even come back in the evening if necessary. Those who do the least while there are those who come the latest and leave the earliest. This is a matter that others beside the civil servants are interested in. The whole country is interested, for the country pays the salaries. I would like to have some answer from the minister as to what the government propose to do in that connection.

Mr. J. D. REID. I am most agreeably surprised at the speech of the hon. member (Mr. Turriff). Yesterday, he had quite a different speech——

Mr. TURRIFF. Not at all.

Mr. J. D. REID. Yes, the hon. gentleman then was quite satisfied that the civil servants should go to work at ten o'clock.

Mr. TURRIFF. No.

Mr. J. D. REID. The speech that the hon. gentleman made——

Mr. TURRIFF. Read it.

Mr. J. D. REID. It was in opposition to the speech that I made. But if he had taken my speech of yesterday, and read it here, he would have seen almost word for word what he has said now. Evidently, he has changed his mind——

Mr. TURRIFF. Not at all.

Mr. J. D. REID. Certainly. Yesterday he was proving that some of the civil servants stayed as long as half past four, and that was an awful hardship——

Mr. TURRIFF. No, no.

Mr. J. D. REID. Certainly, he——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Reid) to the fact that he is referring to a past debate, which is out of order.

Mr. J. D. REID. I accept your correction, Mr. Chairman. So far as that is concerned, in the remarks I made yesterday——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Mr. J. D. REID. Can't I refer to my own speech ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is a past debate.

Mr. TURRIFF.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then, I withdraw that also. For my part, I do not wish to find any fault with the civil servants, for I believe they are good men ; but I agree with what the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has said that to have the Civil Service go to work at 9.30 in the morning—and many of them seem to go at any time between 9.30 and ten—and work until four, with an intermission of an hour and a half in the middle of the day, is not enough. That is only five hours of actual work, and I claim that eight hours would not be an unreasonable time for these men to work. If they went on at nine and quit at five, as I believe they should, it would only be seven hours work, giving them one hour for lunch, as they have in banks and other institutions. In fact, I believe that in banks and other business houses some of the clerks do not even have as long a time as that for lunch. These men not having heavy work or brain work of a sufficiently arduous character to require shorter hours, should put in a reasonable number of hours' work and I agree with what the hon. gentleman has just said that there should be a Bill or some understanding whereby government employees should work a uniform number of hours. If the government do not bring it in I hope some other hon. gentleman will and if he does I shall support it.

Mr. FISHER. The practice is a little different in different departments. I am not prepared to say off hand what it is, but I think the Civil Service Act contains a clause dealing with the hours of work. If not there is a rule laid down under the Act. But I know that the practice is slightly different in different departments. I appreciate the difficulties which arise from that. In my own department some of the officers stayed a little longer than others, it created a great deal of ill-feeling and jealousy and I was obliged to ask my deputy minister to arrange that they should all come in and leave at the same hour. I think there are very few civil servants who do not reach their offices at 9.30, the usual hour at which they are required to be there. There is a book kept in which they have to enter their names with the minute at which they arrive, and the officers who are in charge of the different branches would certainly take to task any civil servant who was frequently arriving after the hour at which he was required to be there. I believe there are rare exceptions—not as many as my hon. friend would indicate. The hours are usually from 9.30 until 4 o'clock, with an hour or an hour and a quarter for lunch. I think in some departments an hour is allowed, and in others an hour and a quarter. I do not know of any department in which an hour and a half is allowed, but I am speaking subject to correction.

Mr. FOSTER. That makes a six hour day.

Mr. FISHER. Practically a six hour day, and I think that is the general rule. The question of adding to that, in consequence of the increase in salary now, is one that is worthy of consideration, but it has not been embodied in this resolution, and I doubt the advisability of it. If it were adopted it ought to be by way of an amendment to the Civil Service Act. This resolution is not an amendment to the Civil Service Act. This resolution provides for the introduction of a Bill for one particular thing, and when that one particular thing has been carried out this ceases practically to operate. I did not think it was wise that it should be an amendment to the Civil Service Act because it is of a temporary character and the Civil Service Act is a law which deals with and regulates the Civil Service permanently.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. Does it fix the hours?

Mr. FISHER. I do not know whether the Act actually fixes the hours or not. I am not sure; I would have to look it up to see. If it does not, I do not quite know how it is that the hours are fixed. They can be fixed, I suppose, by ministerial orders in the different departments themselves. It would be very much better that they should be uniform, and that they should be fixed in such a way that they would be definite.

Mr. BARR. It does seem to me that hon. gentlemen in this House must come to the conclusion that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) is wrong in his understanding as to the hours of work of the members of the Civil Service. In visiting the different branches of the service we find it difficult to do business because of the non-arrival of members of the Civil Service, and I do think that they should be in their places during the time the House is sitting. We do know that hon. gentlemen are worked very much harder than the civil servants. We also know that their time is very much engaged and that unless they have an opportunity of doing their business in connection with the different departments before ten or half past ten, their business is interfered with. Committees meet at ten o'clock and we have no other time in which to visit the departments. It is the exception to find these men in their places at half past nine. I would suggest that the rule should be that they should be in their places during the time that the House is sitting and that they should arrive at their offices at nine o'clock. I do not believe it possible that there is a a tab kept upon them. It seems that many of the junior officials come and go just as they choose. I am informed that while there is a rule regarding the hours of attendance in some cases, in many instances there is no rule and that many officials have almost a free hand. I do not think that any business man could do business as it is done in our departments. As far as the deputies and heads of the departments are concerned they are conscientious men and do their work properly, but I think that many of the subordinates are not fulfilling the duties of their positions as they would be compelled to do in a bank, or in the commercial world. I think that the servants of the people should attend to their duties just as regularly and as punctually as men are required to do in any other walk of life. I do not think that civil servants are underpaid. I think that the outside service have much more work to do and much greater responsibility than the inside service. The whole system should be carefully looked into and a better system devised.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I would like to ask the minister a question that I have asked of several of the older members of this House and to which I have been unable to get a satisfactory answer. I would like to know who comprise the inside service and who the outside service?

Mr. FISHER. I would not like to answer off hand. If my hon friend will read the section of the Act covering that point I think he will see. I could not, off hand, do anything but read the definition in the Act.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would like to ask the minister if there are any civil servants in Ottawa who were not brought in under the Civil Service Act of last year?

Mr. FISHER. There are in the city of Ottawa the departmental services and also some services which pertain to Ottawa just as similar services pertain to Toronto, Montreal, Winnipeg or any other city. The employees of the Ottawa Customs house and the local office of the Inland Revenue Department, for instance, were not brought into the inside service by last year's Bill, but are still in the same position as similar officials in Montreal or Toronto. It is only the departmental services that were brought into the inside service under the Bill of last session. A large number of people were paid out of lump votes of one kind and another in the city of Ottawa in the service and these were all brought in.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister be good enough to bring in a statement of the number of those in Ottawa who were brought from the outside service into the inside service ?

Mr. FISHER. Certainly.

Mr. LEWIS. I would urge the minister to add to the list of those who will receive this increase the railway mail clerks

throughout Canada. They are men who loyally perform their duty and who live a hazardous life; they belong to that department which has a surplus, and I do not think there are any harder worked men in the Civil Service of Canada than the railway mail clerks.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the committee rises, I would ask whether or not the return just handed to us embodies all the conditions of the various orders in council establishing the reorganization of the different departments ?

Mr. FISHER. As far as I know it does; I have not seen the return myself. The instructions were that the orders in council for the reorganization of the departments should all be included. I understand that the Interior Department order is not there as it was not completed. There will have to be also two resolutions of the Senate and of the House of Commons.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand that. The statute of last year, section 8, subsection 2, made the following provision:

The order in council shall give the names of the several branches of the department, with the number and character of the offices, clerkships and other positions in each, and the duties, titles and salaries thereafter to pertain thereto.

The return brought down has four headings, first, a name, second the title, character and duties of office or position, third former salary, fourth proposed salary. Under the heading or 'title, character and duties or post or position' the only thing that I observe is the title of the position which the officer is to fill, and I do not observe anything defining otherwise the character or the duties of the office or position. It seemed to me when we were discussing the matter last year that it would be exceedingly important that the duties of the office should be defined as far as possible. I am not at all insisting that the duties of each officer should be brought down and laid as a return on the table of the House, but I think they ought to be defined in the department, and it seems to me that any order in council dealing with the reorganization of a department which is confined to conferring a title, such as clerk or stenographer or something upon a particular officer and stating whether his salary is the same or greater, is not a compliance with the statute of last year nor does it fulfil one of the principal objects of that statute. I am not so much concerned with the hours of service of the civil servants in Ottawa; in fact I know some institutions where it is absolutely forbidden clerks and employees to do any work after office hours or in the evening for the reason that reasonable hours are given for doing a reasonable amount of work in office hours, and any clerk who is not able to do that reasonable amount of work within these reasonable hours is prima facie considered unfit to continue in the service of the institution. I think reasonable hours of service should be assigned, and should be set out with some particularity in order that every person in the service in Canada may know that by virtue of his position in the Civil Service, certain duties are incumbent on him and he must perform this amount of work in office hours, in ordinary conditions at least. I realize that in time of emergency, for instance, during the session, it may be necessary for clerks to work outside of office hours, possibly in the evenings; but the duties should be defined and every clerk should understand that he has certain things to do within certain hours. I mentioned last evening some matters that had been brought to my attention by men previously in the service who stated to me, as one of the crying needs of the service, some means of inspection. I do not know that these orders provide for inspection, but I think the time of the Civil Service Commission might be employed to some extent in that way either through themselves or others. I know that in most great corporations there is a thorough system of inspection by which the heads of the corporation are able to know from time to time, by the reports of competent people, whether every officer of the corporation is able to perform his duties. I was told by a young man not now in the service that the man next to him when he was in one branch of that particular department, occupied nearly all his time in reading novels during the day without any one to inspect or supervise him; and the man next him was occupied in some other manner of as little advantage to the people of this country who were paying him his salary. The same young man told me of another man in the same department who had worked industriously and indefatigably who had worked after hours night after night and year after year to qualify himself for the duties of his position, who had passed an examination in a certain outside institution which gave him a very high status, and who was working on in the department on a very small salary, having received absolutely no consideration or recognition for the honest, able and indefatigable endeavours which he had made to qualify himself better to serve the people of this country. It is with matters of that kind that it seems to me efforts at reorganization of the departments should be concerned, and I hope that the endeavour of last session to improve the Civil Service of this country will not stop short of some thorough system of inspection such as that employed by some of the great corporations of this country. I trust that my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture will take this into consideration, because I think it is vital and es-

sential to placing the Civil Service on the best possible basis.

Mr. FISHER. I may say to my hon. friend that the Act of last session provided, under certain circumstances, for an inspection and report upon any department by the Civil Service Commissioners. There is not and never has been any provision for regular continuous inspection. I am not prepared to say that that would not be a good thing ; at the same time, I doubt very much the value of it. Such instances as my hon. friend has just adduced are clear evidence that some officials above those described was derelict in his duty. It was the duty of the deputy minister or the chief of the branch in which these persons were employed not to have allowed that kind of thing to go on. I think the responsibilities and duties of the higher officers of the Civil Service would be rather interfered with if any ordinary inspection system were to be adopted; they would perhaps be less inclined to look closely after the details of their administration. I have had opportunities occasionally of administering one or two departments other than my own, and while I have no doubt that while such cases as those mentioned by my hon. friend do occur sometimes, they are rare exceptions to the general rule. As a general rule, the officers of the different departments are kept up to their work by their immediate chiefs, who again are looked after by the deputy minister in a pretty business-like way, though in a large service like this, with upwards of 2,500 employees in Ottawa, a few instances of the kind mentioned may occur, instances which is is hard to overcome. There may be some body who is intolerably lazy or inefficient. and if he were to be dismissed from the service at a time when he could not go on the superannuation list, and after he had been paying into the superannuation fund for a good many years, with perhaps a family dependent upon him, such an action might seem unduly severe. It requires a good deal of determination and perhaps hard heartedness to visit such a man with the just measure which his delinquencies would properly bring down upon his head. But I believe the instances of that kind in the service are rare, and, as a general rule, while the hours are shorter than those in commercial life, and while the salaries are pretty good in comparison, the average civil servant gives a fair return for the salary he is paid; the service is efficient, and the business of the country well carried on. I had an opportunity during the last year of studying closely, in writings at any rate, the systems of the United States and Great Britain, and I venture to say that today the public service of Canada is carried on more economically and more efficiently, in proportion to the number of men employed than the service of either of those two countries.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I cannot concur in the view which my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture has advanced as to the possible results of a system of inspection. Under a system such as is carried out in a bank, when a branch is examined, and it is found that any of the subordinate officials are not performing their duties in a satisfactory way, that fact is set down as a black mark against the chief of that branch whose duty it was to see that the subordinates properly performed their duties. Therefore, a system of inspection, instead of lessening the supervision of the man in charge of the subordinates, ought to increase it.

Mr. HAGGART. As I understand, under the Act the theoretical organization of the departments is left to the deputies themselves; the duties appertaining to each office and the salary attached to it are prescribed. In trying to improve the service, why not adopt the system of inspection that exists in England? Why not also adopt the system of registration that exists there? This will show what every man in every department does every day, and the commission could ascertain whether he has being doing his duty or not. You may have efficient heads of the departments, but unless you have a registration of the duties and the work done by each officer you will always have pets in the department who will do nothing while the others will be doing the work.

Mr. FISHER. I may say that the Act of last session provided for a record of the clerks to be kept. There was nothing of that kind in the former Civil Service Act. The Act of last session did not go perhaps as far as my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) suggests, and I do not for a moment say that what he suggests is going too far; but it did provide for a record of the work of every clerk, so that when his name came up for promotion or increase of salary, that record could be referred to.

Mr. FOSTER. I notice running through the papers the last few days some very strange statements with regard to the system of overcharging civil servants for loans. The statement is made by members of the service and parties outside that the departments are the happy hunting ground of loan sharks, especially on pay days. If that be the case, some deputy head or other officer is very lax. The government buildings should not be allowed to be used for business of that description. No doubt when a civil servant is approached by gentlemen of this kind before his fellow colleagues, such insistent gentlemen can get what they like, especially if the official be a little sensitive. Somebody ought to take this mat-

ter in hand and see that traps are set in these preserves for that kind of poacher.

Mr. FISHER. I quite agree with my hon. friend. Some years ago it came to my knowledge that a certain individual was pursuing some of the clerks in my department and I gave instructions that he was not to be allowed to come in at all. I do not think that the departmental offices are the places for that kind of business. It is private business which ought to be done elsewhere and outside office hours. I have read the accounts in the paper and agree that the thing should be put a stop to; but how to stop it I am not prepared to say. No doubt many of those who are in the clutches of the usurers, if they are usurers, have got there by reason of their extreme weakness or more or less laxness in their conduct.

Mr. HUGHES. They are often unfortunate.

Mr. FISHER. No doubt, but very often their indebtedness is due to gambling and other things they ought not to indulge in. The matter comes within the administration of the criminal law in this province. As I am not a lawyer, I cannot well give an opinion as to how it should be dealt with. But in the public interest the thing ought to be stopped because no man who is in the clutches of an usurer, and is deeply in debt, can do good work for his employer. In this case it is the country which is the employer, and the heads of the departments should do what they can to prevent that kind of work going on inside of their departments.

Mr. SPROULE. The record is not such a one as my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has mentioned. It is simply a record of the efficiency and conduct of the employees. It does not show what work they are doing.

Mr. FISHER. Their efficiency would be gauged by the amount of work they do. If one clerk did only half as much of the same kind of routine work as another, he would be called inefficient and the other efficient.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that a report every three months by the chiefs of the branches to the deputy head on the efficiency and conduct of the employees does not give much information as to the work they do. It does not give any record of what mechanical work they perform.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I hope the hon. minister will not lose sight of what I mentioned, namely, that the orders in council do not seem to prescribe the duties in accordance with what the statute demands.

Progress reported.

Mr. FOSTER.

SUPPLY—C. P. R. NEW STOCK.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). I intend to take up the time of the House for a few minutes in calling attention to a very important matter. Had I thought the House would have gone into Committee of Supply to-day, I would have notified the government of the item I proposed to bring to the attention of the House, and I regret I have not been able to do so. But the subject is one of so much importance to my mind that I hope we shall have further opportunity of discussing it in this House. I read in the last annual report of the Canadian Pacific Railway the following clause:

> To be in a position to provide additional money from this source (issue of stock), if and when necessary, your directors thought it wise to ask the consent of the Governor General in Council to a further increase of ordinary capital stock from $150,000,000 to $200,000,000. This consent has been formally given.

In other words, the Canadian Pacific Railway, the greatest institution in this country, has been given authority, according to the statements of its president, to increase its capital stock from $150,000,000 to $200,000,000. Whether that be so or not, I have only the authority of the president of that company; but in the 'Globe' newspaper of the other day I found this statement:

> Small holders of the Canadian Pacific write to 'The Globe' asking why the company cannot give some information as to the basis upon which the new common stock will be issued. Possibly the best answer is that the company itself must first ask the Canadian Parliament for authority to issue the stock. The Canadian Pacific might not be able to say that it was the business of no outsider what method it used to raise new capital, and at the same time benefit its proprietors. It might be able to say this if there were no Railway Commission to fix freight rates, having regard to the profits earned and capital actually invested. The Railway Commission must take into consideration the rights enjoyed by shareholders as well as the dividend return, when considering the application of shippers for the reduction of freight carrying charges. Nevertheless it would be well to remember that in spite of its wealth the C.P.R. is face to face with a good deal of competition, and to meet this will require all the money the road can secure. If the directors prefer to give the shareholders what is practically a stock dividend, instead of a money bonus, from the land fund for instance, they might very easily justify their position. While its control is here, the great bulk of C.P.R. stock is held abroad, and is in the hands of very important interests. It would be unfortunate if the company was

forced to take any position which the foreign shareholders would consider as unfair to them, as the confidence of European and British investors alone has maintained the premier Canadian stock at a high level, and has been the means of bringing the country itself to the favourable attention of foreign financial centres.

I propose to show to the House that it is of the utmost importance to the people of this country how the capitalization of our railways is increased, and that, for that reason, there ought to be some control of the government over the issue of securities by railway companies. I shall show that the Act for that purpose passed in the State of New York in 1897 has been of the utmost advantage to the people of the State. Can it be shown that the giving to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of power to increase its capital stock from $150,000,000 to $200,000,000 without imposing conditions was of advantage to the public? I contend that it is in the public interest that such new capitalization should be in the form of bonds, and not in the form of stock. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company could borrow on bonds, probably, at 4 per cent, but if it floats stock, it expects to put aside in its net earnings at least 10 per cent to cover the interest on that stock. I propose also to show that, if the company is allowed to issue stock, that stock should be sold to the public at the highest rate it will bring, and all the money realized should be put into the treasury. But the proposition, as I understand it, is that the ancient and discredited example of the American railways should be followed, and that the issue of stock should be of the nature of what is called 'cutting a melon' for the benefit of the stockholders. In other words, this $50,000,000, which would bring, perhaps, 150 on the market—it is quoted at about 175 and has been as high as 200—shall be issued at par, which will have the effect of dividing $25,000,000 taken from the people of Canada among the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that this flotation shall be added to the money on which the shareholders are drawing 7 per cent with prospects of still greater earnings. I contend, therefore, that, especially when a company is as well established as the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, its issue of securities should be in the form or bonds, but, if stock is to be issued, it should be put upon the market for what it will bring, and the money used for the benefit of the road. I totally agree with this idea of 'cutting a melon' representing $25,000,000 for the benefit of the shareholders, and especially do I denounce it in connection with a company like the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which has already been so heavily bonused in money and land, given a great franchise. I learn from the 'Statist' and the 'Economist,' the two leading financial papers of England, that the Canadian Pacific Railway to-day is establishing surplus earnings equal to 10 per cent on its stock. If it is the intention of the company to take that much out of the traffic earnings, I think that charge is altogether unfair. Suppose that the company wants $50,000,000, as the president says it soon will; if it availed itself of the current price of stock, even discounting to-day's quotation by 25 points, it could raise the money by an issue of $37,500,000 of stock. Or, if it issued $50,000,000 of bonds, it could raise the money at 4 per cent, an annual charge of $2,000,000. In the form in which they propose to issue it, this will represent a fixed charge upon the earnings of the road, paid by the people of this country of $5,000,000 a year, or $3,000,000 more than should be paid, and this proposed method of issue capitalized, represents $75,000,000. In other words, this proposal, which some people ignore or say is of no moment, means that the passenger and freight rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway are to be burdened, quite unnecessarily, with a fixed charge to pay interest on $75,000,000. For, no railway maintains itself except out of the charges it makes upon the public, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company proposes to take from the public, by this unfair, improvident and improper flotation, enough to pay the interest on $75,000,000. Only 38 per cent of the net income of the Canadian Pacific Railway is required to pay the interest on its bond issue. Why should not 60 or even 70 per cent of the net income be used to pay interest on bonds? To maintain a proper equilibrium between the stock and bond issues, at least 75 per cent of the net earnings should be devoted to the payment of interest on the bonds. If this issue is allowed, there must be heavy unnecessary traffic charges. It cannot be otherwise. The State of California has made the announcement that because of the improper watering of stock of the railways in that state by Mr. Harriman, the traffic charges have had to be advanced by the amount of $10,000,000 to pay the interest on that water. I have been told that this is no concern of the people. But I contend that it is every concern of the people, for freight charges are based upon fixed charges, interest and dividend charges, and, unless the greatest care is exercised in authorizing these flotations the public will suffer. To show that the public have suffered, I think I can say with perfect fairness that the financial troubles of the last few years in the United States have been largely due to the over-capitalization of corporations, and especially railway corporations. Dividends have to be paid on all this water, and the money has to come out of the people.

To show that the American people are not neglectful of the situation, I wish to

point out that in 1897 the state of New York, perhaps following the good example of Canada, established a railway commission, which to my mind is the finest piece of legislation I know of in New York state. I also wish to say that we have in Canada an excellent Railway Commission, and my object mainly here to-day is to see that the government put into their railway law the legislation which has been put into the law of the State of New York governing these things. I will read the provision in the New York law. Section 55 of the Public Service Commissions Act reads as follows:

A common carrier——

For instance the Canadian Pacific Railway corporation.

——or street railroad corporation organized or existing, or hereafter incorporated, under or by virtue of the laws of the State of New York, may issue stocks, bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness payable at periods of more than twelve months after the date thereof, when necessary for the acquisition of property, the construction, completion, extension or improvement of its facilities, or for the improvement or maintenance of its service or for the discharge or lawful refunding of its obligations, provided and not otherwise that there should have been secured from the proper commission an order authorizing such issue, and the amount thereof and stating that, in the opinion of the commission, the use of the capital to be secured by the issue of such stock, bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness is reasonably required for the said purposes of the corporation, for the purpose of enabling it to determine whether it should issue such an order, the commission should make inquiry or investigation, hold such hearings and examine such witnesses, books, papers, documents or contracts as it may deem of importance in enabling it to reach a determination.

Now that I contend should be our law. The Governor in Council, when this $50,000,000 was authorized, if it has been authorized, should have exercised some discretion and probably would, if we had it in our law. My chief object in bringing this matter before the House to-day is to urge upon the government the insertion of a clause in the Railway Commission Act of Canada which will give the Railway Commission authority to control all such issues, and that the railways, before they can get such authority, shall be obliged to establish that it is in the public interest that the authority be given. Though that Act was only passed in the United States in 1897, and the commission was organized less than 18 months ago, they have had before them up to the latest date I could get, seven applications for an increase in stock and issue of bonds. It is a very illuminative thing to read the findings of the commission on these various applications. I will read two or three short paragraphs from them. For instance, on an application of a company on April 7, in connection with the Lehigh & Hudson River Railway, and on which decision was given May 7 last, there is this statement, and the commission is living up to it.

It is sufficient for present purposes to call attention to the fact that some obligations may be the proper subject of capitalization and other obligations may not be. One purpose of the Public Service Commissioners Law is to restrain and limit the hitherto irrepressible elasticity of corporate capitalization to the matters which may properly be capitalized, and the same discriminating scrutiny should and will be extended to indebtedness as to other subjects enumerated in that statute.

Now the same sin, and it is a great public and political sin, prevails in Canada today; that sin is the hitherto irrepressible elasticity of corporate capitalization, it must be restrained, it must be limited, it must be directed in channels which will make the least charge on the railway, and therefore on the public. It has got so bad in the United States, as I said before, that the financial panic we have heard so much of is said to be due to this extensive and improper capitalization People say that Roosevelt is the man who brought on the panic in the United States. I say that the panic in the United States is largely due to this over-capitalization that has taken place there; and it will disarrange our finances here and it will make our railway charges here exorbitant if we do not check it. I say the time has arrived when we ought to check it in this country. Here is another deliverance of the Railway Commission in New York:

In other words our order should not operate to increase the interest charges upon this property by one per cent or any per cent for the next sixteen years without some corresponding increase in the company's assets in property or in cash to be devoted to the construction and improvement covered by the case under consideration. Indeed it may be questioned whether a present low interest bearing bond should be permitted to be retired by a bond bearing higher interest in any event when the present bond would run a reasonable period before maturity.

The Railway Commission in the United States says that a railroad company should not even be allowed to substitute a bond of a high rate for one of a lower rate, because it knows that every such increase of that kind is to the detriment of the people and must end in the increase of freight rates. Now, if we are to work out the great object that we had in view in establishing this Railway Commission—and we are working it out, the commission is doing good service in this country every day, and I give the government credit for enforcing that commission fairly and strengthening it in different directions—but if it is to do what we intended it to do, that is, to regulate the

freight charges of this country, it must also do another thing, and regulate the security issues of the companies if it wishes to keep the freight rates at a reasonable figure. If unnecessary capital is issued, or if stock at a high dividend rate is issued where a low interest bearing bond will do, we are simply failing to effect a cure, we are stopping a leak at one end and allowing a leak at the other. My main object to-day is to bring to the attention of the government this statement which is made in the Canadian Pacific Railway annual report, that the authority has already been given, and also to draw the attention of the government to the need of making a provision in the Canadian Railway Act which will give the Commission full power to pass judgment on all the proposed increases of capital and bonds of any railway company in this country. I have heard it argued in this House that it is no concern of the people what the amount of stock issue may be. I say it is of great concern to the people, not only the amount of the issue but the character of the issue; and when a railway is once established, its issue for development and extension purposes ought largely to be confined to bonds instead of stock. I say it will be a scandal, a scandal that no public man can justify, if there is to be perpetrated in a few days, as I believe there will be, the cutting of this 'melon' whereby $50,000,000 of securities are to be issued to the shareholders at par. It is not in the public interest, it is not to the credit of parliament that the law should remain as it is to-day. I ask the government to give the most careful consideration to this state of affairs, and that before this session is over, indeed before this thing can be perpetrated, if the authority has been given, in some way it should be regulated, and that no increase of security shall be allowed until the reasons for that increase, and the nature of the security that is to be issued, shall pass the scrutiny and receive the sanction of the Board of Railway Commissioners of this country.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) who has again shown that he pays particular attention to the way in which large corporations are managed and particularly to the railway problem. The question of the financing of these very large concerns is one that cannot be settled off hand and cannot be managed unless it be by men who have given it a great deal of attention and who, year after year, have profited by the experienced gained. It will go without saying, no matter what any person may think of certain lines of conduct, of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that it is one of the best managed companies in the known world to-day. While we want to maintain our rights as a people there is one condition that we must maintain, and that is that the credit of the undertakings of the Canadian people and on behalf of Canadian people must stand high in the markets of the world. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company has carried out its undertakings in a marvellous degree. When it was first launched there were differences of opinion as to how it should be done no doubt, and honest differences of opinion. They had their difficulties in the beginning, in the carrying out of the construction of the road, and they had their financial questions to grapple with. The parliament of Canada assisted them to an extent that it was thought by the majority, at least, was justified. But, leaving all that aside, up to the present time, the Canadian Pacific management stands out as one of the best in this or any other country. When this company, after years of experience, finds that the interests of the people in one particular portion of the Dominion demand a further extension of railway accommodation, it is their business, it is their duty to the people of Canada to, as far as possible, acquiesce in that request and give the people of the great west the railway accommodation that they are asking for. No person will take any exception to that. The only question that can be raised in connection with it is that we regret that the railway companies are not able to give the accommodation as rapidly as the great needs of the west demand that they should, and it is our duty, not only as a government, but as a parliament, to aid any company as far as we possibly can in the endeavour to bring the markets of the world as close as possible to the doors of the people who have gone into our unsettled country in the western part of Canada. We have spent a large amount of money and we are to-day spending large amounts of money to do that very thing. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company come to the government and ask them to allow them to increase their capital stock. What for?—in order that they may yield to that demand and obtain the capital to build lines into parts of the country that do not now have railway accommodation. The necessity of this, of course, need not be argued for a moment, because every one agrees that it is necessary. But my hon. friend takes exception to the way in which it is done. I may say there is room for argument as to which is the better method; there is no doubt in the world about that. But the government on this occasion followed the examples and lines they have always followed with regard to increases in capital stock. If a company come, make a good case, and state that they want to extend their line for the benefit of the people or to take care of the traffic of the country, we have always given them an opportunity to do it in this way. This

is no new departure. This is the old line of conduct. Whether it is the better way or not is open to argument, and I was glad to hear the remarks of my hon. friend with regard to it. The men who are engaged in large undertakings, in the management and securing of capital, particularly in a time like this, must take into account the difference in cost or interest between issuing new stock and selling bonds. But is there not another difference? Is there not a difference between placing a new mortgage on a property that now exists and extending the sphere of the proprietorship? The stockholders are the proprietors; the bondholders are the holders of what we might commonly call a mortgage on property and there is a difference. It might make a marked difference in the value of the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway and in the credit of the company itself if they were to issue a large amount of bonds at any price in order to raise more funds to extend the lines of the company. We must most certainly, as far as possible, keep intact the credit of the company, and we are part proprietors of the great Canadian Pacific Railway in this country, and the better way to keep their credit intact, the better way to advance it, as far as the effect on the market and the stock is concerned, will be by an issue of stock rather than by another large bond issue. It strikes me that those in the financial world, particularly when the finances of the world are in a sensitive condition, will look at it in that way, and while I admit that it is open for argument, I contend that there is a strong argument from the financial standpoint in favour of an issue of stock rather than another large bond issue. My hon. friend very rightly refers to New York state, but this much must be remembered, that it is a far more difficult thing, ordinarily speaking, to finance an undertaking in a new country where the opportunity for traffic is much less than in a thickly settled country——

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The Canadian Pacific Railway has the best credit in the world.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, because it is managed along the lines I have indicated rather than along the lines that my hon. friend has indicated.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. No, they have issued bonds heretofore, but they have quit doing it.

Mr. GRAHAM. I know. In Canada we have a very small population per mile of railway. No country has as great a mileage of railway per head of population as the Dominion of Canada, but to reverse it, no country in the world to-day has a greater tract of territory per mile of railway than has the Dominion of Canada. We are a very large country with a comparatively small population. New York state has a very dense population, and California has likewise. In the states of the union to which my hon. friend referred the density of population gives the railways a traffic which the Canadian Pacific Railway, or any other road in this country, cannot expect to have for years. In other words, the Canadian Pacific Railway, as well as other railways in Canada, are dealing with what is to be in the future rather than what is at the present time, and it is necessary for them to be given every opportunity by the government and parliament of Canada to retain their financial position which stands high in the world to-day. In granting this extra issue of stock, as I said before, the government have done what they have done before, not in the dark, not in secret, but in the open, prepared to bring down the order in council if necessary and prepared to explain why this has been done. I say again, we think it was the wisest thing to do; it is, of course, open for argument, as my hon. friend has said, but under all the circumstances I would be prepared as head of the Railway Department to do the same thing again, to allow the Canadian Pacific Railway under present circumstances to obtain this money in order to extend its lines into the great Northwest country where they need more railway facilities.

My hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has raised one other important point, that is the question of referring questions of this kind to the Board of Railway Commissioners. There is a good deal to be said in favour of that course, and I promise my hon. friend that I shall give the suggestion the consideration of which it is worthy. There is, however, this further question whether the government that is responsible to the people—more directly responsible in Canada than are the members of the American government who do not have to go to the people for election, while we are constantly in contact with them—should decide on cases of that kind, or whether, they should be referred to the Railway Commission for first consideration, coming to us for final decision. I promise my friend to give the whole question full consideration.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, the question introduced by the hon. member for York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) is one that has been before this House for a great number of years. It was debated again and again in the Railway Committee where Mr. Mulock drew attention to the increased rates to which the people of the country must be subjected by reason of the watering of stock or the increased issue of bonds or stock. The hon. gentleman says that there is legislation in the United States against any issues of this kind. That may

be perfectly right, such matters may be left to the Railway Commission as the Minister of Railways suggests to judge whether it is or is not right that an issue of stock or of preferential securities should be made in a certain way, but the Railway Commission have jurisdiction over all these matters and it is their duty to see that the people who eventually have to pay for these things, pay for only the actual cash which has been invested in the undertaking and do not pay the fancy prices that the railways put on their securities.

What are the facts in reference to the particular thing of which the hon. member complains, an issue of a certain amount of stock, I think $50,000,000 to build 600 or 700 miles of railway in the Northwest ? If that money was to be raised on the undertaking itself it could not be raised on any better terms than it is now being raised. The undertaking of this work lessens the property which the present owners of the Canadian Pacific Railway have—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. No, no.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. It does.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It does.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. It lessens it to the value of the undertaking, and have not the owners of the road a right to take that into consideration in awarding the stock to the new proprietors? But if they do as they do in some places in the United States and may do in Canada, it is the duty of our commission to see that in fixing the rates for these roads the fair consideration shall be the actual amount of cash that has been put into the undertaking. The principal reason for seeking to prevent the watering of stock is the idea that some day or other the country will become possessors of the railways. If the railways were taken over by the state their valuation would not be fixed at all on watered stock but would be fixed as in the case of any other undertaking or corporation on the basis of what it is worth as a going concern at the moment it is taken over. That is the consideration and the only consideration with the government. It may have an effect on some people owing to the fear that the railways will exact higher freight and passenger rates from the people because a price has been given to the stock which does not correspond to the value of the property or, in other words, the security has been watered. But to guard against such a result as that, we have appointed a commission for the purpose of protecting the people of the country in these matters.

In reference to the particular matter at issue, the people of this country desire the building of 600 miles of railway in the Northwest. How are they to get the money? Can they raise it on the undertaking itself?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. On the whole property of the concern.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. You raise it on the whole property. Then have not I, as a stockholder in the Canadian Pacific Railway, a right to consider whether the building of that property would affect the security that I have ? That is the primary consideration and the holders of Canadian Pacific Railway securities have a right to decide upon it. The only consideration worthy the attention of the people of this country is that in the eventuality of the state becoming the possessor of the railways they shall get them at their proper price and value. This is provided for in nearly every Railway Act of the British parliament. I admit to a certain extent with the hon. member for York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) that the tendency of legislation in this country and of ideals throughout the world is that in all matters of transport the people of the country should have control either by ownership, or as we have done here in this country, by the people ruling the railways through a commission in regard to the fixing of rates.

All these attacks upon property are not a benefit or essential to the people of this country.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. It is not an advantage to have these matters discussed on the lines pursued by my hon. friend here.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Oh, oh.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. The proper line is to take a reasonable view of what is necessary in the interest of the country and I think that it is in the interest of the country even on the proposition laid down by my hon. friend. that this legislation should pass.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). There are two things that ought to be taken into consideration when such a proposal is made, either to the Governor in Council or to the Railway Commission. It seems to me that the first question is the money needed and for what purpose ? Is it for the purpose of better accommodating the public or providing some want which up to that time has not been provided ? And the second, if this obligation is to be incurred, how can you best raise the money so that the smaller amount will do as much good as a larger amount raised in some other way. It seems to me that it resolves itself into this. We have given the Canadian Pacific Railway and every other corporation of the kind a large consideration in money and lands to provide services for the public and therefore the country has an interest in this question as well as the Canadian Pa-

cific Railway and we must always have an interest in it.

We did that good service for the public. The public therefore has an interest in it. Now, the public ought to get the benefit of that service by paying the smallest possible rate in the way of freight or passenger charges. Suppose the company wishes to build 400 or 500 miles more road, and require this money. For what purpose do they require it? In the first place they require it in the interest of the public, as the public has demanded the accommodation, and that, I assume, should be fairly taken into consideration by the Governor in Council before they decide whether they will allow the company to sell more stock for the purpose of raising the money. They reach the conclusion that the money is needed in the interest of the public, and that it is proper to give that authority to the company. Then, I think they should consider, how can this service be supplied to the public at the smallest possible outlay? If the sale of $37,500,000 of stock will provide capital enough to supply what is needed, surely there is no justification for selling $50,000,000. Because if $50,000,000 of stock is sold, those who use these roads, either for the transportation of their goods or for travelling, must pay the interest on that $50,000,000. They could get lower rates if they only had to pay fixed charges on $37,500,000. It seems to me that this can be accomplished by putting the stock on the open market and selling it at the highest figures that it will bring. The Americans are doing this. They are compelling some of the companies that come and ask permission to sell stock, to sell it at public auction, realizing that the smallest amount of stock that can be sold for the most money is the best bargain that can be made in the interest of the public. If that is being done in the United States, I do not see why it could not be done in Canada. I have never yet been able to see either the wisdom or the justice of allowing men controlling a public utility, for which we pay large sums of money, to sell stock at 170 or even 150 and put $50 out of every $100 into their own pockets; using it, not to give a better service to the public, but only to increase their own wealth, and imposing upon the public the necessity of paying higher freight and passenger rates in the future.

Mr. THOMAS CHISHOLM (East Huron). I just wish to say that the company could raise all the money it requires to extend its lines if it would sell all its land in the Northwest at a reasonable price. The land has been culled over until a great deal of it is of inferior quality, and the company is asking in some cases as much as $25 an acre for it. It is asking prices which the settlers cannot give, and in this way the company is retarding the progress of the country. Let the company sell the land at a reasonable price, and it can get all the millions that it requires to build all the branch lines needed in that western country.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee of supply.

Department of Inland Revenue — salaries, $87,700.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). This provides merely for the statutory increases and for six men of the outside service who have been brought into the inside.

Mr. SPROULE. The Government has been providing in the new Civil Service Act for increasing the salaries of the civil servants. Do they intend at the same time to keep up the old statutory increase?

Mr. PATERSON. I understand that the increases provided for in the Act will go on.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the minister mean the old statutory increase of $50 a year, to which every civil servant thought himself entitled, or the statutory increase provided for in the new law?

Mr. PATERSON. Under the old law, there is a provision for a statutory increase of $50. That is changed under the new law, and that $50 is included in this amount which we are asking now for next year.

Mr. SPROULE. Then will that statutory increase be continued or replaced by something else. Heretofore there was a very wide difference of opinion as to whether it was automatic or not. For a long time it was considered automatic, but ministers of this government have said that it was contingent on reports made by the deputy minister, and that even then each minister might exercise his judgment. The ex-Postmaster General (Sir Wm. Mulock) contended over and over again that he had no right to give these increases and did not give them for several years.

Mr. PATERSON. As a general rule the increase will be given unless there be some record of want of diligence. In cases where there is such a record it will not be given. But as a rule it will be regularly given until the maximum is reached.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any annual report on each official by the deputy head or only in cases where a report is asked for? If the statutory increase does not act automatically, there ought to be an annual report. If the increase is only given in such cases as the deputy head may recommend, injustice may be done to some official. There ought to be some fixed principle.

Mr. PATERSON. I understand from my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr.

Fisher), who is more familiar with the provisions of the new Act, that a report has to be made by the heads of the different branches every three months to the deputy head. The deputy head reports to the minister and his report also goes to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. T. J. STEWART (Hamilton West). Does the Act provide for a statutory increase of $50 per year to all the Custom house officers in the outside service ?

Mr. PATERSON. It applies to none of them.

Mr. T. W. CROTHERS (West Elgin). How are we to understand the operations of the Act of last year in conjunction with the Act which it is proposed to pass this session ? Here is an individual in the first division, subdivision A, whose salary last year was $2,700. Under the Civil Service Act, the minimum to which he would be entitled would be $2,800 in that division. I understand that $50 is the annual increase to which he will be entitled, beginning the first of September last. I would like to know whether, under the Act contemplated by the resolutions of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, this man will receive an additional sum of $150, making his salary this coming year $3,000, instead of $2,850.

Mr. FISHER. Did my hon. friend cite the case of a clerk at $2,700?

Mr. CROTHERS. His salary for 1908-9 was $2,700. It is proposed now to make it $2,850. I understand he is placed by the Civil Service Act of last session under subdivision A of the first division, of which the minimum salary is $2,800, and that his salary may go up, at an increase of $50 per year, until it reaches $4,000. $50 has been added to the $2,800, making his salary $2,850. My question is whether, under the Act foreshadowed by the resolutions of the Minister of Agriculture, this individual will have this year $150 in addition to the $2,850, making his salary $3,000 instead of $2,850. I understood the right hon. the leader of the government to say yesterday that such was the case.

Mr. FISHER. I do not know the individual case, but this appears to be a man who was in subdivision B of the first division this present fiscal year, because he is getting $2,700, which is $100 below the maximum of that division. Apparently the department intends promoting him to subdivision A of the first division at $2,800. This item is wrong because in the first division the statutory increase is $100 and not $50. However, I am informed that this $50 is for the six months at the rate of $100 increase each year. Therefore, although this gentleman is to be promoted to subdivision A of the first division and will get six months of the statutory increase of $100, he will practically get this fiscal year $2,850. He was in subdivision B of the first division on the first of September at $2,700. Under the resolution, to be eligible to get $150, he would be obliged to stay within his class, so that he would only get $100. Therefore, under the resolution before the House his salary on the first of September will be raised to $2,800 and he will have that until his promotion takes place into subdivision A of the first division, when he will have $2,800, which is the minimum of that division, and then would get his statutory increase of $100 per year in the ordinary course.

Mr. CROTHERS. The question I have asked is whether this particular individual will be entitled to the additional $150?

Mr. FISHER. I said he would get $100 of the $150 on the first of September because he could not go above the maximum of his class until promoted. He would then be promoted and would get the ordinary statutory increase of $100 per year, which is to be provided for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. SPROULE. It does not seem to me that the Act is very clear, or else the explanation of the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Agriculture is wrong. My inquiry was whether the statutory increase was given automatically or whether it was contingent on something else. The answer was that it was contingent on a good report. To ascertain what is meant by that, let us turn to the Act. It is provided that the Civil Service shall be divided into two divisions, namely, the inside service and the outside service. The inside service is defined as consisting—

Of that part of the public service in or under the several departments of the executive government of Canada and of the Auditor General, the Clerk of the Privy Council, and the Governor General's secretary employed at the city of Ottawa, or at the Experimental Farm station or at the Dominion Astronomical observatory near Ottawa, but not including the officers, clerks and employees employed at Ottawa in the second or outside departmental division.

Now, when you turn to the Act to ascertain what record is to be kept of the employees, on which they are to qualify for increase, you find it provided that :

A record of the conduct and efficency of all officers, clerks and employees below the first division shall be kept in each department.

It appears by the first section that I have read that the first division is the inside service. And a record of all below this first division, or inside service, is to be kept. Surely that is not clear.

Mr. FISHER. It seems to me quite clear. Under section 3, there is a clear definition

of what is meant by the inside service and what is meant by the outside service.

Mr. SPROULE. The inside service is the first division.

Mr. FISHER. No, it is the inside service, and the inside service is divided into divisions and subdivisions.

Mr. SPROULE. The Act clearly says 'The Civil Service shall be divided into two divisions,' and the first of these divisions is the inside service. And section 40 provides for a record of conduct and efficiency of officers, clerks and employees below the first division.

Mr. FISHER. That refers to divisions under section 5. If my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) will refer to that section, he will see that it defines the divisions and subdivisions.

Mr. FOSTER. If we are clear about that, let us understand this first case. As I understand it, this clerk comes under the Act in subdivision B and is getting a salary of $2,700.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. He goes into subdivision A, the minimum salary of which is $2,800. That is, he receives an increase of $100 by that promotion. Does that reduce the other increase by $100 ?

Mr. FISHER. The general increase which we are now providing comes into force on September 1. At that date, this officer was in subdivision B at $2,700. Under the resolution which is now before the House, he gets as much off that $150 increase as his position in that subdivision permits—that is, he is not increased beyond the maximum of his sub-division.

Mr. FOSTER. So, he gets $100 ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, because $2,800 is the maximum of the division. Then, apparently, it is the intention of the Minister of Inland Revenue—about which I know nothing—to promote him into subdivision A of the first division, the minimum salary of which is $2,800. Therefore, he will receive that salary on going into the new subdivision.

Mr. FOSTER. He, at that moment, receiving $2,800 ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Or $2,850 ?

Mr. FISHER. No, $2,800. He will be promoted into the other subdivision, the minimum salary of which is the maximum salary of the other. But he will be eligible for the statutory increase, which, in the first division, is $100 a year. And apparently the accountant of the department has provided for that occurring half way through the next fiscal year, and has, therefore, only asked for $50 of the statutory increase instead of $100.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose this holds with all these employees. Now, the regular employees under the old Act were 36 in number ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. And the regular employees—so to call them for convenience sake—in this new schedule are still only 36.

Mr. FISHER. They are given here at 42.

Mr. PATERSON. Six from outside.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, six have been brought in. Now, I would like to analyse that in the case of this department and see where we are. Who are these who are brought in from outside ?

Mr. PATERSON. They were paid out of outside votes.

Mr. FOSTER. What were the names, and what were they getting?

Mr. PATERSON. Lewis is one, he was getting $600; and doing clerical work. Cantin was getting $500. Ekins was doing clerical work, and getting $600. Then there were two messengers, Bourgouin, who is getting $750, and L. Roy, who is getting $500. Then there is provision made for Davidson, another messenger, at $500.

Mr. FOSTER. Provision made for a vacancy is not the addition of an outside man. Here you are taking in a number of outside men.

Mr. PATERSON. We are making provision for the appointment of another.

Mr. FOSTER. You have only transferred five men from the outside, now you want to add an extra man as messenger. How long had these five clerks been in the employ of the department?

Mr. PATERSON. Over a year.

Mr. FOSTER. All of them?

Mr. PATERSON. I would not be sure.

Mr. FOSTER. We would like to be sure. This is a test case of the working out of this aggregation of laws.

Mr. PATERSON. Bourgouin has been on since June, 1903. I will get the rest of the information for the hon. gentleman during the evening.

Mr. FOSTER. I think there is an error in having it six, it should be five; then the one ought to be in the other column. In the next, the laboratory, you had eleven men, who seems all to have been brought in from the outside, and in the chief technical

engineer's branch the same. The same in the weights and measures, the same in the methylated spirits. I would like some information on all these. The minister may think this is calling for a good deal, but this is on a special occasion, and we would like to see how the thing is working out.

Mr. PATERSON. These are brought in under Act of Parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. But how will we know that all sorts of irregularities have not taken place in bringing them in? Now we are putting them where they go on the establishment, where they have a regular status, where they can get all the advantages of the Civil Service Act. We want to know how they got in. We know that when they were in there last they came in through the door of examinations, and were regularly appropriated for. Here you are putting thirty-two new clerks on, and we want to know their status and standing before we translate them to this haven of rest.

Mr. PATERSON. Supposing you knew that, what good would it do? Under the law we are instructed to bring these men into the inside service, and we do that, even if they have only been on six months or three months.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister says he was compelled by law to bring in these six men. There were only five, and they wish to smuggle in another.

Mr. PATERSON. No provision was made for him last year. I will get the information the hon. gentleman asks for. But I will ask the hon. gentleman to note this. Take, for instance, the laboratory branch, where you have eleven men who have been paid out of outside votes. Parliament passed a law that these should be brought into the inside service, and we are simply carrying out the law and bringing them in. Now, does it matter whether these men have been in the outside service fifteen years, or one year, so far as carrying out the law is concerned? Must they not come in, and if so, what will be the value of these particulars the hon. gentleman is asking for?

Mr. FOSTER. What the law says in effect is that the men who have been in bona fide employ in the outside parts of the departments here, should be taken on at the salaries they have had. That may be done in many different ways. I am not saying this is not all proper and straightforward, but the question already put has brought out one fact, that you claim six men and you only had five.

Mr. PATERSON. We have a provision for that.

Mr. FOSTER. You are putting on a new man. In the same way, we would like to know with reference to these others.

Mr. PATERSON. Supposing I admit that this is a fact, that this one should have been put in the other column? No provision was made in the estimates of last year. Still I press my question on the hon. gentleman. I suppose that I could give the particulars with regard to each of these officers of the department. They have been bona fide in the service, but paid for out of the outside votes. Under the reorganization they will be bound to be brought in no matter whether their term of service has been for one, or five, or seven years. Therefore, I was asking the hon. gentleman whether any good purpose would be served by getting these particulars,—I do not object—as to how long each one of these had been in the service. Supposing he had been only a year, we would still have to bring him in under the law.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose he had only been in one day?

Mr. PATERSON. Well, that would be running pretty close.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be running close, but it would be doing more than that; it would be showing a piece of sharp practice on the part of the minister.

Mr. PATERSON. It would depend on whether there was a necessity for the services of the officer when he came in.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, there is no need taking up an hour quarrelling over this. If the minister promises that we shall have the information let him give it to us pleasantly and we will get along all the better.

Mr. PATERSON. Is there any other information you want?

Mr. FOSTER. That is all I see at the present time.

Mr. PATERSON. Shall we pass this item?

Mr. FOSTER. Better get the information.

Mr. PATERSON. Shall we take the next item?

Mr. FOSTER. I imagine we will run up against the same thing with every other minister. I do not believe there is a minister prepared to give the information as to the hundreds and hundreds of men they are putting on the outside list. I propose to ask each minister, and I suppose that when I do each minister will reply that he does not know a blessed thing about it.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think that is quite a fair statement of the case.

Mr. FOSTER. It may not apply to them all.

Mr. FISHER. Personally I would be prepared to give the hon. gentleman that information. There are about 200 of my officers who have been paid out of the lump vote for the outside service but who have been working here in Ottawa and doing exactly the same kind of work as those in the inside service. By the Act of last session these people were all brought in. I confess that I did not have prepared a statement of all these officers and of their duties, but I will have it prepared.

Mr. PATERSON. You will find it in the Civil Service list.

Mr. FISHER. No, I confess that they will not be found in the Civil Service list.

Mr. PATERSON. In my department they will be.

Mr. FISHER. In mine they will not be. They were not in the inside service and they were not in the outside service according to the Act.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, this is a thing which, when it is once done, is done.

Mr. FISHER. I quite agree with that, but I do not think it is quite fair for my hon. friend to intimate that because we have not that information off hand we are trying to force the thing through. Knowing what the hon. gentleman wants I will have the information for him when the items are taken up. Perhaps it would be well to take up these items and discover what information is required and then we can leave them over until that information is obtained.

Mr. PATERSON. What shall we do meanwhile?

Mr. FOSTER. Go on with other government business that is ready.

Mr. PATERSON. We have this ready.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not seem so.

Mr. PATERSON. Is there any information wanted about the Inland Revenue vote?

Mr. FOSTER. Is there anything more than the general vote?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. FOSTER. This is for clerical assistance?

Mr. PATERSON. There is no change whatever. Suppose we go on to outside service of the Inland Revenue Department and see if anything is wanted there.

Mr. FOSTER. If the minister wishes it, although I suppose we will have the real man back here some day. Why not take the minister's own department—Customs?

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. PATERSON. There the same question will arise, I suppose.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, take the outside service.

Mr. PATERSON. The Deputy Minister of the Department of Inland Revenue has been granted leave of absence; I think he is going away on Thursday and I thought that perhaps you would allow his estimates to pass.

Mr. FOSTER. If you take up his estimates we will go through them.

Excise—salaries of officers and inspectors of excise, &c., to provide for increases depending upon the result of excise examinations, $426,-400.05.

Mr. CROTHERS. Would the minister give us the particulars of that?

Mr. PATERSON. There is an increase of $9,277.49. This represents the regular statutory increases.

Mr. BARR. What will be the result if these officers do not pass the excise examinations?

Mr. PATERSON. They will not get promotion unless they pass.

Mr. BARR. Then, of course, the money will remain in the treasury?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. This $9,000 is simply for statutory increases for the present staff? Are there any additions?

Mr. PATERSON. No, I understand not.

Mr. FOSTER. This simply provides for the statutory increases which will come to the different officers after proper examination?

Mr. PATERSON. That is as I understand it.

Mr. J. ARTHURS. (Parry Sound). I find on page 23 that $31,307.93 has been accounted for as for the services of men brought from the outside to the inside service. This increase of $9,277 would apparently be added to that making a total increase of $40,584.93.

Mr. PATERSON. No, that would not be connected with this. This is excise. There are none of the other items apparently in which there are any increases, so that there would not seem to be much room for explantation. It seems to be a very carefully prepared estimate : the vote has been kept down in every item except where it has been increased by statutory increase.

Mr. FOSTER. The increase is not heavy.

Travelling expenses, rent, fuel, stationery, &c., $90,000.

Mr. FOSTER. We would like to have this item divided into its various heads.

Mr. PATERSON. I could not do that off hand.

Item allowed to stand.

Stamps for imported and Canadian tobacco, $85,000.

Mr. PATERSON. Those are the stamps for placing on the tobacco. About that amount of money is required each year.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are those printed?

Mr. PATERSON. In Ottawa under contract.

Mr. FOSTER. What is this item of commissions?

Mr. PATERSON. As I understand the vote for the year before was $70,000 and this was spent within a few hundred dollars, and it is estimated that this year they will require this amount, but they cannot say how much will be left of the $85,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the commission?

Mr. PATERSON. This is the commission paid to collectors of customs for duty collected by them, some $10,000; and a small item of $100 to the postmasters in Quebec who sell these twist tobacco stamps.

Mr. FOSTER. I was counting that commission in as part of the $85,000, but it is a vote by itself. Then I find all that was spent for the stamps was $69,577 in 1907-8.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, that is right.

Mr. FOSTER. What has been spent this year up to the present time?

Mr. PATERSON. We ought to be able to tell that but we cannot tell you how much was spent in the whole year.

Mr. FOSTER. But you can tell how much was spent until now on an estimate. It may be that the tobacco business has grown so that you require $15,000 more for stamps. That would be a pretty rapid growth.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, it is growing. It can be got if the hon. gentleman insists upon it. I will try to have it after recess.

Mr. FOSTER. There is another point. You have a vote of $10,000 to pay collectors. In 1907-8 all you spent was $4,800. How is it that you want a little more than double that this year?

At six o'clock, Committee reported progress, and House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at 8 o'colck.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 23) respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.—Mr. W. McIntyre.

Bill (No. 24) respecting the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company.—Mr. W. McIntyre.

Bill (No. 25) respecting the Joint Section of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, at Fort William, Ontario.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 26) respecting the Kootenay Central Railway Company.—Mr. Geo. Taylor.

Bill (No. 27) to incorporate the London and Lancashire Plate Glass and Indemnity Company of Canada.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill (No. 28) respecting the Union Station and other joint facilities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Midland Railway of Manitoba, at Portage la Prairie.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 29) respecting the Winnipeg and Northwestern Railway Company.—Mr. McCraney.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Stamps for imported and Canadian tobacco, $85,000.

Hon. Wm. PATERSON. (Minister of Customs.) I presume my deputy is getting the information asked for before recess and is not here yet. Could we not pass the In-Inland Revenue items and give the information on other items?

Mr. FOSTER. It is hardly fair to ask the House to pass a million dollars or more just on good will. The minister should have made himself acquainted with his estimates, or should have had the deputy ready.

Mr. PATERSON. I am referring to the item under 'Civil Government.' That is not a million dollars.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister has not the information.

Mr. PATERSON. It will be here.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the minister wants us to pass the estimate and take the information afterwards?

Mr. PATERSON. All I ask is to close up this item 14, and then we will go on with Customs or Justice.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, if the minister has the information about these outside men we will go into that.

Mr. PATERSON. That was all that was asked for, and it will be here.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, let it stand until the information is ready.

Mr. PATERSON. But it keeps so many other items back. And what is the use?

Mr. FOSTER. The minister should have his work ready.

Mr. PATERSON. It was not anticipated that such questions would be asked.

Mr. FOSTER. Any deputy with a head on his shoulders, or any minister in charge of the estimates might have anticipated that such questions would be asked.

Mr. PATERSON. The deputy has a head on his shoulders, and so has the minister, and neither anticipated that—

Mr. FOSTER. Then it is time they did.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Before the item is finally passed, I would like to get some information with regard to this sum of $60,000 to enable the department to supply methylated spirits

Mr. PATERSON. We are proposing to let that stand in the meantime.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Item 94 stands. Resuming item 14, Department of Inland Revenue

Mr. FOSTER. The minister will see that we are up against the same difficulty as in item 294. The minister has not the information, and the deputy is not here. If the minister has any item ready, let us take that up, and wait until the deputy comes. Perhaps the Minister of Customs' own estimates are ready.

Mr. PATERSON. I explained the reason why I wanted to get this through. Of course, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), does not sympathize with it, all right. The deputy has been given leave of absence on account of impaired health, and this is the last night he can be here. I thought it would not be too much that the question asked might be allowed to remain, the information to be supplied by the department.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there nobody who can give the information?

Mr. FOSTER. No, no one ready.

Mr. PATERSON. No one is ready with such information as has been asked for, because nobody anticipated that such information was either necessary or desirable. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) is ready to go on with his estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. If the ministers are not ready, we cannot do business.

Mr. PATERSON. The ministers are ready to answer anything that will serve any good end.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not the minister see that we are doing here what has not been done before within my memory?—We are adding six or seven hundred names to the establishment. Does the minister expect us to pass such votes without asking questions? Why, it is simply absurd. I do not think there is another minister who would ask us to do that.

Mr. PATERSON. This is not a case of six or seven hundred names. In this item, we are adding five names, and these are simply taken in from the outside service. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), asks the names. I do not object to that. But what purpose will such information serve? I ask the hon. gentleman that question. If any saving of money were proposed, or if there were any ground of legitimate criticism, it would be different. But such questions, as I say, were not anticipated. We say we will get the information. Of course, if the hon. gentleman will not allow me to go on, I cannot go on.

Civil government—administration of justice—salaries, $94,648.75.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a large increase here.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). The increase is merely apparent, not real; it is caused by the transfer of the salaries of a number of officials from different portions of the estimates to their present position. Under the amending Civil Service Act, the inspectors of penitentiaries, whose salaries were $3,100, are now called clerks in the first division, subdivision A., and their salaries are provided for in the third item on page 12 under the head 'Administration of Justice'—two clerks at $3,150. Before the statute of last session, that amount of $6,300 would have appeared under the head of 'Penitentiaries.' The increase is only the $50 statutory increase.

Mr. FOSTER. The names are Stewart and Dawson?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Yes, Mr. D. Stewart, and Mr. G. W. Dawson. In the same way, Mr. W. P. Archibald, the Dominion Parole Officer, was receiving a salary of $2,000. He was provided for previously under the head of the Penitentiaries Branch. He becomes a clerk in the first division, subdivision B. The effect is to increase his salary by $100, $2,100 being the figure in that class. That is one case of an actual increase in the Department of Justice under the new classification. There are, I believe, seven such cases altogether in the department.

Mr. FOSTER. How much of a flat increase will he get?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I presume, though I speak without consideration, that he would be entitled to the full amount of the flat increase in addition to his salary. I ought not to make that answer without referring to the terms of the Civil Service Act. It depends whether or not he is at the maximum of his class. Then E. J. Adams, architect, penitentiaries branch, is another

official who was previously provided for under the head of penitentiaries. He now becomes a clerk in the second division of subdivision A, at the same salary as before.

Mr. FOSTER. What is his present salary?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. $1,650, there is no change. He was not classified until this year. He has now been classified in the second division, subdivision A, at the same salary as he had before. These four officers had salaries aggregating $9,850, and that is an apparent increase of that amount in the salaries of the Justice Department, whereas in truth it is merely a transfer in the estimates from one branch of the service to another. Then four clerks, by the operation of the recent statute, have become permanent clerks, whereas they were previously temporary, and provided for under the head of contingencies. These are T. Morris, $800 ; Miss L. M. Pillar, $550 ; a messenger Jobin, $700, and another messenger Hamel, $273.75. These are not cases of increase, but simply of transference from temporary employees to the permanent service.

Mr. FOSTER. What do they get when they come in ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The figures I have given. They are provided for in the items mentioned on page 12, under the head of Administration of Justice.

Mr. FOSTER. It reads there, $637.50 instead of $550.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I am not sure whether the $637.50 item in the printed estimates is intended for Miss Pillar or not. If it is, as is possible, it is the annual increase which she would be entitled to before the end of twelve months, added to this $550.

Mr. FOSTER. The annual increase then would be $87.50. How do you make that out ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Assuming that the $637.50 is intended for Miss Pillar, it would be an increase of $87.50 over the $550 at which she stood on the 1st of September last ; and it is to be accounted for, I suspect, by the circumstance that she is intended to be recommended for a special increase under the statute, $50 in addition to the statutory increase, that is an annual increase on the whole of $100, and this $87.50 would be the fraction of that amount for the portion of the year after the anniversary of her entrance into the service would arrive. Then the two messengers stand at the same figures exactly as they were receiving previously.

Mr. FOSTER. $75 was added.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. One was $273.75 which, with the statutory increase, would now be $323.75. One was $700, and $775 was intended to cover his salary. I do not know any reason for the $75 as distinguished from $50. I am not able at the moment to explain why that is $775.

Mr. FOSTER. One question with reference to the last four, when they were appointed to the service, or if they had been in the service for more than a year.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. They were made permanent on the 1st of September last. When they entered the service I am not able to state without reference to papers that I have not with me. They were all in it when I took charge, and had been for some time. My statement that they were in it when I took charge is, I think, not applicable to the messenger Hamel. He is a boy, who was taken into the service by the deputy a year or more ago. He was there before the 1st of September, I cannot state when he came in. Then a further circumstance accounting for that apparent increase between last year's total vote and this year's, is in the increases which have been attendant upon the new reorganization scheme. Those increases aggregate $900, or $1,000 it will be, because one of the propositions which I had made when the brief from which I am speaking was prepared, has not been carried out.

These increases are, first, Mr. F. H. Gisborne, who, before the classification of last September, was receiving $2,450. He has been graded in the first division, subdivision A, at a salary of $2,800, which, with the statutory increase, would be the $2,875 item in the first division, subdivision A, in the printed estimates. Mr. Gisborne is a barrister who has been a first-class clerk, or chief clerk under the old system in the department for many years. I do not remember exactly when he entered the service, but it was in the time of Sir John Thompson, eighteen or twenty years ago. Then, Mr. Chisholm, another gentleman of whom exactly the same thing can be said, a qualified barrister and discharging very important duties in the way of examining and certifying titles to properties which are bought for government purposes throughout the country, was recommended by me to council for grading in the first division, subdivision A, but that recommendation has not been acted upon and he remains classified in accordance with the salary which he was receiving on the 1st September last; that was a salary of $2,000. He has been graded as in the first division, subdivision B, at a salary of $2,100; so that there will be an increase of $100 to him, an increase of $350 to Mr. Gisborne, $150 to Mr. Coté, who is the registrar of applications for clemency in the case of criminals, and who was receiving $1,950, but who goes into the first division, subdivision B, and so re-

ceives a salary of $2,100. Mr. Narraway, accountant of the department, received $1,900 before last September, he has been graded in subdivision B of the first division and now receives $2,100. He will thereby receive an increase of $200. Miss Asselstine, stenographer, penitentiary branch, was receiving $800 before September; she is classified in subdivision A of the third division at $900, so that she will have an increase of $100. Mr. Archibald, parole officer, who was previously receiving $2,000 is now graded in subdivision B of the first division and will receive $2,100. These increases, by reason of the new classification, aggregate $1,000. Then, the difference between the figure of last year and that of this year is further accounted for by the statutory increases which I have detailed and which aggregate $1,225. Coming to the courts, which are now made branches of the department to the extent of being included in the classification under the new Civil Service Act, we have to some extent, the same thing occurring as in the department proper. There is an increase to Mr. L. W. Coutlee, the assistant reporter.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister take them in the order in which they are given here?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. This is the only increase by reason of the new classification. Following them in the order in which they are given here, the first item of $4,000 used to be statutory. It is now provided for in this vote. It provides for the registrar of the court. There is no change. The next two, in the first division of subdivision B, are the two reporters of the Supreme Court. There is an increase of $200 to Mr. Coutlee by reason of the reclassification. He had been receiving $1,900, he is now to receive $2,100, being graded in the first division of subdivision B. In the second division, subdivision A, are Mr. Lawson and Mr. Bligh, clerks in the Supreme Court, in whose case there is no change.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the salary of the other reporter?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Mr. Masters, senior reporter, was receiving $2,350 before September 1. There is no change. There are no other changes otherwise in the Supreme Court. In the case of all the other officials of the court they are graded in accordance with the salaries they were receiving on 1st September last.

Mr. FOSTER. They are the same as before?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The same individuals and the same salaries in each case. The same thing is true of the Exchequer Court. The salary of the registrar, which is $3,000, is not changed in amount, but it used to be provided for under the statute. Now it is included under Civil Government, otherwise there is no change. The same individuals are continued at the same salaries respectively being graded in accordance with the amounts they were previously receiving.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you also take the Dominion Police?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The Dominion Police, I should have mentioned, are in the same position as the two courts.

Mr. FOSTER. Who are these two officers?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The commissioner, Mr. Sherwood, provided for previously by statute, was receiving, I think, $2,950 previously and is now receiving $3,050 by a statutory increase of $100 from the 1st October. The other officer is Mr. Cawdron, whose salary was previously part of the Dominion Police appropriation and who is now to be provided for under Civil Government. He was getting $1,300 before and by the statutory increase from the 1st April he will be entitled to $1,350.

Mr. FOSTER. What are his duties?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. His duties are largely clerical as secretary and factotum of the commissioner, he and the commissioner constituting the staff except for the men on the force.

Contingencies, $10,400.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The explanation of the decrease of $2,100 in this item is that the return which I had the honour to present to-day in regard to paroled prisoners was provided for in that $2,600.

Mr. FOSTER. You are not anticipating such another this time?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. No.

Department of Inland Revenue—salaries (including A. McGill at $3,000), $87,700.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman asked for the names of the six temporary employees who were transferred. They are:

Name.	Date of Appointment.	Salary.
		$
J. W. Z. Cantin	Aprll 1, 1908	500
H. B. Lewis	Nov. 22, 1907	600
E. G. E. Kins	Dec. 20, 1907	600
E. Bourgeois	June 30, 1903	750
L. Roy	Feb. 1, 1908	500
A. S. Lyon	July 9, 1908	500

Mr. FOSTER. Had Cantin and Roy passed the Civil Service examinations?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. J. D. REID. To what positions were they appointed ?

Mr. PATERSON. One was a messenger and the other a clerk.

Mr. FOSTER. Are there any other increases in that statement. other than the statutory increases outside of the additional salaries of those six ?

Mr. PATERSON. No. The deputy says there were two increases one from $800 to $900 and the other from $850 to $900, Miss Griffith and Miss Baird.

Mr. FOSTER. They came by virtue of the classsification ?

Mr. PATERSON. By virtue of the Act. I am safe to say that there are no increases except under the Act and the ordinary statutory increases.

I was also asked for the names of the 11 laboratory employees with their classifications, salaries and dates of appointment. They are as follows :

Name.	Classification.	Date of Appointment.	Salary.
			$ cts.
A. McGill (chief analyst)	1st Div. Subdiv. A	July, 1887	3,000 00
A. Lemoine	2nd " B	July, 1901	1,200 00
J. A. G. Valin	2nd " B	January, 1901	1,200 00
E. L. C. Forster	2nd " B	July, 1908	1,250 00
C. C. Forward	2nd " B	August, 1908	1,250 00
E. Davidson	3rd " A	June 1902	900 00
S. E. Wright	3rd " A	October, 1893	900 00
E. Belisle	3rd " A	August, 1905	1,000 00
A. C. Macfarlane	3rd " A	March, 1907	900 00
J. A. Rickey	3rd " A	June, 1907	1,000 00
J. Ladouceur	3rd " A	April, 1902	900 00
			13,500 00

Mr. FOSTER. Did these go in at exactly the same salaries they were receiving?

Mr. PATERSON. They went in at the same. Of course, the statutory increase is always understood.

Mr. FOSTER. Why are there two additions?

Mr. PATERSON. The two extra assistant analysts were required and passed their examination before the Inland Revenue Board.

Mr. FOSTER. What extra work was put upon them?

Mr. PATERSON. The staff was short owing to the death of Mr. Macfarlane. Mr. McGill was promoted to Mr. Macfarlane's place, and the additional work necessitated these two appointments.

Chief electrical engineer's branch, $6,900.

Mr. PATERSON. There are six there. Does the hon. gentleman want the names and salaries of these?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON. O. Higman at $2,800. The hon. gentleman knows that he has been a long time in the service. In July, 1901, J. A. Whyte, at $1,200; in June, 1906, C. J. Evans, at $950; in January, 1908, N. R. Cole, at $900; in May, 1908, E. D. K. Matthews, at $550; in January, 1908, M. E. E. McKell, at $500.

Mr. FOSTER. What were these men appointed to do? What is their particular work? How is it you have had to add so largely to the electrical branch?

Mr. PATERSON. Mr. Whyte is inspector of gas metres; Evans is a mechanical expert; McKell is a stenographer.

Mr. FOSTER. The information I wanted to get was this: You have added three to the electrical engineering branch during 1908, making six altogether. What is the extra work which has made it necessary to double the staff?

Mr. PATERSON. Three of them were temporary and were paid out of contingencies. There is no additional staff.

Mr. FOSTER. Although they were paid out of contingencies three of them were appointed in 1908. They were not working before that. How did you happen to double the staff in 1908?

Mr. PATERSON. Simply because of an increase of work.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not enough. Can you not find out what it was?

Mr. PATERSON. A general increase in the work of the department all the time. The deputy cannot specify.

Mr. FOSTER. This is electrical engineering work; what is the work they do?

Mr. PATERSON. Two of these mechanical experts adjust scales and metres. Formerly they were sent to outside places to do the work, but it is thought better to have it done in the department.

Mr. FOSTER. That disposes of two. What about the other one?

Mr. PATERSON. One is a stenographer.

Mr. FOSTER. The expense of examining and testing them before was paid out of contingencies, I suppose?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, so I understand.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the department find that by employing the two the work is done at a cheaper rate or in a better way?

Mr. PATERSON. The work is better done.

Weights and Measures inspection branch, $5,000.

Mr. PATERSON. This covers the salaries of James Fyfe, first division, subdivision A, salary $2,800. E. C. Way, appointed in May, 1908, 3rd division, salary $800. Mrs. L. Barbeau, 3rd division, appointed August, 1906, salary $500. T. Burgess, lower grade, appointed August, 1892, salary $900.

Mr. FOSTER. What necessitated the addition of Mr. Wade in May, 1908?

Mr. PATERSON. He is a thoroughly trained scale inspector, and the department thought they were fortunate in securing his services. Mrs. Barbeau is a typewriter and Mr. Burgess is a carpenter. In the methylated spirits, W. Armstrong, superintendent of warehouse, gets $2,000, appointed June, 1887. F. Parent, $1,200, appointed in May, 1891. James Hogan, warehouseman, appointed 1902, $900. F. H. Popham, assistant warehouseman, $750, appointed July, 1904.

Travelling expenses, rent, stationery &c., $90,000.

Mr. PATERSON. The items of this expense will be found in the excise report, page 136.

Mr. FOSTER. How much has been expended, so far, out of that amount ?

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot give the hon. gentleman that information.

Stamps for imported and Canadian tobacco, $85,000.

Mr. PATERSON. Up to November 30, the amount expended for tobacco stamps was $53,588.52, or at the rate of $82,482.80 for the present year. The demand for stamps cannot be calculated definitely, and sufficient stamps must be kept on hand to meet all possible demands of the trade. Of course, any unexpended part of the vote lapses at the end of the year.

Mr. FOSTER. The expenditure on stamps seems to be increasing rapidly.

Mr. PATERSON. Only through the increase of tobacco manufacture, I think.

To pay Collectors of Customs for duty collected by them, 1908-9, $10,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I see that in 1907-8 only $4,281 was expended. How is it that $10,000 is required ?

Mr. PATERSON. The years overlap the accounts do not come in, and some must be paid out of the next year. The amount given can hardly be taken as the yearly expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. What amount has been expended so far this year ?

Mr. PATERSON. Nothing. The accounts will not come in until the end of the year.

Mr. FOSTER. If they come in at the end of the year, then this $4,281 must represent what was paid for 1907-8.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, unless some came into the next year. They take amply sufficient in this vote to cover that.

Mr. FOSTER. That is it—the vote seems very large in proportion to the amount expended.

To enable the department to supply methylated spirits to manufacturers, the cost of which will be recouped by the manufacturers to whom it is supplied, and to pay for rent, light, power, freight, salaries, &c., $60,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is this to supply the users of methylated spirits with cheap material ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What does it cost the government to make it, and at what rate is it supplied to manufacturers ?

Mr. PATERSON. It is sold at actual cost of manufacture—53 cents a gallon.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many manufacturers use it ?

Mr. PATERSON. Hundreds of them—it is used very generally.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Have experiments been made with a view to furnishing agriculturists with a cheaper grade of methylated spirits or denatured alcohol ? I do not need to tell the minister of the opportunities afforded agriculturists in many of the countries of the world to procure cheap denatured alcohol for use as a source of power on the farm.

Mr. PATERSON. This is the cheapest the government has been able to produce, and, as the price is dearer than that of gasolene, gasolene meanwhile, keeps the lead.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. But, if it can be made in Germany at 20 cents or 25 cents a gallon, is there any reason why we should not carry on experiments with a view to supplying it at a similar price ?

Mr. PATERSON. I am told that if you allow for the difference in the gallon measure of the two countries, it is not sold cheaper in the United States than here. In Germany, it is made out of potatoes, and the labour employed is paid wages that would not do for our people.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The only place of manufacture is Ottawa ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does not the minister think it would be wise to manufacture in other places, for instance, in the Northwest ? The charges for freight from Ottawa to distant parts of the country must be enormous.

Mr. PATERSON. That is under consideration, I believe. There are no spirits, I think, manufactured in the Northwest, and the freight would be the same on that as on methylated.

Mr. MILLER. One reason why the spirit is sold in Germany at a lower price than in Canada is that the German government pays a bounty on the production there, and that lessens the price to the consumer in Germany.

Mr. BLAIN. Is this a new idea on the part of the government, to supply methylated spirits to the manufacturer at cost?

Mr. PATERSON. No, we have done it for a great many years.

Mr. BLAIN. How much was expended last year?

Mr. PATERSON. About $46,000.

Mr. STAPLES. Can the minister tell us what is the customs duty on methylated spirits?

Mr. PATERSON. If it comes in under the head of spirits, $2.14 per gallon.

Mr. STAPLES. Have any experiments been made with it as a motive power to take the place of gasolene?

Mr. PATERSON. I am not aware that there have been any experiments made in this country, and the deputy doubts if there have been any made in the United States. Gasolene is cheaper.

Mr. STAPLES. I understand that experiments have been made in other countries, and that they have proved satisfactory. I am seeking this information on account of the manner in which gasolene has been utilized as a motive power in the west. We are rapidly working into gasolene ploughing, and things of that kind, and if we could get methylated spirits in free of duty it would be a great advantage to the agriculturists of the west. If the government would allow me to make a suggestion, I think it would be well for them to experiment along those lines and ascertain what its value would be as a motive power.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Power-ploughing is the coming system of ploughing, but power-ploughing when done by steam entails very heavy machinery. If you could do power-ploughing by gasolene or alcohol the machinery is much lighter, and you get over the whole difficulty of supplying a power plant with water and with fuel. The great trouble in power-ploughing now is to get water to the engine, and to get fuel to the engine. But if we could have gasolene or alcohol at a cheap rate there is no doubt the whole system of ploughing would be revolutionized, to the great advantage of the agriculturists. The suggestion made by my hon. friend (Mr. Staples) is well worth the attention of the government.

Mr. PATERSON. That is quite true, and if anything cheaper than gasolene could be found, it would be a great advantage. Methylated spirits at the present price cannot compete with gasolene.

Mr. STAPLES. If you have not made the experiment it would be well worth a trial. There is a large appropriation asked for here, some $60,000; I think it would be well to spend a portion of that in experimenting along those lines.

Mr. MILLER. As I understand it, that this $60,000 all goes back again, that is the cost of producing methylated spirits that are sold to manufacturers for manufacturing purposes. The United States government, for nearly ten years, have been taking a deep and active interest in the question of denatured alcohol for such purposes as the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples), and the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) have mentioned. In the United States they can manufacture denatured alcohol cheaper than we can manufacture it in Canada from any of the sources from which we now do manufacture it. If we could manufacture it as they do in Germany, from potatoes, or in France, from sugar beets, we might perhaps produce it more cheaply than we do now from grain. But the United States can produce the ethyl alcohol from corn much cheaper than we can produce it from the grains we have in this country. They are experimenting in aid of agriculture, and have experts who for years have been carrying on special experiments along that line. It seems to me that it would be perhaps more prudent that our government should not spend any money for a year or two, but wait the re-

sults of experiments that are being carried on across the line.

Mr. STAPLES. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Miller) that if they have been experimenting with corn and such grain as they can grow to advantage in the United States, why can we not experiment with the grain we are growing in this country? I think it is not asking too much in the interest of agriculture to expend a portion of this large amount for that purpose. I would suggest that until we are able to produce methylated spirits in this country we should not exact such an enormous duty. Why not let this in from Germany, and let us have the benefit of it in the west until such time as you can put on the market a commodity that will answer the purpose for which we desire it.

Mr. PATERSON. There would be great danger in the matter of revenue, and there might be in other directions too, if you were to let it in free.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. But the minister must see that cheap alcohol, outside of all questions of drink, is being used more and more in the industries, whether it be in the shape of methylated spirits, or used as a preservative, or in connection with science. I find an agitation all over the country, and you find it in the scientific press of other countries. The demand for cheap alcohol for industrial and other purposes is increasing, and it is well worthy the attention of the government whether we should not try and give the public cheaper alcohol than we do at the present time. I know there is a danger to the revenue, and that would have to be guarded against. But the American government have come to the conclusion that it is necessary for them, and that it is their duty to find a way of producing cheap alcohol for industrial uses.

Mr. HERRON. Many requests come from my part of the country appealing to the minister to take off the duty on methylated spirits. I believe that if it were not for the enormous restrictions put on by this government it would be manufactured to a greater extent in the western country. The people there think it very strange that they should have to pay such an enormous price for this article that could be manufactured from the refuse of the products of the farm that are now practically going to waste. Potatoes, frozen and damaged grain and even straw could be utilized for this purpose. I think it would be well worth the serious consideration of the government to see if there could not be some means taken to permit of the manufacture of these products in the west. I hope the minister will think it over seriously.

Mr. PATERSON. The department are closely watching all the experiments that are being tried in the United States. As far as I am aware none of them has been successful yet. In reference to the production of the Northwest, if there were a distillery there that was producing alcohol the department could easily permit the manufacture of methylated spirits, but I understand that alcohol is not produced in the west yet, and that until it is done I do not know how you could reduce the cost.

Weights and measures, gas and electric light inspection—salaries of officers, inspectors and assistant inspectors of weights and measures, $72,500.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an increase of $4,650.

Mr. PATERSON. That is due to new appointments and small increases of salary granted to deserving officials and in no case exceeding $100.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the new appointments?

Mr. PATERSON. J. F. Bugeaud and A. B. Caldwell, appointed January 1, 1908, at $400 each.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are their districts?

Mr. PATERSON. Gaspé. H. Spicer and J. C. Thompson appointed at Winnipeg at salaries of $600 each. They are down for $100 more, so that they will be increased to $700.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister know the receipts of the Weights and Measures Department as compared with the expenses, and do the receipts come any where near paying the expenses?

Mr. PATERSON. The total revenue collected during 1908 was $83,021.32 as against $54,927.26 for the nine months ending March 31, 1907, and the total expenditure for 1908 was $101,492.24 as against $69,466.15 during the nine months ending March 31, 1907. So that it runs about that much of a deficit year by year.

Salaries of gas and electric light inspectors, $39,200.

Mr. PATERSON. The increase is due to new appointments and small increases in salaries.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who are some of the new appointees?

Mr. PATERSON. Mr. H. Fraser of Belleville, who was appointed on January 2, 1908; his present salary is $1,000. Mr. Renahan of Toronto, appointed March 1, 1908, at a salary of $900; and Mr. Roche of Ottawa, who was a temporary employee, but has been made permanent.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. How many inspectors of electric light meters are there?

Mr. PATERSON. About sixty altogether of gas and electric light.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The public are complaining about the inspection of electric meters. They have no knowledge that there are government officials who will inspect them, and it is complained that many companies through the country have their meters set to run fast.

Mr. PATERSON. The meters must all be inspected, I believe, on installation, and if any complaint is made subsequently it is attended to by an inspector. If the charge is not sustained, the person making the complaint pays for the inspection, and if it is well founded the company pays for the inspection.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. A great many of these instruments are imported from the United States. Have the instruments to pass inspection by the government before they pass customs?

Mr. PATERSON. No. They must be inspected before they are installed.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. In towns?

Mr. PATERSON. Under the Inspection Act, any place.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. If I owned a plant in a town of 5,000, imported my meters from Pittsburg and installed them in the houses myself, what protection is there for the public against these instruments?

Mr. PATERSON. You would be liable to a penalty.

Mr. BARR. Does that extend to villages?

Mr. PATERSON. Everywhere. For the year 1908, 41,062 were verified. Every five years I believe they are inspected.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I wish to support my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. J. A. Currie) in the position he has taken in regard to this matter. In some of the smaller towns we experience trouble in getting the inspector to come and investigate the condition of the electric light plants and inspect the meters. In the town where I live we have trouble now and have had for some months, and the man who manages the plant in that town informs me that he has several times asked the inspector to come down from London and inspect the meters for him, but has been unable to get him to come.

Mr. PATERSON. Will the hon. gentleman give the name of the place so that the officer can be communicated with?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Petrolea, Ont.

Mr. PATERSON. That will be attended to by the deputy.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe). The question I asked has not been answered—how many electrical inspectors are there besides the gas inspectors?

Mr. PATERSON. The same men act in both capacities.

Mr. CURRIE. They must be good men, for it takes a high grade electrical engineer to inspect an electric meter.

Mr. PATERSON. It is a mechanical test, I understand.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who is the last inspector appointed?

Mr. PATERSON. Major Harris was appointed in January, 1908.

Mr. J. D. REID. What was he doing before he was appointed?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know.

Mr. J. D. REID. Where did he come from?

Mr. PATERSON. Brockville, I understand.

Mr. J. D. REID. Perhaps the Minister of Railways and Canals can tell us who this man was or what he was doing.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know what he was doing immediately before his appointment, but he was a graduate of McGill University in electrical engineering and took very high honours. He had experience on the Pacific coast and was manager of the Brockville electric light for one year.

Metric system, to provide for the delivery of lectures and the publication of maps, charts, pamphlets, &c., $3,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is being done in the way of lectures?

Mr. PATERSON. Nothing for the last two years.

Mr. FOSTER. Then why do you take the vote?

Mr. PATERSON. The money is expended in supplying metric sets to schools.

Mr. FOSTER. $3,000 worth?

Mr. PATERSON. No, it has not been spent every year.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. When are we going to have the system adopted?

Mr. PATERSON. I suppose that with the diffusion of these samples the people are being educated in the system, and when they are sufficiently educated to demand it I suppose it will come like other measures.

Mr. FOSTER. How much was spent last year?

Mr. PATERSON. $98.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the use of taking a vote for $3,000 when you only expect to spend $98? I thought this was a year in which the government were practising

economy. Does the minister think it is a good idea to take votes when you do not intend to spend the money?

Mr. PATERSON. We do not know what we may do.

Mr. FOSTER. If the minister does not know what he is going to do, on what basis does he ask parliament to give him the money?

Mr. PATERSON. The minister may perhaps expend more in the way of distributing the samples this year than he has done before.

Export of electric power, $2,500.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Will the minister tell us what this is used for? What organization has the government for the regulation of the export of electric power?

Mr. PATERSON. Under the law every company exporting electric power must apply for a license, and there is an inspection and travelling expenses connected with the work.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is there an official in charge of it?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, Mr. Higman has that under his charge.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Where can we find a report of what the official has been doing in the last year?

Mr. PATERSON. I am told there is a report; but I think a question on that subject was asked by the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) the other day and the answer will be found in Hansard.

Intercolonial Bureau of Weights and Measures, $216.

Mr. J. D. REID. Explain that.

Mr. PATERSON. That is Canada's annual contribution to this bureau. This is not in reality an increase, but appears here owing to the fact that the supplementary estimates for the current year did not by an oversight include this amount.

Adulteration of food and fertilizers, under the administration of Act respecting fraudulent marking, $30,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many convictions were obtained during the past year under this Act ?

Mr. PATERSON. Quite a number, but I have not the exact number.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The general impression is that the Act was not carried out very strictly, not only with regard to the adulteration of food but also of fertilizers. On looking at the report from the Inland Revenue Department, we find that there is a great deal of adulteration both of food and fertilizers and it is important that it should be stopped.

Mr. PATERSON. My hon. friend is quite right. My deputy tells me that it is intended to bring in a Bill this session that will enable us to deal with the matter more efficiently than in the past.

Mr. STEWART. Will it cover anything but fertilizers ?

Mr. PATERSON. No, only fertilizers.

Mr. J. D. REID. Are fertilizers which come from the other side inspected ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many officers are in the department for the purpose of enforcing the carrying out of the Adulteration of Foods Act ?

Mr. PATERSON. Sixteen confidential inspectors outside.

Mr. BLAIN. How much money was expended last year in salaries ?

Mr. PATERSON. $3,700 was paid the inspectors and over $12,650 in the laboratory.

Mr. BRODER. What is done when the samples of adulteration are collected ? Are the names published ?

Mr. PATERSON. The parties are prosecuted where fraud is intended and the names published.

Mr. BRODER. Many a time the merchant might not be aware that the goods purchased are adulterated.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, and it is then rather hard on him to publish his name.

Mr. BURRELL. When a manufacturer is found guilty of adulterating food products is a fine imposed ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, when he does it fraudulently.

Mr. BURRELL. Do the fines amount to anything serious ?

Mr. PATERSON. Not to a very large amount.

Mr. BURRELL. Would it not be advisable to increase very heavily the amount of fines in cases of fraud so that there would not be so heavy a drain on the finances of the department in connection with the Act. The general impression is that the fines are not heavy enough.

Mr. PATERSON. They are not very heavy, that is true.

Mr. J. D. REID. Last year the amount of fines collected by the government on adulterated fertilizers was $10. Was that all the amount that was collected ?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not think there was over $150 collected altogether.

Mr. J. D. REID. According to the papers there has been considerable adulteration of food product. Surely the minister will not admit that there has not been one instance in which a fine was imposed during 1908 for the adulteration of food.

Mr. PATERSON. There have been several but perhaps not as many as there should have been.

Mr. J. D. REID. Where will we find it? On page J-28 of the Auditor General's Report I find under the heading of fines and forfeitures:

Electric light..	$125 00
Excise..	593 62
Fertilizers..	10 00
Gas..	20 00
Weights and measures..	74 00
Total..	$822 00

There is nothing there to show that there were any fines or forfeitures for adulteration of foods at all.

Mr. BURRELL. The country feels generally that it is highly important that the law against adulteration should be strictly enforced. It is only fair that the people who fraudulently adulterate food should pay a large portion of the cost of inspection.

Mr. PATERSON. I am informed that there have been a number of fines imposed. It appears in the Inland Revenue Report with other items—adulteration of food, fines and penalties, $148.25—not a very large amount.

Mr. J. D. REID. I find a list on page J-36 of the Auditor General's Report, under the head of 'Adulteration of Food,' and totalling $148.25. Does this mean that fines were collected from the men whose names were given?

Mr. PATERSON. In some cases the prosecutions may not have been pressed. Hon. members can understand that, while the officers endeavour to enforce the law as best they can, yet an adulterated article may be found in the hands of an innocent holder, who would not know that he was violating a law.

Mr. BURRELL. Is not the remedy against the manufacturer? Is not his name on the package? And, if so, surely he can be held. I find that in Ottawa there are ten analysts and a dozen scattered over the country. This is a very expensive staff to keep up, and yet there seem to be no results to show what they have been doing for the enforcement of the law.

Mr. J. D. REID. And I would like to know exactly how they find out what foods are adulterated. Here at page J-25 of the Auditor General's Report, is a list of salaries and contingencies under 'Food Inspection.' J. Hogan, Kingston, was given a salary of $198.52; J. Talbot, London, $49.98; A. E. Sanderson, Ottawa, $11.66; T. Kidd, Seaforth, $500; H. J. Dager, Toronto, $90.28; J. J. Costigan, Montreal, $350. Is there not a general inspector who goes to different places and collects samples?

Mr. PATERSON. The department send to their collectors of excise to procure samples of certain articles and forward them to the department. For this service, these officers are allowed a small sum.

Mr. J. D. REID. What is the position of this man, T. Kidd, Seaforth, who was paid $500?

Mr. PATERSON. He devotes himself to that work and does nothing else. He is the only one.

Mr. J. D. REID. His travel account amounts to $162.90. He cannot have travelled much for that.

Mr. PATERSON. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Reid) is right.

Miscellaneous—Proprietary or patent medicines, $5,000.

Mr. PATERSON. This will be required to meet the expense of administering the Proprietary or Patent Medicine Act which comes into force April 1, 1909. A similar sum will be included in the supplementary estimates for the current year.

Mr. J. D. REID. Has the minister any details showing how it is intended to expend the money?

Mr. PATERSON. It will be necessary to pay expert medical men to ascertain what is necessary to constitute the proper medicines and so on. Also, literature will be necessary for distribution.

Mr. BLAIN. Have the officers been selected yet?

Mr. PATERSON. No officers are being appointed. This is being administered by the present staff.

Department of Secretary of State—Salaries (including P. Pelletier at $3,000), $53,737.50; contingencies, $6,500.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State). In explanation of these estimates, I may say that the amounts are those at which all these officers were brought under the recent Civil Service Act with the exception of the Assistant Under Secretary of State. He has been senior chief clerk, and takes charge of the business of the department in the absence of the Under Secretary. He has had 21 years' experience in the department, and his duties include the supervision of certain applications under the Companies' Act, the applications that are made in the French language. The late Secretary of State, in view of Mr. Pelletier's duties, recommended that he should be

given this increase of $200. There are no new appointments in the department.

Mr. J. D. REID. Are you positive?

Mr. MURPHY. Perhaps the hon. member refers to a position in the first division of subdivision B. That position is vacant by reason of the transfer of Mr. Foran, who was formerly in the department, and who has been made secretary of the Board of Civil Service Commissioners. That office is retained, but no appointment has been made to it as yet.

Mr. J. D. REID. How many of those that were on as temporary officers were made permanent?

Mr. MURPHY. Three messengers, J. A. Jessop, J. Brankin and H. H. Duggan.

Mr. J. D. REID. I think this item should have been allowed to stand over, because we did not expect it was coming up to-night.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) had some pertinent questions which he wished to ask the minister.

Mr. MURPHY. I shall be pleased to answer any questions to-morrow which any hon. gentleman may desire to ask me.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister said that Mr. Pelletier had an increase of $200. I see on page X—3 of the Auditor General's Report that he got $2,700 last year. Is that the same gentleman the minister refers to?

Mr. MURPHY. That is the same gentleman, he got an increase of $100. He came in at $2,800 at the minimum of that class. This provides for an addition of $200.

Mr. J. D. REID. Are the gentlemen mentioned on page X—3 the same gentlemen who come in under this item of $30,000?

Mr. MURPHY. I think so.

Mr. J. D. REID. When was H. H. Duggan appointed?

Mr. MURPHY. He was appointed last year, I think about seven or eight months ago, at a salary of $500.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to get the exact date to-morrow.

Mr. AMES. Is this a new item, $600 for a private secretary?

Mr. MURPHY. No, that is a continuation of the same item.

Mr. AMES. Formerly a private secretary was a first-class clerk. Is he now outside the Civil Service Act?

Mr. MURPHY. No.

Mr. AMES. Why is he listed here as in receipt of an allowance instead of listing him as an employee?

Mr. MURPHY. He would not get the $600 unless he were put in here in this way —allowance for private secretary. It is the same in all the departments.

Mr. AMES. Why is a change made in that particular method of doing it? In the Auditor General's Report the private secretary is included among first-class clerks. Is this an extra $600 given to an employee who gets another salary in another capacity?

Mr. MURPHY. No. I understand it has been the practice in the past to pay the $600 to a gentleman occupying a position in the department, whether he be a first class or a second class clerk. My information is that this amount has been paid for years past in the same way.

Mr. AMES. In the Auditor General's Report we see that A. Brophy gets $1,500 as a first-class clerk, then he receives $600 more for acting as private secretary.

Mr. MURPHY. That is correct.

Mr. AMES. Then my question was not properly answered. I asked whether that $600 went to an employee who was already drawing a salary under another head, and the minister said no.

Mr. MURPHY. I did not so understand the hon. gentleman's question. If that is what he means, I must answer yes.

Mr. AMES. The $600 goes to an employee who is already receiving a salary in another capacity?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Let us understand it. The private secretary of a department is taken from one of the clerkships. My own opinion is that the system is all wrong, but it has been the rule in this government for years My opinion is that a minister ought to be able to select his private secretary, pay him a straight salary, any salary he likes. The practice has been to take a private secretary from the employ of the department. He receives the salary that he gets as a clerk and this $600 is combined with it to make up his salary as a private secretary. This has been the practice for years. He does nothing as a clerk, he does his work as a private secretary, but he is taken out of the ranks of the clerks and given this salary.

Mr. AMES. Is this $600 extra allowance uniform in all the departments ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. AMES. Plus whatever he received in the way of a salary as an ordinary employee ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Might I ask the minister to urge upon the government that they change this system and put into force the system that he has suggested to-night ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Speaking for myself, I have always taken very strong ground, even before I came here, on this subject, believing that the minister should be in a position to select his private secretary from wherever he chose. But, it has been the custom to select him from the department and add this allowance to the salary that he is receiving as a clerk. There is now a clause in the Act which provides for a private secretary being taken in, but he must be brought in at the minimum of the class in which he happens to fall. Take my own private secretary as an example ; he was a temporary clerk and in order to get him as my private secretary I had to bring him in under the second division of class B at $800 and the $600 added only gives him a salary of $1,400, which is an absurd salary for the secretary in a department like that of Railways and Canals. He is brought in at the reorganization at $800 but in next year's estimates I am going to ask that his salary be placed on a fairly decent basis. The ministers are hampered in providing for their private secretaries by that rule, but it has been the practice in the past.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The practice originated in this way : In former days a minister would bring in a man who suited him and he would employ him as his private secretary. When the minister was going out of office he would ask for an appointment of some kind in the department in order that he might be retained. I imagine that is the way it arose.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Contingencies, $6,500.

Mr. J. D. REID. What is the explanation of this ?

Mr. MURPHY. There is a reduction of $1,000 ?

Mr. J. D. REID. How is that explained ?

Mr. MURPHY. It is estimated that for clerical assistance a vote of $1,000 instead of $2,000 will be sufficient. This is to provide for the extra clerks that may be required to get out returns or anything of that kind during the session. There is always extra work in the department by reason of the connection of the Printing Bureau with it.

Department of Railways and Canals—Salaries (including M. J. Butler at $8,000; G. A. Bell, at $2,800, and C. B. Robinson at $1,200), $129,662.50.

Mr. J. D. REID. Give us an explanation of that.

Mr. GRAHAM. The explanation with reference to Mr. Butler is that he being the deputy minister with a salary above that allowed by the statute, his name has to be mentioned. The name of Mr. Bell is also mentioned. He is the head of a branch that I have provided for in the estimates. He was brought into the department in 1900, I think. He is a very able man and his duties are to audit all the accounts in the department and in connection with all the railways throughout the country. If, for instance, a railway applies for a subsidy it has to prove that it has expended a certain amount and I have to send him all over Canada to audit these accounts. He has to meet the auditors of the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Pacific Railway and other companies. His salary is increased over $1,000. I want to bring him into the branch as the head of it. He is one of the ablest men in the service. In the reorganization under the Act I could only bring him in at the salary he was getting, but in the estimates for next year I name him so that there cannot be any question as to the legality of the matter. My private secretary is Mr. C. B. Robinson. I had to bring him in at $800 under the Act because he had to come in at the minimum of the class in which he was employed being the second division of class B. I propose to give him a salary of $1,200 in addition to the $600 which will make his salary $1,800. There are two others whom I should mention. Mr. Bowden has been put in class A which will give him $300 of an increase and Mr. Alward who has charge of the law department and becomes the solicitor, the former solicitor having resigned some months ago, is put in class A, and his salary is raised several hundred dollars.

Mr. J. D. REID. What position did he occupy last year ?

Mr. GRAHAM. He was assistant to the law clerk.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is he a barrister?

Mr. GRAHAM. He is a barrister of standing and has been in the department for years. It is a very important branch and I am putting him at the head of it as he is a very capable man.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many men were brought in from the outside service ?

Mr. GRAHAM. There are some in our department who have been working there since 1872, 1880 and 1890, but they were never made permanent. Some forty-five of these are now made permanent.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Were there any appointments in 1908 ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, Mr. McCrimmon, a young man, was appointed in the third di-

vision of subdivision B just at the beginning of 1908 at a salary of $650.

Mr. J. D. REID. What is he doing ?

Mr. GRAHAM. He is a clerk in the records branch.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is he the only one ?

Mr. GRAHAM. He was the only appointee in 1908. There were some in 1907.

Mr. J. D. REID. How many in 1907?

Mr. GRAHAM. Seven I think altogether. Of course these are appointed to vacancies that occurred; we made no new positions in 1907.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. In 1908-9 the amount expended for this purpose was $63,000; but for this year it is $129,000, a difference of $45,000. Would the bringing in of the outside service make that difference?

Mr. GRAHAM. There were some increases in the reorganization and some statutory increases amounting to a little over $8,000. My accountant informs me that we have several vacancies in our department that have existed for some time. We did not fill them last year, but we may fill them this year.

Mr. J. D. REID. How are the vacancies caused?

Mr. GRAHAM. In every department there are so many clerkships. New ones are organized and old ones are sometimes dropped. These have been provided for for years in some cases and some men have been promoted, but during the last year we did not fill some of these vacancies. The reorganization of the department has taken place and one or two of these vacancies must be filled by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the commission make technical appointments too?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is a clause that for special reasons appointments may be made upon the commission giving certificates.

Mr. J. D. REID. If these vacancies have existed for a number of years, the minister must know that it is not necessary to fill them this year. What are the vacancies?

Mr. GRAHAM. We found some of these in the outside and some in the inside service. In the reorganization of the service it is almost impossible for the head of a department to see just how matters are going to work out under the new Act, and

though we make provision for these vacancies, if we find that it is not necessary to fill any of them we will drop them. Under the old Act we could take a general vote and employ assistance under that, but under the new Civil Service Act we cannot do that, and in order to protect ourselves we make provision for these possible vacancies. Under this Act there is no elasticity. If we want a man in the department, we have to go to the commission and explain that there is a vacancy and we cannot promote unless a vacancy exists.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the total number of employees in the department?

Mr. GRAHAM. Eighty-four. We are asking for 95, including these vacancies.

Mr. BLAIN. What will be the total increase of salaries under the new classification?

Mr. GRAHAM. Under the classification coming into effect on September 1 the increase is $3,800.

Mr. MAGRATH. How many employees last year drew $63,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. Thirty-nine. The total number is now made up of both inside and outside employees.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. PATERSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. J. D. REID. What will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. PATERSON. As to-morrow will be private members' day and the House will rise at six o'clock that will be in the hands of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Of course, if the private members' work runs out, we shall go on with civil government.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, February 3, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Minister of Public Works for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1908.—Mr. Pugsley.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 33) respecting the Niagara-Welland Power Co.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 34) to incorporate the Ontario and Michigan Power Company.—Mr. Conmee.

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Salisbury and Harvey Railroad Company.—Mr. Emmerson.

Bill (No. 36) respecting The Southern Central Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. W. McIntyre.

Bill (No. 37) to incorporate the Western Canadian Life Assurance Company.—Mr. Knowles.

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company. — Mr. Dubeau.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT—POWERS OF RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (E. Hastings) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 39) to amend the Railway Act. He said: Last session the government introduced a Bill to amend the Railway Act so as to confer certain additional powers on the Board of Railway Commissioners, giving the Board jurisdiction in complaints made by the Crown or by a corporation with regard to certain specified matters. The list included a number of matters on the face of it, but mainly matters with regard to which negotiations are not usually conducted as contracts made between a corporation or the Crown and the railways. I propose to add to, along the same line, that the commissioners should have power in contracts made with regard to the operation of the road. It is well known that contracts are made between municipalities and the government or a railway company, and that in the overwhelming majority of cases, they refer to the operation of the road. In consideration of the operation of the road, a bonus is given by the municipality or a subsidy granted by parliament. Exactly in the line with the government measure of last year, I propose to give the commissioners authority with regard to such contracts.

In one other respect this Bill goes further than the amendment of last session. Under that law, appeals of the kind to which I have referred can only be made in cases between the Crown or corporation and the railway with which the contract was made. It is well known that, in this country, there are practically only two or three railways. In the great majority of cases contracts are made between the Crown or a corporation and some minor railway which has been subsidized for a part of the country through which it runs; and, usually, after the contract is made and the railway constructed, this minor railway is absorbed by one of the larger railway corporations. The result is that the larger railway has the benefit of the money which the municipality or Crown has expended, while the municipality or the Crown loses the benefit of the contract on account of which alone the money was advanced. The Bill which I have now the honour to propose would allow the board to act in such a case, and would provide that the railway which has possession of the property in consideration of which the bonus is given should be held responsible for carrying out the contract made by the road which has been absorbed and which, having gone out of operation, cannot be held to its contract. This, it will be seen, is on the same line as the government Bill of last session, but it extends the principle a little further in the two directions I have indicated.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—ALLOTMENT OF ROOMS.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR asked:

1. Outside of the Chamber of the House of Commons, the reading room and library, how many rooms are available in the parliament buildings for members of the House of Commons, including members of the administration and the staff of the House of Commons?
2. What is the total floor space of the said rooms?
3. By whom are the said rooms occupied, to whom have they been allotted, and what is the floor space of the rooms in question in each case?
4. Under whose direction has such allotment or arrangement been made, and when was it last made or revised?

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). The following is a list of the rooms occupied by the members of the House of Commons and members of the administration and staff by numbers, with the names of the occupant or occupants, and floor area of each room; these have been allotted under the direction of the Minister of Public Works and the Honourable Speaker of the House of Commons:

Room Nos.	Occupants.	Rooms occupied.	Floor area.
1	The Clerk of the House ..	2	627·9
2	Accountant..	1	266·5
3	Asst. Clerk of Votes and Proceedings.....	1	188·4

Room Nos.	Occupants.	Rooms occupied.	Floor area.
3½	W. H. P. McDonnell	1	146·8
4	Chief Clerk of Votes and Proceedings	1	211·4
5	Secretary to the Leader of the Opposition	1	257·5
6	Leader of the Opposition	1	484·0
7, 7½	Hon. Minister of Public Works	2	583·6
8	Press room	1	1,042·6
8½	Clerk of the Crown in Chancery	1	304·7
9	Ottawa liberal members	1	149·6
10	Press gallery room	1	476·8
11	Chief clerk of French Journals	1	122·0
14	Post Office	2	984·0
15	Asst. Accountant	1	402·9
16	Liberal Headquarters	1	1,259·5
17	The Speaker's chambers	14	4,512·2
18	The Speaker's office	2	406·9
19	Hon. Minister of Finance	1	585·10
20	Smoking room	1	565·0
21	Hon. Minister of Railways	2	521·8
22	Hon. Postmaster General	1	216·8
23	Hon. Minister of Interior	1	193·2
24	Hon. Minister of Customs	1	203·7
25	Curator of reading room	1	170·11
26	Deputy Sergeant at Arms	1	228·10
27	Hon. Minister of Agriculture.	1	165·0
28	Hon. Minister of Justice	1	182·9
29	Debates office	6	1,299·3
30	Committee room; Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders, Miscellaneous, Private Bills and Debates	1	693·6
31, 32	Examiner of Private Bills, Banking and Commerce and Public Accounts Committee	1	828·0
33	Clerk of the Crown in Chancery	2	806·3
34	Tower room, Committee on Agriculture and Colonization and Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament	1	565·3
35	Distribution office	1	850·0
36	Ontario Conservative members	1	326·0
37	Conservative ex-Ministers	1	309·1
38	Hon. Geo. E. Foster	1	335·2
39	Routine and Records office	1	262·11
40,41,42	Stationery office	2	799·3
43, 44	French translators	2	702.8
45, 46	English and French Journals.	1	602·8
47	Secretary to Law Branch, Mr. Loucks	1	237·0
48	Law Clerk	1	395·8
49	Chairman of Printing and of Rys. and Canals Committee	1	395·5
50	Asst. Law Clerk	1	175·7
51	Mr. Bickerdike and others	1	258·7
52	Ontario Liberals	1	474·10
53	Ontario Liberal members	1	252·4
54	Hon. Solicitor General	1	183·8
55	Chief translator	1	270·6
56	Ontario Conservative members	1	276·3
57	Official stenographers	1	246·5
58	Conservative members	2	840·8
59	Deputy Speaker	4	774·0
60	Quebec Liberal Whip	1	378·9
61	Asst. Clerk of the House	1	498·9
62	Railway Committee Room	1	2,630·8
63	Mr. Carvell and others	1	314·3
64	Mr. McLean (York, S.)	1	267·4
65	Conservative members	2	185·0
66	Hon. Minister of In. Revenue	1	237·8
67	Col. Hughes and Conservative members	1	550·0
68	Mr. Stanfield and Conservative members	1	523·3
69	Chairman of Debates and Liberal members	1	223·1
70	Dr. Béland and others	1	211·4
71	Chairman of Debates and Liberal members (Quebec)	1	173·3
72	Conservative members, Mr. Lennox and others	1	181·6
73	Dr. Barr and Mr. Marshall	1	114·11
74, 75	New Brunswick Liberals	2	617·2
76, 77	Nova Scotia Liberals	2	550·2
78	Northwest Liberal members	1	416·7
79	Mr. Gauvreau and others	1	385·2
80	Prince Edward Island Liberal members	1	401·8
81	Hon. Minister of Militia	1	188·1
82	Quebec Liberal members	1	855·6
83	Ex-Ministers (Liberals)	1	390·4
84	Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries	1	456·11
85	Secretary of the Premier	1	253·6
86	Right Hon. the Premier	1	460·6
87	Liberal Whip (Mr. Calvert)	1	241·6
88	Hon. Secretary of State	1	180·0
89	Conservative Headquarters	1	801·0
90	Conserv. Whip (Mr. Taylor)	1	189·0
91	Conservative Whips	1	324·0
92	Northwest Liberal members	1	460·6
93	Mr. Lapointe and others	1	264·9
94	N.B. and P.E.I. Conservatives and Mr. Doherty	1	177·5
95	Dr. Reid and other Conservative members	1	174·6
96	Mr. Rivet and others	1	177·5
97	Conservative members	1	486·6
98	Sessional clerks	1	915·2
99	Sergeant at Arms (quarters)	5	1,927·5
100	Mr. Dubé (quarters)	8	2,849·0
101	House cleaning stores	1	266·0
102	Stationery store room	1	372·4
103	Store room—Sgt. at Arms	1	178·3
104	Blue-book room	1	233·2
	Steward of the Speaker	6	1,661·7
	Vaults, Distribution office	2	478·10
	Paste room	1	316·6
	Messengers' waiting room	1	330·10
	Mr. Dubé's office	1	214·8
	Totals	158	53,245·9
12, 13	Telegraph office—G.N.W. and C.P.R.	2	510·0
	Restaurant, dining rooms, kitchen, store room, etc	12	8,883·9
	Totals	14	9,393·9
	Grand totals	172	62,639·6

LAND GRANT OF QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RAILWAY.

Mr. McCRANEY asked:

1. What was the area and approximate location of the land grant to the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Steamboat Company for the construction of the railway from Regina to Prince Albert?

2. Under what authority was such grant made, and when was it earned?

3. What persons and corporations have acquired this land grant, and in what amounts?

4. What quantity of land has been patented to each?

5. Has the Saskatoon and Western Land Company acquired any other lands from the government than those which form part of the grant above-mentioned?

6. When were the selections of the Saskatoon and Western Land Company made, and what has been the cause of the delay?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of Interior). 1. 1,625,344 acres. The area reserved by the original orders in council dated respectively December 30, 1884, February 4, 1891, June 10, 1892, and August 1, 1902, was all in what is now the province of Saskatchewan, and the selection of lands to satisfy the area earned as above was all within the tracts so reserved. The location of the tract may be described as an irregular shaped block in central Saskatchewan, extending from the north limit of the Canadian Pacific Railway main line belt reserve to township 52.

2. By Chapter 60 of 48-49 Victoria, assented to July 20, 1885, and Chapter 23, of 50-51 Victoria, assented to June 23, 1887.

3 and 4. An area of 128,000 acres was assigned to the Land Corporation of Canada by assignment dated February 5, 1892. These lands have all been patented.

Applications for the issue of patents in the name of sundry persons were filed in the department by the company to the number of 117 for areas in each case of one section or less area between March 20, 1891, and September 5, 1902. These lands have all been patented.

A patent for an area of 2,240 acres was applied for in the name of Harvey Matthews of White Bear lake, Minnesota, dated September 22, 1902. This land has been patented.

An area of 30,614·90 acres was assigned to Edmund Boyd Osler, and Herbert Carlyle Hammond, of Toronto, and Augustus Meredith Nanton and Harry William Nanton of Winnipeg by assignment dated December 30, 1902. These lands have all been patented.

An area of 97,164·06 acres was assigned to Augustus Meredith Nanton of Winnipeg by assignment dated December 30, 1902. These lands have all been patented.

An area of 839,640·97 acres was assigned to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company by assignment dated October 25, 1902. These lands have all been patented.

An area of 239·92 acres was assigned to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company by assignment dated March 21, 1903. This land has been patented.

An area of 493,269·34 acres was retained by the government as security for certain advances to the railway company under an agreement dated August 5, 1889; of these lands an area of 1,442 acres has been patented in the name of sundry persons on the application of the assignees of the railway company.

5. Of the above area of 1,442 acres, 1,284 acres has been patented to the Saskatchewan and Western Land Company, Limited.

No other lands comprised in this railway company's land subsidy have been patented to the said Saskatoon and Western Land Company, Limited. The said Saskatoon and Western Land Company, Limited, has not acquired any other lands from the government.

6. The Saskatoon and Western Land Company had no right of selection on account of this railway company's land subsidy. The selection of the area of 493,269·34 acres retained by the government as security as above and of which area the said Saskatoon and Western Land Company, Limited, is the grantee of 1,284 acres as above, was completed on September 13, 1906, by the assignees of the railway company, and was confirmed by order in council dated May 8, 1907. The unpatented lands comprised in this selection have been recently assigned by the said assignees to Canada Saskatchewan Land Company, Limited.

MEN EMPLOYED ON WELLAND CANAL.

Mr. LANCASTER asked:

1. How many men, not on the regular staff, were employed on the Welland canal during the months of September and October, 1908?

2. What was the nature of the work for which the said men were so employed?

3. On whose recommendation was the work required to be done?

4. What rate of wages was paid to the said men?

5. What is the total amount paid, or to be paid, for the said work?

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

1. Exclusive of staff pay-list, there were employed on the Welland canal during the month of September, 1908, 416 men, and during the month of October, 1908, 611 men.

2. These men were employed on the following different works: 'Repairs,' 'Electric lighting and power plant,' 'Survey of canal,' 'Repairs to foundation of lock No. 2,' 'Deepen ditches and enlarge culvert at Marshvile,' 'Heavy repairs.'

3. The work was required to be done on the recommendation of the superintending engineer.

4. The general rate of wages was $1.50 per day of 9 hours for labouring men; $2 to $3.50 per day for foremen; and teams from $3.50 to $4 per day. At the Marshville culvert work, an extra allowance was made to cover board of men who did not live in the vicinity.

5. The amounts of the appropriation for the said works are:

Repairs	$80,000
Electric lighting and power plant	50,000
Survey of canal	20,000
Repairing foundation lock No. 2	12,000
Deepen ditches and enlarge culvert at Marshville	15,000
Heavy repairs	30,000

ROSS RIFLE—REPORT OF COMMITTEE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked:

1. What were the dates of the two last meetings of the Small Arms Committee, and what is the present composition of such committee?

2. Has this committee reported on the Ross rifle, Mark II? If so, what is the nature of the report?

3. Has this committee reported on any rifle manufactured by the Ross Rifle Company other than Mark I and II?

4. Is the government aware of any defects, structural weaknesses or deficiencies in Ross rifle Mark II? If so, what is the nature of these defects?

5. Has the Ross rifle Mark II been definitely accepted by the government as the service rifle of the militia of Canada?

6. What was the date of the last contract with the Ross Rifle Company for rifles, or what mark are they to be, and how many have been delivered on the contract up to the present time?

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

1. (b) The personnel of the Small Arms Committee is as follows:

President—

Bvt.-Col. S. Hughes, M.P. Railway Staff.

Members—

Lt.-Col. W. P. Anderson, R.O.; Lt.-Col. J. H. Burland, R.O.; Lt.-Col. C. Greville-Harston, R.O.; Major R. A. Helmer, D.A.A.G., for Musketry; Major A. O. Fages, R.C.R.; Major J. B. Pym, I.S.A. &M.G.; Major W. H. Davidson, 8th Regt.; Major J. E. Hutcheson, 43rd Regt.

Associate members—

Lt.-Col. F. M. Gaudet, R.C.A., Supt. Dom. Arsenal; Lt.-Col. J. W. Harkom, R.O.; A. E. McIntyre, Esq., Ph.D.; A. H. Walters, Esq., M.A.

4. The Ross rifle in common with all other rifles, military or sporting, may be said to have certain defects, structural weaknesses, or deficiencies. It is not the custom of any government to publish to the world what it considers to be the weak points or strong points of the arms with which its troops are equipped.

6. The date of the contract (there is only one), is March 22, 1902.

As regards the other particulars asked for in questions 1 (a), 2, 3, and 5, the department proposes to adopt the principle followed by the Imperial War Office and to reserve to itself the right to make public only such information as may be deemed to be advisable in the public interest.

STRAIGHTENING OF ASSINIBOINE RIVER.

Mr. MEIGHEN asked:

1. What requests, petitions or prayers, if any, from public bodies or others, were received by the government urging the straightening of a portion of the Assiniboine river, southeast of Portage la Prairie City, and what were the dates of receipt of same?

2. When was the work on same first commenced and when finished?

3. Were tenders called for the said work or any part thereof? If not, why not?

4. If not done by contract under tender, what plan was adopted for accomplishing the work and paying the men employed, and through whom were they paid?

5. What was the immediate urgency for undertaking this work at the time it was done?

6. What has been the total amount expended to date, what was the nature of the necessary excavation, and what is the cost per cubic yard?

7. What, if any, provision has been made by the government for disposal of the sewerage of the city of Portage la Prairie, as the present method of disposal of same is said to be interfered with by the work so done?

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

1. Petition signed by residents along the Assiniboine river, received March 19, 1903; letter from C. Winslow, Dacotah, May 2, 1904; petitions signed by residents of Portage la Prairie, January 10, 1905; letter from J. O. Smith, Elie, November 6, 1905; letter from J. O. Smith, Elie, January 29, 1908.

2. Commenced 19th September, 1908, closed 31st October, 1908.

3 & 4. Tenders were not called for the work as it was considered more satisfactory to perform same by day's labour. Work was done by a staff of men under a foreman in the employ of this department, and payments were made partly through Joseph Cauchon, departmental paymaster, partly by direct cheque from department.

5. To prevent the flooding of a portion of the city of Portage la Prairie and the surrounding country.

6. $4,152 to excavate earth, at an estimated cost of 22 cents per cubic yard.

7. No provision has been made as this is a public work, constructed by the government, at the request of citizens of Portage la Prairie, and for the benefit of the city and the adjoining country.

FLOW OF WATER IN HOLLAND RIVER.

Mr. JOHN A. CURRIE asked:

1. Has the government caused to be made or received a report from any engineer on the flow of water per minute through the east branch of the Holland river, in the vicinity of Newmarket?

2. If so, what is the flow of water in cubic feet per minute over the weir at Newmarket?

3. Has the government any information or estimates of the number of lockages that can be made through the Newmarket branch of the Trent Valley waterways at Newmarket each day (a) at high water, (b) at low water?

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

1. Yes; during the summer of 1907, and throughout the summer and fall of 1908, gaugings were made once a week, by Mr. Kerr, divisional engineer, Newmarket, of the east branch of the Holland river, south of Newmarket.

2.—Summer and Fall of 1907.

Number of Readings.	Month.	Weir No. 1 Cu. ft. per M. Newmarket.	Weir No. 3 Cu. ft. per M.	Total Cu. ft. per M.
Mean of 2.....	July	321	348	369
" " 5.....	August	271	42	313
" " 5.....	September	508	146	654
" " 4.....	October	392	85	477
" " 4.....	November	697	188	885

On the 27th March, 1908, a gauging of the spring flood was made of the river south of Newmarket, and on the Boagertown branch the combined flow of the two streams amounted to about 139,000 cubic feet per minute.

Mr. Kerr has not sent in report for gaugings for year 1908.

3. (a) Lock at Newmarket, takes about 52,000 cubic feet of water for a lockage, and say fifteen minutes for a lockage would equal four an hour; so that the flood discharge of the river for one and a half minutes, will operate the Newmarket locks for one hour; (b) at low water the canal cannot be operated without storage reservoirs south of Newmarket, which must conserve the spring floods for use of navigation during the summer months.

In addition to main reservoirs, the level above each lock is designed to store a depth of two feet of water, above normal navigation level of six feet.

EXTENSION OF TRENT VALLEY WATERWAYS.

Mr. JOHN A. CURRIE asked :

1. Has the government caused any report and survey to be made of the proposed extension of the Trent Valley waterways from Lake Simcoe to the Georgian bay (a) by way of the valley of the Nottawasaga river, or (b) by way of the Severn river?

2. Is it the intention of the government to lay this report before the House? If so, when?

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

1. Yes. Surveys have been completed; but the plans in connection with the report, are not yet ready.

2. Yes, when the report is received and considered by the government.

DREDGE AT SELKIRK.

Mr. BRADBURY—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. What was the total amount expended in converting the snag boat at Selkirk into a dredge?

2. What was the total cost of the dredge as completed?

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1. $9,092.

2. $39,092.

POST OFFICE IN ELMWOOD, MAN.

Mr. BRADBURY—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Has any negotiation taken place to purchase a site for the proposed post office at Elmwood, Manitoba? If so, by whom, and has a site been purchased? If so, when, and what price?

2. Is it the intention of the government to proceed this spring with the construction of the post office at Elmwood?

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

1. (a) Yes.
   (b) Site purchased by Joseph Greenfield, superintendent of Dominion public buildings, Winnipeg.
   (c) 6th October, 1908.
   (d) $5,500.

2. It is not the present intention of the government to proceed this spring with the construction of the post office at Elmwood.

FORTIFICATIONS AT ESQUIMALT.

Mr. BARNARD asked :

1. Has any expenditure in connection with the naval station at Esquimalt been authorized by the government of Canada, or to the knowledge of the government of Canada, by the imperial government? If so, to what amount, and for what purpose?

2. How many guns were left by the imperial authorities at Esquimalt when the imperial troops were withdrawn from British Columbia?

3. Is the government aware that one or more of said guns are said to have been left lying unprotected from the weather for months beside the public highway leading from Victoria to Esquimalt?

4. What was the numerical strength of the imperial troops at Esquimalt immediately before they were withdrawn?

5. What is the numerical strength of the permanent corps at Esquimalt at the present time?

6. What is the numerical strength of the permanent corps at: (a) Halifax, (b) Kingston, (c) Quebec, (d) Toronto, (e) Winnipeg, (f) London?

7. What force is considered by the Militia Department to be of adequate strength to maintain and man the fortifications at Esquimalt?

8. What was the cost, for the last fiscal year, and upkeep of the permanent force at: (a) Halifax, (b) Quebec, (c) Kingston, (d) Toronto, (e) Winnipeg, (f) London?

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

1. This is confidential and cannot be given.

2. The same number of guns as were left at Esquimalt by the British government are, however, still there.

3. The guns are where they were placed by the imperial troops. Their future disposition has been arranged with the full concurrence of the Imperial War Office.

4. Approximately 350, but the department has no information as to the exact strength.

5. 142.

6. It varies considerably from time to time, but by the latest returns it is:

Halifax, 1,269 (This includes 69 civilians paid out of the vote for the permanent force).
Quebec, 363.
Kingston, 317.
Toronto, 262 (This includes 1 civilian paid out of the vote for the permanent force.
Winnipeg, 106.
London, 107.
Esquimalt, 142 (This includes 6 civilians paid out of the vote for the permanent force).

7. 152.

8. This cannot be precisely stated, for the cost of the active militia attached for instruction to the several schools cannot be separated from it, and further it is largely affected by the number of men stationed at each place at a given moment which fluctuates for various reasons, e.g.: recruiting. The expenditure at each station during last fiscal year was as follows:

(a) Halifax	$761,086 90
(b) Quebec	226,540 13
(c) Kingston	165,702 16
(d) Toronto	229,207 07
(e) Winnipeg	81,028 48
(f) London	75,545 58
(g) Esquimalt	103,052 50

I have added Esquimalt, as I suppose that information is desired.

WHARF AT WESTPORT.

Mr. JAMESON asked:

1. Has any portion of the appropriation voted at last session of parliament for the erection of a wharf at Westport, in the county of Digby, province of Nova Scotia, been expended? If so, what amount has been so expended?

2. If not, is it the intention of the government to proceed with the work? If so, when? If not, why not?

Mr. BARNARD.

3. Will the government advertise for tenders in connection therewith, and when?

4. What is the estimated cost of the proposed work?

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

1. No.

2 and 3. It is not the intention of the government to proceed with this work at present. It has not been thought prudent to engage at the present time upon such a large expenditure as the work would involve.

4. $33,000.

WHARF AT LITTLE RIVER, N.S.

Mr. JAMESON asked:

1. Has any portion of the appropriation voted at the last session of parliament for erection of a wharf at Little River, in the county of Digby, province of Nova Scotia, been expended? If so, what amount has been so expended?

2. If not, is it the intention of the government to proceed with the work? If so, when? If not, why not?

3. Will the government advertise for tenders in connection therewith, and when?

4. What is the estimated cost of the proposed work?

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

1. No.

2 and 3. It is not the intention of the government to proceed with this work at present. It has not been thought prudent to engage at the present time upon such a large expenditure as the work would involve.

4 $16,500.

MAGNETAWAN RIVER.

Mr. ARTHURS asked:

1. What sums have been expended on improvements to navigation of Magnetawan river above Kearney?

2. Has an estimate been made of the total cost of such improvements, and what is such estimate?

3. Is it the intention of the government to complete this work?

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

1. No expenditure.

2. Yes; $16,182.80, including the construction of a lock and dam.

3. It is not the intention of the government to proceed with this work at present.

RURAL MAIL DELIVERY BETWEEN THEDFORD, ARKONA AND PORT FRANK, ONTARIO.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. Has the government decided to establish rural mail delivery on the routes between Thedford, Ontario, and Arkona, and Thedford, Ontario and Port Frank?

2. If so, what is the cause of delay in establishing said routes?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (for Postmaster General):

1 and 2. An application was recently received at the department for the establishment of a rural mail delivery service between Arkona and Thedford, and has been referred to the proper officers for inquiry and report.

The department was also asked to establish a rural mail delivery service between Thedford and Port Frank, but on account of the courier refusing to undertake such service, tenders are now being invited for a new contract for the conveyance of the mails between the two terminal points, including the collection from and delivery to the rural mail boxes.

MAIL CONTRACTS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. Have any contracts for the carrying of mail, which expire in the month of April, 1909, been renewed without asking for tenders?

2. If any such tenders have been renewed, where are the routes situated, what is the price paid for carrying the mail, and what is the name of the carrier, and his place of residence?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (for Postmaster General). This information is so voluminous that I would suggest that the hon. gentleman's question stand as a notice of motion for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion for a return.

SWAN LAKE, INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. STAPLES asked:

1. Has the government consummated the purchase of any portion or portions of the Swan Lake Indian reserve in the province of Manitoba? If so, what portion or portions, and what was the consideration?

2. Has any of the land so purchased been sold? If so, to whom, at what price and on what terms?

3. If unsold, when is it the intention of the government to put it on the market?

4. Will it be sold by auction or otherwise, and on what terms and conditions?

5. Is it the intention of the government to throw open any or all of it for homesteading?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. On the 21st of January, 1908, the Swan Lake Band of Indians surrendered to the Crown 5,283 acres, comprising portion of the Swan Lake Indian reserve, No. 7, Manitoba, containing 2,880 acres, and Indian reserve 7A, in the province of Saskatchewan, containing 2,403 acres, which surrender was on the following conditions,—

(a). That the minimum price at which the Swan Lake lands are to be sold will be ten dollars per acre.

(b). That the minimum price at which the Battleford lands will be sold will be six dollars per acre.

(c). That the Indians' equity shall be considered as one-third of the price of the land.

(d). That the first payment to be made to the Indians at the time of formal surrender shall be equal to one hundred dollars to each soul of population.

(e). That the second payment, being balance of the one-third of equity, shall be paid as soon as sufficient funds are realized from the sale of the land.

(f). That the interest on the funded moneys placed to the credit of the Indians from the sale of these lands shall be paid to them on the per capita basis at the time of the annual treaty payments.

2. The land has not as yet been placed in the market.

3. It is the intention to place the land in the market at an early date.

4. It is the intention to sell in the usual way by public auction, terms of sale being one-tenth cash and the balance in nine equal annual instalments, with interest at five per cent.

5. No.

CONSTRUCTION OF DRY DOCKS.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

Are any negotiations in progress or have any proposals been made for construction or extension of dry docks under the provisions of the Dry Docks Subsidies Act of 1908? If so, by whom and at what places?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). The answer is: Yes, by the Vancouver Dry Dock and Shipbuilding Company, at Vancouver, B.C. In order that my hon. friend may not be misled by this. I may say that there were applications made to the government under the previous legislation, and it has been intimated that they will ask to come in under the new legislation, but no new proposals have been actually received except this one.

IMMIGRATION OF BRITISH SUBJECTS.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

1. How many immigrant British subjects, have been prevented from landing in Canada by reason of the provisions of the order in council passed on May 27, 1908, upon the authority of chapter 33 of the Act of last session?

2. How many immigrant British subjects, not coming from the country of which they are natives or citizens, and upon through tickets purchased there, have entered Canada as settlers since May 27, 1908?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. None.

2. 1,466.

INTENDING IMMIGRANTS PREVENTED FROM LANDING.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

1. How many persons have been prevented from landing in Canada by reason of the pro-

visions of the Order in Council of May 27, 1908, founded on chapter 33 of the Acts of last session?

2. Of what countries were they natives or citizens, specifying how many of each country?

3. How long in each case had they been absent from the land of their birth or citizenship?

4. From what countries or places did they come in each case?

5. Have any remonstrances or representations been made to the government on behalf of persons prevented from landing by the countries to which they belong or from which they embarked?

6. Will the government bring down and lay on the table of the House these documents, if there are any?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. 1,049.

2.

Australian	44
Croatian	23
Galician	4
Hungarian	8
Belgian	11
Bulgarian	45
French	3
German	16
Greek	10
Hebrew	37
Italian	588
Japanese	16
Polish	73
Roumanian	4
Russian	20
Finnish	6
Spanish	2
Swiss	6
Danish	3
Swedish	45
Norwegian	26
Armenian	7
Syrian	41
Not stated	11

3. Not recorded.

4. From the United States.

5. No.

6. See answer to No. 5.

PAYMENTS TO THE W. S. LOGGIE CO.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Wright—asked:

1. What amounts of moneys were paid during the years 1906, 1907 and 1908, to the W. S. Loggie Company, Ltd., in respect of contracts with the Department of Marine and Fisheries, the Department of Militia and Defence, the Department of Public Works, the Department of Railways and Canals, or the National Transcontinental Railway Commission?

2. What were the dates, and amounts of such payments, respectively and for what purposes?

3. Were all the supplies, or work for which such payments were made, let by tender, and to the lowest tenderer?

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

Mr. LENNOX.

Marine and Fisheries Department.

1. 1906-7 $129 42
   1907-8 788 32

2. W. S. Loggie Co., Ltd.

1906-7.

Aug.	16.	$62 00	Shippegan hatchery.
Oct.	9.	18 89	Shippegan hatchery.
Feb.	11.	48 53	fog-alarm, Escuminac.

1907-8.

June	12.	$ 83 68	Miramichi lightship.
"	18.	35 17	construction lights.
"	22.	12 00	meteor service.
Aug.	3.	4 60	maintenance light.
Oct.	3.	42 22	Shippegan hatchery.
"	24.	413 25	Escuminac fog-alarm.
Nov.	13.	45 90	Miramichi hatchery.
Dec.	9.	5 62	Miramichi buoy service.
"	20.	37 30	Sheldrake island light.
Jan.	18.	13 50	Miramichi hatchery.
Feb.	26.	94 58	Miramichi hatchery.

for purchase of lumber, hardware and various construction material.

3. No tenders were called for.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). The answer for the Department of Militia and Defence is as follows:—No payments have been made by the Department of Militia and Defence during the three years in question to the W. S. Loggie Company, Ltd.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). The answer for the Department of Public Works is as follows :—This company had no contracts with this department during the years mentioned.

MR. W. T. R. PRESTON.

Mr. GERMAN asked :

1. Has the Department of Trade and Commerce received any complaints from any Japanese board of trade in Japan, other than the foreign boards of trade, criticising Mr. W. T. R. Preston's work as Canadian Trade Commissioner?

2. Has the said department received any complaints against Mr. Preston or his work from any officials of the Japanese government?

3. Has the said department received any complaints against Mr. Preston or his work from any newspapers or trade papers published in Japanese?

4. Has the said department received any Japanese newspapers or opinions of Japanese complimenting Mr. Preston upon his work? If so, what is the nature of that?

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

1. No.

2. No.

3. No.

4. Yes. The statement is made by the 'Yorodzu Choho' of Tokio that Mr. Preston is a gentleman to whom the best thanks of all the Japanese are due and complimenting Mr. Preston upon two articles of his which appeared in the 'National Review.'

STEEL RAILWAY CARS.

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

Has the government had their attention drawn to the alleged fact, that in the railway wreck which took place only a few days ago on the Pennsylvania Railway in the Allegheny Mountains, where both the engines and wooden cars were crushed into a mass of ruins, that a steel Pullman car immediately behind the engine escaped without, as account states, a scratch? If so, is it their intention to make inquiry, and if true, introduce the use of steel cars on the Intercolonial Railway, so as to ensure the greater safety of life to the travelling public?

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

1. No. The government has not had its attention drawn to the wreck; but the experience had with the strongly built sleeping-cars has shown that they have gone through wrecks time and again, without injury. There is no doubt whatever that steel cars would have a higher resisting effect than wooden-framed cars ; but sufficient experience has not been had to reach any definite conclusions with regard to the same. The greatly increased cost of changing to the service of steel cars, however, will preclude the possibility of this being done for many years to come.

USURY ACT, 1908.

Mr. STAPLES asked :

1. How many persons were prosecuted under the Usury Act of 1908?
2. Under what clause or clauses were those prosecutions taken?
3. Who were the persons prosecuted, and what was the penalty enacted in each case?
4. What amendments, if any, have been made to the Act since 1906?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) : The answer is made in the supposition that the intention was to refer to the Money Lenders Act, 1906.

Prosecutions for offences against this statute form part of the administration of justice in the different provinces of the Dominion, and are entirely under control of the provincial authorities. This government is therefore not possessed of any information from which any statistics on the subject could be given. No amendment has been made to the statute.

MAIL AND STAGE ROUTES.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked :

What is the total number of existing mail and stage routes in Canada and the total number of miles covered by such routes?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). Owing to the time that will be involved in obtaining this information, it is requested that this question be allowed to stand.

TRADE WITH GERMANY.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. What means, if any, has the government taken to improve our trade relations with Germany?
2. What was the total exports of agricultural products to Germany from Canada in the year 1908?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. The answer was given to a similar question put by the hon. member last session, and which the hon. member will see in Hansard.
2. The total exports of agricultural products from Canada to Germany during the calendar year 1908 amounted to $551,920.

PRE-EMPTIONS AND HOMESTEADS.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. Between April 1 and December 31, 1908, what has been the total acreage sold as pre-emptions and purchased homesteads?
2. What total amount of money receivable by the government does this represent?
3. How much was paid in during the above mentioned period?
4. Approximately what quantity of agricultural land remains undisposed of within the surveyed area?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Pre-emptions—1,979,860 acres.
   Purchased Homesteads—99,279 acres.
2. $6,229,699.43.
3. $129,295.82.
4. 41,500,000 acres.

PROTECTION OF OUR COAST LINE AND SEAPORTS.

On the order:

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

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries asked me to notify him beforehand when this resolution would be taken up. If the Prime Minister sees no objection I would like to take it up on Thursday next.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is quite agreeable.

An hon. MEMBER. Do you mean to-morrow?

Mr. FOSTER. A week from to-morrow.

DEVELOPMENT OF OUR FISHERIES.

Mr. JOHN H. SINCLAIR (Guysboro) moved:

That in the opinion of the House it is advisable to appoint a Select Standing Committee of the House to deal with questions relating to Marine and Fisheries as they arise from time to time, and that the rules of the House be amended accordingly.

He said: Mr. Speaker; during the last session of this House I had the honour to move a resolution similar in its terms to the one I now propose, and while no opposition was offered, yet no action was taken to carry its purpose into effect. Of course, you will recollect that the government were so very much engaged during the last session, and the opposition were so very busy trying to get into power that my resolution necessarily did not receive that attention which its importance deserved. I trust, Sir, that I will have better luck this time and that some action will be taken by parliament to give effect to my proposal. I was very much interested in the speech of the leader of the opposition delivered in the House last Monday in favour of conserving our natural resources. That speech contained a great deal of valuable and useful information, and we will of course all agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) as to the vital necessity of conserving the natural resources of Canada. However, in the motion which I now place before the House I am not thinking so much about conserving natural resources as I am advocating the development of a great Canadian industry which has enormous possibilities for adding to the wealth and prosperity of our land. My idea is that it would be a great improvement over existing conditions if we should have a special Marine and Fisheries committee meeting year after year and devoting its labour and research to the development of the fishing industry of this country. There seems to be a growing tendency amongst all legislative bodies to relegate the general work of legislation to special committees which have opportunities for ascertaining the facts, considering them, tabulating them, and placing them before parliament so that parliament may consider the results, and take whatever action is needed, or that may be recommended. For example, 100 years ago there were only five select standing committees in the Congress of the United States, but as the country became larger, as new states were added, and as new interests arose the committees of Congress increased until during last session there were no fewer than 50 committees considering different questions.

They have such committees as that on elections, ways and means, appropriations, judiciary, banking and currency, coin and weights and measures, commerce, rivers and harbours, the merchant marine and fisheries. Thirteen members constitute this latter committee of congress which deals with all questions relating to the merchant marine and the fisheries. It was made a standing committee on December 21, 1887. They have also committees on agriculture, foreign affairs, military affairs, naval affairs, the post office and post roads, public lands, Indian affairs, territories, railways and canals, manufactures, mines and mining, public buildings and grounds, Pacific railroads, improvement of the Mississippi river, education, labour, militia, patents and so on, 50 committees in all to do the work of congress, which is apportioned to these various committees and tabulated and made ready for consideration by the House. In the Canadian parliament, as you are aware, we have ten select standing committees of this House, the committees on agriculture and colonization, banking and commerce, railways, public accounts and so on, all doing useful work. In Great Britain there is a committee on trade which under the rules of the imperial parliament, deals with questions relating to marine and fisheries. In the province of Nova Scotia, for 50 years prior to confederation, there was a select standing committee of the legislature of that province for the consideration of questions relating to the fisheries. This was also true, I believe, of Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick, I am not familiar with the practice of the other provinces. At the time of confederation, when all questions relating to the fisheries were handed over to the federal parliament, these committees were discontinued in these local legislatures and it is rather a remarkable circumstance that we have allowed fifty years of confederation to pass away without a select standing committee of this House to deal with questions relating to marine affairs or to our fisheries.

In raising this question last year I gave the House considerable information that I had collected showing the great importance of our fishing industry. I pointed out our immense coast line on the eastern shore of Canada being about 6,000 miles in length. Then we have also a very prolific fishing district on the western coast, and including the northern waters we have about 15,000 miles of coast line in this country. We have a great many people engaged in this great industry. In the province of Nova Scotia alone there are 25,000 men engaged in it. If you multiply that number by five, to include their families, you have about 125,000 persons, about one quarter of the whole population of our province directly dependent on the fishing industry. Taking all of the provinces of Canada we have about 76,000 men on our coasts making a living on the sea in this

way. If you include the men and boys and girls engaged in packing, there are about 88,000 in all, showing that a very large proportion of the population of Canada are engaged in this industry. A very large amount of capital is invested in the industry and the output each year amounts to something in the vicinity of thirty million dollars. The industry is only in its infancy. It is capable of great development. The two great requisites for the development of this industry are better transportation facilities and a better market.

The source of supply, the ocean, is inexhaustible; it is simply a question of putting the fish on the market in a proper way.

The present administration have done a great deal in that direction for which they should receive credit. They have provided a system of cold storage for bait which has done a great deal in Nova Scotia to assist the fishing industry. In former years it was very difficult in the spring to find bait for the fishing vessels. The bait visits the coast in the fall of the year and disappear in a few weeks. But by the present system it is preserved until the spring when it is ready for use and in that way the ships and fishing boats are able to fit out and go to sea and to work in the early part of the season which they could not do formerly. Then the present administration have done a great deal in the way of the propagation of fish along the coast, the propagation of lobsters for example, which is one of the most important branches of the industry. They have also given us better transportation facilities, they have given us an increased number of refrigerator cars and have placed a daily fast freight between Halifax and Mulgrave and Montreal. The train of course does not reach Montreal in a day but it leaves daily, it has a schedule time and we know it will arrive there in reasonable time. The express rate per hundred for carrying fish from Halifax or Mulgrave to Montreal has by this arrangement been reduced from $1.50 to 38 cents which has done a great deal to stimulate the industry in that direction. Then the government has done something in the way of subsidizing steamers to collect fish at points where the Intercolonial Railway touches the sea, which is also very important and at those points where the steamers have called the trade has expanded in much greater ratio than at other points where they have not these facilities. I believe that a great deal more can be profitably done in that direction. An expansion of this system would not only furnish business for the Intercolonial Railway but also develop this important industry along the coast. Then we have also had, as you know, a number of breakwaters and wharfs constructed along the shores of the maritime provinces all of which have been useful in the development of this great industry. The coast has been well lighted and buoyed during the last few years. All of these things are assisting but a great deal remains to be done. I am glad to see that the Department of Trade and Commerce has taken this matter up and shown some interest in it. I am also glad that the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) is showing an interest in this great question and that the government are continuing the good work they commenced some years ago. I submit that there is a great deal of work for this committee to do, and I feel sure that there will be no opposition to it on either side of the House. I shall therefore not take up more of your time but shall move the resolution which is in your hands.

Mr. C. JAMESON (Digby). Representing, as I do, a constituency the people of which are largely interested in the fishing industry, I cannot refrain from making a few observations with regard to this resolution. There is an impression throughout the country, I think I may go further and say there is a belief throughout the country, that the Department of Marine and Fisheries is in need of the services of a surgeon. I do not know how deeply that belief has penetrated this House, but the hon. gentleman who has moved this resolution, instead of suggesting the bringing in of a surgeon, has advised calling in a standing committee. Well, Mr. Speaker, standing committees are no doubt of great value. For instance we have a standing committee of this House on agriculture which has done excellent service, but the value of which is not perhaps always recognized, because notwithstanding the fact that the Standing Committee on Agriculture has done excellent work, we find that the different governments of the day have, each in its turn, from time immemorial, claimed all the credit for abundant harvests and leaving Divine Providence, the farmers and the Standing Committee on Agriculture out in the cold. My hon. friend who has moved this resolution, has made, it seems to me, a very excellent case for some change in the administration of the Atlantic fisheries. There can be no doubt that those fisheries are of the utmost value and capable of great development, but it is equally undoubted that they are not to-day in that flourishing condition they ought to enjoy and which, with better methods of administration, they would experience. I have no desire to occupy much of the time of the House, but I think it well, at this particular stage, to draw attention to the decrease in the number of those permanently employed in the Atlantic fisheries during the past quarter of a century. In doing this I

take, as the basis of my computation the number of persons to whom the bounty has been paid out of the funds set aside by the Dominion government for that purpose. It seems to me that such is the only true test to be applied in order to arrive at the actual number of those constantly engaged in that industry; and I find that these figures fall very much below these given in the Year-book from time to time.

In the year 1882 the total number of fishermen drawing bounties was 29,932. In Nova Scotia the number was 17,473. Eight years later—and I may say that I have divided the quarter of a century into three periods—in 1890 the number had increased to 39,050, being an increase of 9,118. In that year there were 20,673 fishermen employed in Nova Scotia who drew bounty, being an increase in that province alone of 3,200. In 1898 the number had fallen to 29,402, a decrease of 9,648; and in the province of Nova Scotia the number fell to 17,278, or a decrease, in that province alone, of no less than 3,395. In 1907 there was a further decrease. The total then stood at 25,920, showing a falling off of 3,482, while in Nova Scotia it stood at 13,917, or a decrease of 3,361. In other words, in less than 17 years, the total decrease in the number of drawing this fishing bounty was no less than 13,130, and in Nova Scotia alone no less than 6,756.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Has my hon. friend the figures showing the catch of fish in those years?

Mr. JAMESON. I have not the figures under my hand, nor do I think it possible to secure figures giving accurately the catch of fish in any statistical work published by the department. A great deal of what would be valuable statistical matter, if accurate, is obtained by the department from year to year, but I fear that in this connection very little importance can be attached to those statistics because they are not altogether reliable. The same condition prevailed in Great Britain a few years ago, and when it was brought to the attention of the particular board or department having charge of such matters, the suggestion was at first scoffed at that anything could be wrong in connection with the statistics published; but a most careful and complete investigation showed that these figures, published from year to year, were absolutely without value, and, upon the best information which I can obtain, the statistics regarding our Atlantic fisheries are to-day utterly valueless as giving any accurate idea of the total catch of fish or its market value. Let me point out one instance in which these returns are untrustworthy. A certain quantity of fish is caught and later on the fish is dried and exported as dry fish. The fishery officer comes along and asks each fisherman how many thousand pounds of green fish he has caught, and takes down his reply. Then he goes to the man who cures these fish and asks him how many cured fish he has handled during the year, and this man says so many thousand quintals. The fishery officer then adds the total of green and cured fish together, and thus, in many cases, double the quantity of fish actually caught is included in the total column. I am not saying that any particular blame attaches to the fishery officers or the department. The practice is one which has grown up and which is due more or less to the fact that it has been found very difficult indeed to get reliable information of this character. So that it is high time, if we are to make these statistics of any value to the country, that a careful revision of the work should be undertaken; and no better means for doing that could be found than this committee which my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) has suggested. The fact that there has been a decline in the fishing industry of the maritime provinces is one to which I wish to draw particular attention. That they are declining many of our fishermen are ready to admit and at least throughout Nova Scotia, our fishermen have for some time become alive to the fact that some change is necessary, if they are to get the most profit that can be had out of the fisheries. With that obect in view they have associated themselves together at the different fishing stations along the coast into organizations known as Fishermen's Unions. These unions meet together from time to time to discuss everything relating to their interests and frame resolutions. Then, annually or more frequently, delegates from these unions meet and endeavour to harmonize the resolutions which have been passed by the various local committees or unions and transmit them, perhaps I might say for the benefit of the department, at least I can say for the benefit of those concerned. In this connection, I wish to pay a tribute to the gentleman who was instrumental in having these unions organized and who, I was informed almost single-handed, carried through the legislature of Nova Scotia the Act under which they have come into existence. That gentleman is Mr. M. H. Nickerson, a member of the legislative assembly of Nova Scotia, sitting, I think, for the county of Shelburne.

There has been, throughout the province of Nova Scotia, an agitation on the part of many interested in the fisheries in favour of the creation of what is known as a fishery board, after the pattern of the board of that name which exists in Scotland. I am not personally inclined, with the information I have under my hand and with such study as I have been able to give to the work which the Scotch fishery board has carried into effect, to say that I would advise the creation of just such a board at this

moment but it is a fair subject for careful consideration. The conditions in Scotland differ very considerably from those in Canada with respect to the legislative status of the board. In Canada, we have the administration of the fisheries under a department of the government and the department should do practically what the fishery board might be expected to do, with the exception, perhaps, that the Fishery Board of Scotland is composed in part of men appointed to represent the fishermen themselves. That fishery board is composed of seven members, four representing the fishermen, one a legal adviser, one an expert, and the chairman. The chairman is the only one who receives a salary, the others getting only their travelling expenses. The object of the fishery board in Nova Scotia, if created, would be, briefly, to remove, if possible, the administration of the fisheries absolutely from the caldron of party politics. That, I think, is a condition which, gentlemen on both sides of the House will admit, is most desirable. Then, they would endeavour to devise and frame suitable regulations with respect to the fisheries and would see to the proper enforcement of these regulations. They would also establish a standard pack and package in connection with the fisheries. Some of the fish which are put up in Nova Scotia are not of as high quality as they might be, or as are put up in some other countries while some are of the very highest quality. This possibly, is owing to the fact that no standard of cure, or pack, or package, has ever been established. That course would necessarily be along educational lines, which would be most desirable, and could well be carried out through the medium of these fishermen's unions, to which I made passing reference a moment ago. Another object of the fishery board would be to seek wider and more profitable markets for the product of our fisheries. That is something most devoutly to be desired. As it is now, the ordinary fisherman has no market beyond the purely local one; but through the medium of these fishermen's unions some plan might be devised whereby a more co-operative work could be carried out, so that the fishermen would gain greater profit from his labour. And let me tell the hon. members of this House that the fishermen are worthy of the utmost consideration that can be bestowed upon them, and that any assistance that can be rendered them by the administration of the day or through the medium of this standing committee would be no more than they are properly entitled to. They are men who, day after day, and year after year, are obliged to go out, and, at the risk of their lives and property, endeavour to win a livelihood for themselves and their families from the turbulent sea. I know that in my own county there are a large number of men who are fishing throughout the entire year; and to prosecute the fisheries in the winter season on the rugged and blustery Atlantic coast or in the Bay of Fundy is certainly no child's play. The man who follows such a life needs a hardy frame, strong limbs, and the heart of a lion.

Now, I wish to refer, before closing, to a new feature which has developed in respect to the in-shore fisheries of certain parts of Nova Scotia and more especially within my own knowledge, to those of the western part of the province: that is, the doing away with the old-time sailboat and adopting in its stead the more noisy but more profitable vessel propelled by a gasolene engine. In a speech made in this House a year or two ago, in moving a motion similar to that now before the House, the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) said, or quoted from some writer who said, that the initial cost of embarking upon the inshore fisheries was comparatively insignificant, that all that was necessary was a boat, a few nets, or lines and hooks, and a tub of bait. Conditions have changed in the fisheries, as in almost everything else, and to-day, the fishermen who win their livelihood from the sea have to adopt modern methods and bring their appliances strictly up to date. The cost of a staunch and fairly roomy fishing boat now is much greater than it was even four or five years ago, because it must be made strong enough to carry the gasolene engine. Then, the cost of the engine itself is very considerable, and the expense of operating it amounts to from 25 to 50 cents a day. So, hon. gentlemen will see that the fishing which is prosecuted now throughout the entire year, entails a much greater expense to the individual who carries it on than when sailboats only were used. And the advantage, not only to the fishermen themselves, but to the country, is that in using these boats they can go out even against an adverse wind, and can get off at almost any time of the tide, and in that way many valuable days are saved and the fishermen are enabled to take advantage of the slack tide to ply their avocation, which they could not always do in the old-time sail boat.

In conclusion, I heartily endorse the motion of the hon. member for Guysborough in favour of the appointment of this committee. Perhaps I have trespassed unduly upon the time of the House in speaking as I have. As a new member, perhaps I am scarcely justified in occupying so much time. My apology for taking up the time of the House is the importance of this matter from the standpoint of the people of the county I represent, and of many other counties in the province of Nova Scotia. I trust it will be the aim of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House to unite in an earnest effort to put this industry upon the best possible basis, in order that the fishermen as

individuals, and the country generally, may benefit and prosper thereby.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). I wish to make a suggestion in connection with this motion. We have a good many committees in this House, and the members of those committees have a good deal to do. I think the moving of this resolution is a proper time to bring to the attention of the government and the House the need of a better distribution of the work between this House and the Senate. I believe the time has come when the Senate of Canada ought to be reorganized and be put in a position to take up some of the work that this House now has to perform. If that were done, instead of the Senate now being off on a holiday for a month, they would be discussing fishery questions, they would take up the question of the conservation of the natural resources of this country, they would take up the bankruptcy matter, which was before them some years ago, and which they handled very well. While I have every sympathy with this motion, and would like to see a committee of this House appointed to deal with the question involved, I desire also to say that this House, and perhaps the other House—because I believe they are ready to consider the question as a co-ordinate branch of parliament—should unite in a reorganization, so that the Senate may take up some of these great public questions and deal with them, and thus relieve this House of some of the work it has now to undertake. This House has at present a great deal to do, probably it has more than we can do, and do it as well as it ought to be done. So I take occasion to suggest to the government, not only the consideration of this motion, but the consideration of some plan by which the work would be distributed between the two Houses to the advantage of the performance of public business.

Mr. A. B. CROSBY (Halifax). The motion introduced by my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) is one of great interest to me as a member from the maritime provinces. The question he has discussed whether we shall have a standing committee of this House to deal with questions relating to Marine and Fisheries. The arguments advanced by the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson) afford a strong reason why we should have such a committee. Such a committee would relieve this House from considerable work and discusion that now devolve upon it in relation to these matters, and would undoubtedly be able to give to them better and more consideration than single members of the House could do. The hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) has suggested an argument for this committee that I had not thought of before, and that was that the Senate had adjourned no doubt to go a fishing because they had nothing else to do, and if such a committee were formed, some of them might find something to do in connection with it. When you travel along the shores of the province of Nova Scotia—and I am now speaking in the presence of hon. gentlemen who are acquainted with the facts—you will frequently come to a fishing district which, some years ago, was very prosperous, whereas the district is now more or less depleted. You will understand of course that I am now speaking of the shore fisheries. You would probably find some empty houses in the district, whose former occupants, the fishermen, have gone to town or somewhere else. When you go through an interior county and find a farmhouse without a tenant, you make up your mind that the farmer has gone somewhere else, and that the soil is not being tilled. So it is with the shore fishermen. I do not blame this on the government, but I do say, as the hon. member for Guysborough has said, that it is time we had a committee of this House to which matters of that kind might be referred. I have no desire to disparage the manner in which the fisheries are administered by the Marine and Fisheries Department, I do not mean to say that anything has been left undone by the department that should have been done, because I presume they are doing all they possibly can. Nevertheless, our shore fisheries are becoming less every year, and I could say a great many things in relation to that question which might perhaps not be pertinent to the motion before the House. Now my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Jameson) said that a fisheries board was required. I think every hon. member of this House has received some resolutions or a report of some gentlemen in the east who are interested in the fishing industry, and who wish to form a fisheries board. I think this also is a matter that could well be referred to such a committee as has been suggested. I do not wish to be understood as saying that the fishing industry generally of Nova Scotia is less prosperous than it has been, but the shore fisheries have certainly become almost a thing of the past, but I may say especially with regard to that good old county of Lunenburg, that were it not for the deep sea fisheries that have been carried on and developed by the good people of that county, our Nova Scotia fisheries generally would not make as good a showing as they do make to-day. Any one who is acquainted with the shore fisheries and with the deep sea fisheries, and can make a distinction between them, will recognize that while the fisheries generally have increased greatly during the last twenty or twenty-five years, the increase in our deep sea fisheries has been very good, but not what it should have been. I do not mean to say that last year was better

than the previous year, because variations are sometimes caused, not only by the condition of the fisheries, but by the way the returns are made, and the lack of good luck that happens to deep sea fishermen. Our deep sea fisheries have increased by leaps and bounds in the last twenty-five years ; but our shore fisheries—and by shore fisheries I mean those which are worked within the three mile limit by what we call boat fishermen—that industry I am sorry to say has decreased in Nova Scotia, and that is an industry that we should strive in every way to revive and develop. We talk about our great valuable lands in the west, and we are proud of them. We talk about the development of these lands, and we are proud of it, and are determined to do everything we can to promote that development. But even if you were to do nothing with those lands and let them lie uncultivated, they would still be there just the same. But if you fail to help and assist the shore fishermen, if you allow the shore fisheries to die out, it will be very difficult indeed to re-establish them in the position we have seen them occupy. I think therefore that the appointment of such a committee as is proposed will be a step in the right direction

The cold storage matter has also been referred to, and I congratulate the government on having carried on the cold storage system. But a great deal yet remains to be done, that system is not yet doing all we expected it to do, it is not giving all the accommodation that the government no doubt expected it would give. Now one of the ways by which we can help that system is to appoint a committee who will consider matters relating to cold storage. Cold storage is intended to provide bait for the shore fishermen as well as for the deep sea fishermen. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that any further argument is required to show why such a committee should be appointed, after we have heard the strong arguments advanced by the hon. member for Guysborough. I think this House should have no hesitation in appointing such a committee and I am sure that this industry, which is of very great importance to us and of paramount importance to the Dominion of Canada, will be benefited by the appointment of this committee. This resolution takes a long step in the right direction and I trust this House will have no hesitation in passing the resolution of my hon. friend from Guysborough.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Lunenburg). Mr. Speaker, when a resolution similar to the one now on the Order Paper was discussed last year it met, if I remember correctly, with favour from my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) and, I think, from my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), as well as others. I think that the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and his followers also concurred in the resolution. Unfortunately, however, it evoked some lengthy discussion, which, I think, occurred on a Wednesday sitting. When six o'clock arrived some hon. member was on his feet discussing the resolution and he unfortunately moved the adjournment of the debate which placed the resolution at the foot of public orders and it was never reached again during the session. I am very glad that the remarks made by all the other speakers to-day have been very brief and to the point, and I desire to say that my observations will not unnecessarily prolong the debate as I would like very much to see this resolution carried before six o'clock. Before giving a few reasons why I think this committee should be appointed, I wish to say that my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Jameson), presented some statistics which I think were intended to give to the House the idea that because there were in recent years a lesser number of applicants for fishing bounties in the province of Nova Scotia there was a reduction in the total value of the fish taken in these waters. I do not think that is correct. I do not wish to provoke any discussion upon the value of our statistics, but I want to say to my hon. friend that in recent years the statistics regarding the number of applicants for fishing bounties have been far more reliable than they were in the years to which my hon. friend referred. The fishing industry is doubtless a great asset. I think that even we who come from the maritime provinces are apt to overlook its great value. We are apt to think of the great agricultural resources of the west, of the mineral resources and of the timber resources of our country, but we should remember that we take, I think, according to statistics, fish from the seas to the value of $40,000,000. I agree with the hon. member for Digby that there is a necessity for better statistics relative to our fisheries. If I remember correctly last year the value of the fisheries, according to the blue-book issued by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, was about $38,000,000. I think these figures considerably underestimate the value of our fisheries. There is this to be remembered concerning our fisheries: While we are taking annually fish to this great amount from the seas, exporting them to foreign countries and bringing back to Canada coin or some other valuable returns, we are not necessarily depleting our fisheries. We all know that the constant production of crops from the soil lessens its value and productivity and that if we cut down our timber resources it takes considerable time for the timber to reproduce itself. Without any expense on the part of the government our fishermen can go to the waters surrounding this country and take from them fish to a

very considerable value which adds very much to the national wealth. I wish to give just a few reasons why I think this committee should be appointed and I just wish to refer to four or five matters which I think this committee should deal with. If the committee is appointed I have not the slightest doubt that the work which it will do will be proof of the wisdom of its appointment. A year or two ago I discussed the treaty of 1818 between Great Britain and the United States of America which related principally to the north Atlantic fisheries. On that occasion I took particular pains to discuss a feature of the treaty of 1885, I think the treaty of Washington, which established what is called the modus vivendi and which permits American fishermen certain rights, which rights are prohibited to them in the treaty of 1818. On that occasion I found that the Prime Minister, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, a great many of my colleagues from the province of Nova Scotia, and a great many members of the House, were of the opinion that the people of this country did not wish to abrogate the modus vivendi clause of this treaty. I thought it was a great mistake to have ever given these privileges to the United States, and I was always very much surprised that that very eminent statesman, Sir Charles Tupper, should have consented to these privileges being granted However, they were granted and they have been continued by this government since they came into power in 1896. If I appeared before the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or before any member of the government, or before the Governor in Council, and ask for a revocation of the modus vivendi, I probably would be asked to give reasons for it. I probably would be asked the question if the people of my province desire the revocation of these privileges. It would be very difficult for me to answer that question. As far as my own county is concerned I could answer that question very quickly in the affirmative, I could say the same concerning many other counties in the province of Nova Scotia, but in some counties there would be some opposition to it. I think it is very important that the government should know what is the opinion of the people of the maritime provinces on this question. We should summon before that committee men competent to give evidence on this question and have it made a matter of public record. The other day my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) was called to Washington to act in conjunction with a representative of the Newfoundland government to prepare a case for reference to the Hague tribunal during the present year. I have no doubt that the interests of Canada and the interests of the maritime provinces in particular were well safeguarded by the Minister of Justice, but he has very little information which he can gather in the Department of Marine and Fisheries concerning this question, and I think that if we had had considerable evidence from people who understand the operation of the modus vivendi clause of this treaty in the blue-book, it might have been very valuable to the Minister of Justice the other day at Washington. Last year we had some legislation regarding the Norwegian coasting trade in Canada. I understand that under some old treaty and under some order in council passed by the Canadian government, Norwegian vessels were permitted to engage in the coasting trade in Canada. When the resolution came up before the House of Commons last session very few men in this House were in a position to give an intelligent vote upon that measure. It is true there were some gentlemen in the House who had given some attention to it, but it was largely a one-sided expression of opinion that came from them. There was a great deal to say for and against the abrogation of that order in council. Now I say had that committee been in existence last year we might have had some representatives of those who wished to continue this order in council and we could have summoned representatives of those who were opposed to the further continuance of the order in council. In this one respect, such a committee could have done valuable service for this country and it might have contributed very much to the enlightenment of hon. gentlemen on that measure.

We heard the complaint made year after year that our Canadian shipping is decreasing and so it is. It is difficult to see what the remedy for that is, but a remedy there may be, and a committee to which would be specially delegated matters relating to Marine and Fisheries could very properly summon to Ottawa gentlemen who are capable of giving expert opinion in reference to the decay of our shipping interests, and making suggestions which might tend to revive and develop it. Another important question is that with reference to steam trawl fishing. In our Atlantic waters, fishing operations are carried on by steam trawlers which come from France. These steam trawlers ply out of two or three ports and in many of the other fishing ports of France there is considerable opposition to this mode of fishing. In certain parts of Nova Scotia it is a very live issue. I hear many complaints from fishermen in my own county who suffer injury to their nets and trawls by the operation of these French steam trawlers. This is a question which has engaged the attention of the British government for many years and they have appointed one or more commissions, but I suppose like all other questions there are two sides to it. However, it is high time that the Department of Marine and Fisheries should take this

question up for consideration. It would be a very easy matter, if this committee were constituted, to summon persons who are acquainted with this mode of fishing and ascertaining their best judgment as to whether steam trawl fishing is injurious or otherwise. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson) spoke of the appointment of a fishery board. No doubt there is a great deal to say in favour of the appointment of such a board, and there is something to be said against it. That also is a question on which this committee might advise the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and his officers. There are many gentlemen in Nova Scotia who have given a great deal of attention in recent years to this question, and I am sure they would be glad to come before such a committee and give valuable information. On many occasions this government and preceding governments have appointed commissions to travel through the country in order to ascertain the views of the people upon lobster fishery regulations and other questions concerning our fishing industry. My experience of these commissions is, that while they visit a great many sections of the country and examine a great many witnesses and present a report to the department, the evidence taken is generally so voluminous that it is not, and indeed cannot be read by members of parliament or by anybody else. I doubt very much if even the officials of the department can afford the time to acquaint themselves with the details of the evidence taken by these commissions. In my opinion a special committee of this House would do better work in connection with many of the questions, do it more expeditiously, and at less cost, and give more practical results. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I express the hope that the committee called for by this resolution shall be appointed, and I doubt if amongst all our select standing committees there can be found one which can do more excellent work than this committee would be capable of doing. I am sure such a committee will prove a very valuable aid to the Minister of Marine, to his department, to the officials, to every member of the House of Commons, and to the country generally.

Mr. GEORGE W. KYTE (Richmond, N.S.) I desire, Mr. Speaker, to say a word or two by way of supplementing what has been said by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. McLean). I can assure you, Sir, that it is with great interest I have listened to the discussion which has been promoted by the resolution moved by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). In this parliament we are called upon, from time to time, to deal with great questions; questions in which are involved the prosperity and the happiness of our people, but in my opinion no more important question than the one now under consideration could be submitted to us. I was very much edified by the speech of the hon. gentleman who moved the address in reply to His Excellency's speech at the opening of parliament. I was much pleased that he gave such prominence to the agricultural industry as one of the great sources of our national wealth, nor do I think that the hon. gentleman over-stated the importance of that industry, but, Sir, the vast importance of the fishery industry of Canada must not be forgotten by this parliament. I think I may fairly conclude from the tenor of the speeches of hon. gentlemen that there is no controversy as to the propriety of adopting this motion. I take it for granted that the consensus of opinion is that a committee such as that proposed is a proper insitution to add to the existing organization of the House of Commons, and that being so it is perhaps not necessary for me to prolong the discussion. But, Sir, may I have your permission to make one or two observations with respect to the statement made by the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson) to the effect that the fisheries of Nova Scotia are declining. I am not disposed to accept that as a fact. I believe that the changed conditions which undoubtedly do exist in respect to our fisheries are not due at all to their depletion, but rather to change in the methods of prosecuting the industry. We must not forget that many years ago the most remunerative return from the fisheries of the maritime provinces accrued from the salt fish. Forty or fifty years ago there was a large and remunerative market for salt fish, but from year to year that market has dwindled, until to-day the necessity has arisen for the fishermen of the maritime provinces placing the products of their industry upon the markets of the world in the form of fresh fish.

I believe that there are great opportunities of development in this country that can keep the fishing industry quite apace with all possible demands which may be made upon it by reason of the increased population of the western provinces. The government are each year spending large sums of money to induce immigrants to occupy the fertile plains of the west, and are building railways to afford these people railway accommodation and such means of transportation as will give them the best possible facilities for the handling of the products of their labours. One of the most important of all the duties which this committee would be called upon to discharge would be to consider that very question of transportation. We are face to face with the fact that the fishermen of the maritime provinces are not able to send the products of their industry into the centres of population throughout Canada and as a consequence the fishing industry is not as remu-

nerative for them as it otherwise might be. I do hope that one of the first matters to be taken into consideration by this committee is that very question of transportation, in order to see if we cannot devise some means by which the fresh fish of Nova Scotia can be sent forward to Ontario, Quebec and the west with that facility with which the manufactured goods and the flour of Ontario and western Canada are sent into the maritime provinces. The interchange of commodities spoken of some thirty or forty years ago as likely to arise from the construction of the Intercolonial Railway has not taken place with that plenitude that the supporters of confederation at one time hoped for. I am rather inclined to think that the balance of trade has been altogether against the maritime provinces; the people of Ontario and Quebec, enterprising as they are, have got rather the best of us in the matter of trade, and while they have sent down hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of their manufactured products into the maritime provinces they have taken very little from us except the actual money paid for the purchase of their goods.

It is upon the natural resources of the maritime provinces that we must rely to make up that interchange of commodities which should exist between the eastern and western provinces. We do send some coal into Quebec and a very small portion into Ontario, but apart from that item we send scarcely anything into western Canada or into the great central provinces. The question of transportation is the obstacle which has retarded the development of the increase which I have suggested, and I am firmly of the opinion that that condition might be ameliorated if this question of transportation were taken up and the products of the fisheries of the maritime provinces were given a special rate by which they would be able to reach the populous centres of Canada.

I have said that the apparent decline in the fisheries of the maritime provinces is not due to the depletion of that industry but rather to a change of conditions. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson) referred to the fact that in western Nova Scotia the sail boat is largely disappearing and the fishermen are resorting to gasolene boats for the prosecution of their industry. I must confess that I am not sufficiently familiar with the customs regulations on that point, but as the time has come when it is absolutely necessary for the fishermen of the maritime provinces to prosecute their calling by gasolene boats rather than by the ordinary sail and row boats, the purchase of these engines is going to amount to a considerable item to the fishermen. The Minister of Customs might then well consider if he cannot find his way clear to reduce to some extent at least the duty on gasolene engines which will hereafter become an actual necessity for the fishermen of this country.

The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean) referred to another question which is of vital importance to the people of the maritime provinces, that of the coasting privileges enjoyed by vessels flying a foreign flag. That question was to some extent settled, I understand, by an order in council passed some six or seven months ago, but there are, it appears to me, other questions involved in that which may well occupy the attention of this House and the appointing of a committee as suggested this afternoon would simplify to my mind a great many of the difficulties that would be encountered were we obliged to present these questions to the full House. I do not imagine for a moment that the people who are engaged in the fishing industry of Canada are less capable of prosecuting their calling than they were in the past. I am convinced that were the opportunities given to them and were the changed conditions which have come about in the last twenty years in relation to that industry, simplified and made easier for them by means of such legislation and such acts of co-operation as this parliament can bring about, the shore fisheries of the maritime provinces would be as profitable as ever they were.

To illustrate this point, let me say that in the last season the fishermen of the maritime provinces, or of Nova Scotia at all events, enjoyed the satisfaction of getting the greatest amount of shore fish that they have taken in any season during the last forty years. The catch of mackerel in Nova Scotia far exceeded that of any other year and naturally we would be inclined to the opinion that last year was a most profitable year for the fishermen. I regret, however, to have to say that the very contrary was the case. The fishermen of Nova Scotia, not having markets or means of transportation available which would enable them to send their fish fresh into such markets as purchase fish in that condition, lost a large proportion of their catch by reason of being unable to cure them; and when they cured them they lost a great proportion of their profit by reason of the falling market resulting from the large catch in eastern Nova Scotia. Thus we come back to the great question of transportation, which after all is the one affecting the price of fish to our people and I would be glad indeed if this committee, if appointed, would take into consideration that question, which transcends, I believe, all others affecting the prosperity of our fishing population.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North). Mr. Speaker, representing as I

do a very large body of fishermen in the maritime provinces, and as almost all of the members of this House who represent fishing counties have spoken, it would probably be regarded as indifference on my part if I allowed this opportunity to pass without saying something on behalf of the large body of fishermen in my county. At the outset, let me congratulate the hon. gentlemen who are new members in this House, like myself, who have spoken on this question, particularly the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) who has just taken his seat, upon the very excellent presentation of his case and of his own abilities as a representative which he has made in this House. The same would apply to my hon. friends, the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Crosby) and the member for Digby (Mr. Jameson). The only little cloud upon the horizon in the remarks of my hon. friend from Digby was the introduction of party politics into this matter. That was not at all necessary and did not add at all to the strength of his argument.

Mr. JAMESON. What politics did I introduce?

Mr. McKENZIE. I refer to my hon. friend's statement at the outset that it was very necessary to perform a surgical operation on some part or limb of the Marine and Fisheries Department. He almost provoked me into saying that possibly an operation might be beneficial somewhere else just as well. But leaving that point—and I have no other fault to find with the observations of the hon. member—and possibly his introduction of politics to the extent he did was because he may have thought it necessary to stamp himself clearly and distinctly so as to show to which side of the House he belonged, and we know that some of the men in the colony opposite might be charged with supporting the Opposition while they are supporting the Government—let me say that although I may be called a new member, I was in this House a little while once before, and had then the opportunity of saying something very much along the lines of the remarks made by the hon. gentleman who has moved this resolution (Mr. Sinclair) and I wish to express my endorsation of what he said. My hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Jameson) has given much credit, and with perfect truth, to Mr. Nickerson, member of the local House for the county of Shelbourne, for what he has done to improve the condition of our fishermen. But let me tell my hon. friend that I was also in the local House at that time and so was my hon. friend who moved this resolution (Mr. Sinclair), and the first time that Mr. Nickerson ever appeared as a member of a committee appointed to deal with fishery matters, was upon a committee moved for by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). Yet it would almost appear, from the remark of the hon. member from Digby that Mr. Nickerson had to fight a battle in the local House in order to get such concessions for the fishermen of Nova Scotia as they were entitled to and in order to bring their case before the public. My experience in the local House does not bear out that contention. I always found that the members of that House were ever willing to do whatever they could in behalf of any industry in the maritime provinces or in any part of Canada which could be benefited by anything our local legislature could do. I would not like to charge any member with a desire to do otherwise than promote to the best of his ability any industry in this country which might tend to the general welfare and add to the comfort and wealth of the people. The consensus of opinion expressed to-day in favour of the resolution before us would bear out that remark. I do not think that we have to expect from either side other than the fullest and best assistance in all such matters. As regards this resolution, it is not necessary that I should say anything in its behalf because there is only one side to it. No one can question that the case is a strong one and that the fishing industry is most important and if the appointment of the committee is going to aid the further development of that industry there can be no possible objection. So far as the county I have the honour to represent is concerned, I may say that we catch more fish on the coast of Victoria county than possibly in any other county in the Dominion, and we enjoy the reputation of making the best cured fish that can be procured in the maritime provinces. There is a gentleman in Halifax, whose name I do not recall at the moment, who last year was called upon to gather for some people in the United States a large quantity of first-class fish. I am proud to say that he found more of the high grade fish he required along the northern part of Victoria county than in any other part of the maritime provinces. I agree with my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte) that it is not the Department of Marine and Fisheries alone which can assist in developing this great industry. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries and his department have done much, as has been pointed out by my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), but the Department of Railways can also come into play in this matter. That department can do a good deal in furnishing the proper kind of cars fitted for this industry, and we look to it to furnish first-class cars and give us such rates as will enable us to place our fish in the markets of central Canada and incidentally in some of the markets further west and also in the United States. The Department of

Public Works can also do much to help out the fishermen, especially along the exposed coast in Nova Scotia, and in that connection our position is perhaps not as well understood by some of our members from the west as it ought to be. We find that our fish are taken away from our very doors by Americans who are better equipped than we are, and with whom we cannot compete successfully on account of our lack of harbour facilities and of large vessels and boats. The consequence is that American schooners come from Boston and other places along the coast right up to the edge of the three-mile limit and sometimes within that limit, and catch our fish and carry it to the United States markets and sell it there whence it often finds its way back to Canada and is sold in Toronto and Montreal and other large centres. That is the condition of things which exist to-day, and it does not require any argument to point out how much better it would be to have our fish caught by our own people, along our coast, and carried directly to our own markets and sold to our own people. Our fishermen would then get better prices than they can to-day, even when they sell to Americans and our consumers would get fresher fish at less prices. It will therefore be necessary for the Public Works Department to spend some money in giving us harbours of refuge at different places and thus enable our fishermen to compete with the Americans who have larger vessels and are in a better condition to catch fish. I cordially endorse what my hon. friend from Richmond has said to the effect that wherever possible we should do something for our fisheries, by lowering the customs duties, particularly upon their nets or engines or whatever else enters into that industry, and in every other possible way. I may say in conclusion that I agree entirely in the observations of the different gentlemen who have addressed the House in this matter. I did not rise for the purpose of making out a case because that was made out by the mover of the resolution, and the case required only to be stated to the House in order to make it clear that whatever we can do to carry forward this great industry should be done by the government with the assistance of every hon. member of this House.

Mr. J. W. MADDIN (Cape Breton South). Mr. Speaker, I deem it my duty to take part in this debate and to express my approval of the resolution as moved by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). I agree with some of the speakers who have preceded me that the fishing industry in Nova Scotia has decayed to some extent of late years, and that this is true of the fisheries of the whole Atlantic sea-board of Canada. A number of causes have contributed to the decadence of this industry, most of which have been enumerated by the speakers who preceded me. But I would suggest that one reason why the fisheries of Nova Scotia, and the maritime provinces generally, are not prosecuted more closely than they have been of late years is to be found in the local conditions obtaining in the fishing villages. The social conditions and environment are so different from those of other parts of the province that there are but slight inducements to the rising generation to remain in these fishing villages. For instance, I would call the attention of the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) to the fact that there are a large number of fishing villages on the Atlantic sea-board in which they have only one mail a week. Cut off from railway facilities, from telegraph and telephone lines, these places are so isolated, so cut off from society, that there is but little to attract the rising generation to continue to live in them and prosecute the fisheries. I agree with the speakers who have preceded me on both sides in approving this resolution. I believe a committee such as is proposed, will have a far-reaching effect in restoring conditions in connection with the fisheries of the maritime provinces. And, if the scope of this committee is made wide enough, and its inquiries go far enough, they may develop a number of causes that have led to the conditions now existing and that are not generally known to the members of this House or to the people of this Dominion. It was only a matter of eighteen months ago that I counted 31 American schooners fishing off the coast of my county in broad daylight and well within the three mile limit, and no gunboat there to protect the interests of the people of Nova Scotia. It is pretty well known that a large percentage of the mackerel catch of the Gloucester fleet around our coast are taken within the three mile limit. And it is well within the knowledge of some members of this House that a vessel loaded to the hatches with mackerel, caught within two miles of the shore was taken to the port of Halifax, and that, after the vessel had lain there two or three weeks, her owners paid $400 and she was released. Our law is clear on this subject. If that vessel was guilty of infringing our law both cargo and vessel should have been seized and confiscated, but if she was not guilty, both should have been released without penalty. There are American capitalists who would readily capitalize companies to-morrow to come within our three-mile limit, deplete our inshore fisheries, and load their vessels to the hatches with mackerel, if they could do it on paying a fine of $400. Then, if I may, I would bring to the attention of the House the question of license for the packing of fish. In the province of Nova Scotia, I believe, the whole catch of the lobster fishery is packed by ten or twelve concerns. Under the con-

ditions that exist, whilst the fishermen are paid a certain amount per pound live weight, they are not informed with regard to market values of the packed article and so do not know what value to put upon their catch. I am at a loss to know, and should be glad to be informed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or any hon. member of this House, why it is that a man who catches lobsters cannot come ashore and can them as he dries his codfish or pickles his herring or mackerel. Why so important an industry as lobster packing should be a monopoly in the hands of ten or twelve people who are enabled to get a license to pack the catch is a matter wholly beyond me. With regard to the other aspect of the question, the social conditions in the fishing villages, this might be helped by daily mail services, and this is a subject that the Postmaster General might take up in the broad manner which has characterized him in other things. I do not wish to approach this question in a partisan spirit or drag politics in. I well believe that it is the desire of the Postmaster General to facilitate the mail service and to grant services as far as possible. If he would take into consideration the claims of the fishing villages in the isolated parts of the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick—and perhaps in the province of British Columbia for all I know—it would go a long way to make the homes in these villages more attractive to the young people and so induce them to remain. I strongly endorse this resolution of the hon. member for Guysborough, believing that it will result in good to those who go down to the sea in ships and brave the perils of the deep, who are such an important class to the Dominion of Canada, and who at great danger to themselves are contributors in no small measure to the wealth of Canada on both the Atlantic and Pacific sea-boards.

Mr. W. S. LOGGIE (Northumberland, N.B.) It seems to me that we have wandered far over this resolution, and that we have discussed the merits of the fishing industry more than the merits of the resolution itself. I may add, however, that there can be no question that the problem of transportation is so intertwined with that of the fishing industry, that if anything can be done to improve transportation it certainly would be in the interest not only of the producers but of the consumers of fish in Canada. It seems to me that Ontario and Quebec should consume more of our eastern fish than they do. It is to be regretted that fish coming from the American sea-board should be brought in under duty and consumed by the cities of Toronto and Montreal instead of their bringing in fish from Halifax or other sea-board towns in Canada. In my own county, the urgent matter is transportation.

For example, a petition has been presented to the government asking them to build a branch line along the Miramichi river, and along the sea coast, a coast where large quantities of smelts are at present taken and during the summer season large quantities of Atlantic salmon. These fish, during the winter season, have to be teamed about twenty miles to the nearest Intercolonial railway station, and then, if they are to be sent off in a fresh condition, must be sent by express. I want to say that the express rates, although they are lower than in former years, are still too high, and if anything can be done to bring about a reduction in the express charges on fresh fish. I believe it would be in the interest of all concerned, of the consumer as well as of the producer. It seems to me that if the committee suggested in the resolution can assist in any way to bring that about it would certainly do some good. It is really singular that now we seem to be united on the importance of this resolution, and yet parliament has been discussing the management of the Marine and Fisheries more or less for the last forty years without action in this regard. Judging from the expressions we have heard from both sides, we wonder why a committee of this nature was not heretofore appointed. I certainly think it would be in the interest of the country at large that it should be appointed at once.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John City). I did not anticipate making any remarks on this resolution, but after hearing the statements that have been made by hon. gentlemen on both sides, I feel that I cannot allow the opportunity to pass without saying a word or two. I have great pleasure indeed in supporting the resolution which has been brought before the House by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). Although I come from a part of the country where the inhabitants are perhaps not so deeply interested in fishery questions as they are in Nova Scotia, still I can say that the fisheries of the Bay of Fundy are very valuable, and should be preserved and developed. We have there, on both sides of the bay, both on the Nova Scotia side and the New Brunswick side, very valuable fisheries indeed. The regulations that have been framed, I was going to say enforced, but I cannot go that far—the regulations of the Marine Department in regard to bay fishing, and inshore fishing, and river fishing are not carried out. I have heard it stated over and over again that the fishery overseers find it almost useless to prosecute men for breaking the regulations, because as soon as a man is reported, influence is brought to bear in his favour, the fine is remitted, and the fishery officer is discouraged from doing his duty. A great deal of that is done. I

think that if a special committee such as proposed by this resolution were appointed to look into these matters, and were given some measure of control, the regulations of the department would be better carried out. Several other important matters in connection with the fisheries have been brought up this afternoon. There is the curing of fish, and the packing of fish. I understand from a little booklet that has been distributed among the members that the packing of fish in the maritime provinces is very badly done, that there is no standard package, that the packages leak, and the fish put into them are allowed to deteriorate in quality; the packages are not tight enough and strong enough, and the brime leaks out to the consequent damage of the fish. These are some of the important matters that such a committee might look after. Then there is the matter of dynamiting fish. I saw in the press the other day that some American fishermen were driven off from some of our inland waters for dynamiting fish. I may say, although I have heard it contradicted in this House, that the inland waters of Canada are not the only waters on which dynamiting takes place. I have myself, when sailing on the Bay of Fundy, heard shots fired by persons who were dynamiting fish. This is something that ought to be looked into, along with the other matters I have mentioned.

Then there is the matter of the dogfish nuisance which has several times engaged the attention of this House. Last year I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was presented with a petition from the Board of Trade of St. John, who were requested to do so by a large number of fishermen residing on the Bay of Fundy, the petition dealing with the Dogfish Reduction Works. A copy of it was put into my hands, and I took the trouble to communicate with several persons whom I thought would be able to give me some information as to the success or non-success which was attending the establishment of these reduction works. I will ask the House to listen while I read some of the communications I have received. They are from practical men, and would be of value in a consideration of this subject. The first letter I wrote was to A. H. Whitman, of Canso, N.S., whose name I think the minister will remember, and I am sure the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) is acquainted with it. I asked my correspondents to reply to the following questions:

1. Are the reduction works an advantage to the fishermen? If so, in what way?

2. Is the price paid for dogfish fair and reasonable?

3. Do the establishment and use of the reduction works have any effect in diminishing the numbers of dogfish?

Mr. DANIEL.

I will first read Mr. Whitman's letter, which is signed by A. H. Whitman & Son, Ltd.:

Canso, N.S., January 23, 1908.

J. W. Daniel, Esq., M.P.,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—We have your favour of 13th instant, and may say in reply that the dogfish reduction works here have not yet reached a point where they can be called a commercial success.

They operated only a few weeks last season while the dogfish were so plentiful as to interfere with the catching of food fish. We were much less troubled with dogfish in 1907, than for several years past, and are of the opinion that they are leaving these shores.

The quality of both fertilizer and oil manufactured each year has improved as the men have become more familiar with the work. The fishermen will not catch dogfish when they can get any other fish to catch. The quantity caught makes so little impression upon the hordes that used to infest the coast that it cannot be noticed.

Messrs. E. K. Goodwin, George Walsh, John McNeary and James Lumsden are four intelligent fishermen here who probably have opinions of their own about this dogfish work. As a rule the fishermen are glad to have it in operation, but unless dogfish are very plentyful it is operated only at a loss.

You will see, Mr. Speaker, that I asked this gentleman to furnish me with the names of some fishermen who would be able to give information as to the success or otherwise of these reduction works. I will read the replies I received from these men, every one a practical fishermen:

Canso, N.S., February 15, 1908.

J. W. Daniel, Esq., M.P.,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of your favour inquiring about the dogfish reduction works, and in reply beg to say.

This is the question :

1. Are the reduction works an advantage to the fishermen, if so in what way? Materially in giving employment at the time when no other branch of fishing can be successfully prosecuted on account of the dogfish pest.

2. Is the price paid for dogfish fair and reasonable? No, I think not, it does not warrant a general outlay for catching them.

3. Does the establishment and use of the Reduction Works have any effect in diminishing the number of dogfish? I cannot say, there is so few caught that they are not missed much from the great schools that invade our shores. I might say that one of our oldest citizens, who has made a success of fishing, says in his opinion the Reduction Works is the best thing the government has ever done for the fishermen.

Hoping you may use your influence for the establishment of a number more along the coast, I remain, yours very truly, E. M. Goodwin.

The next letter is from James R. Lumsden:

1. Are the Reduction Works an advantage to the fishermen? If so, in what way? Yes, in the first place when the dogfish come in on the shore it puts a stop to all other fishing as they destroy nets and gear. The fisherman can make very good pay in catching them.

2. Is the price paid for dogfish fair and reasonable? Yes.

3. Does the establishment and use of the Reduction Works have any effect in diminishing the numbers of dogfish? I do not think the Reduction works has been in operation long enough to answer that question, but the dogfish in our bay for the year 1907 were the scarcest they have been for years. Whether the Reduction Works had anything to do with it or not or some other cause I don't know. My opinion is that there ought to be several reduction plants along the shore as it is quite a task for one plant to do the work because it cannot grind up all that is caught in this place.

I remain, yours truly,
(Sgd.) JAMES R. LUMSDEN,

The next reply is from George Walsh:

Dear Sir,—By the use of the Reduction Works these pests become an industry and are disposed of for value which certainly is an advantage to fishermen.

The price paid for dogfish is fair and reasonable.

Use of the Reduction Works has an effect in diminishing the dogfish.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) GEORGE WALSH.

There is only one more letter and I will read that:

Sir,—In reply to your respective inquiries re the Reduction Works at Canso, I wish to say they are a great advantage to our fishermen; they afford a market for dogfish which infest our fishing grounds from August until about the end of October and which formerly prevented our men from fishing during those months.

At the price paid for dogfish a man can make a fair day's pay when fish are plentiful.

Dogfish were not nearly so plentiful on our fishing grounds last year as in former years. I believe the numbers of dogfish will decrease in proportion to the number of reduction works in operation.

I am, sir,
Yours truly,
(Sgd.) JOHN McNEARY,
Canso, N.S.

These are the opinions of practical fishermen and each one of them approves of the establishment of dogfish reduction works. As far as the Bay of Fundy is concerned we have no dogfish reduction works there and I know from practical experience, having seen them, that the Bay of Fundy is filled with these pests to the detriment, I was almost going to say, destruction, of the food fish which come into that bay in such large quantities. They are so destructive that they destroy the nets, they destroy the food fish that are on the hooks of the trawls even as they are being hauled from the bottom of the sea up to the boats to be taken in by the fishermen. When I spoke upon this question before I referred to a very graphic description given to me by one of the fishermen whom I interviewed after he had come ashore and who assured me that of a catch upon the trawls, which contained about 2,000 hooks, 1,700 food fish, as they drew them up to their boats, had been eaten off to the heads by the dogfish and destroyed; so that instead of having a good haul of food fish the man who had spent his time had simply made a haul of heads of food fish and the hooks that were hanging to the trawls. That is something that took place to my own knowledge in the Bay of Fundy and it is a striking example of what is taking place there all the time. I think that matter is one that might well be taken up by a committee such as is foreshadowed by the resolution before the House moved by the hon. member for Guysborough. There are other points which I might bring up but most of them have already been brought before the House by those who have preceded me. I have much pleasure in supporting the resolution.

Mr. HONORE GERVAIS (Montreal, St. James). Mr. Speaker, I would ask the House to be allowed to say one word in support of this resolution. There is only one course to be taken by the House and that is the adoption of this resolution. Many things have been said and well said in favour of the resolution. There is no doubt that the trouble with regard to the fishing industry does not lie with the lack of improved apparatus or of facilities for catching fish, but I think that the whole trouble comes from the lack of proper facilities for selling the fishermen's product. As a matter of fact, most of the fish caught along the shores of the maritime provinces are sold in the United States, and the people of Montreal have been in the habit for the last twenty years of importing part of this same fish into Canada. We have been paying for the last ten years as much as $5,000 per week to the railway companies for the transportation of fresh fish from the United States to Montreal. We have been paying to this government as much as $3,000 per week for duty on that fish. I think that the difficulties against which the fishermen of the maritime provinces are now contending arise from the lack of proper facilities, such as refrigerators and fish markets, in the great cities of the central portion of Canada. By establishing a system of fish refrigerators along our coast, by building especially equipped railway cars for the transportation of live fish ac-

cording to the German fashion, by transporting the fish rapidly from the seashore to the great cities and by the construction of buildings or fish markets in Montreal, Toronto and elsewhere for the proper handling and sale of fish, the existing difficulties will be largely overcome and the fishermen of the maritime provinces will again enjoy that progress and prosperity with which they were blessed in bygone days.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, before the minister replies I would like to say a word or two with reference to this question. Those who are older in time and experience in the House I think cannot but feel very great satisfaction in listening to the discussion which has taken place this afternoon. The discussion has not been directed to the end of passing the resolution. That I suppose was a foregone conclusion from the first; the discussion has rather tended towards eliciting information and suggestions from a great many different points of view as to the fishery industry in all its phases. With reference to the resolution itself, I have not heard any good reasons why the two departments of Marine and Fisheries should be included in it. There is a very wide field of work for such a committee with reference to the fisheries, but it seems to me that the department itself ought to be quite capable of dealing with what are peculiarly marine matters. Now, we are going to have this committee and very possibly it is but the forerunner of other such committees. We must keep in mind that while economizing the time of parliament we must not by the appointment of committees deprive the House itself of its proper workers. As a rule our committees are too large; they might with a very great deal of profit be very largely diminished in the numbers of their members, because the larger the committee the greater the aggregate of party feeling in it and the more numerous the extraneous questions which are discussed. In my opinion the actual power for work of a committee increases in the ratio of the fewness of its members. We lose a vast deal of time in some of our large committees, and holding this opinion I would not have this committee composed of more than 15 or 20 members, selected from both sides of the House. I would have it an absolutely good working committee, not a committee which would be fishing for this or fishing for that, but a committee which went straight at its object of conserving our fish resources and broadening and developing the industry. If we are to have committees on our great natural resources there will be three or four more of such, and, in my opinion, no man can serve efficiently upon more than two committees. If he does his work well on one important committee, that, together with his work on the floor of this House, and the conduct of his correspondence, gives him plenty to do. With reference to the fishery question itself, I think it will be acknowledged by all members of this House that the tendency is, each year that passes, towards the greater depletion of the fisheries. That is the tendency in our lumber industry, it is the tendency in our coal and mineral industries, but it is more particularly the tendency with regard to our fisheries. Our population is continually increasing, fish foods are more eaten, the means of transportation are every day becoming better and cheaper, fresh fish is more easily obtained and there is a greater consumption of it. As the price of fish rises, and it is constantly rising, old methods give place to new; the less destructive methods of catching fish are supplanted by more destructive methods and the constant effort is to take as many of the denizens of the waters as possible from their habitat and transfer them to the tables of the people. All this is a constant menace to our fisheries. There is more than that. Don't let the people of the maritime provinces think that the only fish in the world are to be found in the salt water. The fisheries in our inland waters are of immense benefit to our people. The source of supply from these inland fisheries is near to the people and it is most important that there should be a perennial never failing supply of fish from these inland waters. Both the inland and the salt water fisheries are of course important, but with the distribution of the increased population in our country, the inland fishery industry is perhaps more important still. If, in view of the increasing demand, you allow destructive methods of fishing then the inland fisheries will be depleted in such a ratio that it does not require very long vision to see the practical disappearance of our food fish. To-day the vast majority of fish that are taken from our inland waters are transported to the markets of another country and are eaten by people in Chicago, Detroit, or Boston, who do not care if it is the last fish in the stream so long as they get it on their breakfast table. The Minister of Marine, the members of the government, the members of this House, have read the statistics and they know that this is the truth. It is time there was a stop put to it. It may be ultra doctrine but it is a doctrine that every good Canadian will subscribe to that the food fishes of this country exist primarily for the consumption of the people of Canada, not even for the consumption of this generation of Canadians but for the consumption of future generations. If we set our minds to it, it is possible for us to keep up a perennial supply of fish in these inland waters, as well as in our salt waters, so long as Canadians require fish food. I do not believe that any one will doubt

that. But we have to be more heroic than we have been. The minister has got to be able to say to the supporter who comes to him, when both of them are absolutely certain that all the fish have been taken out in that season that ought to be taken out, that he will not permit any extension of the close season, or any departure from the regulations, that he will not yield to any request or any pressure, however strong. I know as an administrator in that department and as an observant member of the body politic, that this is a tremendous force in this country, and we have got somehow or other to eliminate patronage from the fisheries of this country. That one sentence contains it all. We have got to place this branch of the public service either departmentally or by a commission, under hard and fast, scientific, reasonable, common-sense jurisdiction and administration. If we do that we can have fish, if we do not do that we will come to a time when we will not have fish. I have a letter from a man who knows what fisheries are, because he was born amongst them, brought up with them and spent a part of his life in both fishing and dealing and has taken a wide interest in the subject. What does he tell me? Within ten years, unless we do something more than we are doing now, it will not be possible to get a decent sized lobster along the Atlantic coast of Canada. We have been warned about that. The lobsters have been a diminishing race until they have almost entirely vanished from the coast of the United States, they have been pushed gradually, further and further north until they have now passed the Maine coast which has a very little remnant of lobster fishing left and the Americans are invading our coast. To-day you boil lobsters from 4 to 9 inches long. The law says you shall not, but the inspector does not say you shall not nor does the administration. This man writes and gives instances where inspectors shut their eyes to the fact that hundreds of thousands of lobsters were boiled last year and canned which were from four to nine inches in length, more nearer four than nine.

Now we must, government and opposition, set our faces like flint with reference to these great fish resources of this country, if we hope to keep them and to hand to our children those inestimable blessings of food fishes which have been ours so luxuriously and abundantly. To-day we have six million people, before long we will have twelve million, then twenty, then thirty, then forty million, and still I say that if we do rightly in this matter our forty million people can have their food fishes many years from now just as we have them now, but they cannot unless we take hold of this matter.

Then we want education. I do not believe that a fisherman, although he is born in the brine and goes to sea every day in the year, ever passes the time when some good information will not be useful to him. Your farmer is in the same position, so is every man. We do not grow up into special knowledge. What has been done by the Department of Agriculture? Whatever has not been done or has been done, whatever have been the lapses or excellencies of that department, one thing is certain, that by a persistent method of generally enlightened education they have taught the farmers of this country and have brought them up by large strides ahead of where they were before this education began. I think a similar method of education can be adopted for the fishermen. It is one thing to catch a fish, it is another thing to land that fish on the table of the ultimate consumer, so that the fisherman shall have as large a proportion of the profit as possible, and this cannot be done unless proper methods are used. I am not here to teach the fishermen, I cannot do it, I do not know myself what is necessary, but I say that the Fisheries Department ought to lay itself out to get at methods not so much of catching fish, the fishermen will attend to that, but methods of curing, packing, and all that tends to make the ultimate market value the highest possible and so bring the greatest profit to the person who is engaged in the business. I am heartily in favour of this resolution. I was glad to hear our young men take such sane ground and such intelligent ground with reference to this matter as they have this afternoon. I have seldom heard a debate in this House participated in by so many young men which has been so free from anything that was not germane to the subject and which has been stuffed so full of good common sense, as the speeches we have heard this afternoon from our young members.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Mr. Speaker, I think we must congratulate ourselves upon the contributions which have been made to this debate by some of the new members of the House. Their knowledge of local circumstances has enabled them to give us the best information upon the important question of the fisheries. I hope this will not be the last time when this question of fisheries will come before the House and we will hear such speeches as we have heard to-day. I congratulate the new members very heartily upon the way in which they have discharged their duties in the circumstances, and I am sure that this debate will have a very good effect on the relations between these members and the administration of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Several important questions have been dealt with during this debate. I shall first discuss the question which is at issue, namely the formation of a new committee of this House. Committees of this House

are formed for the purpose of dealing with the ordinary legislation or with the work of the session. The session is called for a special purpose, for the purpose of passing laws and making legislation, the voting of supplies and the controlling and investigating of expenditures. Bills which come up before this House are generally referred to the committees in order that a few members may devote more time to the questions involved in these Bills than would be possible in the House. It would be, I think, contrary to the ordinary principles which are followed in the British House of Commons if we were to form committees which will make all sorts of investigations. I understand that in some cases investigations are absolutely necessary, but the particular work which the committees are called on to perform is the work of legislation. That is, I am sure, the object which my hon. friend had in view when he proposed that a committee of this House should be appointed to look into the questions relating to Marine and Fisheries. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said a few minutes ago that no reason had been adduced in the debate why the Marine should be joined with the Fisheries in this committee. During two or three of our last sessions some very important Bills were brought before this House relating to marine. These were referred to special committees which investigated and reported, and these reports were embodied in the laws we passed last session. When last year my hon. friend made a motion for the formation of a committee on Fisheries, I asked him whether he would not be willing to add to this resolution the subject of Marine, as the two were very closely connected, and might be investigated by the same committee. That was the object I had in view. Various important Bills come up nearly every year concerning Marine, and I thought that since it was the opinion of the House and the government that we should have a Committee on Fisheries, it would be just as well to give to that committee the power to deal with the questions of Marine. That is why I asked my hon. friend to add to his motion questions affecting Marine as well as those affecting Fisheries. In England and in the United States it is the same committee which deals with both questions. I am glad to see that there is no objection at all to the formation of this committee, and the government accepts with the greatest pleasure the motion made by my hon. friend, and in a few days will be able to submit amendments to our existing rules, which no doubt will receive the unanimous consent of the whole House?

My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), has mentioned some of the things which have been done by the government, and has spoken of the importance of improving our transportation system. Several other members have also dealt with this question, and I may be permitted to say a word or two on it. I was sorry indeed to find out, when I came to the department, that a large quantity of our fish, instead of being shipped direct from the maritime provinces or the great lakes to our centres of consumption, were sent to the United States and in some cases reshipped from the United States to Canada. It is a great pity indeed that our fisheries should be exploited by American fishermen in this way, and I thought that by encouraging the transportation of fish from the maritime provinces and the great lakes to Canadian centres we would hereby divert that trade from the United States. I was also sorry to hear that some of our banking institutions were not very willing to lend money on our fisheries. I do not know why they refused to give advances for the development of that valuable industry, with the result that the business, instead of being carried on by our own people, was carried on by Americans. I have no objection to our exporting some of our fish, as we are producing much more than we consume—and have to depend on foreign markets to some extent, but I regret, in common with my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), that any exporting should be done to our detriment and that our fisheries should become depleted. It therefore becomes necessary to find out whether there be not some means of preventing it. As regards transportation, let me state what we did last year with the $25,000 voted by parliament. During the months of September, October, and November, the department made an arrangement with the Express Companies by which these companies charged the shippers of fish only two-thirds of the regular express rates, and collected the other one-third from the department. This gave the shipper from Halifax to Montreal $1 per 100 lbs. The express rate from Boston to Montreal is 80 cents, and the duty $1, making the total $1.80 per 100 lbs., thus giving an advantage to the shippers from the maritime provinces to Montreal over the shippers to American ports. The result has been extraordinary. It is true that the Minister of Customs received less revenue from fish, evidently as the result of the policy we have pursued. But I have been glad to hear from merchants in Halifax and in Montreal that there is a larger demand for fish brought direct from our Atlantic sea-board. One merchant in Montreal, I am informed, received 50,000 pounds more within one month than he used to receive in former years. This he attributes to the policy we have adopted. The cost to the department is almost nothing. I have not the figures by me at the moment, but they are very small. We intend to continue the policy, and have agreed to renew the arrangement, beginning on the 20th instant.

I do not think it necessary to go at length into a description of what the government has done for the development of the fisheries. I may mention briefly the cold storage for bait and also the cold storage for fish that we have established. Each of these is very important, the latter being the means of putting the fish on the market in the proper condition. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel) has referred to the dogfish. The reduction works that we have established are more or less of an experimental nature. I realize that they have not been a commercial success so far. For that reason, we cannot expect private parties to enter upon this industry now. But we are going to carry on these experiments for some time yet, and, should we be able to prove that this work can be carried on on a commercial basis, we expect that private capital will embark in the industry and that there will be no further necessity for the government to carry on these experiments. We have established also hatcheries in different parts of the country, and it is expected that, with the money to be voted for next year, others may be established. My hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Jameson) has spoken of the way in which our statistics are collected, and has given an instance in which figures were collected from the fishermen and afterwards from those in charge of curing establishments and the two were added together in the report. I should be greatly surprised if this could happen. However, if my hon. friend has the exact information at hand, he would oblige me greatly by giving it to me, in order that a recurrence of such instances may be prevented.

Mr. JAMESON. I would like to ask the minister if an officer of his own department was not sent to Nova Scotia to inquire into this very matter of discrepancy in these statistics?

Mr. BRODEUR. If my hon. friend will give me, even privately, the information in regard to the case he speaks of, I will see to it that instructions are given—or repeated, for instructions have already been given—as to the way these statistics should be collected. We have no desire that the results as shown by the figures should be different from what they are in fact. My hon. friend from Digby has spoken of the question of the fishery board. I agree with him; I am not ready to accept the idea of forming a board on the same lines as that which they have in Scotland. I do not think the time has come when such a board can be formed here to advantage. I find that the people in Scotland at the present day do not take advantage of the inspection provided by the board to so great an extent as might be expected. So long as the imperial government gave the money for the branding of the herring, the system went on very well, but when the payments ceased and the standard was raised there was a change. I see that during 1906 out of 1,967,862 barrels of herring sold, only 306,033 barrels were branded under the authority of the Fishery Board. Of course, a tax has to be paid for the branding of that herring, and people there, like people in this country, do not wish to be taxed, and so they are not taking advantage of this system of branding to as great an extent as formerly, owing largely of course to the high general standard of private trade marks.

My hon. friend (Mr. Jameson) says—and the same was said by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster)—that party politics should not interfere with the administration of fisheries. So far as the department is concerned, there is no party politics in the administration of the fisheries. We see to it, as well as we can, that the regulations are observed. Of course, it is not an easy matter to enforce regulations restricting the fisheries; such regulations are usually unpopular. The suggestion made by my hon. friend from North Toronto deserves consideration—that we should carry on an educational campaign to cause the fishermen to see that the enforcement of the regulations and the improvement of the methods of curing and packing would be in their own interest. As to this question of curing and packing, some years ago we engaged the services of Mr. Cowie, an experienced man, to come and teach our people to cure herring as they are cured in Scotland. The teaching given by this gentleman has, I believe, been appreciated, and I do not know of any place where his visits have not been received with delight by the fishermen and also by those engaged in curing and packing the herring.

My hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean) referred to the very important Question of the modus vivendi. I would not like to discuss that question at length, but, speaking for myself, I think that the modus vivendi is not of so much benefit as some people believe. The result is that when the Americans come into our waters and procure this license to enable them to purchase supplies and outfits, to ship crews and to tranship cargoes, they are practically taking the business away from our own fishermen, they are simply controlling the business which should be done by our own fishermen, and any profits or benefit that might accrue in those fisheries go to Americans instead of Canadians. That is the view I take personally of this matter. If this committee were formed, I would like to see it study this question, and I hope that some day it will be put in a position to investigate it. I think it is a most important question. This is a business that we should try to keep in Canadian channels for the bene-

fit of our own people. There is no reason why this business should be controlled by Americans instead of Canadians. We have the resources, we have the money, we have the intelligence among Canadians, and we ought to control the business. That is my personal view of the matter.

My hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean) has alluded to the question of steam trawlers. In some parts of Europe steam trawlers are considered a very desirable method of fishing, but I do not think that so far they have been considered as such in our own country. Even in Europe there is a great divergence of opinion as to whether they should be used or not. In some parts of France, however, steam trawlers are used to a considerable extent, they are sent into the north sea and also to the grand banks. But in some other parts of France, especially in Normandy and Brittany, the people are strongly opposed to the use of steam trawlers. In this country there is only one opinion, and that is that steam trawlers should not be permitted within the three mile limit and the bays. So general is this feeling that we passed lately an order in council prohibiting the use of steam trawlers within such limits. Now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Maddin) stated that some American boats had been fishing within the three mile limit, and that although they had been seized by some of our own boats, they were let off without a penalty.

Mr. MADDIN. What I said was that I saw thirty-one vessels fishing within the three mile limit. It was not one of these that was seized, but another vessel was seized, as I was informed by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Crosby), and was taken to Halifax and held there for three weeks, and then released on payment of a fine of $400. But that was not one of the boats I saw.

Mr. CROSBY. Mr. Speaker, I thought we were discussing the question of the appointment of a committee. If I had known that this discussion was going to take so wide a range, I would have been glad to discuss some of these outside questions myself.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has the floor.

Mr. CROSBY. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has a right to make a point of order.

Mr. CROSBY. I must say that instead of discussing the question of the appointment of a committee we have been wandering over the whole fishery question in this country as it has existed for the last ten years.

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The discussion has certainly been broad, but I think that it all had relation to the advisability of appointing such a committee as is proposed, and brought forth the reasons therefore, and consequently it was in order.

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand that we have been allowed to discuss the question of the fisheries generally in order to adduce reasons for the appointment of this committee. My hon. friend from Cape Breton stated a fact to which I wish to call the attention of the House for a moment. He stated that some American boats had been fishing within the three mile limit. I am greatly surprised to hear it, because generally speaking our fishery cruisers on the Atlantic coast are very diligent; their instructions are to follow closely American vessels coming there to fish, and to see that they do not come within the three mile limit. I would be greatly surprised to hear that our cruisers have been found remiss in this matter. The officers of our boats are men of great intelligence and experience, like Captain Knowlton, for instance. I would be surprised to hear that he had allowed an American vessel within the three mile limit. I know that when an infraction of the law does occur they take immediate steps, with the means at their disposal, to ascertain the fact, and if they find that the vessel is fishing within the three mile limit she is immediately seized.

Mr. CROSBY. I may say that the vessel I referred to was taken into Halifax and tied up there, and Captain Knowlton let her go. I am not here to discuss that matter now, but I will be glad to do so at any future time.

Mr. BRODEUR. Will my hon. friend give me the name of the boat in order that I may make some inquiries?

Mr. CROSBY. I will do that.

Mr. BRODEUR. Of course, we must remember that it is sometimes difficult to find out exactly whether these boats are within or without the three mile limit. They are cute, they generally keep on the border line, and when they see one of our cruisers coming they immediately get outside the limit. So it is very difficult to detect them in a violation of the law.

Mr. CROSBY. I understood the hon. member for Lunenburg to tell the minister that if a boat is seized and held up she has either got to be confiscated or released. I would like to follow him on that subject, but I will not do so now.

Mr. BRODEUR. If it turns out that in some cases our officers have been remiss in their duties, I will see that no such thing occurs again.

Mr. CROSBY. I did not intimate that anybody had not done his duty.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will not continue the discussion any longer. But in view of the reasons which have been given to this House in favour of the appointment of a committee, I may say that I concur heartily with the motion, and see no objection to its being adopted. We will see that rules are drafted later on, and will bring them down for adoption by the House.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing how many sessional clerks and messengers have been appointed to the House of Commons since 1880; their names and the dates of their appointment; if appointed by the Internal Economy Commission or otherwise; how many sessional clerks and messengers have been removed from the House of Commons since 1880; their names and the dates of their removal; if removed by the Internal Economy Commission or otherwise.—Mr. Paquet.

For a return showing what precautionary measures were taken by the government to combat the introduction of the foot and mouth disease into Canada from United States; what officials were appointed especially for the work, the dates of appointment, length of service, remuneration paid to each as salary or expenses; the present danger, and when the embargo on live stock from the United States was raised.—Mr. Sharpe.

RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 6) to amend the Railway Act.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I would ask my hon. friend to allow this to stand. I want to get something practical out of this legislation on level crossings if I can, and I am referring this Bill to the Chairman of the Railway Commission. He is in Winnipeg, I am sending all the Bills to him. I am not trying to block the Bill or anything of that kind, but I want to get his expression of opinion on all these things and see if I cannot get something practical out of them.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Bill is a public Bill and if the matter is delayed and then sent back here from the Senate, probably, it will never be concluded during this session, and this slaughter of the people at the railway crossings will go on as it has gone on notwithstanding the fact that we have tried to stop it for three years. This Bill has been very carefully considered by this House for three years. It is the product of the combined intelligence of the whole of this House after five years of discussion. I do not think that the chairman of any railway commission can tell us how to make this law. I have every respect for the Chairman of the Railway Commission as an administrator —that is his business—but I do not agree that the Chairman of the Railway Commission can give us any pointers with regard to this legislation. We as legislators are here to make law for him to carry out It is his business to carry out the law that we make in this parliament. It is the people's business to make laws, and although I have the greatest respect for the Chairman of the Railway Commission and for the present Board of Railway Commissioners, it is not within their province to tell us anything about the kind of law that the people want passed; it is their province to carry out to the full the law that we may make. In view of the fact that this House for three years unanimously adopted this as a proper piece of legislation to relieve this terrible evil existing in the country, the slaughter of helpless men, women and children at all these level crossings, we should not further delay. The House of Commons has dealt with it, the House has done its duty, three years ago the House of Commons put it up to the Senate to do their duty, it has not yet been attended to by the Senate and I warn the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) that I shall have to blame somebody if this Bill is not read a third time and sent on to the Senate as quickly as possible.

Mr. GRAHAM. I agree with a great deal of what my hon. friend has said, but we want to have something practical. As he remarked, this Bill has been passed three times by the House of Commons. I am in hopes that we can deal with this question in a way that will bring about the result that my hon. friend has in mind, and that we all have in mind, and that is to get rid as quickly as possible of the dangerous level crossings. I know it is our business to legislate but there is no person so competent to give us advice as to the most practical way to bring about the desired result as the men who are putting the law into force.

Mr. LANCASTER. They do not know the evil like we do.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will see that the men who have to apply the law will be able to give us a lot of useful information as how best to accomplish the object we have in view.

Mr. FOSTER. Then we would have to refer all our Bills to the judges.

Mr. GRAHAM. There have been a great many Bills in the parliaments of the country that have been referred to judges before

they have been passed so as to get them into the shape in which they will bring about practical results.

Mr. FOSTER. I never saw one taken out of the House in this way.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is not taken out of the House. My hon. friend is mistaken about that.

Mr. FOSTER. It is taken out of its order.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is not taken out of the House nor out of its order. I am asking this House to let the Bill stand as hundreds stand, and I am giving a reason in support of that request that will appeal to the country. It is that I may have an opportunity of conferring with the Chief of the Board of Railway Commissioners, not to defeat the object of this Bill, but to bring about the practical results that we are all looking for; that is to do away with the dangerous level crossing.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals that there has been the opportunity of a year at least to obtain the opinion of the Chairman of the Railway Commission upon this Bill. It has passed the House at least on two occasions, passed the House unanimously, and it has gone to the Senate by a unanimous vote. It seems to me rather late in the day, after the Bill has been before parliament for so long and there has been so abundant an opportunity to obtain the views of the Chairman of the Railway Commission upon it, to suggest a postponement on that account. I have every possible respect for the opinion of the Chairman of the Railway Commission in this connection, but if he desires any modification, if he suggests any modification and if that modification commends itself to the government it can be presented to the Senate and it can come back to this House for consideration later on. It does not seem to me that the suggestion of the minister is based upon any reasonable consideration for the reasons that he mentioned. In the first place, there has been abundant opportunity for more than a year to obtain the views of the Chairman of the Railway Commission. If that has not been done, it has been due to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals having too much on his mind—I suppose too much work. Well, that is not a good reason for asking delay now. Send the Bill up to the Senate and the views of the Chairman of the Railway Commission can be obtained and acted upon by the government if the government think it advisable that there should be any modification of this Bill.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac). Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the county of Frontenac which I have the honour to represent has on different occasions seen fit to petition this House, the Railway Committee of the Privy Council and at the present time the Board of Railway Commissioners, that action should be taken for the better protection of the public at level crossings I feel that I should say a word why I think this Bill of my hon. friend from Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) should receive its third reading at the present time. I am led to think that there is some reason for this delay other than that which has been advanced by the Minister of Railways. He tells us he wants to consult with the Board of Railway Commissioners, but in view of the fact that at the last election word was sent out by the Grand Trunk Company to its employees in the county of Frontenac to cast their votes against me and in favour of my opponent, I am led to wonder if there is not another reason than that ostensibly given by the Minister of Railways. On three occasions has the House of Commons given expression to its opinion with regard to level crossings, and I was in hopes that to-night that expression of opinion would be repeated by a unanimous assent to the third reading of this Bill. The toll of death at these level crossings throughout the county of Frontenac is ever increasing. In a distance of some seven miles from the village of Collins Bay up to the Grand Trunk crossing at the outer station where two lives were lost on the 26th inst., there have been some fourteen or fifteen lives sacrificed. The rails of the Grand Trunk are red with the blood of victims along that piece of track. How much longer is the sacrifice to continue; how much longer are we going to withhold an emphatic expression of opinion that an end must be put to this state of things. There is no difference of opinion in my county about immediate action being necessary. The people are not only unanimous that action should be taken but they are indignant that action has not been taken sooner. I believe that the railway commissioners are desirous of protecting life and I know they are doing good work, but they are doing that work independently of this parliament. Why should the House delay action now? Will not delay at this time encourage the Senate to repeat its former treatment of the measure? If this were the first time such a measure as this were presented to the House there might be a reason for delay, but this Bill having been passed on several previous occasions there is no necessity for delaying it now, and I voice the opinion of my constituents when I demand that it shall receive its third reading to-day.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). We have had this Bill before the House until it has been termed a hardy

annual. We have had it up for five sessions; it has been before special committees; it has been before general committees; it has been thrice passed upon by the House; we have enunciated as a House of Commons our policy upon the Bill and that policy has been frustrated by the Senate. Although I have great respect for the railway board, I do not think this parliament should surrender its judgment entirely to it. I was anxious the other day that we should have the opinion of the railway board upon the broad question of railway crossings from one end of Canada to the other, as transmitted to the minister. The very first day parliament met I put a series of resolutions on the Order Paper with reference to that matter, but this is a specific question which the hon. member (Mr. Lancaster) has advanced persistently from year to year and upon which we have proclaimed the policy of this House of Commons to the country. And because the Senate, for good reasons or otherwise—I am inclined very decidedly to think otherwise—has seen fit to bowl out this Bill there is no reason why we should delay it now unless the Minister of Railways can advance substantial reasons for a change of policy. I trust before this session ends the House shall fully consider the whole question of railway crossings throughout Canada, but that is another question altogether and it affords no reason why the special provisions of this Bill should not pass.

I am puzzled at the attitude of the Minister of Railways who thinks it desirable we should have the opinion of the railway board, and yet when the policy of the railway board on the general question of level crossings was transmitted to the Minister of Railways the other day he did not think it well that it should be submitted to the House. No doubt the Minister of Railways had good reasons for withholding that information which was so much desired by this House and so earnestly desired by the people of Canada, but is it logical that he should now recommend delay until he consults the railway board when he has in his possession the opinion of the railway board on a cognate question and refuses to submit it to parliament. The government has had ample time within the last year to consider the attitude of the Senate; they have had ample time to submit this question to the railway board, but in the meantime the sacrifice of life has been increasing and the conditions call for the immediate passage of this Bill. As has been said by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), when it is considered by the Senate any reasons that are proper to be submitted to them, by the railway board or otherwise, can be submitted by the ministers for consideration of the Senate and they can send it back for our consideration. In this way proper time will be given for the proper reconsideration of this Bill which was not passed and could not be passed last session by reason of the delay in forwarding the Bill. I have a great desire that in this session we shall have a consideration of the broad question of railway protection throughout Canada, but that is no reason for delaying the passage of this Bill which we have already considered.

Mr. W. B. NANTEL. (Terrebonne). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer to this House a few remarks in French. I do not intend to make a speech, but I only wish to ask the hon. Minister of Railways a question. It seems evident that the conditions require the immediate passage of this Bill, and still the hon. gentleman recommends delay until he consults the Railway Board. Should the Board of Railway Commissioners express the opinion that it is not desirable to pass such a law, are we to bow to their decision? Not by any means, that is no reason for delaying the third reading of this Bill. I wait the answer of the Minister of Railways.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is not a question at all of putting their jurisdiction against ours but we have been dealing with this for two or three years and I am anxious to have a practical result from it in a broad way. I have had a good deal of discussion with the Chairman of the Board of Commissioners upon this question, and I have asked him to put his views on the matter in a concrete form in the way of a Bill and let me read it in that form. My request is a very reasonable one; I would like to have the chairman consider this and give his ideas in concrete form. The Bill submitted by him might not be what we want, but it will be a great help. This is far beyond a private question, it affects the lives of the people. I have a message from the chairman of the Commission saying that he will do this and give me something tangible in a few days.

Mr. LANCASTER. I suppose the Minister is anxious to stop this continuous killing of people in this country. How will sending this Bill to the Senate in the usual way prevent what he wants to do? The people are demanding protection in this matter. There has been no suggestion in committee or on the second reading of any change in the Bill, and why should it not go to the Senate in the usual way? Every man's constituents from Halifax to Vancouver are demanding the stopping of this toll on human life, and unless something is done the people will take the matter in their own hands. Trains will be derailed, although I do not recommend such a course, if they are going to run at 60 miles an hour through thickly peopled portions

of the community without thought of what occurs to the people on the highways. The people will not stand for all this nonsense. Let us get the opinion of the Chairman of the Railway Commission, and of everybody else that will help us, but let us not delay sending the Bill to the Senate. If the railrailways want to maintain the speed of their trains, we want speed to counteract the result of that speed. I cannot see why an extraordinary and unusual course should be taken in regard to this Bill. The minister does not pretend that the Bill would not be good law or wise legislation.

Mr. GRAHAM. My request is very reasonable. My hon. friend will see that the delay I am asking him for does not interfere with the passage of his Bill, as the Senate have adjourned until the 25th.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) is within his rights, and if he wants to press his Bill he can do so, and nobody will object. I call his attention simply to this: he has this legislation very much at heart, and in this he has the sympathy of every man in this country I am sure. What we have seen recently is simply appalling, and a stop not only should, but must, be put to it. I would ask him, however, if he is following the better course to reach the end he has in view, in which we are all prepared to second him. The legislation which he has promised is very drastic. It has twice passed this House unanimously, but it has met with a different fate in the other chamber. The only reason why it was not passed by the Senate is evidently its very drastic character. The moment this Bill passes, every railway company is liable to very heavy penalties. My hon. friend will agree that while it is reasonable that the railway company should be compelled to slacken the speed of trains when passing through thickly settled portions of the community or should take extra precautions if they want to maintain their speed, there are quite a number of localities where a level crossing is not likely to produce very severe danger.

Mr. LANCASTER. This is limited to congested portions.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Exactly, but even so a question arises as to what is a congested part, and further there are many congested parts, and if the companies may be unable, with all the good will they might have—and I do not think they have very much good will in this matter—to at once comply with the requirements of this law, they would be subject to these penalties. The Minister of Railways has already taken up the question with the man who, above all others, is competent to advise in this matter, that is the Chairman of the Railway Board. They have been in conference upon it, and my hon. friend expects that he will have before many days an answer to the inquiries that he has put to the Chairman of the Railway Board, advising him as to what in his judgment would be the best legislation.

The matter has been taken up in other countries. I understand that the state of New York has a Bill similar to the Bill of my hon. friend in intent but not in enactment whereby it is contemplated and enacted that the Bill shall come gradually into force, and perhaps it may be advisable to adopt a similar course here. My hon. friend loses nothing by this delay, but if he wants to go on he is within his right and I shall not interfere. Let me suggest to him that the Bill comes to-morrow as the first order of the day. If it is not dealt with to-morrow it comes up on the following Thursday as the first order.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will that be the result?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly. I have no intention to take away the right of my hon. friend. This Bill will come up to-morrow. If it should not, it becomes the first order of the day on the following Thursday. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Foster) set down the important motion he had for to-morrow, but he and I forgot that on Thursdays public Bills take precedence of notices of motion, and therefore we shall have to select another day. He will have an opportunity to-morrow or the following Thursday to go on with his motion.

Mr. LANCASTER. I hope the Prime Minister does not think that my sincerity will entirely run away with my judgment. I see the wisdom of what he points out and I want to hold the friendship of the House with regard to this Bill. I do not want to antagonize people in this House or outside, but I want to prevent this terrible toll if possible. On the understanding which my right hon. friend gives that this Bill will take the head of public Bills and orders, I am content, and I assume that the Minister of Railways will accept his suggestion and accelerate it as much as he can.

At six o'clock the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 4, 1909.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

EAST BOUND TRAFFIC OVER I.C.R.

Mr. SINCLAIR—by Mr. Bickerdike—asked:

What percentage of the traffic passing over the Intercolonial Railway is east bound?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). 1. For the year ended December 31, 1908, percentage of eastbound tonnage, was 37·93 per cent.

VACANCY ON BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. STAPLES asked:

1. When will the vacancy on the Board of Railway Commissioners, caused by the death of the late Hon. Mr. Greenway, be filled?
2. Has the government received any petitions or resolutions from any organizations asking that an able and practical farmer be appointed to the position? If so, from what organization?
3. Do they name any particular person or persons whom they want appointed? If so, who is the person or persons?

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

1. This has not yet been decided.
2. The government has received representations from various bodies interested in agriculture requesting that a farmer be appointed to the Board of Railway Commissioners.
3. The government is of opinion that it would not be in the public interest to announce the names submitted, at present.

DOUBLE TRACKING OF INTERCOLONIAL NEAR AMHERST.

Mr. RHODES asked:

In reference to the survey proposed for double tracking of the Intercolonial Railway from a point at or near Amherst to a point at or near Truro, via Parrsborough:
1. When did actual field work begin, and when did it cease?
2. Has the survey been completed? If not, why not?
3. Have plans and profiles been prepared? If not, why not?
4. What is the total cost to date?

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

1. Field work began August 24, 1908, finished December 1, 1908.
2. Survey has been completed.
3. Plans and profiles have been prepared.
4. $9,914.05.

COST OF BRIDGE OVER SHELL RIVER.

Mr. ROCHE asked:

1. What was the original estimate of cost of bridge recently completed over the Shell river at Shellmouth?
2. What was the total cost of the bridge?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister Public Works):

1. $9,772.40, exclusive of approaches, based on design which was not adopted.

$33,000 exclusive of approaches and superintendence, based on design of steel superstructure and concrete substructure as finally adopted.

2. Contract price steel superstructure..	$20,400 00
Contract price concrete substructure..	16,596 00
	$36,996 00
Extra work required to reach suitable foundations.. .. .. $	3,535 85
Superintendence, travelling expenses, advertising, &c.	2,420 84
	$5,956 69
Total cost..	$42,952 69

COST OF POST OFFICE AT SELKIRK.

Mr. BRADBURY asked:

What was the total cost of post office at Selkirk, Manitoba?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works), $30,666.21, including site.

DELIMITING BOUNDARIES OF MANITOBA.

Mr. ROCHE asked:

1. What progress has been made towards arriving at a settlement with the government of Manitoba in regard to the terms to be included in the Bill to be introduced delimiting the boundaries of the province of Manitoba?
2. Will a conference with the provincial ministers be held before the Bill is introduced?
3. Will the Bill be introduced in time to be considered at the ensuing session of the local legislature?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I may inform my hon. friend that a Bill is now being prepared in the Department of Justice to give effect to the resolutions which were adopted last year with reference to the boundaries of Manitoba, Quebec and Ontario. The Bill with regard to Manitoba will be submitted to the government of the province of Manitoba for conference between the government of that province and the government of the Dominion. It will be submitted to the provincial government in time to be considered by the provincial legislature.

RIDING MOUNTAIN TIMBER RESERVE.

Mr. ROCHE asked:

1. What amount was paid by the government by way of compensation to those who had squatted in the Riding Mountain timber reserve, in order to have them remove from the reserve?
2. When, where, and by whom was the money paid to the half-breeds who had located at Clear lake, township 19, range 19?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. $3,575.

2. On 22nd September, 1908, at Elphinstone, to all but one who was paid at Grandview on 7th December, 1908. Payment was made by W. A. Davis, chief forest ranger.

STURGEON IN LAC DU BONNET.

Mr. BRADBURY asked:

1. Does the government realize that Lac du Bonnet, Manitoba, is a natural and important breeding ground for sturgeon?

2. Is it the intention of the government to allow sturgeon to be taken for sale out of this lake?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1 and 2. The lake has been reserved against fishing for some years past; but I have received certain representations as to whether the closure should be continued, which I am considering.

ST. ANDREWS LOCKS.

Mr. BRADBURY asked:

How many employees had the government in connection with the construction of St. Andrews locks, and what are their names and salaries?

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

1. Eleven employees.

2. E. A. Forward	$191 75
E. S. Miles	150 00
H. G. Kerrigan	130 00
E. H. G. G. Hay	100 00
John Boyd	150 00
Walter Jull	90 00
Wm. H. Davis	60 00
C. H. Campbell	55 00
George Moore	50 00
Wm. Billington	50 00
Bella Billington	14 00

COMING CENSUS.

Mr. BOYER (Translation) asked:

1. Is it the intention of the government to ask the parliament to vote at this session the moneys necessary for the taking of the next census?

2. If so, will the census work be started in the early part of 1910?

The Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture.) In the answer to the hon. member, I may state that the votes necessary for the taking of the next census will be submitted next session only.

FRENCH TRANSLATION OF DOMINION LANDS.

Mr. BOYER asked:

1. Is it the intention of the government to have translated into French the Dominion Land Act and the recent departmental regulations relating to the purchase of homestead and pre-emptions?

2. If so, when will the French copies be delivered to the public?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior.) The translation into French of the Dominion Lands Act and the recent departmental regulations relating to homesteads and pre-emptions is now well under way, and it is expected that the printing will be completed and a supply received for distribution within the next few weeks.

SALARIES IN DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What is the name, position and salary of each clerk in the outside service of the Department of the Interior at Ottawa, who receivel increase of salary after June 1, 1908, what is the amount of the increase, the date on which it was granted, and the date it became effective, and also the date or dates in which such increase was actually paid?

2. What is the name, position and salary of (a) each clerk in the temporary inside service, Interior Department, at Ottawa, who tendered his resignation from the inside service since 1st July, 1908, and (b) of any persons appointed to the outside service of the Interior Department at Ottawa since same date, with position and salary to which they were appointed, and in both cases the dates of resignation and appointment?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

Name.	Position.	Salary.	Amount of increase.	Date when granted.	Date becoming effective.	Date when actually paid.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	1908.	1908.	1908.
Burgess, G	Clerk	800 00	250 00	Aug. 27	Aug. 27	Oct. 6
Claffy, Miss N	"	900 00	80 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Cohoon, A. K.	"	1,200 00	300 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Laflamme, P	"	1,200 00	200 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Lafleur, O	"	1,000 00	50 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Maber, S.	"	2,500 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Matheson, R. B.	"	2,100 00	200 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Nagle, C. E.	"	1,000 00	50 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Perrin, H. B.	"	1,450 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 6

Name.	Position.	Salary.	Amount of increase.	Date when granted.	Date becoming effective.	Date when actually paid.
		$ cts.	$ cts.			
Ryan, A	Clerk	900 00	130 00	Aug. 27	Aug. 27	Oct. 6
Shannon, C. V	"	1,600 00	50 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Tremblay, Miss M	"	900 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Trudel, E	"	1,600 00	200 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Tupper, H. C. L	"	800 00	250 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Williams, John	"	900 00	130 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Wyld, Grier	"	1,200 00	200 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Darrach, A. M	"	970 00	150 00	June 22	June 1	July 9
McElligott, J. P	"	700 00	150 00	" 22	" 1	" 9
Challies, J. B	"	1,500 00	100 00	" 20	July 1	" 31
Kennedy, Miss M. A	"	700 00	50 00	" 23	" 1	" 31
Kealey, Miss M. T	"	700 00	50 00	" 23	" 1	" 31
MacRitchie, Miss E	"	700 00	50 00	" 23	" 1	" 31
Duhamel, Miss A	"	700 00	50 00	" 23	" 1	" 31
MacCuaig, Miss A. J	"	650 00	50 00	" 23	" 1	" 31
Henry, C. R	"	650 00	50 00	" 23	" 1	" 31
McDougall, Miss G	"	650 00	50 00	" 23	" 1	" 31
Moore, Miss I	"	650 00	50 00	" 23	" 1	" 31
Laflamme, Jules	"	600 00	50 00	" 23	" 1	" 31
Jeffers, Miss B	"	600 00	50 00	" 23	" 1	" 31
Lefurgey, Miss N	"	600 00	50 00	" 22	" 1	" 31
Traversy, W	"	700 00	50 00	" 23	" 1	" 31
Perrault, R	"	550 00	50 00	" 23	" 1	" 31
Connolly, L	"	550 00	50 00	" 23	" 1	" 31
Pallister, Miss E. J	"	550 00	50 00	" 23	" 1	" 31
Ellis, F. T	"	700 00	50 00	" 23	" 1	" 31
Reynolds, Miss M. E	"	700 00	50 00	" 23	" 1	" 31
Thomson, Miss M	"	700 00	50 00	" 23	" 1	" 31
Curley, John	"	700 00	50 00	" 23	" 1	" 31
Featherston, J. E	"	1,200 00	350 00	July 2	" 1	" 31
Chandler, H	"	800 00	150 00	" 10	" 1	" 81
Parkinson, Chas	"	800 00	300 00	" 10	" 1	" 31
Johnson, D. W	"	1,000 00	100 00	" 21	" 1	" 31
Graham, M	"	1,000 00	100 00	" 24	" 1	" 25
Reiffenstein, J. H	"	1,900 00	100 00	Aug. 6	Aug. 1	Aug. 31
Genest, S. M	"	1,900 00	350 00	" 6	" 1	" 31
McCabe, E. J	"	1,050 00	50 00	" 12	" 1	" 31
Anderson, Wm.	"	1.330 00	50 00	June 30	June 1	July 9
Blatchley, H. M	"	1,050 00	50 00	" 30	" 1	" 9
Clunn, T. H. G	"	1,350 00	50 00	" 30	" 1	June 30
Henderson, F. D	"	1,350 00	50 00	" 30	" 1	" 30
Lecourt, C. E	"	1,450 00	50 00	" 30	" 1	July 9
Nash, T. S.	"	1,550 00	50 00	" 30	" 1	June 30
Roger, Alec	"	1,250 00	50 00	" 30	" 1	" 30
Umbach, J. E	"	1,350 00	50 00	" 30	" 1	" 30
Wilson, E. E. D	"	1,300 00	50 00	" 30	" 1	" 30
Pigeon, Jules	"	550 00	50 00	" 30	" 1	" 30
Cragg, N. W.	"	950 00	50 00	" 30	" 1	" 30
Larmonth, F.	"	770 00	50 00	" 30	" 1	" 30
Valiquette, R	"	600 00	50 00	" 30	" 1	" 30
Dawes, Miss A. E	"	550 00	50 00	" 30	" 1	" 30
Fulford, H. L	"	750 00	50 00	" 30	" 1	" 30
Geddes, A. L	"	770 00	50 00	" 30	" 1	" 30
Humphrys, H. W. R	"	950 00	50 00	" 30	" 1	July 9
Mayne, T. R	"	650 00	50 00	" 30	" 1	June 30
Savage, S	"	770 00	50 00	" 30	" 1	" 30
Mackay, A. S.	"	1,050 00	50 00	" 30	" 1	" 30
Oliver, Allan	"	850 00	50 00	" 30	" 1	" 30
Plaskett, J. S	"	2,150 00	50 00	Aug. 10	July 1	Aug. 31
Macara, J	"	1,950 90	50 00	" 10	" 1	" 31
Gauthier, L	"	1,950 00	50 00	" 10	" 1	" 31
Simpson, W	"	1,650 00	50 00	" 10	" 1	" 31
Stewart, R. M	"	1,650 00	50 00	" 10	" 1	" 31
McDiarmaid, F. A.	"	1,500 00	50 00	" 10	" 1	" 31
Tobey, W. M	"	1,450 00	50 00	" 10	" 1	" 31
Wallis, J. D	"	1,180 00	50 00	" 10	" 1	" 31
Labbe, J. H	"	1,200 00	300 00	" 10	" 1	" 31
Robertson, E. Blake	"	2,500 00	500 00	" 5	" 1	" 31
Fitzsimons, Harvey	"	1,900 00	100 00	" 10	" 1	" 31
Crean, F. J. P	"	1,200 00	300 00	" 17	Aug. 1	" 31

Name.	Position.	Salary.	Amount of increase.	Date when granted.	Date becoming effective.	Date when actually paid.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	1908.	1908.	1908.
Caldwell, W. R	Clerk	900 00	180 00	Aug. 17	Aug. 1	Aug. 31
Patching, R.	"	1,200 00	200 00	" 26	" 1	" 31
Olmsted, C	"	720 00	170 00	" 26	" 1	Sept. 3
Turcotte, E	"	800 00	200 00	" 26	" 1	" 3
Young, R. E.	"	3,400 00	400 00	" 31	July 1	" 10
Scott, W. D.	"	3,600 00	400 00	" 31	" 1	" 10
White, W. J.	"	3,400 00	400 00	" 31	" 1	" 10
Knight, Mrs. C. M.	"	600 00	50 00	July 31	" 1	July 31
Buckham, J. H	"	1,000 00	50 00	" 31	" 1	" 31
Hutton, J. B.	"	600 00	50 00	" 31	" 1	" 31
Rombough, J. I	"	1,000 00	50 00	" 31	" 1	" 31
Anderson, John	"	900 00	50 00	" 31	" 1	Aug. 31
Douglas, R. G	"	900 00	50 00	" 31	" 1	July 31
LeSueur, R. H.	"	1,250 00	50 00	" 31	" 1	" 31
Gardner, Miss E	"	550 00	50 00	" 31	" 1	" 31
Taylor, Fred	"	720 00	220 00	Aug. 31	Aug. 1	Aug. 31
Glenn, Miss M. M.	"	600 00	50 00	" 18	July 1	" 31
Beilby, Miss R.	"	600 00	50 00	" 18	" 1	" 31
Hand, S. E	"	900 00	50 00	" 27	Aug. 1	" 31
Harnett, W. C	"	950 00	50 00	" 27	" 1	" 31
O'Hanly, R. W.	"	700 00	50 00	" 27	" 1	" 31
Watt, J. E	"	900 00	50 00	" 27	" 1	" 31
Cohoon, A. K.	"	900 00	50 00	" 27	" 1	" 31
Nagle, C. E	"	950 00	50 00	" 27	" 1	" 31
Smith, A. E	"	950 00	50 00	" 27	" 1	" 31
Lefurgey, Miss J.	"	600 00	50 00	" 27	" 1	" 31
McDougall, Dan	"	850 00	50 00	" 27	" 1	" 31
Tyo, Miss K	"	650 00	100 00	" 27	" 1	Sept. 3
Haggerty, Wm.	"	800 00	50 00	" 27	" 27	Oct. 6
Johnston, J L	"	1,200 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Lamb, Wm	"	1,400 00	150 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Reinhardt, E	"	800 00	250 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Robertson, A. S	"	1,200 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Turnbull, Miss M	"	900 00	350 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Buckham, J. H	"	1,200 00	200 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Edward, H. L.	"	1,200 00	350 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Kemeys-Tynte, E	"	1,200 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Latimer, A. E.	"	1,200 00	250 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Marin, M	"	700 00	150 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Savage, S	"	800 00	30 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Batterton, W. P.	"	1,200 00	250 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Bennett, C. H.	"	900 00	50 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Chamonard, L.	"	900 00	300 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Esdale, R. J.	"	900 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Higgerty, H. J	"	800 00	150 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Pelton, A.	"	1,200 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Spence, C. F	"	1,600 00	350 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Martin, Miss M	"	900 00	200 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Shiels, Miss E.	"	900 00	200 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Johnson, Miss V. E.	"	900 00	200 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Beale, A. M	"	900 00	180 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Gilbert, C. G	"	1,000 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
McIlmoyle, Miss C. J	"	550 00	50 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Featherstone, J. E.	"	1,600 00	400 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Pinard, A.	"	1,000 00	50 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Ryan, T. W.	"	1,000 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
LeSueur, P. H.	"	1,400 00	150 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Desjardins, E	"	700 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Fagan, W. C	Messenger	650 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Turcotte, E	Clerk	900 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Merrifield, J. R	Messenger	700 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Blyth, D. F	Clerk	1,600 00	350 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Charlebois, H	"	700 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Taylor, G. J.	"	800 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Landerkin, G. F	"	1,400 00	150 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
O'Leary, Jas.	"	650 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Anderson, W	Draughtsman	1,600 00	270 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Archambault, E	"	800 00	150 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Ault, H. W	"	1,000 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Baine, H. E	"	1,850 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5

Mr. OLIVER.

Name.	Position.	Salary.	Amount of increase.	Date when granted.	Date becoming effective.	Date when actually paid.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	1908.	1908.	1908.
Barber, H. G.	Draughtsman.	1,600 00	250 00	Aug. 27	Aug. 27	Oct. 5
Bastien, L. A.	Clerk	900 00	180 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Begin, P. A.	Draughtsman	1,650 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Belleau, J. A	"	1,700 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Begin, W.	"	800 00	150 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Bennie, Jas.	"	1,000 00	80 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Beveridge, Jas.	"	1,600 00	470 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Blanchet, A. E.	"	1,450 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Blue, W.	"	800 00	150 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Bonnell, M. B.	"	1,000 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Bray, R. P.	"	1,100 00	200 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Brice, E. E.	"	1,000 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Brown, T. E.	"	2,100 00	550 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Bryant, E. D.	"	1,600 00	520 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Burgess, E. L.	"	1,600 00	250 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Carroll, M. J.	"	1,300 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Carruthers, H. K.	"	1,600 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Chalifour, E	"	2,100 00	300 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Chandler, S.	"	1,000 00	250 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Challies, J. B.	"	1,600 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Clunn, T. H. G.	"	1,450 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Craig, R. W.	"	1,000 00	80 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Cuming, A. L.	"	1,600 00	350 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Currie, P. W.	"	1,750 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Darrach, M.	"	1,100 00	130 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Davies, T. E. S.	"	1,300 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Davy, E.	"	1,100 00	200 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Day, H. S.	"	1,100 00	200 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Devlin, A.	"	800 00	200 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Dennis, E. M.	"	1,600 00	300 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
d'Orsonnens, A.	"	1,300 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Dumouchel, G. E.	"	1,050 00	70 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Elder, A. J.	"	1,600 00	300 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Elwell, Wm.	"	1,600 00	400 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Engler, Carl.	"	1,750 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Flindt, A. H.	"	1,000 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Gagnon, J. S.	Clerk	900 00	50 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Genest, P. F. X.	Draughtsman.	1,600 00	250 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Genest, S. M.	"	2,100 00	200 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Gillmore, E. T. B.	"	1,700 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Goodday, L.	"	1,100 00	200 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Grant, A. M.	"	1,000 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Grant, A. W.	"	1,100 00	200 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Green, W. T.	"	1,600 00	300 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Harris, K. D.	"	1,000 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Harrison, E. W.	"	1,000 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Hawyard, H. E.	"	1,000 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Helmer, J. D.	"	800 00	150 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Henderson, F. D.	"	1,600 00	250 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Hill, S. M.	"	1,600 00	300 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Hunter, R. H.	Clerk	1,800 00	150 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Inkter, T. B	Draughtsman.	1,600 00	470 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Kilmartin, A.	Clerk	800 00	150 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Kitto, F. H.	Draughtsman.	1,200 00	300 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Langlois, Jno.	"	1,600 00	250 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Lawe, Henry	"	1,600 00	200 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Lecourt, E.	"	1,550 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Lepage, J. B.	"	1,600 00	100 00	" 27	27	" 5
Lynch, F. C. C.	"	1,300 00	250 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
May, J. E.	"	1,600 00	250 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Maynard, F. H.	"	1,100 00	200 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
McClennan, W. D.	"	1,350 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
McElligott, J. P.	"	800 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
McLaughlin, M. J	"	1,100 00	200 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
McMillan, J. P.	"	1,000 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
MacIlquham, W. L.	"	1,600 00	350 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
McRae, A. D.	"	1,100 00	200 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Milliken, J. B.	"	1,000 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Moore, R. T.	Clerk.	700 00	10 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Morgan, W. E.	"	900 00	80 00	" 27	" 27	" 5

Name.	Position.	Salary.	Amount of increase.	Date when granted.	Date becoming effective.	Date when actually paid.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	1908.	1908.	1908.
Morley, R. W	Draughtsman	1,600 00	350 00	Aug. 27	Aug. 27	Oct. 5
Moule, M. J	"	1,350 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Nash, T. S	"	2,100 00	550 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
O'Connell, J. R	"	1,450 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Ouimet, E. G	"	700 00	150 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Osmond, H	"	1,000 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Peaker, W. J	"	1,000 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Perrin, Vincent	"	1,300 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Pigeon, Jules	"	800 00	250 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Proctor, G. S	"	1,300 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Reiffenstein, J. H	"	2,100 00	200 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Rice, F. W	"	1,600 00	350 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Rochon, E. C	"	1,100 00	200 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Roger, Alex	"	1,350 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Rowan-Legg, E. L	"	1,750 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Shanks, Thos	"	2,100 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Sheppard, N. B	"	2,100 00	450 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Smith, Jacob	"	2,100 00	250 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Spreckley, R. O	"	1,200 00	300 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Stronach, R. S	"	1,000 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Sutherland, H. E	"	1,100 00	200 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Strothers, J. H	"	9 0 00	300 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Sylvain, John	"	1,450 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Tache, Henri	"	1,600 00	400 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Umbach, J. E	"	1,600 00	250 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Villeneuve, E. J	Clerk	800 00	200 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Webb, G. C	Draughtsman	1,100 00	200 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Weld, W. E	"	1,600 00	350 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Whitcomb, H. E	"	1,000 00	170 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Williamson, F. H. H	"	1,100 00	200 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Wilson, E. E. D	"	1,400 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Wilson, H. W	"	1,050 00	180 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Wood, C. G	"	1,000 00	80 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Woodruff, John	"	1,600 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Binks, C. R	"	600 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Brown, Allan	"	650 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Cullen, M. J	Clerk	1,000 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Dawson, R. J	"	800 00	300 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Gaudry, G. A	"	900 00	180 00	" 27	" 27	" 5
Holbrook, C. H	"	700 00	200 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Paquette, A	"	700 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Tremblay, A	"	750 00	200 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Shore, A. H	"	600 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Watters, Jas	"	1,000 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Bethune, Duncan	"	800 00	80 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Curran, Jos	Messenger	600 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Fraser, Robt	Clerk	1,600 00	150 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Fraser, J. S	"	900 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Gillies, Alex	"	900 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Graham, J. S	"	800 00	80 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Hearnden, J. R	"	600 00	50 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Jacob, F. D	"	1,000 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Lang, Miss J	"	700 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Larmonth, F	"	800 00	30 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
McCann, Jas	"	800 00	80 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Morin, T. J	"	850 00	80 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Parlow, Geo. H	"	900 00	50 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Rogers, E	"	800 00	80 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Thompson, W	"	1,000 00	50 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Triganne, Miss M. A	"	600 00	50 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Vailquette, R	"	700 00	100 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Arcand, A	"	800 00	80 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Bourgeois, J. O	"	800 00	80 00	" 27	" 27	" 6*
Cannon, J. B	"	1,200 00	300 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Harper, W. E	"	1,600 00	200 00	" 27	" 27	" 6
Parker, T. H	"	1,200 00	300 00	" 27	" 26	" 6
Swinburn, A. H	"	800 00	80 00	" 27	" 27	" 6

*(Left Service Since.)

Mr. OLIVER.

2. One clerk in the temporary inside service.

(a) G. J. Taylor, clerk in Stationery Branch, resigned on the 26th August, 1908.

(b) Appointments since 1st July, 1908.

Name.	Position.	Salary.	Date of App't.
Arthur, A. J.	Clerk, Ry. and Swamp Lands	$ 900 00	Aug. 27, '08
Atchison, M. B.	" " "	600 00	July 18, '08
Arnott, Miss E. G.	" Secretary's Branch	500 00	Aug. 28, '08
Addison, W. G.	" Surveys "	500 00	" 27, '08
Beardsly, Geo.	" Patent "	800 00	" 28, '08
Butler, J. A.	" Registration "	720 00	" 1, '08
Blyth, Ernest	" T. G & Irrig. "	500 00	" 28, '08
Burrill, W. R	" Accts. "	720 00	July 28, '08
Butterworth, Frank	" " "	900 00	Aug. 27, '08
Cordukes, J. P.	" Surveys "	900 00	July 28, '08
Dewar, Miss J. D	" Registration "	500 00	Aug. 26, '08
Ebbs, E. J.	" Surveys "	500 00	" 27, '08
Fowler, Hartley	" Dom. Lands "	800 00	" 28, '08
Fortier, A.	" Accts. "	900 00	" 15, '08
Fortier, Miss C. L.	Clerk, Immigration Branch	500 00	July 9, '08
Gamble, Miss E.	" Patent "	500 00	Aug. 28, '08
Grindlay, Thos.	Draughtsman, Geog. "	1,200 00	" 7, '08
Hambleton, Miss A.	Clerk, Patent "	500 00	" 27, '08
Hickey, Miss M. C.	" Secretary's "	500 00	" 28, '08
Hancock, Miss A.	" Accts. "	500 00	" 28, '08
Johnston, Geo	" Immigration "	720 00	" 14, '08
Kniewasser, A.	" Registration "	800 00	" 28, '08
Kydd, Miss Irene	" Patent "	500 00	" 28, '08
Lawson, V. L.	" " "	800 00	" 28, '08
Latimer, W. R.	" Ry. and Swamp Lands	720 00	July 27, '08
Leggett, W. H.	Clerk, Stationery Branch	$ 1,200 00	" 3, '08
Lepage, Miss L.	" Immigration "	500 00	Aug. 29, '08
Lightfoot, Miss G.	" " "	500 00	July 6, '08
McDonald, Miss L.	" Dom. Lands "	500 00	Aug. 28, '08
Martin, M. H.	" Patent "	800 00	" 28, '08
Mitchell, Frank	" Mines "	800 00	" 26, '08
Murphy, A. J.	Messenger, Secy's. "	500 00	" 28, '08
Murphy, A. S	" Accts. "	500 00	" 28, '08
McCormick, Miss J.	Clerk, Seed Grain "	500 00	July 21, '08
Norrish, B. E	" Surveys "	900 00	" 31, '08
Odell, R. K.	" Ry. & Swamp Lands	500 00	Aug. 27, '08
Pedley, Miss A. S.	" Registration Branch	500 00	July 2, '08
Purvis, G. E.	Messenger, Sch. Lds. "	500 00	Aug. 28, '08
Rattey, Miss A.	Clerk, Patent "	500 00	" 27, '08
Ray, Miss F.	" Secy's. "	500 00	" 28, '08
Roberts, Miss W.	" Forestry "	500 00	July 2, '08
Worden, G.	" Patent "	800 00	Aug. 27, '08
Wright, W. A.	Messenger, Secy's. "	500 00	" 27, '08
Wadlin, L. N.	Draughtsman, Sur. "	900 00	July 14, '08
Wilians, T. B.	Clerk, Immigration "	1,200 00	" 3, '08

Temporary Clerks Appointed in accordance with Civil Service Amendment Act of 1908:—

Miss Jessie McJanet	Clerk, Forestry Branch	500 00	Nov. 27, '08
Miss Rheba Fraser	" " "	500 00	" 30, '08
Miss Amy Grimes	" " "	500 00	" 30, '08

SOUTH AFRICAN LAND GRANTS.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE asked:

1. Has the government under consideration any changes in the conditions relating to the South African land grants?

2. Do the proposed changes contemplate a relaxation in the condition of residing on the lands so granted? If so, what are the proposed changes?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior): No changes are contemplated.

DOKIS INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. GORDON asked:

1. Have all berths in Dokis Indian reserve been paid for in accordance with tender, requisition?

2. If any have lapsed for non-payment, what are the numbers, and are they for sale now?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. All berths on the Dokis Indian Reserve have been paid for except one, viz., berth

No. 2, sold to Mr. Patrick McDermott, of South River, Ontario.

2. This berth is held by the department and has not been again offered for sale.

DAM AT MONTREAL RIVER AT LATCHFORD.

Mr. GEORGE GORDON asked :

Has the contract for building dam on Montreal river at Latchford been let? If so, when will the work be started?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). No contract has yet been let. The matter is under consideration.

NEW POST OFFICE AT CHESLEY.

Mr. DONNELLY asked :

1. Was the amount voted last year for a new post office at Chesley expended?
2. Will there be a further amount placed in the estimates at this session?

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

1. No.
2. Matter will have due consideration.

LOWERING THE WATERS OF LAKES SIMCOE AND COUCHICHING.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE asked :

1. What, if any, measures have been taken by the government to lower the waters of Lakes Simcoe and Couchiching?
2. What moneys, if any, have been expended for this purpose, the date of expenditure and persons superintending the same?
3. Is it the intention of the government to take further measures to lower the waters of said lakes, thereby reclaiming thousands of acres of first-class arable land?

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

As this question covers a number of works done in the neighbourhood during several years, it is suggested that a return be asked for.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion for a return.

TRUST FUND OF RAMA INDIANS.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE asked :

1. What is the amount of the trust funds held by the government on behalf of the Indians on the Rama reserve, North Ontario?
2. Has the capital account of this fund been diminished by the government lately? If so, when, by how much, for what purpose, at whose instance and by whom was the money expended?
3. Were the said Indians consenting parties to a diminution of their trust lands? If not, under what authority were the funds utilized for other purposes than for the immediate benefit of the said Indians?

Mr. OLIVER.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. The trust funds of the Rama Indians held by the government amount to $14,-335.78.
2. No.
3. Answered by No. 2.

EXHIBITIONS ASSISTED AND PARTICIPATED IN THE DOMINION.

Mr. PAQUET asked :

1. What exhibitions in this country were subsidized by the government in 1908?
2. What was the amount of each of these subsidies?
3. What exhibitions out of Canada were subsidized by the federal government in 1908?
4. What was the amount of each of these subsidies?
5. Who were the official representatives of Canada at these exhibitions?
6. What was the salary of these representatives?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

1. The Dominion Exhibition held at Calgary, Alberta.
2. $50,000.
3. There were no exhibitions out of Canada subsidized, but the Dominion was represented at and participated in the Franco-British Exhibition, held at London, England, and the Scottish National Exhibition held at Edinburgh, Scotland.
4. The amount expended during the year 1908 was at London about $333,000 and at Edinburgh about $27,350.
5. At London, the Hon. Arthur Boyer, Honorary Commissioner, and Mr. William Hutchison, the Permanent Exhibition Commissioner; at Edinburgh, Mr. T. H. Race.
6. Hon. Mr. Boyer received no salary, but was granted a living allowance of $15 per day. Mr. Hutchison receives a salary of $3,000 a year and expenses when abroad. Mr. Race was paid $10 per day for his services and living expenses.

DELAY IN ISSUING CHEQUES TO MEN EMPLOYED IN TORONTO HARBOUR WORKS.

Mr. MACDONELL asked :

1. What is the explanation of the delay in issuing cheques to men employed on the Toronto harbour works?
2. Is the government aware that it is asserted the wages for October had not been paid on December 23?
3. Is the government aware that this delay has entailed great hardship upon those who are thus deprived of their wages when urgently required?
4. Have the wages for October been paid? If so, on what date?

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

1. Exhaustion of appropriation.
2. No.

3. No.

4. Cheques for October and November wages were mailed from Ottawa on 23rd December, 1908.

POST OFFICE MACKEY'S STATION, ONT.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked :

1. Has the government received complaints regarding the management of the post office at Mackey's station, Ontario, and the condition and delivery of mail at that place?

2. If so, what is the nature of said complaints, and what action has been taken to improve the conditions found there?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). No complaints have been received at the department regarding the management of the post office at Mackey's station, Ontario, since the appointment of the present postmaster in 1905.

DOMINION 4 PER CENT LOAN.

Mr. AMES asked :

When the Canada reduced 4 per cent loan shall fall due on January 1, 1910, what will be the amount of the sinking fund in hand towards its redemption?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (for Minister of Finance). Approximately $25,236,343.

DOMINION LOANS.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. When the loan of £1,926,654 fell due on the 1st May, 1907, how much was redeemed and how much was extended, and in what form?

2. When the loan of £1,500,000 fell due on the 1st of April, 1908, how much was redeemed and how much was extended or converted and in what form?

3. When the loan of £4,500,000 fell due on the 1st of November, 1908, how much was redeemed, how much was extended, and in what form?

4. What was the total of loans other than temporary, which fell due between the 1st of April, 1907, and the 31st of December, 1908?

5. Of this total how much was redeemed and how much still forms part of the public debt?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (for Minister of Finance):

1. £95,256 14s 6d. was redeemed; the balance £1,831,398 1s. 5d. was extended to 1st of May, 1911, at the rate of 4 per cent per annum, with option to holders, up to 30th of April, 1910, of converting into 3 per cents of 1938 at £105 3 per cents for each £100 of 4 per cent.

2. £376,200 redeemed. £1,123,800 converted into 3½ per cents 1930-50 (February issue).

3. £2,582,207 18s. 11d. redeemed ; £490,499 16s. 6d. converted into 3½ per cents 1930-50 (October issue); £1,427,342 4s. 7d. converted into 3¾ per cents of 1908. Total, £4,500,000.

4. £7,926,654 15s. 11d.

5. £3,053,664 13s. 5d. redeemed; £4,872,990 2s. 6d. extended and converted into other loans.

LIVE STOCK ON EXPERIMENTAL FARMS.

Mr. STAPLES asked:

1. How many heads of stock are there on the respective experimental farms, and what do they consist of?

2. What is the estimated value of the different kinds, and for what purpose are they utilized?

3. How many acres are there in each experimental farm?

4. How many acres are there under cultivation on each farm?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I would ask that this be put in the form of a motion for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion for a return.

KINGSTON MILITARY BUILDINGS.

Mr. EDWARDS asked:

1. How many cottages or dwellings were built last year on the military grounds near Kingston?

2. Were they built for the accommodation of the servants of the military college?

3. What was the cost of the said dwellings?

4. Were tenders called for the work, and by what contractor was it done?

5. What amount of money has been expended on the new rifle butts at Barriefield?

6. Were tenders called for, and by whom was the work done?

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

1. Sixteen.

3 Contract price $77,739; buildings not yet completed.

4. Yes; M. Sullivan.

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

2. No, but for the 'Civil Subordinate Staff' of the R. M. C.

5. Eighteen targets have been erected at a cost of $12,158.80.

6. Yes, public tenders; the successful tenderer being contractor W. M. Leacy, Prescott, Ont.

PURCHASE OF LAND NEAR KINGSTON FOR MILITARY PURPOSES.

Mr. EDWARDS asked:

1. From what persons during the last four years was land near Kingston purchased by the government for military purposes?

2. How much land was acquired from each person, and what was the price paid?

3. Who acted as agent for the government in effecting the said purchases?

4. Did the government through its agent agree to erect or to pay for the erection of fences bounding the land purchased?

5. Is it the intention of the government to acquire more land adjoining that already purchased?

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

1 and 2. Land has been purchased from the following: E. A. Milton, 34 37-100ths. acres for $3,437. The Misses Kelley, 55 77-100ths for $1,952.

3. The negotiations for the purchase of the above two properties were conducted by the officer commanding, eastern Ontario command, assisted by Mr. George Cliff, a real estate agent.

4. Not so far as the department is aware.

5. Yes.

IMPORTATION OF MAIL BOXES.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. The government having stated that they purchased six thousand mail boxes and brought them into Canada without paying duty, under whose authority were these boxes and fittings delivered, or how was possession obtained without entry being passed at customs?

2. What is the date of said entry, and through what port of entry did they come?

3. Is it the practice of the Customs Department to furnish accounts covering payments of duty on goods imported into Canada, and did the Customs Department furnish such accounts covering the mail boxes?

4. Was the Minister of Customs or any officer in the customs service of Canada requested to forward a statement or account showing the amount of duty payable? If so, on what date was the request made, by whom was it made, and was the request granted?

5. Were prices paid for the rural mail boxes the same as is charged the United States government for similar boxes? If not, what is the difference in prices?

Hon. WM. PATERSON Minister of Customs):

1. Possession was obtained of rural mail delivery equipment by the Post Office Department prior to customs entry on order from the Department of Customs, upon undertaking for payment of duty after delivery.

2. The dates of customs entries for this equipment are as follows: Port of Ottawa, 26th of January, 1909; Port of Toronto, 30th of January, 1909 (as per documents sent through Department of Customs, 28th of January, 1909).

3. The Department of Customs, in special cases, furnishes vouchers for payment of duty on imported goods. Upon an invoice being furnished, officers of the Department of Customs gave instructions as to the rate and amount of duty to be paid on the said equipment, and officers of Customs at the ports receipted the vouchers for the payment of the duties.

4. The controller of postal stores on or before 12th of January, 1909, delivered to the Collector of Customs, Ottawa, an account of the rural mail delivery equipment imported, with request for advice as to the rating and amount of duty payable. The request was granted.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1, 2, 3 and 4. These questions refer to the Customs Department.

5. So far as the department is aware, the United States government does not buy rural delivery boxes, but patrons of such routes are required to supply themselves with the approved boxes at their own expense.

INQUIRY ON SS. 'MONTCALM.'

Mr. PAQUET asked:

1. Has the Minister of Marine lately placed a new officer or engineer on the 'Montcalm' at Cap Rouge?

2. What is the name of this engineer, and when was he sent to the 'Montcalm'?

3. Is he charged with studying the efficiency of the work of the 'Montcalm,' as regards the opening of navigation up the river from Quebec?

4. Is he charged with studying the results of the work of the 'Montcalm' with regard to inundations?

5. Does he perform other duties and what are they?

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

1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. One of the engineers attached to the staff of the St. Lawrence ship channel, Mr. N. B. McLean, is at present on the steamer Montcalm observing the ice conditions and reporting to the department.

THE ROSS RIFLE.

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

In the answer given to Mr. Northrup on Monday, last, (page 346 of 'Hansard') in regard to the claims for damages that have been put in for injuries received through the use of the Ross rifle, it is stated that the accident to Sydney A. Fletcher, New Westminster, British Columbia, was caused by the rifle bursting. This is incorrect. The accident was caused by the cartridge case bursting and injuring the firer's eye. The rifle was not injured at all.

MOTION AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all corespondence, orders in council, papers, and documents relating to the question of fisheries in the Pembina river, in the province of Manitoba, and of regulations or agreements with the United States government in reference to rivers running from one country into the other.—Mr. W. H. Sharpe.

LEVEL RAILWAY CROSSINGS.

Mr. LENNOX. Can the Minister of Railways tell me when the return will be

brought down as to the number of accidents at level crossings, which was ordered on my motion at the opening of the session?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways). This requires quite a lot of research, but I am asking the officials to furnish all the information required by the House as speedily as possible.

REPORT OF MR. JUSTICE CASSELS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask the Secretary of State when the report of Mr. Justice Cassels will be printed and laid before the House?

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State). I have been furnished with a memorandum showing that the first volume of evidence consisting of about 350 pages was issued in October last. It is explained that there was a gap in the manuscript caused by the evidence given in French not being translated into English. That has since been done and the second volume consisting of about 350 pages will be distributed early next week. The third volume is in type and will be distributed on or about the 16th inst., and the remaining volumes will follow in quick succession after that.

RAILWAY COMMITTEE OF PRIVY COUNCIL

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When may we expect the information promised by the Minister of Railways (Hansard, page 268) concerning the orders of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council in relation to level crossings.

Hon. Geo. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I have already brought down the order in reference to the crossing at Kingston. It is quite difficult, I understand, to get these orders of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, but an official of the Railway Department who was formerly an official of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, is endeavouring to get them.

PROTECTION OF OUR COAST LINE AND SEAPORTS.

Mr. FOSTER. Yesterday a day was set for the resolution which I propose to submit to the House, but afterwards the First Minister stated that that being government day——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not government day, but public Bills and Orders.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any objection to taking the discussion up on Tuesday, the 15th ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is government day.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it not sufficiently important ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will try to arrange a day for my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. If it does not come on that day I am afraid it will have to go over for another fortnight.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Very good.

INTERNATIONAL WATERWAYS TREATY.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Some time ago the hon. the leader of the opposition made inquiry as to the waterways treaty which is now being considered by the Senate of the United States. I told my hon. friend we would communicate with the home authorities, and I have to-day the authority of His Excellency the Governor General to give to the House the despatch which His Excellency has received on this subject from the Earl of Crewe, the Colonial Secretary. The despatch reads:

London, January 29, 1909.

I am in receipt of your telegram of January 28, and from your telegram of January 9, I gather that your responsible advisers have the full text of the treaty before them.

According to press reports there seems to be some misunderstanding as to the presentation of the treaty to the Dominion parliament.

In this country the treaty-making power is the King, acting on the advice of his responsible ministers, who in cases of treaties which affect a Dominion Act of course in full consultation and accord with the government of the Dominion concerned.

In the United States the treaty-making power is with the advice and consent of the Senate, and until the Senate of the United States of America approve of any treaty it is not the practice to publish or present to parliament either in this country or in Canada, or to publish in the United States or to present to congress. The fact that the Senate of the United States see the treaty before the parliament of the Dominion, but not before government of the Dominion, is therefore entirely due to the terms of the constitution of the United States.

I am in hopes that your responsible advisers will clearly explain this to parliament, and will point out that the relation between the parliament of the Dominion and the government of the Dominion in this respect is practically analogous to that between the Imperial parliament and the government of His Majesty the King.

(Sgd.) CREWE.

PASSENGER TICKETS ACT.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville) moved second reading of Bill (No. 2) to amend the Passenger Tickets Act. He said : Last year I presented this Bill in exactly the same form, but the Prime Minister did not wish it to go to the committee on account

of the absence of the Minister of Railways. The Bill proposes to add two clauses to the Passenger Tickets Act. In this bill I ask that the mileage book issued by the railway companies should be good on their trains. At present if a passenger has purchased a thousand mile book and presents it on the train, the conductor cannot take the number of miles off, but has to insist on the passenger paying for a ticket. All that the owner of a book can do is to get a ticket in exchange at the station for the number of miles torn off by the agent. On the other side of the line, they issue these books, but there these books are good on the trains. I claim that when a railway company sells a mileage book, that book ought to be valid on the train as well as at the station. In Canada the railway companies charge 2½ cents per mile for their mileage books. On the other side of the line they charge 2 cents per mile; and I understand that some of the American railway companies which run trains partly through Canada, issue mileage books, which are good in Canada, at 2 cents per mile. It seems to me that our railway companies should reduce the rate to 2 cents per mile for these mileage books, and if necessary limit the duration of these books to a certain time. This matter is one which I would like the Railway Committee to discuss. Another clause in this Bill deals with the interchange of tickets from union stations. There are a number of stations in Canada which are called union stations because they are used by more than one railway company. Often the trains of different companies start almost at the same time and passengers are apt to take the wrong train. A passenger who has bought a ticket by the Canadian Pacific Railway will sometimes take the Grand Trunk Railway by mistake, and the conductor of course cannot accept his ticket. My suggestion is that if any one should happen to get on the wrong train, going to the same point, the conductor should accept his ticket, and the company would then collect from the other company who sold it. It may be said that if the passenger has the money, there is no reason why he should not buy a ticket and collect the other one from the other company. But it takes two or three months to get the money back, and often the passenger may find it almost impossible to collect it. He may be living at New York and may take the train in Toronto for Montreal and take a Canadian Pacific Railway train instead of a Grand Trunk Railway or vice versa. If he had purchased a Canadian Pacific Railway ticket and then by mistake took the Grand Trunk Railway train, there is no reason why the conductor should not accept that ticket and hand it to the company who would in turn collect the amount from the Canadian Pacific Railway. This would not cause the companies any great inconvenience, because every day they are selling tickets on which they must collect the money from one another. For instance, I purchase a ticket at Toronto for Ottawa. Half the trip is on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Canadian Pacific Railway have to collect from the Grand Trunk Railway the amount from Brockville to Ottawa. My proposition therefore will not impose on these companies any extra trouble worth mentioning. I have in my mind a case in which a woman got on a train in Toronto bound for Montreal. It was a night train. She had a Canadian Pacific Railway ticket and by mistake she got on the Grand Trunk Railway train. She had not enough money to pay for another ticket so that the conductor had to put her off at Port Hope. She was taken back to Toronto and had to stay there until the next morning so that she could not get to Montreal until the next night. This was a great inconvenience, especially as this woman had been called to Montreal on account of sickness in her family. I can see no reason why the Grand Trunk Railway should not have accepted her ticket and then collected the amount from the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Does my hon. friend know of any other case?

Mr. J. D. REID. I have heard of others but I do not suppose there are many. There are, however, some in which the hardships are very great. It is easy for a passenger to take the wrong train, and these mistakes are made generally by persons who may not have the money to purchase other tickets. These are points I would like the Railway Committee to consider and discuss. I do not want to take up the time discussing the question, as we can do that much better in committee. The right hon. the Prime Minister gave a good reason last year why he could not allow it to go to the committee, but now that the Minister of Railways is here (Mr. Graham) I would ask the right hon. gentleman to let the Bill go to the Railway Committee.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways). I am not sure that we ought to hold the railway companies responsible for the mistakes which the rest of us make. While there is something in the contention of my hon. friend, I presume that there is no very extensive grievance through people getting on the wrong train with the right ticket. If the great body of the public were in the same position as my hon. friend and myself, it would make no difference to them which train they got on, but unfortunately for them they are not in that happy condition. The trouble possibly arises primarily in the fact that the stations are not constructed as they ought to be for great traffic. In a properly constructed and conducted union station of large pro-

portions, it is almost impossible for a passenger to get on a wrong train because he cannot get in or where the wrong train is. As regards the question of mileage books being honoured on the trains, there is room for argument and I would like to hear some discussion of it by the Railway Committee. I have had conductors on Canadian trains honour my mileage coupons and I think the order which provides that they do not accept the mileage coupons except at the station, if it exists, must be of recent date However, that is worthy of discussion. There may be reasons of convenience and safety to the companies which justify such an order.

As to the question of the rate at which the books ought to be issued, I stated last night that the Canadian parliament has adopted a course with reference to the control of rates through a Board of Railway Commissioners, both as to freight and passengers, and I believe we ought, at least for the present, to give that board a fair trial in the arrangement and adjustment of rates, both passenger and freight. If there be any hardship, any reason why passenger rates should be reduced from one point to any other point, the Board of Railway Commissioners has full power under the Act to hear that complaint and adjudicate upon it. When it is said the railways of Canada must give a mileage book rate of 2 cents per mile, it is well known, particularly in a new country, that there are parts of these railway lines, and the entire road of some companies, that could not stand a rate of 2 cents per mile; but parliament, in its wisdom, has placed these matters in the hands of a Board of Railway Commissioners, deputing them to adjust the rates in different parts of the country according to the conditions that exist in that part of the country. There are some sections on new roads where it would be very unjust and unwise to tie the company down to a rate that might be perfectly fair on some other part of that same line or on some other line, and the difference of conditions existing in different parts of the country has led parliament to place this control of rates in the hands of a Board of Railway Commissioners, and I might say to my hon. friend that I am willing to have some other parts of the Bill discussed in the Railway Committee, and cannot say that this part shall not be discussed, I set my face against that part of it and say that the government could not consent to changing our policy in that direction. If there is any complaint the board has been established for the purpose of adjudicating upon such a complaint.

There may be some difference of opinion in the committee as to this interchange of tickets. My hon. friend has referred to the fact that one line now collects a rate for another line, but there is this difference: The line on which the traffic originates has a joint traffic arrangement with the line with which it connects and they divide the receipts pro rata according to their joint tariff arrangement. Under this proposition there is no joint tariff arrangement because under the system suggested, the Grand Trunk, for instance, if it sold a ticket, would simply originate the ticket and would have the contract, and it would work out that the road that originated the traffic would pay a percentage to the road that completed the traffic for collection and its part of the freight, and we would find here that the road that sold the ticket and got no profit would have to pay the road that did not sell the ticket, but got all the profit for collecting its ticket. You could not make that work in practice unless you could make the law work backwards in this particular case. My own view is that it would be difficult to work. I have had some experience in selling tickets in the past. The ticket seller has to make his returns daily; the conductor takes up a certain number of tickets and his collections must correspond eventually with the ticket seller's report of tickets for that day. If we allowed that mixing up of tickets and required one railway to honour the tickets of another railway, we would interfere a good deal with the rights of these companies and the contracts they make with the passengers.

Having said this much and explained my position in regard to the price of mileage tickets, I have no objection to having this Bill go to the Railway Committee for discussion, without committing myself to any part of the Bill.

Mr. LANCASTER. I agree with the Minister of Railways that the matter of the rates might perhaps as well be left to the Railway Commission. The minister has not dealt with the clause requiring the conductor to accept these mileage tickets. If a man once pays his money to any agent of the company, why should he have to exchange the tickets he thus buys for any other ticket? The railways sell these tickets for their own benefit, and having sold them that sale should be final. I would think that principle of the Bill ought to be sustained.

There is some need for the part of the Bill compelling a railway to honour the ticket of another railway whose trains start from the same station, as in the case of the Union station in Toronto. I have often seen people put off the train at South Parkdale because they had tickets of the other line. The trains leave at nearly the same time and there should be some protection for people who take the wrong train, par-

ticularly as the trains of the same railway do not always leave from the same platform. It might be advisable to enact that where the trains leave the same station within half an hour of each other the tickets of the other line should be honoured. The railways could honour each other's tickets in this way and adjust their accounts at the end of the month as they do in other matters. In some parts of the country there is an evil such as is sought to be remedied by clause 7b of this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENT.

On the order:

Second reading of Bill (No. 3) to amend the Railway Act.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Mr. ROBERT BICKERDIKE (St. Lawrence, Montreal). I understand that, under the arrangement arrived at just before the adjournment of the House last evening, it will be impossible for me to go on with this Bill, as the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham), has taken us into his confidence and informed us that he intends to bring down a Bill to cover this case. Had this Bill gone on, I should have desired to propose an amendment in the form of additional clauses. With the permission of the House, I will read these clauses, which I commend to the favourable consideration of the Minister of Railways. My contention is that the whole of this matter should come under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission. They are the only people, I think, who can deal with it intelligently. Therefore, I would have proposed to introduce the following:

2. All highway crossings at rail/level shall be constructed, protected and maintained in accordance with the orders and regulations of the board.

3. The board may determine what highway crossings at rail level, now used, are, in its opinion, dangerous, and thereupon the board may direct the company to change the curve of the railway at such crossings, or alter the approaches thereto, or erect gates thereat, or make such other changes as the board deems necessary for the protection of persons using such crossings. Provided that no company shall be required to make such changes in any one year at more than twenty-five per cent of the crossings upon its railway which are determined by the board to be dangerous.

2. The board may direct at which of such dangerous crossings the necessary changes shall be made during the first year and so on in each succeeding year until all such dangerous crossings have been so changed.

I hope that this principle will be incorporated in any measure on the subject that is adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER. That can stand as a notice. Stand.

Mr. LANCASTER.

CRIMINAL CODE—AMENDMENT.

Mr. ROBERT BICKERDIKE (St. Lawrence, Montreal) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 4) to amend the Criminal Code. He said: As I said, when I introduced this Bill, the object is to add to the number of cases in which the lash may be used. The first is for those who carry concealed weapons and use them on the slightest provocation. The next is in the case of assault upon females. The section says:

Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to three years imprisonment, and to be whipped, who assaults his wife or other female and thereby occasions actual bodily harm.

The Bill provides the same in the case of those guilty of robbery; and the fourth case is that of assault with intent to rob—highway robbery. In my opinion, in all these cases, the judge should be given discretion to sentence the offender to the lash as well as to imprisonment.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). Before the second reading is carried, I would like to say a word on the general subject adverted to by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bickerdike) who has introduced the measure. In doing so, I wish to be understood as expressing the individual opinions on the subject which I myself hold, and as not desiring that those opinions should carry any especial weight except such as my position as one of the members of this House might involve. I am opposed to the whole principle of inflicting punishment upon criminals by the use of the lash. I regard it merely as a survival of the days of primitive man, when the only canon of punishment known was the law of retaliation, which exacted an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, a life for a life. In later days, days which, while not within living memory, are not yet so far gone by, the principle of retaliation seemed still to survive in regard to many offences known to the British law. In the days of the Stuarts punishment by the infliction of personal pain was the rule, perhaps, rather than the exception, and we read of the use of instruments of torture. We see these instruments of torture preserved in our museums, and we think ourselves better than our forefathers, who applied the rack or the thumbscrew or the boot, or other means of inflicting bodily pain upon those who had offended against the law or who were charged with some such offence. We consider ourselves, in modern days, to have become more civilized, to have attained truer ideas of the principles upon which punishment legally and judicially imposed for offences against the criminal law ought to be administered. And yet the principle, or practice, of flogging for certain offences still applies, and provisions that it may be

the means of punishment still appear upon our statute-book. I am not proposing that there should be alterations; I am not prepared to set up my individual opinion against the opinions of very many men thoroughly as well able to form sound judgment upon this subject as I can be, and I am not proposing to amend the Criminal Code by reducing the number of cases in which whipping may be administered. But there are serious practical difficulties in the way of carrying out the law as it now stands in the few cases in which whipping is a part of the punishment which the law prescribes. One practical question is: Who is to be the official who shall administer this punishment? The judge adds to his sentence of so many months, or so many years, imprisonment—quite as an off-hand matter, it may be—a provision that the prisoner shall be flogged once, or twice, or it may be three times, during the course of his sentence. That is all the court does in the matter; no directions are given, but it is left to the officers of the law to carry out the sentence of the court. The prisoner goes to some jail, or prison, or penitentiary, and the responsibility for seeing that the sentence is carried out rests upon the head of that institution.

The warden of the penitentiary sees perhaps for the first time when the prisoner arrives accompanied by the warrant of commitment, that flogging is to be administered to this man. Is the warden himself to handle the knout, or is he to delegate that duty to one of his subordinate officials; and if to one of them, is the warden to select the man who shall carry out the sentence of the court? In practice the matter is reduced to that. The warden has to nominate some one of his subordinate officials and instruct that man, putting I suppose the instrument of punishment into his hands, to lay the lash on the bare back of the prisoner. That punishment will be either a farce, a perfect mockery, or it will be something so terrible to think about that it ought, I think, to give any one concerned in the infliction of such punishment, or in ordering it, pause before he pronounces the words that would condemn any fellow human being to such degradation, and to a punishment of that description. It all depends upon the willingness of the executioner, upon the amount of energy he puts into his right arm when he lays on the blows. The punishment may be a farce, or it may be something terrible to contemplate. I suppose it is intended to be a real thing, that it is meant to be a whipping laid on with all the strength that the warden or guard of the penitentiary who may be willing to administer it, can put into his blows.

I do not discuss the moral effect upon the man who administers the punishment. I think, to say the least of it, that it cannot be an elevating effect. I do not wonder when I find that many and many a man who has accepted a position as guard or warden, or police official in our penitentiaries, says, when ordered to administer a whipping, this is not within my contract, I did not come into the public service of Canada to be a quasi executioner. It accordingly reduces itself in practice simply to what I say, that there are some particular guards in the penitentiaries who are willing to do this thing; there are others who are unwilling, and we have to select such means as we can find. In the custody of our prisoners in penitentiaries or in jails no matter, I may say, how highly the prison offence which they may commit would seem to deserve the lash, no matter though the offence may be one of such an effect upon the other convicts as practically to destroy the whole discipline of the institution, no matter though the offence may be one arising out of pure ugliness on the part of the convict the lash is not used. We have upon occasion, and in extreme cases, used an instrument of punishment best described by the word paddle, and with which we administered a sound spanking upon the convict. I see a considerable difference between the two things. The lash is designed to tear the flesh, to bring blood; the other instrument will at least leave no external sign of injury. At times we punish in our penitentiaries by turning the hose upon the prisoner, in a confined cell so that he cannot escape when the water is turned on. We find that a very effective punishment indeed. It produces discomfort. It may be that at the time of the infliction it produces more or less of a sensation which might properly be described as pain, but it produces no ill effects. For my part, and for every reason, I state myself to be entirely opposed to the principle of punishing an offence against our laws by something which is literally nothing but an infliction of bodily pain.

It is said that there is a kind of fitness, a kind of special propriety, in punishment of this sort for offences against women. There might be other punishment suggested that would seem to be even more proper. No man I suppose, in this House or out of it, would seriously suggest the mutilation of an offender against these laws; and yet in conversation men say to one another at times that that would be the proper punishment. Is there any difference in principle? There may be a difference in degree; but so far as I am concerned, each proposition seems to me to rest substantially upon the same principle for its foundation.

In regard to this particular measure which has been proposed by my hon. friend, four specific offences are mentioned as those which he proposes to add to the list of

crimes already mentioned in the Criminal Code for which whipping may be inflicted by the presiding judge, or the presiding magistrate, who disposes of the charge. The possession of a deadly weapon is one, also assaults, not assaults of the character which are commonly spoken of as criminal assaults, indecent assaults, but the ordinary assault and battery of a man beating a woman. Then highway robbery, or assaults with intent to commit highway robbery. Now taking these in turn, I may say to my hon. friend that so far as the offence of carrying a deadly weapon is concerned, my views go entirely with his own. I see no justification whatever in this country for a man carrying upon his person about the streets a weapon which can only be used for purposes of offence. A knife may be a deadly weapon, a razor in the hands of a desperate man may be a most deadly weapon. But these are generally instruments of usefulness. I would not be disposed to extend to the carrying of instruments of that character the special punishment which my hon. friend is proposing here, or any special punishment. The carrying of a dirk or dagger, a weapon that may be used only for the purposes of stabbing, is altogether a different story. But even in that case, while every one would, I think, agree, while certainly I would agree, to the fullest extent with the views of my hon. friend that the carrying of such weapons ought to be made punishable, I would not be willing to add to the imprisonment the punishment of whipping. So with regard to the offences of highway robbery, robbery with violence, or an assault with intent to commit such robbery.

I am perfectly aware that, as a matter of record, the offence of garrotting at one time became so prevalent in England, in London particularly, that extreme measures had to be resorted to in order to stamp it out, and the punishment of whipping was prescribed. That was carried out by the judges, and as a consequence the crime of garrotting was in a short time at an end and no longer known in that portion of the world. But I may concede to my hon. friend, or to any one who advocates the application of whipping to offences of the character of highway robbery or assaults with intent, that if there were such an unusual condition of things in any community in this country as seemed to call for very special and extreme measures of repression, whipping might be for a time used as a means of putting an end to what might be called an outbreak or epidemic of the character I am referring to.

But, I know of no ground for believing that any such condition of things does, at the present time, exist anywhere in Canada. In conversation my hon. friend mentioned to me the prevalence of offences of this sort in certain portions of Montreal, and I have been unable to avoid noticing, in reading the files of prisoners' cases, of applicants for clemency during the last few months, or during the time that I have been in charge of the Justice Department, that these offences did seem to be more prevalent in the city of Montreal than anywhere else in Canada. There are more frequent convictions for offences of that character apparently in Montreal than in Toronto or any other of our larger cities. But there have been no representations made to the department from judges, juries, or other quarters that the offence of assaulting with intent to commit highway robbery, or the actual commission of highway robbery, has become so rife in Montreal or anywhere else in the country that such special, extreme measures to repress it are necessary and in the absence of such representations I certainly feel myself unable to go with my hon. friend to the extent of enacting that such offences, wherever committed in Canada, should henceforth be punishable, at the will of the presiding magistrate, by the use of the lash.

There remains the offence of assault and battery where a woman is the victim of it, and in this regard I will admit that the application of the law of retaliation, (because it simply comes to that) is more justifiable because the apparent fitness of things seems to make it more proper, or less improper, to demand whipping as a part of the punishment than in any of the other instances that my hon. friend has selected in the measure now under consideration. I have, even in regard to offences of this character, the feeling which I have already expressed. I think that simple imprisonment ought to be, and would be, in all ordinary cases, a sufficient punishment for the beating of a woman by a man, but the offender is one for whom no man worthy of the name would have any sympathy and whom no man would wish to protect. I certainly do not wish to stand here as the defender of such a man. I am prepared to offer no opposition to my hon. friend's measure in so far as the second clause is concerned, making any one convicted of an offence of the character described against a woman liable to be sentenced to flogging. I certainly think that even in such cases sentence to such a punishment ought to be sparingly pronounced, but there may be cases in which it is the only way to protect our women from the assault and beating of a husband, or, it may be, of a father. At any rate if my hon. friend is willing to limit the provisions of his Bill to the second clause, I shall offer no opposition to it, but as far as the other clauses are concerned, while I speak, as I say, my own sentiments alone, and am speaking for no other member of this House than myself, I am opposed entirely to the position of my hon. friend.

Mr. AYLESWORTH.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron). Mr. Speaker, I am surprised and sorry that the hon. member for North York (Mr. Aylesworth) has expressed the opinions that he has just delivered himself of in this House. I am glad to know that it is solely as the member for North York that he has spoken. My opinion is that his expressions still may do harm, as he is also the Minister of Justice for Canada. I consider that a man who is brutal enough to commit any of the brutish crimes which are outlined in the Bill of my hon. friend for Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) should be punished in a physical way, in the only way that will affect him. One of the main reasons that the hon. member for North York has stated for not inflicting this punishment is that he cannot get any one to inflict it. That is a matter of detail and we need not discuss it here. Otherwise we might say that a man should not be hanged because we cannot get any one to hang him. I congratulate the hon. member for Montreal on his Bill and I hope it will carry; crimes of the class in question are rampant and must be put down.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). Mr. Speaker, I merely rise to express my dissent from the propositions laid down by the Hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth). The Minister of Justice, in his remarks, spoke and I think very properly and very naturally from the standpoint of the criminal, but he uttered not one single word from the standpoint of the unfortunate victim. I have always understood that in all penal legislation the one great thing was the defence of the inoffensive portion of the community. If it be true that offences of this character are being committed in this country, if it be true that the existing means of punishment have proved insufficient to prevent such offences, then I think this House should be prepared to resort to any means that may be necessary to protect the women of this country. I quite agree with all that the Minister of Justice says against the punishment that may degrade a man. I believe that it was a disgrace to the British navy that flogging existed to the extent to which it did, because we all know that the British seamen were, on the whole, a noble band of men, but I fail to see how a brute such as the one of whom we read in the papers the other day, convicted of an offence against his own daughter, a girl of 18, could be degraded by any punishment that could be inflicted. I desire to say that I shall support the Bill of the hon. member as it is, not for a moment as a matter of vengeance, not at all in order to be vindictive, but simply as the surest and best means of putting a stop to these offences. The Minister of Justice himself must admit that in cases of extreme emergency the very course suggested would be a course sufficient to wipe out such an offence as this. Therefore, on behalf of the inoffensive portion of the community, the women and children of this land, I am prepared to support this legislation. In fact, I would go a step further and say that I have often felt that the provision on the statute-book applicable to this offence is really for the benefit of the lazy loafer. As perhaps every man in this House and every lawyer knows a man unwilling to work is supported by an honest, industrious wife until patience ceases to be a virtue and he is taken to court. She lays a complaint and the husband is punished by sending him to the county jail where, all during the winter, he lives in comfort and luxury, while the poor woman that he has sworn to support is obliged to go out and support herself and her family. If the hon. gentleman would introduce another clause to provide that those men who failed to support their wives and children should not be rewarded by being sent to the county jail where they will not have to work, but would be given an adequate punishment it would have the effect of compelling them to do their duty in this regard.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). My hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Northrup) has not apprehended the remarks of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice said in his opening remarks that he was simply expressing his own opinion and his own opinion was that he was against the suggested punishment of flogging in all cases, but he stated that in so far as offences against women were concerned he left this clause to the judgment of the House. He expressed his own opinion but he did not go any further. He presented objections which I think are worthy of consideration with regard to the other disposition of the Bill which concerned offences there described, such as garrotting which was at one time prevalent in England. But, there is a class of beings who beat their wives and they deserve no sympathy from anybody. I would have no compunction whatever in giving the man who beats his wife or who beats a female a taste of his own medicine. However, when the Bill gets to committee it will be for hon. members to consider whether they are prepared to apply the lash for the other offences described in the Bill. For my part I would hesitate to say that a man who carries a concealed weapon should be whipped, or even that a man who commits such a heinous offence as robbery should be subjected to the lash. We all remember that some years ago the offence known as garrotting was so prevalent in the city of London that the magistrates asked that the lash be applied for that offence, and the law having passed in a very short time afterwards the offence disappeared,

which shows that the passage of such a severe law may have a very salutory effect in suppressing certain offences. I do not know that at the present time the offence is so prevalent in the city of Montreal—where it seems to be more prevalent than elsewhere—as to warrant such an extreme measure as inflicting the lash. I think this Bill should be read a second time and then go to committee so as to further elicit the opinion of the House. I repeat that I think my hon. friend from Hastings did not quite apprehend the views of the Minister of Justice who merely suggested that it should be left to the House to determine what should be done.

Mr. A. M. BEAUPARLANT. (St. Hyacinthe). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I did not expect that this bill would come to-day for its second reading. This is not meant as a reproach against my hon. friend from Montreal (St. Lawrence). On the contrary, I acknowledge that he was entitled to press with the utmost expedition a piece of legislation which he holds as good. Therefore, I will not deal with this question; I merely intend putting upon record my disapproval of the proposal which the hon. member for St. Lawrence has just put forth.

We often hear it said that we live in a progressive era. Then, I think it would be a backward move to pass this measure.

I was pleased to hear the Minister of Justice saying that, as a matter of principle, he is opposed to this bill. Such an attitude on his part is consistent with that spirit of toleration which in my opinion is the liberal tenet. At the same time, it seemed to me that the statements put forth by the hon. member West Huron (Mr. Lewis) and the hon. member from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) who have dealt with this question from the opposite side were tainted with the spirit of former days.

The hon. member for St. Lawrence no doubt seeks a most praiseworthy result, that is the betterment of men, but is he positive that he will achieve his end by those violent means?

I contend that the enforcement of such a punishment renders him who undergoes it an irreconcilable foe to society: Now then such cannot be the aim of society which has the least interest in bringing about that result.

That punishment is not only a disgrace for the culprit, but the dishonour is shared by the members of his family. That is unjust, still it is so. Public opinion will overlook and forget the jail and the penitentiary, but it will not overlook such a punishment. It looks upon it as upon the death penalty. Recent events have justified my fears on that point. A man was hanged. He left behind him a brother and two nephews who were leading a quiet and honest life in Montreal. The nephews were two good natured workmen in a manufacture and were surrounded by the esteem and good will of their fellow-workers. Immediately after the hanging they were the butt of the most offensive and cruel remarks. They could not but be morally affected by such a situation. They found work elsewere but they were again tormented in their new employment. The result was that being constantly wronged, they became wrong-doers themselves and now they are both in the penitentiary.

Some will say that this is an exceptional case, but I rather think that it is an instance of what happens unfortunately too often. Therefore I contend that upon no account has society the right to do such an injury to people who are no offenders against its laws, especially when it has for its own protection other means which do not involve such lamentable results. To achieve that end society can rely on the jail and the penitentiary which ought to afford enough protection to the community.

I maintain that the existing legislation countenancing that ignominious punishment ought not to be tolerated any longer. However we are now discussing the proposal put forth by the hon. member for St. Lawrence and I must content myself with impugning it. The disgracing punishment by the lash has a demoralising influence upon the man who undergoes it, so that he cannot pluck up his courage and become an honest man again. That is a sufficient reason to reject it. Moreover I think that, the hon. Minister of Justice antagonizing this proposal, we shall hear no more about it.

Mr. JAMES W. MADDIN (South Cape Breton). The Minister of Justice, in reviewing this Bill, has said a great deal in which I concur. I agree with the hon. gentleman in all that he said with regard to the infliction of punishment, and I think the member for Hastings misunderstood the Minister of Justice, because as the Criminal Code now stands whipping is provided for all offences of an indecent nature committed against women.

However, when it comes to imposing corporal punishment for such offences as carrying concealed weapons or wife-beating, I submit that in doing this we are returning to the days of barbarism. Before hon. members vote on this measure, they should bear in mind that, under our criminal law, power is vested in the magistrates to summarily try cases of certain offences, such as indecent assaults and wife-beating, and the punishment in such cases is of a very arbitrary nature. In our Penitentiaries Act it is provided that persons condemned to imprisonment for less than two years may be confined in a county jail and not be sent to penitentiary at all. Within recent years, in many of our municipalities,

where hard labour is imposed, the prisoners are obliged to work on the public highway. In a number of counties in the province from which I come, the judges in cases where imprisonment may be imposed for two years, are in the habit of making the term 12, 15 or 18 months in the county jail of the county where the offence was committed. Thus if the lash is to be applied for these various offences, the Bill will go further than its mover contemplated. The duty is not then cast on the warden of the penitentiary but on the keeper of the county jail and the sheriff of the municipality, and I submit that these are men of considerable refinement and good breeding and it would be exceedingly repugnant to them to take up the lash and apply it to the back of one of their fellow creatures.

This is not a new question by any means. For a number of years it has been agitated throughout the leading law publications, both on this side of the Atlantic and the other, and the consensus of opinion seems to be that it is not wise to return to the lash for trifling offences. In fact the majority of authorities are of the opinion that it is unwise to apply the lash in any case. As regards that part of the Act which punishes a man for wife-beating, I wonder what the mover of the Bill has to say about the woman who beats her husband.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I would say, serves him right.

Mr. MADDIN. As a matter of fact, if statistics were well and intelligently collected throughout the length and breadth of the country, while the records would not show as many cases of husbands beating wives as of wives beating husbands, still there are a number of such cases. I agree with my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Northrup) in having no regard for the man who strikes a woman under any provocation. But my hon. friend has taken but one view of the case. I have no regard or sympathy for the man who hangs about the house, a drunken loafer, living by the earnings of his wife. But what about the diligent hard working man who works eight or ten hours per day, and when he comes home finds his supper not ready, his children not washed and his wife gallivanting about the country. What is sauce for the goose might very well be sauce for the gander, and the mover of this measure might well be asked to incorporate in it husband as well as wife beating.

There is another very serious objection. So long as those who administer the laws of the land do not look with favour on a particular statute, that statute will not be successfully applied. I do not think it is to the discredit of our judges to say that the majority, in cases where whippings are imposed are very loath to impose it. As a matter of fact the punishment is optional just as it is in this Bill, and in a large number of cases the judges are very loath to impose it. In my short experience where I reside, I only recall three instances in which the lash was imposed, and for some reason or other it was not in these cases applied. What will be the result if legislation of this kind be adopted? If the lash is not applied now in cases where it may be imposed, it is not more likely to be applied when imposed in more trifling cases, and a law which is not enforced will be looked upon by the criminal as so much dead wood which he need not take into account. Therefore I say that while the lash may have a tendency to lessen the outbreaks of crime of a certain violent character, I have no doubt that the diet described in Oliver Twist, which was supplied in the parochial workhouse, and the other rigours of that workhouse would be sufficient deterrents in cases of a less serious character, such as are dealt with in this measure.

Mr. W. B. NANTEL (Terrebonne.) (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I shall say but one word on the question which is now before the House. I entirely agree with the hon. Minister of Justice on this point. In the first place I do not think that the circumstances prevailing in Montreal, for instance, would justify such a measure. I hope that we shall never go back to the barbarous ages, which in my opinion would be the result of this measure. The offence however odious, for which flogging is intended as a punishment, is after all but a mere misdemeanour, therefore it is more or less serious.

As a matter of principle, I am in favour of the death penalty, although I am entirely adverse to flogging. I will say more, I would favour the wiping of that punishment out of our criminal code. With still more reason, I cannot approve of it in such a case as this when there is no motive to enforce it as the offence is not serious enough. Therefore I hope that this legislation will never become a part of our criminal law.

Mr. A. B. CROSBY (Halifax). I am largely in accord with the hon. Minister of Justice as to this Bill. The fact that the majority of the lawyers in this House are opposed to such clause is one reason why I favour it, because that is an indication to me that it will have the effect of decreasing offences of that character and there will be less work in the courts for some lawyers. My hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Maddin) put the question why there should not be some provision for the protection of men. Well, the man who goes to his home and is beaten once by his wife and then is foolish enough to go back, deserves to be beaten the second time.

That is not the case with the poor wo-

man; she has to stay at home all the time, she has frequently to submit to abuse in order to care for her children. The man at whom this punishment is aimed is the very man who will frequently trouble and bother such a woman, disturb her and her family and eat the food which she has provided by her day's hard work for her children. Therefore I am quite in accord with the punishment proposed. I am quite sure that the difficulties in connection with the infliction of the whipping can be overcome. We cannot be too careful or too severe in this particular, and while I agree with the Minister of Justice in all the other matters to which he has referred, I am in sympathy with the section of the Bill regarding the care and protection of our women.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee on the Bill.

On section 1—Whipping for possession of weapon.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. After listening to the discussion I have decided to accept the suggestion made by the Minister of Justice. It is not exactly what I expected to get, but I am one of those who will take what I can get and hope for more later on. I move that clause one be struck out and shall move amendments to clause 2 and clause 4.

Motion agreed to, and section 1 struck out.

On section 2,

The following section is inserted immediately after section 292:

292a. Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to three years' imprisonment and to be whipped, who assaults his wife or other female and thereby occasions actual bodily harm.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I would call attention to the state of the existing law upon a cognate subject. Section 292 of the Criminal Code provides a punishment of two years imprisonment—not three,—and whipping, for any man who indecently assaults any female, or makes such an assault with the woman's consent, where such consent is procured by fraud. I would suggest to my hon. friend that there can be no reason why an assault which is not indecent should be the subject of a more severe punishment than that which the law now prescribes for an indecent assault, and therefore would suggest the substitution of two years for three years. If that is done the purpose of my hon. friend can be accomplished more neatly by simply adding to the present section 292 a third subclause which would make the section read:

Every one is guilty of an indicatable offence and liable to two years' imprisonment and to be whipped who indecently assaults any female, &c., &c.

And 3,

Who assaults his wife or other female and thereby occasions her bodily harm.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would agree with what the Minister of Justice has said except the last few words. I was going to move to strike out the words 'or other female,' I believe that any man who assaults his wife and does her harm cannot be punished too severely. I have no sympathy with the statement that a man could be assaulted by his wife; I do not think there are many men whose wives can hurt them very much. But I do say that any man who assaults the woman he has undertaken to care for for life ought to be lashed. I do not think the same punishment should apply in the case of any female; such a provision would undoubtedly give rise to many cases of blackmail. In many cases in the Criminal Code the prosecution are called upon to corroborate in some material particular the serious offence against the female. This is a good and salutary provision. If you put it in this way and make any man subject to the lash for assault upon a female occasioning bodily harm, you will have a serious condition of blackmail. I do not think it necessary. There is already this serious punishment for men who indecently assault females. I would move, in place of the amendment of the Minister of Justice, to strike out the words 'or other female' because such cases are already dealt with in the serious case of indecent assault. I think the only assault, other than an indecent assault, for which a man should be lashed is an assault upon his wife.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I certainly object to that; I think a man is just as guilty, if not more so, if he goes and beats another man's wife than if he beats his own.

Mr. LANCASTER. No, for exactly the reason I say, a man and his wife might levy blackmail. Then a man swears to protect his wife and he does not undertake to protect the other.

Amendment (Mr. Lancaster) negatived: Yeas 62, nays 71.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to the fact that a large number of those who voted were not present when the question was called.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. By the vote the amendment is lost.

Mr. BARR. I have asked for a ruling on a very important question, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to have it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The rule of the House is that a member may not vote on a question unless he has heard the question put.

Mr. BARR. Then, I sumbit that a large number of those who voted on the other side could not have heard the question, because they were not in the Chamber when it was put.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is impossible for the chairman to choose out those who came in late.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I move the following amendment to section 2 :

Assaults and beats his wife or any other female, and thereby occasions her actual bodily harm.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. As I understand the amendment, it is that all the words in section 292 be struck out and the words just read be inserted.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That will not carry out the purpose suggested by the Minister of Justice. It requires provision in the line mentioned by him, namely, to append this as a subsection of section 292. To pass the amendment in the form proposed will make absolute nonsense, and, if put on the statute-book, would make us all ridiculous.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is moved that section 2 as it stands in the Bill be expunged, and the following be inserted instead :

Section 292 of the Criminal Code is amended by adding thereto the following:
Or (c) assaults and beats his wife or any other female, and thereby occasions her actual bodily harm.

Mr. SPROULE. It does seem to me that the statement of the Minister of Justice ought to be heeded. If we provide a law to inflict a punishment and there is no provision for the infliction of the punishment, we commit an absurdity. Is the Minister of Justice prepared to suggest an amendment which would provide some one to inflict the punishment ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Perhaps not every hon. member has a copy of the Criminal Code before him; therefore, in order to understand what we are doing, I will read the section as it now stands :

292. Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to two years imprisonment and to be whipped who (a) indecently assaults any female; or, (b) does anything to any female by her consent which, but for such consent, would be an indecent assault, if such consent is obtained by false and fraudulent representations as to the nature and quality of the Act.

That is the clause as it now stands. If the amendment is carried it will subject any person who, by assaulting any woman, occasions her actual bodily harm, to the punishment of two years imprisonment and being whipped.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would ask the minister if that is one of the sections in regard to which corroboration is required; because if not, I certainly must oppose that amendment. It will be a very dangerous law to put upon the statute-book if it is not accompanied by a requirement for corroboration. I have not the statutes before me, but perhaps the minister can tell us. Let us know what we are doing.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I may say in reply to my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) that I am not able to answer his question on the spur of the moment. My impression is strong that no corroboration is required, but I may be in error in that respect. I suggest that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the committee rises I would like to add a word along the line of what my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) has said. The Minister of Justice made a very emphatic and cogent argument against the whole principle of this Bill. The two principal points he made were, in the first place, that the infliction of this punishment for any offence is degrading and ought not to be imposed. In fact, if the argument of the Minister of Justice were carried to its legitimate conclusion, the enactments already upon the statute-book in that regard should be eliminated. The other point which the minister made is that it is impossible to carry out the punishment, that there is no person appointed by law upon whom that duty can be imposed, unless you are to presume that the warden of the penitentiary or the keeper of the jail can himself select one of his subordinates, and order him to perform what the minister regards as a degrading duty, degrading not only to the person who receives the punishment, but degrading to the person who inflicts it. Now the committee has arrived at the conclusion that in respect to one offence the punishment by whipping or flogging should be extended. Well, it seems to me that before this committee rises we ought to have some statement from the minister as to what the law is in that regard, and that this Bill should be amended so that the duty of carrying it out shall be imposed upon some definite official, who, if he fails to carry out the law, will himself be guilty of an offence. We ought not to put these punishments upon the statute-book and leave them to be disregarded, as they have been in the past, according to the testimony, not only of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, but of gentlemen of the legal profession in this House who have given their experience.

Progress reported.

OPENING OF GOVERNMENT TENDERS.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Mr. Reid (Grenville).

That in the opinion of this House tenders received in any department of government should be immediately placed in safe custody under seal so as to prevent any possibility or suspicion of tampering; and should be opened in public at the time and place mentioned in the advertisement and in the presence of at least three principal officials of the department; and the persons so tendering or their duly authorized agents should be at liberty to attend at the said time and place and see such tenders opened and recorded, if they so desire, and the proposed amendment of Mr. Guthrie thereto.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey). When I was speaking a few days ago in reference to this motion, I made some allusion to the remarks of the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) in reference to dredging contracts that had been let to the Hon. A. G. MacKay. In the course of his remarks the hon. member for North Grey stated that in these days Conservatives did not tender for contracts of any kind with this government, because, owing to the manner in which contracts are let, it was of no use for them to tender. I think that statement is not according to facts. I remember talking a little while ago with a very prominent Conservative in this country, and he referred to the frequent remarks of a gentleman who was, during the last parliament, a member on the opposition side of this House, and this gentleman with whom I was speaking said that this late Conservative member had dredging contracts on the brain. He said it was true that some men in this country were making a large amount of money out of dredging contracts, but they do not all belong to one political party. He said that one of the most intimate of his personal friends is a Conservative who has made a considerable amount of money, and is making money to-day, out of dredging contracts. I did not ask him to give me the name of his friend who was so making money out of dredging contracts, because it was none of my business. I simply give you his statement for what it is worth. I understand that a Conservative named Poupore, formerly a member of this House, is a prominent contractor with this government, and is I hope making a reasonable amount of money out of his contracts. I understand another gentleman——

Mr. CROTHERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. gentleman speaking to the question before the House?

Mr. MILLER. I am also informed that a gentleman—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not hear the hon. gentleman's last words, but I presume the rules of the House will be observed.

Mr. MILLER. I shall endeavour to observe them. I think I am. I am speaking in direct contradiction of the words used by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro), and of his argument, and I think that certainly has a direct bearing upon the motion before the House. A man named Boone from Sault Ste. Marie—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I rise to a point of order. I do not so regard it. My hon. friend from York, New Brunswick (Mr. Crocket) was making a reply to the Hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) and he was called to order because he was not discussing the question directly before the House which related to the opening of tenders. The point of order having been taken the Speaker then in the Chair sustained him. I would respectfully submit that exactly the same principle should impel the hon. gentleman now addressing the House to speak to the resolution and not introduce matters that are obviously not relevant under the ruling which has already been pronounced.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. As the House is aware, I have just taken the chair and did not hear the remarks that were objected to. If the point of order is pressed I shall have to call back the Speaker to rule on the matter.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. The mover of this resolution gave as a ground in support of it—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman should await the return of the Speaker.

Mr. MILLER. I will endeavour not to infringe at all. At the present time I do not think I am infringing the rules or saying anything which is out of order. In discussing the matter of opening tenders—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but a point of order has been raised, and it has not yet been settled.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is not pressed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman does not press his point of order, of course, the hon. gentleman who has the floor may proceed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the hon. gentleman waives his point he may go on.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The point of order is pressed; perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Miller) may waive the line of argument.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is what he should.

Mr. MILLER. Certainly I am quite prepared to do that. But, if I am ruled out of order I scarcely know on what ground I can stand.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MILLER. I contend that I am in order. It has been argued that tenders are not properly opened, and that certain bad effects have resulted. I am endeavouring to prove that these bad effects have not resulted. Then I wish to show that what the hon. member for North Grey has stated, that owing to the manner in which tenders are opened it is impossible for Conservatives to obtain contracts from this government, is not a fact, and I am endeavouring to show that Conservatives have obtained and are obtaining contracts as the result of tenders they have put in to this government. I understand that Mr. Poupore has many times received contracts from this government as a result of tenders that he has put in under the method that is now in vogue.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I rise again to the question of order. I submit that the hon. gentleman has no right to discuss the tenders of Mr. Poupore or any one else under the ruling which you pronounced when this debate arose on a previous occasion.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have already decided, on a point of order being taken, that the debate must be confined strictly to the motion and the amendment thereto, and anything irrelevant is out of order. I am not prepared to say that the last words were relevant not having heard them.

Mr. MILLER. My argument and what I was stating was this: I understand that the motion before the House declares that the present method of opening tenders is not a good one, that evil results follow, and that in consequence some new method ought to prevail. In support of the resolution it has been stated that Conservatives do not tender for public contracts, and that men of all shades of politics belonging to all parties, ought to have fair play. I want to show that the argument is not a proper one, that the statements are not correct, and that it is not so that as a result of the present method of tendering Conservatives do not obtain fair play. In order to prove my contention I have been endeavouring to show and will show—and perhaps that is the reason why the point of order is so persistently urged—that Conservatives have obtained, do obtain and may obtain contracts from this government as other people do.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I venture to submit that this is no more relevant than was the consideration of the question regarding dredging contracts in the harbour of St. John. If this is relevant then that is relevant.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I might just call your attention to the fact that in this motion which is being discussed certain amendments to the regulations applying to the reception and opening of tenders were suggested by the mover to prevent any possibility of suspicion or tampering with tenders. Every gentleman on the other side of the House supporting this resolution, either directly or indirectly, stated his suspicion that there was tampering with tenders. Surely the hon. gentleman is permitted to answer that? Surely that is cognate to the question before the House? It is entirely different from the case of the Mayes dredging contract because that was clearly irrelevant. nobody having asserted that there was anything improper with respect to the reception or opening of those tenders.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, my ruling is well-known to the House. Having decided that a certain matter is out of order it is no argument to say that it is in answer to what was said because a lot of what was said was irregular. I hope that hon. gentlemen will follow the rule and confine themselves to matters relevant to the question under discussion. Bourinot says that illustration is sometimes permitted, but to undertake to discuss any specific case under this resolution would be clearly out of order.

Mr. MILLER. I bow cheerfully and always to your ruling. I contend that I was doing what you say I am permitted to do—using this case as an illustration. I am prepared to show a long list of names but I am content to let that pass. I want to say in conclusion that it seems to me that it would tend very much to shorten the sessions of this House if members would confine themselves to charges which are not founded upon suspicion but which they can back up by evidence. The mover of the resolution suggests that there should be three persons present in place of two at the opening of tenders. Does he think that that would make any real change in the conditions or that if there is wrong-doing with two persons present there might not be equal wrong-doing with three? I do think there may be something in the suggestion of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake), who spoke a few days ago. He gave it not altogether as a suggestion but as a statement of the practice in some departments in Great Britain, and it was that the persons who are present when tenders are opened are changed from time to time, and that they are not always the same persons who are performing that duty. I think that the contention of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works was well founded, and that there is a great deal in it

that if you say that contractors must be present when tenders are opened you simply lend yourself to a system that permits conniving and conspiring, and which will cause a great deal more evil and produce worse results than can or do exist to-day. The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) said:

I have always been in favour of the principle of letting contracts by public tender in a bona fide upright and conscientious manner.

No doubt the hon. member was sincere when he said that, and I should think every member of the House could use the very same words with an equal degree of sincerity. But the trouble with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Middlebro) is that like too many of his friends on the other side he is prone to let his suspicion rather than his reason govern him. I believe that we should endeavour to adopt all methods that it is possible to adopt even if it were only for the purpose of lessening the suspicion of our friends on the other side of the House. If it were possible that the Auditor General or some such official in whom we all have confidence could be present when these tenders are opened, I would be agreeable to the adoption of such a system, but in the meantime I think the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) is the better of the two proposals before the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The amendment which has been presented by the hon. member (Mr. Guthrie) declares that the method of inviting, opening and considering tenders as embodied in the order in council of June 18, 1900, is in the opinion of this House a proper safeguard in the public interest. That order in council makes the following provision:

Where tenders are called for by any department of the government they shall be addressed to the officer of the department specified in the notice calling for tenders. In the notice it shall be specified that the tenders shall be under seal and endorsed 'tender for . . . . ' specifying the work or supplies for which tenders are called. When received they shall be stamped by the official to whom addressed, with the day and hour of their receipt, and placed under lock and key until such time as it shall be found convenient for opening them.

It does not seem to me that this provides any sufficient safeguard in the public interest. What is the meaning of the provision that the tenders shall be under seal? So far as I can understand, it only means that the person tendering shall affix his seal after his name, and it does not even go to the extent of providing that the tender shall be sealed up in a package or envelope. That may have been the intention of the gentleman who drafted the order in council, but he certainly did not say it. Therefore, there is absolutely no provision in the order in council as to tenders being inclosed in an envelope, and yet it is considered by the member for Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) a perfectly adequate safeguard. The other safeguard provided in this order in council is that the tender shall be placed under lock and key. That is the most absurdly slipshod expression I have ever heard of in an order in council or any other document, if the intention is to safeguard the public interest. In short, the order in council omits every single one of the very necessary safeguards which are contained in the resolution presented by my hon. friend from Grenville. The motion declares :

That in the opinion of this House tenders received in any department of government should be immediately placed in safe custody under seal so as to prevent any possibility or suspicion of tampering; and shall be opened in public at the time and place mentioned in the advertisement and in the presence of at least three principal officials of the department; and the persons so tendering or their duly authorized agents should be at liberty to attend at the said time and place and see such tenders opened and recorded, if they so desire.

When this motion was presented to the House last year, the right hon. the Prime Minister endorsed it in every particular except one, and that was with reference to the tenders being opened in public. But, even if you omit that provision, you will see that the order in council falls very far short of the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Reid). Under the circumstances the attitude of the government in inviting the House to approve of a supposed safeguard which is not a safeguard at all, ought not to commend itself to our judgement. I believe that the provisions contained in the resolution of my hon. friend from Grenville are the provisions which will commend themselves to the people of this country as adequate and necessary safeguards in the public interest.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Lunenburg). Some of the discussion on this resolution has been relevant, but a great deal of it has been irrelevant. I am as anxious as any other hon. gentleman in the House that a vote should be taken before six o'clock, and, therefore, I will prolong the debate for only a few moments. I purpose supporting the amendment of the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), and I will construe my vote as being an affirmation that the regulations now in force are preferable to those proposed by the hon. member (Mr. J. D. Reid). I agree, to some extent, with the leader of the opposition when he says that the existing regulations are not absolutely perfect; the drafting is

very imperfect indeed. The present regulations respecting the reception and opening of tenders for government work and supplies are, that they shall be stamped by the officials to whom they are addressed with the date and hour of receipt, and then placed under lock; that at a later date they shall be opened before the minister and an official of the department, and in the absence of the minister by another official of the department to be designated by him. The resolution of the member for Grenville proposes two changes only; first, that the tenders shall be opened in the presence of three officials, and, secondly, that the public as well as the tenderers shall have an opportunity of being present. Wherein are the present regulations defective, and if they are defective how can the suggestions contained in the resolution of the member for Grenville remedy the defect. I submit in all fairness that the recommendations contained in the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Reid) are not of a business like character and cannot commend themselves to anybody. To my mind it is utterly unimportant and trivial as to whether one or two or three or one hundred and three persons are present at the opening of the tenders. If there is any stage at which tenders should be protected it is while they are being received by the official of the department to whom they are addressed and while they are in his possession, and it is a mere waste of time to discuss how many persons shall be present when tenders are opened or whether the public shall be present or not. The resolution before the House does not suggest throwing around the officer who receives these tenders any protection or safeguard whatever.

Mr. J. D. REID. Will not the fact of having them opened at the time and place mentioned in the advertisement do that ?

Mr. MACLEAN. I shall come to that later. The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) was right the other day when he said we must trust some one official in matters of this kind. As he said, the business of the world is carried on by reason of trust which man extends to his fellow men. Well, under the present regulations, and even under the regulations as proposed to be amended, the tenders would all be received by one official. If you do not trust this official what would you require to do in order to safeguard both public and private interests. You would require to have two or three men to watch this official as he opened his mail every morning, and two or three others keeping eye on the lock, and two or three more sleeping with this man at night, which might seriously disarrange domestic affairs. You would have to make sure that on the day and at the hour for closing tenders, the time piece of this official was right, and perhaps you could not even trust the clock and a committee of two or three would have to go out and ascertain the time of day by the sun. My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle made a very good suggestion the other day. He suggested that if there be any objection to the mode of receiving and opening tenders, it is at this point the amendment should be made and not as regards how or when tenders should be opened, because that is after all, a very trifling matter which ought not to occupy the attention of the House one second. If you are going to make an amendment, I would say, let the officer who receives the tenders endorse on it the time and hour of reception and sign that with his own hand. Let him then pass the tender on to another officer, to be called the custodian of tenders, and let him also mark the time of reception as the former official. Then when the time for the reception has expired let these tenders be brought before the minister or his representative and be opened in the presence of the minister and these two officials.

As regards the proposition to have these tenders opened before the public, there is nothing in it to commend it to the judgment of this House. Just see what inconvenience that would occasion. But first let me say that the lowest tender is not always accepted. In some instances it may not be wise to accept it, either because of the financial inability of the tenderer or some other good reason. Imagine then what would follow if every person who tendered knew who were the other tenderers and what were their figures. One can easily understand how, when the lowest tender was rejected, the party who made that tender would storm the department in his attempt to satisfy the minister that he was quite competent and trustworthy and ought to get the contract. It is easy to understand how he would appeal to parliament and how hon. gentlemen opposite would make frenzied attacks on the government for not having accepted the lowest tender.

As to whether one or two or three are present at the opening of the tenders that is a matter which is utterly irrelevant and unimportant. But if you take these regulations as they stand, they are open to the construction that the tenders shall be opened in the presence of three officials. In this connection I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to what I think is imperfect drafting. The last clause reads: 'They shall be opened in the presence of the minister of the department calling for tenders and one of the principal officials of the department designated by that minister.' My reading of that clause up to that point is that the tenders are brought before the minister and one of his principal officers, and are opentd by the of-

ficer who received them, so that they are opened in the presence of three persons. True the remaining portion of the clause rather weakens my contention because it says: 'Or in the presence of the minister or where it is not convenient for him to be present they shall be opened by two of the officials of the department to be designated by the minister.' It seems to me that there is a little confusion here which requires to be removed.

My hon. friend the mover of the resolution (Mr. Reid) laid special stress upon that part of it which provides for the opening of these tenders in public and in the presence of any of the tenderers who may see fit to attend. Of course if the tenders are opened in public it follows that the parties tendering may be present, but it would be very unfortunate if that feature were introduced into the regulations and it is one which ought not to commend itself to this House.

Mr. CROTHERS. I quite agree, I simply want to emphasize one point in addition to those mentioned by the hon. leader of this side. The regulations provide that in the absence of the minister, he may name two officials who may open the tenders. The hon. Minister of Public Works in introducing these resolutions, told us the other day that that provision was inserted to meet cases in which the minister could not be present, and he cited Moncton where tenders are opened for hundreds of thousands of dollars and where it would not be convenient for the minister to be present.

Mr. GRAHAM. At present there are no tenders opened at Moncton.

Mr. CROTHERS. I was not referring to what the Minister of Railways said, but to what the Minister of Public Works said, that they were opened at Moncton.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not want to interrupt, but I would not like that impression to go to the public, and I want the House to understand that tenders are not opened at Moncton.

Mr. CROTHERS. I accept at once the statement of the Minister of Railways that the tenders are not opened at Moncton, but I do not know anything to prevent them being opened there. As a matter of fact, he says they are not, but they might be opened at Vancouver, or Victoria, or anywhere else in Canada. The regulations give the minister power to name two officials without stating who the officials shall be or their status. They may be two subordinate officials, and I submit that the provisions enabling the minister to name two subordinate officials anywhere in Canada would not command the confidence of the people in this country.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Guthrie.

YEAS.

Messieurs

Allen,
Aylesworth,
Beauparlant,
Béland,
Bickerdike,
Black,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Boyer,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Bureau,
Calvert,
Carrier,
Carvell,
Cash,
Chew,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Chisholm (Inverness),
Clark (Red Deer),
Clarke (Essex),
Conmee,
Currie (Prince Edward),
Delisle,
Demers,
Devlin,
Dubeau,
Dugas,
Ecrément,
Ethier,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Gauvreau,
German,
Gervais,
Girard,
Gordon (Kent),
Graham,
Guthrie,
Harris,
Harty,
Hodgins,
Hunt,
Knowles,
Kyte,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lavergne,
LeBlanc,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Low,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
MacNutt,
McAllister,
McCoig,
McColl,
McCraney,
McGiverin,
McIntyre (Perth),
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McKenzie,
McLean (Sunbury),
McMillan,
Major,
Marcile (Bagot),
Martin (Montreal),
Ste. Mary's),
Martin (Regina),
Martin (Wellington),
Mayrand,
Meigs,
Michaud,
Miller,
Molloy,
Murphy,
Nesbitt,
Neely,
Oliver,
Papineau,
Pardee,
Parent,
Paterson,
Pickup,
Proulx,
Prowse,
Pugsley,
Rankin,
Reid (Restigouche),
Richards,
Rivet,
Robb,
Ross,
Roy (Dorchester),
Roy (Montmagny),
Rutan,
Savoie,
Schell,
Sealey,
Sifton,
Sinclair,
Smith (Middlesex),
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Stormont),
Stratton,
Sutherland,
Talbot,
Tobin,
Todd,
Tolmie,
Turcotte (Nicolet),
Turcotte (Quebec County),
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Warburton,
White (Victoria, Alta.),
Wilson (Laval).—118.

NAYS.

Messieurs

Ames,
Armstrong,
Arthurs,
McCall,
McCarthy,
Maddin,

Barker,
Barnard,
Barr,
Blain,
Blondin,
Borden (Carleton),
Boyce,
Bradbury,
Broder,
Burrell,
Campbell,
Chisholm (Huron),
Clare,
Cowan,
Crosby,
Crocket,
Crothers,
Daniel,
Doherty,
Donnelly,
Edwards,
Elson,
Fraser,
Goodeve,
Gordon (Nipissing),
Haggart (Winnipeg),
Henderson,
Herron,
Jameson,
Lake,
Lalor,
Lancaster,
Lennox,
Lewis,
Lortie,
Macdonell,
Magrath,
Marshall,
Meighen,
Middlebro
Monk,
Nantel,
Northrup,
Osler,
Owen,
Paquet,
Perley,
Price,
Reid (Grenville),
Rhodes,
Roche,
Russell,
Schaffner,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Sharpe (Ontario),
Smyth,
Sproule,
Stanfield,
Staples,
Stewart,
Taylor (Leeds),
Taylor (New Westminster),
Thoburn,
Thornton,
Wallace,
White (Renfrew),
Wilson (Lennox and Addington),
Worthington,
Wright.—76.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Macdonald,	Hughes,
Lemieux,	Haggart.
Emmerson,	Currie (Simcoe),
Law,	Bristol,
Fielding,	Foster,
Gladu,	Beattie,
King,	Porter,
Geoffrion,	Forget,
McLean (Huron).	McLean (S. York),

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at Eight o'clock.

House in Committee of Supply.

Department of Customs.—Salaries and contingencies, $214,675.

Mr. PATERSON. The first item is Commissioner and Chairman of Board of Customs. Last year the salary was $4,000 under the Act When he comes into class A of 1st division, it is $5,000. It is automatic. The assistant commissioner last year received $3,600, and the statutory increase will make it $3,700.

Mr. HENDERSON. I thought the statutory increase was $50.

Mr. PATERSON. In the 1st division it is $100. The maximum of this salary is $4,000. Then, in the second division, subdivision A, there are 13 salaries to be provided for. There were 8 before, and 5 were brought in from the outside. Before that there is the first division, subdivision B. That subdivision runs from $2,100 to $2,800. There are six estimated for in that, three that are permanent and three that were brought in from the outside. In the second division, subdivision A, which runs from $1,600 to $2,100, there are thirteen estimated for. Eight of these are in the inside service and five are brought from the outside. The next is second division, subdivision B. There are 121 estimated for, 104 of whom are brought in from the outside or were temporary. That class runs from $800 to $1,600.

Mr. TAYLOR. You have made an increase of one? You had 104 outside, 16 inside and now you are providing for 121. Where does that extra one come in?

Mr. PATERSON. That is a position not yet filled. We are estimating for a typewriter that we will have to secure.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will this typewriter be appointed by the commission?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is that the case with all officers? I had my attention drawn this afternoon to the question as to who would appoint the clerk of the committee on agriculture to succeed Mr. McLeod. Would that also come under the commissioners or would he be appointed by the officers of the House?

Mr. PATERSON. That is within the jurisdiction of this House, as I understand it. There are 23 in the third division, subdivision A, which runs from $900 to $1,200. Seven of these come from the outside. The third division, subdivision B, runs from $500 to $800. Five are brought in from the outside. Then, in the next class, that of the messengers, there are six estimated for. Five are brought in from the outside and there is an addition we are providing for. We will require another packer.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the minister just explain why it is necessary to have another packer. Is the work so much greater this year than last that it is necessary to have another? The feeling of the House is that the number of civil servants should not be increased but rather a reduction should be made. I hope the government will do what they can to keep down the expenditure and not make any more unnecessary appointments.

Mr. PATERSON. There is a great deal of work of that kind. All the different

ports and outports have to have their stationery sent to them and the work of these packers consists largely in that. For some time we had an extra employee from the Department of Public Works doing that work, but we prefer to have an officer of our own. I agree with my hon. friend that it is desirable when our revenue is decreasing that we should go carefully. While we are providing for these appointments it does not mean absolutely that additional officers must be employed. I think the commissioner feels that it will be necessary to have this typewriter and this messenger, but if he finds he can get along without them the appointments will not be made.

Mr. HENDERSON. The minister has indicated that the work of these messengers is largely in connection with sending out stationery to the ports and outports. Of course, the larger the number of outports the larger the number of messengers that will be required. I understand the government has given an assurance that there will be a customs port established at Milton in my own county. I understand this because the gentleman who opposed me in the recent election gave the people there the assurance that there would be a customs port opened at that point. I suppose that this is one of the results of it. Evidently there is going to be an additional customs house and with that I am finding no fault. I would be very glad if the minister would open a custom house there. It is the county town and I do not know any reason why it should be without a customs port any more than any other county town in the province should be without one. Perhaps the minister can give us an assurance to-night as to whether he intends to implement the promise or not and if a port will be opened there. We had the very strongest assurances that a port would be opened in the interest of the people there. I take it for granted that the promise was given by the minister no matter who should be elected. I will not assume for a moment that the minister simply intended to open a customs house there if my opponent was elected because that would be a kind of bribery held out to the electors that I do not believe the Minister of Customs would countenance. I believe that if he made the promise that a customs house would be opened in Milton it will be opened no matter who is elected. I have sufficient confidence in the minister to believe that he would not hold out a bribe to the people of that county or say that in the event of a supporter of the government being elected a customs house would be established. I am bound to believe he is too honourable a gentleman to offer a bribe of that kind to the electors. The people did not elect a supporter of the government, but nevertheless we expect that whatever promise was made in good faith by the minister, or the candidate who gave the assurance, will be carried out. It will be very useful to have a customs house at that place, and as the government has determined upon it I would like to have it as soon as possible. Perhaps the minister can inform the committee when it will be done?

Mr. PATERSON. When these estimates are through I am going to ask the committee to go on with the outside vote and then that question will come up.

Mr. J. D. REID. You could answer that in a few minutes.

Mr. PATERSON. I suppose my hon. friend and myself are very much of the same mind. If there has to be a member of the Liberal persuasion from Brant, I suppose my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) would as soon see me here as any one else. And on the other hand if there is to be a Conservative from Halton I am pleased it is the hon. gentleman. I do not claim any superior virtue, but I should not consider it proper for me to say in any county: If you will elect so and so you will get something, and if you don't you will not get it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would not have asked for this to-night if I thought the promise were only to be carried out in the event of the return of a supporter of the government. I do not believe the Minister of Customs would make any such one-sided pledge. Was the statement simply made by the hon. gentleman who opposed me to catch a few votes, or did the Minister of Customs make the pledge?

Mr. PATERSON. A great many requests come for these custom ports from members on both sides, and in the Northwest especially.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Answer the question straight. Did you make the promise?

Mr. PATERSON. No. I did not make the promise to Halton. I do not make any promise in connection with any of these requests. We say we will inquire whether the business will warrant it or not, and speaking now for Milton, I should judge it is a point that would deserve consideration if we find ourselves able to open any other port. If there has been a promise given, then because the election turned the way it did will not effect the question in any way.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. A. HAGGART. It is reported in the press that Colonel Scott, collector of customs at Winnipeg, was about to be superannuated and a successor appointed. Would the Minister of Customs give me some information as to that?

Mr. PATERSON. I have been asked that question outside the House. So many statements get into the newspapers that are without foundation that one cannot keep track of them. All I can say is that so far as I am concerned, I have taken no steps in the direction of relieving Colonel Scott from the duties of his office. Colonel Scott has not asked to be relieved of his duties, and my personal inclination is that so long as an officer can discharge his duties properly and wishes to remain I do not view with favour a change being made. There has been no action taken on my part looking to the immediate retirement of Colonel Scott. I suppose Colonel Scott is now at an age that if he asked to be superannuated his request could be complied with under the superannuation Act. There has been no intimation on my part as to superannuating Colonel Scott against his will. Does that answer the question?

Mr. A. HAGGART. I think that answers it. Colonel Scott we know to be an energetic man who does not require superannuation, and of course the minister is speaking for the government.

Mr. PATERSON. I did not catch that.

Mr. A. HAGGART. The Minister of Customs has told us that Colonel Scott has not asked for superannuation, and I infer he will not be superannuated until he asks for it?

Mr. PATERSON. So far as I am aware he has not asked for superannuation, and of course if anything were to be done it would have to emanate from the Department of Customs.

Mr. J. D. REID. Are we to understand that so long as Colonel Scott is able to perform his duties satisfactorily he will not be superannuated until he asks for it?

Mr. PATERSON. I have not had the question brought before me for action. I do not know how the report originated. What I have said is so long as the duties of an office are performed satisfactorily I would not be inclined to make a change unless, of course, the public interest would render it desirable.

Mr. CROCKET. Has there been any request for the superannuation of the collector of customs at Fredericton?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not like to interrupt hon. gentlemen, but I would point out that a discussion on the outside service has no relevancy to this vote for the inside service.

Mr. CROCKET. But the discussion has been allowed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is true, and I was about to suggest that it was not relative to this vote.

Mr. CROSBY. Will it not look bad in the eyes of the people that while the customs revenue is decreasing the government is adding to the number of officials?

Mr. PATERSON. It is for that reason that we are proceeding with great caution, but I think we are meeting the wishes of hon. gentlemen on both sides that there should be an increase in the salaries, and that the staff should be maintained at a strength sufficient to do the work. Although the amount received may not be so large there is still a great volume of correspondence to be attended to.

Mr. CROSBY. If we are going to open new ports there might be some excuse, but the minister has not told us that new ports will be opened.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Would the minister give the names of the 129 officials who were brought into the service during the last 12 months?

Mr. PATERSON. These were not all brought in during the last 12 months because many of them had been in the service for years. Some years ago we thought it desirable in the public interest that a number of statistical officers who formerly prepared statistics at outside points should be brought to head quarters at Ottawa so that the statistics would be gotten out at an earlier period and be of more use to the commercial community. These officers were brought to Ottawa about eight years ago, many of them had been in the service for years and years before that.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman wants to know the names of the 129 who were brought in during the last 12 months.

Mr. PATERSON. The accountant gives me the following appointees during the year 1908: F. Clemenson, appointed July 16, resigned September 15; R. Braid, appointed March 26; J. Devlin, August 24; C. W. Dunlop, February 25; A. M. Dupuis, March 17; W. H. McElroy, March 7; F. H. Wood, June 17; Miss Sherry, July 17; T. A. Hastings, August 1; F. Barrette, February 5. The commissioner informs me these appointments were mostly made to fill vacancies.

Mr. WRIGHT. I understand there are a number of officials engaged in compiling the Trade and Navigation returns and others engaged in preparing the returns of the Trade and Commerce Department, which are practically of the same nature. An arrangement might be made to have the figures for the two branches in the one publication and unnecessary expense saved.

Mr. PATERSON. The Trade and Commerce Department have no statistical officers and they use our tabulation.

Mr. HENDERSON. The returns of the Minister of Customs deal with imports entered for consumption and the Trade and Commerce returns give the imports whether entered for consumption or not. The returns prepared by the Department of Customs are most essential, but in the figures of the Trade and Commerce Department there is considerable duplication, which causes a great deal of expense and confusion as well.

Mr. S. SHARPE. An item of this kind should not be allowed to pass without a protest from the members on this side, because the Minister of Customs has increased his staff by ten or twelve, which will entail a minimum increased expense of $8,000 a year, while at the same time the revenue is decreasing. I think the Minister of Customs is not conducting his department with that measure of economy which he would have us believe.

Mr. PATERSON. I think that the hon. gentleman did not understand me. They have not been increased by that number.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. But there have been some ten new appointments in the face of a decreasing revenue.

Mr. PATERSON. They have been mostly to replace those who left the service.

Mr. J. D. REID. Whom do they replace?

Mr. PATERSON. Mr. Dunlop replaces another who resigned. Mr. Dupuis replaced Mr. Wall, who went to the Post Office Departement and Mr. Wood replaced another Mr. Wood, who resigned. Mr. Hastings succeeded Mr. Bellis, who was promoted.

Mr. J. D. REID. Whom did Mr. McElroy replace?

Mr. PATERSON. He is a new appointment.

Mr. J. D. REID. And Mr. Barrette?

Mr. PATERSON. He is also a new appointment.

Mr. J. D. REID. And Miss Sherry?

Mr. PATERSON. That is another new appointment. Mr. Braid is a stenographer in the commissioner's office.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then the hon. gentleman admits that at least six or seven thousand dollars are added to the expenditure of the department?

Mr. PATERSON. No, $800 is the highest salary.

Mr. J. D. REID. And Mr. Devlin?

Mr. PATERSON. That was a new appointment in the statistical branch.

Mr. J. D. REID. That makes about seven new appointments.

Mr. PATERSON. Five new appointments the accountant tells me. That is pretty economical out of a staff of one hundred and seventy-six.

Mr. S. SHARPE. With a decreasing revenue?

Mr. PATERSON. But we worked along all the time with an increasing revenue with a staff which we would have been justified in increasing. Last year was a year for revenue of which we never saw the like, and we are in hopes that this year there will be a renewed increase, a hope no doubt which my hon. friend shares.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. If the hon. minister will read his speeches of two or three years ago when we had an increasing revenue, he will find that he justified the increase in his staff by the increase in the revenue. I have always been willing to admit that he was not so great a sinner as his colleagues, but I am afraid that, in face of the decreasing revenue of last year, he has shown that he is being led away by the bad example of his neighbours, and is increasing his staff in the face of a decreasing revenue.

Mr. PATERSON. In looking back at the speeches of other years, one forgets the circumstances at the time.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. What right has the hon. gentleman to increase the number of employees in his department when there was not the same amount of work to be done? It looks as though he had just appointed some friends to fill positions which were made on purpose to accommodate them.

Mr. PATERSON. My hon. friend is a business man and he knows that we may have a decreasing revenue in a year when trade is depressed and yet have an increase in the work. There might be as many entries with a shrunken revenue as with a larger revenue. There would be as many invoices, or more, only they would be smaller in amount, and these would entail just as much work as in a year of greater revenue. We have not filled two of these places which became vacant, and I have not found the heads of my department at all extravagant.

Mr. BRODER. The decrease in revenue rather affects the outside service, because the bulk of the customs work falls on the customs officers throughout the country.

Mr. PATERSON. But the statistical work deals with all of them. Let me give another reason for the extra work. As the tariff existed prior to last year, certain material was allowed in free for certain purposes, and the importer would simply make a declaration that these articles were

for those purposes and they came in free. We found that the practice was abused and that goods brought in free for specific purposes had, in some cases, gone out of the hands of the importer into those of other men who were not entitled to this privilege. I then changed the system and said that these articles, though free under the tariff, should pay the duty, and then the importers would file their claims for a rebate, which we would check by our officers. Hon. gentlemen can therefore understand how much work that cast on the department, but I believe that the department gained more in revenue than it cost by the extra expenditure.

Mr. OSLER. The other evening it was admitted that some action should be taken to make civil servants work longer hours; and in view of the increases in their salaries they ought to work longer hours.

Mr. PATERSON. What does the hon. gentleman suggest as the number of hours they should work?

Mr. OSLER. The feeling of the House was that the present hours were too short.

Mr. PATERSON. What hours would you suggest?

Mr. OSLER. From nine to five would be suitable and reasonable, I think.

Mr. PATERSON. Not speaking of one department more than another, but dealing with my own department alone, because it is now under discussion, I may say that our hours now are from nine to five.

Mr. OSLER. If the hours of the other departments were increased, could not some clerks be transferred from those other departments to the customs ? Certainly it is not well to increase the staff with a decreasing revenue. The only possible justification, one would think, would be the expectation that the revenue is going to increase.

Mr. PATERSON. I am not passing judgment on the other departments. I give the hours that my department observe. We think that we get good work out of the officers.

Mr. CROSBY. Is it not well to consider all this before we provide salaries for additional officers ? I have listened to gentlemen here who tell us that we have five or six hundred officials more than is necessary. If we are to add five more to the customs alone, it certainly does not look well. It seems most unfair to the people of the country to increase the staff while the revenue is decreasing.

Mr. PATERSON. As I say, I am not passing judgment on other departments. Work in others may be heavier for all I know. I have given our hours, and I may say that those are observed, for there is an attendance book. The minister does not have to sign it, but if he had, I think he would be found the only sinner. He does not attend very early, but perhaps makes it up in later hours.

Mr. CROSBY. The minister holds to the principle of increasing the staff with a falling revenue ?

Mr. PATERSON. No more than is necessary.

Department of Customs.—Contingencies, $9,000.

Mr. PATERSON. There is an increase here of $2,000 in sundries. This increase is only apparent, as the travelling expenses of officers at Ottawa whose travelling expenses, prior to September 1, 1908, were paid out of the vote for Board of Customs, in 1909-10, will be paid out of this vote for civil government contingencies. In 1907-8 the travelling expenses of these officers amounted to $1,673.95. Besides, there are the sundry expenses of the statistical office, $341, which will have to be paid out of contingencies.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I would draw the attention of the minister particularly to the argument used by himself a moment ago. I find the increase, over and above all that was paid to these members of the outside service to be over $1,600. To that add $150 per head for those who are brought in and those who are already in. And, in addition, there are the new appointments. Referring to the estimates of 1896, the total of employees in the inside service was 32. I find now that those in the inside service number 45, but the additions from outside make the total almost double what it was. In 1895, the expenditure was $36,800, whereas the expenditure now although it is impossible to distinguish between the two divisions, would be over twice the amount. Ten vacancies have occurred, but instead of trying to reduce the staff, the minister has filled the vacancies and appointed new officers besides. The minister's argument at one time was that the staff must be increased because the revenue was going up, but now that the revenue is going down there is no decrease in the staff. Now the same hon. gentleman argues that a diminution of the revenue brings about no decrease in the necessary work. If this can be justified, surely the revenue is no guide to the expenditure of this government.

Mr. PATERSON. Going back to 1896, you find a different position altogether.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. We had an economical government then.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not want to say anything against my predecessors. I think that the gentlemen that you have had at

the head of this department were pretty close—I do not know but that, perhaps, they were as close as I am. But look at the comparison of revenue; nineteen millions in 1895, last year fifty-eight millions—three times the amount. We are going to drop eleven or twelve millions this year, but I expect we are going to pick up next year and these are the estimates for next year. I am sure that all hon. gentlemen will join with me in the hope that the revenue will increase. Since 1896 the revenue has increased threefold. I do not think the number of entries increased that much, but still there was a vast increase in the number of entries. An entry of $10 takes as long to make as an entry of $1,000.

Mr. CROTHERS. I am not able to follow the hon. minister's logic. When asked for an explanation for that increase in the number of his staff by 5 clerks, he told us that with a decreasing revenue there was as much work as when there was an increasing revenue. That might be a reasonable answer for retaining the same number on the staff, but it is not an answer for increasing the staff by 5 clerks. Then, in explaining the expenses on sundries, he proposes to increase the allowance by nearly 50 per cent. We who are from the rural parts of the country and not acquainted with handling millions, would like to know all about these sundries. We know that sundries, like charity, often cover a multitude of sins. I would like the minister to explain not only the expenditure of $1,500 or $1,600, but to explain to us new members from the country the whole sum of the sundries.

Mr. PATERSON. I am from a rural county like the hon. gentleman himself. This sum of money was paid last year for the same service, travelling expenses of officers that were in the outside service.

Mr. CROTHERS. Generally, what are the sundries for?

Mr. PATERSON. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Auditor General's Report, page F—5 he will see the customs contingencies all set out.

Salaries and contingent expenses of the several ports in the Dominion including pay for overtime of officers, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $1,800,000.

Mr. PATERSON. There is an increase here of $95,000.

Mr. BARR. Can the minister tell us how much of this $95,000 increase is due to overtime earned by officers? I should think that when these officers work only four and a half hours a day we should not have so much overtime.

Mr. PATERSON. At centres such as Halifax, St. John, Montreal, Hamilton and other places trains are coming in at all hours of the night and you have to have officers there to attend to them. In Montreal a steamer comes in; she unloads day and night and you have to have your officers there to attend to that. The hours of these officers are from 8 to 6 and in the olden times they got no overtime. When they worked overtime we used to make the railway and steamboat companies pay them. The companies came to my predecessor as well as to myself and reported that they saw no reason why they should do that. They said that the revenue of Canada should be looked after by officers in the pay of Canada and, with a disinclination to swell the expenditure of my department for some years, I took the position of my predecessors and waved them off. Finally their argument prevailed with me. I could not see any reason why a railway or a steamboat company should have to pay officers of the Dominion government. It was our duty to look after the Dominion revenue. I might have said: Do not run your trains at night; do not come into the harbour at night, and if I had said so they would have been forced to pay the officers. We assumed that burden ourselves, and now these men who were largely paid in days gone by by the transportation companies are paid by ourselves, except that if they want any Sunday labour we will not give it to them. We give it to them on holidays, but on Sundays we do not. With officers working during the day the question might arise as to whether a man having worked from 8 to 6 o'clock is in a position to do two or three hours more labour, but unfortunately in many cases the pay of our officers at these large ports is such that it is impossible almost for some of them to live on what they get, and there is a very great desire on their part to augment the salaries which they earn between eight and six by putting in two or three hours at night and getting 25 cents an hour for it. The question has occurred: Would it be better for us to engage men specifically who should go on at six o'clock at night and remain until six o'clock next morning to do the work that is now done or allow these men to have a few hours extra work, which work arguments their salaries and which, they claim, does not give them more than they require to provide a living for themselves and their families. That is the whole explanation.

Mr. BARR. Can the hon. gentleman tell us approximately the amount that is given for overtime? Is it not a fact that there are some who are employed for night work?

Mr. PATERSON. About $95,000.

Mr. BARR. It says 'including overtime.'

Mr. PATERSON. The payments are set out in the Auditor General's Report by

provinces as follows: Ontario, $24,048.58; Quebec, $34,382.67; New Brunswick, $8,-812.40; Nova Scotia, $5,320.55; Manitoba, $5,205; British Columbia, $13,295; making a total, with the amounts expended in Prince Edward Island, Alberta, Saskatchewan and the Yukon, of $94,346.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. These items will be chargeable other years as well as this year. That does not account for the increase.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know anything as to that, but the hon. gentleman asked a specific question and I was answering that. What we want to do with this vote is to provide that in case we have to open some new ports we may be able to do so. We are fighting shy of that as far as we can. We have so many applications.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Are there any new employees to pay out of this amount?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, there will be new employees. But we have to estimate that we may, notwithstanding our disinclination to increase the number of ports, find cases that are of such merit that we will have to yield. We want to do as well as we can this year and we want to do as as little as possible in the way of supplementing salaries, though, if our feelings were consulted, we would do a great deal more. With the decline in our revenue we will have to ask the officers to be patient with us, more especially as within the last two or three years in the Customs Department there have been increases of salaries to outside officers of between $200,000 and $300,000. While that seems a large sum of money, but when you spread it from the Atlantic to the Pacific with nearly 2,000 employees, you can see that it would not be a very large increase for any one. There are some who have complained to us that in our division of the money their cases have been overlooked. We do not intend to give it to every one, but there are some cases in which they say that an injustice has been done to them. We propose to ask for a few thousand dollars so that if there are some cases of exceptional merit which have been overlooked we may be able to deal with them, and, if there are new ports to be opened, that we may have the money to open them. There are new towns constantly developing in the Northwest which to-day may not be of much importance, but which within the next twelve months may have to be established as customs ports.

Mr. LALOR. I believe that the outside service is underpaid in many instances and I congratulate the Minister of Customs that he has decided to increase the salaries of his officials in the outside service. I believe that will meet with the commendation of the House. Is the minister giving the increases on account of merit or simply as a percentage on the present salaries?

Mr. PATERSON. We have endeavoured to consult with the collectors at the large ports and we have taken the reports of our inspectors at the smaller ports in making these increases. Three years ago there were to be found men in Montreal who had been fifteen or twenty years in the custom service and who only received $500 a year. We were able to increase their salaries first to $550, then to $600, and then to $650. My aim is that in the large cities where living is expensive, every officer shall have at least $700 a year. They work faithfully from eight o'clock until six, and I think the Dominion of Canada will not want them to work for less than $700 a year. If I get this money I will consider some of these cases. I say frankly and fairly that no consideration guided the department in the distribution of this money which could be considered an unworthy reason. I know of course from the date of their appointment how they came into the service but I can say that simply because they did not come in under me, no officer was debarred from that which was his fair due. You will have to trust us in the distribution of this money to do what we think is right and fair to the various officers. If any hon. gentleman knows of any case where merit has not been recognized and if he lets me know I will be very pleased to consider it.

Mr. GOODEVE. In view of the invitation given to us by the minister I wish to mention a very peculiar condition of things in connection with the custom office in the city of Rossland. In the early days of Rossland we had a large custom business there, but with the collapse of the boom the number of entries and the custom business generally decreased very materially, so that there was not employment for one half of the former staff. Mr. B. R. Macdonald who was Collector of Customs at Rossland, and who I do not hesitate to say is one of the very best officers in the whole service, applied to be removed to Prince Rupert, believing that would become an important place and that his long and faithful service justified promotion. He was sent to Prince Rupert but was not appointed collector. Things drifted along at Rossland for some time, and the remaining officials in the office were sufficient to carry out the work, but eventually the collectorship was declared vacant. There was in the office at Rossland a man who had been in the service for seventeen years or more and who had been collector, but no sooner was the collectorship declared vacant than the Liberal Association called a meeting to receive applications for the position and they recom-

mended a certain man who not only had absolutely no experience in custom work but who had never done clerical work of any kind in his life. He was a blacksmith. I am not reflecting on his occupation in any way. I respect the man very much and he was a clever man in his own business, but he had no experience in clerical work and yet because he had been an influential party worker he was, on the recommendation of the Liberal Association, placed in the position at $1,600 a year, over the head of a man who had been in the service for seventeen years. Now, here is a case in which merit has been overlooked. Here was a man taken from a blacksmith shop and given a salary of $1,600 a year while the two other men in the Rossland custom house who had served for years received $900 a year and $1,200 a year respectively. All the new collector at Rossland had to do was to go to the office each day and one of the regular officials who was well versed in the law, and who was now made subordinate to him, had to instruct him in his duties. For this sinecure, as I say, he is receiving $1,600 a year. No wonder there is an increase of $95,000 in this vote. Now, there is more in the story. When Mr. Macdonald went to Prince Rupert, although he was one of the best men in the service, he was refused the appointment of collector and a man who had never been in the customs service and who had no experience whatever was appointed to the position. Strange to say when the new political appointee to the collectorship found that the boom did not come at Prince Rupert as he expected he believed he could make more money back in the city of Vancouver and he resigned. These are too glorious instances to show how the money of the people is wasted. Why does this collector at Rossland receive $1,600 a year practically for a sinecure? The other men were doing the work and doing it well, and I venture to say that there is a continued falling off in the revenues of the office; so that there was absolutely no need for the appointment. And why did not the men who had long worked in the service of the country receive that advance which the minister says he gives to those in the inside service? Why should not the outside service be treated in the same way as the inside? The hon. minister assured us that when a vacancy occurs in the inside service the other men are moved up but he has not carried out that principle in the outside service. It is appointments made in this way which destroy confidence in the government of this country. I would like an explanation of the instances I have referred to.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman is no doubt stating that he thinks it his duty to point out to this House, but I do not think he knows all the circumstances. My recollection is that Mr. MacDonald, who was collector at Rossland, asked to be transferred to Prince Rupert on the ground of ill health and his request was granted.

Mr. GOODEVE. He was collector at Rossland, and he asked for a similar position at Prince Rupert, but another man was made collector there and Mr. Macdonald was made subordinate to him.

Mr. PATERSON. But he is there and is in receipt of his salary. As we presumed, Mr. Macdonald was going to remain at Prince Rupert and another collector had to be appointed instead of giving the appointment to Mr. Grigor there was another person recommended, and I hope he is a good officer. If the hon. gentleman says he is not, I shall have to get reports on him from my inspector. I may be asked why the position was not given to Mr. Grigor. I am informed that he has to do relieving duties at times, because in a province like British Columbia, we require to have at these different ports an extra man to take the place temporarily of an officer at another port who may be ill. If there has been any injustice done, I shall be very sorry, but I do not think I am open to the charges of extravagance. My hon. friend will not say we should discharge an officer at any port simply because there may be a falling off in the revenue.

Mr. GOODEVE. What I complain of is that they took an outside man of no experience and unnecessarily placed him in office in view of the decreasing revenue and entries. They did so purely for political purposes. I was not referring to Mr. Grigor, whom the hon. Minister has mentioned. Mr. Grigor is a good man and a friend of mine, but during my election he deliberately left his office and went to Nelson and stayed two weeks there electioneering against me while all the time he was drawing his salary. I am not saying any thing against him because he has had experience in the office and is a personal friend of mine, but what I object to is that out of that increased vote of $95,000, I can point to two instances where the money of the country is paid to men who are appointed simply because offices had to be made for them.

Mr. PATERSON. But there was a vacancy was there not ?

Mr. GOODEVE. When the revenue and the entries were falling off, the office could have been left vacant. When one man could fill it for five or seven months without any assistance what necessity was there for making another appointment. I am not asking the minister to discharge anybody because it would be most unfair to discharge an employee on the ground that there was a temporary falling off in the

revenue; but when an office became vacant and there was no need to fill it, why appoint a man to that office, especially one who has no experience. In that one instance you could have saved $1,600. I am not reflecting upon your appointee further than to say that the office should have been given to the man who had done good and faithful service during 17 years.

Mr. PATERSON. It would not do to leave a port without a collector.

Mr. GOODEVE. Why not give the place to the man who deserved promotion ?

Mr. PATERSON. The thing has been done and if it be wrong we will have to look into it. But you could not leave the port without a collector. The vacancy was caused by the collector asking to be removed to Prince Rupert. We went on for a time with the officer in charge and then another officer was appointed temporarily to do the work. I suppose that Mr. Stephens was not able to attend to all the work.

Mr. GOODEVE. There are three employees in that office. I am not divulging anything of a private character because it was published in the Daily 'Press' that the Liberals had called a meeting for the express purpose of recommending a man for the appointment. There were three or four applicants, and among them were men who had been long in the service and were entitled to promotion. The government passed over a man who had done faithful service for 17 years and who still has his old salary of $1,200 and they placed a political partisan over his head in the office at $1,600.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. Will the minister take note of the facts that this customs officer whom he appointed at $1,600 a year engaged in political work ?

Mr. PATERSON. I was very sorry to hear that.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the minister dismiss this officer, according to the resolution of the House for which he voted, that civil servants must not take any part in elections? It is charged that one of his officers vacated his position and went out on the stump for two weeks at a time, in aid of the Liberal candidate.

Mr. PATERSON. I trust the hon.gentleman is mistaken. If the hon. gentleman will write me a letter stating that this officer neglected his duty and spent his time electioneering against him, I will write to the officer and ask him what explanation he has to make, as I think it is always fair to the officer to do.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman made the statement from his seat in the House.

Mr. GOODEVE. I am not making a charge against the officer but against the minister and his department for making an appointment for political purposes. We have two excellent men there; Mr. McDonald is one of the best men in the service, and I have no charge to make. But I am asked to vote for an increase of $95,000, the revenue is falling off, and here is a case where an unnecessary officer is appointed.

Mr. PATERSON. I think it was proper to fill the office and I have never yet, I frankly confess, considered the fact of a man being a Liberal as a bar to his appointment to office, other things being equal; that is not done under party government.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Does this vote contemplate an increase in the staff?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. How large?

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot tell you that, it will depend on the requirements. Of course in a country developing as rapidly as Canada is we cannot estimate exactly what increases will be required in the Customs service 14 months ahead.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. Does that include the port about which the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) inquired, Milton?

Mr. PATERSON. There is one of the points we have to consider.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. Is that estimated for?

Mr. PATERSON. We have not worked out any detailed scheme as yet.

Mr. LALOR. The hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) has brought up an interesting question as to the principle followed by the minister and his department in making appointments in the Customs service. We are told that in the inside service men are appointed according to merit and service; is the same principle followed in the outside service? Are appointments made by the promotion of efficient officers to vacancies or are they made by an outside political pull or by the award of a patronage committee?

Mr. PATERSON. Promotion does not follow in the outside service as a matter of course. As a rule if a collectorship at a port becomes vacant a new appointment is made.

Mr. J. D. REID. There have been promotions, but it is not the rule.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, there have been promotions, but that is not the rule.

Mr. LALOR. Does not the minister think it a better policy to promote a man who has done efficient service rather than appoint a

new man? At Port Colborne a vacancy was caused by the death of Mr. Sidey, but I notice a new man has been appointed, and the local paper states that although he is the son of a worthy citizen of Welland, he has been for a number of years living in Chicago. In such a case, where there are good officers, they should have been promoted.

Mr. PATERSON. I think there is only the one official there.

Mr. LALOR. There were two, Mr. Ramsden the landing waiter, and the late Mr. Sidey.

Mr. PATERSON. Mr. Ramsden held a dual position, partly under the Customs and partly under the Railway Department.

Mr. MAGRATH. The answers given by the minister have been most satisfactory to me. I understand this item deals with the outside officers. There has been a good deal of talk here about the salaries and hours of the inside service. I have always believed that the inside service has been starved, and I am pleased to see that their salaries have been increased. Is there any indication of increase in the salaries of the outside service? Are the salaries provided by this item the same as have been in force for some years? because I have the same feeling towards the outside service. It, too, is being starved. The cost of living has increased greatly in the last few years. I hope the minister has that feature in view.

Mr. PATERSON. This year we granted increases to officers in the different provinces as follows:

Province.	Number of increases.	Aggregate amount.
Ontario..	310	$23,430
Quebec..	274	14,400
New Brunswick.	55	3,100
Prince Edward Island.	13	800
Nova Scotia..	124	6,600
Manitoba..	52	3,650
Alberta..	14	1,200
Saskatchewan..	13	1,050
British Columbia.. ..	63	5,150

These are the increases granted during the past year. The hon. gentleman will see that this is a small increase among so many officers. Many of the increases have been only $50 or $100 or $150, but the hon. gentleman can readily see that even with the increased amount granted each year for three or four years past by parliament the increases have not been large. But when you spread it over about two thousand officers from the Atlantic to the Pacific it gets pretty thin.

Mr. MAGRATH. If it is convenient for the minister to give it, I would like to get some information. Take the case of a customs port with a revenue of $200,000 a year, what is the salary paid to the chief officer there? I want to make a comparison between the salary of a first-class clerk in the inside service and that of an officer in charge of a port such as I speak of, and distant, perhaps, two thousand miles from Ottawa. If I can get the information, I believe I can show that such an officer is not properly paid.

Mr. PATERSON. There is a little difference in the provinces, but in such a case as the hon. gentleman speaks of, the salary of the collector would be from $1,500 to $1,800. Of course, there are other officers at the port.

Mr. MAGRATH. Does not the minister sympathize with the idea that these men should be paid more?—for I believe they should.

Mr. PATERSON. I can certainly ask for more if the House will give it to me. Personally, it will be very pleasing for me to do so. But I have asked all I can venture to ask, and even when I ask for the amount I do, there seems to be a disposition to criticise me very closely.

Mr. MAGRATH. I do not believe there is a business in this country in which men having the custody of $200,000 a year are paid only $1,500. I have no desire to embarrass the hon. minister, and am satisfied with the answers he has given. Some gentlemen here do not appear to be satisfied with the conduct of affairs in British Columbia, but I would remind them that they are overlooking that doctrine 'To the victors belong the spoils'—a doctrine which has been developed as a hot house plant. but this, however, is not the time to discuss that.

Mr. CROSBY. I do not want to vote money until I have some idea what is going to be done with it. As junior member for Halifax, one of the leading customs ports of Canada, I desire to say that, if it were not for the overtime that the officers there work, they would starve—a man has to work night and day for a mere existence. We have from 67 to 70 men there working at salaries of from $650 to $750. The collector is a man who left a very lucrative business to take his present position, a man held in the highest esteem by the citizens of Halifax. He receives $3,200 a year. I am not complaining of what is paid to the inside service, but you pay a first-class clerk on the inside service more than you pay our collector. If it were not for the honesty of the people of Halifax and Nova Scotia, we would not get as much revenue as we do. If these officers were not honest men, they would pay themselves. The minimum, the very lowest, salary that an officer should be asked to work for in a port like Halifax should be $1,000 a year, and it should run from that to $4,000 for the collector. Next to the collector comes the surveyor, who

now receives a salary of $1,500. Then we have two chief clerks getting only $1,200 a year, then the cashier at $1,150. And there are from 10 to 15 who run from $1,000 down. with about 70, as I have said, with between $650 to $750. I do not think that we should have more officers, but we should try to pay the officers we have fair salaries. If the minister will give me some reason to believe that the money he asks for is going to be used to augment the salaries of these men, so that they can make a decent living for their families, I am prepared to support this item. Perhaps the other cities are in the same position, but I do not think their position can be quite as bad in this respect as that of Halifax. If the Minister of Customs can say that he will look after Halifax, and that the minimum salary of a customs officer in Halifax shall be $1,000, that will do, and I shall feel that there is a desire on the part of the Customs Department to treat the cities outside of Ottawa fairly. I am not saying a word against the inside service or the gentlemen who occupy positions in it, but while Halifax is a pleasanter place to live in, it is as dear as Ottawa. I want to see our men get something like a fair share of the money we vote for the department. If the minister will assure me that he is going to deal with those officers of whom I have spoken—and he knows the collector of Halifax and the officers there, and I am sure he will agree that they are, as I have said, a fine lot of men; I will say no more.

Mr. PATERSON. Unhappy is the lot of a Minister of Customs, with some critics asking him to increase his estimates tenfold and others declaring that he is already asking an unreasonable amount. I admit that our officers in Halifax are good, they work hard, and I suppose living has increased in Halifax as it has in other places. But when you ask me to bring them up to $1,000, I would have to come to parliament and ask for over half a million of money, and I do not think parliament would be disposed to do that. Last year, for instance, the increases amounted to $59,450, that was distributed over all the provinces. Here I am only asking for one-tenth of what the hon. gentleman asks me to do. Within the last few years we have made increases running into the hundreds of thousands. While I am proposing $60,000 to increase certain salaries, I am bringing upon myself a mass of communications and representations, and raising hopes from the Atlantic to the Pacific that I shall not be able to gratify, because there will not be a man in the service, scarcely, who would not wish to get a share. We will pick out what we consider the most deserving cases. Every officer in the Dominion will think he is entitled to a piece of it.

Mr. MARSHALL. I think we ought to be fair to the minister. I think he is perfectly right in asking for this increase. I understand he will not use it unless it is necessary. We must remember that this country is growing, and there will likely be new offices opened. While we are criticising the expenditures we must be fair. In my own town, for instance, we have a very good officer who is getting, I think, only $700 or $750 a year. If the revenue went down one-half, are you going to close that office? That man cannot work for less than that, and it is not fair to ask him to do it. I am in sympathy with this estimate the minister is asking for. Any person can see that it is necessary to provide for the future. There is another thing. It is impossible for the minister or any other minister to make appointments that will please everybody. I understand that these appointments are made on the recommendation of the local executive of the Liberal party. If there is an appointment made in Rossland, as has been explained here to-night, I fancy the minister is governed by the reports from the executive, and I fancy that if we were in power, in making appointments, the advice of our local representative would receive earnest consideration. I can understand, as the minister says, that he does not know whether there will be one more or a dozen more officers required next year.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice here the ever recurring phrase 'Notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary.' I understand when we amended the Civil Service Act that one of the purposes was to do away with that very thing.

Mr. PATERSON. The new Act does not apply to the outside service.

Mr. SPROULE. You are dealing with the outside service now.

Mr. PATERSON. We are working under the old Act, and I had to put in these words, because otherwise we could not pay for overtime.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister explained a few minutes ago that part of this increase was required to enable the customs to pay the officers for their overtime work.

Mr. PATERSON. That has been done for several years.

Mr. J. D. REID. I understood that the system in vogue for several years was that when officers went to the railway stations after hours, they collected from the railway for their overtime. I have understood since that instead of allowing the officers to collect from the railway the government collects from the railway and divides that among the officers. I wanted to know if that is the case. In my own town, for example, for years and years the officers

would go down to the Canadian Pacific Railway, perhaps at 9 or 10 at night, and for their overtime they would send in a bill at the end of the month for $40 or $50 as the case might be, and the Canadian Pacific Railway would pay it. Now has the Canadian Pacific Railwav been relieved of that expense, do the government pay it now and collect nothing from the railway, or does the government collect from the railway and divide it among the employees?

Mr. PATERSON. No. In the old times, as I have explained, we required the transportation companies to pay for this overtime. But they never paid the officers direct, we did not permit that. The government collected from the company the amount of the overtime of the men and paid it to the men. The railway companies did not pay the officers direct. But a few years ago, when parliament sanctioned the change I asked for, we relieved all the transportation companies of this payment of overtime, and it is now paid out of the Dominion treasury. We require the transportation companies to pay now only in exceptional circumstances. For Sunday labour we will not pay, but we make them pay to us, and we divide it up among the men.

Mr. CROSBY. In the city of Halifax is it not a fact that the merchants pay the extra time of the officers ?

Mr. PATERSON. I suppose this is what the hon. gentleman refers to. Importers bringing goods into the county are supposed to deal on a cash basis. We do not let them have their goods until we get their money, that is a safe way of doing business. But as there are large importations made by merchants who do not want to pay all the money at once, there has been known for years what we call the bonding system; that is, we have a bonded warehouse in which they may store their packages of dutiable articles. They do not want to pay the duty all at once, which may amount to a very large sum, and they put their packages into a bonded warehouse and take them out as they wish, five or ten packages at a time. They apply to us, and we send one of our officers to open that warehouse and deliver to them the number of packages they want, and collect the duty thereon. For many years we charged a uniform rate of $40 for a bonded warehouse. One man might put $300,000 worth of goods in a bonded warehouse, and another only $50,000 worth, perhaps another $10,000, but none of them would pay more than $40. In the case of a large importer we found that it would take perhaps the whole time of one of our lockers to attend to that one house, while another man who paid as much for his store house, $40, might only require the service of a locker once or twice a week. We thought that was not fair. We said: We will make the men pay us who have bonded warehouses, it is a privilege given to them, they are saving the interest on the duty which is a large amount and if they are going to take the time of our officers for their own convenience and benefit we will establish a uniform rate that they shall pay for the time that they use our officers.

Mr. CROSBY. Surely the Minister of Customs does not mean to tell us that about the ordinary bonding system in the customs.

Mr. PATERSON. That is the only way that the merchant pays anything and that is what the hon. gentleman is asking about.

Mr. CROSBY. I think there is another way. I think the Minister of Customs has given a wrong impression of the bonded system. He has given the impression that a man puts his goods into the bonded warehouse because he wants to save his money. Does the minister mean to tell us that there are not hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of goods put into the bonded warehouse and then shiped out to another country?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. CROSBY. Well, then, how are they saving money in that case?

Mr. PATERSON. How did they get the goods there? Do you suppose that we leave the doors open to them to go and put the goods in without an officer being there?

Mr. CROSBY. That is where you get your revenue.

Mr. PATERSON. If they do not have the services of the officer they do not pay him.

Mr. CROSBY. Oh, that is not the matter I am discussing. Did the minister not say distinctly that the reason for the bonded warehouse was that a man could put his goods in there and save his money because he would not have to pay the duty until he took them out? I am sure that 25 per cent of the goods go out of the bonded warehouse in Halifax without paying duty at all, and the deputy minister of Customs knows that. I do not want the impression to go abroad that the merchants in Halifax put their goods into the bonded warehouse for the purpose of saving money when they do not.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. A. K. Maclean). Carried.

Mr. CROSBY. I beg your pardon. I am not carried yet. Is it not a fact that the merchants pay for the overtime of the officers after hours? There may have been a change made but if so it has been made recently.

Mr. PATERSON. I am very sorry if I have offended the hon. gentleman in any way by my allusion to the fact in my explanation that the bonded warehouse means a saving to the merchants storing their goods there.

Mr. CROSBY. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if I am not right in my statement about the warehouse?

Mr. PATERSON. I am going to answer the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CROSBY. Well I want an answer, yes or no. If I am right I am right, and if I am not, I am not.

Mr. PATERSON. I said they put their goods in there for the purpose of saving revenue. Let me put it in a happier way and say that by virtue of putting their goods in there they save it, and I do not think it is any disgrace to a man to do it and I see no cause for offence. If these goods are going to be re-exported they cannot go into the bonded warehouse unless our officer is there to see them go in and they cannot take them out a month or a year after unless our officer is there to see the goods as they go out. For the services the officer renders they pay and they pay nothing else.

Mr. SPROULE. Is not that officer paid his regular salary from the vote we give every year?

Mr. PATERSON. He is paid his regular salary, but do not confuse this with overtime. The officer doing this does not get the money paid for the bonded warehouse. It comes into the Dominion Treasury.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Has the minister any idea what amount was collected for the services of lockers last year?

Mr. PATERSON. It was $29,000.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Does the minister not think that the government, having relieved the railways of a similar charge, it would be a proper thing to relieve the commercial community also? Are the railways and steamboat companies more deserving a consideration in the monetary sense than the mercantile community? That is a question I would like the minister to consider during the coming year. It is not so much the amount of money that they are required to pay for the services of an officer as the difficulty of getting an officer when he is wanted.

Mr. PATERSON. It is an advantage to a man to be able to defer the payment of duties and especially when it runs into thousands or tens of thousands, or, as in some cases, hundreds of thousands of dollars. But he is one man perhaps in a business community of a hundred of fifty who gets that advantage. Should the other men who do not avail themselves of it, and who get no benefit from it, contribute towards that expense or should we not get that $29,000 for the service rendered to the man who has the benefit of it and place that money in the Dominion Treasury? Outside of the question of overtime, the money comes into our treasury. The principle is that the man who gets the benefit pays for it, while the man who does not take advantage of it pays nothing for it. I am sure that the merchants using the bonded warehouses will admit that it is absolutely fair.

Mr. CROSBY. The minister has not answered my question. I asked him if there was not money paid by merchants and shipping men at Halifax for extra time. I would like to get that question answered, yes or no.

Mr. PATERSON. I am told that there have been $101 paid by all the bonded houses for overtime throughout the Dominion of Canada, and that has only been when they wanted an officer before eight in the morning or after six o'clock at night.

Mr. CROSBY. Can I get the minister to leave bonded warehouses for two or three minutes and tell me if there has been any money paid to tide waiters and officers on ships which come into Halifax to discharge cargo by steamship agents and shipping men?

Mr. PATERSON. For Sundays.

Mr. CROSBY. And for no other time?

Mr. PATERSON. No other time.

Mr. CROSBY. How long has that been the case?

Mr. PATERSON. About three years.

Mr. CROSBY. I thought it had taken place very recently. I would like to know when they were relieved.

Mr. PATERSON. That is a reform we have made.

Mr. CROSBY. A reform! Then, I want you to make another reform and give the men the money you have taken away from them. If you will give them the same proportion I am prepared to vote for these estimates.

Mr. PATERSON. If they have the services of this officer between eight in the morning and six at night, according to the hours they use him for their own benefit, they must pay us, the money goes into the Dominion Treasury and it is not given to the officer, but if they take an officer before eight in the morning or after six at night they pay us that money, which money we pay to the officer and which has amounted for the whole Dominion of Canada to $101.

Mr. CROCKET. Is it the intention to superannuate the inspector of customs at Fredericton?

Mr. PATERSON. It is proposed to superannuate the collector at Fredericton.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the minister any objection to state what applications he has received for the office, and from whom?

Mr. PATERSON. I am safe in saying we have received no applications yet and I do not know that I am anxious to get them. The superannuation has not been passed and we are not yet in a position to fill the office.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the Minister of Customs purpose making the further reform of providing out of the consolidated revenue fund a sufficient sum to pay the cost of advertising the meetings of these political committees who recommend appointees. Would not that be a logical addition to the expenditure of the country?

Mr. PATERSON. I have not had an opportunity of studying how this was done in times past but I will look into it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister has not only looked into it but he has acted upon it in the case of Rossland. In view of the exposé in that case I should think the minister ought to pay the extra salary of $1,600 out of his own pocket.

Mr. CROCKET. Did the collector at Fredericton apply for superannuation?

Mr. PATERSON. I am not aware that he did.

Mr. CROCKET. I understood the minister to say when speaking of Winnipeg that there would be no superannuation except upon the application of the collector himself. Why is that rule departed from in the case of Fredericton?

Mr. PATERSON. I qualified that statement by saying that the collector should be able to discharge the duties of the office. The public interest may require the superannuation of a collector without his applying for it.

Mr. CROCKET. From whom has the minister received any information that the collector at Fredericton is not capable of performing the duties of the office? That statement of the minister will be a surprise to the people of Fredericton.

Mr. PATERSON. We judged from the inspector's report, that it was advisable this step should be taken.

Mr. CROCKET. And without any application for superannuation being received from the collector himself.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. When does the minister propose to superannuate the collector at Fredericton?

Mr. CROCKET.

Mr. PATERSON. It is in process. These superannuations have to pass the Treasury Board who inquire into the merits. You can superannuate an official for cause after he attains 60 years of age, but the Treasury Board do not approve superannuating a man simply because he is 60 years old unless it is for the benefit of the service.

Mr. TAYLOR. The benefit of the party.

Mr. PATERSON. Oh no.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is this action taken upon the report of any person?

Mr. PATERSON. The report of our inspector.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the minister bring that down?

Mr. PATERSON. I don't think it would be well to ask for that. The inspector reports to us confidentially in a measure, and to publish the report might hurt somebody's feelings. I have no objection to bring it down, but I would rather show it to my honourable friend. Of course I do not impute anything wrong but it was considered advisable to superannuate the collector in this case.

Mr. CROSBY. I believe that the minimum salary of customs officials in the city of Halifax should be $1,000. I believe also that they should be brought under the Civil Service Act because there is always a tendency for the man with a pull to get more than others who have not the pull, and I know very good officers in Halifax who have not had an increase of salary for several years. The only way they can get fair treatment is to bring them under the Civil Service Act. If the minister would indicate there would be a general increase in the salaries of the Halifax officials, I would be satisfied..

Salaries and travelling expenses of inspectors of ports and of other officers on inspection and preventive service, including salaries and expenses in connection with the board of customs and salary of chief and general inspector at $4,000 per year, $135,000.

Mr. PATERSON. There is a reduction of $104,500 in this vote caused by the transfer to the inside service of officers whose salaries were formerly charged to the vote for the outside service.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was there any particular group of officers so transferred?

Mr. PATERSON. It would principally refer to the clerks in the statistical office.

Mr. J. D. REID. Were there any new officials appointed in 1908 under this item?

Mr. PATERSON. They would be included in the names I have given. I have given the names of the new employees of my department.

Miscellaneous—Printing and stationery subscriptions to commercial papers, flags, dating stamps, locks, instruments, etc., for various ports of entry, express charges on samples, stationery and forms, legal expenses, premiums on guarantee bonds and uniforms for customs officers, $87,500.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the minister refer to page F—42 of the Auditor General's Report? He will there find an item of $827 paid W. G. Charleson—a name that comes up frequently in our public accounts—for a lot of goods. Were these goods purchased by tender? I find an item of 24¼ dozen of padlocks amounting to $250.50, or equal to $10.33 a dozen.

Mr. PATERSON. These are all purchases made at different times during the year and tenders are not asked. The locks are for bonded warehouses, and have to be a special kind of padlock, which cannot be opened by the ordinary key. The purchasing officer is one who has been in the department for 30 years and in whom we have full confidence, and he has certified to the price as reasonable.

Mr. J. D. REID. I suppose the minister has a patronage list the same as the other departments?

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, very little.

Mr. J. D. REID. We find in all these items the same names cropping up as appears in the patronage list of the other departments. The hon. gentleman takes the ground that becauses he has the certificate of his purchasing officer the prices are reasonable. Well, when we complained of the excessive prices in the Public Accounts Committee last year we had the minister pleading that it was an outrage to insinuate that any of their officials would certify to prices which were not absolutely correct. The result of the investigation, however, made by the commission appointed by the government themselves has proved that such certificates are not at all to be relied on, and this man Charleson is one of those who charged prices much higher than are charged private individuals for the same goods. Although the Minister of Customs does not require to purchase as many supplies as some of the other ministers, he is just as guilty as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) who is smiling now over the way in which he administered his department, and which enabled him to distribute among his friends hundreds of thousands of dollars robbed from the people, a fact which he must have known because it was brought to his attention by members on this side.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the Minister of Customs say that he still keeps a patronage list after the disclosures made by the Cassels' Commission ?

Mr. PATERSON. We have very little in the way of patronage. I have no personal knowledge of the particular item in question, but I am informed that these are largely goods bought at different periods. These locks have to be made with keys different from other padlocks, and we have to make a special arrangement for their manufacture. However, as the question has been raised, I shall look into the matter tomorrow.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. minister ascertain what kind of kettles were bought at $1.75 ?

Mr. PATERSON. I am told that they are for testing tea in the laboratory.

Mr. TAYLOR. You can get the very best copper kettles at $1.25 and we are paying $1.75.

Mr. PATERSON. There is 50 cents to be accounted for.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not quite enough to ask us to accept the statement that because these prices have been certified to by an experienced officer they are therefor all right, because when we examined into the purchases for the ice-breaker 'Montcalm' and found cups and saucers charged at over $1 a piece, and the prices certified to as fair and reasonable we ascertained afterwards that these charges were simply robbery. When we look through the Auditor General's account and see the large number of supplies purchased from the same firm, Charleson & Co., who supplied these locks, and many of them charged at exorbitant prices, according to the judgment of those in the trade, we are justified in coming to the conclusion that there is something wrong. We are justified in concluding that there is something wrong and in asking that in view of the recent disclosures of the evils of the patronage system, the minister shall abandon the use of the patronage list in making purchases for his department. Charleson is on the patronage list and is able to sell goods to the department, but time after time we know that goods have been supplied by him above the market price.

Mr. PATERSON. For the little purchases we have to make in my department, I do not think we could adopt any other plan than our present one. I could not have more confidence in any purchasing agent than I have in our present one, and to advertise for the articles would cost five times what they are worth.

Mr. SPROULE. My question is, will the goods be purchased without resorting to the patronage list, will instructions be given to the purchasing agent to buy where he can get the goods at the lowest price?

Mr. PATERSON. I will look into the matter.

Mr. SPROULE. It is a question of principle, not of a few items here; it is a question of the interest of the country.

Mr. PATERSON. I admit that the interest of the country is supreme, but it is not in the interest of the country to go advertising for a few hundred dollars' worth of goods bought during the year.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not want him to advertise.

Mr. PATERSON. These purchases can all be investigated before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. The minister says he has a purchasing agent who has been in the service 30 years and who is perfectly honest. The rule has been that this agent has been told to go to Charleson's and purchase say tea kettles. Charleson says the price is $1.75, but at another store it would be $1.20. If the minister has allowed rake offs of 50 per cent on tea kettles that is not working in the interest of the country.

Mr. PATERSON. I hope he does not think I got a rake off. I did not know that anything was bought from Charleson. Certainly it was not done under my instructions. The commissioner hears what has been said and I have no doubt that he will investigate it in the morning; I will myself if I can think of it.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think that is going far enough. Some of the other ministers without being asked have undertaken to abolish the patronage list, and surely it is not too much to ask the hon. minister to do so.

Mr. PATERSON. You do not want to make me promise to adopt a new system until I find out whether it is best. Leave that to me.

Expenses of maintenance of revenue cruisers and preventive service, $30,000.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. I think this item will have to stand, as we are referred to for the details to section 'O' of the Auditor General's Report, which we have not yet received.

Mr. PATERSON. I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. George Taylor) would not want this item to stand, particularly after the full discussion we have had. There is a decrease of $10,000. This steamer 'Constance' is used in the customs preventive service in eastern waters. The Marine Department manage the vessel and we recoup them for what they do. The captain is our officer. And, as I have said, there is a decrease of $10,000. I hope the hon. gentleman will not ask that this item stand; in fact, I know he will not. Well, we will call that carried. This next amount is also one that will commend itself to the committee.

Amount to be paid to the Department of Justice to be disbursed by and accounted for to it for secret preventive service, $5,000.

This money is required for purposes which, possibly, we may not wish to disclose. The money is at the disposal of the Justice Department. The audit is a confidential one, in which, I think, the leader of the opposition shares.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. We have no objection to that item. But to the previous item, if you will look at the Auditor General's Report, page F—43, immediately after the item of the steamer 'Constance,' appears certain charges for the steamer 'Arctic,' and we are referred to page F—37 of the Auditor General's Report of 1906-7. We have not had an opportunity yet to look that up. And the charge for the 'Constance' here is $25,078.54, for which no details are given. Therefore, I think the vote should be allowed to stand. It will only take a few moments to put it through when we have had an opportunity to see the next part of the Auditor General's Report if everything is right with these amounts for the 'Constance' and the 'Arctic.'

Mr. PATERSON. I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. George Taylor) will not press that, and that any hon. member on that side who has influence with him will get him to withdraw his objection. The expenditure on the 'Arctic,' so far as we are concerned, was to pay the expenses of sending a customs officer to assert Canada's sovereignty in northern waters by collecting customs dues from the American and Scotch whalers there.

Mr. CROSBY. What revenue did he get?

Mr. PATERSON. Not much, it is true, but though it was only the hundredth part of what it cost to send the officer there, I am sure the House will agree that it was only proper to assert Canada's sovereignty in those waters.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. I thought Captain Bernier did that by raising the flag?

Mr. PATERSON. So he did. But we sent a customs officer with him and when we send a customs officer it means something, for he gets the hard cash.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. So far as I am concerned, if the minister, on some item of the Marine Department——

Some hon. MEMBERS. On the supplementaries.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. I understand that there are to be no supplementaries.

Mr. PATERSON. I am afraid we shall have some for this year, but I hope none for next year. I am ready to give the information at any time.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. On some item of the Marine and Fisheries estimates, the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) will allow this item to be discussed.

Post Office Department—Salaries, $488,944—Contingencies, $65,755.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. On what page of the Auditor General's Report are the expenditures for last year given?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). The part in which these appear is not yet printed. But this is for the inside service only.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Let the item stand. Surely the Postmaster General is not going to ask us to pass this without the report?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not know what special questions may be asked with regard to this. I am confident I can give all explanations to satisfy hon. members. If this were for the outside service I could understand that there might be some difficulty, but it is for the inside service——

Mr. J. D. REID. I would remind the Postmaster General that there are many members who never saw the Auditor General's Report, and, of course, they would like to have an opportunity to study these details.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As a matter of course, the item cannot be pressed without the Auditor General's Report if any objection is taken.

Mr. PATERSON. Take Public Works.

Public Works Department—Salaries, $324,800. Contingencies, $15,000.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Previous to the coming into effect of the present Civil Service Act, there were only 36 employees of the Public Works Department on the Civil Service list, while there were about two hundred employed, the large majority of whom were not on the permanent list. Under the new law these are now brought into the Civil Service. If hon. members will refer to page 26 of the Estimates they will see the details. The number of officers to be provided for is 237, nearly all of whom were in the employ of the department previously.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. Will the minister give us a list of the appointees of the Public Works Department during the last twelve months?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot do so to-night, but I should be glad to furnish it in answer to the inquiry made.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. Better bring down the information, and meantime let the item stand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think I can give the explanation. We propose providing for one additional engineer and one chief draughtsman, amounting to $4,200. In addition, we provide for an additional clerk in the third division of subdivision A, amounting to $900. Then the statutory increases for 1909-10, for 196 employees, amount to $5,262.50. Then we think we do well to make provision for unforeseen additional appointments or other changes to the extent of $5,000. Then there is the balance covering the differences between the annual increases in the salaries and the increases authorized by order in council dated May 5 and August 6 and August 31 of 1908, amounting to $8,958. I have a list of the names of all those who were in the service when the Civil Service Act came into force, also of the 196 employees who have been brought under the Civil Service Act. I will read them to the hon. gentleman if he desires.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is an enormous increase in the vote, and I would suggest that the minister put his explanations as fully as possible upon the 'Hansard,' and then we will let the item stand and take it up to-morrow when we can see the explanations.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Won't the hon. gentleman let it go through to-night? I will be glad to give information later on in a return.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would be glad to accommodate the hon. gentleman, but I would prefer that he put his explanations fully upon the 'Hansard' so that we can understand them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not wish unduly to press the item, but it is early in the evening. I think I have given quite a full explanation already. In addition I have here the names of all those who were in the temporary service and who were transferred to the permanent service by virtue of the Civil Service Act. Those names I need not read to-night, because they are all embodied in the order of classification which has been brought down to the House. The hon. gentleman will find there the names and present salaries, and also salaries under the reorganization.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Generally speaking, is the increased vote due to the fact that men are placed upon the regular permanent staff who have been paid out of many other votes of different characters in the public works estimates during previous years?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. As an illustration, turn to the miscellaneous, and the hon. gen-

tleman will find that there are two votes alone showing substantial decreases. Take the miscellaneous vote on page 7 of the estimates. Last year there was a vote for the engineering branch of $185,000, this year we are only asking for $145,000. The reason is that the engineering staff resident in Ottawa was largely upon the temporary list, and they all go to the permanent list. In the same way, under the architectural branch, there was $65,000 last year, and we only ask for $25,000 this year. Then in the estimates of this year the temporary and non-professional branch at Ottawa amounting to a very large sum, is wiped out altogether, and that is what makes the difference and accounts in the largely increased amount for the Civil Service. The amounts for temporary clerks are struck out altogether, and the amounts for engineering and architectural branch are reduced in the vicinity of $80,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Comparing this vote for 1909-10 with the vote last year covering the same items, in different forms, was there an increase or decrease, and for what amount ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The increase would be $25,000. That is made up by the salary of the deputy minister, increased by $1,000. We provide for an assistant deputy minister at $3,600, and we are providing for an additional engineer and a draughtsman $4,200 for both, also another third class clerk. We also provide $5,000 for other increases in the staff that may be found necessary during the coming year. Then the remaining $8,958 is made up by the differences between the annual increases in the salaries and the same increases which were made by orders in council of May 5 and August 6 and 31 last.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Could you tell us offhand how much of the increase is due in the first place to additional employees, in the second place, to statutory increases, and in the third place, to increases of any other character ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The new employees get statutory increases as well. I have just given them to my hon. friend.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is contemplated by the provision of $5,000 ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is contemplated possibly there may be some additions to the staff required, some additional architects, and possibly some addition to the cement branch, and in the clerical staff as well. The work in the department is increasing. One might suppose from the reduction in the estimates that the work was not increasing. But I want to tell the committee that the work goes on just the same. Under the estimates provided last year the architectural branch and the engineering branch still go on making their plans and specifications, because we do not understand that the work provided for last session is being dropped, it is merely postponed. All the necessary work will have to go on in order to fulfil the policy adopted by parliament last session.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The minister has not given the figures as they are stated on page 26. He says there is an increase of 2 in the first division, and 1 in the third division. But if he will look at the second division, there were fifty-eight temporaries and eleven permanent, and he is asking for seventy-five, an increase of six in the second division. He has not stated that to the committee at all but the figures are here before us.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would be included in the $5,000. I say that amount is for possible increases. There are a number who are not actually in the employ of the department now, but I have put in $5,000 for the purpose of covering that.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman estimates 75 at $98,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As against 69 before.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. That increased six over last year and then my hon. friend is asking for an extra $5,000 so that he may appoint more.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In making up the $28,000 I have put in $5,000 as the possible amount which may be required for these additional clerks.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend is asking for 9 and there is a reduction of 2 in one of the items in the third division. There are 43 outside and 4 permanent, making 47. take 2 from your 9 new appointments and it leaves an increase in the staff of 7 in the face of a falling revenue. Then I want that information because I am informed that just before the Civil Service Act took effect there was a large number added to the staff.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There were no additions to the staff just before the Civil Service Act came into force.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. There were a number of employees added to the force; I do not know whether you call it the staff or not. Then I want the names of the new appointees.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think my hon. friend is entirely in error. Possibly he may have in his mind that some additional labourers may have been employed, but there were no additions to the staff just before the Civil Service Act came into force.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Does the transfer from the outside to the inside service mean a change of occupation or residence?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. In the Public Works Department there was an organization of what was known as the temporary non-professional class. Away back in the time of Sir Hector Langevin this system was adopted. The number of those who were in the civil service was very small as compared with the temporary appointments. That system was carried right on until the Civil Service Act came into force on the 1st September and which brought all these into the permanent service. It does not mean any change in the employment at all and they have been brought in at the salaries which they had been receiving before the 1st September.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think we will take the minister's statement and look it over, and possibly it may obviate any further discussion. Let the item stand and we will look over the statement.

Item allowed to stand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What item shall we take up?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think we had better adjourn now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is very early to adjourn. Had we not better take up public buildings chargeable to capital?

Ottawa Astronomical Observatory—additional buildings, etc., $14,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This vote of $14,000 is asked to make provision for the construction of a residence for the chief astronomer, and also to complete coelostat house and standardizing hut in connection with the astronomical observatory. The proposed building to be occupied by the chief astronomer is to be a brick building with a stone foundation two and a half stories in height. The residence of the chief astronomer will cost about $16,000. As a great deal of the work of the chief astronomer has to be done at night it is necessary that he should have his residence close to the observatory. The vote of last year was $23,000, and we are now asking for $14,000 to finish the work.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. Has the contract been let?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract for the residence has not been let.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. Has the $23,000 been expended?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not all. There was a contract for a coelostat hut and standardizing hut at $13,900, besides which there was the cost of heating, electric wiring, etc.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. I thought that $23,000 was voted for the new building under contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was voted for the standardizing hut and the new coelostat house, the contract for which was $13,900, heating apparatus $1,000, electric wiring, $500, etc.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. To whom was the contract for the building let?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To Messrs. John O'Leary and M. J. Whelan, of Ottawa, the lowest tenderers. Messrs Doran & Devlin were the lowest tenderers for the residence.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Were public tenders asked for the residence ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and five tenders received.

Mr. STAPLES. Where is this residence going to be located?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Close to the observatory.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Is it the policy of the government to erect residences for the chief clerks?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a residence for the chief astronomer.

Mr. STAPLES. What salary does he get?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know at this moment; he is an officer of the Department of the Interior. It is my duty as Minister of Public Works to provide the necessary accommodation for the chief astronomer.

Mr. J. D. REID. Were there only two tenders for this building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For the coelostat house and standardizing hut. These were the lowest tenderers.

Mr. STAPLES. I think the minister should be able to give us the salary that the chief astronomer is getting. If he is getting a large salary why should the people of Canada furnish him with a $15,000 residence? We have had instances in this House where the government have built residences for people in the service who are receiving enormous salaries. A great many of the people who pay the money have to live in small houses and paying a man a salary such as I am told the chief astronomer gets and furnishing him with a $15,000 residence is exacting more from the poor labouring classes of this country than should be exacted by any government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Ordinarily speaking my hon friend would be entirely right. The government does not, as a rule, provide residences for its employees, but my hon. friend will see that to enable the chief astronomer to perform his work properly it is necessary that he shall be at night constantly at the observatory. The observatory is two or three miles from Ottawa and it would be very inconvenient for him to reside in Ottawa. I resisted the pressure for a considerable time, but on urgent representations made to me I felt we would have to erect a residence for Mr. King.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Is there any diminution in his salary in consideration of his getting this house free of rent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. J. D. REID. What is the amount of the tender for this residence?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The lowest tender was $12,300.

Mr. STAPLES. Are we to understand that $15,000 will complete this residence? My experience is that these buildings cost twice their estimated cost.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This contract is for the building alone and then there will be the heating and wiring, and I assume from the information I have that $3,000 or $4,000 additional will be necessary.

Mr. STAPLES. Is it essential that the chief astronomer should have a residence for his family close to the observatory. Even though he has to work at night, he is not any worse off than any others in that respect, and I don't see why it is not possible to provide him with suitable quarters which will not cost anything like this enormous amount. Why should we build such an expensive residence for a high paid official when the poor labouring classes of the country have to live in huts ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I hesitated, just as my hon. friend (Mr. Staples) would have done were he in my position, to build this residence, but there was no house close to the observatory which he could get and it would be unreasonable to ask him to build one himself. It was brought to my notice that a good many years ago a residence was erected by the Conservative government on the experimental farm for Dr. Saunders and for some other officials.

Mr. STAPLES. What did it cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a very fine residence and making allowance for difference in cost of material and labour it would be quite as expensive as this one.

Mr. STAPLES. The whole policy of the government seems to be to give advantages to the highly paid officials, while withholding from under-paid officials who do the greater portion of the work, that consideration to which they are entitled. I know men who are working in the Civil Service in this city for $40 and $45 a month and who are expected to rear their families on this miserable pay. But when we come to the highly paid officials the policy of the government is to increase their emoluments by leaps and bounds.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In view of the fact, that, instead of adopting the report of the commission to give a percentage on salaries which would be an advantage to the highly paid officials the government proposes to give a flat increase of $150 to each civil servant, the criticism of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Staples) is hardly just.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. This building is to be erected right under the eyes of the Department of Public Works in Ottawa with their immense staff and yet they pay Mr. John Sharp as clerk of works for 143 days at $4 per day.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Sharp is one of the staff of the Public Works Department and his services in this case are properly chargeable to that building.

Mr. WRIGHT. I voice my protest against putting $20,000 into a building for the accommodation of any civil servant in Ottawa. I think a $10,000 house to be good enough for any man we employ.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. But that is not a patch on it, for if the hon. gentleman looks at the Auditor General's Report he will find the government paid to the Office Specialty Company, (a pet company here in Ottawa established to get business from the government) $5,970 for library fittings for this building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is for the observatory itself and not for this residence.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. The item says here: 'For fitting library steel cases, gallery and stairs, and bevelling below the gallery, $5,970.' I want to draw attention to another item on the same page. E. P. McGrath & Co. have supplied 182 lineal feet oak for transit house at 15c. per lineal foot; two inside doors with fan lights, and two pine door frames with fan light and oak door, with locks, &c., supplied and set up, $132.15.' Just fancy $61 per frame door with a fan light in it. Were these bought by tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will see that the first item is for fittings for the library, steel cases, gallery and stairs and panelling below the gallery, less the amount of $970 paid the previous year. In the laboratory there is a library because there must be various works which are of great importance to the chief astronomer. There must also be records of his observations from night to night, which must be preserved, and it is not improper that they should be kept in steel fittings so as to make the inside of the building as fire proof as possible. Then the stairway from the bottom to the upper gallery must be of iron, as they are in all large libraries. This was let by tender. There are only two firms which make these fittings in Canada, and tenders were received from the two.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Is there a library also provided in the residence?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Will there be a man employed in that building as caretaker?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I don't propose to furnish a caretaker.

Mr. BLAIN. Are the two firms from which the hon. gentleman asked tenders on the patronage list?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are only two firms in Canada where these goods can be got. One is in Ottawa, and the other is in a city in western Ontario. Before purchasing, a very careful examination was made of the fittings made in the United States, and used generally in the public offices in Washington and the different state capitals, and the chief architect ascertained that the prices asked us were fair and reasonable.

Mr. S. SHARPE. In view of the strong condemnation of the patronage list by the Civil Service Commission, does the hon. gentleman propose to abolish it ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have given instructions to abolish it as far as possible, and invite public tenders. I am now considering the establishing of a purchasing department, as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has done, in accordance with the report of the Civil Service Commission, but that organization will take a little time and the person in charge of that branch will have to be thoroughly experienced and reliable.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. How comes it that the hon. minister paid $2.50 per barrel for 85 barrels of cement bought from Kirby & Co., when he could buy that cement at Hull for $1.80?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was but a small quantity and no tenders were called for.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. You could purchase it by retail at $1.65. I see the familiar name of Chas. Patton down for four fire extinguishers at $15 a piece, or two more than last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Last year the order may have been a large one and $15 is a reasonable price, for they are very good articles.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Does this item include the furnishings for that house as well as the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. S. SHARPE. What is the necessity for such a large house? Has the gentleman a large family or does he expect to, or are other gentlemen going to live with him?

Mr. BLAIN. Does the minister propose to furnish the house?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no intention to ask for such a vote. That might properly be done by Dr. King himself.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the minister think a residence of this cost is required?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will be perfectly frank. When the plans and estimate were first presented to me I said I thought the house was too expensive and asked the chief architect to cut it down and this has been done.

Mr. BLAIN. What will the total cost be?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The lowest tender is a little over $12,000 and with the heating, wiring and plumbing it will likely cost somewhere between $15,000 and $16,000.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Has the work started yet?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Personally I cannot allow this item to go without a very strong protest. I can see no pressing necessity for a public building of this kind when hundreds of buildings are required all through Canada that are not provided for in the estimates. In North Ontario, for instance, the minister, the day after the issue of the writ, sent an officer of the department to Uxbridge to get options on lots for a post office to cost $8,000. The options were for sixty days and the urgent public necessity for a building of that kind was strongly urged. The people there are in need of that building far more than this gentleman is of a residence; that post office will serve from 3,000 to 5,000 people while this serves only one, and I would suggest that this appropriation should be dropped and one for the Uxbridge post office substituted. I must strongly protest against this large item when there are other more urgent and pressing claims.

Mr. BLAIN. Was any vote passed last session for the erection of this residence?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was a vote for additional buildings in connection with the observatory and I explained to the House that it was contemplated to errect a coelostat house and other buildings and a residence for the chief astronomer.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Does this Mr. Sharpe get $4 a day all the year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, he is employed permanently.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. That is $1,460 a year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. And he earns every dollar of it.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. Who purchased the 85 barrels of cement at $2.50 and who paid $106 for two pine door frames and a fanlight in the two doors? Who ordered these and certified to the accounts?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They would be purchased under the direction of the chief archi-

tect who is responsible for the purchase and also the price.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. Who else tendered for the work awarded to the Office Specialty Company?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot tell whether the other concern tendered or not, but prices were asked from both companies.

Mr. WALLACE. Where is the Office Specialty Company situated?

Mr. PUGSLEY. At Newmarket.

Mr. WALLACE. In what county is that ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would know better than I do.

Mr. WALLACE. I thought it might be in New York.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I could suggest a use for this money, which, I think, would be much more in the public interest than building a handsome residence in Ottawa for this already well-treated official. I desire to present the claims of the city of Chilliwack, in the constituency I have the honour to represent. I have been looking through these estimates to see what provision was made for the public building in Chilliwack promised by a minister of the Crown, who has disappeared for the time being, but who did us the honour to visit us during the election. He promised that, if the government was sustained, we should have a handsome public building for post office and customs purposes erected in Chilliwack. Now we are told that an era of economy has set in, and we cannot have the building that was promised. But when we examine the estimates, we find that economy is only in spots, and the high spots struck by this era of economy are those that have the good fortune to be represented by members of the opposition who will stand up for the rights of the people, and that the expenditures to provide the comforts of civilization are centred around the seat of government in Ottawa. As an hon. friend near me remarks, we all had to buck these promises. It is time to register our protest in the most solemn way. I think it is due to this House that we should have some explanation from the government as to why they have gone back in this most heartless manner upon the promise made by their defeated colleague to the people of Chilliwack.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The question the hon. member (Mr. J. D. Taylor) has asked is a very proper one. It was a matter of very great regret to me to be obliged to postpone for the time the consideration of a post office building at Chilliwack. An appropriation was made last session and the necessary steps were taken towards securing a site, but tenders were not called for because there was delay in acquiring a site. But I would say this, in justice to myself and as an explanation to our friends on both sides, that when the time arrived when, by reason of declining revenues, we had to make a reduction, in the public interest as we thought, in the expenditures, we found there would be great difficulty in discriminating amongst the public works which had been provided for last session, for all seemed to have very considerable merit. I could say to my own conscience that I have not asked for a vote for a single public work in any part of Canada which could not be justified on public grounds. What we did was this : We drew the line sharply between public works in respect of which tenders had been called, or which had been undertaken by day's work and those in regard to which no tenders had been called. In doing this an enormous reduction was made in my estimates, something over $8,000,000. I desire to say to our friends on this side of the House that nothing has occurred in my public life that has given me greater regret than to be obliged to postpone the building of wharfs, public buildings and other public works in the various constituencies throughout Canada to which parliament was pledged last session. I wish to express, in the most sincere manner, thanks to our friends in parliament who have yielded to our views and have acquiesced cheerfully in the determination, upon grounds of economy, to postpone—I trust for only a short time—the construction of these public works. I may say to my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. J. D. Taylor) that Chilliwack does not stand in a different position from many other places throughout the Dominion. We have not discriminated between our supporters and opponents, but have treated all alike, acting upon one principle, and postponing the construction of these public works. We have also felt it necessary to postpone some for which tenders had been called.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. What about the minister's promise ? We do not mind a promise made by an ordinary candidate, but, when a minister makes a promise, that pledges the government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What minister ?

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I was just about to remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) of the facts. During the campaign in Chilliwack, the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman), the minister who represents the province of British Columbia, on his responsibility as a minister, and expecting that his statement would be taken as that of an honourable man at par, told the people that if they and others would assist, and if the government were returned to power, a most substantial government building would be constructed in Chilli-

wack. I submit that conditions have not changed since the tenth day of October, when the Minister of Inland Revenue upon the stage of the theatre in Chilliwack, made that promise, and that the government is in honour bound to carry out this pledge, even though the people of that riding did by a very substantial majority return the present member instead of the gentleman put forward by the government of the day.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was any statement made as to when this building was to be commenced? The hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Taylor) must have patience.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. As we do not seem to be very busy, and as time is not pressing, I would like to inform the committee of something that did occur at that time. We were discussing at Chilliwack a matter of very pressing importance for British Columbia, the matter of better terms——

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. A. K. Maclean). The hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Taylor) is departing from the resolution if he is going to discuss the question of better terms.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to the debate all evening, and have heard a large variety of topics discussed, but have not heard anybody called down yet for being out of order. I do not think I am going further astray than those who have preceded me. In answer to the minister who has asked the question, I would like to explain the circumstances which occurred at this meeting in Chilliwack. We were discussing the question of better terms. In answer to our argument that we were not receiving from this government the terms we had a right to expect, we were told by the Minister of Inland Revenue that the province of British Columbia was about to receive better terms from the government at Ottawa. But, he stated, instead of giving this money to be squandered by the McBride government, they were spreading it over the province in the shape of appropriations for government works of all kinds. Why, he said, we have given you a substantial public building in every place of any importance in the province; we have purchased in Chilliwack a valuable site, and we intend to erect a first-class building upon it. Of course we all understood, every reasonable man would understand, the minister to mean that having purchased a site he intended to proceed immediately with the erection of that building. I submit that it was not businesslike on the part of this government to buy an expensive site in the city of Chilliwack, promising the people that if this government were returned they would erect this building, and then, after the government had been returned, to turn around and say: We find that the finances are so straitened we have no money with which to erect a building, and we propose to allow the lot to stand idle and take the money we intended to expend in Chilliwack and with it erect a palatial residence at the city of Ottawa for a highly paid official of this government. I submit that is not the proper way in which this government should treat the people of British Columbia.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. PATERSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. What business do you propose to take up to-morrow?

Mr. PATERSON. I did not ask the Prime Minister, but I suppose we will go on with the estimates, probably Civil Government and Public Works.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.20 a.m. Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, February 5, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 40), to incorporate the Great West Permanent Loan Company.—Mr. A. Haggart.

Bill (No. 41), respecting the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Schell.

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

Bill (No. 43), respecting the Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Cash.

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

SUPPLY—CANADIAN RAILWAYS.

Hon. WM. PATERSON moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, before you put that motion I again must trespass on the time of the House for a few moments to refer to the question of what I might call the delinquencies of Canadian railways in connection with their capitalization. I wish to point out, in view of the wide powers that have been given to the Canadian Pacific Railway in the matter of capital that when such powers are given, the service accorded to the people ought to be considered, and I think I will

be able to show in a very short time that to-day even so great a railway as the Canadian Pacific is not giving the public the service that it ought to give in consideration of the great franchise granted to it and the enormous resources that it has at its command. It will surprise any one who looks at the railway service now given to this country to see the preference that is given by our Canadian railways—that we subsidize with land and money, roads to which we give splendid franchises—to the traffic of a foreign country. They devote their main energies to accommodating the traffic whether passenger or freight that originates in a foreign country. In the province of Ontario we know that the great Canadian Pacific Railway, with all its resources, gives its first attention to what is called the American trade. In Toronto and all along the main line in Ontario you see what are called the produce and beef trains from Chicago which are given the right of way and precedence over Canadian traffic. There are people who are prepared to say, and I believe they are right, that the rates accorded to this traffic that originates in the United States are lower than those which are accorded to the produce of our Canadian farms. Talking to railway men, they have told me that the one class of train over the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway running through the province of Ontario that ranks as to right of way almost with the accommodation train is the beef train from Chicago. You find that the chief executive and the chief officers of the Canadian Pacific Railway apparently are devoting their best attention, their best engines, the right of way over the road and things of that kind to the accommodation of American traffic that originates in Chicago. I do not think that ought to be the case and yet it happens to be the case. Local traffic is neglected. In the city of Toronto we have asked that great Canadian Pacific Railway Company to give us a suburban service which would be as much for the benefit of the country lying around Toronto as for the city and they have told us deliberately that it is not their intention to supply a suburban service and that the people should go to the trolley lines if they want a service of that kind. The Grand Trunk Railway Company have also taken that position. The Grand Trunk have told the citizens of Toronto that if they want a suburban service, if they want the same kind of treatment that is accorded to the people of Montreal, where an excellent suburban service is given by both railways, they cannot have it, that there is not the business for it to do that they cannot see any money in it and that they cannot afford to make the experiment. Yet the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is accumulating a net surplus that is equal to ten per cent of the stock of the company.

There is another thing that we have been told by this great corporation and by the others and that is that we cannot look for any kind of improvement in relation to the traffic of Ontario, and that the one ambition of the company is to extend its system. Expansion is the great idea of the railway magnates rather than service to the country, and the Canadian Pacific Railway to-day are very busy building up their extensions in the United States. They are acquiring great systems of railway over there and they have told us that they have not time to attend to the Ontario business because they are too busy with the expansion of their road. They say that they are also occupied with the expansion of their system in the west. That may be all right, but I contend that they ought to give more attention to the local traffic, to the reduction of rates on local traffic and to an equalization in rates as between Canadian and American traffic. This is a serious charge to make, and when a railway company like the Canadian Pacific Railway come to the government and ask for an increase of their capital, as this company have asked for an increase of their capital, some terms ought to be put upon them. They should be asked : Are you accommodating the traffic in your own country ? But apparently they can do what they like in Canada; they can carry passengers in the United States for two cents a mile and they can charge Canadians three cents a mile. That is unfair. I have contended in this House time after time that we should have a two cent a mile rate in this country, and especially on the railroads which give a two cent a mile rate to their American traffic. And the answer given to me is: This is a new country; Canada is not like the state of New York; we will have to charge three cents a mile in Canada. No, Canada is not like the state of New York and it is not like the state of New York because the great Canadian Pacific Railway, for one reason, is in a position to have a net surplus of earnings equal to ten per cent on its capital stock, a state of things which is unequalled by any other railway in America to-day. I do not want to be told again that I must have some consideration for the Canadian Pacific Railway and other railways because Canada is a poor country with a sparse and scattered population, in view of the fact that that population is paying a net profit to the Canadian Pacific Railway of ten per cent on its stock.

There is another disastrous feature of railway operation in Canada and that is the wanton disregard by these great corporations of the lives of the people and the lives of their servants. The sacrifice of human

life on the railways is increasing from year to year. The railways tell us they cannot afford to provide life-saving devices and yet here is a company proposing to give $35,000,000 as a gift to its shareholders. In the little city of West Toronto in my constituency hardly a week or a day passes that there is not a funeral of some person killed on the railroad. We have the strange spectacle in West Toronto that now we hold an annual memorial service for the railway men killed by trains and forty or fifty names are called out on the death roll at this annual service. I am told that the credit of the Canadian Pacific Railway must be maintained and so it must, but is the credit of that corporation to be maintained at the expense of high rates to be paid by the Canadian people and at the expense of an immense loss of human life. How many railway crossings could be protected out of this $35,000,000 that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is to-day taking from the public and making the public for ever pay the interest on? When I say that the net surplus earnings of the Canadian Pacific Railway are over 10 per cent on its capital I have as an authority the 'Statist' and the 'Economist,' two of the leading financial journals in England. It is all wrong that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be allowed to what is commonly called 'Cut a melon' and distribute it in the shape of from $25,000,000 to $35,000,000 among its shareholders, and which it can only do if it is allowed to continue charging exorbitant rates. On that surplus they could well afford to reduce their rates ; on that surplus they could well afford to give the farmers of the west lower transportation for their products; on that surplus they could afford to provide devices to safeguard the lives of the people. I read in their report that last year they issued $24,000,000 of the same kind of stock among their shareholders and they succeeded so well that they wanted to repeat it to the tune of $50,000,000. So long as they are allowed to do that there never will be another bond issue, there never will be another mortgage debenture sold and there never will be any preferential stock issued. This of course is an alluring system of finance for the shareholder of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and he is largely a European who is growing fat on the Canadian who has to pay railway tolls. My contention is that the reputation of the Canadian Pacific Railway is now so well established in the financial centres of the world that it can get all the money it wants for the extension of its lines by the issue of bonds. But, they have other resources. They have over 8,000,000 acres of land in Alberta and Saskatchewan and they have 4,000,000 acres more in British Columbia, and for some of this land they are asking $25 an acre, but even taking it at $5 an acre it will give them all the money they want to build new lines. I have been told by some wiseacres: You are interfering with the credit and the standing of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the money markets of the world, and yet they have this 12,000,000 acres of land worth from $12 to $20 an acre none of which they need to touch. It is true that in the past they have sold a great deal of their land and put the proceeds into the road, but hereafter that land is to be kept as a guarantee that they will be able to pay 10 per cent on this stock which is sold to the shareholders at par when it would and should command a premium of 75. I was also told not very long ago that New York was the only state that could protect the issue of securities, but, I have good authority for saying that when Mr. Taft is inaugurated a month hence the chief plank in his administration, after tariff reform, will be that the Interstate Commerce Commission shall take complete charge of all kinds of securities issued by railways which do an interstate business. I was glad to hear the Minister of Railways say the other day that he thought this question was well worth considering, and I hope he will give it a good deal of consideration and that he will find a way to regulate the issue of these securities by the railways. There cannot be a regulation of railway rates until there is a regulation of the issue of securities, and securities should not be permitted to be issued unless the railway can show that it has no other resources in its treasury. The Canadian Pacific Railway has to-day a treasury the extent of which nobody knows. It is all very well to say what a fine railway it is, but do you think that its annual financial statement tells the whole truth about what is in its treasury and what its resources are? Not at all.

There is a great deal more. Before the road is authorized to issue a single dollar of additional stock, it should show that it cannot use its resources to carry on financing in a more economical way. It has still 12,000,000 acres of land and other great resources that it could mortgage, and so could easily raise the money it requires. Considering the preference given to traffic that originates outside this country and the lack of attention to local traffic, and considering the extravagant system of financing that it proposed, I think we ought, once and for all, to tell the company that, if it wishes to raise more money, it must raise it on some system that is less a tax on the man who pays the traffic charges. For we must never lose sight of the fact that it is not the railway that pays the interest charges on these securities, but that these are paid by the people who have to bear the traffic charges. Until I have further information I must again say that the order in council to which I have referred was most unwisely issued. I hope the minister will give us a copy of it—he has promised that he would

bring it down. I contend that it would not be wrong, in view of the facts I have given, to recall and reconsider that order in council, calling upon this great railway to show that it cannot raise the money it requires for the extension of its line other than by the issue of stock at 100 when its stock is bringing 160 or 170 in the open market. I have not a word of criticism to pass on the Canadian Pacific as a railway proposition. We are all proud of it. It has opened up the country and will do a great deal for the country. But a railway is something that concerns the people; it is part of the administration of the country, and it ought to seek to serve the people quite as much as to make its investments attractive to the capitalists of the world. It is all very well to speak of maintaining a reputation in the money markets of the world, but it is also important to do justice to the Canadian people. In that connection I would like to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals whether or not the provision in the original charter of the Canadian Pacific Railway, under which we are not to interfere with their freight rates as long as they do not exceed ten per cent, has been commuted. I was told by a previous Minister of Justice in this House that that clause had been commuted, but I am not sure as to that, and I would like to know the facts now or later at the minister's convenience. I know that the feeling in the Canadian west is in favour of regulating the issue of securities by these railways, and we are only beginning to realize that this is the keynote of the regulation of freight rates. I have already told the House, and I tell them again, that the reason the great capitalists of Europe neglect American railway securities is that they distrust them. Within a few years these securities have been sent back to the Americans, and the trust companies and savings banks who had loaned money on these shares have had to take them over. The investors of the United States are not taking them, and the people of Europe refuse to take them. Why? Because these railways have been over-capitalized. We read in the papers that the American roads are moving to exclude the Canadian Pacific from their territory on the ground that the Canadian Pacific carries freights at less rates than they can—I am a little doubtful about that—due to the fact that the American railways have such enormous fixed charges through over-capitalization. So we see there is real danger in over-capitalization, and the only way to take charge of the traffic rates is to take charge of the issue of capital. I leave this subject for the present, but I intend to return to it until we have some assurance that the regulation of the capital of railways is a matter of public concern that must pass some form of public inspection with a view to making the railway charges as low as possible.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I will not detain the House with any lengthy remarks, for the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean) and I discussed the matter pretty fully the other day. I am afraid I should have to repeat what I said then. But, even though it be a repetition, I may say that the question of rates and the question of service, as to both freight and passengers, have been handed over to the Railway Commissioners, and I stand to my opinion that, having adopted this course, we should follow it until it proves a failure—which I think it will never prove. I think that the Board of Railway Commissioners have done a work as good as any like body in the world, perhaps better. As to the order in council to which the hon. gentleman refers, I will have pleasure in bringing it down. I overlooked it.

MARINE DEPARTMENT INVESTIGATION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the discussion which has gone on is not to be continued—and, so far as I am concerned, I will reserve my remarks for another occasion when my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) proposes to bring it up—I would like to mention two matters. The Secretary of State (Mr. Murphy) yesterday gave an explanation—or what he seemed to consider an explanation—of the extraordinary and unusual delay that has taken place in the printing of the evidence taken before Mr. Justice Cassels. He told us, what we already knew, that one volume of about 325 or 350 pages had been printed or distributed early in October. He promised another volume next week, and the third volume in two or three weeks from now—I have forgotten the exact date. He told us also that a fourth volume would be out at some time in the future, which he did not undertake to define. Now, I want to tell my hon. friend (Mr. Murphy) that I regard his explanation as the most extraordinary statement I ever heard in this House in regard to the printing of a public document of so much moment as the one to which I have alluded.

Let me point out to him why I regard his explanation as extraordinary. Every day we have debates in this House from three to twelve or one o'clock, which debate takes up more space in print than a single day's evidence before Judge Cassels. That debate is printed and ready for examination by any hon. member in this House by ten o'clock on the following morning. Yet my hon. friend comes to this House, when evidence taken in September last has been withheld from us in a printed shape for four months, and seems to imagine that his statement is an explanation which the House ought

to accept. I say that that evidence, with ordinary diligence such as is applied in the printing of Hansard, could have been ready for distribution the very next day after it was given, yet four months after that time we are told in a very philosophical way that we will get part of it some time next week, another part in three or four weeks, and another some day in the future, which the hon. member does not name. My hon. friend said that the delay is partly due to the fact that a portion of the evidence was taken in French and there was some delay in translation. If my hon. friend will apply the analogy of Hansard to that, he will find that Hansard is translated into French and printed and is not more than ten days behind the English edition. The translation need not cause a delay of over a week or two at the outside. My hon. friend had better look into the matter and give some reason why the distribution of the evidence is delayed. I am not disposed to accept that which he is pleased to call an explanation; and I shall venture to treat this matter as of sufficient importance to engage the attention in a considerable debate at no distant day, unless we have an investigation made into this delay in the Printing Bureau.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State). I do not know that at the moment I can add anything to the information given yesterday. Like other ministers in charge of departments, I am dependent for information upon the officers who are charged with the actual carrying out of the work. In the main I think it will be found that the work at the Printing Bureau is done with as much expedition as is possible in work of that character. Speaking with the diffidence and lack of experience of a new member, may I say that I do not see the analogy between the printing and the issue of Hansard and the getting out of something altogether outside the regular line of work, such as the collection of evidence and the issuing of it in pamphlet form. If there be any means of expediting the work, I shall see that such means are adopted.

THE INTERNATIONAL WATERWAYS TREATY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. With respect to the dispatch which was read in the House yesterday by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, I wish to make a few observations: The dispatch is as follows:

London, January 29, 1909.

I am in receipt of your telegram of January 28, and from your telegram of January 9, I gather that your responsible advisers have the full text of the treaty before them.

According to press reports there seems to be some misunderstanding as to the presentation of the treaty to the Dominion parliament.

In this country the treaty-making power is with the King, acting on the advice of his responsible ministers, who in cases of treaties which affect the Dominion, acts of course in full consultation and accord with the government of the Dominion concerned.

In the United States the treaty-making power is with the advice and consent of the Senate, and until the Senate of the United States of America approve of any treaty it is not the practice to publish or present to parliament either in this country or in Canada, or to publish in the United States or to present to congress. The fact that the Senate of the United States see the treaty before the parliament of the Dominion, but not before government of the Dominion, is therefore entirely due to the terms of the constitution of the United States.

I am in hopes that your responsible advisers will clearly explain this to parliament, and will point out that the relation between the parliament of the Dominion and the government of the Dominion in this respect is practically analogous to that between the Imperial parliament and the government of His Majesty the King.

(Sgd.) CREWE.

There seems to have been a misconception created in Great Britain, and evidently the same impression is in the mind of the Colonial Secretary, that some remarks which have been made in this House were directed against the action of the imperial authorities, and that the government of Canada was not held responsible by this parliament for any action taken in connection with this treaty. So far as any remarks of mine may have created any such impression, I desire to say that they have been absolutely misunderstood. In respect of a question of this character, I hold the government of Canada responsible to the parliament of Canada for its policy and action, whether in relation to negotiations with the United States or in relation to upholding the rights of this country in any communication or negotiation between the government of Canada and that of Great Britain.

I appreciate what the Secretary of State for the Colonies has said regarding the practice by which the Senate of the United States deals with treaties in secret session. Before the arrival of his dispatch I looked at the United States authorities and I found that the practice in the United States is exactly as he states. But it is only a practice. I have under my hand the constitution of the United States, and that constitution imposes no obligation on the Senate of the United States to deal with treaties in secret session:

Art. 2. Sec. 2 of the Constitution of the United States, as contained in the Principles of Constitutional Law by Principal Cooley, is as follows:—

The presidents have the power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make

treaties, provided two thirds of the senators present concur.

The article does not impose any obligation on the Senate of the United States to consider these treaties in secret session, and I am convinced, from information which has come to me in connection with this very treaty, that citizens of the United States, who may feel themselves interested in any of the matters affected by it, can without very much difficulty obtain all desired information regarding it before it is published in the press or laid upon the table of Congress. So that while in theory the Secretary of State for the Colonies is absolutely correct, I venture to say that in practice there is a disadvantage for Canada in the way in which these matters are dealt with. The people of Canada do not know at present whether or not this treaty contains any matter which may make it necessary for our parliament to legislate in order that the provisions of that treaty shall become effective in every respect. But I venture to think that that information might possibly be obtained by interested persons in the United States. It would be remarkable in a Senate, composed of I do not know how many members, and with these matters coming to the knowledge of a great many persons who are officers of the House, if the information desired could not sometimes be obtained by interested persons.

I do not know whether the provisions of this treaty would be regarded as extending, by the terms of compromise, to cession of territory. It is needless to point out to the Prime Minister or to any hon. gentleman in this House, that if any easement or right is created by the terms of that treaty in respect of Canadian territory, then that treaty does by its terms amount to a cession of Canadian territory in that respect; and I would like to point out to the right hon. gentleman that under the recent British practice all such treaties are presented to parliament at a very early date, and that parliament is invited to ratify them by an act of parliament, which seems to be regarded as necessary by later authorities. For instance, I find, on reference to Anson on the Law and Custom of the Constitution, edition of 1908, page 106, that:

> In 1890 Queen Victoria, concluding a treaty with the Emperor of Germany, which provided among other things for the cession of Heligoland to the emperor, was advised by her ministers to make the cession conditional on the approval of parliament.

The treaty was not only presented to parliament but was made conditional on the approval of parliament. That was one of the points that I made the other day and I was not attributing the slightest blame to the imperial authorities in regard to it. Whatever credit or blame there may be in respect of a treaty of that kind ought to be attributed to the government of the day, and I would entirely attribute it to the government of the day in Canada. When I was dealing with this treaty the other day I pointed out the advisability, in respect of the important questions which must be covered by it, in respect of its possibility involving a question of cession of territory, that it ought to be presented immediately to the parliament of Canada; and, further than that, its effect ought to be made contingent upon the approval of the parliament of Canada. I observe that in the treaty relating to Heligoland this course was pursued by the ministers of the imperial government who advised Her Majesty.

The citation from Anson proceeds as follows:

> This invitation to parliament to share in the exercise of the prerogative rights of the Crown, and therewith to assume the responsibilities of the executive, was much criticised in debate.

It then refers to the opinions of Mr. Gladstone and of Mr. Balfour. Mr. Gladstone criticised the action of the government; and Mr. Balfour spoke of the question as being in a nebulous condition, but asserted that eminent legal authorities, consulted specifically, had maintained the necessity or parliamentary consent. He no doubt referred to the law officers of the Crown and to other persons, probably of equal eminence in the profession of the law, who had been consulted in regard to it.

I quote further from Anson as follows:

> The course taken in 1890 was followed in the case of the Anglo-French convention in 1904, in which various points at issue between the two countries were settled on terms which involved cessions of territory to France. No question was raised in either House of parliament, except as to the expediency of the terms, when the Bill which embodied the convention was under discussion.

There was no relevant discussion of any importance on that occasion; the only incident of value was that the course taken in 1890 was again taken by the British cabinet in 1904 in advising the Crown with regard to the Anglo-French treaty of that year; and that there was no criticism or comment thereon in parliament.

Inferences might also be drawn from the well known case of Walker vs. Baird, decided by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in 1892. This case related to interference with the working of a lobster factory on the coast of Newfoundland. The owner of the factory was stopped by an officer entrusted with the enforcement of an agreement made between the Crown and the Government of France. The owner of the factory brought an action and it was alleged to be no defence that the con-

duct of the officer was an act of State. Whether or not it could be authorized by the treaty making power of the Crown was discussed but not settled, inasmuch as the statement of defence assumed that the mere allegation that the acts were done in pursuance of a treaty took the matter out of the jurisdiction of the courts.

Lord Herschel's judgment in the case is no doubt familiar to the legal gentlemen in the House. It is quoted in part in this work. Speaking of the argument, Lord Herschel said this:

It was admitted that the Crown could not sanction an invasion by its officers of the right of private individuals whenever it was necessary in order to compel obedience to the terms of a treaty.

Then he continues:

Whether the power contended for does exist in the case of treaties of peace, and whether if so it exists equally in cases akin to a treaty of peace, or whether in both or either of those cases interference with private rights can be authorized otherwise than by the legislature, are grave questions upon which their lordships do not find it necessary to express an opinion.

But they did express an opinion upon the point raised in the case and did hold that the mere making of an agreement between Great Britain and France, in addition to or in interpretation of a treaty. did not authorize the executive of Great Britain or the executive of Newfoundland to interfere with private rights without the sanction of an Act of parliament. Thus, in so far as the fulfilment of this treaty may require any interference with the rights of private citizens in this country, in respect of their lands or otherwise, the sanction and approval of parliament are necessary; and that is another reason why, in my opinion, the treaty ought to have been made conditional upon the approval of the Canadian parliament in the first instance.

The right hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies has stated in a very broad and comprehensive way the practice in Great Britain with regard to the production of these treaties to parliament. I desire, in my observations in regard to the doctrine which he has laid down, to express my most sincere respect and deference for any opinion emanating from a gentleman holding so high a position, not only in the imperial councils but throughout the empire, as the Earl of Crewe, Secretary of State for the Colonies. But I desire to say that my brief researches into this subject do not lead me to exactly the same conclusions as those which have been arrived at by the right hon. Secretary of State for the Colonies. In the despatch to which I alluded he says :

It is not the practice to publish or present to parliament either in this country or in Canada, or to publish in the United States or to present to congress—— before the ratification of the treaty, that is before the treaty has been approved by the Senate of the United States. Until this treaty has been approved by the Senate of the United States there is no ratification of the treaty. In that respect I do not think that the practice has been quite so consistent as the right hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies would have us believe. It is very difficult to obtain reference to precedents from 1887 down. It is unfortunate that Todd's work, the last edition of which bears date in 1887, has not been brought down to a later date. Thus, twenty-one years have now elapsed since any edition has been issued. But taking it down to 1887, I find the doctrine enunciated by Todd as follows—I am reading from volume 1, page 367:

Until of late years, it was not usual to lay before parliament treaties prior to their ratification by the governments concerned. A contrary practice has recently prevailed in several instances.

That seems to be inconsistent with the very general and sweeping statement which has been placed before this House by the Prime Minister in terms of the despatch from the Earl of Crewe which I read a moment ago. Then Todd proceeds to deal with the instances. For example :

In 1865, the government submitted to the House of Commons a 'Sugar Duties and Drawback Bill,' the object of which was, 'to give effect to a treaty which had not yet been ratified, and therefore could not be presented to the house in the usual form, by command of Her Majesty; but for the information of the House, as the treaty required legislation a copy had been presented as a return from the Treasury.'

In 1870 a treaty of neutrality with Belgium was for special reasons informally communicated to both houses of parliament on the day of prorogation, although its formal ratification had not been completed. The same course was taken with regard to the Treaty of Washington in 1871, and in the case of the French Commercial Treaty in 1873.

So here are at least four cases in recent years up to 1887, in which the practice described by the right hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies as a universal practice, was not followed. I would venture to believe that if the records were searched from 1887 down to the present time some further illustrations of a departure from this supposedly universal rule might also be found. I do not myself see any great danger or detriment to the people or to the executive of a country in making a treaty known after it has once been signed If any such danger or detriment is likely to occur, why did it not occur in the cases which I have quoted from Todd. What detriment to the public interest, what detriment to the executive or the people occurred by reason of the communication to par-

liament of these four treaties in 1865, in 1870, in 1871 and in 1873? Mr. Todd does not point out that any unfortunate results were observed as arising from the communication of those treaties to parliament on those occasions. I venture to think that the communication of this treaty to parliament in the meantime would have been attended with no detriment to the public interest, and no embarrassment to the executive, and would have been a more desirable course to follow than that which has been pursued. I sincerely trust that the treaty may be laid upon the table of parliament at a very early day. I do not know what length of time may elapse before the Senate of the United States may come to a conclusion upon the subject. So far as my information goes they have not yet ratified the treaty. Am I right in that understanding?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand it has met with constant opposition in the Senate.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So at the present time we do not know whether or when it will be ratified. Of course my right hon. friend will understand that it might take a very long time. It might not be determined by the Senate this year, it might not be determined until next year, it might not be determined until the following year.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Perhaps not at all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, are we for ever to remain in ignorance of the terms of this treaty? Is that the result? It seems to me an undesirable and unfortunate result, and one which should not necessarily follow from observing diplomatic usage; because in the four instances which were adduced by Mr. Todd up to 1887, the number of which might be increased no doubt by further research, we find several treaties communicated to parliament before ratification, and we have not observed that any detriment to the public interest has resulted from pursuing that course. Under the circumstances I conceived it to be my duty to make my views known to parliament and to the country, as I had introduced the matter in the first instance.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no fault to find with the remarks of my hon. friend, nor with the spirit which has inspired them. In my opinion, however, he has not rightly apprehended the spirit of the communication which I laid before the House yesterday, coming from the Earl of Crewe, the Colonial Secretary. The spirit of the communication is not to make it clear to this country that the Canadian government ought to be held responsible to the people, and that they are either to be blamed or commended for the treaty they have negotiated. That responsibility we fully assume. The Canadian government was represented in the negotiation of that treaty by a gentleman appointed by ourselves as one of the commissioners, namely, Mr. Gibbons, of London, who has been for some years chairman of the Waterways Commission, and whom we considered, from his experience in that capacity, was eminently qualified to look after Canadian interests. I may say at once that we accept full responsibility for the treaty. If blame is to be attached to it, we would be responsible; if credit is to be attached to it, we should be equally the beneficiaries. The despatch of the Earl of Crewe was the result of an inquiry made by His Excellency the Governor General to have the treaty placed at once before parliament, and therefore before the Canadian people. The answer of the Earl of Crewe has been commented upon by my hon. friend a moment ago. My hon. friend has, I think, brought in some matters which are not immediately connected with the subject in hand. He has, for instance, suggested the question whether the treaty-making power in this instance should be supplemented by the parliament of Canada, or whether in such a matter the prerogative of the Crown is paramount. My interpretation of parliamentary law in this matter has always been, that in all treaties except treaties of commerce and treaties affecting the revenue, the paramount treaty-making power is vested in His Majesty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not question that, my observations were directed to the practice rather than to the power.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think the argument of my hon. friend dealt with the treaty-making power. In my humble judgment the treaty-making power is vested in the King, except in matters affecting the revenue. My hon. friend also brought forward an instance to the effect that if the treaty involved a cession of territory, the paramount power resided in parliament. That is the proposition of my hon. friend.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My right hon. friend is quite right; I did take that position as one supported by considerable authority.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, although supported by considerable authority, my hon. friend conceded also that the question was not free from doubt. As I understand the quotation of my hon. friend from such an eminent authority as Mr. Gladstone, it went to show that he argued that the treaty of the sovereign is paramount and that parliament has no authority in the matter. Then, it will depend upon the terms of the treaty as to whether or not the treaty, to become effective, has to be supplemented by the action of parliament or whether it is complete by the exercise of the power of the King. In my opinion this treaty is such that it is complete by the signature of the

sovereign. Whether or not the treaty is wise or unwise, at the present time, it is legal, in my humble judgment. If it were declared that the treaty had to be supplemented by the action of parliament, then parliament would have to pronounce upon it. If, on the other hand, the power of the King is complete, then it will be open to parliament to censure or approve the treaty as the case might be within the exercise of its power in that respect. But that is a question beyond the issue. The main question that was introduced to the House by my hon. friend on a former occasion was as to whether the treaty should be communicated to the people. For my part, I agree altogether with my hon. friend. I see no reason whatever, the moment the treaty has been signed, and even before it is ratified by the sovereign, why it should not be communicated to parliament. I am at one with my hon. friend as to that. It has not been the practice to do so. I am very glad that my hon. friend has brought to my attention the authority of Todd upon the subject, showing that what has been the usage of parliament has been departed from in three cases.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Four.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In the four cases which are cited the usage of parliament in this respect has not been followed. I must say that I was not aware of this, and I shall take the opportunity of looking over the authorities myself and again call the attention of the Colonial Office to them. I repeat what I said a moment ago that for my part I see no reason at all why, the moment the treaty has been signed by the plenipotentiaries, it should not be communicated to the parties interested. I might observe to my hon. friend that while the treaty has been submitted to the Senate of the United States, according to the terms of the constitution, it has not been communicated to the House of Representatives.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, certainly not.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Therefore, in that respect the Americans have themselves accepted the usage that the treaty is not to be communicated to the public until it has been ratified, but we must recognize that parliamentary usage must develop with the times. In former days when the press had not the power that it has at this moment it was quite consistent that a treaty should not be communicated to the people until it had been ratified by His Majesty the King. But in these later days when the press has acquired such power in the national life of every country, I think it would be not a disadvantage but an advantage to the country itself to know what are the provisions of the treaty in which it is interested before it is ratified. If the parliamentary usage were to be changed in that respect it would be an improvement, and it would give more satisfaction to the people of Canada. I repeat that I have no fault to find with my hon. friend, but that on the other hand I agree with him and I shall look at the authorities to which he has called my attention and then communicate with the Colonial Office with reference to the matter.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, in support of the position taken by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), I may say a few words in reference to this interesting question. The paramount power to make a treaty is with the Crown, provided the treaty does not interfere with a subject's allegiance to His Majesty or deprive him of any property. The doctrine was laid down and discussed in this House again and again during the debate on the Washington treaty, and upon several other occasions. The doctrine was also laid down in a case which was decided in reference to South Africa. South Africa at one time was acquired by the British forces. After remaining two or three years in possession of the British it was ceded by an Act of the sovereign by the exercise of his paramount power. An action was brought by a subject owning property in the South African Republic on the ground that he was deprived of his allegiance by the Act of his sovereign. The court held that he was not deprived of his allegiance because the possession which was acquired did not form part or parcel of the empire and the Crown had the right to dispose of it. But at the same time, the Privy Council upheld the doctrine that no act depriving a subject of his allegiance or depriving him of any part of his property which was part and parcel of the British empire, without the consent of the parliament of the country, was legal. I hold that to be an incontrovertible doctrine. The sovereign has the paramount power to exercise the right of disposition with respect to any property provided it does not interfere with the allegiance of a subject or take a portion of the empire and give it to another. This treaty cannot do so. I suppose it does not deprive any subject of his allegiance or property and it is therefore in the paramount power of the sovereign. But, the modern doctrine is this: Parliament claims the right now, having acquired the right by the practice to which my hon. friend has referred and in respect to which he has quoted authorities, of being a party to the treaty. We take the ground that everything affecting the interests of the colony or the Dominion, it being within the British empire, must receive our consideration. We claim that right and we must have it. I think that

under the constitution, the right of the Crown is undoubted if it does not interfere with our allegiance or deprive us of our property, but the modern constitutional doctrine which we have acquired by practice is that any treaty affecting our interests shall be submitted to the parliament of this country for its consideration and approval.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply

Department of Agriculture—Salaries (including G. F. O'Halloran at $6,000) $322,100. Contingencies, $13,500.

Mr. SPROULE. What accounts for the large increase in this item?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). 195 clerks have been brought from the outside service into the inside service and the increase is entirely due to that, with the exception of the statutory increases.

Mr. BARR. Were any new officials appointed?

Mr. FISHER. There is no increase otherwise than by bringing in the Experimental Farm branch, the Statistical branch, the Seed branch, the Veterinary and Live Stock branch, the Dairy branch, and the Archives, as provided in the Act of last session.

Mr. BARR. Have the salaries been increased all along the line?

Mr. FISHER. There are 13 who by the reorganization of the inside service get increases.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the total of the salaries for each of the different branches of the department?

Mr. FISHER. Experimental Farm, Ottawa, $31,700; Public Health, $6,450; Health of animals, $21,250; Live Stock, $12,-100; Seed division, $24,900; Dairy division, $30,500; Meat and canned foods inspection, $6,250; Cold storage, $3,200; Exhibition, $2,-500; Census and statistics, $28,450; Archives, $28,212.

Mr. SPROULE. How many of these 193 have entered the service as permanent clerks without having passed the Civil Service examination?

Mr. FISHER. Twenty-one clerks who were formerly paid out of Civil government contingencies had passed the Civil Service examination. The others were appointed from the outside service which did not require the Civil Service examination, but it is possible that a few of them had passed the examination

Mr. SPROULE. What I want is the percentage of those temporary clerks who are now put into the permanent service without having passed the qualifying examination.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think the hon. gentleman quite understands the situation. These clerks were not temporary clerks, and were not in the Civil Service at all. Though their labours were in Ottawa, they were in outside branches. But, under the Act of last session, they were brought into the inside service. Before that change, they were not paid as civil servants, but were paid out of lump votes, as, for instance, the vote for the Archives, the vote for the Dairy Branch, and so on. But there were temporary clerks who were in the Civil Service under the operation of the old Civil Service Act. These were paid out of civil government contingencies, which was a lump vote under civil government. But, under the old Act, they were required to pass the qualifying examination. There were 21 of them in my department, and they all had passed the qualifying examination and held their certificates. But the rest of this total number of 193 were not in that category, they were not in the Civil Service at all, though they were in the employ of the country, and had not been required to pass the examination, but had been appointed on their merits. These are now brought into the inside service.

Mr. SPROULE. I was judging from the heading of the list, 'Outside and temporary.' But if all these 21 have passed the examiners, how was it that they were temporary clerks?

Mr. FISHER. If the hon. gentleman observed the old Civil Service, no doubt he was aware that there were many permanent 'temporary' clerks. Though appointed as 'temporary' clerks, some of them have been in the department for fifteen or twenty years. They were paid out of a vote, which the hon. gentleman no doubt will remember seeing in the old estimates, for 'clerical assistance,' which came under civil government contingencies.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, but my recollection is that these were not obliged to pass the qualifying examination.

Mr. FISHER. I believe there were instances in the old service of people being appointed to temporary positions without passing the qualifying examination. This must have been done by some means, which, I confess, I do not understand, for I have always understood that the old Act did require such an appointee to be one who had passed the qualifying examination. As a matter of fact, the 21 in my department have passed that examination.

Mr. HAGGART. Surely the minister is mistaken. For instance, in the Railway Department, there are many specially em-

ployed, such as professional men—engineers and others. These are what may be called 'temporary' permanent clerks.

Mr. FISHER. But they are not paid out of a vote for clerical assistance under civil government contingencies.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister has not been quite as frank with me as my question deserved. I did not ask how many were paid out of civil government contingencies, but how many there were. I put the question in the form I did, because, last session, the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), when explaining this Act, told the House that there were a large number of temporary clerks who might be regarded as permanent, many of them having been twelve, fifteen or even twenty years in the government's employ, and the majority, if I understood correctly, had not passed the qualifying examination. These he proposed should be put into the Civil Service at once. I desire to ascertain how many of those in this list have been put on in that way. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) is dealing with those paid out of civil government contingencies, but there are a good many others not accounted for.

Mr. FISHER. I tried to explain that these others were paid out of lump votes, such as I have described, Archives, Exhibition branch, Dairy branch, Seed branch, and so on. These were permanent employees in the service of the country, but they were not civil servants.

Mr. SPROULE. And were not required to pass the qualifying examination?

Mr. FISHER. No. But, according to my understanding of the law, those paid out of civil government contingencies had to pass the qualifying examination.

Mr. SPROULE. The change with regard to this 193 employees means that the amount for salaries here is increased from $84,000 to $322,000. Is there a corresponding reduction in the branches from whose votes these employees were formerly paid?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, there has been a corresponding reduction in these votes. For instance, in Archives, the hon. gentleman will find that there is a reduction of $32,000. The salaries, as a matter of fact, came to $28,212, so that we have reduced them by nearly $4,000. In census and statistics, there is a reduction of $23,500. Now the salaries transferred into the civil government amount to $28,450, which is a little under $5,000 more than the difference. We have started a new system of monthly crop reports, for the carrying on of which I need $5,000 more. The whole reduction in salaries is $28,500 but I have added under the census service $5,000 which diminishes the reduction from $28,500 to $23,500. Take the experimental farm, my hon. friend will see there a reduction of $32,000. The salary reductions were $31,700. We have therefore reduced the vote $300 more than the amount transferred to civil government and so I could go on through all these votes.

Mr. CROTHERS. Take the item, first division, subdivision A, on page 24, $34,850, so that we may see just how the Civil Service Act of last year works out. It would be interesting to know the salary that each of these paid clerks got in the outside service last year and what it is proposed to pay this year. There were eight brought in from the outside. What salaries were they getting when they were in the outside service?

Mr. FISHER. I shall give the list. Dr. Montizambert, who is in charge of the Public Health and Quarantine, has $4,000, and Mr. Saunders, the director of the Experimental Farm has $4,000.

Mr. CROTHERS. Give the salaries they had last year and what they are getting this year.

Mr. FISHER. In these two cases the salaries are exactly the same in each year. They had been getting $4,000 for many years back.

Mr. PERLEY. How is it their salaries were not increased?

Mr. FISHER. If my hon. friend had been listening, he would have heard me say that there are thirty-five in the service whose salaries are not increased by the classification or the proposed Bill and these are amongst them. Mr. Archibald Blue, head of the Statistical Branch has $4,000 and had the same last year. Dr. J. G. Rutherford, Chief Veterinarian, $4,000 last year and $4,000 next year. Mr. J. J. Ruddick, Dairy Commissioner had $3,500 last year and the current year. Next year, by the statutory increase under the Act he will have $3,600. Dr. Doughty, Archivist last year and the current year $3,200. Next year with the statutory increase $3,300. J. F. Roy, Assistant Archivist, $3,000 last year, and the current year, and $3,100 next year by the statutory increase. A. L. Jarvis Secretary and Acting Deputy, $2,600 last year, and $2,800 under the reorganization which took effect on the 1st September. Mr. Jarvis was at $2,600 in the old Civil Service, but by the reorganization he was put into the first subdivision at $2,800. By the Civil Service Act, having been at the maximum of his class for some years, he was elligible and legally had the right to the statutory increase of $100, which would make him $2,900 since the 1st September. During the coming fiscal year he will be entitled again to the statutory increase of another $100, and therefore we are providing that amount for the coming fiscal year. G. H. Clarke,

seed commissioner, $2,800 last year and the current year, and we are providing $2,950. He will be eligible for the statutory increase only. P. E. Ritchie, registrar of copyrights and trademarks and administrator of the Gold and Silver Marks Act, was chief clerk at $2,050. He is put into the first subdivision at $2,800, and in the course of the next fiscal year will have the statutory increase of $100. We therefore provide $2,900. These are the ten clerks, of which eight were formerly in the outside service.

Mr. S. SHARPE. When the deputies of the other departments receive $5,000, why should the deputy minister of Agriculture get $6,000 ?

Mr. FISHER. He is also Deputy commissioner of patents, and parliament decided last year to give him as such an extra $1,000.

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I would like some explanation from the Minister of Agriculture with regard to the increase of salary to his deputy. I see that this gentleman was increased to $6,000, while the salary of the Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue was increased from $4,000 to $5,000. Why this difference in favour of the Deputy Minister of Agriculture ? It is alleged that this officer fills several positions. Even if it were true, he could not give to those duties more time than he can dispose of. When his salary was $5,000, was it not considered a sufficient salary, especially when the other deputy ministers, except the Deputy Minister of Justice and the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, can only receive that amount ?

This gentleman was receiving $5,000 a year, and now he is being paid $6,000. It seems to me as if he was treated with greater generosity than others. When a man receives a salary sufficient for a respectable living he should not be increased in that way.

There are a great many employees in the different departments who are not so highly paid, and who do not receive any such increases. The salary of many of our judges is not so high as that. In Montreal, for instance, the Circuit Court judges are only paid $3,000 and we refused them an increase. I say it again, I find it strange that the government should have increased the salary of this deputy minister from $5,000 to $6,000, and I am awaiting the explanations of the minister.

Hon. Mr. FISHER. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I am quite willing to discuss this question anew if the hon. member from Terrebonne desires, but this increase has been agreed upon last year. Therefore, it is not a new increase. It was made last year, when we voted the estimates of the fiscal year. This item is only the continuation of the same salary paid last year to the Deputy Minister of Agriculture. The hon. member says that there are some judges who are not so highly paid. Judges of the Superior Court in Montreal are paid more than that.

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) I said the Circuit Court judges.

Hon. Mr. FISHER. (Translation.) I may tell the hon. member that the duties of this deputy minister are of a very special character. As Patents Commissioner he has judiciary functions to perform. Some very important cases are brought before him very often. He has to decide upon issues in which sometimes are involved millions of dollars. To fill this position it requires a very competent man, and who possesses at least a knowledge as sure and as learned as any of the best judges of the Superior Court of Quebec. This question has been fully discussed last session, and the House has agreed to pay that salary to this deputy minister. I am not, therefore, asking any more than the continuation of the same salary.

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) But, nevertheless, he has received an increase of $1,000 this year.

Mr. FISHER. (Translation.) No, not at all. He was paid $6,000 during the current year; that is to say, since the law passed during the last session has been in operation.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Would the minister state the net additions to his staff during the past year ?

Mr. FISHER. I could not give the number positively for the past year, I have been dealing with the current fiscal year only. There is only one addition during the current fiscal year.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Does this appropriation contemplate any additions ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, we will have to have one more official in the Archives Branch and provision is made for that. He will be in subdivision 'A' of the second division, a special translator, who will be appointed under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Will there be a promotion ?

Mr. FISHER. No ; he will have to come in from the outside as there is no one in the branch competent for that work.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the minister give approximately the amount of increase ?

Mr. FISHER. I would not like to speak at a guess, but would repeat in general terms that there are no increases except the statutory increases under the Act. The lump

sum increase is due to the bringing in of clerks from the outside service.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Could the minister give a statement of the number of officials and clerks in his department devoting their time entirely to agriculture ?

Mr. FISHER. I suppose my hon. friend would not wish to include in that category the clerical branches, such as the accountant's branch, although they are largely engaged in work connected with agriculture. Perhaps it would be better if I should give him the number of officials in the non-agricultural branches and let him subtract that from the total. That statement would be about as follows :

Branch	Number of Clerks.		
	1st Division	2nd Division	3rd Division
Archives (including provision for one appointment)	2	12	20
Census and Statistics	3	6	22*
Copyright and Trade Marks	1	2	5
Patents Branch	1	19	26
Public Health (two employees)	.....	.....	.....

*And one messenger.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What about exhibitions ?

Mr. FISHER. One stenographer in the deputy's office attends to the correspondence of that branch, but the rest of the exhibition branch are still in the outside service.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see by the details at page 23 that the minister is apparently asking an appropriation to pay the salaries of 269 officials, which would be an increase of 16 over the number of last year, including the outside servants who have been brought in. If any manufacturing or mercantile institution in Canada ran its business in this way, increasing its staff with a falling revenue, it would be in the bankruptcy courts in twelve months.

Mr. FISHER. While there is an apparent increase it is not a real increase. Several of these votes are there in consequence of promotions. I anticipate in the coming fiscal year to promote some to higher divisions, and I have to make provision for their salaries. There are two vacancies by death and these are not included in the 193 brought in. I want a translator in the archives and I also require an assistant entomologist and botanist at the experimental farm. Dr. Fletcher, who was entomologist and botanist, has unfortunately passed away, and I will take this opportunity of saying that in his death Canada has lost one of the most efficient public servants of the country. His untimely demise is most deplorable from every point of view, and it is practically impossible to fill his place. I am making provision here for the bringing in of two men to fill the joint position held by Dr. Fletcher, and I hope there may be a little enlargement of the work. I have no hesitation in saying that if that work is to be continued and extended as it ought to be in the interests of agriculture in this country, it will require two men to take the place of that lamented and most efficient officer. The work of the department is growing all the time and men must be found to do it. The farmers of Canada are constantly complaining, and even hon. gentlemen opposite frequently complain, that I do not do more work for the agriculture of the country. I am trying to meet that in the most efficient and profitable way to the agricultural industry and the additions that are here provided for are necessary to continue and increase the work of the department.

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) The hon. minister, when answering to my question a moment ago about the salary of the patents' commissioner, said that this employee was filling a quasi-judiciary charge, that he had to give his decision upon very important cases. I will ask if the commissioner is a lawyer?

Mr. FISHER. (Translation.) Yes, Mr. O'Halloran, who is deputy minister of the Department of Agriculture, is a lawyer, and he was very prominent at the bar at Montreal.

Mr. NANTEL. Then, it is a lawyer who fills the charge of deputy minister of Agriculture?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, he is a lawyer.

Mr. S. SHARPE. I have no complaint to make of the officials in the patent office who are very courteous and very obliging, but it seems to me that they sometimes get the cart before the horse. When an application for a patent goes in, instead of first deciding on the patent ability of the invention they deal with certain informalities in the papers. I think the first question to be decided is whether the invention is patentable, and if there is any little informality in the papers they can then be returned. The present system causes great delay and expense and finally the invention may be decided not to be patentable at all.

Mr. FISHER. I am not very expert in the process of law, but I believe it would lead to very grave irregularities and possi-

bly injury to the applicants for patents if the suggestion of the hon. gentleman were carried out. If a patent were to be issued and there were irregularities in the papers there would certainly be a lawsuit to annul the patent. After having been in the hands of the examiners for a month or six weeks it would be very much more difficult to correct informalities than to have them corrected at once. To make a patent valid, it is absolutely necessary that all the conditions provided by the law shall be followed with exactitude. It would involve the department in a great deal of repetition of work and it would endanger the future of the patent if the suggestion of the hon. gentleman were carried out. The present practice obtains in all patent departments of all countries as well as in Canada, and it is the result of the experience of 40 odd years in issuing patents.

Mr. S. SHARPE. The informality could be corrected before the patent issue and then there could be no question of the validity of the patent afterwards.

Mr. HUGHES. There are advertisements appearing in the farmers' magazines under very peculiar circumstances concerning the distribution of thoroughbred horses. Some time ago a gentleman in Victoria county had a memorandum sent to him asking him to apply for one of these animals when it would be furnished free, and all fees would go into his own pocket. I wrote to the department to ascertain the facts and I received a very satisfactory reply, but I would like to know if the minister has any further information to communicate with reference to this.

Mr. FISHER. It is a matter which the department officially knows nothing about. These advertisements are not issued by the department nor with any recommendation or guarantee from the department. I understand that some of my officers know these people, and they have said, entirely unofficially, that they believe them to be perfectly honest and honourable people. More than that I cannot say. My hon. friend will quite understand that it would be impossible for the department to aid private enterprise in this way, and this is entirely and absolutely a private enterprise which the department has nothing to do in any shape or form. I have nothing further to say than I have already said with regard to the people concerned in it. Personally I know nothing.

Department of Labour—Salaries, $27,100; contingencies, $1,450.

Hon. R. LEMIEUX (Minister of Labour). There is an increase of $5,450 in the total amount asked for. First, there is an increase of $1,000 to the deputy head, and an increase of $100 for the secretary of the department. By the way, I may say that since the election of Mr. Mackenzie King as a member of this House, Mr. Acland, the secretary of the department, has been promoted as deputy minister, and a new secretary will be appointed in a few days. There have been some new appointments which, together with the statutory increases, make up the balance of the increase. The Department of Labour has become more important since the operation of the new Compulsory Investigations Act, and more work is thrown upon it.

Printing and Stationery, including printing of 'Labour Gazette,' allowances to correspondents, administration of Conciliation and Labour Act, travelling expenses, &c., and $500 to be paid W. J. Glover as accountant, $30,700.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This is the same vote as we took last year. The printing of the Labour Gazette, we expect, will absorb $14,200; allowance for correspondents, $5,000; accountant, $500; stationery, $1,800; travelling expenses, $4,000; printing for the department, $2,500; miscellaneous, $2,600. The Labour Gazette is printed by the Printing Bureau, and the estimate is based on a possible issue of 14,000 copies per month. The Labour Gazette is sent to all the institutions in the country, to every member of the House, to our ordinary subscribers, and is sold to the various labour unions. As regards allowances for correspondents, for which we ask $5,100, we have forty correspondents whom we pay $100 per year. We have one legal correspondence who is charged with the duty of making legal reports. We have secured for this service a very eminent lawyer, recommended by the Minister of Justice, whose name I forget at the moment. He receives $300 a year to report specially on labour cases that come before the several courts. We have correspondents in the principal centres of the Dominion. This year we may go a little further. We have been asked by some important centres, especially in the west, to appoint correspondents for those places; but as we had fixed a certain number for the various cities and towns which were entitled to have correspondents, we were debarred from appointing new ones. But when the reorganization of the department takes place, I feel sure that the new minister will extend his favour to some other cities and towns.

Mr. RHODES. In regard to these correspondents, does the service they perform depend entirely upon their own discretion, or are they called upon to contribute certain articles?

Mr. LEMIEUX. If the hon. gentleman will look at the last issue of the Labour Gazette, he will see what the work of the correspondents is. They have to report on the special conditions of the labour market of the several centres where they are locat-

ed. They have to inform the Minister of Labour of the scale of wages paid, and the changes that take place, and also report on the accidents that occur. Their work is framed by the department. Especially do they perform the work of statists, that is to say, they gather what we call labour statistics.

Mr. RHODES. Does the department define the answers which the correspondents are to give?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. RHODES. I notice, for example, that the correspondent at Amherst, N.S., is A. D. Ross. May I ask how it came about that Mr. Ross was appointed?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I could not single him out of the 48 and answer the hon. gentleman. The labour correspondents, as a rule, are appointed at the suggestion of the labour unions of the district where they reside. We generally take the best equipped man for that work.

Mr. RHODES. This correspondent would not have been appointed at the instance of the labour union of our county because he is the editor of the Liberal paper in Amherst and has absolutely no knowledge of the labor question beyond what any ordinary individual might have. My remarks in respect to this correspondent are not made in any spirit of factious opposition, but I desire to find out if the department is endeavoring to get the men who are best adapted to make a report upon labour conditions. I would say with all deference that it would occur to me that there are many other men in that district who are much more competent to deal with labour conditions than the gentleman whose name I see here, although that gentleman is a very admirable man within his own particular sphere—that of newspaper work.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In some districts I have been taken to task by my hon. friends because I have appointed some Tory editors.

Mr. RHODES. I have no objection to this gentleman's politics. I merely mention the fact that his sphere is newspaper work. There is no reason why he should give a report upon labour conditions in any better manner than any other individual. In fact he has no special knowledge of the labour conditions, and it would occur to me that if the correspondents throughout the Dominion are chosen from the same field as this man, the usefulness of the Labour Gazette must be very materially impaired.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I shall not make a plea for the Labour Gazette; it speaks for itself. In the last two or three years it has been considerably improved. This is evidenced by the requests that I receive from every part of the country for the free gift of the Labour Gazette. Of course, subscribers have to pay for it. Generally speaking our correspondents are very fair.

Mr. RHODES. I am not questioning the fairness of this correspondent. I believe he is a gentleman who would do the very best with the knowledge that comes to his hand, but he is not a man who is qualified to give a good report upon labour conditions in the country because he has no special knowledge of them.

Mr. MONK. Who are the correspondents employed by the department in Montreal?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The corespondents employed in the province of Quebec are as follows: Quebec City, P. J. Jobin, and E. Little; Three Rivers, Joseph J. Ryan; Sherbrooke, H. Logie; St. Hyacinthe, V. V. Phaneuf; St. John's, A. D. Pepin; Montreal, G. Audet; Maisonneuve, E. Pelletier; Hull, R. Laferriere. As regards the special condition of the labour market and labour affairs generally speaking in Montreal, Toronto, and Winnipeg, the deputy minister and secretary of the department deal chiefly with these large cities although we have our special correspondents there also. But, as they are the chief industrial centres the department has a knowledge of the local conditions at these points.

Mr. MONK. What is the total amount you pay to these local correspondents?

Mr. LEMIEUX. One hundred dollars a year each; we have 48 in the Dominion and one legal correspondent for the law reports.

Mr. MONK. Is the correspondence published in the Labour Gazette?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. BARNARD. I would like to ask the minister if Mr. Ditchburn of Victoria was recommended by the Trades and Labour people.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I could not answer my hon. friend. He must have been recommended by the Labour Union. The minister of Inland Revenue of that time was certainly asked for his advice on that point.

Mr. BARNARD. Following the lines of my hon. friend of the right (Mr. Rhodes) I might inform the minister that Mr. Ditchburn was the campaign secretary and has been conducting work in Victoria for the last eighteen months on the Liberal side.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Of course, my hon. friend would not expect that a correspondent of the Labour Gazette who receives $100 a year would not take part in the campaign although they are not selected because they are campaigners. Is not Mr. Ditchburn a journalist?

Mr. BARNARD. He belongs to the typographical union.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He is a man of some ability, if I remember well.

Mr. BARNARD. I do not deny that for a moment; he managed to make a very good fight.

Mr. BURRELL. I notice the name of A. B. Docksteader as correspondent in Nelson. Is that the gentleman who ran in the Liberal interest in the last provincial campaign? Although I admit, as the minister says, the salary is very small, and the minister is anxious to get good correspondents, it is very singular that they have all very strong Liberal proclivities. Their labour sentiments are very strongly tinged with labour liberalism, so called.

Miscellaneous, Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907, $16,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The amount required for the purpose of administering this Act is uncertain depending on the number of compulsory investigations which take place during the year. During the first year of the operation of the Act the expenditure amounted to $19,233. During the second year it is likely that the expenditure will reach $16,000, and we take this figure as the amount which may likely be spent. The amount is not very large when we consider the service rendered to the country by the administration of the Act.

Mr. AMES. This money, I suppose, is paid largely in fees to persons who consent to act as arbitrators in these various industrial disputes?

Mr. LEMIEUX. As my hon. friend knows the board appointed under the Investigation Act is composed of three persons, one appointed by the employers, one appointed by the employees, and the third selected by these two, or, if they do not agree, by the minister himself. The Act provides that the chairman shall receive $20 for each day's sitting and the other members $15. If they sit only half a day they receive only about half of that amount. We have been surprised, in view of the number of investigations that have taken place, that the amount has not exceeded $19,000 the first year and $16,000 last year. We generally had as chairman of the board men of a very high type, like Professor Adam Shortt, who was anxious in each case that a settlement should take place, and therefore took great pains to see that matters were expedited in a proper spirit and concluded within a reasonable time. Really, it is remarkable that while last year we had so many investigations they did not cost more than $16,000.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Does the department pay all the arbitrators?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. MONK. I want to ask my hon. friend, as this Act has been in operation for some time, if the labouring classes themselves are quite satisfied with it as it stands to-day. I have heard a good deal of dissatisfaction expressed over certain dispositions of the Act, and these complaints must have reached the Department of Labour. It would be well that we should be informed as to what these complaints are. In consequence, what are the amendments which have become necessary? What amendments does the government intend to place before the House this session? and how soon shall we see those amendments?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am glad that my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has brought to the attention of the House the views expressed by some of the labour unions concerning the operation of this Act. Generally speaking, the Act has worked well; it has been but little criticised by either the labour unions or the employers. In fact out of fifty-one cases submitted to boards of arbitration, there was only one case in which the findings were not accepted by both parties. The complaint made against the Act by some of the labour unions is that the onus of applying for a board, in the case of a strike or a lockout, should not be always on the party which threaten to strike, but on the party which really causes the strike. Let me explain by referring to the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and its employees. We were told by the labour representatives, a few weeks ago, that the strikers would have preferred that the department should appoint a board at the request of the Canadian Pacific and not at the request of the men. They contended that if a strike was threatened, it was due to the fact that the company had given notice that changes would be made in the schedule of wages and in the character of the work. The men say: We apply for a board, and, if later, we do not accept the findings of the board, the public is prejudiced against us. On this question, will you allow me to read a very sensible article published by a newspaper not friendly to the government, but in this matter nonpolitical, and a paper which, I am pleased to say, generally takes very high ground on these questions of capital and labour. I read from the Montreal 'Gazette' of Tuesday, January 19, that is, just after the interview of the representatives of the labour unions with the right hon. leader of the government and myself:

THE LEMIEUX LAW.

The complaint is made of the Lemieux Act by the labour unions that the cumbersome machinery employed in the first stage of bringing the Act into force gives the employer an advantage, the incidental delay enabling him to prepare for a strike.

The case is well put by the Montreal 'Gazette.'

In other words, the unions complain that the keen edge has been removed from the axe, and it is no longer possible in the particular trades and industries coming under the Act to take the employer by surprise and force him to grant unreasonable demands. In setting up this complaint sight is lost of the fact that the primary aim of the Act was not to assist either the employer or the employee, but to protect the innocent third party—the public, which, in the case of a cessation of transportation facilities, or of coal supply, &c., really suffers the greatest actual loss and inconvenience. Similarly the intent of the Act is that when a decision is rendered by the arbitrators the force of public opinion will compel the parties to accept it as a settlement. A specific instance in which delay is alleged to have worked to the disadvantage of the union is the recent strike of the Canadian Pacific machinists. It was alleged that the company was given an opportunity of preparing for a strike, and the loss of the battle is ascribed to this fact. This is plainly erroneous. The defeat of the men was due to lack of public sympathy, and public sympathy was wanting because the company consented--

Very reluctantly, I may add.

—to accept the decision of the arbitrators notwithstanding that it had withdrawn its representative from the board, and that his place had been filled by an appointee of the Minister of Labour. The public objects to strikes which interfere with its convenience, and only tolerates them when it believes the men are in the right, and that no other method exists of securing fair treatment. The leaders of the machinists should have recognized this. They did not, and now seek to place the blame for their lack of common sense upon a factor that was not apparent until they had been offered their opportunity and refused it. Boiled down, the complaint of the labour leaders is really that they are not given a heads-we-win-tails-the-employer-loses standing. That is all this citation of the case of the C.P.R. machinists can mean. If the arbitrators had rendered a decision in favour of the men, and the company had refused to accept it, utilizing the delay for preparations which had finally resulted in the defeat of the men, and the ignoring of the award of the board, one could understand its use as an illustration of a grievance against the Act. The union leaders lose sight of the fact that the decision of the board is meant to reflect public opinion, that when an employer accepts such a position he bows to public opinion, and that when they seek an amendment to the law it is public opinion and not the employer they would place at a disadvantage. To grant such a request would be equivalent to destroying any little value the Act possesses.

Of course, this is from the Montreal 'Gazette,' and dealing with the case which my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) had in mind. In it the complaint which the labour leaders had expressed is well put. This is the only real grievance put before the Minister of Labour as regards the operation of the Act. Speaking for the department and for the government, I may say that we do not intend, after two years operation, and successful operation, of the Act, to amend it this year. It is better that the Act should be fully understood by the country, and should be allowed to operate during one or two years more, and then, if necessary, the House can make changes. For the present, I do not believe that it would be in the interests of either employers or employees to change the law. On the whole, I say again, the Act has worked well, and the country has benefited by it.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Let me put the view of the men as I understand it, and as I have learned it from my communication with those in my own constituency where there are a large number of Canadian Pacific Railway employees. They say that if they are dissatisfied with their conditions, before they can strike they must ask for a board, and then, if they refuse to accept the decision of the board, they are charged with bad faith. But, as I say, they are compelled under the law to ask for a board before they can strike. When the decision is given, if they do not wish to accept it, they have the right to strike. It may have been their intention from the very first to strike, yet they are misrepresented by the public as men first asking for an arbitration and then refusing to abide by it. Some way must be found to better their position; for, while the minister says that the Act must be tried out and receive further consideration, I am convinced that the railway employees all over the country are dissatisfied with the Act in this respect of which I speak, and contend that it is unjust to them. Especially severe was the criticism by this same newspaper, the Montreal 'Gazette,' that they had asked for a board, and then refused to abide by its decision. It is hard to get the people to understand that the first thing the men must do, before going on strike, is to ask for a board. Then, if not satisfied with the board, they should still have the right to refuse to work, and inasmuch as the men are placed in an unfair position by having first to ask for a board, the minister should find some way to improve their position. The men also urge that if an employer proposes to change the rate of wages or the other conditions, he ought to be compelled to ask for a board also. That, perhaps, would be putting the boot on the other leg. The men have a substantial grievance and the minister has not heard the last of it. Some protection must be given them against the unfair insinuation, constantly made, that when they ask for a board, they are not willing to abide by its decision. They cannot help asking for a board, and they do not want their right to strike to be taken away by being compelled to do this.

Mr. RHODES. As this is a question which affects a very large and important

element in my constituency, I would ask the minister to answer fully the question of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) as to what complaints have been received by him from the labour organizations in various parts of the country. As I understood him, the only complaint which so far has reached his ears is the one voiced in an editorial which appeared in the Montreal 'Gazette.'

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend will understand that we receive a large number of letters containing suggestions and observations of various kinds and some times complaints. But all the complaints we have received will be found boiled down in the article just alluded to. The other day the leaders of the labour unions met the Prime Minister and myself. These men were the spokesmen of the labour congress which met at Halifax, and they stated the only complaints they had to lay before the government.

Mr. RHODES. Did that application come from the Trade and Labour Congress which met in Halifax in September last?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, and the complaints were expressed by Mr. O'Donaghue, who is the legal representative of the labour unions. He came with my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) and Mr. Simpson, of Toronto. These gentlemen were special delegates and had several resolutions of the Trade and Labour Congress which they laid before us.

Mr. RHODES. The hon. minister appears to conclude that, boiled down, the grievances presented by the delegates of the Trade and Labour Congress are similar to those given in the Montreal 'Gazette.' Did the minister receive a communication from the grand council of the Provincial Workmen's Association of Nova Scotia, which met in convention in Halifax in April, 1908? If I remember rightly. There was passed a resolution at that meeting, composed of delegates representing all the mine organizations of Nova Scotia, to the effect that the council was unanimous in requesting a repeal of the Lemieux Act in so far as it affected the province of Nova Scotia. And I was advised by the secretary of the Provincial Workmen's Association for the county of Cumberland that such resolution had been forwarded to the department.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have some recollection of having received a remonstrance from that quarter. We had some complaints from that district, but I cannot remember their nature. Of course, we receive many letters and communications, but, speaking generally, the complaints of the labour unions may be reduced into the one I mentioned a moment ago and which was given expression in an article in the Montreal 'Gazette.' I might mention that when the Bill came before the House, the railway employees strongly opposed it. They said that their brotherhood was a very superior organization and had its own methods of settling disputes with the railway companies and they preferred these to the Board of Conciliation. But the spirit of the Act is to protect, not so much the employer or the employee as the public, and we believe that in the case of public utilities, such as transportation companies, the public should have the benefit of compulsory investigation.

Mr. RHODES. I quite understand that the Department of Labour must receive many letters from individuals and that many of these would come from perhaps irresponsible parties. But it would seem to me that a resolution, under the seal of the grand council of a labour organization, representing the whole province, calling for an absolute repeal of the Act in so far as it affects that province, is one that the minister should not ignore, inasmuch as it should indicate to the department that there was something radically wrong in the working of the Act. I am not prepared to speak off-hand with respect to the Act itself, but I do know that the miners of Nova Scotia consider they are labouring under a very serious disadvantage because of its operation. They say precisely what President Gompers of the American Federation of Labour says respecting injunctions, namely, that the injunctions take from organized labour the only implement they have for obtaining redress of their wrongs. The miners of Nova Scotia point to many defects in the Act. In the first place, if a board of conciliation is called for by the men, they choose one arbitrator and the management chooses another.

These two meet and if they cannot agree then a third arbitrator must, under the wording of the Act, be chosen by the Labour Department. The labour men in my county object very strongly to that provision of the Act because they say it leaves a string upon the arbitration board, one end of which is in the hands of the Labour Department, and they say that the Act would be very materially improved if this third man were to be chosen by a judge of the Supreme Court rather, than by the Labour Department. In this way they claim that the third arbitrator would be chosen absolutely free from any influence or connivance on the part of the Labour Department. They suggest that another amendment would improve the Act. There is no compulsory means of causing a board of conciliation to view the workings of a mine for instance. We know that very frequently boards of conciliation are composed of men who although they may be able lawyers, or

professors of note, have no practical knowledge of the working of a mine, and in one or two instances, if I am correctly advised, the board has refused to go and view the workings. The union in my county suggests that a provision be inserted in the Act that either one party or the other can compel the board to go and view the workings.

A third amendment suggested and it seems to me most reasonable, is that if one party to the dispute fails to appear, as has happened in some cases, then the verdict shall go to the party who has called for the board and who appears, in precisely the same manner as does the verdict in a civil suit, if the defence does not appear there shall be a verdict by default.

A fourth amendment, and it is of vital importance to the man who earns his bread by the sweat of his brow, is a change in the fees allowed witnesses. Under the present Act the fees allowed for witnesses are about one-third of what the men would earn if they were enabled to do their day's work instead of having to appear before the board.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is the fee paid by the courts.

Mr. RHODES. Quite so but it is a grievance nevertheless. It is all very well to say that this is the fee paid in the courts and that would perhaps apply if this were under the provincial government. Nevertheless it is a grievance that these men receive only a dollar and a half a day when if working they would receive $4 or $5 a day.

I regret that I cannot now place the case of the miners before the minister as I hope to later on; I mention these matters simply to indicate to the minister that there is a feeling in my county and throughout Nova Scotia of resentment towards this Act and a feeling that it is a means of undue oppression.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am very glad to have the benefit of my hon. friend's views as he has summarized them.

Mr. RHODES. I am simply voicing the views of the miners in my constituency. I have offered no expression of my own opinion whatever.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am glad my hon. friend has summarized their views in the way he has. I have noted his remarks and now that he has summarized the suggested amendments it comes to my memory that the miners of Nova Scotia who were interested in three or four different boards which were constituted expressed those grievances. But my hon. friend will realize that later in the session the question of labour will be discussed more fully and then we will take up these objections. I must say that we can hardly have this Act in operation in all of the provinces except one.

Mr. RHODES. The request of the miners of Nova Scotia that this Act shall not apply to that province is not quite so bad as it appears because when the Act was first introduced in this House there was a clause which said that it should not apply to any province which had an Act similar in its tenor to this one, and there was some discussion at that time as to whether it should apply to Nova Scotia. In passing through committee that clause was struck out. We have a Conciliation Act there and I am inclined to think that the workmen regard it as the more workable Act and better adapted to their requirements than the Lemieux Act, so-called.

Mr. BURRELL. Whether the operations of this Act are satisfactory or not, I think the point raised by the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) is perfectly in order, namely that a large body of employees, those engaged on the railways, are by no means favourably impressed with the operations of the Act. In my province a large proportion of the railway employees are by no means satisfied with the way the Act works, and if I recall the facts aright I believe that this was brought to the attention of the government at the time the Act first came before the House. I think a resolution was offered by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) to the effect that the Railway Act which the men considered was sufficient to enable them to adjust their differences with their employers should be left to cover their case. I have heard that expression volunteered very freely throughout the west and would ask the minister if it is not true that the railway employees are by no means showering compliments upon the ministers but are rather registering complaints.

Some resolutions reported.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. F. D. MONK. When may the House expect the report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries? There are many reasons why we would like to have the report as soon as possible. What is the cause of the delay and how soon will the report be ready?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot answer as to that, but I understand the report is in the hands of the printer.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 8, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

LOAD-LINE ON SHIPS.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 45) respecting a load line on ships sailing on the inland waters of Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. LEWIS. This Bill has reference to an official load-line on ships sailing on the inland waters of Canada, and also to coasting vessels, but not including foreign ships. It is modelled after the sections of the English Act with reference to the load-line on ships. The purpose of the Bill is to lessen the liability to these very regrettable accidents which happen in the fall of the year, and which cause very great loss of life, as in the case of the 'Jones' two years ago, and the 'Asia' some years previously. The clause referring to the inland waters applies only after the 15th of September, and until the 15th of May in each year. There is also a clause with reference to the load-line of barges on the coasting waters of Canada, and that clause is modelled on a Bill brought in by Mr. Lawrence, formerly member for Colchester, but which was not passed into law. There is also a clause which obliges the captain who enters his ship outward from each port in Canada after the 15th day of September until the 15th day of May in each year to leave with the customs officers before he gets his clearance a list of every person leaving port on his ship, with names and addresses. There is also a clause with reference to the loading of ships. One of the chief causes of these accidents is that ships are loaded on deck in a hurry to get produce out in the rush in the fall of the year.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Might I ask the Prime Minister what is the reason of the delay in organizing the Public Accounts Committee? It is very important that this committee should be organized at the earliest possible moment, if we are to expedite the work of the session, and already a week has passed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that all the committees have been called for organization to-morrow.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have not heard of that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that is the arrangement.

REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When may we expect the report of the Department of Fisheries?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I think it is ready; it will be brought down as soon as I get it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It will be distributed almost immediately?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved that Mr. Warburton be placed on the Public Accounts Committee in the place of the Hon. Charles Murphy.

Motion agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved that Mr. Harris be placed on the Committee of Agriculture in the place of Mr. Prowse.

Motion agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved that Mr. McCraney be added to the Committee on Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—BRANCH LINES.

Mr. EMMERSON. I desire to ask the Minister of Railways as to when we may expect a copy of the report of the commissioners authorized by him to inquire into the branch lines of the railway connecting with the Intercolonial, which information was promised in the speech from the Throne.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM. It is quite a large report, and is being copied as rapidly as possible. I asked my deputy about it to-day, and he said that we would have it in a very short time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Shall we have it printed ?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege, for the purpose of correcting a statement made by the parliamentary correspondent of the Toronto 'News.' I may say that in my experience of thirty-four years in parliament I have never before thought it advisable to refer to an incorrect statement in regard to myself made in the press, even though I knew it to be erroneous; but this statement is one which I think I ought to contradict at once. The Ottawa correspondence of the Toronto 'News' a few days ago contained this statement:

A few weeks before the House opened Mr. Templeman wrote to Mr. Borden asking him if the version of the telegram published was correct. Investigation revealed the state of affairs set forth above, and Mr. Borden, meeting Mr. Templeman, expressly informed him that his telegram had been garbled, and told him what its real terms had been. Thus Mr. Templeman knew the facts and Sir Wilfrid used the garbled version. Two pieces of dirty fighting in one speech. We long have known Sir Wilfrid Laurier to be exceptionally dexterous in his way of stating a case; are we to be forced to use an uglier word than dexterous? Of coure, the garbling of the telegram in Victoria was dirty fighting. It is the sort of trick to which excited partisans resort only too often. Grant that. But what about the effort to represent Mr. Borden as sending the garbled, not the real, versions? And by the First Minister? It looks as if Mr. Borden is becoming so formidable that it is time to besmirch him.

With regard to this I have only to say that shortly after the elections Mr. Templeman spoke to me about the telegram in question, informing me that he had written to the hon. leader of the opposition to ask him if he had really sent it. At the time he spoke to me he informed me that he had not received any answer from the hon. leader of the opposition. That was the only time I spoke to him in regard to the matter. As to what passed between Mr. Templeman and the hon. leader of the opposition, I have nothing to say. As to the inference that I knew that the telegram was garbled, there is no proof of that, and I have now to quote to the House a letter which was sent to me by Mr. Templeman on January 22, the day the debate took place in this House. It is in those words :

Department of Inland Revenue,
Office of the Minister, Ottawa, Jan. 22.

My Dear Sir Wilfrid,—The version given me of the discussion in the House this afternoon of Borden's 'total exclusion' telegram was not very full and may not be accurate. But I was informed that Mr. Borden stated something to the effect that there was an error in the telegram or that he had advised me that there was an error.

Mr. Borden spoke to me in the club shortly after his return to the city and explained that he would send me an answer—that he had not overlooked it—and that he desired to obtain some information in regard to it. I inferred that his absence from the city and his desire to get 'some information' was the cause of the delay in answering my letter. He did not say there was an error. That is such an important admission that I would have noted it. That was the only time we spoke on the subject of my inquiry about the authenticity of his telegram and I have as yet no reply in writing.

Had he informed me there was an 'error' I would have advised you as that would seem to support my view that the telegram was a forgery. The point—as to whether Mr. Borden stated to me what he said he did—is of no great importance, perhaps, but his admission that there was an error is of importance.

I thought it just as well that you should know my version of the incident.

Yours truly,

(Signed) W. TEMPLEMAN.

This only confirms what I have already stated, and what I repeat that at the time I quoted the telegram I did not suppose it was a forgery; indeed, this is the last thing I would have supposed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as what took place between Mr. Templeman and myself is concerned, it is quite true that I did not send a written answer to him, but I spoke to him explaining the reason why I had not done so. And I certainly understood from what took place between us on that occasion, that he would gather that there was some mistake in the telegram. I had no doubt that that impression would be firmly imprinted on his mind from what took place, I understood that he required no further answer. In his letter to me he expressed his own conviction that I had not sent the telegram in the terms in which it was published; I have his letter to that effect which I can produce. While on this matter, I wish to refer to comment made in at least one Liberal journal, the Montreal 'Herald.' Notwithstanding my explanation made twice in this House, it repeated the statement a few days ago that I had known immediately after the publication, on the 26th day of October, that the telegram had been altered. For the third time I repeat in this House that I did not know anything about that until the middle of December after my return from the south. Therefore the statement of the Montreal 'Herald,' the inaccuracy of which I cannot account for on any principle of fair-play, is absolutely untrue. I make that announcement for the third time in this House; but I do not doubt that the misrepresentation will continue in certain quarters.

PRIVATE BILLS.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. TURRIFF moved the second reading of Bill (No. 30), respecting the subsidy from the Ontario Government to the Lake Superior branch of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

Mr. LENNOX. I would ask the hon. gentleman to explain the necessity for this Bill.

Mr. TURRIFF. I do not know that I can give very much of an explanation; but my understanding of the matter is that this Bill is to confirm an agreement made between

the government of Ontario and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. LENNOX. I can see that much by the Bill itself and by the notice on the Order Paper ; but what I would like the hon. gentleman to explain is how the necessity for the Bill arises.

Mr. TURRIFF. I will explain all that before the Railway Committee.

Mr. LENNOX. That is not the time. This is the time.

Mr. CONMEE. I did not notice the Bill on the Order Paper, but I happen to know something of the matter. I think there are provisions in the Provincial Act granting the subsidy from which the company desires the relief. That perhaps is the secret of the Bill. If so, I would ask the hon. gentleman to let the Bill stand for a few days until we find out what it means.

Mr. BARR. I think we should know something about this Bill. The hon. gentleman thinks the explanations should be made before the Railway Committee; but all the members of this House do not belong to that committee. My hon. friend from Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) suggests that there may be secrecy about it and we ought to know whether that is the case or not.

Mr. TURRIFF. If the Bill does not commend itself to the good judgment of the Railway Committee, which is composed of practically every member of the House, we shall never hear any more about it. However I have no objection to its standing.

Motion withdrawn.

QUESTIONS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES IN HALIFAX COUNTY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked:

1. What was the number of (a) permanent employees, and (b) temporary employees in the service or employment of the Department of Marine and Fisheries in the county of Halifax upon (a) the first day of each month, (b) the 15th day of each month, and (c) the 31st day of December in the year 1908.

2. What was the total amount of pay-roll of the said department in the county of Halifax during each of said months?

3. How many temporary employees or labourers were engaged or employed in said county between the first day of September and the first day of November, in the said year, 1908?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). In reply, I beg to submit the following statement:

List of Permanent and Temporary employees in Department of Marine and Fisheries, Halifax County, from January 1 to December 31, 1908.

Month.	Ans. to No. 2.	Ans. to No. 1.		Ans. to No. 1.	
	Monthly wages.	Permanent.	Temporary.	First day of Month.	Fifteenth day of Month.
	$ cts.				
January	5,504 70	66	84	64	62
February	5,362 09	66	83	62	63
March	5,672 68	66	85	64	64
April	5,642 04	66	85	65	65
May	5,947 56	66	85	67	69
June	6,109 68	67	114	69	94
July	6,044 79	67	96	69	74
August	6,143 02	67	92	71	71
September	6,115 19	68	98	72	73
October	8,404 80	69	208	74	118
November	7,982 36	69	176	154	118
December	8,010 42	69	149	118	104
	76,939 33				

Total Dec. 31, 1908, 97.

3. Total number of men employed between September 1 and November 1, 1908, 508.

THE VETERANS OF 1866—LAND GRANTS.

Mr. EDWARDS—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Has the government under consideration the granting of lands to the veterans of 1866?

2. If so, is it the intention of the government to introduce legislation during the present session for that purpose?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The government received on Friday last, an important and influential delegation on this question. The question is now engaging our attention.

PAYMENTS TO W. S. LOGGIE CO., LTD.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What amounts of money were paid during the years 1906, 1907 and 1908, to W. S. Loggie Company, Limited, in respect of contracts with the Department of Railways and Canals, or the National Transcontinental Railway Commission?

2. What were the dates, and amount of such payments, respectively, and for what purposes?

3. Were all the supplies, or work, for which such payments were made, let by tender, and to the lowest tenderer?

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

1 & 2.

Year ended December 31, 1906, for freight claims I. C. R. $197 17

Year ended December 31, 1906, for ties. 242 01

Year ended December 31, 1907, for freight claims.. .. ..$ 243 85
Year ended December 31, 1908, for amounts refunded on deposits made for sidings.. .. .. 114 00
Year ended December 31, 1908, for freight claims, I. C. R.. .. .. 393 63

Nothing has been paid the W. S. Loggie Co., Limited, by the National Transcontinental Railway Commission.

3. Ties were purchased at the prices fixed for that season. The price was the same as paid to others.

REVISION OF VOTERS LISTS, PARRY SOUND.

Mr. ARTHURS—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What was the cost of revision of voters' lists in unorganized townships of Parry Sound district, in 1908, under Dominion Election Act?
2. How many voters were on lists for such unorganized townships before last revision?
3. How many names were added and how many removed?
4. Were there any appeals and how many?
5. What is the total number of names now on voters' lists for unorganized townships of the said district?

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State):

1. $751.41.
2. The Clerk of Crown in Chancery reports that the unorganized list was not furnished, consequently he has no information.
3. Same as to No 2.
4. Appeals were before the judges, but the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has no information with regard thereto.
5. The total number of voters in the unorganized districts is 2,353.

LOAN OF DECEMBER, 1907.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Perley—asked:

1. Of the loan of £1,500,000 floated in December, 1907, how much was available for the construction of public works and similar undertakings?
2. Of the £3,000,000 raised by loan in February, 1908, what amount was available for public works, &c.?
3. Of the £5,000,000 raised in June, 1908, at 3¾ per cent. what amount was available for the construction of public works, &c.?
4. Of the £5,000,000 raised in October, 1908, at 3½ per cent, what amount was available for the National Transcontinental Railway and public works?
5. Of the £6,000,000 raised by loan in January, 1909, how much will be available for public works, and how much will be required to meet outstanding obligations, temporary loans, &c.?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (for the Minister of Finance). The following reply has been sent me by the Finance Department:

1. £1,470,526 8s. 10d.
2. £1,425,428 1s. 7d. was available for National Transcontinental Railway.
3. £3,496,080 18s. 1d.
4. £2,689,851 7s. 11d. was available for the National Transcontinental Railway.
5. (a) About £1,640,000; (b) £4,234,178 1s. 7d.

ROSS RIFLE FACTORY BAYONETS.

Mr. WORTHINGTON—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Has machinery been installed in the Ross rifle factory for the manufacture of bayonets?
2. If so, was this machinery manufactured or purchased in Canada?
3. If not, where was it purchased?
4. Are the bayonets manufactured entirely in Canada?
5. If not, what portions are manufactured elsewhere?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia):

1. Yes.
2 & 3. The department has no information on the subject.
4. Yes.
5. Answered by No. 4.

COMMUTATIONS OF DEATH PENALTY.

Mr. BEAUPARLANT asked:

1. In how many cases each year during the last twenty-five years has the death penalty been commuted in Canada?
2. In how many cases in each year during the last twenty-five years has capital punishment been carried out?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

DEATH SENTENCES COMMUTED OR EXECUTED FROM 1884 TO FEBRUARY, 1909.

Year.	Sentences.	Commuted.	Executed.
1884..	11	2	9
1885..	19	8	11
1886..	8	4	4
1887..	6	3	3
1888..	11	5	6
1889..	2	0	2
1890..	12	2	10
1891..	4	2	2
1892..	6	3	3
1893..	6	4	2
1894..	8	3	5
1895..	5	2	3
1896..	4	4	0
1897..	6	2	4
1898..	11	4	7
1899..	14	3	11
1900..	8	2	6
1901..	7	4	3
1902..	13	4	9
1903..	10	5	5
1904..	9	4	5
1905..	8	3	5
1906..	5	3	2
1907..	12	5	7
1908..	14	7	7
1909..	1	0	1
Total.. ..	220	88	132

S.S. 'ANTICOSTI'.

Mr. CROSBY—by Mr. Rhodes—asked :

1. What amount of work has been done on the steamship 'Anticosti' at Halifax, within the past year?
2. Were tenders called for the said work? If so, who were the tenderers, and what was the amount of each tender?
3. Was any portion of the work done for which tenders were not called? If so, by whom and for what amount?

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

1. Work to the value of $5,107.
2. Yes.

Tenders for hull repairs—

Halifax Graving Dock Company, Halifax Nova Scotia..	$ 4,850
New-Burrell-Johnson Iron Company, Yarmouth, Nova Scotia..	6,700
Nova Scotia Iron Works, Dartmouth Nova Scotia..	7,627
A. A. Webber & Son, Dartmouth Nova Scotia..	13,975
Engine repairs—	
W. W. Howell & Company, Halifax, Nova Scotia..	189
New-Burrell-Johnson Iron Company, Yarmouth, Nova Scotia..	250
Moving diaphone—	
Longard Brothers, Halifax..	68
N. Evans, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia	75

The lowest tender was accepted in each case.

3. No.

POSTMASTER AT ETOBICOKE.

Mr. WALLACE asked:

1. Has any appointment been made for postmaster at Etobicoke?
2. If so, by whom were recommendations made?
3. What is the salary?
4. Were there any applications for the vacancy? If so, how many?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1, 2, 3 & 4. An appointment has been made to the postmastership of Etobicoke, rendered vacant by the resignation of the postmaster, the person selected for the position having been recommended by Dr. P. D. McLean, ex-M.P. The salary attaching to the office is $35. Only one application for the position was received at the department.

RURAL MAIL DELIVERY, GREY COUNTY.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO asked :

1. Has the government taken any steps towards the establishing of free rural mail delivery between Owen Sound and Balaclava, in the county of Grey? If so, what steps have been taken? If not, why not?
2. Does the government intend establishing said delivery on said route? If so, when?
3. What increase, if any, has been made in the estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1910, as compared with the estimates for the preceding year, in consequence of the system of free rural mail delivery announced by the Postmaster General?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1, 2 & 3. An application for the establishment of a rural mail delivery route between Owen Sound and Balaclava has been received, and is now the subject of inquiry. In connection with the estimates of this department for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1910, the amount asked for under the head of 'mail service' has been increased by $193,000, which increased sum, it is estimated, will be required for extensions to ordinary land service (including rural mail delivery service), railway service and steamboat services.

MILITARY PROPERTIES AT ST. JOHNS, PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Are the military properties at St. Johns, province of Quebec, under lease at the present time? If so, what are the names of the tenants, prices and conditions of the leases, and duration?
2. Was the Department of Militia and Defence at Ottawa, the recipient lately of an offer of $90 a year, from Mr. Alfred Camaraie, of St. Johns, province of Quebec, for the rental of the military property at said St. Johns, latterly leased to Mr. C. A. Papineau? If so, what was the reply given?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia) :

1. The following have each been granted a lease of a portion of the military property at St. Johns, Quebec :

(a) The corporation of St. Johns. License of occupation, resumable at any time by the Department of Militia and Defence, at a rental of $1 per annum.

(b) St. Johns Amateur Athletic Association for a term of twenty-one years from December 1, 1907, at a rental of $5 per annum, subject to the following conditions:—The lessee to pay rent and taxes, and to repair and keep up fences; not to cut down timber; not to carry on any business that shall be deemed a nuisance on the premises; not to assign or sublet the leased premises, or any part thereof, without leave in writing from the lessor; to allow the lessor to enter and view state of repair and to repair according to notice; to leave the premises in good repair. The lessor covenants with the lessee for quiet enjoyment; to have right of re-entry on non-payment of rent or non-performance of covenant, and also the right to determine the lease at any time by a demand of possession of the leased premises or any part thereof.

The lease also may be determined by either party giving notice to the other in writing, six months before the expiration of the first or any subsequent year.

2. Yes. The application is under consideration.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY—MANUFACTURE OF FURNITURE, ETC.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. Has any furniture, consisting of seats, tables or benches, been manufactured during the past two years at the penitentiary of St. Vincent de Paul, province of Quebec?
2. Has such furniture been sold or otherwise disposed of outside of the said penitentiary?
3. Have a certain number of pews been so manufactured in said penitentiary for the use of a church in Ottawa? If so, what was the price at which said pews were disposed of?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):
1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Yes. $102.87.

PAROLED AND PARDONED PRISONERS—COST OF RETURN.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What was the cost of preparing the return in answer to an order of the House for a statement of paroled and pardoned prisoners?
2. What is the number of pages comprised in the return?
3. Out of what vote was the cost of the return paid?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):
1. $1,100.
2. 686.
3. From a vote for 'Payment of extra clerks for services rendered in preparation of returns ordered by parliament,' 1907-8, $75, and from vote 'To enable the Department of Justice to defray the expenses in preparing returns re application of convicts for clemency, 1908-9,' $1,025. I might be allowed to add that I was entirely in error in thinking that this payment was made out of the contingencies of the Department of Justice as I did when that item of the estimates was under consideration last week.

Mr. FOSTER. Also in saying that it was $2,100.

DRILL HALL AT BELLEVILLE.

Mr. PORTER—by Mr. J. D. Reid— asked:

1. Did the government erect the drill hall at Belleville, or a portion of it, upon land not belonging to the government at the time? If so, to what extent and how did the same occur?
2. Has title to any such land been since acquired? If so, when, how, at what price, how was the price arrived at, and to whom paid?
3. Has the drill hall been taken over from the contractor, and what has been the total cost of building and grounds complete?
4. Do the officers' quarters at Belleville, part of the former drill hall, belong to the government, the city of Belleville or the contractor for the new drill hall?
5. Has the department considered the desirability of acquiring, if necessary, and setting a part of the officers' quarters of the old armoury at Belleville for the use of the 49th Hastings Battalion? If so, what determination if any, has been arrived at?
6. Is there any dispute as to the ownership of these officers' quarters? If so, what and between whom?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia):

1, 2, 3, 4 and 6. These questions appertain to the Department of Public Works.

5. Yes. This question has been considered, but as an armoury has been provided for No. 1 company 49th Hastings Battalion in the new armoury, it was not considered necessary and advisable to keep up a separate building for the accommodation of this company.

Mr. J. D. REID. I suppose that the questions unanswered will still remain on the notice paper?

Mr. SPEAKER. The paragraphs relating to the Public Works Department in this question will stand.

ICE-BREAKER FOR NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS.

Mr. FRASER asked:

1. Has a contract for a new ice-breaking steamer for winter navigation of Northumberland straits been awarded to Messrs. Vickers Sons & Maxim, Limited, London, England, or to any one else?
2. If so, what was the contract price?
3. On what date was said steamer to be delivered?
4. Has the government received any information from the contractors that said steamer will be delivered on date specified in contract? If not, when will delivery be made?
5. How much has been paid to date on said contract?

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

1. The contract has been awarded to Messrs. Vickers Sons & Maxim, Ltd., London, England.
2. One hundred and three thousand pounds sterling (£103,000).
3. The 11th of May, 1909.
4. Yes. The steamer will be delivered according to contract.
5. One hundred and twenty-five thousand three hundred and sixteen dollars and sixty-six cents ($125,316.66).

'STANLEY' AND 'MINTO'—OFFICERS AND MEN.

Mr. FRASER asked:

1. What are the names and given residences of the officers and engineers of the steamers 'Stanley' and 'Minto?'
2. What are names and given residences of the sailors, stewards, firemen and other officers and crew of said steamers?

3. When and where was each person shipped or signed articles?

4. How many men, including officers, are employed on each steamer?

5. Who engages crews of said steamers and on whose recommendation are they employed?

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

1. Names of the officers and engineers of the 'Stanley' and 'Minto' are:

'Stanley'—Angus Brown, master, G. T. Heighton, 1st officer; I. C. Rhude, 2nd officer; McGregor Fraser, pilot; P. W. Lyon, 1st engineer; Wm. Hislop, 2nd engineer; Edgar Finlayson, 3rd engineer; L. Martin, 4th engineer.

'Minto'—Allan Finlayson, master; John McPherson, 1st officer; W. Sencabough, 2nd officer; Angus Smith, pilot; Joseph Ferguson, 1st engineer; W. H. Clark, 2nd engineer; L. R. Unsworth, 3rd engineer; Alfred Roebuck, 4th engineer.

Particulars of residence of officers and engineers are not on record in the department.

2. Names of the sailors, stewards and other officers and crew of said steamers are:

'Stanley'—H. R. Cook, operator; D. D. Ryan, purser; Andrew Lavers, checker; Harry Hill, steward; John McCarvill, 2nd steward; W. E. Grimes, waiter; A. Gillis, pantry boy; Maurice Donovan, mess steward; R. Beck, cook; Wallace McDonald, 2nd cook; Edward McDonald, carpenter; Mungo Ferguson, watchman; John Macmillan, quarter master; John Blue, quarter master; Dougal McIsaac, deck hand; Wm. Grant, deck hand; R. Campbell, deck hand; R. Marshall, deck hand; Wm. Poole, deck hand; Gilbert Desroche, deck hand; Zacharie Cormier, deck hand; Dan. Nolan, deck hand; Dan. Falconer, deck hand; James Arbing, oiler; Wm. McFadgen, oiler; James Donovan, oiler; Alex. Stevenson, fireman; Hammon Alchorn, fireman; Sam. Martin, fireman; Vincent Mahar, fireman; H. McNeil, fireman; E. Harding, fireman; L. Wood, fireman; Albert Herron, fireman; R. Locke, fireman.

'Minto'—Joseph Maloney, operator; M. C. MacDonald, purser; J. R. Davies, checker; J. T. Lantz, steward; Noah Garnhum, waiter; Harold Arsenault, waiter; Brent McInnis, waiter; Aneas McCormac, mess man; Nicholas Pelly, cook; Aneas Hennesy, assistant cook; John McPherson, carpenter; Sam. Donovan, watchman; John H. Watts, seaman; W. A. McKinnon, seaman; Benj. Graham, seaman; John Moran, seaman; Ham. Bertram, seaman; P. A. McIntyre, seaman; James Roach, seaman; Herbert Anderson, seaman; Frank Trainor, seaman; R. Dooley, seaman; Neil Campbell, seaman; James Currie, seaman; John Dunn, oiler; William Meek, oiler; Albert Feavyer, oiler; Thomas Butler, fireman; Philip Fougere, fireman; Walter Hammel, fireman; John McKenna, fireman; Daniel McEachern, fireman; Andrew Blackier, fireman; Bert. Smith, fireman; Charles Thistle, fireman; Daniel Chipman, fireman; Lawrence Langill, fireman.

3. The crews are signed at Charlottetown and Pictou; the date of signing is not on record in the department.

4. 'Stanley' 43; 'Minto' 45.

5. The agent at Charlottetown attends to engaging of the crews and in the case of an officer or engineer the recommendation of the officer commanding the marine service and the approval of the head of the department are necessary.

RAILWAY AID IN ALBERTA.

Mr. McCARTHY—by Mr. Armstrong—asked:

1. Has the Premier of Alberta, or any member of the provincial government of Alberta, by interview or correspondence, represented to the Minister of Railways, or any member of this government, the desirability of aid being granted by the Dominion Government for the construction of railways in the province of Alberta?

2. If so, when did such interview take place, between whom, and what was the decision arrived at?

3. Is it the intention of the government to grant immediate aid for such purpose?

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

1. The premier and attorney general of Alberta, waited upon the Prime Minister and the Minister of Railways and represented to them the desirability of further federal aid for the construction of railways in that province.

2. The interview took place some weeks ago.

3. It is not the intention this year to add to the obligations already incurred in granting aid to railways.

'OPPORTUNITIES IN CANADA.'

Mr. McCARTHY—by Mr. Armstrong—asked:

1. How many copies of the book intituled 'Opportunities in Canada, 1909' printed by order of the Minister of the Interior, have been published?

2. How many copies up to date have been distributed and where?

3. What is the cost of publication and distribution of the same?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. 'Opportunities in Canada' was not printed by order of the Minister of the Interior. Its publication is a private enterprise, but the Immigration Department believing that it gave useful information about Canada ordered 20,000 copies of the most recent edition for distribution.

2. 15,000 in England and 1,000 in Canada.

3. 16 cents per copy.

EXPENDITURES ON RAMA ROADS AND BRIDGES.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE asked :

1. Were any public moneys expended upon the roads and bridges of Rama township, in the county of Ontario, during the year 1908? If so, out of what fund were the moneys expended?

2. What were the dates of expenditure, amounts and the number of men and teams employed on the work, rates of pay, and who, superintended the expenditure?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. The sum of $2,000 was voted at the last session of parliament for improvements to roads and bridges in the township of Rama, in the county of Ontario, in which township the Indian lands and those of the whites are intermixed and the roads and bridges are of common benefit. This sum was paid by the Department of Indian Affairs to the treasurer of the municipality of Rama on the 25th September, 1908.

2. The reeve, clerk and treasurer of the township of Rama have certified to an expenditure of $1,500 for last season; $500 remaining on hand to be expended next season. The work was done under the supervision of the municipal council.

FREE RURAL MAIL DELIVERY.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked :

What is the total amount paid to mail and stage routes, on which rural free mail delivery is likely to be established?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). As rural mail delivery services are only established upon existing stage routes subject to applications therefor being received at the department, it is impossible to estimate what amount mail contractors will receive for such services, as the department is unable to judge to what extent advantage may be taken by the public of the opportunity of enjoying such services.

IMMIGRANTS REJECTED AND DEPORTED.

Mr. PAQUET asked :

1. What is the number of immigrants deported during the fiscal year 1907-8?

2. What is the number of immigrants who underwent the medical examination at Quebec during the fiscal year 1907-8?

3. What is the number of immigrants who were deported, after medical examination at Quebec during the same fiscal year?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. 1,172 rejected; 825 deported after landing; total, 1,997.

2. 138,932.

3. 278 rejected after medical examination at Quebec.

COLONIZATION SUBSIDY TO LAKE ST. JOHN RAILWAY.

Mr. PAQUET asked :

Does the Federal Government still grant, in the interest of colonization and repatriation, an annual subsidy to the Lake St. John Railway Company? If so, what is the amount of that subsidy?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Yes, $8,000.

IMMIGRATION BOUNTIES, 1907-8.

Mr. PAQUET asked :

What amount has the government paid as immigration bounty during the fiscal year 1907-8?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

$140,657.97 made up as follows:
- 5,976.50 commissions on settlers from United States.
- 2,412.00 bonuses on children sent out by philanthropic societies.
- 90,375.99 British bonuses.
- 41,893.48 continued bonuses.

IMMIGRATION AGENTS IN FRANCE.

Mr. PAQUET asked :

1. Has the government appointed new immigration agents in France since the 1st of January, 1908?

2. If so, what are the names of these agents, how long have they been employed and what are their salaries?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Yes.

2. J. E. Cyr, appointed October 8, 1908, at $2,000 per annum. Paul Auve, appointed April 7, 1908, at $100 per month for three months. Edouard Montpetit, appointed April 10, 1908, at $60 per month. Leo. Eauclaire, appointed November 30, 1908, at $100 per month for three months.

PAMPHLET ON QUEBEC.

Mr. PAQUET asked :

1. Has the Minister of the Interior lately issued a pamphlet on the province of Quebec? If so, is this pamphlet published in both official languages?

2. How many copies have been or will be distributed, and where?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Yes, 'La Region du Lac Saint Jean, Guides des Colons.' Issued in French only.

2. 26,400 copies printed. These are being distributed among French speaking persons in the United States and in Canada, most of them in answer to letters of inquiry.

IMMIGRATION FROM DIFFERENT COUNTRIES.

Mr. PAQUET asked :

1. How many immigrants arrived in Canada during the fiscal year 1907-1908 from each

of the following countries: United States, Great Britain and Ireland, France and Belgium?

2. What was the amount expended in each of those countries during the same year for immigration work?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1.—

From the United States	58,312
From Great Britain and Ireland	120,182
From France	2,671
From Belgium	1,214

2.—

	Approximate.
United States	$250,000
Great Britain and Ireland	270,000
France	20,000
Belgium	7,000

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—LOANS RE CONSTRUCTION EASTERN DIVISION.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Perley—asked:

1. What sums of money have been raised by way of loans for the purposes described in clause 23 of chapter 71 of Edward VII, 1903?

2. What rate of interest is payable by the government on each of the sums so raised?

3. What have been the total interest charges on these sums at these rates up to and including January 1, 1909?

4. What amount of debentures has been issued by the commissioners and deposited with the Finance Department in respect of advances from the proceeds of said loans?

5. What has been, up to and including January 1, 1909, the difference between the sums paid on the moneys borrowed by the government and the interest received on the moneys advanced to the commissioners?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (for Minister of Finance):

1. (a) £1,425,428 1s. 7d.; (b) £2,689,851 7s. 11d.

2. 3½ per cent.

3. £85,520 13s.

4 and 5. The debentures issued by the Commissioners, now amounting to $46,000,000, and deposited with the Minister of Finance, were not issued in respect of the loans referred to, but were issued generally as moneys were required for payment of construction work. The statute makes no provision by means of which the Commissioners can make payment of the interest on these debentures as it accrues, until such time as there is net revenue and income derived from the operation of the road, when the principal and interest becomes a first lien thereon.

SAVINGS DEPOSITS AND LOANS, 3 PER CENT OR OVER.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE asked:

1. How much money is on deposit in the Government Savings Department?

2. What loans, with dates and amounts, negotiated by the government are drawing over 3 per cent per annum, and what are the rates of interest thereon?

3. What loans carrying over 3 per cent have been borrowed from banks in Canada, from what banks, when these loans will mature, and rates of interest thereon?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (for Minister of Finance):

1. $58,863,647.26.

2. Payable in London.—

	£	s.	d.
1874 Loan extended to 1911 4 per cent	1,753,830	4	10
1875-8 Public Works Guaranteed Loan 4 per cent	3,200,000	0	0
Loan of 1884, 3½ per cent	5,000,000	0	0
Canada reduced 1885, 4 per cent	6,443,136	2	9
Loan of 1885, 4 per cent	4,000,000	0	0
C. P. R. land grant loan 1888, 3½ per cent	3,093,700	0	0
4 per cent. loan of 1908-12, 4 per cent	1,379,600	0	0
3½ per cent. loan 1908, (February issue) 3½ per cent	3,000,000	0	0
3¾ per cent. loan 1908, 3¾ per cent	5.000,000	0	0
3½ per cent loan 1908 (October issue) 3½ per cent	5,000,000	0	0
3¾ per cent loan 1909, 3¾ per cent	6,000,000	0	0

Payable in Canada.—

Reduced loan of 1883, extended 3½ per cent	$1,425,800	00
Dominion stock issue—		
A reduced in 1897, 3½ per cent	58,899	67
B reduced in 1897, 3½ per cent	325,900	00
C reduced in 1897 3½ per cent	49,066	34
E extended for 10 years, from 1st July, 1906, 3⅜ per cent	2,500,000	00
Dominion stock issued 1891, 3½ per cent	404,200	00

3. $5,000,000 for one month; Bank of Montreal, Otawa; March 2, 1909; 4 per cent.

LIVE STOCK KILLED ON RAILWAYS.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE asked:

1. How many heads of stock, horses, cattle, pigs and sheep, and their value, have been killed on the properties of railway companies in Canada during the past five years?

2. In view of this destruction, does the government propose to compel the railway companies to adopt a safe and effective cattle-guard?

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

1. The department has no information.

2. Provision for proper cattle-guards is covered by the Railway Act, section 254.

PURCHASE OF LINDSAY BLOCK, OTTAWA.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. Is the government negotiating with the T. Lindsay Company, Limited, of Ottawa, for the purchase of its real estate on the corner of Rideau and Sussex streets?

2. Is the government aware that Senator Belcourt is the president of the T. Lindsay Company, Limited, and that Mr. Emmanuel Tassé, of Ottawa, is one of the directors?

3. Is the government aware that Mr. Emmanuel Tassé is already the ministerial candidate for the city of Ottawa to succeed Sir Wilfrid Laurier as member for Ottawa, and that his candidature is especially encouraged and supported by Senator Belcourt and Mr. Thomas Lindsay, the president and manager of the said company?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

1. The government is not negotiating with the T. Lindsay Company, Limited, of Ottawa, for the purchase of its real estate on the corner of Rideau and Sussex streets.

2. The government is not aware that Senator Belcourt is president of the said T. Lindsay Company, Limited, nor that Mr. Emmanuel Tasse, of Ottawa, is one of the directors. Moreover, it is not believed that the presence of Messrs. Belcourt and Tasse or absence from the board of directors of the said company is of any concern to the public service.

3. The government is not aware that Mr. Emmanuel Tasse is the candidate for the city of Ottawa to succeed Sir Wilfrid Laurier, or that his candidature is supported by Senator Belcourt and Mr. Thos. Lindsay.

SUPPLY OF MINIATURE RIFLE TARGETS.

Mr. HUGHES—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Is it the intention of the government to supply miniature rifles, targets and necessary supplies for use at company and rifle association headquarters, for practice in the science of rifle shooting?

2. Is it the purpose of the government to extend the service above referred to, to universities, colleges, collegiate institutes and school cadet corps generally?

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

1 and 2. These matters are under consideration, but there is no immediate intention of supplying miniature rifles.

ELECTION IN COMOX-ATLIN.

Mr. BURRELL—by Mr. Goodeve—asked:

1. When was the tenth parliament dissolved?

2. When was the writ for Comox-Atlin issued in the general elections for the eleventh parliament?

3. What date was fixed for the nomination, and what date was fixed for polling day?

4. On what date was the writ issued for the vacancy in Comox-Atlin?

5. What date was fixed for nomination and what date for polling day?

6. Who is the returning officer, and where does he reside?

7. Was such returning officer advised of his appointment by telegram?

8. Was he by telegram instructed to prepare the proclamation before the writ could reach him? If so, by what minister or official was the communication sent?

Hon. C. MURPHY (Secretary of State):

1. On the 17th September, 1908.

2. On the 18th September, 1908.

3. The returning officer in his proclamation fixed the 28th October for nomination day and the 16th November for polling day.

4. The 22nd January, 1909.

5. The returning officer fixes these dates under section 90 of the Dominion Elections Act.

6. Alfred J. Morris, merchant, Prince Rupert, British Columbia.

7. Not by the Secretary of State or the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, nor, so far as I am aware, by anybody in authority.

8. No instructions sent by the Secretary of State or by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, nor, so far as I am aware, by anybody in authority.

WATER SUPPLY AT ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE.

Mr. HUGHES—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Whence does the Royal Military College derive its water supply?

2. Where is the pumping apparatus located?

3. Has the water been found uniformly pure, or uniformly impure?

4. What steps are being taken by the government to remedy any defects in the supply?

5. Has the ozonization of the water been considered by the government?

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

1. The Royal Military College derives its water supply from Lake Ontario at a distance of 460 feet from the lake shore, towards Cedar island.

2. The pumping apparatus is located on the college grounds.

3. The water is tested regularly both before and after filtration. The filtered water has been found slightly defective upon one occasion since June last.

4. To insure absolutely purity of water, the drinking water is now sterilized.

5. The ozonization of the water has been under careful consideration for some months.

ANNUAL TRAINING OF MILITIA.

Mr. HUGHES—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Have plans been completed for the annual training of the militia for the coming summer? If so, what may they be?

2. What reduction in members is contemplated, if any?

3. What corps are to be exempted from annual drill and training?

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

1, 2, and 3. City corps will train at local headquarters and rural corps in camps of instruction. All details, however, have not yet been arranged.

UNIVERSITY DRILL CORPS.

Mr. HUGHES—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Has the government considered the question of establishing corps for military drill, training and target shooting in connection with the various universities throughout Canada?

2. Has the question of the supply of uniforms, arms, equipments, &c., been considered?

3. Would the government furnish caretakers for the arms, stores, &c., for such?

4. In case one or more regiments were organized in connection with a university, would the government furnish drill sheds and armouries for such?

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

1. The question of establishing military corps, mostly engineer corps, in connection with the universities of Canada has from time to time been considered.

Dalhousie College, Nova Scotia, Engineer Cadet Company, the Toronto University Section of No. II Field Company, Canadian Engineers, and the McGill and Toronto University Rifle Associations, are cases in point.

2. It has been considered that the existing regulations regarding active militia organizations and cadet corps organizations sufficiently apply.

3 and 4. Yes, under the usual conditions.

CAPITAL SUPPLY COMPANY.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. Is the government aware that a company intituled the Capital Supply Company of Ottawa, has just been formed, composed of Messrs. Albert Pinard, Charles Lapierre, Alphonse Larocque and Arthur Beaulieu, for the purpose of obtaining government patronage?

2. Is the government aware that the said Arthur Beaulieu mentioned in the preceding question is an employee of the government as a painter, and during the sessions he is employed as a messenger in the House of Commons?

3. If such is the case, does the government intend, in conformity with the recommendation of the Civil Service Commissioners, to take measures to prevent an employee of the government belonging to a government patronage society?

Mr. HUGHES.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State):

The Government has not incorporated such a company, nor is it aware that any such company has been formed.

SALE OF NIPISSING INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. GEORGE GORDON asked:

When will the Indian reserve between Sturgeon Falls and North Bay be open for settlement?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

It is intended to dispose of the land and timber on the surrendered portion of the Nipissing Indian Reserve between Sturgeon Falls and North Bay at as early a date as possible after the completion of the survey, valuation and classification of the lands and timber.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing how many hogs have been killed during each month from the 1st of November, 1907, to 1st of November, 1908, inclusive, by the following packing companies: the Laing Pack. and Prov. Co., Ltd., Montreal; the Collingwood Pack. Co., Ltd., Collingwood; the Williams Davis Co., Ltd., Harriston; the George Matthews Co., Ltd., Hull; the George Matthews Co., Ltd., Brantford; the George Matthews Co., Ltd., Peterborough; the Whyte Packing Co., Ltd., Brantford; the Canadian Packin Co., Ltd., London, and the number of hogs condemned, including intestines, during the same period.—Mr. Beattie.

For a return showing the Ross Rifles, Mark I, and Mark II, or any other description of Ross Rifle, used by the Canadian Rifle Team at Bisley last year in the regular team competition; what Ross rifles, of any description were used in the Bisley competitions, regular or extra matches, by any member of the Canadian Team, or any Canadian marksmen engaging in such matches; with the name of the individual, and if in the employ of the Ross Rifle Company; the description of the rifle, and in what way if differs from the Ross rifle, Mark I and Mark II both as to length of barrel and such expert accessories as wind gauges, globe or ring sites, spirit levels, &c.; if a target rifle or a service rifle and if to be adopted by the government for the Militia; and where this rifle was manufactured in toto.—Mr. Worthington.

For a return showing what states of the United States have been quarantined by order in council by reason of the prevalence of foot and mouth disease in such states; how many inspectors were appointed by the government to prevent the importation of live stock into Canada from quarantined states; at what points such inspectors were stationed; and what salaries these inspectors were paid.—Mr. Thos. Chisholm.

For a return in detail showing what disposition has been made of the vote of $35,000 to cover the cost of boring for oil, gas, coal, &c., passed on July 15, 1908, with a copy of all correspondence, reports, telegrams, memoran-

da, &c., connected with the matter giving the district in which the wells were drilled, the cost and present condition of each well, and a copy of all contracts and tenders.—Mr. Armstrong.

For a copy of any order in council authorizing the Canadian Pacific Railway to increase its capital stock.—Mr. W. F. Maclean.

A copy of all orders in council, correspondence and papers, including prospectuses, in relation to the loans negotiated by the Minister of Finance from the 1st of January, 1907, to date?—Mr. Foster.

A return showing all contracts for the carrying of mail, which expire in the month of April, 1909, that have been renewed without asking for tenders; where the routes are situated, the price paid for carrying the mail, and the name of the carrier, and his place of residence in each case.—Mr. Armstrong.

A return showing the names of the deputy returning officer, poll clerk, scrutineer or agent, or any other officer who acted, respectively, as such in the several polling subdivisions in the electoral district of Calgary in the recent general election for the House of Commons.—Mr. McCarthy by Mr. R. L. Borden.

A copy of all lists of voters as prepared by the enumerators and completed by the deputy returning officers for the several polling subdivisions in the electoral riding of Calgary, in the province of Alberta, and used in the recent general election for the House of Commons.—Mr. McCarthy by Mr. Roche.

A copy of all applications that have been received for the transfer of villa lots in section 14, township 24, range 1, west of the fifth meridian, and all correspondence in connection therewith since the 10th day of June, 1908.—Mr. McCarthy by Mr. R. L. Borden.

A return showing in detail all moneys received by this government from the sale of land, forest, mines, fisheries and other natural resources of the province of Alberta for the last fiscal year?—Mr. McCarthy by Mr. R. L. Borden.

A return showing what measures, if any, have been taken by the government to lower the waters of Lakes Simcoe and Couchiching; what moneys, if any, have been expended for this purpose, the date of expenditure, and persons superintending the same; the future intention of the government in this direction, for the purpose of reclaiming thousands of acres of first-class arable land.—Mr. S. Sharpe.

For a return showing the number of seizures made by the Department of Inland Revenue during the years 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907 and 1908, the date of seizures; by whom seized; what the seizures consisted of; amount realized by the sale of such material seized; and how the seized material was disposed of. —Mr. Barr .

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

Mr. MEIGHEN—by Mr. R. L. Borden—moved for:

A return showing all surveys made to date in the prosecution of the proposed Hudson Bay railway.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The trouble is that there is nothing to bring down in reply to this motion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That makes it a very simple matter.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. We have no reports from our surveyors yet.

NATION RIVER DRAINAGE.

Mr. ANDREW BRODER (Dundas) moved for:

Copy of all correspondence, orders in council, papers and other documents between the government or any member thereof, and any person or persons, referring in any way to the drainage of the Nation river running through the townships of Matilda and Winchester, in the county of Dundas.

He said:—The Nation river has had quite a history with regard to this matter of drainage. That history goes so far back as a considerable time before confederation, when there was a report made on the practicability of bringing the waters from the St. Lawrence river to the Nation river for power purposes. I do not wish to go so far back as that in asking for this correspondence, but I wish to state that previous to the defeat of the Conservative government in 1896, there was an arrangement come to between the people and the government, that if the people would put a dredge in the river the government would work the dredge. That arrangement was carried out for one or two seasons if I remember correctly. The Conservatives were defeated in 1896, and the incoming government carried out the understanding during the balance of that season and part of the following season. The Hon. Mr. Tarte was then Minister of Public Works, and he held the view that the Dominion government had no right to do this work, but he realized the responsibility for carrying out the contract entered into by the previous government, and he went so far as to offer the people a bulk sum as a quittance of the obligation of the government. I am not sure as to the amount mentioned by the Hon. Mr. Tarte of that time, but at all events it was not satisfactory to those who were dredging the river. In answer to the argument that the Dominion government has no right to undertake such work, I might say that the necessity now for draining the river is greater than it was at any time before, because as the country is being cleared the water gets so rapidly into the river that it overflows its banks and destroys the crops. This takes the question beyond the local standpoint. It has got to be a very serious matter for the people. I may say that the present government have seen fit, for local drainage purposes, to deal with rivers of a similar nature. They have in the county of Prescott, dealing virtually with the same river, laid out quite a large amount of

money at a place called Pitchoff. On the Chateauguay river, in the province of Quebec, in the county of Chateauguay, in the vicinity of St. Chrysostom, the government have laid out, purely for drainage purposes, some $12,000 or $15,000 ; and I think there is an obligation resting on the government to carry out the contract between the previous government and the people with reference to the Nation river. There is no question as to that, because the dredge is there which was built by the people assisted by the Ontario government at that time, as a proof of the contract. The Ontario government assisted by giving $4,000 towards the cost of the dredge. There is no question as to the understanding that was arrived at. The people have expended between $70,000 and $80,000 on that river. The engineers at that time considered that, if the river were enlarged, that would to a very considerable extent relieve the people of the difficulty; but the conditions have so changed that the relief is a very nominal thing to-day. I simply bring the matter to the attention of the government in the hope that they will deal with it on its merits and in accordance with the obligations resting on the government.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). My hon. friend and myself, from force of circumstances, perhaps know more about the situation of this river than most of the other members of the House. This is a matter which has been before the public, and in which the public in that part of the country have been particularly interested, for, I suppose, twenty-five or thirty years. I had the honour of being a member of the counties' council of the united counties of Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry when some of the practical work in connection with it was undertaken, and I realize what my hon. friend says about the interest taken in that part of the country in the matter. The more the country has been opened up and drained into the Nation river, the more need there has been to get the water away. It is a comparatively small stream at low water, but it contains ledges which high water cause rapids, and the object of the work done has been to remove these ledges and so improve the flow of the water. At certain times the Nation becomes a violent stream, with the water so high that at some places it forms a lake a mile wide, flooding the land in the vicinity, so that sometimes the people are obliged to transfer mails and passengers across the lake by boats. The harm done by the flooding of this river is very great. A great deal of work has been done on it, and just what ought to be done now is a question for consideration. The provincial government has granted some aid, the Dominion government has also granted aid in days gone by, and the people have taxed themselves very heavily. It is a matter not purely local, as it is quite wide in its scope. I support the resolution for bringing down the papers in order that the House may see in just what position the matter is.

Mr. BRODER. I would suggest that the return be made from the year 1894.

Motion, amended as suggested, agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.

On the order:

Resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Mr. Borden, that in the opinion of this House it is advisable to appoint a select standing committee on natural resources, who shall have authority to inquire into and consider and report upon all matters appertaining to the conservation and development of the natural resources of Canada, including fisheries, forests, mines, minerals, waterways, and water-powers, and to whom may be referred from time to time any report, document or matter touching the subject which they are appointed to consider.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In accordance with the suggestion made by my hon. friend the other day and in line with the observations I then made, I would suggest, if it be agreeable to him, that instead of having one committee we should have a Committee on Fisheries, as agreed to by the House, a Committee on Mines and Minerals and a Committee on Forests and Waters. I think forests and waters should go together. This is so in European countries. In France, for instance, there is a 'Departement d'Eaux et Forests.' I would suggest that the order stand in the meantime for further consideration.

Order allowed to stand.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Archives $28,000.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). This is the usual vote except that it has been reduced by the amount transferred to the civil government. The amount transferred is $32,000. The civil vote is increased to that extent and the vote for Archives reduced. The work in the branch is carried on the same as heretofore.

Mr. E. PAQUET (L'Islet). (Translation.) Who are the scholars engaged presently by the government in the archives at Paris?

Mr. FISHER. (Translation.) We have several clerks doing the transcription of the records in the Bibliothèque Nationale in France. These are not scholars, but young men entrusted with this work.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) What is the nature of the work done by the Abbé O'Leary, former professor of history?

Mr. FISHER. (Translation.) He does not work in Paris but in Canada, and he is busy making researches for collecting the historical documents scattered pretty near all over the province of Quebec, and having some bearing on our history. The work he does is under the supervision of Dr. Doughty, in order that we may be able to locate those historical documents.

Mr. J. D. REID. As I understand, in the archives department, the salaries at Ottawa last year amounted to $23,721.54. There were no others outside of the staff at Ottawa who were transferred so that if the vote has been decreased $32,000, that is more than the Auditor General's Report shows was paid altogether for salaries. The page in the Auditor General's Report is D—8.

Mr. FISHER. When I was going through the civil government items of the Agriculture Department, I gave the exact figures of the reduction in the Archives.

Mr. J. D. REID. I see, at the page I refer to, which says 'Salaries at Ottawa, $23,-721.54.'

Mr. FISHER. I have not with me at the moment the list of those transferred to civil government with their salaries. I had that when the committee was considering the civil government items the other day. But I stated that the salaries, as a matter of fact came to $28,212, which was the amount given me by my officers. We have reduced $32,000. What the other reduction is due to is not shown in the notes I have before me. My deputy will be here in a few minutes and I can get the information from him.

Mr. J. D. REID. Better let the item stand until we get the information.

Mr. E. PAQUET. (L'Islet.) (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, allow me to make a few remarks about our archives. It is with pleasure that I grant the amount of $28,000 here asked for by the Minister of Agriculture to keep up the work of our archives. The literate people stand in with the hon. Minister of Agriculture and encourage him in his patriotic and historical work. We are proud of the record of our country and we must make ourselves familiar with it. What has been done so far stimulates the writers on our history.

By order in council dated April 17, 1907, the Minister of Agriculture has instituted a commission on historical documents. He was most fortunate in his selection of such men as the reverend Abbé Gosselin and Mr. Edmond Roy for the pursuance of such work in our province. It is important that an intelligent classification of our written records should be made in order that they may be more easily got at by those desirous of studying them. I am pleased to quote among the students in that branch of our archives the reverend Abbé O'Leary, my old professor in history at the Seminary of Quebec. In the last fifty years, Mr. G. B. Faribault, the Abbé Tanguay, the Abbé Verreault and Mr. Joseph Marmette have been in Paris to make researches in the archives there and made very precious discoveries in the way of documents of the highest importance. Those who are working in the French archives under the direction of the Minister of Agriculture are performing a national work.

According to the report of the Minister of Agriculture, students in our history are also getting useful information in the archives in London. The last documents which have been added to the national collection give valuable knowledge on the maritime provinces. Let us keep up these historical searches. Let us be proud of our archives, they are the depository of our national traditions.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER. (Translation.) I am happy to hear the observations which the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Paquet) has just made. I feel proud over them and I want to thank him most heartily for the good words he spoke in favour of the work performed for our archives. He was quite right in saying that it is necessary that our Canadian records should be preserved. I am pleased to be able to tell him that we have lately erected in Ottawa a fireproof building, a most suitable building, in fact a fine building where they are now deposited. Considerable work was performed in the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris in searching for and sorting documents relating to Canadian history. Messrs. Marmette, Richard and others have gathered such an amount of them that we have been so far unable to have them all copied over, but that part of the work is just now being pressed with all possible celerity.

We have engaged the services of Mr. Biggar, well known in Canada for his historical researches and studies. This gentleman is now engaged in pursuing this work in Europe, that is in Paris and London. He understands French as well as English. His researches are not confined to Paris alone, but are spread over Spain, Italy and Britain. He is superintending that part of the work in Paris. I should like very much to further press the copying over of those records, but it is not in our power to do so. It is somewhat difficult to get competent men to do this work. In England, we have clerks who are performing this task, and we are carrying on the work of transcription as fast as we possibly can. When I took up my department, Canada was providing $6,000 a year for the archives, but

having found out that there was much more to do in that direction, I am pleased to say that parliament has always voted the increased appropriations which I asked from time to time for the archives. I may say at the same time that those increases were always voted without hesitation not only by the party in power but by the opposition as well. I hope that I shall have in the future the same encouragement that was shown me in the past for the work of the archives. I also hope that under the supervision of Dr. Doughty, a very competent and devoted official, I might say a most enthusiastic official in the pursuance of his duties, all this work will be pressed forward with vigour and to still more satisfactory results.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques-Cartier.) (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I want to say that we are very much satisfied indeed of the declarations which have just been made by the hon. minister in answer to the remarks offered by my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Paquet). My hon. friend from L'Islet has stated a point to which great importance is added in the province of Quebec, and I believe no other province in the Dominion is as anxious as ours that the national records should be carefully looked after and properly stored. All of us, my hon. friend from L'Islet, the hon. minister and myself have those records at heart. I am glad the hon. minister has seen fit to do justice to the opposition in acknowledging that we never refused to grant him the sums required for the proper keeping of our records. This seems to surprise him somewhat, but experience must have taught him of old that when the government wants money for legitimate purposes and for the benefit of the public, the opposition never refused its sanction.

We have in Mr. Doughty a gentleman of such consummate competency it would be almost impossible to get a better on than he, and I think we should carry out all the suggestions which might come from him.

Now to come down to practical business, I would like the minister to tell us how he intends spending the $28,000 here asked for. I see that $60,000 were spent in the fiscal year 1908-09. This item is reduced to $28,000 this year. It is not customary for us to complain of any diminution, especially in the present condition of affairs. I believe, on the contrary, that we may congratulate the government for the excursions it may attempt in the field of economy. But we are interested in knowing how such retrenchments are arrived at as compared with the sums expended last year. What does the department intend spending for the archives in France? What staff do we employ just now for the gathering of records ? I know Mr. Biggar by reputation ; I believe he deserves all the good that is said of him. Is he alone engaged in collecting archives in France? I heard the minister say awhile ago that it was hard to get clerical help in France. Are the copies which we intend obtaining for our archives to be made in the national libraries or from documents held by private families whose records are connected with the history of our country ? I believe we can gather at a very low cost in French, all the documents we require, provided we take the necessary precautions.

I would be thankful to the minister for telling us how he will proceed in the course of the coming year to collect copies of those immense books of records which are actually held in France? What proportion of the money which we vote annually will be devoted to this task in the coming year ? There is no doubt that we can secure large returns in employing for that work nobody but absolutely competent men. It is pretty much the same as this in immigration work, but not as much as in the archives. It is possible to employ in immigration work a whole lot of people as was done in the past, to recruit settlers and spend large sums of money worthlessly. I think the hon. minister ought to tell us what he purposes doing with this $28,000 both in France and England in the course of the coming year.

Mr. FISHER. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, nobody else but Mr. Biggar worked at the collection of those records in France. We already have a large number of documents selected and laid by in the Bibliothèque Nationale, in Paris. We want to have them copied before selecting more, not because it wouldn't be worth our while to press further our researches in that direction, but because we have sufficient records already awaiting transcription. In the meanwhile, Mr. Biggar keeps up his researches in different parts of France, in the private libraries of historical mansions and elsewhere from which he obtained lists of documents that are probably of some interest to Canada. Mr. Biggar takes these matters upon himself and when he comes across documents which bear upon our history, he has the power to have them copied, inasmuch as we cannot get them in Canada. I do not see that I can give more information upon the work that is being carried out in France.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) Do the same remarks of the hon. gentleman apply to the work carried on in England? Did Mr. Biggar first made a selection of the documents that are to be copied in England? Do we employ clerical help there in doing the transcription?

Mr. FISHER. (Translation.) It is the same in England as in France.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) Now, is the whole of these $28,000 to be affected to this work?

Mr. FI$HER. (Translation.) Oh, no.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) How then is this item applied?

Mr. FISHER. (Translation.) Besides Mr. Biggar's salary, $7,000 is provided for researches conducted in Europe under Mr. Biggar's care, then there is the messenger's salary, and certain office work at the archives here, $2,000. There is the salaries of the employees outside of Ottawa and who do not belong to the Civil Service, $2,000. Transcription to be made in Canada, $4,000. Purchase of books, newspapers, &c., $3,500. Printing, $5,000. Expenses by the commission on messengers, $500. And $1,000 for sundry expenses.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) The amount of $4,000 for transcription in Canada seems to me pretty high. What documents are there to copy? Are they documents belonging to private collections?

Mr. FISHER. (Translation.) Most of those historical documents, if not all, are held in the court houses at Montreal, Quebec and Three Rivers. Quite a number of them are also to be found at the provotship in Quebec. Others are to be found elsewhere. This sum provides for the transcription of these documents.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I do not want to keep up unduly the discussion upon an item which is not opposed, but it seems to me that the sum which we affect to transcription of documents held in Canada, is higher than should be in relation to the results obtained. It might be that the returns are commensurate to the amount of money spent, but I doubt it. I believe that for a young nation like us, whose records are so extensive and which desires to extend the lasting work of its national history, we appropriate a sum of money rather inadequate to the task.

In reviewing the budget, I could easily find a great number of items which are extremely high and which are devoted to purposes less interesting, less urgent than the keeping of our archives. On this subject I may say that we, on the opposition side, will ever be ready to grant all items asked by the government, even if the amount was higher than this one, provided that it would be clearly stated what use it is intended for. If they are deserving and free of all waste, if practically, they would increase the volume of our national archives, they will receive our cordial support.

There is presently, in England and in France as in Canada, number of papers which are in danger of being lossed, and it is necessary that we should have in the administration of this department—which is much more important than we believe—men in every way able to keep them. We will always be willing to vote the moneys necessary for this object. I must say before resuming, that the hon. minister has made since a few years most commendable efforts, for the preserving of our archives.

Mr. J. D. REID. I see that Professor Adam Shortt received $1,675. He received $1,500 for editing constitutional documents. Is Professor Shortt employed by the year to do that or was it simply a contract?

Mr. FISHER. Professor Shortt was not employed by the year. This is work of an exceptional character, requiring a man of exceptional attainments. There was no question about Professor Shortt's qualifications for the work, and an arrangement was made with him that he should do it and we should pay him accordingly.

Mr. J. D. REID. In what way?

Mr. FISHER. He sent in an account which on careful examination was considered to be fair and just and reasonable, and we paid it.

Mr. J. D. REID. Was it by the day or just a lump sum?

Mr. FISHER. Just a lump sum. He did this at odd times during almost three years.

Mr. J. D. REID. I see that during the same time Professor Shortt received $2,500 from the Labour Department for acting in connection with labour disputes.

Mr. FISHER. I think all of this work was performed before he acted in the labour disputes.

Mr. MONK. What is the salary paid to the archivist?

Mr. FISHER. $3,200 a year.

Mr. MONK. Has he an assistant?

Mr. FISHER. No, he has no assistant archivist. Mr. Edmor Roy is the next official in the archives branch, but he has not been called assistant archivist.

Mr. MONK. It seems to me that Mr. Doughty's position and qualifications are sufficiently important to place him upon the same footing as the deputy head of a department. His work requires very important qualifications and Dr. Doughty possesses them in an eminent degree. He has no assistant and is called upon to bring into life a new department. I think the House would be quite ready to vote him a larger salary than that.

Mr. FISHER. I am very glad to hear my hon. friend say that. Dr. Doughty is now in the Civil Service and is subject of course to the Civil Service rules, like the heads of other branches. I do not think a department ought to be created unless there is a considerable amount of administration and detail work which there is not in that case.

Mr. MONK. I did not advocate making a department; I submitted that the duties

are sufficiently important and require high enough qualifications to justify Dr. Doughty being placed on about the same footing as the deputy head of a department.

Mr. J. D. REID. I asked the minister about the $32,000 reduction in salaries?

Mr. FISHER. In the first place I am informed that Mr. Roy's salary of $3,000 was not included in the Auditor General's Report. He was appointed since it was prepared, in March of last year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the whole Archives branch now subject to the new Civil Service Act?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So that in future persons who are employed in that department will be recommended by the Civil Service Commissioners?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am very glad of that, and I join in what my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has said with regard to Dr. Doughty's qualifications, which in my opinion are of a very eminent order; I feel that the country would be placed in a very unfortunate position if we should lose his services. As far as I am concerned I would be very glad indeed to support the government in placing his salary upon a better basis than it is at present, because I know how extremely assiduous he has been in the work in which he is engaged. It is more than a mere matter of duty with him, it is not only a duty but a pleasure, the work of his life, and from personal observation of the work which he is performing, I have formed a very high appreciation of the services he has rendered the country since he has been placed at the head of the Archives department.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think that anyone in or out of the government appreciates or understands Dr. Doughty's work more than I do. I take a good deal of credit to myself for having got Dr. Doughty to become the Archivist, and I understand and fully appreciate not only the quality of his work but his personal character and devotion to that work which is of a very peculiar character, and which there are not many men qualified to perform. I know of no one in Canada as well qualified as Dr. Doughty.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister has not yet explained the $32,000.

Mr. FISHER. The Auditor General's Report does not show the salary of Mr. Roy of $3,000 and another of $1,000 or $1,200. That is in addition to the $28,000 of salaries which are transferred from payments from the Archives branch to the civil government. Dr. Doughty made out an estimate of what he required this year and the estimate came to less than $28,000. He asked for that $28,000 to carry on work outside of the work provided for by the salaries. $28,000 has been transferred to civil government and there is $28,000 of work to be done outside of this out of the vote to Archives.

Patent Record, $17,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is paid almost entirely to the King's Printer ?

Mr. FISHER. Altogether.

Census and statistics, $11,500.

Mr. J. D. REID. There is a decrease.

Mr. FISHER. There is a transfer of $28,850 of salaries to civil government, but I have asked for $5,000 more for other work of the census and statistics branch. If it had not been for asking for that $5,000 more the vote would have been reduced by $6,500. I have asked for $5,000 additional to be applied to the work of issuing monthly crop bulletins, which we undertook last summer, and hope to continue.

Mr. J. D. REID. That will be spent for salaries?

Mr. FISHER. No, that is outside work. None of this vote will be spent for salaries in Ottawa, but it will be required for printing, correspondence and the expense of getting out these crop statistics.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the total cost of the Census Department each year?

Mr. FISHER. The total cost for the coming year will be $28,450 in salaries under civil government, and $11,500, which brings the total to $40,000 in round figures.

Mr. BLAIN. Will that be an increase over last year?

Mr. FISHER. An increase of $5,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many civil servants are engaged in the department?

Mr. FISHER. Twenty-nine in Ottawa.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has there been a material increase in the last few years?

Mr. FISHER. No, not material. Of course in the census years there were many more, but since the compilation and completion of the last decennial census they have not been increased practically at all. I will not say there has not been one or two added at some time or other, but practically there has been no increase.

Mr. STAPLES. I would like to ask the minister to explain the system adopted in collecting these crop statistics.

Mr. FISHER. The system has been practically this: We have tried to find farmers throughout the country, who have shown by some correspondence or connection with the department with other work, that

they are men of intelligence and take an interest in the agricultural work of their particular sections. These have been communicated with and asked to send in periodical reports, which they do by mail, and which are then made up into the estimates which these bulletins contain. We do not pay these correspondents anything. We expect them to do it, and we, in return, give them the advantage of sending bulletins to them and any other information from the department which they wish to have.

Mr. ROCHE. Is not that a duplication of the work carried on by the various provincial governments?

Mr. FISHER. Some of the provincial governments do that kind of work, but there is no such work done generally for the whole of Canada. We do make use of the bulletins and reports that the provinces issue for the purpose of checking these statistics, but that work, being done only by some provinces, does not give the results for the whole Dominion which we require to have.

Mr. STAPLES. Are these bulletins issued weekly or monthly?

Mr. FISHER. Monthly.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. May I ask the minister if it is not possible for him to gather together a greater volume of statistics in regard to the trade of foreign countries? During the past few years we have been urging upon the minister the necessity of enlarging the statistics in that regard and giving us some comparisons between Canada and other countries similarly situated, the Argentine Republic, for instance, or some other foreign countries. I know it would require some research, but I cannot help feeling that we are not in touch with the statistics regarding the trade and commerce of these countries to the extent that we should be. I know that the department have improved somewhat in that regard in the last few years, but I would like to urge upon the minister the necessity of making further investigation and trying to bring down a more complete statement with regard to the trade and commerce of different countries, especially with regard to the exports and imports of products such as we produce from our own farms, mines and timber areas.

Mr. FISHER. I can understand the value of such information and the convenience of having it. But, we would simply have to go to the same documents that are now available to any individual. We might, of course, compile them and work them up into different forms of comparative tables. But I may say to my hon. friend quite frankly, that we have so much more to do in regard to our own statistics than we have been able to do, that I have hesitated to turn the labours of my own staff, or the money which is voted by parliament for this purpose, to the compilation of statistics outside of Canada. I have in my mind much that we might do in Canada in the way of getting statistics which we have not yet done and which I would like to see done and that is one reason why, in this work, I am asking for $5,000 more than I did last year. It is to try and increase the amount of information to be given out and made available for our own people about our own work. I think it would be better to spend the money and devote our time and energies to our own work than to foreign work which is done in each country for itself and the results of which are largely available in the library for those who wish to study them.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I quite agree with the minister in regard to this information being available in the library and that is why I cannot understand why it would not be comparatively easy to gather these statistics together. If they can be gathered without a great deal of effort out of books in the library, the people in Canada who are desirous of getting in touch with these statistics not being able to come to Ottawa and investigate for themselves, would be put in possession of this information. It would be a source of interest to our people in general to have this information to a greater extent than they have at the present time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ascertain from the minister whether or not the annual statistics compiled with respect to some of our own matters should not be made a little more complete and should not be made to conform more to the information that is set forth in the decennial census returns. I have not made any careful examination of the yearly statistics that are produced in the Census Department as compared with the results of the decennial census of 1901 except in one respect, and that was to endeavour to obtain from the last statistical report respecting lumber such information as would enable me to ascertain whether or not the lumber cut in various particulars had increased and to what extent, since 1901. I found that they did not seem to run on the same lines. There was not the same division of production. Could not that be accomplished? For example, in the census of 1901 there are returns for so much sawn lumber, so many cubic feet of timber, so many cords of wood for fuel, so many railway ties, but when we come to 'Census and Statistics Bulletin No. 2, issued at Ottawa, 1907,' I do not get information of the same character as is contained in the census with reference to the lumber industry, and it is, therefore, impossible to make a comparison. I may add that upon application to the officers of the Census Department I received every possible assistance and all the in-

formation they had in their possession, and what I say is not by way of censuring them in any way, but for the purpose of ascertaining whether a better method cannot be devised. Possibly this particular information may appertain more properly to the Forestry Branch of the Department of the Interior when that is placed in good working order. From the yearly reports of the United States you can ascertain practically all the information about the production of lumber that you would obtain in the decennial census. In the Forestry Report of the United States for 1906 it is stated that they had obtained returns from about 12,000 mills in the United States with regard to sawn lumber. If the information published in our bulletins could be systematized a little better it would be much more valuable.

Mr. FISHER. I am informed that there is about the same difference between the information in the American decennial census and their yearly reports as there is in our publications. The blue book which the hon. gentleman refers to gives the return of manufactured lumber and not what might be called crude lumber cut in the forest. I quite agree that it is best to make the figures as nearly similar in character as possible in all our publications so as to enable comparison. I will discuss the matter with the chief statistician.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This bulletin gives the number of establishments, the capital, the number of employees, the wages for labour, and the value of the product, but it does not give the quantity of the product. I know that you can obtain from the forestry service of the United States all the information respecting the annual production that you get in their decennial census.

Mr. FISHER. I am very glad to have suggestions of that kind because they will all help to perfect the various bulletins which we issue.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have in my hand a bulletin entitled 'Census and Statistics, Monthly, No. 7, Vol. 2, January, 1907, published by authority of the Minister of Agriculture,' and I suppose this report is issued by Mr. Archibald Blue. I think sufficient care is not taken in the preparation of statistics with a view of their absolute correctness so as to make them of practical value. For instance, in this bulletin I find it stated that the average wage for farm help in Canada is $24.60 per month for males and $13.50 for females, but it is not stated whether that wage includes board and lodging. Perhaps the minister can say what the intention was.

Mr. FISHER. The statement ought to have been made in that table that those wages were in addition to board and lodging in these cases.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Mr. HENDERSON. That certainly should be stated.

Mr. FISHER. I agree with you.

Mr. BARR. The idea conveyed by the bulletin is that the wages are paid to that extent during the whole twelve months of the year, whereas they are not paid for more than six or eight months. That is misleading to people wishing to come to this country.

Mr. FISHER. I cannot offhand answer the question; I shall have to look into the matter and see. Of course, wages do vary at different seasons of the year; but I took it that when they were put down in the bulletin as being so much a month, that meant the average of the year.

Mr. HENDERSON. The wages as given in this bulletin are both the monthly and the yearly wages for males for the whole of Canada, namely, $24.60 a month or by the year $209, which would practically be $17.50 a month. I apprehend that $24.60 would only apply to certain months of the year. The danger of this report is that no doubt some copies of it will go to the old country and people coming to this country and relying upon it will be surprised. If, as the minister says, the board and lodging are included, I think it is unfair to Canada to place in the hands of the people in the old country statements that do not convey the full information they might reasonably expect. I think the hon. member for Dufferin is correct, that the wages per month applies only to say six months of the year.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. The figures which purport to give the rates of wages for farm hands and female servants, leaving out of consideration board and lodging, are very misleading. It is well known that all over the country farm hands and domestic servants get their board and lodging, and these are always taken into consideration in fixing wages. In the future compilation of these figures, I think it would be well to give the wages for six months in summer and the wages for six months in winter. This would convey a more accurate idea to the general public and those interested, and the fact that board and lodging are taken into consideration should be distinctly stated in publications bearing the stamp of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. In the Auditor General's Report, page E 9, I find this item: 'Amounts paid secretary treasurers of municipalities for lists of farmers, $1,074.74.' Did the minister send for lists to the secretary treasurers of all the municipalities, or were some favoured above others?

Mr. FISHER. I am informed that when the lists of farmers were being made up, the

secretary treasurers of municipalities were in many cases asked to supply lists. That was done only in Quebec and the maritime provinces, as we had the information for the other provinces.

Mr. BARR. How did you obtain that information for the other provinces ?

Mr. FISHER. We got it from the provincial governments.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Why could you not utilize the voters' lists in the different municipalities ?

Mr. FISHER. The voters' lists do not show who are farmers.

Mr. BARR. Why could you not get the lists for Quebec and the maritime provinces as well as Ontario ?

Mr. FISHER. The provincial governments in those provinces had no lists.

Mr. S. SHARPE. What would be the nature of the prosecutions in regard to the census ?

Mr. FISHER. I think they were for the refusal by some persons to give the information required by the Census Act.

Statistical Year Book, $6,000.

Mr. MONK. The subject of our Statistical Year-book is one which has been discussed every year for many years past. Ours is the most miserable Year-book published by any country, bar none. It is a wretched Year-book. Perhaps my hon. friend the minister will remember that several years ago we had a very long discussion in this House, in which the subject was threshed out completely. A member from Nova Scotia, Mr. Ross, who is now in the Senate, brought in all the year-books published by all the great British dependencies, and compared them, in regard to the printing, the forms, the manner in which they were prepared, with our own. In the year-books prepared in Australia and New Zealand, the information is carefully classified, and is given in a very pleasing form, which attracts the eye of the stranger. Our Year-book lacks all these elements It is as dry as the Public Accounts Blue-book

There is nothing grouped in it in such a manner as to attract attention. That is a defect which we ought to remove. $5,000 or $6,000 additional is nothing. We spend immense sums to attract immigrants. We make folders, we encourage newspapers, political friends of the government, to the tune of from $50,000 to $100,000 to publish absurd, useless information and we do not seem to be able, although this matter has been frequently discussed and criticised and protested against, to produce a good Year-book. Here is another point. Our Year-book is published very late. The one last published is that of 1907. We ought to have our Year-book of the last year published at the very beginning of the new year, and surely it is possible to have a staff sufficient and competent to collect all the information and have it published at the beginning of the year. Compare our Year-book with that of New Zealand. The latter has maps of the different parts of that country and photographs, and is a book which you could send to any one who desires information about that country. You cannot publish a proper book for $6,000—such a book as could be circulated in our schools and abroad. It is about time we made a new start in this matter, it is essential that a young growing country like ours, about which information is sought on all sides and by all classes of people, should publish a complete and interesting information on our possibilities and resources. Other countries take a pride in publishing Year-books infinitely superior to ours. What we are publishing is simply a waste of money.

Mr. BARR. If we go back four or five years, we find that the Year-book now published is not equal to what was then published. We then had the returns of other countries and a lot of other valuable information not given in the present publication. We either should publish a Year-book which we will not be ashamed to send out to those desiring information or not publish one at all. Would the Minister of Agriculture inform us how many were published in 1907 and when we may expect to get the Year-book of 1908?

Mr. FISHER. I am not at all convinced by my hon. friends of the advisability of doing what they suggest. Years ago our Year-book was increasing in bulk to such an extent as to contain a good deal of duplication of tables and a great deal of information about foreign countries not at all necessary for our purposes. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) says rightly that New Zealand published a very attractive pictorial volume, very much of the nature of a picture book, but I do not think that is what we ought to expect in a statistical year-book. And I know that the Commonwealth of Australia to-day has discarded that type of work and is now issuing a book of the same character as our own. The Year-books of European governments are of the same character as ours. They do not go into long descriptive accounts of the country, and voluminous dissertations on its industries. Such things are out of place in a statistical year-book. Such a book ought only to contain statistical information compiled so as to be available to the student who wants accurate information of that kind. That I think, we have accomplished. I do not think that the Canadian Year-book ought to be expected to contain information about other countries. That

information can be found in the Year-books of these countries.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Every one has not the opportunity of having access to the Year-book of other countries. A good deal of the information contained in former Year-books, which has been left out of the present edition, was of great convenience to students and others.

Mr. FISHER. If I were to adopt that suggestion. I would have to load down our Year-book to such an extent that it would be a volume no one would want to handle.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. That was not the case in the past.

Mr. FISHER. Our Year-book in 1896-1897 was a very bulky volume.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. A great deal better that the present one.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think so for the purpose for which it is printed. It may have had reading matter for people who want this class of reading, but it was not a useful and complete volume of statistical tables concerning our own country. I am sorry if hon. gentlemen do not agree with me in that. But my judgment in the matter was formed after a good deal of hesitation. And I find my opinion in accord with the practice of older countries in Europe and of the United States as well, for they issue year-books of the same character as ours. And, while Australia in days gone by, did as the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has explained, it has come round to our view, and to-day the latest Year-book from Australia is compiled and printed exactly on the line of our own. New Zealand, I think, issues such a year-book as was formerly issued, but I think I am safe in saying that it is the only country that does so. This seems to be confirmation of our judgment and practice in making our Year-book what it is.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) May I request that the Minister will make every possible effort to let us have as soon as possible the French edition of the Year Book. I will take advantage of the opportunity to request that he will also hasten the publication of the French copy of the report on Co-operative Associations.

Hon. Mr. FISHER. (Translation.) The last mentioned volume is under the control of the Minister of Labour. I shall, however, take care that the request of the hon. member for L'Islet is duly transmitted to him.

As for the Canadian Statistical Year Book, I may say that I have endeavoured to have the English and French copies sent to the Printing Bureau on the same day. In my Department I have issued instructions that all bulletins and reports are to be translated without delay and the English and French copies forwarded to the printer at the same time. It was found impossible to do this immediately, but I will endeavour to have the order carried out in the future.

Mr. MONK. I asked my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) a question which, I think, he has not answered. How is it that our Year-book comes out so late? The last Year-book out, I think, is the one of 1907. That is a year behind. Why cannot we have the Year-book at the beginning of the year, giving the results of the year just closed? If the minister holds that the Year-book should only give statistics alone, with nothing to please the eye, no maps, nothing which we saw in the Year-books from other countries displayed on the table, why should it take a year to produce it? Why cannot we have it as promptly as other statistical compilations?

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) knows that the Year-book is compiled from the reports of the different departments and statistical reports. It takes a little time to compile the figures after these reports are out.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. Some time ago I received a letter from one of my constituents asking me to ascertain the quantity of mica produced in Canada and the quantity exported. I sent the letter to the Department of Customs and received an answer from the commissioner giving me the quantity exported, but explaining that he could not give me the information as to the quantity produced in the country. I had a copy of the Year-book lying on my desk, and, opening it, I saw the heading: 'Mineral products by quantity and value.' So I sent my corespondent the Year-book. Meeting him on the street the other day I asked him if he had received it, and he said that he had, but that it gave him no information. He said it showed the quantity produced in 1901. But what is the use of publishing in 1908 the figures for 1901? Any other information that it had he had already received in the Trade and Commerce and other returns. If we are to have a Year-book, and if we are to have a bureau and a staff charged with the duty of compiling information for the use of the public, what is the good of republishing information from the census of 1901? We ought to have in the department information as to the products of mines right up to date and not only information eight years old. The gentleman who asked the information of me is a manufacturer in Gananoque, but he found that the Year-book gave him nothing but information which he already had.

Mr. FISHER. I speak subject to correction, but I think that if the gentleman had looked over other pages of the book he would have found information from the

Mines branch giving later information. The last authentic returns are those of the census of 1901, and they are put into the Year-book for that reason. But the Mines branch makes estimates and has returns every year, and I think I am right in saying that my hon. friend would have found compilation of these figures in the Year-book as well as that which he did find.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would not the reports of the Mines Departments of the various provincial governments give the information pretty well up to date?

Mr. SEALEY. I had the pleasure of presenting the recently published Year-book to the representative of a large financial institution in London, and, after looking it over for a time, he said that in the course of his business he became somewhat familiar with the Year-books of many countries, and the Canadian Year-book furnished the greatest information in the shortest and most convenient shape of any that he had seen.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Civil Service Commission, salaries, $30,575.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State). These estimates were before the House on a former occasion, and at the request of the Prime Minister were allowed to stand in order that certain corrections might be made. The salary of the secretary appears in the estimates as $3,050; this should be $2,900.

Mr. J. D. REID. In addition to admitting candidates to the Civil Service, does the Civil Service Commission control promotions in the different departments ?

Mr. MURPHY. There is a difference between appointment and promotion. The deputy head of a department recommends the promotion and the commission must grant their certificate approving of the promotion before it can be made.

Mr. J. D. REID. The commission must accept the deputy's recommendation ?

Mr. PATERSON. No, they are not bound to accept it.

Mr. J. D. REID. They examine the candidate before granting the certificate.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think they are bound to examine.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the commission anything to do with the outside service ?

Mr. MURPHY. No.

Mr. MONK. Have the Civil Service Commissioners laid before the government a general scheme setting forth the method of holding the examinations and their scheme of procedure ?

Mr. MURPHY. The commissioners are preparing a set of regulations to be laid before the government which I understand will form part of the report to be laid before the House. The commissioners have been in conference with the heads of several leading universities and other institutions for the purpose of securing a uniform standard for examinations throughout the country. They have not yet absolutely decided on that standard and for that reason the regulations have not been laid before the government. They have held examinations along lines laid down by themselves and from the candidates successful at these examinations they have recommended several candidates for the Civil Service.

Mr. MONK. I suppose we will have these regulations before the estimates are all passed ?

Mr. MURPHY. If they are submitted to the government in time they will be laid before the House. They will be given to the House at the earliest possible date.

Mr. J. D. REID. Will the commission recognize the certificates of those who passed before the introduction of the new Civil Service Act as a qualification ?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes. The commission have recently notified persons who have passed the examinations in times past to send in their names, addresses and dates of passing so that they will have a list ready.

Mr. J. D. REID. Will successful candidates be qualified without further examination ?

Mr. MURPHY. I cannot answer that.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Have the places at which examinations will be held been announced?

Mr. MURPHY. That is a matter within the discretion of the commissioners; they may select different places in the Dominion to suit the convenience of the public.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. There seems to be an unusually large staff. The commission did not get under way, did it?

Mr. MURPHY. They are just getting under way.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Are they to be located in Ottawa?

Mr. MURPHY. The headquarters are to be in Ottawa.

Mr. MONK. I do not like to press my hon. friend unduly, but I think the committee will admit that it would be more satis-

factory in voting these amounts for this new arrangement that is going into effect this year to have before us the regulations and plan upon which these commissioners intend to proceed. But we will take the assurance of my hon. friend on that point that we shall get them.

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. MONK. Therefore, we are passing this vote of $19,000 pretty much on the assumption that everything will be all right. I will call my hon. friend's attention, however, to this: There are two commissioners at $5,000 and a secretary at $3,050.

Mr. MURPHY. $2,900.

Mr. MONK. I was going to observe that it seemed a little high, but we will leave that. Then, there is one examiner at $900, one at $600, and one, Mr. DeCelles, at $600. These, I understand, will assist the commissioners to superintend the competition for entry into the Civil Service. But, I do not understand this: In subdivision B we have three other examiners at $800.

Mr. MURPHY. They are clerks employed in the office.

Mr. MONK. I understood these were examiners, and I was wondering why we wanted examiners in the different subdivisions.

Mr. MURPHY. They are not examiners; they do clerical work in the office of the commissioners in Ottawa. I might explain further that there was an error in the item to which my hon. friend has just drawn attention. The proof was corrected and the item should have been printed in accordance with that correction. That item of $2,100 should have gone into the item below, the first item under 'contingencies,' and it should have read:

Amount required to pay temporary examiners and to meet the cost of holding the different examinations required by law, $10,000.

These items should not have been separated and the total will be $2,250 less than as it appears here. Then the other items under 'civil government' relate solely to the Ottawa staff required by the commission.

Mr. MONK. Who is the secretary of the commission?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. William Foran, formerly secretary of the Board of Civil Service Examiners.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Is it the purpose to examine candidates individually or in a body in a hall?

Mr. MURPHY. I understand that examination papers are set and that the competitors write as they do at a University examination.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Then why the necessity of three examiners?

Mr. MURPHY. Because examinations are held simultaneously at different places, and these examiners are required to conduct them.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Will the same number of examinations be held each year as formerly?

Mr. MURPHY. The dates at which the examinations are to be held and the number of examinations are two of the matters before the commission. I do not think they are restricted as to places or dates. My understanding is that they intend to hold examinations more frequently than formerly.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Will the permanent examiners be kept on during the whole year or just at the time the examinations are being held?

Mr. MURPHY. Just at the time the examinations are being held. It is not the intention to have any permanent examiners. That item is incorrectly printed. It should have given the total amount for these examinations as $10,000. The wording of the item as it appears here was applicable to the former Board of Civil Service Examiners. There were permanent examiners attached to the board and this is a relic of the former system.

Mr. BARNARD. Do I understand the minister to say that it has not yet been decided where the examinations will be held?

Mr. MURPHY. The Civil Service Commissioners have not yet decided upon the number of places where examinations will be held.

Mr. BARNARD. I would ask the minister to bear in mind that there are a number of people in British Columbia and the west who would like to enter into this competition and some provision should be made to hold examinations in those provinces.

Mr. MURPHY. These are the matters that are engaging the attention of the Board and that is the reason why the regulations that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) referred to are not yet complete. It is to meet such contingencies that the regulations are being framed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How have the appointments been made since the 1st of September? The Act came into force on that date and after that date it was necessary to appoint to the inside service by competitive examination. Have all persons appointed since that date been appointed by competitive examination?

Mr. MURPHY. So I understand.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How has that been accomplished?

Mr. MURPHY. There were examinations held a couple of months ago, and I do not know of any appointments having been made prior to that. I understand that any appointments that were made were appointments based upon the result of those examinations.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the hon. gentleman know whether or not the old examinations have been utilized for that purpose?

Mr. MURPHY. I do not know to what extent the results of the former examinations have been utilized, but I am informed that a number of temporary clerks have been brought on for temporary work who had passed the previous examinations. A few moments ago I explained to another hon. gentleman that the Commission had inserted notices in the papers asking those that had previously passed the Civil Service Examination under the old board to send in their names, addresses and the dates upon which they had passed the examination, so that they might have them for reference.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are there not records of these examinations in the department and in the hands of the present Civil Service Examiners?

Mr. MURPHY. There are.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So that I suppose they could have been resorted to for the purpose pending the holding of new examinations? I do not know whether it would be in strict compliance with the statute or not, but in default of anything better it would have been wise to have utilized them.

Mr. PATERSON. I have had one experience with reference to the new Act. An officer died in one of our branches and the vacancy had to be filled. In accordance with the wishes of the commissioners, the deputy of the department addressed a communication to them stating that we required another clerk in subdivision B, or whatever it was—I think in the class running from $800 to $1,000. He expressed a wish that they would give him a name of a clerk, stating that he would have to do accounting work and suggesting that he should be good at figures and have a retentive memory. They simply, from the records now before them, I suppose, selected a young man and sent him to us. We do not pass an outside clerk making the appointment. The commissioners decide on the person who is to be appointed, they notify the Auditor General, and he comes on without any outside clerk being passed. He must have three months' trial. The deputy cannot object to him until he has had three months' trial, then if he finds he cannot do the work, he must within six months notify the commissioners that he is incompetent for the work and they give us another person. But, if the deputy does not notify them within six months that the person they have sent is incompetent he becomes permanent.

Mr. J. D REID. Who are the other permanent examiners? I see there is one gentleman named.

Mr. MURPHY. These were the old examiners. The other two were Dr. J. C. Glashan, Inspector of Public Schools in Ottawa, and Dr. Thorburn.

Mr. J. D. REID. Do they act in a body or does each go to a different place and hold an examination?

Mr. MURPHY. They go as directed by the Board.

Mr. J. D. REID. They go individually to hold an examination

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. And the papers are examined by these men and the result sent to the commissioners?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. GOODEVE. Do I understand that the $900 and the $600 respectively are paid to these men for holding an examination half-yearly?

Mr. MURPHY. I do not know that it is correct to say that these gentlemen will only hold semi-annual examinations. I understand the examinations are to be held more frequently than formerly and held in different provinces so as to give a larger number a chance to compete. I cannot speak with exactitude at the moment, but I understand these gentlemen do perform other duties than merely attending at the examinations.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. They perform other duties besides that?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, and it is not the intention to have these men permanent as was the case under the old system. They will be selected by the commissioners from time to time, and this vote is to provide funds to pay these gentlemen.

Mr. GOODEVE. Then am I to understand that no matter how many examinations are held the total salaries will be $600 and $900 respectively?

Mr. MURPHY. These were the salaries received by the examiners on the old board.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE. Did I understand that these examiners were to be sent from one province to another to hold examinations?

Mr. MURPHY. I understand that is the intention.

Mr. WARBURTON. The system formerly was that the examination papers were pre-

pared in Ottawa and sent to the local examiners in different cities in the Dominion, where the examinations were held. The papers were sent in a sealed package, and the work of the local examiners was merely to watch the candidates. When the answers were written by the candidates they were sealed and returned to Ottawa where they were passed on by the examiners. The secretary of the school board in Charlottetown was the examiner under the former system, but he had nothing to do with preparing the papers or with passing on the candidates' answers after they were written. I understand that a similar system will be followed in future. I had a conversation with Professor Shortt the other day, and I gathered that the intention is, instead of having only one examination each November, to have an examination in November and another in May. I had occasion to see the commissioners to make inquiry in connection with a young man who was trying to get an appointment, and I found that in the case of a young man from my own province, a vacancy occurred in one of the departments in Ottawa, and that the young man, who had come out highest in the examination, was notified that he would get the appointment if he chose to take it. In this case the candidate who had received the highest number of marks did not accept the position, and I understand the appointment was given to the candidate who stood next highest in marks. That seems to be a very fair system. Hon. gentlemen will remember that formerly there used to be what was known as the Gilchrist Scholarship of £100 sterling under which from year to year a number of very eminent Canadian students —amongst others President Schurman of Cornell University—went to the University of London and many of these took very prominent positions in the educational world. In the case of the Gilchrist Scholarship the papers were sent out from London to the different examiners in the different provinces in Canada, and they were opened in the presence of the candidates and of one or two gentlemen who were called examiners but who were really present for the purpose of seeing that the examinations were properly conducted. The answers, were written by the students, and as in the case of the Civil Service examination. they were sealed up and returned to London, where the marks were awarded. I understand it is the intention of our Civil Service examiners to conduct the examinations in that way in future, but under the new system the man who gets the highest number of marks will be offered the position, while formerly if a candidate passed the examination he might be appointed irrespective of his standing, or indeed he might be appointed to a position and pass his examination afterwards.

Mr. J. D. REID. It is a pity the minister was not able to give us that explanation.

Mr. WARBURTON.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. If these permanent examiners are to be sent from place to place, what is the necessity for temporary examiners?

Mr. MURPHY. I understand there will be no permanent examiners in the sense that they were permanent under the old system. I shall, with the permission of the House, read the explanation that has been made to me:—

The scheme of competitive examination provided by the Civil Service Act will necessitate the employment of many outside examiners who will be entrusted with the preparation of questions and the marking of the candidates' papers, and the expenditure for this work alone will be considerable, especially as it is proposed to hold the general competitive examinations twice a year.

In addition to this there will be the remuneration to the presiding examiners and their assistants at some eighteen centres throughout the Dominion, as well as the rent to be paid for halls and the necessary furniture to equip them for examination purposes. Then again it is not improbable that a number of special technical examinations will be required during the year, for which the services of outside examiners will be utilized, and which will entail some expense. While the commission can only estimate approximately what the cost will be for the different services during the first year under the new system, it is fully expected that the amount asked for will be required.

It is hoped before the close of the next fiscal year to submit for the approval of the Governor in Council a regular tariff of charges for the different services required under the new Act.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I do not see what difference it makes whether you call them permanent examiners or what you call them. I want to know what these men do for the salaries of $900 and $600, and the distinction between them, and what are called temporary examiners?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is another thing that I would like the hon. gentleman to explain at the same time, that is, whether or not the scheme is the same as the hon. member for Queens, Prince Edward Island, has explained, or the one that he himself has explained, because they are entirely different. The scheme which has hitherto prevailed, as far as I understand the explanation which was given, is that the papers have all been marked by a central body of examiners at Ottawa. The scheme outlined in the memorandum which the Secretary of State has read refers to a system of marking at different places by examiners appointed for those places. That is a very different thing, and we would like to know definitely just how that is going to work out. If you have a system of competitive examinations, how will you work out the scheme of having papers marked by twelve or eighteen different examiners throughout the country? The system of

marking cannot be precisely the same. Of course, I speak with a great deal of deference, so far as the proposal is concerned, because no doubt the Civil Service Examiners have bestowed a great deal of consideration upon it. That, however, would strike me as an initial difficulty. I do not understand at the present moment how the system will be worked out, and would be glad to have further explanations.

Mr. MURPHY. I do not know that the actual marking will be done at the outside places.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If I caught the memorandum correctly, it did say that.

Mr. MURPHY. It provides that the outside examiners shall be entrusted with putting the questions and marking the examination papers. Then it goes on to indicate that the presiding examiners may have assistance at these different centres. That is the only information I have on the subject.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I would like to have an answer to my question.

Mr. MURPHY. I do not observe that it is the intention of the commission to make any difference between permanent and temporary. As I have already explained, the term permanent examiners is a misprint, and should not have appeared.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Section 11 of the Civil Service Act contains this provision :

The present civil service examiners shall continue to hold office during pleasure and shall be under direction of the commission.

As I understand, under this provision, the three Civil Service Examiners continue in office during pleasure.

Mr. MURPHY. Messrs. DeCelles, Thorburn and Glashan are the three gentlemen who form that board, I do not understand that it is the intention to continue them for any length of time, but it is intended to select such gentlemen as may be available for the purposes of these examinations—not necessarily these three gentlemen.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This item refers to these three gentlemen, does it not ?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Up to the present time it has evidently been the pleasure of the government to continue these three men in office. My hon. friends on the treasury benches do not seem to be familiar with their own orders in council, because I find in a return brought down to-day an order in council of the 16th of October, which, after reciting that the Civil Service Commissioners are engaged in formulating a code of rules and regulations for competitive examinations, provides :

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Secretary of State, acting on the advice of the Civil Service Commissioners, is pleased to order and it is hereby ordered, in order that the interests of the public service may not suffer, and in order that everything may be done in compliance with the strict requirements of the law, that until such time as the rules and regulations above indicated are established by the Governor in Council, the ordinary entrance examinations or their equivalent, heretofore accepted for the inside service, and still required for the outside service, shall be the test for the employment of clerks in the third division of the inside service as prescribed by the said amending Act; it being nevertheless distinctly understood that, even in this interim arrangement, the competitive system shall prevail in such entrance examinations, that is to say, that those having the highest percentages in passing the entrance examinations in question shall be given the preference in appointments made as above set forth.

That is what I suggested a moment ago might very properly have been done. I am finding no fault with the order in council, but I think we might have had the explanation given a little more fully, so that we could have understood what the situation was.

Mr. MURPHY. I may say that I was not in office when that order in council was passed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was not finding fault with the hon. gentleman any more than the other ministers.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if the examiners just referred to have anything to do with examining applicants for positions in the permanent force; for I see at page 52 of the estimates an item of $700 to pay Civil Service Examiners for examining applicants for commission in the permanent force.

Mr. FISHER. I can give no explanation of that. It must be some arrangement in the Militia Department to employ the old Civil Service Examiners; but it is not under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Is this $700 appropriated for this service included in the salaries of the examiners ?

Mr. FISHER. It must be extra pay.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I fully agree with the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. S. Sharpe) that twelve men appear to be a very large number to examine persons for positions in the Civil Service. I should think that three or four at the outside could accomplish that work. Here is a staff of twelve men which is going to cost the country about $30,000 a year. It is simply an outrage.

Mr. PATERSON. They are the masters—the absolute masters now.

Mr. J. D. REID. What is the average number of new appointments made each year in the Civil Service.

Mr. MURPHY. I cannot give that information.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE. How many in your own department?

Mr. MURPHY. There have not been any that I am aware of.

Mr. J. D. REID. According to the statements of some of the ministers the other evening, there were in the last year only five or six appointments in each of their departments. If there are, say ten or eleven departments, with an average of five or six appointments during the year in each, that would mean some 60 new appointments and it is going to cost $30,000 per year simply to examine applicants to fill that number of positions. Surely the Secretary of State must have an estimate of how many vacancies there are to fill each year on an average.

Mr. MURPHY. I can only answer for my own department, and there were none in it last year.

Mr. FISHER. I should say, speaking offhand, there are in the neighbourhood of 150 new appointments each year. I am simply making a statement from what I know from experience in the last ten years.

Mr. J. D. REID. Will the Secretary of State agree to give us, on some other estimate, a memorandum showing how many vacancies there were in each department during the year 1908, and the number of vacancies and new positions that were filled?

Mr. MURPHY. I shall try to get that at the earliest date posible.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Taking the statement of the Minister of Agriculture that there were probably 150 vacancies filled last year, along with the commission he engaged in making the selections.

Mr. FISHER. The commission have a year's work to do before they can get the lists from which to select those people. They have to hold examinations all over the country. They have to prepare the papers and organize the examinations and under the new Act they have to prepare special examinations for technical officers and others. So that they not only have to hold two large examinations once every six months, of the ordinary class of applicant, but also special examinations. I have myself three cases in which I shall have to apply to the commissioners in a very few days for examination for officers, and in each case there will have to be special papers drawn and opportunity will have to be given to every one in Canada to compete, just the same as if there were a hundred positions to be filled.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Are the examinations held in dierent provinces ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, if one clerk has to be appointed, opportunity must be given everyone throughout the Dominion to compete.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps my hon. friend could explain a matter I inquired about some time ago. Is it proposed that there shall be certain papers sent and that the answers of the candidates shall be marked by the examiners in different cities and different parts of the country?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot give an absolute answer. The same examination papers will be used everywhere and will be prepared and sent to wherever the examinations are going to take place just as in the old examinations. I cannot say whether the answers are all sent in to the central body here to pass upon, but I think that will be the case.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I received a contrary impression from the memorandum given by the Secretary of State, and I thought that possibly the Minister of Agriculture would be able to speak definitely upon the subject.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it the intention of the commission to apportion the appointments from the different provinces according to population? In the United States the appointments are made to the Civil Service from the different states in proportion to their population.

Mr. FISHER. There is no such provision in the Civil Service Act.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I would like a little better explanation in answer to the question I put. You can say that this item is wrong, if you like, but if you take the two items you will find they make a total of $10,000. If this item is wrong, why is one of these men put down at $900 and the other at $600?

Mr. MURPHY. This item was in continuance of the practice that prevailed under the old plan of Civil Service examination. The intention is, and should have been carried out, to strike out that item, a lump sum of $10,000 being asked for to hold these examinations here and in the eighteen centres referred to in the memorandum.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. But that does not explain why one man is given $900 and one man $600.

Mr. FISHER. One of these men is Dr. Glashan, inspector of schools for Ottawa. Not being a member of the Civil Service, he was given $600. The others are members

of the Civil Service and they were given $600 for one and $900 for the other.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What were his duties?

Mr. FISHER. Their duties were to prepare the papers for examinations, send them out and examine and mark them when they came back.

Mr. J. D. REID. It cost $2,100 before, and it will cost us $30,000 hereafter.

Mr. FISHER. Besides the examinations, we have the services of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Is it the intention to have the Civil Service examining body carry on examinations for the various branches of the service? For instance, there is a vote to be proposed of $11,000 for examination of masters and mates. I understand this does not now come under the Civil Service any more than the examinations for the permanent force, but I understand there has been a great deal of abuse in connection with this examination.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. A. Currie) is wandering from the item before us.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I simply ask whether this central body will carry on these various examinations.

Mr. FISHER. The Civil Service Commissioners, operating under the Act of last session, do not conduct examinations for the outside service.

Mr. MONK. I do not wish to delay the committee, but it seems to me that we are asked to vote this money pretty much in the dark. Many of the questions which we are compelled to ask would have been unnecessary if somebody had done the preparatory work showing why the money is asked for. We ought to have the regulations prepared by these commissioners. I do not wish to delay the Secretary of State unduly, but I would like to ask him when, as a matter of fact, we are to have these regulations, so that we may see exactly what the new commission intends doing. For instance, my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) asked a very pertinent question, whether any distribution was provided for as between the different provinces of those who were to enter the service, as had been provided in the United States when they began to do what we have undertaken—to give the preference to merit instead of to political patronage in Civil Service appointments. The minister says there is nothing provided in that regard. Is that absolutely so? It might happen that, for instance, Prince Edward Island would find within it so much talent that the 150 candidates necessary every year would come out of that province, and such large provinces as Quebec and Ontario would get nothing. Surely that is a point which the Civil Service Commissioners have considered. Or are we to understand that there is to be no apportionments as between the different provinces, merit being equal? We all know what the former Civil Service examination amounted to. The Secretary of State (Mr. Murphy) knows it very well. Heaps of men were piled up in the Civil Service without examination, but with the understanding that they would submit to examination later on. The Civil Service examination has become practically a dead letter. Since we are now adopting a step forward, and making a reform, we would like to make sure that it is really going to be carried out as intended.

Mr. FISHER. If I may take it upon myself to answer : I said there was no provision in the Act such as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) speaks of. When the Act was going through parliament, the question was more or less discussed. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) was present, and I do not remember that he proposed to put such a provision in the Act.

Mr. MONK. No, certainly.

Mr. FISHER. Then, I suppose he did not wish it to be put in. In his remarks, it seems to me, he is thinking more of patronage than of the good of the service. It seems to me that it does not matter much whether one province or another gets a little more patronage under the Civil Service Act, but it does matter a great deal that the best men should go into the service, and that is the object of reform, that is the object of competitive examination. I think the Act will carry out the intention we had in passing it.

Mr. MONK. I must say, Mr. Chairman, that I never had a more senseless answer to a reasonable question. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) seems to have patronage on the brain. I never spoke of enforcing any special enactment as to that. Nobody knows better than my hon. friend that there are a great many administrative measures that are not introduced into Acts and it seems to me it is perfectly proper for us at this stage, when we are voting the money necessary to have this Act put into execution, to ask if those who are going to carry it out have given that particular feature of the case some consideration. My hon. friend will not say that when the American people started out to accomplish a reform far greater than any that we have accomplished here, they did not display some wisdom in finding that they had to attribute a certain number of civil servants to each state. That is not put in the statute but it is a matter for consideration.

Mr. FISHER. That is in the American statute.

Mr. MONK. I doubt it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It is.

Mr. MONK. We are spending a large sum for the reform of the Civil Service and it is fair to ask if the consideration has been given to the attribution of the civil servants to the provinces of the Dominion in a certain proportion. For instance if a man from Quebec disappears from the Civil Service, will his successor be nominated from that province or will merit only govern? I am not advocating one side or the other but ask whether that point has been considered by the government or the commissioners. The answer of the Minister of Agriculture is that there is nothing in the law. If the committee think that is a satisfactory answer I do not. Can the minister give an approximate date when we will have before the House the regulations that will govern the proceedings of the commission?

Mr. MURPHY. Since the hon. member made his inquiry I find that these regulations will be available within a week and I will have pleasure in presenting them to the House. I move that the item of $3,050, salary of the secretary, be reduced by $150, that the item of $2,100 for permanent examiners be struck out, and that the resolution be amended accordingly.

Mr. MONK. I would not consent to the adoption of the item unless assured by the minister that we shall have an opportunity of discussing the regulations.

Mr. MURPHY. Certainly.

Mr. J. D. REID. There is a difference of opinion between the Minister of Agriculture and the Secretary of State. As I understand the Secretary of State, the examinations will take place at eighteen different places, and whoever holds the examination will examine the papers, decide the number of marks of the candidates at these points, and on the number of marks sent in for each candidate, the commissioners will decide the special qualifications that he possesses. The Minister of Agriculture's statement is entirely the opposite. He states that the papers will be sealed up, sent in to Ottawa, and examined by the commissioners.

Mr. FISHER. I think my hon. friend misapprehended me. I said that they would be sealed up and passed on by the commissioners, but as to whether they would be passed upon by the examiners at different places I did not know.

Mr. J. D. REID. But the Secretary of State has a memorandum from the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MONK.

Mr. FISHER. If he has, that is all right.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then I understand that is to be final, and that what the Minister of Agriculture stated is not correct?

Mr. FISHER. I am not going to set up my opinion against the Board of Civil Service Examiners.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then that, I understand, is to be final?

Mr. HUGHES. Is there any provision for accepting the degree of a university or a teacher's certificate in lieu of an examination?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. HUGHES. Why not?

Mr. FISHER. That was decided by parliament last session.

Mr. HUGHES. It is not too late to reform.

Resolution as amended agreed to.

Civil government—Post Office Department—Salaries, $488,944.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). This item last year amounted to $376,831.25. This year it is $488,944. The explanation for this increase is as follows:—Increases in the salaries of certain employees raised from the minimum of their respective classes under the Civil Service Act of last year, $57,836; 18 additional employees made permanent under the provisions of the amendment to the Civil Serivce Act of last year, $57,836; 18 additional clerkships and 6 additional messengers, packers and sorters, $24,800; 20 increases of $100 each, $2,000; 442 increases of $50 each, $22,100; 3 increases of $46 each, $138; increases in provisional allowance, $650. I will take each item separately. First, let us take the Post Office Department, 1st division, subdivision A. There is the deputy head, Dr. Coulter, raised from $4,000 to $5,000. I need not give any explanation as to that as it was fixed by statute last year. The officers in Class A are all heads of branches of the department and have a large staff under them.

Mr. TAYLOR. How does the superintendent of correspondence come to get a raise of $1,000 ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. He had a salary at $1,950 and besides he had an allowance of $600 as my private secretary making $2,250. He now loses the allowance of $600 and he becomes head of the correspondence branch so that the increase to Mr. Verret is only $350.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is this a new office ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes; it was recommended by Dr. Coulter.

Mr. J. D. REID. The fact remains that you have actually increased his salary $950.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the minister made any new appointments in connection with this great boon of free rural mail delivery which he has conferred on the people?

Mr. LEMIEUX. In the province of Quebec Mr. Bolduc the chief inspector and in Ontario Mr. Ross, superintendent of post offices in Toronto, have been appointed heads of this service. In each province the inspector will be in charge of that branch of the service.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. There have been no new appointments made in Ottawa in connection with that service ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. And there are not likely to be any.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. There would appear to be an increase of ten officials under this vote.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The business of the department has expanded considerably and we have had to appoint some new officials to cope with it. Mr. Moon has been promoted to be chief clerk; some fifteen years ago he was secretary to the then Postmaster General and I think he acted as secretary for Sir John Macdonald also. He is a very effieient officer and we thought he should be promoted. Mr. Martin an old and deserving official has also been appointed to a chief clerkship on the special recommendation of the deputy postmaster general.

Mr. GOODEVE. The superintendent of correspondence received last year $1,950 and he apparently found time to act as private secretary to the minister for which he received $600 in addition. This year he has dropped that additional duty. In other words, while he does less work than before, his salary is increased by $350.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If the facts were as stated, I would say that my hon. friend had made a very good case. But I must explain that last year Mr. Verret, my private secretary, was a chief clerk as well. My hon. friend knows that the Post Office Department is naturally a department of letters. Every morning we receive heaps of letters from every section of the country, some addressed to the Postmaster General officially, and some in my name. The sorting and distribution of all these letters has to be done by a man who knows the business of the department. Of course, we have some French settlements in the maritime provinces, we have the province of Quebec, and we have many French people in the west, and if my hon. friend will consult the Civil Service List, he will find that I have not one officer in the higher ranks of the department speaking and writing in French and capable of attending to and preparing answers to the correspondence in French. Mr. Verret, while acting as my private secretary, was assisted by four subsecretaries in attending to the correspondence. Now he will not have to do that work, but will be confined to the superintendence of correspondence in the department. I must have a first-class officer who is well versed in the two languages, and he is the only one out of twelve who is fully qualified for that work. He is a very competent and good officer, and I need him.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Will the minister explain to the House what his total salary was last year and what it is this year?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Last year is was $2,550; this year it is $2,900.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I would like to ask the Postmaster General if it is the policy of the department to maintain the sale of stamps as a monopoly. In the city of Toronto stamps could formerly be purchased from licensed persons all over the city. Now the sale is confined to the various branch post offices, where stamps can only be obtained during office hours.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The sale of stamps is a public utility, and the government alone can sell them. As a matter of fact, we have not reduced the number of licenses in the city of Toronto. Whenever the members apply for licenses in their respective constituencies, I am only too pleased to grant them, provided the licensees are a certain distance from each other. If my hon. friend will assign any of these licenses in his constituency, I shall be only too glad to comply with his request.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the minister any officer whose duty it is to examine into the literature that is coming into our country? Last session I called his attention to a number of undesirable publications coming into Canada, and I understood that some of them are coming in still in large numbers, as well as many others. The minister, by reducing the rate of postage to Great Britain has opened the door to a class of literature that is anything but of an elevating nature, while at the same time he has shut the door to the very best kind of literature coming from the United States. Our people are compelled to pay at least 50 cents a year for each monthly or weekly coming in, and at the same time he has placed on the weekly papers of Canada a ban that practically prevents them from having in the United States the circulation which they had for a number of years. I notice that the minister has made arrangements whereby these papers can go in to the United

States a little more conveniently than they could some time ago. I would like to ask him if he intends to continue the same arrangement that he had last year in regard to periodicals from the United States and in regard to Canadian weeklies going into the United States.

Mr. LEMIEUX. As regards undesirable literature coming from England, I may say that during my recent trip to England I had an interview with the Postmaster General of Great Britain, Mr. Buxton, and I had with me the Hansard of last session, wherein my hon. friend referred to certain very undesirable periodicals coming into this country. Mr. Buxton answered by showing me a leaflet published by the Post Office Department of Great Britain, giving the names of the only periodicals which were authorized to come under the arrangement arrived at between the Canadian Post Office Department and the British Post Office Department. I know that the British Postmaster General is not willing to give to the undesirable papers the privilege which the legitimate periodicals have received through that arrangement, and I am sure, from the assurances that I have received from our officers and from numbers of the clergy of all denominations, that these undesirable periodicals have ceased to come through the mails. However, it is impossible to prevent them filtering in, for though they do not come by the Post Office Department, they may slip in through the Customs Department. I do not wish to shield myself behind my hon friend the Minister of Customs. We all know that as far as moral and sound literature is concerned, he is immune against any attacks that can be made upon him. I am sure he takes all the necessary precautions to protect this country against such undesirable literature. At any rate he has assured me that he has done so in the past. As regards the other question, the rates between the United States and Canada, I think we had better postpone to another occasion the very interesting discussion which no doubt we shall have on that matter. I may say however, that the weekly press have practically ceased sending protests. We have established at several points on the frontier, with the consent of the Washington authorities, means of sending the weeklies at the old rate, and since a few months, I have not received any protests.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Has my hon. friend received a petition from the post office inspectors to be placed in the inside service? And is he disposed to regard it favourably?

Mr LEMIEUX. I have, but I would not like to speak for the government on this point. Last year, when my hon. colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, introduced the new Civil Service Act, he said it would first apply to the inside service at Ottawa, and that later on we would bring under the operation of the Act a number of officers. I would be quite willing to have the post office inspectors come under that Act, and have had applications to that effect, not only from the inspectors, but from the ordinary clerks and lower grades of the service as well. The outside service are quite willing to come under the operation of the Act, and also receive the bounty received by the inside service

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Is the hon. minister considering the advisability of raising the rate of interest in the post office savings banks?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is a question hardly proper to discuss under this item.

Mr. LEMIEUX. At all events we shall await the return of the Finance Minister.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. I give the hon. gentleman notice that I shall bring it up in another way.

Mr. LEMIEUX. When my hon. colleague (the Minister of Finance) returns, I presume that question would be discussed.

Mr. MONK. I would remind my hon. friend that the letter carriers of Montreal have petitioned his department for an increase in pay. I do not want to go into the merits of their demand just at present, but my hon. friend is aware that these men are getting very small pay for the work they do. Living in Montreal and having to pay the rent and taxes which prevail there and the schooling of their children, and the variety of expenses which only occur, or occur in a much larger degree in large cities like Toronto and Montreal compared with smaller places, their pay of $1.50 to $2 per day for the responsible work they have to do in all sorts of weather is very inadequate. They perform their duties faithfully and are well entitled to an increase, and I am sure that my hon. friend, who has made several improvements in the service in the city of Montreal, will consider favourably their petition.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I cannot say more at present than that the matter is under my very serious consideration just now.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Might I ask which official of the Post Office Department had to do with the extension of free delivery in the cities? We in New Westminster, encouraged by the statement of the Postmaster General a couple of years ago that he contemplated an extension of free delivery not only to the smaller cities, but to the tows as well, have been petitioning the department for an extension of that service

to New Westminister. In the meantime we have seen the service extended to other places with lower standards of population and revenue—for instance Three Rivers and St. Hyacinthe.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What is the population and what is the revenue of New Westminster ?

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Our population is something over 12,000, and our revenue considerably over $20,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am very glad my hon. friend has brought to my attention the case of New Westminister. I did not know it had a population of 12,000 and a revenue of over $20,000. If such be the case, I invite my hon. friend to my office, and he will be given letter carriage in that city. The rule we have adopted is that wherever there is a population of 12,000 and a revenue of at least $20,000, that city will be entitled to free delivery.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I have a statement from the mayor of New Westminster, and I believe it was sent to the department, of an official census, showing the population of New Westminster to be 12,198, and that the revenue is over $20,000 is established by the official reports.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If you have the population and the revenues and your city will number the streets, it will not take fifteen days before it gets letter carrier delivery.

Post Office Department—Contingencies (including $50 a year to pay W. Cooch for inspecting letter carriers' boots) $65,755.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is an increase here of $14,000. It is made up of: Printing, $11,000; sundries, $3,200. The increase in the amount of printing is due to the increase of the business of the department. A part is the printing of the forms and pamphlet which I shall distribute in a few days to hon. members in explanation of, and for carrying on, the rural mail delivery service. Out of the item of sundries, we pay for newspapers, telegrams, telephones, washing towels, travelling expenses of officers on duty and various other items.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Does the Postmaster General intend to establish free mail delivery wherever it is petitioned for ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly—according to the principles of the Post Office Department. I will explain that in a few days. Of course, it will be on existing stage routes. It will be established as we receive requests,—we are not going to differentiate.

Mr. BARR. Will any particular number be required on the petition ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Of course, we cannot give free rural mail delivery for one individual. But, generally speaking, where twenty farmers——

Mr. BARR. And they must agree to take the boxes ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Of course, the letters could not be received otherwise.

Mr. BARR. And for a box $3 is to be paid?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. BARR. Any other expense ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No. The box becomes the property of the person who pays for it.

Mr. HUGHES. Why does the minister call this 'free mail delivery'?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is free.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is this printing of which the minister speaks done by tender ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Our printing is all done by the Government Printing Bureau, but, of course, we have to pay the Secretary of State. In other things, we buy nothing except by tender.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The Postmaster General of course, is aware that the American Bank Note Company do business with his department to the amount of $60,000 or $70,000 a year.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is a special contract which covers not only the printing of stamps but also the printing of the Dominion notes. That contract is with the Minister of Finance. It was made, I believe, in 1897, and has been renewed once or twice since then.

Arts, agriculture and statistics—Statistical Year-book, $6,000.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. We will have to have a lot of discussion on that. Why not take item 7, Department of Public Printing and Stationery?

Mr. FISHER. We were discussing this Year-book before dinner, and we had better dispose of the item, I think.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. We have the Secretary of State (Mr. Murphy) here, and it would be better to take this item of Public Printing and Stationery and adjourn at a reasonable hour, especially seeing this is private members dav. There are a few of our friends investigating the Year-book, and they are not prepared to discuss it tonight.

Mr. FISHER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. George Taylor) to say that the gentlemen about him want further time to consider this and to look up the facts? If so, I would not prevent them. If they wish to study the Year-book, by all means let them do so. Let us take another item—the vote for exhibitions.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. That is worse; take something easy.

Arts, agriculture and statistics—Exhibitions $75,000.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Does this include the $50,000 given annually for the Dominion exhibition ?

Mr. FISHER. No, this is for foreign exhibitions.

Mr. BARR. How many exhibitions are provided for in this vote ?

Mr. FISHER. One—that at Seattle next summer.

Mr. BARR. Was there a grant to the exhibition in Scotland last year?

Mr. FISHER. We spent some money upon our own exhibit at an exhibition in Edinburgh; we do not give any grants to foreign exhibitions.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the minister give the names of the officers who were at the Dublin and Edinburgh exhibitions?

Mr. MONK. I would like to have also the list of those who represented Canada at the Anglo-French exhibition, with the salaries or allowances given to each one.

Mr. FISHER. The exhibition at Dublin was two years ago, so I have not the details of that here. The same staff, to a large extent, looked after our interests at the Anglo-French and the Edinburgh exhibitions. They were as follows:

Name.	Salary.	Per diem Allowance.
	$	$ cts.
William Hutchison, permanent Exhibition Commissioner	3,000	20 00
H. Hains, stenographer and secretary.	1,200	5 00
E. Girardot	1,200	5 00
W. D. Dalglish	1,200	3 50
A. W. Despard, Edinburgh	1,200	3 50
S. Anderson	1,200	3 50
J. O. Turcotte	1,080	3 00
H. B. Fitzsimon	1,080	3 00
Miss R. J. Barrett, superintendent needlework	$3 per day	3 00
T. H. Race, Edinburgh	$5 "	5 00
A. W. Tolmie, London	1,200	5 00

	Salary and Expenses.
S. C. Lacroix, London	$7 per day.
W. F. Barnes, London	$7 "
E. Poulin, London	$7 "
Robt. Dechesnes, London	$7 "
L. E. Annis, Edinburgh	$7 "
M. Turriff, Edinburgh	$7 "
J. M. Lapierre, London	$7 "

There was also the honorary commissioner to the Anglo-French exhibition, the Hon. Mr. G. TAYLOR.

Arthur Boyer, who was allowed $15 a day with no salary.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. For what exhibition is this amount intended next year ?

Mr. FISHER. The Yukon-Alaska exhibition at Seattle.

Mr. MONK. Would the minister give the details of the estimate?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Hutchison, the chief commissioner, has gone to Seattle. He informed me before leaving that he expected the building would cost a little under $20,000 and that the present staff, with the exception of three or four, will be required, but I have not his definite report as to which should be continued and which left off.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. What is the nature of the exhibition, is it international or state or a county fair?

Mr. FISHER. It is intended to include the whole Pacific coast of America. The invitation to Canada to participate was accepted on very strong representations from British Columbia and the Yukon. Other countries bordering on the Pacific ocean are also invited to exhibit and I understand are accepting.

Mr. JAMESON. Does not the minister think that the allowance of $20 a day to Mr. Hutchison, who receives $3,000 salary, is rather liberal? During 275 days of the year Mr. Hutchison drew at the rate of $20 a day or $5,500, and then there appears to have been a term of abstinence or rigid economy, 90 days, during which he was allowed only $10 a day. What is the explanation of these two allowances?

Mr. FISHER. The $20 a day is allowed Mr. Hutchison during the period when he is actually on the ground of an exhibition. Of course, while representing Canada at the exhibition he has to take his share with commissioners from other countries and give entertainments and receive the guests of Canada at these exhibitions. As for the days when he is allowed $10, that is during the time that he was abroad working on an exhibition, but not having to do this entertaining, because the exhibition was not running and there were no other commissioners there and no people coming who would expect to be entertained by the representative of Canada.

Mr. JAMESON. Has there ever been any system whereby instead of guaranteeing a per diem allowance, Bills were sent in as representing the cost of entertaining visitors or distinguished persons with whom the commissioner might find it advisable to come into contact. Is there any basis upon which this $20 per diem allowance is fixed?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, years ago when Canada had exhibits at the Chicago Exhibition, and, later on, at the Paris Exhibition and some others, that was the system. It was found to be very unsatisfactory. There were all sorts of petty little details appearing which were made fun of and created debate in the House and in the country which was felt to be quite unnecessary and quite undignified. The feeling was that the system should be changed and in the case of a man like Mr. Hutchison, who is not known probably to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, but who is known well to the older members of this House, there is no suggestion of thought that he does not spend the money exactly in the way in which it is intended.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the minister what system is followed in dealing with the accounts of the exhibition commissioner, and how it happens that accounts for 1905 are only being dealt with in the volume of the Auditor General's Report now before us, three years after the expenditure has been incurred?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot give an explanation off-hand, but I suppose there were some accounts held over for discussion, or something of that kind or perhaps they did not send in proper vouchers and the accountant in the department refused to pass them.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I was prompted to ask that question by the minister's statement that we should take the fact that this money has been spent by Mr. Hutchison as a sufficient warranty for us to pass this vote without further inquiry, but on looking over this volume of the Auditor General's Report, I see the following:

Wm. Hutchison, commissioner, living allowance, March 27 to December 31, 1905, 279 days at $20.

That is his living alowance for 1905. It appears in the Auditor General's Report three years later, and it is not a reasonable supposition that Mr. Hutchison went without the money during these three years.

Mr. FISHER. Without the details of the accounts of 1907, I can only imagine that it was an open account which ran along and which eventually was settled by Mr. Hutchison?

Mr. J. D. REID. How is that if he was paid $20 a day?

Mr. FISHER. I need not say to my hon. friend that if he was over on the other side of the Atlantic he might not have drawn the full amount that was due to him, but that the matter was settled up finally and the accounts closed three years later. I have no other explanation to give of it at present.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. There must be some further explanation than has been given to the committee. This item on the face of it bears evidence of having been the subject of serious discussion in the department. But, to proceed, I read here:—

Less cost of banquet $670.05, paid in 1904-5.

I think there is something about this item which ought to be explained.

Mr. FISHER. I have an explanation to give my hon. friend which has just been given to me. Mr. Hutchison gave a large banquet to his fellow-commissioners at Liège, and it was such a large thing and so unusual that he thought the cost ought not to be taken out of his living allowance. He therefore sent in a special account for it. There was considerable correspondence with regard to it, but I refused to allow it to be paid except from his living allowance and eventually it was settled in that way, and he was required to pay the expenses of the banquet out of his usual $20 a day. Although paid in 1904-5 the correspondence did not occur until 1907, and therefore the account appears in the report of 1908.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. The next item appears to have been the cause of some complication too. It is a large bill for living allowance and travelling expenses.

Barry, Miss R., living allowance, 61 days at $5; transportation, Montreal to Liverpool and Havre to New York, $200; sundry travelling expenses, $157.25.

Here is the part of it that seems to show that there is something special about this item:—

Less paid in 1906-7, $450.

I think that there should be some explanation of why this account was paid piecemeal.

Mr. FISHER. This is exactly the same thing. Miss Barry made some charges and sent in bills for some things which we could not allow, but which she looked upon as being over and above her living allowance. There was a long correspondence, and the account was finally settled on the basis of the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who is Miss Barry?

Mr. FISHER. Miss Barry is a lady who is well known in the city of Montreal. She is very much interested in the advancement of women's rights, she is a member of the Women's Council, and she was engaged to represent the ladies of Canada at one of these exhibitions.

Mr. BURRELL. Would the minister explain the method of exhibiting fruit at the Anglo-French exhibition?

Mr. FISHER. The representation of the fruit districts of Canada was made as general as possible. We have to get the fruit which will show to the best advantage and keep the best. I was not present at the

Anglo-French exhibition, but I believe that most of it was shown in cold storage glass cases, and some was shown in the open. As soon as it began to deteriorate from contact with the air it was replaced by new fruit taken out of our cold storage which was not shown before it was taken out.

The fruit was gathered from all over the country and such fruit was shown chiefly as would keep the best. In the early days of the exhibition, starting in May and lasting till November, that season's fruit could not be shown, and we had to get fruit of the season before. We had to keep that in cold storage, take it out and show it at the exhibition from time to time as the exhibition proceeded. For the first three or four months of the exhibition that had to be done, but later on we got the earlier fruit and placed it on exhibition.

Mr. BURRELL. I am afraid the minister did not quite apprehend the drift of my remarks. I understand the government took the ground that it was better to exhibit fruit as Canadian fruit and not as special exhibits under the names of various provinces.

Mr. FISHER. Certainly.

Mr. BURRELL. Of course I understand it was desired to show fruit that was essentially Canadian, but this does seem to me to be a mistake. I am informed that a person who proposed to emigrate from the old country to the province of British Columbia went to the exhibition desirous of seeing British Columbia fruit. When he got there it was impossible for the commissioner to point out where the British Columbia fruit was, except—and I say this with all deference to our friends from Nova Scotia—except that of course it made its presence known by its superior excellence. Even though special advertisement was not given to the different provinces, it was in my opinion a great mistake to so mix up the whole fruit exhibit that intending immigrants could not ascertain which fruit came from a particular province. I am told that one man decided to emigrate to Manitoba, thinking that certain very excellent fruit was the product of that province, although I do not think our friends from Manitoba will be likely to admit that the growing of fruit is their long suit. I repeat that in my opinion it was a great mistake that there was not a clear line of demarcation between the fruits from the various provinces.

Mr. FISHER. We decided years ago that the exhibit by the Department of Agriculture should be a purely Canadian exhibit, and that we should not divide it on provincial lines. The latter was done in the earlier days and it was not a success. I have repeated and strong compliments from our rivals at these exhibitions directed to the fact that we made the one national exhibit. Australasia has exhibited over and over again in competition with us and she has shown her exhibit divided according to her states, and other countries have done the same. We have gone on the principle that the Canadian exhibit in one harmonious whole should represent the Dominion of Canada, and there is an almost unanimous opinion, if not quite unanimous, that this is the most effective and best way to represent our country. I sympathize with the view of my hon. friend (Mr. Burrell), but as a matter of fact while there may have been a collection of fruit shown as coming from Canada, yet individual exhibits bear the name of those from whom they have been procured with their post office addresses so that the province whence the fruit comes would be indicated in that way, Although I was not at the Anglo-French exhibit, I am pretty sure there were boxes of fruit and individual plates of fruit marked as coming from British Columbia. On the whole our exhibits have been national and not provincial, and that is one of the chief reasons why they have attracted a great deal more attention than the exhibits of other countries.

Mr. BURRELL. While I believe in the policy of not making any special advertisement of a particular province, yet I was distinctly informed that this man was told by one of the commissioners in charge that he would not and could not show him any special fruit grown in a particular province.

Mr. HUGHES. At page D—13 of the Auditor General's Report it appears that the pavilion cost us $39,643, and that it was disposed of for $1,460. Is not that a rather cheap sale?

Mr. FISHER. I must frankly say that we find it very difficult to dispose of those buildings. We had to erect this particular building in accordance with the regulations of the London County Council, which required a very expensive structure, and we either have to take the building down ourselves and dispose of the material or sell the building as it stands. We contract to take the building away and leave the land as it was before we commenced to build, and I have no doubt that Mr. Hutchison did the very best he could and he probably thought himself lucky to be able to get anything for the building.

Mr. HUGHES. I see in the Auditor General's Report that Mr. G. P. McHugh got salary and living allowance from May 8 to November 29. Might I ask if he is a son of Senator McHugh?

Mr. FISHER. I think so, but I am not quite certain.

Mr. HUGHES—Is it the custom of the department to employ the sons of liberal members of parliament and senators?

Mr. FISHER. Any good men we can get.

Mr. HUGHES. And there were none but good men?

Mr. FISHER. I hope not.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. At page D—11 of the Auditor General's report there is a deduction on account of the payments made in 1905-6 to Mr. James Brodie, secretary of the exhibitions. Was Mr. Brodie also given a banquet that year?

Mr. FISHER. No, but Mr. Brodie unfortunately was taking larger pay than he had been authorized to take and eventually I had to recall Mr. Brodie to settle up his accounts, after having tried for a long time ineffectually to get a statement of them. Mr. Brodie ceased to be an employee of the department afterwards.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. In 1908-9 there is a payment of $84.75 to Mr. Brodie.

Mr. FISHER. That was the final balance in closing the account and settling up the matter.

Mr. J. D. REID. Are these exhibits sold by the government?

Mr. FISHER. No, we use them from year to year when they are fit to be used, but when they are not fit for use of course we cannot sell them.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. In view of the fact that the estimates in all other departments are being cut down, and also in view of the fact that Seattle is a very strong trade competitor with our Northwest, and also because adding to the welfare of its exhibition would be rather a detriment to Canada than a benefit, I wish to enter a protest against voting this large sum of money for that exhibition.

Mr. FISHER. I think my hon. friend hardly realizes the amount of money that is spent in these large exhibitions. For instance, in the Franco-British exhibition, Australia spent $600,000. $70,000 is a very small amount to spend on an international exhibition.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The hon. gentleman overlooks the fact that this is purely a local or state exhibition.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend is altogether wrong, as he will find if he consults the representatives from British Columbia.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. I think the hon. minister should at least have given us the number of officials for whom this money is intended. He is asking for a large sum in bulk without giving details as to how he intends to spend the money.

Mr. FISHER. There will be something under $20,000 for a building, something under $20,000 for the whole staff, $8,000 or $10,000 for printing and literature for distribution, a heavy item for bringing the exhibits which were in London last summer all the way across the Atlantic and across the continent to Seattle, and a large item for packing and taking out the exhibits and setting them up.

Mr. S. SHARPE. How many officials do you expect to have ?

Mr. FISHER. Eight or nine altogether.

Mr. JAMESON. The minister has omitted a very important item, the item of entertainment.

Mr. FISHER. That is included in the $20 a day payment.

Mr. THOBURN. Will the minister explain how there was such a difference in the daily allowance of the different officials at the Dublin exhibition ? For instance, we find Mr. Turcotte receiving for 290 days $3 a day, while Mr. Quinn received for 228 days $8 a day.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Turcotte is one of the permanent men, with a salary besides the living allowance of $3 a day, while the $8 a day to Mr. Quinn, one of the temporary men, included both living allowance and salary.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The hon. minister stated a few moments ago, in reference to Mr. Brodie, that the $84.75 was a final settlement of the account. If he turns to page D—14, he will find the following: 'James Brodie, secretary, salary, 3 months to March 31, 1908, at $1,700 per year, $425.'

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend will notice that the salary is up to the 31st March, 1908, while the $84.75 was paid in 1908-9, just after that date, and was a final settlement.

Mr. MONK. Has the department dispensed with Mr. Brodie's services ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. MONK. For what reason ?

Mr. FISHER. Because Mr. Brodie had been drawing a larger sum for his living allowance than he was entitled to draw.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The hon. minister in replying to my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. J. D. Taylor) gave particulars of a banquet of Mr. Hutchison which cost $670. But that was not the only banquet. There were two, as my hon. friend will see if he looks at page D—10. I find here in connection with this item at the Liège Exhibition pay to Wm. Hutchison ' less cost of banquet $670.05 paid in 1904-5 and $885.45 1905-6.'

Mr. FISHER. I am informed that that is the same banquet and the only item of that kind.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister explained a few moments ago that there was a change in the system. Formerly when the government gave a banquet the details came in and were paid for at actual cost, but my hon. friend wanted to help Mr. Hutchison and so he gave him $20 per day living expenses, to be spent just as he liked. Being an advocate of temperance, the hon. gentleman didn't want any expenditure to appear for liquor so he gave this allowance of $20 a day, out of which Mr. Hutchison spent about $10, and, no doubt, put about $10 a day in his pocket. Here was an expenditure of the people's money which ought to go to the improvement of the farmers. Then there is Miss Barry, living allowance, 61 days at $5 a day besides transportation, Montreal to Liverpool and Havre to New York, $200, and sundry travelling expenses, $157.25. This is just throwing away the money of the country. Here we have $75,000 asked for to pay for an exhibition in Seattle, and no doubt we will have the minister coming back for another $300,000. There will be the same story as in the case of the pavilion erected in Dublin at a cost of $39,000 and which was sold for a few hundred. What earthly use is there in spending money in the United States on exhibitions? It is high time these foreign exhibitions should cease. It is money just thrown away for the benefit of a large staff of officials such as senator's sons at $5 a day and $6 a day living expenses without any benefit to the country.

Mr. HUGHES. What is shown at these exhibitions? I presume the minister shows himself at them occasionally?

Mr. FISHER. I have not been at one for five years except at Dublin.

Mr. HUGHES. I thought he must have been at Dublin judging by the large expenditure there. I notice some details of expenditure for a page or two, but surely there were other items besides what are found in these pages. I see that the Massey Harris Company are down for a binder complete at $150 and a plough at $50 and so on. Are there no other agricultural implement manufacturers recognized as well? Further down you will find an item for cheese purchased from one firm and another item 'pay to J. C. Sutherland for writing preparing and proofreading a pamphlet "The Twentieth Century in Canada," $250, and to the King's Printer for 20,000 copies of that pamphlet $723.93.' Were there any other exhibits than those recorded on these pages?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, any number of them. A great many are exhibits sent to all the exhibitions such as mineral exhibits and exhibits of a permanent character. We have found the greatest difficulty in getting our agricultural implement makers and other manufacturers to furnish us with exhibits.

Mr. HUGHES. I don't see why you sent binders to Dublin.

Mr. FISHER. Binders are used in Ireland.

Mr. HUGHES. Not very largely.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend is entirely mistaken. Lots of people from Scotland and England went to Dublin as well as the Irish and our agricultural implement manufacturers do a very large business in the old country and Europe generally. We have to get these exhibits as best we can. Our manufacturers are so busy supplying the Canadian demand that they will not look to the outside.

Mr. HUGHES. Are not the exports of these implements increasing?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, they are much larger than they were twelve years ago.

Mr. HUGHES. Does not an apple tree produce more fruit ten years after it was planted than the first year?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, but until it is planted it does not produce anything.

Mr. BURRELL. In connection with the Seattle exhibition, what kind of display is specially mentioned?

Mr. FISHER. We propose to make a general exhibit. We hope to get a lot of fruit from British Columbia and trust our hon. friends from that province will aid us in that work. Also from Eastern Canada to show that other parts of Canada produce excellent fruit as well as British Columbia. We hope also to send mineral exhibits from British Columbia and Eastern Canada. One of the officers of the Geological Survey has been arranging to get a mineral exhibit from British Columbia and hopes he will be able to succeed. A large proportion of the expenditure of these exhibitions is in connection with the general display which makes the Canadian pavilion the most attractive on the ground, such as agricultural decorations, ropes of grain heads and such things as that. These attract people into the pavilion and once there they examine the other exhibits and learn what Canada is producing.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. What happened to that binder? I do not see any reported sale?

Mr. FISHER. I am told we still have it. It was shown in London last year.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Is it intended to have, at the Seattle exhibition, any pamphlet corresponding to 'The Twentieth Century in Canada?' If so, under what auspices will it be prepared? I ask this be-

cause in pamphlets issued under the auspices of the Department of Agriculture I have observed that there was a tendency to ignore British Columbia and to convey the impression that agriculture is confined to the portion of Canada east of the Rockies. I can assure the minister that that is a mistake.

Mr. FISHER. I agree that that would be a mistake, but I do not think that it is the case. The literature we distribute is mainly that prepared under the auspices of the Immigration Department, although we have had some prepared by ourselves.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Who was 'The Twentieth Century in Canada,' prepared by?

Mr. FISHER. It was prepared under our auspices. It was a former pamphlet of our own which was brought down to date by Mr. J. C. Sutherland.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. He received $250, and travelling expenses $24. Is he one of the officers of the department ?

Mr. FISHER. No, he is a newspaper man who is well acquainted with the general resources of Canada.

Mr. HUGHES. Is the Department of Agriculture in the habit of sending copies of its pamphlets to members of parliament ?

Mr. FISHER. Not those sent to exhibitions.

Mr. HUGHES. It would be a courteous thing to do.

Mr. FISHER. It shall be done, if the hon. member (Mr. Hughes) wishes it.

Mr. BURRELL. I think the suggestion made by my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. J. D. Taylor) is a very good one. The information in most of the literature issued by the Immigration Department has shown a peculiar tendency to stop at the Rocky Mountains, as if there were no province west of that. And, as I have come across the gentleman employed by the Dominion government, it has seemed to me that their knowledge was limited to that part of the country east of the Rockies. Of course we desire to see the Northwest and all eastern Canada thoroughly advertised, but we believe that British Columbia also should come in for its proper share. I trust that the Minister of Agriculture will bring pressure to bear on the Department of Immigration to have British Columbia given its proper space.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FISHER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. What business will be taken up to-morrow ?

Mr. FISHER. Minor Bills, first, then the Civil Service resolutions, and after that Supply.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, February 9, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

The Forty-First Annual Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries concerning fisheries.—Hon. L. P. Brodeur.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 46) respecting the Crawford Bay and St. Mary's Railway Company, and to change its name to 'The British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba Railway Company.'—Mr. W. McIntyre.

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

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Montreal Terminal Railway Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 49) respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Devlin.

Bill (No. 50) to incorporate La Compagnie du chemin de fer International de Rimouski. —Mr. Ross.

Bill (No. 51) to incorporate the Royal Casualty and Surety Company of Canada.—Mr. H. H. McLean.

Bill (No. 52) respecting the Bank of Vancouver.—Mr. Cowan.

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

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 19) to amend the Post Office Act (Hon Rodolphe Lemieux) read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1—compensation for loss of registered letters—

Mr. SPROULE. What do you mean by 'registered domestic article?'

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will give the House a few explanations regarding this Bill. Section 9, subsection K of the Post Office Act reads as follows, in regard to the powers of the Postmaster General:

prescribe and enforce such regulations as to letters directed to be registered, as to him

seem necessary, in respect to the registration of letters and other matter passing by mail, as well between places in Canada as between Canada and the United Kingdom, or any British possession, or any foreign country, and to the charge to be made for the same, not exceeding five cents per each letter or article.

As every member of the House knows, it costs five cents, besides the usual postage of two cents, to register a letter. We have two classes of registered letters, the international and the domestic. Under the terms of the Postal Union Convention held at Rome in 1906, the Canadian Post Office Department agreed to become a party to the following provision:

In case of the loss of a registered article, and except in cases beyond control, the sender or at the request of the sender, the addressee is entitled to an indemnity of 50 francs.

All nations which adhere to the Postal Union are now responsible to the extent of 50 francs for each registered article which is lost, that is to say, the proven value of the article. What we do for international registered letters which are lost we intend to do for domestic registered letters that are lost.

This regulation for indemnity for the loss of registered letters has been adopted by Great Britain and the United States of America. The regulation of the English Post Office Department for compensation for the loss of registered inland correspondence reads as follows:

Subject to the rule stated below, the Postmaster General pays compensation voluntarily and as an act of grace for registered correspondence, including parcels. The fee payable over and above the postage is the ordinary registration fee for two pence, the limit of compensation being five pounds sterling. Compensation in respect of money of any kind (coin, orders, notes, cheques, stamps, &c.) will only be given in those cases in which the money is inclosed in one of the registered letter envelopes sold by the post office and the packet is tendered for transmission by the registered letter post.

My hon. friend sees that in England they indemnify to the extent of £5. We intend to indemnify to the extent of $25, as is done in the United States' postal law. Let me read the text of the postal law dealing with this indemnity:

As a part of such system of registration he (the Postmaster General) may provide rules under which the sender or owners of first-class registered matter may be indemnified for loss thereof in the mails, the indemnity to be paid out of the postal revenues, but in no case to exceed $100 for any registered piece, or the actual value thereof when that is less than one hundred dollars, and for which no other compensation or reimbursement to the loser has been made; provided that the Post Office Department or its revenues shall not be liable for the loss of any other mail matter on account of its having been registered.

And the United States regulations based thereon read:

Indemnity shall be paid for the value of the lost domestic first-class matter not to exceed $25 in any one case in accordance with the law and the regulations of the Post Office Department.

What we do to indemnify the sender or in respect of the addressee, as the case may be, of an international registered letter, we should at least do in the case of our own domestic letters, and we shall follow the regulations in that respect adopted by two of the most progressive countries, England and the United States. Let me now give to the House a few statistics of interest in connection with this matter. The estimated number of registered letters (not including other registered articles) posted in Canada during the five fiscal years, is as follows:

1903-4	5,986,000
1904-5	6,594,500
1905-6	7,475,000
1906-7	8,338,667
1907-8	9,078,000

The number of registered letters posted to the department as lost through various causes during the course of post in Canada during the same five fiscal years is as follows:

1903-4	116
1904-5	115
1905-6	104
1906-7	100
1907-8	208

What would have been the liability of the department for the last two fiscal years if the powers I am now asking parliament for had been conferred on the Postmaster General? It would have been as follows:

1906-7	$ 381 33
1907-8	2,184 78

That is the proven value of the letters lost because we would not pay the $25 for each letter lost. We would pay according to the proven value of the loss. If a letter lost contained only ten dollars, we would only pay that amount. In certain countries I believe, however, they pay up the amount fixed by statute. Last year (1907-8) we would have been called on to pay $2,184.72, but $1,621.22 of this amount was due to the fact that a postal car was wrecked and totally consumed by fire near Moorhead on November 14, 1908.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. How much was claimed as having been lost?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The amount claimed is larger, but still it is remarkable how very little is claimed, if we take into consideration the vast amount of registered mail matter which passes through the mails. I

have not the figures, but they are not large and of course fictitious claims have been made on the department.

Mr. SPROULE. The amount which a letter contained up to $25 is paid in full, and above $25, only that sum is paid?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes. This has worked very well in the United States and England, and really we have been a little backwards in this connection. We ought to have adopted that last year, but waited until we saw how it worked out in other countries.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the hon. minister give some idea of the amount to be set apart for this work?

Mr. LEMIEUX. We claim that under these regulations more care will be taken by the officials and the department to trace lost letters. In fact, it will be almost impossible to lose a registered letter. Of course a car or a steamer may be wrecked, but, taking the estimates of previous years, the amount will be very small. There will be more care taken and the department will make more money, because many more people will register their letters when they know the department is liable for each registered letter to the extent of $25.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Will there be any change in the form of receipt given for a registered letter? Will the amount the letter is said to contain be stated on the receipt?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes. At present we have only the five-cent stamp, which shows that a letter is registered and there is no declaration by the party that it contains money. In the future, under the regulations to be framed, the amount in the letter will have to be stated if it is feasible.

Mr. LENNOX. There is no provision in the Act for ascertaining the amount at the time of registration.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That will be part of the regulations. We need not amend the Act for that.

Mr. LENNOX. As a matter of practice, the Post Office official will not take any notice of the amount you are sending. Will there be a regulation by which the postmaster is bound to ascertain, at the time of registration, the amount being sent?

Mr. LEMIEUX. There will be under the new regulations.

Mr. LENNOX. I presume that this is not retroactive?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. LENNOX. Because, I have a very interesting case of loss in my own riding, and I have not been able to get any report that the matter has been properly investigated, though I have drawn the attention of the department to it several times.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Has my attention been called to it in the House?

Mr. LENNOX. I do not know.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) will send me a note of it——

Mr. LENNOX. I have done the note part of it; I have written several letters and have been assured that the matter would be investigated. It will be a very interesting case if investigated.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would like to know the case.

Mr. LENNOX. I will give the Postmaster General the facts on another occasion. I would like to ask him also if he has considered the question of making compensation to the person who suffers loss—outside of this matter altogether—through the dishonesty of a government official? It seems to me that in such cases compensation should be made.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am glad the hon. member has called attention to this matter. Whenever an official of the post office appropriates money from the sender or from the addressee, the department, as a general rule, after full investigation makes good the amount. We have a special fund in the department for that very object. Of course, the instances in which we are called upon to make compensation are very few, but it does happen, perhaps two or three times in the course of a year, that dishonesty is practised in these matters by a government official. In that case, we make good the amount. The regulation under which this is done was passed several years ago by my predecessor, Sir William Mulock.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there a regulation, or does the minister intend to make a regulation, to provide for keeping the address of an individual who registers a letter?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not usually enforced.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Under the new arrangement the department will be on the alert, as it will not wish to pay $25 for a lost registered letter. We intend to make the most stringent regulations for the protection of all the parties concerned. If there is not sufficient protection under the present regulations, we will have them framed in the proper way.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not sure that the Postmaster General understands my question. I asked if the address of the sender would be taken. I have never known the address of the sender of a registered letter to be asked for.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, the postmaster is obliged to have the address of the sender as well as the addressee. An invoice is sent from office to office following each registered letter. It is very difficult to draw a registered letter from its appointed route because of this invoice system, but with the provision that is here proposed we shall take even more care.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the regulation a very good one. Personally I could never understand why there should not be compensation to the loser of a registered letter when a registration fee has been paid. Many cases of loss have been brought to my attention, and some of these I have brought before the department. I have learned that registering simply means keeping trace of a letter, but without compensation in case of loss. It seems to me that a registration ought to be an insurance as well.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. As I understand it, if postmasters lose public money through the act of burglars, they have to bear the loss. I have known cases where postmasters have desired to give up the money order business in order to get out of the risk, the public money that they have in charge being, no doubt, an attraction to burglars.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If postmasters have taken the necessary precautions, for instance by keeping their postal notes, money, &c., in a safe approved by the department, and by using due diligence, the Post Office Department generally recoups them any loss they may sustain in the way referred to.

Mr. HUGHES. Is there to be any means of ascertaining whether the value is in the registered letter or not? Any one in business knows that sometimes a man will claim to have sent certain money by registered letter, but the receiver says that the money to the amount claimed was not enclosed.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Under the new regulation the sender will have to prove the amount before it is sent, because the department will be called upon to recoup him according to the proven value contained in the letter.

Mr. PORTER. I understand that there is a provision by which a person desiring to transmit money to a foreign country may go to a postmaster, make his deposit of money and get a receipt therefor, and that money will be paid to a person named in a foreign country. But in case the money is not delivered, what provision is there for the depositor getting it back?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The regulations concerning registered letters, as well as ordinary letters, passing between two countries, are framed by what we call the Postal Union——

Mr. PORTER. Pardon me. I do not speak of a registered letter. But suppose I deposit money with the postmaster to be paid to a certain person, say in Russia?

Mr. LEMIEUX. We have postal conventions with different countries by which we restrict our postal or money orders.

Mr. PORTER. Suppose I send $25 in that way and it is not delivered in the foreign country, how do I get my money back?

Mr. LEMIEUX. If it is lost in Canada and the Post Office Department is proven responsible, Canada pays the money. If, on the other hand, the loss is proven against the foreign country, the foreign country pays the money.

Mr. PORTER. Is there any limitation fixed? In the two cases I refer to, over a year has elapsed since the money was sent, and the party sending it seems to have no redress, although he has made application time and again. The only answer he gets is that inquiry is being made. Is there any limit to the time within which this is to be paid?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, there is no prescription.

Mr. CROTHERS. Is there any good reason why the sum should be limited to $25? It seems to me that if the whole people of Canada, through their government, undertake to perform a service for individuals and fail in the attempt and lose a sum of money, the whole people, through their government, ought to make good that loss to the individual. It may be considered advisable to limit the sum that the Postmaster General should undertake to convey from one part of the country to another; but if that sum is unlimited, if a man sends $100 through the government and it is lost, it seems to me that the government should sustain that loss and not the individual.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is some force in what my hon. friend says. But we must not take too many risks, we must remember human frailty in undertaking to carry money from one part of the country to another. The express companies and the banks do that work, and they take very good care to insure themselves against possible loss. My hon. friend should understand that the average citizen will not confide to His Majesty's post so large a sum as $100 in bills. He may venture to send $5, $10 and perhaps $20 or more, but he hesitates to send a large amount of money in that way. He prefers to go to a bank or an express company, who will send a large parcel of bills for him. But those companies have special insurance against loss. As regards limiting the amount to $25, in postal matters generally we follow the example of the two countries most advanced in postal matters, namely, Great Britain and the United States. In Great Britain the sum is limited to £5, in the

United States to $25. The system has worked wonderfully well in those countries. I think we should adopt the same system or try it, at all events.

Mr. CROTHERS. I think if we changed the law and made the government responsible for the whole amount in case of loss, the people of Canada, so long as the present Postmaster General presides over the department, would have unbounded confidence in the department, and would be willing to confidde a much larger sum than $25 to the department for delivery. Why should the people be obliged to send these large sums of money through banks or express companies instead of through the government?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I may mention in this connection that I have under consideration a plan of government insurance under which the Post Office Department will take charge of larger amounts, though that plan is not yet ripe for legislation. At present, large payments are sometimes made through the Post Office Department by banks and companies, showing the confidence they have in the service, and that confidence is justified by the very few losses that have occurred. Registered letters are so well traced that banks and large corporations are sending relatively large amounts of money through the Post Office Department. If we carried larger sums we would have to provide a special system of insurance, with a rate higher than the present rate of five cents. My officials are now studying very closely a plan in this direction and perhaps next year I may take the House into my confidence on that subject.

Mr. HUGHES. I need not remind the minister what came to his notice last year, of a very heavy loss that occurred between Lindsay and Dunsford. I think $500 disappeared mysteriously, and the loser could get no redress. I may also remind him of another case that the late member for Durham, Colonel Ward, brought frequently before the minister, where an officer of the department was proven to have received the money for the money order and never transmitted the money order. Is it the intention of the department to make this Bill retroactive, so that the loser in this case could get redress?

Mr. LEMIEUX. That will not come under this Bill. I recollect Colonel Ward's case, and I examined the papers very closely at the time. Has my hon. friend read the report on that case, issued by the department?

Mr HUGHES. I have not read the report, but I have read all the evidence except the final report.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have the evidence and at the close of last session I satisfied Col. Ward that he should not press the matter further, because it was a special case. I need not say anything more about it.

Mr. HUGHES. I could not let that pass, because that is a reflection either on the gentleman who paid the money, or it is a reflection on Colonel Ward. There is no doubt that the postmaster took the money, that is well established.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would not reflect at all either on Colonel Ward or on the postmaster. The best thing I can do is to send the report to my hon. friend, and he will see that the department is not at all liable in that case.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM. Does not the department keep a certain amount of money from the postmasters for the purpose of making up losses?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, in case of possible dishonesty on the part of the officials there is a special fund in the department called a guarantee fund; and wherever an official has been dishonest, and a claim is made on the department, an investigation takes place, and the money is paid by order in council if the department is liable.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM. Is that not a species of insurance for the transmission of money? I may say that I think it is a criminal offence to send a letter purporting to contain money, that does not contain money.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, but under the new regulations the evidence must be given and made clear to the officers in the department that there is money in the letter. That is how we intend to frame the regulations.

Mr. OSLER. Is the clause confined to money only or does it cover articles of value ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, all registered articles.

On the question shall the Bill be reported.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before the Bill is reported, I desire again to present the amendment which I offered last year to the Postmaster General and which I then understood would be considered by him providing the revenue of the country would permit. We remember that last year a considerable reduction was made on drop letters in cities or larger places where letter carriers were employed. Formerly the postage on drop letters in cities where letter carriers were employed was two cents. By the legislation of last year that was reduced to one cent in this way. Section 58 of the Post Office Act reads as follows :

On letters not transmitted through the mails but posted and delivered at the same post office, commonly known as local or drop

letters, the rate shall be one cent per ounce weight which shall in all cases be prepaid by postage stamps affixed to such letters.

The clause, as originally enacted has also the following words :

Except that in cases where there is a delivery by letter carriers the rate shall be two cents per ounce which shall also be prepaid by postage stamps.

By the enactment of last session these words commencing with 'except' were expunged from clause 48 which practically made the postage on drop letters, whether in cities, towns, villages, or rural districts, one cent. To my mind this was a decided discrimination in favour of the cities as they enjoy the free delivery while in the rural districts there is no free delivery. It would only be fair that the rural districts should receive some compensation now that the revenue of the postal department has increased to such a very large amount. I intimated when the Bill was up last year that I desired to move an amendment to give effect to the proposition which I then made and make now to have the postage on drop letters in all places where letter carriers are not employed reduced from one cent to one half cent per ounce. The reduction would be fifty per cent in both cases. Fifty per cent of the postage was removed from drop letters in cities where letter carriers were employed, and I proposed then that we reduce the postage on drop letters in all other parts of the country to the same extent. There is no question but that this would be quite a boon to the people. Merchants throughout the country would no doubt use the post office to a much greater extent in sending out their bills, circulars, and other material appertaining to their business; in fact, I think the post office would derive a revenue at half a cent an ounce which would very largely recoup what would be lost by the reduction owing to the very much larger use that might be made of the mails. No doubt many others besides merchants in rural districts, such as doctors and others sending out accounts for like purposes would use the mails to a greater extent, and I think it only fair that the rural sections of the country should be considered along with the cities in this reduction of postage. I take no exception—I took no exception a year ago—to the reduction on drop letters in cities; in fact, I believe I expressed my approval of it: I thought it was quite right and proper as the revenue of the country could afford it. But, whilst that was the case I claimed in the interest of the rural districts, one county of which I represent myself, that we should be put on a par with the cities and be given a corresponding reduction in postage. Hence, I have prepared an amendment which I will offer to the Postmaster General, and if he has found the revenue has been sustained that no material loss has accrued owing to the reduction of postage in cities, I hope that he will take this amendment into his favourable consideration and grant to the rural districts the same favour and consideration that he has been gracious enough to extend to the cities. The amendment I propose will be in the form of clause 2 to the Bill now before us and will read thus:

Section 48 of the Post Office Act, chap. 66 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, as amended by chap. 53 of the statutes of 1908, is amended by adding thereto the words following: Except that in cases where there is no delivery by letter carriers the rate shall be one half cent per ounce to be prepaid by postage stamps.

The effect of the amendment, if adopted by the House, as I trust it will be, will be exactly as I have stated, that drop letters in all places outside of cities where letter carriers are not employed, will be subject only to half a cent postage instead of one cent as now. That will be the entire difference, and I ask that the minister will favourably consider this amendment. I would like very much to have it submitted to the House. If it is not received by the minister this year I hope it will be another time, but I do not desire to do anything that will prevent its adoption at any future time.

Mr. SPROULE. What are you going to do provided this amendment passes, with those localities where rural free mail delivery is established ?

Mr. HENDERSON. Free mail delivery is yet in its infancy, and consequently I do not know that it will really be a factor in connection with this matter. Free mail delivery will be in the country and could not affect letters that are posted to be delivered in any village or town by the citizens of that village or town. I beg to submit this amendment, moved by myself and seconded by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Chisholm).

Mr. LEMIEUX. There are obvious reasons why I should express the hope that my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) will not press his amendment. I do not receive the amendment in any bad spirit; on the contrary, it would possibly commend itself to me were I fully informed of the operation of the effect of reducing the drop letter rate in cities from two cents to one cent. It is quite true that last session I promised my hon. friend that if there were no loss in the revenue because of reducing the drop letter rate in cities I might perhaps extend the favour of the rural sections, but my hon. friend will remember that the promise was given not a year ago, but only a few months ago when the House was in session. From what statistics I have been able to gather I think it is fairly safe to assume

that the reduction of the drop letter rate will not eventually result in a loss of revenue, but we must at least wait for one fiscal year to pass before we can pronounce on that with certainty. When we have that information complete I will look forward with hope to the possibility of granting the boon to the rural sections proposed by the amendment of my hon. friend.

Mr. HENDERSON. In view of the promise of the Postmaster General it is probable that with his assistance at the expiration of the fiscal year I will be better able to get this amendment adopted than were I to press it now In view of the argument advanced by the Postmaster General, I rather think it will be my wisest plan to accept his proposition, feeling assured that should we meet here at the expiration of the fiscal year I will have the assistance of the hon. gentleman to extend this boon to the rural districts as it has been extended to the cities. I may say that the Hansard will show that the promise of the Postmaster General was that he would make this applicable to the rural sections in one or two years, and as that promise was given only last July the Postmaster General cannot be held too strictly. I will accept the hon. minister's offer of material assistance, but I may tell him that next session he will not find me quite so pliable if he should raise any objections.

Amendment (Mr. Henderson) withdrawn.

Bill reported.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Might I ask the Postmaster General whether he has yet established a postal service in Gowganda and improved the service at Elk lake?

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend is just in time with his question. The hon. gentleman called on me the other day to ask for a post office at Gowganda and a service between Gowganda and the railway, and this morning we received word from Ontario, that objection would be taken to the grant or sale of any lot on which a building could be erected until at all events a few weeks hence. We have written the Hon. Mr. Cochrane this afternoon, asking him to consider our case before any other, as our desire is to serve the public. If my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) will press his friends of the Ontario government we will do our best on our side.

On the motion for the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. GERVAIS. Next sitting of the House.

ANIMAL CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACT.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) moved second reading of Bill (No. 18) to amend the Animal Contagious Diseases Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does this Bill contemplate making any change in the law or is it merely to carry out the law as it is supposed to be at the present time?

Mr. FISHER. It effects a change. In the revision of the statutes a certain clause was transposed from one section to the other with the result that the amount which was to be paid in compensation was increased over the amount fixed by the statute which was being revised. This is an Act to amend the Revised Statutes so as to place the figures as they were before the revision. We want to revert to the original law. The present law has been changed from the original law.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was that done intentionally or unintentionally?

Mr. FISHER. Unintentionally, by the revisers.

Mr. SPROULE. As I remember the original law, it provided that the government should pay for the loss of animals slaughtered because affected by certain classes of contagious diseases, one of which was tuberculosis. I brought to the attention of the minister last year or the year before, a case in which a person applied for compensation but could not get it. What is the law with regard to that? Is the government responsible for the loss of animals which are slaughtered because affected by tuberculosis, or is it not?

Mr. FISHER. It is not. The law provides that the minister may cause to be slaughtered animals suffering from infectious or contagious diseases or suspected of being so infected, and that he may order a compensation to be paid to the owners of such animals.

Mr. SPROULE. If tuberculosis is included in the list of infectious or contagious diseases, one would naturally expect that the government would be responsible for some portion of the loss sustained by the owner of tuberculous animals slaughtered by order of the government.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1—compensation to owners of diseased animals.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How did this change occur? Was it through some transposition of language or through some omission?

Mr. FISHER. Section 12 of the old Act provides that the Governor in Council may pay compensation for animals slaughtered under the provisions of the Act. Subsection 2 provides that the compensation, if any, shall be two-thirds of the value of the slaughtered animal. Section 4 fixes the maximum of value. In the revision of the

statute the same words and the same amounts are used, but the amount is applied to the compensation instead of the value. The consequence is that the compensation may be as high as the full value, which was not intended, and I am simply moving to restore the provision of the original Act.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I understand that since the revision of the statutes in 1906 until the present Bill has been introduced, the amount paid in respect of slaughtered animals has been unlimited.

Mr. FISHER. No, it has been limited.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I would like to ask if between the revision of the statutes and this date the minister has paid any greater amounts for cattle slaughtered than he did prior to 1906, under the old statute.

Mr. FISHER. No, because we have been fixing the values on the basis of the old Act, acting as if the old Act was in force. We had the power to fix the full value, but we preferred to have the law made correct, and to act within its limitations rather than upon our own will.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Since the outbreak of the foot and mouth disease in the United States, the frontier ports, as I understand, have been guarded by certain officials of the government. Gananoque being one of these points where people are crossing daily, I understand that two men are patrolling there, and in addition a veterinary surgeon has been sent there from some distance. I have received the following letter:

We have a veterinary surgeon here named Dr. Joint. The Department of Agriculture has sent a man here at a great expense to inspect or look after the hoof and mouth disease He is a veterinary surgeon. Can you find out from the minister why this is necessary when we have a fully qualified man here to do this work at a much less expense, and as we are anxious to have a veterinary surgeon here we think it very unfair on the part of the Agricultural Department to side-track it. The farmers of our district are anxious to have a veterinary surgeon here, but if there is anything that can help him to make a good fair living, this riding should be considered and not some outsider. Anything you can do will be appreciated by the farmers and the townsmen of Gananoque.

Yours truly,

E. R. CHAPMAN.

I think that puts the case fairly. We have a qualified veterinary surgeon in Gananoque, and yet the minister sends one in from outside point. The one he sent has been there for some time although there was no crossing until a few days ago when the ice took. Why was not the local vet. called upon? Where there is a local vet. at one of these points, no matter what his politics—and I do not know the politics of the one we have—he should have the patronage of the department. I hope the minister will recall the man he sent and instruct Dr. Joint to do the necessary work.

Mr. FISHER. I did not know of this case at all. I have not the slightest idea who have been employed except that as much as posible we utilize our own permanent staff on this work of guarding the frontier. They were not sufficient to do all the work, especially in the earlier days when the disease was very acute, and when we were making special examinations inside Canada as well as outside. We have utilized our permanent staff as much as possible so as to avoid the expense of employing others. The expense has been very great any way. Where we cannot use the men on our permanent staff, we have tried to utilize the men on the spot as much as possible. I shall make inquiry into the case, and if the complaint be well-founded, I shall see that the services of a qualified man on the spot are retained.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the embargo in connection with the foot and mouth disease removed or not?

Mr. FISHER. It still exists and is strictly enforced although we have been able to relieve it, so far as horses are concerned. But we have not considered it safe to relieve the embargo in the case of cattle and other live stock. We are only enforcing the embargo against those states of the Union in which the disease has occurred. The New England States have not been infected, and therefore we have not imposed any embargo on the State of Maine which adjoins my hon. friend's province.

Mr. DANIEL. What about the state of Kentucky?

Mr. FISHER. That state is a long way from our boundary and is not infected. We shut out any animal coming from any state infected and which is quarantined by the American authorities. We also shut out any animals which passed through those states. For instance if any animal from Kentucky passes through New York or Philadelphia, which are infected, it would be debarred from coming into Canada. But the places we are specially guarding are the frontiers of contiguous states. Wherever New York, Pennsylvania, or Michigan, which I think are the only three states infected, which touch our boundaries, we guard the frontier. In the case of a New England State, we only guard our frontier to the extent of preventing the entry of any animals which may have to come through Pennsylvania or New York, even if they originally came from an uninfected state. I may say to my hon. friend from St. John that we were obliged to make some regulation about the ship-

ment of cattle from St. John to Europe. One of the great dangers was that if Canada were suspected of having the disease, the quarantine would be enforced against us on the other side and our trade in live animals cut off. The port of St. John does one of the largest export trades in winter of live cattle to Great Britain. I am not sure if there are not regular lines of steamers from Portland and Boston which touch at St. John on the way to Great Britain. The United States regulations permit animals from states not infected, to be shipped from Boston or Portland to Great Britain. We would not allow that in Canada, and therefore had to make a rule that ships from Boston or Portland containing American cattle should not be allowed to touch at St. John, even for the purpose of landing passengers. We did that in order to protect our stock yards and wharfs at St. John from any possible danger of infection, so that there would be no danger of our export of Canadian cattle from St. John to England being interfered with. Until there is a change in the American regulations, we would not be justified in relaxing our own. I was in Europe at the time the outbreak took place, and was fortunate enough to have in Rome, when I was there, a prominent member of the Department of Agriculture in England, and our chief veterinery, Dr. Rutherford. It was largely due to that fortunate circumstance that we were able to show just what we were doing and prove to the English authorities that there was no danger to their herds and flocks from any importation of Canadian cattle, and the result was that no restriction was placed on the landing of Canadian cattle in the mother country. Suspicion at first attached to Canada in the minds of the English people, because in the earlier reports of the outbreak of the disease in the United States, it was stated that the disease originated in Ontario and that animals sent from Ontario to Philadelphia were infected. We proved conclusively that if they were, they must have contracted the disease in American yards shown to have been infected, where they were unshipped, fed, and watered. When this was shown to the English authorities, Canada was relieved of all suspicion in their minds, and they did nothing to interfere with our trade.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I have heard drovers in Toronto say that it would be a good thing to prevent, by law, the export of our cattle in cases of that kind, especially such cattle as many of those that are shipped from Toronto to Buffalo.

Mr. FISHER. I do not understand.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The cattle going from Toronto to Buffalo, of which I speak, are of a very inferior grade and sold at low prices for slaughter in Buffalo. Had the export been prohibited, there would have been no mention of Canadian cattle being affected over there. Certainly, some day, Canada will be quarantined by another country by reason of such conditions as these.

Mr. FISHER. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean) mean to say that after the outbreak took place we should have prohibited the export of Canadian or that the export of cattle should be prohibited altogether?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. When there was an outbreak.

Mr. FISHER. Then, we would not have been saved the difficulty.

Mr. DANIEL. I am not quite clear about the answer which the minister gave with regard to horses. Has any embargo been placed on horses purchased in the State of Kentucky that may have to pass through Pennsylvania or New York in order to come into Canada? Are these horses debarred from Canada?

Mr. FISHER. I think not.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Listening to the reply of the minister to the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) I could not but think of the price paid for certain animals that were found diseased at the port of Point Edward. By the Auditor General's Report of 1906, page D—10, it appears that Mr. J. T. Brethour, of Burford, Ont., received compensation for eighteen hogs amounting to $1,533, and Messrs. Douglas & Son, of Mitchell, received $932 for twelve hogs, slaughtered on account of disease. As I understood the minister he was trying to lead the hon. member for North Grey to believe that compensation paid for hogs in years gone by had not been in excess of the limit he was placing in this Act. I could not but feel that he was trying to cover up some of his own wrongdoing in years gone by, for he evidently made a serious blunder in this case.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) seems to have forgotten a very essential part of the transaction to which he refers. He ought to have remembered that this money was not paid under the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, but was paid out of the exhibition vote for animals that had been sent for exhibition purposes. These animals were paid for at full value just as any other exhibits that may be lost or destroyed while in our charge are paid for.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Where does the minister get authority to take money set apart for exhibitions and pay it out in this manner?

Mr. FISHER. I have the authority, because the whole matter is in connection with an exhibition. These hogs were sent for exhibition, as we might send a reaper

or a binder. If that reaper or binder were destroyed while in our charge, and with us responsible for the exhibit, we should be morally liable for the value. On different occasions we have paid for exhibits which we have been unable to return to the owners.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Then, there is no limit upon the amount of money the minister is privileged to pay under such circumstances. Why does not he place, even in this present Bill, a limit upon the amount that he may pay for animals that may have been sent out of Canada for exhibition, and that are found, while outside the country, to be diseased ?

Mr. FISHER. The payment for these animals has nothing to do with the Animal Contagious Diseases Act. They were dealt with as any other exhibit would have been dealt with.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister would lead the committee to believe that the government were exhibiting these animals, whereas the owners of the animals were sending the exhibit as a commercial enterprise.

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. BLAIN. I would direct the attention of the minister to the discussion of last year. It was shown that when the matter was brought to the minister's attention, he wrote a letter over his own signature stating that he did not see how compensation could be allowed. But when political influence was brought to bear, he had to turn about and pay the enormous prices mentioned. I rather think the amendments to the law that are now before us are made because this matter was discussed in this House last session.

Mr. FISHER. It has nothing to do with it, in any way, shape or form. The hon. member (Mr. Blain) may not know it. though I think he does—that Mr. Brethour, who was paid this amount, is a well known conservative. No political influence was brought to bear on myself, or, so far as I know on any hon. member on this side of the House.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. minister (Mr. Fisher) is now introducing politics into it—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BLAIN. Yes; this is an old story with the government—to get some liberal-conservative to unite their influence with that of the administration. I did not raise the point whether these gentlemen were liberals or conservative. I pointed out last year that the minister had paid for hogs $150 a piece in one case, $160 in another case, $65 in another case and $180 in another case, these hogs having been slaughtered because they were diseased. The correspondence in the case clearly showed that the government were not clear as to whether the hogs contracted the disease in quarantine or at the exhibition. The question whether the owners were liberal or conservative is not a matter in which the House is particularly interested.

Mr. FISHER. I am glad the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) disclaims any political element in this question. I understood him to say that in the first place, I declined to pay the money, but that when political pull was exercised——

Mr. BLAIN. I did.

Mr. FISHER. I simply answer that the gentleman to whom the money was paid is a conservative, and, so far as I know, never supported this government or the party that supports this government.

Mr. SPROULE. He may have got some good Liberal to intercede for him. I understood the minister to say a short time ago that animals coming from Kentucky would not be quarantined at the border, though they might come through a state in which contagious diseases existed. But I understood him to say previously that this would really ensure them being quarantined.

Mr. FISHER. I told my hon. friend that I thought there had been a relaxation in the case of horses. Speaking from memory, I think the Director General of the Veterinary Department told me that in regard to horses the disposition had been relaxed, and that they might come from any state now.

Mr. PORTER. As I understand the original Act, the provisions in regard to compensation are the same for horses and for cattle, and that it is a matter of discretion whether compensation should be paid or not. I would like to ask the minister whether, in case of horses killed for glanders, he knows of any case where compensation has been refused?

Mr. FISHER. I do not.

Mr. PORTER. I am told that it is the invariable practice of the department to grant compensation in cases of that kind.

Mr. FISHER. It has been for some years back, but it was not so years ago.

Mr. PORTER. Where cattle are slaughtered for tuberculosis, are there not many cases where compensation has been refused?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. PORTER. Then I would like to ask the reason for the discrimination. Why pay the owner of a horse which is slaughtered for disease and refuse to pay the owner of another animal which is slaughtered for another disease? If the principal is right in the one case, it appears to me it should be right in the other.

Mr. FISHER. At first sight my hon. friend would appear to be right. But we have to deal with these diseases in a practical way. In certain classes of contagious diseases, such as glanders and hog cholera we think we are within measurable reach of stamping them out. With that object in view we wish to slaughter, not only animals which are diseased and immediately dangerous, but animals which are sure to incur infection, and thus prevent them from spreading the disease. In regard to glanders we are in a position to do that. A few years ago we determined to try and stamp it out, and I am glad to say that we are progressing reasonably towards that end. I do not mean to say that we are likely ever to be able to stamp out glanders absolutely, and that there may not be occasionally a few sporadic cases in Canada. I think we can do with regard to glanders what we have practically done in regard to hog cholera. The situation is different with regard to cattle suffering from tuberculosis. Tuberculosis is a disease not easily recognizable. While we have a sure test of the existence of the disease in an animal, it does not prove to be a sure test to show whether the disease is communicable to other animals. As a matter of diagnosis, it is practically impossible for a veterinary to say whether, when he finds by the test tuberculosis in an animal, the disease has so far progressed a to become communicable and dangerous. I have no hesitation in saying that there are a large number of cattle which have responded to the tuberculine test and have been shown to be infected by the disease, but which were not in the slightest degree dangerous, either to other animals or to the human species. There is no test by which we can tell which animals are dangerous and which are not. But so far as the glanders are concerned, the veterinary experts inform me that in case of any animal that responds to the mallein test, the disease is sure to be present and within a short time, to be dangerous both to other animals and to men. Under these circumstances we feel it is our duty to try to stamp out the disease of glanders, and for that purpose to pay compensation, where necessary, for animals slaughtered in the interest of the public at large. The disease of tuberculosis has not reached that stage, according to the expert testimony of veterinaries and physicians. Under these circumstances I never felt myself able to undertake towards bovine tuberculosis the same action that we have taken in regard to hog cholera, where we have succeeded so well. In regard to glanders we have made long steps towards stamping it out, and I hope that within a couple of years it will have practically disappeared. I appreciate the difficulty of making people understand the difference. I would be glad if we could devise a system under which we could hope, even by expending a considerable sum of money, to stamp out bovine tuberculosis, but we have not yet been able to evolve any such system.

Mr. PORTER. In view of this explanation I suggest to the minister whether it would not be practicable or advisable, in case of certain diseases, to remove the provision of the former Act and to make payment compulsory, leaving a discretionary power, as at present, in case of other diseases. For instance, in case of a disease where the object is to stamp it out, and where a certain amount of success has attended the effort, as in the case of glanders, to make payment compulsory, while in other diseases where the same progress has not been made in stamping them out to leave them to be dealt with in the discretion of the department.

Mr. FISHER. Practically that is what we have done, only we have made the payment in the case of glanders and hog cholera compulsory by regulation and not by statute. The system is made uniform under the regulations which were passed according to the provisions of this statute.

Mr. PORTER. My reasons for suggesting that is this: It has been suggested to me by farmers that if they knew for a certainty that they were going to get a certain amount of compensation for animals slaughtered it would be an object for them to discover disease and have an animal destroyed, whereas, under the present regulation, it being a matter of discretion with the department whether they shall be paid or not, they hide it and keep it from being discovered. It seems to me that it would assist in stamping out the disease if the payment were made compulsory, so that they would know that they would get compensation for slaughtered animals.

Mr. FISHER. As a matter of fact, they do know. It is thoroughly advertised that, in cases of glanders and hog cholera, they do get compensation, and it is also thoroughly understood that in cases of tuberculosis they do not.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know whether I understood the minister correctly or not, but if I did his statement was to the effect that the reason tuberculosis is not included amongst the contagious and infectious diseases with respect to which farmers get paid if they have to slaughter animals that are affected, was because a veterinary surgeon could not determine at any stage whether there was serious danger of the animal affecting others.

Mr. FISHER. Hardly at any stage of the disease.

Mr. SPROULE. I hardly think that a veterinary surgeon would agree with the minister in the statement that they are unable to tell, when certain stages are reached whether an animal is dangerous to the surrounding herd. Take, for instance, an animal where emaciation is going on rapidly; accompanied with a cough; I do not suppose that the minister contends that a veterinary surgeon would not say that the animal was dangerous to others around it. If there is some stage at which the veterinary does know as a matter of professional knowledge that ought to be a strong reason why animals so affected should be included in the list, and I do not think that a veterinary would agree with the minister's contention that they are not included in the list because the veterinary cannot tell when they have become dangerous.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend is quite right. If I said that—I will not deny it positively, but I do not think I did—I did not in any way desire to convey the impression that there was not some stage of the disease when the veterinary could not diagnose it as dangerous. You could very well have a number of animals affected with tuberculosis in such an advanced stage that an ordinary diagnosis would be sufficient to determine the disease, and I have been considering and discussing with my veterinary authorities the advisability of treating such cases of tuberculosis in the same way as we do glanders or hog cholera. While I confess that I do think it might reduce the danger I can hardly hope by that means or any other means that have yet been devised or thought out to stamp out the disease in the same way that I think we will be able to stamp out hog cholera and glanders.

Mr. SPROULE. It might not be possible to stamp it out, but the danger from it might be minimized very much.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do I understand the policy of my hon. friend's department to be of this character that if an individual has in his possession an animal which is necessarily dangerous both to other animals and to man, that animal is destroyed or may be destroyed and compensation results as a matter of course, but that if an individual has in his possession an animal which is not necessarily dangerous either to other animals or to man, which animal may be destroyed, the compensation is altogether discretionary?

Mr. FISHER. No, we take it as a matter of course that if we order destruction we will pay compensation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Always?

Mr. FISHER. Always, whenever we order it, but we do not pay compensation if an individual kills the animal himself and comes afterwards to us and asks for compensation.

Mr. LENNOX. That is a phase of the matter that I want to mention to the minister. As I understand by the Act and from what the minister has just said, the only cases, no matter what the disease may be, in which he pays compensation, are those cases in which the destruction of the animal is ordered by the minister. Of course, I can understand that there may be good reasons for it, but I have had actual cases come to my knowledge, several of them, some of which I have communicated to the department, in which there seems to be a good deal of hardship arising out of the fact that the animal was necessarily destroyed, but not destroyed through the agency of the government. The people in the country do not know the law, but they do know that certain diseases are exceptionally dangerous. They know, for instance, that hog cholera and glanders are two diseases that are exceptionally dangerous, and that they require almost immediate attention. They call in an experienced and qualified veterinary and he directs—very often they think that they have a lawful right to so direct—that the animal should be slaughtered. I do submit to the minister that in a case of that kind, where it can be established beyond a doubt, that the matter was done in perfect good faith then in all honesty the government should pay. What does the minister think of that? I would say to the minister that if he likes he can separate the classes of cases. He can say that in these exceptionally dangerous cases immediate action should be taken and that in the less dangerous cases the present procedure should apply. But, I do submit to the minister it is a hardship, when a qualified practitioner comes in and orders the destruction of an animal, that, because, forsooth, the remedy was taken at the earliest possible stage, the owner of the animal should not have compensation, whereas, if he had allowed the animal to linger and communicate the disease to probably many others of the herd, and spread it throughout the neighbourhood, there should be compensation. Why should not a certificate by a duly qualified veterinary, whether there has been any action by the department or not, entitle to compensation when he has acted of necessity in order to prevent the spread of the disease? I have had several cases of that kind, three or four that I can recall at the present time. I have brought them to the attention of the minister, and I have one before him now. I have not lost faith that we will be able to succeed in this case. I think the law might be very much improved in that regard.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend, I am afraid, is an advocate, and perhaps he is

interested because of having these particular cases, but I will recall to his memory the fact that when we raised the proportion of the value of the animal to be paid in compensation some years ago we threshed that question out here, and I myself was fully convinced of the danger. I had my attention very strongly drawn to the danger of exaggerated compensation. I remember my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) pointing out and urging upon me the danger of collusion between practitioners and the owners of animals. It was suggested that the fact that the owners were the clients of the practitioners would dispose the latter to perhaps slaughter a little bit hurriedly and value a little high. In the interests of the public treasury we have to guard against anything of that kind. While these diseases are dangerous, there is no great difficulty, if any, in a farmer isolating a case on his farm for a day or two until the government veterinary arrives. The law provides that any practitioner must notify the department at once when he finds in his ordinary practice a case of contagious disease, and we immediately order one of our permanent officers to go there and investigate. I venture to say there is hardly any part of Canada which one of the government veterinaries of wide experience, would not reach within a day of our receiving notice of the existence of the disease. There is a good deal in having experience in handling some of these diseases, because we find that a good many local practitioners who are quite good veterinarians have never seen a case of glanders. I hope the district of my hon. friend is not so affected——

Mr. LENNOX. It is the finest county in the province.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. FISHER. I venture to say that in the province of Ontario pretty nearly one-half the ordinary veterinary practitioners have never seen a case of glanders, and I say that with pride, and it is a source of great satisfaction to us. In the maritime provinces I do not believe there are half a dozen veterinary practitioners who ever saw a case of glanders. In some parts of the province of Quebec glanders was prevalent a few years ago and we had to spend a considerable amount of money and use a great deal of diligence to stamp it out; but we have succeeded and to-day there is not one case where there were ten a few years ago. I think in a short time we will be able to say that glanders is practically stamped out from the entire province of Ontario. I believe it would not be in the interest of the public treasury to depart from the rule, that where we pay compensation it shall only be done on the order of an officer of the department.

Mr. PORTER. When cattle are sent in from the country to the abbatoir at Toronto and slaughtered, and then found to be affected with tuberculosis, both the buyer and the seller of these cattle are absolutely in ignorance of the existence of the disease until the animal is killed. The flesh of that animal is then condemned by the officer of the department under the Inspection of Foods Act, and as I understand no compensation is paid. Why should not compensation be paid for an animal condemned by an officer of the department after it was killed, as well as for an animal condemned by an officer of the department before it was killed? If compensation is paid in the one case why should it not be paid in the other? It is worthy of consideration as to whether compensation should not in such a case be paid to the person who suffers the loss.

Mr. FISHER. The condemnation of an animal at the abbatoir as unfit for human food is entirely different from the condemnation of the live animal which is affected with a contagious disease. The principle of compensation under this Act is to prevent the spread of contagious disease among our live animals, while the condemnation of the carcass at the abbatoir is for the protection of the public health. The dead animal does not convey the disease to any other animal.

Mr. PORTER. It conveys the disease to man if its flesh is consumed.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, but that has nothing to do with the contagious disease spreading to other animals which the Act now under consideration is intended to prevent. When we order the slaughter of a live animal, we consider that the owner has suffered for the benefit of the owners of other herds and that in the public interest he ought to be compensated. As the animal is diseased and consequently not at its full value we only pay two-thirds of the value. The question raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Porter) is an interesting one, and I dare say it will come up for discussion on the estimates for enforcing the Canned Foods Act.

Mr. PORTER. While it is very important to prevent the spread of contagious diseases amongst animals, it is very much more important to prevent the communication of that disease to human beings, and in that light it seems to me that compensation should be granted in the case I have mentioned.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I wish to call attention to a provision of this Act which bears harshly on the farmers and horsemen of British Columbia, and which has been the cause of no little hardship in my own riding. I refer to the provision by which the government is nominally entitled to pay

compensation to the extent of two-thirds of the value of an animal slaughtered. The value of the animal is limited to $150 in the case of horses other than thoroughbred. A couple of years ago we had reports of the prevalence of glanders in British Columbia, in consequence of which government officials were sent into the various sections of the province with authority to apply the mallein test and to slaughter any horses which reacted to that test. In British Columbia a horse of the value of $150 is a very ordinary animal indeed; that amount does not represent one-half the value of the average working horse in that province. It certainly did not represent the value of a large proportion of the horses which were condemned under the mallein test and slaughtered, and for which their owners were only offered $100 in compensation. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture to consider whether, in fairness to us in British Columbia who have to pay so much more for our horses and our cattle than the farmers in eastern Canada have to pay, there should not be a provision in this Act stating specifically that this compensation should bear some relation to the real value of the animal, and if we should be so unfortunate as to again come under suspicion as we did a couple of years ago, that our farmers should not be so heavily mulcted as they were then. I know of case after case in which horses valued at between $300 and $400 were slaughtered, not because they had the glanders, but because there was a suspicion that they might develop glanders. They were slaughtered on suspicion only, and yet their owners received only $100 of compensation. The minister shakes his head, but I am speaking, not from hearsay, but of my personal knowledge of events that occurred in the city of New Westminster. The thing became such a scandal, the subject of such an outcry, that a meeting of horse owners was held, and a delegation was sent to the Minister of Inland Revenue, when he was on a visit to Victoria, with the result that the work of testing and inspecting horses was stopped, and from that day we heard nothing more about glanders in my riding. What I want to point out is that when dealing with British Columbia, in the matter of salaries, for instance, we make a difference as compared with other parts of the Dominion, and in most lines of business it is recognized that prices are higher in British Columbia than in other provinces. Therefore I contend that it is a hardship upon our people that this Act should continue as it is, particularly in the case of horses slaughtered, not because they have the disease, but because the mallein test seems to show a disposition on their part to contract it and that they might in time become dangerous to the community. The owners of these horses should receive fair compensation, instead of being put to the serious loss to which so many have been put by the application of that test.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend himself has shown that his statement of the case is not a fair one. I understand him to say that these horses did react to the mallein test. That being the case they had the disease, though it may not have been apparent in the animals' noses. The horses having once contracted the disease, the veterinarians tell us that it is liable to become bad at any time and without warning, so as to be communicable to other animals. In regard to the value of the horses and the payment of compensation, no doubt certain classes of horses in the west—in Saskatchewan and Alberta as well as in British Columbia—are a little higher in value than in Ontario or Quebec, although I do not think there is a very great difference. But it would be very difficult indeed to put in the Act a provision that in British Columbia the value should be allowed to go to say $100 higher than in Ontario, and that therefore the compensation should be somewhat higher. That would be a difficult thing to work out, and I am afraid that it would lead to demands in all parts of the country for discrimination. I would not like off-hand to agree with it, although I sympathize to a certain extent with my hon. friend's suggestion.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to enter a protest against so light and airy a disposition as the minister has shown, in saying that I admitted that the horses had the disease because they reacted to the mallein test. I am not a veterinary surgeon, but I have sufficient acquaintance with the procedure in these cases to know that the department realizes that reaction to the mallein test is not a positive proof of glanders. So much is that the case that the department provides for no less than three tests at long periods apart. Though a horse may react to the test to-day, the veterinary surgeon does not say that it has glanders. He says: it may have glanders, and I will test it again. After a long time he applies the second test, and again says: I am not sure that the horse has glanders; I will test it the third time. All this is contingent on the owner of the horse paying the cost of quarantining it during the period it is under test, and also agreeing to absolve the department from all liability of payment of compensation if, on the last of this series of tests, the horse is found really to have glanders. If reaction to the mallein test were positive proof that a horse had glanders, the department would not make provision for a series of tests of this nature. I rise to make this explanation merely because I do not think it is a proper answer

to ridicule my presentation of the case, and to say that I admitted that the horses had glanders. I said that a great majority of the horses were condemned on suspicion only. There are horses in British Columbia to-day which reacted to the mallein test, but their owners would not allow them to be shot, and these horses to-day show no suspicion of glanders.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend is quite right in saying that under certain circumstances the department has agreed to the position he states. The rule of the veterinarians is that reaction to the mallein test is conclusive evidence of the disease. My hon. friend says that some of these animals reacted once, and afterwards did not react, and were released. I think that possibly a few cases of that kind have occurred but very few indeed. We throw the onus on the owner because absolute quarantine is only granted as a rule where the owner has a very valuable horse and prefers to take the risk of not getting compensation rather than allow it to be slaughtered. He prefers to go to the expense of an absolute quarantine than have the animal slaughtered. All the veterinary authorities consider the mallein test as an absolute one, like the tuberculine or any other. That tuberculine test is practically absolute, yet cattle have been condemned and slaughtered, in which afterwards on examination no trace of tuberculosis was found. But the scientific world have taken the tuberculine test as being so absolutely sure that the number of cases in which it has not been accurate is almost infinitesimal. A similar experience may be found in connection with the mallein test, but that test is considered by the veterinary authorities as absolute.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I would ask the hon. minister if he will take steps to ascertain whether it is not really the case that horses in British Columbia are so much more valuable than the average elsewhere, that he should make some discrimination in their favour.

Mr. FISHER. I shall certainly look into the matter.

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I notice, that under the law, the animal must be valuated by the minister or by a person appointed by him; and moreover, that the price to be paid must not exceed such figure, that is to say $150 for a grade horse and $300 for a thoroughbred.

It seems to me that the law could be made more simple, and thus prevent all the annoyances to which the minister is exposed. The way should be to pay an average and uniform price; two classes being made a certain price would be paid for a common horse, and so much for a thoroughbred, the price being fixed by the statute itself. There would then be no necessity of sending valuators on the ground and by that a saving of many costs, and the minister would not be exposed to the annoyance nor to the accusations of undue favour given to political friends, as has been insinuated a moment ago.

Nevertheless supposing that we would not be very particular as to the price to be fixed, it seems to me that there would not be much inconvenience, because a horse affected with the glanders or other contagious disease has no value, and the owner must expect to lose. The above remarks apply with greater force to other animals.

Hon. Mr. FISHER. It would be really more simple and easy for the minister to accept the suggestion of the honourable member ; but, unfortunately, I think this would give a sort of encouragement to owners of horses of no value; we would be paying too much for horses of no service and not enough for the good ones. We must encourage the betterment of the breed, and, I would rather pay a little more to obtain that end, even if it costs me more annoyance than to accept the way suggested by the hon. member, which would undoubtedly be more simple, but also far worse.

Mr. GUTHRIE. There is another class of cases, which comes within the meaning of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, for which no compensation is provided. I refer to cases in which the officials of the government do not order the slaughter of the animal but order it to be quarantined. Let me cite a serious instance which occurred in the county of Wellington last November. Cattle were purchased and sent forward for export, and at Black Rock or opposite on the Canadian side, they were stopped by the Dominion authorities on the suspicion that one of the animals had mange. The whole consignment of several carloads was stopped. They were returned via Toronto to Fergus in Wellington county at a cost of $297 freight. The shipper was Mr. John Black, one of the largest cattle exporters in Canada. When they were returned to him he had no premises in which to keep them. They were placed in quarantine, special barns had to be procured, where they were kept for some two weeks at a large expense for special attendance. It then turned out that the cattle did not have mange at all. The ox suspected was found quite free from any contagious disease whatever. During the interval permit was given the owner to slaughter his animals immediately, which meant he would have had to sell them to some Toronto packer and receive little or nothing, and they were a very fine class of export cattle. Ultimate-

ly he was given a clearance and allowed to sell his cattle or export them. His net loss on that transaction was between $1,800 and $2,000. True there was suspicion but there was no disease. Had the animals been slaughtered he could have received compensation; but I believe that under the circumstances he is not entitled by law to any. There should be some provision to meet cases of that kind. I can understand that very great care has to be exercised in inspecting cattle for export to Great Britain, but in cases where no disease actually exists the owner should be given compensation.

Mr. FISHER. The case cited by my hon. friend appears to be one of hardship, and it is unfortunate that the owner had to suffer this loss. The details will be looked into and I shall be glad to know exactly the facts.

Mr. BURRELL. In the crusade against glanders some two or three years ago, can the minister tell us whether that crusade ceased because the disease of glanders was wiped out or whether it was because of the indignation excited among the ranchers of British Columbia partly through the inefficiency of the test and partly because of the inadequate compensation? I quite agree with my hon. friend from New Westminister (Mr. Taylor) that the compensation is entirely inadequate in the case of horses slaughtered in British Columbia, owing to the greater value of these animals in that province as compared with other provinces. It is quite possible to suppose a case in which a horse could be five times the value of the compensation paid. And for that reason, the difference of value should be put on it. I imagine the intention is to place a fair value on the man's animals. In our portion of British Columbia, far removed from New Westminster, an ordinary team is worth about $600—certainly, you could not purchase them for less than $500. And to put a price of the sort outlined by the government and pay two-thirds of it would cause a rather indignant feeling on the part of the farmers, especially if he thinks the test is not infallible and that sometimes his animals are slaughtered on suspicion only. I know that the feeling through the Okanagan and down the Similkameen was very strong, and I think that it was the cause of the action of the department being changed in the way it was.

Mr. FISHER. I know that there was a good deal of excitement, but the department did not deliberately change what the hon. gentleman calls 'the crusade' in consequence of the protests made. We tried, as far as possible, to deal with the public in a conciliatory way, and to educate the public to an appreciation of an understanding of our motives and methods. Speaking from memory entirely, I urged upon my officers to proceed with greater caution, and to use—if I may say so—more conciliatory methods than they seemed to be exercising. As to change of policy, there is nothing of the kind; and that policy, I am glad to say, has practically brought about a cessation of the disease in British Columbia. I have no doubt that the condition to-day in regard to horses in British Columbia is enormously improved in consequence of what was done at that time. The difficulties in the way of making discrimination as to the value of animals in different parts of the country are very great, and I doubt very much if any such arrangement could be come to that would not work greatly to the detriment of the treasury, as well as bring about cases of injustice. I am willing to think about it, and see if anything of the kind can be worked out, but I confess that I cannot see any prospect of it.

Mr. MOLLOY. I, for one, would object to an increase in the compensation for glandered horses. The reason is that a glandered horse is not worth a single dollar. I have had some experience as an inspector and I would certainly object to any increase in compensation for a horse proven by the post-mortem to have been diseased. A glandered horse is not only valueless, but he is a source of danger and may cost the country an immense sum of money. I remember one band of bronchos brought into the county in which I live, and the result of their coming was that disease was spread over the whole county. Therefore, I object to pay over $100 for that which is not worth a ten cent piece, and is a source of danger to the country. Is it not a fact that the Canadian government is paying larger compensation for animals that are slaughtered in this way than any other country in the world? And why should horses be worth more in British Columbia than in Manitoba? The city of Winnipeg boasts, and justly, that it has the finest horses of any city in Canada. Why people in British Columbia should expect more for their glandered horses than people in other provinces, I cannot understand. Besides, such a thing would cause a great deal of dissatisfaction. This is the first time I have learned that the department is paying for horses that are destroyed on suspicion. Horses are not destroyed on suspicion. The very fact that the government allows the owner of the horse to reserve the animal to be subjected to the mallein test for the third time, I think, is a wise provision. I have tested horses for the third time and have found that they reacted, but the second and third time the reaction is not so marked as the first time. Besides, a horse whose entire system is permeated with disease might not react at all. That is one case where you have

to go by the clinical symptoms. So far as increase in the compensation is concerned, I certainly object to any.

Mr. BURRELL. I would point out that section 3 of this Act says:

Section 32 of the said Act is amended by adding after the word 'disease' in the seventh line, the following words,—'or of the suspicion of such disease.'

If the hon. member for Provencher (Mr Molloy) is going to be logical, he should move an amendment providing that no compensation be paid, for he is evidently under the impression that the government are wasting the people's money by giving compensation. But I feel sure he is astray on the facts, for, so far as British Columbia is concerned, there is at least a very strong feeling that animals have been slaughtered on suspicion, without knowledge.

Mr. MOLLOY. I do not feel at all bound to move that compensation be done away with. I am proud that the Canadian people pay so large compensation as they do. But I honestly think that $100 for a horse that is not worth a dollar is enough. True, the owner suffers the misfortune of the loss of the horse, or even the loss of a part of his herd. A man not having enough horses to do his work may purchase a horse not knowing that he is introducing disease into his herd. I do not think the innocent buyer should suffer. But when the country helps to bear the loss to the extent it does, I do not think there is any reason for increasing the compensation.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer). It is astonishing how, in this world, circumstances alter cases and change the view we take of questions. I happen to be, not a veterinary surgeon, but a representative of western farmers. And I happen to have had a couple of horses destroyed by glanders. I found the compensation extremely useful as assisting me in contending with the conditions of a new country and the difficulties of the pioneer work in which I am engaged. From this point of view, I should be prepared to differ slightly from my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. Molloy). The western farmer must face circumstances of very great difficulty. He tackles a life which is entirely new to him; and when he has the misfortune to get a pair of glandered horses, I can assure you from personal experience the compensation comes in very handy. From the point of view of the country, it is not always a loss to pay that compensation, for there are homesteaders in the west who if they had not that compensation in such a difficulty would be left for a considerable time without horses altogether, and the wealth that they would otherwise earn, not only for themselves, but for Canada, would be unearned. I think that, from that point of view, even a broad and sympathetic view of the case of the settler would commend itself to my friend from Provencher if he tried for a moment to forget that he is a veterinary surgeon and place himself in the position of the farmer. But from the public point of view, there is another argument to be urged. The man who knows that he is going to have the only horse which he has destroyed, with all the difficulties of his life to face, having to provide for his wife and family and needing something to tide him over the struggles that lie before him in the early years of his life as a settler, will be apt to hide for a long time the fact that his horses have the glanders. I think it is a wise policy to give every encouragement to the settler—up to a reasonable point, which, I think, is two-thirds of the value of the animal—to divulge at the earliest moment the fact that he has a glandered horse, and thus afford protection to the owners of animals with which the others might come in contact. On these grounds, both of sympathetic regard for the earlier settler in his struggles and of the public good, so far as that is concerned, I offer my hearty support to the attitude of the department and a modest demurrer to the view taken by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Molloy).

Bill reported.

Mr. FISHER moved the third reading of said Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the Bill is read a third time, for the benefit of those who have asked the question, can the minister state briefly what are the quarantine regulations against stock going from Canada to the United States at the present time—as briefly as he likes.

Mr. FISHER. I would hardly like to give an answer off-hand to so important a question, for it involves, not only the regulations against one kind of stock, but against all kinds of stock, and those regulations vary in regard to different kinds of stock. If I were to attempt to give a brief explanation, I might leave something out.

Mr. SPROULE. Could not the minister instruct some one in his department to get the information and make it public—because the question is often asked us, and we cannot tell.

Mr. FISHER. I will do so.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time, and passed.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS ACT—AMENDMENT.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved the second reading of the Bill (No. 20) to amend the Government Railways Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is it?

Mr. GRAHAM. Last year, it will be remembered, the Government Railways Act was amended to change the conditions under which those suffering loss by having animals killed, could recover compensation. An error was made in not putting in the exceptions that are in the general Railway Act. I am advised by the Justice Department that the way to obviate the difficulty is practically to repeal what we did last year and introduce the exact terms of the ordinary Railway Act, and make it apply to government railways. It repeals what we did last year, and introduces a clause found in subsection 4, chap. 37, of the Railway Act, section 294.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not quite understand how that will work out. It is intended that there should be a fiat granted, as in the ordinary procedure in the Exchequer Court? If not, how is it proposed that the Crown should be served?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is expected that the department, in all these cases, will allow the privilege of going to the Exchequer Court, where we settle a great many cases. There has been a good deal of discussion, not so much over the court process of recovering, but over the fact that our conditions were not the same. The people suffering losses under the old Government Railway Act had to prove more than we propose to require of them under this new Act. This is in identical terms with the ordinary Railway Act, except that we put 'His Majesty' where the word 'company' occurs.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not criticising the object of the Act. It seems to me that the Crown when it engages in the business of transportation ought to be subject to the same liability for the negligence of its officers as any private corporation. But I wished to know how it is to be worked out, because this measure provides that compensation can be recovered in any court of competent jurisdiction. Now, as far as the Exchequer Court is concerned, we know that recovery can be had against the Crown there. There are rules of the court, and statutory provisions as well, providing that a petition should be presented. The Crown is not usually sued by its own writ; it is sued by a subject, by means of a petition, and a fiat on that petition. Then there is a procedure for service of a petition by depositing it in a certain department of the government. When you introduce a rough and ready provision like this, adapted, not to proceedings against the Crown but to proceedings by one subject against another, I was desirous of ascertaining in what way it will work out, according to the view of the government. I do not precisely understand that at the present time.

Mr. GRAHAM. Last year it was thoroughly threshed out and section 29 was inserted amending the Government Railway Act by providing practically what we are providing here.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am afraid my hon. friend does not understand me.

Mr. GRAHAM. There has been no objection taken to the granting of a fiat in every instance in which it has been asked for.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not criticising the object of the Act; I am endeavouring to see whether or not it would be effective in its present form. If I am satisfied it will be effective in its present form I have no word to say, but I am not satisfied of that at the present time nor can I say that the assurance of my hon. friend absolutely removes my difficulty. It would be contrary to all precedent that the Crown should issue a writ against itself; therefore, you must proceed by petition, I presume, and yet this statute does not seem to make any provision for such a procedure. It says that the subject may recover in any court of competent jurisdiction. I am not aware that in any court other than the Exchequer court there is procedure at the present time, nor do I know there is authority in the judges of the respective courts to authorize any procedure for the purposes of a section like this. I may be entirely wrong in this, but at all events I would like to have some information on the subject.

Mr. GRAHAM. Perhaps I misunderstood my hon. friend and did not catch the technical idea. This Bill does not provide in any way for the extension of jurisdiction to any court outside of the Exchequer court.

Mr. LENNOX. Then, it is badly worded.

Mr. GRAHAM. Any court of competent jurisdiction means the Exchequer court in this case.

Mr. EMMERSON. Where the Crown is a party that is the only court having jurisdiction.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is the only court of competent jurisdiction.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then I misunderstood the section. I thought it was the intention of the section to permit these proceedings to be had in the ordinary courts of the land and not confine them to the Exchequer court. Then may I ask why the draughtsman did not simply say: The Exchequer court? It would have re-

moved a great deal of misapprehension on my part to have done that. If the expression 'in any court of competent jurisdiction' means, as the minister assures me it was intended to mean, the Exchequer court and the Exchequer court alone, it would seem to me to be a very much simpler mode of draughting simply to use that expression, and if it is intended to confine the remedy to the Exchequer court I would respectfully suggest that it would be better to say so.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is no objection to saying that. We have just followed the language of the Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the difficulty has arisen from the fact that language applicable to suit between subject and subject has been applied to an entirely different thing, namely, to a petition by a subject against the Crown for compensation.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would move that where we have the words 'in any court of competent jurisdiction' we say in the Exchequer court.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If it can be fairly worked out it would be very much better to give jurisdiction to the courts throughout the country rather than to confine it to the Exchequer court. However, that is a very large question and I would not be prepared to urge it upon the minister at this stage.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is a question that I have been considering a good deal and possibly I may have something to say with regard to it before the session is over. In this Bill I am simply trying to remedy a mistake that we made last session.

Mr. PARDEE. Suppose jurisdiction were afterwards extended to the other courts would it not be well to leave the language as it stands in the Bill at the present time? It would save an amendment to this Act. By this Bill petitioners can only come to the Exchequer court and this would not have the effect of extending jurisdiction to other courts.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am inclined to think that actions will be attempted in other courts under the language as it is at the present time, and they will probably fail. However, if the minister proposes to extend to other courts the jurisdiction to entertain proceedings against the Crown for compensation of this kind or otherwise I would not have any special objection to allowing the language to remain as it is at present for that purpose.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would not like to commit myself at the present time. Possibly we had better leave this at it is and if such a change should be made later on it would not require an amendment here, as this would meet the case. This question is a large one; it means giving up a prerogative of the Crown which prevents any subject from suing the Crown except permission is granted to him. Therefore, to say that a person could sue the Crown in any court of law would be to reverse the position which the Crown has always taken. I think it would be wise to leave this wording as it is at the present time as there is no other court that would have any jurisdiction except the Exchequer court.

Mr. LENNOX. If the matter is going to be considered and if this is going to have any general beneficial operation it would be necessary to give the parties the right to sue in local courts. It is not a suit for a large amount as a rule. It is an action for compensation for the loss of a few animals and unless the person injured can be given the right to sue in the local courts it is of very little advantage. If he has to come to the Exchequer court and prosecute his action he will not get much benefit. It may be that in that way the Crown frequently escapes but if the scope of the Act is extended in such a way as to apply to the courts generally, as it appears by the wording here, it will give the injured person a better opportunity to prosecute his claim. I might also call the minister's attention to the expression 'in any action' after the words 'His Majesty'. That does not seem to read very well. I think it is intended to be 'by action in any court.' I would like the minister to consider whether it can be worked out so as to extend the right of action to local courts. I do not know whether it can be but it would be beneficial to parties having claims against the Crown.

Mr. GRAHAM. The wording is from the Railway Act, chapter 37. We have followed it exactly.

Mr. LENNOX. It is bad wording.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friends should have got it right when they were putting it through. I was not here. This is what we get for following a bad example. It is nothing new that we are introducing here to-night; this is to remedy something that was passed last session and we are endeavouring to get this tribunal a little closer to the people. The Exchequer court is a perambulating court and goes to the people instead of the people coming to it. If we should extend jurisdiction to the courts generally we would relinquish a prerogative that the Crown has retained from time immemorial. Whether that ought to be done or not is a question that requires consideration. There is quite a demand for it, I will admit, and we are considering it, but at the same time that is not proposed here and I would like to amend this Act so as to make it workable.

Mr. HAGGART. The principal element of an amendment of this kind is to do away with the necessity of getting a fiat for an action.

Mr. GRAHAM. Unless the Intercolonial Railway runs through the hon. gentleman's constituency this clause does not apply. I am trying to bring the government railway under the General Railway Act in this respect.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Would not the same law apply to the railways in Canada?

Mr. GRAHAM. That which I am introducing now has been in the Railway Act for years, and I am simply applying it to the government railway.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I understand it has been held in the courts that if a railway runs through a man's farm and his cattle are killed the railway company is responsible, but if the cattle of a farmer through whose land the railway does not run are killed on the track the company is not responsible.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not amending the Railway Act at all; I am merely applying this provision to the Intercolonial Railway. Speaking from memory, I think it has been held that if a man's cattle get from his own farm to a place where they have no right to be and are killed, negligence may possibly be shown and he has not the same claim for damages as would the man whose cattle are killed having strayed directly from his farm to the railway.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I do not think that is right.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is the general law and we are not amending it in any way.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SALISBURY & HARVEY RAILROAD—PROTECTION OF LEVEL CROSSINGS.

Mr. CONMEE—for Mr. Emmerson—moved second reading of Bill (No. 35), to incorporate the Salisbury & Harvey Railroad Company.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe). I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of Railways to this Bill, and to ask him to have it stand. We are face to face now with the very big question of the protection of level crossings. I believe the minister appreciates the importance of that question as much as anybody, and he has told us that he is investigating it; and I hope that we shall have at an early day a declaration of policy from him in reference to the whole question of railway crossings in Canada so far as they are governed by Dominion law. All legislatures which have had to deal with this matter, except in Great Britain, where they began right, have had to some extent to separate the different methods of dealing with it, according as the railway was an existing railway or a new enterprise. A more rigid rule has been applied to the new enterprises than to existing railways, and in Canada we shall probably have to be guided somewhat by the same principle. I think it would be unwise to go on incorporating railways at this session of parliament without having first laid down our policy upon this level crossing question. I appreciate that the matter as I present it is not without difficulty. We do not want to hold up these Bills; but at the same time, in view of the fact that the minister will very soon be able to declare to parliament, in a general way at all events, what he proposes in regard to level crossings, this Bill and other Bills of similar character ought to be allowed to stand. There is an alternative way of dealing with these Bills; that is, for the minister to state to the House that in allowing them to go to the Railway Committee, he will see to it that they are made subject to such legislation in reference to railway crossings as shall be enacted by parliament, which will probably get over the difficulty. But I feel it to be my duty as one member of the House to endeavour to prevent the incorporation of any new railways this session —or extensions, probably, as has been suggested to me—without some provision being made, having for its aim the elimination of grade crossings as far as possible, and, where that cannot be done, the affording of a reasonably adequate protection to the public using the highways. If the minister will say that he will see that proper amendments are made when the Bill goes to the Railway Committee, I would not be disposed to protest further; but I certainly urge on the minister not to allow it to go baldly before the committee until we have something more definite in regard to this question of railway crossings.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways). I see that my hon. friend appreciates the difficulty. I am not now going to discuss the danger of level crossings, nor the remedy that we may apply to remove the dangers as far as possible. We will discuss that a little later on.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister appreciates that I do not expect him to do so.

Mr. GRAHAM. I appreciate the situation as much as anybody can, because it is brought to my notice perhaps more thoroughly than to that of any other member of the House. I have a strong personal opin-

ion on the way this question ought to be dealt with, but I do not feel at liberty to express it now, as I have not discussed it at any length with my colleagues. I may say this, however, without announcing a policy, that I believe that railways which have already been constructed with our consent and approval, without any restrictions in their charters, are in a different position from those to which we hereafter may give charters; and whatever plan we are able to work out for the protection of the public will be made applicable to whatever charter is put through this session. I hope we shall be able to devise something that will meet with the approval of the entire House, and whatever conclusion we do arrive at will be made applicable to all the new charters.

Mr. SPROULE. This question has attained so much importance of late that it cannot be delayed very much longer. I agree with every word uttered by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), and I am glad that the Minister of Railways expresses himself along the line we hoped he would. I have always felt that there was something in the vested rights of railways which were chartered before any provision in regard to the protection of crossings was made, and that they should be dealt with differently from railways that may be chartered in the future. But we cannot commence too soon to deal with the question, and whatever legislation is enacted for that purpose should apply to every charter which passes this parliament hereafter.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). I agree a good deal with what the hon. gentlemen have just said, but I cannot for one moment concur in the idea that the Railway Act, the general law of this country in regard to railways, is not to apply to all railways. The spirit of the Act is that it applies to all railways to-day, and anything that may be passed by this House as a portion of the general Act should apply to railways already in existence as well as to new railways. That is the key-note of the Act, and I cannot agree with the idea that we are to have two laws on this subject, one for the new roads and one for the old roads. But, certainly, the question must be settled this session, and on a broad, progressive basis.

Mr. GRAHAM. It would not be exactly two laws. But there are two different conditions which we must recognize. The main idea is that we should try to attain the same objects in reference to both roads, but the machinery for the two may be a little different on account of the different conditions.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SOUTHERN CENTRAL PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE (Strathcona) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 36) respecting the Southern Central Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. J. D. REID. Where does this railway run?

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. This Bill simply provides for an extension of charter. The road originates in southern British Columbia and runs through the southern portion of Alberta and for a considerable distance north in that province.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not want to object to this Bill, but the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) will see that this company was incorporated in 1903—six years ago—and I would like to know whether any work has been done on this railway?

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. Preliminary surveys have been carried on in the usual way. The Bill will be in committee, and at that time, I presume, the solicitor of the company will be ready to give full information.

Mr. BLAIN. I think the answer of the Minister of Railways and Canals to my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) was a very fair one, and a very frank one. I did not quite understand that he intended it to apply to extensions of charter or revivals of charter as well as to new legislation.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would not like my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) to take advantage of the statement I make now, for I express my own opinion and on the spur of the moment. I believe that where a road is not constructed, the part not constructed ought to come under any legislation we pass, the same as a new line.

Mr. HUGHES. How can you bring in part without the whole? That would be one-sided legislation.

Mr. GRAHAM. That condition will probably not arise.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

WESTERN CANADIAN LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE (Strathcona) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 37) to incorporate the Western Canadian Life Assurance Company.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I understand that it is the intention of the government this session to bring down an Insurance Bill containing very drastic provisions, and involving, I understand, a great many amendments in the insurance law. It may be

that the provisions of that general Bill will conflict, to a certain extent, with the provisions of this. That being the case, I would suggest that this Bill be allowed to stand until the government have declared their policy on the general Insurance Act as promised in the speech from the Throne, and I ask the minister in charge of these matters to allow the Bill to stand, or give us the same assurance as was given to the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) with reference to the Railway Bills. I would also suggest that the name proposed for this company is, perhaps, an encroachment, to a certain extent, on the rights of the Canada Life Assurance Company. The name very much resembles the name of that company, the principal difference being the prefixing of the name 'Western.' It seems to me that the Bill might be objectionable to that company.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not, perhaps, an authority on this particular Bill. My hon. friend (Mr. Knowles) who introduced the Bill seems to be absent. There can be no doubt in the world that whatsoever general legislation is brought in affecting insurance will be applicable to this company. No doubt the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who is in charge of the Bill, will see to it that this legislation is kept in harmony with the general Bill.

Mr. HUGHES. There is no hurry; the matter cannot be decided until the Minister of Finance returns.

Mr. GRAHAM. We might let this go to committee, and they will probably detain it there. In fact, I would advise them to do so.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. How are we to know whether this is in harmony with the general Bill before that Bill is submitted to us?

Mr. GRAHAM. This much is sure—the Minister of Finance will probably give the assurance when he comes—that if there is anything in this Bill out of harmony with the general Bill, the general Bill will govern.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 33) respecting the Niagara-Welland Power Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 38) respecting he Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—Mr. Dubeau.

THE GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS ACT.

House again went into committee on Bill (No. 20) to amend the Government Railways Act.—Mr. Graham.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO.

On section 1.—Gates not closed.

Mr. J. D. REID. This requires some consideration. According to it, a man might shut the gate on his farm all right and then some one, passing over the line, might open it and leave it open and the cattle might get out and be killed. The owner of the animals would not be in fault, yet according to this he would not be able to recover any loss.

Mr. GRAHAM. The burden of proof is on His Majesty. All these clauses are in the Railway Act and have been there for years and we are simply making them applicable to the Intercolonial Railway.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY NEW STOCK.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) moved that the House go into committee of Supply.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Before we go into committee of Supply, Mr. Speaker, I would like to get on record the order in council which was brought down yesterday regarding the Canadian Pacific Railway increase of capitalization. The order in council is as follows:

On a report dated August 13, 1908, from the right honourable the president of the council submitting that the C.P.R., in a letter from Sir Thos. Shaughnessy, dated August 10. 1908, has applied for the approval of the Governor General in Council of a proposed increase in the capital stock of the company under the provisions of the Act 55-56 Vic., chap. 35, and has submitted a certified copy of the resolution passed by the directors that such increase is in the interests of the company, and that the president of the company be authorized to make application for the approval by the Governor General in Council of such increase.

The minister further submits that the ordinary authorized capital stock of the company stands at present at the sum of $150,000,000, divided into 1,500,000 shares of the par or face value of $100 each. The company represent that looking to the business activities and general development that are likely to follow a bountiful harvest, it is of the utmost importance that they should be in a position to secure from time to time the funds necessary for continuing the works of improvement and for providing the additional equipment and facilities that are sure to be required in order to keep pace with the progress of the country and the consequent expansion of traffic, and they ask for approval of an increase of $50,000,000 in the authorized capital, making the authorized issue $200,000,000.

The minister recommends that the application of the company be granted, and that the issue of further stock of the company be approved to the extent of $50,000,000 in shares of $100 each, making a total of ordinary capital of $200,000,000, provided that none of such new stock be issued at less than par, and that

the issue be authorized by resolution of the shareholders of the company as provided by section 3 of the said Act 55-56 Victoria, chap. 35, and further that no part of such capital so to be raised shall be applied to the construction of any works outside of Canada.

'The Minister further recommends that the said $50,000,000 shall not, nor shall any part thereof, nor shall any moneys arising therefrom, no matter how disposed of, be deemed capital expended in the construction of the railway within the meaning of section 20 of the company's act of incorporation, and the power of the Parliament of Canada or the Governor General in Council to reduce the tolls upon the railway of the company shall in no wise be affected by any such increase of capital stock, in whole or in part, nor by the expenditure of any such moneys in the construction of the railways, or otherwise, but the same shall be excluded from consideration in determining the amount of capital actually expended in the construction of the railway.'

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY,

Montreal, August 10, 1908.

Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier,
Premier, Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—Although a considerable portion of the proceeds of the last issue of ordinary capital stock is still available, the board of directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, looking to the business activities and general development that are likely to follow a bountiful harvest, consider it of the utmost importance that the company should be in a position to secure from time to time the necessary funds for continuing the works of improvement and for providing the additional equipment and facilities that are sure to be required in order to keep pace with the progress of the country and the consequent expansion of trafic.

To that end the directors proposed to recommend to the shareholders at the October meeting that the authorized ordinary capital stock of the company be increased from $150,000,000 to $200,000,000 subject, as provided in statute 55-56 Victoria, chapter 35, to the approval of the Governor in Council. It will then be possible for the company to issue and sell this stock in such amounts from time to time as may be necessary or desirable for the purpose of the undertaking.

I beg to inclose herewith a certified copy of a resolution of the board of directors, adopted at a meeting to-day providing for such increase and authorizing this application.

I venture to respectfully request that this increase in the company's ordinary capital stock be sanctioned by an order in council containing the same conditions and restrictions as the order in council passed February 10, 1906, which authorized the increase from $110,000,000 to $150,000,000.

As I am informed that you and some other members of your cabinet will be leaving Ottawa in the near future for a short holiday, I also respectfully ask that this sanction be given at an early date, because in order that this matter may be dealt with at the October meeting the notices should be transmitted to the Old country before the end of the present month.

In this connection you may be interested in knowing what the company has done in the way of additions to its rolling stock equipment in recent years and I therefore beg to submit the following comparison of the various classes of rolling stock owned by the company in the years 1902 and 1908:

	1902.	1908.	Increase.
Locomotives..	745	1,404	659
Passenger cars	842	1,648	842
Freight cars..	22,535	47,725	25,190

This is equivalent to an addition to our equipment of one locomotive every three working days, one passenger car every two days and fourteen freight cars each day during the entire period of six years, at an aggregate cost of about $37,000,000, and unless we are all very much mistaken, this work must be continued without cessation.

I have the honour to be,
My dear Sir Wilfrid,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) T. G. SHAUGHNESSY,
President.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Extract from the minutes of a meeting of the board of directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, duly called and held at the principal office of the company, at Montreal, on Monday, August 10, 1908.

Whereas the authorized ordinary capital stock of this company at this date is $150,000,000 divided into 1,500,000 shares of the par or face value of $100 each;

And whereas pursuant to the provisions of section 3 of the Act 55-56, Victoria, chapter 35, Canada, the company being duly authorized in that behalf by its shareholders at a special general meeting duly called for the purpose, may from time to time increase its capital stock for any purpose for which the company requires new capital, to such amounts and at such times as the shareholders at any such meeting may determine, such issue being first approved by the Governor in Council;

And whereas the company requires from time to time new capital for the purposes of its undertaking, and it is desirable to increase the amount of the said authorized ordinary capital stock to $200,000,000, being an increase of $50,000,000:

Now therefore it is resolved as follows, that is to say:—

That it is in the interests of this company that the ordinary capital stock of the company be increased from $150,000,000 to an amount not exceeding $200,000,000 in shares of $100 each or its equivalent in sterling money of Great Britain, to be issued and sold for the purposes of its undertaking as may be determined by resolution of the shareholders of the company;

2. That the president of the company be, and he is hereby authorized to make an application in the name of the company to the Governor in Council to have the said proposed increase of stock duly approved of;

3. That the secretary of the company be and he is hereby authorized and directed to give notice in the manner and form provided by the statutes and by-laws relating thereto for the holding of a special general meeting

of the shareholders of the company at the head office of the company immediately after the annual general meeting of the company to be held on Wednesday the 7th day of October next for the purpose of authorizing the said increase of capital stock, and of determining the manner and form in which the same shall be issued and disposed of.

(Sgd.) W. R. BAKER.

I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Railways to what happened in this House in 1902 when the capital stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway was increased by $20,000,000, and I want to read a sentence or two from the speech of the Minister of Justice, now Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, who introduced the Bill. In that speech, which will be found on page 2934 of the Hansard of 1902, and which is well worth reading, the then Minister of Justice said:

In the Bill I have the honour to lay before the House, the government has taken the precaution to make it a matter of state that the money is to be applied to the purposes which it is said to be necessary at the time the order in council was applied for.

In other words, while the Canadian Pacific Railway was given the right to increase its capital by $20,000,000, the minister made it his duty to put into an Act of parliament that the money so raised was to be devoted to special purposes. He then proceeded to say:

Now this regulation was necessary only with respect to two points, namely with respect to issuing any part of this amount of capital stock at less than par—for under their charter they would have had right to do so—and there is a restriction that the $200,000,000 shall not be issued at less than par.

—and then with respect to the tolls, it is made a matter of special stipulation that when you come to apply section 20 for the regulation of tolls this additional twenty millions should not be taken into account. And further, they have thought proper, at the suggestion of the Minister of the Interior, to provide that this money should be specifically applied for the purposes for which the company say they require to have it—that is, it should be applied in the improvement of the property of the company.

And that also was added to the Act of parliament that then went through. The then Minister of the Interior, now the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), in reply to some remarks I made after the Minister of Justice had spoken, said:

My honourable friend——

Meaning the then member for East York.

—will learn, I think, with great delight, that the first order in council provided that an immediate reference should be taken to the courts for the purpose of determining the amount of the capital actually expended in the construction of the road, so that we might know exactly where we are in respect to the control of rates on this railway. That was the first thing to take into consideration, and that arrangement was arrived at before the order in council was finally passed giving the company power to increase their capital stock.

Now, what I want to know to-night is, first of all, is it the intention of the government to introduce a Bill authorizing this increase of capital, and imposing the conditions that were imposed in the then Bill, namely, that the money shall be applied to a specific purpose, and that the stock shall not be sold for less than par. I also wish to ask the minister whether the promise made by the then Minister of the Interior was fulfilled, that an immediate reference was to be made to the courts to ascertain the actual cost of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I am somewhat in doubt whether that work was ever done. I think it ought to be done; and my main object to-night is simply to get this order in council and the schedule that accompanies it, put upon the record to give the minister an opportunity of saying whether we are to have a Bill this session dealing with this increase of capital, and whether that reference which was outlined by the then Minister of the Interior has ever been made, namely, that we were to have a reference to the courts to find out what the actual cost of the investment of the Canadian Pacific Railway was. That is very important. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company to-day, I believe, claim that they are simply under that charter, and that the rates can only be interfered with by this parliament when their earnings exceed 10 per cent on the actual amount invested in the company. I ask the minister if it is so, whether that reference was ever made, and whether that amount has ever been ascertained. I also want to know whether he intends to introduce a special Act this session in reference to that matter, like that of seven years ago.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I am sorry I cannot give my hon. friend definite information on this point. I do not know whether that reference was ever made to the courts or not. Perhaps I am wrong, but it strikes me that the Bill was necessary.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Well, why was it in the previous case?

Mr. GRAHAM. If it is necessary, undoubtedly one will be introduced; but if it is not necessary, I am not in a position to state that it will be. I think all the conditions mentioned in that legislation are guarded in the order in council.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. But the Minister of Justice held, not only that they should do it by order in council, but that it should be in an Act of parliament.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not arguing that point. If it is necessary to have an Act of parliament, no doubt there will be an Act of parliament in order to bring into active operation the order in council, or to confirm it I think the conditions in the order in council cover everything that is covered by the conditions in the legislation referred to. I think the company cannot issue stock at less than par. A great many people think, my hon. friend perhaps does not think, that one way to protect the public would be to allow no company to issue its stock above par, either. I am not expressing an opinion, but that is the opinion of a great many men with whom I have talked, who think that would protect the public perhaps more than anything else against over-capitalization, principally against what we call wildcat schemes. However, after reading what my hon. friend has said in the 'Hansard' I will be able to answer him more definitely.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Another thing. The power to control the capital stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway was in parliament in 1892, but for some reason or other it was transferred to the jurisdiction of the Governor General in Council. I would also like to know why there is this distinction between the Canadian Pacific Railway and other roads. If other roads wish to increase their capital stock they come to parliament and get a special Act, and everybody has notice of that Act, and everybody can govern themselves accordingly. But the great Canadian Pacific Railway Company apparently can increase its capital stock by an order in council. Now when the road was first incorporated the control of its capital stock was altogether in the hands of parliament, but a strange thing has happened, and now the control of that road in regard to its stock, and it is the greatest road in the country, is a matter of order in council, and, as we saw in 1902, of an order in council that at that time was confirmed by an Act of parliament. I also wish the minister to look up that matter and be able to tell the people of this country how this change has taken place, and what there is to justify it.

Mr. SPROULE. In the matter of increasing the capital stock of a railway like this, I agree with the contention of my hon. friend from York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) that it ought to be a matter of legislation in parliament. I do not know what the provisions of the Act are, or whether it empowers the Governor in Council to do it or not. But if it does empower the Governor in Council to do it, it seems rather strange that the last time they increased the stock they did it by Act of parliament confirming an order in council. I would regard a railway corporation coming to this parliament for consideration just the same as I would a company that wanted to extend their line, or wanted to extend the time, or wanted to amend their charter in some particular. When it comes before parliament asking for consideration, parliament, in its wisdom, should amend that Act in any direction that is absolutely needed in the interest of the people, and it is then for the corporation either to accept the Act with the provisions tacked on, or not ask for the Act. I do not think that parliament, in its wisdom, would go so far as to do any great injustice, but I do not think it would be doing injustice to a railway corporation, when they come to parliament asking for favours, if parliament should in its wisdom ask for favours in return on behalf of the people.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to ask the minister what is the position of this matter. Has the government power to increase the capital by order in council, or is it necessary for the company to come to parliament with a Bill to increase the capital? The minister who passed this order in council must understand the situation.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not in a position to say whether it is necessary. I have been of the opinion that it was not necessary, but I cannot say absolutely. It is a question that has been raised at the moment and I would have to look into it.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the minister get the information and give it to the House at a later stage?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. I promised the hon. member for South York to have his entire remarks investigated, or read carefully to-morrow, and give a reply to all the questions he raised.

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

Railways and Canals—Capital—Lachine Canals, to complete wharf and basins, $150,000.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). This is a revote; $300,000 was voted last year for this work.

Mr. J. D. REID. Was there anything done under this vote?

Mr. SPROULE. Would it be out of place to ask the minister to give us some information with regard to the government's policy on the enlargement of the Welland canal or the building of the Georgian Bay canal? The country has watched these questions with a great deal of interest and I am sure that a great many members of the House would be pleased to hear what the government's policy is. The promise was made during the election that some day the Welland canal would be enlarged and the

people were led to expect that operations would be commenced in the near future. Others think that the implied promise was given that the Georgian Bay canal would be commenced soon. It would be very interesting to the country to know what the government's policy is.

Mr. GRAHAM. I never made any promise that either of these works would be done immediately. I have expressed the opinion in this House and reiterated it in the country that the position that Canada holds this year in the grain trade would be more than maintained if we enlarged the Welland canal. Last year this House voted a certain sum of money to make surveys, and I will have to ask for the voting of another certain sum to complete these surveys. I have abiding faith in the power of the development of our waterways to cheapen our transportation, and I believe that it will not be many years when either one or both of these things will be done if Canada is to hold her place. But, at the present time, I am not in a position to state what the policy of the government is. The estimate and report of the Georgian Bay canal scheme are in the Department of Public Works, and they have been laid before parliament. The report of the engineers on the Welland canal cannot be brought down until the survey is completed, and that will take perhaps another year. We are going on steadily with the work, and I am asking for another appropriation to complete this. By that time I hope I will be able to give the House an estimate of what it would cost to complete the enlargement of the Welland canal, or to build it anew in part. My own opinion is that it would maintain the trade in the carrying of grain by water from the west to the east and do its share of carrying the package freight from the east to the west. Notwithstanding the fact that the State of New York has voted one hundred million dollars for the enlargement of the Erie canal, experts tell me that the Welland canal, if enlarged to take the larger class of vessels from Duluth and Fort William down to the end of lake navigation, Kingston, Brockville or Prescott, we can get a rate for the carriage of grain that will be less than any rate that can be obtained by way of the Erie canal.

Mr. SPROULE. I noticed during the elections remarks attributed to the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) to the effect that he had the assurance that if the government were returned to power again, they would at an early date commence the enlargement of the Welland canal. I was somewhat curious to know what foundation in fact these remarks really had, and to that end I put the query to the Minister of Railways and Canals. But, I see that he rather fights shy of the question, and is not as desirous now of leaving the impression on the country that it will be commenced at an early date as his candidate was when such a statement was going to get votes. I presume that something of the kind was carried on in the campaign along the proposed route of the Georgian Bay canal. I thought I saw some remarks by some of the candidates to the same effect, and I wondered then whether they had any inside information which justified them in making the statements that they did. I think it is well that we should be frank with the country, and it is equally correct that the ministers should be frank with us. I do not think that members of this House, when talking to the country, are justified in going beyond the information given to the House, because I do not think it is proper for the government to give any private information to any private member of parliament. I think the government should first give their policy to the country through the House. That is the duty of the ministers, and that is what is expected of them, and if it were the invariable practice there would be less credence given to such random statements as we see in the press from time to time when it is important to leave the impression upon the minds of the people that if a certain political party are returned to power wonderful things will be accomplished with regard to works in which they are interested. I do not see the hon. member for Welland in his place to-night; if he had been here I should have liked to have his explanation of it.

Mr. AMES. Would the minister kindly give us a fuller explanation with reference to the work that is proposed to complete in connection with the Lachine canal.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is to construct the wharf and two basins on the north side of the canal to afford better facilities for shippers.

Mr. AMES. At what point?

Mr. GRAHAM. At Cote St. Paul.

Mr. J. D. REID. On the government's own property or on somebody else's?

Mr. GRAHAM. On our own property.

Mr. AMES. Has this work been partially done already?

Mr. GRAHAM. The work is just let and the only money expended to date has been for the purchase of cement. It was got by tender.

Mr. J. D. REID. At what date was the contract signed?

Mr. GRAHAM. Some little time ago.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who are the contractors?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Canadian General Development Company. Five tenders were received.

Mr. J. D. REID. As I understand it, this vote was given a year ago and this is simply a revote. Last year we were told the work had to be proceeded with at once and $300,000 was voted, and now we are told no work was done. Is it possible it was placed in the estimates last year to lead the people to think that $300,000 would be spent before the election? I suppose the tenders were called for about election time?

Mr. GRAHAM. This work has nothing to do with the elections. If it were to have any influence on the elections I suppose we would have let the contract and had the men at work on it weeks before the election.

Mr. J. D. REID. You could have promised it.

Mr. GRAHAM. Promises don't go very far in this age. The session closed late last year and the money was not available until prorogation and the contract was not let until later.

Mr. AMES. Last year $300,000 was voted and this year you are asking a revote of $150,000, leading to the inference that $150,000 was spent last year.

Mr. GRAHAM. Following the usual practice we took a vote for $300,000 last year, which was expected to complete the entire work. This year we expect we will only be able to spend $150,000 and hence we ask for that sum.

Mr. AMES. Your original intention was to spend $300,000 in one year, and now you have decided to spend $150,000 in each of two years.

Mr. GRAHAM. If I followed my own inclination I would put in the original estimates the entire amount the work is expected to cost so that every one would know it, and that done I would take a vote for the money we expected to spend that year. In this case we have only spent a small amount for the purchase of cement and we are asking for $150,000, and next year we will ask for the additional $150,000.

Mr. AMES. That is exactly what I said you had done.

Mr. HUGHES. Is not the explanation that the order has been issued to economize during the coming year? At a stage in the history of the country when the ordinary business industries are more or less depressed the government is going to adopt the policy of cutting down the national expenditure in every department. I have always opposed such a policy on the part of the government, whether Liberal or Conservative. When the ordinary business industries of the country are depressed is the very time when the government should give the country the benefit of its credit and enter extensively into the construction of national works for the development of the country. Then, when the business interests of the country are prospering, it is time for the government to stay its hand in expenditure. I believe the government is seriously to blame for cutting down its expenditures in view of the depression which existed last year and which is pretty sure to exist this coming year. If work is actually necessary for the development of the country the money should be expended now.

Mr. MONK. The Lachine canal referred to in this vote is in my constituency. The wharf accommodation is entirely insufficient for the immense traffic at that particular point; the basins are too small and accidents are continually happening there and at the Cote St. Paul bridge. There is therefore absolute necessity for additional wharf accommodation at that place and also for the enlargement of the basins. The work was projected a very long time ago and it is only now that it is being carried out.

Mr. AMES. The estimates state that this $150,000 is to complete wharf and basins, but as the minister says it will cost $300,000 altogether. Is it not misleading to use the words 'to complete?'

Mr. GRAHAM. I think the word 'complete' is out of place there.

Mr. SPROULE. It has always been the practice to show in one column of the estimates the amount of money voted the previous year and in another column to show the revote so that the House would know how much had been spent during the year. The changed form of these estimates is an innovation which leads to confusion and which gives a just ground for complaint. The present form in which the estimate is put tends to confuse the members of the House as to the amount of money expended and the amount needed to complete the work. A return to the old form is advisable. In addition, I would like to know who are the officers of this Canadian Improvement Company—the president, the secretary and the directors—and who are the sureties.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is an incorporated company. It is not possible for me at present to give that information, but I can ascertain who the members of the company are. These companies have to put up as a deposit a percentage on the contract. In this case there were five tenders and the lowest tender got the contract.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I would like also to ask the minister when it became the policy of the department to charge repairs to capital account. I notice that the second item here is to stop leaks. Is it the custom of the department to charge this to capital account?

Mr. GRAHAM. These are leaks which have existed in the north bank for some time, very dangerous leaks. It is really a new concrete wall that we are putting up and it will close up the bank.

Mr. BARR. Where did the government get the cement?

Mr. GRAHAM. It was all purchased by tender.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice a separate item here for the testing of cement. Has that been customary? I thought that was done by regular salaried officials of the department.

Mr. GRAHAM. We test the cement for our own works. These men are paid by the year to do this work, and this is the same item we had last year.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Will the minister tell us from whom he purchased the cement, the quantity purchased, and the rate per barrel?

Mr. GRAHAM. This cement is all bought by tender. I may say that cement is cheaper now than we have ever had it before. This is bought from the Vulcan Company in Montreal.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does the Vulcan Company manufacture cement, or are they middlemen?

Mr. GRAHAM. They manufacture.

Mr. C. A. WILSON (Laval). There are two manufacturers of cement in that part of the island of Montreal that constitutes the riding of Laval: One is the Vulcan Portland Cement Company and the other is the Lakefield Portland Cement Company. They are situated about two miles apart.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Which company got the contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Vulcan Company.

An hon. MEMBER. It is a Tory concern.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Is the Lakefield Company a Tory concern?

Mr. C. A. WILSON. No, the Lakefield Company is a better concern for the government than the other company.

Mr. GRAHAM. This cement is purchased by tender, and the contract is given to the lower tenderer without any variation.

Mr. BARR. How many barrels were bought from the Vulcan Company?

Mr. GRAHAM. 20,000 barrels at $1.62, f.o.b. at the works. I may say that the bags returned will make a reduction of forty cents a barrel.

Mr. OSLER. I think the House will remember that a few years ago the government went into a speculation of buying cement in anticipation of contracts, and bought 30,000 barrels that turned out to be absolutely useless. I do not know what system the government had then or what system they have now of testing the cement, or whether this cement has been tested so thoroughly that there is no doubt about it. I do not understand why the government should buy cement in anticipation of the contract. Who were the inspectors?

Mr. GRAHAM. One of our staff. We have a rigid inspection of our cement.

Mr. SPROULE. Has that cement been delivered?

Mr. GRAHAM. It was delivered f. o. b. at the works.

Mr. BARR. Where is it now?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is in our own sheds at Montreal, right near the works.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. What is the next lowest tender?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not that information, but I can assure my hon. friend that the lowest tenderer got the work.

Mr. AMES. The point raised by my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) is of sufficient importance to make it necessary to take a few moments to discuss it, and that is the point of charging these items to capital. Just consider the position we are in from a financial point of view. In the year 1908-9 we shall spend probably every dollar of our revenue on current expense, and every dollar that we add to capital account this year will be borrowed, say at three and a half per cent, on loans not due for fifty years yet to come. We are borrowing this money without making any provision for a sinking fund and are arranging that the third generation after us shall repay it. Is it just to them that we should charge 'stopping leaks in the Lachine canal' to capital? Look over the list and you will see the same thing occurring everywhere repairing slopes and all that. Should these things be charged to capital?

Mr. GRAHAM. Certainly.

Mr. AMES. And building wharfs? We are building wharfs all through the maritime provinces and elsewhere and charging them to income, while here we are paying for a wharf from capital account. I submit that any money invested in capital account should be expended on something permanent, something that will stand for fifty years from now. It is not fair to put burdens on future generations if they are to have none of the advantages connected therewith. We ought to keep our public works in good repair, but we should do that without charging the expense to capital

account and borrowing the money to do it and making that money repayable fifty years from now.

Mr. C. A. WILSON. I quite agree with the hon. member from St. Antoine that the leaks in the Lachine canal should be repaired. I am not an expert in that work, but we are manufacturing cement in the riding I have the honour to represent, and I do not see why the hon. member from St. Antoine should ask questions about these tenders, provided that, according to the judgment of the minister, the contracts were granted in the public interest. In a few days from now, perhaps a few hours, the government will be asked whether some repairs will be made to the wharf at Pointe aux Trembles; and I do not see any reason why those two factories in Laval county should not get the contracts for cement, provided their tenders be the lowest, or at any rate be judged by the Minister of Public Works or the Minister of Railways as being the ones which should be accepted in the public interest. It is certainly absolutely necessary that those works on the Lachine canal, which are in a condition menacing ruin, should be repaired. That is my policy, and I hardly think that the hon. member from St. Antoine division will venture to criticise it.

Mr. AMES. This question is a very important one and might as well be tested at this point as at any other. I would move that the item to stop leaks on the north bank of the Lachine canal at Cote St. Paul be charged to income and not to capital.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is springing something new on the House. We are simply following in this matter the same practice which has prevailed for years both under his friends and ours. It is a practice which is perfectly defensible. The canals give no revenue, as a few years ago we made them free, and consequently there is no revenue account against which to charge these items. It is absolutely necessary to protect the walls and it is for that purpose we are asking that vote. Then I doubt if my hon. friend has any right to make the motion he did. This is a question involving expenditure. He could move to strike the item out or reduce it, but not to increase it or charge it against any other account. All he can do, if he does not approve of the item is to take the responsibility of moving that it be struck out. He cannot have it charged against income account by a vote. No member of the government could do that.

Mr. AMES. The question I have raised is one that can be just as well discussed and threshed out on some other item at some other time, so that I have no objection to withdrawing my amendment at this moment. But I shall bring the matter up again in the form of a resolution, so as to put on record our opinion with regard to charging the repairs against capital account.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I do not see why this item should be pressed when we do not know the amounts of the different tenders and who the tenderers really are.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I understand the minister to say that this cement was purchased by tender at $1.62 per barrel. I want to refer to what took place here the other night. I then asked:

How comes it that the honourable minister paid $2.50 per barrel for 85 barrels of cement bought from Kirby & Co., when he could buy that cement at Hull for $1.80.

To that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) replied:

That was but a small quantity and no tenders were called for.

I then said: You could purchase it by retail at $1.65. This item proves what I said the other evening. The Minister of Railways purchased this cement by tender at $1.62, but the Minister of Public Works went to some of his political friends and purchased 85 barrels at $2.50, showing fifty per cent profit.

Mr. J. D. REID. From whom was the cement purchased?

Mr. GRAHAM. The bulk of it came from Montreal. My hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Reid) wants to know the particulars of this contract. I have already told him that it is a schedule contract. I can give him the details of the schedule if he wishes.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. The hon. minister (Mr. Graham) must know that this is not an answer. Even though this is a schedule contract, he must know the quantities and he must have moneyed it all out or he would not know what vote to ask for. Now, a word with reference to the charge he makes that it has been the habit of his department from time immemorial to charge such expenditures as this to capital account. I take issue with the hon. gentleman and deny that the case is as he says. The money spent in repairs on the canals or in inspecting cement cannot fairly be charged to capital. And, as to the general question of our right to deal with this matter as proposed in the motion which has been withdrawn, we have not the right to move that an estimate should be increased, but we have the right to say whether an estimate should be charged to capital or to current account, and without the consent of the Governor in Council. Now, I understand that $150,000 has been expended and that $150,000 is a revote.

Mr. GRAHAM. No, we had already discussed that before my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) came in. It is a little confus-

ing as it is presented. But, as I explained, we had a vote last year for $300,000; parliament sat until late in the season and we did not let this contract until December. Consequently only $40,000 out of the $300,000 has been spent. This year we expect to spend only $150,000.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. If the hon. minister has entered into a contract, why does he ask for only $150,000? Suppose the contractor completes the work, will he wait for a year for his pay?

Mr. GRAHAM. We expect that we will be able to spend only $150,000 this season.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. What does the contract money out at ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I gave all the information with regard to this matter when the item was before the committee last year. I did not suppose that these details would be required to-night, so I have not these details before me. But I have sent for them and will be able to give them soon.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. When is the work to be finished under the contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. May 1, 1910.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. At that time the minister will require the whole amount of the contract. Where will he get the money after the amount of this estimate has been spent?

Mr. GRAHAM. From parliament, I hope; there will be a session in the meantime.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Does the hon. minister intend to follow the practice of the Department of Public Works and, at the end of the year, ask for fresh tenders for the uncompleted work, or is this contract for the whole work?

Mr. GRAHAM. I hope that no person will be so silly as to take the objection which was taken against the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) in the last parliament. He proposed to extend a contract, but a member of the opposition strongly urged that he should ask for new tenders. The result was that it cost the country over $100,000 more than it would have cost. The contract in the case now before us is for the completion of the work.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I strongly endorse the remarks of the hon. member for St. Antoine with reference to charging this amount to capital. If the department is charging repairs to capital, it ought to deduct 5 per cent annually to provide a fund for those repairs. I am rather sorry the motion was not pressed to charge this to current account.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is practically not a work of repair, though it will have that effect. The leak in this bank has been repaired from time to time out of current account, but now we are building a new concrete wall in front of the bank. I might say that it is practically a new bank.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The deputy minister has had time to figure out the total amount of the contract. I do not wish to do the figuring. There are officials in the department who are supposed to have this work finished, and the minister, of all others, is the man who ought to know the amounts before he lets the contract.

Mr. GRAHAM. I know that my hon. friends opposite do not wish to be unreasonable. I have explained why I have not these details before me at the moment. I gave the details last year.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. But that explanation was merely of an estimate, whereas now a contract has been made.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. There is another anomaly here. The hon. member tells us that $40,000 has been expended under this contract for cement—the cement has been bought and paid for. And yet he asks also $2,500 for the purpose of testing this cement.

Mr. GRAHAM. We are constantly buying cement for the repair of the canals, and we have to pay the salaries of the men who test that cement.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. You don't mean to say that you charge to capital account testing cement for the purpose of repairing a lock?

Mr. GRAHAM. The staff are charged to capital account. Just as the building of a cement wall is charged to capital, so testing the cement to build that wall is rightly charged to capital account.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. But all the cement he requires for this work on the Lachine canal, except for repair of the locks, has been bought already and paid for, and all the testing must apply to the material for repairing the lock and the wall; yet he charges that amount to capital account.

Mr. GRAHAM. This cement is merely a bagatelle to all the cement we use on the St. Lawrence canals.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In case tenders were called for and the lowest tender was accepted last year, why does the government buy the cement? Why does not the contractor buy the cement?

Mr. GRAHAM. We always supply the cement. As the ex-minister will agree, we want the very best quality of cement, and we test it. We make it a practice that our tenders shall never include the cost of cement; that we supply ourselves.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that the customary way of testing cement that goes into public works? I thought it was tested week by week and day by day, because sometimes you will get a consignment of cement a part of which may be very good and another part very poor.

Mr. GRAHAM. We keep a staff of men constantly at work doing nothing else but testing cement. We test the cement as it is received, and also as it is used. We also test it for its keeping qualities where it is stored.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand you employ other men besides those employed in testing cement, and how is it that you charge a portion of the work to this vote and another portion to some other vote? What becomes of the contention of the minister that we cannot pay this out of revenue because it should come under capital account?

Mr. GRAHAM. The whole work is in connection with capital account, and the expenditure ought to be charged, I think, to capital account.

Mr. SPROULE. For re-testing the cement?

Mr. GRAHAM. We charge testing the cement to capital account.

Mr. SPROULE. But there are several employees who are paid by salary and who test cement regularly.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have an engineer, Mr. Lordly, in charge of this work, and he is paid entirely out of capital account, whatever work he is engaged on.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. There is another peculiar thing. You purchase $40,000 worth of cement a year before you commence to work. What were the peculiar circumstances that required the purchase of the cement at that particular time? In what month did you purchase it?

Mr. GRAHAM. We want to have our cement ready so that the contractors cannot raise any question that we detain them. This cement was purchased recently, and the delivery was completed only a few days ago.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Perhaps the minister will tell us when it was paid for? Was it last year?

Mr. GRAHAM. Part of it was, and the balance will be paid in this year.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. When was the last payment made?

Mr. GRAHAM. $32,400 was paid in January last past.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. When were the tenders opened?

Mr. GRAHAM. Very shortly after they were received. The tenders are marked by two officials and placed in a safe.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Can the minister tell us when they were received?

Mr. GRAHAM. I cannot remember.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Was it before the elections?

Mr. GRAHAM. They had nothing to do with the elections. But I can get that information.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I think the item ought to stand.

Mr. GRAHAM. It was asked for in the usual way, and given to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I cannot understand why he should purchase cement in the month of October for contracts to be performed in the following year.

Mr. GRAHAM. The explanation given by my deputy is that the contractors expected to do some work this fall, and they kept urging us to get the cement. But they did not go on with their work until we had the cement a little ahead of time.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Did the minister say that the contract was let in January?

Mr. GRAHAM. We were going to let the contract earlier than that. The contractors urged that we should be ready with the cement so that they would not be detaind. Contractors are always ready to find fault and to complain that they are being delayed. We preferred to get it ahead of time. The date of the contract was October 24.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is the contract with the Canadian Development Company. That is not the contract for the cement. I have sent for the cement contract to give my hon. friend the date.

Mr. J. D. REID. Let the item stand until it comes.

Mr. HUGHES. Did we understand the minister to say that he would ascertain the names of the officers of this development company which received the large contract?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Will the minister find out the name of the president of the Lakefield Portland Cement Company?

Mr. GRAHAM. The contract with the Canadian General Development Company is signed by Beaudry Leman.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Surely the hon. gentleman would not enter into a contract with a company unless the contract was signed by the proper officers. I under-

stand it has to be under the seal of the company and signed by the secretary or the president. Surely my hon. friend has no right to enter into a contract without the signatures of those officers.

Mr. GRAHAM. That would depend on the by-laws of the company. It is signed by the head of the company and bears the corporate seal of the company.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. What is the name?

Mr. GRAHAM. Beaudry Leman.

Mr. C. A. WILSON. That is a well known name in the province of Quebec. He is an engineer. He is also a great nationalist, a friend of Mr. Bourassa.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will send this contract over to my hon. friend opposite. There is the signature of the secretary that I cannot decipher.

Mr. J. D. REID. I think we should have from the minister a list of the different tenderers showing the amount of each tender. There were five tenders and if we had that in detail it would go on Hansard. If the minister had come down and made the statement that last year there was $300,000 voted for this work, we have spent $40,000 of this amount for cement, tenders were called on such and such a date by public advertisement in the newspapers, and a contract was awarded on such a date to whatever firm got it, there would have been no trouble about it. I have been listening to ascertain what the position is and I cannot understand who the five tenderers were, what each tender amounted to or what the date of the calling for tenders for cement was. All we want is that little explanation and I for one undertake to say that the item will go through.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have no objection at all to bring down the name of the tenderers. I do not think that my hon. friend as a business man will say that in connection with each of these items, unless the matter is questioned, we should give the tender of every man.

Mr. J. D. REID. We are entitled to it.

Mr. GRAHAM. The House has never asked for it but I will bring it over.

Mr. J. D. REID. It has been the custom.

Mr. GRAHAM. Where there has been any question as to the contract having been awarded to the lowest tender, of course, the tenders have been asked for. I will bring it over if my hon. friend wants it, but my experience in this House and in another House for ten years has been that unless there was a question as to the contract being given to the lowest tenderer these particulars have not been asked for owing to business reasons that any man will realize in a moment. But, if my hon. friend wants it I will bring down all the tenders although business men do not like it.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister states that it has not been the custom in this House, but at any time we wanted any details with respect to any item the minister has always been able to supply them. We have the right to know the names of tenderers and in so far as I am concerned I want to know them now. The minister feels annoyed because I do want them.

Mr. GRAHAM. No, I am not annoyed.

Mr. J. D. REID. If the minister had a statement with regard to every item I am sure that the estimates would go through very easily. I do not think it is fair to ask us to pass these items in the way that the minister is doing to-night without offering to give us the slightest detail. The minister said that he gave all the details about this particular item last year, but I have been trying to find the details in 'Hansard'. They would be in 'Hansard' if they had been given.

Mr. GRAHAM. Not altogether.

Mr. SPROULE. There are a lot of men here now who were not here last year.

Mr. J. D. REID. I cannot find any thing at all in 'Hansard' as far as this item is concerned. As my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) states, there are a great many new men in the House and they are entitled to the details which were given last year.

Mr. HUGHES. The original vote was $300,000, the minister has paid $40,000 for cement and he is spending $150,000. Does that include the $40,000 for cement?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. HUGHES. Then the minister has a large sum of money voted that will not be expended for two years. Yet, he has purchased all the cement and is going to keep it stored for two years.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is not enough cement for the work.

Mr. HUGHES. Then there is a large quantity of cement bought and it is going to be stored until next summer to carry on this work. I again impress on the minister if this work is necessary he should expend every dollar of the money voted each year. The time for the government to stand to their guns and come to the relief of the people is when there is general depression in the business industries of the country. Men are out of employment all over Canada to-day, and the policy of the government is to throw more men on the streets and leave more mouths unfed by cutting down expenditure. If I had the power I would move to amend that vote.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not the power either.

Mr. HUGHES. The minister can take steps to get it done and I cannot.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Was the cement purchased by tender last year ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, we always purchase our cement by tender.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. The Canadian Portland Cement Company sold you 5,000 barrels last year at $2.62 a barrel; that is a higher price than you are paying this year?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. It is a dollar a barrel more. You also purchased 2,500 barrels at $2.40 a barrel from another cement company; were these contracts let by tender?

Mr. GRAHAM. All our cement contracts are let by tender and we take the lowest tender in every case. That price is gross, and we get 10 cents per bag for the four bags in each barrel, or 40 cents.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Portland cement should be supplied actually when it is needed as it depreciates greatly by keeping. The minister has purchased $40,000 worth of cement on a $300,000 contract and he will have to keep it a year or two before it is actually used.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have just got delivery now and they will start using it on the 1st of April.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. The half of that cement will be used this year and the rest of it in a year and a half, and if it is in bags it will be perfectly useless at the end of that time.

Mr. GRAHAM. There won't be a bag of it left then.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The minister said this contract was entered into in January, but the contract is signed on the 24th of October. It will take me some time to figure out how the prices in the contract compare with the current prices and whether the contract has been really let to the lowest tenderer or not. I ask the minister to let the item stand so that we can have access to the contract in his department or somewhere else to-morrow.

Mr. GRAHAM. In order to give my hon. friend the information he wants I must ask that the original contract be given back. If you take that away we will have no contract at all.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I merely wish to have a look at it in the morning.

Mr. GRAHAM. You can see a copy of the contract any time you like.

Mr. AMES. What percentage on the total amount of the contract does the security represent?

Mr. GRAHAM. Usually 10 per cent.

Mr. AMES. The security furnished here is $23,698 so that the tender would be for $236,698 and the time for completion is May, 1910. We are only asked to vote $150,000 of that amount, which leaves a balance of $86,000. The $150,000 we are now asked to vote is for the fiscal year 1910, which expires on the 31st of March, 1910. Therefore, this contractor is held to complete his work by the 1st of May, 1910, but he will have to expend some $86,950 in the month of April next. On the face of it your contract is an impossibility taken in connection with the present vote, unless you intend to extend the time for the completion of the contract.

Mr. GRAHAM. We will have another session of parliament before the expiration of the contract. In April the canal is unwatered and he would do a large share of his work then. However, it is seldom that these contractors absolutely complete such contracts on time.

Mr. AMES. Is there a forfeit in this case?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not think there is a penalty in any of these cases, but they can only get an extension of time by order in council. Notwithstanding what has been said by my hon. friend who has hit the nail on the head fairly well, I may say that we do not want this year to expend any more money than we think is absolutely necessary.

Mr. HUGHES. Now we are getting at the reason.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, my hon. friend struck the nail on the head as he quite often does—if the nail is in the right place. This year we believe not more than $150,000 can be expended, but if more is expended it can be provided for next year as we will have a session of parliament before the final estimate will be passed.

Mr. HUGHES. Then we are to understand that the government intends to add further to the depression throughout the Dominion by curtailing works that are necessary to be carried on in the interests of the country? We are going to have more men unfed and homes unprovided for owing to the fact that the government have brought a period of hard times on the country.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend does not agree with some of his friends, the hon. member for North Toronto, for instance, that it is a time for economy.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am not speaking of economy. I am speaking of the conduct

of public affairs. If the government wanted to be economical, they had plenty of opportunity during the years of plenty in the business of the country. This year and last year are lean years, and the government are in a panic and are hauling in their sails and turning on the labour market of the country thousands of unemployed men still further to increase the depression.

Mr. M. MARTIN (St. Marys). Does the hon. gentleman approve of the minister buying these 20,000 barrels of cement?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Not one barrel of that cement has been made since the minister gave the contract. It was old stock on hand. The cement men saw the depression coming, and they made a slick deal with the department in anticipation of it. Half of that cement will be useless when the works go on.

Mr. M. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman must remember that that cement had to be bought on account of all the permanent works being done at Montreal. Last year we made twenty miles of new streets, and we are going to make more next year. The minister had to buy the cement ahead to get it in time. The hon. gentleman says the government should give work. Well, the minister, by buying that cement, gave work to that factory.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Has the minister the information I asked for, as to the date when the tenders were received?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have been unable to get it this evening; but I will bring it, with the names of all the tenderers, in the morning. In the meantime the item may stand.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Can the minister tell me whether the $40,000 worth of cement is now lying at the factory or at the canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is in our storehouse in Montreal.

Mr. AMES. There is just one more element of danger which the minister's remarks bear, and it is this. He speaks of having given a definite contract of $238,000, and he now asks us to vote only $150,000, and he says that probably the contractors will go on and do more work than the appropriation will cover. Is that going to be the fixed policy of the government—to intimate to the contractors that we are having less money voted than we expect to spend this year, but that they can go on over-expending? I see in that an element of great danger. I hope the contractors will be given to understand that the government is responsible only for the moneys that parliament votes, and that until parliament votes a further sum they are taking a great risk in going beyond the amount voted.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES

Mr. GRAHAM. We do that in the case of all contracts. We have notified all concerned that we want to keep the expenditure within the appropriations this year, and that if they go on and rush the work and over-run the amount voted, they do it at their own risk, because they cannot get any more cash until parliament votes it at another session.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister says that he does not see the object of bringing down the tenders except to show that the contract was let to the lowest tenderer. There is another reason why we desire to see the tenders. These tenders are sometimes made upon schedule prices. For instance, one tender may put rock excavation below another, and some other item, such as cement work, higher; and the engineer, in going over the various tenders, is able to tell the government which tender in the main is the lowest. It is interesting to see how he reaches his conclusion by comparing one tender with another. For that reason it is absolutely necessary to know what the schedule prices of various tenders are; otherwise one could not make an intelligent comparison. I understand that the hon. minister is satisfied to bring down all the tenders.

Mr. GRAHAM. If my hon. friend wants them. There is not a man in the House who is not an engineer who can figure them out. We have an engineer in the department who 'moneys out' these tenders. I will bring them down, though it has not been customary to do so.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to say, as one who has been in this House for a great many years, that it has been the custom.

Item allowed to stand.

Department of Public Printing and Stationery, $88,399.50.

Mr. J. D. REID. Will the hon. minister explain that item?

Mr. MURPHY. The committee will observe that there is a difference of $36,824.50 between the total amount of these estimates for 1909-10 and the total amount of the same estimates for 1908-09. This difference is accounted for by an amount of $34,470.50, which represents the salaries paid to the employees brought under the Civil Service Act of last session and the remainder, namely, $2,354, represents the increases which have been granted the staff for the incoming year. The gentlemen who have been brought in from the outside, and whose salaries represent the greater amount of this increase, are as follows: One in the second division of subdivision A, who has been put in charge of what is called the franchise room. Then in the second division of subdivision B, two gentlemen have

been brought from the outside service. In former years these were paid out of the bulk sum voted for wages for the Printing Bureau, from what is known as the King's Printer's advance account .One of these occupied the position of chief foreman and the other of entry clerk. All these gentlemen were brought in at the salaries they were formerly receiving. There have been no new appointments, but simply a change in the status of the former employees, all of whom were in the outside service.

Mr. GEORGE. TAYLOR. There is one new appointment.

Mr. MURPHY. There is a position there which has not been filled. In the third division, subdivision A, there have been eight clerks transferred. These gentlemen occupied various positions in the lithographic room, accountant's office, delivery office, and advertising and corresponding branch. Then there have been seventeen transferred to the third division, subdivision B. These are clerks now performing different duties in the stationery branch, accountant's branch, correspondent's branch, storekeeper's office and acting in secretarial positions. Then the last group representing the transfer of eleven from the outside to the inside service, is made up of the messengers and packers who were employed in the Bureau. The other positions, to which my hon. friend from Leeds referred, is that of Superintendent of Printing. The salaries are the same as these gentlemen formerly received plus the increases they are entitled to automatically.

Mr. HAGGART. Last year for the same service, there was only $75,000 required, and this year you require $81,000. Why this increase?

Mr. MURPHY. There have been no increases except the statutory increases under the new Act.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Will those amount to $6,000?

Mr. TAYLOR. There is $1,000 in Deputy Minister's salary.

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, that is a statutory increase.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. The total amount required for the outside service taken in is $31,000. The total amount expended last year for the inside service was $31,000. That makes $75,000 and you are asking $81,000, or an increase of nearly $6,000. How much would the statutory increases amount to? What increases were given the different officers, who are they, and why were they entitled to an increase?

Mr. MURPHY. I could best explain that by going over the list of the gentlemen brought in.

Mr. HUGHES. Start with the Deputy Minister.

Mr. MURPHY. The Deputy Minister is Mr. C. H. Parmelee and he receives an increase of $1,000, which is a statutory increase.

Mr. HUGHES. Who is the first assistant to the King's Printer?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Wm. McMahon. Then in the first division, subdivision A, the gentleman whom my hon. friend from North Victoria inquired about was placed in that division.

Mr. HUGHES. I do not see any vote for 1908-9 for an assistant to the King's Printer?

Mr. MURPHY. That is a new title given Mr. McMahon, the Superintendent of Printing, and he receives $2,900 per year.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I understand that this Printing Bureau is paid for all the work it does for all the other departments at current rates?

Mr. MURPHY. That is my understanding.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Yet notwithstanding it shows a deficit of from $40,000 to $50,000. Why should it not be self-sustaining?

Mr. MURPHY. I do not challenge the statement, but shall inquire into it.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Printers throughout the country cannot understand why a bureau which receives contracts from all the other departments at fat prices should not be self sustaining. I am told that a lot of the work is duplicated. For instance, the work of setting up English is frequently given to French printers who are not very conversant with the language, and the setting of French work is given to English printers, who suffer under a like disability, and consequently the work of each has practically to be done over again. This has been brought to my attention by several practical printers, who do not understand how this department needs a vote when it has good fat contracts for the printing of the several departments of the government.

Mr. MURPHY. I have not before heard the complaint to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. A. Currie) gives currency. I shall make inquiries, and, perhaps, at a later stage, I shall be able to inform the hon. gentleman and the committee definitely as to whether the statements made to the hon. gentleman have any foundation in fact. I may, however, point out that the Printing Bureau does a great deal of work outside of the departments for which it is not paid—the issuing of 'Hansard', the printing of special reports, and a great many other things of that kind and these may possibly represent the amount to

which the hon. gentleman refers. As to the duplication of work of which the hon. gentleman has heard, I think that in all probability on inquiry it will turn out to be in large measure unfounded.

Mr. SPROULE. What becomes every year of the money we vote for 'Hansard'.

Mr. MURPHY. It is true there is a vote for 'Hansard'.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Then, why try to give the impression that this item is virtually to pay for 'Hansard'? If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Murphy) will ascertain from the foreman of his printing department how much money was expended for straight setting and how much for corrections, he will soon ascertain whether I am correct or not. And I will ask him to bring that information down before we pass the item. For there is not a newspaper man in Canada who is not interested in this matter, especially those who run job offices. They would like to have a share of the government's business, and cannot see why the government maintain a bureau at great expense to do work that might as well be done outside.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. I do not know that I clearly understand the explanation the hon. minister tries to make. The amount voted for 1908-1909 was $44,475. The amount asked for next year is $81,299.50. The hon. minister says that he is paying out of this vote amounts which formerly were paid out of outside votes and that he is paying the exact amount of salaries that those taken in from outside had on September 1 last. The foot-note shows that the votes for those in the outside service for 1908-1909 was $28,722.83, with increases under the Act from September 1 1908, to March 31, 1909, of $1,154.78. The statutory increases only amount to $1,200. So, we have a deficiency still to be accounted for something like $6,000, of which $1,200 is taken up as the minister says.

Mr. MURPHY. No, $2,354, as appears in the estimates.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Does that include the $150 proposed to be added to the salary of each civil servant?

Mr. MURPHY. No, nor does it include $1,000 increase to the deputy minister under the Act of last year.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Then, there is still $3,000 left.

Mr. MURPHY. Speaking subject to correction as to the exact figures, my understanding is that whatever difference there may be is represented by increases to these gentlemen brought in.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Will the hon. minister kindly point out to me in the Auditor General's Report the details of expenditure for last year in this department?

Mr. MURPHY. I have not the report at hand.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I have two volumes of it here.

Mr. MURPHY. Unless they appear in those volumes—

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. They do not, and that is one reason why I think the item should be allowed to stand.

Mr. CROTHERS. Will the minister give us the name of the officer for whom this $2,900 is provided, and tell us whether he was in the service before or not? If he was in the service, from what position did he retire and what salary was he receiving? If he was not in the service, what special qualification had he that he was given this prominent position over the heads of others?

Mr. MURPHY. The hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. J. Haggart) has asked me with regard to the position for which the amount of $2,125 is provided. That is for the unfilled position of Superintendent of Printing. Until I am satisfied that some person is required in that position, there will be no appointment. The position was held by Mr. McMahon until last month, when he was promoted to be assistant King's Printer, his salary being represented by the item of $2,900. He has been in the Bureau since its organization, and was in the employ of the contractors for government printing before that. He has special qualifications for the office. He received a salary of $2,800, and this additional $100 represent the statutory increase.

Mr. SPROULE. Of what department is the deputy minister here referred to a deputy?

Mr. MURPHY. My knowledge of that is confined to what I have learned from the statute. The law creating the Department of Public Printing and Stationery provides that it shall be attached to the Department of the Secretary of State, who is given administration of the department.

Mr. SPROULE. Heretofore there has been no deputy?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, the former deputy was Dr. Dawson, who was superannuated on account of failing health and age.

Mr. SPROULE. But $1,000 was added for the new man, who, it happens, was a member of this House.

Mr. MURPHY. That $1,000 was added by the statute of last session which fixed the salaries of certain deputies at $5,000.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Has any application been received for the unfilled position?

Mr. MURPHY. A great many, but each applicant has received the stock answer that the minister in charge is not satisfied that it is necessary to make any appointment.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) is a practical printer, and if the Secretary of State will apply to him he will recommend him a good man.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. There will be a reduction in the outside service vote to correspond with the increase in this?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. What is the amount of the reduction?

Mr. MURPHY. I have not the particulars, but when the item is reached I will have the information.

Fumigation stations, $5,000.

Mr. FISHER. I have been doing this work for some years, and it is going on satisfactorily. There is one station at St. John, N.B., one at St. Johns, Que., one on the Niagara frontier, at Beechburg, I think, one at Windsor, one at Winnipeg and one at Vancouver.

For the enforcement of the 'Gold and Silver Marking Act, 1908,' $4,000.

Mr. FISHER. This is a new item. Last year we passed an Act providing for certain markings on gold and silver ornaments or plate, which are being sold, and we have been appealed to by the trade to appoint an inspector to enforce the Act. I thought at one time there would be no necessity for an inspector, but I have been informed that the Act is being violated, and the trade has appealed to us strongly to enforce it.

Mr. BLAIN. Who is the officer?

Mr. FISHER. He has not yet been appointed.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand you are providing $4,000 for an officer. How do you provide for his travelling expenses?

Mr. FISHER. And expenses for prosecution, if there are any. We hope that the $4,000 will cover everything. I have not fixed the salary yet.

Mr. STAPLES. What will be the qualifications?

Mr. FISHER. I hope to get some one who is acquainted with the gold and silver trade.

Tracadie and D'Arcy Island Lazarettos, and leprosy generally, $10,000.

Mr. FISHER. There is an increase of $2,000 due to the fact that we have been trying to deport Chinese lepers in British Columbia. As a rule these men are quite willing to be deported and sent back to China, and the authorities there have no objection to their being landed in China. Unfortunately, we are finding more of this class than we had expected, and we shall probably require a larger sum.

Mr. SPROULE. Would not that properly come under the immigration expenditure?

Mr. FISHER. It has been managed by us, because we have control of the leprosy stations at Tracadie and D'Arcy island. Some of these people have been in British Columbia for years and could not be deported by the immigration authorities.

Mr. SPROULE. Then if the time has passed which allows their being deported under the Immigration Act, what authority have you for deporting them under any other Act?

Mr. FISHER. No authority except their being willing to go, we paying the expenses to send them.

Public Works Health Act, $8,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that for the purpose of paying inspectors of public works to see whether the general precautions regarding health are being carried out?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. How many are employed for that work, and how are they engaged—by the year?

Mr. FISHER. They are engaged by the year and they travel about and examine public works wherever they are being constructed. I had only one until about fifteen or eighteen months ago when I found the work was very heavy and increasing, especially in the west, and I had to appoint another. That gentleman resigned a couple of months ago and I have not yet appointed a successor,

Mr. SPROULE. What salary do you pay?

Mr. FISHER. Either $1,500 or $1,800 a year and travelling expenses.

Mr. STAPLES. Who is the man who resigned?

Mr. FISHER. Dr. Chamberlain. He was working in the west.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the inspector from time to time visit the works or does he only make one inspection during the season?

Mr. FISHER. He must visit them once in three months.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who is the inspector now?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Fisher. He has been the inspector since the commencement of the work.

Mr. J. D. REID. Has any person taken Dr. Chamberlain's position?

Mr. FISHER. Not yet. I expect to appoint some one. During the winter there is not such a large amount of work going on.

Mr. J. D. REID. It is about a year since Dr. Chamberlain resigned?

Mr. FISHER. No, not later than last summer.

Mr. J. D. REID. I think it was about June.

Mr. FISHER. I think it was later than June, but I am not positive.

Mr. PORTER. Suppose the inspector finds the conditions unsatisfactory, what is done?

Mr. FISHER. The contractor is notified and if he does not immediately comply with the law he may be prosecuted. I do not remember that we have had any case of prosecution. The moment complaint is made the inspector is ordered to go, even if he has been there a month ago, to examine into the facts of the case and make a report.

Mr. PORTER. Do I understand that there have been complaints?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. In one case where the complaints were partially well founded the contractors were notified that they must remedy the grievance. The Act and the rgulations specify what provision must be made for he employees and what precautions must be taken. The rule is that contractors are allowed to take a small sum, I think fifty cents a month, from the wages of the employees to cover the expenses.

Mr. PORTER. Is that duty imposed upon the contractor by reason of his contract or by reason of the Public Health Act?

Mr. FISHER. By reason of the Public Health Act.

Mr. PORTER. There is no clause in the contract in regard to that?

Mr. FISHER. Not necessarily. There might or might not be.

Mr. SPROULE. For what purpose is that fifty cents a month taken from the employees?

Mr. FISHER. For the purpose of giving them medical attendance.

Mr. SPROULE. That is a different thing altogether from the inspection of public works.

Mr. FISHER. It has nothing to do with the pay of our inspector. It reimburses the contractors for the outlay they are obliged to make in the interest of their employees in providing hospitals and medical attendance. It is very much in the nature of an assessment in a union or organization of any kind for the purpose of insuring the members of that organization medical attendance.

Mr. SPROULE. That has been the common practice for thirty years?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, and that Act simply provides that certain requirements shall be complied with in consequence of holding back that amount of money.

Pensions—Mrs. Delaney, $400.

Mr. HUGHES. That is for Mrs. Delaney, whose husband was shot at Frog lake?

Mr. PATERSON. I think it is.

Mr. HUGHES. I support the item very strongly, but I want to draw the attention of the government to the fact that the men who, while defending their country, were shot down at Frog lake have never had their graves decorated or cared for in any way. I brought this matter to the attention of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) last year and I would be pleased if the Minister of Customs, who is leading the House to-night, would take it into his serious consideration and have the graves of the late Messrs. Delaney, Gowanlock and Gilchrist looked after. I beg to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) to it. These graves should be put within a little railing. It would not cost much; it would be a matter of courtesy, and I am sure that the soldiers throughout the country would appreciate it very much.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will make inquiry about it.

Pensions payable on account of the Fenian Raid, $2,000.

Mr. JAMESON. I noticed the other day that when the veterans were before the Prime Minister and the Minister of Militia and Defence it was said by some of them that there had been no recognition of the services of those who had served in defence of their country upon the occasion of this raid other than those who received wounds and were disabled. There was a certain recognition.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). There was not only a recognition of those who were wounded, but if my hon. friend had been present at that meeting he would have seen that there was a recognition of the services of every man who turned out in defence of the country at that time, because he would have seen the evidence of it on the left breast of each man in the medal which he wore and which is the very highest recognition that can possibly be given by any country.

Mr. PORTER. Last year a pension was granted to the widow and children of the late Lt.-Col. Hallowell who was wounded at Batoche and died last year. Is that a pension that would require a vote?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, that is statutory under the Militia Pension Act.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. PATERSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. FISHER. It is private members' day, but if we reach government orders we will go into Supply.

Mr. SPROULE. What department?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot say.

Motion agreed, and House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, February 10,1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 2 o'clock.

RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. W. B. NANTEL (Terrebonne) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 54) to amend the Railway Act. He said: The Supreme Court of Canada has given judgment reversing and infirming a decision of the Court of King's Bench (appeal side) of the province of Quebec. The decision of the Supreme Court is that the Superior Court of the province of Quebec has no jurisdiction to compel railway companies, under the Railway Act, to make farm crossings and other similar work for the benefit of farmers whose lands are intersected by a railway, but that such jurisdiction belongs to the Board of Railway Commissioners. I wish to amend three sections of the Railway Act, sections 252, 253, and 254, and have it declared that the Superior Court of the province of Quebec has jurisdiction in such cases.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

MAIL AND STAGE ROUTES.

Mr. ARMSTRONG—by Mr. Blain—asked:

What is the total number of existing mail and stage routes in Canada and the total number of miles covered by such routes?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

Upon 31st March, 1908, the end of the last fiscal year, there were 8,091 mail and stage routes in operation, the travelled mileage on which amounted to 17,102,214 miles.

POST OFFICES AT GREENWOOD AND GRAND FORKS.

Mr. BURRELL asked:

Were any options secured from property owners in the towns of Greenwood and Grand Forks, for post office sites?

2. If so, from whom, what were the dates, and what are the other particulars?

3. Have the options been allowed to lapse?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (for the Minister of Public Works):

1. Yes.

2. Greenwood:

Two sites have been reported upon: (a) the Pioneer Hotel property situate on lots 20, 21 and 22, Block 5; (b) site on corner Copper and Deadwood streets; lots 13 and 14, Block 4 (50 by 110 feet), owned by F. W. Hart, option price $2,000, until February 15, 1909; lot 15, Block 4 (25 by 110 feet), owned by estate Thos. Miller, option price $750, making a total for the three lots (75 by 110 feet) of $2,750.

Grand Forks:

Site owned by S. A. Hall, situate lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 in Block 16, bounded by Bridge, Main, Third and Fourth streets, option price $3,000, to expire November 20, 1908.

3. Greenwood: No.

Grand Forks: Order in Council passed to purchase property for $3,000 November 6, 1908.

HALIFAX POST OFFICE.

Mr. CROSBY asked:

1. When were instructions given for the reconstruction of the post office at Halifax? and when was the work commenced?

2. Is the work being done by contract? If so, when were tenders called for?

3. What was the amount of each tender, and who were the tenderers, respectively?

4. What length of time is allowed for the completion of the work?

5. Does the contract contain any penalty clause for the completion of the work within a certain time? If so, what is the penalty?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (for the Minister of Public Works):

1. Date of contract, July 18, 1908.

2. Yes; March 13, 1908.

3. M. E. Keefe, Halifax..... $94,000
W. Doran and R. M. Devlin, Ottawa..... 114,000
J. MacInnes & Son, Ltd., Halifax..... 145,000

4. Twenty months from date of signing the contract.

5. No.

HALIFAX CUSTOMS HOUSE.

Mr. CROSBY—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

1. What has been the total cost to date of the new customs house at Halifax?
2. Was it built by contract or day's labour?
3. If by contract, in what manner were tenders called?
4. Who were the tenderers, what was the amount of each tender, and whose tender was accepted?
5. Was any time specified within which the building should be finished? If so, what time?
6. What length of time was required for the construction and completion of the said customs house?
7. Has the contractor been paid any moneys on account? If so, how much?
8. What amount, if any, remains to be paid the contractor?
9. Were there any extras? If so, what amount and to whom paid?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (for Minister of Public Works):

1. $330,005.75, including site, heating apparatus, wiring, fittings, &c.
2. By contract.
3. By public advertisement.
4. M. E. Keefe (accepted tender)..$250,000
Sullivan & Langdon 254,512
Rhodes, Curry & Co., Ltd.. 254,795
S. M. Brookfield.. 292,244
5. Yes. To be completed September 15, 1904.
6. The time named in the contract was twenty-nine months; but it was found, after construction had been commenced, that there was difficulty in procuring stone of suitable sizes, which perforce considerably delayed the work.
7. $248,595.68.
8. The sum of $3,072 retained for minor works not made equal to that called for by by contract.
9. $1,667.68, paid to M. E. Keefe.

WELLAND CANAL.

Mr. LALOR—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

1. How many men are permanently employed on the feeder of Welland canal?
2. What is the total sum paid in salaries to permanent employees on Welland canal feeders per annum?
3. What is the total amount paid in repairs on Welland canal feeder during the past five years, 1903 to 1908?
4. How many boats have passed through the Welland canal feeder during the past five years, 1903 to 1908?
5. What is the total revenue to the government from Welland canal feeder, including water-power rentals for five years, 1903 to 1908?

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

1. Three men are permanently employed on the feeder of the Welland canal.

2. Total amount paid in salaries to permanent employees on the Welland canal feeder per annum, $1,760.
3. Total amount paid in repairs on Welland canal feeder during the past five years, 1903 to 1908, $50,500. (This includes wages and material.)
4. Seven hundred boats passed through the Welland canal feeder during the past five years, 1903 to 1908.
5. Total revenue to the government from Welland canal feeder for the past five years, 1903 to 1908, $830. (This is the actual revenue received, and does not include rentals which are in arrears).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC BRANCH, MONTREAL.

Mr. GERVAIS asked:

1. Has the government entered or is it about to enter into any agreement with any company, person or persons, with regard to the construction of a branch line between Montreal and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, under which the subsidy which was voted by Act 7 and 8 Edward, section 1, or 49, will be paid such company or persons?
2. If so, what are the names of such companies or persons, and what are the conditions of such arrangements?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). No.

DREDGING MOSSY RIVER.

Mr. CAMPBELL asked:

1. How much money has been voted for the purpose of dredging Mossy river?
2. When was such appropriation first made?
3. How much has been expended?
4. In what way has such money been spent?
5. Who have been the recipients?
6. What has delayed the carrying out of this work?
7. Is there a separate estimate for lowering Lake Dauphin? If so, what is the amount?
8. Is it the intention of the government to go on with this work this coming spring?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (for Minister of Public Works):

1. $33,500.
2. First vote was for year 1902-3.
3, 4 and 5. During the years 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907 and 1908, the sum of $21,640.91 has been expended by day's labour and covers payments made to crew of departmental dredge 'Priestman' and sundry persons who furnished fuel, &c., for dredge and casual repairs to same.
6. The necessity of constructing a new plant, the dredge, tug and dump scow which the department has now on Lake Winnipegosis being entirely unsuited for the class of work required.
7. Yes, $10,000.
8. A vote of $5,000 has been included in the main estimates for 1909-10, at present before parliament, to enable the work to proceed.

LAKE NIPISSING FLOODED LANDS—CLAIMS OF SETTLERS.

Mr. GEORGE GORDON—by Mr. George Taylor—asked:

What is being done with reference to claims of settlers around Lake Nipissing, and the flooded lands?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (for Minister of Public Works): Claims have been examined and reported upon and are now in course of settlement.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—ENGINEERS DISMISSED.

Mr. GEORGE GORDON—by Mr. George Taylor—asked:

1. How many engineers, divisional or otherwise, have been dismissed from the service of the Transcontinental Railway in Ontario and Quebec since November 30, last?
2. What are their names and the reasons for dismissal or suspension?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):
1. Eight.
2. Frank Moberly, E. P. Goodwin, G. F. Hanning, M. J. Leatherdale, E. Irvin, K. R. McLennan, C. H. Morse, H. R. Wade. Dismissed because their services were not required; as the work in that part of District 'D' was suspended for a time.

STURGEON FALLS AND SUDBURY—PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. GEORGE GORDON—by Mr. George Taylor—asked:

Is it the intention of the government to build public buildings this year at Sturgeon Falls and Sudbury, and has land for that purpose been secured?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (for Minister of Public Works): Lands to serve as sites for public buildings at Sturgeon Falls and Sudbury have not yet been purchased; matter under consideration.

DRILL HALL AT BELLEVILLE, ONT.

Mr. PORTER asked:

1. Did the government erect the drill hall at Belleville, or a portion of it, upon land not belonging to the government at the time? If so, to what extent and how did the same occur?
2. Has title to any such land been since acquired? If so, when, how, at what price, how was the price arrived at, and to whom paid?
3. Has the drill hall been taken over from the contractor, and what has been the total cost of building and ground complete?
4. Do the officers' quarters at Belleville, part of the former drill hall, belong to the government, the city of Belleville or the contractor for the new drill hall?
5. Is there any dispute as to the ownership of these officers' quarters? If so, what and between whom?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (for Minister of Public Works):
1 and 2. Settlement was made with the city by which $1,600 will be paid, this being the difference between the purchase price of the hospital lot and the city's contribution to the new site.
3. (a) Yes.
(b) $126,078.08 less $2,500, amount contributed by the city.
4. To the government.
5. To be answered by Department of Militia and Defence.
6. No.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). In answer to section 5 of this question, so far as I know there is no dispute. I will make further inquiry, however.

PORT BRUCE HARBOUR.

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

1. What was the amount of money expended on Port Bruce harbour, including dredging, for the last four years, viz: for 1905, 1906, 1907 and 1908?
2. Is it the intention of the government to spend any money in Port Bruce harbour in the present year 1909, on the dock, to extend the piers or for any other purpose?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (for Minister of Public Works):
1. The expenditure including dredging:

In 1905-06	$ 4,947 76
1906-07	4,999 83
1907-08	665 11
1908-09	5,846 25
Total	$16,458 95

2. Matter under consideration.

POINTE-AUX-TREMBLES WHARF.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. George Taylor—asked:

1. What was the amount payable under contract by the government for the construction of the wharf at Pointe-aux-Trembles, in the county of Portneuf, province of Quebec?
2. Who was the contractor and who was the lowest tenderer?
3. Were tenders for the said work or construction called for publicly through the newspapers?
4. What amount has been claimed by the said contractor for extras and what amount has been paid under the said head to said contractor?
5. What was the nature of the said extras?
6. Who were the superintendent, the engineer and the inspector of said work?
7. What has been the revenue derived from said wharf since the construction?
8. Who is the guardian of said wharf and what is his salary?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (for Minister of Public Works):
1. $22,490.

2. Onésime Poliquin.
3. Yes.
4 and 5. No claim to date.
6. Engineers, Thomas Breen and A. R. Décary; inspector, R. Plamondon.
7. No revenue has been received.
8. No guardian has been appointed.

GUYSBOROUGH COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS.

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

1. What portions, if any, of the following appropriations voted last session for public works in Guysborough county, Nova Scotia, have been expended, namely:

Guysborough public buildings, improvements	$1,400
Melford wharf	2,000
Port Felix, wharf and approach	2,500
Spanish Ship Bay, Liscomb, wharf on west side of bay	1,800
Fox island, extension of beach, extension work	2,000
Liscomb harbour wharf	3,000
Dover wharf	3,000

2. If any money was expended, for what, and upon what item or items was it expended?
3. Does the government intend to proceed with these works this year?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (for Minister of Public Works):

1 and 2. Out of the appropriation of $1,400 for Guysborough public buildings, the sum of $412.17 was expended for lighting. No expenditure upon any of the other appropriations mentioned.
3. Matter under consideration.

ROYAL NORTHWEST MOUNTED POLICE —BARRACK GROUNDS AT CALGARY.

Mr. McCARTHY asked:

1. Have any applications been received by the government for the transfer to any railway corporation or corporations, or person, of the grounds now occupied by the Royal Northwest Mounted Police in connection with their barracks at the city of Calgary?
2. If so, from whom have such applications been received for the transfer of the same?
3. On what date and for what portion of said property?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The answer is: No.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—CONTRACTS.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. To whom have the contracts for sections 8, 12, 13, 16 in D, 16, 17, 19 in E, 19 in F, and 20, of the Transcontinental Railway been let?
2. What is the estimated cost per mile and the total cost in respect of each of these subdivisions?
3. Where is the point of intersection where the North Bay branch of the Grand Trunk Pacific is expected to connect with the main line?

Mr. GRAHAM.

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

1 & 2.

District.	Section.	Contractor.	Estimated Cost per Mile.	Total Cost.
			$	$ cts.
'B'	8	M. P. & J. T. Davis	33,606	5,011,346 50
'C'	12	Macdonell & O'Brien	42,6 0	4,559,284 50
'C'	13	" "	33,185	3,815,279 10
'B & E'	16	M. P. & J. T. Davis	31,784	3,308,048 25
'E'	17	" "	20,199	2,019,908 25
'E & F'	19	O'Brien, Fowler & McDougall Bros.	47,288	5,967,208 75
'F'	20	" "	37,977	902,324 00

3. The Department has no information.

FISH HATCHERY—LAKE WINNIPEGOSIS.

Mr. CAMPBELL asked:

1. What amount has been expended on the fish hatchery in Winnipegosis?
2. How long has it been in operation?
3. What quantity of spawn has been hatched and put in the lake each year respectively?
4. How much in bulk of spawn was secured during the past season?
5. How many men are employed at the hatchery, and at what salary each?
6. Who is in charge and at what salary?
7. What qualification had he for the position, and what official position had he under the government previously?
8. If he was dismissed, why?
9. Was he a returning officer under the Greenway government of Manitoba previous to his appointment on the Dominion Civil Service list?
10. Had that anything to do with his appointment, and who recommended him to be fish inspector?
11. By whom was he recommended to be overseer or manager to the fish hatchery?

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

1. $17,809, including construction and equipment of hatchery, caretaker's cottage, wharf and piping, and general maintenance.
2. Short period last fall.
3. None; hatchery only completed last fall.
4. 16,000,000.
5. Two. Officer in charge, $1,000 per annum. Assistant, $2 per day.
6. A. J. McPherson, $1,000 per annum.
7. Experience gained whilst fishery overseer on Lake Winnipegosis. Fishery overseer.
8. He was not dismissed.
9. Not to the knowledge of this department.
10. No. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries.
11. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

TARIFF ON HOGS FROM THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. BLAIN asked:

Is it the intention of the government at this session to increase the tariff on hogs coming to Canada from the United States, in accordance with the request of the Dominion Swine Breeders' Assocation?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I am sorry to say, my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) will have to wait for the delivery of the Budget Speech for an answer to this question.

HEALTH OF ANIMALS—EXPENDITURE.

Mr. PERLEY asked:

1. What was the total expenditure in each of the years 1904 to 1908 in connection with the health of animals, including inspection, compensation for animals slaughtered, &c., &c.?

2. How much of this in each year was on account of bovine tuberculosis?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

1. Expenditure—

1904-5	$ 190,253 27
1905-6	421,993 50
1906-7	276,667 99
1907-8	320,538 10
Total	$1,209,452 86

2. Owing to the peculiar nature of the disease in question and the difficulty, under existing conditions, of dealing with it in a manner similar to that followed in the case of most of the other communicable diseases of animals, slaughter of affected animals is not ordered by this department, and no compensation is therefore paid. While the officers of the Health of Animals branch test pure bred animals for breeding purposes and milk production sold for export to the United States, owing to the fact that such officers are on the salary list of the department and such testing forms but a portion of their duties, the expenditure in connection with the same cannot be accurately arrived at.

Tuberculin is supplied free to owners making application to the department and complying with certain specified conditions. This tuberculin is prepared in the biological laboratory of the department, is of a uniform potency, its present manufacture costing less than one-third of that of the commercial product.

During the years 1904 to 1908, inclusive, tuberculin has been issued from the biological laboratory as follows:

	Doses.
1904-5	3,145
1905-6	1,967
1906-7	3,430
1907-8	5,935
	14,477

doses at an approximate cost of $900.

Experiments have been conducted during the years 1907 and 1908 in the application of the open air treatment to a number of cattle known to be affected with tuberculosis, though not in an advanced stage, with a view to ascertaining to what extent it may be possible to cure the malady or at least check its progress. With this end in view a number of animals so affected have been kept on an experiment station in the vicinity of Ottawa, at an approximate cost of:

For year ending—

March 31, 1907	$4,727 69
March 31, 1908	3,252 31

These experiments have not yet been concluded.

INSPECTORS OF CANNING FACTORIES.

Mr. MARSHALL—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. How many inspectors of factories, canning fruits and vegetables, are appointed for the several provinces; what are their names and what salary does each receive?

2. How many inspectors of meat canning establishments are appointed for Ontario, and what are their names and the salary of each?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

1. Under the Meat and Canned Foods Act, inspectors are not appointed for particular provinces. Their services are available for the whole Dominion as they may be required.

For the inspection of establishments putting up fruits and vegetables, two appointments have been made, viz., Russell Bowlby and F. E. N. Boulter. Each receives a salary of $1,200 per annum.

2. The inspectors at present serving in the province of Ontario under the Act and their salaries are as follows:

Bone, D. R., V.S.	$ 900
Brown, Dennis	900
Brownridge, G. C. V.S.	1,200
Bruce, E. A., V.S.	1,300
Dickinson, S. S., V.S.	1,200
Edgecome, J.	900
Edgett, C. E., V.S.	1,200
Everett, M. W.	900
Farewell, E. R., V.S.	900
Fisher, F., V.S.	1,200
George, J. H., V.S.	1,200
Henderson, W. A., V.S.	1,200
Hodgins, W. A.	900
Irvine, D. A., V.S.	1,200
Irvine, J. D., V.S.	1,200
Johannes, C. J., V.S.	1,200
Jones, F. A., V.S.	1,200
Lawson, Wm., V.S.	1,200
Lowrey, F. H. S., V.S.	1,200
McLeish, J. A., V.S.	1,200
Marshall, H. E., V.S.	1,200
Morrin, W. A., V.S.	1,200
Morse, J. E., V.S.	1,200
Murray, R. E., V.S.	1,200

Pine, T. M., V.S.	$1,200
Porter, J. W., V.S.	1,200
Ramsay, A. C., V.S.	1,200
Ransom, S., V.S.	1,200
Ross, H. H., V.S.	1,200
Tennent, D. C., V.S.	1,200
Thompson, J. R., V.S.	1,200
Walker, A. C., V.S.	1,200
Walsh, F. A., V.S.	1,200
White, J. B., V.S.	1,200
Willson, L. A., V.S.	1,300

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—OUTSIDE SERVICE AT OTTAWA.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

What is the name, position and salary of each clerk or other employee on the outside service of the Department of Agriculture at Ottawa who received increase of salary on and after April 1, 1908; what is the amount of the increase or increases, the date on which it was granted, the date it became effective and the date or dates on which these increases were paid, and date of appointment?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). In answer to the hon. gentleman, I must say that the return would be so voluminous that I would prefer that he put his question on the Order Paper in the form of a notice of motion, and I will bring down the information.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to call the minister's attention to this fact, that when he brings down the return in answer to a Notice of Motion, it is not available to all the members of the House. If the information is given as an answer to a question, as was the case in the Department of the Minister of the Interior, it is put in the 'Hansard' and every member of the House is immediately seized of the information. So if it is not more trouble to the minister —I do not see that it would be—it would be a great convenience to the House if it were given in answer to a question.

Mr. FISHER. Then I will say that on Friday I will ask to have it put into the 'Hansard.' But I could not undertake to read the whole thing over.

NEW EXPERIMENTAL FARMING STATIONS.

Mr. LAPOINTE asked:

1. Where does the Department of Agriculture intend to establish the new experimental farming stations, for which a credit of $30,000 is asked in the estimates of 1909-10, under the number 52?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). 1. A portion of this vote will be used to complete the establishment of the Experimental Station at Rosthern, Saskatchewan. It has not yet been decided where the balance will be expended.

MILITIA DEPARTMENT—ARMOURIES.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE asked:

1. How many officers of the Militia Department in Ontario supply at their own expense armouries for storing the property of the government?

2. Has the government any settled policy in regard to supplying armouries at company headquarters of infantry regiments? If not, why not?

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

1. None. There are, however, 188 commanding officers of the squadrons or companies in Ontario, who are paid an allowance for the care of arms, and who are required to provide out of that allowance the necessary accommodation for the storage of arms, equipment and clothing issued to them in their capacity as commanding officers.

2. It is the policy of the government to eventually provide armouries at headquarters of companies or units, but in carrying out this policy it is necessary to have regard to the needs of the different localities and to the parliamentary appropriation available for new armouries.

QUARANTINE BUILDINGS AT GRETNA.

Mr. WM. H. SHARPE asked:

1. What was the total cost of the quarantine buildings at Gretna, in Manitoba?

2. What was the price of the land for the said building, and from whom was the land bought?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

1. $3,085.50.

2. The land on which the building is erected was not purchased, but was leased from the Midland Branch of the Great Northern Railway at a nominal rental of $1.00 per year.

NEW RAILWAY STATION AT TRURO.

Mr. STANFIELD asked:

Is it the intention of the government to erect a new railway station at Truro, Nova Scotia? If so, when does the government propose starting such work?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). It is the intention to build a new station at Truro, but it may not be possible to undertake the work this year.

MAIL CARRIAGE—LONDONDERRY STATION TO GREAT VILLAGE.

Mr. STANFIELD asked:

1. Who has the contract for carrying mail from Londonderry Station to Great Village, and what remuneration does the contractor receive?

2. How many trips does he make each day, and what trains is he expected to meet?

3. What time are the mails made up for these different trips at the Great Village post office?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). The contractor for carrying the mails between Londonderry station and Great Village is Mr. A. S. Kent. Under the terms of such contract he is obliged to make four trips each day, meeting the following trains:

Passing west at 6.07 p.m. and 10.10 a.m.

Passing east at 3.48 p.m. and 7.24 p.m.

His remuneration is at the rate of 35 cents per trip. It is the postmaster's duty to prepare mails for despatch from Great Village within such time as to admit of the courier making the necessary train connections.

DAMAGE TO PROPERTY AROUND STONY LAKE.

Mr. SEXSMITH asked:

Has the government paid any property owners in or around Stony lake damages caused by the raising of water? If so, who were they, and what was the amount?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). This will be a pretty voluminous return, a great many names in it. I would ask my hon. friend to move for a return, and I will bring down the information in that way.

WHARF AT BIRDSALS LANDING, RICE LAKE.

Mr. SEXSMITH asked:

1. What is the cost of the wharf at Birdsals Landing on Rice Lake?

2. Was it built by contract or day labour, when was the work commenced, who was in charge of the work, and what was the amount paid?

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

1. $3,731.89.

2. (a) Day's labour.

(b) 1st September, 1908.

(c) George Payne, foreman under J. G. Sing, resident engineer, Toronto.

(d) $3,731.89 as above.

BY-ELECTION COMOX-ATLIN, CARLETON, ONT.

Mr. BURRELL. Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to call the attention of the Prime Minister to a discrepency between a statement made by him in answering a question, and the statement of the Secretary of State. On February 2, the Prime Minister, in answer to a question by the leader of the opposition stated:

The writ was issued yesterday for Comox-Atlin, and will be issued to-day for Carleton.

Then on February 8, the Secretary of State, in answer to a question by myself said that the writ issued for the vacancy in Comox-Atlin on the 22nd of January, 1909. I wish to be informed which statement is correct, that of the Prime Minister or that of the Secretary of State.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The error may be mine. Perhaps I had in mind the writ for Carleton. I will look into it.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing the names of all officers, accountants, superintendents and employees in general of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Construction Commission; the place of residence of each of them at the time of their appointment; the salaries paid to each of them; their place of employment, and the names of persons who recommended such appointments.—Mr. Gervais.

For a return showing the quantity of summer-caught white fish and the value; the winter-caught whitefish and the value; the pickerel, quantity and value; the sturgeon, quantity and value, exported to the United States for each year respectively, during the years from November, 1893, to November, 1908, from the Manitoba ports.—Mr. Bradbury.

For a return showing the number of seizures made by the Department of Customs during the years 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907 and 1908; the date of seizures; by whom seized; what the seizures consisted of; amount realized by the sale of such material seized, and how the seized material was disposed of.—Mr. Barr.

For a copy of all correspondence, papers, reports, estimates, orders in council, &c., in connection with the surveys of and boring in, and called for tenders for dredging or excavation in the St. John harbour and Courtney bay or either of them during the year 1908; a copy of the advertisements, names of the papers in which they were inserted, the tenders received and dates, the names of the tenderers, and the amount of each tender; which tender, if any, was accepted, the deposit required and in which bank it is deposited.—Mr. Daniel.

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, papers, reports and valuations of officers or experts, and orders in council, in connection with the purchase, removal and repairing of the dredge 'Industry' and parts thereof, including scow, boilers and parts.—Mr. Foster.

For a copy of all correspondence, papers, orders in council, advertisements, tenders, contracts, &c., in connection with dredging in the harbour of St. John, N.B., covering the area dredged by Gershen B. Mayes, the Dominion Dredge Company, John Moore, or other parties, during the years 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907 and 1908; the quantities dug under each contract, the amounts paid to each contractor, the date of each payment, and to whom made.—Mr. Daniel.

For a return showing since the constitution of the Railway Board in how many cases they have ordered protection of highway rail-

way crossings, (a) by separation of the highway and railway, (b) by gates, (c) by other means, and the method adopted in each case; how the proceedings were initiated in each case; what order was made as to the expense of the work or service in each; at what points separation of highway and railway was ordered, and the actual or estimated cost in each case; in how many, and what, cases applications were refused.—Mr. Lennox.

For a return showing how many officials were appointed in the year 1908 to the various departments and brought from the outside service into the inside service under the Civil Service Act, with their names and salaries; and what addition to the various staffs have been made thereby.—Mr. Samuel Sharpe.

IMMIGRATION TO UNITED STATES AND REPATRIATION—CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND COLONIZATION SOCIETIES.

Mr. PAQUET (L'Islet) asked: (Translation.)

For a copy of all correspondence, reports and documents between the Department of the Interior and the immigration agents in the United States; and between the Department of the Interior and the colonization societies since the 1st of January, 1908.

He said : Mr. Speaker, I ask for a copy of correspondence between the Minister of the Interior and the colonization societies, between the Minister of the Interior and the immigration agents in the United States ; in order to study the work of repatriation.

The solution of this social problem is the most important in the interest of the Canadian people ; I recognize the value of the work done in the past. I do not desire to raise a tablet to the methods adopted, and on the ruins erect new systems. We must preserve such things that meet our requirements, social and economic, but at the same time, improve and consolidate them and bring them to perfection. Our object is to quicken the work of repatriating the Canadian descendants of the races that civilized France and the British isles. In this work, too complete and too imperfect, I desire especially to study the repatriation of the French Canadians.

In the days of the French administration, we see our ancestors already on the shores of lake Champlain, in the plains of the west and on the banks of the Mississippi.

The French missionaries and discoverers left the St. Lawrence valley and overran the American territories, implanting Christian civilization as they went. They did so to discover new lands in the interests of France, of civilization and of religion. Successive generations of Canadian birth ploughed the English colonies of our continent.

With respect to the causes that have influenced the immigration of our people to the United States, permit me to cite our historian, Mr. DeCelles. 'A law of the English parliament allowed a colonial minister and the Canadian government to dispose of the vacant lands of a province to their favourites at a nominal price. At times the Government made use of its powers over the public domains to coin money and increase the revenues. Mr. Rouillard, in his work, 'The Province of Quebec' said, 'Already, long before the distribution made to the loyalists, the colonial executive had commenced to grant great stretches of the public domain still remaining in an uncultivated state to monopolists without compelling them to make settlements under penalty of confiscation for failure to do so. Thus the British American Land Company received for its share 600,000 acres. From 1773 to 1811, more than three million acres of public lands were distributed among 200 favourites, of whom some had as much as 60,000 to 80,000 acres each. The Governor, Mr. Milnes, took for his part, 70,000 acres.

From that time the monopolists had but one object in view, namely, to wait for the increased value of their lands and watch for speculative developments. In this way, the Domains, debarred from cultivation and preserved in a wild state, served as a barrier, preventing the settlers from penetrating further into the interior of the country. It was no rare spectacle to see the agents of the public lands seeking, in the face of the colonizing movement everywhere, presenting itself, to oppose it under the pretense that the timber trade outweighed the interests of colonization. Hence, great was the number of the French Canadians who took the route for the United States.

The English bureaucrats, from 1760 to 1848, by informal persecution, by exile, by the scaffold, by plundering laws, by the confiscation of patriots' belonging, prevented clearings, paralyzed commerce and industry, and restricted to the narrowest proportions the developments of the French population, and thus opened the way to the disastrous emigration of the French Canadians to the United States. French Canadians were found in the armies of Washington.

After the troubles of 1837, a more extensive emigration took place towards New England. These families fled before fire, iron and proscription. As one orator said: 'Honour and gratitude to the magnanimous Martin Van Buren, the president of the American nation, who offered to our unhappy exiles land, employment, and the protection of a generous people.'

From 1760 to 1848, the Anglo-Saxon bureaucracy showed no intention to favour colonization in the province of Quebec for the advantage of a race that it wished to humiliate, to denationalize and perhaps to destroy.

As regards the French Canadians, it was an era of ostracism. Instead of encouraging French colonization, the Government disposed of the crown lands in favour of speculators.

From 1845 to 1849, 20,000 French Canadians quitted their native soil.

From 1848 to 1854, these figures rose to 40,000

From 1840 to 1848, the Canadian parliament voted $300,000 to promote the settlement of Lower Canada. The same parliament supremely unjust with regard to our province, voted two millions at the same time for colonization roads in Upper Canada.

No doubt improvidence and extravagance led some families to the United States, to become the servants, if not the slaves of American capitalists. But a great number of our compatriots owe their abandonment of their country to the persecutions of the English bureaucrats, and the indifference of governments that exhausted them in unhappy struggles when they should have united their forces and created a national industry.

To cite the Rev. Father Hamon: 'The emigration en masse only began after the civil war in 1860. Then the industries of the east witnessed a prodigious development. They devoted themselves to the construction of manufactures, and the Canadians came in great numbers looking for work. The flood of emigration overcame all obstacles, swept over all the dams, and, animated with resistless force, invaded the towns and villages of New England. In a few years, thousands and thousands of the cultivators of the soil had exchanged a rural existence for the lives of workmen in the immense manufactures of the United States. The labour of these vast works is to a large extent in their hands.'

This great Canadian emigration to the United States dates form the close of the civil war. Then arose in all directions those varied industries that soon covered the eastern states with gigantic manufacturing establishments, and the French Canadians in great numbers went there in pursuit of easier conditions in industrial pursuits.

The expatriated French Canadians have worked, without counting the days, without measuring the effusion of their sweats, for the glorification of their race and of their Gospel. The Franco-Americans, to the number of 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 are accomplishing a splendid work on the soil of the United States. They have known the proofs required from strangers; but did not at that time ask from the national societies the cohesion indispensable to assert their imperishable rights and save their ancestral traditions from shipwreck. Without deserting the flag of their nationality they have never betrayed that of the new country. They know how to prove their loyalty to the institutions of the Republic while still remaining attached to their faith, their language and their customs. Our compatriots are with energy making the conquest of a large place in the politics, the commerce and the industry of their new country. In the annals of the great Republic, the French Canadians rave with pages alike original and illustrious. On November 8, 1908, they effected a remarkable achievement: our compatriot, the Honourable A. Pothier, was elected Governor of Rhode Island. As a journalist writes: 'It is the natural crowning of a work accomplished by persistence, and for years, for the advancement of his fellow-citizens, and for the prosperity and good name of his State.

The expatriated French Canadians display the strength, tenacity, courage and heroism of the French race. They struggle against the assimilation of their race and elaborate the future in preserving the language of their ancestors and remaining faithful to the flag of that virile and generous democracy that astonishes the world with the boldness of its conceptions and its triumphs in all the spheres of human activity.

It would be unpardonable treason, undignified abdication, real national suicide not to make every effort to bring back to Canadian soil such a generous population.

As far back as 1848 the bishops of lower Canada exhorted the clergy and the people to do all in their power with a view of favouring the settler and of improving his social condition. Bishop Turgeon said: 'Let all French Canadians contribute according to their means and without delay to the work of colonization, and every difficulty will disappear.' The bishop deplores the departure of so many excellent Canadian families who are casting their lot in a foreign land far from the alters of their youth and their native land. Patriotic suffering is perhaps the most bitter of all moral sorrows. In the face of this alarming emigration of our compatriots, Lafontaine, together with the civil, religious and political authorities, worked strenuously in favour of the expansion of the French-speaking population on Canadian soil.

Colonization and repatriation societies were at that time founded to promote the interests of agriculture and of repatriation. In Lower Canada these colonization and repatriation societies were generously endowed.

It is impossible to think without emotion of those thousands of Canadians toiling in the factories of a foreign land. Their labour, energy, talent and patriotism enrich the ajoining republic to the detriment of Canada.

Our countrymen, no doubt, play a noble part in the United States, where they have been attracted by an extraordinary era of commercial and industrial prosperity; they are becoming there the representative of French civilization. But in order to fulfil our mission on Canadian soil, and if we would save the prestige and preserve the influence of that ancient race who civilized our land, it is necessary that the French Canadian family should sustain no loss.

Reverend Father M. Martineau, in his pamphlet: 'Projet de Colonisation,' says: 'If the three millions of French Canadians sprung from the 60,000 souls who formed the Canadian nation in 1760, resided, if not all, in the province of Quebec at least within the limits of Canada, would we not be in a much better position to protect and defend our rights, our language and our faith and to lend a helping hand to the feebler groups of our countrymen living among people who are often hostile to them?'

We ardently desire the return of 'our people' in order to increase the prestige of our nationality and to contribute our full share to the prosperity of the Dominion.

The work of repatriatoin is a great national work, but we understand that it is a difficult one. As a public speaker once said: 'Repatriation has got beyond the domain of official literature' it is going on every day with increasing success. Thanks to the work of colonization societies, to the help of the railways, to Governments' grants, to the good will of public men and to the active and disinterested help of the public at large, the final results are no longer uncertain.

Statistics furnished by the Department of the Interior are encouraging. From 1901 to the 1st December, 1907, 31,644 Canadians have returned to Canada.

Our immigration agents in the United States report favourably in this respect. Mr. D. Gauthier writes as follows to the Minister of the Interior: 'It is everywhere recognized that Canada is the land of the future, offering as it does exceptional advantages for the settlement of numerous families and an excellent field for the investment of capital. As a rule, Canadians living in the United States favour the idea of returning to Canada. They intend and before long they will do so. We have sown the seed in fertile soil and may reasonably expect an abundant harvest.'

On the 11th July 1905, Rev. Father Vachon wrote: 'I have continued the work begun some years ago and I am pleasd to be able to report good results as to the quality and the number of settlers.'

Mr. Scott reported, 7th July, 1906: 'The repatriation of French Canadians has occupied the attention of the Department since some years past and considerable progress has been made.'

Mr. PAQUET.

Mr. White, inspector of agencies in the United States, wrote on the 15th April, 1907: 'Part of our work is being done among French Canadians.

Besides the agents already mentioned we have opened an office at Biddeford. Our prospects are very good.'

In the work of repatriation it is necessary to show our progress.

Trade of Canada.	
1868	$ 57,567,000
1907	617,964,000
Imports.	
1868	73,455,000
1907	359,000,000
Exports.	
1868	57,567,000
1907	258,000,000
Agricultural Exports.	
1868	12,871,000
1904	37,000,000
Exports of forest products.	
1868	18,274,000
1904	33,000,000
Exports of Mineral.	
1868	1,446,000
1901	40,369,000
Deposits in Chartered Banks.	
1877	62,000,000
1907	589,000,000

Our trade and our progress attract the attention of civilized nations. A great economist, M. Pierre Leroy-Beaulieu declares that Canada is to-day the country offering the greatest inducements to immigrants, its development being the most rapid, especially as regards agriculture.

We may well expect the return of a certain number of our own people when we consider that Americans, recognizing the value of the lands and the industrial future of Canada are selling their establishments in the United States for the purpose of casting their fortunes on our side of the border.

In 1906, 57,000 immigrants came to us from the United States. This is a recognition of the vast resources of Canada. Colonization and repatriation societies have laboured fruitfully at the task of repatriation. They have organized colonization and repatriation congresses in which have been discussed the best means of securing our national development. Our fathers rallied round these associations as around a banner protecting our national future.

Some of them, helped by Government subsidies, now maintain agencies in New England for the purpose of promoting the return of our countrymen.

With very small financial means, colonization and repatriation societies, thanks to the zeal of their directors, have done much good work. They have favoured colonization and secured the return of a considerable

number of Canadians. They retain the services of able and practical lecturers in their effective propaganda throughout New England.

The governmnt formerly granted an annual sum of $4,000 to the Lake St. John Colonization Society. This has been discontinued and M. Réné Dupont appointed immigration agent. I would like to know what induced the minister to stop that grant.

Allow me to read an extract from the report of the Mutual Colonization and Repatriation Society for the year 1907. 'Fifteen thousand booklets and maps have been recently distributed among the Canadians of New England and the agricultural clubs of the province of Quebec, over and above our monthly distributions, by means of our agents in the United States, of a number of publications in the French and English languages, of pamphlets on western farm lands and those of Ontario and Quebec.

We have inserted advertisements in the French newspapers of New England calling upon our fellow-countrymen residing there to return to Canada where they will obtain farms and be well provided for under the care of the Montreal Colonization Sosiety. The statistics embodied in this report establish the truth of the statements therein contained.

The funds at the disposal of colonization and repatriation societies do not allow them to carry on their work with sufficient energy. Their grants should be increased so that the New England repatriation agencies might be multiplied.

We have several emigration agents in the eastern states ; Mr. Laurier and Mr. Tessier are at work in Michigan. Would it not be in the interests of Canada to have a few more French Canadian agents in Minnesota, Illinois and Montana, in the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis where there are important French Canadian groups? Should we not at least have agents speaking both official languages in all our immigration offices of Western America?

Franco-American national societies are playing an effective part in New England The directors and members of these different associations are in close contact with every class of French speaking Americans. Our immigration agents, through the officers and members of these national societies, might reach those families who are not satisfied with economic conditions in the United States and perhaps secure their return.

We call upon the federal government to vote larger sums for the purpose of advertising our wealth and our resources in New England. We ask them to distribute our pamphlets and publications carefully and actively in the Franco-American cities: Fall River, Nashua, Lewiston, Salem, Woonsocket and Lowell.

During the fiscal year 1906-7 we expended $56,000 in advertising Canada in the United States. We have no intention of blaming this expenditure. But, according to the Auditor General's Report, printing in the French language took up a very small portion of this somewhat large amount. Let us demonstrate to Franco-Americans by means of the press, by the voice of public lectures, by colonization literature, the marvellous progress of Canada. They will then gladly return to become active tillers of the beloved soil of their native land.

The authorities have adopted, with respect to agriculture in the province of Quebec, a policy favourable to the work of repatriation. This is explained in a letter written by Mr. Réné Dupont to the directors of the Canadian Press Association, which I will read:

Sir,—With a view of promoting settlement in the province of Quebec. the Department of the Interior has authorized the establishment of an information branch respecting vacant farm lands, so that persons desiring to make a purchase may obtain all requisite data. In the past no agency of this kind existed and we were unable to give satisfactory replies to the numerous requests we received. This agency will be available for all persons desirous of purchasing farms in any part of the country and also for those who have farms for sale. I inclose for your information a blank form which we send to all those having farms for sale and I would be much gratified if you would devote some of your valuable space to the work of explaining this to our compatriots.

RENE DUPONT.

The policy is commented upon in the following manner by a Franco-American journalist:

'A list is being at present prepared of vacant farms in the province of Quebec, with a view of offering them to Canadians residing in the United States. Nothing could be better. Had this been done ten years ago, the results, we feel sure, would have been important. At present, the difficulties to be overcome will be greater, yet practical results will certainly be obtained, especially if in the list are included farms situated along the long frontier line, near which, but on the American side, are to be found numerous and flourishing Franco-American colonies.

'Those who direct the colonization movement in the province of Quebec have hitherto given but little attention to the repatriation of French Canadians. Certain efforts have indeed been made to induce them to return, but the results obtained were such as to confirm the promoters of colonization in the idea that the problem could not be solved. Recent events and the splendid spirit of enterprise of some of our Franco-American countrymen have placed the matter in a different light and the practical solution seems at hand.

'We allude to a new national institution, the 'Crédit Foncier Canadien,' the object of which is to collect into one general fund the savings of the French Canadian population of New England. This institution is earnestly labouring in the work of repatriation. The Franco-American syndicate has already begun important colonization work in the township of Escourt. A large number of our people are returning under the guidance of enlightened men. This, says 'La Revue Franco-Américaine,' is an instance of the happy results to be obtained by association.

'In New England and more particularly in the States of Rhode Island, Maine, New Hampshire and Massachusetts, the work of the Crédit Foncier Canadien is attracting attention among our countrymen. This interest has been increased by the action of the president of the association, Hon. Judge Brochu, who goes from place to place preaching the gospel of the emancipation of Franco-American capital, and explaining to enterprising men the immense field opened to national energy by the undeveloped wealth of the province of Quebec, of which English speaking people alone have hitherto taken advantage. It is in some sort a revendication of the rights of the race to that portion of the soil discovered, colonized and developed by our fathers ; it is a practical and an active implementation of the wise advice once given us : Take possession of the soil ! No doubt our Franco-American friends are not preparing to come over in a body. But this assuredly means repatriation, so far as it can be accomplished.

There are at present in the United States 100,000 Canadians desirous of returning to Canada if they may do so with advantage to themselves.

It may be useful to listen now to the judicious remarks of a friend of repatriation. 'Of the possibility of carrying the work of repatriation in a certain measure, there can be no doubt, provided appeals are made to those who, living since some years in the United States, have not succeeded there and are willing to make another attempt to better their condition. These are numerous enough to deserve attention. And yet, if you speak to the younger members of these families, you will perceive that it will be difficult to make settlement on a farm one of the conditions of their return. Even if they consented to farm, they would prefer going to the Canadian West, now one of the objective points throughout the republic, and one to which thousands of Americans remove every year. You would be astonished at the amount of Franco-Americans who have settled since ten years in the new provinces.

Whatever may be the importance of the repatriation movement to-day, the number of those who have returned is insignificant compared with that of those who remain. We may in any case consider it certain that the return en masse of Canadians established in the United States is impossible. The majority of those who do return have no intention of becoming farmers.

It would be just as easy to induce Canadians from American cities to settle on farm lands as to persuade citizens of Quebec or Montreal to colonize the unexplored townships of Temiscaming or Lake St. John.

Years of strenuous labour will be needed to accomplish to any great extent the work of repatriation. We understand the difficulty and we know, as a public speaker expressed it, 'that a large Franco-American contingent must remain ever on foreign soil."

In the interest of Canada we should encourage the return of a French population important on account of their traditions, heroic in their past and present efforts and sufferings, strong in numbers and steadfast in their ancestral faith. We should encourage their return by the development of transportation, of colonization, of agriculture and of industry. Waterways, railways and colonization roads should be so improved as to secure access to new markets. Our colonization policy should be progressive and enlightened. We should encourage agriculture and adopt scientific methods of cultivation. Every day we behold American farmers settling in the Canadian West with remarkable success. Important Franco-Canadian groups may settle in the West and unite with the first French contingents who civilized Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. They will honour the French name and the Canadian name by prospering among foreign groups. If we would keep the sons of the soil and promote repatriation we should develop industry. French Canadians have sought in the United States that intense industrial life which our neighbours enjoy. As one of our countrymen has said: 'Industry has attracted our people to the United States, industry, prosperous industry will induce them to return.'

With technical education and the development of our agricultural, mining and forest wealth, Canada will become a great industrial country. Industrial development will be specially favourable to repatriation. With industrial progress the national spirit will awaken. Let us erect numerous factories to minister to the requirements of the growing west. Let us establish industrial schools where young men may be trained. Such schools have transformed German industry within the last half century. Our countrymen both at home and abroad develop great taste for all industrial arts. The development of industry appears to me the best way of favouring repatriation.

In this work, we should never forget form in the great republic a group of two millions

of men with social organization not inferior in many respects to that of the province of Quebec and in some points even superior.

In certain important centers, Franco Americans control capital, they have good commercial establishments and take an active part in public business. Their property represents millions of dollars. Their ownership of real estate, naturalization, the establishment of French Catholic schools and of the parochial system attach them to the soil of the republic and render repatriation difficult. A large number of our countrymen are kept there by their interests, their marriage connections and the positions they occupy. In spite of such difficulties, our progress in agriculture and industry lead us to hope that a considerable number of them may return.

Among our immigrants, Franco-Americans occupy the post of honour. Their feelings, ideals and aspirations are the same as ours. Let them then return, they will work with us and to the French Canadian people, to the Canadian people a still more solid foundation upon which may be built up an edifice of material, moral and intellectual greatness.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX (Postmaster General and Minister of Labour). (Translation.) I have no intention of speaking at any length upon the question raised by my hon. friend from L'Islet. I have listened with much interest to his eloquent appeal in favour of the repatriation of our countrymen. It is a matter which must always be of considerable moment to the French Canadian minority in the Dominion.

What has been the policy of the government since they assumed the direction of affairs in 1896? It would be useless to refer to what took place before that time. It is well known that we were then deploring the exodus of our countrymen to the United States. This has been going on since a number of years, and in spite of the National policy, as it was then called, our fair Quebec parishes were being alarmingly depopulated for the benefit of New England.

Liberals at that time contended that a different fiscal policy might stop the outward flow of population. And what happened when they assumed power? Has the present government succeeded in keeping the people in the country? I refer here more particularly to the province of Quebec. The member for L'Islet may read the statistics published by the Census Bureau and he will find that with the exception of the new provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, the province of Quebec alone has maintained and increased her population. It is due to this that the Ontario membership in this House has diminished by five or six seats.

To what are we to attribute this result? Precisely to the attitude of the government. The government altered the fiscal policy of the country in such a manner as to secure the development and the full expansion of national industry which remained stagnant not only in Quebec but in every province of the Dominion, until 1896. Never before, Mr. Speaker, had the industries of Quebec flourished as they have in the last ten years. We have maintained and increased the population of our great cities of Montreal, Quebec and Sherbrooke so much so that Montreal occupies to-day the whole of the island of that name, the labouring population having built up all the outlying ground.

Farm lands in the province of Quebec were being rapidly deserted; to-day, thank God, they are in full cultivation, and when they become too congested the people no longer cross the line, they remove to farms in the western provinces. The member for L'Islet cannot have read the eloquent letters published last year by Abbé Bérubé, in which he calls atention to the number of French Canadians who have settled in Saskatchewan and Alberta since five or six years, in spite of the tempest which certain parties sought to raise concerning the new constitution. This is so true that in certain western parishes peopled, until quite recently by foreign emigrants, our French speaking countrymen will soon be in a majority.

It may therefore be contended that the government has not only checked the flow of emigration and kept the people in the province of Quebec, but that the population of that province has so increased as to furnish settlers to the western fertile belt. The government did even more—I quite recognize that the member for L'Islet was perfectly sincere in his remark—they repatriated all our countrymen residing in the United States who so desired it.

Will my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier tell me how many immigration agents we had in New England before 1897? There was not a single one. The government of that day had not deemed it advisable to appoint a single French speaking repatriation agent.

Since 1896, under the direction of Hon. Mr. Sifton—a man most unjustly spoken of in the province of Quebec—and at the request of Liberal members, the Department of the Interior appointed a certain number of agents, and among them certain clergymen, to undertake the work of repatriation. I make this declaration, Mr. Speaker, not in a spirit of animosity, but because, in Quebec, our opponents have never ceased to proclaim that our policy was hostile to repatriation. I have not before me the names of those agents, but I know that there are twelve of them, with clergymen among them, at different points in the New England states.

The member for L'Islet has stated that the best method of promoting repatriation would be to develop transportation especially as regards waterways. He also referred to the necessity of establishing industrial and technical schools, in order to keep our population in the province of Quebec. You know, Sir, that such foundations are placed not under Dominion, but under provincial authority.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) I simply wished to state that we should establish technical schools to develop national industry. I knew quite well that such establishments do not come under federal authority.

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) I will say to the hon. member that since ten years in the province of Quebec, that is to say, under the present provincial government, industrial and technical schools have so developed that the government has expended half a million on them alone. It is even proposed to form a large agricultural university.

All this tends to show that the Liberal party have done their duty by our countrymen settled in the United States, that not only has the population of Quebec increased, but that it has made headway in Ontario and in the west. If any special point be chosen to give praise to the Prime Minister, who so ably directs the government of this country, it may surely be mentioned that it was he who decided to build the Transcontinental Railway, a gigantic national enterprise, of which, I am happy to say, my hon. friend from L'Islet has approved. The Prime Minister has, by this means, opened to settlement both New Ontario and New Quebec, and if room be lacking in the valleys of the Richelieu, of the St. Lawrence or the St. Francis, our countrymen may confidently rely upon finding there the necessary space for their development.

As for colonization societies, the member for L'Islet is aware that the government has subsidized those of Lake St. John, of Montreal and of Ottawa. The grant to the Lake St. John society was discontinued, because its members appeared to have more taste for politics than for colonization, and the hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay is in a position to funish, on this point, some interesting facts.

My hon. friend from L'Islet is well aware that repatriation is not as easy a matter as he would have us suppose. He has himself mentioned several obstacles, such as the parochial organization deeply rooted among the French Canadian groups of New England. I will say to the hon. gentleman—it is sometimes useful to state home truths—that the most serious opponents of repatriation are to be found among the clergy. When a French Canadian priest has founded a mission in the United States and that that mission has become a parish, with church, college, convent and schools, all handsome, as may be seen at Lowell, Holyoke and elsewhere, when such a place has become in some sort a continuation of the province of Quebec, it is natural enough that the pastor of the parish should not desire to see his flock dispersed even though it be to return to old Quebec.

As for myself, I am far from being indifferent to the fate of those French Canadians who strive to maintain our national traditions on foreign soil. I know that a great number of them desire to return to the province of Quebec ; that has been established. Their elders have remained on the land. In the counties of Berthier and Soulanges, for example, and on the banks of the Richelieu, the farms became too small to contain the numerous French Canadian families. The sons left and settled in New England ; their intention was always to return later on. I met during the last election a cousin of my friend the member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot), who has made a fortune in New England, and who had returned to reside in his native parish. This is an instance among a thousand. A great number of them return home of their own accord and without solicitation on the part of the federal government.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of the Interior, under the direction of Mr. Sifton, and under that of the present minister (Mr. Oliver), has done its duty with respect to repatriation.

Mr. F. D. MONK. (Jacques Cartier.) (Translation.) I think, Mr. Speaker, that we owe a debt of gratitude to the hon. member for L'Isle, for the interesting and absolutely impartial speech he has just delivered on the question of repatriation. Our friend has treated the question from a high standpoint, and with warmth. His remarks were dictated by no party consideration, and I think that the House will admit that he is the first member from the province of Quebec—at least since I have the honour of sitting here—who has raised that question.

Who among the members sitting on your right has ever, since twelve years, made a speech to point out the means which should be adopted to put a stop to that evil, the effects of which the member for L'Islet has so eloquently explained ? The evil he speaks of has since many years been causing to Canada and particularly to the province of Quebec, most serious and painful economic losses. Yet I never heard the gentlemen opposite mention it. I myself have spoken of it two or three time though not in a special manner. But at the present moment, during the opening days of a new parliament, when immigration questions are about to become of burning in-

terest as stated by the hon. minister, who has just sat down, it was right, I think, that a representative from the province of Quebec should rise in this House to draw our attention, not to the Yellow Peril of which he cannot bridge, but to the peril resulting from the weakening of national life in the province of Quebec.

Notwithstanding the eloquent tribute paid by the Postmaster General to the member for L'Islet, I cannot think that he has rendered him entire justice. The hon. minister began by stating that since 1896, the exodus which is causing so much harm to many of our countrymen has been checked.

Mr. TALBOT (Bellechasse.) (Translation.) That is true.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) It is false, it is untrue, for the movement is continuing. It is not as intense to-day as it was in the beginning, by reason of circumstances ably set forth by my hon. friend from L'Islet, but it is continuing all the same. Have the parishes formerly deserted been repopulated? When we journey through the province of Quebec and see the closed houses and abandoned farms, do we find that any of them have been taken up by others among our countrymen ? Not at all.

I may say that in my own constituency where the evil referred to by the hon. member for L'Islet has not been felt to the same extent as in other localities, owing to the nearness of a great city, these houses have nevertheless remained closed. There are also closed houses in the county represented by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. A friend of mine living in that county was telling me last summer that in Rouville, houses closed as a result of that exodus have since been left unoccupied.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). (Translation.) Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question? I think I have a fairly good knowledge of what is going on in my county and I am in a position to state that the hon. member's statement is unfounded. He would oblige me greatly by naming the place where he found such a state of things.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) My hon. friend wishes me to point out the range, the hill, the very neighbourhood where a house abandoned fifteen years ago has since been left unoccupied. He knows very well that I am not able to do that off hand.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Will the hon. member be so kind as to give the name of the parish?

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) The house situated in the parish of which the hon. minister himself is a resident. My informer stated: That is the result of the exodus. And why should we endeavour to pander with the truth? There was a time when people were leaving this country in large numbers. The flow of emigration has diminished since. It is pretty well known that perfect happiness is not to be found in the United States, that milk does not flow in their rivers, nor gold for that matter, that prosperity has some drawbacks in that country. That is why the flow of emigration has diminished, but it has not ceased. I am satisfied that statistics might be found in support of that statement.

Two or three years ago, I went to Philadelphia in company with the hon. Postmaster General. We were invited to a banquet and there we were met by a large number of English speaking Canadians, of great ability no doubt, who had come there from the Maritime Provinces. It is that same exodus which has depopulated the Maritime Provinces which has also drawn away from Canada so many of our French speaking Canadians. Who can deny it? Young men in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, being unable to find at home a wide enough scope for their activity, have gone to the United States and have remained there.

The statement that the hon. member for L'Islet has made in reference to the people of the province of Quebec, of a more or less industrial character, who have emigrated to the United States, might be extended to the remainder of Canada . That exodus has been going on in all parts of the country, and is still going on.

It seems as if the Postmaster General had considered as a reflection on the government as a vicious attack on his party, what was an entirely unprejudiced statement of fact. It refers to a state of things which claim just now our whole attention; but the hon. gentleman has thought fit to throw that red herring across the track and view it as a reflection on this government and his party.

Do hon. members know by what magic at a certain time in 1896, when there was a change of government, that evil which the member for L'Islet has just pointed out came to an end. The Hon. Postmaster General has told us. Some hon. members must have been surprised to hear him make the statement: it is the new tariff policy of the government put in force in 1896. How can that be made to agree with the statements made in public by the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr.Sifton), whose authority the Postmaster General appeals to just now, and whom he eulogizes in the strongest terms. Such change of position is rather surprising to those who have not forgotten that at the time that minister resigned the French party organs of the Postmaster General bitterly attacked that ex-minister.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU (Solicitor General). (Translation.) Who said so?

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) It is the Prime Minister's organ which made an onslaught on the ex-Minister of the Interior at the time he resigned, stating that he had been treacherous to the French Canadians and Catholics. Is that true or false? Does my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Bureau) challenge me to lay that article before the House?

Mr. BUREAU. (Translation.) Certainly.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) He has been slow in answering, and he knows that I am unable to take up his challenge just now.

The hon. Postmaster General has referred to the tariff question. He is well aware that his party has held fast to the policy which we had started in 1878, when a protective tariff was established. Only slight changes have been made to it by the Liberal party. What was the statement made by the ex-Minister of the Interior? Did he not state in this House that practically the tariff had not been changed and that consequently the fiscal question was no longer a party question? How then could the changes effected in the tariff policy have put a stop to the exodus of our fellow citizens to the United States? I leave to the Postmaster General the task of answering that question.

We should not blink at the facts. The Postmaster General stated that in 1886 we had not a single emigration agent among our French speaking fellow-citizens in the eastern states. That is true. I am not aware, at any rate, that we had any at the time. Any one familiar with the management of public affairs knows what was our immigration policy in 1896. We spent barely $125,000 for immigration purposes.

Mr. TALBOT. (Translation.) Whose fault was it if more was not spent?

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I was about to remark that such a moderate expenditure redounds to the credit of the Conservative leaders, who had not lost their heads on that immigration question as the Liberal party have done. To-day we are reaching up in the millions. Did my friend the hon. Postmaster General, or did any of these hon. gentlemen from the province of Quebec, in 1896, dream of appointing agents for the purpose of inducing our fellow-citizens in the eastern states to return to Canada? Did any one dream in 1896, of carrying on work of that kind in the direction pointed to by the hon. member for L'Islet? By no means; there was not a single agent appointed, neither in 1897. The hon. Postmaster General was at the time Solicitor General. Did he accomplish anything in that direction? I am waiting for an answer. Here is what occurred—and there is nobody better aware of it than the Postmaster General himself—the then minister of the Interior had taken it into his head to inflict on the western country and heterogenous people, to fill up that country without care or discrimination. His sole ambition was to fill up the west, a queer notion, which had to be discarded pretty soon, owing to strong complaints made to our government by the United States authorities, regarding the class of people we subsidized. These European immigrants to whom or on whose account we paid bonuses would oftentimes find their way to the United States and flood that country with diseased and undesirable persons, who, on being shut out from the neighbouring republic, returned to Canada and remained a burden to us. How much did we spend in 1897-98 to bring here the first 7,000 Doukhobors? $48,000 to begin with. Will hon. gentlemen in this House who have taken an interest in this question and have studied it claim that the government has acted wisely in spending such an amount for the purpose of bringing here people of whom their fellow-citizens in Europe were glad to get rid; inflicting on the Northwest Territories the presence of 15,000 or 20,000 persons who go about naked on the prairie in quest of the Messiah.

We continued bringing here numbers of people who have been sent west; but after a while, owing to protests forthcoming from the United States, and from this side of the House, it was deemed necessary to adopt stricter regulations. At one time, a few members became indignant at the fact that we were spending over one million dollars a year advertising, after the Preston method, in the west, in Europe, in Germany, in Norway and in the British Isles, while abstaining from all active work in the eastern states. A move has been made with which probably the Postmaster General has had something to do—for I willingly acknowledge his patriotism and good intentions—a move has been made against that policy. In the eastern states, it was urged, there is a desirable quota of settlers to be obtained and nothing is done to enlist them. You have no agents on the spot, your endeavours in that direction are nil; complaints are beginning to be voiced in that regard, try and do something. Was there, yes or no, pressure exerted on the then Minister of the Interior? I have not in mind the present minister, but his predecessor in office the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). At all events, after many and long continued exertions, met with stubborn resistance, the appointment of a few agents was granted. The Postmaster General states that he has to-day two such agents.

I remember the time—and my friend from L'Islet must remember it also—when there were on the spot only a couple of poor, though zealous priests working not in their own interest, but in the country's

interest. receiving a modicum of about $600 per year, and whose accounts for expenses were audited and scrutinized in a gingerly way.

It may be that in the meantime the number of agents has been increased; but do we find entrusted with that important work of repatriating our own people any of those fine gentlemen, who, closely seated in their offices, draw on us at the rate of $6,000 or $7,000 a year, as are to be found in western Canada, in Michigan, or any other of the western states. Insignificant amounts have been voted for the purpose of repatriating our people, as compared with the hundreds of thousand dollars spent for the purpose of enlisting by improper methods—and I shall ever brand them as such—immigrants from various European countries, with the object of settling our lands and helping to build up a young nation; the whole work being carried on recklessly, without anything like the care required under the circumstances.

And what do we see to-day? While we have spent a million and a half in bonuses and salaries to agents spread through Europe for the purpose of bringing here 260,000 immigrants, what have we accomplished towards solving the problem brought to our attention by the member for L'Islet? We have in the United States a million and a half of our fellow-citizens, a number of whom are still British subjects; they still retain that fine feeling which prevents them from giving up their character of British citizens. They are well fitted for farm work, speak both languages, are inured to our climatic conditions. Why should we not carry on in their midst a systematic campaign for their repatriation, instead of continuing to send in their midst incompetent agents, simply because they happen to be the friends of some member, connections of some minister, and are in need of a job. I say that it would be possible for us without difficulty, to enlist 25,000, to say the least, of these admirable settlers who are desirous of returning here. It has been objected, if they are desirous of coming back, should send for them and extend to them those facilities at least which we offer to the Doukhobors, when enlisting them in the back yards of Europe.

The plan proposed by the hon. member for L'Islet is a good one. We should have recourse to those associations having for their object the repatriation of such of our fellow-citizens as are desirous of returning to Canada and settling on farms. I have no information as to what has taken place in the case of the Lake Saint John Colonization Society; but as a rule, our colonization societies are made up of disinterested men, in whose eyes money is no object, their whole aim being the country's good.

If by means of some organization managed on business lines, we succeed in repatriating 25,000 or 30,000 of these good people, and have them take up lands either on the Western praries, or in British Columbia, or in Northern Ontario, or in the province of Quebec, wherein there are still large areas of vacant lands, I say that will be money well spent.

The question of immigration has never been taken up in this House as a truly national issue. We have gone into a system of bonusing the great transportation companies, which were offering inducements to their booking agents in the older countries of Europe for the purpose of recruiting immigrants and sending them to the Northwest. Then that system was extended for patronage ends, by the appointments of immigration agents, former members, or cousins or nephews of influential people, thus enabling them to live at the expense of the Government. I contend that it is time we should take up as a national issue the work of bringing back to Canada our fellow-citizens settled in foreign lands.

There is not only the Northwest to fill up. We have fertile lands still unoccupied in all the provinces. It should no longer be our object to frame our immigration policy with a view to directing westward an heterogenous population which can only be a source of embarrassment and difficulties. Such a problem should be viewed in all its bearings and solved as a whole.

To my mind, that question of the repatriation of our fellow-citizens has been very well set forth by my friend from L'Islet; and I hope the House will give due consideration to his remarks on the subject.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for L'Islet should be congratulated for having called the attenton of the House to that important question of the repatriation of the French Canadians settled in the United States. I certainly would have no criticism to offer of his speech, had it not recalled some utterances of his on the same subject, delivered during the last electoral campaign. That question is worthy of consideration, and it is my excuse for taking part in this debate.

My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has made a speech wherein party feeling is more in evidence than in the remarks made by the hon. member for L'Islet. It seems as if he had taken occasion of this debate to cast reflections on the policy followed by the government. For instance, I notice he has resorted to the Doukhobor cry. Some of our opponents in the province of Quebec have this as their stock argument at public meetings, that a certain number of Doukhobors hailing from Russia have settled in the western country. That is the crime for which our government is taken to task. However the member for Jacques Cartier has forgetten apparently the

statement made by his chief, the member for Halifax (Mr. R. L. Borden), leader of the Opposition, who, in the course of his recent journeyings through the West, highly eulogized the Doukhobors and Galicians.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) What is my hon. friend's authority for such a statement?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) The statement was made in this House last year, the leader of the opposition was present, and it is not to my knowledge that he contradicted the statement. If the hon. member for Jacques Cartier denies that the leader of the opposition has eulogized these people, of course I am bound to accept his statement; but, what I have heard of the debate last year is evidence to me that the leader of hon. gentlemen opposite has used such language, since he has not contradicted the statement. That statement, as I am informed, by the member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) is recorded in Hansard for 1907-1908, pages 1396 and 1397, wherein will be found the proofs in support of my contention, and I presume that in the course of this debate these utterances will be quoted anew word for word.

Moreover, the question should not be considered from the point of view of the partisan, and I very much regret that the member for Jacques Cartier should have thought fit to take such a stand, he who as a rule discusses these questions solely as to their merits.

The member for Jacques Cartier has made an extraordinary statement which, I am bound to say, is wholly without foundation.

Nobody can deny that for many years, people were going from Canada to the United States. This emigration began about 1840. It became more general after the reciprocity treaty of 1854, and was at its highest point, about 1870 and the succeeding years, until 1896.

That emigration from the province of Quebec and the other provinces was very large, as the fact can be proved by the statistics of the American government. From a report that has just been handed to me, I gather that in 1850, the year of the census, the number of Canadians that had emigrated to the United States was 147,711; in 1860, 249,970; in 1870, 493,464; in 1880, 717,154; in 1890, 980,938, and in 1900, 1,179,807.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has laid great stress on the emigration of French Canadians. I see that since a certain number of years, the emigration of the French Canadians, instead of being in the ascension, has rather decreased.

I can see by the American census of 1880 that there was at that time 980,938 Canadians in the United States; out of that number, 678,442 were of English origin and 302,496 of French origin. In 1890, there was an increase and, of a total of 1,179,207 Canadians, 784,741 were of English descent; so there was an increase of over 100,000, while the number of Canadians of French descent had passed from 302,000 to 395,000. We can see, then, that the emigration of French Canadians had proportionately decreased.

Mr. MONK (Translation). What is the minister quoting from?

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR (Translation). These statistics are to be found in a memorandum published by the Trade and Labor Bureau of Washington. They are official.

Mr. MONK. (Translation). Is not the American classification of immigrants different from ours? Would not a Franch Canadian be classified as a Frenchman?

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation). My hon. friend is mistaken; formerly the Canadians were entered without any mention of origin, but since 1890, a new classification has been adopted, and a distinction is made between French and English Canadians.

Mr. MONK. (Translation). Will my hon. friend let me have this paper, when he is through with it?

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation). Certainly; with pleasure. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier said that the emigration from the province of Quebec has been going on since 1896 and that it is quite as numerous as formerly.

Mr. MONK. (Translation). I did not say that; what I said was quite the contrary.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation). I accept my hon. friend's denial, but he said that emigration to the United States was still very large and that a great number of farms were deserted. He mentioned Rouville county and made a reference to the parish of Saint Hilaire. There is not another parish that I know more about and I can say to my hon. friend that when I was a candidate for the first time, in 1891, I travelled through the county, and in the parishes of L'Ange-Gardien and Saint-Paul I saw concessions after concessions where the farms were deserted and the houses closed. What do we see to-day? Conditions are changed. Go through these same parishes and you will not see a single house closed.

Mr. MONK. (Translation). Have those people returned?

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation). Certainly. They have returned and they are prospering, thanks to the agricultural development that has taken place since 1896, and thanks, above all, to a progressive policy in the dairy industry, which is giving handsome profits to those who are engaged in it. That is the real situation and I have no doubt that my hon. friend has made that assertion without due consideration.

Mr. MONK. (Translation). I will find out the exact locality and concessions.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation). I am sure that my hon. friend is mistaken. He may have seen some houses closed, but here is the explanation: the farmers are so well off that they sometimes buy the farm of a neighbour and close the house.

Mr. MONK. (Translation). It is in what is called the 'rang des Trente.'

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation). Here again my hon. friend is wrong. The matter is of no importance, but I simply wished to put my hon. friend right on that point.

Now, has the government done something for the repatriation of the French Canadians? The hon. member for Jacques Cartier has candidly admitted that the government of which he has been a strong supporter before 1896, had never appointed a single agent to that end. He must give us credit for having appointed, not one, or two, or six of such agents, but twelve.

Mr. MONK. (Translation). Will the hon. Minister give us the names of these agents and the places where they are operating?

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Certainly. They are: Réné Dupont, Quebec; J. B. Carbonneau, Biddeford, Maine; C. A. Laurier, Marquette, Maine; Romuald Laurier, 114 rue Dudley, Foxburg, Mass.; Damase Gauthier, Laurentides, Que.; O. Tessier, Saginaw, Mich.; W. H. Beaudry, Mass.; Alex. Ayotte, Great Falls, Mont.; M. L'abbé L. P. Gravel, Gravelburg, Sask.; M. L'Abbé E. E. Gauthier, Pawtucket, R. I.; M. L'Abbé J. A. Ouellette, Montreal, Que.

It must be remembered that the address of some of these agents is in Canada, but that their field of action is in the United States.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier says that we have no agents in the eastern states. If he will refer to the report of Mr. Damase Gauthier, he will be convinced of the contrary.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) What is Gauthier's salary? It must be at least $400.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) At least $1,200.

Mr. MONK. (Translation). Oh, no.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) My hon. friend has given many denials; he can afford to give one more. Let us see what is said in the report of the Rev. M. Blais for the year 1902-1903, page 145:

Besides the repatriation of a large number of our people, I have succeeded in moulding the opinion of the leading class to the advantages of the Canadian west, in interesting them in my work, which will make it easier for me with a large number of persons who think seriously of coming back to Canada.

In his report Rev. M. Vachon, says:

I have continued during the last year the work taken up in previous years, that is, of lecturing in the western states among the most prosperous French settlements in farming districts. The result, I am pleased to say has been satisfactory with regard to the quality and quantity of settlers. Those emigrants formerly from Canada form a very desirable class of settlers, as they are men who have acquired fortune and experience in farming in the United States. I may say that the interest in the northwest is increasing among the French people; this is evidenced by the numerous invitations sent to me from different parts of the country to lecture on Canada. One of these invitations came from as far as Butte City, Montana; I took advantage of this invitation tendered to me to go and lecture in several French settlements of Montana, and not without effect, as it is noticed that the large percentage of French settlers from that direction is higher this year than previously.

Let us look, now, to the report of Mr. Ridout, for the year 1904-1905, page 87:

I must say that through the eastern states that I have visited the majority of the French population is anxious to come back and see our new settlements in Canada. During my lectures I have called the attention of my audience to the advantages that can be found on the settlements in New Ontario, districts of Nipissing and Algoma, Northern Timiskaming and county of Pontiac, province of Quebec.

And the report of Mr. John Hoolahan :

It is a satisfaction to be able to state that the repatriation of French Canadians goes steadily on. While many of these return to their old homes in Quebec and eastern Ontario, a large percentage now turn their steps to the Northwest.

Mr. O'Corbeil says:

I went to Nashua, Manchester and Concord, where the French Canadians are in large numbers and are asking for more information. As a result on that trip, the numerous letters that I receive and the numerous applications that are coming in for literature are good proofs that the repatriation of French Canadians is larger than ever, and is still increasing on account of these people being better informed as to the Canadian west.

Mr. Carbonneau in his report says:

The prospects for this bureau, which is chiefly concerned in the repatriation of the largest number of French Canadians, are most encouraging. During the financial year I have delivered certificates for 405 persons representing 134 families, whose intention are to settle in western Canada or in the province of Quebec, and whose aggregate capital is $48,000.

It can be seen by these reports that our agents have done much for the cause of re-

patriation, not only in the eastern states, but also in the west. It is a well known fact, that there are a great many Canadians in the western states, and the work done in these parts of the country helps also the repatriation in the east and directs the Canadians from the American west to the Canadian west

I will give some statistics to prove my contention. If the hon. member for Jacques Cartier will look at the report of 1903-04, he will see that 4,432 Canadians have returned to this country. In 1904-1905, 3,613 have returned.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) What is your authority for that ?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) The official reports. The proportion in 1904, was 9·8 per cent.; in 1905, 8·3 per cent.; in 1906, 5,000, or 8:6 per cent.; in 1906-7, 2,502, or 7·3 per cent.; in 1907-08, 5,160, or 8·8 per cent. The total for the five years was 20,707 repatriated Canadians, or 9 per cent.

I will now give extracts from the report of the Colonization Society of Montreal.

In 1898, 68 Canadian were brought back from the United States, thanks to the efforts of that association. In 1899, we had 31. In 1900, 92; in 1901, 102; in 1902, 149; in 1903 ,119; in 1904, 228; in 1905, 295; in 1906, 310; in 1907, 330. So, in the ten years, 1,715 Canadians left the United States and have settled in the new parts of this country, thanks to the good work of this association. These statistics are taken from the report of the secretary, dated March 3, 1908.

Have we not in these reports the proof that the government have done their duty towards the cause of the repatriation of the French Canadians living in the United States, and that my hon. friend was entirely mistaken when he said that we have done nothing for our fellow-countrymen. I think I have established that the Conservative government have done nothing, while the Liberal administration have appointed agents and subagents in the United States to bring back our fellow-countrymen to this country.

My hon. friend ought to know, that the time is no more when one could raise the racial and religious cry about immigration. His friends from the Pacific coast devote their time to denounce oriental immigration and his friends of the province of Quebec are chiefly concerned in creating racial prejudices against the government, with that same question of immigration.

M. PAQUET. (Translation.) What justification has the hon. minister to say that the friends of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier are endeavouring to create racial prejudices about immigration? Have I done so in discussing this question the way I have discussed it this afternoon?

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) I say that in the province of Quebec and in British Columbia, the racial cry is being raised about immigration. In British Columbia, they went as far as forging telegrams to create the impression that the head of the Conservative party was totally opposed to oriental immigration. Can my hon. friend deny that? What does he think of his friends who resort to such means?

On the other hand, in the province of Quebec, they are trying to stir the prejudices of the French population under the pretense that the federal governement are not doing their duty.

I think I have established, figures in hand, that the government and the Minister of the Interior, have done all in their power, not only for the repatriation of our fellow-countrymen, but also to attract to this country the greatest possible number of desirable immigrants.

M. NANTEL (Terrebonne). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I confess that I had no intention of taking part in this discussion. I can say further, that I had not the least suspicion that the academic speech of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Paquet) would be followed by such an animated debate. I am inclined to think that politics are not always the best of things. The discussion started on lines acceptable to all and it seems to me that there should be only one way of thinking on this question. It is quite clear to my mind that the government must take the means of settling this immense country of ours.

They are in duty bound to direct immigration from the best sources, to lay the foundations of a great Canadian nation. Then, can they go at a better source, than in endeavouring to bring back to this country those who have left it? The government have done good work in that direction; they are entitled to our felicitations for it. I hope they will continue in the same strain.

The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) said that within ten years, 1,700 Canadians had been brought back to this country. The result is not amazing.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) By the Colonization Society of Montreal, alone.

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) But, may I ask how many strangers have been brought in this country, for the last few years that will never become assimilated and will be a lasting menace for the Canadian race, be it in the east or in the west? I do not care to mention any race in particular, but nobody can deny that the danger exists.

The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries said that the government have at-

tracted a large number of American citizens in western Canada. I know that, and I am inclined to think that, on principle, it is not a desirable immigration. I do not suppose that these immigrants will ever become strongly attached to Canada. They come here to operate the great natural resources of the country, to make money with the preconceived idea of returning to their former homes. For those who do stay, they will always think more of the stars and stripes than of the Canadian flag.

The same thing cannot be said of the French Canadians who have emigrated to the United States. They are favourably disposed towards us. They are people of the same blood. They will become patriotic citizens, always ready to stand by the flag.

I repeat that the government have done a good deal, but that they can do much more and I am bound to say that if politics were eliminated from the question, it would be an easy task to direct towards this country a large number of desirable immigrants from the republic to the south.

Hon. JACQUES BUREAU (Solicitor General). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to detain the House very long. I simply wish to make a few remarks on the speeches delivered by the hon. members for Jacques Cartier and Terrebonne. As to my hon. friend from L'Islet, it seemed to me as if I was listening to some of the speeches he had already delivered during the last elections, I do not think there is any condemnation of the government policy in the words he has uttered. He has recalled to mind the struggles of the French Canadians, the wrongs they had to suffer and from whom the latter came.

The discussion of this question has taken a new turn when the hon. member for Jacques Cartier rose on his feet. This question of repatriation is one which deserves serious consideration and which every one of us has at heart. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier said a while ago that it is always timely to discuss that question, and he asked: who are those who look after it? In answer to him, I may quote the old saying that actions are more eloquent than words. If we have not raised this question it is because we were taking action. As the hon. Minister of Marine said, we have appointed immigration agents in New England to bring back the French Canadians from the United States, and thereby a new movement was determined.

We all agree upon one point: we all want the French Canadians to come back in this country. The hon. member for L'Islet said he did not intend to criticise the government policy, but simply wished to state that the amount spent for French immigration literature is very small indeed. I hold in my hand a statement prepared from the records of the Immigration Department which shows that last year there were printed and distributed, at a cost of $7,935, about 257,000 French pamphlets in order to encourage the French Canadians to come back to this country.

The only means suggested by the hon. member for L'Islet is to start a concerted action intended to cause such a prosperity as would bring back our compatriots. For him it seems useless to send agents in the United States in order to have the country advertised by the means of lectures on our fertile soil and valuable lands.

I do not think this government can be charged with not having changed the conditions since 1896. Moreover, the Postmaster General has stated a while ago how matters were standing in spite of the contrary statements made by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier who in order to support his theory is willing to see in the closed summer houses of those who go and spend the country-season on the shores of the Richelieu river a proof that French Canadians are moving to the United States.

My hon. friend has a sensible soul and a great heart, but whenever he is in need of arguments, his imagination is quick at work. In 1900 or 1903, I took part in a by-election in Argenteuil caused by Mr. Christie's death: there I met the former member for Beauharnois, Mr. Bergeron, and my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier. The latter was deploring in every respect the presence of Doukhobors in Canada; such was his hobby and he could not get rid of it. He was denouncing the government and it was a great sight indeed to see him raising his arms to heaven while calling attention to that dreadful thing. He came back to it today; that was unavoidable. As to the remedy suggested by the hon. member for L'Islet, I do not think that it would better the situation in any respect.

Before I resume my seat I have just one word more to add. The hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Nantel) has just said that we must be very cautious in the selection of immigrants. He said amongst other things that certain immigrants he did not wish to designate were a danger for Canadians. Speaking of Americans from the west who come and settle in Canada, he gave us to understand that their coming was entirely dangerous for the future of the country.

Let me tell him that under the Conservative government, before 1896, I was, like many others, obliged to go and earn in a foreign land the living I could not earn in this country. I have lived in the west, I have known personally the western Americans, and I must say that there are no more loyal, honest, energetic, and intelligent men in the world than these Americans. I wish that the lands of Canada could be peopled with Americans coming from the west. I assert positively that the man working in the Dakota plains or in the

Minnesota mines is not inferior in any respect to French Canadians or any other nationality. I am sorry the hon. member for Terrebonne has thought fit to offer such remarks.

Having made these few observations, Mr. Speaker, I resume my seat and congratulate my hon. friend from L'Islet for his admission that the government have done their duty.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT (Bellechasse).—(Translation.)—I can only congratulate the hon. member for L'Islet at least for the form of the speech delivered by him this afternoon.

This question of immigration is one that is discussed throughout the country, and is particularly important for us, from the province of Quebec, who have a large number of our campatriots in the United States contributing to the increase of our neighbours' welfare.

Like the hon. Solicitor General, I have, together with six brothers of mine, been compelled by the Conservative policy to go and earn in a foreign country the living we could not find in our native land. Those who had to gain their living that way know how hard it is, when the mind is suffering from the absence of a home left behind. The constant thought of those who live in the United States, a great many at least, is to come back in their native country.

I can only congratulate my hon. friend from L'Islet for the form of his speech; but I regret the turn the statements made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier have given to this debate. Did we not hear enough about the Doukhobors during the last federal elections? From north to south, the echoes of the mountains in the province of Quebec are still resounding with the speeches made by the Conservative candidate. The hon. member for L'Islet himself took delight in representing these Doukhobors as fanatical and insane people looking after Christ through the plains of the west.

Every one of us can remember the famous tour made by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden). In Valleyfield, the hon. gentleman uttered certain words the hon. member for Jacques Cartier calls in question. He asked for the proof of such words. I am going to quote for his information the speech the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) delivered in this House on the 15th January, 1908, and wherein may be found the remarks made by the hon. leader of the opposition. The words in question are found in pages 1340 and 1341 of 'Hansard':

Speaking at Valleyfield, in the province of Quebec, the leader of the opposition criticised certain peoples that were coming into the great northwest. On the 2nd of September last. as reported, not in any Grit paper, but by his own organ—sometimes—the Montreal 'Gazette,' he said:

'Between the east and the west there is a vast stretch of territory that could be peopled, and there was danger of the two sections of the country becoming antagonistic to each other. Under these circumstances he thought it most unwise to crowd into the west as the government was doing a class of undesirable immigrants, Galicians, Bohemians, Doukhobors, &c., who did not understand our customs and did not readily assimilate either with the French or English elements of Canada.'

And Mr. Johnston added:

I heard him, I think the next night in Montreal, after I had read this report of his speech and I listened attentively to see whether or not he would correct the report of his speech in the 'Gazette' of that day; but he did not, on the contrary he went on to address himself to the people in Montreal in very nearly the same way.

Winding up his great journey through the western country, how did the leader of the opposition express himself, he who had reviled the Galicians, Doukhobors and Bohemians? Let us see what Mr. Johnston says:

The next day Mr. Borden made a statement in the Winnipeg 'Telegram' as follows—and I want the House to pay particular attention to his words:

'While I am in the west——

He had left the west and had still hope that what he said in the west would not be read in the east.

'While I am in the west I wish to say that in respect to the question of immigration, the report which is attributed to me as referring to certain nationalities as undesirable is quite inaccurate.'

The interview was reported by the Winnipeg 'Telegram,' of the 8th of September last, and it is exactly in the words I have placed before the House. It is worth while calling the attention of the country once more to these words.

It will thus be seen that the leader of the opposition expressed himself one way while in the east and another way when in the west. The member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) stated that there were still in the province of Quebec unoccupied houses. I belong to a county which has been for years and years depopulated by emigration. The flower of its youth have departed to the United States, as farming was no longer remunerative for poor husbandmen burdened with numerous children. All that these good people could say to their boys was: How can you expect me to lend you a hand in acquirement of a farm in the new districts, when myself on the old family homestead, I am unable to provide the requisite education and the necessary clothing.' What inducement was there to bring back to Canada those whom the policy in force at the time had caused to depart? To-day farming is in such a prosperous condition, that the head of a family will not suffer his boy to depart, and provides him with land at a cost of four or five thousand dollars. The sheriff at Quebec informed me

not very long ago that for three months previous there had not been a single compulsory sale in his district. I have been a farmer myself, and had the sorrow of seeing my property sold by the sheriff. What was the cause of it? At the time there was no sale for the products of the farm. In one of the newly settled parishes of my county, a farmer was telling me a short time ago that formerly he was in debt four or five hundred dollars, while at the time of his speaking he had five or six hundred dollars in the bank. There is one other circumstance which the member for Jacques Cartier, did not mention: That while there may still be some houses unoccupied, it is not on account of their owners having gone to the United States, but because they have taken up their abode in large cities such as Montreal or Quebec. I make this statement without fear of being contradicted, as for every Canadian going to the United States, there are five coming back.

The member for L'Islet knows by what means he has succeeded in winning at the polls. He has been unceasing in his encomiums of the government; especially has he made the welkin ring with the five votes cast by him for the government, and above all the vote in favour of the French treaty. He has been untiring in his vindication of his spirit of independence. In the speech which he has just delivered to-day, and which is perfect as to form, I detect the same practice of resorting to insinuation.

Mr. PAQUET.—(Translation.)—Is the hon. member in a position to point out to a single error appearing in my speech?

Mr. TALBOT.—(Translation.)—There is no error for me to point out; I congratulate the hon. member on having paid his respects to the government.

I have a word to say in answer to the member for Terrebonne, in reference to the exodus from the United States to the Canadian west. These settlers are among all others particularly intelligent and energetic. If the member for Terrebonne will look into the statistics, he will find that in the interval of two years, about 200,000 have entered Canada, bringing with them capital to the amount of more than $100,000,000 in cash, stock and personal property. They are very desirable immigrants who will continue accumulating wealth and will contribute to our country's prosperity.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright).—(Translation.)—I have listened with a great deal of attention and pleasure to the speeches delivered this afternoon. It must have been highly gratifying to you, Mr. Speaker, to hear those speeches in the beautiful tongue of your ancestors, the tongue of Molière, and I feel that it would be unbecoming on my part to break the harmonious flow of this debate by using another tongue than the French for the few remarks I wish to make. Many things of practical interest have been said this afternoon, but I expected something more from the mouths of the hon. members for L'Islet and Jacques Cartier. It seems there is not a single Conservative member in this House apart from these two gentlemen who is in favour of a scheme for the repatriation of French Canadians.

During the general election, particularly in the province of Quebec, a great deal has been said about immigration and especially the Doukhobors. I must admit that I am not in favour of bringing here from the continent of Europe immigrants of the class we have had coming to this country, who are of nomadic habits, and, under the pretense of religion, put us to shame. But, on the other hand, it should be acknowledged that when a government is doing every thing in its power to bring about the settlement of those immense territories of Alberta and Saskatchewan, it is not always an easy matter to select only desirable settlers among the thousands and thousands of immigrants who present themselves. I heartily endorse the opinion expressed by the hon. member for L'Islet and by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier in reference to this matter of repatriation.

I am in favour of forwarding the repatriation of French Canadians settled in the United States in preference to bringing here immigrants from the continent of Europe. I think we should spend large amounts towards developing transportation facilities in order to enable Canadians to take up lands in the Northwest. It should be admitted that there are great difficulties to be overcome by the government especially when they have to deal with such an important question as that of immigration. Many are the hindrances in the way; every one should have his due, and credit be given to the government whenever the occasion requires.

Only a few weeks ago I had the pleasure of visiting the government offices in Paris. I had a very interesting interview with their agents, particularly with the commissioner, Mr. Fabre, and Messrs. Wiallard and Geoffrion. I got an insight into the work they are carrying on to induce French immigration. I also had an interview with Mr. de Coeli, the Canadian agent in Belgium, in connection with Belgian immigration, and I was favourably impressed with the interest he shows in his work.

The member for L'Islet referred to the establishment of agricultural colleges. He stated that the Dominion government should help in the establishment of such colleges. I hope the member for L'Islet will cross over the interprovincial bridge and visit the property owned in former times by the Conservative ex-representative of

the county, the late Alonzo Wright. He will find there one of the finest colleges in the province of Quebec, essentially agricultural, established by the fathers of the Holy Ghost, for the purpose of imparting a knowedge of farming to our French-speaking young men.

I do not wish to take up the time of the House, although this question is one of interest, not only to the people of Quebec, but to the whole of Canada. Knowing that the government are doing all they possibly can in the way of repatriation, I have ventured to open my mouth with the sole object of encouraging to the best of my powers the government in the national and patriotic work they are carrying on, now that we have at the helm the greatest and most distinguished of the French Canadians. I am anxious to show to our French Canadian friends that the Irish are in sympathy with them and that the Liberal party is anxious to promote at all times their welfare.

Mr. C. ROY (Montmagny.)—(Translation.)—Mr. Speaker, being a new member I hope I may be permitted to say a few words on the question of repatriation, a matter which has been brought to the attention of the House by the representative of the county adjoining my own constituency. I refer to the member for L'Islet. It is the first time I have the honour to address the House, and I must acknowledge my surprise at finding that, in reference to a question concerning which there seems to be no room for difference, hon. members are nevertheless at variance. I did not expect to find politics mixed up in a question of such national importance.

I should congratulate my neighbour the member for L'Islet, who has confined himself to dealing with the question of repatriation. But what side of the House is responsible for introducing politics into this debate? I must say that it is that side of the House where I occupy a seat, where I have been relegated as a result of the last election; but it should not be inferred from that that I shall be often in harmony with the majority of those who sit on this side of the House. The member for L'Islet has not shown any prejudice, but I am unable to pay the same compliment to the member for Jacques Cartier, who I believe has confused the question of immigration with that of repatriation.

The object the member for L'Islet had in mind was to draw the attention of the House to that national work, the repatriation of our brethern living in the United States. The member for Jacques Cartier, in answer to the Postmaster General, stated that the Conservative government, prior to 1896. had done something towards bringing about repatriation. He wished to give credit to his party to having sent $110,000 towards promoting immigration. For the sake of fairness he should have credited the Liberal government with having increased the amount expended on repatriation as well as on immigration.

Reference has been made to abandoned houses in Rouville county. My constituency adjoins that of L'Islet; I am just as familiar with the county of Bellechasse as with that of Montmagny, and I may say right here that for the last ten or twelve years there has not been any abandoned houses whose owners had been constrained to leave the country and settle in the United States. True, as stated by the member for Bellechasse, there are still to be seen abandond houses, but they are more a matter of congratulation to the government, since the owners of these houses have emigrated to our cities where, owing to the policy pursued by the government, they are enabled to make a living instead of settling in the United States.

The member for Quebec west (Mr. Price), owner of a large saw-mill in the county of Montmagny, will be able to support me when I say that if the population of the town of Montmagny has considerably increased, it is owing to the fact that the inhabitants of Saint Thomas have left their homes to take advantage of the rise in salaries paid to mill hands.

The hon. member from Terrebonne said that it was better to have the Canadians coming back to this country than to receive foreigners. It would be better to have our poor fellow countrymen back from the United States, if they so desire, because the opportunity of doing so was given to them as agents were appointed in the United States. If there were no agents as there are, thanks to the policy of the government who undertook to make Canada known at the various exhibitions, not by sending there bands of Indians nor by any other similar doings capable of stirring curiosity but by displaying exhibits of such a character as to draw the attention upon Canada, they would still attain their end by the important display of our products.

The hon. member from Jacques Cartier found fault with the government because they intended to exercise their patronage in the appointment of their immigration agents; then he asserted that the wages paid to the agents in the United States were too low. If those wages are too low, as the hon. member from Jacques Cartier says, what becomes of his pretension that the government wanted to have a little patronage to exercise ? That is an inconsistency which I am unable to understand and which shows that the hon. member is not in earnest.

I shall say no more. As a French Canadian, first, and as a Canadian without any other qualification, I sincerely wish that

our brethren from the United States come back in larger numbers than heretofore.

In concluding, I shall say that the government cannot be blamed, that they fulfilled their duty by appointing agents and that every year the number of our fellow-countrymen who have come back has increased.

Mr. J. A. ETHIER (Two Mountains).—(Translation.)—Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from L'Islet has seen fit to put upon the orders of the day a notice of motion for the production of papers which virtually summarize the different questions he has asked during the last parliament. Whether he has voluntarily or unvoluntarily forgotten the answers given by the Minister of the Interior, I do not know, although I am bound to congratulate him upon the tone of the speech he has delivered to-day. Had he omitted the insinuations which we have detected in his remarks, they would have been brought forward by the hon. member from Jacques Cartier. As the Postmaster General says, those innuendoes having been repeated by the hon. member from Jacques Cartier, the remarks of the hon. gentleman from L'Islet have lost a good deal of importance.

The hon. gentleman from Jacques Cartier has contradicted to a certain extent the statements of the hon. member from L'Islet. It is not my intention to go over every detail, but I cannot help recalling to these two gentlemen what happened in 1907. Here is what I find on page 6930 of the 'Hansard' of that year :

Generally speaking, the exodus towards the United States has perceptibly decreased, if it has not entirely come to an end, since ten years in New England. There is still here and there an exodus towards the United States, but as I have said, the number of our people going to the United States is considerably less.

Now, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier was contending a moment ago that the exodus of our fellow-countrymen towards the United States was still going on. I assert that those words of the hon. gentleman from L'Islet which I have just quoted are inconsistent with the statements made to-day by the hon. member from Jacques Cartier. We have it from the member for L'Islet that the exodus towards the United States has come to an end ten years ago, still the member from Jacques Cartier holds otherwise.

I understand that the hon. member from L'Islet in moving for a copy of all correspondence, returns, and documents between the Department of the Interior and the immigration agents in the United States, and between the Department of the Interior and the colonization societies since the first of January, 1908, seeks information which has already been given to him. In any case, it is a matter of colonization and repatriation relating to Canada and the United States, and to the province of Quebec especially, not to Doukhobors and Galicians to whom the member from Jacques Cartier has referred to his speech.

As the hon. gentleman from Bellechasse says, the member from L'Islet during the last elections gloried in having sometimes voted with the government, and in the statements he had made in the House; he held that as a token of his independence. But now he finds fault with the policy of the administration as his friend from Terrebonne has also done. My opponent at the last election was flying the same colours, repeatedly saying and asserting on every husting that the government was sacrificing the French Canadian for the sake of the Doukhobors and the Galicians who, in his opinion, were nothing but low debauched people that ought to be driven away from this country. Such was the attitude of those gentlemen and such is the way in which the member from L'Islet behaved to further his own interests.

Mr. PAQUET.—(Translation.)—Mr. Speaker, has the hon. gentleman the right to say that I have acted in this House so as to further my own interests?

Mr. ETHIER.—(Translation.)—I made a mistake; I meant his political interests.

The immigration policy of those gentlemen has always been double-faced. They had a policy for the province of Quebec and another policy for the west. Thus, the hon. leader of the opposition had a different policy on immigration during his electoral tour on the eve of the last general elections, a policy reprehensible in Valleyfield and quite acceptable in Winnipeg, as far as foreign immigration goes. It was the same thing as in 1896, when Sir Charles Tupper had a double platform on the school question, one for Quebec and the other for Manitoba. I shall now come back to the question. Here is what I find at page 710 of the Hansard of 1908:

Mr. PAQUET asked:

1. What amount of money has been paid by the federal government, since January 1, 1900, to the Colonization and Repatriation Society of Montreal?
2. What amount of money has been paid by the federal government, since January 1, 1900, to the Colonization and Repatriation Society of Lake St. John and of Quebec?
3. What amount of money has been paid by the federal government, since January 1, 1900, to the Lake St. John Railway Company for the encouragement of repatriation?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. $25,300.
2. $22,000.
3. $34,000.

Giving a total sum of $81,300.

Therefore the hon. member from L'Islet has already had from the Minister of the Interior that information he asks for to-day.

These being the facts, they dare say that the government has done nothin~ for the repatriation of our fellow-countrymen in the United States.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) The answer only covers that period ending January 1, 1908. I now ask for the statement relating to the time which has elapsed since January 1, 1908.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) The hon. member from Jacques Cartier has referred to vacant houses. I am the representative of one of the princiual farming constituencies in the province of Quebec. There are no manufactures in our county ; every one is a farmer. The same thing may be said of Terrebonne, save for St. Jerome, where there are a few industrial establishments. The hon. member from Terrebonne no doubt recalls that a great number of young farmers from the north used to leave their families to go to the United States. They went awav in order to earn their daily bread which they could not get in their own country, and these things happened under the administration of those gentlemen. Now, what do we see to-day? Rich and prosperous farming communities. No more farms are sold by the sheriff, as it has been pointed out a moment ago by the hon. member from Bellechasse when he was referring to the Quebec district.

If you enter the registration office at St. Jerome for the county of Terrebonne or at Ste. Scholastique for the county of Two Mountains, you will notice that the mortgages are paid off and the discharges numerous ; the farmers pay their debts.

Besides the agents already appointed, the government have established special intelligence officers and we gather from the report of the Minister of the Interior that the United States government are getting alarmed on account of the results :

Here is what the report says:

It is impossible, the Deputy Minister of the Interior observes, in an essay on repatriation, to leave out statistics referring to the American immigration, one-tenth of which is represented by former Canadians.

Everything shows that the government of the United States is becoming alarmed at the return of our former citizens and the emigration of the Yankees from the west towards the rich plains of Canada.

Statistics as well as facts prove that the government did not forget nor sacrifice the French Canadian as it was hinted in the province of Quebec during the last elections, and that the man who to-day would say that their interests are disregarded for the sake of the Doukhobors and the Galicians would not be believed by the readers of Canadian newspapers any more than he was believed by the electorate on October 16 last. And when the public shall hear about this discussion it will be once more proven that under the protection of Canada's greatest son the interests of our fellow-countrymen are as safe as any other.

Mr. JOSEPH DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, if I intend to say a few words upon this question, it is not because the hon. member from Jacques Cartier has apparently reproached the Liberal member for not having spoken before about repatriation. It may have been that we have not discussed that matter but the government have taken measures and deeds are worth more than words.

The hon. member from Jacques Cartier, it seems, has made a poor reply to the statement of the Postmaster General who said that since 1896 the government had put a stop to our fellow countrymen towards the United States. The minister, the hon. member says, should not make that statement because he had himself noticed that the houses vacated before 1896 in the counties of Jacques Cartier and Rouville were still unoccupied. That reply is not conclusive.

We have never contended that he had caused every Canadian to return from the United States. In order to make a satisfactory reply the member from Jacques Cartier should have been able to assert that a great number of houses have been closed since 1896 on account of the departure of the inmates for the United States, a statement which would not have been founded on facts.

So far as the member from L'Islet is concerned, I do not think that he was actuated by the unworthy desire of attacking the administration, but we have heard so many accusations against the policy of the government, so many reproaches about the lack of a policy that I think the Postmaster General was in duty bound to put the facts in their true light so as to dispel the erroneous impression which it was sought to create among the people.

By his motion the member from L'Islet asks for:

A copy of all correspondence, returns and documents between the Department of the Interior and the immigration agents in the United States, and between the Department of the Interior and the colonization societies since the 1st of January, 1908.

I am at a loss to understand how we could deny such a request. On the contrary, we should grant it for I believe that the hon. gentleman, if he carefully peruse those documents, will be enlightened and have a better opinion of the government policy on that matter. He will be able to notice what the government have done and to amend his ideas as to their desire as far as our fellow countrymen are concerned.

For several years past our government has made with foreign countries arrangements with a view to restricting immigration, and by restriction of immigration the return home of our fellow-citizens is not at all meant. If we are bound to congratulate the government for having thus restricted foreign immigration, we are also bound to congratulate them for the inducements extended to our fellow-citizens in order to bring about their return to Canada. We are in need of more men with strong bodies and large brains to help in the development of our great national heritage, and I am aware that no better settlers will ever be found than the sons of Canada, though unfortunate circumstances may have compelled them to emigrate to the United States.

Let us hope that the government will not depart from the policy they have been following heretofore in the country's greater interest.

Mr. J. GIRARD (Chicoutimi).—(Translation.)—Mr. Speaker, in the course of the remarks which have just been made on that very interesting question brought up by the hon. member for L'Islet, reference was made to the cutting off of the subsidy of $5,000 paid during a certain length of time by this government to the Lake St. John Colonization and Repatriation Society, and there was evinced a disposition to blame the government on that account. I witnessed the beginnings of that society while I had the honour of being a member of the Quebec legislature. I took a hand in its organization and it was at my request that the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) agreed to pay the first grant of $4,000, subsequently raised to $5,000, to help it in carrying on its work, which was in good faith deemed practical and beneficial to the country. Subsequently, in view of certain well established facts, I took the responsibility, after consulting public opinion in my district, of recommending to the Prime Minister that the subsidy be no longer paid, and that a trial be made of some more practical organization, or of one at any rate as would secure more satisfactory results to the government. Papers concerning that transaction, which I shall request the government to lay on the table of the House, will set forth the facts which brought about the government's action in the matter and evince its wisdom under the circumstances.

Meanwhile the Prime Minister has approved of the appointment of a member of the clergy as lecturer to visit the principal Canadian centres in the United States, expound the advantages now offered by Canada to those willing to settle on its lands ; and at the same time he has appointed more agents to supervise the repatriation movement among Canadians there. The policy followed by the government heretofore has met with my approval, and I have yet to find anything which I would be inclined to blame; far from it.

To my mind, repatriation is a question of political and social economy, and to such an extent that the work which has been carried on by the government for a number of years has never given very satisfactory results. Hence an inclination to believe that the policy followed has been a wrong one. I am earnestly of the belief that who ever is dealing with this question is desirous to give every one his due, should of all necessity do away with all spirit of partisanship, considering that repatriation is an entirely patriotic move, to which all should be glad to lend a hand, if a result satisfactory to all concerned is to be arrived at promptly. I have had the honour at different times to go to the United States and address at times numerous meetings in Canadian centres. I have met there considerable numbers of Canadians who had not taken out their naturalization papers in the United States, who were anxious to return to Canada, but who deemed it a necessity to remain just where they were, being satisfied that on this side of the frontier they would not be in a position to procure for themselves and their families the same comforts, nor to effect savings to the same extent. The same reason was invariably given: 'In case we returned to Canada, what would become of our daughters and of our boys who find here throughout the week employment suited to their strength, at reasonable salaries, which enable us to live comfortably and even to lay money aside? Were we to be deprived of those daily returns which is coming to us, we would all of us be left without means of living comfortably, and, of course, no savings could be effected.'

So then in the eyes of a great number of Canadian fellow-citizens who are now living in the United States, farming in Canada, despite all we may say to the contrary does not give sufficient returns to induce them to give up a sure thing over there and run the risk of settling down in Canada. As a result, there is a need of persistent canvassing in the midst of those people, who are not sufficiently in touch with what is going on here to appreciate as they should be appreciated our publications and lectures on the subject, and therefore cannot be persuaded that it is of immediate and undoubted interest to them to return to Canada. To fully realize the difficulties in the way of bringing about repatriation, it is necessary to have acquired experience in the matter through reading and listening to anti-Canadian literature and utterances, spread in the form of correspondence and speeches by prominent men. It is all very well to wax eloquent as regards the development of our navigable waterways and of our transportation facilities, as means of facilitating

the success of such a movement. That, to my mind, is no answer at all to the question which is put to us on all sides: What means of livelihood have you to offer to our girls and boys, who contribute daily, however small the quota, to the support and comfort of the family. Such facts as these show what difficulties the government has to cope with in its work. I for one am content of what has been accomplished in the past, and I know that the Prime Minister and his colleagues are anxious to take all the possible measures at their disposal to bring about in a practical way and in a way beneficial to the country, the settlement of that repatriation difficulty. I am aware that they are always glad to receive suggestions from whatever source, provided they are of a nature to promptly bring about the results expected from the moneys spent yearly for that purpose.

In a matter of such great moment, let then each one of us consider it as his duty to contribute his quota of advice and endeavour, and very shortly the House will have the satisfaction of noting a change for the better. I do not wish to detain the House any longer, and I now resume my seat, with the hope that this question will be further discussed later on in the course of this session, and that a greater number of members will then be in a position to give us the benefit of their thoughts and researches in reference to that important matter.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) I am in sympathy with the remarks just made by my hon. friend from Chicoutimi. He has dealt with the question from the social point of view and not from the standpoint of politics. I hope the House will grant an order for the return asked for, which will enable us to judge what changes the government should effect.

I for one have dealt with the question from the social viewpoint, and with an earnest desire to help on the work of repatriation, and accordingly I have set aside all political considerations.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken up to-morrow if we should reach government orders?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will take penitentiary estimates, and if it is convenient to the other side we may take the Civil Service resolution.

Mr. OLIVER. Do I understand that the motion was passed?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. I regret that I did not understand that because I was under the impression that my hon. friend was willing to amend it.

At six o'clock the House adjourned.

Mr. GIRARD.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 11, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the British Columbia Life Assurance Company.—Mr. Cowan.

Bill (No. 56) respecting the Canada Life Assurance Company.—Mr. A. H. Clarke.

Bill (No. 57) respecting the Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Railway Company.—Mr. J. D. Taylor.

Bill (No. 58) respecting the Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Railway Company.—Mr. R. Smith.

Bill (No. 59) to incorporate the Victoria and Barkley Sound Railway Company.—Mr. R. Smith.

QUESTIONS.

UNITED STATES SILVER CURRENCY IN CANADA.

Mr. BEATTIE asked:

1. What amount of silver currency has been coined for Canada for each of the years 1905, 1906, 1907, 1908?
2. What profit accrued to the Dominion Treasury from such coinage in each year?
3. What amount of United States silver currency has been in circulation in Canada during each of the years above mentioned?
4. What steps, if any, has the government taken to limit the circulation of United States silver currency in Canada?
5. Is the government aware that United States silver coinage is being used by the officials for the transaction of business in the post offices throughout Canada?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Finance):

1 and 2:

	Coined.	Profit.
1904-5	$100,000	$ 55,492 87
1905-6	862,000	445,452 53
1906-7	984,000	476,654 14
1907-8	600,000	284 288 20

3. The government is aware that United States currency in considerable quantity is in circulation in Canada, but has no means of ascertaining the amount.

4. In 1905-6, under an arrangement with the Canadian Bankers' Association, $580,224.16 of United States silver was exported from Canada, and in the estimates now before parliament an appropriation has been asked for a similar purpose.

5. The regulations of the Post Office Department forbid postmasters accepting United States currency, but it is understood that in many cases local business conditions make it difficult to carry out this regulation.

DREDGE ON LAKE WINNIPEG.

Mr. BRADBURY asked:

1. Is the government aware that the tug and dredge operating on Lake Winnipeg late last fall is said to have gone to the east side of the lake and worked for some days getting the steamer *Mikado* off a sandbar?

2. If so, what was the expense incurred at this work, and did the owners of the *Mikado* pay same? If not, is it the intention of the government to collect the account?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (for Minister of Public Works):

1. Yes.

2. (a) $393; (b) No.; (c) Yes.

SOULANGES CANAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. BOYER asked:

1. What is the number of employees on the Soulanges canal, and what are their names, salaries and duties?

2. What is the auxiliary staff, and what are their names and salaries?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I would ask that this question stand as notice of motion for a return.

SPECIE RESERVE.

Mr. PERLEY asked:

Referring to the specie, amounting to $61,674,578.70, held by the government on December 31, 1908, as a reserve in connection with the Dominion note issue and the savings bank deposits, at what time was the last inspection and actual count of this specie made, and by whom?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Finance). The specie reserve is held at the offices of the assistant receivers general. These offices were inspected and specie counted as under:

Place.	Date.	Inspectors.
Montreal	June 15, 1908	F. Grierson.... J. E. Rourke..
St. John	July 7, 1908.	G. W. Hyndman
Charlottetown	" 10, 1908.	G. W. Hyndman
Halifax	" 20, 1908.	G. W. Hyndman
Toronto	Sept. 1, 1908.	G. Lowe..
Victoria	Dec. 8, 1908.	G. Grierson....
Winnipeg	" 16, 1908.	F. Grierson....

NOTE.—A small anount of specie is held at Ottawa under joint control of the Auditor General and Comptroller of Currency. This amount was last verified on the 19th November, 1907.

MAIL CARRIAGE—RAILWAY STATION AND WINNIPEG POST OFFICE.

Mr. BRADBURY asked:

1. Who had the contract for carrying the mails between the railway station and the post office at Winnipeg last year?

2. Has any change been made? If so, who now has the carrying of said mail?

3. Were tenders invited for the work? If so, who were the tenderers, what was the amount of each tender, and did the lowest tenderer receive the job?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. Mark S. Peacock during January and February and Matthew Peebles from March 1, to December 31, in each case the work being performed under temporary agreement.

2 and 3. Tenders were invited for a permanent contract to take effect as soon as the new post office building was being used for post office purposes. The following tenders were received :

M. S. Peacock, 54 cents per single trip; Wm. R. Sinclair, 55 cents per single trip; Matthew Peebles, 55 cents per single trip; E. W. Green, 70 cents per single trip.

These tenders being considered excessive the chief post office superintendent was instructed to open negotiations with a view to obtaining more favourable offers with a result that a contract has been made with Mr. Matthew Peebles at the rate of 43 cents per single trip.

SURVEY ON THE NORTH SASKATCHEWAN RIVER.

Mr. McCARTHY asked:

1. What is the average cost per mile of survey of base and meridian lines south of the North Saskatchewan river west of the fourth meridian?

2. What is the average cost per mile of survey of base and meridian lines north of the Saskatchewan river west of the fourth meridian?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The answer to this question requires an examination of the surveyors' accounts for the last thirty years and an investigation of their reports and field notes in order to ascertain what proportion of their time was spent upon the lines referred to. An accurate answer could not be prepared in less than two months, but the following is submitted:

1. The recent surveys of base lines and principal meridians north of the Saskatchewan river between the fourth and fifth meridians and their cost are as follows:

1902, L. E. Fontaine, 16th and 17th base lines (survey includes subdivision work), $35 per mile; 1906, R. W. Cautley, 17th base line, $63 per mile; 1906, A. W. Ponton, 18th base line, $67 per mile; 1907-08, A. W. Ponton, 5th meridian, $153 per mile.

2. The cost per mile of surveys of base lines and principal meridians between the fourth and fifth meridians and south of the Saskatchewan river has not been calculated, but the surveyor general thinks that it would average something like twenty dollars per mile.

FISH HATCHERY AT BANFF.

Mr. McCARTHY asked:

1. What, if any, representations have been made to the government as to the necessity or expediency of establishing a fish hatchery at Banff or in the vicinity thereof, when were such representations made, and by whom?

2. Has any action been taken upon such representations, and is it the intention of the government to establish a fish hatchery at Banff or in the vicinity thereof? If so, when will the work be proceeded with?

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

1. Representations were made during 1908 by the Calgary Board of Trade ; the Fish and Game Protective Association of Alberta; the Calgary branch of the Provincial Fish and Game Protective Association; and the Canadian Pacific Railway.

2. Matter still under consideration.

VISIT OF CHARLES OLIN TO SWEDEN.

Mr. GOODEVE—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

1. What was the total amount paid Charles Olin for services in respect of his visit to Sweden during the winter of 1907-8?

2. Of this amount how much was for expenses?

3. What were the dates of leaving and returning?

4. What, if any, practical results have followed his visit?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. $651.34.

2. $351.34.

3. Left on or about December 9, 1907. Returned about May 20, 1908.

4. Some effective immigration advertising in the Scandinavian countries; that being the main object of Mr. Olin's visit.

POSTMASTER AT ST. JOHN.

Mr. DANIEL asked:

1. Who at present is the postmaster at St. John, New Brunswick, and how long has he occupied his present position?

2. Has he passed the civil service examination? If not, why not?

3. What disposition was made of his predecessor?

4. If superannuated, was it at his own request? If not, at whose request was it done?

5. How long was he in the position of postmaster, and what is his superannuation allowance?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). Mr. Thomas Benjamin Hanington is postmaster at St. John; has occupied that position since 25th April, 1891, but is to be retired upon 1st April next, his superannuation allowance being $1,116 per annum. Mr. Hanington's retirement was considered to be in the public interest. As, therefore, there is no actual vacancy at present, no appointment of a successor has been made.

SPEED OF MAIL TRAINS ON INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. EMMERSON asked:

1. Have any instructions ever been issued by the Department of Railways or by the management of the Intercolonial Railway, with reference to the speed of special mail trains, so-called? If so, what were such instructions?

2. Is it true that orders were issued at any time to the effect that such trains should run at rate of speed not less than fifty-five miles per hour, and is the rate of speed authorized inclusive or exclusive of stops at stations and for taking water?

3. At what rate of speed was the special mail train which recently met with disaster between Dalhousie junction and Campbellton, when one of the locomotive engineers of the train was killed and others injured, running?

4. Was the speed in accordance with the instructions or regulations in such cases?

5. Whose duty is it to direct as to the average speed to be maintained in such cases, and is it optional with the train hands in charge of such trains, or any of them?

6. Is it true that any engineers or conductors of such special trains have been penalized for maintaining a certain average rate of speed, inclusive of stops, or exclusive thereof?

7. Were any instructions issued as respects the average rate of speed to be maintained by the train referred to? If so, what were they, and by whom issued?

8. Do the regulations, if any, provide for any difference to be made in the average rate of speed to be maintained by such trains as between winter and summer roadbed and rail conditions?

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

1. No instructions were issued by the department as to speed to be made by the English mail special. Reports were supplied and all delays that appeared to be undue ones were inquired into.

The engineer of maintenance, November 11, notified all the superintendents:

I have a letter from the general manager, stating that the 'Empress of Britain,' the first of the mail boats, delivering mail at Halifax, N.S., will arrive at that place on the 13th instant——

Until further instructions, trains on your division can make the following rate of speed:

Halifax to Moncton, 45 miles per hour running time.

Moncton to Campbellton, 45 miles per hour running time.

Campbellton to Ste. Flavie, 40 miles per hour running time.

Ste. Flavie to MacKenzie, 35 miles per hour (on old rail).

McKenzie to Chaudière, 45 miles per hour running time.

Chaudière to Daveluyville, 40 miles per hour running time.

Daveluyville to Ste. Rosalie, 45 miles per hour running time.

Will you please notify the trackmasters as nearly as possible the time that these mail trains will run on their division in order that they may notify sectionmen.

Please acknowledge,

(Sgd.) T. C. BURPEE,
Engineer of maintenance.

Circulars in conformity therewith were issued by the several superintendents, of which the following is an example:

Bulletin No. 658,

To conductors and enginemen,
English mail special train.

This is to advise that the engineer of maintenance under date the 11th instant, has sanctioned a speed per hour for these trains, over the districts from Ste. Flavie to Ste. Rosalie Junction, as follows:

Ste. Flavie to McKenzie, 35 miles per hour on old rails.

McKenzie to Chaudière, 45 miles per hour running time.

Chaudière to Daveluyville, 40 miles an hour running time.

Daveluyville to Ste. Rosalie, 45 miles an hour running time.

The rate of speed as per the above must on no account be exceeded.

Please note and be governed accordingly.

(Sgd.) W. A. DUBE.
Superintendent.

This was amended by a subsequent bulletin dated December 5, 1908, No. 664, sanctioning speed of the trains from McKenzie to Rivière du Loup, 35 miles an hour, and from Ste. Flavie to McKenzie, 40 miles an hour.

2. No such orders were issued.

3. From Halifax to Truro, 32 miles per hour; from Truro to Springhill, 36·0 per hour; from Springhill to Moncton, 32·2 per hour; from Moncton to Newcastle, 39·3 per hour; from Newcastle to McLeod siding, where accident occurred, 43·6 per hour.

4. It was within the allowed speed on the section.

5. It is the duty of the superintendent and the despatcher to keep tab on these trains, and the duty lies upon the whole train crew to conform to the instructions contained in the bulletin regulating the speed.

6. No.

7. See No. 1.

8. The regulation for the special trains as to speed limits are enumerated under No. 1. The engineer of maintenance of way modified the rate of speed on all trains from time to time, according to conditions of the track.

WHARFAGE DUES IN PORT OF MONTREAL.

Mr. GERVAIS—by Mr. Lavergne—asked:

1. Has the government promised or is it about to promise, to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, that its by-law or by-laws or decrees providing for the increase of 50 per cent or 75 per cent or less of the wharfage dues in the port of Montreal, will be approved of or confirmed by the Governer in Council?

2. Is it to the knowledge of the government that it is asserted that any such increase would prove detrimental to the harbour of Montreal?

3. Is it the intention of the government to dispose of any such by-law?

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

1, 2 and 3. No by-law has been received from the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal providing for such increases.

HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS OF MONTREAL AND EMPLOYEES.

Mr. GERVAIS—by Mr. Lavergne—asked:

1. Is the government aware that the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal are said to be giving, or are about to give notice of dismissal, without cause, to all of their officers, foremen or employees?

2. Has any such course been approved of by the government?

3. Is it to the knowledge of the government that such a process would prove very detrimental to the workingmen and their families, as well as to the interests of the public of Canada, and especially to the efficiency of the work of the port of Montreal?

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

1, 2 and 3. The government has no information on the subject.

BY-ELECTION IN COMOX-ATLIN.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Before the orders of the day are called—with reference to the question asked yesterday by the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell), I have to inform him that I made a mistake in the date of the issue of the writ for Comox-Atlin. The answer of the Secretary of State was correct. The writ was issued on the 22nd of January.

REPORT OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Civil Service Commission made its report as required by law? I have not heard of any yet. It was required to be laid on the table within fifteen days after the opening of the session.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that it has not been made.

Mr. FOSTER. I call the attention of the First Minister to that. It is a very grave omission for a commission commencing a work like this.

DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—EMPLOYEES AT HALIFAX.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I desire to ask the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to page 695 of the 'Unrevised Hansard,' where will be found an answer of the minister, giving a list of permanent and temporary employees in the Department of Marine and Fisheries in Halifax County. The question asked was:

What was the number of permanent employees and temporary employees in the service or employment of the Department of Marine and Fisheries in the county of Halifax upon the first day of each month, the fifteenth day of each month, and the thirty-first day of December in the year 1908?

Taking the month of January, under the heading of 'permanent,' the answer is 66, and under the heading of 'temporary,' the answer is 84. I do not know whether the reference is to the first day of the month or to the fifteenth day of the month. Then, under the next two heads 'first day of the month' and 'fifteenth day of the month,' the answer is 64 and 62 respectively. I do not know whether this has reference to permanent or to temporary employees, nor do I know whether the 64 or 62 refers to temporary or permanent employees. By referring to the question the minister will, no doubt, see my difficulty.

Mr. BRODEUR. I gave the answer as I received it from Halifax, but I will be glad to bring to the attention of the officers who prepared this answer the observations of my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden). I am under the impression that in the columns headed 'permanent' and 'temporary' are intended to be given all the permanent and temporary employees during the month. In the next two columns is given the information with regard to the number of officers employed on the 1st and 15th of the month. But, it may be that at those dates some persons who were employed during the month were not employed on these two dates. I suppose that is the explanation, but I will make inquiries.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—PRINTING OF REPORT ON BRANCH LINES.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would like to ask if any provision has been made with respect to printing the report laid on the table today by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) in regard to the branch lines. I notice that the report seems to be voluminous and it would seem to me to be in the interest of the members of this House to have it printed.

Mr. GRAHAM. This report was not laid on the table in compliance with an order of the House, but simply at the request of my hon. friend. Let it stand until to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER.

MARINE DEPARTMENT INVESTIGATION.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the Miniser of Marine and Fisheries if he has brought down the communication that was made to Mr. Justice Cassels in reference to the abolition of the patronage list in his department?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, I laid it on the table the other day.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I wonder where it went. We shall have to hold the Minister of Marine and Fisheries responsible after what has occurred in this House.

Mr. BRODEUR. I find by reference to the Votes and Proceedings, page 90, the following:

By leave of the House.

Mr. Foster moved that an order of the House do issue to the proper officer for a copy of official communication, addressed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to Commissioner Cassels, respecting the abolition of the patronage system in the Department of Marine and Fisheries; and the question being put, it was agreed to and the order issued accordingly.

Mr. Brodeur presented,—Return to the foregoing order.

Mr. FOSTER. Then it will go to the Record office.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT VOL. II.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there any information as to when the remaining volume of the Auditor General's report will be ready?

Mr. MURPHY. Next week.

REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

Mr. U. WILSON. I beg to ask the hon. Minister of Interior (Mr. Oliver) when we may expect his report? We have been waiting for it.

Mr. OLIVER. The Interior report is in the printer's hands and will be distributed early next week.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 6) to amend the Railway Act.—Mr. Lancaster.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. JOHN BARR (Dufferin) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 32) to amend the Railway Act. He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill I would like to remind the House that last year I explained the object of the measure and, although there are many new members who were not in the House then, I do not intend to trespass at any great length upon the time of the House on the present occasion. The object of this Bill is to facilitate the crossing of railways by lines or wires

for telegraphs or telephones, or for conveyance of light, heat, power, or electricity, and by water mains, conduits, and sewers. As the law stands at the present time, in order to extend any of these public utilities across a railway, it is necessary for an individual or company to make application to the railway authorities. In many cases great delay is caused. I do not believe it is necessary that such should be the case, but those who are interested in these crossings often experience delays in receiving an answer from the railway companies of from one to four weeks. When the answer comes back it usually is that permission will be given to cross on payment of $5. I think this is all wrong. I have on every occasion objected to the suggestion that the people should be compelled to pay anything for a crossing which they have a right to. Hon. gentlemen are aware that in 99 cases out of 100 these crossings are on the public highway in towns and villages, or on side roads and concessions in the rural districts. The railways do not own these highways. They belonged to the municipalities long before the railways were built, and it seems to me to be an outrage that the people should be asked to pay $5 for what belongs to them. The railways have no power over these highways. All they possess is the right, obtained from the charter granted by this House, to cross these highways under certain restrictions. The provisions of this Bill are that an individual or company asking to be allowed to cross a highway shall give notice to the railway authorities, to the station master, or if there is no station master in the municipality, to the official most convenient. If the company do not take action within fifteen days the individual or company making application may cross the railway according to regulations laid down by the Board of Railway Commissioners.

In this there could be no hardship so far as the railroads are concerned. The instructions from the Railroad Board protect the railroads by requiring that a certain kind of wire shall be strung and that the arms and poles must be in acordance with the rules and regulations. Thus there could be no reason for not granting this Bill.

As to sewers, viaducts, conduits and water pipes which pass under the railroads, I have provided in this Bill, in accordance with the direction of the Railway Board in a number of cases, that in the event of municipalities or individuals crossing a railroad by water pipes or sewers, &c., the engineer of the railway company must approve of the method of crossing and must be paid by the party making the crossing, the charge not to exceed $5. This is the amount awarded in several cases in which I was interested, and as the engineer's time would not generally be occupied for more than an hour, it seems to be a fair charge.

This Bill has been demanded by the people in every part of Canada. When I introduced it last year it was printed in the Municipal Journal and I had many letters from every province, a few of which I read to the House, approving of the Bill. Since this Bill was printed I have received a number of letters which I shall not trouble the House by reading. Hon. gentlemen are aware that in cases of crossing railroads with water pipes, &c., the railways demand not only the $5 but also a lease of $1 a year for all time to come from the municipality or individual, which appears to me to be ridiculous. We have had demands of that kind in the village of Shelburne; we refused to accede to them and application was made to the Railway Commission; but the commissioners were busy at the time and we were delayed for some six or seven months.

The telephone is a utility whose use is increasing very rapidly. In the four years during which the Railway Commission has existed the number of applications for crossings by telephone lines was 2,411 and the number granted 2,328. None were refused, showing that the railroads should have granted those crossings without putting the applicants to the trouble and expense of an application to the Board. During last year there were 1,025 applications of this character to the Railway Commission and I submit that if this Bill goes through it will take a great deal of work off the Railway Commission, which we have heard is overworked. At the time when farmers are building their telephone lines, the Railway Commissioners are usually on their holidays and by the time they return to their offices a large amount of work has accumulated so that there is unnecessary delay to the farmers in securing permission to cross the railroads. Then an application to the Railway Commission entails great expense, particularly upon the small companies which are threading their telephone throughout the country. The telephone has done a great deal for this country. It has united the cities, towns and villages with the country and has made country life much more easy, much more fascinating to the young and rising generation and has had the effect of keeping many young men on the farms who would otherwise not remain there. Under these circumstances I think we should facilitate as far as possible the building of those telephone lines. I had hoped that the time would not be far distant when the telephone lines would be taken over by the provincial or Dominion government. The province of Manitoba has taken over the Bell telephone lines there and I was glad to see the announcement of the Prime Minister of Manitoba that during the past year their telephones have been a paying asset to the province and that they are determined to push the work as rapidly as

possible and build telephones throughout that province. If Manitoba can make the telephone a paying speculation, there is no reason why other provinces should not do so and why it should not be a still greater success if the Dominion parliament should take hold of it and operate it. Some years ago, after weeks of personal investigation before a committee, Sir William Mulock stated that it was the intention of the govenment to bring in a Bill the following year to take over the telephones and run them in connection with the post office. If we had a telephone in every post office and in every farm house where they desired to pay a reasonable price, it would be a great boon to the rural population of Canada. That project did not materialize but whilst we have not these advantages, whilst we are not advancing as rapidly as the province of Manitoba in this respect, I hope that the good example of Manitoba will be followed by other provinces.

While that is the case I submit that it is our duty to facilitate the building of these telephone lines as quickly as possible. In connection with these 1,025 crossings during the last year, if the railway companies had been able to carry out their designs, they would have pocketed over $5,000 of the people's money. I think that should be prevented, and I have a clause in the Bill prohibiting the railway companies from demanding any money from the people on this account. There is no reason why they should. In every case of such a crossing the people are put to considerable expense. They have first to make their application to the Commission, then they have to send a duplicate of the plans and specifications, and in some cases they have to employ a lawyer or some other person to take the necessary proceedings. All this should be avoided. There is no reason why they should be put either to delay or to expense. Under these circumstances I would ask the government to allow this Bill to have a second reading and then to go to a committee, as was agreed to last year—either the Railway Committee or some other committee; and any improvements that can be made to the Bill I can assure you I shall be glad to give careful consideration to, so that it may be made as perfect as possible. I think I have stated the case fairly enough to show beyond a doubt that there is a grievance and that there should be a remedy, which can easily be worked out, and I think this Bill fairly meets the requirements of the case.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Mr. Speaker, this Bill, as my hon. friend has remarked, is not a new one; it has been in the House before, but as this is a new parliament and there are a large number of representatives who have not been here before, perhaps the House will bear with me while I say a few words upon it. My hon. friend has discussed the question of the provinces or the Dominion taking over the telephone lines. That is a large subject, and I have no objection at all to my hon. friend impressing it upon his friends in the provincial legislatures or upon my friends where they have the supremacy in the provinces. The policy adopted by the Parliament of Canada has been government control through the Board of Railway Commissioners over telephones, telegraphs, express companies and railway companies; and this year that power is to be extended along another line. A year ago I had the honour to introduce an amendment to the Railway Act, which brought telephone companies under the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners, and that part of the Act was brought into force by order in council. It was not brought into force at once owing to some representations having been made to me which appeared to satisfy the House on that point. That order in council was passed some little time ago, and to-day telephone companies are under the control of the Board of Railway Commissioners. The gist of my hon. friend's Bill is that any company, either a telephone company, a telegraph company or a municipality, can, without any reference to the Board of Railway Commissioners or to the company concerned, string their wires across a railway or run their pipes under the track. Now, I submit to the House that that is a very serious proposition. At the present moment the question of the safety of the people travelling on our highways is engaging the attention of this House and of the country, and we must be very careful to do nothing to increase the danger to the travelling public either on the highways or on the railways. I have discussed this matter very thoroughly with some men who ought to know, and they tell me that it would be a very great source of danger if every person who thought he knew how to string a wire were allowed to string wires across a railway track near the wires of the railway company, without the supervision of some competent person to see that it was done properly. A great many accidents from fire are said to be caused by the improper wiring of houses, and a great deal of danger might be caused by the improper placing of a wire by inexperienced people across a railway track, where it might come in contact with the wires already there, or, if loosely strung, with the trains.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Cannot any farmer measure six feet?

Mr. GRAHAM. We might ask the same question about the insulation of wires; but there is a proper way and an improper way, a proper place and an improper place for stringing wires. This matter has been

placed in the hands of the Railway Commissioners, who are the servants of the public, and there it ought to be left. My hon. friend will not say that during the past year he had to wait six months for any reply to his communication. My hon. friend said that it occurred a year ago, so that it must have been the same case that he referred to before; it could not have occurred within the past year. I think all such matters have been dealt with promptly within the last few months, and they will be in the future. With regard to pipes under the railway tracks, I am not an advocate of the railway companies at all, but on behalf of the public I think this is a case in which the greatest care ought to be exercised. The railway companies ought certainly to be notified in every case, and if they have something to say as to whether an application should be granted or not, they should have an opportunity to show where and how the pipes should go. Several cases of this kind have been brought to my knowledge. In some cases it is sought to put pipes under railway tracks where the ground is springy, and consequently where the roadbed might be seriously affected and an accident caused to the travelling public. These are reasons for leaving the matter under the control of the Railway Commissioners, in whom we have confidence. I have no objecion to the Bill going to the committee, but nothing has been said to change my mind or I believe the mind of this House as to the importance of exercising the utmost care in allowing wires to be strung across railway tracks or allowing pipes to be put under them, and this care can best be exercised by the men we have appointed for the purpose, that is, the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph lines.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of the report made by Charles Olin to the Department of the Interior, of his visit to Sweden for this department in 1907-8, and of all correspondence leading up to his appointment to make such trip, and in any way relating thereto.—Mr. Goodeve.

For a copy of all communications, accounts, reports and other papers received by the Department of Public Works from A. Edgar Hansom, E. T. P. Shewan, or other person or persons, relating to the survey of the St. John River channel between Fredericton and Woodstock, and of all letters, instructions, &c. from the department to Mr. Hansom, Mr. Shewan or other person or persons in connection therewith.—Mr. Crocket.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY BRANCH RAILWAYS.

Mr. EMMERSON. With the permission of the House I would move:

For a copy of the report of the Commissioners appointed by the government to inquire into, examine and report on the branch lines of railways connecting with the Intercolonial Railway. Also for a copy of the report of the Commissioners appointed by the government of the province of New Brunswick to inquire into, examine and report upon the branch lines of railways within the said province to connect with the said Intercolonial Railway.

He said: I make this motion with the view of having the papers already laid on the table brought in their order so that they may be considered with respect to having them printed.

Mr. GRAHAM. They will be a very lengthy printed document. The only part which would be of much benefit to the House would be the report of the commissioners themselves. The statement as regards the number of locomotives, the condition of the ties, the repairs of the road and all such details are in the report of the Minister of Railways. The documents we are asked to order will be so lengthy that we are not likely to get them this session.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What means has this government of producing the report of the government of the province of New Brunswick?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is on the table.

Mr. SPROULE. Why then move for a return? I thought the intention was to move that it be printed.

Mr. EMMERSON. I made the motion in order to put it in order for printing. While the papers are already on the table, they are not regularly so with the view of having it printed.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM moved that the rules be suspended and that these documents be ordered to be printed forthwith.

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 19) to amend the Post Office Act. —Mr. Lemieux.

SUPPLY—CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY NEW STOCK.

Mr. PATERSON moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Before the motion carries, I would like to ask the Minister of Railways if he is prepared to tell me now

whether that reference alluded to by the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) in 1902, when he said there would be a reference to the courts to ascertain the actual cost of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, has ever been acted on?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have referred that to one of my colleagues who has the matter in hand and is hunting up the exact conditions. I expect to have an answer in a short time.

Mr. MACLEAN. Will the hon. gentleman bring down the order in council itself which was made in 1902 and which corresponds with the order in council increasing the capital stock?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Would the minister remember whether there was a provision in the order in council that the effect would be the same, as regards the percentage of earnings, as the Bill which was introduced by the former Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick)? In other words, is it provided that the 10 per cent should be calculated only on the original stock issued, namely, $65,000,000?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is the last order in council I have brought down, and it does not affect in any way the original condition regarding percentage.

Mr. MACLEAN. There are four orders in council since 1902 dealing with the same question. Will they be brought down also?

Mr. GRAHAM. If my hon. friend desires I will bring them all down.

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

Pension to Mrs. Elizabeth Wilmot, $54.75.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is a new item and the pension was granted under these circumstances. Constable George Ernest Wilmot, Royal Northwest Mounted Police was murdered while on duty at Frank, Alberta, on the morning of the 12th of April, 1908, by some person or persons unknown. Up to the present time no clue to the murder has been obtained. During the first days of April, 1908, a number of burglaries took place in Frank and Sergeant Haslett arranged with constable Wilmot to patrol the town at night to try to capture the criminals. On Saturday night April, the 11th, Sergeant Haslett came off duty at 12.30 being relieved by constable Wilmot and about 7 a.m. the following morning constable Wilmot's body was found lying in an alley-way behind the hotel at Frank. There were gaping wounds on the neck and chest caused by gun shot. Mrs. Elizabeth Wilmot, mother of the deceased, is a widow residing in England and she applied for compensation for the loss of her son on whom she was entirely dependent for support. There is evidence that the deceased was in the habit of sending her money from his police pay. She has two sons living, one of whom is married and has a home of his own and the other is an inmate of an epileptic home. These facts were sworn to before a Justice of the Peace. Following the usual practice in existence since 1885, and, it being a most deserving case, we granted to the mother a pension of one-half constable Wilmot's pay.

Mr. HUGHES. Surely Constable Wilmot was paid more than $108 a year ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is based on 365 days' pay at 30 cents a day.

Mr. HUGHES. Is no cognizance taken of the value of his rations and uniform ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I followed the rule that has been in existence since 1885.

Mr. HUGHES. And that is all the pension the poor woman gets ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The rule followed by private corporations which grant pensions is to take into consideration the value of house rent and fuel where such allowances are made and to add their value to the salary. These things are always taken into consideration in granting a pension to the family of a deceased officer.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not dispute that nor do I say it is not a sound rule, but I found this rule in the department and I adhered to it.

Penitentiaries, $507,350.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this intended to cover all the expenditure on penitentiaries for the year 1909-10 ?

Hon. J. BUREAU (Solicitor General). It is supposed to cover all the expenditure for the year.

Mr. DANIEL. There is quite a large increase in the expenditure for Dorchester penitentiary.

Mr. BUREAU. That increase was caused by the installation of an electric light plant in the penitentiary.

Mr. DANIEL. Will this be a permanent increase ?

Mr. BUREAU. Yes.

Mr. RHODES. Was this plant installed by the government itself; is this amount simply for the cost of wiring ?

Mr. BUREAU. This is the difference in price between lighting by coal oil as formerly and lighting by electric light. It costs us $1,000 more to light by electricity than by coal oil.

Mr. RHODES. What arrangement was made between the government and the electric light company as to installation and electric wiring and so on.

Mr. BUREAU. The wiring and installation was done by the convicts and there was no charge for outside labour. We pay 8 cents per kilowatt for the light. There is $1,000 for increase of salaries and the other $1,000 increase is for electricity.

Mr. RHODES. I would like to find out, if I can, what was the entire cost of the installation of the electric lighting.

Mr. BUREAU. We purchased the material and the labour was done by the convicts.

Mr. RHODES. Perhaps the solicitor general would bring the information down at a later date ?

Mr. BUREAU. The Auditor General's Report will show what supplies were purchased and I will have to get information as to the number of hours the convicts worked on the job and the estimated value of their labour.

Mr. RHODES. May I ask what the arrangement is for the electric light the company has to supply ?

Mr. BUREAU. 8 cents per kilowatt.

Mr. RHODES. Can you make it as little as you choose, or as much as you choose, or does the contract call for the acceptance of any quantity they may choose to give you?

Mr. BUREAU. We take it by meter.

Mr. RHODES. You can stop the service any time you choose?

Mr. BUREAU. There is a contract for five years, but there is no minimum or maximum amount we are bound to take. We take only what we consume.

Mr. RHODES. Then you are not bound to take any.

Mr. BUREAU. Except what we consume.

Mr. RHODES. Can you cut off the service any time you choose?

Mr. BUREAU. No, we have a five years contract.

Mr. RHODES. Are you bound to take a certain quantity of electricity from the company in any event?

Mr. BUREAU. I told my hon. friend that there was no minimum amount that we were bound to take, and no maximum amount either. We take what we require, and pay for what we take.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the estimated cost of lighting the penitentiary per year?

Mr. BUREAU. $1,700.

Mr. DANIEL. What was the previous annual amount for light before you installed electricity?

Mr. BUREAU. $700, and we add $1,000 more for electricity.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Will the committee please confine their attention to the first item, $3,000 for the general vote?

Mr. FOSTER. Will the Solicitor General explain the decrease of $9,000 in that general vote?

Mr. BUREAU. There are two inspectors, a parole officer and one architect, that are mentioned in the estimates. Last year their salaries totalled $8,400. These are transferred from penitentiaries to civil government.

Mr. FOSTER. How do you propose to expend the other $3,000?

Mr. BUREAU. The expense of the parole officer is $1,700, assistance to paroled and discharged convicts, $300, for office contingencies, $1,000.

Kingston penitentiary, $151,200.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I ask the minister to look at the items mentioned in the Auditor General's Report L—17:

Frontenac Lumber & Coal Co., Kingston: cement, 152 barrels at $2; cartage on same, $12.90; hemlock lumber, 10,005 ft. at $22.50; cedar posts, 100 at 20c.; cordwood, 21 cords at $4.50; oak, 10 ft., 80c.; total, $657.32.

Were all these goods purchased by tender?

Mr. BUREAU. They were not purchased by tender. Quotations were asked from various dealers, and these were the lowest figures that were offered. We have no patronage list in the Department of Justice, and never had.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Then I want the Solicitor General to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that here at Ottawa where cement is made, he got 86 barrels for his work on the astronomical building and paid $2.50 for it; and the Minister of Railways purchased his at Montreal at $1.65

Mr. BUREAU. The Minister of Railways bought by the carload, and got it cheaper

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. That shows how political friends have a pull. At Kingston they only get $2 a barrel; here at Ottawa they get $2.50. I do not see why the government should not make a rule, and pay the same price all round. Then turn to page L—18, and the minister will find a purchase from Alphonse Racine & Co., Montreal, amounting to $2,436, principally for dry goods. Were these purchased by tender?

Mr. BUREAU. Yes, those were purchased by tender. Public tenders are asked for through the press.

Mr. WM. R. SMYTH. At Kingston the minister paid $22.50 per thousand for hemlock lumber. Is he not aware that hemlock lumber is not worth more than $13?

Mr. BUREAU. I suppose it all depends on the lumber.

Mr. WM. R. SMYTH. It all depends upon whom you buy it from.

Mr. BUREAU. This was dimension lumber that was required for the repair of a wharf, and that is the reason that we paid a little higher price for it.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. For dimension lumber it ought to be a great deal less. For repairing a wharf you simply need square pieces. I have had a good deal to do with wharf building.

Mr. BUREAU. In these cases prices were invited, and that is the best price we could get. The prices were invited from the local dealers, friend and foe.

Mr. BARR. If there were no advertisements in the paper, only the friends could know.

Mr. BUREAU. We send them a notice asking for prices.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the Solicitor General say that notices were sent to all the local dealers inviting them to tender.

Mr. BUREAU. I am informed there are only three or four dealers in Kingston, and the notice was sent to each of them. Anyway, we gave instructions to ask the dealers for prices.

Mr. CROCKET. I find that our friends the McAvitys of St. John are down for quite a large order for supplies for the penitentiaries. Were tenders invited from them?

Mr. BUREAU. Quotations were asked from the hardware merchants, Robertsons of Montreal, who have a house in St. John, and the McAvitys. The McAvitys prices were the lower, I am informed by the inspector.

Mr. CROCKET. What other firms were invited to tender in St. John outside of the McAvity firm.

Mr. BUREAU. Jas. Robertson & Co. and McAvity were the only two from whom prices were asked.

Mr. CROCKET. All the other hardware dealers in St. John and New Brunswick were not asked?

Mr. BUREAU I am informed not.

Mr. CROCKET. And yet the Solicitor General says the Justice Department has no patronage list.

Mr. G. TAYLOR.

Mr. BUREAU. There is none.

Mr. CROCKET. I notice you are dealing with the same bunch as the other departments.

Mr. BUREAU. These are two of the largest houses in the Dominion, and the prices quoted by smaller houses could not be any better.

Mr. FOSTER. I think this is an opportune moment for finding out, if we possibly can, what the government means and whether it is playing to the gallery and concealing what it is actually doing. In the last two or three weeks an impression has gone broadcast, through the publication of Mr Justice Cassels' report, that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had done away with the patronage system. I am not sure that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries anywhere said that he did away with the patronage system. The communication, as I find it, is that he had instructed that the present patronage lists be done away with. That has gone broadcast through the country and the press supporting the hon. gentleman opposite are heralding it as a great and important reform, that now the government, seeing the error of its ways, has determined to do the square thing and have no more of this system of patronage. I looked at the communication which was sent by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to Judge Cassels, through Mr. Watson, and it was accorded a very prominent place in the report, for what reason I do not know, and the essence of it, boiled down, is simply that the minister had instructed that the present patronage lists should be dispensed with. Now, we ought to have the same method of dealing by the government through all its departments. I think my right hon. friend the Prime Minister will bear me out in that statement. On the question of public policy what one department does the other department ought to do. If the patronage system is wrong and something else should be substituted in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, the same method of dealing should hold in the other departments. I do not think the right hon. gentleman will controvert that statement. The Solicitor General has, by a concrete instance, shown that the patronage list is not abolished in reference to his department. He has not even gone as far as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. BUREAU. That was a year ago.

Mr. FOSTER. This is one of the items that we are discussing now, and in this particular case only two firms have been asked for tenders in the city of St. John.

Mr. EMMERSON. That was a year ago.

Mr. FOSTER. One in St. John and one in Montreal.

Mr. BUREAU Robertson is in St. John also.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, there were two in St. John.

Mr. BUREAU. That was last year.

Mr. FOSTER. That was last year? That is the patronage list. The Solicitor General says there never was a patronage list in the Justice Department. There seems to be a patronage list. I know, of my own personal knowledge of St. John, a number of excellent firms that are engaged in dealing in hardware. I think we ought to have now a declaration of the policy of the government and I think I can bring it out by two questions Will the Prime Minister tell us that, by the abolition of the present patronage lists in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, that department has abolished the patronage system? That is one question. The other question is: Are the reasons which led the Department of Marine and Fisheries to abolish the patronage system if he has done so good enough to base the action of other departments of the government upon? Is the whole government, in the purchase of these supplies, going to abolish the patronage lists and the patronage system, one or the other, or both? The Solicitor General's reply is that in so far as the work is concerned which he is explaining, they have not abolished the patronage list or the patronage system.

Mr. BUREAU. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) takes advantage of this item to say that we have been exercising very little discretion in our purchases, but, looking over these items, purchased from McAvity & Sons, I find that they are all for very small amounts, that they were purchased at various times, and that the total is $1,109 for the year. I see that there were 150 feet of asbestos pipe covering at 15½ cents per foot purchased from that firm. Does my hon. friend mean to say that we should ask tenders through the press, or from every dealer, whenever there is a small repair to be made or a small quantity of anything required? I am informed by the inspector that these houses of Robertson and McAvity are two of the strongest houses in Canada and that getting prices from them would be a fair indication of the lowest prices that could be got from any one. These small purchases were made from time to time as occasion required. Prices were asked from Robertson and McAvity, and McAvity's prices being the lower, the purchases were made from them.

Mr. FOSTER. The Solicitor General has taken care not to answer at all the question that I asked. I am not going to lay up against him as a crime the bad practice of the past, but will he tell me if, for the future, the department whose estimates he is explaining now will do away with the patronage list and the patronage system as it has been carried on in the past?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I would like to ask my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) what system he would suggest adopting in the case of small purchases. In the case of the Department of Marine agency at Halifax some few weeks ago a list of the supplies wanted during the current year was made up. The public were asked to tender in some cases for one fog horn or one paint brush. There were numerous instances where but one article of a particular class was required How would the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) deal with purchases of this kind unless he leaves the matter to the judgment of some officer or agency of the department? Surely he would not insist on public advertisements for such supplies. I think the department has adopted a very good and businesslike method, where the quantity is so small, in asking two reputable business houses to furnish prices, and where the quantity is large in asking the public for tenders.

Mr. FOSTER. I shall answer my hon. friend (Mr. A. K. Maclean), who seems to occupy the place of the devil's advocate in this, after the answers have been given by the minister who is explaining the estimates. I never knew a system or principle of any kind that could not be reduced to an absurdity by applying it to one paint brush or box of pins. The general principle remains the same, and I would ask the minister to reply to my question.

Mr. BUREAU. I explained that we did not ask for tenders from any one but McAvity and Robertson, because the purchases were small and scattered, but the Department of Justice, when a large purchase is to be made, invites prices from the most reputable houses and the storekeeper is responsible in all cases for paying the lowest market price. The instructions are to take good care not to pay over the market price.

Mr. FOSTER. The answer is not satisfactory; where does he draw the arbitrary line between large and small purchases?

Mr. BUREAU. I suppose the answer my hon. friend wants is that we have a patronage list and will stick to it; then he could sail in and abuse us. If we were buying a hundred sacks of cement or a few barrels of flour we would ask for prices——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. By tender?

Mr. BUREAU. By circular from the best houses in the line. I see my friend smiling; that is what we do.

Mr. LENNOX. That is what you ought not to do.

Mr. BUREAU. No. If we followed your policy we would not do it, but we do it in spite of that. We ask all houses for prices——

Mr. FOSTER. All houses?

Mr. BUREAU. All houses reputed to be good houses. We take the best houses in the line and ask prices and take the lowest price.

Mr. FOSTER. Take the Kingston penitentiary. Will the Solicitor General say that general tenders are asked for supplies from all reputable houses and that circulars are sent to them irrespective of their party politics?

Mr. BUREAU. In speaking of one hundred bags of cement I was simply using an illustration. The articles principally used in the penitentiaries are as follows, and before buying them we invite competition by public advertisement in the newspapers.

Mr. CROCKET. For a year's supply?

Mr. BUREAU. For a year's supply, the contract is for a year. The list is as follows:

Fresh meat, pork, bacon, coal, coal oil, cordwood, milk, blankets and prison clothing, grocery staples, grocery sundries, sole leather, leather findings, hardware sundries, hardware staples, dry goods sundries, dry goods staples, oil, tinware, fish, drugs.

Next year we will add cement to this list.

Mr. FOSTER. Lumber?

Mr. BUREAU. We cannot specify in advance what lumber we will require.

Mr. FOSTER. That is satisfactory. I always had an idea that the Justice Department was kept pretty clear from the evils of the patronage system, but I began to get suspicious when I heard the answers of the Solicitor General. I understand it is intended to add other articles to the list next year and that the department will advertise and take the lowest tender. That is a perfectly intelligible and businesslike basis, and if that is the system adopted, I am very glad to know it and to know that it is being lived up to in that department. I would like to have from the First Minister a statement whether that is the system which is to be adopted by the government as a whole? The country is interested in this.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think it is the system which is followed in every department, but to be doubly sure I shall reserve my answer until I make further inquiries, and I shall give the information the next time we go into Supply.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the minister who tendered for these dry goods, which he says were purchased by tender, and if samples were given to the different tenderers?

Mr. BUREAU. When tenders are called for, they are accompanied by a sample. The tenderers were: Lewis & Patterson, Montreal; P. Garneau, Fils & Cie., Quebec; Hodgson, Sumner & Co., Montreal; and A. Racine & Co., Montreal, who were the lowest.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend must know that there are in Kingston some of the largest wholesale houses in Canada, and why were they not invited to tender? Why go to Montreal and pay larger prices than the goods could be purchased for in Kingston?

Mr. BUREAU. My hon. friend is under a misapprehension. These tenders were called for by advertisement in the newspapers. He does not expect us to go to Kingston and press his friends to tender. They had an equal opportunity to do so with the others, and every article mentioned in the Auditor General's Report was not bought on the schedule price given in the tender.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Will my hon. friend say in what newspapers the advertisement for these tenders appeared?

Mr. BUREAU. I have not the information, but can bring it down.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Was it published in any newspapers besides those of Montreal?

Mr. BUREAU. Certainly—in Kingston, St. John, Toronto, Montreal, Quebec and Halifax.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there a patronage list of newspapers?

Mr. BUREAU. I suppose my hon. friend would expect the department to consider the interests of this country and to advertise in papers having the largest circulation and most read by the people. Therefore he can draw his own conclusion.

Mr. BLAIN. In answer to that, I may say that last year I directed the government's attention to the fact that they had spent $600 in advertising for tenders for a small post office in a town in western Ontario, and the advertisement went into Reform newspapers only. I gave the circulation of the London 'Free Press,' in the very centre of that district, which has a larger circulation than any other newspaper, and strange to say, it was not on the patronage list.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. It ought to be.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend from Essex sees the importance of what I say.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Do I understand the hon. Solicitor General to say that lumber is not to be on the stock-list for future purchases?

Mr. BUREAU. Yes.

Mr. S. SHARPE. I think it should be, because I find on page L—17 of the Auditor General's Report that for hemlock $14 a thousand was paid to W. C. Edwards & Co., and $22.50 a thousand to the Frontenac Lumber & Coal Company, a difference of $8.50 a thousand.

Mr. BUREAU. The difficulty is that we cannot ask for any definite quantity of lumber as we can of flour or coal, because we do not know what kind or dimensions we may require during the year, and the quantity is not very great. I will try to find out the reason for the difference in price.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I would thank the hon. gentleman to bring down the schedule of prices of the different articles of dry goods in the tender of Messrs. Racine & Co.; because I am certain that McInnis & Co., of Kingston are prepared to compete with any house in Montreal if they had the opportunity.

Mr. BUREAU. Does my hon. friend think we used any means to prevent the Kingston people tendering? They were as much at liberty to tender as any others. I will bring the schedule of prices

Mr. BRADBURY. The practice followed in every great city is to call for tenders for millions of feet of lumber before they know what they want. They get the prices for dimension lumber and dressed lumber, so that if you want 10,000 or 20,000 feet of dimension lumber, you know exactly what you are going to pay for it.

Mr. BUREAU. The suggestion of my hon. friend is worth considering and we will see whether we can work it out or not.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH (East Algoma). Will the hon. minister give us the dimensions of the lumber he paid $52 per thousand for ?

Mr. BUREAU. I have not the information here.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. We ought to have it.

Mr. BUREAU. I said I could not account for the discrepancy but no doubt it was due to the season or other conditions.

Mr. BEATTIE. The worst feature is that you buy 1,000 feet at $14 and then you buy 10,000 feet at $22.50. There must be great discrepancy in the quality.

Mr. BUREAU. I am not an expert in lumber and cannot account for the difference in price. It may be due to difference in grades. I shall however get the information.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. But a few minutes ago the minister said it was used for wharf repairs.

Mr. BUREAU. Yes, but I did not know the size of it.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. It is well known that Georgian Bay district practically fixes the price for lumber, and those well posted know that mill run hemlock sold for $14 per 1,000 f.o.b. and that lumber from 16 feet to 18 feet was worth a dollar more, and over 18 feet, two dollars more. To these you would have to add the freight and the dealer's profit, so that the prices would be reasonable.

Mr. SMYTH. If you will come to Algoma we will give you the lumber at a good deal less than $14 per thousand feet.

Mr. MILLER. Will the hon. gentleman say that the price of hemlock was the same then as to-day ?

Mr. SMYTH. You can get any amount at Algoma considerably under $14 per 1,000 feet.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. Lumber is selling at four to five dollars a thousand feet less than a year ago.

Mr. FOSTER. As this is a discrepancy which the minister cannot understand, he might ask his officer to get the information and let us come back to the item again.

Mr. J. ARTHURS (Parry Sound). In view of the declaration by the minister that tenders were called for, how is it that we find several firms supplying similar goods at different prices ?

Mr. BUREAU. In the case of each penitentiary, we call for tenders.

Mr. ARTHURS. I am quoting from page L—17 and 18 of the Auditor General's Report re Kingston penitentiary. Take James Crawford, Kingston.

Mr. BUREAU. He has the contract for supplying groceries.

Mr. ARTHURS. But we also find groceries supplied by A. McLean, Kingston.

Mr. BUREAU. He supplied bacon and barley and pork.

Mr. ARTHURS. He also supplied groceries. In dry goods, I find the same thing. I find dry goods bought from Hodgson, Sumner and Company, Montreal, and from Racine and Company, Montreal and from J. Tweeddell, Kingston.

Mr. BUREAU. Hodgson, Sumner and Company have the contract for sundry dry goods and Racine and Company for staples.

Mr. CROCKET. Take Dorchester penitentiary. F. M. Leblanc of Memramcook supplied 2,124 pounds of beef, at $5.87 per hundred-weight, and you paid Charles McKenzie, of Sackville, 7½ cents per pound for 26,442 pounds of beef. I thought that in the case of beef, tenders would be invited for a year's supply, and I cannot understand this discrepancy.

Mr. BUREAU. Leblanc tendered at $5.87 per hundred-weight and supplied some beef at that price before signing the contract. Then he found he had tendered too low and refused to sign a contract, and we gave the contract to the next lowest tenderer.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (Leeds). The minister made the statement that Hodgson, Sumner and Company had the contract for sundry goods and Racine and Company for staples. How it is then that the same lines of goods are charged in both accounts? In the one case 104 dozen shirts and drawers are paid for at $4.50 and in the other 12 dozen shirts and drawers are paid for at $4.75. He bought from Mr. Mills, his friend in Kingston, straw hats at $1.25, and from Hodgson and Sumner straw hats at $1.10. It would appear that the same kind of goods are divided up piecemeal between Hodgson and Sumner and Racine and Company. If McInnis and Company of Kingston who are large wholesale men got an opportunity for tendering they would be able to supply these goods if they were not shuffled out of the contract.

Mr. EMMERSON. Are they Conservatives?

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. They happen to be Tories.

Mr. BUREAU. Tenders are called for publicly through the press and everybody has an opportunity of competing. What my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) calls a discrepancy is explained by the fact that these goods are given to the convict when he is discharged from the penitentiary.

Mr. HODGINS. If I understand Mr. Taylor's contention it is that the patronage should be given to some one in the city of Kingston.

Mr. TAYLOR. All other things being equal.

Mr. HODGINS. If I am rightly informed there is only one wholesale house in Kingston, and therefore there would be no competition if tenders were invited only from firms in that city. Racine & Co. and Hodgson, Sumner & Co., of Montreal, are firms of high repute, and as I have some knowledge of the value of dry goods I can say that the goods are supplied by these firms at fair prices.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I cannot understand why clothing supplied to the prisoners while serving their term is classed as staple articles and tenders called for in respect of same, while clothing supplied to all prisoners, when leaving the prison is not classed as staples and no competition asked in purchasing same.

Mr. WHITE. I see by the Auditor General's Report that you paid $44 for street car tickets. Were these for the convicts?

Mr. BUREAU. The penitentiary is quite a distance from the city, and these tickets are given to officers who go to the city on official business.

Mr. FOSTER. Do all officers get them?

Mr. BUREAU. Only the accountant and storekeeper, and occasionally the engineer.

Mr. FOSTER. You have made a reduction of $40,000 in the binder twine item; what is the explanation of that?

Mr. BUREAU. That is because we are not buying any hemp this year. We have on hand 850,352 pounds of twine and 210,516 pounds of fibre.

Mr. FOSTER. What has been the average manufacture of twine for the past two or three years?

Mr. BUREAU. About 400,000 pounds a year.

Mr. FOSTER. Was more manufactured last year than usual?

Mr. BUREAU. The sales were not up to the average last year.

Mr. FOSTER. For what reason? last year was a great wheat year.

Mr. BUREAU. We sent circulars last year as usual to the Farmers' Associations, and to every one who had purchased from the department previously and we gave the same publicity as in former years.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the twine of inferior quality or was the outside competition greater?

Mr. BUREAU. The main reason is that we require cash with order, and all other manufacturers sell on time.

Mr. FOSTER. But you have always required the cash?

Mr. BUREAU. Money was scarcer last year than the year before, and as we required cash that may account for the difference.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the report of the department give that as a reason or is that mere theory?

Mr. BUREAU. The inspector informs me that there was a heavy demand made for binder twine last year if we would sell it on credit, but as we required cash they would not buy from us.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you purpose varying your method in future so as to sell on credit when you get sufficient guarantee? The twine industry was started at Kingston to give healthy employment to the inmates and is it not better to adopt a prudent credit system rather than let the industry die out, and leave the convicts without employment?

Mr. BUREAU. I am informed by the officer that shortly after the system was installed at Kingston, they sold some of the twine on credit, and they had any amount of trouble in collecting the money that was due for the twine. Perhaps the hon. member for Toronto may be able to suggest some better plan, but for the present we propose to continue on a cash basis.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I will suggest this plan to the Solicitor General. Some years ago the Minnesota State Binding Twine Institution found that they could not sell their twine for cash, and they had to take orders for twine from the farmers, on their note. Eight or ten farmers jointly signed a note for the twine they wanted for the year, each being responsible for the whole amount. As soon as the harvest was over and the grain was marketed, they had the money in hand to pay for these notes. I suggest to the department whether that plan might not be worth consideration, that eight or ten farmers should join together and each be responsible for the whole. I do not see that there would be any danger then. Before harvest very few farmers, in some parts of the country, have ready cash.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The minister stated a little while ago that a tender for staple dry goods was given to Messrs. Alphonse Racine & Co., and for sundries to Messrs. Hodgson, Sumner & Co. Turning to page L—17 it appears that he purchased lines of the same goods from Messrs. P. Garneau Fils & Co., of Quebec, for $1,545. In that order were shirts and drawers, 15 dozens at $4.50, 20 doz. at $6, and 20 doz. at $6.25. Other parties had tendered for supplying these goods, and yet the department go down to Quebec and give an order there for $1,545 without tender.

Mr. BUREAU. I am informed by the officer that in respect to shirts and drawers there was a shipment made by Garneau & Sons to finish up a contract they had in the previous year, and it was paid out of the appropriation for this year.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Were potatoes considered a staple article of groceries for which tenders were called?

Mr. BUREAU. No. They grow their own potatoes at the penitentiary, and they buy only when they are short in their crops.

Mr. MEIGHEN. If there is anything of a staple character I should think it would be potatoes. But I find that you paid six different men for potatoes at varying prices. Would it not be better to advertise and get a price for potatoes for the year? Did you call for public tenders for flour?

Mr. BUREAU. Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN. How is it, then, that flour is purchased from two or three different individuals at varying prices? You purchased flour from James Cummings, 410 barrels at $4.90; from Higham and Ramsay, Stonewall, Manitoba, you purchased 1,548 bags of flour at $1.80, and 410 bags at $2.45, less freight, $256. If the minister calls for tenders for flour at the lowest prices, how is it that he paid these varying prices?

Mr. BUREAU. Last year no tenders were called for and no contracts were given for flour. Generally we do call for tenders, but last year the market was so unsettled that the officers of the department thought it was better not to advertise for tenders, and they did not call for tenders. But that is only one year.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Do you call for tenders for molasses? I find molasses appearing in three different places. Molasses appears in the Crawford account and in the Maclean account, at different prices.

Mr. BUREAU. Tenders were invited for this year and we have let contracts for the current year.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Were they invited last year?

Mr. BUREAU. Last year they were not invited, for the reasons I have stated.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Molasses appears in the Crawford account, 438 gallons at 35 cents, and in the Maclean account, 93 gallons at 36 cents. What is the explanation?

Mr. BUREAU. The Crawford account was under contract. In regard to the Maclean account, the officer explains that it may be an overlapping of the previous year.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that all?

Mr. BUREAU. I do not know; I will have to find it out.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The minister might look at this item: Brown sugar, 8,000 pounds, at $3.85 per cwt., bought from Mr. Maclean. Surely brown sugar is a staple article, or was the market unstable there also ?

Mr. BUREAU. I am not in a position to give the explanation just now. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has asked for the schedules; I will bring them down and then my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) may satisfy himself.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The schedules will not satisfy one on that point.

Mr. BUREAU. You will see by the schedules what we got prices for and what the prices were.

Mr. MEIGHEN. If the tenders were accepted that is the man from whom the goods should have been purchased.

Mr. BUREAU. Certainly.

Mr. MEIGHEN. But they were not purchased from him.

Mr. BUREAU. They may have been classed as staples and sundries. One man might tender for grocery staples and the other for sundries.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Are these items staples or sundries?

Mr. BUREAU. I do not know.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I take from the list, potatoes, flour, molasses, beans, butter, barley; all these are purchased from different individuals. If these are not staples one would be at a loss to understand what staples are. Is there anything the minister considers a staple article of groceries which staple article he has purchased by tender from the lowest tenderer and from that man alone?

Mr. BUREAU. I stated just now that all these things are purchased from the lowest tenderer.

Mr. MEIGHEN. From that man alone?

Mr. BUREAU. There might be various contractors for the different institutions.

Mr. MEIGHEN. They may not be the lowest tenderers.

Mr. BUREAU. I admit I cannot explain this. When I get the schedules down we can again take up the matter and see why these things were purchased from two different parties.

Mr. STAPLES. The minister said that the flour market was unsettled last fall?

Mr. BUREAU. Not last fall, but a year ago last fall.

Mr. STAPLES. The price of wheat was pretty steady last fall.

Mr. BUREAU. Last October we had to ask for tenders, but it was a year ago last fall—October, 1907—that I had reference to.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is just when the elections were on.

Mr. MEIGHEN.

Mr. BUREAU. No.

Mr. J. D. REID. You said you asked for tenders in October last?

Mr. BUREAU. Certainly we asked for tenders in October last, but we did not ask for tenders because the elections were on.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Last year wheat was very cheap and yet they paid $4.90 for flour.

Mr. BUREAU. I will have to retract. I am informed by the inspector that tenders were called for in the public newspapers after the elections.

Mr. FOSTER. That is explained in this way: The year before there was a pretty definite idea that there would be an election here; it was considered that the markets would be unsettled and, therefore, no tenders were asked for. Is that it ?

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask my hon. friend if there is any other kind of work done at the penitentiaries than the making of binder twine?

Mr. BUREAU. We make our own clothing, boots and shoes, and we work for other penitentiaries. We have in the penitentiaries eight instructors for the purpose of training convicts in various trades—carpenters, stonemasons, quarrymen, brickmakers, &c.

Mr. J. D. REID. Do you make any shirts or drawers?

Mr. BUREAU. No, we buy them; we make pants and coats though.

Mr. MONK. Is there any of the product sold outside of the penitentiary?

Mr. BUREAU. No.

Mr. MONK. Or given away?

Mr. BUREAU. There is nothing given away. I am informed by the inspector that sometimes some of the goods manufactured by the convicts are sold outside. There are articles of furniture which are manufactured in the penitentiary for the officers and paid for by them. Of course, they are manufactured by the convicts, who are being taught their trade at the same time.

Mr. MONK. I think that if there are articles of furniture manufactured there and sold to the officers it might give rise to abuses. The case I referred to more particularly was this one: A complaint was sent to me about 96 church pews that had been manufactured at the penitentiary at St. Vincent de Paul, sent up from there to some church in Ottawa and sold for the sum of—I do not exactly remember the sum —but $100 or so. These pews were large and commodious, capable of accommodat-

ing six people and were worth $960 at a low valuation. I would like to know exactly what occurred in regard to this transaction.

Mr. BUREAU. I am informed that there were some pews made by the convicts for a church at Ottawa. The lumber was supplied by the members of the congregation and the sum of $106 was paid for the labour which was used in making these pews by the convicts. That is the only instance.

Mr. HUGHES. Did the church put up an election subscription?

Mr. EMMERSON. It was not that kind of church.

Mr. BUREAU. It put up the prayers.

Mr. MONK. Was the lumber sent down from Ottawa and through whom was that transaction carried out?

Mr. BUREAU. The lumber was sent down from Ottawa and the transaction was carried out through Mr. Dawson, inspector of penitentiaries. He thought it was a good thing to give our apprentices in the carpenter shop some work. The inspector gave them the lumber and saw that the cost of the labour that was put on this work was paid by the congregation.

Mr. FOSTER. Is Mr. Dawson at liberty to do that generally? There are a great many churches that would like to get pews at that rate. I think it is the most extraordinary transaction I have heard of in a long time.

Mr. BUREAU. I understand that this has been done on other occasions. One precedent is the supplying of cut stone for a church at Portsmouth, where Sir John Thompson paid the money and furnished the material.

Mr. HUGHES. Sir John Thompson had nothing to do with it.

Mr. BUREAU. He paid for the cut stone out of his own pocket.

Mr. HUGHES. After it was discovered that it had been furnished from the penitentiary.

Mr. BUREAU. I did not say when he paid it.

Mr. HUGHES. He said it should not have been done at the expense of the people of Canada, and he paid for it out of his own pocket when he found the work had been done at the penitentiary

Mr. BUREAU. It was not paid for in this case by the people of Canada; the $106 did not come from the people of Canada, but from the congregation.

Mr. MONK. That is not exactly the point of view to take. The question is, what kind of operations can be carried on in a general way. My hon. friend knows that there is serious conflict between prison and outside labour, and if this sort of thing can be done in one instance why can it not in another? My information is that at the penitentiary I have mentioned there are serious disorders of that kind. As I have no precise facts that I can establish I do not wish to refer to those disorders in a general way, but this particular case goes to show that the inspector has the right to order work to be done for outside parties for remuneration in money, and I think that is at least opening the door to very serious abuse. It is not fair. If our convicts in the penitentiary can be employed, for instance, on public works, there is a great deal of work that can be done without their labour competing with that of outsiders. That competition we should not encourage. It cannot be allowed to take place.

Mr. BUREAU. The inspector has just explained to me that the work was done at his request for himself; he says it was his contribution to the church I take issue with my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) when he says that at St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary there are disorders of that kind. I want to register a protest. Last year he made charges against the officers and administration of the penitentiary. I spent a week there and made the most minute investigation, but found there was no foundation for the charges made against the officials there.

Mr. MONK. What are the charges against which he protests?

Mr. BUREAU. You say there is great disorder in that line in that penitentiary.

Mr. MONK. When did you hold an investigation?

Mr. BUREAU. Last year after you and the then member for Laval made your charges against the warden and officials of the penitentiary

Mr. MONK. I find it extremely singular that the Solicitor General should have held an investigation there of charges I made without giving me an opportunity of appearing before His Worship to establish the charges. I do not think the investigation was of a very serious character. The only charge I made was that the prefect of the penitentiary took an active, open and violent part in elections. If the Solicitor General went down there and found that the prefect took no part in the elections I cannot say that I think much of his investigation, because it is well known there that Mr. Beauchamp took a very violent part in every election in that county since 1896. That was the only charge I made at that time, but I am making another one

now. My hon. friend seems to become terribly indignant because we offered criticism—

Mr. BUREAU. Not at all.

Mr. MONK. What are we here for, to burn incense before my hon. friend?

Mr. BUREAU I wish you would.

Mr. MONK. I thought we were called upon to point out defects to criticise, and I say that I have had reports that the inspection is not properly done there, that work is done, articles are manufactured there and taken out of the penitentiary.

Mr. BUREAU. And paid for.

Mr. MONK. No, but I have no other instance, but that one about which there is no doubt whatever. An order was given for the manufacture of furniture, worth $960, for which $104 was paid. I take the view that it is unfair; if you open the door to that kind of thing you could have a furniture manufacturer getting furniture manufactured there, you can have prison labour in opposition to free labour. My hon. friend need not get indignant. We on this side of the House will not stand for protest and indignation because we offer fair criticism and bring facts to the notice of the government.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER The item before the committee deals with Kingston penitentiary; shall this carry?

Mr. MONK. Yes, but upon that item I raised the question of penitentiary labour. If I am out of order I will abide by your ruling, but I think that in voting $50,000 for Kingston penitentiary, I am at liberty to raise the question of prison labour.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Two questions have been brought up. The last point is a reasonable one and I think might come under this item, whether or not it is proper and advisable that prison labour should be sold outside of the penitentiary. That is a very old question of debate in this House. But there was another the hon. member (Mr. Monk) did not exactly state, but he insinuated that something had been done which was not absolutely correct, that these pews had been sold to the congregation at a lower price than their real value. As I followed the discussion I think he is satisfied that there has been no dishonesty and nothing wrong whatever, whatever the wisdom of the policy might be. As I understand, the material was furnished by the congregation and the labour, which was supplied by the penitentiary, was paid for by the congregation. Under such circumstances it seems to me there is nothing wrong and that matter should more properly come up when we are discussing the votes for St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary. In the meantime my hon. friend has suggested a larger question whether or not the labour of the convict should be permitted to compete with the ordinary labour. That is a question which has been discussed again and again in this House for the last thirty years. I do not know that anything has been done to assert a principle one way or the other. Generally it was supposed that the labour of the convict should not come in competition with free labour and if this is the only instance, it seems to me to be not worth while discussing it.

Mr. FOSTER. That is true to a certain extent; I think both governments have gone on the principle of not allowing the convict labour to come in competition with ordinary labour. It seemed to be felt that some useful and steady employment could be found for the prisoners, and the compromise was the establishment a good many years ago of the binder twine manufactory which has been carried on ever since in Kingston. But that is different from a general policy announced by this government of not coming into competition with the general labour of the country. That is different from the general policy which has actuated both governments, of not allowing prison labour to enter into competition with the general industries and employments of the country. I do not agree with my hon. friend, however, in treating this matter so cavalierly. I think it is not only unwise, but wrong. I would like to ask whether the department authorized this particular instance or not. It was asserted by my hon. friend that Sir John Thompson had done the same. Will he make the statement in this House that Sir John Thompson, as Minister of Justice, or as premier, authorized that to be done? Or, was it not a matter which, when found out, was not approved of by Sir John Thompson, who took as manly a way as he possibly could of getting out of it? But I think you go a long way into competition with the ordinary trades and labour of the country when you allow the inspector of penitentiaries to furnish a church with $900 worth of furniture for $104.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is not a fair way of putting it.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that pews which were worth about $900 were got by the church.

Mr. EMMERSON. They furnished the lumber.

Mr. FOSTER. I know. The church produced the lumber for making the pews and got the labour for almost nothing. If they had to go into the general market and thus had given employment to the trades in that

line, they would have paid a great deal more, and the trades would have got the advantage. In this case, while the whole country is keeping up the penitentiary, this one particular church gets that advantage. I do not think that ought to be allowed, and I would like to hear whether or not the minister of the department gave his authority for that transaction.

Mr. BUREAU. The minister never gave any special authority to the inspectors. The inspectors took it upon themselves to do this. While on my feet, I may correct an error of the hon. member for North Toronto, who is under the impression that 96 pews were furnished. There were only 42. The lumber was sent to St. Vincent de Paul, and the time was put in by the convicts. It is true, the whole country supports the convicts, and if any church gets the advantage of the cheap labour, every other church should have the same; but still this was a special case. The worthy inspector tells me that it was done in perfect good faith.

Mr. MONK. I do not know what church is in question, and I have no doubt that the object for which these pews were ordered was an excellent one; but I object to the principle. I put a question on the subject to the House the other day, and I believe the answer was that there were 63 pews. Now the number is stated to have been 42. The information sent to me was that there were 96, the value of which was $960. If you open the door to that kind of thing, it means the employment of prison labour to the detriment of outside labour; and I believe that both governments have agreed that that should not be done. In that letter there was an insinuation, as my right hon. friend says, that this was more or less of a practice at St. Vincent de Paul. If so, I think it is important that it should be put a stop to. In connection with Kingston penitentiary I find that there was a revenue of $10,646.93 outside of the binder twine industry. The farm contributed $3,402.41, the tailor $2,579.20, stone $598, and so on. Was this revenue derived from sales made outside, or what is the nature of it ?

Mr. HUGHES. While the hon. Solicitor General is looking up the answer, I wish to make one statement in justice to the memory of Sir John Thompson. As soon as he found out that those articles were purchased from the penitentiary, he instituted an inquiry, the result of which was that condign punishment was inflicted upon the subordinate officers who caused the transfer of the work from the penitentiary to the church authorities, and he saw that the country did not suffer to the extent of one dollar by paying the money himself.

Mr. BUREAU. The revenue from the bakery represents bread sold to the officers; that from the blacksmiths' shop represents work done for other penitentiaries; that from the tailor represents contracts executed by the penitentiary for the Department of Indian Affairs and the Department of the Interior. That is the largest amount.

Mr. FOSTER. Is any of it from work done for outside parties ?

Mr. BUREAU. No.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that this was done by the inspector on his own mere motion. Is it part of the inspector's duty or right to make contracts with outsiders for prison labour ?

Mr. BUREAU. The inspector, as I said just now, gave the work himself. The inspector gave out the work himself.

Mr. HUGHES. To what church does he belong?

Mr. BUREAU. St. Matthew's. Is that my hon. friend's church? The lumber was sent in to the inspector, and he ordered the work to be done as if it were for himself. Being a member of that church, that was his contribution. The time was kept of the labour making the pews, and he paid for that labour at the rate charged for penitentiary work.

Mr. FOSTER. He did that as an officer?

Mr. BUREAU. Yes, and I do not want my hon. friend to understand that I approve of the policy. It is one that is open to question.

Mr. SPROULE. I would think that an inspector of penitentiaries has certain duties to perform, and that outside of these he has no authority to become a contractor for churches or any one else.

Mr. BUREAU. That is hardly putting the case fairly. It has always been the custom for penitentiary officers to have their furniture made by the convicts, and they pay the usual penitentiary rates. This gives employment to the convicts. The inspector did not act as a contractor but as a member of the church, and he availed himself of his privilege as an officer of the penitentiary to have work done for the church as he would for himself, paying the same rates. It was done for a good purpose, and the country lost nothing, and on the question of putting an end to that question I am not ready to pronounce.

Mr. FOSTER. I should have hoped that my hon. friend would have been ready to say no and say it at once. This case arises out of the fact that you give to your officers a perquisite in that way, and that leads us back to the consideration whether an officer should have any perquisites of that kind at all. Why should any officer have the right to get his furniture cheaper than an outsider? The country is paying him a proper

salary or it ought to do so; and this is one of the perquisites, many of which were abolished, and I do not know why this one was allowed to remain.

Mr. BUREAU. How will you keep your convicts busy?

Mr. FOSTER. You should not say that in order to keep them busy, you will allow perquisites to your officers. There are other ways of keeping your convicts occupied. Pay each officer his wage and give him no favours. I would ask the leader of the House what estimates will be taken up after six o'clock? We are at a loss by not knowing five minutes ahead what is to be gone on with. That makes it more difficult for us and the ministers as well. If we knew a day in advance, we would be better prepared to facilitate the business, and the minister himself might be prepared to expedite it if he would only take counsel with his officers before he comes to the House.

Mr. PATERSON. What ought to be going on to-day is the work of the Opposition, but instead they allow their motions to stand on the order papers, and then expect the government to take up its business.

Mr. FOSTER. What will we go on with to-night?

Mr. PATERSON. With these penitentiary estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. And what after?

Mr. PATERSON. I am glad to hear my hon. friend give indication of such diligence in expediting business. We shall, probably, go on with the Indian estimates and Interior Department.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BRADBURY. I find that the department paid $3.60 per barrel for 724 barrels of flour purchased from Higham & Ramsay, of Stonewall, and that the department also purchased from a man named Cummings 410 barrels of flour at $4.90 per barrel. What is the reason for this great difference in the price. Every one knows that the flour made in Manitoba is the best flour in the world, and no better flour can be found any where than that made in the Stonewall mills in my constituency. How did you come to pay Mr. Cummings $4.90 when you only paid $3.60 to Messrs. Higham & Ramsay? While on my feet I may say that I was rather surprised at the statement of the Solicitor General to the effect that the question of employing convict labour in competition with free labour was open to discussion. I believe that every member in this House will agree with me that the principle of allowing convicts to make $900 worth of pews for a church at a cost of some $120 is a wrong principle. It brings convict labour into direct competition with free labour and it should not be tolerated. The Solicitor General, in what I consider a rather flippant manner, said that he did not endorse the principle but he thought it was open for discussion. I say that it is not open for discussion; it is absolutely a wrong principle.

Mr. MILLER. The hon. gentleman ought not to say that pews worth $900 were furnished for $120. I do not say that the principle is right, but it is only fair to say that the parties who got the pews furnished their own lumber.

Mr. BRADBURY. That does not alter the principle at all.

Mr. EMMERSON. It alters the fact.

Mr. BRADBURY. There is no doubt whatever that the pews were made by convict labour and furnished at a much less cost than if they were made by free labour. It is the old story of convict labour coming into competition with free labour and the principle is wrong.

Mr. BUREAU. I do not say that the principle is right in this particular case, and while I do not want convict labour to come into competition with free labour, yet, these prisoners are learning a trade and it is rather difficult sometimes to draw the line. The officers of the penitentiary are allowed to have certain articles made by convict labour and they pay for them.

Mr. J. D. REID. Does the Solicitor General approve of that system?

Mr. BUREAU. I did not say that I did, but the question having been raised I said it was worth considering.

Mr. BRADBURY. What about that difference in the price paid for the flour?

Mr. BUREAU. I am informed that the price of flour varied last year and that the current market price was paid at the time the flour was purchased.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. My hon. friend from Selkirk may not be aware that Mr. Cummings who got the high price for the flour was the Liberal candidate in Brockville some time ago.

Mr. BUREAU. That would not make any difference. Does the hon. gentleman say that more than the current market price was paid?

Mr. MEIGHEN. How is it that if, as we are told, tenders were called for staple articles and the contract awarded to the lowest tenderer and the goods purchased

from him, that these same staple goods have been purchased from so many different parties.

Mr. BUREAU. That was in the case of molasses and sugar.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The explanation given by the Solicitor General was that potatoes were not purchased by tender because it was only when more potatoes than were grown on the penitentiary grounds were required that potatoes were purchased; but as some 1,500 barrels were purchased during the year surely the department could have made a nearer estimate as to its requirements than that. The Solicitor General told us that as the price of flour fluctuated last year tenders were not called for, but he gave us no explanation with regard to the prices paid for molasses, and barley, and beans, and cheese, and butter. Is the minister prepared to give that information now?

Mr. BUREAU. The officers leave the department at six o'clock and any how I had not time to go there.

Mr. MEIGHEN. We can rely on getting that information to-morrow?

Mr. BUREAU. Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Will we get the information before these estimates are passed?

Mr. BUREAU. We can do it on some other item. I will leave an item open.

Mr. EDWARDS. I understood the minister to say that they considered it inadvisable to sell twine to the farmers on credit. Can he tell me what was the length of credit, as a rule, asked by the farmers?

Mr. BUREAU. They asked until after the harvest to pay for the twine, those who asked for credit.

Mr. BRADBURY. Is it not a fact that in the case of Higham and Ramsay they actually tendered for that flour? Were tenders called for in any other case?

Mr. BUREAU. I have explained this afternoon that we did not invite tenders a year ago on account of the unsettled condition of the flour market. These gentlemen had been supplying the penitentiaries before, and we bought from them. They were a reliable firm who had been doing business with us before.

Mr. BARNARD. I understood the minister to say that the officials of the penitentiary were allowed to purchase things that were made in the penitentiary, such as furniture. I see a large amount of revenue here derived from the tailor. Are the officials entitled to get anything in the shape of clothes, or anything from the shoemaker's shop?

Mr. BUREAU. They get clothing and shoes for their families and themselves. The greater part of the revenue from the tailor is owing to the fact that we take contracts with the Indian Department; all the tailor work required on the Indian reservation is done in the penitentiary at Kingston, and we charge it up against the Indian Department.

Mr. BARNARD. On what basis is the price fixed for these goods, and who fixes the price?

Mr. BUREAU. The price is fixed by the accountant of the penitentiary, and by the instructor of the particular branch in which the work is done, upon the basis of 30 cents for labour, the cost of material, and also the cost of supervision.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. Turning to L-18, I find that you purchased from Geo. E. Maybee, of Napanee, castile laundry soap, 2,114 lbs. at 5 cents. Who is Mr. Maybee?

Mr. BUREAU. Mr. Maybee is a manufacturer's agent.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. The hon. gentleman is misinformed. Mr. Maybee is a commercial traveller who visits our town, and I have known him for many years.

Mr. BUREAU. He represented himself to us as a manufacturer's agent.

Mr. CROTHERS. Who would be responsible for buying supplies that were not advertised for by tender for the penitentiaries?

Mr. BUREAU. In such a case a requisition is made by the storekeeper, then it is handed over to the warden, and if the warden approves of it, he turns it over to the inspectors, and if they approve, the purchase is made. Of course it goes before the minister.

Mr. CROTHERS. I see that 1,700 bushels of potatoes were bought in that way. For some, 60 cents a bushel were paid; for others, $1 a bushel, to the same man. No doubt if a staple like that had been advertised for you would have got the whole quantity for 60 cents a bushel.

Mr. BUREAU. That might be, but we could not take delivery of the whole quantity at once. These were bought at different times when the prices varied.

Mr. BARNARD. Could the minister give us a detailed statement showing how much of this revenue was derived from the sales of goods, altogether apart from the government and the penitentiary; also, showing what proportion of it is sold to the officials?

Mr. BUREAU. I could get that information, but it would take some time to prepare it. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman put a motion on the order paper

for a return. It would give us a better chance to get the whole of the details out.

Mr. EDWARDS. Were tenders called for the sand that was supplied?

Mr. BUREAU. No.

Mr. STAPLES. I would like to know whether or not you grow your own potatoes at the penitentiary in Manitoba and whether you are carrying on the farming industry in connection with that institution?

Mr. BUREAU. We try to grow them.

Mr. STAPLES. Does the minister mean to insinuate that we cannot grow potatoes in Manitoba? If they made an attempt at all there is no doubt that they would succeed in growing them.

Mr. BUREAU. We did grow them, too.

Mr. STAPLES. I would like to know whether or not they have been able to supply the demand there or did you go out in the open market to purchase them?

Mr. BUREAU. There were no potatoes purchased in Manitoba, as appears by the details of the penitentiary report, page 168. They were all grown there.

Mr. EDWARDS. The reason I asked the question a few minutes ago as to the purchasing of sand for the penitentiary is this: In the county of Frontenac there are three persons engaged in the sand business. Two of these are strong Liberals and the other one is a strong Conservative. In getting sand for the Rockwood asylum, which is under the provincial government, tenders are asked for and the two Liberals have an equal chance with the Conservative to supply that sand. But in getting sand for the penitentiary apparently tenders are not asked for and a fair chance is not given to all parties. I hope this system will be changed in the future in fairness to all persons engaged in this business.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. BLAIN. I think my hon. friend is entitled to an answer as to whether sand will be purchased by tender.

Mr. BUREAU. He expressed a hope. We do not know the quantity of sand that we will require.

Mr. EDWARDS. You required in the neighbourhood of 200 cubic yards last year.

Mr. SPROULE. This seems an unreasonable evasion. You must be buying sand in large quantities in future. The question is whether it will be bought by tender.

Mr. BUREAU. We only bought $189 worth.

Mr. SPROULE. That does not give the information. The question which has been asked is this: Is it the intention to purchase these articles, where they are obtained in large quantities, by tender or by private advices to men in the business?

Mr. EDWARDS. The Conservative that I referred to and who is engaged in the sand business has been distinctly told on more than one occasion that there was no need of him tendering or thinking of supplying sand to the Kingston penitentiary because of his politics, and I am asking if that sort of thing is going to be allowed, or if you are going to give everybody a fair show as is done in buying sand for the Rockwood asylum?

Mr. BUREAU. I think it is only fair to know by whom the hon. gentleman was told that. If any officials said that to the hon. gentleman's friend they certainly ought to be reprimanded. It might have been told to the hon. gentleman by one of his political friends for the purpose of using it in the House for all I know.

Mr. EDWARDS. In our portion of the country we do not consider that reprimands would do much good. In election time these officials go out and work as actively as any person in the county.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Does the reprimand you speak of mean an advance in salary?

Mr. THOBURN. As a Canadian manufacturer I have an important question to ask. By reference to page L—18 of the Auditor General's Report I find that there were 88 hats bought from a Canadian firm at $1 each. Turning to page L—17 of the Auditor General's Report I find that there were six dozen hats bought from Hicks & Son, London, England, at $1.25 each. As a manufacturer of Canada I would like to know if Canadian manufactured hats are not good enough for those penitentiary chaps at Kingston?

Mr. BUREAU. I am told that the hats that were bought in England were for the officers, being portions of their uniforms.

Mr. THOBURN. It does not say so in the Auditor General's Report. Even if they were, why could not they have been manufactured and purchased in Canada?

Mr. BUREAU. In the minister's report the whole thing is stated.

Mr. EDWARDS. Might I ask for an expression of opinion in regard to the purchase of sand for the Kingston penitentiary? Is it to be done by tender or not?

Mr. BUREAU. We will be glad to ask the hon. gentleman's friend for a tender if he will give us his name.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am young at this business, but I do not think that is an answer to my question.

Mr. BUREAU. Yes, I think it is. The hon. gentleman wants to find out whether we are going to purchase from the same party without inviting tenders——

Mr. SPROULE. Whether by tender or by private agreement.

Mr. BUREAU. We are going to ask for prices.

Mr. EDWARDS. I will be satisfied if the hon. gentleman will give me the assurance that when they want sand they will ask for tenders.

Mr. BUREAU. My hon. friend does not mean to say that if we want a load of sand we are going to advertise for it. If my hon. friend will give us his friend's name we will send him a circular and ask him for prices.

Mr. SPROULE. That is begging the question. You bought during the past year a large quantity of sand, and it is likely that you will buy a large quantity in the future. The question of the hon. gentleman is: Is it the intention of the government to buy by public tender or by contract with private individuals? He is entitled to an answer to that question.

Mr. BUREAU. It is not the intention to buy by private agreement with private parties.

Mr. BLAIN. At page L—36 of the Auditor General's Report, under the heading 'Twine returned into stock,' I see 88,260 pounds, valued at $10,149.90 and 24,050 pounds valued at $2,654.50 put down as having been returned. May I ask the minister if this twine was sold, found unsatisfactory and returned to the department?

Mr. BUREAU. The Canadian Society of Equity were overstocked, they had 88,260 pounds left on their hands and asked us to take the twine back; we did so and refunded them the money. The same thing applied to the 24,000 pounds.

Mr. BLAIN. Where is this firm ?

Mr. BUREAU. It is not a firm, it is an association of farmers in Alberta, for the whole province of Alberta. They club together and give their order but they had this on their hands after the crop was in and asked the authorities to take it back.

Mr. BLAIN. Was the freight paid on it to the penitentiary ?

Mr. BUREAU. It was taken to the penitentiary at Edmonton and is stored there.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. My hon. friend is mistaken. In the next item he will find that the Alberta Farmers' Association returned only 7,200 pounds. The minister should be careful and read the documents in his hands and give answers in accordance with the facts. The facts in this case are that some society of equity returned over 112,000 pounds but the Alberta Farmers Association returned only 7,200 pounds.

Mr. BUREAU. I am informed that the Canadian Society of Equity is an association in southern Alberta but the Alberta Farmers Association operates principally around Edmonton.

St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, $114,000.

Mr. CROTHERS. The farmers will be glad to know that they pay $1.50 a bushel for barley, and $2.50 for peas down there.

Mr. BUREAU. I am informed that this grain was for seed.

Mr. STAPLES. How many bushels ?

Mr. BUREAU. 25 bushels.

Mr. CROTHERS. They paid $5.30 for flour to the Campbell Milling Company but at the next page I see they got Manitoba hard at $3.60.

Mr. BUREAU. The market was fluctuating at that time. That year the flour market was very variable and it was decided not to advertise for tenders but to buy from time to time as we required it. That is the only year tenders were not asked for.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I see that a saddle horse was purchased from Alfred Charbonneau for $245, a generous price.

Mr. BUREAU. We have a certain number of horses there, some for the farm and others for the mounted patrol. My hon. friend will admit that the patrol must have good horses if they are to be of any use. If a prisoner should escape on one of the farm horses the patrol could not overtake him unless he had a better horse.

Mr. CROTHERS. Were the turnips for which you paid $1.10 a bushel for seed?

Mr. BUREAU. I suppose they were bought when the price of turnips was high or they might have been larger turnips.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I see that Robert R. Creighton a clerk at Ottawa was paid $232.79 for two trips Ottawa to Montreal and return.

Mr. BUREAU. That charge is right. Mr. Creighton was paid that amount. He is the accountant of the branch and was making an audit of the books, and that is for his travelling expenses.

Mr. BRADBURY. I see at L—21 a purchase:

Kinsey Boyden, Cincinnati, Ohio, 9 ply jail bars 23,184 pounds at 8¼ cents, 24,185 pounds at 8½ cents, 1,182 pounds at 9 cents.

Could these bars not be got in Canada?

Mr. BUREAU. I am informed that this steel bar, which is tool proof, is not made in Canada.

Mr. MADDIN. I would like to draw the attention of the Solicitor General to the fact that the Nova Scotia Coal and Steel Company roll steel bars of any shape and dimensions.

Mr. BUREAU. Do they roll tool proof steel in Nova Scotia?

Mr. MADDIN. I do not think they do.

Mr. BUREAU I may inform the hon. gentleman that there were inquiries made before it was bought to ascertain whether or not it was manufactured in Canada, and it was found that it was not.

Mr. BRADBURY. I notice at page L—22 that spur gears were bought from the Platt Iron works Co., of Dayton, Ohio. I would like to ask the Solicitor General if it is the policy of the government to buy these things outside of the country when they can be bought in the country?

Mr. BUREAU. These were duplicate parts of a machine which came from there, and therefore they had to be obtained there.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman was good enough to give us a list of the goods supplied to the Kingston penitentiary on public advertisement. Will he give us a list of the goods supplied to this penitentiary? For example, is coal supplied by tender?

Mr. BUREAU. Yes, it is. There were two tenders—the T. F. Moore Co. and Cohen & Son. The tenders were called for by public advertisement in the newspapers.

Mr. J. D. REID. Why was it that the price of coal in Montreal was over a dollar a ton more than it was in Kingston—the same grade of coal?

Mr. BUREAU. I cannot account for that. When we advertise in the newspapers for tenders, all we can do is to accept the lowest tender, which we have done.

Mr. J. D. REID. What newspapers?

Mr. BUREAU. I have not got the list here. I will bring it down.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. If the hon. gentleman will turn to page L—22, he will find that Alphonse Racine & Co. furnished goods. I want to know if they tendered for supplies there, and if so, what supplies?

Mr. BUREAU. There were tenders called for frieze, and theirs was the lowest tender. There were seven tenders put in.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. They supplied shirts and drawers, 127 pairs, at $4.50 per pair, whereas at the Kingston penitentiary the price was $4.50 a dozen. Surely there is a rake-off there.

Mr. BUREAU. That is a printer's mistake. The word 'dozen' is omitted before the word 'pairs.' It should be 127 dozen pairs, at $4.50 a dozen.

Mr. THOBURN. At page L—21 there is an item of $2,173 for lumber, which ranges all the way from $20 to $55 a thousand. Will the minister kindly tell us what kind of lumber was bought at $55 a thousand, and was it bought by tender?

Mr. BUREAU. I have not the details of that item, but I will get them from the department and bring them down.

Mr. J. D. REID. With reference to this coal purchase from L. Cohen & Son, will the minister tell me what quantity of coal was asked for in the advertisement, and did it specify screenings; also what were the names of the parties who tendered, and the prices of the tenders per ton.

Mr. BUREAU. The tender of Cohen & Son is for soft screenings at $3.75 a ton. 1,500 tons were asked for. The other tender, that of Moore & Co., of Montreal, was at $4.75 a ton.

Mr. J. D. REID. When was the advertisement for tenders published ?

Mr. BUREAU. The supplies of the year 1907-8 were advertised to be tendered for up to March 18, for the various penitentiaries.

Mr. J. D. REID. And only two tenders were received.

Mr. BUREAU. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Were the parties invited to tender for all the penitentiaries ?

Mr. BUREAU. It was optional for them to tender for one or for all the penitentiaries.

Dorchester penitentiary, $70,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the department still buy its hardware from the firm of McAvity & Sons, of St. John, New Brunswick?

Mr. BUREAU. Lewis Brothers of Montreal are the contractors for the hardware, both sundries and staples, for the year 1907-8.

Mr. CROCKET. In the Auditor General's Report, I notice that upwards of $1,000 of hardware was purchased from McAvity & Sons.

Mr. BUREAU. These were plumbers' supplies and steam fittings, small orders given at different times, when the things were wanted quickly.

Mr. CROCKET. Without public tender or competition. Is the Solicitor General

aware that the head of this firm is George McAvity, the gentleman who got away with a rake-off of $35,900 in connection with the Mayes contract? If that firm has any account against the government it might be well to set it off, so far as it will go, against that rake-off, seeing that the department is unwilling to take proceedings to recover back the $35,900. In connection with McAvity & Sons, I find that they received $2.45 per barrel for 120 barrels of Portland cement, but I notice that cement was purchased for the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary at $1.85. It might be interesting to the Department of Justice to know that the Public Accounts Committee of New Brunswick had occasion to investigate the accounts of McAvity & Sons some years ago when the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) was in the government of that province, and it was found that they were charging two prices in many instances.

Mr. BUREAU. The penitentiary at St. Vincent de Paul is right close to the market where they deal in cement, which may account for its being cheaper there. I do not know if there are any cement factories in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, and the difference in freight may explain the discrepancy. If you buy from Hull, you will have to pay more freight.

Mr. CROCKET. Would the freight account cause such a difference?

Mr. BUREAU. The purchase may have been at different times and larger quantities may have been required for St. Vincent de Paul than for Dorchester penitentiary.

Mr. ARTHURS. I find that 235 barrels of Portland cement were bought from J. H. Hickman at $2.45.

Mr. BUREAU. Yes, the same price as from McAvity & Co.

Mr. CROTHERS. The chaplain at this penitentiary receives $200 a year less than at St. Vincent de Paul. Is that by reason of his inferior capacity or less onerous duties?

Mr. BUREAU. Less onerous duties, on account of the population being less in Dorchester than in St. Vincent de Paul.

Mr. THOBURN. I find on page L—22 of the Auditor General's Report that the government purchased from T. Prefontaine & Co., Montreal, lumber commencing at $20 and running up to $75 per 1,000 feet. Unless this lumber was made into mahogany chairs or things of that kind, the price seems a fabulous one.

Mr. BUREAU. The $75 per 1,000 feet was paid for oak.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Could the minister say how much of the items for salaries and retiring allowances at St. Vincent de Paul and Dorchester penitentiaries is for each separately?

Mr. BUREAU. Last year there were $38,606.48 for salaries and $2,077.76 for retiring allowances.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. The retiring allowances ought to be put separately in the estimates so that we might know them.

Mr. BUREAU. We cannot tell in advance what the retiring allowances for the year will be.

Mr. CROCKET. How many convicts in Dorchester penitentiary?

Mr. BUREAU. 245, an excess of 51 over the previous year.

Mr. HUGHES. Were tenders called for the installation of a power plant at Dorchester?

Mr. BUREAU. We have no power plant; we are buying the electricity.

Mr. HUGHES. Was an estimate made of what it would cost to run your own power plant?

Mr. BUREAU. It was estimated that a plant would cost $10,000 and salaries of officers to run the plant $3,500 a year.

Mr. BRADBURY. The Sackville Hay & Feed Company were paid $6.10 per barrel for some flour; $3.15 for other flour, and $4.85 per barrel for other flour. What is the explanation?

Mr. BUREAU. They were different grades of flour which were mixed together so as to lessen the cost.

Manitoba penitentiary, $60,350.

Mr. BRADBURY. I notice by the Auditor General's Report that Scott & Stratton, of Stonewall, were paid $4,652 for various lumber supplies. Were these supplies bought by tender? Does the Solicitor General know that this is a very small firm doing business at Stonewall? Where there is such a large amount of lumber required would it not be cheaper for the department to buy from a wholesale house in Winnipeg rather than from these small dealers?

Mr. BUREAU. I am informed the purchase was made after inviting prices. They tried to get the same goods in Winnipeg but they found they could not get as good service.

Mr. BRADBURY. That explanation is hardly in line with what are the facts. Stonewall is about 8 miles from Stoney Mountain and Stoney Mountain is about the same distance from Winnipeg. There is a first-class train service from Winnipeg to Stoney Mountain, so that if the lumber were bought in Winnipeg it could be delivered much easier at Stoney Moun-

tain than from Stonewall. There is something wrong in that explanation.

Mr. BUREAU. I am informed this firm took the order and shipped to Stoney Mountain. The inspector tells me he does not know where the lumber came from.

Mr. BRADBURY. Were public tenders asked for, or was the contract simply given to these people?

Mr. BUREAU. Prices were invited from these people and from parties in Winnipeg, and the prices of these people were lower than the prices we got from Winnipeg.

Mr. BRADBURY. Don't you see at once that when you invite tenders from only two or three people you leave room for that collusion which must have taken place in this case. A firm doing business like Scott & Stratton, in Stonewall, could not sell as cheaply as a large firm in Winnipeg. A small firm like that outside of Winnipeg would have to buy from the Winnipeg firm, and resell it at a higher price to the government.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. What firms were asked to tender for these supplies?

Mr. BUREAU. I have not that information. The prices were asked by the penitentiary officials.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. You will get that information?

Mr. BUREAU. I do not know. It is asking a good deal of the officials to send us down copies of all their letters. They were instructed by the inspectors to ask for prices, and give the contract to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Were their instruction given from Ottawa?

Mr. BUREAU. Yes.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. You will bring down the instruction that was sent by the inspector who to buy it from.

Mr. BUREAU. There is a standing instruction to all the purchasing agents of the various penitentiaries that they are to buy at the lowest market price.

Mr. BRADBURY. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman knows who the firm of Stratton & Scott are. Stratton is the president of the Liberal association of the county of Selkirk; I think that explains the whole position.

Mr. BUREAU. Does my hon. friend claim the prices are excessive?

Mr. BRADBURY. I think they are, in some cases.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I find an item of $48.40 for advertising for tenders for supplies. Was a tender asked for dry goods, and was the lowest tender accepted?

Mr. BRADBURY.

Mr. BUREAU. Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Who was the lowest tenderer?

Mr. BUREAU. For dry goods special, J. M. Garland Sons & Co., of Ottawa. They received the contract for all the articles that are mentioned under the heading of dry goods special for all the penitentiaries in Canada. Dry goods staples for Manitoba went to Racine & Co.; there were four tenderers.

Mr. MEIGHEN. How do independent tenderers know that they may procure contracts? Unless the tenders are taken and accepted only as advertised, and for the articles advertised, then tendering is of no use to the country.

Mr. McCOLL. I think my hon. friend does not understand the matter correctly. If he would read the advertisement carefully he would see that in a general way it calls for tenders for certain supplies, with a form of tendering, and stating that particulars can be obtained on application to the warden. Then if he looks over the tender form, that would specify in detail the different kinds of groceries, and the different kinds of clothing, and so forth, required. One tenderer may be lower for one kind of clothing, and another lower for another kind, and that accounts for the contracts being given to different parties and not all to one.

Mr. MEIGHEN. There is no mention of that in the advertisement. The advertisement says that parties may tender for one or for all of the different public institutions, but it does not say that parties may tender for part of the dry goods, or for part of the groceries, or for anything else under any one heading. It simply invites tenders for one institution or for all. Consequently the public in general would not know that they could go to the department and divide up the tenders for part of the dry goods or part of the groceries; there is no hint of it in the advertisement. I think I understand the advertisement as well as the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McCOLL. If my hon. friend would refer again to the advertisement he will find that it states: 'Forms of tenders can be obtained, with particulars, from the warden'. Has my hon. friend ever seen one of these tender forms? Take a tender for different kinds of clothing for instance. One tenderer puts in a certain price for one class of goods, and another tenderer puts in a price for another class of goods, and so on. A third tenderer may be lower on one class of goods, and higher on another, and the department in each case gives it to the lowest tenderer for the particular kind of goods that is on the list. There is no patronage in the matter at all.

Mr. BUREAU. The specification is contained in the blank form of tender. By applying to the warden of the penitentiary he who desires to tender gets a form, and on that form every article is mentioned under a special heading. Here, for instance, is a tender for dry goods special, enumerating particulars of weight, colour and quality. They put their prices on the different articles. One may tender for blankets, another for prison clothing. The specification is on the tender. They apply for this from the warden, and they get an enumeration of all the various articles required under the special heading.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The minister can accept the tender as to one item, and reject it as to another. Is that not so?

Mr. BUREAU. In the form of the contract they say that samples or tenders will be considered item by item. Suppose a man is lower on blankets we will award him the contract for blankets and not for other things upon which he may not be as low.

Mr. CROTHERS. I am afraid my hon. friend is neglecting the spiritual welfare of some of the inmates of this institution.

Mr. BUREAU. Where?—in Manitoba?

Mr. CROTHERS. Yes. I see there are five chaplains who receive $688 and one who gets $1,000.

Mr. BUREAU. What page?

Mr. CROTHERS. L—26. I would like to know if these five were all in service at the time or whether they were serving periodically, turn about?

Mr. BUREAU. They were serving periodically, turn about.

Mr. BRADBURY. I would like to direct the attention of the hon. gentleman to page L—27.

Higham & Ramsay, Stonewall: bran, 1 ton $18; Imperial flour, 620 bags at $1.55; sundry items, $3.90, $982.90.

A while ago the hon. gentleman stated that the tenders were called for after the general elections. If my memory serves me aright the contract was let for this flour in Selkirk about ten days or two weeks before the elections.

Mr. BUREAU. I am informed that the tenders were called for in November and the contract let in the same month.

Mr. BRADBURY. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he would bring the tender down, because this is a disputed point. It is in my own constituency, and I happen to know the circumstances. I am not complaining of Higham & Ramsay getting the contract because they happen to be friends of my own, although my opponent was bidding high to get them as the public accounts will show. Two weeks before the election Higham & Ramsay received some assurance that if they had not obtained the contract they were going to obtain it. I would like to know whether that is a fact, and I would like the hon. gentleman to bring down the tender.

Mr. BUREAU. I have the tenders under my hand and I have a letter dated Winnipeg, Man., November 26, and addressed to the Inspector of Penitentiaries at Ottawa, as follows:

Dear Sir,—Inclosed we beg to hand you our tenders for the supply of flour at the penitentiaries at Stony Mountain, Sapperton and Edmonton.

The tenders were sent in on the 26th November.

Mr. BRADBURY. What about Stony Mountain?

Mr. BUREAU. It was sent in on the 26th November, 1908.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. What is the date of the tender?

Mr. BUREAU. There is no date on the tender, but here is the letter transmitting the tender.

Mr. BRADBURY. Is that the tender for the supply of flour for the Stony Mountain Penitentiary?

Mr. BUREAU. Yes.

Mr. BRADBURY. What is the date of the tender?

Mr. BUREAU. The 26th November, 1908.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. Who is the tender addressed to?

Mr. BUREAU. The Inspector of Penitentiaries, Ottawa.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. Who is it mailed by?

Mr. BUREAU. I have not the name of the office boy, but it was signed by the tenderers.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. Who signed the tender?

Mr. BUREAU. The Ogilvie Flour Mills Co., Ltd., by R. Dobell.

Mr. BRADBURY. What about the tender of Higham & Ramsay? That is the one I am asking for.

Mr. BUREAU. It is here. It is with the others that were put on the list in the month of November and the contract was awarded, I am told, in the beginning of December. Do you want to see it?

Mr. BRADBURY. That is satisfactory; I will take your word for it.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE. Are these tenders ever dated?

Mr. BUREAU. It all depends upon the man who fills it up. These are not dated. They generally inclose their tenders with a letter.

Mr. THOBURN. At page L—28 I see that Windatt & Co., Winnipeg, supplied 79·7 tons of coal at $9.20. The quality is not specified. Would the hon. gentleman tell us what the quality was and if it was bought by tender?

Mr. BUREAU. Yes, that coal was bought by tender after public advertisement. It was egg coal.

Mr. BRADBURY. The tender sent over here looks all right, but there is no signature and no date. This only confirms the suspicion I have that this was all arranged before my election because it was street talk two weeks before the election that Higham & Ramsay had the contract to furnish the flour.

Mr. BUREAU. My hon. friend will understand we could not let the contract before we had the figures. They were the lowest tenderers. We have accompanying letters showing that they were mailed on the 26th and the 24th of November.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE. Does that not show the time they were transmitted to Ottawa?

Mr. BUREAU. Here is the Campbell Milling Company tender dated November 28 and not signed. Here is the tender of Cumming, of Lynn Lin, dated November 28. All these people were on the list and the contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer. All these being on the list there could not be any game, because we did not know who was the lowest tenderer.

Mr. BRADBURY. I am quite satisfied to take the hon. gentleman's word for it, but it looked peculiar.

There is an allowance to school district 294, Stony Mountain, in lieu of school fees of $250. It is a great hardship to the residents of that district to have this amount so small; the government should allow that district at least $500. The settlement is very small; they have kept up the school; the larger number of pupils attending it are children of the officials, and the government are not bearing their fair share of the burden.

Mr. BUREAU. The matter deserves consideration. There was a time when they were getting nothing and the $250 was fixed at their request as compensation for the extra cost of the children of the officials of the penitentiary.

Mr. BRADBURY. The hon. gentleman realizes that the staff in the penitentiary is increasing and the children are increasing.

British Columbia, $56,500.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. At L—29 of the Auditor General's Report it will be seen that there was an unusual number of retirements last year. Would the minister explain?

Mr. BUREAU. Seven officials retired from the British Columbia penitentiary, Atkins, Bourke, Burr, McKee, McNeill, McNiven and Whyte. McNiven and Burr have since died. McNeill was suspended, but after investigation it was found that the suspension was not justified and he was awarded his retiring gratuity. They are paid one-half month salary for the first five years' service and a full month for each subsequent years in the service.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Is that the only explanation of the extraordinary number?

Mr. BUREAU. Atkins retired on account of physical unfitness for service; Bourke retired after the investigation into the escape of certain prisoners; Mr. Burr retired on account of ill-health and died since; Mr. McNeill retired, as I have explained, and Mr. McNiven and Mr. Whyte on account of ill-health.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. The minister's explanation is not so full as we might have expected. In addition to those to whom gratuities were paid, some permanent guards retired without gratuity. Is there any special reason for the retirement of T. B. Anderson.

Mr. BUREAU. The other guards retired voluntarily, because they thought they could do better outside of the penitentiary.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Do I understand the minister to say seriously that that was the reason for the retirement of Mr. Anderson and Mr. Theroux ?

Mr. BUREAU. I cannot assign the particular reasons. They were not asked for their resignations and were not dismissed by the department, but resigned voluntarily.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Well, I live at New Westminster and have considerable acquaintance with the affairs of the penitentiary there, and I have very positive information that Mr. Theroux did not retire voluntarily, and that there were very special circumstances connected with the request for his retirement. I would like the minister to inquire, before we proceed further, whether some of these incidents cannot be recalled now.

Mr. BUREAU. The only information we have in the department is that he forwarded his resignation, written by himself, to the minister, and that it was accepted.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Well, all I have to say is that the department is far from being

fully informed. Among these gratuities I notice that Mr. Bourke, who is shown by the report of the Minister of Justice to have been a very long time in the service, receives a retiring allowance of only $279.23. The circumstances must be very special to have him so niggardly dealt with.

Mr. BUREAU. That is for the period mentioned there, from July 23, 1886, to October 13, 1892. After fifteen years' service in the penitentiary, he becomes entitled to a superannuation allowance, which he is now getting, in addition.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. It is a fact, is it not, that Mr. Bourke has an application now before the department for a more substantial retiring allowance ?

Mr. BUREAU. Yes.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. May I ask what the claim is ?

Mr. BUREAU. He wants us to add ten years to his service.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. There is another interesting item on this page :

Canadian Detective Bureau, Vancouver: expenses searching for escaped convicts, $2,485.85

I would like some explanation of that.

Mr. BUREAU. This was paid for the services of those who were employed in connection with the Bill Miner escape, and those who escaped with him.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I would like the minister to supplement that by stating whether there were any results from their search ?

Mr. BUREAU. We heard about a month ago that they would probably be apprehended before long.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. According to an answer given in this House the other day, Bill Miner escaped on the 8th of August. Might I ask when this detective bureau were instructed in this matter.

Mr. BUREAU. They were instructed on the 15th day of August. The letter of instructions left on that date.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. What was the reason for the delay ?

Mr. BUREAU. We wanted to get Bill Miner's portrait printed, so that they would not be working at random. We had a lithograph made, and when it was ready, we sent it with the instructions.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. On page L—31 I find this item:

Lieutenant-Colonel A. P. Sherwood, commissioner of police, Ottawa: detective services. $150.

Was that also in connection with the Bill Miner case ?

Mr. BUREAU. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. And the commissioner of police was instructed when?

Mr. BUREAU. On the 12th day of August, the day we heard in Ottawa that Bill Miner had escaped.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. The hon. minister is in error there, because that does not agree with the answer given the other day, that the department heard on the 9th of August that Bill Miner had escaped.

Mr. BUREAU. They heard on the 8th that four convicts had escaped, and on the 12th they learned that Bill Miner was one of the four.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. In the annual report of the minister we read this at page 2:

The unusual number of escapes is a matter of extreme regret. All occurred at British Columbia penitentiary, and were due to general lack of discipline and to disregard of the prison regulation. The staff of the penitentiary has been reorganized, and several subsequent attempts to mutiny and escape have been frustrated. The tendency of some officers to act upon their individual judgment, in defiance of the established regulations, which are the product of decades of experience, invariably leads to disastrous results. The superior officer who disregards the instructions and regulations by which he is governed cannot enforce obedience from subordinates who naturally exercise the same right of private judgment in the discharge of their duties. The successful commander is he who has first learned to obey.

This paragraph charges general insubordination and neglect of duty or worse in the British Columbia penitentiary. I submit that when we are called upon to pass the estimates for the support of that institution, we are entitled to have a serious explanation from the minister in charge of it, and I ask him now to make a fuller explanation than has been made respecting the condition of affairs shown by this report to have existed in that institution.

Mr. BUREAU. I understand that at the time of the escape of Bill Miner, Bourke, the deputy warden, was acting as warden, and did not keep the discipline he ought to have kept, and it was for that reason that the escape took place. Now Mr. Bourke has disappeared, a new warden has been appointed, and the reorganization is complete.

Mr. BURRELL. I do not think that is exactly a satisfactory explanation. The case of Bill Miner was a specially notorious one in British Columbia, and indeed in the whole of western Canada. The man had held up railway trains, his exploits had attracted unusual attention on the other side of the line, and flattering references were made to the expeditious way in which justice was meted out to this man. Yet he

escaped on the 8th of August and the department responsible for the penitentiary did not know until the 12th of August that he had escaped, and did not take steps to recapture him until a week afterwards, when it was practically impossible to catch him.

Mr. BUREAU. When the officer in charge of the penitentiary wired of the escape he did not mention any names. He just said four prisoners had escaped. It was only on the twelfth that we had the name of Bill Miner mentioned in any despatch to the department. Immediately we gave instructions to try and recapture him if possible.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. When the inspector reports upon these penitentiaries, to whom does the report go? Does it go to the Solicitor General or to the Minister of Justice?

Mr. BUREAU. It goes to the Minister of Justice.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. It is the Minister of Justice who would be informed of this, if any minister were informed?

Mr. BUREAU. Certainly.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I am sorry to take up the time of the committee but I am afraid I must supply some of the details as to which the persons responsible for reporting these matters to the department have been so reticent. It has been common report in British Columbia for a long time that Bill Miner did not escape in the ordinary way, that his departure from the British Columbia penitentiary was connived at by persons high in the service of this country. That remained as a matter of mere report until very lately when this arraignment of the officers of the British Columbia penitentiary appeared in the report of the Minister of Justice. The retort to this was the statement by Mr. Bourke, the late deputy warden who had been retired, that he had in this connection some sensational and far reaching disclosures to make, and he added in a subsequent interview that Bill Miner did not escape from the British Columbia penitentiary but was virtually handed out, and that the other three prisoners were permitted to escape in order to cover up the Miner transaction. This statement has been made in the public press by Mr. Bourke, the late deputy warden. It was made a subject of inquiry by me in this House on the 1st of February, and the answer to my question was an intimation that the inspector had written to Mr. Bourke asking him to make the sensational disclosures which he indicated. But here is where the weak point of the procedure comes in; when we turn to Mr. Bourke's statement we find that the very man who asks him for the report is the man whom he charges with knowing something more about this affair than has been communicated to the department. I read in the New Westminster 'Columbian' of the 28th of January this statement said to have been made by Mr. Bourke:

Editor 'Daily Columbian.'

Sir,—Under the heading 'Dispatch from Ottawa gives wrong information,' appears an item in a local paper of to-day. Wrong impressions, where the escape of Bill Miner is hinted at, seem to be in order. Indeed right impressions of anything connected with the penitentiary service are about as rare as angels' visits; for, if a few good men were to retire, truth might be reckoned there among the lost arts.

It was my hope that when I tendered my resignation justice would be done me. It was also my hope that I would be allowed to spend the balance of my days in comparative quietness. These hopes are vanished. Justice has not been done me in the matter of my retiring allowance, and there is evidently a desire to pursue me into retirement with a spirit worse than vindictive. The secrets that I intended to keep must therefore become public. I have written to Ottawa for a report of the Minister of Justice, and if I find the reports to the press of this province correct, I shall open up a new field for moral reformers in which the evils, as compared with those in the old fields will be found as 16 to 1, that is, if moral reformers have courage enough to investigate.

He then proceeds to refer to some other matters which I need not read.

Mr. Bourke returned to the charge on the 3rd of February.

Mr. D. A. GORDON. Who is the editor of that paper you are quoting from?

Mr. HUGHES. That is immaterial.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. For the information of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gordon) I may tell him that I, when I am at home, am the editor of that paper, and that I am not ashamed of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HUGHES. And it is Bourke's own statement you are reading?

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Certainly, these are Mr. Bourke's statements, and I think the merriment of the hon. gentlemen opposite is very much out of place in the midst of an indictment like this.

Mr. BUREAU. Where is the indictment?

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. 'Where is the indictment?' asks the Solicitor General. What have we to hope from such a department of government when the second highest officer in the department having heard the charge that Bill Miner did not escape but was handed out from the penitentiary of New Westminster, returns the answer: Where is the indictment?

Mr. BUREAU. Bourke was in charge when he was handed out.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Mr. Bourke returns to the charge in this way:

I have just received the blue book and find your quotation as given in the 'Columbian' a few days ago——

Mr. BUREAU. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) allow me a question?

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Certainly.

Mr. BUREAU. Is this the Mr. Bourke who was in charge of the penitentiary at New Westminster at the time of the escape of Bill Miner?

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Yes, sir, this is the same Mr. Bourke who was in charge of the penitentiary, and he is therefore in a position to know what went on within the walls of that institution.

Mr. BUREAU. And he is a man who was under oath to keep good guard of the prisoners in the penitentiary.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. If the Solicitor General will kindly permit me to proceed without interrupting me I think I shall be able to show before I conclude that there is good ground for him to believe that persons who are nearer to him have also been disregardful of their oaths in this connection. Mr. Bourke proceeds to say in this second statement:

I have just received the blue book and find, your quotation, as given in the 'Columbian' a few days ago, correct. The die is now cast. The inspectors have left me no choice. I must remain under the cloud which they and their satellites have generated over me or appeal to the public. It may be said I should ask for an investigation. The value of an investigation depends entirely on the character and honour of the man conducting it From long experience and close observation of penitentiary investigations I am sorry to have to say I have not to-day one shred of confidence in them. A penitentiary investigation appears to me as a man clothed with authority to find out certain facts. He goes to work with a whitewash brush in one hand and a tar brush in the other and seeks diligently for everything but the facts required. If by any chance he finds these facts he applies the brush—the whitewash to those he likes, the tar to those he dislikes.

I have another objection to such investigations. I am strongly of opinion that their frequency and methods connected with them are largely responsible for the demoralized condition of that service.

Then he proceeds to moralize, which it is not necessary for me to read, and he concludes in this way:

The Bill Miner case alone would not give this opportunity. It is but an incident. I shall begin at once to collect and arrange my facts and when this is done which will probably be in a few weeks, I shall hand all to the press.

I submit that this statement by Mr. Bourke, which seems to have been brought to the attention of the department here, calls for a serious report to this House regarding the facts connected with this occurrence in British Columbia and as to what the department knows about it. The current report at New Westminster—for which I do not vouch because there is no way by which we can verify it except by the department giving us the facts in its possession—has been published in the press from time to time, as current news of this kind usually is, and that current report is to the effect that Bill Miner in his first train robbery—because he committed two in British Columbia—secured a quantity of valuable securities, and that the owners of these bonds endeavoured to induce him to state what he had done with them, but that he refused to make any communication unless he was released. Further, that certain persons, presumably detectives, were permitted to visit him in the penitentiary on several occasions before he escaped, or appeared to escape; that these persons were still in New Westeminster when he did escape, and that a few weeks before his escape his hair and moustache were allowed to grow, and at a later period he was allowed freedom from the interior of the prison, where criminals of his character are confined, and given the comparative liberty of the brick yard.

Mr. W. CHISHOLM. Did Mr. Bourke state or insinuate anything of that kind?

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I think I am making a statement so serious that I should not be interrupted. Mr. Bourke did not say that, so far as I know, but I say that it is common report.

Mr. W. CHISHOLM. Mr. Bourke will not say so.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. It is common report, and if the hon. gentleman has any further information it is his duty to disclose it. Before I have done with this business I propose to ask for an inquiry, and if that inquiry is granted, I shall see that the hon. gentleman is summoned as a witness. But in the meantime I would ask him not to interrupt the proceedings. The current report is that the very afternoon Miner escaped the fact was wired to the department at Ottawa and when the next day no answer was received, another message was sent to the department urging it to give a prompt reply and asking that a liberal reward be offered for his recapture. Not only one, but three, four, five and six days passed before the department at Ottawa was heard from and before a reward was offered; and when a reward was offered it was the paltry sum of $500 for the recapture of a desperado known all over the North American continent and whose liberty would be cheap to him at ten times that sum.

Mr. TALBOT. And his moustache was so grown you would not recognize him.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Apparently the hon. gentlemen who sit behind and support those responsible for the Justice Department see nothing but a subject for a slim joke in the circumstances I have related. I ask these hon. gentlemen who treat this as a joke if there be any crime in the calendar which they would condemn, when they treat as a matter for merriment the allegation that by the use of a golden key you may unlock the door of a penitentiary and allow to escape a criminal who had committed an offence so grave that pardon for it was out of the question. I am surprised that this matter should be treated in a spirit of levity by any one in this House. This escape of Miner is unique in this respect, that he was the only prisoner who ever got away from British Columbia with the exception of two halfbreeds who escaped from Wright's island, and one of them was recaptured a few days ago. Before this episode, such a thing as a clean getaway was unknown, because escaped prisoners were always caught again. We have in these rumours, all of which have found their way into the press, and in the personal statement of ex-Deputy Warden Bourke that Bill Miner did not escape, but was handed out, sufficient grounds for an investigation, not only into the management of the penitentiary, but into the connecting links between the Department of Justice and the penitentiary at Westminster, and we are entitled to be informed how it is that grave incidents connected with the visit of the inspector previous to the departure of Bill Miner were not reported to this department.

Mr. BUREAU. Does the hon. gentleman make the statement that shortly prior to the escape of Bill Miner there was a visit of the inspector to the penitentiary?

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I have it in the Auditor General's Report here, which gives the date of the visit

Mr. BUREAU. I am not disputing the statement. I did not understand what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I verified it from the Auditor General's Report before mentioning it in this House. The reason I asked if there was any particular incidents connected with the retirement of a couple of the guards shortly prior to Miner's escape, is because the story is current that one of those guards was found to have addressed to him a communication for Bill Miner, enclosing money, and that in consequence of this discovery he was told to resign; yet we are told now this man resigned voluntarily and his resignation was accepted.

Mr. BUREAU. Does the hon. gentleman know the name of the guard?

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. His name was Terroux and I have personal information as to the cause of his retirement. A close friend of his came to me, as a newspaper man in New Westminster, and begged that if we heard anything about his retirement we should not publish it because the poor fellow had been caught in the indiscretion of doing a little for a prisoner and was told he should resign. Later on it was alleged that he was acting as the go-between between some one on the outside of the penitentiary and Bill Miner. My information was that when the Terroux incident was reported, the inspector was actually present in the penitentiary, and that was what led me to ask in this House the other day whether the department had any knowledge of any communication from outside the penitentiary with convict Miner prior to his escape. The answer given me was 'No,' which would indicate that this incident of a receipt of a money letter by Miner was not communicated to the department; that the report was wrong that detectives were permitted to go into the cell and interview Miner there.

The answer I have received gives the contradiction to the story of the detectives which I have mentioned here to-night. I am aware of the discrepancy between this statement and that of the late deputy warden of New Westminster. But I say the situation is so grave, the whole chain of circumstances connected with Bill Miner's escape was so suspicious, even before that ex-deputy warden came forward with his extraordinary statements, that there is serious ground for some kind of inquiry so that this matter may be disposed of. I think the Minister of Justice cannot afford to let an incident like this be dismissed with a laugh on the part of his supporters. I do not think the Minister of Justice could have had the slightest suspicion of any thing of this kind having occurred without taking drastic measures immediately. I have confidence in the integrity of the head of that department. But the answer I have received here, and on a former occasion, leads me to believe that his subordinates have not conveyed to him the information which he should have received. Therefore I ask the minister, as the responsible head of the department to take steps to make a full inquiry and to see that the inquiry is conducted by some other person than the inspector who is now writing to Mr. Bourke, but who stands arraigned on the grave statement of Mr. Bourke to the public press.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I shall not attempt to make an answer to the observations of the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Taylor), as I have not been able to hear them. But I

welcome the opportunity to make to this committee a statement of the circumstances connected with the escape of this particular convict. I should say first that it was not only the only escape that had taken place that summer from this institution. The warden, Col. White, a gentleman who had been in charge of the penitentiary in British Columbia for many years, was at that time unable to discharge the duties of his position, from a serious illness which not only confined him to his room and his bed, but made it impossible to communicate with him on matters of business, and which afterwards turned out to be his final illness. In consequence of that illness the care and charge of the institution had devolved upon the deputy warden. Mr. Bourke had been an official in the service from 1886; he was a man, at all events of long experience, who had gone from the penitentiary in Manitoba to the penitentiary in British Columbia, and was a trusted official of the public service. There had been more than one previous escape that summer under circumstances which, at all events, seemed to indicate that there was a looseness of discipline, a lack of care, an absence of proper instructions to the guards in such a responsible position, and having charge of men of the character of convicts. After these previous escapes had taken place I was not a little taken aback, I am willing to admit, when, on the evening of 8th of August, 1907, a telegram was received from Mr. Bourke stating that four prisoners had escaped, giving no names, giving no particulars, and no indication of what was being done, or could be done, if anything could be done, to effect a recapture. The inspector, Mr. Dawson, was at that time upon official duties in Kingston, Ontario. The other inspector, Mr. Stewart, was in Ottawa; and he and I consulted with reference to what should be done with regard to the condition of things which appeared to exist in British Columbia. We did not doubt that without any instructions from Ottawa there would be at once every possible effort made by the acting warden, and by the guards and officials in charge of the institution, in so far as guards could be spared, to scour the country in every direction, and to make every possible effort to effect a recapture. I do not doubt that that was done. I did not doubt, upon the reports which subsequently were received, that every possible exertion was made by Mr. Bourke and those who were acting under him, to discover traces of the escaped prisoners and to effect a recapture. And I attributed to the excitement that such an occurrence necessarily would cause, and to the efforts which were undoubtedly made by all who were in charge to secure the recapture of the prisoners, if possible—I attributed I say, to that circumstance the fact that no additional communication came from Mr. Bourke on the subject until the 12th of August. But the extent of the message which then came, and which for the first time gave the slightest hint that Miner was one of those that had escaped, was a telegram which Mr. Bourke despatched on the 11th of August. When it reached Ottawa it was not addressed, as it ought to have been, and as I understand Mr. Bourke says his original message was addressed, to the inspectors, but it was addressed to Mr. Dawson individually. On receipt at Ottawa, instead of being delivered to me, or to Mr. Stewart, or to the department, it was repeated to Mr. Dawson at Kingston, and for that reason there was a delay in the delivery of that telegram of some hours, over night, and possibly some portion of a day. But immediately on that telegram being sent by Mr. Dawson to Mr. Stewart, and upon its reaching Ottawa, and upon my becoming acquainted with the fact that Miner was one of those that had escaped, I sent for Mr. Sherwood, the commissioner of Dominion police, and directed him at once to offer a reward for the apprehension of Miner, and to communicate immediately with a man who had recently been in the service, Mr. Chamberlain, of the Dominion Police, who had a few months before gone to Vancouver, and who was there in the position, I think, of chief of police for that city. That was done. Col. Sherwood acted with promptness, and without loss of even one hour. From the time when the first intimation came to us at Ottawa that Miner had escaped, every possible exertion was made, in the offer of a reward, and in securing the services of the best man we knew who could be obtained for the work, Mr. Chamberlain, to endeavour to assist the officials of the penitentiary to discover some traces of the escaped prisoners. These efforts turned out to be unavailing, the prisoners who escaped on that afternoon have not been found up to the present time. A reward was offered, the search continued until it was useless to search longer. Looking back after the event, and with the memory of the depositions which afterwards were taken, and of the exertions which were afterwards made by the officials, I am not able to see in any respect how any thing more could have been done after the escape had taken place by any of the officials of the penitentiary or of the department, in the effort to retrieve the misfortune which had fallen upon the institution and upon the country by the escape.

Mr. Dawson was sent at the earliest moment he could be spared from his duties in Eastern Canada to New Westminster to take charge of the institution. He arrived there on the 27th August. At once, in his

capacity as inspector, he assumed charge of the institution. He remained there until some time in the following December endeavouring to put that institution upon a more satisfactory footing in matter of discipline, in the matter of reorganization, and in endeavoring to find out by a long, patient, painstaking investigation what the trouble was and what was the explanation of the numerous escapes which had taken place during that summer. That investigation was conducted by Mr. Dawson under oath, exercising the powers which the Penitentiary Act confers upon him. The depositions of the witnesses were forwarded to Ottawa, were carefully examined by myself and are on the files of the department. As a result of that investigation in which a most careful effort was made to ascertain the whole truth of this matter, and to find out if possible, where the blame lay, it was thought that there must be some change in the management of the institution. Four prisoners scarcely walk out of a penitentiary or escape through a hole dug under the palisade in open daylight under the very eyes of guards or officials without there being somebody to blame. Mr. Bourke now speaks of the use of a whitewash brush or of a tar brush in every investigation, and speaks as if it were a question as to which had been applied to the officials in this case. I can only say that certainly no tar brush was applied to Mr. Bourke. He was the man in charge, the responsibility rested primarily and to a greater extent upon him than upon any one else. I do not mean that his eye was watching when the escape took place, but it was his duty, his business, his power and right, to assign the different gangs of convicts to the different guards about the institution. It was he who directed where the men were to work upon any given day, what guard, or guards, were to be in charge, who stationed the officials and who was, in that sense, responsible. Mr. Bourke's resignation was not demanded. Mr. Bourke was not dismissed. Mr. Bourke was allowed to retire and was given his retiring allowance calculated upon the full basis of his service. He thought that the rule which, in some instances, had been, years ago, applied to officials in the service by which, in calculating the amount of their superannuation or retiring allowance, ten years was added to their actual period of service, ought to have been applied to in his case. He asked that ten years should be added to his years of service for the purpose of computing his superannuation or retiring allowance. I had to tell him that that had never been done by this government, that, as a matter of policy, I, at any rate, was opposed to the whole pension system and that in so far as his proposition was concerned I could not recommend the granting of what he asked. Mr. Bourke, in his letters to the newspapers on this subject says, according to one of the clippings before me, that his quarrel in this matter—he calls it his quarrel—is with the inspectors. He says:

> My quarrel is with the employees and the officials of penitentiary service, not with the government or Minister of Justice.

Mr. Bourke has a grievance. Mr. Bourke complains that ten years was not added to his service in addition to the actual number of years that he had served in computing his retiring allowance or superannuation. I can only attribute to his feeling of not being dealt with as he thinks he ought to have been the course which he has recently seen fit to take in regard to this matter. He takes offence, or he objects to the remarks which have been made by the inspectors in their annual report, and which have been referred to. That language is, as it purports to be, the language of the inspectors themselves. They say in their report to me:

> The unusual number of escapes is a matter of extreme regret. All occurred at British Columbia penitentiary, and were due to general lack of discipline and to disregard of the prison regulations. The staff of the penitentiary has been reorganized, and several subsequent attempts to mutiny and escape have been frustrated. The tendency of some officers to act upon their individual judgment, in defiance of the established regulations, which are the product of decades of experience, invariably leads to disastrous results. The superior officer who disregards the instructions and regulations by which he is governed cannot enforce obedience from subordinates who naturally exercise the same right of private judgment in the discharge of their duties. The successful commander is he who has first learned to obey.

I did not pen these words. I read them, they were put before me, I approved them then and I approve them now. I think the circumstances called for at least that amount of comment. But, Mr. Bourke, seeing these statements or comments in the report of the inspectors, appears to have rushed into the newspapers; in fact, if I am to credit the statements which he makes in either an interview or a signed letter published in the Daily 'Columbian' of New Westminster on the 3rd of February, he is appealing to public opinion to right him in this matter. I can only say that, seeing as I did on the 29th of January, in the Eastern Canadian newspapers, a telegraphic item that Mr. Bourke stated that he was in a position to make sensational disclosures, I immediately, upon my reaching Ottawa, having read this statement on the train coming to Ottawa, instructed the inspectors to communicate with Mr. Bourke and to demand—to demand as a right—that he should put the department in pos-

session of any information whatever which he had. It is true that Mr. Bourke gave evidence in this matter while the occurrences were fresh. Mr. Bourke was examined at great length before Mr. Dawson in the investigation which took place in the fall of 1907 and while the events were fresh in the minds of everybody. His evidence is upon file in the department and he was sworn not only to answer the questions that were put to him, but to tell the whole truth in regard to this matter. If, notwithstanding his duty as an official of the department and the oath under which he was testifying, he kept back material circumstances which he did not then disclose, it seems to me the disclosure of those circumstances now will come from him with far less weight than if he had told them when under oath to tell the whole truth. Mr. Bourke was written to on January 30 in these terms :

Dear Sir,—An item appeared in a few of the Ontario newspapers yesterday stating that you are in a position to make disclosures regarding the escape of Bill Miner on August 8, 1907.

For the information of the minister will you please furnish us at once with a statement of any information you may possess regarding the matter, that you have not already disclosed?

That letter has not yet, I suppose, had time, in the course of post, to produce an answer here; at all events no answer has yet come. But Mr. Bourke in the meantime has not thought fit to keep silent; he has communicated to the newspapers in the way indicated and yesterday copies of the British Columbia newspapers of February 3, containing the substance of interviews with him or articles written by him reached Ottawa and were seen by me. I refer only to one thing in the communication which the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the committee has in part, or possibly in whole, read. Mr. Bourke speaking of investigations, says:

I have another objection to such investigations. I am strongly of opinion that their frequency and the methods connected with them are largely responsible for the demoralized condition of that service.

I do not know to what Mr. Bourke refers in speaking of frequency. I had not been in charge of the Department of Justice much more than a year when this investigation took place in the fall of 1907, but I have asked those who have been connected with the department for many years in regard to the frequency of investigations referred to by Mr. Bourke and I am told that for more than twelve years there had never been a single investigation in the penitentiary of British Columbia, or occasion for it, until these repeated and numerous escapes in the summer of 1907 called for investigation and inquiry. In these circumstances I am at a loss to understand what is meant by this allusion to these frequent investigations, and I can only say in regard to the attitude which Mr. Bourke has seen fit to take in this whole matter, that if he had communicated directly with the department, either upon the occasion of the escape itself, or upon the occasion of the subsequent investigation, or upon the occasion of his application for a retiring allowance and superannuation or at this date, and before he had resorted to the newspapers for his vindication his representations would have received the most careful attention and consideration which it was in my power to give.

Allusions are made, hints are thrown out, I do not know but statements have been made, it may be that it has been in so many words charged that this was no real escape on the part of the malefactor Miner, that this was something connived at, something assisted by some one in connection with the institution, or some one of the authorities. I can say nothing in that respect except what I know. When a general charge is levelled at everybody at large and it is said that somebody connived, somebody assisted, somebody helped, I do not know who is meant. I can speak for myself at all events and I think I can speak for the officials of the penitentiaries branch of the Department of Justice and repudiate any such insinuation and say that there is not one word, one breath, of foundation for it. Reference is made I understand, to some rumour or story or canard to the effect that there were bonds hidden, stolen property, the secret of whose hiding place was known to Miner and that there was some arrangement, understanding, proposition or suggestion that if there were disclosure of that secret by him his escape would be winked at, he would be allowed to go. There was some allusion to such a thing by some witnesses in the investigation to which I referred. An effort was made to trace the thing up to find if there was the remotest ground or reason under the sun for thinking that any such thing had taken place. It was investigated, so far as was possible to investigate such a shadowy vague and unsubstantial rumour, and it was found to be exactly what I described, absolutely unfounded. If Mr. Bourke has information in regard to the existence of any such understanding, I wish certainly that he would make it known. It is my desire, it must be the desire of every member of this committee, it must be the desire of every citizen of this country who has its welfare or the enforcement of its laws at heart that if there be the slightest reason for supposing even that such a thing is a fact, those reasons should be known and the matter should be put

before this House and before the public. I hope at any rate that if Mr. Bourke is possessed of any information whatever which he has not already disclosed he will respond to the demand which has been made upon him and give us the benefit of that information at once.

There has not been on the part of the department here or of the inspectors or of myself or any one in authority at Ottawa, any delay any laxity, any resting on our oars ; from the very hour when the first knowledge that action was taken and everything was done that could be done in the effort to find the man and to restore him to the institution from which he had gone.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I would like to contrast the very interesting and important statement just made by the minister with the manner in which we were endeavoured to be put off by the Solicitor General when I raised this question an hour ago. I would like to put it to the committee if the statement just made by the Minister of Justice does not warrant the course I took in insisting that we should have an explanation upon this subject. If it does not condemn the attitude of the Solicitor General, who must have known the facts which have just been stated to the House by the Minister of Justice and yet deliberately concealed them from this committee when challenged and invited over and over again by me to give an explanation on this subject——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must not use the term ' deliberately conceal ' in the House.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. If I have gone beyond the bounds of parliamentary decorum, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the term ' deliberately concealed ' from the House, but I wish to say that when an hon. minister is entrusted with the duty of putting estimates through this House, and gives answers as of his own knowledge to questions put to him by a member of the House, he should at least be posted; and that we are entitled to view with distrust other statements when we find him deliberately disposing of a great question like this with the statement that there is nothing in it, in view of the fact that the answer of the Minister of Justice a few moments afterwards shows that there is a great deal in it, and that the department was fully informed on it when the Solicitor General was not. I would like to correct the hon. Minister of Justice on one point. He says that this was not the first escape from the British Columbia penitentiary, but was only one of a series of escapes. That is an error. The report of his own department shows that there were only six escapes during the year—these four and two subsequently from Wright's Island near the New Westminster penitentiary. There were no previous escapes from that penitentiary, so far as I know, or as indicated by the report. To that extent the minister appears to have been misinformed. I would like to call attention to the fact that the most grave passages of the story which I have related to this House have not been dealt with. For instance, the current report in New Westminster is that the guard Theroux was dismissed or ordered to resign because he was found passing communications from the outside to Miner. That has not been dealt with at all, and I submit that we are entitled to an answer as to that. There is also the further report that certain detectives were interviewing Bill Miner. That is either so or not so; I do not know; it is currently reported in New Westminster and that too has not been answered. If we had the positive assurance of the minister that the department never gave permission to any person to go in there and interview Miner, it would do a great deal to clear up the cloud that hangs over this transaction. We have also heard nothing from the hon. minister as to the suggestion that there should be an impartial inquiry into this affair, because, as we have seen, the only answers that have been made so far have been made by the inspector, the very person whom the ex-deputy warden accuses; and therefore, even if he is as innocent as an unborn babe, even if this charge of the ex-deputy warden is simply from pique that his demand for a greater gratuity is not acceded to, it is not proper that the inquiry should be at the hands of the person accused. We should have some statement as to what course the department intends to take, and therefore I would suggest that this item should stand until the minister can read ' Hansard ' and learn what has been said here, post himself on the facts and make a statement to this committee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would not be disposed to attach too much credit to statements such as have emanated from Mr. Bourke, seeing that he has had an opportunity already of giving evidence upon oath and making known any of the alleged facts to which he alludes in his recent statements to the newspapers. The Minister of Justice in speaking of the communication to Mr. Bourke, said that he had demanded from him, not as of grace, but as of right, full information respecting the facts to which Mr. Bourke had made allusion. When we heard the letter read, it did not seem to me that it quite bore out the view of the minister in that regard, because it was couched in the terms of a very polite request rather than of a distinctly stern demand upon this man to make known matters which must have come to his knowledge as an official of the government of this country, if at all. It was: ' Will you please give information

to the department of any of these matters to which you are alluding?' It does not seem to me that this is the way in which the government of this country should deal with a man who had made statements of that kind. He was the deputy warden, the acting warden, in charge of this penitentiary at the time the escape took place. Mr. Bourke has said either too much or too little, and I think the answer that ought to be given to him by the government as those responsible to this parliament, would be to summon him at once before a committee of this House to tell upon oath all he knows of this matter. That is the only way to deal with a man who has made the very grave statements that apparently he has made in the newspaper press. This is due to the government, the parliament and the people of this country; because so long as statements of this kind go abroad and remain uninvestiagted or are treated with indifference, they are bound to bring the administration of justice—and the punishment of offenders is strictly a part of it—into contempt. I therefore suggest to the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General that they should take at once into their grave and serious consideration whether this man should not be brought before a committee of this House, and the statements which he has made so frequently in the public press tested by a thorough strict and stern examination of him upon oath in order that he either withdraw or make good.

Mr. BUREAU. Replying to the hon. leader of the opposition, I may state that his suggestion will have careful consideration. He knows my position and the position of the Minister of Justice. I do not form part of the Cabinet, and if he will allow me to confer with the minister, I have no doubt the request will be granted. As to my hon. friend, who is the editor of a paper in New Westminster, I am surprised at the attitude he takes when he says I deliberately concealed information which I had from the House. He has no ground for that statement. He asked for the reasons why So-and-So was retired. I gave the information as I had it from the officer in charge of the institution. I have no apology to make for my conduct to this House. I have never tried to conceal or hide anything. Whatever answers I gave were true answers, giving the information that was conveyed to me. As to the details of Miner's escape, the hon. member never asked me to go into the history of it or tell him what passed between the government and the officials. To the questions put I gave the answers. He asked if we had heard any news about Miner. I told him exactly the information as conveyed to me by the inspector. He asked what the money was used for. I stated for the purposes indicated in the Auditor General's Report. The hon. gentleman comes with bad grace to claim that we are trying to conceal anything or that we are not true to our trust before the House when he takes common report from the streets, when he takes the stuff he fills his paper with.

The hon. gentleman takes common rumour and sets that against the statement of a man examined under oath. He does this to suit his purpose, and it comes with bad grace from one who will do this, to throw suspicion on the honesty and the loyalty of those who represent the Department of Justice. My answer to questions on the estimates, I admit, may not be as clear as they should be, and I admit that I may at times weary some members of the committee by asking them to repeat their questions, but my hon. friend must not forget that when I am talking English I am not talking my mother tongue, and I think that there is sufficient patience and courtesy in this House to bear with me under the circumstances. At times I may make use of a word which is not technically correct, but when I do so, I do not think that warrants any hon. gentleman in taking advantage of my lack of knowledge and saying that I have given an offensive answer or have tried to deceive the House. And when my attention is drawn to any slip I may inadvertently make, I think I can rely on the kindness of my neighbour to tell me what is the proper word to use. The hon. member for New Westminster tried to throw a cloud over an official of the Department of Justice, the inspector, Mr. Dawson. The hon. gentleman insinuates that there must have been some connivance between some officer high in authority in the administration of our penitentiaries and the convict Miner. But how could there be any connivance between the authorities in Ottawa and the officials in New Westminster? How could there be any plot and conspiracy except by writing or wire? I submit further to the fairness of this committee, who would have been the man at the other end of the line, on the Pacific coast, to hold the strings and be the chief medium in any connivance with the officials in Ottawa? It would certainly be the man highest in authority in the administration of the penitentiaries, Mr. Bourke. And if Mr. Bourke knew that the officials in Ottawa were not doing their duty, if he knew that they were trying to have Miner escape, and did not disclose that when under oath, why does not Mr. Bourke—who wants now to take the public into his confidence and show them how badly he was treated by the department—and what a rascal is the inspector of penitentiaries—why does he not now produce those letters published in my hon. friend's paper? I suppose the reason is that he has not got them. There can be no other reason. I am sure he has not got them. I know, from the knowledge I have of the

administration of the Department of Justice, that not a shadow of suspicion ought to be cast on Mr. Dawson the inspector of penitentiaries. There is no man in the whole service who stands higher in the esteem of his chief and of all concerned with the administration of the department than does Mr. Dawson, and I repeat there is no ground for the suspicion cast upon him by the hon. member for New Westminster to-night. If the hon. gentleman has any charges to make, let him make them. It is his duty to do so. If he has any proof, it is his duty to make a charge, and show that among our officials, in whom we have every confidence, there are men who are betraying their trust, and in this way he will give us an opportunity to inquire into the facts and see that justice is meted out.

The hon. gentleman said that just shortly prior to Miner's escape, one of our inspectors had visited the penitentiary. Well, it was the time for his yearly visit. It was in the month of June, when he went to New Westminster to inspect the penitentiary, as he does in that month every year. During that time, the hon. gentleman insinuates, Theroux had letters and money for Miner.

In this way the hon. gentleman tried to convey the impression that the inspector was in connivance with all those people to procure Miner's escape. And all his insinuations are based on what he calls public rumours. In this way he tries to connect the inspector of penitentiaries with what he says was not an escape but the handing out of a prisoner.

The hon. gentleman insists upon the fact that there were detectives who visited the convict Miner shortly prior to his escape. Well, I am informed that there were, but what was the reason? Miner was arrested for the Kamloops hold-up. The detectives wanted him to give evidence on the Mission hold-up because they thought he knew something about it, and in fact was the guilty party. In this attempt to seek information and discover the culprit, I see nothing reprehensible. That is done in every penitentiary when we believe that convicts can give important information which will lead to the discovery and arrest of criminals.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When did the visits of these detectives take place?

Mr. BUREAU. During the twelve months that proceeded Miner's escape, I am told by the inspector that there were several visits made to him, but that convicts are not allowed to see any one alone. Consequently in every one of these visits the detectives were accompanied by the warden or deputy warden. In this case Mr. Dwight was present with the detectives who visited Miner.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the date of the last visit?

Mr. BUREAU. I cannot say definitely. The information is given from memory only. But the last interview between Miner and the detectives was in the presence of the warden Dwight; and as he was ill quite a few months prior to Miner's escape, I could not give the exact date.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would my hon. friend be good enough to give any information with regard to another fact which was mentioned, and which seems to have some significance, if well founded. I refer to the dismissal of a guard for the alleged offence of having been the means of communication between persons outside and the convict Miner inside the penitentiary?

Mr. BUREAU. As far as the department is concerned, the only information we have is the letter of Theroux and there is nothing in that letter stating that his resignation was asked. He sent in his resignation. There is nothing on the files, nor any letters showing that his resignation has been asked for. He had sent in his resignation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was that during Mr. Bourke's regime.

Mr. BUREAU. I cannot tell from memory; it was sent in in June or July and it was accepted at once.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is important to know whether it was when Mr. Bourke was in charge.

Mr. BUREAU. I am not as familiar with this matter as is the Minister of Justice, and I will confer with him and get all the information I can and convey it to the House. I do not want to have it believed, as my very kind friend (Mr. J. D. Taylor) has insinuated, that if the thing was sifted to the bottom the Solicitor General would be found to have connived at the escape of Bill Miner. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) need not stay awake about that. If the Solicitor General has not conveyed any further information to the House it is due to the fact that the Solicitor General has no further information to convey. There never was on my part any idea of deceiving the House or withholding information from it. I want to say further, that so far as the Department of Justice is concerned, and so far as the Minister of Justice is concerned—and upon that subject I know his views, because we have conferred very often on the question of the officials—there is no man who stands higher and whose character is more above suspicion than Mr. Dawson the inspector who my hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Taylor) has been trying by insinuation and innuendo to connect with this escape.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It would be important that the Solicitor General should confer with the Minister of Justice about that particular incident.

Mr. BUREAU. What incident?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The incident with reference to the guard Theroux.

Mr. BUREAU. I will try and find out the exact state and get all the information available as to why he was permitted to resign.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And whether or not at the time of his resignation it was known to the department here, or to Mr. Bourke, or whoever was in charge of the institution, that he had been guilty of some offence of this character.

Mr. BUREAU. I will get all the records of the department and bring them down.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If necessary it would justify communication by telegram with the authorities of the penitentiary in British Columbia.

Mr. BUREAU. I will do it.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I would like to correct the Solicitor General in his impression that I attributed to him any knowledge of these circumstances. In fact, I was careful to ask him very early in my remarks whether these reports if made would be made to him or to the Minister of Justice, and he replied that they would be made not to him, but to the Minister of Justice, and, therefore, as I thought, he escaped from the situation altogether. I wish to say also that the Solicitor General is very unjust to me when he insinuated that in any sense I reflected on the manner in which he addressed this House or upon the language he used.

Mr. BUREAU. You said I deliberately concealed what I knew.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I am sure that in no remarks I have made to this House have I been guilty of rudeness to any hon. member and much less have I been guilty of so gross an offence as to venture to criticise the English of the Solicitor General whose mother tongue is French and who speaks our language so beautifully. I would like to point out that there is still another point not cleared up in this transaction—and if the Solicitor General would try once or twice more to forget his resentment towards me in that I have drawn from him the very interesting information that we have at last succeeded in extracting—if he would forget that and deal with some of the points I put before him it would be very much more to the purpose. There is this other matter on which I would like to have information, and that is whether or not Miner was prepared for departure from the institution prior to his escape. It is the practice in these institutions that when a convict is about to end his term his hair and moustache are allowed to grow. The story current there is —and I have never heard it denied and it has not been denied by the Solicitor General to-night—that Miner was prepared in these two particulars to remove all traces of a convict from him. We knew nothing of the bonds before, until the Minister of Justice told us that came out in the investigation. The Solicitor General could not tell us that. The report of the visit of the detectives was only a street rumour before, and now the Solicitor General tells us that also is correct. Then we come to this other feature of the story, and I ask whether or not Miner was prepared for departure from the penitentiary two or three weeks before he actually got out. I renew my suggestion that full information respecting all these things should be given before we pass this item.

Mr. BUREAU. The information at our disposal is a sworn statement from the officer in charge that Miner's hair was less than three-quarters of an inch long when he left the penitentiary.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. As a preliminary to this discussion I put this question to the government a short time ago:

Q. Had the department any knowledge of communication from outside the penitentiary with convict Miner prior to his escape.
A. No.

The statement to the House to-night is that detectives visited him on a dozen occasions in the year preceding his escape.

Mr. BUREAU. I explained that.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. How did you explain it?

Mr. BUREAU. These detectives when they go on official duty are not considered strangers; they are on special service.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. That reminds me that the minister stated to this committee that these detectives had gone to Miner to ask him whether or not he had committed the Mission hold-up. There was no doubt at all in the mind of any person in British Columbia about that; there was the fact stated that Miner was recognized and was well known as the man who did commit the Mission hold-up. Even if it were not known, I submit to any lawyer in this House whether it is a rational statement to be made that detectives would be permitted to go into a cell to interview a convict to obtain evidence from him to incriminate himself That evidence could not be used against him afterwards.

Mr. BUREAU. The name of the detective is Bullock and he was trying to get information about the Mission hold up. My hon. friend says it was common knowledge in British Columbia that Miner was the

guilty one in that. Why did not my hon. friend produce that evidence before the the tribunal which tried him.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. He was not tried on that charge.

Mr. BUREAU. He was not tried because they did not have the evidence. Why did you not give to those interested in the administration of justice the evidence as to that?

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. He was not tried on that charge.

Mr. BUREAU. They could not try him unless they had the evidence.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. He was tried for an offence committed a year later and convicted for that offence and sentenced to life imprisonment. What more could you do to him?

Mr. BUREAU. But he may not have been alone in the Mission hold up.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. The story is that these bonds were stolen in the Mission hold up and the Solicitor General bears that out.

Mr. BUREAU. Certainly, they were trying to know what had been done about it; they were trying to get evidence. If we folded our arms and did nothing the hon. gentleman would say: look at the Department of Justice, it is doing nothing, our lives are not safe on the street, and the 'Columbian' would have come out with a warning to the people to carry revolvers and daggers to protect themselves because justice was not administered. But when we try to get information, then we are doing wrong, we are guilty of a connivance with wrong. That may be the hon. gentleman's view, but I do not agree with him.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. The minister stated just now, as I understood him, that these bonds were supposed to have been stolen at the Mission hold up, and he said that certainly we were trying to get information about them. Am I correct?

Mr. BUREAU. I am informed that the object of the interview with Bullock was to get information from Miner about the property that was stolen, he went to the same source of information as my hon. friend. He is informed by common rumour that there were Australian bonds among that property, and they were trying to get from Miner whether he had any knowledge of what disposition was being made of the property.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Solicitor General says, as I understood him, that these detectives were admitted because they were officials.

Mr. BUREAU. No, I did not mean that, I said they were on official duty, going there to seek information.

Mr. BUREAU.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Did they go there at the instance of the government of Canada?

Mr. BUREAU. Speaking from memory, these people were trying to investigate this matter at the instance of the railway company, who were then held responsible for the loss by the express company. They were acting on behalf of the company to get all the information they could about the property.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There seems to be more in the suggestion than one would have gathered from the remarks of the Minister of Justice. We understood from his remarks that this had been investigated and that there was absolutely nothing in it.

Mr. BUREAU. Among the officials of the penitentiary.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I gather from the Minister of Justice and from the Solicitor General that the whole blame for the escape of the four prisoners is cast upon the deputy warden. In view of that, and in view of the strictures laid upon that gentleman by the commission, in which they say there was an unusual number of escapes due to that gentleman's lack of discipline and lack of enforcing the prison regulations, acting in defiance of the instructions of the department—in view of all that, I would like to ask the department if they still intend to superannuate that gentleman, and give him the same treatment as would be given to any man who was retired without any stain upon his record. I understand that superannuation can only be given to a man who has discharged his duties satisfactorily and maintains his reputation for integrity and honesty.

Mr. BUREAU. There was no charge against his reputation. He was accused of being slack in the observance of penitentiary discipline, but that was nothing against his character.

Mr. BURRELL. As representing a constituency in which this robbery took place, I would like to say one word. I want to express the very strong feeling there was throughout the whole of the province at the desperate character of this man's crime, and to ask hon. gentlemen opposite not to treat this whole matter as if it were one in which we were trying to take a party advantage. Hon. gentlemen opposite have no right to assume that I am trying to make party capital out of an incident in regard to which I value the standard of public justice in Canada more highly than I do party advantage. The feeling in that community was of so grave a character that it was participated in by all men regardless of their party affiliations, and I say that we ought to consider this matter as in-

volving the good name of the whole Dominion, and to appreciate that there is a general desire to clear it up in the interest of justice. That in broad daylight so notorious and so desperate a character as Miner was allowed to escape, and apparently, as has been pointed out by my hon. friend, there is evidence to show that that man's hair was allowed to grow in an unusual way, that he was allowed to escape in broad daylight from a penitentiary equipped, as this was, when the moral effect of his capture and his sentence had been so salutary throughout the whole of British Columbia, then I say the matter is sufficiently grave to require that it be probed to the bottom by the department. I do not know this man Bourke, but I agree with the leader of the opposition in saying that either Bourke has said too much or he has said too little.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM. Does the hon. gentleman mean to insinuate that any of the officials of the department were privy to the escape of Miner ?

Mr. BURRELL. If the hon. gentleman can construe any word that has come out of my mouth to-night in such a way as he suggests, he does not understand the King's English. I am speaking on behalf of my constituents, and expressing the moral effect of this whole affair in British Columbia. I say again that this man Bourke has either said too much or too little, and that the matter is so grave that it should be probed. I think the hon. gentlemen opposite should realize that there are many of us in British Columbia who value the standard and reputation of Canadian justice more than we do party advantage.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM. Referring to the statement of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) to the effect that Mr. Bourke said too much or too little, did that hon. gentleman come to his conclusion from the remarks of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor). I wish to put a question to the hon. member for New Westminster. Will he undertake to say that Mr. Bourke suggests in any way whatever that the escape of Miner was due to any negligence, improper conduct or connivance of any of the officials of the penitentiary in British Columbia ? I am not here to defend Mr. Bourke. I know Mr. Bourke, or I know of him as a Tory of the Tories. I realize that hon. gentlemen opposite have placed Mr. Bourke in a false light, and I rise for the purpose of protesting against the aspersion which has been cast upon his character. An aspersion has been cast upon his character by reason of the assertions which were made by hon. gentlemen opposite which assertions have been referred to as if they were expressions of opinion by Mr. Bourke himself. The hon. member for New Westminster went on to explain how it was that Miner had escaped. He read extracts from interviews and letters published in newspapers, from Mr. Bourke and the impression that would be conveyed to the mind of any ordinary hearer is that Mr. Bourke has made these charges. I venture, for one, to say, that Mr. Bourke never made any such charges, that the charges that the hon. member for New Westminster has referred to are charges which were found in the newspaper of which he has been the editor or with which he is connected.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I ask, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Chisholm) is in order in stating that the letters which I read to the House as letters of Mr. Bourke were not letters of Mr. Bourke but fabrications of that newspaper.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM. I never said anything of the kind. The point of order is entirely too premature. The impression which was conveyed to the House by the remarks of the hon. gentleman was that the sentiments which he expressed were the sentiments of Mr. Bourke.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I ask your ruling, Mr. Chairman, on the point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I did not hear the hon. gentleman's point of order. Would he kindly state it again?

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman stated that whereas I had read to this committee, as statements of Mr. Bourke, the extracts which I did read here, they were not the statements of Mr. Bourke but they were statements of the newspaper with which my name is connected. I say that is a reflection upon my honour as a member of this House.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM. The hon. gentleman——

Some HON. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) has the right to explain before the decision is given on the point of order.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM. The hon. member for New Westminster objects that I should ascribe certain sentiments to him. I did not ascribe them to him at all, but what I did state was that the remarks that he made in explanation of the escape of Miner, would, under the circumstances convey the impression that Mr. Bourke had given expression to these sentiments. Now, what I said is that he misled the committee —not intentionally——

Mr. TALBOT. You cannot tell that.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM. I am willing to grant that it was not done intentionally. But, he misled the committee by quoting

from interviews and letters written by Mr. Bourke, not finding fault in a general way, but interviews and letters which did not contain one single iota of a charge against the penitentiary in any way, shape or form, and then the hon. member for New Westminster supplemented that by a statement of his own.

Mr. SPROULE. I ask if this is speaking to the point of order or if it is pressing an argument on another question. We should have the ruling.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM. If I have trespassed against the rules of the House I certainly withdraw anything I have said of that character. But the point that I am endeavouring to make is that I know Mr. Bourke, and that whatever may be his faults in so far as discipline is concerned, whatever may be his weakness, I know him to be a strong Conservative, a man of honour and integrity, and it is on that ground that I rise up to protest against the impression that is sought to be created in the minds of hon. members of the House by reason of the remarks made by hon. gentlemen opposite. I am quite sure that Mr. Bourke will exclaim 'save me from my friends' when he reads 'Hansard' to-morrow. The hon. member for New Westminster said that a friend of Mr. Bourke came to the newspaper office and suggested that this thing should not be ventilated in the press.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is not what I said.

Mr. W. CHISHOLM. Mr. Theroux had said that he did not want to have this thing ventilated in the press, but right at once Mr. Bourke goes to the press himself and supplies the series of articles that appeared in the paper. Let any man read those articles and tell me if he can find in them a single charge against the penitentiary. All that these articles do is to ventilate the grievance of Mr. Bourke because he did not receive superannuation. It is true that Mr. Bourke believes that he is entitled to superannuation. It is true that he says that under a previous administration there is a precedent for granting him the superannuation. That is a debatable point. It may be that morally he is entitled to it. But, as the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) pointed out, there is no case within his knowledge in which such a procedure had been adopted. The whole point is whether they could add time to the time he had already served in order to entitle him to superannuation. Mr. Bourke does not say that he has been treated unjustly or unfairly, but he does say that he is entitled to superannuation, while the Department of Justice say he is not. Whom are we to follow in this matter? Whom are we to suppose right in the matter? We must come to the conclusion that the Minister of Justice and the government are right. I merely rose for the purpose of protesting against any aspersion being cast on the character of Mr. Bourke. Whatever may be his weakness as a disciplinarian and as an officer he is a thoroughly honourable man.

Mr. BUREAU. I was going to ask hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, as there will be considerable discussion upon this point, to let the item stand as it has been agreed and go on with the items for Alberta. There is only one other item left outside of British Columbia. We can leave that and it will bring us back to the discussion of this matter.

Some resolutions reported.

Hon. Mr. PATERSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the leader of the House kindly tell us what will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. PATERSON. If the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) returns to-night from the Forestry Convention in Toronto, the resolution standing in his name, dealing with the Civil Service, will be taken up first. If that is disposed of, it will be followed by the estimates of the Indian and Interior Departments. If the Minister of Agriculture is not here then we will go into supply at once on the Indian and Interior estimates of the Railway Department.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, February 12, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT—INJURIES DUE TO MOTOR VEHICLES.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 60) to amend the Criminal Code respecting injuries to persons due to motor vehicles.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Explain.

Mr. LEWIS. This Bill proposes to deal with a class of offences upon our highways caused by vehicles that were not in common use at the time the Criminal Code was introduced, I refer to automobiles. While I understand that this parliament has no control over the King's highway,

still persons in the rural districts who built the highways for their own use are now very much troubled by automobiles. This Bill proposes to punish drivers of automobiles who are reckless, and who violate the law. It is modelled on the Bill introduced last session in reference to the same matter. I trust that the government, if they do not see fit to allow this Bill to pass, will at least add an amendment to the Criminal Code providing the needed legislation and place on crown officials the duty of finding and prosecuting drivers who break the law. It is true that the owner of an automobile has to keep his vehicle numbered, but when you are tangled up in the ditch with a frightened horse, there is little time given to find the number. I have here an item from the Toronto 'Mail and Empire.' which says that automobiles coming round the corners and dashing through crowds are becoming a menace to people travelling on the streets of Toronto.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CIVIL SERVICE SALARIES.

House again in committee to consider the proposed resolution granting an increase of salaries to civil servants.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). This resolution has been before the committee for some time, and I do not know whether any further discussion is required. A Bill will be introduced founded upon it, but in the meantime I will be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. FOSTER. I made an objection to a certain part of this resolution the other day, and asked the minister to look into it:

That all sums of money voted by parliament for the financial year ending on March 31, 1909, and applicable to the payment of salaries or increase of salaries of persons in the inside service shall be applicable to the payment of increases of salary granted under the Act to be founded in this resolution, so far as such sums are not required for the specific purposes for which they were granted; and during the said financial year there may be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada such moneys required for the payment of increases of salary hereunder as have not been voted by parliament.

I did not see why it was necessary to have that now when parliament was assembled and it would be quite possible to name the exact amount which is necessary, to bring down an estimate and vote it in the regular way. I pointed out that it is an altogether irregular way of arranging for expenditures—to take the whole consolidated revenue and dip into it as is necessary. The whole basis of parliamentary appropriation is a specific request for a specific purpose.

Mr. FISHER. The question is one of convenience in the payments. I do not think there would be any difference at all in the amount which would have to be paid out. This statute, when passed, will define clearly and distinctly what moneys have to be paid out. It would be a mere question of going over the lists of the Civil Service and calculating how much each one would receive and what the aggregate amount would be. It is hoped that this Bill will pass before long and that the payments will then be available for the civil servants. If the procedure of my hon. friend were adopted we would have to have a supplementary item in the estimates, a special item, probaly, put through for that purpose. I would not have any objection to it if there was any particular object to be gained, but I have not seen any object in it. The statute will define what the amount will be in conjunction with the lists which have been presented and which are before the House of all those who are eligible for this increase. I have had statements made up, copies of which I will lay on the table if desired, showing the exact amounts payable to practically every civil servant. Of course my hon. friend might say that with these copies we might at once make up an estimate. But if the Bill passes the money can then be paid over to the Civil Service without any further delay or waiting for a supplementary estimate to be passed. That is the only view I have in regard to the matter. I am not quarrelling at all with my hon. friend's suggestion, but we think that this is the better and the simpler way and the way that would most promptly give that relief to the Civil Service which is the object of the Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, what my hon. friend says, if it has any force in this case, would apply with equal force to every appropriation that is made for every part of the service.

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. I think so. He says it will be more convenient because you would not have to come to parliament and ask for it. He says at the same time that he has exactly the amounts that are necessary.

Mr. FISHER. As far as I know.

Mr. FOSTER. If the minister has the amounts that are necessary, or, if he has not them and can get them, certainly the basis of parliamentary appropriation is plainly contravened if he receives a general power to take out of the consolidated fund the gross amount that is necessary What I think is objectionable is that there should be any break from what is the acknowledged system and basis unless there is necessity for it. There was a necessity last year because you could not tell what

the increases were. We asked in parliament what amount this would be and the answer was: You cannot tell. Then, parliament was proroguing and unless such a convenience as that were allowed at that time you would have to wait for another session of parliament. That was a good reason for it, but if parliament has been going right on last year we would not have submitted to that mode of procedure; we would have asked the government to bring down specific amounts and have them voted. I do hope that the minister will not allow the plea of convenience to influence him in asking the House to depart from what has heretofore been the basis of parliamentary appropriation. He is doing it while parliament is in session and in a position to vote whatever is required.

Mr. SPROULE. If it is only a matter of convenience why do you not make your statute extend to the whole Civil Service instead of asking us to vote money from year to year to pay their salaries? It would be more convenient to vote it by statute and not discuss it at all. But, that is not the wisdom of parliament; the wisdom of parliament is to have the money voted from year to year. While we annually vote a portion of the salaries another portion is paid by authority of statute. I do not think it a good principal. I think it is a very bad one. We do pay the judge's salaries by statute, but that is a different thing entirely. Judges are appointed for life and they get a certain specific sum, but we have never allowed the same principle to prevail in relation to votes by parliament for the Civil Service as far as I know. It is a departure from what has been the established custom and I think the minister is not justified in asking the House to assent to it.

Mr. FISHER. I appreciate fully the difference between this Bill and the Bill of last session and I also appreciate what the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has said, that we ought not to depart from the usual practice of voting specific sums for a specific purpose unless there is very good reason for it. I am not set by any means against the proposition of my hon. friend. I only wish to discuss it a little and see whether we can work it out properly and satisfactorily. Would my hon. friend consider that we would have to specify all these several items or only take one lump sum to serve the purpose for the whole Civil Service? I suppose, to follow the general practice, we would have to state that so much was needed for the Department of Agriculture, so much for the Department of Customs and so on. If that line is adopted I think it would be quite unnecessary to go into the details of each individual salary although in our ordinary civil government estimates we come very close to that. It hardly seems to me that it will be at all necessary. The general principle of the addition to the pay of the service is laid down definitely and clearly in the statute and it cannot be departed from. The only question that arises is whether there will be 25, or 50 or 100 men who shall get $150, whether there will be 200 or 300 who shall get $100, whether so many others shall get $50 and so on. I would like, before coming to a conclusion, to go into that a little and see whither it is going to land us. At the same time I recognize the justice and force of what the hon. gentleman says with regard to this Bill as being different from the situation of the last Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the minister sees the whole difficulty. If you make it a mere matter of the Act and allow the minister to go into the consolidated revenue fund you put it outside of all criticism by parliament. It is true that we adopt the principle of giving a flat increase, but that does not mean that the House is, therefore, giving up all its right to criticise where the money goes or to object if in a certain particular instance it thinks the whole $150 should not go to a certain individual. There is a scale under which some will get $150, there are other cases in which $150 will not be got, and in some cases no increase will be got. This is a matter that the House ought to have under its own purview and should be able to criticise. A statement should be submitted to the House for each department showing what the department is getting under this resolution. While nine-tenths of the cases will not call for any criticism, there are instances—I could name some—where we might wish to suggest that a less amount than $150 should be given.

Mr. FISHER. I do not wish to cavil at what my hon. friend has said, generally it is quite correct; but if this statute is passed the estimate based upon it would be very much of the nature of a statutory estimate and the House could hardly refuse it. Of course, the Bill says that payments may be made on the report of the deputy minister, and it may be that some individuals are of such a character that the deputy minister would not feel justified in recommending this increase. The only way of carrying out my hon. friend's suggestion would be to have an estimate based on the reports of the deputy minister, and if the deputy minister had reported that so and so was entitled to this increase, I do not think that under the statute he could well refuse it.

Mr. FOSTER. I should be sorry to have to vote a lump sum and then have it said that it shall be expended on the judgment of the deputy minister without any chance

for a member of parliament to criticise that judgment. In discussing the Bill I will be prepared to mention some cases in which the payments should not be made.

Mr. FISHER. It has been suggested to me that a schedule might be attached to the Bill setting out the payments.

Mr. FOSTER. If that were done we would have a chance to criticise the schedule.

Mr. FISHER. Then we will leave that open and discuss it later. I suppose a schedule giving the amounts for each department or each branch of a department would be quite sufficient?

Mr. FOSTER, That would be acceptable. When we come to discuss it, the question would be, how did the minister arrive at the schedule? The minister would explain and his judgment would be a matter of criticism.

Mr. FISHER. It would practically be the same as an item in the estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. With that understanding, I for my part will let the resolution pass, but it is not to be understood that I agree with the resolution itself; for convenience and in order to get the Bill before the House I shall make my critisicms when the Bill itself is up.

Mr. FISHER. If we drop out this part of the resolution we may have to insert something else, for we would have to have another resolution. We would be glad to make as much progress with the resolution as possible, and if any hon. gentlemen wish to bring up points that would require investigation before answering them, it would be an advantage to have them do so now.

Mr. FOSTER. I have been more busy gathering information than by digesting it. I have not all the information from all the departments yet. I find this a very complex and knotty question, and I do not know whether we will ever get at the bottom or basis of it. When the resolution is finally passed there will be a basis from which to start; but it is a terror, as the boys say, to get at it in all its bearings. The returns from the minister's own department are explicit. I will pay my hon. friend the compliment of saying that when his clerks send down a return, one can see what it means; but I cannot say that for some of the others, because if there is any way on God's earth for them to make it difficult to find out what they mean, some of these departments know how to do it and do it most religiously.

Mr. FISHER. I have tried to make mine plain.

Mr. FOSTER. For instance, my hon. friend had a very large number of persons in what is sometimes called the outside inside service and he loyally, I think, to the principle of the new Civil Service Act, transferred these men into the inside service at the salaries they were then enjoying. He did not go to the outside list and make preferences and give to scores or hundreds of them increases of salary just prior to their being transferred into the permanent service. I do not want to say any thing harsh, but the assumption was that the men in the outside service were getting what the government thought was a fair provision for their needs—if they did not get that it was the fault of the minister—but, it does not seem to be carrying out the spirit of the Act that just prior to the fateful September 1, one or more ministers should take the officers of the outside service, give some of them $500 or $600 or $700 increase on their salaries and then throw them in a great heap into the new permanent service. I think that proceeding ought to have been carefully considered, and I think that what has been done by some, at least, of the ministers is open to criticism. Most of the departments took the spirit of the Act in the proper sense and brought in the officers of the outside service at the salaries they enjoyed up to that time, and therefore they did not raise salaries in special instances by amounts more or less large so as to put these particular officers on a footing which they otherwise would not have had. I do not think any government can afford to have a sense of injustice spring up amongst its employees. The Prime Minister is the guardian of his different departments and I do not think he can make it conform with his sense of justice that one department should do for its outside employees that which another department does not do. In this case one department has adhered religiously to the spirit of the Act and the discussion in parliament and it has brought in the outside civil servants at the salaries they previously had, but another department puts 200 or 300 of its outside men on a more favoured basis just prior to the 1st of September and brings them into the permanent service. Two injustices are done by that. In the permanent service there were men who for years had performed their duty well; they received none of these increases and they therefore were placed at a disadvantage in having the outside men drafted into the inside service and placed over them. They do feel that is an injustice which ought not to have been perpetrated. Then there is an injustice as between the outside servants themselves. For instance, in the department of the Minister of Agriculture he thinks he ought not to increase the salaries of his outside servants before they come into the permanent service

so that they might have higher salaries on the permanent basis. The outside men in that department are discriminated against in favour of the outside men in other departments in which a different course was followed. As I say, a double injutsice is perpetrated. On the face of it it looks like an injustice and no doubt the ministers who have taken this course will give their reasons for it. Then another thing was done. Just prior to the 1st of September new men were appointed to the outside service without any reference to the conditions of the Civil Service Act. They were appointed a few days prior to the 1st of September and then they stepped right in to the permanent service at the salaries allotted to them a few days previously. That does not seem to be fair. To the minister who thought there was absolute necessity for the appointment of these men three days before the 1st of September, it may be said that the service would not have been hurt if he had waited for three days longer and had these men appointed in accordance with the spirit of the new Civil Service Act. I am sorry to say there are a great many of these examples and it does not seem to me that they can be justified on the principle of equal justice to all. There is another point, and I present it more especially to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. He is in a sense an employer of labour ; on one side of the street he has a number of men working for him, and on the other side of the street he has in his employment a number of equally good men. The men on both sides of the street are doing the same kind of work for him, they are living under the same conditions, the increased cost of living bears as hardly on one class as on the other, and as an employer of labour how does the First Minister justify himself in raising the salaries of the men on one side of the street and in leaving the men on the other side without any consideration? My right hon. friend increases the salaries of men in the inside service but the men in the outside service who are working for him and under the same conditions get no alleviation of their condition. If it is worth while to do a thing at all it is worth while to do it right. This government has money enough, and had money enough, to enable the men in the outside service to cope with the more stringent conditions that have arisen on account of the increased cost of living, and the government should have treated all its employees alike and done even justice to all. There is a sense of injustice which must rankle in the breast of every man who sees his fellow provided for and who finds himself overlooked in that way. These are things that must be taken into account, and when the proper time comes I shall cite individual instances to show what was done. Then, in the case of these outside men whose salaries were raised and dated back in some cases for months and months involving a largely increased expenditure, I would like to know out of what fund this was done. Surely we cannot raise a man's salary unless we have an appropriation therefor, and I have been unable to discover where these appropriations existed. This seems to have been done by order in council and whether in the case of the outside men it goes before the Treasury Board or not I do not know. But at all events there seems substantial ground for criticism and I shall criticise that in detail at a later stage of the Bill. These are some of the points of criticism that I would like to bring to the attention of my hon. friends in general. We can go into them in detail later.

Mr. FISHER. I am glad my hon. friend has taken this opportunity of saying what he has said, and I thank him for the compliments to myself.

Mr. FOSTER. Compliments to your clerks.

Mr. FISHER. I have tried to do what he suggests although there are but few cases in which I have been doing that which he has indicated. Let me explain one or two which may be taken as samples of the others. I have had for a good many years, cerealists at the experimental farm who are scientific men. There is Dr. Charles Saunders, who has qualifications very rare in Canada, and who was appointed on that account. My officers at the experimental farm, under Dr. Saunders, were, I thought, of a character which entitled them to the place in subdivision B of the first division, in which the minimum salary is $2,100. Dr. Charles Saunders, who was in receipt of a lower salary, should go, I thought, under the reorganization, into that subdivision at $2,100. Consequently I raised his salary by order in council shortly before the change, and I raised it for that express purpose, to $2,100. If I had not done so, I would have been hampered by the provisions of the Civil Service Act, because they would apply to a gentleman, who, before this Act came into force, was not in the inside service, and therefore had not the laws, regulations, and restrictions of the inside service applied to him. Before the 1st September last I could, by an order in council with my colleague's consent, raise Dr. Saunders' salary in any way I liked without being hampered by any statute. His salary was paid out of the lump vote for the experimental farm, as were all the salaries there, from Dr. Saunders down. My hon. friend asked where the money was got. That is one of a great many instances in which the salaries were paid out of lump votes, and if those lump votes were sufficient in the year to pay an increase, the increase could be given by order in council, or in some cases, by

ministerial order. A good many in the outside service were appointed by ministers, and their salaries could be and were raised at different times by minister's order. This particular instance is one of a kind which has occurred in other cases and which I am prepared to justify as perfectly fair and just. I have no doubt whatever that many ministers, having had the control and the power to raise the salaries in the outside service in Ottawa, took a good deal of pains and trouble, since the coming into force of the Act of last session to go into the adequacy and relative amounts of the salaries of the men who are paid out of these lump votes, knowing that after the first of September last they could not raise the salaries which were paid out of these votes, and which they thought they were justified in raising, without increasing others, because the new Act applied the rules and regulations of the Civil Service Act to those who before the first of last September did not come under those restrictions as to their salaries or appointments.

No doubt whatever a good many instances of that kind occurred. I have not examined the reorganization sufficiently in detail to know what my colleagues have been doing, but I know that in my own department there were some instances in which I did that.

My hon. friend has spoken of another class of employees, a class, he says, of employees who are working across the street but not in the same offices, and who did not get the benefit of these increases. That is quite right. There has also been brought to our attention the case of other men in other cities who say that they are in the public service just as much as the civil servants, so called, who are in Ottawa, and that they ought to receive the same consideration and increase. It is only the inside service at Ottawa whose salaries, increases, and classification are regulated by statute. In the vast majority of the other cases, those outside of Ottawa, the officials are either regulated by order in council or ministerial orders, and in most cases are paid out of large votes which are under the control of the minister and the department which utilizes these votes. These votes may be increased any time parliament chooses or whenever the minister brings down an estimate and parliament chooses to pass it. With regard to the inside service at Ottawa, a minister might bring down a vote and parliament might pass it, but if the vote were not in accord with the provisions of the Civil Service Act, unless the individual officer is specially excepted by these magic words we used to have so often, and which I hope will not appear again in the government estimates, namely, 'Contrary to the Civil Service Act,' no salary could be increased except as provided by that Act. Since the first of September all the officers who were in the outside service at Ottawa, and who previously were eligible for promotion or change or increase in salaries, according to the opinion of the minister, were put out of the vote given by parliament in a lump sum to pay those officers and for other purposes too very often. Those officers will now come under the Act subject to its restrictions and regulations, and their salaries can only be increased under a definite statutory provision.

My hon. friend is not aware—never having looked into the matter, I suppose, from that point of view—of the great amount of increases which have already been given the outside service in the way I have indicated. There have been large votes taken in parliament, increases of lump votes out of which those outside services were paid, which have amounted in some cases to hundreds of thousands of dollars, and the salaries of the outside services of the country have been increased from time to time fully as much, if not more,—in some instances decidedly more,— than this Act is going to increase the salaries of the inside service at Ottawa. I have here a statement prepared by the Finance Department, in which I find that in the aggregate, in the last five years, the outside service have had increases given them on their salaries amounting to $1,409,000:

Marine and Fisheries Department..	$ 47,038
Inland Revenue	5,350
Customs	345,222
Northwest Mounted Police ..	50,000
Indian Affairs	9,300
Railways and Canals	647,000
Printing Bureau	50,500

These are the increases which have been voted at the request of ministers, in lump sums, out of which the salaries of these outside officials were paid.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is that the total amount for a period of years, and, if so, what period?

Mr. FISHER. That is the total of the increases that have been given at different times during the last five years. These are increases which, when once given, go on every year. If they had been given five years ago, there would have been five times that amount paid out of the public chest to the outside service; but that is not the case. In some instances they have been given by general votes. For instance, I think that two years ago the Minister of Customs got a vote of $100,000 extra for his outside service, and some years ago the Post Office Department got a large sum to increase the pay of the outside service in that department, the aggregate of which amounted to about $250,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the aggregate increase for the Customs Department?

Mr. FISHER. $345,000 in the last five years. I think I am safe in saying that these are increases which were made at certain times, and they have been going on every year since.

Mr. BURRELL. Are these actual increases to officials, or do they apply to the natural increase in the outside service resulting from the increasing needs of the country?

Mr. FISHER. I asked that question and was told that they were increases to existing officials' salaries, and not increases to the number of offices or officers.

Mr. SPROULE. There are two ways of increasing salaries. For instance, postmasters got 40 per cent of the revenues of the office, and if the revenues of the office went up, their salaries went up correspondingly.

Mr. FISHER. I am informed that their salaries were increased apart from that. If there was an increase to 50 per cent, that would be included in these figures. Now, I take for granted that to the Post Office Department and the Customs Department would apply my hon. friend's description of a public servant in the city of Ottawa doing work for the government on one side of the street, and another doing work for the government on the other side of the street, and one getting an increase and the other not. I have not details to show how much the clerks in the city of Ottawa Post Office have had their salaries increased during the last five years, but as the Postmaster General has been giving increases throughout the country, I have no doubt the city of Ottawa post office has had its share.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Allow me to explain that the increase to which my hon. friend refers has not been applied to the clerks in the outside service, properly speaking. That is covered by the increase which I obtained from parliament for postmasters some years ago. The House may remember that Sir Wm. Mulock, when Postmaster General, obtained an increase in the salaries of small postmasters from $12 to $25. and three years ago I obtained a further increase to $35. That acounts for most of that increase. The clerks who are under the statute receive their statutory increases, but there has been no special increase in the salaries of the outside service of the Post Office Department.

Mr. FISHER. These figures indicate that a very great improvement has been made in the pay of the general outside service. There may be portions of the outside service which have not reaped the advantage, while there are other portions which have reaped a very great advantage The figures do not indicate how many there are in each category; but they show that the government has not been unmindful of the needs and desires of the outside service. I want to point out that these increases were possible without an amendment to any particular statute, and are consequently in an entirely different position from the increases made to the inside service, which are made by a definite statute. That is why in this particular case we have introduced a statute and asked parliament to pass it, while in the other case we do not require to do so, as an annual vote in the estimates of each department will accomplish the result desired.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the Minister of Customs inform us whether the $345,000 included in the statement read by the Minister of Agriculture represents an actual annual increase to the outside officials of his department?

Mr. PATERSON. On that point I cannot speak positively. When I take an extra vote, as I did this year, a certain amount of it we hope to use in increasing the salaries of the men in the service, and a certain amount we estimate may be required for new offices. Therefore, I cannot tell positively. I would have to inquire.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the minister would be good enough to inquire. I know there have been substantial increases, but I do not think they amounted to so much as the sum mentioned in the statement of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. FISHER. I have here a copy of the Labour Gazette, which states that the increase of wages granted in 1907 to various employees of the Customs Department amounted to $160,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is quite possible that the person who compiled the figures for the Labour Gazette may have taken the whole $160,000 to represent increases, while a portion of that may have been utilized by the Customs Department for the payment of new officials.

Mr. FISHER. I am informed not.

Mr. PATERSON. There was one year. two or three years ago, when we took an extra amount of $250,000. I remember we took a very large amount; so it is possible that is correct.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Those amounts have been continued after once being taken?

Mr. PATERSON. If they have been given to the same individual. If one died, for instance, and a new man came in, sometimes we started him at a little less.

Mr. FISHER. To show that what I said was correct, here is another item with regard to the Department of Indian Affairs.

It gives the actual number of employees; it says: 39 had their salaries increased by from $60 to $300 per annum and aggregating $9,360. That refers altogether to the outside service, it gives the number of the employees and the increase of their salaries.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is another point to which I would like to direct the attention of the hon. Minister of Agriculture and the Governor General. Section 8 of the Civil Service Act of last year reads as follows:

8. As soon as practicable after the coming into force of the Act, the head of each department should cause the organization of his department to be determined and defined by order in council, due regard being had to the status of each officer or clerk as the case may be.

2. The order in council shall give the names of the several branches of the department, with the number and character of the offices, clerkships and other positions in each, and the duties, titles and salaries thereafter to pertain thereto.

3. After being so determined and defined, the organization of a department should not be changed except by order in council.

It does not seem to me that that has been done by many of the departments; apparently it has been done to some extent by the Department of Inland Revenue; it may have been done by some other departments. It is a statutory provision, it is imperative in its language. It declares that the head of each department shall cause the organization of his department to be determined and defined by order in council, and that the order in council shall set forth the duties appertaining to each office, clerkship and other position. The provisions of this statute seem to have been almost entirely disregarded in the various departments. I would not like to assert positively that ministers of the Crown who have disregarded it have been guilty of a criminal offence, although there is a law upon the statute-book that any person wilfully disobeying a statute is liable to indictment. Of course I have regard to the language of the statute, which is that this work of reorganization shall be done as soon as practicable after the coming into force of the Act. I am ready to concede that if a minister could show that he had devoted every available portion of his time to this work, and had not completed it, he might be able to escape criminal liability. But as it is, I think there would be a good case at least for calling him before a grand jury on a preliminary investigation. At all events, it is a matter that requires explanation. I consider it a very important part of the provisions of that section. You are to define, not only the salaries, not only the character of the offices, clerkships and other positions, but what is absolutely important to a thorough organization of the department, you are to make known by the terms of an order in council the duties which each clerk is called upon to perform as a public servant of Canada. That has not been done; there has been little pretense of doing it. I would again invite the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture to that, and ask him to explain why the provisions of the statute in that regard have not been complied with.

Mr. PATERSON. I have just 'phoned the accountant of the Customs Department in reference to that matter. He tells me that it was he who gave those figures, and that those are the actual increases granted to the men who were in the service, and do not include new offices.

Mr. FISHER. I remember well the remarks of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition which he made with regard to this matter before, and I have looked up a little the orders in council. Perhaps the orders in council might be more full than they are. I have just sent for a copy of the order in council in my own department, and I would like my hon. friend to follow me a little, and I will show him what we have done, which I think is fairly fulfilling the intention of the Act, though I grant that we might go a little further in an elaborate description of the work of a good many offices. Beginning with the first division of subdivision A: Dr. Montizambert, Director General of Public Health. I do not know that I could define much more particularly what the duties of Dr. Montizambert are. I might go on to say that he is in charge of the quarantine service of Canada, and give other particulars and practically transcribe the order in council appointing him, but I do not think that is intended or desired.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would say that where the order in council appointing an officer has prescribed his duties fairly well, the statute would be sufficiently complied with if reference were made to that order in council; in other words, the duties of this officer shall be those set forth in the order in council appointing him on such a day.

Mr. FISHER. Then I pass over Dr. Saunders, Mr. Blue, Dr. Rutherford and so on. We come down to the first division of subdivision B. Dr. James Fletcher, Entomologist and Botanist, Central Experimental Farm; Mr. Shutt, chemist of experimental farm; Mr. St. Denis, secretary of the Census and Statistics office. I should think that was a fairly fair description of the duties of the offices which these gentlemen hold. J. H. Grisdale, agriculturist, Central Experimental Farm. As a matter of fact, in the Treasury Board the descriptions of the officers at the experimental farm are just the same as they are put in

the order in council. Dr. Charles Saunders, cerealist. Perhaps that requires some explanation to most people, but it defines the office of the individual. When you come down further to the lower subdivisions, as a general rule, they are simply clerks, sometimes perhaps doing one thing, and sometimes another. I do not think in most of the lower orders of the service we can do much more than define them as clerks, unless they have some particular work. I have here Mr. C. Martin, assistant editor of the Archives. He is the gentleman who helps to edit the bulletins and publications that go out from the Archives. D. Drummond, live stock inspector; Mr. McRae, live stock inspector; Mr. McMurray, French correspondent, experimental farm. Then here is Mr. Watson, stenographer; Mr. Nolan, patent examiner. I hardly think it could be expected that we should go much beyond that. I confess I did think in so doing that I would be free from any likelihood of prosecution under the Criminal Code for dereliction of duty. But would it be well to encumber the orders in council with more graphic descriptions of the work done?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In some departments the reply is that there is nothing whatever. For example, in the Department of Justice there is no information available of the nature asked for in this address. The Auditor General reports the same thing; other departments report the same thing. The Minister of Inland Revenue seems to have complied with the statute and to have done his work in this connection far better than any other minister, with the exception possibly of the Minister of Agriculture, whose records I have not examined very closely. He has absolutely defined the duties of the heads of each branch and has given a fair indication of the duties of the various officers in the branch. For example, take his organization of the Department of Inland Revenue:

Deputy Minister—The duties of the Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue shall cover the general supervision and administration of all branches of the Inland Revenue Department.

Then he names his clerks, stenographers and typewriters.

Secretary—The duties of this officer shall be to attend to all correspondence, other than of an administrative character, have charge of all records and supplies, and to have general supervision over the correspondence and supply branches.

Then he goes on to deal with the various officers of the secretary's branch. Dealing with the chief accountant he says:

The duties of this officer shall be to have general control and supervision over all work connected with revenue and expenditure, the work of the statistical branches of all services and the preparation of the financial and statistical reports.

Mr. FISHER.

Then he goes on to deal with subdivision A of the first division and proceeds:

The number and character of the officers in the Accountant's branch to be as follows:

1. Assistant accountant—To have particular charge of accounts relative to receipts and expenditure, to record each deposit of revenue, to have charge of the general journal and ledger and to replace the chief accountant when absent from any cause.

And so on with reference to every important office of his department. Then he has taken up the laboratory branch and dealt with it in the same way very thoroughly. I understand from my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), although I have not seen the organization of the Mines Department, that this has been done equally well. The other departments should have devoted the same attention to the statute and observed the same particularity and definiteness in prescribing the duties of the various officers that we find in the organization carried out by the Minister of Inland Revenue and Mines. Otherwise, a great part of the advantage from this statute will be lost.

Mr. FISHER. I perfectly agree with my hon. friend that so far as it is possible and consistent with conciseness the intention of the Act was to indicate these things in the classification. I think it probable that when another classification is issued that will be done to a greater extent.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want to prolong the discussion but there were two points that might be considered as being assented to, made by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture, if they were not noted. In the first place he seemed to argue that if the minister had a lump vote he could make any addition to the salaries of officers out of that lump vote that he chose. I am not sure but that he has the absolute power to do it, but I do not think he has the right. For instance, he comes down with a lump vote, presents it to parliament and says this is to pay officers' salaries. How many officers have you?—so many. What salaries are they getting?—so much. It goes down in 'Hansard'. It is discussed here and parliament says: Yes, that vote is all right, because we know those officers are in the service, we know what they are getting and we think it is not unreasonable. I doubt very much if the minister has the right, after having made that compact with parliament, to go out and, three months afterwards, raise those salaries to any amount he chooses. I do not think parliament will cavil at a reasonable addition if cause is shown but I should not like to let the theory go unchallenged that a minister has the right after having made the compact with parliament which he did, to add, out of that

lump vote, to the salaries of his officers whatever he chose. The other point is in regard to the elasticity of the Act. This new Act is elastic in this respect that specialists under it can be appointed and may be promoted. I am not at all sure but that my hon. friend would have kept better within the spirit of the Act if he had allowed Mr. Saunders to come in at the salary which he did and then taken the means at his disposal under the Act. If the requirements were reasonable parliament would have assented. I myself, after his presentation of the facts, would have raised no objection to the salary being increased. That could have been done under the Act because we must have the provisions sufficiently elastic as to allow such singular and notable case to be provided for.

Mr. FISHER. They are provided for, no doubt. In my organization I was going to put certain officers in a certain classification, which, in my judgment, those officers ought to occupy and I did raise all those salaries to the minimum of the class in which they would come in the exercise of the power which I had. I think my hon. friend is putting an extreme case when he says that a minister, having made a compact with parliament, should not violate it. I quite agree with him but in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred there has been no such compact. A lump vote, it is understood, is going to pay for the service. Part of the payment for the service must be salaries. The distribution of the amount in salaries has never come before parliament and there has been no compact.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes.

Mr. FISHER. Excuse me, there has been no compact of any kind. The minister is obliged to keep within the vote but judgment is left to him as to how he shall spend that vote. He gives the usual explanations and if he went contrary to any of these explanations he would break the compact. There are a number of instances in which the salary of an individual is asked for and voted and under these circumstances it would not be fair to make a change in that person's salary. I do not think it would be consistent with the rights of parliament. But, in a general way, the details of these salaries never have been passed by parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. We have the Auditor General and the Auditor General puts upon the pages of his book which comes before us the name of every officer who receives a salary, and when we are going over the estimates, my hon. friend knows that the Auditor General's Report and the estimates go side by side and that we criticise the estimate with the Auditor General's Report in our hands. If we find any officer whom we think is getting too much we make a protest. I am not going to say it is an actually signed contract, but it is an implied compact. One more point; I have drawn it to the attention of my hon. friend and the other ministers. Is it business-like to take a lump sum of $200,000, $300,000 or $400,000, covering a dozen different things, and put that through without any itemizing at all, a portion of it for salaries, a portion of it for other things and no division at all as to that amount which is properly referable to salaries or as to the amount which it is properly referable to other operations and other things? In my time we had some lump votes, but I would like my hon. friend to take an estimate of 1890, or from that up, and compare it with the estimate now and he will find that the tendency has been to give lump votes. The whole trouble in connection with the North Atlantic Trading Company business that we discussed so much arose from the fact that it was covered up in a lump vote and that the actual contract was entered into under a lump vote that covered a very large contract as my hon. friend will admit. If the vote had been divided as it ought to have been that could not have happened in the first instance. I do hope, although it may be too much to hope for, that succeeding estimates will show more sub-division so that we can define things a little more accurately. The ministers ought not have too much power. It is a great temptation. If your back bencher comes to you and wants something and you can show him you have a special vote for that and your vote will not allow it you have an answer, but if he shows you a vote of $400,000 out of which you can take whatever you like for any purpose, you are shorn of an argument that I am sure the Minister of Agriculture must often want to have.

Mr. FISHER. I can asure my hon. friend I am glad to have that answer whenever I can get it. In bringing the outside service in Ottawa under the civil government we have taken a long step in the direction of what my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has said.

Mr. FOSTER. That is one of the best features of it.

Mr. FISHER. I think it is quite likely we will take other steps in the course of time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. FISHER. In accordance with the agreement we had better rise and report progress and I will bring down the information.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY.

LIFE INSURANCE BILL.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. GEORGE H. PERLEY (Argenteuil). Last year a Bill on insurance was submitted to parliament and referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce where it was considered at many sittings, a great many people from all over the country having attended to give their evidence. In the speech from the Throne an insurance Bill is again promised for this session. The Bill introduced last session was based very largely on the report of the Insurance Commission, which adopted in great measure the provisions of the Armstrong Act in the State of New York, and which in its operation since that time has been found to have many defects. This is a question in which the insurance men and the people generally of the country take a great deal of interest. If we are to have such a Bill this session it ought to be brought down immediately and not left to the close of the session when it cannot be properly considered. I give notice that on Monday next before the orders of the day are called I shall question the government as to whether they will bring down an insurance Bill this session and when they will submit it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In his speech from the Throne it is promised that we are to have legislation with regard to naturalization. That Bill we also should have as soon as possible.

Mr. FISHER. I will inquire of the Minister of Justice about that.

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

Department of Indian Affairs—salaries, $96,762.50.

Department of Indian Affairs—contingencies, $12,550.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). We have the same staff as last year with the addition that we are asking provision for the appointment of a law clerk and a messenger. The increase in the vote is caused by the statutory increases and the transfer of certain members of the outside service to the inside service.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Have you no law clerk now?

Mr. OLIVER. We have not had one for some years, but we find the need of one and we propose to appoint a law clerk at $2,100.

Mr. FOSTER. What changes have been made in your permanent list?

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. OLIVER. We are making provision for promoting the following officers to sub division A of the second division.

Name.	Present salary.	Proposed salary.
J. W. Shore..	$1,487.50	$1,600
G. M. Matheson..	1,470.00	1,600
R. B. E. Moffatt..	1,400.00	1,600
S. W. Hobart..	1,237.50	1,600
P. J. O'Connor..	1,337.50	1,600
R. M. Ogilvie..	1,335.00	1,600
G. L. Chitty..	1,500.00	1,600

Mr. Chitty was in the outside service until he was brought in by the operation of the Act on September 1.

Mr. FOSTER. How long have they been in the service?

Mr. OLIVER. Their records are as follows:

Mr. Shore was appointed March, 1884, as third-class clerk; promoted to second-class clerk, July, 1899; at the promotion examination he obtained sufficient marks for a chief clerkship; he has had 24 years' service.

Mr. Matheson was appointed June, 1888, as third-class clerk; promoted to second class January, 1903; he has had 20 years' in the service and has been in charge of the records since December, 1898; he has a number of clerks under him and his position is a responsible one.

Mr. Moffatt was appointed as an extra clerk in September, 1890; he was promoted to the third class in September, 1891; to the second class at $1,100 in January, 1903; he has been in charge of the special work for the Privy Council, and is an expert stenographer.

Mr. Hobart was appointed temporarily to the Interior Department in January, 1900, at $400; made second-class clerk in December, 1903, at $800; transferred to the Department of Indian Affairs in 1907, and promoted to second class on May 23, 1907.

Mr. FOSTER. His rise has been very rapid. What are the reasons for it?

Mr. OLIVER. The reason assigned is that he was competent and deserving, in the estimation of the heads of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. In that department there are many clerks who were in the service long before 1900 and who have presumably performed their duties well. It would seem that other things being equal the official of longer service should get the promotion. This clerk's rise was very rapid; the salary increased from $400 to $1,600 in eight years and he is now put at the minimum of a class that allows him still further range at the rate of $100 a year. Is the minister very sure there were no other older employees who might have had claims to that

promotion? On what principle was this man jumped over the others?

Mr. OLIVER. The only answer that it is possible to give is that his work has been found satisfactory and he has been given work of a character that when properly performed entitled him to this increase of remuneration. My hon. friend, of course, knows that it is impossble to absolutely give every man in a large department the same opportunity of showing the good there is in him; the work of one section is not as important as that of another, and the man whose fortune it is to be in the section of less important work, even although he may be a good man, has not the same opportunity to show his ability as the man who, by fortune, has been placed in the section of the department requiring a higher class of work. I presume that this man was fortunate in being placed in the section of the department requiring the greater ability and that he showed the ability and received the remuneration.

Mr. FOSTER. I concede that the position of a minister is sometimes difficult; he wants to advance a deserving clerk and at the same time he wants to avoid any injustice to equally deserving clerks in his employ. It would seem, however, that the minister should be able to ascertain the relative capacity of the clerks even in different sections of his department. It is not good for the morale of the department that there should be any sense of injustice among the employees; they want to see a fair deal, and if one clerk is advanced very rapidly, others may feel that they are being treated unjustly. I presume that the minister is pretty sure that he has not done an injustice to any older clerks in that department.

Mr. OLIVER. In this particular case, I am informed that this gentleman is senior in his class, that is to say he is not being advanced over any one in his class.

Mr. FOSTER. All I can do is to call the minister's attention to it, he is the boss after all.

Mr. PERLEY. I see an item providing a salary for a timber inspector. What are the arrangements in regard to timber inspection that you engage an inspector by the year?

Mr. OLIVER. A great deal of the value of the Indian property in the northern part of the province is in the timber on their lands and in order te get the best results for the Indians, it is necessary that we should employ some one responsible to the department who has a knowledge of timber to make the necessary inspection. Mr. Chitty is the gentleman who discharges that duty.

Mr. PERLEY. The department has sufficient work, I suppose, to keep him practically busy all the time.

Mr. OLIVER. The amount of timber held by the Indians in the northern part of the province is very large and there is ample work for him to do.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend explain the two remaining clerks to be promoted ?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. O'Connor was appointed February 15, 1898. He was promoted to a second class clerkship July 1, 1905. He is employed in the Lands and Timber branch and came in at $400.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the particular excellency there—two years longer in, that is all ?

Mr. OLIVER. The work in his branch of timber and lands has greatly increased during the past two or three years owing to the amount of Indian lands which have been surrendered and sold, and in that increase of work this gentleman has borne his part very creditably, and we felt warranted in promoting him from time to time.

Mr. FOSTER. How many in his branch?

Mr. OLIVER. Eight.

Mr. FOSTER. Has he superseded any who are older than himself ?

Mr. OLIVER. In that branch there are a number of ladies, and we have not given them that promotion to the higher branches which possibly the merits of their actual work would warrant, because it is not considered that, in the nature of things, they are able to take the higher positions for which we have to train men and promote them. But aside from that point, Mr. O'Connor has the seniority in that branch.

Mr. FOSTER. How many ladies in that branch ?

Mr. OLIVER. Four.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry to hear the opinion expressed by the minister that, in these days of equality, equal merit in a lady does not entitle her to equal payment with a man. He will have to fight that out with the four ladies in that department and may have a pretty hard time. Will the hon. gentleman explain the next one ?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Ogilvie entered in 1904 as temporary clerk; he was made permanent second-class on August 25, 1905. He got on entering $1,000. He is an architect and does drafting and arranging for the buildings for the department. He is a trained architect.

Mr. FOSTER. And Mr. Chitty ?

Mr. OLIVER. He came in at $1,000 in 1893. His salary was increased to $1,200 on July 1, 1898 and to $1,500 on July 1, 1905. He is a timber inspector.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that account for all the increases in the outside staff ?

Mr. OLIVER. These are the only increases outside of the statutory.

Mr. FOSTER. No other new clerks except the law clerk and promotions?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like an explanation with regard to the twenty brought in. Were they in the employment outside and for what period ?

Mr. OLIVER. They were all old employees.

Mr. FOSTER. Did they all come in at the same salary they were getting before?

Mr. OLIVER. Two received increases on July 1. Mr. Reid's salary was $1,800. It was increased to $2,100 on July 1, 1908. Mr. Fabien had $1,200. It was increased to $1,400 on July 1, 1908.

Mr. FOSTER. Were these the only increases ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Why were Reid and Fabien increased ?

Mr. OLIVER. The increase was given Reid on the ground that his professional work entitled him to it and Fabien on the same ground. Fabien was the chief draftsman and Reid the senior surveyor.

Mr. FOSTER. How long has Mr. Reid been at work?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Reid was employed in 1900, and Mr. Fabien in 1905.

Mr. FOSTER. What did they get when they first came in?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Reid at first got $6 a day; in April, 1903, he was appointed at $1,600, and on the 31st of January, 1904, his salary was increased to $1,800. Mr. Fabien was appointed on the 11th of August, 1905, at $1,000; his salary was increased to $1,200 on the 1st of April, 1907, and to $1,400 on July 1, 1908. Mr. Fabien is the chief draftsman of the department.

Department of Indian Affairs—contingencies, $12,550.

Mr. FOSTER What is the explanation of these?

Mr. OLIVER There is a net decrease of $3,825. First, there is a decrease of $4,825 by the transfer of extra clerks to the inside service. Then, an addition of $1,000 for occasional clerical assistance, as provided by the Civil Service Amendment Act, and an increase in sundries of $2,000 to cover travelling expenses of officials of the outside service, whose expenses heretofore were paid out of expenses generally.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the minister pretty well satisfied that the department is insufficiently manned?

Mr. OLIVER. It is usual to have provision for additional help, if it is required. Under the former Civil Service Act there was provision made for taking on extra clerks. Now we think it is desirable to have at least $1,000 available for that purpose.

Indians, Ontario and Quebec—relief, medical attendance and medicines, Quebec, $6,400.

Mr. FOSTER. How much was spent on that last year?

Mr. OLIVER. The expenditure for 1907-8 was: relief, $5,385.56; medical attendance and medicines, $4,558.47; seed, $102; total, $10,046.03.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no seed included this year?

Mr. OLIVER. There was a supplementary vote for seed taken last year.

Relief, medical attendance and medicines, Ontario, $6,450.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a slight increase here.

Mr. OLIVER. This arises from the transfer of an item for Moose Factory, heretofore voted in the Northwest Territories, because Moose Factory is in Ontario and comes within the limits of treaty No. 9.

Blankets and clothing, Ontario and Quebec, $500.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister get any of this clothing made by any of the government departments?

Mr. OLIVER. We advertise for tenders in the newspapers, and everything is bought by tender. The contract for 1907-8 was $1.95 for 5-lb. blankets. The contractors were Horn Bros. of Lindsay, Ont.

Schools, Maritime provinces, Ontario and Quebec, $73,225.

Mr. FOSTER. What makes this increase?

Mr. OLIVER. It is made by the transfer of five schools from the former vote for Manitoba and the Northwest Territories to the vote for Ontario. The schools for Albany, Moose Factory, Abitibi, Moose House and Fort George. That makes $1,500. The balance is for new school buildings at Restigouche and Tobique.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is the school in Tobique?

Mr. OLIVER. At Pointe a la Garde, near Campbellton. The Indians are Micmacs. The old buildings became useless, and this is for new buildings—$2,000 for Restigouche and $2,060 for Tobique.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the number that gets the advantage in the school of each of these now? Would the minister inform the House shortly as to the progress that is being made through the expenditure upon our schools, and the progress that is being made by the Indian children in the way of education? It is a matter which we have often discussed in this House, and it is well to have a report upon it each year. We would like to know what progress is being made, and whether any change is being introduced in the system of education, and generally, as to the results of the money we are expending.

Mr. OLIVER. The average attendance at Restigouche is 42, at Tobique 22. Answering the questions of the hon. gentleman, it is not possible to give an answer that would be considered satisfactory. The difficulties of an Indian's education, the difficulties of making an Indian into a white man, were not thoroughly appreciated at the time the work was undertaken. There have been grave difficulties met with that were not expected, and only recently are coming to be realized. While a great responsibility has been incurred, and a fully considered effort has been made to discharge that responsibility satisfactorily, it must be admitted that the expectations that were entertained when the present system of Indian education was undertaken, have not been realized. It is not that the Indians are incapable or even disinclined to education, as we understand it, but the fact is that the environment, the necessary environment, of the Indian in a large majority of cases after he leaves school, is such that the education which he has acquired in the school is not of that benefit to him that was hoped or expected. It is not that our system of education has failed to educate, but the conditions surrounding the Indians are still such that I think it must be admitted that the education is not so beneficial to them as at one time we had hoped. At the same time the burden of the work of Indian education which was assumed jointly by various churches concerned in missionary effort, and by the government, has been found hard to bear by the churches who have undertaken the enterprise. It appears that in the light of the experience of the past twenty years some readjustment of the conditions surrounding Indian education will have to be shortly made, with a view to lightening the burden and to achieving better results, that is to say, results which will tend rather to improving the condition of the Indian as an Indian, than to making the Indian into a white man.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the average attendance at these schools for which we paid some $70,000 last year, and how many children have passed through the schools?

Mr. OLIVER. The average attendance at all the Indian schools the last fiscal year was 6,451, and the total attendance was about 10,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How many Indian children are there altogether in the various provinces?

Mr. OLIVER. As we find in the annual report, the Indian children from the ages of 6 to 15 years inclusive, numbered 7,665 males and 7,252 females.

Mr. FOSTER. Then it would seem that about two-thirds of them pass through the schools, and a little over one-third are in average attendance. Can the minister give us an idea as to the trend of this education now? Is it in the larger proportion tending towards education in the trades, what will be useful in after life, or is it the three R's that are being taught?

Mr. OLIVER. The idea of education in the trades which had such a strong hold a number of years ago is not maintained today. If the Indian who had acquired a first-class trade, such as that of carpenter or blacksmith, did not sever himself entirely from his home associations he had no future in that trade as the opportunity to employ the education that he had acquired did not exist. At the present time there is not so much of an effort to inform the Indians with regard to trades as to give them the rudiments of an ordinary education, to teach the Three R.'s, and where the opportunity exists, as at industrial and boarding schools, to give them education in the line of agriculture. The idea is to make the children acquainted with farm life and farm work.

Mr. A. HAGGART. I understand that the environment of the Indians nullifies the effect of the school in a large measure, that the effect which the school would have depends entirely on the character or qualifications of the teacher or master. Are there any standard qualifications for the teacher or master?

Mr. OLIVER. Some of the schools are under the direct control of the Indian Department, but the large majority of the schools are missionary enterprises which are assisted by the government. As far as our control goes, we require a third-class certificate which we think is a sufficient educational standard for the work that is on hand. Our association with the churches in the work of Indian education is because of the expectation and belief that the character of the people who are engaged in Indian education will be such as it ought to be, looking to the betterment of the character and mind of the Indian.

Mr. BARR. Are the children brought and placed in the boarding houses or are they just gathered in from the wigwams? What is the policy of the government? Have they

boarding houses in connection with those schools in which they keep the children?

Mr. OLIVER. These vary in different places. There are three classes of schools —the industrial school, the boarding school and the day school. The industrial school contemplates taking a child absolutely away from his home surroundings, from any connection with his parents or friends and placing him in an establishment where he will live as the white child will live, learn what the white child will learn, and, therefore, it was hoped become as the white child when he has grown up. The boarding school is a school established on or adjacent to the reserve from which the pupils expect to be drawn. In that case connection between the child and his parents is not broken and it is not intended to be broken as it is in the case of the industrial school. Provision is made for the accommodation of the children permanently during the term in the boarding school, but they are visited by their parents from time to time, and, I presume, are allowed to visit their parents as well. Then the day school is just as any day school would be ; the children come to the school and live at home. The number of day schools is very small because it is only an occasional reserve on which the Indians live close enough together permanently to give a regular attendance to the day schools.

Mr. BARR. To what age are the children allowed to remain in the industrial and boarding schools ?

Mr. OLIVER. Until they are 18.

Mr. ROCHE. When the minister spoke awhile ago about the effects of the education of the Indian being largely rendered nugatory by their drifting back to their former environment, did he refer merely to the boarding schools, or did he discriminate between boarding and industrial schools in that regard?

Mr. OLIVER. No, the condition is the same as far as that is concerned.

Mr. ROCHE. Does not the minister think that some scheme might be evolved by means of which those Indians would be placed in some employment and thus utilize the education given by the state rather than that they should drift back to their reserves where conditions became worse than they formerly were, because work on the farm becomes undesirable to them. I would imagine that if the efforts of the department had been directed towards utilizing this education, if the department had gone to the extent of placing them in employment, a great portion of this education would not be lost, but that they would be rendered more valuable citizens.

Mr. OLIVER. Some efforts have been made along the line that my hon. friend suggests. There seems to have been a very satisfactory measure of success achieved by the experiment of settling pupils in a self-supporting colony under the supervision of the agent. They have, up to the present time, made a very satisfactory showing. This is only an experiment, and as it succeeds it will no doubt be extended. But as to taking a grown up Indian and placing him here, or there, or yonder, if that is the suggestion——

Mr. ROCHE. Oh, no.

Mr. OLIVER. —that, of course, could not be done, especially when we consider the nature of the Indian. It is not that the Indian will not submit, but he cannot submit. He cannot continue to live under a condition of restrain. He must have liberty of action or he ceases to exist.

Mr. ROCHE. I would not suggest that the state should force the Indians into any particular trade or employment, but if they were afforded opportunities of utilizing this education and not allowed to go back to their reserves it would be in their interest as well as in the interest of the country. I would not force them into any particular employment, but I would have the means afforded so that they could utilize their education if they desired. The trouble is that many of these Indians, after they graduate, if I may use the expression, see nothing in store and they probably have not sufficient ambition to look around for themselves and secure employment. When the minister speaks about many of these trades having been done away with, I would like to ask him if his remark applies to industrial schools or has the teaching of the various trades outside of agriculture been done away with in western Canada?

Mr. OLIVER. In the industrial schools we still teach some of the trades, but there is not the same stress laid on that teaching as formerly, our effort being to get the boys to go out on the land to farm.

Mr. FOSTER. The question of the education of our Indians is a mightly difficult one, and of late years we seem to be in a condition of drift with reference to it. It is only once a year that in parliament we can devote half an hour to a talk on the Indian question when these estimates are being considered. I do not think there is any improvement in the last ten years; if improvement there has been it has not at all been comparable with the progress made by us in other respects. We spend about $400,000 a year upon Indian schools and that for forty years makes a very large sum of money, for which in the balance we can find no good result. You bring the young Indians to these industrial schools ; you teach them and they seem to make progress whilst they are in the school, but

when they leave they do not make servants and as a rule they go back to the wild state. In very many cases I fear they are worse than if they had never been in the industrial school. We are spending an immense amount of money and we are doing little good with it. If there is anything that gets in to the Indian it may be a little percolation of religious teaching through the missionaries who build up their moral character somewhat, but when they go back amongst their own people, it is difficult to keep any supervision over them, and I am afraid that even permanent results in that respect are pretty hard to measure. Is it not time we did something else for the Indian? Should we longer spend half a million dollars a year without results? Should we not get some active agency at work to investigate this whole question and give us the result of ripened experience, pointing out our mistakes in the past and blazing out a pathway for us in the future? Unless we can educate our Indians in a line towards strengthening an esprit de corps among them and opening up a future career for them for which they are adapted, it seems to me it is almost better that we should leave them their natural state where they do a little hunting and a little fishing and a little agriculture and pass their lives in as good a way as they do now after all the money we spend on their education under our present system. It seems to me it would be better for us to leave them as they are in their simple habits and prevent them from being imposed upon by the white man, or else that we should adopt some other system which after they leave the school may fit them for useful occupation. You cannot make a white man out of an Indian and there is no use our trying that. Give the Indian boy a fair education, instill something of purposes and ambition in him and offer to him some sort of useful career. They ought to make splendid fire rangers and forest rangers and scouts. Is there any inherent disability in the Indian character which makes it impossible for them to do that kind of work? Is there no kind of police duty they can do? In the United States they do utilize the Indians in various ways, they make men out of them, not white men it is true, but they instil in the Indians a good deal of nerve and verve and they are fairly successful in several spheres. Is it not time that Canada should do something? The Indians are our wards it is said, and we should do the square thing by them. But, we ought not go on spending a lot of money, pretending to do something and really doing nothing, and coming around this table every year and nodding to each other and all acknowledge we have failed. I would go in very strongly for appointing a commission, not a partisan commission, but the very best men we can get, to inquire into and to recommend to us the best means for the moral, mental, technical, and industrial education of our Indians. Canada will find the money for that; Canada has never balked at doing her duty by the Indians. We may have taken their lands, sometimes when we should not, but we have always protested our intention to treat them fairly and I believe we have endeavoured to do so.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no question at all but that the intention of the people of Canada is to deal fairly by the Indians, and that is one reason the House has voted from year to year a large sum of money for Indian education without inquiring too closely as to the results. The people of Canada feel there is an obligation resting on them with respect to the Indians and the people of Canada have been quite willing to discharge that obligation. What my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has said about the desirability of bettering the conditions so that there shall not be what appears a waste of money is something in which we can all agree. We are not negligent in the matter but we have to deal with a problem which has never yet been solved. It has not been solved in the United States, it has not been solved in Canada; under no approximately parallel conditions has it been solved in any country. Even if we take the conditions in other countries where there are savage races, there is no other savage race on the same level as the North American Indian. He is in a class by himself and has a persistence of character not possessed by any other race in the world. Having to deal then with such a problem the government of Canada some twenty years ago adopted a certain principle. That principle has been worked to faithfully and well but the event has shown that the principle was not the correct one to furnish a solution. I am not here to say that it was not perhaps the best that could be adopted but it did not give the solution that we hoped for, and I am with my hon. friend in believing that the time has come for us to reconsider our position, if that is not too much to say, and see what better can be done. It is perfectly clear that it is not well advised to occupy the time of the young Indian in learning a trade in which he will never have an opportunity to engage. Having arrived at that idea we are more and more applying education to the land and educating the young men for work upon the land and so far as we have gone in that it seems to me to be the right line. The results achieved tend to show that this work is best suited to the character of the Indian. He has an independence of character that does not allow him to submit to the same dictation, direction and conditions that other races of men will submit to, and

he is more adapted to work on the land than to any other. I have spoken of the colony we have where there has been a very gratifying amount of apparent success. We cannot tell yet whether that is permanent success, but it is apparent success and we have hopes it will be permanent. Again in the case of the Indians of southern Alberta, on the Blood reserve, which is the largest reserve in Canada and of which the Indians were notoriously the most warlike and generally intractable in Canada, we have made very substantial progress. The Indians have irrigated a very considerable tract and in addition to that they are cultivating the ground, raising stock and providing for themselves by cutting hay and working at manual labour for wages amongst the outside community. My own impression is that the progress we are making on the Blood reserve is perhaps more substantial than the progress we are making in the colony of which I spoke, because it is progress that is in the Indians themselves. That is to say they have not lost their individuality and initiative. These qualities are being cultivated or developed and although the progress may be slow, it seems to me that this is the course that will produce the ultimate good result. We are therefore not blind to the necessities of the case. We are using our endeavours on various lines of experiment which must necessarily vary with the varying conditions under which we find the Indians and under which we have to deal with them. While the results of the expenditure have not been such as was anticipated when the policy was first inaugurated, still I believe that we are well warranted in continuing the expenditure to provide education for the Indians, and the Indian Department while it does not profess to have solved a problem that has been found to be impossible by everybody else in the world, are dealing with the problem, and we are making some progress, probably as much progress as is being made anywhere else if not a little more. We are using the knowledge that we have obtained in the past for the purpose of improving our methods and increasing our economy for the future.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister practically admits that the education of the Indian is a failure. I think that can be accepted as a fair interpretation of what he has said.

Mr. OLIVER. That is hardly a fair statement. I do not want to be understood as saying that the Indians have not been educated. They have been educated, but the result which was hoped from that education has not been achieved. So far as the education is concerned, there is no question that it has been imparted to the Indians, but parliament and the country had hoped that education would amount to civilization. Unfortunately the event has proven that that is not the case.

Mr. SPROULE. I was about to elaborate what I meant by education. I did not mean simply education by book knowledge, but civilization and education of habits as well as knowledge. Education of the Indian as a whole has been a failure so the minister admits. That being the case, we naturally look into the subject to ascertain what is the explanation and whether any method can be devised that would better accomplish the object. We have in view three objects, first, the civilization of the Indian; second, their education so far as knowledge goes, and, third, the inculcation of habits that would enable them throughout all time in the future to put that knowledge into practical use. It is a pity it has not been as great a success as we had hoped. Could the minister tell us what percentage of the Indians who have been trained in church schools and what percentage in secular schools? Has the minister made any effort to ascertain the comparative success in each?

Mr. OLIVER. There are something like 315 schools altogether and not more than ten per cent are non-denominational. Most of these are day schools. The boarding and industrial schools are almost entirely under the administration of some religious body, and so there is no opportunity to make a fair comparison.

Mr. SPROULE. There must be thirty-one day schools, and there ought to be some data which would enable us to ascertain whether their work has been a success or not. There may be something in the educational system which would account for the failure and which might be avoided by our adopting a better system. You might change the educational system entirely and make a great success of what is a failure now. It would be worth while for the minister to have some of his officers prepare information which would enable us to institute some comparison.

Mr. OLIVER. I would be glad to give such information as we may be able to secure. My belief is that there is not very much difference in the result in the one case and the other. The differences are due more to other conditions than to the difference between a teacher under the direct control of the department and one under the control of a church. The principle of co-operation between the Indian Department and the churches was accepted by the country some twenty or twenty-five years ago, and I believe wisely, because when the educational institution is under the management and responsibility of a religious body, we have a guarantee in the character and standing of that religious

body, that the teachers will set a good example in conduct and demeanour to the pupils, and thereby be most likely to advance them towards civilization.

Mr. BARR. What percentage does the government pay in connection with the industrial schools and the boarding schools which, we are informed, are under some religious bodies?

Mr. OLIVER. The payment is not by percentage, but so much per pupil. The government pays so much per pupil to the church which takes the responsibility of carrying on the educational institution, and the church has to provide whatever other money is required. The Elkhorn industrial school is carried on at the direct cost of the Indian Department. The other industrial and boarding schools are carried on by the various churches, and we contribute so much per pupil. I think we are in this way contributing from 50 to 60 per cent of the cost of carrying them on.

Mr. BARR. Can any religious body open up those schools and carry them on, or must it first get the government's sanction?

Mr. OLIVER. As we have conducted the business of Indian education so far, whenever any religious body had a mission established amongst the Indians or had acquired authority among them and was sufficiently interested and strong enough to establish a school, they would get permission to do so and they would get the grant per pupil just the same as any other.

Mr. SMYTH. Might I ask if it is the intention of the government to allow the construction by the Ontario government through the Indian lands of a trunk road between Sault Ste. Marie and Sudbury? The hon. minister will remember that last year a large deputation from Sault Ste. Marie interviewed the government on this subject. The Ontario government have spent a large sum of money already in the construction of that road, but they cannot pass through the Indian reserve lying between Sault Ste. Marie and Sudbury. I would like to know if it is the intention of the government to enable the Ontario government to complete that much-needed work by giving them the right to pass through the Indian reserve?

Mr. OLIVER. A number of the municipalities interested in the construction of the trunk road through Algoma interviewed the government on the subject last year, and it was explained to the deputation that it would be necessary for anybody desiring to build this road to let us know by a survey where they wanted the road to be, and that when we were informed on that point, we would take the matter up with the Indians with a view to securing a right of way through the reserve. So far as I am aware, we have never yet been furnished with the information that would enable us to take the matter up with the Indians, who of course are the owners of the land, and must be dealt with as any other owners would be for a right of way across their property.

Mr. SMYTH. As a matter of fact, I know that the surveys have been made, and I understood that the Minister of Public Works of Ontario had been in communication with the Department of Indian Affairs and had sent them the survey and plans of the right of way. Perhaps I have been misinformed.

Mr. OLIVER. So far as I am aware, we have not yet received the plans. As soon as we receive them, we shall be prepared at once to take up the question with the Indians and if possible secure the right of way. I shall be able to say on another day whether we have received the plans or not.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CANADIAN WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 11) to incorporate the Canadian Western Railway Company—Mr. Pardee.

On section 7:

Mr. HERRON. When this Bill was in committee yesterday I omitted having a clause inserted which will make a very slight difference to the conditions of the Bill. I beg to move:

That in subsection (a), line 5, after the word 'meridian' there be added the words 'passing through the town of Pincher Creek.'

This has been agreed to by the promoters of the Bill and a marked Bill has been put in the possession of the chairman, agreed to and initialled by them. Pincher Creek is two and a half miles from the railway station and in exact line with the contour of the proposed railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. If the promoters of the Bill have agreed I have no objection.

Mr. HERRON. They have agreed.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will remember that we discussed it a little yesterday, and one of the gentlemen interested said that he was willing to leave it to the Minister of Railways. I have no objection.

Mr. HERRON. The solicitor in charge has initialled this amendment and it is agreed to by all parties concerned.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. HERRON. I propose that the word 'Pincher' be substituted for the word 'Cowley' in the 7th line and that the word 'Cowley' be substituted for the words 'Pincher Creek' in th 8th line. This road is to extend from the boundary line north. But, although Cowley lies north of Pincher they insert Cowley first. It does not alter the provisions of the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. You want Cowley and Pincher transposed ?

Mr. HERRON. Yes.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 8,

Mr. GRAHAM. We struck out the words 'notwithstanding anything in the Railway Act.' But it has occurred to me that if we were to strike out the words 'along any highway, street or other public place,' we would be taking chances of striking out a street which, although it might not be used at present as a highway, might nevertheless be laid out as a street. Would there be any danger of that?

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. A street is a highway.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thought we had not the exact words we put in the Bill of last year. I thought possibly that a street might be laid out and dedicated for a street, but not yet used as a highway, and we might get into trouble by striking out the word 'street.' I think it can do no harm to leave it in, and it might do harm to strike it out. I move that the words 'street or other,' wherever they occur in the original Bill, be reinserted.

Motion agreed to.

On section 11,

Mr. HERRON. Will there be anything in this amendment to prejudice our local telephone system that was spoken of today in the committee? I thought the minister assured us that this was the usual form of clause on the conditions of telephones—or is it something new?

Mr. GRAHAM. The question was raised in committee as to the connections between this line and some other line. The point I made was that any company chartered by this parliament was under the control of the Board of Railway Commissioners, and the board could make them connect or do whatever they liked, but they could not control another company that was not chartered by this parliament, nor could they compel it to connect on their side. But they could compel this company to connect with the other company if they are willing.

Mr. MAGRATH. Before this Bill is finally disposed of, I wish to place on record a few words in connection with what has taken place in the Railway Committee. I represent a section of country through which this railway is supposed to go. We want the railway; we want all the railways we can get in that country. But, as I said in the committee, I do not wish to go back to my constituents and say that the promoters blandly told me in committee that they were going to spend $2,000,000 and build 200 miles of railway; I think my constituents will expect from me something more definite than that. I want it placed on record that the promoter said his company was going to build this railway without waiting for the connecting road which he spoke of from the United States, which was to come up to the international boundary. I want that on record, because I expect these gentlemen will be coming back to this House. I am not particularly concerned as to whether the telephone lines should be carried underground or overhead; it is railways that we want, on the ground, and not on paper. It occurred to me that when gentlemen come here and tell us they are prepared to spend $2,000,000, they should be prepared to put up 5 per cent as a guarantee of their good faith. I mention that now, as I mentioned it in committee. But my object, as I said, is that if these gentlemen come back I shall have something to say to them if I am in this House.

Mr. SPROULE. The chances are that you will have the opportunity.

Mr. GRAHAM. I guess your prognostications will turn out to be correct.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company. —Mr. Schell.

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

Bill (No. 43) respecting the Hudson Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Cash.

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

Bill (No. 46) respecting the Crawford Bay and St. Mary's Railway Company, and to change its name to 'The British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba Railway Company.—Mr. Wilbert McIntyre.

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

Bill (No. 49) respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company. —Mr. Devlin.

Bill (No. 51) to incorporate the Royal Casualty and Surety Company of Canada. —Mr. H. H. McLean.

Bill (No. 52) respecting the Bank of Vancouver.—Mr. Cowan.

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

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 9) respecting the Brandon Transfer Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 12) respecting the Collingwood Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 14) respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Indian schools, maritime provinces, Ontario and Quebec, $73,225.

Mr. SPROULE. Before six o'clock I asked the minister to furnish us with information as to the number of day schools, the number of pupils attending these schools, the location of these schools; the number of the church schools, the number of pupils attending these schools, and the location of these schools.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). At page 60 of the annual report of the department the information is given out that out of 315 schools 49 are undenominational, 111 Roman Catholics, 93 Church of England, 44 Methodist, 16 Presbyterian, and 2 Salvation Army.

Mr. SPROULE. I was trying to get information as to whether the denominational schools are more successful in civilizing the Indian than what might be called public or secular schools.

Mr. OLIVER. I will have collated from the annual report the information in the form in which the hon. gentleman asks for it.

Surveys, $10,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Are you doing any survey work on the Indian land?

Mr. OLIVER. This is for surveys of reserves under the new treaty in the northern part of New Ontario. We intend also to pay the cost of subdividing small Indian reserves and resurveying old reserves where the land marks have become obliterated and when the Indians interested have no funds of their own.

Mr. SPROULE. Are you carrying on any surveys in the islands of the Georgian bay?

Mr. OLIVER. No, but we had a revaluation made last year.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Who is the surveyor?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Sing was the surveyor; the work was finished three years ago.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. Is it the intention of the department to continue leasing or selling the timber on the Indian lands?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. Has the department issued a letter to certain parties in my riding stating that the department would discontinue allowing them to cut timber. I refer to the Indian lands near Cutler on the Sault Branch in the district of Algoma?

Mr. OLIVER. I am unable to reply at the moment. Speaking generally, we intend to sell the right to cut timber on the Indian lands from time to time as it may be in the interests of the Indians to do so.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. There is a firm in the district of Algoma which heretofore has had the privilege of cutting timber on the Indian lands on the reserve near the village of Cutler, and I saw a letter written by some official in the department informing them that that right would be discontinued. I may say that the gentleman to whom I refer has been heretofore a very strong Liberal, but in his wisdom he saw fit to help me to be elected to this House, and immediately after the elections were over he got a notice from the department that permission to continue cutting timber on this reserve would be discontinued. When this notice was received, the Indians, as I understand, got up a petition asking the government to continue the right to this gentlman to cut the timber. I wish to ask the minister if he has ever given instructions to any of his officers to send such a letter?

Mr. OLIVER. I have no recollection of any sale of that kind, and would have to look over the records before I could give a definite reply. There are many circumstances in which it would be quite proper to give these instructions, but I can hardly understand how any firm would have a standing license to cut timber on any land.

Mr. SMYTH. Their right to cut this timber has always been admitted heretofore. Would that come before the minister or the deputy minister of the Indian Department?

Mr. OLIVER. It would depend on the circumstances. If it were a matter of detail, it would come before the deputy, but if it were a matter of policy it would come before me. I cannot say which it was without knowing the facts.

Mr. SMYTH. You are not in a position to say that notice has been given by the department to this firm that their license will be cancelled on April 31 of this year?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not just now, but will be able when I have the opportunity to refer to all the files. There will be an opportunity later on.

Mr. SMYTH. Who is the deputy superintendent of Indian Affairs?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Frank Pedley.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the hon. minister explain what becomes of this money, the grant to land managing funds? To whom is it paid and who disburses it, and in what way and what does the item mean?

Mr. OLIVER. There were two funds which existed previous to confederation out of which the charges of management of Indian lands were paid. After confederation these funds, which were taken over by the Dominion Government, became, in some way or other, improperly depleted, and the Dominion was indebted to them in a certain amount. Later on means were taken to recoup the funds from the Dominion treasury at so much per year, so that in fifteen years the Province of Quebec fund and in twenty years the Land Management fund will be restored to the position in which they would have been, had they not been improperly drawn upon.

Mr. DANIEL. Who are the trustees of the funds and who operates them?

Mr. OLIVER. The Indian Department became the trustee at confederation, and what are now considered to have been improper charges on them began in about 1880 and ran on until the funds were exhausted. Then the matter was reconsidered and it was decided to place the funds back where they were originally.

Mr. DANIEL. Then the minister's department is the one that operates the funds now?

Mr. SPROULE. With regard to the disposal of the rights to cut timber on Indian lands, could the minister tell us what is to be his policy in the future. We have had several instances brought to our notice of large quantities of timber having been cut on these islands by particularly favoured friends of the government who got that right very cheaply. Had these timber cuts been put up to public competition, no doubt they would have realized a great deal more for the poor Indians. The government might very wisely adopt a different policy from that of disposing of these timber cuts to their private party friends by private sale. When there is timber to be sold on an island or an Indian reserve, that sale ought to be publicly advertised and be made to the highest bidder. That method would realize more for the Indians, whose property it is we are handling in trust, and also give greater satisfaction to the timber trade. What took place on Hope Island was a notable instance given the House last session of this abuse of trust, and there were several other instances of the same kind in the Georgian Bay district. Would the government give us any assurance that they will adopt a better policy in the future?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know that it would be profitable to discuss the method of disposition of the timber on Indian lands, as it has been followed during the many years that the Indian lands have been under the administration of the Indian Department. It has followed very much the system of disposing of timber on ordinary public lands. Long ago when timber was of little commercial value it was more important that the timber on public lands should be cut than that a high price should be obtained for it. But as timber got more valuable the system of disposition was changed on Indian lands as well as on public lands. As to the present policy of the department with regard to timber on Indian lands, I can give no better illustration than the sale of timber on the Dokis Indian reserve on the French river, which took place late last winter or early last spring, when we sold the timber by public auction at the Russell House, after survey, estimate and advertisement, for something over $800,000, besides the dues of $2 per thousand feet.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. How much timber was sold this year besides that?

Mr. OLIVER. I think the returns are in the annual report, but, answering off-hand, I would say that was the only sale during that year.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I wanted to know whether there was any sale since that return was published. The return comes down to last March. I want to know if anything has been sold since then?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot give that information from memory. It will have to come at a later time. In regard to the questions asked by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Smyth) as to the carrying of a leading road through the Indian reserves north of Lake Huron, our records show that on January 31, 1908, we addressed a letter to the secretary of the advisory union of Algoma municipalities, one paragraph of which is as follows:

> Before we can take up the question of the surrender with any degree of satisfaction, it is considered that a plan or sketch should be prepared and forwarded to the department, showing in a general way where the proposed road would enter and leave the reserves in question. If this were done, we would be able to meet the Indians with a fairly definite proposition. Without it, it is considered that much valuable time would be wasted.

That is the last communication we have in regard to the matter.

Mr. SMYTH. Has there been any communication between your department and

the Department of Public Works of Ontario?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not aware of it. Our communications were direct with this union of municipalities, and we, of course, understood that their communications were with the provincial government.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I want to know definitely from the minister whether he will before all his items are passed give us the information as to what timber lands were sold and what rights to cut timber were given since the publication of the blue-book.

Mr. OLIVER. I will give the information on the next sitting day.

Grant for Agricultural society, Munceys of the Thames, $90.

Mr. BEATTIE. That seems to be a very extravagant grant to the Munceys of the Thames to encourage them in agriculture. I think it might be increased.

Mr. OLIVER. This is a small sum given for the purpose of supplying prizes for the agricultural show which these people hold on their own account. They are self-supporting and are well advanced towards civilization, and this is merely a small contribution towards the purchase of prizes.

Mr. BEATTIE. There happen to be two societies which hold two fairs a year, and $45 to each society would not encourage agriculture very much. Out of the large sums granted by the government I should think a larger sum than $90 might be granted for that purpose.

General legal expenses, $13,500.

Mr. HENDERSON. $13,500 for the lawyers and $90 for the farmers! I wonder what the Minister of Agriculture will say about that. During the last election he went through the province of Ontario explaining why cities should represent county municipalities, and why Conservative members representing rural districts should be deposed and somebody living in a town should be put in their places. I am afraid that he has been extending to the Department of the Minister of the Interior his policy of doing everything for the lawyer and nothing for the farmer. I wonder that the Minister of the Interior does not stand up for his own rights and the rights of his own wards and not let the Minister of Agriculture have too much to say in a matter of this kind. It seems to me an explanation is due to show why there should be such an enormous amount of legal expenses in connection with this band.

Mr. OLIVER. The reason that the grant to the Munceys is so small is that they don't need a large grant. There is, I believe, a principle laid down that to him that hath shall be given. But, in the administration of the Indian Department, it is given to him that hath not. It is to those who need that we give, and to those who don't need we don't give. The Munceys are not in need, and therefore there is no large appropriation for them. I think nobody will suggest that the amount expended in prizes at a small exhibition should be very large.

Mr. ALEX. HAGGART. I want to put the lawyers right on this item. We would like a little explanation. Does it include the enforcement of the Indian Act all over the Dominion, and the prosecution of parties for trespassing upon Indian surveys, and taking charge of the Indians generally as against the white man? I find in the Auditor General's Report, on page I—9, under the very same heading 'General legal expenses' payments made to several lawyers amounting to $1,093. I do not know whether that is intended to cover all the legal expenses for the last year—sums paid to lawyers in Ottawa, and in Ashcroft, British Columbia, and other places. A little explanation of that would let the lawyers out.

Mr. OLIVER. This vote is to pay legal expenses necessary in defence of what we believe to be the rights of the Indians in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, not in the Dominion at large. The reason the amount here appears large is because this year we have had an effort to settle a case which has been celebrated in Canada for many years, and we are in hopes of bringing it to a settlement; I refer to the Oka Indian case. Outside of that $10,000, the expenditure in 1907-8 was $1,093.95. That is a normal expenditure. But we estimate a cost in regard to this Oka case, of about $10,000. When we consider that that case has been a source of irritation during so many years, I think everybody will agree that it is desirable to secure a settlement, if we can, by expending this amount.

Mr. BARR. It seems very strange that we should have this item of $1,090 for legal expenses appearing year after year. Are the lawyers employed by the year? Are they on the list like civil servants? I understand this item has been going on for a number of years just the same. There has been one big lawsuit going on for the last twenty years. Do they do the same work year after year, or how is it that we have to pay so large an amount for lawyers' expenses? We know that the Indians are a very peaceable people. I think this is a sum, to a great extent, put down there to be divided amongst the lawyers. If we could increase the agricultural grant and decrease the legal expenses, we would be doing the right thing.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the minister give us any information with regard to the pre-

sent stage of the dispute in the Oka Indian case, and along what lines does he hope to succeed in effecting a settlement?

Mr. OLIVER. I need not go into the merits of the dispute in the Oka case. But the Indians take the position that they want their rights defended and carried to the highest court, that is the Privy Council in England, and whatever the highest court may decide they are willing to abide by. But they say they will not abide by anything short of that, and they will accept nothing less than a judgment by the highest court in the empire. A test case has been entered, and proceedings are now in progress in the city of Monreal, and will be carried forward to a finish.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the test case proposed by the government? Is the case based on what the Indians claim is an infringement of their rights?

Mr. OLIVER. It is a case arranged by the government, but the case is founded upon an alleged infringement of the rights of the Indians. It is a concrete case, and is in the Superior Court of Quebec before Judge Hutchinson.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister has made a reference to the Oka Indian litigation. Was anything paid on that account last year? I find no reference to it under general legal expenses in the Auditor General's Report, although last year $13,500 was asked for legal expenses. The only expense charged in the Auditor General's Report was $1,093. It seems strange that with only $1,000 of expense the minister should be asking for a vote of $13,500. And the same way last year. If this litigation has been going on for several years one would expect to see some charge or payment relating to it in the Auditor General's Report. Has the minister any explanation in regard to the matter? There is nothing in the Auditor General's Report with regard to any payment for the whole year for litigation in connection with the Oka Indians?

Mr. OLIVER. I have already said that the $3,500 in the vote is the amount estimated for ordinary legal expenses. In addition to that the $10,000 that was taken last year was taken with the expectation that we would have been able to get the case forward last year, but the circumstances were that is was not possible to get the case forward last year or to make an expenditure beyond the amount that my hon. friend has mentioned. It was only possible to get the case to court quite recently. When I spoke of the case having been in progress for many years I meant to say that the dispute in regard to the Oka reserve was of many years' standing, but this particular case in court by which we hoped to get a final settlement has only had its beginning within this last year. It is a new case although it is an old dispute, but we have actually now got to trial. Of course, there will be an appeal and it will be carried to the highest court.

Mr. S. SHARPE. How much of the $13,500 did you use last year?

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. That is the year before last.

Mr. OLIVER. In the year ended March 31, 1908, we expended $1,093.95.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. How much have you expended in 1908-9?

Mr. OLIVER. We have about the same expenditure for this year as for last year up to date.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Is there also litigation pending in reference to the Indians of the Grand River reserve? The Brant Indians have been claiming for many years that they were unjustly dealt with in that the government invested their funds in some Welland canal bonds, or something like that, and lost their money.

Mr. OLIVER. A claim is being spoken of as being made by or on behalf of the Six Nation Indians with regard to a transaction which took place some time in the 1830's, I think. That matter is under the consideration of the department at the present time.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Any hope of doing Justice to these Indians?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The facts are historical, I may say.

Mr. OLIVER. Of course, this department only takes responsibility to do justice with regard to what rests upon it, and it does not take the responsibility of doing justice with respect to that for which it is not responsible.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Quite right.

Mr. SPROULE. In this Oka Indian dispute, is the government supplying counsel for both sides of the case and paying the cost out of the Indian fund? Who are the counsel on behalf of the Indians?

Mr. OLIVER. The government is paying the whole of the costs in order to get a decision that will be satisfactory to the Indians and, it is presumed, equitable. The government is paying the cost of both sides to the suit.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you not think it is a great injustice to the Indians? The Indians claim that these others are trespassing and the litigation is to determine the question between the trespasser and the original owner. That the costs of the litigation should come out of the fund belong-

ing to the Indians seems to be unfair to the Indians.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not very familiar with this case myself, but my hon. friend and some of the older members of the House will remember it as a case which has been very celebrated and of long standing. It has been the cause of a great deal of acrimony, and I am sure they will agree with me that it is for the good of the country as well as for the Indians that a settlement shall be procured if possible, and that the price paid for the settlement is not too great if only a settlement can be secured.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think that makes it right. I have some remembrance of this case. It has been going on for a great many years. The Oka Indians were given land in Algoma in lieu of this land as an inducement to move out, but when they got there they did not like the land. They claimed that they were unfairly dealt with. A portion of the band never left the reserve and refused to give up the land. But those who were negotiating to get possession of the land still held on and insisted on taking the land from them. That trouble has gone on for a long time. The Indians still contend that the land is theirs and that they had no right to give it up. The others went to law. Now then, the trespasser comes in, according to the Indians' claim, and, because it is desirable to settle the dispute between the Indians and the others, the government says it is justifiable to take the poor Indians' money and pay the cost of the litigation for the trespasser as well as for the Indian. I am not contending that the Indian is right or that he is wrong because I do not know, but as a matter of principle it would seem to me that if the expenses of the Indians' side were paid out of the Indian fund that would be proper. I cannot see any justifiable reason why the expenses of the trespasser should be paid out of the Indian fund as well, because the portion that is paid for this litigation is taken out of the Indian fund and the Indian loses to that extent. It seems scarcely fair to the poor Indian.

Mr. OLIVER. Unfortunately the money is not being taken from the Indian but it is being taken, by this vote, out of the treasury of the Dominion of Canada and the taxpayers who are on one side of the dispute possibly claim that their share of the cost should not be taken to provide counsel and pay the costs for the Indians in trying to oust them from active possession.

Mr. SPROULE. The money that we vote for Indian purposes we are supposed to have got out of the property that we originally got from the Indians. The country was recouped for it and now we are voting it because the Indians are the wards of the government. We are voting money for the cost of litigation where the Indians are on one side and the trespassers on the other. To vote money to pay both sides is not fair.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) asked the minister a question which he has not answered yet. Who are the counsel for the Indians in the case?

Mr. OLIVER. Messrs. Wainwright & Davidson are representing the Indians for the department.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the suit entered in the Superior Court of Quebec now?

Mr. OLIVER. The court was sitting yesterday and the day before on that case with Judge Hutchinson presiding.

Mr. SPROULE. It will be appealed from that to the Supreme Court and then to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Annuity and administration, treaty 9, $21,200.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. There is a decrease.

Mr. OLIVER. That is accounted for by the transfer of the salary of the inspector from the outside service vote to civil government.

Indians, N.S.—relief and seed grain, $3,200.

Mr. DANIEL. What proportion of this was for seed grain and what for relief?

Mr. OLIVER. There is between $700 and $800 for seed grain.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. How many Indians in Nova Scotia?

Mr. OLIVER. 2,129.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. You are asking $3,000 less than you did a year ago; are there fewer Indians?

Mr. OLIVER. In that year there was a larger expenditure for relief and land was purchased for the Indians at Colchester to the value of $1,300.

Nova Scotia Indians, medical attendance and medicines, $3,700.

Mr. RHODES. What services are required from these medical officers?

Mr. OLIVER. They are expected to visit the reserve on the call of the agent or to prescribe and furnish medicines to the Indians if they call at their office.

Mr. RHODES. I do not think there is an Indian reserve in my county.

Mr. OLIVER. There are Indians settled in the county of Cumberland, but there is no Indian reserve in that county.

Mr. RHODES. Is this salary to the medical officer intended to cover the full cost of medical attendance to the Indians in a particular county?

Mr. OLIVER. The division is not by counties. Certain reserves are allotted to a certain medical man and he is expected to attend on the Indians at the call of the agent or to prescribe for the Indians of this reserve, or I presume any Indian, who may call at his office, and to give them the medicine his prescription requires.

Mr. RHODES. Is the medical officer supposed to do all the medical work within the territory allotted to him?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. RHODES. Then there should be no outside charge for medical services. There is a rather peculiar condition in my county, because the Indian agent is also the medical officer and at page I—13 of the Auditor General's Report there is an item showing a payment to Dr. F. A. Rand of $16 for medical attendance upon the Indians. Dr. Rand is the agent as well as the medical officer. This is a small item, but I feel it my duty to bring it to the notice of the minister. At I—13 there are items for medical attendance, F. A. Rand, M.D., Parrsborough, $200 and $16. Dr. Rand, the medical officer for that district is also the Indian agent.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot at the moment give my hon. friend an explanation, but at a later date I shall do so. Dr. Rand is medical officer for certain reserves for Indians and receives a salary of $200 as medical officer.

Indians, New Brunswick—salaries, $1,458.

Mr. DANIEL. How many reserves are there in New Brunswick and how many Indians?

Mr. OLIVER. Nineteen reserves and about 150 scattered Indians, 1,861 Indians in all.

Mr. DANIEL. There appears to be a similar arrangement in regard to medical attendance in New Brunswick to that existing in Nova Scotia. There are eighteen or twenty medical officers who apparently receive about $200 a year apiece, and then the same medical officers make individual charges for medical attendance. If they are paid an annual salary for medical attendance why is the extra charge put in as well?

Mr. OLIVER. I am in the same position in regard to this question as to the questions relating to Nova Scotia. It may be that these medical men make charges for attending Indians of other reserves.

Mr. DANIEL. Where a medical man attends an Indian from another province a charge is specifically made for it and printed in the Auditor General's Report. I should be very glad to get an explanation in regard to those cases.

Mr. RHODES.

Prince Edward Island Indians—medical attendance and medicine, $650.

Mr. DANIEL. How many Indians on the island?

Mr. OLIVER. Two hundred and seventy-six.

Mr. BARR. How many medical men required?

Mr. OLIVER. One.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The Auditor General's Report, page I—15, shows fifteen or twenty medical men employed. No doubt the reason is that the government has quite a number of political friends there whom they make medical advisers to the Indians and to whom they give from $25 to $50 each. To one they give $200. It looks as if the government were giving these fees to those who will vote for them.

Mr. OLIVER. I must correct the statement that there is one medical adviser. The call may be given to one or another, as the case may be, but they are paid by calls at so much per call.

Mr. BARR. No regular doctor?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

To provide for erection of wharf, Lennox island, P.E.I., Indians, $1,200.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Why is this not done by the Department of Public Works? That department is building wharfs all over the country, why not build one for the Indians? I suppose it is because the Indian does not vote.

Mr. OLIVER. This vote is standing from last year. The expenditure was not made, and we are asking for a re-vote. I cannot say why it is not done by the Department of Public Works, but I think there are many cases in which the Indian Department handles its own work with the view of employing the Indians and giving them some little advantage in that way.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. This is the first time I ever saw a vote taken in the Indian Department to build a wharf for the Indians.

Mr. OLIVER. In this case the Indians are living on an island and require some accommodation to get over to the mainland. We had a vote for a ferry to enable them to get to the mainland a year or two ago.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. We never criticise the Indian vote very much, but this seems very irregular. We have voted money to the Public Works Department to build wharfs to accommodate private citizens, and they should do it here just as well as ask the Indian Department to do it.

Mr. OLIVER. In that work we can give the Indians employment and probably the Public Works Department could not do that.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Why not?

Mr. SPROULE. The minister said some time ago that this expenditure comes out of the consolidated revenue of the country. Is there any account in which the expenditure for the Indians is chargeable against what we get out of the Indians?

Mr. OLIVER. An exact account is kept of the money which comes from the sales of Indian lands, or other moneys upon which the Indians have a special claim; but that has nothing to do with the votes we are asking. In cases where the Indians have not money of their own to carry on their business or meet their requirements, we ask for money from the consolidated revenue for this purpose. Where the Indians have money of their own we administer so as to meet their requirements as economically as possible.

Mr. SPROULE. Take the case now in litigation, have the Oka Indians no money of their own?

Mr. OLIVER. The capital of the Oka band amounts to $4,000. It is so small that it is not of any advantage and would not be sufficient to carry on their suit. In the case of the Oka Indians it is the ownership of the lands themselves which is in question. These Indians have not had the opportunity of acquiring a fund. Should they succeed in their suit, they would shortly be in a position to have a substantial fund, but until they establish their rights they have not that source of revenue.

Mr. SPROULE. There are roads made in the Manitoulin Islands over what is at present Indian reserve. Application has been made to the department, and I understand that they have granted certain sums for making and improving these roads. Would that not be taken out of the Indian fund?

Mr. OLIVER. The Manitoulin Island was all Indian land, and of course the Indian fund gets the benefit of any sales of that land. Therefore it was considered reasonable that the fund should bear the charges of the development of the land by the construction of roads.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that different from the erection of a wharf in Prince Edward Island? In the latter case, would the money be taken from consolidated revenue regardless of the source it came from, while in the former case it would be taken from the Indian fund?

Mr. OLIVER. That is the position exactly. The Indians of Prince Edward Island have no fund; therefore we have to come to their assistance for what they require and what we think they should have. But in the case of the Manitoulin Island the Indians have the benefit of the sale of large tracts of the island, and they still hold considerable tracts which are for sale; so that they have money available for these works. We do not come to parliament for that, but take it out of the fund that belongs to the Indians themselves.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Has the construction of that wharf in Prince Edward Island been begun yet ?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Is it the intention to build it this year?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Indians—Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Northwest Territories—annuities, $173,200; increase, $12,005.

Mr. ROCHE. Is this increase due to an increase of the Indian population ?

Mr. OLIVER. It is due to the adhesion to treaty of the Indians of the territory lying between Manitoba and the Hudson bay, which adhesion was taken last year.

Mr. ROCHE. Is the Indian population in these three provinces stationary from year to year ?

Mr. OLIVER. It is about stationary at the present time.

Implements, tools, &c., $8,432; increase, $3,867.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the explanation of that increase ?

Mr. OLIVER. It is occasioned by provision being made for a larger number of Indians, who formerly lived by hunting, turning to farming, especially on the reserves near the North Saskatchewan.

Mr. LAKE. Might I ask the minister as to the responsibility in which the department stands when an agent gives orders to a merchant to sell agricultural implements or other goods to Indians? This is a question which I know has created a good deal of interest amongst local merchants. Usually, when they come at first, they begin to sell to Indians without orders, and as a rule they lose their money. When the Indians bring the orders, does the department assume full responsibility for paying for the goods, and paying for them at an early date ?

Mr. OLIVER. No. The department does not assume absolute responsibility; but the order is issued in good faith, and it is the business of the agent to use all reasonable measures to collect the money. That is to say, if the Indian has money passing

through the hands of the agent, it will be the business of the agent to see that the order is paid. But if it should be that the Indian has no money passing through the agent's hands, it would not be possible for the agent to make the payment, and of course in that case the government would refuse to take the responsibility.

Mr. LAKE. Then I understand from the minister that it is the duty of the agent to take it from the annuity of the Indian ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, the agent has no right to stop the annuity, but he can take any money earned by the Indian or obtained from the sale of his produce.

Mr. LAKE. Or from the sale of his land?

Mr. OLIVER. No, the Indian cannot sell any land.

Mr. LAKE. I understand that, but portions of the reserve are occasionally sold by the department on it being surrendered by the Indians, and a certain portion of the money received from these sales is, I understand, distributed to the Indians themselves. I have had some accounts put into my hand, two of which have written across them: 'to be paid from land moneys.' Am I to understand from the minister that the agent cannot stop any of these moneys ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, he cannot. When the agent gives orders, he is presumed to have knowledge or belief that the Indian will, at the proper time, have money available to pay the debt, by reason of earning wages or selling produce or stock of his own. The agent has the right to stop that money from going to the Indian, and to pay it to the person who presents the order; but he has no authority to stop annuity money or money accruing from the sale of Indian lands from being paid to the Indian and to pay it to the creditor, except on the order of the Indian. The Indian may order the agent to pay his annuity to the creditor or money coming from the sale of the land to the creditor, but the agent has no authority to take their annuity money, or land money, and pay it to creditors, even though the agent gets an authorization from the Indian who incurred the debt.

Mr. LAKE. There must be many cases in which the money the Indian is to receive for the sale of his produce or his work will not pass through the agent's hand at all. No money coming to them ever passes through the agent's hand. Then if an agent has any order in a case of that sort, all he can do is to exert a moral pressure upon the Indian, he cannot force him in any way to pay the money. In cases of that sort, I should consider it inadvisable that the agent should give orders at all.

Mr. OLIVER. I am stating the actual position, not as a matter of policy, but as a matter of legal right. Of course an agent, in giving orders or authorization, should be sure that the Indian would be both able and willing to pay, or he should not give the order. If it should be within my hon. friend's knowledge that many such orders have been given and are not being paid, by any particular agents, it would be an occasion for us to take the agent to task.

Mr. ALEX. HAGGART. On this item of implements, tools, &c., I find that $68,000 worth of implements and tools were distributed amongst these twenty agencies in Manitoba and the Northwest. Is there any general instructions given to the agents as to where they shall purchase these tools and instruments? Can the agent buy when and where he likes, and give such prices as he likes?

Mr. OLIVER. The garden seeds are bought in bulk by tender by the department here, but the implements are bought by the local agent, and their orders are to buy at the lowest trade prices.

Mr. BARR. Are tenders asked for these implements?

Mr. OLIVER. No, not as a rule. The implements are sold at the standard price. Throughout so large an extent of territory the price may vary according to locality.

Seeds, field and garden, $2,177.

Mr. ROCHE. While I notice there is a considerable decrease in this item from last year, from $11,000 down to $2,000 odd, still, after so many years of voting seed supplies, even garden seeds, is it a fact that none of these reserves are self-sustaining, and that after getting government assistance for so many years, they cannot even produce their own garden and field seeds?

Mr. OLIVER. There is a vast extent of territory and a great variety of conditions. Some of the reservations are able to provide their own seed, and some are not. The reason for the large purchase last year was of course the general crop conditions which affected some of the Indian reservations as well as other localities. This year that condition does not exist, therefore we ask for a much smaller vote. The reserves which require assistance to supply seed during the coming year are what might be called the outside points, which are on the verge of cultivation, Norway House, Fort Francis, Clandeboye. There is wanted at Birtle 200 bushels of oats, at Portage la Prairie, garden seeds to the amount of $5; at Clandeboye, $35 for garden seeds and 150 bushels of potatoes.

Mr. ROCHE. The minister says oats are wanted at Birtle. I presume he means the Birtle agency. That I think consists of several reserves; they are in my own con-

stituency. The district is an oat growing district. Does the minister know what particular reservation this is for?

Mr. OLIVER. It is for the Cree reservation.

Mr. BRADBURY. It is a singular thing that you have to buy potatoes for the Clandeboye reservation, in a district where they raise hundreds of thousands of bushels, one of the finest potato districts in the world.

Mr. OLIVER. There are 150 bushels wanted at the Clandeboye agency. I cannot say why it is wanted. But it does not follow that because some Indians may have seed the others have it.

Live stock, $6,960.

Mr. ROCHE. Is this expenditure purely for the purpose of improving the stock?

Mr. OLIVER. For the purpose of keeping up the stock and increasing it, with an eye to improving it. They are killing stock from year to year, as permitted by the agent. The stock is increasing and improving.

Mr. LAKE. I notice that very large prices are paid for stock which is sent to some of the reservations. I notice one person at Guelph has apparently been shipping up bulls to some of the reservations at an average price of $115. Quite a number of cattle have been sent up by him. I am sure that in the old settlements nearer these reservations, bulls of equally good quality could be got at much lower prices. In fact I notice that many of the reservations are supplied by the local associations. For instance the Alberta Stock Association appears to supply a number at $60 and $70 a piece. The Manitoba Stock Association appears to have supplied some at about the same price. That, I think, is about the price at which good bulls could be got in that country. In the district where I live it has been difficult to dispose of thoroughbred stock. Even yet there is good stock to be got at a much lower price than $115 at which a good deal of the demand appears to have been supplied.

Mr. OLIVER. I believe in years past there have been some purchases of stock from Mr. McRae at Guelph. I believe he is one of the few breeders of Galloways in the country and it was thought well to experiment with a breed of cattle, that, being supposed to be particularly hardy, would be more likely to do well than other breeds under the possibly not high-class attention that they would receive at the hands of the Indians. But during the past two years the large majority of the thoroughbred horned stock that has been purchased has been bought at the stock sales at Calgary, Regina and Brandon, each province being supplied from the purchases at its own stock sale. We have found that very satisfactory and propose to continue it, provided the sales are continued successfully.

Mr. ROCHE. What is the name of the agent at Portage la Prairie?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Logan.

Mr. ROCHE. I noticed his name figuring in the Auditor General's Report for the sale of a great quantity of stock to the Department of Indian Affairs.

Mr. OLIVER. In last year's report ?

Mr. ROCHE. Yes, in the report ending 31st March, 1908.

Mr. OLIVER. What page?

Mr. ROCHE. I noticed one item, page I—20, in connection with the Birtle agency. It says: 'Logan, R., agent, Birtle.' He is not the agent at Birtle. Mr. Wheatley is the agent. I have seen Mr. Logan's name in several places as disposing of stock in the Portage la Prairie agency to the amount of several hundred dollars.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not understand the item, but I will inquire into the meaning of it as it appears in the Auditor General's Report, and let my hon. friend have whatever explanation there is in regard to it.

Mr. MAGRATH. There is a feature in connection with two reserves, with which my hon. friend is familiar, which has been brought to his attention before and which I propose to refer to now briefly. One is the Blood Indian agency and the other the Blackfeet Indian agency. I presume this is about as favourable an opportunity to speak of it as I cannot see any item particularly dealing with agencies. The situation of the Blood agency is this: They hold about 345,000 acres of land. They had a population, according to the last report, of 1,178, and the excess of births over deaths in the last year amounts to 10. But by going back to 1897 I find that the population on that reserve was 1,300, or a decrease of practically a little over a hundred. So that these reserves are becoming depopulated as time goes on. Looking over the returns I find that they have 3,100 horses and 5,500 head of horned stock, or about 8,600 head altogether. We know that that amount of stock will not require more than 150,000 acres and these Indians have 345,000 acres. The Indians are disappearing and I believe, and I am satisfied the hon. gentleman himself believes, that there should be something done with a certain amount of the surplus land so that the Indians who are there to-day may get some benefit from it. There happens to be, as the hon. gentleman knows, a settlement on the south boundary of that reserve which cannot extend in any direction except on to the reserve, and I be-

lieve the hon. gentleman has made some efforts to get the Indians to release a certain proportion of their land. I hold probably the same view as the minister that the trust is sacred to the people of Canada. The Indians are our wards and we have to protect them, but I take the position that if they cannot use the land for the reserve and if the disposal of the land would result in the development of the country, the land should be disposed of. I also realize that the Indian has to be controlled. I cannot say that I endorse the methods which are employed in the handling of the Indians. I do not know much about the subject, but I think it is a mistake to try to educate the head and allow the Indian to continue as a savage in the treatment of his stomach. I think that if we worked the other way we would make more of the Indian. However, I do not suppose the minister wants to listen to my theories on that subject. Does the hon. gentleman believe with me that it is in the interest of the settler, and that it is in the interest of the Indian as well, that the land should be sold? I understand the hon. gentleman to say that we cannot sell Indian reserves. That is quite true, but the Indian is an individual that can be controlled. He can be advised as long as he has confidence in the people that he is dealing with. That has been my experience with the Indian. I do not hold to the opinion that a good Indian is a dead Indian. I want to ask the hon. gentleman if he has not made efforts to get these Indians to dispose of some of that land? I understand that he has, but if he would, when he is in the country, endeavour to make it possible himself to see the Indians, I believe that it could be accomplished. There is no use sending a boy on a man's errand to the Indian. He likes to get hold of the chief muck-a-muck of the country when he is going to do anything. I think that if the hon. gentleman would take that into consideration and if, when he is in that section of the country, he would let us know we would endeavour to meet the Indians and see whether that cannot be accomplished. The hon. gentleman goes as far as I do in believing that a portion of this land might be sold and that the settlers should have the opportunity of buying it and paying a proper price for it. I do not believe in taking advantage of the Indian, and I do not believe anybody in Canada wishes to do so. But there is the settler starving for land; there is the Indian without the means of occupying more than probably one-third of his land; he is dying off, and as time goes on, unless we can get the Indian to sell some of his land, he will disappear without having received any benefit from his property and it will revert to the government. I would like to hear what the hon. gentleman has to say with regard to this proposition. As far as the expenditure is concerned I have nothing to say.

Mr. OLIVER. As the hon. gentleman has said, I am fairly familiar with the conditions connected with the Blood and Blackfeet reserves, the two largest reserves in the west, the best situated and of the very greatest value. I am entirely at one with the opinion expressed by my hon. friend that it would be very much in the interest of the Indians that a very considerable portion of these reserves should be disposed of, the money made available to the Indian and the land made available to the man who would use it. That is the policy I have been carrying forward to the best of my ability and in pursuance of which we have secured a number of very substantial surrenders of Indian lands, to the benefit, I think, of the Indians who surrendered, and, of course, to the benefit of the settlers and of the country by reason of the land having become productive, whereas it would have remained unproductive had it remained in the hands of the Indians. We have undertaken to secure surrenders of part of the Blood reserve, and we have had some discussion in regard to the surrender of part of the Blackfoot reserve. We have not been successful in securing the surrender. I do not know that it is a thing that will be advanced very much by being spoken about.

Mr. MAGRATH. The Indians do not read 'Hansard.'

Mr. OLIVER. The Indians are apt to hear what is said and to translate into it their own ideas and possibly to get exaggerated views of their own situation. So far we have found them indisposed to sell at any price; I may say they have practically refused to consider the matter. That of course is the result of the domination of certain individual men of influence in the band and any one who knows the persistence of the Indian character will believe that so long as these men remain it is going to be a very difficult matter to get their assent. An instance of this persistence on the part of the Indians is the case of timber on the Dokis reserve which was sold last year. Here was a reserve small in area, of absolutely no value to the Indians, and yet they held it for years and years while its value was in danger of being absolutely destroyed by the timber being burnt. But although they lived in poverty while they were rich in the value of that reserve, yet for years they would not listen to a proposition of surrender. At long last we secured the surrender of the timber and this little band of 83 Indians at once came into wealth to the amount of over $800,000 in cash, and

not less than $1,000,000 in dues when the timber is cut and sold. When you consider that perhaps all the Dokis band were really not thoroughbred Indians whereas the Bloods and the Blackfeet are not only thoroughbreds but have the reputation of being the most intractable Indians on the North American continent, except perhaps the Apaches of New Mexico, you will see the difficulty. I do not want to say that the task is impossible, but I do want to impress upon the House that it is one of very extraordinary difficulty. I quite appreciate the compliment my hon. friend (Mr. Magrath) has paid me in suggesting that if I should undertake the work I might be successful. I beg to assure him that if I had as much faith in myself as he has attributed to me I would lose no time in undertaking to secure the surrender. Unfortunately I have not that confidence in my own persuasive ability and I am afraid I might fail as others have failed. However, it is the policy of the department as at present administered to secure the surrender of Indian lands when these lands are of no present value to the Indians and when they would be of present value in adding to the productive wealth of the country. That is our policy; we have carried it forward very successfully during the last few years. It is our policy in regard to the Bloods and the Black Feet as it is in regard to all the reserves in the country.

Mr. MAGRATH. Has the minister any objection to state whom he sent to try and get the Indians to release. I think Mr. Markle was one and possibly the Rev. John MacDougall went also.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. MacDougall was negotiating with the Sarsees, but I do not think he went to the Blackfeet or Bloods. Mr. Markle had been trying to deal with the Blackfeet with whom he was well acquainted because he lived for a number of years on the reserve, and I think Mr. James Wilson the former agent on the Blood reserve attempted to get a surrender in the first instance but that attempt was made before I came to the department. Mr. Markle has made one or two attempts but without success.

Mr. MAGRATH. I believe it would be in the interests of the people of that locality if the Minister of the Interior as head of the Indian Department would go to these Indians himself. I have more faith in the hon. gentleman in that respect than he apparently has in himself, and I believe that the Indian wants to be approached by the head man. I find that the income of these Indians according to the last annual report amounts to about $31,000 which on the basis of five to a family gives them $130 a year each, and the expenditure in connection with these Indians has amounted to something like $37,000, which is very considerable. In connection with the Blackfoot reserve I draw the attention of the minister to the fact that there is an irrigation enterprise being extended in the country adjoining that reserve. There is only enough water for 15 per cent of the semi-arid country either in Canada or in the United States, and if you could make an arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway to apply water to that land now is the time to do it as it is perhaps the only opportunity you will ever have. If the water is applied to other lands now it will preclude the possibility of the portion of that reserve along the railway ever receiving water.

Mr. HERRON. I wish to ask the minister if anything has been done with regard to the surrender of a portion of the Peigan agency. I believe the department has had applications for the surrender of a portion of that reserve.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not recall that there have been any efforts with regard to the Peigan agency, at all events they have not been so persistent as with regard to the Bloods and the Blackfeet, if there is a prospect of succeeding we are prepared to undertake it.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE. Have the Indians of Swan Lake surrendered all their land?

Mr. OLIVER. No, only about half of it. They had two reserves and have surrendered the whole of their reserve in the Battleford district. The surrendered lands are in process of being surveyed and offered for sale.

Supplies for destitute Indians, $121,105.

Mr. ROCHE. The minister stated that the medical men in Nova Scotia attending schools and hospitals and reserves were paid when called upon or when any Indians waited upon them for medical attendance at their offices. Does this hold good in regard to this vote as well? For example, there is a hospital in the Birtle agency. It is attended by a Dr. Wright of Russell. I notice in the Auditor General's Report, page I—20, that he drew $973 last year for attending at that hospital. Was he paid only for the trips he made when sent for or does he make periodical trips whether sent for or not, in addition to prescribing at his office?

Mr. OLIVER. I understand he is paid to make a monthly visit whether called upon or not and has to answer calls as well.

Mr. ROCHE. Does he get anything in addition to his mileage and regular attendance fees for operations?

Mr. OLIVER. I understand that this covers all services.

Mr. ROCHE. Can the minister say how far Dr. Wright lives from the hospital?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to say. Perhaps my hon. friend could.

Mr. ROCHE. Dr. Wright has to travel fully twenty-five miles to this reserve, and there is located in the town of Rossburn, within three or four miles of the hospital, another physician, Dr. Evans, of equally good professional qualifications, and it would be much less expensive for the department to employ the physician living nearer the hospital, besides being so convenient in case of emergency. If the two physicians lived in the same town, I would not object. Dr. Wright, who was the Liberal candidate in the last election, is able to hold down the job, which is looked upon by his fellow-practitioners as something of a snap; but I do not think it is at all fair to the other medical man in this district.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not familiar with the circumstances. Russell is an old town and very likely Dr. Wright was practising there and was given this work before there was a Rossburn, and it is quite possible that Dr. Wright is giving satisfaction and that there is a desire not to make a change.

Mr. ROCHE. Since the facts have been laid before the minister I presume he will take them into his consideration and try to save the department as much as possible. I would also refer to another old friend of the minister, Dr. Lafferty of Calgary. The Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Aylesworth) when filling the position of Postmaster General, laid down the principle that no postmaster whose salary was sufficient to maintain him should engage in other business in competition with the business men of the town. This principle was applied in Cannington when it was only suspected that a postmaster had an interest in a grocery business. Why is that principle not applicable to medical men? Dr. Lafferty is practising in Calgary and the other medical men are handicapped by reason of the subsidy he gets from the government for attendance on industrial schools and Indians. He draws the following amounts for attendance of this kind: Indian school at Calgary, $345; Calgary Industrial School, $200; Sarcee Agency, $350; Blackfoot Agency, $654; Stoney Reserve, $443; or altogether, by way of salary and expenses from this department last year he received $2,000 in round numbers, in addition to his general practice in Calgary. Again I would not object if he was upon all fours with competing medical men in Calgary. It is well known that he is the director of ceremonies in Liberal matters in Calgary. But other medical men are located nearer the reserves than he is. The Blackfoot agency is forty or fifty, perhaps seventy, miles from Calgary, and still Dr. Lafferty is brought all that distance to attend the reserves. Dr. Lafferty is taken all the way out there and is running up expenses in connection with his trips, whereas there are two medical men right at Gleichen where the agency is located. I do not think it right to import a medical man from Calgary to attend the Indians there whose services I do not suppose would be valued any more highly than those of the two medical men who reside at Gleichen and who, by reason of their convenience as well as professional attainments, would give as good satisfaction, to say the least, as Dr. Lafferty. Stoney reserve is some twenty-five miles from Calgary, and for his services and expenses at this reserve Dr. Lafferty drew $443. The Minister of Agriculture laid it down the other day as a principle that in cases of quarantine, where there was a local veterinary surgeon in the locality affected, he should be employed to look after the quarantine. And in one instance in which it was pointed out that there was a local veterinary in the locality, he said he was not aware of that fact or he would not have sent a man there, and he would see that that was not done again. If that principle is applicable in the Agricultural Department, it should be equally applicable in the Department of the Interior. I would ask the minister if he does not think it is rather unfair to give Dr. Lafferty $2,000 practically of a subsidy for attending these four reserves when there are medical men right in the immediate neighbourhood of each?

Mr. OLIVER. The case of Dr. Lafferty is much the same as I suggested was probably the case with Dr. Wright. At the time Dr. Lafferty was appointed, I do not think there was any question that he was as conveniently situated as any other medical man for carrying on the work. True, since then other medical men have come in who are no doubt more conveniently situated, but the House will appreciate the undesirability of displacing a man who is giving satisfaction and has been long employed.

Mr. TAYLOR. You will be saving money for the country.

Mr. OLIVER. I think that the employment of a medical man is on a somewhat different footing from the employment of other officers, and that in the case of the Indians, the employment of a man who has their confidence, who has had long experience among them and who takes great interest in his work is very desirable. I think it would be a mistake to let such a man go for the difference in cost. As to the impropriety of Dr. Lafferty practising in

Calgary and at the same time attending the Indian reserve, I can only say that if he is able under the circumstances to retain any practice in Calgary it must be because of his very superior qualifications.

Mr. ROCHE. How often has he to visit those reserves?

Mr. OLIVER. He has to make a regular visit once a month to each, and has to go on call as well, so that his Indian work must take up a good deal of his time.

Mr. ROCHE. I notice in the Auditor General's Report an item for the expenses of a trip of Dr. Lafferty to Ottawa, $160.85. What business had he of a public nature that brought him to Ottawa and entitled him to charge up his expenses against the department?

Mr. OLIVER. There was a medical convention held here with regard to tuberculosis, and as Dr. Lafferty has had special opportunity of studying that disease in the course of his practice on the Indian reserves, it was thought in the public interests that he should be given the opportunity of placing his information at the disposal of the convention.

Mr. ROCHE. Is this an annual event?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say, but if it be an annual event I should certainly think it proper that the convention should have the advantage of Dr. Lafferty's experience in dealing with these diseases.

Mr. ROCHE. In looking over the reports of this convention, I fail to see any important part taken by Dr. Lafferty in laying his views on this most important subject, before the convention.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister is laying down a very extraordinary principle. We have many medical experts in this country, whose experience and knowledge would be as valuable at that convention as Dr. Lafferty's. If it be in the public interest to pay Dr. Lafferty's expenses to that convention, should not the government pay the expenses of these other men as well?

Mr. OLIVER. I would think that Dr. Lafferty's experience in dealing with tuberculosis among the Indians would be of considerable value to the convention, and I am bound to suppose also that the experience of other men interested in the same subject would be of considerable value to Dr. Lafferty in his work among the Indians. Even if you say that the information he had acquired was of no value to the convention, I still hold that the information to be there gathered would be of value to Dr. Lafferty and consequently to the Indian Department, and worth all it cost.

Mr. SPROULE. Turn the convention into a school for the purpose of improving medical men.

Mr. OLIVER. I take it that was the purpose of the convention.

Mr. SPROULE. If that argument be sound, would it not be equally fair and just to pay other medical men, say those coming from the maritime provinces, where their professional experience brought them much more knowledge of that kind probably than Dr. Lafferty would have? Would it not be fairer that they should be paid than he, because they gave their professional knowledge, not only to the world at large, but to Dr. Lafferty to make use of when he goes back to attend the Indians? It seems to me unfair to pay one and not the other.

Mr. OLIVER. The difference is this: Dr. Lafferty is working amongst the Indians for the Indian Department, and the Indian Department through the Indians gets the benefit of any additional information he secures, whereas the Indian Department has no interest whatever in the amount of information the other gentlemen get. I do not think there is any person in all Canada who has the same opportunities that Dr. Lafferty has for studying this particular trouble, or who may be presumed to have the opportunity of using to advantage any information that he might acquire; having in charge three Indian reserves, one of them having, if not the largest, the second largest Indian population in the country, and the others having a very considerable population, and with the decreased Indian population which my hon. friend from Medicine Hat has spoken of, everybody must realize that there are very remarkable and melancholy opportunities for studying that particular disease under the notice of Dr. Lafferty.

Mr. SPROULE. There may be, and there may be other localities where there are five or ten deaths from consumption to every one there is in that country; and suppose a very eminent medical man comes from one of those localities and gives information which Dr. Lafferty would use for the benefit of the Indians and the Indian Department, would it not be reasonable for the country to pay him as to pay for Dr. Lafferty? If it is pretended that Dr. Lafferty is an expert in that line above dozens of other medical men in the country, or has any greater opportunities for studying the disease or treating patients afflicted with it, that may pass with men outside of the profession, but it will not pass with men in the profession who are doing perhaps twice or three times the practice of Dr. Lafferty in the same line.

Triennial clothing, $4,645; increase, $1,969.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the cause of this increase? If the Indians are dying off so rapidly, how is it you want more clothing?

Mr. OLIVER. This clothing is supplied every three years, and a larger number happened to come in for their clothing this year than the number that came last year.

Indian schools, $276,541; decrease, $9,051.

Mr. ROCHE. If my memory serves me correctly, Dr. Bryce made a rather uncomplimentary report—in fact, rather severely reflecting upon the sanitary arrangements of many of these schools which he inspected a year or so ago. Can the minister give us any information as to whether steps have been taken during the past year to remedy the condition of affairs complained of by Dr. Bryce?

Mr. OLIVER. It is true Dr. Bryce did make a comprehensive report in regard to the health conditions of the Indian schools, and there is no doubt that it was not altogether complimentary. These schools were built many years ago before very much attention was given to this particular trouble, which affects the Indians more especially, and which requires, above all other diseases, the best housing conditions. The buildings were constructed without due regard to what we have so fully in mind today, and of course as time went by they were getting older and less suitable, and it was with a feeling of that fact that we had Dr. Bryce make an examination and report. Since the report has been made there has been some substantial improvement in the conditions, but to put the buildings on a proper footing would require the larger number of them to be absolutely renewed. Therefore, the improvement of the conditions up to the point it is desired to reach is necessarily comparatively slow. Besides, only part of the buildings were constructed by the Indian Department or by the government. The capital expenditure upon a very considerable number of the schools was made by the different missionary societies, but latterly the department has been from time to time assisting these societies to improve the sanitary conditions of the buildings and generally to bring them up to the modern standard.

Mr. MAGRATH. Who are the inspectors of Indian schools? Is there more than one?

Mr. OLIVER. The inspectors of agencies inspect the schools.

Indian surveys, $15,000; increase, $4,000.

Mr. ROCHE. Where have the surveys been principally carried out during the past year?

Mr. OLIVER. That part of the survey work was done on St. Peter's reserve, on the Red river below Winnipeg. We secured a surrender of the reserve, and it was necessary to make a new survey of it in order to provide for selling the land. Swan Lake, on which we secured a partial surrender, was surveyed, and I believe the reserve Sturgeon Lake.

Mr. ROCHE. What is the necessity for the $4,000 increase?

Mr. OLIVER. Because we have secured several surrenders of reservations, and require to subdivide them in order to sell.

Mr. MAGRATH. Are those surveys performed by contract or day work?

Mr. OLIVER. The surveys are done by two salaried surveyors of the department, Mr. Reid and Mr. McLean.

Grist and sawmill, $637.

Mr. LAKE. Is the department thinking of giving up the maintenance of these grist and sawmills?

Mr. OLIVER. Where the conditions have changed, or where settlement has changed the conditions so that it is not necessary to keep up saw or grist mills, I suppose we would dispense with them; but where conditions remain as they were when the mill was established, we intend to maintain it.

Mr SPROULE. How many grist and saw mills have you running now?

Mr. OLIVER. About six. They are portable mills.

General expenses, $222,324.

Mr. ROCHE. I would like to ask the minister if there is anything in the press report of a week or so ago about Mr. J. J. McKenna, Assistant Commissioner, being about to receive another appointment, and to be succeeded by Mr. S. Jackson, the ex-member for Selkirk.

Mr. OLIVER. In regard to that, I may say that for some time it has seemed to the department that the necessity for the Commissioner's office in Winnipeg, at least the necessity which existed in former years, had practically come to an end, and that the staff now employed in the commissioner's office might be employed with some advantage in other parts of the department's work. It is proposed that the office be dispensed with, abolished, and to employ the members of the staff there in other branches of the department.

Mr. ROCHE. Without making any addition?

Mr. OLIVER. There will be no office to make additions to.

Mr. ROCHE. On page I—30 of the Auditor General's Report there is an item:

Ben Rush, Melfort: amount charged on account of increase in cost of material between the time of submitting and awarding contract, $200.50.

This is part of an item of $2,839. It struck me as peculiar that the contractor should be allowed $200 for increase in the

cost of the material after the contract was submitted. That, I presume, means the time between the date when the tenders were asked for and received, and the time the contract was signed. The effect was to raise the amount of the tender by $200. It seems a somewhat unique principle to act upon. I wonder whether, if the material had diminished in value in the meantime, the contractor would have consented to diminish his contract by that much.

Mr. OLIVER. I scarcely think the hon. gentleman can consider the latter suggestion seriously. If he wishes, I will have an inquiry made, and bring the facts to the House.

Mr. ROCHE. And bring the other tenders too.

Mr. BRADBURY. I cannot find an item in the Auditor General's Report regarding a boat used on Lake Winnipeg. I know the Indian Department have a boat there, but I do not find an account in this book.

Mr. OLIVER. When an agent is making his annuity payments he must travel by boat, and my information is that he hires a boat when he requires to make payments. We have not a boat of our own.

Mr. BRADBURY. That is not the boat I refer to. There was a fisherman's boat employed by the month. The boat was employed for three months, and after the time expired it was engaged again for two months until after the election was over. It was used for election purposes. My opponent used that boat on Lake Winnipeg for two weeks.

Mr. OLIVER. Of course the use of that boat would not appear in the Auditor General's Report for this year, it would appear in the next one. The boat was employed in connection with the surrender of the St. Peter's reserve. Part of the terms of the surrender was that the Indians should be aided in removing from the old reserve at St. Peter's to the new reserve at Fisher river, and the boat was employed for some months in that work going back and forward between the two reserves.

Mr. BRADBURY. I desire to call the attention of the minister to some facts regarding the surrender of St. Peter's reserve. There is great dissatisfaction over the manner in which that surrender was conducted. There are men who take a great deal of credit for having secured the surrender of the reserve. I am led to understand that the manner in which the surrender was secured was very questionable. I know the nature of the Indian and I heard the hon. gentleman explain how hard it is to deal with him. When they called the chiefs and council together to secure their consent they refused, and there is a report current in Selkirk since the surrender was made that the surrender of the chief and council was purchased and that these men were bought to sell the band. There is a great deal of dissatisfaction existing to-day amongst the band with the manner in which the surrender was made. I might call to the attention of the minister the manner in which the land was handled. I heard the minister say a few minutes ago that the Indian had no right to sell land. I have always understood that the Indian, being a ward of the country had no power to convey, but this surrender was unique inasmuch as it made the Indian a land owner. The department gave the Indian sixteen acres of land to dispose of as he saw fit. The consequence was that this land immediately dropped into the hands of a few speculators and about 25,000 acres of land which should have netted the department or Indian from $10 to $15 per acre has been purchased by a few friends of the government because none but a political friend of the agent at Selkirk dare take the chance of purchasing this land because there was no guarantee, when he had negotiated with the Indian for this 16 acres of land, that he would be able to obtain a title. He was at the mercy of the Indian agent. Consequently, the land fell into the hands of friends of the government. The Indians have disposed of the land and have received not more than $3.50 to $4 per acre. There is a great deal of discontent, not only among the Indians but among the people of Selkirk who feel that there was a deal in this transaction. Of course I do not suppose that the minister will believe that possible. I am not blaming the minister for it. I am trying to draw his attention to it. But, a deal of this kind did take place at Selkirk. I have a petition from the Ojibways who occupied part of the reserve asking that they be granted another reserve. They are not satisfied with the reserve which you have given them at Fisher river.

With regard to the boat that the minister spoke of, it was in commission for, I think five or six months of the year, and in addition to that another steamer was engaged for taking the Indians out. While they had the 'Fisherman,' the 'Mikado' was commissioned to take out Indians and supplies. The 'Fisherman' was in active commission by my opponent Mr. Jackson travelling up and down the lake; he was using it for canvassing purposes. I did not object to it, but I do not think that a boat paid for by the people should be used for political purposes.

With regard to the officials of the department, I understand that there was an order issued by the government that no official was supposed to take part in a political campaign. There is not a government appointee in Selkirk that was not actively engaged in the campaign from the Indian

agent down. This practice is deplorable and something ought to be done to stop it.

Mr. OLIVER. The hour is getting late but I might make a statement in regard to this particuar reserve that may be of some interest to the committee. But, principally I want to draw the attention of the committee to the difficulties which appertain to the position which I at present happen to hold. A few minutes ago the hon. member representing Medicine Hat (Mr. Magrath) voiced the opinion, and voiced it well, that the department should use every endeavour to secure the surrender of a certain reserve or parts of two certain reserves. Now my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury), in whose district the department was successful in securing a surrender last year, complains strongly of the method and of the results of the surrender. The surrender was negotiated by a gentleman who is now the chief justice of Manitoba. He was appointed as the sole commissioner to secure the surrender because of his prominence, of his standing and of his legal ability. It was thoroughly understood that the question was a most difficult one, that it was most complicated, that the surrender could not be secured by any ordinary negotiations, and therefore a gentleman in whose legal ability, as well as in whose character, I presume, everybody had confidence, was selected. He carried the surrender through with a great deal of difficulty, after many hitches and after it appeared that it had become impossible. However, he did secure the surrender and it certainly contained many peculiar terms. I do not suppose there ever was a surrender like it before, and I fervently hope that there will never be one like it again. One of the terms was that the Indians should be given title to some part of the reserve. It was a remarkable condition but I place it before the House as an evidence of how far the department is willing to go in order to meet the Indians and in order that the land may be turned to beneficial use. The Indian would only sign the surrender of the reserve as a whole when he got this particular piece of land as his very own to do with it as he pleased, and when he got it as his very own we had no control over him as an Indian Department or as a government. He could dispose of it as he pleased and the buyer who wanted that land had to buy it from him under such terms as might be agreed upon and took such chances as any man must take who deals with another man who has not been used to ordinary legal responsibilities in business transactions.

Mr. ROCHE. Was it upon Mr. Howell's recommendation the department granted these 16 acres?

Mr. OLIVER. It was not on his recommendation; it was in accordance with one of the principal terms in the treaty which he made with the Indians, and the term upon which the whole surrender hinged. I regret it should be said that improper means were used to secure this surrender. I cannot imagine that the gentleman who is now Chief Justice Howell would be a party to any improper proceedings.

Mr. BRADBURY. I did not say so and would not like to have it inferred that I did.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend did not say it. I say that the surrender was on the responsibility of the present Chief Justice Howell. and I do not think that he would be a party to anything of that kind. The Indian Department certainly had no knowledge of it because the matter was placed absolutely in Mr. Howell's hands. I regret that the Indians concerned are not satisfied, because in my humble estimation, the Indians got a great deal the best end of the bargain, and if I had been transacting the business in person they certainly would not have got as good terms as Mr. Howell gave them. However, if my hon. friend knows the Indians as well as I do he will know that the fact that an Indian is not satisfied with his bargain is not evidence that he did not get the best of it. I had hoped all along that in securing this surrender it was for the benefit of the Indians themselves, and for the benefit of that part of the country. I believe the Indians will be better off on the new reserve and that the town of Selkirk and the surrounding country will be very greatly benefited by the fact that the surrender was made.

Mr. BRADBURY. I do not want it to be inferred for a moment that I intended to cast any reflection on Chief Justice Howell. What I said was that these rumours were circulating around Selkirk and I have it from one of the head men that they did receive from that commission four or five times more land than the average Indian received. In addition to that, these men were kept constantly in the employment of those who were purchasing this land. I know one man who told me himself that he paid the chief and council $2 per day for attending at his office and helping to negotiate sales. I have a letter here from Chief Prince's son which bears out what I state, namely, that the chief and council received some inducement for agreeing to make that settlement; an inducement which the band knew nothing at all about but which they have since found out and of course they are very much dissatisfied. I think I know the Indian pretty well, as I have lived among them for 27 years. I know there is a great deal in what the minister has said, that once an Indian parts with something he wants to get it back again. The point I was trying to impress

upon the committee was that there could have been a much better settlement made with the Indians in the interest of the Indian himself and in the interest of Selkirk. The surrender itself was a good one, it was what the people of Selkirk wanted, but I do not think the interests of Selkirk were taken into account in the details of that surrender. We had three or four hundred Indians living along the river, some of them fairly well off and every one of them a wage earner and they spent their money in the town of Selkirk. Now this land has passed into the hands of large owners, the capitalists have got it, and they are holding it for a very high price so that the land will lie idle along that river for many years to come, and when it is settled there will not likely be one settler where there were 100 before. While I am on my feet, I want to say that the minister knows we have on Lake Winnipeg a number of Galicians settled on land which is utterly unfit for any human beings to make a living out of. To my mind the wise policy of the government would have been when they secured that surrender to sell the reserve on 20 year or 30 year payments to these Galicians. These people are developing into an excellent class of settlers and they would have been a credit to that part of the country, and a great help to the town of Selkirk. I regret very much that the surrender was put through in the manner in which it was, and I think if the minister had to put it through again it would not go through on the same lines.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fisher, House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 15, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of the Interior for the year ended March 31, 1908.—Mr. Oliver.

FISHING BOUNTY.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. CROSBY. I beg to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) if it is not a fact that all the fishing districts in the county of Halifax are without the blank form required to be filled up in making application for the fishing bounty for last year, that the money should have been paid before this?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know anything about the matter, but I will inquire from the officers of the department and inform my hon. friend.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the minister should find that there has been delay, such as my hon. friend from Halifax has mentioned, would he be good enough to inform him as to what is the cause of the delay?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. These blanks should have been filled in between April and August last but they have not yet been supplied and information is desired as to the cause of the delay?

Mr. BRODEUR. I will get the information and give it to my hon. friend.

REMOVAL OF PLANKS FROM HIGHWAYS.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) if the report in the western papers is true to the effect that the Board of Railway Commissioners has issued an order forbidding railways, during winter, to remove planks from the public highways at crossings ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have heard nothing whatever about it.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It is reported in the Winnipeg newspapers.

INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. PERLEY. I would like to ask the right hon. the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) whether they intend to bring in an Insurance Bill this session, and if so, when; as I think it is very necessary that we should know as quickly as possible.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is expected that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will be here in a few days and then perhaps I will be able to answer the question of my hon. friend.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION REPORT.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask if the Civil Service Commission have presented their report yet, as required by the Act ?

Mr. FISHER. That report does not come down until the end of the fiscal year, and the report of the commission as to their operations this year will not be due until next session.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems that, having been appointed on the 1st September, 1908, they ought to give their report as required by the Act.

Mr. FISHER. I should take it that the report would cover the fiscal year, that it would be presented to the government like any other departmental report and would be laid on the table in accordance with the Act. As no report can be made to parliament this session it would be presented at the next session of parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the Prime Minister would look into the matter.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have already looked into the matter. The other day, when my hon. friend inquired for the report of the Civil Service Commissioners, I sent over at once and asked the commissioners to come to my office, which they did. When informed of the request of my hon. friend they did not anticipate that they were called upon to make a report. I cannot express any opinion on the matter but I asked Mr. Shortt, and Mr. Larochelle whether, according to their interpretation, of the Act they were bound to put such a report on the table this session.

POST OFFICE RETURNS—RE-APPOINTMENTS, &c.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Murphy) to call the attention of the Post Office Department to the fact that they have sent in an incomplete report in answer to an order. The Post Office Department must be bigger than to have made only twelve appointments, no promotions, and only one transfer.

Mr. LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). During the year?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, according to the report.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will inquire into it.

BRAZILIAN ELECTRO STEEL AND SMELTING CO.

House in committee on Bill (No. 10) respecting the Brazilian Electro Steel and Smelting Co.—Mr. Pardee.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me to be a bad policy for this parliament to incorporate companies designed to operate in foreign countries, and to give them powers which they are to exercise subject to the laws of the country in which they operate. I have always thought this was one of the devices adopted by a certain class of people to raise money out of their friends at home to be invested in foreign countries where it is quite impossible for the parties who furnish the money to have any intelligent oversight of its expenditure. We have two or three Bills on the Order Paper to incorporate such companies at the present time. They are first incorporated under the Joint Stock Compnaies' Act, then they come here for an Act of Incorporation, and without a very close analysis of the measure we do not know whether we may or may not be giving them power which it is unwise to give them. It seems to me there ought to be some one connected with the government who would look into these Bills very carefully, because I am afraid their effect is very often to mislead innocent public who are induced to put money into these enterprises and who sometimes lose their money. These companies should be incorporated in the countries in which they are going to operate.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have generally referred these Bills to special committees and have accepted their reports. The suggestion made by the hon. gentleman may be very proper, and I have no desire to combat it at the moment, but I have no doubt all this will be looked into by the committee before the Bill is allowed to pass.

Mr. SPROULE. I was on that committee for a considerable time, and I remmber that the committee paid little attention to these Bills because it was contended that when such a Bill got a second reading the principle was adopted and that all that remained for the committee was to consider the clauses.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is undoubtedly true with regard to a public Bill, but it is certainly not so in the case of a private Bill. The first question put on a private Bill is whether the preamble shall pass, and that is the first thing the committee has to deal with.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 15) respecting the Mexican Land and Irrigation Co.—Mr. Pardee.

LAKE SUPERIOR BRANCH GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC.

Mr. TURRIFF moved the second reading of Bill (No. 30) respecting the subsidy from the Ontario government to Lake Superior branch of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. TURRIFF. This is a Bill to confirm an agreement made between the Ontario government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and contained in chapter 18 of the Ontario statutes of 1904. Section 21 of that Act provides that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company shall come before this parliament and get an Act to confirm the agreement. This Bill is introduced at the request of the Ontario government and to carry out that arrangement. It applies particularly to sections 3 and 22 of the Ontario Act.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. What is section 3?

Mr. TURRIFF. It is as follows:

1. In addition to the provisions of the Railway Act with respect to tolls, to be taken or levied by the said companies it is hereby enacted that there shall be no secret special rates, rebates, drawbacks or concessions to favoured shippers nor any act or thing that will affect or prevent free competition in any line or lines of trade.

2. Each of the said companies shall be obliged, upon the request of any township or county, municipality through which the line of railway passes, to carry road making material, gravel or stone, required for improving any of the road within any such municipality, at the cost of handling and carriage.

Section 22 provides that in the event of the Dominion government taking over the road, the subsidy given by the Ontario government shall be returned to them by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. These two clauses are being confirmed in the Bill which I am now asking to be read the second time.

Mr. CONMEE. I have sent copies of this Bill to the city of Port Arthur, which is interested in it, because the subsidy granted by the Ontario government was granted upon condition that the road should come to the shores of Thunder bay. I do not say that this Bill would relieve the company of that obligation, but it might do so. In my opinion the road as constructed is six or seven miles from Thunder bay.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the hon. member (Mr. Conmee) oppose the Bill?

Mr. CONMEE. No, I am only asking that it stand until I have an opportunity of hearing from the representatives of the city of Port Arthur. I had an interview this morning with one of the gentlemen connected with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, and I understood from him that the Bill was to stand until the solicitor of the company came here to discuss the Bill and I desire to hear from Port Arthur. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. GRAHAM. This Bill seems to be a peculiar Bill. If I understand it correctly, it is to carry out an arrangement made between the Ontario government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. To begin with, I can hardly accept the policy that any other government and any company can get together and make an agreement which will commit us to pass any Act. It may be all right or it may not be all right. There may be some things in the Bill which it would be perfectly proper for us to confirm in order to protect the Ontario government against any acts that might be done by the company in default; but there is another part referring to rates which to my mind is not in accordance with our Railway Act. While one portion of the Bill insists that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company must not give any special rates or rebates to any person, another portion says that it must give special rates and rebates. To my mind these provisions are contradictory, and we are asked to confirm them both. The Board of Railway Commissioners having been adopted by us as the means whereby we control rates, for my part I want to adhere to that policy, and I would not wish to assent to any Act that would take the control of the rates to be charged by a company chartered by this parliament away from the Railway Commission. There may be some things in the Bill that it is necessary for us to confirm, but there are two or three things in it which at present I do not think we ought to confirm.

Motion for adjournment of debate agreed to.

ONTARIO AND MICHIGAN POWER COMPANY.

Mr. JAMES CONMEE (Thunder Bay and Rainy River) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 34) to incorporate the Ontario and Michigan Power Company.

Mr. BOYCE. I would ask the hon. gentleman to give some explanation of this Bill, as I believe it is practically the same as the Bill that was introduced last year.

Mr. CONMEE. I did not think it necessary to take up the time of the House in discussing the Bill before it went to the committee. I think hon. gentlemen understand the Bill fairly well. It is practically the same Bill as was introduced into the Senate last year, and practically the same as was carried in the Senate two years ago, with this difference, that in the previous Bill provision was made for the storage of water on the rivers mentioned, and in the first Bill reference was made to the Sturgeon river. All reference to that river and to storage of water upon either of the streams or the tributary waters has been removed from this Bill. The hope of the promoters was to simplify the Bill in order to remove criticism. It does not differ at all from a large number of Bills that have passed this House in recent years. I may say that the Ontario legislature has passed Bills similar in character to this, but with less safeguards. If it were necessary for me at this stage to discuss the Bill specifically, I think I could satisfy hon. gentlemen that no Bill that has come before the House within recent years has had better or more specific safeguards to protect the public interest. I would suggest that the Bill be allowed to go to the committee, where it can be discussed in all its details.

Mr. BOYCE. This is the third session during which we have had discussion on the

principle of this Bill. Last session my hon. friend endeavoured to secure the passage of the principle of the Bill under this name and the preceding session under another name, but in each case he has met with a reverse, either in the Senate or in this House. The first Bill was defeated in this House, while the second was thrown out in the Senate committee after a somewhat lengthy debate. The objections to this Bill are serious, and I do not want to have it thought I am endeavouring captiously to take up time. By the Bill certain private rights are sought on two rivers flowing into Lake Superior, the Pigeon and Nepigon rivers. It is sought to acquire the use of the water-power on these rivers, accompanied by the right to acquire such lands, privileges, &c., as are necessary to carry out the operation of those water-powers. The Ontario government has laid out with considerable care a power policy for the development and control of power and the regulation of rates in that province. That power policy has been twice approved by the people of Ontario. It involves the very principles of control over water-powers of which this Bill endeavours to rob the province. Therefore, if this Bill were objectionable in nothing more than its invasion and violation of the principles of provincial rights, it should not be allowed to receive its second reading. I would point out in this connection the provisions of section 14, which are as follows:

In case of any dispute or difference as to the price to be charged for power or electrical or other energy, for any of the purposes in this Act mentioned, in use or to be provided for use upon the Canadian side of the international boundary, or as to the methods of distribution thereof, or as to the time within which or as to the quantity to be furnished, or the conditions upon which they shall be furnished for use, or as to the value of any lands, timber or other material, or the exercise of any of the provisions of this Act, such dispute or difference shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 17 of *The Railway Act*, be settled by the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada on the application of any user of or applicant for power, electrical or other energy produced by the Company, or upon the application of the Company.

One of the chief provisions of the Ontario Power Act is the control with regard to the user of the power and the regulation of rights which this section 14 would take away from the province. I do not want to discuss the Bill clause by clause; I am merely pointing out objections to its principle. The Senate committee was very emphatic in its condemnation of the Bill owing to its invasion of the rights of the province, counsel for the province being present and objecting to it. I hope, therefore, the House will not allow the Bill to receive its second reading.

Mr. BOYCE.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I would not for a moment take the ground my hon. friend does that it would be wise to negative the motion for the second reading. For my own information I would ask if these streams are boundary waters?

Mr. CONMEE. The Pigeon river is an international water and the Nipigon is a navigable water, and in my opinion also international in character because it forms a source of the lakes and connecting channels which are international. A case arose which makes that point quite clear in connection with the Rainy river. A company developing a power at Duluth undertook to divert a portion of the waters from the watershed of the Rainy river to the St. Louis river. The Canadian section of the Waterways Commission objected to that proceeding. There is a report upon that subject, the result of which was the Duluth Company were prevented from diverting portions of the water from flowing into Rainy lake, the source of Rainy river. The same conditions exist at Nipigon. Certain of the waters flowing into the Nipigon can be diverted very easily—I am speaking from personal knowledge of the ground—to the Albany river. There are very few points at the head of most of the large rivers on the north shore where that cannot be done, and there is a question as to where the line should be drawn as to what is international and what is not. These streams certainly form the international waters of the great lakes, and if we read correctly in the press, the recent treaty provides that the jurisdiction of the commission shall extend not only to the basin of the lakes but to the area of drainage. It is quite apparent that there must be a regulating power somewhere. In some respects the question of international waters are just as much an issue in the one stream as in the other.

Mr. BOYCE. Does the hon. member base his claim in reference to the Nipigon river on its being an international water?

Mr. CONMEE. Not at all, that is only incidental; it is a navigable water.

Mr. BOYCE. For what distance?

Mr. CONMEE. No dam or bridge can be constructed across any navigable stream without the consent of the federal authority. There is a case in point. A Bill has been passed by this House relating to the development of water-power at Fort Frances by the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company.

Mr. BOYCE. That is an international water.

Mr. CONMEE. Certainly, so is the Nipigon river, to a certain extent at least, in my opinion.

Mr. BOYCE. Not seriously?

Mr. CONMEE. Yes, I am quite serious, and I am quite prepared to back up my opinion with sufficient evidence.

Mr. FOSTER. On what do you base it?

Mr. CONMEE. On common sense.

Mr. FOSTER. Let us have a chunk of it.

Mr. CONMEE. I know my hon. friend would perhaps be the better of a little of it. I was trying to enlighten him, if I could. I won't say at this stage that I will undertake to satisfy my hon. friend that I am right, but if he will tell me where he can draw the line between what is international and what is not international water, he will give me some information that I would like to get. The Pigeon river is an international boundary,—there can be no doubt about that.

Mr. PERLEY. For what distance is it an international boundary?

Mr. CONMEE. Perhaps three hundred miles.

Mr. BOYCE. Oh, no. Do you include the lakes?

Mr. CONMEE. Yes, the Pigeon river and the lakes in that water route extend from Lake Superior to the north west angle of the Lake of the Woods, a distance of nearly three hundred miles. If I understand correctly the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite, the question of jurisdiction would be a fair subject for legislation. I have read some newspaper articles in which it is declared that there is no more right in this parliament to grant a charter to deal with an international stream than there is to deal with any navigable stream. Perhaps some of the hon. gentlemen on the other side will enlighten us upon that point. I was referring to the Bill that passed this House in connection with the Rainy River Development Company—the Ontario and Minnesota Power Bill. That Bill did not afford sufficient protection to the public. Local interests petitioned parliament for and obtained sweeping amendments to the Bill providing for the distribution of electricity, for the outflow of the water through the waste weirs, for the establishment of the works on the Canadian side of the international boundary,—for if these waste weirs were not on the Canadian side of the boundary how could this government control the flow of the water? and how could navigation be protected below the dam if the company could hold back the waters for a week, or, as they might do, for months? For the area of Rainy lake is very great, and it would take a long time to raise its level greatly even though all the water were held back. By exercising this power, the company could destroy navigation on the river below. I do not need to argue that question very much. But it is to the interest of a power company to hold back the flow of water until the period of low water, and then to draw the level down gradually so as to maintain their power at their power station. The result of this policy might be to make a difference of twelve or fifteen feet in the level of the lake—I am speaking of Rainy lake. I have seen differences in the level of that lake varying from six to twelve feet, the result merely of natural conditions, the precipitation and the nature of the season. These are matters that must sooner or later be provided for and dealt with by some authority; and I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite if they think the provincial authority has power to regulate it. I believe it has not, for it has no power over navigable waters. It is said that because the province owns the land over which the waters flow they have paramount control.

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask a question? Does the hon. gentleman contend that if, in a river three hundred miles long, there is a portion fifty miles long that is navigable, therefore the Dominion has control over the whole stream?

Mr. CONMEE. It certainly has control over that portion that is navigable. I am not going to draw so fine a line as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) has in his mind.

Mr. SPROULE. This Bill takes over the whole stream.

Mr. CONMEE. No, but one point on the stream. In my opinion 'navigable stream' means not only the river itself, but also the tributaries back to the watershed of the river. For, if that were not the case, it would be an easy matter to dry up the stream. I can give the hon. gentleman a case in point. In the United States the control of navigable waters is in the Secretary of War,—as these waters may be needed for purposes of defence, they are put in control of that department. The Fox river, in Wisconsin, which is the outlet of Lake Winnebago, enters Lake Michigan at Green bay. It is in about a similar position to the Nipigon. The distance from the mouth to the source of the Fox river is 45 miles. There are established along this river at Appleton, combined locks and at other points, some of the largest pulp and paper manufacturing industries in the United States. These power companies, in order to secure water for their works, had control of the lake by a dam. They drew the water down to such a level as to destroy navigation. The wharfs at the villages along the lake shore could not be reached by boat because of the low water. The federal

authorities of the United States closed the outflow, and compelled these companies to maintain the lake at mean level. It is as inevitable as anything can be that this parliament must, some day, grapple with these questions. But these questions are not raised in this Bill. The hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) says that this Bill was defeated in this House. That is not the case.

Mr. SPROULE. He said it was defeated in the Senate.

Mr. CONMEE. He said it was defeated in this House too. It passed the Senate two years ago, but did not come to a vote in this House. And the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) knows very well the reason why it did not come to a vote—he obstructed it, and so the Bill was not reached. This is a very much improved Bill. I said that I did not propose to discuss the Bill on this occasion. But I am willing to discuss it, and seeing that discussion is forced upon me, I will say a few words concerning it. I would ask hon. members, what is there in this Bill that interferes with provincial rights? I ask the hon. member who has already spoken and others who are yet to speak to answer that question.

Mr. SPROULE. Perhaps I may be permitted to say a word at this point. Suppose that on a certain stream, three hundred miles long, there is navigable water for a distance of fifty miles, and that on the rest of the stream there are many available water-powers. Now, these water-powers are regarded by the province as their asset, and they propose to work them and control them. This Bill interferes with that right.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. member, (Mr. Sproule) is entirely mistaken. The Bill takes away no rights from the province. The river is not three hundred miles long, but about forty-five miles long, and it is navigable throughout its length except at the several falls. If my recollection is correct, there is a total fall of over three hundred feet on the river, and there are seven or eight points at which about 25,000 horse power can be developed. This Bill asks for but one. Hon. gentlemen must bear in mind that it is not in the nature of a monopoly. It has been so represented, and I fear, notwithstanding the explanation of the fact, it will be still misrepresented. But there are seven or eight other points on the river at which an equal amount of power can be developed, that is, the same volume of water and the same head can be obtained at different points. This Bill asks for one. Now I may ask, does the province own the stream? I am told by very eminent legal men that there is no ownership in water, and that if there is in this case, it certainly does not belong to the province. As I stated a moment ago, it is more or less international in character, because it is a feeder of these international waters that divide the two countries; there can be no question about that. The Bill merely gives this company power to go on and construct works. If the province of Ontario own any land, any rights, if they own a water privilege, why, they must be paid for it; it cannot be taken for nothing; they will have to be dealt with and their rights satisfied.

Mr. BOYCE. Is the hon. gentleman not aware that the Ontario government to-day is claiming jurisdiction over this very river, the Nipigon river, under its power law?

Mr. CONMEE. I am aware that the province of Ontario is objecting to all these Bills. They have an agent here and have had for the last four or five years, yet the Bills have gone through just the same.

Mr. BOYCE. Not this one.

Mr. CONMEE. They had an agent here objecting to this Bill.

Mr. BOYCE. But it did'nt go through.

Mr. CONMEE. There are good reasons why the Bill did not go through. The hon. gentleman stated that it met defeat in this House. That is not true. It did not meet defeat. The hon. member from the Soo, speaking at first, said the Bill was defeated in this House.

Mr. BOYCE. It did not get through this House.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. gentleman said it met with defeat here. He is not correct, it was not reached.

Mr. BOYCE. I was correct in saying that it was defeated by the Senate committee, am I not, this same Bill?

Mr. CONMEE. It was defeated by the Senate committee last year. There are several reasons why the promoters of this Bill are within their rights in coming to this parliament to ask for this legislation. In the first place, they say that the legislature of Ontario has no constitutional authority to clothe them with the powers they require. The British North America Act, I think, bears that out. Under section 92, reference is made to the exclusive powers that the legislature can exercise, and one of them is subsection 11 to charter companies for purely local objects, local enterprises confined within the province. Then, section 91 defines what subjects are within the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal parliament. It includes the navigation of navigable waters, railways, telegraphs, and that class of legislation. It includes other things—but I do not want to take up the time of the House by reading them, because

I assume that hon. gentlemen are fairly familiar with the Act. It includes all questions not specifically assigned to the legislatures. Now perhaps some hon. gentleman will point out where, in the constitution, there is any power assigned to the legislature of Ontario or any other legislature to confer on companies the powers which this company require to carry out their undertaking. I cannot find it, I do not think it is there. I am well aware that it may be argued that certain powers do follow; but it can be argued with a great deal more force that a company seeking powers having other than provincial objects have a right to come to this parliament, and this parliament alone can give them power to carry out their undertaking. I am fortified in that. When the Minnesota and Ontario Bill relating to the Rainy river came before this House, His Honour Judge Fitzpatrick, was then Minister of Justice. That question came before him, and he wrote a letter to the then Minister of Public Works stating his opinion that this parliament had a right to grant the legislation. His opinion went a great deal farther; I have not got it under my hand at the moment, because I did not expect to discuss this question. But it went this far. Certain amendments were proposed, to the Bill, by a petition on behalf of the town of Fort Francis, and the minister's opinion went so far as to say that in granting legislation, or in certifying to plans, the parliament of Canada had a right to impose the conditions asked, or such of them as were in the public interest, some ten or twelve amendments were made to the Bill, as I have already pointed out, guarding the public interest in that respect. Then I may say that the present Minister of Justice wrote a letter last year upon this very matter; it was read, and is on record before the Senate committee, in which he stated that as the objects of this company were not confined to provincial purposes only but were also international and interprovincial, the parliament of Canada was the only power that could give them the charter they were asking for. So under these circumstances I do not think it should be treated lightly. If the interest of the public is going to be prejudiced, if the interest of Ontario is going to be prejudiced in any sense, I could understand it, but that is not the case.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On what ground was it that the Senate rejected the Bill last year?

Mr. CONMEE. That is a pretty difficult question for me to answer. In the first place, I would answer it in this way, that some of the senators did not take the trouble to understand the Bill, some of them were absent, some of them had the opinion which, I fear, some hon. gentlemen opposite entertain, or profess to entertain. I see my hon. friend from West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) shaking his head, and I think he may hold the opinion I am about to mention, namely, that this Bill is an invasion of provincial rights. Now I take issue with that opinion. I need not refer to the British North America Act to establish the fact that this parliament has the right to pass any legislation that, in its opinion, is necessary for the order and good government of Canada, or to pass any legislation it may choose to pass that is for the general advantage of Canada. I have the section under my hand, but I will not take up the time of the House to read it. It is admitted that they have the power. I do not think that any hon. gentleman will deny that. The constitution specifically confers upon this parliament the power to pass this legislation, it has the constitutional right to deal with the subject and the legislature has not the right to deal with it. No where in the constitution is there a specific provision that would give the legislature that power.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Is there anything in the Bill which gives the company the power to expropriate?

Mr. CONMEE. Yes, the company will have the power to expropriate certain lands.

Mr. LENNOX. No.

Mr. CONMEE. Let me just explain that for a moment. In other provinces this company would have the right to build these works without coming here for this right, but in Ontario land sold under the Mining Act is subject to a provision which reserves a chain as a road allowance. Along the margin of rivers, where municipalities are organized, these roads pass under the control of the municipality and become highways. In this case there is no municipality. Therefore, the control of that chain reserve is in the Ontario government, and it is to overcome that difficulty that powers of expropriation are necessary. There is also the question of the bed of the river.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Have we the right to give the power to expropriate from the Crown in the province?

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. gentleman has been a member of this House for the last twenty-five years or more, and hardly a session has passed but what he has voted for granting just that power. He has conferred it upon company after company all his life, and now he is asking me a question. He had better look at his own record first. I answer: Yes, we have the right. I go further and say it is our duty to do so because it is a public enterprise. The hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) asks

me if I am not aware that the Ontario government has a policy——

Mr. BOYCE. No, I asked if they did not apply that policy to the Nipigon river and the hon. gentleman said : Yes, they did.

Mr. CONMEE. Well, I will take it that way; so far they have not applied their policy to the Nipigon river.

Mr. BOYCE. They claim to have applied it, but there is no power developed there.

Mr. CONMEE. I can put the hon. gentleman right. Some three years ago the city of Port Arthur requested the Ontario government to give them the use of 3,000 horse-power. They could have taken it from the Nipigon river, the Kaministiquia river, the Pigeon river, the Mackenzie river or a dozen other rivers, but they did not do it. Now, it has taken the Ontario government about six years to make up their minds that they are going to do something at Niagara. I am not now discussing their policy; I am not objecting to it, nor am I approving of it, but if there is any excuse for it, any justification, it is that they were going to do something with that power. I would ask the hon. gentleman how long it would be before they could spread that policy to other sections of the country. The company own the land on both sides of the river. In the case of Pigeon river, the land has long since passed from the Crown. Nevertheless the Crown may have rights in it. There was no chain reserve because the lands were patented previous to the provisions in the Ontario law. Nevertheless, the Ontario government may be said to have an interest. I believe they have. I am not disputing that. Maybe they have an interest in the bed of the river, but it is not an interest that is paramount; it is subject to the control of the Federal authority. I do not think that will be disputed. With respect to the Nipigon, or any navigable river, this parliament has the right to charter a company to improve navigation, to build dams, to build channels, to divert the water over the foreshore, to do anything of the kind, or it might go on and do it itself, and it has done it time and again. Where is there an invasion of provincial rights? These questions were not raised, I presume, in former years. It might be that the value of such undertakings was not as well understood in those days. If the province has rights we cannot take them away. There is no power in this parliament to take from the province that which it possesses. This Bill does not propose to take anything from the government or any individual. The company must first pay for what they get, so that I do not think the province is in any way injured. I noted an article in the 'World' newspaper and another in the 'Globe', in which it was urged that the measure was depriving the province of revenue. I cannot see that. If the province has any rights there it can exact a sum of money for them, it can exact an annual rent for them, or it can protect itself by getting the value of that which it possesses whether it be an easement, or whether it be a title to the land itself. It is just recently the vessel men have called the attention of the government to the fact of the interference with navigation by power companies on navigable streams. I presume that they refer principally to the Niagara river. That fact illustrates my contention that the question is one that must be dealt with in this parliament and that it must be dealt with in some authoritative way. I have read statements of what are said to be the terms of the treaty recently entered into or about to be entered into, and I was discussing it to-day with a member of the Waterways Commission. His understanding of it is that it extends to the watersheds, not alone to the basin of the lakes but to the source of the lakes. I take it for granted that that would be a necessary condition, and I understand that the treaty makes provision for that. So that, we have this question to deal with. Now, I submit that no good purpose can be served by holding the Bill back to be discussed in this House. The best plan is to let the Bill go to the committee. There is nothing in the Bill which is not in lots of other Bills. The Bill is subject as well to amendment. I may say to hon. gentlemen on behalf of those for whom I am acting that I shall fight as hard as I can for the principle of the Bill. If defeated, we will take defeat, but we must be defeated fairly. The Bill has never been discussed on its merits in this House or ever in committee, and I do not want hon. gentlemen to assume that because I have referred to the Bill to-day that in the rambling remarks which I have made, I have grappled with the questions or discussed them in all the fulness with which they should be discussed. I do trust that hon. gentlemen will allow the Bill to go to committee and then we will get at it in the regular way.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). I do not intend to discuss the principle of the Bill now, but in justification of a statement I made with reference to it I have to offer a few remarks. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee) is applying for a charter to utilize the waters of the Nipigon river, not for navigation purposes, but for power purposes, and he tells us the Nipigon is an international river between Ontario and the United States. What right has this House to give any company the right to dam a

navigable river for the purpose of utilizing its water-power? That river is navigable form Lake Superior to Lake Nipigon, and I remember that the hon. gentleman himself had a measure before us the object of which was to navigate that river and in connection with a rail haul to carry freight for the building of the Transcontinental Railway. I asked the hon. gentleman did he ask for powers of expropriation and he expressed much surprise that I should ask such a question. I ventured mildly to say that we were not in the habit of giving expropriation powers to private companies and he retorted that I ought to know better. I can tell him that we never do give such powers to any company that is not declared to be for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. CONMEE. This Bill declares that it is for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. If it does, then that is still more objectionable. If by merely declaring a work for the general advantage of Canada that is all that is necessary to give a private company power to utilize the waters of a boundary river and to expropriate property belonging to the Crown in Ontario, it is time there was an end put to that kind of thing. These local companies with local objects should go to the provinces for their power. Why, if all you have to do is to say in a Bill that it is for the general advantage of Canada, you might over-ride every provincial right. Surely some reason must be given to show that such a work is for the general benefit of Canada beyond our mere ipse dixit in an Act of this parliament.

Mr. C. A. MAGRATH (Medicine Hat). As one of the young members of this House, I find it somewhat difficult to follow the legislation which is brought before us. This Bill has only come to my attention within the last few moments, and while I shall not refer now to the interference with provincial rights which may be involved, yet I see another principle incorporated in this Bill which as a young Canadian I strongly object to. My objection is not so much to what this Bill says as to what it does not say. I hold the belief, Sir, that the water system of this country is the most valuable asset we have, and I asume that the water-power which this Bill seeks to monopolize belongs to the people of Canada. We had a gentleman of some eminence in this city a few days ago and he told us that the future of the American continent was dependent upon its water-powers, and to that question I shall briefly allude now. Section 13 of this Bill provides that this company shall at all times be prepared to furnish for use in Canada one-half the water-power it develops. Here we are, a people of about 7,000,000 adjoining a nation of nearly 100,000,000 with immense means to develop international waters for power purposes, while we are not in a position at present to keep pace with them in that respect. I object to the principle of allowing power to be sent out of this country to develop another country, until at all events we know that we have power sufficient for the purposes of Canada for all time to come. If hon. gentlemen opposite can assure me of that, then I would not be selfish about it, but I do not want to see this country put in the position that in the future we will have fifty per cent of our power exported to the United States, while lacking sufficient for our own purposes. Vested interests will be created on the other side and trouble will come if, once having allowed its export, we should attempt to keep our own power in our own country for our own development. I feel strongly about this matter and I regret that I had not the opportunity to go more fully into the Bill. But I thought I should present these views so that I might ask the House to proceed cautiously with legislation of this character.

Mr. GEORGE H. PERLEY (Argenteuil). I entirely support what has been said by my hon. friend from Medicine Hat (Mr. Magrath). The hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) has made out a very good case why this Bill should be thrown out. Something may be said to support the contention that the Pigeon river is an international river, but any gentleman who will stand up in this House and in cold blood argue that the Nipigon river is an international stream ought to be laughed out of court. The Nipigon river is entirely within the province of Ontario, and whether it is a navigable stream or not is another question, but for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee) to ask us to declare that the Nipigon river is an international river is asking us to swallow too much. The hon. member (Mr. Conmee) has told us that we have in this parliament passed many charters similar to the one he now asks for, but surely we ought to learn wisdom as the years go by, and if we have passed legislation containing any improvident provisions, that is no reason why we should continue in our wrong-doing. We are only now beginning to learn the real value of our water-powers in Canada; we are told that water is to be our coal in the future, and that being so we should safeguard this natural asset in every way. To pass a Bill with such sweeping provisions as this, allowing these private individuals to expropriate property from the province of Ontario and to control the water in two of the great streams of that province, would be a huge mistake.

This Bill was thrown out in the Senate last year, and I assume that there was good reason for that. At all events, it seems to me that we ought not to give it even a

second reading when on its face it claims to relate to a work for the general advantage of Canada. That language is absurd, as it relates to a purely local undertaking. The hon. member for Rainy River has challenged us on this side of the House to point out in the British North America Act where power is given to the local legislature to grant a charter of this nature. One would suppose that the hon. member had been studying the British North America Act night and day, and had it by heart; but I find no difficulty in pointing to a clause in the British North America Act giving the Ontario legislature power to deal with this matter. Subsection 10 of section 92 mentions, among the other powers of the local legislatures, that with reference to 'local works and undertakings other than such as are of the following classes;' and these exceptions are limited to 'those which connect the province with another province or extend beyond the limits of the province.' In other words, the local legislature is distinctly given power over works such as are proposed on the Nipigon river. At all events, I for one would certainly be opposed to this Bill getting even a second reading, while it has section 2 in it.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmoreland). This is a discussion of a very old subject. I think it was at the last session that a very lengthy discussion arose with respect to a Bill entitled 'An Act to incorporate the Saskatchewan Power Company.' I raised the question on that occasion of not so much the power but the advisability of this parliament attempting to deal with the subject. I deprecated the idea of the parliament of Canada incorporating companies which might properly be incorporated by the legislatures of the respective provinces, and I think it was pointed out that any company seeking such powers could secure them from the provincial legislature. The necessary powers in connection with the damming of streams or the construction of other works on streams or the control of water would necessarily be obtained from the Minister of Public Works, to whom this parliament has in a measure delegated these powers by the Act relating to Public Works and navigable waters; so that a company securing from the provincial legislature power to build dams and construct other works could only do so after obtaining permission from the Minister of Public Works. The Act incorporating the Saskatchewan Power Company was passed last session, and the strange feature of that Act was that there was no declaration in it that the work was to be one for the general advantage of Canada. Moreover, we gave the company power to expropriate land, on the ground that the Dominion government owned the lands in the western provinces, and controlled the navigation of the Saskatchewan river. Now, it seems to me that if this parliament was justified in incorporating the Saskatchewan Power Company, it is much more justified in incorporating this company, inasmuch as it relates to an international stream.

Mr. Sproule. The Nipigon river is not an international stream, though the Pigeon river is; but they seek power to deal with both.

Mr. EMMERSON. So far as the Bill relates to an international stream, the power should be sought from this parliament; and I go further and say that the provincial legislature would have no power to deal with it. Therefore the object of this Bill carries with it the implication that this parliament must deal with this subject, and that the promoters of the legislation could not secure the necessary power from the local legislature. We did not refuse to send to the committee the Bill to incorporate the Saskatchewan Power Company, and I think it would be fair to send this Bill to the committee. There the provisions of the several sections could be dealt with, and those which properly come under the jurisdiction of the provincial legislature could be removed from the Bill.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). I listened very attentively to the remarks made by the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee), and one of the reasons he advanced in appealing to the House to allow the second reading of the Bill, was of such a startling nature that the House had better be careful of the legislation on which it is entering. He gave as a reason that one of these rivers, while not itself on the international boundary, flowed into one of the great lakes, and therefore became an international stream.

Mr. CONMEE. If the hon. member will pardon me, I did not make that statement. I stated that because it was a tributary of the great lakes, as the question of the right of international waters extended to the watershed, it more or less became a question in issue in this case in regard to that river. I did not go beyond that point.

Mr. NORTHRUP. The hon. gentleman has gone a good deal farther than I stated, for he would not only include such a stream as that, but all other streams which might flow into it. It is very easy to lay this down as an abstract principle, but when one lays aside the superlative wisdom which only would justify a man in moving the second reading of a Bill like this, and comes down to ordinary everyday life and thinks applying the principle to our own province, say to the city of Toronto, we would find that the Humber and the Don were two international streams, and that it would be necessary for this parliament

to legislate in regard to any works that might be proposed to be constructed on those two rivers. The hon. gentleman seems to be so consumed with the importance of those works which are stated to be for the general advantage of Canada that they have obscured his vision altogether and he cannot see that they are not for the general advantage of the country.

Mr. CONMEE. Is the hon. gentleman aware that this government has exercised power with regards to the works on the Don?

Mr. NORTHRUP. Very possible under certain circumstances it might, but I do not think it has ever laid down that it would be proper for this government to give a company power to construct a dam 10 to 15 miles up the Don on account of its being an international stream and the dam being for the general advantage of Canada. I do not think that the House has up to the present time gone as far as that. Not only is there the objection to the principle laid down, but there is a very strong objection to allowing a Bill to go to its second reading with this objectionable clause in it. I venture to say that when the British North America Act was passed it never entered into the contemplation of the legislators of the old country who framed section 92 (10—C):

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

That this clause was intended to be other than such a clause would be in the case of a parliament similar to that which passed the British North America Act; it was taken for granted that there would at least be some conscience in a parliament dealing with these questions. It was never contemplated that the Dominion parliament would declare the most contemptible, insignificant, little piece of work to be for the general advantage of Canada. It was never expected that this House would declare something that was obviously untrue, and thereby bring such little pieces of work within its jurisdiction. I have no hesitation in saying that this House would be departing entirely from the principles of good government if it allowed the passage of such a Bill. I suppose the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) thought he had simply to insert the second clause declaring this to be for the general advantage of Canada and every member of this House, from Nova Scotia to British Columbia, would leap to his feet to secure this valuable work which would contribute so much to the happiness and prosperity of his constituents. When we come to deal with it in the spirit of common sense I do not think the hon. gentleman himself would advance any particular reason why this paltry enterprise should be declared for the general advantage of Canada. If the clause stated that it was for the general disadvantage of Canada I could understand it being inserted in the Bill. One has only to look at the clause allowing the rivers to be dammed and consider what the hon. gentleman says about one river being navigable and the other international to see that it is an imposition on the common sense and good nature of this House to ask for the passage of the Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Quite apart from the question of the general advantage of Canada is it the hon. gentleman's opinion that under the constitution, by which navigable rivers are placed under the jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada, such a river could be barred or impeded in any way by an Act of a local legislature; in other words, that the local legislature can give authority to bar or impede a navigable river?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I certainly think not; I think the local legislature would not have power to give a company authority to bar the navigation of a navigable river, but at the same time I think if the water-power were sufficient to justify works being constructed, the local legislature of Ontario could do as they have done at Niagara and give power to a company to extract power from the water, although not the power to dam the river.

Mr. CONMEE. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. I allowed the hon. member for Rainy River to speak the second time in answer to a question.

Mr. CONMEE. I think I have the permission of the hon. member who had the floor. I wanted to answer one or two questions. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Magrath) stated that he was opposed to granting permission to export a portion of this power into the United States. That is the general law. The power at Niagara has been exported for many years. We have an Act of parliament governing it, and that clause was put in as a protection so that half the power might be always at the demand of the Canadian people. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Northrup) calls this an insignificant piece of work. It is a work involving the development of 35,000 or 40,000 horse-power. It is proposed to extend the lines into various parts of Canada as well as to the United States, and yet the hon. gentleman chooses to sneer at it——

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think I can allow the hon. gentleman to proceed on this line.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think my hon. friend ought to be permitted to speak as often as he likes upon this Bill, because it certainly requires all the efforts which even so able a gentleman as himself can present to convince this House that it should be passed. The Prime Minister has asked the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Northrup) a question which indicates, perhaps, that he has not considered the Bill very attentively. The Bill does not give any power of damming the river. So far as I understand, even if this Bill passes, the company would still be obliged under the provisions of chapter 115 of the Revised Statutes to obtain the consent of the Department of Public Works before it could put a dam upon the river. If the legislature of Ontario chartered this company for the purpose of developing water-powers generally, or upon any river, naming it, that company would be obliged to come to the Department of Public Works before it could obstruct the navigation of any river of the character mentioned. This company will be obliged to do the same thing, and, therefore, the argument that this is a navigable river is no argument whatever in favour of the passage of this Bill by the parliament of Canada.

This Bill has to be considered in the first place from the standpoint of the jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada to enact it, and in the next place upon the point of expediency. If we have jurisdiction, is it expedient that we should enact this legislation?

So far as jurisdiction is concerned, I would be prepared to concede that, in respect of international waters, the company must come to the parliament of Canada and to the parliament of Canada alone. I would say that, speaking off-hand. But, so far as navigable waters are concerned, it would seem to me that a company possessing general authority to develop water-powers in the province of Ontario could carry out its undertaking even upon navigable waters, although it would be obliged to come to the Public Works Department of Canada before it could have power to obstruct navigation in any way. The hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill must rely in respect of Pigeon river, upon the fact that these are international waters, and, in respect of the Nipigon, upon the declaration in the Bill that the undertaking is one for the general advantage of Canada. I consider that parliament has been altogether too prone in the past to make a declaration of that kind upon insufficient grounds. Over and over again, gentlemen who believe, for some reason, that a particular Bill would not pass the provincial legislature have come to this parliament, and have had Bills introduced which, without that declaration, would obviously be within the power of the provincial legislature alone, and have asked the parliament of Canada, without investigation, and without any clear right or authority, to pass these measures and in that way assume jurisdiction over the matters in question. That ought to be corrected. It has, in the past, led to the invasion of provincial rights and of the jurisdiction of provincial legislatures. I believe that no such declaration ought to be made by the parliament of Canada, except after the most careful investigation, at which the provincial authorities should have the right to be heard; and it should be made only in cases where it is perfectly clear that the undertakings are really for the general advantage of Canada. In what respect should this undertaking be declared to be 'for the general advantage of Canada'? How will it advantage the province of British Columbia, or the province of Prince Edward Island, that this particular water-power should be developed on the Nipigon river? Such an undertaking is obviously not within the class contemplated by the provisions of the British North America Act to which I have called attention. So far as jurisdiction is concerned, it does not seem to me that my hon. friend (Mr. Conmee) has made good his case, with respect to the Nipigon river at least. Over and over again, we have seen instances in this parliament of men coming to parliament with particular undertakings in their minds, affixed to these undertakings being something else which is really within the jurisdiction of this parliament of Canada although the main part of the undertaking is not within our jurisdiction. Whether that is the case in this instance or not I do not know. But in every case where there is suspicion that this is being done, parliament should give the most careful attention to the undertaking and should see to it that parliament is not imposed upon by constructive fraud of that kind.

As to the expediency of passing the legislation, I wholly concur in the cogent observation of my hon. friend from Medicine Hat (Mr. Magrath). Mr. Gifford Pinchot, in his very illuminating and instructive address delivered in Ottawa not long ago, pointed out that the astutest and most far-sighted men in the United States, possessing wealth and influence, are already seizing upon the water-powers of the United States with an eye to the conditions that will exist twenty-five, fifty, or a hundred years hence. Why should we not look to the same conditions that are likely to obtain in the future in this great country? Why should we enable any man, or set of men, to create in this country the beginning of a monopoly in respect of matters of this kind? As my hon. friend (Mr. Magrath) has well said, these water-powers will be of infinitely great-

er importance twenty-five years hence than they are to-day, and they ought to be preserved and retained, as far as possible, for the benefit of the people of the whole country, and not given away for the purpose of creating ten, fifteen, or twenty millionaires of the future. As to this question of expendiency, I am ready to concede that we cannot well debate it now. If parliament is to be assumed to have the jurisdiction, the matter of expediency can best be considered in committee. If it does go to committee and if the committee is called upon to consider it in that aspect, then I think very careful attention should be given to the observations of my hon. friend from Medicine Hat, as well as to those of my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley), and we should have good reasons indeed from the promoters to justify us in passing such legislation as this, which confers upon them that which, though nominally not so, may become, in substance, a monopoly.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has put the vital points in the proposition now before the House. One is: Have we the right to pass this legislation? The second is: Granted that we have the right to pass this legislation, ought we to pass it? Of course, it is conceded that a great many things that men as well as parliaments have the right to do may wisely be left undone. I am not saying that that is the case here, but it is a point for the House to consider. The question of provincial rights is one that is now before the public, and will be so long as we are a community divided into provincial and federal jurisdictions. I have always endeavoured very carefully to protect the rights of the provinces in their spheres, and I am prepared to continue to do so. On the other hand we must not be so careful about protecting the rights of others that we give up rights of our own. The line of demarcation is sometimes difficult to draw when you come to a question of this kind. Here we find one stream, an international one. and another one in respect of which the point raised is navigation. I will not discuss the question of expediency, because, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) says, we can better discuss it in committee. This much, however, might, in fairness, be pointed out in reply to my hon. friend, and in support of a measure, it is debatable whether it is wise to refrain in all cases from developing a power merely because part of the energy developed will have to be exported. It may be that the demand in Canada, at present, is not sufficient to warrant capital in developing the power at all. Would it be wise to allow Canada to remain for years without her share in that development, or would it be better to allow it to be developed so that Canada could get the share that she can use leaving the remainder to be exported? It is a fine point to argue. I think that, in some circumstances, we would be warranted, in order to secure the development ourselves, to allow part of the power to be exported, if the denial of this right would mean that we could not get capital sufficient to develop the power. Then there is the question my hon. friend from Medicine Hat (Mr. Magrath) has brought up, and which has been referred to by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. It is well known that this question of our water-powers, the preservation of our forests and reforestation are live questions, and they are so interlinked with one another that you can hardly discuss one without dealing with the others. The denuding of our forest areas means the destruction of our water-powers; and this question is of such magnitude that, as hon. members are aware, a conference is being opened in Washington this week in which the United States, Mexico, and Canada are taking part for the discussion of the general subject of conserving our natural resources, including these which we have been discussing to-day. I earnestly hope that something will develop from that conference that will give us some light in dealing with these matters; because if there is one thing more than another that means a great deal to the Dominion of Canada at the present time, I think it is this question of water as a transportation medium, and water as a power developer. These two things are of vast importance to Canada, and to conserve them as far as possible for our own benefit I think ought to be the study of all men who take an active part in public life.

Now the Bill before us raises, as I have said, the question of provincial rights to a certain extent. I am not sure just to what extent it is raised. I have listened with a good deal of attention to my hon. friend from Rainy River (Mr. Conmee), and the way he has put his case. If the paragraphs in the Bill contain bona fide statements, then it becomes an international work and ought to be dealt with by this House; and if it be truly an international work it could not be dealt with by any other power than this House. My hon. friend has referred to the innocent yet powerful paragraph saying that this work is for the general advantage of Canada. I am afraid—and I am comparatively free to say so, and can afford to criticise—I am afraid that this parliament perhaps for many years gone by has been quite a sinner in that regard. Looking at this question from the standpoint I have occupied for the last eight or ten years—excepting the last two years—I have often thought these words were placed in Bills when they had no right to be there, and that charters were issued to railway companies and other companies by Dominion authority that should have been left to provincial authorities. My view point has not changed in that respect. I believe that

there is a sphere which truly belongs to the provinces and which we should not interfere with; on the other hand, we have our own sphere that we should jealously guard. I have just been looking at it, because I hardly expected it would come up to-day—and without committing myself to this Bill at all on the second reading, there may be portions of it that ought to go through and others that ought not. As the leader of the opposition says, those representing the provincial side of the case could be best heard before the committee. With that understanding, and so as to give all parties, including the province, a right to be heard, I have no objection to the Bill being sent to the committee, reserving the right to oppose the Bill in committee, and not committing myself at the present stage to any points in the Bill.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton). I have listened with a good deal of interest to the leader of the opposition discussing this very interesting question of constitutional law, because after all the interesting parts of it are the constitutional phases which are raised. I think it is conceded that we have a right to pass a part of this Act of incorporation, and if there were no other authority for that than the statement of the hon. leader of the opposition, as a Nova Scotia man, I would be quite prepared to accept it. But I would not have said anything if the leader of the opposition had gone a little further and dealt with the question of what I would call the smaller streams. This international stream may not be the larger one, but I take it for granted that it is the larger one, and that the other streams mentioned are the smaller ones. I think the legal gentlemen of the House will agree that the law has been found to be that if this House has a right to grant a charter for the main purpose—and I think the main purpose to be to control, or to do something in the way of controlling, an international stream—if that right is in this House; if then it becomes incidental to carrying out that main purpose to grant the further power, we have the right even if, in principle, and on the face of it we have to transgress provincial rights. That statement is in accord with the decisions of the Privy Council on this point. Then if it is necessary to control this Nipigon river or other small streams, if it is necessary in order to carry out the purpose of this charter to control these small streams to expropriate land, or do anything else that may be necessary to carry out the main purpose of the company, then there is jurisdiction in this House under the decisions of the Privy Council, to grant a charter and to extend the powers to the necessary extent. I think the legal gentlemen of the House will agree with that proposition. It would appear to be largely a question whether the acquiring of these smaller streams is incidental to the main purpose or not. Now as to the general proposition, as to the ownership of the streams in the older provinces, Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, where the land is vested in the provinces, I think it will be conceded that the property in the streams is in the local government, subject to rights of navigation. I think that is the law. But in Manitoba and the west generally, where the land is not vested in the provincial governments, that doctrine, of course, would require some modification. Whether it can be stated as a matter of law that the right in a stream is in the provincial government when they do not own any land at all? I am not expressing an opinion on that point.

Mr. SPROULE. This is in the province of Ontario entirely, except the portion that is near the international boundary.

Mr. McKENZIE. So far as I know anything about it, I would say that so far as smaller streams are absolutely within the province of Ontario, the right to the land and the right to the bed of the river is in the provincial government, subject to rights of navigation. But as I said before, if interfering in any way with the smaller streams is necessary to the carrying out of the main purpose of this charter, then the right is in this parliament to grant and control those rights, if it is incidental to carrying out the main purpose of the character.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not understand that this was the case of a large stream which is an international stream, and smaller ones ancillary to it, but they are two absolutely distinct streams.

Mr. McKENZIE. Well, that does not affect my argument. Even if it is a smaller stream, if, in order to carry out the purpose for which the charter was granted, it is necessary to have something to do with the smaller stream, the right is vested in this parliament to grant that right.

Mr. SPROULE. These are both large streams, and they are hundreds of miles apart.

Mr. McKENZIE. They may be, but what I say is clear. I see the hon. member for North Toronto, who is no doubt a distinguished lawyer, laughing and shaking his head. But it has so happened that even distinguished constitutional lawyers like himself have agreed and laid down the principle which I simply reiterate, that if it is necessary to transgress provincial rights in order to carry out the main purpose of a charter which we have a right to grant, that right is vested in this House. That is a principle which I merely reiterate. It is a question of fact and not a question of law whether the acquisition of rights over these smaller

streams in the province of Ontario is incidental to the main purpose or not. If it is not incidental to the main purpose, I certainly say that I do not think there is any jurisdiction in this House to interfere with it unless clause two of the Act is accepted.

Mr. LANCASTER. What about the exercise of a right in a case like this?

Mr. McKENZIE. What I said is clear, I said that so far as an international stream is concerned, we have the right, that is, conceded by every lawyer in this House, and to interfere with what may be regarded as provincial rights so far as that is necessary to carry out the purpose of the main charter.

Mr. LANCASTER. What about the justice of so interfering?

Mr. McKENZIE. That is a question of fact. I do not know the facts and I am not going to state any opinion. I am dealing with the question of law.

Mr. LANCASTER. No one disputes that we have the power.

Mr. McKENZIE. I say we have not the power unless the interfering with the smaller streams is necessary for the carrying out of the greater project over which we have the greater right. As far as the conserving of the water power is concerned and keeping it within our jurisdiction, I agree with my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) to this extent that it is not an easy matter to say that we shall always hold this power in reserve, not touching it and looking for some future development or necessity. The government of Nova Scotia, some time ago, made a new departure in connection with the granting of lands and water-powers. They do not grant absolute rights to any person with respect to these franchises or properties. They have adopted the policy of leaseholds, and I think it would be the better policy in this case. I do not think it is wise to grant an absolute right or power with respect to water or water-powers any more than it is wise to give absolute control over coal lands. In Nova Scotia we only give leaseholds for coal properties and for many years, when persons have come to the local legislature looking for powers with respect to streams, we have adopted the course of giving them a lease subject to the absolute control of the government and subject to cancellation. In cases where the Dominion government part with control over these resources, or permit the exercise of these powers, I think a policy similar to that adopted in the province of Nova Scotia would be advisable, and in that way keep these resources under the control of the government, so that if in the future the necessity arises for a change in the conditions such change can be made. In so far as the constitutional question is concerned, that is the view I take and I would not have said anything at all if the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) had dealt with these incidental powers which are vested in this House provided the exercise of them is essential to the main purpose of the charter.

Mr. BRODER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee) who is promoting the Bill, what his estimate is of the water power on the Nipigon river? I understand him to say that it is 80,000 horse-power on the Pigeon river. What has he estimated for the Nipigon?

Mr. CONMEE. It is estimated that the Nipigon river has about 200,000 horse-power. This one point would cover perhaps 20,000 or 25,000 horse-power.

Mr. BRODEUR. The Nipigon river is 100 miles away from the Pigeon river and they have nothing whatever to do with each other. There is another matter which has not been touched upon and which ought to be mentioned. Nipigon lake and Nipigon river possess the best trout fishing in the world. There should be nothing allowed to be done to interfere with this famous fishing resort. There are a great many tourists coming from New York, Boston, Philadelphia and other places to fish in Nipigon river and lake. The hon. gentleman says this is a navigable river, but he will not say that it is continuously navigable. You can navigate it by canoes which enable you to get around the rapids, but you cannot navigate it with any other craft. You get the finest speckled trout in the world in Nipigon lake, which has a coast line almost equal to that of Lake Ontario, and I think that this House and this committee, before adopting this Bill, should obtain the fullest information as to the proposal of this company and the condition of these waters. The Nipigon and Pigeon rivers have no more to do with each other than black has with white. I think the hon. gentleman has simply hitched the two together to get them both through because the power of the Nipigon is more valuable than that of the Pigeon. He had in his Bill of last year the Sturgeon river. There is not as much power on the Sturgeon river as on the Nipigon river, but there is a good deal. I do not think that a Bill granting such wide powers should be allowed to go through this House in the interest of American capitalists. The hon. gentleman has just enough Canadians in it to give colour to it. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) presented to the House an argument in favour of the development of this power because the people

want to use it, but when there is need for the power there is no question but that capital will come in to develop it. This is a question that this House ought to consider very seriously before taking the step proposed by the hon. gentleman who has introduced this Bill. I have been up both of these rivers by canoe and I know something about them. The House knows very little about them. If this Bill is permitted to go to the committee there should be the fullest information available with reference to maps, the location of these rivers, their navigability and the value of the water powers upon them.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, the sense of the House seems to be that this Bill should go to the committee, not permitting our own judgment to affirm the principle but simply to have the matter dealt with and investigated, both as to jurisdiction and policy. With regard to the question of jurisdiction of this House, I think, for my part, that the jurisdiction is certainly in this House and not in the local legislature. The local legislature has been jealous, and naturally so, that their powers should not be interfered with by any action of this House, and in so far as this view of theirs is concerned I would be disposed to respect it in its entirety. But, I would lay this proposition before the House: With regard to one of these schemes, suppose that this work should be necessary, that it would be to the advantage of the public and that parliament, representing the people of Canada generally, should be of the opinion that this work should be constructed, who has the power to create the entity which brings this work into being? As to one of these streams, the Pigeon river, everybody is agreed that the parliament of Canada alone has that power. I think there is no question as to that. That was stated by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). But, if I understood my hon. friend, a moment ago, he stated also with regard to the Nipigon river that as it is altogether situated in the province of Ontario, and that although it is a navigable river the province of Ontario would have the power to create the entity which would be necessary to be created in order to carry out the work and not this government. But, he qualified his contention by the statement that whilst the local legislature has power to create the entity, still the power which is vested in this new entity would be exercised only by coming to the Minister of Public Works and obtaining authority to deal with a navigable river.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Just as this company would be obliged to do.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I doubt that. I would like to call the attention of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition to the fact that in so far as a navigable river is concerned the local legislature has not the power to create a corporation which would exercise any rights over a navigable stream.

Mr. BRODER. This river is not navigable at all.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Assuming it is navigable. The argument is that they have the power although it is navigable.

Mr. BRODER. It is not navigable without public works being constructed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That may be, but the argument is that it is navigable and therefore we have the power here to deal with it. But my hon. friend the leader of the opposition stated that if it be a navigable river the legislature of Ontario would have the power to create a corporation which could be given power to deal with the waters of the streams, except that it could not exercise the powers vested in it by the legislature unless it came to the Minister of Public Works to have its powers ratified. As I read the law my opinion would not coincide with that of my hon. friend. The law in this respect is chapter 115 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, an Act respecting the Protection of Navigable Waters.

2. In this part, unless the context otherwise requires,——

(a) 'Work' includes any bridge, boom, dam, aboiteau, wharf, dock, pier or other structure, and the approaches or other works necessary or appurtenant thereto;

(b) 'Lawful work' means any work not contrary to the law in force at the place of the construction thereof at the time of such construction.

This is broad enough to cover the opinion of my hon. friend, but there is this qualification in section 3:

3. Except so much of this part as relates to rebuilding or repairing any lawful work, nothing thereinafter in this part contained shall apply to any work constructed under the authority of any Act of the parliament of Canada or of the legislature of the late province of Canada, or of the legislature of any province now forming part of Canada, passed before such province became a part thereof.

So it seems that the power to deal with navigable streams is confined to the parliament of Canada or to any province of Canada, provided it was passed before such province became part of confederation. Since a province became part of confederation the power seems to be taken away from it to deal with navigable waters.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is it not the other way?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I read it in the way I have interpreted it. It says:

3. Except so much of this part as relates to rebuilding or repairing any lawful work, nothing hereinafter in this part contained shall apply to any work constructed under the authority of any Act of the parliament of Canada or of the legislature of the late province of Canada, or of the legislature of any province now forming part of Canada, passed before such province became a part thereof.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does not the restriction apply the other way?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I assume it is not in the power of a provincial legislature to give authority to create any work interfering with a navigable river, but power is given to the Minister of Public Works to pass regulations with respect to works which are authorized. The Minister of Public Works cannot give authority to a thing which is illegal in itself, but he supervises the exercise of the power granted by this parliament. If this parliament gives power to construct a bridge or any work over a navigable river, the authority to which this power is given must go before the Minister of Public Works to have its plans approved. I do not know that it goes any further than that and, therefore, I would assume that the authority to deal with a navigable river is left exclusively with this parliament. I do not give this as a final opinion; I simply throw it out for consideration. I am very glad this Bill will go before the committee because I am not at all sure as to the power, and on the question of policy I have very serious doubts that we should pass this Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). If the right hon. gentleman looks at section 3 he will see that the effect of it is that while the statute contains provisions against any interference with navigable waters it says:

Except so much of this part as relates to rebuilding or repairing any lawful work, nothing hereinafter in this part contained shall apply to any work constructed under the authority of any Act of parliament of Canada or of the legislature of the late province of Canada, or of the legislature of any province now forming part of Canada, passed before such province became a part thereof.

That exactly lets in the exception I have referred to. For example, in the port of Halifax if any one should desire to extend his wharf so as to interfere with navigation he would apply to the Minister of Public Works for permission and he might get it.

Mr. LANCASTER. He need not get incorporated himself.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is not a question of incorporation at all. A private citizen owning some land bordering on the harbour and perhaps owning some land under the water may desire to improve his property by building a work which will interfere with navigation and he must get authority to do so. If he sells his land to a company incorporated by the provincial legislature and that company desires to do the same thing, it must come equally to the Department of Public Works for permission before that work can be lawfully constructed. If that permission is not obtained then the work is a public nuisance. That whole subject was gone into in a case argued before the Supreme Court of Canada about 20 years ago. A man had constructed a wharf out into the harbour of Halifax without obtaining permission and a vessel ran into it and there was negligence on one side or the other, and the wharf owner lost his case, if I remember correctly, for the reason that the wharf was a public nuisance at the time inasmuch as this permission had not been obtained. My point was simply this: That if a company in the province of Ontario is authorized to develop water-powers generally, without naming any river —and a river or stream need not be named —it would require to come to the Department of Public Works in respect to a navigable river and obtain permission to interfere with navigation, and, inasmuch as the Bill does not authorize interference with navigation this company would have to do the same thing. Therefore, the argument that it is navigable water falls to the ground, because the question of interference with navigable water has already been dealt with by the parliament of Canada in such a way as to enable a company whether incorporated by the provincial legislature or by the parliament of Canada to interfere with that navigation, but only under certain conditions and with the authority of the Department of Public Works.

Mr. CONMEE. Will the hon. gentleman permit me to ask a question?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Certainly, two.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. gentleman referred to section 92 which provides for the approval of plans by the Department of Public Works.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, I referred to chapter 115 R.S.C.

Mr. CONMEE. I understood the hon. gentleman referred to section 92.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I never mentioned it.

Mr. CONMEE. That section does provide for the ratification of plans, and I am not

particular whether we take that section or the other section referred to. Will the hon. member say that these sections give the Minister of Public Works jurisdiction to regulate a structure in the sense of stipulating what flow of water shall pass through a dam and in what seasons of the year so as to maintain navigation either above or below? Does the section go that far?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is a very well known principle of law which I have no doubt is familiar to my hon. friend (Mr. Conmee) because he has looked into these matters very thoroughly.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am saying it quite seriously because the hon. gentleman has displayed evidence of a great deal of research. It is a well known principle of law that when power is given to grant or withhold permission, that implies power to grant subject to conditions. Therefore, as there is power in the department to withhold permission, there is also power to grant it subject to prescribed conditions.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to say a word with regard to this matter because I have noticed that in the Railway Committee——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken.

Mr. SPROULE. No.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have your name on the list as having spoken.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 57) respecting the Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Railway Company.—Mr. J. D. Taylor.

Bill (No. 58) respecting the Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Railway Company. —Mr. R. Smith.

QUESTIONS.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

Mr. MEIGHEN asked:

1. What is the total of the appropriation made to date for Hudson Bay Railway survey?
2. What has been the total expenditure of such survey?
3. How many persons, officers and workmen, have been employed on such survey?
4. What has been the total number of days of employment to date of all employees?
5. On what date did the first actual work commence, and is the work in actual progress now?
6. When is it expected the survey will be completed?
7. Does the government propose constructing the road as surveyed under the appropriations asked for in the estimates immediately as such surveys are available for construction purposes? If so, on what basis as to providing for cost of construction?

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

1. $100,000.
2. Expended to January 25, 1909, $61,567.-72.
3. The number of men employed on surveys, since they were fully organized, about October 1, 1908, has averaged about 110.
4. The total number of days of employment of all men, till January 31, is 15,352 days, including Sundays.
5. The first actual line was run by Party No. 1, at Frog river, about 35 miles, from the Pas on September 14, 1908.
6. It is expected that the survey will be completed between the 1st March and the 15th, 1909, from the Pas to Fort Churchill. The work is still progressing.
7. No decision will be reached pending receipt of estimates and reports upon the completion of the survey.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. AMES—by Mr.Perley—asked:

Have the Commissioners of the National Transcontinental Railway furnished the government with any memorandum of more recent date than that prepared by Mr. Schrieber, dated 31st May, 1908, in respect of the cost of the National Transcontinental Railway? If not, is it the intention of the government to ask for a revised statement?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The estimate given by the engineer of the Transcontinental Railway Commission on April 3, 1908, was $63,427 per mile for the government portion of the line between Moncton and Winnipeg and a memo. dated 12th February, 1909, confirms that estimate.

COAL OIL EXPLOSIONS

Mr. SCHAFFNER asked:

1. How many deaths have occurred in the past four months in Manitoba through coal oil explosions?
2. What effort did the Department of Inland Revenue make to fix responsibility for those fatalities?
3. What investigation, if any, has been made by the Dominion government officials, and what was the result of these investigations?
4. Has the department any information that would indicate the identity of the parties responsible for the adulteration of coal oil in Manitoba?
5. What steps, if any, has the department taken to prevent further adulteration of coal oil?

6. Did the Attorney General of Manitoba advise the employment of detectives in connection with the coal oil explosions? If so, was his recommendation acted on?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (for Minister of Inland Revenue):

1. Eighteen, so far as the department is aware.

2. On the first appearance in the press of an account of one of these explosions, instructions were issued to the officials of the department in Winnipeg to investigate and report all the circumstances in connection therewith.

3. The officials of the department who conducted the investigations inquired as to the names of the persons from whom the coal oil which exploded was purchased or obtained, the names of the firms by whom it was originally supplied, and the manner in which it was being used at the time of the explosions. Samples of the oil which exploded could not be secured, but samples of similar oil in the possession of persons from whom the oil which exploded was purchased were, in every case where possible, obtained and tested. Numerous samples of oil in the hands of different dealers and oil merchants were also tested.

The results of these investigations show that in every case (except one, which was due to the explosion of a lamp), the accidents were caused by the pouring of coal oil on smouldering fires in order to hasten the burning of the fuel; that in some instances the oil was fully up to the standard required by law, that in other instances it was below, and that it is extremely dangerous both to life and property to pour coal oil on a fire no matter how perfect the quality may be.

Two dealers who had sold coal oil which exploded, and which was not up to the standard, were prosecuted and condemned to the penalty provided by section 24 of the Petroleum Inspection Act.

4. The department has information indicating fairly well a source from which defective coal oil was obtained, but it would be impossible to say who would be responsible for any adulteration of such oil which may have taken place.

5. No steps can be taken which will effectively prevent the mixture, by error or inadvertence, of gasoline with coal oil, as these liquids are similar in appearance and are both kept in stock by nearly all dealers in either. As gasoline has the higher commercial value, no one is likely to adulterate coal oil with it intentionally.

6. The Attorney General of Manitoba telegraphed suggesting that the department should engage some extra men for detection work in connection with the coal oil explosions referred to, but there seemed no advantage in taking that course, as the regular officers of the department appeared to be sufficient in number for the work, and necessarily more experienced and better equipped for the carrying out of the provisions of the Petroleum Inspection Act than new men could be.

THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

What is the name, position and salary of each clerk or other employee on the outside service of the Department of Agriculture at Ottawa who received increase of salary on and after April 1, 1908; what is the amount of the increase or increases, the date on which it was granted, the date it became effective and the date or dates on which these increases were paid, and date of appointment?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture): I have the list here, which at the hon. gentleman's request I lay on the table for 'Hansard':

Name.	Position.	Present Salary.	Amount of Increase.	Date Increase granted.	Date Increase effective.	Date Increase paid.	Date of Appointment.
		$	$ cts.				
Moore, W. W	Chief of Markets' Section	2,100	200 00	May 26 Aug. 31	April 1—$100 Aug. 1— 100	June.. Sept..	June,'94
McNeill, A.....	" Fruit Section...	2,100	200 00	May 26 Aug. 31	April 1— 100 Aug. 1— 100	June.. Sept..	.... '01
Barr, G. H.....	Dairy Expert.	2,100	300 00	May 26 Aug. 31	April 1— 100 Aug. 1— 200	June.. Sept..	Apr., '07
Whitley, C. F	In charge of Dairy Records	1,450	50 00	May 26	April 1.....	June....	June,'91
Bouchard, J. G. ..	Dairy Expert.	1,050	50 00	" 26	" 1.....	" ...	July, '05
Halpin, D. J.....	Stenographer.....	950	100 00	" 26 Aug. 31	April 1—$ 50 Aug. 1— 50	June.. Sept..	Feb., '02
Sinclair, H. H....	Clerk.....	900	100 00	May 26 Aug. 31	April 1— 50 Aug. 1— 50	June.. Sept	July, '06
Aylmer, Hon. J. F. W.....	"	850	50 00	May 26	April 1.....	June....	Apr., '07
Baker, M. R.....	Chief Fruit Inspector...	1,300	50 00	" 26	" 1.....	" ...	Aug., '06

Name.	Position.	Present Salary.	Amount of Increase.	Date Increase granted.	Date Increase effective.	Date Increase paid.	Date of Appointment.
		$	$ cts.				
Henderson, I. L.	Clerk	900	200 00	May 26 Aug. 31	April 1—$ 50 Aug. 1— 150	June. Sept.	Aug., '00
Macdonald, M.	"	550	50 00	May 26	April 1	June	Mar., '07
Hubbell, A. H	"	700	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Aug., '00
Schingh, A.	"	600	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	May, '06
Trudel, A	"	550	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	July, '07
Langford, B.	Stenographer	650	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Jan., '06
Keir, A.	Clerk	550	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Aug., '06
Elliott, M. L.	Stenographer	600	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	July, '06
Robinson, K.	"	900	200 00	" 26 Aug. 31	" 1—$ 50 Aug. 1— 150	" Sept.	Jan., '02
Beauchesne, A. B.	"	850	100 00	May 26	April 1	June	Sep., '02
Armstrong, R. E.	Messenger	650	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	July, '90
Kilburn, B. M	Clerk	550	2 50	Aug. 31	Aug. 1	Sept	Dec., '06
Cochrane, R. J.	Cold Storage Clerk	1,400	200 00	" 31	" 1	"	May, '91
Hudon, J. L.	Clerk	650	50 00	" 31	" 1	"	Oct., '06
Charlan, F.	Chief, Tobacco Section	2,100	400 00	May 26 Aug. 31	April 1—$100 Aug. 1— 300	June. Sept.	Oct., '05
Fletcher, Dr. Jas	Entomologist & Botanist	2,600	150 00	May 26	April 1	June	July, '76
Shutt, F. T.	Chemist	2,550	150 00	" 26	" 1	"	Aug., '87
Grisdale, J. H	Agriculturist	2,400	150 00	" 26	" 1	"	Feb., '99
Macoun, W. T.	Horticulturist	2,200	150 00	May 26	April 1	June	Sep., '87
Saunders, C. E.	Cerealist	2,100	350 00	" 26 Aug. 31	" 1—$150 Aug. 1— 200	" Sept.	May, '94
Cramp, T. M.	Accountant	1,600	450 00	May 26 Aug. 31	April 1— 100 Aug. 1— 350	June. Sept.	Feb., '02
Gilbert, A. G.	Poultry manager	1,300	50 00	May 26	April 1	June	July, '82
Gray, D. D.	Farm foreman	1,050	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Oct., '06
Pelletier, Eug	French correspondent	1,200	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	— '89
McMurray, A.	" "	1,100	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	May, '90
Charron, A. T.	Assistant chemist	1,600	250 00	" 26 Aug. 20	" 1— $50 Aug. 1— 200	" Sept.	July, '95
O'Hanley, M. C	Stenographer	1,100	50 00	May 26	April 1	June	Nov., '93
Watson, J, F.	"	1,100	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Mar., '93
Gibson, A.	Assistant botanist and entomologist	1,600	500 00	" 26 Aug. 20	" 1— $50 Aug. 1— 450	" Sept.	Apl., '99
Charlton, H. W	Assistant chemist	1,300	100 00	May 26 Aug. 20	April 1— 50 Aug. 1— 50	June. Sept.	Nov., '99
Fortier, V.	Poultry manager	1,100	50 00	May 26	April 1	June	Oct., '97
Wetmore, G. K.	Assistant accountant	900	200 00	" 26 Aug. 31	" 1—$100 Aug. 1— 100	" Sept.	Jan., '07
Spencer, A. G.	Assistant chemist	1,300	300 00	May 26 Aug. 20	April 1— 100 Aug. 1— 200	June. Sept.	June, '07
Letourneau, J	Stenographer	700	100 00	May 26 Aug. 31	April 1— 50 Aug. 1— 50	June. Sept.	" '07
Belanger, A	Clerk	700	100 00	May 26 Aug. 31	April 1— 50 Aug. 1— 50	June. Sept.	Apl., '94
Doughty, Dr. A. G.	Dominion archivist and keeper of records	3,200	200 00	May 26	April 1	June	May, '04
Laidlaw, R.	Clerk	1,300	100 00	" 26	" 1	"	Aug., '05
Holmden, A. R.	Clerk in charge of maps	1,300	100 00	" 26	" 1	"	Dec., '05
Pelletier, L. M.	Translator	1,400	200 00	" 26	" 1	"	Jan., '06
Martin, C.	Assistant editor	1,200	300 00	" 26	" 1	"	Mar., '08
Mercure, P. L.	Clerk	950	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Feb., '02
Grey, F	Translator	1,000	100 00	" 26	" 1	"	Oct., '94
Phelps, M. G.	Librarian	900	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	" '06
Casey, M.	Assistant Librarian	900	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Nov., '92
Poirier, D.	Clerk	750	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Aug., '06
Robertson, M.	"	675	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	June, '05
Macdonald, F. A.	"	650	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Mar., '04
Greaves, M.	"	650	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	June, '05
Brown, K	"	625	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Aug., '06
Shouldis, L.	"	550	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Jan., '07
Mackay, J. F.	"	550	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	" '07
Muir, V	"	550	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	" '07
Russell, H. M.	"	650	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Apl., '07
Ogilvy, G	"	550	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Jan., '07
Smith, M.	"	550	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Sep., '06
Bigras, V.	"	550	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Jan., '07

Mr. FISHER.

Name.	Position.	Present Salary	Amount of Increase.	Date Increase granted.	Date Increase effective.	Date Increase paid.	Date of Appointment.
		$	$ cts.				
Fee, N.	Clerk	550	50 00	May 26	April 1	June	Jan., '07
Bradley, J. D.	"	700	130 00	" 26 Aug. 31	" Aug.	1—$ 50 1— 80	" Sept.	Aug., '03
Macpherson, J. C.	Asst. supt. of Compilation	1,800	200 00	May 26 Aug. 28	April Aug.	1— 100 1— 100	June. Sept.	May, '01
Macphail, E. S	Supt. of Compilation	2,100	500 00	May 26 Aug. 28	April Aug.	1— 200 1— 300	June. Sept.	Mar., '01
Godfrey, E. H.	Editor	1,800	300 00	May 26 Aug. 28	April Aug.	1— 200 1— 100	June. Sept.	May, '07
Munro, J. R.	Records Clerk	1,300	100 00	May 26 Aug. 31	April Aug.	1— 50 1— 50	June. Sept.	Apl., '87
Watt, R. E.	Criminal Statistics Clerk	1,250	150 00	May 26 Aug. 31	April Aug.	1— 50 1— 100	June. Sept.	Sep., '83
Brown, F.	Stenographer	900	100 00	May 26 Aug. 28	April Aug.	1— 50 1— 50	June. Sept.	Feb., '01
Marcil, R. R.	Clerk	900	150 00	May 26 Aug. 31	April Aug.	1—$ 50 1— 100	June. Sept.	May '01
Pelletier, A. J.	"	900	150 00	May 26 Aug. 31	April Aug.	1— 50 1— 100	June. Sept.	Oct. 04
Pelletier, J. C. H.	Stenographer	750	50 00	May 26	April 1	June	Aug. '00
Ross, C.	Clerk	900	200 00	May 26 Aug. 31	" Aug.	1—$ 50 1— 150	" Sept.	— '81
Babin, E.	"	700	50 00	May 26	April 1	June	— '74
Battle, K.	"	700	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	May '01
Bradley, A.	"	650	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Nov. '05
Bouret, A.	"	700	100 00	" 26 Aug. 28	" Aug.	1—$ 50 1— 50	" Sept.	" '05
Jenkins, M.	"	650	50 00	May 26	April 1	June	— '01
Kehoe, G.	"	650	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Nov. '05
Keir, L.	"	650	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	" '05
Lovekin, F.	"	650	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	" '05
Field, R. H.	"	700	150 00	" 26 Aug. 31	" Aug.	1—$100 1— 50	" Sept.	" '06
Drysdale, B.	"	600	50 00	May 26	April 1	June	Sep. '06
Bertrand, E.	Stenographer	600	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	May '01
D'Auray, S.	" "	600	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Sep. '06
Thompson, E.	Clerk	600	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Jan. '06
Archer, W. A.	Stenographer	600	100 00	" 26 Aug. 28	" Aug.	1—$ 50 1— 50	" Sept.	Feb. '75
McGillivray, A.	Clerk	550	50 00	May 26	April 1	June	Dec. '06
Gravel, O.	"	550	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Nov. '06
Ogden, A. E.	Stenographer	600	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Oct. '06
Hilton, Dr. George	Chief Veterinary Inspec.	2.500	300 00	" 5	" 1	"	Dec. '00
Moore, A. E.	Chief Travelling Veter'y.	1,900	100 00	" 5	" 1	"	Aug. '97
Higgins, Chas. H.	Pathologist	1,900	100 00	" 5	" 1	"	June '99
Barnes, R.	Chief Meat Inspector	1,800	400 00	" 6 Aug. 31	May Aug.	1—$200 1— 200	" Sept.	Sep. '07
Sharman, C. H. L.	Clerk	1,600	150 00	May 26 Aug. 31	April Aug.	1— 50 1— 100	June. Sept.	Aug. '98
Bruce, E. A.	Travelling Meat Inspect'r	1,300	100 00	May 11	May 1	June	May, '07
*Laidlaw, Wm.	Assistant Pathologist	1,200	600 00	April 27	April 22	"	Apr., '07
Hadwen, S.	" "	1,200	100 00	May 26	" 1	"	" '02
Bayless, B. M.	Stenographer	1,000	150 00	" 26 Aug. 31	" Aug.	1—$ 50 1— 100	" Sept.	May, '01
Mackie, A.	Clerk	900	50 00	May 26	April 1	June	Oct., '06
Gowling, A.	"	900	100 00	Aug. 31	Aug. 1	Sept.	" '07
Dewar, M.	Stenographer	550	50 00	May 26	April 1	June	Jan., '07
Drummond, B.	Clerk	700	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	May, '03
St. George, D.	"	600	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Jan., '05
Clark, H. G.	"	550	50 00	June 1	" 1	"	May, '07
Mahon, T.	"	550	50 00	May 26	" 1	"	Jan., '07
Hutchingame, J.	Messenger	600	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Sep., '06
Spencer, J. B.	Clerk in Charge, L. S. Division	2,100	150 00	" 26 Aug. 31	" Aug.	1—$ 50 1— 100	" Sept.	July, '05
Clemons, W. A.	Clerk of Live Stock Records	1,600	50 00	May 26	April 1	June	Feb., '00
Drummond, D.	Live Stock Inspector	1,150	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	" '00
MacRae, C. M.	" "	1,150	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Jan., '05
Clemons, G. W.	" "	1,100	100 00	" 26	" 1	"	Apr., '01
Grant, J. F	Stenographer	550	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Dec., '06

Name.	Position.	Present Salary.	Amount of Increase.	Date Increase granted.	Date Increase effective.	Date Increase paid.	Date of Appointment.
		$	$ cts.				
Pelton, L	Stenographer	550	50 00	May 26	April 1	June	Apr., '06
Boulet, L	Clerk	700	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Jan., '99
Bonneville, J. G	"	600	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	May, '06
Brown, L	"	600	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Mar., '96
Clark, G. H	Seed Commissioner	2,800	200 00	" 26	" 1	"	Apr., '00
Raynor, T. G	Seed Inspector	1,600	100 00	Aug. 31	Aug. 1	Sept	June, '01
Eddy, E. D	"	1,600	400 00	May 26 Aug. 31	April 1—$200 Aug. 1— 200	June Sept	" '07
Coté, J. C	"	1,350	150 00	May 26 Aug. 31	April 1— 50 Aug. 1— 100	June Sept	Oct., '03
Michaud, G	Assistant Seed Analyst	1,350	150 00	May 26 Aug. 31	April 1— 50 Aug. 1— 100	June Sept	Jan., '05
Cranston, A	Stenographer	950	150 00	May 26 Aug. 31	April 1— 50 Aug. 1— 100	June Sept	June, '01
Bond, Wm	Assistant Seed Analyst	1,000	200 00	" 31	" 2— 200	"	July '07
Milette, S	Stenographer	900	200 00	May 26 Aug. 31	April 1— 50 Aug. 1— 150	June Sept	" '03
Brown, A. L	"	900	200 00	May 26 Aug. 31	April 1—$ 50 Aug. 1— 150	June Sept	Mar., '00
Hartley, M. F	Clerk	900	200 00	May 26 Aug. 31	April 1— 50 Aug. 1— 150	June Sept	May, '02
Bradley, A. M	"	900	200 00	May 26 Aug. 31	April 1— 50 Aug. 1— 150	June Sept	Feb., '03
Kipp, S	Messenger	700	100 00	May 26 Aug. 31	April 1— 50 Aug. 1— 50	June Sept	Oct., '04
Reardon, L	Clerk	600	50 00	Aug. 31	" 1	"	Dec., '04
Winthrop, W. J	"	600	50 00	" 31	" 1	"	Mar., '06
Lafontaine, M	Stenographer	700	150 00	" 31	" 1	"	Jan., '06
Gow, Duncan	Clerk	700	200 00	" 31	" 1	"	Oct., '07
Hill, H	"	650	50 00	May 26	April 1	June	Mar., '05
Ralston, R	"	650	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Feb., '05
Fisher, J	"	650	50 00	" 26	" 1	"	Dec., '05
Rogers, C. G	"	1,350	50 00	" 26	Aug. 1	Sept	'82
Nowlan, A	"	1,100	200 00	" 31	" 1	"	Apr., '06
Gagne, W. D	Stenographer	900	250 00	May 26 Aug. 31	April 1— 50 Aug. 1— 200	June Sept	Jan., '04
Dorè, L. J. O	Clerk	1,100	200 00	Aug. 31	" 1	"	May, '08
Willimson, J	Messenger	500	32 00	" 31	" 1	"	Nov., '07
Desfosses, A. J	Stenographer	1,000	50 00	May 26	April 1	June	Apr., '06

* Given increase of salary after examination qualifying as Veterinary Inspector.

LAKEFIELD WHARF.

Mr. SEXSMITH—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. How much has been spent to date on Lakefield wharf?

2. Was the work done by contract or by day labour, when was work commenced, and is the wharf completed?

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

1. The amount voted for this wharf was $4,050. Expended to date $3,421.76. The balance of this appropriation, $728.24, will be expended this spring in filling in approach.

2. This work was done by day labour. The work was commenced in the month of October, after navigation had closed. The work could not have been started any sooner owing to the dock being used by various steamboat companies. The last work done on the dock was in December. The dock is completed excepting the filling in of the approach.

Mr. FISHER.

WHARFS ON STONY LAKE.

Mr. SEXSMITH—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. How many wharfs have been built on Stony lake since 1900?

2. When and where were they built, what was the cost of each wharf, and were they built by contract or day labour?

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

1. Only one wharf was built at Stony lake since 1900.

2. Juniper island, last year (1908). The appropriation for the work was $1,500. The total amount was expended. It was built by day labour.

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What sum was voted for the outside service of the Department of the Interior in Ottawa, salaries of clerks, for the fiscal year 1908-9?

2. What was the total number of clerks employed in the said outside service of the Interior Department at Ottawa on April 1, 1908, and what was the amount required for the payment of their salaries for the year 1908-9?

3. Will the Minister of the Interior lay on the table of the House the orders in council by authority of which the increases of salary detailed on pages 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 563 and 564 unrevised 'Hansard,' 1909, were granted?

4. Was the question of these increases submitted to the Justice Department or to the Treasury Board? If so, will the minister table the decision arrived at by these?

5. What was the total amount involved in the increases granted as above as a charge against the consolidated fund?

6. What was the total amount involved by the new appointments as detailed on pages 564 and 565 unrevised 'Hansard,' 1909?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. $394,122.50. The salaries of the seven temporary clerks employed on the 1st April, 1908, in the School Lands branch amounting to $6,250, have not been included in the above sum, as the amount required to pay their services is not voted by parliament, but paid out of the School Lands funds.

2. 416; $381,292.50.

3. The information will be brought down on a motion for a return.

4. No.

5. The total amount of the increases as detailed in 'Hansard' is $41,760; but, through a clerical error, one name, that of Mr. G. B. Dodge, was omitted from the list so that the total amount involved is $42,510.

6. $31,580.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I ask the hon. minister if he would not revise his answer on part 3, and bring those down without formality of a notice of motion?

Mr. OLIVER. It would require a little time to prepare them.

Mr. FOSTER. It is merely to forward the business, because we must have them before we can do much with the Civil Service.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Make the motion now.

Mr. FOSTER. I move for an order of the House for what is asked for in question number three.

Motion agreed to.

SIR P. LAKE'S SPEECH.

Mr. TALBOT—by Mr. Calvert—asked:

Has the attention of the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence been drawn to reports which have been published in the press of an address stated to have been given by Major-General Sir P. Lake to the members of Toronto University Rifle Association on February 4, 1909, in one of which reports the following appears:

'The warning of General Lake.

'Western ideas and western civilization must be imposed on the Orient, said the General, and if we can't put it up to them by mere argument we must force it, and be prepared to fight if necessary.'

And has he any information to give to the House upon the subject?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). Yes, Sir P. Lake himself called attention to the matter and stated that the Press reports of his address had been so condensed, and so much matter omitted as to convey a misleading impression of what he had actually said; he had not referred in any way to present day Canadian political questions, nor made any statement which would in any way be offensive to Japan; he showed me full notes of his address, and from them it was evident that nothing had been said to which exception could fairly be taken. The remark attributed to General Lake in the extract quoted—that 'Western ideas and western civilization must be imposed on the Orient'—is so absurd as to carry with it its own refutation.

EMPLOYMENT OF BUSH CAMPBELL.

Mr. S. SHARPE asked:

1. Is there an official known as Bush Campbell employed on the Trent canal, Lake Simcoe division? If so, what are the terms of his employment?

2. Does the government allow him a sum for rent of house? If so, what is the amount?

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

1. There is no official by the name of Bush Campbell employed on the Trent Canal. There is on the Lake Simcoe-Balsam Lake Division of the canal a bridge-tender and caretaker of dam, named Donald Campbell.

2. Donald Campbell is paid $30 per month and is allowed $6 a month for house rent.

REFUSAL OF LAND SCRIP TO NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. HUGHES asked:

1. What are the reasons advanced by this or any preceding government, for refusing land scrip to members of the Northwest Mounted Police who served during the Northwest rebellion of 1885?

2. Is it the purpose of the government to recognize even at this late date the claims of those who were members of that force during the rebellion of 1885?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I answered a similar question by the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Claude Macdonell) a few days ago and I have now to repeat that reply as follows:

1. When the subject of rewards for services during the Rebellion of 1885 was

under consideration by the government of that day, a distinction was made between the Mounted Police, whose ordinary duties of maintaining law and order were within the limits of the disturbed districts, and the militia, who were called upon to leave their homes and occupations, at great personal inconvenience, resulting in many cases in serious embarrassment to themselves and families.

This distinction was marked by excluding the police from participation in the issue of scrip.

In 1893 the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories passed a resolution praying that the Dominion government would grant scrip to the Mounted Police, and on several occasions members have asked questions in the House. The reply has always been adverse to reconsideration.

PAYMENT OF ELECTION OFFICERS.

Mr. WRIGHT—by Mr. Elson—asked:

1. Under which department of the government rests the responsibility for the payments of the accounts of the returning officers, deputy returning officers and other officials in connection with Dominion elections?

2. Have the election expenses of the above officials for the election held in October last been paid by the government?

Hon. CHAS. MURPHY (Secretary of State):

1. The office of the Auditor General.

2. Partly.

Accounts completed and paid..	64
Accounts in process of settlement, part of which have been paid..	123
Accounts not yet received..	12
Accounts received in part..	9
Accounts received within last two weeks, which have not yet been examined..	10
	218

Muskoka accounts received on 19th January.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK INTEREST.

Mr. SHARPE asked:

1. What rate of interest on deposits in the Government Savings Department have prevailed, and what are the dates of the various changes of said rate?

2. What is the total number of depositors?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

1. Government savings banks (including post office savings banks): From 1873 to October 1, 1889, 4 per cent; from October 1, 1889 to July 1, 1897, 3½ per cent; from July 1, 1897 to present time 3 per cent.

2. Total number of open accounts, 197,746.

LOCKMASTER AT FENELON FALLS.

Mr. HUGHES asked:

1. What pay does the lockmaster at Fenelon Falls receive?

2. Is he allowed rent for his dwelling? If so, how much, or has he a dwelling provided by the government?

3. Is he allowed to keep an assistant? If so, what allowance for wages is made him by the government?

4. Does the lockmaster get paid for lost time when out through the country purchasing fowl?

5. Is he allowed by the government to go through the country during elections speaking for the Liberal candidate?

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

1. Lockmaster at Fenelon Falls is paid the sum of $30, a month as lockmaster and caretaker of dam; he also receives an additional $100 a year for his duties as statistical officer.

2. Up to the 1st February last, he has been allowed $6 a month for house rent. The government has just completed a house for the lockmaster at Fenelon Falls, which will now be occupied by him, in lieu of the $6 per month he has in the past received in this connection.

3. No.

4. No.

5. No.

PNEUMATIC TUBES AT MONTREAL.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Perley—asked:

1. What was the quantity and value of the pneumatic tubes purchased for the use of the Post Office Department at Montreal?

2. When were these bought, from whom, and how delivered?

3. Where are the said tubes at present in storage, what has been the storage cost to date, and what is the present rate of storage per month?

4. Is it the intention of the government to make use of these tubes in Montreal or elsewhere? If not, why not?

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

1. 8,007½ lineal feet at $1.45 per foot; $11,610.88.

2. Date of contract, February 9, 1905; from R. Maclaren & Company, of Glasgow; to be delivered in Montreal.

3. (a) On the government property, corner St. James street, St. Felix street, and Imperial avenue.

(b) $2,940.88.

(c) Nothing.

4. No. It is not the intention to proceed with the installation of the pneumatic tube system.

WHARF BETWEEN LONGUE POINTE AND POINTE-AUX-TREMBLES.

Mr. C. A. WILSON asked:

Has the government received any requests, either from private individuals or industrial and commercial companies, for the construction of a new wharf at places situate almost half-way between the villages of Longue

Pointe and Pointe-aux-Trembles? If so, is it the intention of the government to build a wharf at that place?

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

(a) Yes.

(b) An appropriation of $5,000 was included in the current year's Appropriation Act.

DREDGING IN RIVER JESUS.

Mr. C. A. WILSON asked:

1. On what date was the dredging of the River Jésus commenced, in that part of the river from Bout-le-L'isle and Charlemagne as far as Terrebonne and Sault St. François de Salles?

2. Who has been and who are the contractors for this dredging?

3. What amount has been appropriated for this dredging?

4. How much has been expended up to the present time?

5. What is the length, width and depth of the channel on that part of the river where the works have been carried on up to the present time?

6. Up to what point are these works to reach?

7. Is it the intention of the government to continue in the spring?

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

As dredging has been done on River Jésus between the above named places since 1881, I would ask that this stand as a notice of motion for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion for a return.

INCREASES TO CIVIL SERVICE SINCE APRIL 1, 1908.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What was the name and date of the first appointment, position and salary at time of increase of each clerk or other employee in the outside service of the Department of Public Works at Ottawa, to whom any increase of pay was given on and after the 1st of April, 1908, the amount of such increase or increases, the date on which increase was granted, the date it became effective, and the date on which the increase was paid?

2. The same question is asked of the following departments Militia and Defence, Marine and Fisheries, Railways and Canals, Customs, Inland Revenue, Public Printing, Indian Affairs, Auditor General, Finance, Mines and Post Office Department?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I would ask to have this stand as a notice of motion for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as notice of motion for a return.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have the answer for the Militia Department.

Mr. FOSTER. As I stated before, an answer laid on the table and published in the 'Hansard' would be immediately available to every member of the House. A big return such as that would be when brought down becomes unuseable by any except the mover and one or two others for a good deal of time and consequently does not come before the House, but I thought this was so important a matter it would be well to have it published in 'Hansard.' I already have the information for the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture, which are the two largest, down as answers.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Mine is there now.

EXPENDITURE ON AGRICULTURE.

Mr. EDWARDS asked:

What amount of money has been expended by the government of Canada for purely agricultural purposes during each of the fiscal years 1900 to 1908, inclusive?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). In preparing the answer the expenditure under the following appropriations was taken: Experimental farms; printing the bulletins and reports; fumigation; aid to agricultural societies; dairying, seed, &c., including cold storage; health of animals; one-fourth of civil government salaries.

1899-1900	$297,191 56
1900-1	309,088 57
1901-2	406,668 57
1902-3	444,324 75
1903-4	459,595 47
1904-5	554,565 79
1905-6	747,184 02
*1906-7	566,010 11
1907-8	762,589 89

*1906-7 fiscal year only 9 months.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY TERMINAL SITE, WINNIPEG.

Mr. A. HAGGART asked:

1. Who conducted for the government or the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners the negotiations for the purchase of the Winnipeg terminal property for the railway, from J. H. Kern and F. C. Mathews?

2. Was the price agreed upon by the agent conducting the negotiations laid before the government before closing the purchase?

3. What inquiries, if any, were made by the government, the Railway Commissioners or the officials as to the actual value of the property?

4. Was it known to the government that the vendors, Kern & Mathews, had become registered owners a short time previous at less than half the price asked from the government?

5. Did the officials, agents or solicitors acting for the government or the Railway Commissioners inform the government or the department that over $100,000 was the profit of the vendors?

6. What reasons existed for not ascertaining the price of the property by expropriation proceedings?

7. Is the government aware now that an extravagant price was paid for the property?

8. Is there any truth in the rumour that there is a probability of abandoning the property and acquiring more suitable land for terminal purposes nearer the city of Winnipeg?

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

1. The commissioners themselves, also through their agent Mr. T. L. Morton, Winnipeg, and their solicitor, Mr. T. H. Johnson, and the chief engineer, Mr. Lumsden.

2. Report of the transaction was submitted by the commissioners to the government before purchase was completed.

3. The commissioners in company with their land agent and chief engineer personally examined and inspected lands in the vicinity and decided that among those available were two properties, but the one purchased was more suitable than the other for divisional yards, although cheaper. The other was held at $3,000 per acre, but afterwards reduced to $2,000. Kern & Mathews asked $300 per acre or upwards, but after negotiations by Commissioner Young, the land agent and the solicitor, Mr. Johnson, it was reduced to an average of $277.50 per acre which was considered a low figure in comparison with the price asked for adjoining lands. The chief engineer approved of the purchase in the public interest, and the matter was closed accordingly.

4. No.

5. The commissioners have had no knowledge of the profits and gave no information to the government.

6. Based on the report of their officers and the opinion and recommendation of their chief engineer, coupled with the ascertained value of lands in the vicinity, the commissioners considered that the property was obtained at a much lower figure than if expropriation proceedings had been taken, and further the commissioners pursued the policy of railway companies by not giving publicity as to their intentions about divisonal yards, so as to avoid a rise in values.

7. Property was really bought at a low figure for reasons aforesaid.

8. No.

PAYMENTS TO NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING COMPANY.

Mr. McCARTHY asked:

Have any moneys been paid to the North Atlantic Trading Company, or to any person on their behalf, since the date of the cancellation of said contract between the company and the government? If so, what sums and upon what dates?

Mr. A. HAGGART.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Yes.

March 14, 1907..	$24,333 33
November 30, 1907..	36,901 50
November 29, 1907..	5,215 10

The last mentioned amount was a refund of the £1,000 deposited with the government as a guarantee of good faith and security for the due fulfilment of the contract, and the interest accrued thereon from the 14th April, 1902.

ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked:

1. On whose recommendation or authority was the Ross rifle accepted and adopted by the government as the national arm of Canada?

2. Is the Small Arms Committee responsible for the adoption of this Rifle by the government?

3. If so, did the committee report in favour of the rifle, and on what date?

4. What was the composition of this committee when the report or recommendation was made?

5. Was the report of the Small Arms Committee unanimous?

6. If not, did any member report recommending the rifle? If so, who?

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

1. The rifle was adopted on the recommendation of the Minister of Militia and Defence after it had been reported on by a board of expert officers. A copy of the report of that board has been laid on the Table of the House. Subsequently, after a considerable number of rifles had been manufactured, its use as one of the service rifles of Canada was authorized by General Order 104, June, 1906.

2. The Small Arms Committee was not organized until March, 1908.

3, 4, 5 and 6. Answered by No. 2.

CONTROL OF TELEPHONE COMPANIES BY RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. MACLEAN—by Mr. Calvert—asked:

1. Have any Canadian telephone companies been placed under the control of the Railway Commission?

2. If so, what is the date of the order in council?

3. To what telephone companies does such order in council, if any, apply?

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

1. Yes.

2. No order in council placing under jurisdiction of board, but by Act of Parliament, chapter 37, Revised Statutes of Canada, amended by chapter 61 of 1908, Part I of which was declared in force, under authority of an order in council, dated February 1, 1909, on and from February 8, 1909.

3. To all Canadian telephone companies chartered by the parliament of Canada.

CABLES TO VANCOUVER ISLAND AND ALONG PACIFIC COAST.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR asked:

1. Has application been made by any person, corporation or government for permission to lay a cable under the waters between Vancouver island and the mainland, and their extension northward along the coast of British Columbia?
2. If so, by whom, and what action has been taken on such request?

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

1 and 2. No request has been made for permission to lay a cable under the waters between Vancouver island and the mainland.

The Governemnt of the United States of America asked permission to lay a cable through Hecate strait and Dixon entrance, these being Canadian waters—and the permission was granted. This cable duplicates a part of the outside cable already established between Seattle and Alaska.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT CHILLIWACK, B.C.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR asked:

1. Has any property been purchased, or are there in progress negotiations for the purchase of any property in the city of Chilliwack?
2. If so, from whom has such property been purchased, what is its extent and location, and at what date was the purchase made?
3. For what purpose was any property so purchased required?

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

1 and 2. An order in council passed August 31, 1908, to purchase site on Young and Victoria streets, 80 feet frontage on each street by 115 feet deep between streets, from J. H. Henderson, for $3,000.

3. For the erection of a public building.

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSION.

Mr. BORDEN—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

1. Who are the members of the International Fisheries Commission appointed under the provisions of the treaty between His Majesty and the United States of America, signed on the 11th day of April, 1908, and relating to the fisheries?
2. Have the commissioners prepared a system of international regulations as contemplated and provided by the terms of the said treaty?
3. What has been done under the provisions of the said treaty?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

1. The Canadian Commissioner is Professor Edward E. Prince, B.A., F.L.S., F.R.S.C., Commissioner and General Inspector of Fisheries for Canada.

The United States Commissioner is Dr. Jordan, President of the University of California.

2. Not yet.
3. The commissioners have been appointed, and have made some progress in the preparation of international regulations

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT—SALARY INCREASES.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

Will the Minister of Public Works lay on the table of the House the orders in council passed from the 1st of May, 1908, to January 31, 1909, authorizing increase to the employees of that department?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Yes, on motion for a return.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask leave to move that resolution.

Motion agreed to.

WATERWAYS TREATY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN—by Mr. George Taylor—asked:

1. When did the government first receive a copy of the recent Waterways Treaty as it was signed by the plenipotentiaries of the high contracting parties thereto?
2. On what date was the treaty signed?

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

1. 29th January.
2. 11th January.

NIAGARA RIVER—WATERFLOW OVER THE FALLS.

Mr. MAGRATH asked:

What is the amount of water in the Niagara river annually discharged over the Horseshoe and American falls, respectively?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). At mean water of Lake Erie, the International Waterways Commission report for 1906, page 250, gives the discharge over the American Falls as 27,800 cubic feet per second, and over the Horse Shoe Fall 194,600. More recent determinations by the United States Lake Survey give 26,600 and 186,400 or in the proportion of 1 to 7.

At low water stage, these figures would be reduced, in the first instance, to 22,300 and 157,500 respectively and to 21,500 and 150,000 for low water stage Lake Erie.

PROVINCIAL BOUNDARIES.

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

1. Has the government decided upon the boundary lines between Manitoba and Ontario on the one side, and Ontario and Quebec on the other, under the resolutions adopted last year with reference to the boundaries of these provinces?

2. If so, when will the Bill giving effect to such resolutions be submitted to the House?

3. Will such Bill be submitted to the government of the province of Ontario before it is introduced into this House?

4. Does the government intend to include a harbour or harbours on the Hudson bay, in the portion to be allotted to the province of Ontario?

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

1. The boundaries of the extension of the province of Ontario were decided by resolution of this House passed last session. It is expected that the Bill will be introduced at no distant date.

2. No exact date can be given to-day.

3. The Bill will certainly be submitted to the province of Ontario before it is introduced in this House.

4. The government will give the province of Ontario the shore which has been determined upon by the resolution of last year.

PUBLIC DEBT—LOANS OF DECEMBER, 1907, AND OCTOBER, 1908.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Perley—asked:

1. In connection with the loan of December, 1907, of £1,500,000 of four per cent debentures, due October 1, 1912, (a) what was the amount of the full six months' interest payable by Canada on April 1, 1908; (b) reckoning the interest at four per cent, what would be the total amount of actual interest earned to that date on the sums paid in upon the subscription dates?

2. What is the same information regarding the loan of October, 1908?

3. Is this interest bonus added to the debt, or is it regarded as a distributed annual charge during the duration of the loan?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Finance):

1. (a) £119,100 the loan of December, 1907, were converted into 3 per cent of 1938 before 1st January, 1908, and consequently on the 1st April, 1908, interest charged for this loan was on £1,380,900 amounting to £27,618.

(b) £12,098 17s. 4d.

2. (a) £87,500.

(b) £26,178 1s. 7d.

3. As a distributed annual charge during the duration of the loan.

CLAIM OF ALFRED DICKIE.

Mr. STANFIELD—by Mr. Rhodes—asked:

1. When was payment of $442 made to Alfred Dickie, Lower Stewiacke, for damages by fire on April 5, 1905?

2. Was payment ever refused? If not, why so long delayed?

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

1 and 2. $442 was paid Alfred Dickie in settlement of his claim for fire damages, on May 23, 1907. The department is not aware that the claim was ever declined; but Mr. Dickie refused for a long time to accept less than the full amount of his claim which was $542.

MILEAGE OF RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

Between the period from 1888 to 1908, inclusive, what was the total mileage of railways authorized to be constructed under charters granted by the Dominion parliament, inclusive of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Canadian Northern Railway Company, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The reply to this will be so voluminous that I would ask it to stand as a notice of motion for a return.

Mr. SPROULE. I would make the motion now, by permission of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no necessity for that, I think. The order of the House provides that, in such circumstances, the question stands as a notice of motion. But, of course, this can be carried.

Mr. SPROULE. But the motion is often moved by consent, and it has been done three or four times already.

Mr. SPEAKER. Carried.

LOBSTER LICENSES IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. FRASER asked:

1. How many licenses to fish and pack lobsters in the coast waters of Prince Edward Island have been issued by the Dominion government since January 1, 1904, to this date, and to whom were same issued?

2. Has the government received any petitions, requests, or correspondence from any person or persons, or corporations since January, 1, 1904, asking for licenses to fish and pack lobsters in said province? If so, who were the applicants?

3. Is it the intention of the government to issue any new licenses during the present year?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The answer to this will be so voluminous that I will ask the hon. member (Mr. Fraser) to move for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand as notice of motion for a return.

40TH BATTALION HASTINGS RIFLES.

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

Has the government considered the advisability of setting apart the officers' quarters of the old drill hall in Belleville for use of the 40th Battalion, Hastings Rifles? If so, what is the determination?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). This information has already been furnished to parliament this session in reply to a previous inquiry by the hon-

ourable gentleman (vide 'Hansard', unrevised, page 701).

RURAL MAIL DELIVERY IN PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY.

Mr. PORTER—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

1. Has rural mail delivery been established in Prince Edward County, Ontario?

2. Has anything been done towards establishing such rural mail delivery? If so, what, where and at what expense?

3. Has there been any refusal by any mail carriers to collect or deliver mail in Prince Edward County? If so, by whom, when, and for what cause?

4. Is the department aware whether any letters have been mailed in any such rural mail boxes and allowed to remain undespatched owing to refusal of carriers to collect the same?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

The department was informed, through the Chief Post Office Superintendent, that twenty-four rural mail delivery boxes had been erected on the Picton and West Lake mail route, but that the contractor, Mr. Alfred Mills, refused to serve these boxes, it being understood that he was not satisfied with the remuneration offered. Tenders are therefore being invited for a new contract to convey the mails between these two points, such contract to also include collections and deliveries from rural mail boxes established or hereafter to be established. The department has no information that letters have been mailed in the boxes now erected.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—BRANCH TO ORILLIA.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Perley—asked:

Has the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company filed with the government any plans or report as to the line specified in Section 11, subsection 5, of 6 Edward VII., chapter 99, connecting a point on the National Transcontinental Railway between the eighty-third and eighty-fifth degrees of west longitude, with the town of Orillia? If so, what is the estimated length of said line, its cost and the probable date of its completion?

Hon. Geo. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). No such plans have been filed in the Department of Railways and Canals.

ZINC IN ALBERMARLE TOWNSHIP, ONT.

Mr. BEATTIE asked:

1. Is the government aware that an extensive ore body of zinc blende has been discovered on lot No. 30, 3rd concession of Albermarle township, county of Huron, Ontario?

2. Has the government taken any measures by the granting of a bounty or otherwise to encourage the zinc mining industry in Canada?

3. In view of the fact that the development of this industry will require the investment of a large amount of capital, is it the intention of the government to take any such measures?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. The Department of Indian Affairs has no knowledge as to zinc on lot No. 30, con. 3, township of Albermarle. This lot was sold on the 28th of February, 1900, by the Department of Indian Affairs, to Stephen Irwin, and patent issued therefor on the 12th of August, 1908, to Thomas Lindsay, of London, Ont., who acquired the interest of the original purchaser at a tax sale.

SUBSTITUTE FOR A VOLUNTEER.

Mr. HERRON asked:

1. Can a volunteer become a substitute for another volunteer, and perform the homestead duties on both grants?

2. Can a volunteer or his substitute reside on his homestead and do his resident duties under his South African scrip if the scrip is located within nine miles of his homestead?

3. Can a South Africa land warrant pass through the possession of more than one substitute?

4. Can a volunteer or his substitute obtain his patent without residing on the land by getting his improvements done by another party?

5. Can any person other than a veteran, hold and locate and obtain patent for more than one certificate?

6. Can a volunteer or his substitute obtain entry for a South Africa land warrant, and for the homestead and pre-emption adjoining at the same time, and fulfil the homestead duties on both by residing on one quarter only, either the scrip land or the homestead?

7. Can a South Africa certificate pass through the possession of more than one substitute before locating it, and after it has been located by a veteran or his substitute, can they transfer their rights before obtaining patent?

8. Can a South Africa scrip be located on two quarter-sections that corner each other?

9. Can two veterans or their substitutes locating on the same section obtain their patents by residing together?

10. Will a veteran or his substitute have to commence residence within six months from the date of locating his land warrant, or within six months from December, 31, 1910?

11. Is there any way by which a veteran or his substitute can obtain patent without residing six months in each year for three years in succession on the land?

12. Does the government intend to make amendments to the South Africa Land Bill of last session?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Yes, provided he can perform the necessary residence in each of three years, with the required cultivation upon each half-section.

2. No.

3. No.

4. No. Residence must be performed personally by the locatee, though there is nothing to prevent him having the improvements made by some one else.

5. Yes. A person may be the substitute of two volunteers, but it rests with him to perform the required duties upon both half-sections.

6. No. The duties required on the homestead must be performed in accordance with the Dominion Lands Act, and residence spent on the half-section secured under South Africa land warrant cannot be counted, neither can residence performed on the homestead be counted to the advantage of the military homestead.

7. See answer to question 3. A substitute may be appointed either before or after entry is made by the grantee, and if the settlement duties have been partially performed by the grantee they may be completed by the substitute.

A patent must be issued either to the volunteer or his substitute.

8. No.

9. No.

10. Residence must be commenced by the locatee within six months of the location of the warrant.

11. No.

12. No.

WHARF NEAR LISMORE, PICTOU COUNTY.

Mr. RHODES asked:

1. Has the government constructed or repaired a wharf at or near Lismore, Pictou county, Nova Scotia, within the last three years?

2. If so, what was the total cost of the wharf?

3. Are there any unpaid accounts outstanding? If so, for what, what amount, and to what persons are they due?

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

1. Yes.

2. $4,277.67.

3. Pay-list and accounts for October-November, amounting to $1,105.77, are now in the hands of the departmental paymaster, who wires that he has made an appointment to meet the men for payment to-morrow, 16th instant.

DEBT OF CANADA ON JANUARY 31, 1909.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR asked:

1. What was the amount of the net debt of Canada on January 31, 1909?

2. By what amount did the net debt increase during the twelve months ending January 31, 1909?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Finance):

1. $308,226,027.11.

2. $48,721,413.42.

These amounts only represent the results based on the receipts and payments which passed through the books of the Finance Department up to the last of January of each year referred to.

DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—EMPLOYEES IN COUNTY OF HALIFAX.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Some days ago the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) asked a question as to the number of employees, temporary and permanent, in the county of Halifax. The question was as follows:

1. What was the number of (a) permanent employees and (b) temporary employees in the service or employment of the Department of Marine and Fisheries in the county of Halifax upon, (a) the first day of each month, (b) the 15th day of each month, and (c) the 31st day of December in the year 1908?

2. What was the total amount of the payroll of the said department in the county of Halifax during each of said months?

3. How many temporary employees or labourers were engaged or employed in said county between the first day of September and the first day of November, in the said year 1908?

My hon. friend drew my attention the other day to the fact that the answer was not very clear, and I recognize that it was not. The answer did not show specifically whether the one or the two columns referred to the temporary employees or the permanent employees. I must say also that I think there was a mistake in the last answer, which stated there were 508 employees, whereas the correct number is 208. I append the revised answer in full.

LIST of Permanent and temporary employees in Department of Marine and Fisheries, Halifax County from Jany. 1 to December 31, 1908.

Permanent	Temporary.		Month.	Monthly wages.
1st and 15th day of mo.	1st day of mo.	15th day of mo.		
66	64	62	Jany....	$5,504.70
66	62	63	Feby...	5,362.09
66	64	64	March .	5,672.68
66	65	65	April...	5,642.04
66	67	69	May....	5,947.56
67	69	94	June ...	6,109.68
67	69	74	July....	6,044,79
67	71	71	Aug....	6,143.02
68	73	73	Sept....	6,115.19
69	74	118	Oct.....	8,404.80
69	154	118	Nov....	7,982,36
69	118	104	Dec.....	8,010,42
			.....	$76,939.33

Total December 31, 1908, 97.

Total number of men employed between September 1st and November 1st, 1908—208.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all correspondence between Rothwell, Johnston & Stubbs, lawyers, of Winnipeg, and the government, or the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners respecting their instructions in regard to the purchase of the Winnipeg terminals from Kern & Mathews, and in respect to the legal services rendered by them for the government, and passing of titles of the property, and a copy of the solicitors' bills of cost, charges and correspondence arising therefrom; and of all correspondence between the government and the Railway Commissioners and the vendors, Kern & Mathews, from the commencement of the negotiations; and also showing what steps, if any, were taken towards expropriating the property, or obtaining judical determination as to the value of the said property.—Mr. Bradbury.

For a copy of all orders in council, regulations, reports, correspondence, documents, and papers under, relating to or touching the several treaties of April 11, 1908, between His Majesty and the United States of America, relating to or touching any action, proceeding, appointment, reports or other matter made, had or undertaken under or pursuant to the said treaties or either of them.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a copy of all orders in council, correspondence, reports, documents and papers relating to the recent waterways treaty, so-called, between His Majesty and the United States of America.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

At Six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

A BUREAU OF PUBLIC HEALTH.

Mr. J. B. BLACK (Hants) moved:

That in the opinion of this House the time has arrived when the government of Canada should perfect organization whereby present scientific knowledge would be made practically available for the suppression of preventable diseases.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is exactly the same motion that I made last year. I have several reasons why I thought it best to introduce it again this year. One was that last year it was introduced on a Wednesday afternoon and there were only four of the hon. members who were able to speak on the question, while there were some fourteen or fifteen who desired to do so. I thought it better to bring in the motion again this year in order that every one, if possible, who had nothing to say upon it last year might speak now and also that those who did speak upon it last year might have the privilege of doing so again. Another reason is that I, as well as other medical men, consider this if not the most important, one of the most important questions that could be introduced into the parliament of Canada. This question affects not only the lives and health of our people, but the prosperity of the country. It affects the Finance Department, the Labour Department; it affects the prosperity of the country now and its future greatness. Thirdly, I introduced it again because it is the wish of the medical profession and many of the laity. In introducing this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I may say that I represent not only many laymen interested in improving the health of the people, but I represent 6,000 medical men in the Dominion of Canada. I may say that this is not my question. As you well know it is not my resolution, but it is the motion of the medical profession of Canada. I happen to be one, although at the present time, at least, disengaged from the activities that claim the energies of nearly the whole of the 6,000 medical men, and you all know the hard, busy life of the medical man. He would give greater public utterance to his views upon this question of public health had he more leisure. His time of work extends not only from morning till night, but from morning till morning sometimes, and again from morning till night without any let-up for rest. He has not only to provide for a family, for those dependent upon him, but for the welfare of innumerable sick who take the most of his thoughts and his time. For that reason we do not hear, as often as we otherwise would, the voice of the medical man on this question of public health. Nevertheless he is thinking of it; nevertheless, he is acting about it. When medical men meet in annual association, as we do for the whole Dominion once a year, and for every province once a year, and for every county sometimes as often as once a month, this question comes up very prominently. It is more before the medical profession to-day than it ever was; it is more before the public of Canada to-day than it ever was. Those of the medical men who have been reading the public addresses of presidents of medical associations, and of medical men before the Canadian clubs or other bodies throughout Canada will agree that, for the last two or three years, the burden of these addresses has been 'the public health.' Formerly, at the annual meeting of the medical association, some subject of disease or its treatment, some surgical operation, was usually introduced by the president in his annual address. Now, I have observed, year after year, the presidential address is on some such subject as Public Health, State Medicine or Hygiene. This subject has taken such a hold in the neighbouring republic than a committee of one hundred laymen has been working steadily for the last four or five years to induce the American government to consolidate their various federal boards of health into one single bureau of public heath. And this is the course we hope to see taken in Canada.

Such a hold has this question taken in the United States that Columbia University, one of the first universities on this continent, has taken the lead and established a chair of Public Health, the first of the kind in any medical college in the world. Heretofore medical colleges have contented themselves with teaching how to cure diseases—to the making of people well. Now, Columbia University, in the city of New York, is in the advance guard, teaching medical men how to teach the public to keep from getting sick. It is rather anomalous that we should be engaged in spoiling our own business. But there are a great many men—the great majority—in the medical profession who are willing to sacrifice themselves for the benefit of others rather than consider their own selfish profit.

Some Hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLACK. Two or three laymen say, 'hear, hear.' I am glad to hear them say it. I am now in the ranks of the older men of the medical profession; I have practised alongside two generations of them down in that province by the sea; and I would like to say that I do not believe that in any profession or business in this country, or any other country that I have ever known, can be found a more self-sacrificng, unselfish, generous body of men than the medical men whom I have known and practised along side of. And I take them as a sample of those to be found all over Canada. I also had another reason for introducing this to-day, because, though, last year, I got a speech into the heads of the government, I want, to-night, if it is within my power, to get it into their hearts. I want them to dream dreams and see visions of this subject, until a bureau of public health for the education and instruction of the people shall be established here I do not think we have any right to wait to see what other countries are doing. We are forming here one of the latest, and, as we hope, one of the greatest nations in the world. We are the 'heir of all the ages,' and we can pattern by the mistakes and sins of omission and of commission of other countries. And as we are, man for man, the best educated country in the world—and I say that advisedly, and can quote one of the best authorities in Canada in support of my statement—we should lead in this question of public health for the sake of humanity.

I plead this cause of a bureau of public health for several reasons. I plead it because Canada is suffering enormous losses of people yearly from diseases that could be prevented. I plead it because we are suffering not only loss of people, but loss of enormous money values. I plead it because this loss is unnecessary—because there is no reason why it should continue.

I plead it because the government can and ought to institute a bureau that could teach the public how to live. The government have taken the lead in teaching farmers how to farm. They have taken the lead in teaching them how to make cheese and butter, and have achieved great results thereby. They are teaching the people with a view to awakening an interest in the preservation of our forest trees. They have taken a deep interest, and done a great work, in protecting the lives of our domestic animals. Now I do think it is time that our government should institute a bureau to educate our people to stop dying before they ought, to stop dying until accident or old age overtakes them. Now, some may think that death comes from Providence, that we all must die, and, therefore, to talk of preventing death is to talk of that which is not feasible. Of course the fiat has gone forth that all men must die, and I am glad we must. I think there is no man who has arrived at old age, who has done his duty by his family, by his country and his God, but should be willing to depart this life for a better one. But it is uncalled for, and unnecessary that our people should die in their childhood in their youth, or in middle age. We are losing about 81,201 of our people every year. The estimate of scientific men who have studied the question of public health is that one-third of that number die of preventable diseases—die while yet wage earners, die while yet of value to the state; and their value as citizens adding to the wealth of the country is lost, needlessly, uselessly, and without recall. At this estimate the country is losing every year 27,066 people that we should not lose. Looking at this loss merely from the monetary point of view, and putting the value of a man's life to the state, as it has been estimated over and over again, at $1,000, we are losing every year $27,066,000 from lives sacrificed without any sense or reason and without any need of the sacrifice. The heaviest tax paid in Canada to-day is the tax for funerals, for burials, for the unnecessary sacrifice of human life. I am saying nothing unguardedly, Mr. Speaker; I am saying nothing on the impulse of the moment; I am saying nothing that I have not studied out for years, and that I am not prepared to prove by facts and statistics. Of all the unnecessary and inhuman deaths in Canada, the slaughter of little children, of the babies, is the most unnecessary. We are losing every year 31,347 children under five years of age, most of them done to death by bad milk. It is the estimate of those who have studied the question of sanitation that while one-third of the adult lives we are losing can be saved, one-half of the lives of these children can be saved by proper care and by protection.

We have heard a great deal of righteous indignation against the slaughter of our people at level crossings, and there has not been a word too much said in that regard. In the last five years, I think, there have been 270 people killed at railway crossings —an unnecessary number. Nobody should have been killed there; but what is the effect of the slaughter at railways crossings compared with the 27,066 people who die in Canada every year of preventable diseases? One is just as unnecessary as the other. I have here an extract from a Toronto paper headed 'More ruinous than the drink evil,' and almost every word that it says can be applied to the unnecessary slaughter of little children and adults from preventable diseases:

In connection with the order given by Hon. G. P. Graham that the Railway Commission conduct an investigation into the level railway crossings, a comment in this week's issue of the 'Canadian Churchman' is interesting. It classes work in this direction saving human life as more urgent than labour for the temperance cause. It says :—

'We are told of the horrors of war, and a goodly proportion of our people spend much time, money and labour in what is called the temperance cause. There is an ample field for benevolent enterprise and expenditure in devising means for averting the calamitous railway accidents that are all too frequent. Why not have a guild or society of earnest men and women band together, whose humane and beneficent bond of union would be the endeavour to bring about the abolition of the deadly 'level crossing.' Surely if the lessening of sudden deaths, the prevention of intense bodily suffering to individuals, grief to families and the constant loss of valuable lives to the community, offer motives for action, it is time that combined and organized effort undertook this urgent reform. In the last analysis it is a question of money versus human life.'

If a religious newspaper can write with that energy and earnestness with regard to the loss of 270 lives in five years at level crossings, with how much more energy and earnestness should the press of this country speak out against the unnecessary slaughter of 27,066 people in Canada every year from preventable diseases?

Now, the great practical question that presents itself, after all, is: are there any diseases that we can prevent? Science answers that question most emphatically: yes. May I read some remarks that I made last year:

Let us consider the question of typhoid fever alone. There are cities and towns in Canada that have their cases of typhoid every day in the year, any one of which is preventable. Professor Irving Fisher, of Yale University, says:—

'Typhoid fever can be practically abolished by the prevention of the pollution of the rivers and other sources of water supply and by improving our milk.'

Medical writers of undoubted authority have said that it is a disgrace to any community to have an epidemic of typhoid fever. I have seen cases where the cause was so apparent, the filth so near, that the result, as well as the conditions, admitted of no other word than disgraceful.

The fact is now beyond controversy that typhoid can be wiped off the face of the earth. If we attend to the purification of our water and milk supply typhoid fever will be prevented. It is not only a disgrace for a city to have typhoid fever but I believe it is a crime. If the driver of an engine or the conductor of a train is guilty of culpable negligence through which that train is thrown off the track and lives are sacrificed, there is a legal claim against the railway company for damages and there is a criminal charge of manslaughter against the officers of the train. I would like to ask what difference there is in degree between the carelessness of the trainmen and the carelessness of a city not one thousand miles from Ottawa which to-day has 1,000 cases or more of typhoid? If our people were sufficiently educated do you think they would for one instant tolerate the administration of a city council that would allow the pollution of its water supply to continue day after day and year after year? I am not a lawyer but I maintain that the municipal government which allows its people to drink polluted water is as blameable for the loss of lives as the train officials by whose negligence a train is run off the track. I find that cases almost parallel with this have come before the courts in England and have been decided there. In the case of Brown vs. the Three Counties Asylum of Bedfordshire, a widow sued for the loss of her husband who died from typhoid caused by the impure water served by the asylum authorities and she got a verdict of £650. It occurs to me that if some widow in the city I have referred to would bring action against the city council for the loss of her husband by typhoid fever it would be the means, more than anything else, of educating the people on this question. If the city had to pay for the loss of the breadwinner of a family the municipal authorities would probably begin to think about the propriety of establishing a filtration plant to supply pure water to the citizens. I want to say it again, that the supervision of the water supply and proper supervision of our milk supply would banish typhoid fever from the land. Smallpox has been pretty well banished, and it would have been completely banished if the present regulations were properly carried out. Medical science has discovered means for the abolition of many diseases that formerly scourged the earth. To-day medical science has become so exact that scientific research has traced the cause and the prevention of these diseases to a cer-

tainty, so that we no longer doubt that we can put an end to typhoid, to scarlet fever, to measles, to whooping cough, to mumps, and other kindred diseases. No medical man will deny that. The question then remains, should not Canada undertake as quickly as possible measures to prevent these diseases which carry so many of our people to an untimely grave? Let us admit that these diseases can be prevented, and having admitted that, we can reduce the deaths amongst adult population by one-third and we can reduce by one-half the number of deaths among our infant population. The next question is can we afford to take measures to that end? My answer is, yes. From a monetary point of view alone it would pay us. As I have shown we lose annually by certain diseases alone what would represent $27,066,000. Spend a fraction of that in educating our people how to avoid the disease and in teaching these cities which are now scattering typhoid all over Canada how to prevent typhoid, and how much of this $27,000,000 a year would be saved? Therefore, I say that from a monetary point of view alone we can afford to take active and energetic measures to prevent typhoid, and we will be richer in the end for it. Is it the duty of the government to embark in this good work? I think so. This government admits it is their duty to teach the people to conserve our natural resources and to protect our forests; they consider it their duty to protect our domestic animals from disease. This government very wisely expends half a million dollars a year and they employ 107 veterinarians to protect the lives of our domestic animals. Is not a man worth more than a sheep; is not a human being worth more than an ox? And if it is the duty of the government to protect the lives of our domestic animals is it not one-thousand-fold more their duty to protect the lives and the health of our own people? There is a little story told by Dr. Hurty, so short and so much to the point that I will venture to repeat it to the House.

A little mother under 25 years of age was told by her physician that she had the beginnings of consumption. She was told that it was curable, that the government had sanitoria to cure it. She wrote to the government saying: I am told that I have consumption in its early stages and can be cured by outdoor life, continued rest and plenty of food. I do not want to die; I want to live. I think I am of value to the State; I want to raise my children, to make them good citizens. Where can I get well?

The reply was to this effect: This great Christian country has not yet risen to the mighty economy of saving the lives of its people or its little mothers from consumption or any other disease. At the present time, so far as we are concerned, the only place you can go to is the grave. The little mother died of consumption, that preventable, that curable disease; the home was broken up and the children were taken to the orphan asylum.

That is the first part of the story—this is the second:

A big fat hog one morning found that he had a pain in his stomach. He squealed loudly and the farmer came out of his house to see what was the matter. The hired man said: He has got the 'hog cholera.' So the farmer telegraphed to the Secretary of the Veterinary Department of the government, and the reply came quick: Why certainly I will send you a man right away. And sure enough the man came. He said he was a D.V.S.—that is, a Doctor of Veterinary Surgery, and he was, too. He had a government syringe and a bottle of government medicine in his hand bag; he went for the hog and the hog got well.

Now here is the moral—be a hog and be worth saving.

Mr. Speaker, if hogs can be saved, men can be saved; if it is worth the while of the government to save a hog, it is a million times more worth while to save the lives of human beings. I do want the government to get it into their heads that the lives of the people can be saved and must be saved. Of course it costs money, but is it not worth the expenditure? From a monetary point of view only, is it not worth the expenditure? I do not want to touch upon the sentimental side of this question, although there is a sentimental side to it. There are tragedies from the ravages of disease which, if pictured in better words than I can command, would bring tears to every eye in this House. When we consider the needless loss of so many people, when we consider the enormous death rate, the suffering and the agony of little infants who have died from poisoned milk, we stand aghast. No medical man who has attended a case of cholera infantum, infantile diarrhoea or acute indigestion, all coming from poisoned milk—and when I say poisoned milk I mean milk that is brought from the country in the ordinary way into the city to be sold, not a drop of which is pure unless it is pasteurized or sterilized, —no medical man who has looked on the faces of these suffering children and felt his own inability to save their innocent lives, has been free from bitter heartache. Any medical man can picture to you the dying agonies of men and women in the prime of life who have left their families helpless, all for want of proper knowledge. Much has been said of tuberculosis and much has not yet been told. We can say the same things of typhoid fever, scarlet fever, and all the other unnecessary and

preventable diseases that are sweeping our people off the earth needlessly. It is simply because we have been used to these things, that our fathers and our forefathers have been used to them for generations, that we passively allow this dreadful waste of life. If laymen could see as clearly as medical men the needlessness of this loss and suffering, I do not believe we would wait a year or a month to take the first steps to remedy this terrible evil.

I do not wish to speak in detail of what a federal bureau of public health should do, but I take it for granted that its first step would be education—educate the people, teach them how they can avoid preventable disease, teach the cities how they must avoid disease, for there is where the great slaughter comes. I have been told by some in authority that this is the work of the provinces. So it is the work of the provinces; it is the work of the cities, it is the work of the villages, it is the work of every individual. But I maintain that a federal bureau of public health would not interfere with the health departments of the provinces, but would rather be an educator to them, would be a stimulus and a guide to them. Such a bureau would teach the whole people more effectively than any provincial organization could do. But so far as my knowledge goes this question is as much a question for the federal authorities as for any of the provincial authorities. In the British North America Act, although among the fathers of confederation was one doctor—and he was a good doctor in his day as well as a pretty good politician—there is very little reference made to public health. I find only two clauses. The first section dealing with it defines the power of the federal government in this regard. They are to have charge of quarantine and the establishment and maintenance of marine hospitals. The Act assigns to the provinces:

> The establishment, maintenance and management of hospitals, asylums, charities and eleemosynary institutions in and for the province other than marine hospitals.

In practice most of this work has been left to the provinces by the federal government, but I hope better days are coming and that the federal government will take hold of these things. There is much, Mr. Speaker, that a federal bureau of public health could do. As I said, its functions should be, for years to come, educative. Teach the people by literature, by public addresses, in every way possible, how to stop dying before their time. It is hardly worth while to go into details, there are so many of them I might mention. But the conditions in our factories all over the country, the unwholesome conditions in which men, women and little children work in our factories, are such as to require immediate attention. The provinces, at least the province of Nova Scotia, have deemed it wise to appoint government inspectors of poor houses and prisons to see that sanitation regulations are carried out. Now, if a criminal's life is worth watching, how much more is the life of the bread earners worth watching, the men, women and children in our factories. Go into them to-day, go into them at any time until the summer heat and you will find many of them in the most unsanitary condition. Go into some of the Canadian mills, and you will find that the protection of the workers has never been considered. This is one of the very important things that a bureau of public health could look after. The school houses are unsanitary to a degree all over the country. They are a little better in the cities, but they are unsanitary to a degree in the country parts where I have known and seen them. We should provide for the examination of children in schools, the proper examination of our water supply, both in towns and country, for typhoid arises almost as frequently from the farm house well as from the river or lake supply of the city. Most people do not know this. I may say from experience in regard to the water supply in the towns of Nova Scotia, taking the stretch of country known as the Annapolis valley from the town of Windsor to the town of Annapolis, little less than 100 miles, in which there are from 12 to 15 towns and villages, that every doctor calculated on his autumn supply of typhoid fever arising from well water. In the last twenty years all those towns have been supplied with a magnificent water system from the mountains. On each side of the valley a pure supply of water comes into all those towns, and in those towns typhoid fever is unknown except that which is brought in by those who go to visit their country cousins, who have taken it from the farm house well. There is very little typhoid in the towns and villages except that which has been imported. Now, I say all these matters should be under the supervision of an official of the government, and the people should be instructed where to put their wells and how to keep them clean. I might go on and tell you what a board of health could do, but it would take me all night, and I would not be half done.

I said in the beginning, Mr. Speaker, that this question was a most important one. The medical profession have given the matter a great deal of earnest attention. If I did not fear to weary you I would like to run over what has been done by the medical associations of Canada and the appeals they have made to this good government of ours, for it is a good government. I would like to show what has been done by the Canadian Medical Asociation since 1902.

I do not know what was done before that, but I hold in my hand a record of what has been done since 1902. In 1902, at the thirty-fifth annual meeting of the Canadian Medical Association, the largest and most representative meeting of the medical profession up to that time, was held in the city of Montreal on the 16th, 17th and 18th of September. The following resolution was proposed by Dr. E. P. Lachapelle, Montreal, and seconded by Dr. J. R. Jones, of Winnipeg:

Resolved, that in the opinion of the Canadian Medical Association, now in session, the time is opportune for the Dominion government to earnestly consider the expediency of creating a separate department for public health, under one of the existing ministers, so that regulations, suggestions and correspondence, on such health matters as fall within the jurisdiction of the federal government, may be issued with the authority of a department of public health.

In 1903 a similar resolution was passed. I notice it is stated that the deputation that waited on the Prime Minister in 1903 was most courteously received. I am sure that could be said of the Prime Minister, not only in 1903, but in every year since he has been in public life. They reported that he listened patiently to the sentiments set forth, and finally authorized Dr. Roddick to place a resolution on the order paper with a view to having a discussion in parliament before the Privy Council took up the matter in earnest. Sir Wilfrid Laurier also stated that in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, who was familiar with the whole question, he would not willingly go into the matter at a greater length with a view to legislation in the minister's absence. In 1904 there was another deputation, and a committee was appointed. In 1907 I had the pleasure myself of forming one of another deputation from the Canadian Medical Association that waited on Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Now, Mr. Speaker, I only mention these things to show that this is no new matter, the medical profession has been asking it for years. I feel sure that the reform will come, and that it will come soon. The finances of the country ask for it, the prosperity of the country requires it, suffering humanity demands it, dying men and women who have no need to die demand it. If we as a Christian people have caught the genius of Christianity, surely, in God's name, this reform will come and come soon, and I hope to see it before another year.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM (East Huron). I wish to say a few words in support of the very important resolution which has been so ably and fully discussed this evening by the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black). I must admit, however, that it appears he has left very little for me to say, and that little more should be required to be said.

He has treated the question so thoroughly, so correctly, and so exhaustively, that I think he surely must have made an impression upon the government. It seems to me that the government, after hearing the facts he has stated, and after listening to the fund of information he has laid before the House, and the pointed, not to say alarming statements, he has made, should lose no time in taking action. He has clearly shown us that delay in a matter of this kind means to the Canadian people a loss not only of millions of dollars but also of thousands of lives. He has told us that 27,000 people die in Canada every year from preventable diseases, and he might very well have added that ten times, if not fifty times, that number are compelled afterwards to go through life struggling, handicapped with weakened constitutions and to suffer the immense losses in time and in money which preventable sickness has entailed upon them. Preventive medicine has made such rapid progress during the last five or six years that perhaps those members of the government who are not medical men should be excused for not keeping themselves abreast of the times and not properly posting themselves in a matter of this kind. But, after to-day, they will scarcely be able to plead excusable ignorance in regard to this matter. If they would investigate and post themselves with regard to the works of the great masters in this line, of Prof. Koch, of Germany, and Pasteur, of France, they would very soon realize how very far behind the people of Canada are with regard to the question of preventive medicine. These great men, paid by their governments large salaries and furnished with well-equipped laboratories and assistants, have devoted their lives to this study and they have practically revolutionized the whole practice of medicine. They have pointed out to us not only how a great many diseases can be entirely prevented, especially those diseases that have their origin in germs, but they have also shown how, by a certain scientific line of treatment, people can be made immune to certain diseases. They have taught the medical profession that their first duty, as my hon. friend from Hants has said, is to keep the people well, is to keep them from getting sick, and they have shown them that there is truth in the old French adage that the best way to keep well is not to get sick. When we consider that nearly all the diseases which have their origin in germs can be prevented and that many others can be so managed that people would be immune to them, the government certainly have a very serious duty to perform in connection with the matter. We are spending $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 a year to prepare to meet an enemy that may never come to us; that is war or something of that kind.

It is nearly a hundred years since Canada was engaged in any foreign war and we are spending this large amount of money to meet an enemy that, if it did come here, would spare at least the poor children, women and old men. But there is an army invading our country at the present time that is taking away our people, that is slaughtering 27,000 every year and impoverishing a great many others. Are we going to make no effort to oppose this army? What we propose is that there should be a bureau of health established by the government, that it should be placed under the control of some well educated young Canadian, that he should have youth and a thorough education and that he should be competent to take the position as head of the department and conduct it in such a way as to ensure its success. He should be an enthusiast in his work and try to make for himself a name that would rival that of the great men of Europe. It should be his particular duty to study the particular diseases that are peculiar to this country and to instruct us in the best ways of avoiding them. It is scarcely fair that we should get all our information and all our benefit in this respect from France and Germany. These people are heavily taxed and still they put their hands in their pockets and pay these men to conduct these very necessary and useful experiments.

In the first place, the Dominion government have already certain departments of medicine established and all we would ask is that they be consolidated and that a proper head be placed over them. The Minister of Marine, as we have been told, looks after the marine hospitals; the Minister of the Interior looks after the inspection of immigrants; the Minister of Agriculture has his department of quarantine, and the Minister of Inland Revenue looks after the quality of our food; so that the Dominion government have already admitted that they have certain duties to perform in this matter. If these different departments were consolidated and the people were properly instructed, beneficial results would follow. They should be taught to use what God has given them; that is sunlight, and they should be shown what great advantage can be derived from the proper use of sunlight. If you go into many houses you will find that they are darkened, and if you ask the people why they will tell you that they do not wish to have flies in the house. The flies have more sense than the people; they will not stay in a darkened room. All these things could be pointed out, such as the advantage of pure, uncontaminated water and pure air. We know that there is a prejudice in the country against the open air. We know that although it is one of the principal things that are to be used in the cure of consumption, people who are troubled with lung disease have a special prejudice against the open window. This should be all explained to them, and the injury resulting from the use of contaminated air should also be pointed out. The government have already taken the responsibility of sending out a very useful pamphlet with regard to the spread of tuberculosis. It was prepared by our good friend, Mr. H. H. Miller, M.P., and the government took the responsibility of having it printed and of having a large number of copies circulated through the country. This action of the government is calculated to do a great deal of good. Why have they not sent out other pamphlets on these lines? Why have they not sent a pamphlet telling the people that it is absolutely unnecessary that people should have typhoid fever? Look at the number who are dying all over the country as the result of typhoid fever. This disease as the hon. member for Hants explaind, is entirely unnecessary. If the dejecta from every typhoid fever patient were at once cremated or disinfected in a proper manner we would very soon have no typhoid fever in the Dominion of Canada. Similarly in the case of smallpox. I remember very well, in 1848 and 1849, when the famine was in Ireland and Scotland, that there was an immense immigration into this country, and I remember, although I was only a small boy, that I noticed that the older people who came from the old country were covered with pock-marks. It was supposed that every person should have smallpox at some time in his life; yet, see how few people have it now. It is not more than 200 years since a slave was advertised to be sold in Montreal and one of the principal recommendations in regard to that slave was that he had had the smallpox. We know that there is a feeling abroad in the country that every child must have scarlet fever, whooping cough and measles at some time. Yet, it is not necessary that children should have any of these diseases. These diseases are all absolutely preventable. There is another class of disease which is just as easily preventable, and the people should be instructed in regard to them. I refer to the diseases resulting from improper dieting and the improper use and mastication of food. People should be taught that food is the fuel consumed in the human system and that therefore it should be carefully regulated according to the amount and quality of the work to be done. They should be carefully instructed and told that men who are engaged in heavy, active, out-door manual labour require much more food than those who are engaged in inside sedentary employments.

You may go along any back line in the country and you may come to some wayside cheese factory or saw-mill and if you ask the old engineer there he will tell you that

if he continued to add fuel to the fire after the machinery had ceased to work he would very soon ruin the engine or burst the boiler. People seldom exercise so much good judgment in regard to their own systems. The wealthy and those who have least to do often take the most food and of the richest and strongest kind. They can afford it; it looks aristocratic and it pleases their taste and their appetite, but medical men can tell them that very often the consequences are disease and death. When more food is taken into the system than can be assimilated or is necessary for the nourishment of the body, the surplus simply goes to decay and turns to poison in the stomach and intestines. Nature makes an effort to get rid of these poisonous materials through the bowels, the liver, the kidneys, the skin and other excretory organs; but if this over indulgence is continued for many years as it often is these excretory organs become exhausted; they gradually fail to do their duty, the blood and the system become loaded up, with effete, and worn out, and poisonous material and the foundation is laid for many dangerous and fatal diseases. Therefore the people should be instructed as to the quality and quantity of the food they should take. More, they should be carefully instructed also that the food should be properly cooked and how to cook it. They should be told also that in every case food should be carefully and very thoroughly masticated and mixed with the saliva. In fact, in every case the food should be retained in the mouth until it is not only chewed into a pulp but until it is perfectly mixed with the saliva which is a highly important digestive ingredient. You often hear people say their teeth water when we know as a matter of fact that no water comes from the teeth, but we do know there is thrown out a fluid from the salivary glands of the mouth to assist in the very important act of digestion which is carried on in the mouth, a fact which is very often forgotten by people when they are taking their food. It should be represented to the people that even the softest of food such as porridge and mashed potatoes should be carefully and thoroughly mixed with the saliva before it is swallowed, and that the food should be moistened with the saliva which nature intended to moisten it. Tea and coffee, and even milk, and water, or any of these fluids have no digestive power, and if we insist in bolting our food in large chunks and washing it down with these or any other fluids we need not wonder if we are troubled with indigestion. The saliva is an alkiline fluid and it is necessary that it should chemically combine with the acid gastric juice of the stomach to set up and continue the proper and healthy process of digestion, and therefore the food should be prepared in the mouth before passing to the system. A morsel of food should be taken into the mouth and thoroughly mixed with the saliva and then well masticated before it is swallowed. The right quantity of fluid should be taken of course, but it should be taken at the right time. In the country, especially in the winter, I have found as a medical man that there is a great mistake made in regard to the amount of fluid that should be taken. There are two mistakes made by the people who are not engaged in heavy labour in the winter and this applies even to farmers; they take more food than they require and a great deal less fluid than is necessary. In taking this fluid it should be taken in a proper way. They may drink between meals or between bites if they choose, but a person who is troubled with dyspepsia or weakened stomach trouble should never take fluid into his mouth while food is there. Then again, starchy foods and meats should be particularly well chewed. If they are not, they simply rot and go to decay in the inside, and what more dangerous material could you have internally than rotten meat or fermenting and decaying vegetables? And if we persist deliberately in thus making graveyards of our stomachs is it any wonder that we find our own way to the cemetery? Then again I would neither advise nor recommend that we should give the children in the schools and the people throughout the country a course in anatomy, nor yet that we should give them much more than a mere indication, as I have given you, of the information that may be given to them in regard to digestion. But we can teach and publish pamphlets that will convey to them some idea about the functions and the care of the human system. There is no more important study in which men can engage than an investigation of the proper and healthy workings of their own bodies. I think there are few people who will deny that. Is it not strange then that we can find many who thoroughly understand the most intricate workings of other machinery but who at the same time appear to know or care little about their own systems; about the necessity for a rigid and faithful observance of the simple laws that govern the healthy action of their own bodies. Farmers and mechanics and others appear to know well that by taking proper care of their agricultural implements and other instruments of labour, these can be made not only to work better but to last longer. Every engineer knows distinctly that he must thoroughly understand a locomotive before he is allowed to take charge of one on a railroad. Even the boy with a bicycle is well aware that it must be regularly oiled and cleaned and cared for or its usefulness will soon be gone and ultimately it will be ruined. Let us take another example—that of the fashionable and fastidious young man who drives his own touring car

through the country and who becomes so enamoured of and interested in its workings that he forgets all about his costly clothing and so utterly disregards appearances that you will see him lying prone on the road, on his back, gazing upwards to see what has gone wrong with the machinery of his automobile. In all probability he regards that machine simply as a toy to be laid aside without profit at the close of a summer holiday, and yet, foolishly we think, he gives it his very best attention and his very best care, while one-half the earnest attention given to the study of the structure and workings of his own body might add many years to his life and save him from an immense amount of disease and suffering. The human machine is an automobile far more valuable and important than the most elaborate touring car that ever was conceived and perfected. Yet, notwithstanding all this every human being, every man and woman in the country, is compelled to take charge of and run a machine, their own bodies, that is far more complicated and interesting and far more difficult to manage than any of these I have mentioned. Few fit themselves properly for the task, and the result is, what the member for Hants indicated this evening, that after spending a whole lifetime in the practice of medicine I state here that in my opinion most of the sickness and far more than one-half the deaths which occur in this country before sixty years of age are due either directly or indirectly to ignorance of the laws of health and of nature or to carelessness in applying them. Now, this study could be made interesting to the public. The people could be instructed in regard to the functions of their own bodies; they could be shown that the human machine is a wonderful piece of mechanism and the wonderful working of it could be pointed out to them in an attractive new way. It could be demonstrated to them that by having even a partial knowledge of the peculiar functions of the human body they might extend their lives for many many years. I happened to notice in a paper yesterday that some insurance company is proposing to send out literature to those it insured, and it makes the statement definitely that the period of human life could be extended by fifteen years.

As I have said, the human machine is a wonderful piece of mechanism. Its beauty, symmetry, elasticity, strength and adaptability are so perfect that the result is simply amazing. If a man constructs a great number of machines for a certain purpose, they are usually so much alike that one cannot be distinguished from another. But that is not the case with nature's great Master Mechanic. There are said to be over four hundred millions of people on the earth's surface. Each one of these has an organism of his own; and yet no two of them are exactly alike. Notwithstanding this wonderful variation, the structure of the human system is so perfect that if it were run in every case in accordance with the dictates of common sense and the law of nature, I believe that it would, barring accidents, last about a hundred years. But in many cases not only are the dictates of common sense ignored, but the laws of health and of nature are so neglected and violated that the result is simply appalling.

The study of the human system might do our people good in more ways than one, because I cannot understand how any man who becomes familiar with its structure and operation can believe that it took its present form by chance or accident or even by gradual development. There are so many evidences of design in it that there must have been a designer, and that the designer must have been able to create. For my part, I cannot comprehend how any man can thoroughly apprehend the wonders of his own body, and be an unbeliever or an atheist. For, after all, the greatest mechanical achievements effected by mankind have been simply poor imitations of nature and of nature's great Designer, Creator and Controller. For example, the telegraph is supposed to be a recent invention but it has been long in use in the human system. The brain is, as it were, a central electric station, from which the mind, with wonderful accuracy and rapidity, sends forth its messages to every part of the body. Think of a lady at a piano, think of the rapidity of her fingers and the accuracy of the sounds produced, and reflect that her performance is governed by a little electric cell located in the brain. Some doctor has said that the human brain occupies less space in proportion to its capabilities than any other machine ever invented. It sends forth a nerve to every ultimate fibre of some five hundred muscles, to every pin-head area of the various glands which keep the machine oiled and heated and cooled. On the surface of the average human body there are sixteen square feet of skin, which is so completely covered with nervous fibre, that the point of a pin canot find a spot unguarded. Similarly our ears are nature's perfect telephone, and Bell's is only an imitation. The telephonic switchboard of the brain is remarkable for its accuracy and completeness. Then, again, the telescope is only an enlarged representation of the eye of man or an animal. Just stop for one minute and consider if some little chance or accident had entered into the location of the eye. Consider how its delicate mechanism is guarded by the brows, the lids, the lashes and the solid bony structure around it. Think how inconvenient it would have been if our eyes had happened to be located in the soles of the feet. How liable the delicate

structures would have been to injury or destruction; and think how humiliating and annoying it would have been to our young men if they had been compelled to sit down and take off their shoes and stockings and hold up their feet every time they wanted to look at a beautiful young woman or some other interesting object. Then, suppose, our mouths had happened to be located in the backs of our necks. Food would have reached the gullet just as well, but it would have been very inconvenient to have been compelled to carry the porridge and milk and the toast and tea of our breakfast around to that part of our body in the morning. The old saying that there is many a slip between the cup and the lip would in that case have been still more appropriate. Then, consider how inconvenient it would have been if our ears had been located on our elbows or under our arms. I might go on with illustrations of this kind to show that the human body is not the result of chance or accident. There are evidences of design in every part of it. Every organ not only adds to the beauty and symmetry of the system, but is so located as to be in the best possible position to do its duty easily and effectively. Think, for example, of the way in which the human system is guarded in the matter of food. First, we have two sharp sentries, the eyes, so located that they can see everything that enters the mouth. The food has to pass their scrutiny first. Then, as it enters the mouth, its savoury or unsavoury condition is challenged by two other sentries, the nostrils. Next the lips test its hardness or softness. Then it is met by thirty-two sturdy sentries, all clad in white and drawn up in battle array; these are the teeth, which subject the food to careful examination lest some foreign or deleterious substance may be covered up in it and thus smuggled into the system. While they are doing their duty, there stands behind them another sentinel, the sense of taste. But it is quite possible that the food, having passed these guards and undergone these examinations, might still contain some little invisible germs that succeeded in passing through after all. These are searched out by the saliva, which is thrown out by six other sentinels three on either side of the mouth. It is well to remember that the saliva is poisonous to these germs, that if it is well mixed with the food, it will destroy even typhoid germs, but when the food is taken rapidly into the stomach, the saliva does not have a chance to do its full work. Then, if something deleterious should succeed in getting past all these guards or sentinels, the very moment it reaches the stomach, a telegraphic message is sent from the brain ordering that the dangerous intruder shall be ejected. I or any other medical man in the House could go on and give examples to show how this kind of literature could be made interesting to the public and do a great deal of good. It should be made readable, and it should be free from Greek or Latin phrases and from technical terms. It should be given in simple language and in a common sense way; and if the people were instructed in this way, I am satisfied that they would be greatly benefited. This is the kind of work that should be taken up by a bureau of health. I could go on all night describing the beauties of the respiratory system, the circulatory system or the secretory system.

In every branch of the subject we find equal wonders and equal perfections. This would be the work of a Bureau of Health and I do hope the government will turn their attention to this matter and adopt an intelligent and aggressive policy. They can at least prevent ignorance, and it is ignorance that is causing the death of so many of our little children and of our grown up people. Much has been done in the prevention of tuberculosis, but it is a pity that this work has been left too largely to private subscriptions and private enterprise. I am sure that when the government consider and fully understand this matter, they will bring honour to themselves and great benefit to the country by instituting a federal bureau of health. As to the argument that the provinces will take it up, there is work for the provinces, work for the cities, work for the county councils, for the township councils, and for the school sections. There is no place where more can be done than right in the school, as I have said. The schools should be inspected, the children should be instructed, and diseases should be checked in the school room in their inception. I am convinced that if we expect to become the great people we should on this continent, the dominating people as I am sure we ultimately will, we must be a healthy people. All we can ask the government to do is to vote just one half the amount of money spent each year in unnecessary funerals in Canada; if they will do that we will have a bureau of health that will astonish the world. If they will vote for this purpose one-fourth of what they spend in bringing immigrants to Canada, we will fill the places of these immigrants with healthy Canadians. I would ask that they would take some action in this matter without further delay. I have great pleasure in seconding the motion so ably moved by my hon. friend from Hants (Mr. Black). I am sure he did it in all unselfishness, and I would be glad if he and I, in our old days in the profession, could be the pioneers in securing this great good for the country before we leave our places in the House and in the profession. I hope the young medical men, the

clergymen, the newspapers and every man in this House will preach this new gospel of sanitation and press on until we have in Canada a thoroughly healthy and prosperous people.

Mr. D. H. McALISTER (King's and Albert). Mr. Speaker, I listened with great pleasure to the addresses of the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black) and the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. T. Chisholm) who have so ably proposed this resolution. But, Sir, I was surprised indeed to notice how little attention was paid to the subject by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. It is one of the most important questions that have been discussed in the House this year or that will be,. yet gentlemen left the chamber, one half of those who remained went to sleep, and one quarter did not pay attention. If I cared to do so I could make half the members now here leave the chamber and could empty the galleries by saying there are millions of microbes in this chamber. Suppose there is a consumptive in the gallery to-night, as I have quite strong reason to believe there is, and if that lady should expectorate once on the floor, how many germs do you suppose would be put into circulation? One million.

The object of the resolution we are discussing is to enlighten our people along these lines, to prevent the people with that disease coming to a place like this, and to teach them how to take care of their sputum and to sterilize that which would cause infection. It may be said that this is not a matter for this government. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of tremendous importance. I am sorry to say there are too many people in Canada who are not aware of the dangerous germs that are in existence. Pathologists have proved beyond a doubt that all diseases are transmitted by germs. When I had typhoid fever some 19 years ago, it was not known that that disease was caused by a germ, but since then it has been proven beyond a doubt that it is a germ disease. What are these little germs like? Like the little pollywogs in the water. It would be interesting, if time would permit, to describe the development of these germs in the water, their entrance and the great battle which takes place between this germ, the typhoid baccillus, and the lencocyte in the blood. This conflict generates a poison called a potomaine, which in many instances creates sufficient constitutional disturbances to cause death. The hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black) told you of the number of deaths from typhoid fever, and I have no reason to doubt the correctness of his figures. He could have told you there are thousands and thousands dying of tuberculosis today, from a disease caused by germs, and that the death of these people was unnecessary, that the disease could be banished from our country if certain precautions were taken. That is what the government should realize, they should become seized of the idea that this thing can be done, and as my hon. friend says the time has come when it must be done. As an illustration of the manner in which typhoid can be checked, in our little town of Sussex, I myself had as many as eleven cases of typhoid at one time before the installation of a waterworks system. I was myself almost ignorant how these people were being infected by the bacilli, and I am safe in saying that not three per cent of the inhabitants realized what was causing the disease. They were using water from wells which were contaminated from cess pools, &c. Every year we lost from three to six people from that little town. Some six years ago the waterworks were installed, the water was taken from a river that was perfectly pure and was run into a filter. Since then there has not been a case of typhoid in the town. That shows that typhoid fever can be done away with if the proper precautions are taken and it is the duty of the government, I believe, to prevent the pollution of our rivers. Take Montreal, for instance, where they have a great epidemic of typhoid. I believe the federal government should take that up and force the city of Montreal to instal a filtration system. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. M. Martin) who is an alderman of the city of Montreal, tells me they are going to spend $2,000,000 this year in trying to escape from that dreaded disease typhoid. I presume they will seek to do this by installing a filtration plant.

It does not matter about the cost; it is not a matter of money at all, it is too serious a proposition for that. We are very careful, as has been nobly said by the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black), that the dumb animals should be protected and half a million dollars a year is expended to protect them. Why, then, should not human beings be protected? They ought to be. I confess that I myself am afraid of the bacillus tuberculosis. I feel that I have in my constitution appropriate soil for its growth. Some claim that tuberculosis is not hereditary. I know it is hereditary, in this sense, that, while a child may not be born with consumption, it may be born with a delicate mucous membrane of the air passage, inherited from father or mother, associated with a weak resistance, so that when the germ comes it grows like an oat in soil that has been prepared for its reception. Medical men know that patients come to them sometimes and say that they have a cough, have not felt well, associated with emaciation and night sweats. These symptoms date from a cold. The cold did not give them consumption; it

only prepared the mucous membrane of the air passage, so that when the germ was taken in it took root and grew and formed a nucleus for the dreaded disease. We spend thousands of dollars a year in bringing foreigners into this country to become citizens and live under the dear old flag. It is estimated, as the hon. member for Hants has shown, that the average male inhabitant, able to keep himself and others, is worth $1,000 to the country under whose flag he lives. We must bring in immigrants because we are not prolific enough to populate this country otherwise. If we are bringing in others, why not protect those we already have? Thousands of our people are dying every year who could be saved from dying; we want this government to show the people how to live. I am not looking for a job myself, and I do not want to go around the country lecturing, but I do not see how a better thing could be done by this government than to employ one or both of the hon. members who moved and seconded this resolution to speak to public audiences, to instruct the people in the germ theory, teach them how to be careful of their health, explain to them, if they have a consumptive in their house, how to destroy the sputum, and so on. It is wonderful what can be accomplished in this way if we take the necessary means to do it. We do not expect the government to do everything—and it would be a bad thing for us young doctors if they did. I am not surprised to hear these statements from the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black) and the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Thos. Chisholm), for it seems to me they will not be practising medicine very much longer—I think they expect to remain in politics for the rest of their lives; they must be looking for a senatorship, or they would not talk as they do. If the government will do what these gentlemen ask it to do they will accomplish one of the greatest reforms ever accomplished in Canada. The hon. member for East Huron made a remark on which I would like to enlarge. He said that we eat too much. There is no doubt about it. More people in the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and all over the world, die of overeating than of overdrinking.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McALISTER. That may seem a bold statement to make, but I mean it and I am ready to stand by it. The hon. member for East Huron explained that when people take too much into their stomach it lies there and causes poisoning. But I propose to go further than that. If the stomach is in good condition it will digest far more than the system requires. The little glands or ducts take up more than is necessary and thus it is carried into the circulation. The human system is a machine and requires only so much to keep it going. If more than is needed is forced into the circulation it causes dilatation of the circulatory system which is made up of capillaries, veins and arteries. These are muscles like any other. If you exercise the muscles of your arms for half an hour a day, development will take place. If too much of the products from food is forced into the capillaries, veins and arteries, the arteries are going to become enlarged. They do not become stronger as the muscles of your arms become stronger with exercise, but they become weaker, and that makes an old man out of a young one. A man is as old as his arteries, not his years.

However, that is a little aside from the subject and is more than I intended to say. In fact, I am not prepared to say very much on this subject and I will not trouble the House for more than a few moments longer. In conclusion, I would say that this subject should receive the earnest and sincere consideration of every member of this House. I am not saying that because I am a medical man. But I am a firm believer in the germ theory. I was taught that in old McGill, by Professor Adami, who is an excellent authority on pathology, and I have proven it for myself in my own practice that practically every disease is associated with some germ. Of these there are three we should particularly ward against, the tubercular bacillus, the typhoid bacillus and the diphtheria bacillus. And in that fight we should have the assistance of the federal government. Just how this is to be done, of course, is a matter to be worked out by the government itself. I hope that both sides of the House will see their way clear to support this resolution. And, in that connection, let me call attention to the fact that these germs attack Liberals and Conservatives alike.

Mr. JOHN WESLEY EDWARDS (Frontenac). It is not my intention to take up much time discussing this resolution, so ably proposed by the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black) and so exhaustively dealt with by the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. T. Chisholm) and the hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. McAllister). The resolution calls upon the government of Canada to perfect an organization whereby present scientific knowledge would be made practically available for the suppression of preventable diseases. I observed that the hon. gentleman who preceded me dwelt upon scientific methods to be used in preventing disease. I think that probably enough time has been taken up in impressing the members of this House of the wonders of the human body, and of the desirability of preventing disease so far as we possibly can.

Certainly I think this question is one deserving the most careful consideration on the part of every member of this House. Let me mention particularly one argument made use of by the hon. gentleman who so ably proposed this resolution, I mean the figures he gave showing the number of deaths which occur annually in Canada from preventable diseases. Mr. Speaker, those figures reveal a serious condition of affairs, and I would ask this House to consider them carefully. I think that was the strongest point in the argument made by the hon. member for Hants. If, not 27,000, not 20,000, not 5,000, but if only 1,000, persons in the Dominion of Canada die annually whose deaths could be prevented by any Act of this legislature, certainly you will agree that it is the duty of this legislature to try to prevent that loss of life. We are well acquainted with the old adage that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. I think we all subscribe to that statement. While medical science has done a great deal in the past to lengthen the span of life, and we have been furnished by certain departments of this government with the facts proving that in the last 25 years the average length of human life has been increased, the facts that have been brought to our attention tonight must have convinced us that still more can be done in the same direction. If it is a good thing to cure disease, it is a far better thing to prevent it. I feel convinced that before the end of this century men will occupy the seats we are filling today who will look back to the early years of this present century and wonder that the parliament of Canada was so apathetic over a matter of such great national importance.

Mr. J. BARR (Dufferin). I agree with much that has been said by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House as to the importance of the question which has been brought to our attention by the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black). We have been told how much medical science has done in late years to prolong human life, but it is sad to reflect that medical men themselves have not been the greatest beneficiaries of the increased discoveries in medical science. The farmers of our country, and the members of the learned professions other than the medical profession, have benefited from the advances made by medical science more than the members of the medical profession themselves. Now when we come to consider the resolution calling upon this government to take action, we are led to inquire whether the fathers of confederation were wise in relegating to the different provinces the subject of public health, giving them charge of that most important question. We are led to ask ourselves whether the Dominion government are better constituted to deal with that question than are the provincial governments. While I do not wish to differ from hon. gentlemen who have preceded me, I am still doubtful whether we could do more towards accomplishing the object we all have in view by asking the Dominion government to deal with this matter than by leaving it to the provinces. For my part I am of the opinion that the provincial governments can work out this problem better than the Dominion government. We know that in several provinces the local governments have made great strides in the past few years in the direction of improving public health. Take for instance the province of Ontario, with which I am best acquainted. We all know what great strides that province has been making in that direction the last few years. In every municipality they have a health officer; the municipal council appoints a health officer, and generally chooses him from amongst the best medical men they have. It is the duty of this officer to visit every person that is infected with disease, to examine into the environment, into the water supply, which we all know is one of the greatest sources of disease. It is his duty to look into the milk supply, and to ascertain if possible the cause of every outbreak of contagious disease. Now do you think that a Dominion health bureau could accomplish more than is being done by the provincial health bureau? Is it not possible that there might be an overlapping of duties, that there might be friction between the two bodies? What more can be done than is being done at the present time? We are making rapid strides along that line already. We know that every house has to be placarded in which there is infectious disease. If the average length of human life has been prolonged twenty or twenty-five years, I believe it is due to the provincial machinery, to the work that is accomplished by the health officers in the different provinces. Therefore, before we ask the federal government to appoint a federal health bureau, we should consider this question very carefully. Of course I would not suggest for a moment that any medical man wanted a federal bureau appointed for the purpose of getting an office. So far as medical men are concerned, I believe they are far above any monetary consideration whatever. But this is a question which we should consider before any more steps are taken along that line. It is possible for us to make that machinery more perfect and it is wise for us to do so. That machinery is being made more perfect each year. As far as Toronto is concerned, we have probably, at the head of the bureau, a number of the best medical men in Canada, and I believe they are accomplishing great work, a work that could not be accomplished by other bureaus in Can-

ada. Any outbreak is immediately reported to them and if necessary they send experts. We have not only that, but we have, in connection with our agricultural societies a woman's institute. They come around and deliver practical lectures in connection with cooking. They bring with them material and in the presence of our wives and daughters demonstrate the advantage of cooking in relation to the health of the community. They show how food can be more easily digested and they tell the people the kind of food that can best be taken in. That movement is both useful and practical. I can come to no other conclusion than that the fathers of confederation were wise in their day in leaving to the provincial authorities to work out this problem. I believe that much has been accomplished and that much can yet be accomplished for the good of mankind. We may say that every life we can save is a matter of great importance, but there is another side to this question. We might ask ourselves the question, what the Dominion government has done since confederation as compared with the work of the provincial boards of health, and I submit that the achievements will not stand comparison, that the provincial government have done much more along this line and that the Dominion government, in so far as they are working out the problem, have not accomplished what they should have.

Mr. BLACK. Does the hon. gentleman take into consideration that there are other provinces outside of Ontario making up this Dominion?

Mr. BARR. I might tell the hon. gentleman something that he probably does not know and that is that there is not a province in the Dominion of Canada that I have not visited, and that there is not a provincial board of health whose work I have not looked into. I must say that while some are not up to the province of Ontario with respect to the promotion of public health, they are doing an important work. But, if my hon. friend's province is not up to the standard he should turn his attention to that and bring it up to such a standard that it will be capable of dealing with this important question. I think they are dealing in a fairly effective manner with this question in all of the provinces, but I think Ontario is the banner province in this respect. Our hospitals are year by year becoming better equipped. and the officers of these institutions are doing their work well. The trained nurses throughout the country have accomplished probably as much as the medical profession have. These two, the trained nurses and the medical profession, working hand in hand, have accomplished a great deal of good. Now, we might ask ourselves the question if the marine hospitals under the control of the Dominion government are better than are the hospitals in the cities and towns of the different provinces. I have visited one or two marine hospitals and I have been unable to find any superiority in them although the work they are doing is very good.

Now, let us turn our attention to the question of the medican inspection of immigrants coming in to this country. I have travelled in other lands, I have visited the older countries, I have watched the course pursued by the medical men with respect to our immigration, and I must say that their methods are perfectly outrageous. I was surprised not long ago at what I saw at one of our ports. A boat came in with a large number of immigrants. The health officers stood there and passed those immigrants at the rate of from seven to eleven a minute. I took the time. There were immigrants passed that were a curse to this country. I saw these officers passing men who were not healthy. We have had immigrants admitted to this country affected by a certain disease of the eye, they have brought that disease into Canada and it has not been stamped out. Yet, the medical health officers looked on while these people passed. Their instructions were that they must not impede the landing of the immigrants. They had only a given time and the result was that men, women and children passed these officers who ought not to have been allowed to come into this country and would not have been allowed to enter the United States if they had attempted to go there. Is it possible that medical men can examine two or three hundred immigrants at the rate they were passing off the boat which was under my observation. There were those that were not healthy in many respects, men, women and children afflicted with diseases that had been handed down to them from their fathers and grandfathers and yet they were allowed to become citizens of this country. Go to our hospitals and compare the number of immigrants that are in these institutions with the number of patients drawn from our own population and you find there are ten immigrants to one native born, proving beyond a doubt that a large amount of the disease that we have in this country is traceable to immigrants who are coming in from Europe and even from England, Ireland and Scotland. If this parliament would inaugurate a good system of inspection it would be a good thing for the country. First, before the immigrants enter the boat they should be submitted to a careful examination by competent medical men and then, when they land in this country, they should be carefully gone over once more and every man, woman and child, should be turned back who is not healthy. If we adopted this system we would accomplish more for the health of the country than we could hope to accom-

plish by the creation of such a bureau as has been proposed, which would probably clash with the health departments of the different provinces and accomplish very little good. If the government and the medical men of this country would turn attention to that question, they would accomplish more than they could by the formation of a bureau of health as far as the Dominion is concerned. Under these circumstances, I think the first thing to be done will be to take this question into consideration and until it is demonstrated that we can accomplish more than the provincial boards of health have done we had better leave the question to be dealt with by them.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, since I took a seat in this House thirty-one years ago this important question has from time to time engaged its attention. We have discussed it over and over again and yet it seems to me that in all that time we have made but very little headway. It has been claimed by some that we have made a good deal of headway lately. While we have done some things that are commendable we have left undone, in my judgment, many things which we might very well have done. The hon. member who moved this motion (Mr. Black) spoke of the number of people who die annually that might be saved, the number being stated at over 20,000. Every member of the House, whether he be a medical man or not, will agree that it is desirable to reduce the death rate, and we agree also that it is in our power to reduce the death rate from preventable diseases. The professional science of the age has given us the means to prevent consumption, typhoid fever, diphtheria, scarlet fever, smallpox, and other such diseases if we only use the right means. On the possibility of stamping out these diseases, the medical profession is unanimous and I think it will be admitted they are competent judges on that point. One hon. member instanced that if a lady in the gallery who might be infected with tuberculosis should expectorate down on the floor of this House millions of bacilli would be liberated, causing danger to every member in this chamber. That illustration brought home the danger to us in a very forcible way, but I wondered at the time if he thought of the 'germane' that was on that side of the House all the time and to what danger gentlemen over there were exposed, not to say anything about those on this side. One of the gentlemen on the other side told us that the great thing was to educate, educate, that if we put our present day knowledge into practice we would attain the end we desire. But, as I understand we are met right here in this parliament with an insurmountable difficulty and that is that our constitution does not give the federal government the power to establish a bureau of health, I remember that about thirty years ago a very important deputation waited upon the government of that day and represented the importance of establishing a bureau of health. Those who take the trouble to read the debates of the period will see that the ground was intelligently covered by many eminent medical men who were then members of this House. The government desired to do something in the direction of mitigating the evils pointed out by the deputation, but, Sir Charles Tupper, and Sir John Macdonald and I think the Minister of Justice drew attention to the fact that while we could deal with quarantine and marine hospitals, anything further in that direction would be infringing on the rights of the provinces. That deputation pressed on the government the wisdom of amending the British North America Act so as to give the federal government the power, and it seems to me that until we do amend the British North America Act we cannot do any very effective work. In my judgment it would be an easy thing to amend the British North America Act if we brought together representatives of the different provinces, and of the boards of health throughout the Dominion, and of the medical association, and agreed to present a petition to the Imperial parliament to amend the constitution. I think, Sir Charles Tupper did make representations to this end to the home secretary of that date, but he left political life in Canada at that time and we were deprived of his valuable services and everything seemed to drop just then. But what was done was not all lost. There was a sum of money voted by the federal parliament for the purpose of supporting a health journal which was published for a great many years and which had an important, educative effect. We went further and provided for the collection of mortuary statistics and endeavoured to so tabulate them that the percentage of deaths from the various diseases could be ascertained. But what has always been the mystery of my life is that while we think it is justifiable to spend millions of dollars a year bringing immigrants to our shores we deem it necesary to vote only $500,000 for the purpose of endeavouring to reduce the death rate amongst our own people who are our most valuable citizens. There is where I think we have been short-sighted and parsimonious. I notice Sir, that while former motions of this nature called for the establishment of a board of health, this motion simply states that the time has arrived when the government of Canada shall perfect organization whereby present scientific knowledge would be made practically available for the prevention of preventable diseases.

If that is all we ask the government, they have no excuse. They cannot say that it is

not in our power to do that. There is no obstruction from the standpoint of the British North America Act; there is no interference with the rights of the provinces. We can do that by voting money enough to educate the people, to distribute this knowledge, to publish all the pamphlets and fly sheets we like. But I think we should go further than that. I think we should have a department or bureau of health, and we could very well have it without in any way coming in conflict with the important work that is being done by the various provinces. What is more, I think we should have some such conference as was suggested a few years ago, that would enable us to pass a law that would bring every medical association and teaching body in Canada under one medical clause, which would give a medical man power to cross the boundary line from Quebec to Ontario or from Ontario to Quebec or from Ontario to Manitoba, wherever it was necessary to save life and promote public health. I regret that when that attempt was made, many members of this House prevented it being accomplished. Does it not show a narrow-mindedness and selfishness on our part that we are not desirous of doing all the good we can in this respect? If medical men have not the liberality to do this, we simply show the world that our profession has not attained that importance that it ought to have attained long ago. But leaving that aside, what can the federal government do? It can do all that this resolution asks. It can grant the money to educate. It can use its own machinery for issuing and distributing the pamphlets, papers, fly sheets, and everything else necessary to educate, without infringing on the rights of any province or any portion of the country. It is said that great forces move slowly. Well, parliament must be a great force, for it certainly moves very slowly in regard to this subject. I have not taken the interest in it of late years that I did in my early life in this House, because it seems to be almost a waste of time to discuss it here, so little attention is given to it. I have noticed that when it is discussed, most of the members leave the House. At the present time there are only about 10 on the other side of the House and a few more on this side. If that is an indication of all the interest that parliamentarians in this country take in this important question, I do not wonder that parliament moves slowly. If we were unanimous in our desire and aim and stood by each other in our effort to obtain it, there is no government in the world that could refuse us, especially if we asked only what is asked in this resolution. Even if we went further, and asked the government to try to get an amendment made to the British North America Act conferring on the federal parliament the right and authority to deal with this subject, we could get that without very much trouble. We do not seem to be as sincere and energetic and unanimous as we profess to be, or we would accomplish very much more than we do. I can only say that I agree with everything that has been said on this subject to-night, and it has been a mystery to me why we have not made greater progress than we have. The government have done something, but they could do a great deal more, and I hope the day will soon come when they will take up this important subject and do something not only for the benefit of the present generation but for the benefit of posterity as well.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I wish to congratulate the mover of this motion not only on the spirit which prompted him to bring the question to the attention of the House at this early stage of the session, but also on the large-heartedness which has induced him to study the question and show such a complete mastery of it as he has done to-night. We might reasonably expect this from a doctor in a large practice, who has given so much of his life to the care of humanity. It is essentially a question which the medical fraternity can discuss in its details and in its professional aspect much better than those of us who are only laymen. But still it is a question which affects and interests every one in the Dominion, whether lay or professional. It comes very closely home to the family life of the country, and there is no doubt in Canada to-day a vast mass of ignorance in regard to the commonest precautions against disease, the dispelling of which is very important to the economic progress and welfare of our country. As my hon. friend who has just sat down says, this is an old question in the House of Commons. It is a complicated question, because it interferes to a certain extent with the constitutional rights of the provinces. We have discussed these time and time again. I will not go into any details with regard to them to-night, because most of us are familiar with them. I will only point out that several of the questions brought up to-night and put forward as arguments in favour of a motion of this kind are so evidently connected with that portion of the public health which is directly relegated to the provincial legislatures, that we cannot touch upon them all. One gentleman spoke of sanitation and drainage. My hon. friend who moved the resolution spoke of the way in which typhoid fever is disseminated by wells. This is a question which is entirely local in its character, entirely within the purview of the municipal and provincial authorities as a question of public health. It does not come within our purview in any way whatever, and nothing we could do in a legislative or legal way could touch it. One hon. gentleman, I think the hon. mem-

ber for Dufferin (Mr. Barr), spoke of the health officers all through the country, in the province of Ontario especially. That is true, and it is also true of other provinces, I suppose of all the provinces. I can say myself, from knowledge of the province of Quebec, that in all the municipalities and parishes of our province there are health officers whose duty it is to look after the public health and to carry out the sanitary regulations provided for under the provincial laws. My hon. friend who has just spoken expressed his desire to have the whole medical profession and practice assimilated, so that a medical man in one province, having obtained his degree in medicine, should be entitled to practise in all parts of the country. My hon. friend will remember that not many years ago this House discussed that question, and an Act was put upon the statute-book entitled, I think, 'The Medical Council Act.' So jealous were the members of the medical profession themselves of their rights in each province and so fearful was this parliament of overstepping the bounds of provincial rights and prerogatives, that we were obliged to say that the Act would only apply and come into force in any province when the province itself had adopted it.

Mr. SPROULE. It could only come into force when all the provinces had adopted it.

Mr. FISHER. Still worse. And up to the present time, although it is six or seven years since the Act was passed, it has not come into force, evidencing that this is a question which is hedged about by very difficult problems. It is one which we cannot deal with lightly and if we deal with it in any way that I can conceive of, we would run the risk of very soon treading upon the privileges and prerogatives of the medical profession or those jealous of provincial rights; and the likelihood is we would be stopped in a great deal of our work.

I confess myself to have so much sympathy with the motives of those who urge this and with the importance of the work itself, that I would be very glad indeed if we could organize some office or officers here who would be able to spread information through the country in regard to human medicine in the same way as we in my department distribute it to-day in regard to the health of animals and other agricultural matters. But I fear the difficulties and do not believe that it would be possible for us lightly or easily to overcome those difficulties. I would be glad to do it. I know that some of my colleagues at all events are in sympathy with me in this, but it is so important a question, so difficult a question, that I do not consider we would be justified at the present moment in adopting this resolution in a thin House, on such a day as this, and I would therefore ask my friend to allow me to adjourn the debate in order that we may have it more thoroughly threshed out and have the opinion and views of more members of the House and that the government can have an opportunity of seeing whether there is any possible way of accomplishing what is here aimed at. I beg therefore to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—YARMOUTH HARBOUR BUOYS.

Mr. FISHER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. CLARENCE JAMESON (Digby). Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns I beg to call the attention of the government to the fact that two of the buoys or aids to navigation near the entrance to Yarmouth harbour, the northwest buoy and the southwest buoy, have been out of position for some time, the former for several days, and the latter for about three weeks. In this connection I may read a short extract from the Yarmouth 'Times' of the 12th instant:

> Officers of ships navigating the port of Yarmouth camplain bitterly to 'The Times' that two of the most important navigation aids off the harbour have been allowed to remain out of position for a long time. It is about three weeks since the south west buoy was found adrift and was towed into Abbott's Harbour, yet it appears that no effort has been made to replace it and this in spite of the fact that the department was promptly notified. Similarly the north west buoy was found adrift some days ago and towed into Yarmouth and although the 'Lansdowne' has been sent to restore it to its position and has been in port for some days nothing appears to have been accomplished. We are informed on good authority that the whole system of navigation aids along the coast is in a deranged condition. In the meantime lives and property are at a great risk and mariners are navigating their ships under a strain which they should not be called upon to bear. We repeat that a government steamer during the winter months should be constantly patrolling the coast between Yarmouth and Halifax.

Yarmouth is a very important port. Apart altogether from the large number of merchant vessels ordinarily visiting such a port there is a large fleet of fishing vessels which are constantly in and about that port. There are also the steamers of the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company which ply between that port and Boston, making several trips each way every week and carrying many passengers and valuable cargoes. The lack of proper aids to navigation may cause a serious loss not only of marine property but also of much more valuable life. The large expenditures which the Department of Marine is making in connection with the aids to navigation should, it seems to me,

assure the most ample protection which could be afforded. However that may be, it is incumbent upon the government to make the most ample provision for the proper maintenance of aids to navigation, not only in the Bay of Fundy, but also along the southwest shore of Nova Scotia, and anything short of such a provision, which will safeguard the lives and property of those interested, will leave the government responsible in the event of any disaster which may result from deficiency in these aids.

Mr. FISHER. This matter now comes to my attention for the first time. I shall draw my colleague's attention to it, and I have no doubt the information required will be given.

Mr. SPROULE. What work will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. FISHER. First of all one or two minor Bills, then the resolution on the Civil Service, and then Supply, continuing the estimates of the Minister of the Interior.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, February 16, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, before the business of the day is proceeded with, I desire to raise a question of privilege. During the discussion of the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee), yesterday, I attempted to speak but you ruled that I could not as I had already spoken. I maintained at the time that I had not spoken, but had simply interrupted to ask a question. I wish to vindicate the correctness of my memory from 'Hansard.' My first interruption was to ask:

Does the hon. gentleman contend that if, in a river three hundred miles long, there is a portion fifty miles long that is navigable, therefore the Dominion has control over the whole stream?

The hon. gentleman replied to that. Later Mr. Conmee said:

I ask the hon. member who has already spoken and others who are to speak to answer that question.

Referring to the fact that we had contended it was an interference with provincial rights. Then I said:

Mr. JAMESON.

Perhaps I may be permitted to say a word at this point. Suppose that on a certain stream three hundred miles long, there is navigable water for a distance of fifty miles, and that on the rest of the stream there are many available water-powers. Now, these water-powers are regarded by the province as their asset, and they propose to work them and control them. Does not this Bill interfere with that right?

The hon. gentleman replied to that. That was all that was said on this question. I merely refer to the fact to vindicate what I said because I had intended to say a great deal more on the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may state in answer to the remarks of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that I kept a note during the debate, writing down the names of the different members as they spoke and I placed the name of the hon. member for East Grey on that list. Of course I had no intention of preventing him from speaking as he had a right to do; if I did so, it was because I was under the impression at the time that he had already spoken. If I did him an injustice of course I am quite prepared to apologize to him.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 61) respecting the Burrard, Westminster Boundary Railway and Navigation Company.—Mr. Ralph Smith.

Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Neely.

Bill (No. 63) to incorporate the Royal Canadian Accident Insurance Company.—Mr. Ames.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

On the orders of the day being called.

Mr. LENNOX. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to an item in the Evening 'Citizen' of yesterday in connection with level crossings. The minister will recall that on January 25 an order was made for information to be brought down to the House concerning the number of accidents at level crossings, and on subsequent occasions I inquired of the minister about it and I think I had virtually his promise that the return would be facilitated and brought down at the earliest possible moment in order that this question might be discussed. It has not yet been brought down but I see that the information has been given to the press before it has been given to this House. While it is very desirable that the press should have knowledge of these matters, the first to be acquainted with them should be the members of this House. The article in the 'Citizen' would indicate that the information contained in it had been in the possession of

the Railway Board all the time. It says so in fact, and so I suggest to the minister that it is hardly treating us fairly not to bring this return down and present the information to the House before it goes to the public. This is in a sense a repetition because a little while ago we had it in the press that the minister was taking certain action and that correspondence had passed between the minister and the Chairman of the Railway Board. I requested the minister to bring down the information he had, but the minister thought it was not wise to do so. I hope this return will be brought down to-day as I wish to discuss this question at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is right; information of this kind when asked for as a return should come to the House first. This return has been prepared and it is somewhere between the Secretary of State's Department and the House. I thought we would have it this afternoon, but we will have it to-morrow at least. The other matter to which my hon. friend refers was not information that I obtained from the board but a private letter from the chairman of the board.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It would be a convenience if it could be brought down at a later stage of to-day's sitting as it is desired to discuss this to-morrow.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is the first intimation the hon. gentleman gave me that he was going on to-morrow.

Mr. LENNOX. I was going on yesterday but the information was not here.

Mr. GRAHAM. I shall ask the Secretary of State to telephone his department and have the return brought down as rapidly as possible.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 21) to amend the Railway Act—Hon. Geo. P. Graham—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before we take up the Bill clause by clause, the minister will perhaps give an explanation of the Bill as a whole, so that we may the better understand it as we take up each section.

Mr. GRAHAM. The first section, 360a, is for the purpose of giving the Board of Railway Commissioners power to regulate the rates for electrical power developed by companies to whom we may lease water-powers. There are some peculiar instances in which it would be impossible to provide for this in the contract, but wherever it is possible, in case of any dispute, the rates are to be submitted to the board. The other clauses are in reference to returns to be made by the different companies. Section 370 of the Act provides for annual returns. The forms approved by the department vary considerably, and we want to furnish forms on which the returns shall be made, as some of the old forms are really valueless. Then, we are extending the time for the returns from July to August. The companies complain that they cannot get all their information compiled by the first of July. The remaining clauses of the Bill are designed to secure more complete returns, to get them in better shape, and to compel the companies to give them to us within the time specified.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does this Bill cover a case in which the government have formerly leased water-power without specifying the purpose for which it was to be used?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have a great reluctance to doing anything to interfere with existing contracts. I do not think we could do that very well. For instance, a company owns at present a large share of water-power, and under their contract they have the right to sub-let without any hindrance. We take over all their property and re-elect the power to them; but we cannot interfere with the contracts they have already made. But wherever possible we make provision in contracts that the Board of Railway Commissioners shall regulate the rates.

Mr. HAGGART. In a great many railway charters, the company is given power to develop water-power along its line of road, and power to let for commercial purposes the surplus water-power over that used by the railway. Does this apply to that case?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is not really the object of this Bill, though possibly the Bill might apply to a case of that kind. In all the railway charters we give now, containing that power, we are providing that these matters must be referred to the Railway Commission. I do not wish however to put anything in the law to interfere with existing contracts.

On section 1—in disputes between lessee of water-power and applicant for electricity, the board may fix price.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As I understand this section, it imports into the Railway Act a new clause conferring upon the board the statutory power to determine rates where under lease from the Crown of water-power to a private corporation, the rates charged by such corporation are, according to the terms of the lease, to be determined by the board. In other words the board in such cases already has a quasi jurisdiction by virtue of the contract between the Crown and the lessee. It is desired to implement that by this

statutory enactment, which declares that the board shall have its usual power in respect to the adjustment of rates in such cases.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, that is the object, clearly stated.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Take, for instance, a company or an individual which has leased from the government water-power to run a saw mill or for any purpose other than the development of electricity. They have a perpetual lease, or a lease for a long period, but they have ceased using this power for mill purposes. Would they require to go to the government and get a new lease in order to entitle them to use that water-power for the development of electricity, and would this section apply to them?

Mr. GRAHAM. It would depend upon the conditions of their contract. If their lease was limited to certain purposes, I suppose they could not go outside those purposes; or if they did, their lease might be cancelled or a new lease executed.

Mr. SPROULE. Why not apply this to all leases from the Crown of water-power, and not leave it so that if that provision was omitted from the lease, the board would not have jurisdiction?

Mr. GRAHAM. I explained when we went into committee that, owing to the very technical conditions arising and which will continue to arise every day with reference to powers that are being increased by public works, such as the building of the Trent canal, it is impossible, in some cases, on account of existing contracts, for us to apply this provision without interfering with these contracts. But in all new contracts where we at all have the power, we are putting this in.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Ordinarily speaking, this condition should go into all new contracts, but the minister explains that some contracts, which might be regarded as new, are in reality merely a continuation of old contracts, although the new contracts may give an increased amount of power. Then inasmuch as that description of new contracts merely continues old conditions, and as the old conditions include contracts already made between the lessees and other persons—for instance between a town or a village and its inhabitants—the minister has not found himself able to include this new condition in new contracts of that description for the reason that to do so would seem to interfere with existing vested rights under contracts created years ago. But except in those cases, this condition is included in all new leases or contracts for the use of water belonging to the Crown.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is the case stated.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) inquired whether in these cases the lessee gets more power. I understand from the minister that, in some cases at least, he does. Inasmuch as a new contract includes the old power, which is already under lease to private individuals, he does not want to interfere with that contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is a difficult situation to work out exactly. In a great many cases the policy we are trying to adopt is to take over the property altogether of these people and re-lease them certain powers. It is a matter of arrangement. Where they have subleases with which this provision would interfere, we cannot very well apply it, but in every new lease we do.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Here is a company which has the right to develop 100 horse power, but under the changed conditions, the water develops 1,000 horse power. Does that company get the 1,000 horse power for the same sum as it did the 100?

Mr. GRAHAM. It might become possessed of all the power, but it would have to pay a good deal more. We take over its rights altogether and make a new contract, but we have to protect any contracts which are existing under the old lease.

Mr. SPROULE. In the case of contracts now running and which are terminable at a certain time, if you renew that contract, do you regard it as a new contract and insert this provision?

Mr. GRAHAM. Most of the leases are for twenty-one years and renewable. The conditions are generally retained when the leases are renewed, but the prices may be changed; and I assure my hon. friend that if I had a new lease to make, unless I were precluded altogether on account of existing contracts under the old lease, I would put this clause in the new one.

Mr. PORTER. Take the case where a municipality has already, under lease from the Crown, acquired certain rights, such as the case of the town of Trenton. I can quite understand why the provisions of this Bill should not apply to the conditions existing under that old lease. But, if I understand the minister correctly, by the work that is going on in the Trent canal the power will be developed to a greater extent and the municipality of Trenton will be able to generate a greater amount of power than under the old conditions. While clause 1 of the Act should not apply to the municipality of Trenton to the extent of the power they developed under the old condition, why should it not apply to the extent of the additional power that is generated under the new conditions. In other words, the town of Trenton will be getting an additional amount of

power to sell to their customers—say in the city of Belleville or the town of Trenton—and they will be under no control at all. They can impose any terms they like, and having control of that power they can use it very much to the disadvantage of the people surrounding if they should be so disposed. It seems to me the clause might be made to apply to the extent of any additional power generated under the new conditions.

Mr. GRAHAM. As I have explained several times to deputations, I have had it in mind that where we could assist the municipalities by giving them the power under a fair arrangement we were rather inclined to do so. I have never thought of putting any restrictions directly upon the municipality in dealing with its own power, particularly as Trenton has acquired rights there that we have to get before we can proceed with our work. Unless expropriation proceedings were taken in a great many of these cases, it has to be a matter of arrangement, and it is a good deal better for the department to make agreements than it would be to expropriate. The town of Trenton has acquired rights in the stream, and speaking from memory the arrangement is that we should take over all the rights they have and re-lease to them at a certain rate the power that will be developed.

Mr. PORTER. But not the supply of power in excess of the old power?

Mr. GRAHAM. All the power, and mark you, we have to get the consent of the town of Trenton to release to us the title to what they now have. There are two sides to it; they concede us that and we concede to them the right to the use of all the power at a certain rate. In a lease of that kind it was not my intention to put any restriction on the municipality.

Mr. OWEN. I agree with the minister and I approve of the Bill so far as the municipality of Campbellford is concerned. I do not think that any municipality who owns the water-power, or has leased the water-power, or had any rights upon the Trent river previous to the building of the canal should be interfered with. I think these municipalities should be allowed to sell their power within their own limits at whatever price they saw fit. With regard to developing a greater number of horse-power, we must not forget that the lessees are only entitled to the surplus water and we never can tell exactly how many horse-power will be developed because the waters in these rivers are not always the same height, and in a dry season there will be less water and less power developed than in another season in which there may be rain I agree with the Bill in so far as it restricts the lessees of power from the Crown forming a combine as to price. Under this Bill they cannot combine to put the price up high, and therefore those making applications for power will not be prevented from establishing industries in a municipality. I approve of the clause which puts the lessees under the Railway Commission and I approve of the Bill as a whole.

Substituted section 372, semi-annual return of accidents.

Mr. FOSTER. 'Every company, if required by the minister so to do,' shall make a return of accidents and casualties. Why should not that be compulsory? That should not be left discretionary with the minister.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am inclined to think there is something in that. The return is only made every six months. With the consent of the committee—it is quite a radical change in the Bill—I move that we drop that section. In that case the old clause will stand.

Motion agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

ILLICIT OR SECRET COMMISSIONS.

Bill (No. 31) to prevent the payment or acceptance of illicit or secret commissions and other like practices.—Mr. Aylesworth—read a second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 2: Definitions.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) why this Bill is confined to secret commissions. Suppose the consideration were given in the way of a bonus or in some other way and not as a commission, would it then be outside of this Act? There are many ways in which you can give a consideration.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The reason why this is limited to secret commissions is that a commission which is open and disclosed, known to the principal, is not an illegal thing. If any person chooses to pay to my agent a commission and I am aware of it there is no offence on the part either of the agent who receives such commission or of the man who pays it. The whole offence is in the secrecy of it and in the betrayal which would therefore probably be caused of the interests of the employer.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not the feature of it that I am referring to. It is the question whether you could not give something in lieu of a commission, say a bonus, that would be a consideration the same as a commission would be and do it secretly.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The definition of 'consideration' is that it 'includes valuable consideration of any kind.'

On section 3,

3. Every one is guilty of an offence and liable upon conviction on indictment to two years' imprisonment, or to a fine not exceeding two thousand five hundred dollars, or to both, and, upon summary conviction, to imprisonment for six months, with or without hard labour, or to a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars, or to both, who,—

(a) being an agent, corruptly accepts or obtains, or agrees to accept or attempts to obtain, from any person, for himself or for any other person, any gift or consideration as an inducement or reward for doing or forbearing to do, or for having after the passing of this Act done or forborne to do, any act relating to his principal's affairs or business, or for showing or forbearing to show favour or disfavour to any person with relation to his principal's affairs or business; or

(b) corruptly gives or agrees to give or offers any gift or consideration to any agent as an inducement or reward or consideration to such agent for doing or forbearing to do, or for having after the passing of this Act done or forborne to do, any act relating to his principal's affairs or business, or for showing or forbearing to show favour or disfavour to any person with relation to his principal's affairs or business; or

(c) knowingly gives to any agent, or, being an agent, knowingly uses with intent to deceive his principal, any receipt, account, or other document in respect of which the principal is interested, and which contains any statement which is false or erroneous or defective in any material particular, and which, to his knowledge, is intended to mislead the principal.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is this the exact language of the English statute?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The language is not identical, but is practically indistinguishable and is certainly indistinguishable in meaning. I cannot point out the exact differences very well without comparing the sections line by line, but in substance the wording is identical.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the minister read the English corresponding section?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Yes, I will read the English section.

If any agent corruptly accepts or obtains or agrees to accept or attempts to obtain from any person for himself or for any other person any gift or consideration as an inducement or reward for doing or forbearing to do or for having, after the passing of this Act, done, or forborne to do any act in relation to his principal's affairs or business or for showing or forbearing to show favour or disfavour to any person in relation to his principal's affairs or business.

And so on.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. FOSTER. May we have the English section corresponding with paragraph (b)?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The corresponding section in the English Act is in these words:

If any person corruptly gives or agrees to give or offers any gift or consideration to any agent as an inducement or reward for doing or forbearing to do, or for having, after the passing of this Act, done or forborne to do any act in relation to his principal's affairs or business or for showing or forbearing to show favour or disfavour to any person in relation to his principal's affairs or business——

&c.

Mr. PORTER. If I may be permitted to go back to the first clause of section 3; do I understand that the offence under this Act is punishable either upon indictment or by summary conviction? I notice that section 3 provides, in the first place, for punishment upon indictment and that the latter part of the same clause provides for punishment upon summary conviction. If an offence under this Act can be tried by a police magistrate or justices of the peace and punishment inflicted, why make the same offence punishable upon indictment? Why have these two provisions instead of one?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The intention was that the offence, when it took place, might be prosecuted either upon indictment or by way of summary conviction, depending, of course, upon the seriousness of the offence. If, for instance, I find that my butcher is paying a few cents daily to my cook for the sake of securing my business that would scarcely be an offence which would be thought serious enough to prosecute upon indictment. On the other hand, if it were in larger matters of business, it might be ridiculous to proceed by way of summary prosecution, and the intention was, in framing the Act, that either course might be adopted according to the judgment of the prosecutor and of the tribunal before whom the prosecution might come for hearing. If the magistrate having the defendant summoned before him, upon investigating the circumstances, found the case, in his judgment, so serious that it would not be met by the lesser punishment which is provided in the section of imprisonment for six months, or a fine not exceeding $100, or both, he would decline to proceed and commit the person charged for trial upon indictment. On the other hand, if a person was found guilty and indicted for an offence which under the circumstances seemed comparatively trivial, the judge would no doubt sentence to the punishment which might have been imposed on a summary proceeding.

Mr. PORTER. The objection I see is that no provision is made for determining,

and by whom, whether the prosecution shall be on an indictment or in a summary manner. Would it not be possible to provide that certain offences shall be tried by summary process and others more grave by indictment? It is now left to the discretion of the magistrate as to whether he shall try an offence or not, no matter how grave that offence may be. If the complainant should stand in with a magistrate the magistrate might try the case and dispose of it in any way he saw fit, whereas if it were taken to the Superior Court on an indictment it might be dealt with in an altogether different way.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. It would be quite practicable to frame language which would draw a hard and fast line and make the place where the prosecution should be dependent upon the amount of money involved, but I think that would not be desirable. The more trivial offence graduates into the more serious by imperceptible degrees. It would be scarcely possible to lay down any definite rule as to amount which would govern every case that might conceivably arise. I would think it would be preferable to leave that to the sound sense of the magis trate or judge before whom the prosecution might come. It would be, in the first instance, for the good judgment of the prosecuting attorney or those before whom the charge is laid, and it would be a no more important duty to determine that than it would be to determine the amount of punishment which ought to be imposed.

Mr. CROTHERS. Are there any general provisions in the Criminal Code which would assign cases of this kind? Surely it is not intended to leave it open to have such charges brought before an ordinary justice of the peace? It should be defined whether a police magistrate should try the case or whether it should be tried before a county court judge or in the high court. Other crimes are assigned by the code to one court or the other. If a case comes before an ordinary justice of the peace in the country and objection is taken that he has not jurisdiction to try it, where is there anything to determine whether or not he would have the right?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. There are already provided for in the Criminal Code many classes of offences which may be tried either upon indictment or upon summary proceeding. I do not think there has been any practical difficulty in administering the law, and this would be of precisely similar character. The magistrate would have jurisdiction undoubtedly, and if he wishes to misbehave—if magistrates ever do misbehave—I suppose there would be nothing to prevent his trying a very important case and nothing but public opinion to correct him if for a very serious offence he imposed a very trifling punishment.

Mr. PORTER. When we can guard against that why should we not do so? It seems to me that the amount involved in a transaction of this kind ought not to determine the question of jurisdiction. A man who fraudulently cheats a widow out of $2 is just as much a criminal as the man who cheats the government out of $2,000, and the magistrate might think he would try the widow's case but not the other. It seems to me it would be wise to define it now.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The imperial statute is precisely in the same shape as this. The proceedings there are either upon indictment or upon summary prosecution with a slight difference in the amount of punishment. I have not heard of any practical difficulty that has been met with, and it did not occur to me that there was any occasion to differentiate this legislation from our general laws on the subject.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Have there been any cases tried under the imperial statute which would throw any light upon this?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. There have not been many, but some. A very interesting article appeared on the subject in the 'Times' newspaper in which reference is made to the number of cases. I cannot exactly say how many prosecutions there have been under the imperial statute, but in the two years during which it has been in force I do not think there have been altogether as many as a dozen.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the minister aware of what special interpretation or significance has been given to the word 'corruptly' in these cases? Has the meaning of that word been brought into question at all? The statute provides against any person who corruptly accepts any gift or consideration, &c., and the use of that word coupled with the possibility that a very important case might be tried before a magistrate (and perhaps brought before that magistrate having regard to the imminence of proceedings of another character), would seem to indicate that some little care should be taken in the consideration of the language which we should employ. It might be quite possible that more attention should be given to the exact language of the statute in this country than in Great Britain. I am not sure that would be the case, but possibly it might, having regard to the qualifications of persons who might be called upon to adjudicate in such matters.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. A great part of the debate on this Bill in the imperial parliament was on the absence or presence of the word 'corruptly.' After very full discussion

and consideration it was thought better to retain it in the clauses, and I have retained it in the Bill now under consideration. As I understand the significance of the word from a legal point of view, it can perhaps be best paraphrased by the expression 'intending to do that which the Act means to forbid.' It carries with it the idea certainly of an evil intent as opposed to an innocent transaction, and requires, to satisfy this meaning, that there shall have been conduct by the person accused which proceeded from a wicked intention, an evil mind, an intention to do the thing which the law forbids. I do not know that I could state in better language what I understand the meaning of the word to be. It is a word of very general use in similar legislation. All our election legislation against bribery is accompanied by the use of the word, and in that connection it has been much discussed by judges, both in the old country and in Canada. I think it would be preferable to retain the word; no harm can be done by retaining it; because if there could be an infraction of this legislation which does not proceed from evil intent, it ought not to be punishable.

Mr. CARVELL. It seems to me that the objection urged by the hon. gentleman opposite is well taken. I have no fault to find with the principle of this Bill. I think it is good. Unfortunately, the justices of the peace all over Canada are not appointed as they are in England. We have in the different provinces a large number who are appointed for political reasons, and we have many whom I do not think the Minister of Justice would want to sit in judgment over him or over any person in whom he had any interest. I am glad to say that we have very many excellent justices of the peace all over Canada. Now, you could easily imagine that an unfair justice of the peace might take upon himself jurisdiction to try a very serious offence, and impose a very slight punishment for it; or, on the other hand, a very trifling offence might be treated by him as a very serious one, and he might send the accused up for trial. In my opinion, there should be some election provided for the accused, because he must be considered innocent until he is proven guilty. Therefore, I think we should follow to some extent the idea laid down in the Criminal Code of Canada regarding assaults of a serious nature, that is, that the accused shall have the right to elect whether he shall be tried summarily by the magistrate, or go before the grand jury. I am not sure whether or not the right of appeal would be allowed the accused in case the magistrate tried him summarily. But it seems to me that we are giving too much power to an unscrupulous justice of the peace in leaving the section as it is. I am not saying this for the purpose of finding fault with the Bill, but only with the view of making it perfect. If the Bill passes as it stands, I think a great deal of injustice may be done in working it out.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I can understand that the word 'corruptly' has been left in the English statute without any definition, perhaps for very much the same reason that courts of equity have always refused to undertake an exhaustive definition fraud. But there is a difference, as the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) has just pointed out, when a word of such wide interpretation must be construed by a justice of the peace, very often without very much legal or technical knowledge. I entirely agree that a great many of the justices of the peace are very capable of dealing with these matters, but you occasionally find those who are not. I remember in my own province some years ago of a justice of the peace undertaking to administer the criminal law of Canada, and the only information he had at his command was that contained in an obsolete volume of the Revised Statutes of Nova Scotia of about 1857; but he was quite confident in his power to administer the criminal law of Canada under the forms and instructions contained in that volume. Then, there is another consideration, the converse of that mentioned by the hon. member for Carleton. Suppose that a very serious offence had been committed against the provisions of this statute, and that proceedings were imminent to indict the person accused. Suppose that person, through the intervention of some friend, had proceedings instituted before a magistrate, who might not be bound by any very definite authorities as to the manner in which he would construe the word 'corruptly.' It seems to me quite possible that by means of that kind a person who really had been guilty of a very serious offence against the law, might escape with either no punishment or a very light punishment. I do not understand from the Minister of Justice that there is any especial duty cast upon the magistrate to declare that the offence is of so serious a character that he shall not proceed. In fact, I am not sufficiently familiar with the present procedure to know whether it is possible for him, after information has once been laid before him for the purpose, to decline to proceed. I think there is a good deal in these considerations which requires the attention of the Minister of Justice and of the committee before we pass the measure in exactly the form in which it is now presented.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Of course, this legislation is along the line of the criminal law. It might, without any impropriety, have been introduced by way of amendment to the Criminal Code. The intention was

always that the general provisions of the Criminal Code, as to procedure and as to every point which would have application, should govern under this statute, and there is no objection to a clause being introduced providing that the general provisions of the Code shall apply, or that this Act shall be read as a part of the Criminal Code. So far as the retention of the word 'corruptly' is concerned, I certainly would attach a great deal of importance to it. This legislation would prevent, for instance, any secret present which might be given by a tradesman or a customer to any person in the employment of another with whom he was dealing. It is a common enough thing, I suppose, for customers of the Bell Telephone Company to send a pair of gloves or some other trifle by way of a present at Christmas to the operator who receives their messages in the central office. If that is done secretly, with the corrupt intention of securing favours thereby at the expense of the company or at the expense of other customers, it is an improper thing. But if that is done openly and above board, there is no impropriety in it. Perhaps the best idea can be conveyed by an illustration, of the meaning to be attached to the word 'corruptly' in the statutes. If the butcher wants to make a present to the cook of one of his customers, and the customer is aware of it, there is not the slightest impropriety; but if he does that secretly and for the purpose of securing custom, then it becomes a transaction of an entirely different nature. With regard to the gravity of different transactions, let me refer to the article to which I have already alluded in the London 'Times', which gives some instances of prosecutions under the imperial statutes. A fine of one pound was imposed upon a warehouse clerk for having given money to a carter to carry parcels. Of course I am giving a mere statement of the case, as I have not the details, but that was the case of a very trifling offence punished by a fine of one pound. A butcher for sending meals to a cook was fined two pounds. A traveller, for offering a bribe to a hotel keeper for the names of visitors, was fined five pounds —and so on, in increasing severity, according to the gravity of the offence. After all, in the administration of all statutes, a good deal must depend on the good judgment of the official who determines the case, whether he be a justice of the high court or a justice of the peace. It may very possibly happen that justices of the peace are not always men of the soundest judgment, but, when all is said and done, a judge is a judge, and a justice of the peace, no matter how illiterate, may be called upon to pronounce an Act of this parliament ultra vires. We have to take things as we find them, and it would seem impossible to guard beforehand, by any device of legislation, against the possibility of some one who lacks sound sense and judgment being called on to act under this statute. I may say further that, so far as public officials are concerned, this is no new legislation. We have already, in part four of the Criminal Code, general provisions against bribing or attempting to bribe officials of the government or municipal councils by any form of transaction. Those offences are similar in character, whether committed against the public interest or merely against private individuals. The object of this legislation is not to declare transactions of the character of those struck at illegal. They were always illegal. They were illicit and improper and contrary to the law, but the purpose is to make them punishable as criminal offences in cases between individuals as well as in transactions in which public officials are concerned.

Mr. CROTHERS. Speaking from memory and without having the Criminal Code before me, I do not think there are any provisions in it which give a single justice of the peace acting alone, jurisdiction to impose punishment to the extent of six months in prison. There are several provisions in the Criminal Code providing for jurisdiction in such cases by two justices of the peace or a police magistrate, but I cannot think of any which gives such power to a single justice of the peace. I would suggest, as a proper safeguard, that some few words should be added after the words 'summary convictions' which would limit the jurisdiction to a police magistrate or two justices of the peace or a judge of a higher court. We know that there are several sections in the Criminal Code which provide for the jurisdiction being in the hands of two justices of the peace or a police magistrate, and some such provision should be inserted here. I also quite agree with my hon. friend for Carleton, N.B., (Mr. Carvell) who spoke in favour of their being some provision for bringing the case before a jury instead of leaving it within the power of a justice of the peace, acting singly, to send a man to prison for six months.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. To the suggestion that these cases should come before two justices of the peace I make no objection. There would certainly be some security in that if it be thought that this legislation is so much more drastic than ordinary legislation that it requires to be safeguarded by exceptional provisions. I think that today one justice of the peace, in many cases, tries just as important charges as some might be under this legislation; and it has always to be borne in mind that this is peculiarly the kind of prosecution in which it is quite possible charges may be made out of some vindictive feeling and where

the public interest is not the motive actuating the accuser.

Mr. CARVELL. Notwithstanding the concession made by the Minister of Justice, it does not seem to me to go far enough. No doubt, in his very distinguished career, the Minister of Justice has had the good fortune, to a greater extent than many of us, of dealing with judges rather than justices of the peace. I make no distinction between a justice of the peace and a police magistrate, although I know there is a distinction in the statute. I have in my mind police magistrates appointed to certain courts, who are not half as well qualified as some justices of the peace. A police magistrate is appointed under exactly the same influence as an ordinary justice of the peace, and we will be going a long way towards jeopardizing the liberty of the public if we place the trial of so important a matter either in the hands of a justice of the peace or a police magistrate. I submit further that the accused should have the right to elect whether he shall be tried before a police magistrate or a jury. From my experience as a lawyer, if you get a case before a jury of twelve men, who must agree on a conviction, you are pretty sure to have a common sense decision, for there is a good deal of common sense in average humanity. If a prisoner has the right to elect for trial by jury, he can have no fault to find if he be found guilty, and he is not likely to be convicted unless the finding is justifiable. I hope that the minister will consent to have some safeguard thrown around the accused and not leave him simply to the tender mercies of even a police magistrate.

Mr. AMES. If that phase of the question is exhausted, here is another question I would like to ask, and that is whether this Act would cover the case of a government employee who undertook to solicit subscriptions, let us say, for campaign purposes from persons who are either selling supplies to the government or have contracts with the government, and to whom these officials represent that a lively sense of favours to come or recognition of favours passed, should be sufficient reason to cause them to give subscriptions. Even supposing these subscriptions were used for proper purposes, would they still, under this Act, be a crime?

Mr. CONMEE. Will the hon. gentleman not include the agents of the opposition who would write to certain persons that if they wanted appointments or favours or certain measures passed, they could only gain their object by taking a certain course. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will include such agents in his motion.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I would think that any such transaction as the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) has referred to would be very thoroughly covered by our present legislation without reference to whether or not it would be covered by the Bill now under consideration. In the Bill under consideration the presence of the word 'corruptly' might relieve that man from the punishment of this particular statute if the benefit which he was offering was not to go to the person who received it but to some other person and was for perfectly legitimate purposes. But under the existing law, section 158 of the Code, the word 'corruptly' is not used and any man who

> Makes any offer, proposal, gift, loan or promise, or gives or offers any compensation or consideration, directly or indirectly, to any official or person in the employment of the government, or to any member of his family, or to any person under his control or for his benefit, with intent to obtain the assistance or influence of such official or person to promote either the procuring of any contract with the government for the performance of any work, the doing of anything, or the furnishing of any goods, effects, food or materials, the execution of any such contract, or the payment of the price or consideration stipulated therein, or any part thereof, or of any aid or subsidy payable in respect thereof;
>
> Is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to a fine of not less than one hundred dollars, and not exceeding one thousand dollars, and to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year and not less than one month and in default of payment of such fine to imprisonment for a further time not exceeding six months.

That definition it seems to me would cover entirely the case the hon. gentleman puts. It would not be any the less on offence, for instance, to give money to a government official in order to procure favours from him because it was a stipulation that the receiver of that money should use it not for his own purposes but for some other purpose. If it is given for the purpose of securing a favour which that official is in a position to bestow it is in itself an offence against the provision of the code I have read.

Mr. AMES. The minister has not dealt with the case I had in mind. He has taken an instance where the contractor approaches an official to induce the official not to do his duty, for a consideration. The point I had was where the official approaches the contractor in order to secure from the contractor a contribution which he will not use for himself but will pass on to other parties but which those men who subscribed understand is a subscription given because they have been faithful in the past or will be in the future.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I possibly misunderstood the hon. gentleman's question but under the statute not only is the giver but the recipient liable to the punishment I have mentioned. The statute goes on in a

separate subsection to provide that any one is liable who

Being an official or person in the employment of the government, directly or indirectly, accepts or agrees to accept, or allows to be accepted by any person under his control or for his benefit, any such offer, proposal, gift, loan, promise, compensation or consideration.

Mr. CARVELL. This latter discussion only emphasizes the point I have been trying to make. The minister takes it for granted that somebody must decide whether or not this is a corrupt act. In that I agree, the difficulty that I see is leaving the decision in the hands of an illiterate country magistrate to make that distinction. If the country magistrate makes up his mind that he is going to try such a case summarily, and as I read the Bill he has the power to do this, he may send the accused to jail for six months. There is no appeal, and according to the practice in that portion of Canada from which I come his only recourse would be by certiorari and as a rule certiorari only goes to jurisdiction and if the justices of the peace have jurisdiction as they have under this section the defendant certiorari is of no use to him and he goes to jail and stays there six months. If the defendant has the right to full election and he goes before the jury he may be convicted by that jury but you have a judge who charges the jury and must state the law and if he misstates the law there is an appeal to the higher court. So the discussion here about the meaning of the word 'corrupt' &c., emphasizes the necessity of giving the defendant the right to say whether the matter shall be tried summarily or whether he will go to the grand jury. I hope the minister will at least consider this before asking to have the legislation passed.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I think it would be very dangerous to give to the accused an absolute right of election which would ensure his being tried perhaps before a friendly magistrate. The effect of such a provision would seem to me to be that if there were magistrates who were willing to lend themselves to the purposes of the accused, care would always be taken to have a prosecution of that sort arranged and disposed of before any other charge could be laid. After all, while the danger of trial before a man who may not be qualified undoubtedly exists, as my hon. friend points out, is that danger any greater in the case of an offence struck at by this measure than under the existing law? In that part of the code which deals with summary trials by magistrates we have all manner of minor offences covered and there are already every day in the week all over Canada cases being disposed of by magistrates which are of very great practical consequence to the individuals concerned. I suggest to my hon. friend whether if these clauses appeared in the code or if the proposition to legislate here were in the shape of a proposed amendment to the code to insert this clause, it would occur to him that there was any greater danger in regard to prosecutions affected by this legislation than with regard to transactions covered by existing legislation.

Mr. CARVELL. I do not think there would be any greater danger. I think there is too much danger already and if this parliament has in the past enacted legislation which has perhaps been ill-advised and ill-considered, that is no reason to continue that condition of affairs; if it can be pointed out that this is a case that should be treated differently, around which greater protection should be thrown, I think it is the duty of this parliament to throw protection around the accused in this case. I would not think for a moment that the accused should have the right to say that he shall be tried either summarily or as on an indictable offence, because I would leave some discretion in the hands of the magistrate. But I would go so far as to say that if the accused says he wants this matter to be tried as an indictable affair, then he should have the right to have it tried in that way. But if he says, I want it tried summarily, and the magistrate says, no, it is too grave a matter, of course the magistrate should have the power to send him up for trial. But when I use the word 'election' I mean that he cannot be forced to take his trial at the hands of an illiterate magistrate, perhaps, but he ought to have the right to appeal to a higher court where he can get justice.

Mr. LENNOX. It is always understood that he has the right to go before a jury.

Mr. McKENZIE. I think it will be conceded by lawyers that uniformity in procedure is highly desirable, and that in all criminal matters, as the criminal law is uniform in Canada, is the only statutory law perhaps that is purely uniform, we should have a uniform procedure. I think therefore that so far as procedure is concerned—and it is procedure we are discussing now—the code of criminal procedure should be made in its entirety to apply to this law, which is a criminal law. If the Minister of Justice will make the procedue of the code apply absolutely and unequivocally to this law, I do not think that the lawyers in this House, particularly those who are versed in criminal law, would have any fault to find. I have had something to do, both as a lawyer and a little as a judge, with the administration of the criminal law, and I have not heard much fault found with the present conditions of the criminal law, as laid down in the criminal code. I think it is conceded by all criminal lawyers that the

accused is sufficiently protected, that he has every right that he could possibly expect to a fair trial, if he has a right to elect in some instances to be tried before a magistrate. It is only in very rare instances that he must be tried before a magistrate on a criminal offence. There are a few cases, I think, which apply distinctly to sailors and other parties who commit offences, and who are about to leave the town, and must leave the town, in a short time; I think there are a few cases in which they must be tried before the magistrate, and the jurisdiction of the magistrate is absolute. Apart from these, there are few instances indeed where you can force a man to be tried before a magistrate without his consent. I think, therefore, the procedure, so far as this Bill is concerned, should be in every particular the same as the procedure applying to every section of the code, no more and no less, and great care should be taken that no ingenuity can show that there is any difference, because this is really a thing that should be a part of the code, and to which of course all the safeguards of the code should apply. If this is a criminal offence, it is certainly not the intention of the Minister of Justice that a man caught under this law, should have less protection than a man who is caught under some section of the code. If therefore, we have absolute certainty of a uniform procedure, and that the same safeguards are provided under this law as under the code generally, I do not think the profession or the country will have any fault to find.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Perhaps the best course to meet the views of hon. gentlemen would be, before the preamble is put to the committee, that the committee should rise, and in the interval before the Bill is taken up again, clauses can be framed to meet the suggestion which has been made.

Progress reported.

CIVIL SERVICE SALARIES.

House again in committee to consider the proposed resolution to grant an increase of salary to certain members of the Civil Service.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State). When this resolution was last before the committee, an understanding was reached between the leader of the opposition, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), that the resolution would be amended so as to cover the suggestions that were then made regarding the manner in which the moneys to be paid under this Bill, when finally adopted, should be provided. The Minister of Agriculture is obliged to be absent for a short time, and he has asked me to present the amendment which meets the views that were expressed when the discussion, to which I have referred, took place. I may say that in order to give full effect to the suggestions of my hon. friends opposite, it is proposed to prepare schedules detailing the expenditure that will be detailed under this Bill in each department. These schedules will be printed with the Bill, and will form part of the Bill; so that full information will be afforded, and thus the views expressed by the hon. member for North Toronto will be fully met. I understand it is not intended to do more to-day than move this amendment and ask that the resolution as amended be reported. I therefore beg to move that the resolution be amended by striking out all the words following the word 'granted' in the nineteenth line and substituting therefor the following:

And during the financial years ending March 31, 1909 and 1910 respectively, there may be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada such further moneys as may be required for the payment of increases of salary under the Act to be founded on this resolution, as have not been voted by parliament, the whole not to exceed the amounts as set forth in the schedules to the Act to be founded on this resolution.

Mr. FOSTER. The objection that was made was that the resolution as submitted to the House gave the government the power to take whatever money might be necessary out of the consolidated revenue fund without specifying the amount in any more definite way. There was some talk across the floor in reference to it and this amendment fairly meets the view that was held by gentlemen on this side of the House and obviates that difficulty. Under this amendment schedules will be attached to the Act, a schedule which will give, for each department, the number of officers and the amounts in each division which are to be voted as an increase and consequently will be just as explicit and just as full as would the items put through in the form of a vote in the estimates. As far as I can see that would be perfectly satisfactory. With that we agreed the other day to allow the resolution to be reported, but I stated expressly that we reserved the right, on the second reading of the Bill, to criticise the principle of the resolution. Just before the resolution is passed I want to invite the attention of the House for a moment to two or three salient points, with regard to which, for myself, I consider the resolution is not a wise one. They can be thought over, and hon. gentlemen, exercising each his own judgment, may be able to express their own thoughts with regard to them. I may be wrong in the view I take of the matter. It is rather complex but this seems to be what this resolution aims at. It gives into the hands of

the government a sum of money equal to $150 for each clerk employed or each official under the present Civil Service Act. These clerks are divided roughly into three classes as they are combined now and have been since the first of September. There is the class of outside insiders, who were not part of the permanent service but who, under this Act, were drafted into the Civil Service and became thereby permanent with all the rights and privileges of the permanent service. There was also a class of official possible of creation by appointment and paid out of lump votes and civil government contingencies who, being appointed previous to the first day of September, became thereby eligible to be transferred into the permanent list with all its rights and privileges. There was the third class, the old permanent civil servants, who, of course, remain in the Civil Service. What this resolution does is this: It puts no bar to the class that I have mentioned, who were formerly the outside insiders, paid for out of lump sums or out of civil government contingencies, receiving, each one, the flat increase of $150 even though three days previous to the time set for the Act coming into force, the first day of September, a person in this class may have received an increase of $100, or $200, or $500, or $700. There is no bar; each one of these may have the $150 flat increase. There is no bar also to the person who was a late new appointee and who, being appointed late, stepped over into the permanent list as it is organized and established under the provisions of the Civil Service Act amendments. These also are not barred from receiving the $150 increase. But when you come to the old permanent service, those who had to scratch gravel to get into the service, who had to pass the examination, and had to submit themselves to all the rules, you find there are bars. What are these bars? They are these: First, if it so happens, under a set of circumstances, that the old servant was within less than $150 of the maximum of his class, whatever his class might be, say for example that he was within $50 of his maximum, he cannot receive the $150 increase. He can receive only the difference between the $150 flat increase and his unappropriated maximum which, in the case to which I refer, would be $50. Here is, to my mind, the injustice. There is the man who was in the outside inside service who, on the first of September received his increase of $200 or $300, or $500 to compensate for hard times, straightened circumstances and the increased cost of living. There is no bar to him, he gets his $150 out of this sum that we are going to vote, but the man who had been in the permanent service, who got in by passing the examination, who submitted to the regulations, proved himself fit and who struggled up for fifteen or twenty years under these conditions of increased cost of living gets none of this flat increase if he is at his maximum and gets only $50 if he is within $50 of it, according to the circumstances. That does not appeal to me as being fair, and it is against that that I protest. There seems to be an undue preference given to the outsider and the man who has borne the heat and burden of the day as regards the principle of the Act, who has submitted to its regulations and rules, is discriminated against in the manner that I have stated. When we come to the second reading of the Bill, I intend to adduce a great many instances of this kind and to try and plead with the House for some amelioration of the condition of those whom I consider are worthy servants and are being used somewhat unfairly, under the arbitrary principle which has been introduced into the resolution.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand the criticism of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) but I do not understand the remedy which he has in his own mind. I do not know whether the remedy which he suggested was that we should decrease the bounty given by parliament to those in the inside outside service, or whether we should increase the bounty given to the permanent servants. I take it that his suggestion is that he should increase the bounty given by parliament to the permanent regular service, that is to those who have reached the limit of their class and that we should in some way compensate them by giving them more than they would receive under this measure. I am not prepared to express any opinion at the present time, but I suppose we shall have to examine the criticism of my hon. friend in due time, but I would like to know from my hon. friend as to the schedule to be attached to this Bill. I understood that it was the intention of the Minister of Agriculture that the schedule should provide for each department the maximum or the total amount which it is intended to give.

Mr. FOSTER. It does.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Minister of Agriculture stated also that he expected to have a list of the names of those who received additions to their salary. That is not the way we prepare our estimates; we say so many in each class and so on. It is immaterial to me how it is done, but I understood that the totals were to be given in the schedule, the details being communicated to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what I intended to say. I made my criticism so that my right hon. friend and others could think it over. If there was an injustice there is some way by which it can be remedied.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. And when we come to the second reading of the Bill, we will probably have wisdom enough to know how it can be remedied.

Resolution reported.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Indians, British Columbia—Salaries, $26,020.
Relief of destitute Indians, British Columbia, $9,000.

Mr. BRADBURY. In the settlement of St. Peter's reserve, was there any arrangement made by which minors could transfer the land. My reason for asking that question is that a number of young men under twenty-one years of age, some only eighteen years of age, have sold their land and I have several complaints from parents regarding that matter.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I am informed that the land did not go to the minors; it went to the parent and the parent had the right of disposition.

Mr. BRADBURY. There is some mistake in that, because these young men have parted with their rights. I know of one case in particular where a young man twenty-one years old had the patent issued in his name, as I understand, and he sold his land.

Mr. OLIVER. The terms of the surrender did not provide for grants being given to minors, and if there are any such transactions they are outside of the arrangement and are of course of no effect.

Mr. BLAIN. This is rather an important item and the minister should give some explanation.

Mr. OLIVER. Assistance is given to the hospitals at the rate of $1 per day for Indians, only up to 1,000 days and 75 cents per day over that number. The expenditure for 1907-8 was $26,989.43. Medical and hospital attendance and medicines are provided for Indians who cannot afford to pay. The physicians are either upon salaries, which represent a fair remuneration according to the number of Indians and for services and medicine supplied, or, when paid by accounts, they are allowed the lowest possible charges made to poor white cases. Medicines are supplied to medical missionaries and distributed to Indians under their charge. The following are the hospitals and the amount granted : Lytton $1,500 ; Kincolith, $1,500 ; Port Simpson, $2,000 ; Hazelton, $2,000 ; Bella Bella, $2,000; Clayoquot, $1,500; Telegraph Creek, $2,000 ; Alert Bay, $1,500.

Mr. SPROULE. Are these private hospitals?

Mr. OLIVER. They are supported jointly by the department, the province and the mission.

Mr. BARR. How do the missionaries distribute the medicines if they do not understand drugs?

Mr. OLIVER. The medicines are supplied to medical missionaries. Only those who have medical qualifications are permitted to distribute the medicines.

Mr. BARR. I have been up through that country, and I have not found among the missionaries any who have medical qualifications.

Mr. SPROULE. Who control the hospitals with regard to determining their efficiency for the purpose intended and what fees shall be charged? And are these hospitals inspected?

Mr. OLIVER. These hospitals were originally missionary enterprises, but they draw support from the province and the Indian Department. We have our own medical men upon whose certificate as to the hospital and its work we make payments. We make no payments without such certificate.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that the Indians are charged a smaller fee than white people?

Mr. OLIVER. When physicians outside of the hospitals are called to treat the Indians, we pay them the lowest scale that is allowed in the case of poor white patients. The hospitals are free to the Indians.

Mr. SPROULE. What proportion does each contribute approximately to the support of these hospitals?

Mr. OLIVER. The basis of payment on the part of the province and the department respectively is not the same, but we pay approximately about the same amount.

Mr. AMES. In the general hospitals in British Columbia, I suppose the Indians are paid for by the government at the rate of so much per day ?

Mr. OLIVER. The Indian hospitals are free to the Indians. In the hospitals which are not Indian, we pay the ordinary charge, which amounts to about a dollar a day.

Mr. AMES. You pay, then, only for what you receive?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. AMES. You pay no subsidy to these other hospitals at all?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. AMES. And those of which you have given the list are exclusively Indian hospitals?

Mr. OLIVER. Not exclusively. In the beginning they were for the most part missionary enterprises, intended especially for the benefit of the Indians, but they do not absolutely exclude white patients.

Mr. AMES. I understand, then, that there are two kinds of hospital care given to the Indians. One is in general hospitals in centres like Victoria and New Westminster, where the regular rate of a dollar a day is paid for each Indian patient, and the other is in these missionary hospitals at different points which are subsidized by the government without reference to the number of Indians in them.

Mr. OLIVER. No. We pay in them the same rate of a dollar a day until the total number of days reaches one thousand, and after that we pay 75 cents a day.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the minister state what denominations own or control these hospitals and the amount each received last year?

Mr. OLIVER. Two of them are Church of England—Lytton and Kincolith; Hazleton, Bella Bella, Clayoquot and Port Simpson are Methodist; Telegraph Creek is Presbyterian. Then there is Alert Bay, B.C., Coast Mission, which is practically in connection with the Church of England. The amounts which we estimate we will require are practically the same as the amounts we have paid in the past year.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. If the minister will turn to pages J—59 and 60, he will find that the expenditure in connection with the Northwest Coast and West Coast agencies of British Columbia totals $20,751, but that out of that amount there has been paid $11,571 for salaries to agents and travelling expenses, leaving only $9,180 to the poor Indians. How does he explain that?

Mr. OLIVER. The figures of expenditure represent the amounts which have to be paid to the officers whose names are given in the report, and the remainder is what the Indians receive. The Indians of British Columbia do not receive any annuity payments. Our dealings with them are simply in the way of supervision and direction and not in the way of support as in the prairie country or under some of the treaties in eastern Canada.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. It appears to me there is a good deal more going to the agent than to the Indians?

Mr. OLIVER. We are paying the agents of course to direct and protect the Indians.

Schools, $93,000.

Mr. AMES. Would the minister give us some general idea of what has been the result of our educational efforts among the Indians of British Columbia?

Mr. OLIVER. The conditions in British Columbia differ somewhat from those prevailing in the prairie provinces, both as regards the surroundings of the Indians and the nature of the Indians themselves. The consequence is that the Indians there derive more benefit from education than do those in the prairie provinces. There is, however, a very large Indian population in British Columbia. By reason of the nature of the country, that population exists in small communities widely separated from one another, so that although we have quite a large number of schools and although we expend on them a large sum, we still reach only a small proportion of the total population. Owing to the conditions, our educational efforts have been more successful in British Columbia than in the prairie provinces, but have not been applied to nearly as large a proportion of the population.

Mr. SPROULE. In what respect have our schools been more successful in British Columbia? Is the educational work there different?

Mr. OLIVER. The education is pretty much the same but in British Columbia, where the Indians are compelled, by the force of circumstances, to adopt to a considerable extent the ways of civilization, living close to civilized communities, restricted to very much the same means of livelihood as white people would be, they are brought to a great extent in line with the conditions which would govern a white settlement. We find in the Indian settlements of British Columbia that the people live in very decent houses and that the men are employed in useful labour and frequently are very well dressed and show the evidence of civilization very much the same as their white neighbours do.

Mr. AMES. What proportion of the known Indian population comes under educational influence?

Mr. OLIVER. Possibly fifty per cent.

Mr. BARR. Would not the climatic conditions have considerable influence? In British Columbia the temperature is so mild that the Indians do not die off so fast as in the prairie provinces, where they suffer to a far greater extent from cold and hunger during the severe winter, and consequently cannot give the same attendance to the schools. They could also attend the schools in winter in British Columbia more readily than in the prairie provinces.

Mr. OLIVER. The British Columbia Indians certainly live under more advantageous circumstances than those on the prairie.

Mr. SPROULE. Are the British Columbia Indians of the same tribes as the prairie Indians and are their schools conducted on the same lines?

Mr. OLIVER. The schools are of the same classes as in the prairie provinces, industrial, day and boarding schools. The British Columbia Indians are of different tribes from those on the prairies and of somewhat different disposition and character. They take more naturally to the ordinary ways and conditions of civilization; they will take employment to a degree that the prairie Indian will not and are of course more likely to benefit by education. The Indian of the plains is essentially an aristocrat; he looks upon labour, as we understand it, as beneath him, as degrading. That is his essential idea of life and it takes generations to cause him to break away from that idea; whereas the Indian of British Columbia has always been able to secure his livelihood while living in communities and under conditions which, while they required labour did not require labour of a severe or exhausting character. It was, however, sufficient to make the Indian of British Columbia take more naturally to civilization than the prairie Indian. On the prairies civilization absolutely kills off the Indians whereas in British Columbia they survive it much better.

Mr. BARR. Are the Indian tribes of British Columbia increasing or decreasing? I saw a statement that the Siwashes are increasing.

Mr. OLIVER. In British Columbia the Indian population as a whole is about stationary; on the prairies it is decreasing.

Mr. SPROULE. Could the minister give us any information as to the percentage of Indian children educated in the different classes of schools, so that we may judge if there is any difference in the schools which would account for the practical failure of education among them, of which the minister spoke the other night and as to which most of us are inclined to agree with him.

Mr. OLIVER. We find as I said that there is practically no difference in results. The results are not the fault of educational effort but the consequence of the nature of the Indian and of his environment.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. Last year we voted $97,300 and this year the vote is $93,000. How much of that vote was expended last year?

Mr. OLIVER. $85,700.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. The minister is taking a vote for salaries of $26,020. The same vote was taken last year but I find from the figures at page I—65 that the salaries for the different Indian agencies in British Columbia amount to $56,975, so it would look as if money voted for other purposes had been used for salaries.

Mr. OLIVER. The Auditor General has not made the distinction between salaries of officials and salaries paid to medical attendants and to teachers in schools.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. Medical attendance is all separated.

Mr. OLIVER. As I read the item on page I—66 the Auditor General gives the salaries of agents, and then the salaries of medical attendants and then the salaries of teachers, and all these together give the figure my hon. friend read. This bears out what I say. We are asking for a vote separating the salaries and medical attendance, and the schools.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I notice in the item the names of a number of teachers, so I fancy that some of the moneys voted for schools have gone on salary account. We ought to be able to trace how this $85,000 spent last year has been paid. The accounts are mixed.

Mr. OLIVER. The totals are not made up that way. But if my hon. friend will look at page I—66, Northwest Coast Agency, the first lines give the salaries of agents, then follow other lines giving the salaries of medical officers. Then in the balance of the paragraph appears the salaries of teachers. They are all there, but the classifications are not totalled.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I think the minister ought to have them classified so that we can check the expenditure. It is very misleading as it is now.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman's experience in parliament must convince him that the Auditor General is a law unto himself. We cannot compel him to give figures in any other way than he chooses.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I presume he keeps the accounts as he gets them from the department.

Mr. OLIVER. On page 164 Part II of the report of the Department of Indian Affairs, the figures are classified just as we are asking the House to vote them.

Surveys and Reserve Commission, $2,500.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Would the minister give us some information of that item?

Mr. OLIVER. This amount is to provide for delimiting the boundaries of the reserves and for the expenses of the commissioner who is employed on that work.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Might I ask the minister if there has been a conference between the Dominion government and the provincial government regarding the disposition of the Indian reserves?

Mr. OLIVER. The question as to the rights of the Indians is under discussion between the Indian Department and the government of British Columbia, and has been under discussion for some time. The latest phase of the matter is that the government of the province saw fit to take the case into the provincial courts to decide the jurisdiction of the province. That is as far as the matter has gone.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Could the minister state whether the Dominion government was represented in those proceedings, or what is the attitude of the Dominion government?

Mr. OLIVER. This government was not represented at those proceedings. The attitude of the Dominion government was that it would be necessary, in order to reach a satisfactory conclusion, that both parties should come to an understanding as to the questions to be submitted to the courts. The provincial government, for reasons of their own, saw fit to submit a case prepared by themselves, and of course we had no part in it.

Mr. BARNARD. Was not this government notified that a case was going before the courts?

Mr. OLIVER. I understand that the Justice Department was notified by the provincial government that such action was being taken. But I am informed that the Justice Department viewed the case as I have stated.

Mr. BARNARD. If the minister would look up the files in connection with this matter I think he would find that there are one or two communications from the provincial government, dating some time back, which have not been replied to. He will find at least one communication from the Chief Commissioner of Lands in connection with this matter, now several months old, and which has not yet been replied to. It was dated before the proceedings taken by the provincial government.

Mr. OLIVER. Of course the Justice Department handles legal questions. If our department received such a communication I presume it was transferred to the Justice Department to take action. I am not able to give my hon. friend any further information in regard to it.

Mr. BARNARD. As a matter of fact, I think the minister will find that there is an agreement practically ratified by order in council between the province and the Dominion, which provides that the reserves should be decreased as the population of the Indians decreased, proportionately; that the provincial government has taken up the question with the Dominion government and has shown them that the population of the reserves has decreased, and has asked them to release certain lands which are now contained in the reserve. Has not such a communication been made to the department?

Mr. OLIVER. The question my hon. friend mentions has been under consideration. But preliminary to any action being taken upon that question, it was felt by this government that it was necessary, first, to know what the rights of the Indians were, which rights were the subject of dispute between this government and the government of British Columbia. The provincial government took the position that the Indians had no right except the right of occupation. The government, which is the trustee and guardian of the Indians, could not admit that proposition and could not go into any discussion as to whether the Indians had too much or too little land until it was decided whether they had any rights or not. That is the question that it is the desire of this government to have settled by a higher authority. It is something more than a year ago that the proposition was made by this government to British Columbia that there should be a submission of this question as to what right or title the Indians had. Up to the present time the government of the province has not agreed to that and therefore no progress has been made.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Pending the decision of the larger question, I would like to invite the attention of the minister to the possibility of dealing with some individual instances. I have in mind particularly the case of the Indian reserve on Maria island in the riding of New Westminster closely adjoining Agassiz. The area of land suitable for agriculture in that valley is very small. A large tract is taken up by the experimental farm and other large tracts are monopolized by Indian reserves, held in the names of Indian tribes that are almost extinct, at least in so far as these particular reserves are concerned, where they carry on no agriculture and give very little sign of occupation. It has been urgently represented to me that the government should be moved to take into consideration the inconvenience it is to settlers to have the settlements so circumscribed as they are by the fact of these large Indian holdings and there is a very great desire that the government should take possession of this land and put it up for sale. I may say that there are people willing to pay good prices for the land in question with the idea of bringing in a larger number of families, making their community stronger and enabling them to handle local affairs more efficiently than they can be handled at the present time. I would like to ask the minister whether he thinks it at all feasible for such a pro-

position to be entertained in advance of a general settlement.

Mr. OLIVER. There is hardly time to deal with the question before six o'clock.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

MONTREAL TERMINAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. GEOFFRION—by Mr. Proulx—moved the second reading of Bill (No. 48) respecting the Montreal Terminal Railway Company.

Mr. J. D. REID. Explain.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Geoffrion) is not present.

Mr. J. D. REID. We cannot pass it if it is not explained.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands.

BRITISH COLUMBIA LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. COWAN—by Mr. Taylor—moved second reading of Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the British Columbia Life Insurance Company.

Mr. SPEAKER. Mr. Cowan being absent this order will have to stand also, on the same principle.

CANADA LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

On the order being called for the second reading of Bill (No. 56) respecting the Canadian Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Clarke (Essex).

Mr. SPEAKER. This will also have to stand for the same reason.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Idians, British Columbia—Surveys and Reserve Commissions, $2,500.

Mr. OLIVER. When the committee rose at six o'clock the hon. gentleman from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) was asking for an expression of opinion from the department in regard to making special arrangements for the surrender of an Indian reserve situated in the valley of the Fraser near the experimental farm at Agassiz, and close to the Canadian Pacific Railway line, and in what might be called the very heart of the best agricultural district in British Columbia. He was anxious to know if special arrangements might not be made in regard to the surrender of this reserve, while awaiting a decision on the general question of dealing with reserves throughout the province. The Indian Department is very well aware of the conditions surrounding this particular reserve. One objection to making a special case of this reserve is that it is almost identical in circumstances with many other reserves throughout the province, and that so far from being a special case it is rather a specimen case. In the opinion of the department it is not desirable under such circumstances to make special arrangements in regard to a single case when that arrangement cannot be made applicable to all similar cases. The natural conditions in the province of British Columbia are such that in securing lands for the settlement of the Indian bands in that province and permitting them the right of selection, it has come about that in almost every valley, and adjoining almost every white settlement in every valley, and it might almost be said adjoining almost every point at which there is white settlement in every valley, there is an Indian reserve. This comes about by reason of the topographical conditions which naturally separated the Indians into small bands, each band being resident in a single valley or in a single part of a certain valley. And so, we have in the province of British Columbia, 1,000 Indian reserves scattered about through the valleys and naturally quite as numerous in the parts of the province that are occupied by white settlers as in the parts which are not. This question of the Indian reserves in British Columbia is of paramount importance in the development of that province. It will be understood that in a country so mountainous as British Columbia the valleys have special value, and so it is that where these reserves are situated, at the present time (within the last few years particularly under the development that has taken place) these lands have become of extra special value, so that while there was a question arising about the location of these reserves a few years ago that question has now become a burning one and I might say a dominant question in the development of the province. It may seem strange that such a small area should be so very important in a province with such a stupendous total area, but when you take that area and split it up into a thousand parcels and place each of these parcels in a locality which has been selected by those who knew the province best, you have certainly a very serious bar to the settlement and development of that province. The tenure of Indian lands in British Columbia is somewhat different from that prevailing in other parts of Canada. In all other parts of Canada the Indian is held to be the absolute owner of the land; he is the absolute proprietor not as an individual but as a community. In British Columbia, however, that

is not the position as it has been understood. I need not go into any lengthy explanation at the moment, but in the case of Indian reserves in British Columbia until the administration of this government, up to a certain point it was understood that while the Indian owned the land he occupied, and while that land was administered by the Dominion government as the guardian and trustee of the Indian, the government of the province had what was called a reversionary interest in all those Indian reserves.

The Indian Department recognized this as being the position; and so, in any disposition that was attempted to be made of Indian lands for the benefit of the Indians, the reversionary interest of the province of British Columbia was always considered. What the value of that reversionary interest might be was not a matter that could very well be settled; but it was always recognized and kept in view in any transactions in Indian lands. Therefore, Indian lands in British Columbia had not the same value to the Indians that they would have had had they been held under the same tenure as lands in the northwest provinces or in Ontario. But it was always considered that the interest of the Indians was paramount to that of the province. Now, recognizing the desirability of bringing those lands which were not in use by the Indians into profitable occupation, and at the same time securing for the Indians the full benefit of their interest in them, which is in accordance with the principle of administration of Indian lands observed by the Canadian government ever since it undertook to handle Indian lands—when an application was made by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company for a certain part of the Metlakatla reserve for the purpose of a terminus for the railroad on the Pacific coast, the Indian Department approached the Indians occupying the reserve, and negotiated a surrender of their rights in some 13,000 acres of the reserve, for which the Grand Trunk Pacific Company paid something like $100,000, which is at the credit of the Metlakatla Indian band. In the agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, it was especially stipulated under seal that the reversionary interest of the province of British Columbia was not in any way prejudiced by this transfer of Indian rights. The Indian Department, I may say, believed that the transaction was in the interest of the Indians, in the interest of the province, and in the interest of all Canada, as well as in the interest of the railway company; and believed that to such a degree that before entering into the arrangement with the railway company, the Dominion government asked the province to waive its reversionary interest in those lands, believing that the province would benefit sufficiently by the proposed transaction to warrant it in doing so. The provincial government, however, in their wisdom declined to waive the reversionary interest, and so the sale was made subject to that reversionary interest. A little later certain communications passed between the government of the province and the government of the Dominion in regard to this particular transaction, and in regard to the general question of dealing with these Indian reserves, with a view of getting the question into such a position as would enable the Indian Department to dispose of unused or unneeded Indian lands for the benefit of the Indians, and for the benefit of the settlement of the province. In the course of the correspondence, the government of British Columbia saw fit to take a position which had not previously been contemplated—a position different from that which it formerly held, as we understood it; and in an order in council dated the 28th of February, 1907, the provincial government states its position in these words:

> It follows, then, that the Dominion government has no right or power to make or grant a lease or transfer of any Indian reserve, or portion of a reserve, in this province, and that where any lease or transfer has been made, the reserve or portion of a reserve so leased or transferred now belongs absolutely to the province. It would appear that in at least three instances transfers or leases have been made by the Dominion government of portions of Indian reserves, namely 3·21 acres of the Myuke reserve in Kootenay, 7 acres of the False Creek reserve in Vancouver, and 13·567 acres of the Port Simpson reserve. These lands now belong to and should be claimed by the province.

That is to say, the provincial government, instead of claiming a reversionary interest, claimed an absolutely proprietary interest in the lands, declaring that the Indians were merely the occupants, and not in any sense the owners of the lands. It must be evident that this declaration on the part of the province absolutely prohibited the Dominion government from taking any further action in regard to the alienation of Indian lands. The Dominion government could not undertake to dispossess the Indians without securing value to them for their interest, whatever it might be. I presume that the committee will recognize that as being the correct position. It is the traditional position of the British government in Canada, and has been the unaltered position of the Canadian government ever since it has been handling Indian affairs. Therefore the Indian Department, in undertaking to deal with Indian lands in the province of British Columbia, could only be a party to their alienation when assured that the Indians were receiving full value for what-

ever interest they had in the lands. It must be evident that unless a title can be given for the land, no man will pay his money for it. The position therefore is this: A cloud is placed on the title to Indian land by the government of the province of British Columbia which prevents any one from investing his money in it, and thus causes a tie-up in the situation unless the Dominion government is prepared to take the ground that the Indian has no right in these lands.

Mr. SPROULE. Where the Indians abandon their reserve, as they did around Kaien Island, and the reversionary right brings that back to the Crown, you could not interfere with the title then.

Mr. OLIVER. The Indians did not abandon their reserve, but sold a part and retained the remainder.

Mr. SPROULE. As long as the Indians were settled on that land and the tribe remained, it was theirs, but if they vacated it and went away, it reverted to the Crown; and the contention was that the band abandoned their reserve and went to the United States. Afterwards, however, a portion of another band came and squatted on this reserve and took possession of it, but the province, under the reversionary right, owned the land and pretended that the others were only squatters.

Mr. OLIVER. The province did not make any pretention with regard to abandonment, but simply claimed that if the Indians either sold the land or ceased to occupy any portion of the reserve, it became vested in the province. I am not arguing the question of the validity of that contention, but I am saying that such a declaration by the British Columbia government necessarily tied up the land and prevented this government disposing of it and at the same time discharging its trust to the Indians. That being the case, and we did not in any way wish to take any action which would bring us into conflict with the province, but still, not considering that we would be warranted in acceding to their position, we stated that we would be willing to facilitate a decision by a court of competent jurisdiction. It seemed to us that by reference to the proper court, we would obtain a decision either acknowledging the rights of the Indians or stating that they had no rights, and in the latter case relieve the Indian Department of all responsibility in the matter. We have not since been able to come to an arrangement with the province for the submission of the matter to the decision of the courts, and consequently the land is absolutely tied up, and the Indian Department is prevented from dealing with it with the view of releasing such portion to settlement as is not needed by the Indians, and giving the Indians the benefit of whatever legal rights they have in the property. The fact that an arrangement has not yet been come to is not due to any laxity on the part of this government. On September 24, 1906, the Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs wrote the premier of British Columbia making a certain suggestion as to the settlement of the dispute. On December 5, 1906, no answer having up to that date been received, another letter was sent asking a reply, and on March 13, 1907, the following reply was received by the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs:

Adverting to your letter of Dec. 5, 1906 and other correspondence with reference to the Indian reserve question in this province, I beg to state that the action of the federal government in connection with the Indian reserve in British Columbia has been so unsatisfactory of late that this government does not intend to enter into any further arrangement with the Dominion authorities.

Yours truly,
WM. McBRIDE.

It is only fair that the House should be made aware of the facts in this case. It is of the highest importance to the province of British Columbia that where these reserves are not beneficially occupied by the Indians, they should be available for disposition, so that they could be occupied by those who would turn them to good account; but the responsibility for the present position rests absolutely with the province of British Columbia and not with the Indian Department, as the latter has not shown any lack of legitimate and persistent effort to bring about a satisfactory conclusion.

Mr. WRIGHT. Was there any dispute between this government and the province of British Columbia prior to the correspondence just read?

Mr. OLIVER. There was always a question between the two governments with regard to these Indian reserves. It will be easily seen how such a condition of affairs will exist, the tenure being so different in British Columbia from what it is in any other part of the country. The government of British Columbia took one view and the Dominion government an entirely different view. There was always more or less conflict of opinion, but in 1876 an arrangement was arrived at. In the carrying out of that arrangement there was of course room for differences of opinion, which occurred from time to time. And it was because there was more or less friction that the Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs wrote the provincial government in March, 1906, in order to secure a working arrangement which would enable these lands to be dealt with.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not a fact that when the lands for the terminals of the Grand Trunk Pacific were sold to that company the federal government took the ground that they and they alone had the right to sell the land and that the provinces had no right in them? That contention was continued for some time, and I think it was said in this House by some one representing the government that they and they alone had the right to sell and the province had no right to refuse.

Mr. OLIVER. I think there was an impression in the minds of some members of the House that the government had taken that position; but the government never took that position. Their position was stated in the House, but in order to make the matter perfectly clear, I shall take the liberty of reading an undertaking given by the Grand Trunk Pacific before the government would undertake to deal with the Indians for this land. The undertaking reads:

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS

That we, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Town and Development Company, Ltd., are jointly and severally prepared to accept letters patent from the Dominion government to the Grand Trunk Pacific Town and Development Company, Ltd., for the lands in Kaien island, Digby island and Tsimpsean peninsula, applied for by the G. T. P. Railway Company upon the terms contained in letter of June 27, 1906, addressed to Mr. D'Arcy Tate, assistant solicitor of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company (which last mentioned company by instrument dated June 18, 1907, did assign, transfer and set over all its right, title and interest in the said lands to the Grand Trunk Pacific Town and Development Company, Ltd.), that is the patent to be issued and accepted without recourse against the Dominion in case of the establishment of any claim on the part of the province of British Columbia to the said lands or any interest therein.

In witness whereof, each of the said companies has hereunto set its corporate seal, countersigned by the proper officers in that behalf, June 24, A.D., 1907.

The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company,
(Seal G.T.P.R.Co.),
FRANK W. MORSE,
Vice-president and general manager.
HENRY PHILIPS,
Secretary.

The Grand Trunk Pacific Town and Development Company, Ltd.
(Seal G.T.P.T. & D. Co., Ltd.)
FRANK W. MORSE,
Vice-president.
HENRY PHILIPS,
Secretary.

In the presence of: D'Arcy Tate.

Mr. WRIGHT. The minister took the ground that there had been a change of base on the part of the British Columbia government As I understand, the government of British Columbia have claimed the inherent right in the property, they still take the same position and I fail to see any change of base on their part.

Mr. OLIVER. That is not as it is understood here. Of course I am not suggesting that the government of British Columbia has in its own knowledge changed its position, but its position has been changed as we understood it. Formerly we understood, as I have already said, that the Indians owned these lands subject to the reversionary interest of the province of British Columbia, that is to say that the Indians had the right of occupation, the right to use, lease or sell the lands, subject to that reversionary interest.

Mr. WRIGHT. How did it come about in the first place that the position of the Indians in British Columbia is different from their position in the rest of the Dominion?

Mr. OLIVER. The reason is that in the greater part, at any rate, of the rest of the Dominion the lands were acquired by treaty from the Indians on certain fixed terms. It is true that some lands in British Columbia were acquired in the same way by treaty, but as far as the greater part of the province was concerned, no treaty was made with the Indians, the right of the Crown was asserted without regard to the rights of the Indians and occupation was taken of the lands by the white people without treaty with the Indians, except in a limited number of cases in the early part of the British occupation.

Mr. SPROULE. Did not British Columbia by an Act of the legislature, cede these lands to the Indians or for the Indians, inserting in their Act a provision that in the event of their abandoning occupation or transferring it to others the reversionary interest of the province in the lands would bring them back to the province?

Mr. OLIVER. I think that is right. When the provincial government was organized, I think they passed an Act of parliament taking authority to set apart certain lands for the occupation of the Indians; the difference was that it was not by treaty with the Indians as was the case here in Ontario and in the prairie provinces; it was an Act of dominant authority. There are some lands in British Columbia in regard to which a treaty was made with the Indians, but that is only a small part.

Mr. A. HAGGART. From the explanation of the minister I understand that the government have practically given a quit claim to the G. T. P. Railway Company; they have given no obligation or covenant to furnish title.

Mr. OLIVER. That is it.

Mr. A. HAGGART. If you had given a quit claim, is it not entirely a matter between the railway company and the local government?

Mr. OLIVER. Entirely.

Mr. A. HAGGART. We would be out of it then?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. A. HAGGART. And you have the $100,000 consideration?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. A. HAGGART. Well that should not concern this House very much.

Mr. OLIVER. No. That question is settled, that deal is closed. My hon. friend, as a member of the legal profession, will see that when the Grand Trunk Pacific came forward and paid their $100,000 for the right of the Indians in those lands and then had to buy the lands from the province of British Columbia, they had practically thrown away their $100,000, which we have to-day in the treasury for the benefit of the Indians, and that experience is what I am trying to emphasize to the House. Certainly no other person having money would go through the same experience. It absolutely prevents the sale of any more land.

Mr. BARNARD. Would not the fact that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company paid a considerable sum of money for this reversionary interest of the province of British Columbia in addition to giving them a 25 per cent interest in the townsite, suggest to the minister that the legal advisers of the Grand Trunk Pacific had come to the conclusion that the Grand Trunk Pacific had a pretty strong claim.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I desire to express my appreciation of the courtesy of the Minister of the Interior in making his interesting explanation of the position of the Indian lands in my province. Until I heard him to-night I had not understood that it was the fixed policy of the Dominion government to reduce the areas of the Indian reserves whenever the condition of affairs with respect to the title to the lands would warrant them in so doing. I am sure the announcement of this policy will be received with a great deal of pleasure all through British Columbia, where, as the minister has informed this committee, the fact of so large a quantity of land being locked up in Indian reserves is the cause of a great deal of annoyance. I think his announcement ought to stimulate the movement in the province for arranging an amicable settlement of this question. I had understood that the provincial government had made a bona fide attempt to submit a case to the courts in which the Dominion government were invited to join issue with them. We had the impression that the Dominion government were disinclined to put the matter to the test. But the statement made to the committee to-night encourages us to believe that the hon. the minister, recognizing how important it is for us that this matter should be settled, will use his best endeavour to facilitate such a settlement as the province desires to make. There is one more question I would like to ask, to come back to my starting point. In the event of the people of Agassiz being able to arrange with the provincial government with respect to a disposition of Maria island, will the Department of Indian Affairs here facilitate the sale of that island?

Mr. OLIVER. It depends entirely on the character of the arrangement. We would very much prefer to have the question settled as a whole rather than deal with it by piecemeal; but for the reason I have already mentioned, there are so many cases practically alike that we would certainly be accused of favouritism or unfairness if we undertake to deal with one here and one there rather than with the whole of them together.

Mr. BARNARD. Do I understand from the remarks of the minister that the government is ready to sell any land on these reserves in cases where the reserve is larger than is required? According to the agreement made with the province in 1876, that could be done provided an arrangement could be made with the provincial government. If that is the case, I think this matter might be arranged without much trouble.

Mr. OLIVER. Our policy is to bring into use the land that the Indians are not now using, and to secure to them the financial benefit from the transfer of the land.

Mr. BARNARD. According to the basis of the agreement which was made between the provinces of the Dominion in 1876, and which was set forth in an order in council by the Dominion government, and accepted by the provincial government.

Mr. OLIVER. There appears to be a wide difference of opinion between the province and the Dominion as to the purport of that agreement, and I do not wish to say anything further than that we would be glad to secure a settlement by the highest authority.

Mr. BARNARD. Then would it not be advisable for the minister to take some part in this discussion that is going on before the courts at the present time? That might facilitate a settlement.

Mr. OLIVER. As I understand the matter, when there are two parties to a dispute and a settlement before the courts is desired, a stated case is agreed upon by the parties for submission to the courts. But as I understand this matter, the British Columbia government did not give us an opportunity to unite with them in stating the case. They stated a case of their own and submitted it to their own court, which, of course, they had a perfect right to do. But unless we had an opportunity to agree to the statement of the case, we could hardly be considered as parties to the decision.

Mr. BARNARD. There must be some misunderstanding. The minister has read some communications between the two governments with respect to this matter. Would he bring down all the papers in connection with it, because the information I have is that there are communications later than those referred to by the minister from the provincial government to this government which probably would throw some light on this question. If the minister will bring them down we would be in a better position to understand the situation. It is a matter of great importance to the people of British Columbia; it is a question which I think all parties are anxious to settle.

Mr. OLIVER. The papers, as I have said, are in the Justice Department and not in my department. The hon. gentleman is aware of the means he must take to secure them. It is not within my power to bring them down.

Mr. BARNARD. The minister has thrown out the suggestion that the government is anxious to sell these lands that were not required on the reserve. Does that apply to all the lands reserved for the Indians or only a portion of them?

Mr. OLIVER. The principle applies to all the reserves in every part of the country.

Mr. BARNARD. I understood the minister to make a distinction between some Indians who had what he called treaty rights and others.

Mr. OLIVER. No, I did not make any distinction between them in discussing this question. But in regard to another matter I said that some Indians were under treaty and the balance were not. But so far that point has not been raised in the discussion, although no doubt if a case came before the courts it would be raised.

Mr. BARNARD. Is the department of the opinion that it could sell the lands on any of these Indian reserves, putting the provincial government altogether aside, for the sake of argument? Could the department dispose of the Indian lands? If not, is there any distinction between the different reservations?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not wish to be drawn into a statement that I have no proper authority to make. Given the condition that there was a reserve which was the result of a treaty between the British government, we will say, and the Indians, then whatever the terms of that treaty were of course they would prevail. I do not know whether there are any such cases, but that is the case in this part of the country, and possibly it is the case in some parts of British Columbia. I may say that we have never raised that question at all. We have assumed in all our discussions with the provincial government that they held a reversionary interest in all the Indian lands.

Mr. BARNARD. I read in one of the coast papers a reference to the fact that a reserve close to Vancouver, if not actually within the limits of that city, that situated at Greer's beach, or Kitsilano, had been transferred to the city of Vancouver. Can the minister tell me if he knows of any transaction of that kind?

Mr. OLIVER. No, that reserve has not been transferred to the city of Vancouver. Seven acres of the False Creek reserve at Vancouver were, some years ago, leased to a lumber company and that is one of the cases that the British Columbia government takes exception to holding that the land belongs to the province.

Mr. BARNARD. What I want to get at is whether or not quite recently the Kitsilano reserve has been done away with, and whether the land has become the property of the city of Vancouver or any body besides the Indians.

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. BARNARD. I would like to know if the minister can tell us anything about the Songhees reserve situated in the city of Victoria. That is a burning question at Victoria. These Indians own 112 acres practically in the middle of the city of Victoria. They have half of the water frontage on the harbour and the land held by them is practically of no use. It increases the cost of municipal administration very considerably by reason of the fact that roads and telephone poles have to be built around this reserve and very seriously retards the development of the city. I would like to know if the minister can hold out any hope of a settlement of this question.

Mr. OLIVER. The Indian Department has a very vivid remembrance of the Songhees reserve. Everything that my hon. friend has said in regard to the Songhees reserve is on the records of the department. There have been several attempts made to

secure a surrender of this land. In 1897 a commissioner went out and negotiated with the Indians, and again in 1906 the present deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs went with the fullest possible powers to negotiate a surrender. He made satisfactory arrangements with the British Columbia government with regard to their reversionary interest, but he found it impossible to secure the surrender by the Indians. We quite appreciate the desire that exists to procure it from every point of view, and we have exhausted every effort to secure the surrender of the reserve. I am sure my hon. friend knows what the difficulties are and it is not necessary that I should detail them to the committee but they have so far been impossible to overcome.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Why does not the department exercise the rights of the Crown, expropriate this land and settle this difficulty?

Mr. OLIVER. That is a matter for consideration but I presume parliament would only consent to that being done as a last resort. Certainly, as a member of the government I would not advise that the government should undertake the responsibility; because it would be so radical a departure from the accepted and traditional policy of British rule in this country that it should not and would not be undertaken without the fullest sanction of parliament which would have to take the responsibility. I am not prepared to say whether such a proposition may be submitted to parliament or not but in such a case I would certainly say that parliament would have to take the full responsibility.

Mr. BARNARD. I think the minister will admit this is very nearly a case for the last resort. The minister said that the department had exhausted every effort to settle the question. I am not blaming the department because I think they have made some effort to settle it, but it is a matter that must be settled in the near future.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (Simcoe). Is it not a fact that a portion of British Columbia was taken possession of by the Crown and that any rights the Indians have to that portion of the coast are not sovereign rights in any sense of the term but that the Indians are simply occupants, leaseholders or users of the soil? We have had cases in Ontario where the sovereign rights of the Crown were exercised, a man's property was taken away from him and the court decided that the Crown could do no wrong. If this property is within the city limits of Victoria, if it is necessary that the Indians should be moved out and if provision is made by which they will receive a sufficient amount of land elsewhere, suitable to their habits, condition and mode of life, why should not the government transfer them to another location? Is it not a fact that the government have removed Indians from several reserves to other reserves in order that the lands occupied by them might be made available for a white population? Would it not be possible to assist the city of Victoria to introduce a Bill into this House making provision for the disposition of these lands, letting any money benefit accrue to the department for the Indians, or to the province when the matter is settled?

Mr. OLIVER. As far as I am aware the government has never done as my hon. friend has suggested. We have secured surrenders from the Indians and we have secured exchanges but always with the consent of the majority of the band. That has been a fundamental principle and the suggestion that my hon. friend makes would be a departure from the traditional policy. I do not say that it should not be done but I am pointing out that it would be a departure from the traditional policy and it would require to be very carefully considered before being undertaken. With regard to the tenure of the land, as far as the greater part of the area of British Columbia is concerned it is in the position that my hon. friend has stated, but I am informed that this particular reserve happens to be subject to a treaty between the Crown and the Indians. I may be mistaken but I am given to understand that such is the case.

Mr. BARNARD. With the Hudson Bay Company?

Mr. OLIVER. With the Hudson Bay Company as representing the Crown.

Cleansing Indian orchards, $1,500.

Mr. SPROULE. Have they the San José scale there?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think it is the San José scale but it is a fungus pest.

Yukon Indian Schools, $15,000.

Mr. SPROULE. How many Indians in the Yukon?

Mr. OLIVER. About 3,000.

Mr. SPROULE. How many of school age?

Mr. OLIVER. It is impossible to tell the number of children of school age, but there are schools at Moosehide, Carcross and Selkirk.

Mr. SPROULE. This is a large expenditure for a few pupils.

Mr. OLIVER. We took a vote last year but we did not expend the money and this is a revote. We wish to erect a small boarding school at Carcross which is a Church of England mission, with a view of doing the best we can for the Indian

children. The bands are small and scattered over an immense area and a boarding school is practically the only way in which to give any of the Indians education.

Timber inspector and valuator, $1,200.

Mr. WRIGHT. Who is the timber inspector and where is he located?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. John Fraser, of Gore Bay, Manitoulin.

Travelling expenses and clerical services for inspectors, $2,700.

Mr. WRIGHT. I call the attention of the minister to some of the items included in these travelling expenses. For instance, there is a Mr. J. D. Ramsden, inspector, for whom we bought a travelling bag at $11.25, a coat for $6, and one pair of shoes for $10.50. For a gentleman named Stewart we bought a pair of boots at $10.50. Again, we find that there was purchased an air bed at $30, three pairs of boots $25, sundry clothing $20.30, kit bags $29.50, dunnage bags at $8.50, blankets and so on. I protested last year very strongly against the government buying clothing and boots and travelling bags for these officials. I think they are pretty well paid. We let them travel just as comfortably as possible in Pullman cars; we furnish all the help that is necessary at high wages, and we pay all their expenses of every kind. I protest against the department continuing the system of buying travelling bags and trunks for men who go out for a week or two. I don't think we should buy a $30 bed for any of these officials. I suppose these things become their personal property and that we never see them again. I would suggest that the minister should consider the matter and see if he cannot cut out some of these items.

Mr. OLIVER. These inspectors are employed in the treaty which lies to the north of the height of land in northern Ontario, towards Hudson bay. The trip they have to make is altogether out of the ordinary, and it requires an extraordinary outfit in the way of clothing and camp equipment. As these men only receive the same salaries as the men who do their work under ordinary conditions it has not been thought unfair to the country that they should get in addition the special camp appliance and special clothing they require for this extra service.

Mr. WRIGHT. I draw the attention of the minister to the fact that a large number of these Indian reserves are not above the height of land, but in Northern Ontario. I think we paid out for this one trip to the Indians, nearly $8,000 in expenses of one kind and another. It seems to me that the amount of money spent in this way is altogether too large and that it might be cut down very considerably if it is looked after.

Mr. SPROULE. Does Mr. Fraser report on the value of Indian land timber in the Georgian bay district when it is about to be sold?

Mr. OLIVER. His work is inspecting and valuing on the Manitoulin Islands and along the north shore of the Georgian bay.

Mr. SPROULE. Was it Mr. Fraser who valued the timber on Hope Island a couple of years ago when it was sold?

Mr. OLIVER. That was valued by Mr. Chitty.

Mr. WRIGHT. What reserves are being surrendered by the Indians on the north shore of the Georgian bay ?

Mr. OLIVER. All the bands on the north shore of the Georgian bay have surrendered large areas of their lands, and it is in carrying on the sales of timber and lands that these men are employed.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Is it the policy of the government to induce the Indians to surrender their lands in settled parts of the country, and move further back to the unsettled districts?

Mr. OLIVER. It is our policy, not so much to induce the Indians to move away, as to induce them to surrender lands which they are not using and which other people would use, securing for the Indians the difference in value.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Does not the experience of the minister show that the Indians do not follow agricultural pursuits to any advantage, and that it is better to move them from settled municipalities back to unsettled districts where there is hunting and fishing? For instance, we have a band of Chippewa Indians in North Ontario whose presence is complained of as retarding the progress of the municipality in which they are settled. Would it not be better to get them to exchange their lands for lands in the unsettled portions of the country? Does the government contribute anything towards the upkeep of the roads in that municipality?

Mr. OLIVER. It is our policy to secure the removal of the Indians, but it is also our policy to recognize the sacred right of the Indian to his land. He has an absolute right to the ownership and occupation of his lands just as any other proprietor; and while we are quite willing to use what inducements we may to secure his removal, we do not recognize any responsibility to secure it and are not deserving of any blame should they not be removed. In regard to the contributions by the Indian Department, I think there is in the constituency represented by the hon. gentleman a reserve which is very peculiarly situated, in which the Indian land is intermixed in

some way with land of ordinary occupants; and representations were made to the government that this resulted in an unfairness to the settlers. Therefore a small contribution was made on behalf of the Indians towards the roads of the municipality. But that was an entirely extraordinary condition, which I do not think exists anywhere else.

Mr. WRIGHT. Has the department made any attempt to induce the Indians to take up their individual holdings and assume the responsibilities of citizenship? I think an effort should be made in that direction wherever the Indians manifest sufficient progress. In the riding which I represent, we have a small band of Indians, part of the Oka tribe, who came up there a few years ago and took up individual holdings. These Indians are becoming fair average farmers, some of them doing as well as the average white man and becoming very good citizens. We see very little difference between these Indians and their ordinary white neighbours. The Indians in my district do not participate in the government grant, and therefore exercise the franchise, and I believe they exercise it as well as other people. I believe that wherever there is a reasonable hope of inducing the Indians to take up their individual holdings and assume the responsibilities of citizenship, the government should make the attempt to induce them to do so.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Are these Indian lands liable for municipal rates or statute labour?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Will the hon. gentleman say whether it is the policy of the government to continue these grants in my constituency or not? Are they to be annual, or periodical, just on the eve of an election? I am afraid that the hon. gentleman allowed political considerations to influence him in making the grant, because it was made in September or the beginning of October last. About $2,000 was put into the hands of active political workers on the assumption that it was payment from the Indian Department to this municipalty; and these political workers spent the money for the advantage of their own political friends, for upbuilding roads and bridges in the municipality. I am not objecting to the grant at all. I am calling the minister's attention to the extraordinary circumstances that it was made on the eve of an election, and I understood him to say that it was the only grant ever made to a municipality by his department. I ask the hon. gentleman to say whether it is the policy of the department to continue such payments, and whether we may expect the bounty of the government to be bestowed on this municipality in the future.

Mr. OLIVER. I am afraid that we can hardly promise it annually, or even periodically; my hon. friend had better say semi-occasionally. There have been grants made on two occasions; and though my hon. friend connects the election with the payment, I think the fact is that when the need for roads or bridges has become pressing, then the money has been contributed. If there was any election work in the handling of that money, it was not on the part of the Indian Department, either directly or indirectly, but by the officers of the municipality, to whom the money was paid, and who had its entire expenditure.

Mr. CROSBY. As the item for travelling expenses and clerical services for Messrs. Boyd and Fraser amounts to $2,700, I would like to ask the hon. minister how often these gentlemen leave their homes, how long they are away from their homes, and who draws the money for the clerical expenses?

Mr. OLIVER. I can bring down a detailed report of the amounts paid to these men if my hon. friend wants it, but I suppose it will be sufficient for me to say that they are travelling the greater part of their time and that the greater part of this amount is for travelling expenses. The amount for clerical assistance is only a small part of the whole, and is for the making up of the reports which they have to forward to the department from time to time.

Mr. CROSBY. It does not seem to me it makes much difference what salary you give a man if you give him all his expenses and all the money for clerical expenses he makes on you, and if he makes more than double his salary in travelling and clerical expenses. I would like to know how long they are away on those journeys. Are they away long enough to wear out an $8 pair of boots every trip they make?

Mr. OLIVER. If the hon. member desires a detailed statement I can easily bring it to the House, but cannot possibly furnish it at this sitting. Speaking generally, these men are employed for the purpose of travelling, and are travelling practically the whole year. If they were not travelling, they would not be doing the work they were hired to do. Of course when men are travelling their expenses are paid besides their salary; and if they travel enough it is not to be wondered at if their expenses should be as much as or more than their salary.

Mr. CROSBY. If the minister will bring down a statement I will be satisfied.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE. As the hon. minister says that these agencies in my constituency are peculiarly situated, and practically acknowledges the liability on the part of the government to assist in keeping up the municipal roads and bridges, would it not be advisable to open up negotiations in order to induce the Indians to exchange their lands for lands further back? There is a great deal of complaint on their score. They retard progress and do not contribute towards the roads. Would it not be better for the government to get rid of the liability by having them change their lands and go further back?

Mr. OLIVER. That is quite in line with our policy, but we do not undertake to exercise compulsion. The most we can do is to exercise persuasion.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The hon. minister promised the other evening to bring down a statement of the Indian lands which had been placed under lease or sold or the cutting rights given on them since March last.

Mr. OLIVER. I have the statement here. The following sales of timber were made by the Indian Department since the last report published:

Dokis reserve, French river, 8 berths, namely:—

4 and 6	$265,000
1	178,000
3 and 5	126,500
8	102,000
7	131,000
2	69,000
	$871,500

Chiefs point, Georgian Bay, burned timber:

Prices tendered by Mr. N. D. Seaman, of Sauble Falls, Ont.:

Hemlock	$ 7	per M. ft.	B.M.
Pine	10	"	"
Elm	8	"	"
Birch	6	"	"
Ash	8	"	"
Tamarack	7	"	"
Cedar	7	"	"

These prices are over and above Crown dues at tariff rates.

Kettle and Stony Point reserves, Lake Huron, burned timber.

Prices tendered by Mr. T. W. Mitchell, Arkona, Ont.:

Hemlock, tamarack, soft elm, maple, beech, birch, black ash, $4 per M. ft. B.M.
Basswood, $6 per M. ft. B.M.
White ash, $10 per M. ft. B.M.
Cordwood, 15 cents per cord.
And Crown dues at tariff rates.

Giants Tomb island, Georgian bay.

Timber sold to Mr. C. Beck, Penetanguishene, for $3,750 and Crown dues at tariff rates.

Permits issued to Indians to cut and sell timber were authorized as follows:

Cape Croker Band.

Sold Kastner and Newman, Wiarton, Ont., at prices tendered, namely:

Maple	$10.25	per M. ft.	B.M.
Beech	7.00	"	"
Elm	12.25	"	"
Basswood	13.25	"	"
Hemlock	10.00	"	"
Cedar	11.00	"	"

Quantity estimated about 500,000 feet in all. Sold George Niebergall, Wiarton, the previous year about 1 million feet, B.M.

The Indians only furnished about half the quantity and they are to supply the difference this season; the prices tendered by Mr. Niebergall are as follow:

Maple	$10
Beech	6
Elm	11
Basswood	13
Hemlock	9
Cedar	11

Garden River Band.

Railway ties sold Harris Tie and Timber Company, Ottawa, at shipping point, cedar and tamarack ties 25 cents each; hemlock ties, 20 cents each; on right of way Canadian Pacific Railway, cedar and tamarack ties, 33 cents each; hemlock ties, 28 cents each.

Shesheguaning Band.

Sold to B. S. Graham, Silverwater, Ont.

Cedar ties, No. 1, 32 cents each; cedar ties, No. 2, 16 cents each; posts, 6 cents each.

West bay band.

Sold to R. L. Graham.

Ties, No. 1, 30 cents each; ties No. 2, 15 cents each; posts, 5½ cents each.

Sold to Rixon, Ainslie and Stoddarts:

Oak, $10 par M. ft.; basswood and elm, $8.
Manitoulin island, unceded part:
Ties sold to Wm. J. Pulling and Co., Windsor, at 34¼ cents each.

Watha reserve.

Sold to F. McGibbon and Sons, Penetanguishene, about 150,000 feet B.M., of burned hemlock, at $1.71 per M. ft. B.M., and Crown dues.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE. Would the minister be good enough to take into consideration the desirability of giving some annual sum in payment of our liability to the municipalities instead of making large grants, as he says, semi-occasionally. That would meet the necessities of the case and relieve the department of the suspicion of political partisanship and, as my hon. friend beside me suggests, of the worry of pull. Two thousand dollars in one municipality cannot be spent to advantage in one month, and we had some $1,500 spent in the four weeks just prior to the elections. If an annual sum were distributed to this municipality they could spend it to much greater advantage and that would be also in the interests of the department.

Payments to Indians surrendering their lands under provisions of section 70 of the

Indian Act, which will afterwards be repaid from the avails of the lands, $50,000.

Mr. LAKE. What are the arrangements for payments to the Indians out of the money obtained from land surrendered by them?

Mr. OLIVER. Roughly speaking an upset price is placed upon the lands. That is, the Indians agree to surrender the land for sale provided the land is not sold at a less figure than that agreed on, which of course varies in different reserves. On signing the surrender an arbitrary sum of so much per head is paid down to bind the bargain. Then a certain percentage of the total price received, varying from 20 per cent up to 50 per cent, is paid to the Indians as it is received. That is for every dollar that is paid in on the purchase price of the land 50 cents may be paid direct to the Indians. From that 50 cents of course, is deducted the first payment made to bind the bargain. The balance, 50 cents, is funded and the interest on that is paid to the Indians each year, generally speaking at the same time as the treaty payments, an equal amount per head.

Mr. LAKE. What interest is paid?

Mr. OLIVER. Three per cent, the government rate of interest. That is 3 per cent annually, on 50 per cent of the total price for which the reserve has been sold.

Mr. LAKE. I had a letter suggesting that interest is not being paid to the Indians on the Assiniboine reserve.

Mr. OLIVER. I fancy that in that case the annual payment has not yet accrued. The interest does not begin until the land is sold.

Mr. LAKE. I think the land was sold some time ago. There are moneys credited in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. OLIVER. My impression is that the first payment of interest upon the sales in that reserve is not yet due.

Mr. LAKE. Have all the lands which were surrendered been sold yet, and if not, what proportion still remain unsold?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say just how much, there have been two sales and some of the land is still unsold. I shall obtain the information and give it to the hon. member.

Relief to destitute Indians in remote districts, $10,000.

Mr. CROSBY. How much was spent last year, how long has this vote been running and is it increasing or decreasing?

Mr. OLIVER. Last year $9,900 was spent. This is for the relief of Indians outside the treaty limits in the far north, practically in the Mackenzie River country, in Keewatin and in the Yukon. A grant of this character has been made fer the last fifteen or twenty years and the tendency is for it to increase rather than decrease.

Mr. CROSBY. Could the minister say how much of this is spent in getting the money into the Indians' hands?

Mr. OLIVER. This is to pay for supplies actually given to the Indians. I presume the reason of the difference between the amount of ten years ago and the amount to-day, is that ten years ago when the season of scarcity came the Indian simply died, whereas now his life is preserved by the relief he gets.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. In that item is there included any relief money expended in Northern Ontario?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. I think that is one of the most humane items in the whole estimates, and every member of the House should be well satisfied to let that item go through, and even to increase it. I had occasion a few days after the election to wire the department about an Indian woman and some children who were starving in northern Ontario, and I want to thank the minister publicly, and the department, for the prompt manner in which they wired back to have relief extended to these starving people. I was struck with the generosity and promptness of the department at the time, and I have much pleasure now in endorsing this item and would be glad indeed to see it increased.

Mr. OLIVER. The Indian items now being passed, I wish to say that on Friday last a number of questions were asked me and I promised to bring down the answers. Some of the gentlemen who asked the questions are not here, but I have the answers ready. First, I have an answer to the question of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche). The item for a bull shown in the Auditor's Report as being purchased for the Birtle agency from 'R. Logan, agent' has not been detailed properly. It was, together with others, purchased at the Brandon sale of bulls out of funds advanced for the purpose, and Mr. Logan, who is the agent at Portage la Prairie, accounted for the money advanced. Nine bulls were bought at this sale; three for the Birtle agency (one charged to cattle vote and two to bull fund) from the Cattle Breeders' Association, whose receipt is held by the Auditor General, at a cost of $261.20, delivered at Birtle, including transportation and other charges, and six for Portage la Prairie agency for $619.40, including transportation.

Then the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) asked a question about the payment of $16 to Dr. F. A. Rand, medical

officer for the Indians of Cumberland county, N.S. This was due to an outbreak of small-pox amongst the Indians. The payment was for special services rendered by the doctor in vaccinating the Indians at the different places where they are located in the county, viz.:

1907, Jan. 7. To visit to Halfway River 10 miles to vaccinate Indians.....	$5 00
1907. Jan. 7. To vaccinate fourteen Indians at 25 cents each..	3 50
1907, Jan. 11. To visit to Springhill Junction to vaccinate Indians (25 miles) and vaccinating four at 25c..	3 50
1907, Jan. 30. To visit to Southampton to vaccinate Indians (20 miles) and vaccinating nine at 25c.	4 00
	$16 00

Mr. RHODES. That reply simply means that it is not the duty of the officer to attend small-pox cases.

Mr. OLIVER. Where they are not on the reserve. I understand these Indians were scattered about. There is, of course, a difference between small-pox and an ordinary disease. This is a special allowance for vaccination, but it is not the treatment of disease.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Is the medical officer paid on a yearly salary?

Mr. OLIVER. Some are and some are not.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. In connection with the Chippewa Indians of Rama township in my constituency, there is an item of $250 to Dr. McLean, 12 months; another item, hospital attendance, Dr. McLean, $61, in I—84.

Mr. OLIVER. Dr. McLean gets $300 a year, $250 from the appropriation and $50 from the funds of the band. The special claim mentioned there is, I think, a bill for attendance on some Indian who was not a member of the band.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Then there is another item: Medical attendance, Dr. A. P. Ardagh, $25; Dr. W. A. Henderson, $47.

Mr. OLIVER. I assume those are for medical attendance on Indians who are not members of the band, but who have come into the district and require medical attendance. Then I have another answer to a question of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche). In regard to the payment of $200.50 to H. B. Rush, over and above the contract price for the erection of buildings at Kinistino reserve, the facts are that the department called for tenders in July, 1906, and Mr. Rush's tender was the lowest received. The contract, however, was not awarded at that time as a question had arisen as to whether it would not be advisable to erect the buildings at Nut Lake reserve instead of Kinistino, and this question was not decided until too late to build that year. The following spring, on March 15, 1907, Mr. Rush was notified to proceed with the work and almost at once, on May 4, he drew the attention of the inspector to the fact that prices had increased and that he would like to be allowed the difference. Upon completion of the work, he put in a claim of $200.50 to cover the difference between the advance in the cost of materials between the date of his tender in 1906 and when he was notified to proceed with the work. The matter was referred to Mr. Inspector Chisholm for his report (copy of which is attached hereto) and payment was made upon his recommendation, as it was considered the contractor had a just claim, according to the facts and figures submitted.

The Auditor General made some inquiries in regard to this payment and the facts were placed before him. The tenders were as follows: A. N. Claggett, $3,780; W. Wortley, $3,575; H. B. Rush, $2,600.

Then, a question was asked with regard to the notice given to the lessees of a timber limit that their license would be terminated.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. That is the question of the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Smyth).

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. The Indians of the Spanish river reserve petitioned the department in November, 1907, to terminate the license as the licensees had held it over twenty-one years, that they were only cutting small quantities annually, that it is contrary to agreement to hold the limit indefinitely and allow timber to become merchantable which was not merchantable when the license issued, but has since grown to be merchantable, that no bonus was paid for such and it never was surrendered for sale, that the licensees do not employ Indians and only work the limit with one contractor, and they have had ample time to remove the timber. The matter was referred to the Department of Justice, which replied that the surrender of the timber by the Indians only included timber that was merchantable at the time and not what became merchantable since; that the license is confined to timber then licensed and the licensees may be required to remove what remains of the timber covered by the license within a reasonable time at the end of which the license will be determined. The licensees were advised accordingly, on November 24, 1908, and notified that as ample time had been given for the removal of the timber actually covered by their license, the department is obliged to terminate it on April 30 next.

Mr. SPROULE. Have the Indians of Manitoulin island the right to lease land for the purpose of boring for oil?

Mr. OLIVER. They are the absolute owners of the reserve and of the minerals and natural resources as well. Therefore, I think there can be no question that they have the right to lease. Of course, the Indian Department, as their guardians, negotiates the lease so that any lease that is made is subject to the consideration and approval of the department. The Indian Department is responsible for the lease being in due form and provident.

Government of Northwest Territories—Salary of Geo. D. Pope, as accountant to the Commissioner, $300.

Mr. SPROULE. Are these all the salaries that these people get or have they salaries from another source?

Mr. OLIVER. This is for a very small service.

Mr. SPROULE. Are they under the Civil Service Act?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. The Civil Service Act provides that where a civil servant receives a salary from one source he is not entitled to receive anything from any other source unless subject to the provision 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary.' You are paying a salary from two sources, contrary to the Civil Service Act.

Mr. OLIVER. I understand that under the Civil Service Act all that is necessary is that the persons receiving these salaries shall be named in the estimates.

Miscellaneous—Maintenance, construction of roads, bridges and other necessary works in connection with the Hot Springs reservation, near Banff station, Alberta, $45,000.

Mr. SPROULE. You just continue the same amount from year to year?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Was the amount voted last year all spent?

Mr. OLIVER. It is not all spent yet, but it will be during the year.

Mr. HUGHES. Is it the intention to connect Banff and Field by a driveway? It would be a good idea to have that work carried out.

Mr. OLIVER. That is a very good idea, but it is quite expensive. At present we are connecting the prairie with Banff by a road and we will no doubt continue it to make the connection my friend speaks of.

Banff water works and sewerage, $10,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that to complete?

Mr. OLIVER. We will spend $10,000 the current year and this is a revote of $10,000 to complete the works.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the government any plans regarding proposals to develop these springs for curative purposes?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. HUGHES. We know that the Spas in the Old Country are visited by hundreds of thousands of people and if we develop these resorts in the mountains, while it would primarily benefit the railway companies, it would indirectly benefit the country to a certain extent. Perhaps it is not one of the functions of the government to undertake this, but I am surprised the railway companies have not done more.

Mr. OLIVER. The number of visitors to Banff and other resorts has greatly increased in recent years, and I think we have reason to congratulate ourselves on the progress made, considering the distance these resorts are from the centres of population. No doubt the flow of travel will increase as the time goes on.

Costs of litigation, $11,000.

Mr. ROCHE. How much was expended last year for this purpose?

Mr. OLIVER. About $9,000 will be spent during the current year.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Does the government employ local solicitors?

Mr. OLIVER. The Justice Department engages the solicitors, and we pay the law costs.

Mr. S. SHARPE. You pay solicitors fees out of this vote?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. S. SHARPE. What are the functions of the Solicitor General? why does he not take charge of the litigation for this department?

Mr. OLIVER. Although the Solicitor General is very competent and versatile he is not able to cover all the ground.

Mr. HUGHES. Is he a lawyer?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. PATERSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. If we reach government orders to-morrow, what business will be taken up?

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot say exactly, but possibly the items in the Department of Railways and Canals.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, February 17, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked:

1. What was the number of (a) permanent employees, and (b) temporary employees respectively in the service or employment of the government upon or in connection with (a) the Intercolonial Railway, and (b) the Prince Edward Island Railway upon (a) the first day of each month, (b) the 15th day of each month, and (c) the 31st day of December, all in the year 1908?

2. What was the total amount of the pay roll of each of the said railways for each of the said months?

3. Were salaries or wages raised or lowered for either permanent or temporary employees during the said year upon the said railways or either of them?

4. If so, on what occasions and to what extent on each occasion?

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

The only change in salaries, besides those that are provided for in the different schedules and which are made from month to month as the employees become entitled to them by length of service, was an increases granted in May, 1908, to the telegraphers, and which was made to date from April 1; this for nine months from April to December, inclusive, aggregated $22,500.

NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES.

1908.	Intercolonial Railway.		Prince Edward Island Railway.	
	Permanent.	Temporary.	Permanent.	Temporary.
January	7,467	858	457	61
February	7,610	995	459	68
March	7,540	767	459	60
April	7,577	766	458	91
May	7,609	1,685	459	106
June	7,516	2,156	460	148
July	7,609	1,953	459	144
August	7,545	1,793	461	156
September	7,442	1,962	461	242
October	7,468	2,922	459	247
November	7,459	1,881	461	292
December	7,192	1,286	461	204

Total Amount of Pay Roll.

1908.	I. C. Ry.	P.E.I. Ry.
January	$457,836 98	$22,853 70
February	450,541 40	22,105 93
March	459,823 15	22,788 71
April	437,585 80	22,529 26
May	467,595 90	24,455 04
June	487,424 45	24,941 33
July	502,348 27	26,423 09
August	487,461 35	26,755 84
September	499,368 90	27,132 79
October	538,490 44	29,030 15
November	480,726 93	27,620 64
December	464,971 96	26,034 33

THE MAYES DREDGING CONTRACT.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

1. Was Mayes' first tender for dredging at St. John 50 cents a cubic yard, and was it refused because he could not comply with the condition as to Canadian dredges, or why?

2. Was the condition removed at the instance of Mayes, or parties acting for him?

3. Was the contract without this condition, awarded to Mayes at 55 cents a cubic yard?

4. Were tenders called for again, by advertisement, between the time of Mayes' first and second tender?

5. Having regard to statements made and documents read by Mr. Hazen at a public meeting at St. John during the last general election, the discussion of the Mayes-McAvity incident by the press during and since the month of October last, as well as the alleged connection of the Minister of Public Works with that transaction, and the allegations recently made upon the floor of this House, all to the effect that the condition above mentioned being removed, Mayes was about to repeat his tender at 50 cents a cubic yard, but was induced by George McAvity, not to do so, but, instead, to tender at 55 cents a cubic yard, the extra five cents per yard to go to McAvity as a rake-off or reward to him for exerting his influence with the government to increase the number of yards to be dredged and to secure the contract for Mayes, and the allegation that McAvity actually received the extra five cents a yard, amounting to the sum of $35,933, and having regard to the exceptional importance and gravity of the matters charged, will the government take measures to have this matter of the Mayes tenders and contract and the alleged transactions and dealings in connection therewith, fully inquired into and ascertained? If so, when and how?

6. Is the government of opinion that they can and should recover this $35,933, if the facts are substantially as alleged?

7. Has the government consulted the legal department as to his right to recover this money, and will they do so? If not, why not?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention, as well as the attention of my hon. friend, to this allegation in the 5th part of the question: 'as well as the alleged connection of the Minister of Public Works with that transaction.' I am not aware that there has been any allegation, that has been persisted in, in any quarter, in regard to any 'alleged connection of the

Minister of Public Works' with the Mayes-McAvity transaction. I would say that the question was improper on that ground. I may say that I would not object to the question, though it is irregular, if under your honour's interpretation of the rules of the House I would be permitted to answer it fully.

Mr. SPEAKER. Would you prefer the question to stand until it can be looked into, to see whether it is properly put?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Just as your honour decides.

Mr. LENNOX. It has stood now for a long time, and I am prepared to take the Speaker's decision on the matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. So am I.

Mr. SPEAKER. Then, let these words be struck out: 'as well as the alleged connection of the Minister of Public Works with that transaction.'

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. (a) No, it was $8.90 per cubic yard for material described in the specification as class 1 and 49 cents per cubic yard for material of class II, being all other material than was embraced in class I.

(b) Yes.

2. The information in the department is that the condition was not removed at the instance of Mayes, or parties acting for him, but that it was removed because the next tender, that of M. J. Haney and Roger Miller of Toronto, who were prepared to comply with the condition, named a price of $3.50 per cubic yard for material described as class I and $1.25 per cubic yard for material described as class II, and as most of the material to be excavated was of class II, it was considered that the tender of Messrs. Haney and Miller was too high, and more than the department would be justified in paying for the work. It was made evident by the first call for tenders that there were very few Canadian registered dredges available to do the work, and it was considered most probable that by striking out the restriction and calling again for tenders more competition would be secured.

3. At $8.60 per cubic yard for material of class I, being 30 cents per cubic yard less than his previous tender, and 55 cents per cubic yard for material of class II, being six cents per cubic yard more than his previous tender, it was so awarded to him as being the lowest tenderer, the other tenderer being again Haney & Miller of Toronto, whose tender was $3.25 per cubic yard for material of class I and $1.00 per cubic yard for material of class II.

4. Yes.

5. The government, through the Department of Public Works, has already fully inquired into the awarding of said contract, with the result that it appears to have been awarded to the lowest tenderer in the usual and proper manner, after public advertisement calling for tenders, Mr. Mayes' tender, being $8.60 per cubic yard for material for class I as against $3.25 per cubic yard by Haney & Miller, and 55 cents per cubic yard for material of class II, consisting of silt, sand, &c., as against $1.00 per cubic yard by Haney & Miller.

It does not appear to the government that there would be any public advantage in making further inquiry into the matter, and the government has no present intention of making further inquiry.

6. No.

7. For the reason that if there was no collusion between the then Minister of Public Works, or other officials of the department, and Mayes and McAvity in connection with the tenders, which has not been alleged, and the contract was awarded in good faith to Mayes, as being the lowest tenderer, any person of ordinary business knowledge and without having a legal training, would know no right of action would exist to recover back any portion of the amount paid under the contract so awarded.

MR. THOMAS COSTELLO.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked:

1. Was a man named Costello, or any other individual, sent to Bradford, England, or any other place, at the instance of the Department of Customs, or any department of the government, with a view to ascertaining and reporting on the condition of the English woollen industry, and the cost of manufacture, as having a bearing upon the question of higher Canadian import duties or other changes in the tariff?

2. If so, has the report been received, and what is the nature thereof? If not, when may it be expected?

3. Has the government any information regarding the presence in England on behalf of the United States government of United States Government Agent W. Graham Clark, who was also gathering information looking to tariff changes on woollens imported into the United States?

4. If so, what is the nature of his report, and how does it compare with that of Mr. Costello?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. Mr. Thomas Costello, a Special Officer of Customs, was sent by the Department of Customs to England, in 1908, for the purpose of gathering general information respecting the woollen industry in that country and with the view of aiding in the appraisement of woollen goods at their fair market value for duty purposes, under the Customs laws, when imported into Canada.

2. Yes. The report deals with the cost of the production of woollen goods in Great Britain.

3. The Government has no information respecting a report by W. Graham Clark on the woollen industry in England.

AMERICAN PORK, &c., ENTERED AT KINGSTON.

Mr. EDWARDS asked:

1. What quantities of pork, bacon, lard and other animal products were entered at the port of Kingston, Ontario, from the United States for home consumption during the fiscal year ending March 1, 1908?

2. What were the respective values thereof, and what amount of duty was paid upon the same according to different classification?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1 and 2—

	Quantity.	Value.	Duty.
Lard, lbs.	28,147	2,224	562.94
Lard compound, lbs.	90	12	1.80
Canned meats	1,000	116	31.90
Extracts of meats		$423	$116.34
Preserved meats, N. O.P., lbs.	100	16	2.00
Total		2,791	714.98

AMERICAN HAY, &c., ENTERED AT KINGSTON.

Mr. EDWARDS asked:

1. What quantities of hay, oats and other farm and garden produce were entered at the port of Kingston, Ontario, from the United States, for home consumption during the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1908?

2. What were the respective values thereof, and what amount of duty was paid upon the same according to different classification?

3. How many horses under three-years old, horses over three-years old, cattle under three-years old, milch cows, sheep, lambs and pigs were brought into Canada by way of Kingston, Ontario, from the United States during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1908?

4. What were the respective values thereof and the amount of duty paid upon the same, according to different classification?

Hon. Wm. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1 and 2—

	Quantity.	Value.	Duty.
Oats, bush.	53	$ 41	$ 5.30
Pease, bush.	1	7	0.15
Melons, No.	1,270	104	38.10
Potatoes, bush.	29	28	5.80
Sweet potatoes, bush	60	50	6.00
Tomatoes, fresh, bush	7	15	4.50
Vegetables, n.o.p.	..	363	108.90
Total		$608	$168.75

3 and 4. Information is not available from Customs Returns as to value and duties on horses and cattle, separately by classes under and over 3 years old.

DRAINAGE OF NATION RIVER.

Mr. BRODER asked:

1. Is it the intention of the government to assist the people interested in the drainage of the Nation river, in the townships of Matilda and Winchester, in the county of Dundas? If so, when?

2. Did the engineer who visited the locality traversed by such river during the summer of 1908 report in favour of such work being undertaken by the government?

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

1 and 2. Although this would seem to be a class of work coming within the province of the local government, on representations made to the Public Works Department an engineer visited the locality, and, as a result of his examination into existing conditions, reported that until a proper and comprehensive scheme was devised, which would require further careful consideration, there would be no object in proceeding further with the work which would undoubtedly entail a very large expenditure.

PUBLIC WORKS EXPENDITURES.

Mr. ARTHURS asked:

1. What amount has been expended to date upon each of the following public works for which the following appropriations were voted last session:

Byng Inlet—Improvement	$10,000
Callendar—Extension of wharf	1,000
Kearney—Wharf	1,000
Magnetawan—Wharf	1,200
Parry Sound—Extension of wharf.	5,000

2. Have contracts been let for any of the above works? If so, which and when?

3. Have any of the above works been commenced by day labour? If so, when?

4. Does the government intend to proceed with these works this year?

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

1. Byng Inlet $ 26.82 for printing
   Callendar 1,118.23
   Kearney 482.27
   Magnetawan wharf 571.57 for purchase of wharf
   Parry Sound 4,001.54

2. No.

3. Callendar commenced September 1, 1908 (completed).

Kearney commenced October 5, 1908 (completed).

4. Parry Sound commenced October 14, 1908 (completed).

Byng Inlet and Magnetawan. No further vote has been included in main estimates 1909-10 for either of these works.

QUEBRACHO EXTRACT.

Mr. ARTHURS asked:

1. What quantity of Quebracho extract has been imported into Canada for home consumption in each year from 1900 to 1908, inclusive?

2. Is the government aware that this extract is used as a substitute for hemlock bark?

3. Has the government been requested by petition or otherwise to place a duty upon Quebracho extract?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. Quebracho extract is not separately enumerated in the Customs classification of imports, so that the answer to this question cannot be given without a special investigation, which would take a long time to complete.

2. The government is aware that Quebracho extract is used for tanning purposes.

3. The Department of Customs is not aware of any application made to place a duty on this extract since the present tariff came into force.

BILLS OF LADING—RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. ROBB asked:

1. What jurisdiction has the Railway Commission or the government of Canada over the Bills of lading or forms of Bill of lading issued by the vessels plying on Canadian waters?

2. Is the government aware that in the unanimous resolution adopted by the Dominion Marine Association which provides that a new Bill of lading for vessels carrying grain out of any Canadian port, there is the following clause: 'provided that the vessel shall not be responsible for shortage exceeding one-half bushel for one thousand bushels carried?

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

1. It is a legal question, on which it would not be advisable to express an opinion.

2. The department has not been so informed.

LAND WARRANT AND WARRANTS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked:

1. Is it possible for one man to enter for the land upon more than one land warrant, under the South African veterans' land grant? If so, how many may one man make an entry for?

2. Has a man having bought several such land warrants the privilege of entering all or any (a) in his own name, or (b) in the name or the names of others?

3. In case one enters for land on a South African land warrant, can the right be disposed of to another during the three years required for settlement duties? If so, under what conditions?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Yes. A settler may acquire and locate two South African land grants, but can only hold them by performing the duties upon each of the two half-sections strictly in accordance with the homestead conditions of the Dominion Lands Act.

2. The purchaser of a warrant cannot locate it unless he is the duly appointed substitute of the original warrantee. (a) He cannot otherwise locate it than in his own name. (b) He cannot locate it in the name of others.

3. A substitute may be appointed either before or after entry is made by the grantee, and if the settlement duties have been partially performed by the grantee they may be completed by the substitute.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How many can the purchaser of a warrant locate?

Mr. OLIVER. He can locate as many as he holds assignments for, but he can only prove up on his location on a maximum of two at a time.

Mr. HUGHES. I think the minister hardly answered the second part of part 1 which says:

If so, how many may one man make an entry for?

I wish to know if it is possible for a speculator or a gentleman interested in the purchase of these land warrants to enter for half a dozen or 100 of them in his own name?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. There is nothing to prevent any person who chooses from buying as many of these warrants as he pleases and taking assignments of them to himself, which assignments would be registered in the department and the warrants themselves could be located by him. But as the right expires in 1911, that is within three years, and as he would require the full term of three years to prove up on a maximum of two, and as they are not transferable a second time, he would lose all the money he invested in the remainder of the warrants he had purchased.

HOMESTEADS AND PRE-EMPTIONS IN MANITOBA, ALBERTA AND SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. HUGHES asked:

1. How many acres have already been taken up in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, respectively, by homestead and pre-emption, by railway lands, by Hudson bay lands; by other corporations or persons; by waste, swamp or mountainous land unfit for tilling; by lake areas, including Winnipeg, Winnipegosis, Manitoba, Big Quill, Brick and Beaver?

2. What is the area in square miles of each province above named?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). It would take about a week to prepare this information, and I would ask the hon. gentleman to let this stand as a motion for a return.

Mr. HUGHES. Why not adopt it as a motion for a return?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). It will stand as a notice of motion.

Mr. HUGHES. We passed a dozen such the other day, which were put as questions and allowed to be adopted as motions for returns.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Those had reference to the Civil Service Bill which is in the public interest, but it is not convenient to extend that precedent to other questions.

Mr. HUGHES. Some of them had no reference to the Civil Service Bill, and I object to any invidious distinction. I must insist on the precedent being applied to this question or I shall object to its application to any other. The word 'brick' in the question should be birch.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am informed that the procedure was irregular before, and it can only be taken by the consent of the House. This will stand as a notice of motion.

DREDGING ST. JOHN HARBOUR, N.B.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. R. L. Borden—asked :

How much money has been paid by the government for dredging the harbour of St. John, New Brunswick, for each year since January 1, 1904, the persons or companies to whom payments have been made, the amount to each, and the sums, if any, yet due and to whom due, for any work done up to that date?

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

Payments.

1905, paid G. S. Mayes		$ 98,600 00
1906, paid G. S. Mayes		111,160 00
1907, paid G. S. Mayes	$195,201.30	
1907, paid city of St. John	25,000.00	
1907, paid Dominion Dredging Co.	338,521.53	
		558,722 83
1908, paid G. S. Mayes	$84,782.33	
1908, paid Dominion Dredging Co.	35,637.67	
		120,420 00
1909, paid Maritime Dredging and Construction Co.		919 50
Total amount paid		$889,822 33

Balances still due.

To G. S. Mayes (contra claim under action)	$ 5,091 80
To Maritime Dredging and Construction Co.	14,285 66
Total amount due	$19,387 46

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—AMOUNT PAID FOR CONSTRUCTION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked:

1. What was the total amount expended by the government in connection with the construction of the National Transcontinental Railway during the twelve months ending 31st of January, 1909?

2. What was the amount so expended in each of the twelve months during the said period?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (for Minister of Finance):

1 and 2.

February, 1908	$ 1,562,921 19
March, 1908 (including payments made in April and May for fiscal year 1907-8)	4,144,015 46
April, 1908	15,513 62
May, 1908	1,338,177 29
June, 1908	1,823,511 06
July, 1908	2,272,287 76
August, 1908	2,993,204 62
September, 1908	2,317,944 70
October, 1908	2,712,637 68
November, 1908	2,364,645 31
December, 1908	3,055,237 18
January, 1909	1,501,452 02
Total	$26,101,547 89

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked:

What is the total amount which has been expended by the government up to the present date in the construction of the National Transcontinental Railway?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (for Minister of Finance). $48,265,129.77 up to and including the 15th day of February, 1909.

ESCAPE OF BILL MINER.

Mr. MEIGHEN asked:

1. On whose authority were the outside detectives admitted to the cell of or in private conversation with Bill Miner in New Westminster penitentiary prior to his escape on August 8, 1907?

2. How was such authority conveyed in each case to the warden?

3. What were the dates of such visits, and who accompanied the detectives into Miner's cell on each visit, if any one did?

4. Were two or more detectives ever permitted to talk to the prisoner at the same time?

5. Were the objects of the detectives' visits made known to the department prior to said visits? If so, what objects were so made known?

6. When did the department first become aware that the purpose of the visits of the detective or detectives was to locate or secure information as to certain bonds and other property believed to be within the knowledge of Miner?

7. Did the department get its information as to the said bonds from the detectives or from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, directly or indirectly? If not, from whom?

8. Was the detective or detectives wholly or partially in the pay of the government in this matter? If so, what were they paid?

9. What was the amount of said bonds, if known? If not known, what is the best information the department has as to the amount of same?

10. Since the escape of Miner has the department taken any steps to ascertain whether such

bonds have been located, or the disposition of same? If not, does the department purpose doing so?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

1, 2, 3 and 4. The only interviews which, so far as the department is aware, took place with convict Bill Miner while he was in imprisonment in the penitentiary at New Westminster are the following: 1. 12th June, 1906, in the warden's office and in his presence and hearing with Alex. D. McIntyre, of Kamloops, barrister, who had acted as Miner's counsel or solicitor at his trial. 2. 12th January, 1907, in the guard-room, in the presence and hearing of the deputy warden, with John H. Stanton, of Portland, Oregon, said to be a detective. 3. 9th February, 1907, in the warden's presence and hearing, with R. E. Bullick, of Vancouver, said to be in special service of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and one Jake Terry. 4. 28th May, 1907, in the guard-room, in the presence and hearing of Keeper Stewart, with G. R. Murray, of Victoria, B.C., a provincial police officer. 5. 27th June, 1907, in the brick yard, in the presence and hearing of Keeper Stewart, with Chief Constable McIntosh of the New Westminster city police force, Detective Waddell, of Vancouver, and Sergeant Wilson, of the R.N.W. Mounted Police, the officer by whom Miner was apprehended.

Penitentiary regulations authorize wardens to permit members of the family of a convict to visit him at stated intervals; all others are required to obtain permission from the Minister of Justice before they can visit any convict. In admitting Mr. McIntyre and Messrs. Bullick and Terry the warden acted on his own responsibility. In admitting the others above named the deputy warden (who was at the time in charge) acted on his own responsibility. Permission was not obtained or asked in any of the cases from the minister or the department. No visitor was at any time admitted to convict Miner's cell.

5. Neither the minister nor any one connected with the department in Ottawa ever heard of any of the said interviews till after Miner's escape, and no authority to permit any of the said interviews was ever given to anybody by the minister or by any official of the department at Ottawa.

6 and 7. During the investigation conducted by Inspector Dawson after Miner's escape and on 13th September, 1907, Instructor MacKenzie stated in his evidence that after the interview with Bullick and Terry, Miner had told him that Bullick said Miner would be pardoned if he would surrender to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company certain Australian bonds which the company believed he (Miner) had taken from their express car on the occasion of the robbery at Mission. MacKenzie further deposed that he had reported Miner's statement to the warden, who said he knew about it. No record of the interview of Messrs. Bullick and Terry with Miner is entered in the convicts' visitors book; the other four interviews mentioned above are duly entered. In view of the evidence given by Instructor MacKenzie and the absence of any mention of this interview in the visitors' book, Mr. Inspector Dawson wrote to Mr. Bullick asking a statement of all interviews had by him with Miner (alias Edwards) in the penitentiary, and received a reply dated 5th November, 1907, in which Mr. Bullick says:

> I might say the only time I visited Edwards in the penitentiary was on the 9th of February last (1907) in company with Jake Terry. The late warden, Colonel Whyte, was present all the time. The visit was merely to see if Terry and Edwards knew each other, as they were both in the San Quentin penitentiary together. There was a short conversation between Terry and Edwards in reference to the Mission hold-up September, 1904.

The department has no information except that above stated as to the bonds referred to, or whether any such bonds were stolen or ever existed, and if Mr. Bullick ever made to Miner any such statement as Miner said he made, neither Mr. Bullick nor anybody else had any warrant or right whatever to do so.

8. No.

9. The department has no knowledge or information whatever except that Miner told Instructor MacKenzie that Bullick spoke of them as valued at £50,000 sterling.

10. No.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—CONSTRUCTION MILEAGE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked:

1. How many miles of the western division of the National Transcontinental Railway are completed and in operation?

2. What amount has been paid to or received by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company out of the proceeds of bonds guaranteed by the government in respect of such mileage so completed and now in operation?

3. What amount has been paid to or received by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company out of the proceeds of bonds guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company in respect of such mileage so completed and in operation?

4. What was the average cost per mile of the mileage so completed and in operation?

5. What was the net price received for the bonds mentioned in the second and third paragraphs respectively of this question?

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

1. 667 miles. The other portions of this question relate to the Finance Department.

Mr. SPEAKER. The portion of the question not answered stands.

COAL AND TIMBER LANDS IN SASKATCHEWAN AND ALBERTA.

Mr. LAKE asked:

1. What is the approximate area of coal and timber lands, respectively, in each of the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta; (a) owned by private individuals or companies; (b) leased by the government to private individuals or companies; and what is the approximate area in each province on which mining or lumbering operations are actually being carried on?

2. What was the approximate amount of revenue collected by the government between January 1, 1906, and December 31, 1908, on account of (a) payments for coal lands; (b) coal royalties; (c) bonuses and rentals on timber lands; (d) timber dues; (e) hay lands; (f) grazing lands; and (g) irrigation areas within each of the above provinces?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I am informed it will take about ten days to prepare the matter required for this answer, and I would kindly ask the hon. gentleman to let the question stand as notice of motion for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as notice of motion for a return.

CAPTAIN OF DREDGE 'RICHELIEU.'

Mr. MONK asked:

1. Was the captain of the dredge 'Richelieu' removed last autumn? If so, upon what grounds?

2. By whom has said captain been replaced, and upon whose recommendation?

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

1. All men (including the captain) were paid off when the dredge was laid up for the winter, excepting the caretaker, C. Bissonnette.

2. No appointments will be made until next spring.

CONSTRUCTION OF HOPPER SCOWS.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. What is the purpose of the construction of the two centre Hopper dumping scows at St. Johns, province of Quebec, for which tenders have been called by the Department of Public Works, on the 8th February, instant?

2. At what particular place are the said scows to be constructed?

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

1. To replace worn out scows as tenders for dredge 'Richelieu.'

2. As the contract has not yet been awarded, it is impossible to say where the scows are to be constructed.

RICHELIEU IMPROVEMENT OFFICE.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. Has an office been opened at St. Johns, province of Quebec, in connection with what is known as Richelieu river improvements?

2. What do these improvements consist of?

3. Under whose supervision locally are said improvements being carried out?

4. What are the names and salaries of officers employed in and about said office of improvements, and what is the rental of the office?

5. How much has been expended to date on said improvements?

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

1. Yes.

2. Dredging, blasting and construction of a movable dam.

3. Paul Paradis, engineer-in-charge.

4. Paul Paradis, engineer-in-charge, $1,900 per year; Albert Gosselin, assistant engineer, $3 per day; Edmond Papineau, rodman, $2.50 per day; rent of office, $20 per month.

5. $18,918.97.

INTERNATIONAL TUBERCULOSIS CONGRESS.

Mr. PERLEY asked:

1. Did the government send any delegates to the International Tuberculosis Congress, held in Washington, last fall?

2. If so, who were the delegates, and what was the total expense connected with the same?

Hon. CHAS. MURPHY (for Minister of Agriculture):

1. Yes.

2. F. Montizambert, I.S.O., M.D. Edin., F.R.S.C.E., D.C.L., director general of public health.
   J. G. Rutherford, H.A.R.C.V.S., veterinary director general and live stock commissioner.
   Rev. T. H. Boyd.
   Total expenses $744.95.

POSTMASTER AT BROPHY'S.

Mr. MADDIN asked:

1. Who is the postmaster at Brophy's post office, Antigonish county, Nova Scotia?

2. Has any change been made during the past eighteen months? If so, when did it take place, and what was the reason therefor?

3. Who is the postmaster at the said post office at the present time, and when was he appointed?

4. What are the circumstances in connection with any change which has been made in the postmastership?

5. To whom was the last payment of salary made?

6. Who was postmaster at said post office one year ago?

7. How long has he been acting as such, why was he dismissed, and when?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX. The present postmaster at Brophy's is Thomas Brophy, but some time ago the post office, having been placed under quarantine, the mails were delivered at the house of the

mail contractor, who has since been acting as postmaster.

RAILWAY CAPITALIZATION AND RATES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, as orders of the day will not be reached, might I ask the indulgence of the House to make one or two inquiries? I would first ask the Minister of Railways whether or not there has been any ruling of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada which would indicate that the amount of stock capitalization of any company, whether excessive or otherwise, is taken into consideration in the regulation or fixing of rates, instead of the actual cost of the road?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). My hon. friend had given me notice of this question and I have the following memorandum from the Board of Railway Commissioners:

I know of no case in which the board, in fixing the tolls, has had regard to the capitalization or stock issue of the company rather than to the cost of construction, &c. You will remember that in Klondike Mines Railway Company's application for approval of its proposed standard freight tariff, after a hearing and upon the report and recommendation of the chief traffic officer, the board approved the tariffs of this company up to the distance of thirty miles from Dawson, and directed that the company should be notified that before applying for approval of further standard tariffs, it should furnish the board with returns showing the cost of construction and equipment of the company up to that time, and its running and operating expenses, to enable the board to determine the rates that should be allowed for further distances.

FISHING BOUNTY APPLICATIONS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would ask whether there is any information in reply to the question asked by the hon. member for Halifax as to the delay in sending out papers necessary to make application for fishing bounties. As I understand, those which should have been sent out and filled in between April and August last year have not been sent out and the fishermen have therefore not been able to prepare their applications.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say I have no information to give to my hon. friend. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) has been engaged in an important conference with gentlemen from different provinces, but I shall call his attention to that matter.

PUBLICATION OF WATERWAYS TREATY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would ask the Prime Minister whether or not his attention has been called to the publication of what purports to be a copy of the recent Waterways Treaty between His Majesty and the United States of America in the 'Evening Telegram' of Toronto; my attention has been directed to it in that newspaper. I do not know whether it has been published in any other. I do not know whether the terms of the treaty are correctly set forth, but if they are correctly set forth I would ask the Prime Minister whether or not there is any special reason why the treaty should not be laid upon the table of the House. It seems rather unnecessary to keep up the pretense of secrecy when this treaty, through some means, I do not know what, is being published in the press of the country. If it is being correctly published then there seems no reason why it should not be laid before parliament. If it is not being correctly published, I invite the attention of the Prime Minister to what purports to be an accurate copy of the treaty in terms, and I think it ought to be stated that that is not a correct copy of the treaty if the alleged publication is not founded upon fact. There would seem to be no good reason why the parliament of this country should be kept officially ignorant of the terms of the treaty when it is being published in the press of the United States and Canada and in the press of Great Britain, because a very full summary of it appeared in the London 'Times' of January 28 last.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have seen from time to time in the newspapers of this country reports which pretended to be copies of the Waterways Treaty. Some were fairly accurate and some were not so accurate. I have not seen the publication in the Toronto 'Telegram' to which my hon. friend refers. If I understand him aright, the publication purports to be a verbatim copy of the treaty. It may or it may not be.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It purports to be a copy of the message of President Roosevelt to the Senate conveying to the Senate the terms of the treaty in absolutely accurate form.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know that it is not, but if it is I am quite sure that it has not reached the public by the permission of the United States authorities. It may have come to the newspapers in some surreptitious manner. I can only say to my hon. friend that I quite agree with him and that I see no reason why the treaty should not be made public immediately.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask the Prime Minister to suggest to the chairman of the Public Accounts Committee the im-

portance of calling meetings of that committee with a reasonable degree of frequency? We have now entered upon the fifth week of the session and up to the present time there has been no meeting of the Public Accounts Committee for the transaction of business. There was a meeting for organization at which some business was transacted. It is not usual that any business should be transacted at the first meeting. There have been no further meetings. I have asked that a meeting should be called for to-morrow. It may be that the delay in calling a meeting may be due to the absence of the chairman. I would suggest that the chairman of an important committee such as the Public Accounts Committee, whenever he finds it necessary to be absent from his duties in this House, should place matters in the hands of some other member of the committee so that there might not be the slightest delay in the transaction of the business of such an important committee as that. I am doing that in the interest of all of us, because there is a certain amount of business that must be transacted by that committee. The Prime Minister will realize that as well as I do. If that committee is delayed the prorogation of the House will be delayed in order that certain business may be brought to a conclusion. I think it is very important, in the interest of an early prorogation, that we should have more frequent meetings of that committee and a word from the Prime Minister would mean a great deal towards the accomplishment of that very desirable object.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Does my hon. friend want a meeting for to-morrow?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes; I think a meeting has been arranged for to-morow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Clarke, the chairman, is away just now. My hon. friend will agree that he is a very painstaking gentleman and appreciates the importance of the office which he occupies. I will call attention to the remarks of my hon. friend.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have no adverse comment to pass upon Mr. Clarke. Indeed, he may have taken the precaution to which I have alluded. But, I merely say this by way of precaution and I hope that no further delays will occur.

ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON moved:

For a return, subsequent to the bringing down of similar papers, of all correspondence, reports, memoranda, &c., between any officer, non-commissioned officer or man of the permanent force, Royal Northwest Mounted Police, Militia, Canadian Bisley Team, or Civilian Rifle Club, relating to the Ross rifle, its merits or demerits, or any accident that may have happened in connection with the same.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). I have no objection with the understanding that purely confidential papers shall not be brought down. I understand the hon. gentleman wishes papers similar to those which have been laid on the table in continuation of the return of last year. I have no objection to that.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all correspondence, reports and papers of every description treating of or in connection with the application of or grant to Francis Percival Aylwin, of the city of Ottawa, of a tract of land in the province of Alberta for irrigation purposes. — Mr. Magrath.

For a return showing what amounts the government has paid property owners in or around Stony lake for damages caused by the rising of water, and who they were. —Mr. Sexmith.

For a return showing what amounts the government has paid property owners for damages caused by the holding up of water in the Otonabee river between Hastings and Peterborough, and the names of the parties receiving settlements.—Mr. Sexsmith.

For a copy of all correspondence between J. H. Davis and the Department of Marine and Fisheries referring to the fisheries of Manitoba; and of all petitions and correspondence from the Fisherman's Union, Gimli, Manitoba, to and with the said department.—Mr. Bradbury.

For a return giving detailed items of the sum of $10,646.93, being revenue received from Kingston penitentiary other than from sale of twine, as shown on page L—36 of the Auditor General's Report, and stating what proportion of such revenue was derived from sales to officers of the penitentiary, with the names of such officers, and the amounts and nature of the goods purchased by them.—Mr. Barnard.

For a return showing particulars of the places where the expenditures mentioned in column 365, unrevised 'Hansard,' for wharfs in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and British Columbia, where made, together with amounts expended in each instance for construction and repairs, respectively.—Mr. Barnard.

For a return giving a list of railway charters granted since January 1, 1900, other than to the Grand Trunk, Grand Trunk Pacific, the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Pacific Railway Companies, showing those whose powers have lapsed, and the length of each of the proposed roads and branches, the date of charters and renewals, if any, the total mileage constructed, the capital stock authorized, subscribed and paid up.—Mr. Magrath.

For a copy of all correspondence or petitions received from F. W Colclaugh, while he was inspector of fisheries for Manitoba, referring to the operations of commercial companies and others.—Mr. Bradbury.

For a return showing the amount of money paid by the government, including all branches of the service, from January 1, 1897 to January 1, 1909, to the Logberg Printing Company, Winnipeg.—Mr. Bradbury.

For a copy of all correspondence respecting the improvements made in the Assiniboine river near Portage la Prairie, in September and October, 1908; and of all papers, vouchers, orders, resolutions, returned cheques, etc., in any way relating to the said work or to carrying out of same.—Mr. Staples.

For a copy of all lists of voters as prepared by the enumerators and completed by the deputy returning officers for the several polling subdivisions in the electoral riding of Qu'-Appelle, and used in the recent general election for the House of Commons; also for a return showing the boundaries of the said polling subdivisions, and the names of the enumerators, deputy returning officers, poll clerks, candidates' agents or scrutineers who acted for each poll.—Mr. Lake.

For a return showing the number and the names of all persons who were entitled to receive patents, and did receive patents, under the treaty made by Mr. H. M. Howell for the surrender of St. Peters' reserve, Manitoba.—Mr. Bradbury.

For a return showing from whom the wood working machinery was purchased for Intercolonial Railway shops at Moncton or elsewhere since January 1, 1908, how much from each and the prices paid; from whom the iron working machinery was purchased for the Intercolonial Railway shops at Moncton, or elsewhere, since January 1, 1908, how much from each, and the prices paid; the dates, (a) of purchase, and (b) of delivery—Mr. Clare.

For a return showing 1. How many copies of documents were printed for distribution to the public by the Department of Agriculture for the years 1904-5-6-7-8.

2. How many copies of such publications were distributed to the public in each of the said years.

3. The method of distribution adopted.

4. What mailing list is used, and when revised.

5. The cost of printing, translation and distribution of such publications for the said years.

6. The same information as in numbers 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 as applied to the distribution of the evidence taken in each of the said years before the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, despatches, memoranda, &c., between the imperial government, or any member thereof, and the Governor General, government or any member thereof, relating to or bearing upon the question of Canada contributing to the support of the British fleet, or purchasing ships of her own, or assisting in any way in maintaining with the mother country the supremacy of the seas.—Mr. Worthington.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN.

ESCAPE OF BILL MINER.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR (New Westminster) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence passing between the Department of Justice and the officers of New Westminster Penitentiary or other persons whatsoever, relating to the visit or proposed visit of detectives to Bill Miner during his incarceration in said penitentiary; also of the report of the Inspector of Penitentiaries after investigating the circumstances connected with Miner's escape, and of the evidence on which such report is based; also a copy of telegram sent from the said penitentiary to the department or its officers respecting Miner's escape, and of such telegrams as received and of telegrams sent and received in answer within two weeks from such escape.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). There is no objection to bringing down the return asked for by this motion, but I think I should take this occasion to state that there are upon our files communications which are of a confidential character and which I think it would not be in the public interest to bring down, relating to the efforts made to recapture Miner after his escape, the reports of various detectives and others who were engaged in the effort to find the escaped prisoner and the details of the information and of the assistance they received from different individuals. I mention that merely in order that there may be no misunderstanding about the matter when the return is laid on the table.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSINGS.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe) moved:

That in the opinion of this House, the appalling number of accidents at level crossings demand that the matter of railway crossings throughout the whole of Canada should at once engage the earnest consideration of the people's municipal and parliamentary representatives.

2. This imminent, and increasing peril incident to the present method of railway construction and operation may, by slow degrees, and in isolated instances, be mitigated by the exercise of powers vested in the Railway Board, but can never reach the thousands and thousands of cases crying out for safeguards, and cannot reach even a tithe of them within any reasonable time.

3. The question of railway crossings from ocean to ocean is a matter of supreme importance, and urgent to the last degree. The toll of sacrifice increases with the multiplications of lines and the increase of speed and traffic, and no sensible improvement can be hoped for so long as the initiative for redress is left to casual and individual action.

4. The rule, and the presumption from the acceptance of a charter, should be separated, or protected crossings elsewhere, with the onus upon the company of establishing a justi-

fication for exceptional treatment in exceptional cases.

5. It is the duty of the government early this session to deal with the whole question of railway crossings in a thorough and comprehensive way and with a view of eliminating, as far as reasonably possible, the level crossings from our system of railways, and where this cannot be done, the adoption of such other methods and devices as will secure, in as great a degree as is possible, the safety of the people using the highways.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move this resolution I realize that it is a very broad and a very difficult question, and that there are many members in the House who would present it in a more efficient way than I may be able to. I realize too—and I hope I shall be understood as expressing that opinion throughout any argument I may use—the very important services rendered by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) upon one phase of the question, namely, as regards that portion of the railway crossings on highways in Canada situated within the limits of thickly settled portions of cities, towns, and villages. I shall on this occasion endeavour to enlist the sympathy and attention of the representatives of the people on the broad question of the elimination of railway crossings on the level of the highways as far as our circumstances and conditions will permit, having regard to the vast extent of our country and to the enormous expense involved in a complete separation of railway and highway grades. In presenting this motion I hope that I shall perhaps have the satisfaction of having it accepted by the government without opposition, and I may say that last year, of two resolutions which were so accepted by the government I had the honour of presenting one. I do not propose this resolution in any political sense, and consequently I trust that in its support I will have the united action of all members of the House. Last night I obtained a return as to the number of accidents on railway crossings during the last five years. That return does not give us complete information ; in fact the scarcity of information and the delay in obtaining it is not exactly suggestive of energy in devising a remedy which will prevent these accidents. The Minister of Railways has recently indicated that this session he intends to take some action in the matter, and I give him my assurance that I will endeavour so far as I can to co-operate with him in securing the best possible solution of this question. The return of the accidents which have occurred at railway level crossings for the last five years ought to be sufficient to arouse the government to action and to cause them to follow the example of the government of the United States and of other countries in announcing a definite policy.

We have in Canada 15,000 level crossings. Of these it is said that 3,115 are already protected. The nature of the protection has not been stated, and I think it is very important that we should know whether or not as a matter of fact we have that number of crossings actually and effectively protected. In perusing the returns I would be inclined to think not, for I find that a good many accidents have occurred at crossings said to be protected. Now, no sensible man will imagine that we can have all the railway crossings from one end of Canada to the other—15,000 at the present time, and more being constructed from year to year—made absolutely safe for the people using the highways. I realize that. I realize that there are thousands of crossings, on the western prairies and in other parts of the Dominion, where there is an open view of approaching trains from either side, and where the highway is also visible to those operating the trains—which require no artificial devices in order that people may be reasonably safe. On the other hand, I feel that there are hundreds, perhaps thousands, which should have some protection in the nature of a gate. There are highway crossings which, however sparsely settled the locality may be, may operate as a trap; for instance, where the railway is cut through an embankment, and where the highway approaches the railway through a cutting, so that a person passing along the highway cannot see an approaching train until it is almost upon him. All these should have protection of some kind, and I believe it will be found that they should be provided with gates. Then there are undoubtedly, not only in the crowded centres but also in the rural parts of the country, scores and perhaps hundreds of cases where, at a reasonable expenditure of money, the highways could be separated from the railway, being placed either above or below the railway.

The returns for five years show that in Canada during that time there have been 270 deaths at level crossings and 350 injuries, making a total of 620 casualties. The returns are from the Railway Board, the Intercolonial Railway and the Controller of Statistics in the Railway Department. It is a peculiar fact that in all the enormous number of crossings there are not a very great many where accidents have occurred, and there are some which have been great offenders. For instance, the Grimsby accident of the other day followed a great disaster of some time ago ; and a little precaution would have prevented both. Dunnville is in the same category. Last fall a Mrs. Miller and her child were run down by a train at this crossing, and perhaps a little precaution on our part would have prevented that accident. Kingston has been the scene of a good many accidents. There, on the 20th

March, 1905, a man was killed; on the 6th of October, 1906, a man was killed at Princess street; again, on the 19th of December, 1907, another person was killed at Montreal street. Toronto, too, has been in a condition which would have suggested a remedy for a long time. There a person was killed on the 16th of January, 1905; another on the 3rd of November, 1905; another on October 16, 1906; on January 7, 1907, one was severely injured; in March, 1907, a person was killed, and at another crossing a person was severely injured. That something should have been done is made plain by the fact that three of these accidents occurred at one crossing, namely, that at Brock avenue.

As I have said, we have not very detailed information in this matter, in connection with the operation of our railways in Canada, but we have important statistics with regard to a country very similar to ours, that is, the United States, and a brief examination of the conditions there may be helpful to us in determining what we should do. In 1888 the State of Massachusetts took the lead and appointed a railway commission. The report of that commission brought out a somewhat startling fact, which has been further demonstrated and emphasized in recent years; that is, that a greater number of people are killed at railway crossings than there are of passengers killed on the trains. The report of the Massachusetts Commission showed that in 1890, of the total number of people killed, 7 per cent were passengers, 33 per cent employees, 47 per cent trespassers, stealing rides or walking along the railway track, &c., and 11 per cent were people killed at highway crossings. This fact is more than borne out by the statistics of the United States since that date. From 1900 to 1906 inclusive, the number of people killed at level crossings exceeded the total number of passengers killed on American railways by 85 per cent. The deaths in each year up to the 30th of June were as follows:

Year.	Passengers killed.	Killed at crossings.
1900..	214	558
1901..	257	619
1902..	305	519
1903..	320	624
1904..	400	607
1905..	502	622
1906..	304	667
Total..	2,302	4,256

The numbers of those injured at crossings is enormous as well:

1900..	1,093
1901..	1,112
1902..	1,063
1903..	1,234
1904..	1,239
1905..	1,308
1906..	1,666
Total..	8,715

Mr. LENNOX.

Making the total number of victims at railway crossings, during those seven years, 12,971. Take the wonderful contrast we find where there is a separation of the railway from the highway. We have a striking instance of this in the case of the Columbian exhibition. Shortly before the exposition began, the Illinois Central Railway elevated some eight or nine miles of its tracks in Chicago. It did that at its own expense with the assistance of the Columbian exposition. Not a dollar was paid by the State or contributed by the city, although the expenditure was over $3,000,000. During the six months of that exhibition that railway company handled—largely by reason of having the streets and its railway lines separate—19,500,000 people without the loss of a single life. Other countries are doing something, and I ask my right hon. friend 'what are you going to do about it.' That we ought to do something, I am sure he will admit. Mr. Borden D. Whiting, a railway commissioner on the New Jersey Board says:

> Grade crossings must not be tolerated on crowded public thoroughfares and must be abolished before they are soaked in blood.

In my resolution I speak of 'imminent and increasing peril.' Why? Because the danger increases in proportion to the increasing number of trains and so on. And in the Dominion at present we are increasing in all those matters which go to make up danger. What is it that determines the number of accidents at level crossings? It is the number of trains and tracks, the speed of the trains, the character of the crossings and the extent of the highway traffic. Each one of these elements is an increasing quantity and contributes more and more to the danger as the years advance. I ask the Minister of Railways and the leader of the government what should be our great object in Canada to-day in connection with this railway question. We have had great railway problems to solve, but none so important as the one which now confronts us. Go into the library and you will find a dozen books upon the railway problem, and I venture to say that the heart of that problem for us is the protection of our highways and the providing of reasonable security for those who use them. Our object should be safety, in the first place, and then moderate tolls, speed, frequency of service and comfort. But the paramount object we should have in view is the public safety; and safety to the degree we hope to have it, cannot be obtained until we have grappled with this problem and endeavoured to solve it by eliminating grade crossings, wherever possible with reasonable expenditure; and, as an alternative, in all other cases where the crossings are concealed or otherwise dangerous, by having gates and other devices for the public protection.

The ideal system is of course to be found in Great Britain. Britain was the first country to grasp the proper way of dealing with this question. In fact, I think I am right in saying that it is the only country which did realize at the outset the folly of sacrificing the highways in order to secure the railways. Germany has at present a magnificent railway system from the point of view of security and otherwise, second only perhaps to that of Great Britain. But the difference is this. Britain began right and preserved her highways while building her railways, whereas Germany sacrificed her highways to build her railways and then had to pay enormously in order to reclaim her highways and obtain the security for highway traffic which she now enjoys. But of course that security has only been obtained at an enormously increased cost and such will be the case in Canada, as it has been in the United States, when we come to reconstruct our system. In that regard we shall have to pay enormously more than we would have had to pay if we could have begun as Britain did.

Speaking on this question, I might say—and it is of interest now when we have the question of government ownership of railways coming up from time to time—that this subject is very closely connected with the question of the nationalization of railways. Germany has been enabled to separate the highways from the railways with greater facility by reason of the nationalization of her railways; and as a cognate proposition, just in proportion as we see to it that the companies afford a reasonable protection for all people having occasion to use the highways, shall we be postponing the day of the nationalization of railways in Canada.

Mr. Seth Low was speaking quite recently on the question of the Hepburn Bill. He pointed out that while the prediction had been made that that Bill would be a failure, one year's operation of it had shown that the vesting of larger powers in the Railway Commission in the United States, had been an eminent success, not only because the measure was operating well by reason of the machinery conferred upon the board, but because the railways had immediately volunteered to carry out the provisions of the Act so that the Board of Commissioners were under no necessity to take action against them. And no doubt whenever you frame adequate laws for the protection of the public, you will have those to whom these laws are to be applied volunteering to carry out the orders of the board without waiting for action to enforce the law. Therefore, we may be encouraged in Canada, if we can form a policy on this great question by the belief that it will not require to be enforced in many instances, by the Board of Railway Commissioners, but that the railway companies will be on the alert to carry out the provisions of the law.

I have referred to the English system, and I wish to read a clause or two of the English statute as being the most concise way of expressing exactly what the law is in Great Britain. I realize that in Canada we cannot expect, except in our cities and large towns, to carry out the English system in anything like its entirely for many long years to come; but there can be no good reason advanced why we should not begin to eliminate the grade crossings. The English statute says:

If a line of railway crosses any turnpike road or public highway, then, except where otherwise provided by the special Act, either such road shall be carried over the railway or the railway shall be carried over such road by means of a bridge, and such bridge with the immediate approaches and all other necessary works connected therewith, shall be executed and at all times thereafter maintained at the expense of the company.

Provided always, that with the consent of two or more justices in petty sessions, as after mentioned, it shall be lawful for the company to carry the railway across any highway, other than a public carriage road, on the level.

Now, we have this condition of things that, even with the enormous railway system in Great Britain, there can be no level crossing, except by special Act of parliament, upon any road where driving is done.

The next section provides for the maintenance of gates where the railway crosses a carriage road on the level, which gates are to be kept closed except when in actual use by persons crossing the railway—the exact opposite of what we adopt in Canada, though I am not prepared to say which is the better of the two—and providing that there shall be men in attendance, as we have here. But the lowest order of protection in Great Britain, from one end of it to the other, is gates, with a house in which a man is to be lodged and the other appliances for the safety of the public, such as devices for lighting, the ringing of bells and other means of helping to safeguard the public.

Now, it should be distinctly understood, also, that every dollar of the expense of these works in Great Britain is borne by the railways. In saying that, I do not want to be unreasonable. We have to recognize that the railways are a great factor in the development of Canada. I do not want to be a crank and say we can do the same here as is done in Great Britain. All I say is that the fact is as I have stated, and it is a fact that should be kept in mind as one of the elements in the case. There is another provision in the law of Great Britain, and if we had had that here the Grimsby disaster could not have occurred. It is as follows:

Where the railway crosses any turnpike road on a level adjoining a station, all

trains on the railway shall be made to slacken their speed before arriving at such turnpike road, and shall not cross the same at any greater rate of speed than four miles an hour.

In Grimsby we have the highway in the neighbourhood of the railway station. With all the safety devices they have in Britain, so mindful are they of the wisdom of preserving human life, they compel the railway trains to slacken speed to not more than four miles an hour. You may be sure that under these conditions not many level crossing accidents occur in Great Britain.

I have already said that the English railways pays for all these works. But that is not all. They pay taxes as well, and very heavy taxes. They pay the ordinary taxes, and also what is called a government passenger duty. In 1901 these taxes on 22,078 miles of railway amounted to £4,331,334, or equal to about $1,000 of taxation per mile of railway. Nor is even that all. In Great Britain when the railway company has observed all the statutory conditions, it must provide specially for special cases. Therefore, when there is necessity for special devices not described by the statute, the railway company must, at its peril, provide such special devices and take such special precautions as are adapted to the conditions prevailing at the point concerning which the question arises.

The result of all this is that Great Britain is a model for the world, the wonder of the world, not only as to the safety of railway travel, but as to the absence of accidents at railway crossings. As regards railway travel, the safety is so great that from 1st October, 1900, to 31st March, 1902, a period of eighteen months, not one passenger was killed upon the English railways. Let me give one or two other comparisons in reference to this matter. Here is a line from Mr. Franklin B. Locke, an American, writing in the 'Century Magazine,' comparing the American system with the English system, that is, comparing a system that is similar to ours with the English system.

In this connection a few broad comparisons are significant. In the city of Buffalo, for instance, it was reported, a few years ago, that sixty-one fatalities occurred at grade crossings in eighteen months, being two more than the number reported for the whole of Germany for the previous five years. Again, in the report of the Terminal Commission to the Mayor and Common Council of Chicago, it was stated that over two hundred people lost their lives at the grade crossings in that city in 1891. This is nearly as many fatalities as occurred in the whole of Great Britain and Ireland from the same cause during the succeeding five years. These figures seem to indicate that these two cities afford from three to five times as many fatalities of this class as the whole of Great Britain and Ireland and Germany combined.

Mr. LENNOX.

In reference to this matter I find an interesting comparison in 'Hazell's Annual,' referring to the year 1904. It shows the proportion of passengers killed and injured to passengers carried.

Passengers Killed to Passengers Carried—1904.

	In England.	In United States.
Killed..	..1 in 199,758,000..	..1 in 1,622.267
Injured.	..1 in 2,244,472..	..1 in 78,523

It is only fair to say that the American railways carried their passengers much longer distances on the average. That is an element to be taken into consideration. But when we compare one in practically two hundred millions with one in one and a half millions, the comparison is certainly very startling. In other words, the death rate for railway passengers is 123 times greater in the United States than in England. Then he gives the proportion of employees killed and injured to the total number employed.

Proportion of Employees Killed—1904.

	In England.	In United States.
Killed..	.. ..1 in 10,144..	.. ..1 in 357
Injured....	..1 in 748..	.. ..1 in 19

And Mr. Frank Dixon, writing in the 'Atlantic Monthly' in 1907, and carrying the figures down to 1905, said that of the total number employed in United States railways 1 in every 133 was killed and 1 in every 9 injured in that year. Coming to the next great railway country, France, I shall read a clause from their law.

Except in the case of local obstacles sufficiently serious in the opinion of the government, any railway intersecting national highways or departmental roads shall pass above or below such highways or roads.

A gentleman dealing with this says:

Level crossings are tolerated only on rural or private cross-roads.

I find on further research that when a railway passes a highway or public path on a level it must have a gate of specified style, it must have a man in attendance; a cottage is provided at an expense ordinarily of $1,000 and all the expense entailed is borne by the railway company. In that connection we must not lose sight of the fact that in France not only is all the expense borne by the railway companies but the railways revert to the state after a period of ninety-nine years.

To speak briefly of the conditions in the United States, I want the government to follow me in this idea. The governments of many states in the United States have adopted the principle of defining what shall be the prevailing conditions in reference to the construction of railways over highways and this has also been, as you have perceived, the policy of Great Britain, Germany and France, and I think of European countries generally. Be that as it may, the

closest analogy you can get to our conditions is in the United States and they have adopted a definite policy as regards the features of railway construction which I am now discussing. I want to urge upon the government that they should and should now at this session enunciate the policy that we shall have, as far as possible, as to the existing roads a separation of the highway from the railway, that we shall in other cases wherever necessary have a protection by gate or other properly approved device, that that shall be the policy of the law of the country and that its working out only shall be left to the railway board.

Massachusetts I think was the first state in the field. Their law provides that there shall be no new railway constructed on a grade crossing until the board has investigated the matter and has ordered that it may be so

Then as to the existing roads, the general law provides the policy that shall be adopted for reclaiming the highways by separation of the highway from the railway. The general law is that the railway pays 65 per cent, the state pays 25 per cent or more and the municipality pays 10 per cent or less. That is to say there is 35 per cent of the cost to be borne between the municipality and the state and the board may order any proportion of that 35 per cent to be paid by the state, but cannot order the municipalities to pay more than 10 per cent. Expenditure by the state is limited to $500,000 in any one year and to $5,000,000 in all. Then they have special statutes by which they eliminated a great number of grade crossings at certain points, notably Boston, Brocton and Newton. In reference to these cities the state paid 31½ per cent, the cities 13½ per cent and the company 55 per cent.

New York attempted to adopt the Massachusetts law with regard to the expenditure. The railways were not exactly opposed to the abolition of the grade crossing in the state but they were opposed to the allotted proportion of the expense. Let me say that I do not understand that the railways will put up any organized hostility to the proposition that we are making but may object to the proportion of the expense they are to pay. The railways realize that in the interests of the traffic which they wish to handle, the desire for rapidity, the desire for safety and the elimination of that much vexed question of the cattle guard in many instances, it is to their interest as much as possible to separate the highway from the railway crossing, and to have protection at other points. New York therefore was not able by reason of the strong organized opposition of the big railway interests to pass a law as favourable to the people as the Massachusetts law, and the law there is that the company shall pay 50 per cent, the state 25 per cent and the municipality 25 per cent. Their law provides:

All steam surface railroads, hereafter built except additional switches and sidings, must be so constructed as to avoid all public crossings at grade, wherever practicable so to do.

And as regards the division of expense:

Whenever under the provisions of section 60 of this Act new railroads are constructed across existing highways, the expense of crossing above or below the grade of the highway shall be paid entirely by the railroad corporations.

It then goes on to provide for conditions such as the extension of a new street where none before existed, across an existing railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. Where the railway has possession of the territory first does it make any difference as to the cost ?

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, it does. The section reads:

Whenever, under the provisions of section 61 of this Act a new street, avenue or highway is constructed across an existing railroad, the railroad corporation shall pay one half and the municipal corporation wherein such street, avenue or highway is located shall pay the remaining one-half of the expense of making such crossing, above or below grade; and whenever a change is made as to an existing crossing, in accordance with the provisions of section 62 of this Act, 50 percentum of the expense thereof shall be borne by the railroad corporation, 25 per cent by the municipal corporation and 25 per cent by the state.

In the case of a new railway the railway pays the whole of it; if it is the change of an existing grade, where the highway was in possession first then the railway pays 50 per cent, the state 25 per cent, and the municipality 25 per cent. In Maine they have practically the Massachusetts law where they want to change the grade with regard to an existing highway and an existing railway. Then, the statute provides that for a new railway there shall be a separation of grade unless the Railway Commissioners, after notice, authorize the crossing on the level, the elimination of level crossings being the rule, the cost being borne entirely, I think, by the company, although, as to that, I am not positive. The state of Michigan has pretty drastic laws as to this question. It puts it into the power of the Board of Railway Commissioners to order whatever they like as regards the protection of railway crossings. The elimination of level crossings, the separation of grades, the providing of gates, the providing of flagmen or whatever they think necessary they can order if they think fit and the entire cost is charged to the railway company. In Ohio the company pays 65 per cent, or more if so ordered.

Mr. LANCASTER. Who pays the balance in Ohio?

Mr. LENNOX. The balance is paid either by the state or by the municipality; I am inclined to think that it is the state that pays the 35 per cent. As regards Connecticut, the commissioner may order of his own motion the separation of grades. In that case the company pays 75 per cent, and the state pays 25 per cent. Then, there may be the case of the application by a railway company for the elimination of a grade crossing. In that case the company pays the entire cost and, in that connection, I may say that they are bound by statute to apply for the elimination of one level crossing every year. Each company must apply for the elimination of at least one level crossing each year for every sixty miles of their railway, and the result has been that in ten years they have cut out 549 level crossings out of a total of 1,526, leaving 977 to be provided for in the state. They have also a provision as to the case where the application is by the municipality and where the railway existed before it was crossed by the highway. Then, as to new railways to be constructed after the passing of the Act, they are to have separate grades constructed at the cost of the company. There are other states, many of which have been referred to in the public press, and it is not necessary for me to deal with further illustrations. They enunciate clearly enough the policy of the United States with regard to this matter. They show clearly that they have come to the conclusion that it is not wise to leave it entirely to the Railway Board, but that the representatives of the people should define, within general limits, what shall be the policy as to this great and important matter.

As to the question of cost, that is, of course, a matter for the government to consider, but they are always anxious to have some idea from us so that they shall not go wrong. I have clear ideas as to some portions of this question and not very clear ideas as to others, but I would like to give the government the benefit of my consideration as far as it has gone. How are we to meet the expense? As to new roads, as to any charter that we shall grant during this session, I submit to the government that we should make it the law that the railway company shall separate the highway from the railway, or that they shall provide gates as a good alternative, unless they show that in particular instances the separation or the gates are not necessary, and that they should pay the entire cost of the work. I would recommend that policy with reference to all new railways, unless, having regard to any peculiar local conditions, such as the extending of the railway through a sparsely settled portion of Canada, we should, for good reasons, see fit to exempt them from that liability by the statute by what they shall be chartered. As to the question of municipalities contributing towards the expense, I shall leave to the city municipalities the fighting out of that question for themselves, but as to the rural municipalities I do not feel that there should be no portion of the expense charged up to them. I might interject just here, with great respect to the Railway Board, that I am sorry that in the matter of the Grimsby crossing, they did not observe that rule. I claim that in every case where the highway and railway cross upon the level and where the highway was one of the original highways which existed at the time the railway was built, the company should be at the total charge of providing and maintaining all the appliances for safety that may be ordered by the railway board. As to the further question of expense as to existing roads that we have to deal with, that are in existence to-day, reclaiming our highways in that regard, I do not feel that perhaps I am very competent to pronounce a judgment upon that, but as I feel at present, I do not think it would be unreasonable that Canada should contribute something to the expense. The railways helped to make Canada. It was absolutely impossible at the time some of these roads were built that the precautions which were taken in Great Britain and the older countries of Europe could be taken here, and I say that to put these railways upon a proper basis as regards these crossings, it does not appear at the present time to be unreasonable that the Dominion government should contribute something towards the change of grade. As to the sources of income available to the country there is this point to be kept in mind by the government and by parliament in dealing with this question: England taxes her railways to the extent of $1,000 a mile and the United States tax theirs to an enormous extent. We nominally are beginning to tax ours through the provinces. This tax is very little and I would not be sorry if I could see an arrangement made between the Dominion and the provinces by which the provinces would forego the taxing of railways if the money were diverted to securing a better condition of things as regards railway crossings. In the United States the lowest amount at which any railway was taxed in 1906 in an organized state was $107 per mile, and the highest was $1,683 per mile, an average of $349 per mile for all the railways in the United States. Pennsylvania alone paid in 1906, as railway taxation, $6,982,973. The United States collected from all the railways in that year $74,602,171. If Canada collected on her railways at the same rate at which they impose taxes on railways in the United States, a revenue of from $8,000,000 to $9,000,000 a year would be obtained.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. Do you know what the federal taxes on the United States railways amount to?

Mr. LENNOX. I have not got that separately. I was suggesting to the govern-

ment that probably some adjustment should be made in reference to the taxation, which obtains in Canada now whereby the burden upon the railways in changing grades would be lightened. It should be borne in mind too, that we have contributed very largely towards railway building, at a much higher rate than the United States have. The United States never have a cash subsidy to a railway and they have not given a land grant since 1871. Mr. Blaine estimates that the total contribution to railway building in the United States by the various municipalities and governments amounted all told to $1,000,000,000, and had they aided railways as liberally as we in Canada have it would amount to three or four billions, instead of one.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there any federal taxation on railways in the United States?

Mr. LENNOX. I should judge from what I was reading that there was, but I did not ascertain the amount.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then there would be federal, and state, and municipal taxation on the railways of the United States.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes. I am merely suggesting that we are taxing our railways very little in the first place, and in the second place that probably some distribution could be made in the line of diverting existing taxation to this very desirable work. In conclusion, I may say I have every hope that at last—not much behind the rest of us, but a little behind the rest of us—the government has come to realize the importance of this subject. I am not too sanguine as to what the government may do. Some things would indicate that they are not prepared to do much just at present. It does not look as if the government had considered the question for any length of time; we had no indication of it in the speech from the Throne; we had a very hesitating acceptance of the Lancaster Bill, but we have got it and I hope the government has put the Senate into proper order with regard to it.

Mr. FOSTER. What, what?

Mr. LENNOX. We had no data a month ago and what is now brought down after a month of delay is very meagre. There was a hurry up order by the Minister of Railways a little while ago upon the railway board and there was a response, but that response has not been divulged to us. There was another hurry up order on the board when the Lancaster Bill came on, but that I understand, was not responded to.

Mr. GRAHAM. Would my hon. friend tell me what that was?

Mr. LENNOX. When the Lancaster Bill came up for third reading, I understood the minister to say that he had written to the chairman of the railway board, that he expected an answer from him, and that he would like the matter to stand over. I do not say, however, that it concludes the matter that there was no response to that hurry up order.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a stretch of imagination.

Mr. LENNOX. I only mean to show that the Minister of Railways has awakened to the necessity of there being some protection. He did not think of it until we brought it to his attention, but that is no reflection on him if he does the right thing now. Of course it is for the government to formulate their own policy, but I would suggest to the right hon. the leader of the government that on this question it would be wise to consult the municipal representatives of the people, and I would like to see him bring to Ottawa representatives from all the county councils and municipal councils, and as it is a matter for the general advantage of Canada and for the general advantage of the railway companies and for the unbounded advantage of our people, I would like to see them get the railway companies to transport these gentlemen free of charge to Ottawa. If he did that he would have the benefit of the advice and suggestions of the immediate representatives of the people. I would also urge the great necessity for getting information upon the subject. We know the number of railway crossings there are in Canada, but that is about all we do know. With all respect for the railway board, I believe it is impossible for them to grapple with this question, unless they have greater assistance than they yet have. I believe the first thing to do is to employ competent men to collect material throughout the country and to bring in a general report as to the condition of all railway crossings in Canada, classifying them and saying: at this point the crossings require no protection, at this point certain protection is required and at this point the level crossing shall be abolished. Let the railway companies be heard and let the people locally interested be heard and let a determination be come to as to what remedy shall be adopted in respect to existing railways. I also urge upon the governemnt that they should make a declaration of policy upon this matter and that there should be a law made by parliament to guide us. It is not enough that we have six competent members of the railway board; we have a parliament here of more than 200 members and it is the wisdom of parliament, centered if you like in the government, that should pronounce upon the policy of Canada in this matter. We have been drifting along and in a little while we will have our court made law made by the railway board. I am here to say that I do not think it is wise that we should have that condition of things. It is

for the courts to construe the law and to enforce it, not to make it, and I do not distinguish between the railway board and other courts in that regard. What I suggest is that we should adopt a Canadian policy declaring that all the King's highways shall be safe—I mean reasonably safe, not absolutely safe, but relatively safe—that in future railway construction the safety of the highways should be guarded and that a remedy shall be applied where safety under existing conditions is absent.

Then, as I have said, and as the resolution more concisely indicates, the presumption should be protection everywhere—that every railway company shall prima facie be bound to protect the interests of those who cross the railway on the highway, and in order to be exonerated in any particular case, it must show the railway board that there is needed either no protection or only a certain kind of protection.

These views are very inadequately expressed, I know. I feel that this is a very difficult but at the same time an engrossing and all-important matter. I know that I have had the very complimentary close attention of the right hon. leader of the government during my imperfect discussion of this matter, and for that I am exceedingly grateful. I recognize just as fully as anybody that the desire of protecting the people does not belong only to one side of the House; I recognize that we are all at one in the desire to do what is in the best interests of the country. But I have urged this matter to some extent also from a knowledge that railway companies have powerful influence, and that they exert this powerful influence upon the government benches, as they will endeavour, I suppose, to exert them upou us at no distant date. And so I have at some length ventured to urge very strongly my views on the government. May I put the matter in another form? I think our primary law should be that the highway and the railway crossing should be separate, the one above the other; that our secondary law should be that where that condition cannot obtain, there shall be the protection of a gate wherever there is anything in the nature of a trap or shut-in crossing and that the railway company can always escape an undue burden by showing to the railway board that in the particular instance referred to the need of safeguards does not exist. In that way we shall have what will be fair to the people, and, what is of equal importance, just to the railway company.

In concluding, let me refer to what has been said across the floor of the House, on one occasion at least. Some gentleman on this side of the House said to the distinguished leader of the government that he had had some rare opportunities of distinguishing himself during the time of his administration. The right hon. gentleman admitted that he had had some opportunities of distinguishing himself in regard to the great problems that confront us from time to time in this House. Whilst he has had many such opportunities in the past, he has had no better opportunity of distinguishing himself than he has now in dealing, in a large, broad, comprehensive, statesmanlike way, with this great and imminent problem now confronting us. He has not only an opportunity of distinguishing himself, but what is far better, an opportunity which I hope he will embrace, of doing lasting good to the people of Canada in the solution of this great question.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the House has listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of my hon. friend. They have shown that he has paid a good deal of attention to this question and has devoted considerable research to ascertaining the conditions that exist in other countries. I may say in the outset, that I think there is not much difference of opinion between us as to the end we all desire to attain. Possibly later on there may appear to be not much difference as to the means necessary for attaining that desired end. My hon. friend, of course, with his usual sense of humour, could not refrain from interjecting a joke concerning what he called my hurry-up order; but he did it with such good nature and so obviously with his usual humourous intent, that I forgive him.

Mr. FOSTER. He knew you would appreciate the joke.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. I am glad to see that the question of the Railway Commission is one on which there is no difference of opinion. We agree that they have done good work, are doing good work, and will probably do good work where we give them that work to perform. This question of railway crossings opens up the great question of transportation in one or two aspects. We must concede that unless Canada's trade is to stand still and she is to be outstripped in the matter of transportation, fast trains must be run, and run daily, both for passengers and freight. For years we have tried to attain that object; because it must be remembered that in this country the public carriers have not the advantages that they have either in the old land or in the United States. As I have said time and again, it is the density of population that makes traffic. Some of the states referred to by my hon. friend have so much greater traffic than we have in this part of the world, that the conditions are not similar in so far as the burdens carried by the railways are concerned. I admit with him that the conditions in the old land—in Great Britain, Germany and France—are ideal

conditions. But if he will compare those countries with Canada in regard to density of population, he will see that Canada cannot be compared with them as to the conditions of transportation. Canada is a new country, and it has been our endeavour, both in Dominion, provincial and municipal boundaries, to encourage the improvement of transportation facilities. It may be possible that we have carried this encouragement to a larger extent in all these spheres than some at this date may think we should have done. But we were dealing with the transportation problem in its earlier stages, and I believe the people of Canada, the people of the provinces and the residents of municipalities would under similar conditions do the same thing again for the improvement of transportation. Now, as I have said, these fast trains must be run. The question of income to the people who work on the farm and in the factory is largely tied up with the transportation problem. The prices they are to obtain depend not wholly on the quantity or quality of the goods they produce. They might produce goods in large quantities or of excellent quality; but unless transportation facilities were provided to get their goods to the markets of the world quickly and in good condition, they might as well not have produced at all or in as great quantities or of such excellent quality. The price of the goods depends on the quality that exists when they reach the market, and that quality sometimes depends on the speed with which they are taken to market. Now, in whatever is done or decided to be done in Canada, this must be borne in mind, that the interests of the people and the interests of the railways are one in the matter of bringing the producer as closely as possible to the consumer, or, in other words, to the markets of the world. In Great Britain the conditions are ideal. As my hon. friend has pointed out, in the construction of their railways they provided against level crossings. But, as I have said before, the conditions, even in the construction of these roads, perhaps were not as ours are.

My hon. friend mentions another thing which I think worthy of note. He said that the United States have not in recent years given any aid to railways. That is true, I believe. But this must be remembered in making a comparison between the two countries. The United States had no rival practically in the development of their trade, so far as this continent was concerned, whereas Canada has to build up a commercial position and develop her trade side by side and in competition with a country like the United States whose population is ten times greater than ours. It is like building a main street through a great many of our towns and villages. Scattered along it on both sides are inhabited and vacant lots, but the village or town is not compact, and it costs large amounts of money in many of our municipalities to build such streets and sidewalks which necessarily extend over a large territory. That is exactly the condition in Canada. We have a territory as large as the United States, but a population twelve times smaller. If we had not given any aid to our railways, we would not to-day have the Canada we have. Canada has taken the position she enjoys in the markets of the world because people have been safe in going to any part of our new country in the hope that within a reasonable time they would be furnished with railway facilities to carry their products to market. That has been the principle which has guided the governments of Canada and the provinces and our municipal councils in giving aid to railways.

My hon. friend pointed out that the conditions of the crossings should be examined into. That is true, but in his own remarks he gave us a fairly accurate answer. He said that, in the experience of the last five years—which is the best experience we can have as it brings us through the time when we have had the most rapid transportation—the dangerous crossings in Canada have been practically located and have been confined to a comparatively few localities. Of course I would not pretend to say that there are no dangerous crossings where no one has been killed, but the more dangerous ones would naturally be where accidents have taken place. Some two years ago the Board of Railway Commissioners proceeded to ascertain the location of the various crossings in the Dominion and asked the railway companies to give them schedules or plans of these crossings. There are a great many of these plans in the possession of the board at present and others are constantly coming. Of course, it is a little difficult for the Railway Commissioners, with the engineering staff at their command, to get them all in the order and condition they want, but they are getting them as rapidly as possible. I did urge the board a few weeks ago to make an examination of the dangerous crossings so that we could have some reliable data, and a return has been brought down which gives us a pretty good idea of these crossings and their results. I find, in looking over the return, that there were killed in Canada during the last five years 270 people at level crossings. That is a loss of life which is deplorable, though, I admit, not as large as I thought it would be when I asked for the information. My hon. friend quoted one railway on which no loss of life occurred last year at level crossings. I might say to him—and it may be something in favour of government management of railways—that on Prince Edward Island no fatal level crossing accident has taken

place during the last five years. On the Intercolonial Railway, during the last five years, fifteen fatal accidents have occurred at level crossings, but this may be incidental to the country and location, because, of course, all level crossings are not dangerous.

I now come to a difficulty which does not confront any state in the union in dealing with this question. In Canada as in the United States we have our federal authorities and we have our provincial authorities as they have their state authorities, and we each have our municipal authorities. In the United States the railways are largely under the control of the state unlike Canada where they are under the control of the federal authorities. If my hon. friend will study the question of railway commissions in the United States he will find that the states have boards of their own in most cases, while in Canada we have the one board which controls the whole country. A state legislature can say what a municipality must do. These legislatures control the highways through the municipalities, but the Dominion of Canada cannot say what a municipality must do, speaking in general terms, as it does not control the municipality and it does not control the highways, the highways being under the control of the municipalities, and the municipalities in their turn being governed by the provincial authorities. So that it is easier for the state authorities to deal with the whole question, municipal and provincial, than it is for the Dominion. And my hon. friend will have noticed that in the division of expenditure, it was not between the United States federal authorities, the municipalities and the railways, but between the state legislatures, the municipalities and the railways. There is that difference, but it is not insurmountable, and I am prepared to say now that while it is more difficult to work out in Canada than in any state in the union, still the difficulties are not such that we need despair of being able to overcome them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Did not the Board of Railway Commissioners make a division of the expenditure in connection with the proposed viaduct in Toronto?

Mr. LENNOX. And Grimsby?

Mr. LANCASTER. That is a level crossing.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There must be some way of working that out.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think the distinction is this, that where the municipality has asked to have it done, then the board can impose part of the burden on the municipality, but under the state jurisdiction, the board can impose it no matter who asks. And in the city of Toronto, I think that the city itself asked the board to make a ruling. At Kingston the board did make a ruling, imposing part of the expenditure on the county, part on the county and part on the railway, but that was done at the request of the county if I remember rightly.

Mr. BRODER. They make an agreement previously, I think, and that agreement is carried out by an order of the Railway Commission.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think at Kingston there was an order of the board on the application of the county.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the hon. gentleman is right. Where the municipality makes an application the Railway Commission may grant the application subject to conditions.

Mr. LANCASTER. Our statute does not say it is a condition precedent that the municipality must make the application. The jurisdiction is general. Under sections 237, 238, 239 the board may act on its own motion without application from any municipality.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Will my hon. friend read the section?

Mr. LANCASTER. Section 237, subsection 2:

> The board may, by order, grant such application upon such terms and conditions as to protection, safety and convenience of the public, as it may deem expedient or may order that the highways be carried over or under the railway, or be temporarily or permanently diverted, and that such works be executed, watchmen or other persons employed, or measures taken as under the circumstances appear to the board best adapted to remove or diminish the danger or obstruction arising or likely to arise therefrom.

That is where the railway is originally being constructed. Then comes section 238:

> Where the railway is already constructed upon, along or across any highway the board may order the company within a specified time to submit to the board a plan and profile of such portion of the railway, and may upon such submission, make any order in respect thereof, as in the last preceding section provided.

If the board can make an order under section 237, making it impossible for the company to have a level crossing, surely they can, under section 238, order a company already existing to take away its level crossing?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not sure that that touches the point. They can make the order, but that does not apportion the expense. All the orders, whatever the powers, have been made under the conditions stated. I may be wrong, but that is my recollection. The question has been raised

how far the jurisdiction of the board can extend over a municipality. There is the principle of law which, roughly stated, is that, where parliament has the right to pass a certain Act, it can pass any other law in order to enforce the original one, even if the second Act is not altogether within its jurisdiction. In that relation it has been held that they could impose the amount of costs or even a penalty on the municipality. However the difficulty then arises, as the hon. member will understand, that we in this Dominion parliament have not the control of the municipalities as the states have to which he is referring. But, as I said a moment ago, that does not mean an insuperable difficulty. If there is to be a comprehensive measure dealing with level crossings in a satisfactory way, it cannot be attained by doing anything to make a division among the people, either as to municipalities, provinces or in any other way. We must agree to some measure which, while it may impose burdens that otherwise would not be imposed, will be in accordance with the conditions which exist in Canada. It is a difficult problem to work out. I have spent not minutes, but hours and days in trying to solve it, and have come across difficulties too numerous to be detailed to the House. It is a large problem, and yet has many small details which are difficult to work out. My hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) touched one. I think, perhaps, he is wrong; but he has touched this side of the question, which, no doubt, is a popular one to touch but may not be practicable in working out the question that no rural municipality should be asked to pay. He leaves the cities to fight out their own battles. I am afraid we should not succeed if we approached the question in that way. If we are to eradicate the danger of level crossings, somebody must bear some burden; and the people who have helped to create the condition, no matter who they may be, will have to be asked to bear a reasonable share of the burden of removing the condition which they themselves have helped to create. How far that principle ought to be carried I do not know. But let me point out—and I would call my hon. friend's special attention to this point—that in every state he mentioned the principle which he said he would not adopt has been adopted. That is, the municipalities have to pay a share, though a minor share, of the expense.

Mr. LENNOX. Many, but not all.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is quoting these states as examples for us to follow, but drawing a line at that point. Perhaps he is right. But I submit that if we are going to make a success of getting rid of the level crossings, we must not say anything that would create lack of harmony, and we must all be ready to bear a fair share of the burden that must be borne in order to bring about the result. We have all contributed to bring about the present condition. My hon. friend pointed out that a new provision is laid down for railways yet to be built. That is quite true. The Dominion has contributed to the conditions which now exists because, for years and years, we have allowed railways to be built under charters granted wthout any great restraint as to how their crossings should be constructed, or even how their entrance into cities should be made. Of recent years, and as the traffic has grown greater and railways have become the more numerous, the conditions under which railways are to be constructed are made more stringent, and greater care is taken than was thought necessary years ago. I submit that the provinces have contributed their share as to the present conditions. Not a few of the railways now under federal jurisdiction received their charters and powers of construction, and were actually constructed, under provincial authority. Some of them are still under provincial control, though comparatively few. I believe I am not putting it too strongly when I say that all railways doing more than a merely local business would better serve the people, and be better controlled, under our jurisdiction. However that may be, the provinces, in granting these charters and allowing the construction of railways under their jurisdiction have assisted in bringing about present conditions in relation to grade crossings. The municipalities have also contributed. I have belonged to at least one municipal council, and have travelled a good deal throughout the province, and am aware that in years gone by, every municipality that was asked to contribute a bonus, even for the shadow of a railway, was ready to give it. They do not grant these bonuses to the same extent now. But, in years gone by, they have allowed railways to cross even their main thoroughfares on the level and to run through the busiest parts of their towns without let or hindrance. This applies not only to rural municipalities, but also to towns and even cities. So, these conditions have been allowed to arise with the consent of us all, and I submit that we are all more or less bound, if we are going to make a success of the undertaking, to contribute, though possibly in a very small amount, to do something to get rid of this difficulty which we have helped to create, and in the removal of which we are so deeply interested. The Dominion might grant aid, and the provinces might grant aid. And let me call my hon. friend's attention to another point, which, perhaps, will come up later on, and which is worthy of consideration. Presuming that the board has jurisdiction to fix the amount to be paid by a municipality, how is the municipality to raise the money? Speaking of the pro-

vince of Ontario, it could not, under the provincial laws, pay that money without submitting a by-law to the people.

Mr. LANCASTER. Or getting provincial legislation.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am coming to that. They must submit it to the people, or else go to the legislature for a special Act. This brings me back to the idea I have expressed, that, in order to make this a success, it will be necessary for all parties concerned to take concerted action. First, the Dominion ought to consider well what it should do in this case. We cannot say what any province will do, but in order to be successful the federal authority ought to communicate with the various provinces with an idea of coming to some amicable arrangement by which they would assist, so far as possible, and pass legislation that would enable the municipalities to do their share if they were asked to under an order of the board.

No one would reasonably argue that the great share of this cost should not be borne by the railways themselves. Whatever division might be made among the rest of us would be a minor division. I would not like to enact that the state, municipality or province should be compelled to pay up to a certain limit; there might be cases where they should not pay up to the limit fixed, and if I were drafting a law to-morrow I would ask that they should not be called upon to pay more than a certain amount and it would be in the jurisdiction of the board whether they should pay a less amount or pay anything.

Looking at the accidents that have taken place during the last five years and the reports that have been given of those accidents at level crossings by the officials of the Board of Railway Commissioners, this peculiar fact stares us in the face, that if ordinary care had been exercised by the traveller on the highway, 90 per cent of these accidents would not have taken place.

Mr. LANCASTER. Where do you get the evidence of that? That is the statement of the railways.

Mr. GRAHAM. No, it is the statement of the officials handed to me by the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. LANCASTER. They get their information from the railways, the railways are the real authorities for that statement.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think that is not correct. Every accident that has occurred since the board was appointed has been investigated by an officer for that purpose and his report goes to the board and on these reports, I understand, this information has been furnished to me.

Mr. FOSTER. That I suppose is a very small proportion.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think that wherever an accident takes place they send an officer to investigate the cause of the accident.

Mr. LENNOX. I think the report shows only 180 of that class out of a total of 270. There are a great many of which no particulars are given.

Mr. GRAHAM. I repeat the statement that from the information I get I think 90 per cent of the accidents would not have occurred if the travellers had exercised due care.

Mr. LENNOX. Does that make any difference?

Mr. GRAHAM. It possibly may not, but my hon. friend will understand its bearing when I complete my statement. It may not and does not alter the fact that if the railway crossings had not been there the accidents would not have taken place, nor does it alter the other fact that governments and parliaments have to keep in mind that the public often have to be protected against their own carelessness. This is a case where all are united in agreeing to protect the public against what may be their carelessness, but I submit to the judgment of the House that where the public are to be protected against accidents by public enactment, they ought to be asked to do something to help themselves. I refer my hon. friend to a law or to a practice that has become law through judgment of the courts, in Pennsylvania, that every traveller upon a public highway must stop before he crosses a railway track. A sign is placed at each crossing reading: 'Stop, look, listen.' The railway is compelled to put that sign at every crossing and the public are compelled to stop and read that warning or forfeit any claim to damages if they are injured; but I think the onus of proving that they did not obey that injunction is cast on the railway and my hon. friend will agree that it is difficult for a railway to prove such a thing so that any burden put upon the people is offset by the onus being placed on the railway. If something could be placed in the law or the regulations which would infuse into the minds of the people obedience to such a mandate, if it did not compel obedience, that they ought for their own safety to stop before approaching a railway crossing, eight out of ten of the fatal accidents would never occur and the danger of level crossings would be reduced to a minimum. You ask how to do that—I do not know. I am not prepared to say and we might come to the point that this parliament had no jurisdiction, that we might be guilty of an interference, as lawyers say, with the civil rights of the individual, if we endeavoured to interfere and say how the individual was to travel along the highway when the highway belongs to the municipality and can only

be regulated by the municipality or the legislature.

In order to make this successful we must have the co-operation of all classes interested. I may frankly say to my hon. friend that I have not been idle on this question, I have been studying it with all the care I could exercise during a busy session and for some months before, and I am impressed as thoroughly as any man in the House can be impressed with the idea that it is time we had some systematic effort to protect, as far as possible, the lives of the people on the highways crossing the railways. It is not a question that can be settled off-hand or in a moment. I am free to take my hon. friend and the House into my confidence and say that I intend to bring this matter to the consideration of my colleagues in a very few days. I might go further and say that but for the absence of the Minister of Finance, I would have discussed it weeks ago. I have been holding it in abeyance in order that there might be a full discussion on it, and I have a policy in mind concerning it which I wish to lay before my colleagues. That having been said and with the full understanding that we are all in sympathy with the idea of eradicating as far as possible the level crossings, I know that my hon. friend will be satisfied not to press his motion until we have discussed it further. The conditions now existing as to railways that we may have helped to create may not have been our fault, but the conditions on railways hereafter created will be our fault. If we allow them to be built as they have been in the past. I take it for granted that this House would be prepared to support a measure which would in principle say that on any railways to be in future chartered by this House, except in the case of extensions for switches, terminals or something of that kind, the greatest care should be taken to avoid this danger. If, when these railways are constructed, it should be found by the Railway Commissioners that level crossings have to be removed or protected in any way the railways should be required, in that case, to bear all the burden of such removal or protection. They would then know what was before them when they construct a railway. They would have it constantly in their minds that if they did not protect these crossings when they were constructing the railway they would only have to go to the expense of protecting them a little later on and that no municipality, province or Dominion would help them. I have detained the House longer than I had any desire to do, but this is a pretty broad question, a question with regard to which we are all of one mind. a question to which there is no political or party side and one in regard to which it ought to be the endeavour of the House to come to some arrangement by which the lives of the people may be protected, and even if in working out that scheme we may not all have our ideas carried out to the fullest extent, I believe the people of Canada will expect parliament to do something in order to bring about the desired result.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). Mr. Speaker, I apprehend that the House will not find fault with me for saying a few words upon this important matter. I wish to thank the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) for the valuable statistics he has placed upon 'Hansard' for our information and the information of the whole country in dealing with this question. So far as the object to be served and so far as some of the principles involved in the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) are concerned, in the main I agree with him. But, as to the manner of working out these principles I must differ to some extent and possibly if, for a few moments, I were to state frankly why I differ from some of the obseravtions of the Minister of Railways and Canals the time may not be entirely wasted. First of all, I would say that we must divide this subject into two subclasses. The elimination of level crossings is one thing, and requiring protection on level crossings is another thing entirely. In so far as the ideal and much hoped for condition of the elimination entirely of level crossings is concerned, I would say, from the knowledge of the subject that I have acquired, that it would not be an unreasonable thing that the state should pay a proportion of the expense. As far as allowing railways to still run upon the highways is concerned, and protecting the crossings because of the rapidly increasing danger, I would say, and I will give a few reasons for my belief, that the whole burden of that should be borne by the railways. The elimination is a condition where you are taking away from the railways something which you permitted them to suppose they had a right to in their charter. In the anxiety to build railways we permitted them to cross highways upon the level. I do not say that we usurped the right of the provinces, but if my hon. friend (the Minister of Railways and Canals) is right in saying that the provinces still control the highways, then we did usurp the jurisdiction of the provinces in so far as we permitted the railways to run across the highways, but we did it in the interest of building railways. We did it because otherwise the expense of building railways would have been prohibitive and we would not have had the transportation facilities in the country that we so much desired. When we permitted a railway to run upon or across a highway we gave it an easement— I do not say a right, but I do

say that their rights in regard to that matter are very much exaggerated. We gave them that permission for the sole purpose of securing the building of a railway outside of the provincial jurisdiction, and that railway, of course, became a work for the general advantage of Canada. It established a connection between one province and another, between one part of Canada and another, and became a national railway in that sense. As far as it was necessary for them to cross highways, we gave then that jurisdiction because otherwise we would not have had power to allow them to cross highways at all. In giving them that jurisdiction we were permitting them, for their own profit, and to encourage them to invest in the hope of the profit they would get, but still for their own profit, to use the King's highway for the purpose of their track, for the purpose of transporting from one part of the country to another. We must not forget also that we must look at the conditions which existed when we gave that easement or right; that is to say that the railways ran not one-half as fast as they run now, that they ran upon a single track and that the number of trains was probably 25 per cent of what it is now. People did not contemplate that within a few years the danger would be very much multiplied, as it has been by their running upon or across the highways in that way. It is only fair when we speak of our having contributed to the condition of danger upon the level crossing to say that when we gave these railways the right to use these level crossings we did it in contemplation of things as they were then, and when nobody supposed that there would be the danger that has arisen since because of the acceleration of speed, the multiplication of trains and double tracking. So that, when the people say that they think the railways which created the danger should pay the cost of removing it they are not unreasonable. When they say that this danger is increased at the instance of the railways because of conditions that were not contemplated when we gave them permission to cross the highways upon the level I say they are not unreasonable. And they are equally not unreasonable when they say that the cost of protecting against this great danger should be borne by the creature which causes the danger. The danger is not in the railway running its trains slowly enough or infrequently enough, but the danger is in the multitude of trains and in the rapidity with which they are run. None of these accidents in which people are killed are caused by slowly running trains. These accidents occur because the train does not stop or slow down either because there is no station at the crossing or because it is an express train which does not stop at that point. It is the rapidity of the train that kills the people. In cities, towns and villages, but more particularly in villages and small towns, are these deaths occurring. Why? Because trains running from city to city, or from city to large town, or large town to city, run through villages and small towns at the rate of sixty miles an hour, and it is these trains that are causing the deaths and injuries. The rapidity is such that people cannot avoid the train in time. That was never contemplated when permission to cross highways was given some years ago. So that when we speak of contributing, I want it distinctly understood that in so far as I am concerned I can see no possible ground or excuse whatever for any contribution being made by the people of the state, municipalities, or provinces to render nugatory the great dangers which our railways cause while they are running upon the level crossings. That is why I say we should divide the question into these two subjects. The danger is entirely the creation of the railway because of the action of the railway in multiplying the number and increasing the rapidity of their trains. They are doing this for their own profit and properly so. We want them to make as much profit as they can, to carry as large a quantity of goods as they can and as many people, but while they are running these trains in the interest of the country they are running them for their own profit. At the same time by virtue of the carrying on of their business they create a danger upon these level crossings which was never contemplated when we gave them permission to cross them.

I have given this matter a good deal of consideration, and speaking for myself, I cannot see any just ground for saying that anybody other than the railways should contribute to the expense of protecting the level crossings. Of course the total abolition of level crossings is the ideal condition but as we know that is so expensive as to be prohibitive in many cases. The abolition of the level crossings, that ideal condition, would be more or less interfering with the easement which you gave to these railways when you permitted them originally to cross on the level. You said to them that in order that they might raise capital to build their railways at a moderate cost they might use the King's highways, and therefore in fairness to them—and I want to be fair to the railways—we should, I think, contribute to some extent to the cost of bringing about that ideal condition. But we would not be the only gainers by that; the railway companies themselves will save thousands of dollars a year because it will then not be possible for them to come in contact with any obstruction on their track which would impede and endanger their trains in operation. Such a condition would

also save them an immense amount of money in maintenance, and before the special committee which some years ago considered that Bill which has now for the third time gone to the Senate, the representatives of the railway companies admitted that if they had the means they would prefer crossing under or over a highway, but the expense made it out of the question. The railways always admit that the expense of maintenance is comparatively trifling once you have the level crossing done away with and the grades separated. Therefore, when we take from them the right or the easement to run upon the level which we gave them in their original incorporation, it is worth something to the people and the people should contribute. This question is very much allied to who should contribute, and here I differ from the Minister of Railways. Why should the province or municipality pay? Has not this parliament of Canada taken under its wing all the railways of the country that are of any moment and given them to the control of the Dominion Railway Commission to the exclusion of all provincial authority. This question is very much allied to the question of subsidies to railways. We grant a subsidy to a railway to develop the country and to furnish transportation facilities, and if in doing that we find the railway ought to be constructed more expensively by eliminating level crossings, I suppose the subsidy would be increased. I am not saying that we should not in some proportion contribute to the cost of eliminating level crossings, but I can see no reason why it should come out of any other purse than the Dominion exchequer. Why should the small town or village in which these accidents occur be made to contribute. It is not they who get the benefit of the fast running trains; it is the larger cities. I would not agree entirely with my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) that the cities should be put on a different plane.

Mr. LENNOX. I did not quite say that. When I said I would leave the cities to take care of themselves I meant that the cities having a large number of able representatives in this House, they should deal with that question for themselves.

Mr. LANCASTER. In view of that explanation I do not differ from my hon friend (Mr. Lennox) as I thought I did, but of course the cities must allow a member of this House who represents a rural constituency to give his ideas on the general question, and I quite agree with the Minister of Railways that we should approach this in a broad and general way and not from any local standpoint. And, if there is going to be any general principle laid down, what better general principle can you have than that the state should pay. The city pays more taxes to the Dominion than the village does, and why therefore not let the city through the Dominion exchequer, and the town and the village through the Dominion exchequer contribute their share. The municipality, unless it is a large municipality, gets no benefit from these fast running trains and my contention is that unless you put the burden upon the Dominion entirely you are not going to do substantial justice. I do not think there is any question but that a very great majority of the people of this country while they would be willing to be taxed in some way for the elimination of level crossings, would, 95 per cent of them say, that there is no fairness in taxing either the province or the municipality for providing protection upon crossings where the trains are to continue to run upon the level. The hon. Minister of Railways says that the municipality creates the traffic. Is that quite a reason for saying that the municipality should pay the cost of protecting the level crossings? The municipality creates the traffic for the profit of the railway. The more the municipality prospers, the more goods are shipped on the railway and the more it contributes to the profits of the railway; but the municipality gets no part of the profits of the railway. The railway is making that much more profit from the people; the people are that much better customers of the railway. But the people have no opportunity to share in the profits of the railway, and of course cannot have, unless there is government ownership. If the people contribute to increase the traffic of the railway, more people are liable to cross the tracks on the highway, and therefore there is greater liability for accidents. That seems to me to be no argument for saying that the people ought to pay more for the protection of the highway. I would put it the other way, by saying that the railway ought to pay more, because it is creating more danger and because it is getting more traffic.

I wish to say a word or two in regard to what has been done by this House on this matter. I said several years ago in this House that so long as the railways cross the highways on the rail level, they should protect the highways at their own expense. It took this House some years to come to that conclusion. Bills which I had the temerity to introduce for several years, five years ago, four years ago, three years ago, did not pass; but the combined wisdom of this House put the Bill into shape that it passed three years ago unanimously. I did not get all I contended for. I did not get the principle of protection so that the railways would have absolutely to protect and be at the mercy of a court or jury in some particular case. But this House concluded to send up to the Senate a Bill which required the Railway Commission to decide what protection should be necessary in the thickly settled parts of

cities, towns and villages, and provided that this protection should be afforded at the expense of the railway. The decision was not left to the mere whim of any jury, but was submitted to the judgment of the Board of Railway Commissioners, who were to decide what protection should be afforded for any particular crossing or class of crossings, and were to impose on the railway only what expense would be fairly necessary to carry out their order. Of course, that decision of this House in regard to level crossings does not touch the question of contribution to the cost of abolishing level crossings. That question, as the Minister of Railway says, has never really been dealt with by this House. The Act passed three years ago by this House and sent to the Senate would not apply to any case where there is a subway or an overhead bridge, and where the railway goes either under or over the highway. Although I am open to conviction, having no other object than the Minister of Railways, which is to eliminate this terrible evil from the country, I am bound to say that I am more than ever of the opinion that the principle adopted by this House for three years was a salutary principle; that is to say, that while the railways continue to run on the level across highways, they must put in some protection, to be determined by the Board of Railway Commissioners in every instance, and that if they do not do that, they must slow down their trains to ten miles an hour.

If we come to the conclusion that we have to eliminate level crossings, I am with the Minister of Railways that there should be some contribution. So long as we do not eliminate, I am dead against, and I believe the people of this country are dead against, any municipality or the province or the Dominion contributing in any way to the protection of level crossings by the railway, which creates the whole danger and has multiplied it greatly since it got permission to run on the highways. But when we eliminate level crossings and make the railways, as some of the states have done, remove a certain number every year, I am in favour of the people contributing a certain portion of the cost. I am not prepared to say what would be a fair proportion; we would have to go into certain calculations as to what it would cost in different parts of the country. Perhaps a fair contribution would be from 15 to 25 per cent. I am not going to commit myself to any particular proportion; but certainly it should not be over 25 per cent; and I believe the contribution should come out of the Dominion treasury, and not from the provinces or municipalities, because the Dominion has usurped the jurisdiction of the provinces with regard to railways, and has taken away from them the power to put any restrictions upon them or to control them in any way.

Mr. LANCASTER.

In conclusion, I might point out to the Minister of Railways that if these statistics of the number of deaths, which have been given to him, are correct—and I do not doubt that he believes them to be correct—I am very much surprised; because I have for five or six years kept track of the accidents at level crossings, and though I may have lost some, my records show fully 25 per cent more than the number of deaths shown by those statistics. My records show that, instead of 270, over 400 people were killed at level crossings during the last five years. But, assuming the figures given by the board to the minister, and no doubt believed by the board to be correct, the board has no knowledge that they represent the actual number of people killed, because it gets the information from the railways. It is true the information has to be sworn to by some officer of the company, but he does not run the trains or see the accidents. He gets his information from the reports sent in to him, and he has not the evidence of the man who knows; he has only hearsay evidence, coming through a lot of sub-officers down to the men on the trains, and the minister will readily understand that if the railways can attribute an accident to anything that will exonerate them, they will do so. Therefore, although the number of deaths may be correctly stated in their reports, the cause of death is not always given correctly. I say this because I know that the Railway Commission wants to serve the people properly, and if they will take the warning that they ought to have the statistics furnished them by the railway companies carefully looked into and not rely on them entirely, it will do no harm. The proportion, even if correctly stated by the Minister of Railways, is one to each 425 miles in Canada, while in the United States it is 1 to 660 miles, and the difference is due to the fact that the legislation in the United States is more advanced.

I shall not, in view of the discussion that has taken place, trouble the House any longer. I trust that anything that I have said will be accepted in the spirit in which it was uttered. My sole object is to assist in enacting legislation which will eliminate this terrible evil. If my Bill which has again gone to the Senate be found after a year's experience not sufficient, we shall have to try and improve on it. And as regards the elimination of level crossings, with which the Bill sent to the Senate does not deal, I shall be glad to assist the Minister of Railways in every way possible, to put into practical legislation the protection of the people. But in my opinion the contribution, if any is required to be made by the people, should not be attempted to be levied on the provinces or on the municipalities at all, but be paid entirely by the federal authorities.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac). I wish to preface the very few remarks I intend making on this subject, Mr. Speaker, by expressing my gratification at the unanimous concurrence of the House in the Bill of my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), and I hope that, in dealing with this question of level crossings, which is recognized by members on both sides as of vast importance, we will find equal unanimity. I would not have risen at all to address you, sir, did I not consider it my duty to place the county of Frontenac right before this House. In reply to an inquiry which I had on the paper regarding the accident down near Kingston at the Montreal street crossing some time last month, the Minister of Railways made the statement that the Grand Trunk Railway showed a willingness to go on with the building of the subway, but that the county of Frontenac and the city of Kingston objected on account of the expenditure. As the hon. minister had not the opportunity to get the facts, his error was excusable, but I wish to put the position of the county of Frontenac in that matter correctly before the House. As far back as 1898, Mr. D. D. Rogers, who then represented the county in this House, took steps to have the railway crossings in the county protected. In 1902 the county sent a deputation to Ottawa which waited on the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. That deputation asked that a subway be built at the outer station near Kingston. True the city of Kingston did raise the objection that as the station was outside the city, they should not be asked to bear any part of the cost. However, the request of the county of Frontenac was granted by the Railway Committee and that commission issued an order placing the cost of the approaches on the county and city jointly and calling on the Grand Trunk Railway to proceed with the work. Nothing however was done, despite the protests of the county of Frontenac on several occasions against efforts made by the city of Kingston and by the Grand Trunk Railway system to prevent the subway from being built. Despite these protests nothing was done until February 17, 1904. The county council then sent a letter to Mr. Hayes, of the Grand Trunk Railway, asking him to go on with the work as ordered by the Railway Committee, and in June, 1904, at a special sitting of the Board of Railway Commissioners the Grand Trunk applied to have the former order of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council amended. This request was not granted, but the Board of Railway Commissioners, at the request of the council—and I want to emphasize that—approved of the order of 1902, and asked the Grand Trunk Railway to go on and construct the subway. No steps, however, were taken by the Grand Trunk Railway to build that subway or protect the public from June, 1904, to July, 1905. At that time it came to the knowledge of the county that a somewhat similar case was pending in which the city of Toronto was interested, and in July, 1905, the county of Frontenac expressed its willingness to allow the matter to stand until that case was finally decided. These facts clearly show a disregard by the Grand Trunk Railway of the order of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, in the first instance, and then of the subsequent order of the railway board, as well as a disregard for the public. Throughout this whole matter for the last ten years, there has been no lack of effort made by the county of Frontenac to have the subway built and certainly no effort made to prevent its construction. In spite of the opposition in the adjoining municipality of the city of Kingston and of the Grand Trunk Railway, the county of Frontenac has been continually persistent in its endeavours to have the subway constructed and the public protected.

I have here a memorial addressed to this House by the council of the county of Frontenac, calling attention to the number of accidents at that level crossing and asking this House to take such steps as will insure the protection of the public. This petition is signed by the warden of the county and every member of the county council. It has been said that since the Dominion and provincial governments have contributed by bonus or other substantial aid to the construction of this railway, they are accessories to the danger created. I cannot see the matter in that light. If we go back to the time when the Grand Trunk Railway was constructed, we can understand that the municipalities were deeply interested in having that railway built, but they had no idea that, as the years went by, the danger would become so great as it is, owing to the speed of trains and other causes. Let us take the position of the Grand Trunk Railway in this matter and I am going to confine myself almost entirely to the conditions in my own county. Let us take this crossing, popularly called the Montreal Street crossing. There have been a number of deaths at that crossing. It has been said by the Minister of Railways that a good many accidents are due to individul carelessness. I do not think that could be contended as regards deaths occurring in that place. I believe the railways should be held responsible so far, at least, as that particular crossing is concerned. And I will give my reasons: When the railway was first built, there was only one track. Later, they laid another track in the course of double-tracking their system. But, more than that, they made a railway yard or shunting ground right across the highway. I submit that when the Grand Trunk Railway laid six tracks across the highway there, they did so with an utter disregard of the convenience of the travel-

ling public, and with a criminal disregard of the lives of the people using the highway. So far as expense in making that crossing safe is concerned, I think the responsibility should fall upon the Grand Trunk Railway Company which created the danger.

I am not going to attempt to lay out a plan whereby these dangers can be obviated. But I believe that something can be done with regard to the hundreds, perhaps thousands, of these crossings that will lessen the danger—done quickly and at comparatively little expense and without waiting for the more general action under which all crossings may be dealt with. There are many crossings in country places where the trees or bushes approach close to the railway on either side of the highway so that a person travelling on the highway cannot see the train approaching until he is on the track, and so cannot take means to avoid danger. I think many members of this House who have travelled through the country will agree with me that by simply cutting down the bushes or trees which obstruct the view of the people travelling on the highway, much might be done to remove danger at these level crossings. Again, I think that in laying out new towns or cities, danger might be greatly lessened by making it obligatory to build streets running parallel with the railway track into which the streets running at right angles would run. In this way the crossings could be merged into a few and danger greatly lessened, and that at comparatively little expense.

I have no intention of going into this subject on broad lines. It has been very ably introduced by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) who has contributed to the debate many facts and figures, which, I am sure, we shall all consider carefully and with great interest. My object in speaking was simply to place my own county in a proper light before this House, so far as these level crossings are concerned. The people of the county of Frontenac have not asked what their share of expenses would be to get rid of these level crossings. They have asked that the danger be removed. Up to the present time at least, there has been no cavilling on their part at the expense. I trust this matter will receive the attention of both sides of the House, and that it will be dealt with thoroughly and in a way to prevent the fatalities which we all so much deplore.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I merely wish to add a word to this very interesting discussion to express to the House the great interest that we in the province of Quebec take in the very important question raised by my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). I had not the advantage of hearing all that was said by that hon. gentleman in support of his motion; but reading the motion I find that it expresses exactly our feeling upon this subject. I have not seen the report showing the number of accidents that have occurred, but I think that we have had, in Quebec, about the same number of these distressing fatalities as have happened in the province of Ontario—some that we have had during the past year being of a most appalling character. We have not, in the past, taken as much interest in the discussion of this subject as has been evinced by our colleagues from Ontario. Indeed, these hon. gentlemen have persistently brought this matter to the attention of the government. It is also a very urgent question for us in the province of Quebec. I was glad to hear the declarations made by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham), that the government was going to take up this subject without delay and see if something could not be done to diminish the number of fatalities. I listened to what was said by my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), and I quite agree with him that, so far as making the level crossings safe is concerned, there should be no contribution by anybody but the railway companies themselves. But when you would propose to eliminate a level crossing altogether, I must say that I feel some embarrassment in holding the same conclusion. I do not know if I understood my hon. friend to say that he thought that no contribution ought to be made except by the federal government.

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes, I say so—as distinguished from the municipality and the province.

Mr. MONK. It may be that my hon. friend is right. He has given a great deal of study to this question, which I have not. But I incline rather to believe that not only the government should contribute, but there should be some mode by which the municipality should contribute in a proportion which I am not prepared to designate at the present moment. The elimination of level crossings by the railway company with a contribution only by the government would give rise to a great deal of difficulty, I think, because it involves interference with the roads. I think it would be necessary—and I think it would be fair as a general rule—that the municipalities should contribute something, and that they should be interested and co-operate in the elimination. I do not think the province should be called upon to contribute—I do not see any reason why such a contribution should be called for. In Montreal at least, we have found that the urgent necessity for the elimination of these terrible death-traps arises from the growth of municipalities around the crossings, making a great artery of the road which crosses the railway, and thus making it far more dangerous. This and other reasons, I think, might be adduced as reasons why the municipality should become interested in the work and contribute in some small proportion. I think that in

Toronto the work of substituting other crossings for level crossings was contributed to by the municipality under special agreement

In Montreal we concluded an agreement with the Grand Trunk for the elimination of level crossings by contributing, I think, the sum of $1,000,000, and I would be inclined to say that not only the municipalities interested in the elimination of the crossings but also the government should contribute something. I would be inclined to place the initiation of that elimination with the municipalities. Of course any scheme of that kind would, under the present conditions, necessitate enabling legislation by the provinces empowering the municipalities to take action and to have recourse to what is in reality a Dominion tribunal established to regulate our federal railways and, having had recourse to that tribunal, to be bound by its directions. I think it is only fair in some instances I have in mind to ask that the municipalities should contribute something, and that the Dominion government should contribute a fixed proportion determined in advance, but not an arbitrary proportion, a percentage of so much which would be defined by legislation.

This motion entirely meets with the views and desires of the province of Quebec and I hope the promise made by the Minister of Railways will be fulfilled as promptly as possible.

Hon. J. HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, in supporting the very excellent resolution of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) I wish to compliment him upon the research he has made and on his very excellent speech in support of his motion. The subject is one of the most important that comes before this parliament for consideration. It is associated with the subject of transportation, and transportation is, after all, the highest politics and the vital question for the parliament of Canada to consider. Anything in reference to transportation ought to be considered carefully and well by the people of Canada. It is all-important to us that the transportation of passengers and freight should be rapid in order to compete with other countries. If we have speed and level crossings we must have danger to the people of the country. The figures brought forward by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) in support of his resolution giving the number of accidents which occurred among railway employees on this continent in comparison with other countries where they have better provision for safeguarding public crossings were appalling. I had no idea the death rate was so high. We are suffering from the effects of early conditions in this country. We were bound to have railways, but we could not have them if we imposed European conditions upon them. We had to submit to all these difficulties and dangers which now accompany our railways in order to get them. We are getting out of that position now. What ought we to do? We should do as the Minister of Railways has suggested and impose upon railways to which we grant charters in future certain provisions in reference to crossings. I prefer the manner suggested by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), that these conditions should be statutory and the enforcement left either to a court or to the Railway Commission. But the time has arrived when we must do something not only in the interest of the people of the country themselves, but in the interest of the railway companies. They are anxious to have the Commission make inquiry into these crossings for the purpose of arriving at some plan or other by which these dangers should be either gradually eliminated or in some way guarded against. The amount that a railway company pays in the shape of damages for loss of life, in pensions to injured employees and destruction of material would to a great extent offset the cost of doing away with the level crossings or guarding them. I was struck with the law of Connecticut mentioned by the hon. member providing that each railway line in the state shall eliminate one of these dangers for every 60 miles of road each year. That would be a gradual improvement in the conditions.

I realize the difficulty of an arrangement between the federal and provincial governments and the municipalities as to contributions towards the elimination of these crossings. My contention is that the power vested by the British North America Act in the federal government with respect to railways covers everything incidental to the charter which we give them. If it is necessary to cross a highway, jurisdiction over which is in the province, we do not need to get legislation from that province in order to regulate the manner of crossing. The very power given to us to grant a charter for a railway gives us everything incidental to it. I am not going to give any opinion of my own, but I am going to state to the House that I have listened to the biggest lawyers that were ever in this House, to Ministers of Justice to whom the question had been submitted, and they were all of the opinion that where power was given to the federal government to do a thing everything in the slightest degree incidental to it, although the province would otherwise have had jurisdiction, was also given to the federal government. What practical legislation can we enact on this question? It would be unwise and unfair to pass legislation to say that a crossing shall be overhead or under-

ground. In Great Britain that is the law except in very exceptional cases. As my hon. friend says, a level crossing is permitted perhaps in the Highlands of Scotland. where there is not much travel over the road, and then a gate is required to protect it. We cannot adopt such a law as that in this country at the present time. We could not get railways built, but we must gradually go in that direction. One of the primary objects that we must keep in view in our legislation in reference to railways is the protection of the lives of the people, and our legislation should have that tendency as long as it does not act as a detriment or as a bar to the development of our transportation facilities. A well considered scheme may be thought out, one that would apply to the future and also have regard, to a certain extent, to the past. I prefer not giving powers to the Commission to be exercised arbitrarily as they think proper. I prefer the suggestion of my hon. friend from Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) that there should be a well thought out scheme adopted by the parliament of Canada and that it should then be placed in the hands of the Commissioners to be carried out. Whatever scheme is adopted its guiding principle should have in view greater protection to the public at level crossings.

Mr. F. F. PARDEE (West Lambton). Mr. Speaker, just a word in connection with the resolution which is now before the House. As has been so well said by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) who has just taken his seat, transportation is perhaps the very greatest question that this country has before it and in connection with that I just wish to differ from the remarks of the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) regarding the question of the cost of the elimination of level crossings. There can be no doubt in the mind of the members of this House that level crossings are a menace to the lives of the people. They are a menace to every one who has occasion to travel upon the highway, and, taking that view of the matter, it lies with this House to devise some means in order that protection at level crossings may be provided. The hon. member for Lincoln, however, takes a view with which I am not inclined to agree. He starts out with the premise that the railways, at the time they obtained their charters, in years gone by, did not have the idea that fast trains would ever be run upon these roads, and upon this ground he bases the remark that the fault is the fault solely and wholly of the railways by reason of the multitude and rapidity of the trains. He further makes the remark that the fault is the fault of the railways only by reason of their desire to make more profit by the running of fast trains. As has been said by the hon. member for Lanark the transportation question is foremost in the minds of the people of Canada to-day. If, to-day, you were to eliminate these trains, if you were to take away from the freight and passenger service which you have by these trains to-day, if you were to have no fast trains, if you were to cut out these trains both for passengers and freight, I submit that the first people to find fault with you and to say that you had done absolutely wrong and that the railways were utterly to blame would be those who are to-day enjoying this service. Therefore, I think it is plainly evident that that argument will hardly hold water because you cannot take away from what you have got, and you have only got what you have now by reason of the increased demands of the people. If that is so should it be said that the fault is absolutely that of the railways? I take the position that it is not. If it is the fault of the railways it is because the demands of the people have compelled the railways to do what they are doing at the present time in the running of their trains. But now, the other question comes up. If the railway crossing is to be eliminated, in what way shall it be done? My hon. friend from Lincoln says that he thinks they ought to bear the whole cost. If the Dominion is to bear the whole cost of the elimination of crossings, when you take into consideration the fact that there are in the Dominion of Canada to-day upwards of 12,000 level crossings and when you come to take into consideration the further fact that it may cost a few hundreds of dollars to make them, some of them, overhead or underneath, while others may cost millions, would it be fair to say that when the people themselves are being protected through the various provinces and municipalities, the Dominion as a whole should bear the cost? If you allow the municipalities to get out of their share of the burden, I would ask the hon. gentleman how he would arrange such a scheme as the viaduct in Toronto?

Mr. LANCASTER. What I say is that if the municipality and the province pay in addition to the Dominion, then the municipality is paying three times over and the province twice. The man in the municipality pays his taxes to the province and the man in the province contributes the revenue to the Dominion.

Mr. PARDEE. What the hon. gentleman says may be true, but I would ask him if the municipality and the province to-day receive their share of the taxes from railways, is it not fair that the municipality and the province should bear some of the burden?

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes, but they should not pay three times over.

Mr. PARDEE. The railways are paying to the municipalities and the provinces large sums in the form of taxes, and under these circumstances it is not an unfair argument to ask that they should be required to pay something towards the elimination of these crossings. I did not intend to get into an argument with my hon. friend regarding this point. I agree that this is a big, broad question. that it should not be approached in any spirit other than in that of endeavouring to, in some way, lessen the danger, to get rid of the crossings, and it should be done in the most equitable way that can be devised by this House. If it is approached in that spirit, as it will be, then I think that some scheme will be worked out whereby the demands of the people will be satisfied. There can be no doubt about this point that a scheme cannot be formulated in a day or in a week. It is a matter that will have to be carefully considered so that justice may be done to all. This is a question that the government ought to take into consideration because it is a burning question with the people of the country. It is something that should be taken into consideration at once and it is something in regard to which some decision ought to be come to as rapidly as possible. It will not do to say that in so far as the railways are concerned they are the people to blame because the people who built the railways are simply carrying out what they are bound to carry out under their charters; that is to do the best they can for the people and to improve the service as much as the service is required to be improved. In the doing of this they are running trains; they are running faster trains and they are perhaps putting the people in the way of more danger than heretofore. But they are only doing what their charter calls on them to do, and they are doing it in the public interest and for the service of the people of Canada.

Mr. LENNOX. In reference to the suggestion of the Minister of Railways that this debate should not be continued in the absence of the Minister of Finance he has been good enough to say to me that he will afford another opportunity to the gentlemen who wish to speak on this question if he does not introduce a Bill this session as he intends to do. It being six o'clock I thought I would mention that that is perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. GRAHAM. Would the House permit me to offer a thought for consideration in reference to the question as to municipalities and provinces contributing for all the crossings? If whether they are in my municipality or in my province the Dominion would contribute, then when my province and my municipality get the additional benefit of having a level crossing eliminated in their borders should they not contribute something more?

Mr. LANCASTER. Is it a benefit?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think it is a great benefit. I have no idea at all of trying to choke off discussion, and if I produce a Bill it will give opportunity for full discussion to every person. If such a calamity should overtake me that I should not be able to introduce a Bill I assure my hon. friend that the government will see that he will have every opportunity to further discuss this resolution.

At six o'clock the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 18, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. The clerk of the House has received from the clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of the Hon. William Templeman, member elect for Comox-Atlin, British Columbia.

FIRST READING.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 64) to amend the Dominion Lands Act. He said: This Bill is to correct what appears to have been an error which crept into the Bill as it passed last year. When the Dominion Lands Bill was before the Senate on July 17, 1908 —three days before the closing of parliament—an amendment was there moved to the following effect as appears by the minutes of the Senate:

The order of the day being read for the third reading of Bill (No. 181) entitled an Act to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the public lands of the Dominion, as amended, the Hon. Mr. Scott moved, seconded by the Right Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright, that the said Bill, as amended, be now read a third time. The Hon. Mr. Lougheed in amendment, moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Perley:

That the said Bill be not now read a third time but be amended by restoring to section 42 in the 6th line thereof before the word 'schools,' the word 'public' so as to read 'public schools', as now in the present law respecting Dominion lands. The question of concurrence being put thereon, the same was resolved in the affirmative. The question of concurrence being again put on the main motion, the same was resolved in the affirmative. The said Bill, as further amended, was then read a third time accordingly. The question was put whether this Bill as further amended, shall pass. This was resolved in the affirmative.

Ordered, that the clerk go down to the House of Commons and acquaint that House that the Senate have passed this Bill with several amendments to which they desire their concurrence.

The message was taken down to the House of Commons on the same day, as appears from the Votes and Proceedings, July 17, 1908, page 1454. The minute is as follows:

A message was received from the Senate agreeing to the Bill (No. 181) to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the public lands of the Dominion with an amendment which is as follows:

Page 8, line 21—after 'provide' insert the following as subclause 9 of clause 15:

'Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to two years imprisonment, who buys, trades or sells, or professes to buy trade or sell land, or any interest in or control of land open to homestead entry, or for which homestead entry has been granted, before patent therefor has been issued.

The House then adjourned at 1.55 o'clock a.m. until 11 o'clock a.m. this day.

It will be seen that the amendment moved by Senator Lougheed and adopted by the Senate did not appear in the message sent to the House of Commons and therefore that amendment did not come before the House for concurrence. Who was responsible for this omission, and whether it was the result of accident or design is to me unknown. In any event it never came before this House. This House agreed to the one amendment sent down, as appears from the following entry in our Votes and Proceedings of July 18 last, page 1464:

The amendments made by the Senate to the following Bills were taken into consideration and agreed to, namely Bill (No. 189) to amend the Civil Service Act, and Bill (No. 181) to consolidate and amend the Act respecting the public lands of the Dominion.

The result is that the clause, as it now stands, in the statutes of 1908, materially changes the law, as the word 'public' is omitted and the words now are: 'organized and carried on in accordance with the law of such province.

That was a material change in the Act. And, right here, I wish to draw attention to another thing. When the first Dominion Lands Bill was brought down, it had explanatory notes after the several clauses. The clause to which I now refer contained an amendment which appears in the Bill of 1908, and the note at the foot of it refers only to another amendment of the law which was properly brought to our attention by that explanatory note. But, when the Bill of the succeeding year was brought down, which purports to have the same explanatory notes at the foot of each clause, and where this important amendment was made in that clause, there is no reference to it in the explanatory note, but there is a reference to another change which was made in that clause. It was clause 42. In the Act of 1906-7, the clause is practically the same as in the old law and provides as follows:

All moneys from time to time realized from the sale of school lands should be invested in securities of Canada to form a school fund and the interest arising therefrom, after deducting the cost of management, should be paid annually to the government of the province within which such lands are situate toward the support of public schools therein.

The explanatory note says:

This provision is the same as in the present law, except that the words 'or territory' have been struck out, as the territory referred to has been divided into the new provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, and there are no school lands beyond.

In the Bill of 1908, in which the important amendment I have referred to is made, there is no explanatory clause, except the one in the former Bill which I have just read. It makes no reference to the other very important change introduced into this Bill of 1908. Therefore reading the explanatory notes, as one naturally would, and finding no statement to the effect that this important change was to be made, in all human probability, a few of the members, when the Bill was going through, read the clause as it is now in the law. The Bill which I now introduce is to amend the Act so as to make it read as it was heretofore. The section now reads:

All moneys from time to time realized from the sale of school lands should be invested in securities of Canada to form a school fund, and the interest arising therefrom, after deducting the cost of management, should be paid annually to the government of the province within which such lands are situate, towards the support of schools organized and carried on in accordance with the law of such province.

The words of the old law were:

—toward the support of public schools therein.

My amendment would restore the wording of the original clause before this amendment was made in 1908.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 65) to amend the Railway Act. He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is, word for word, the Bill I promoted in this House last year. The Bill, after being introduced and read the first and second times, was sent to the Railway Committee, and there amended into the shape in which it now is. It passed the Railway Committee and came to this House, but was so late in getting through the Railway Committee that the session ended before it could be reached. The Bill provides that every railway company that receives a charter from this parliament shall be compelled not to spend fifteen per cent within the first two years as provided by the present law, but shall be compelled, if the railway is under 250 miles in length, to build ten per cent of the mileage during the first

two years, an additional ten per cent in the third year, another ten in the fourth year, and to complete the road in five years as at present; if the road is over 250 miles in length, the company shall be compelled to build at least one-twentieth of the mileage in the first two years, an additional one-twentieth in each of the third and fourth years, and to complete in five years as at present. I believe that something along this line is absolutely necessary. I speak with some experience of how these matters work out, in the western country at all events. The constituency I represent is an old-settled constituency—settled since 1882—and there are many settlers in that country who have been waiting year after year for a road to be built; charters have been granted eight or ten years ago, and yet nothing has been done toward extending these lines of railway. The companies come before this House and before the Railway Committee, and, on one excuse or another, they get an extension of time. We have seen it this year in the Railway Committee that, almost every time an effort is made to force a railway company to build so much of its line each year, the excuse is made: You cannot pick out one railway company and treat it differently from the others. I agree with that; it would not be fair to treat one differently from the others. But I believe that it would be in the interest of the country generally, and especially of the west, that all railway companies should be compelled to build a certain proportion of their roads every year or forfeit the charter. It has been stated, time and again, that the possession of a charter does not prevent another road from getting a charter and going on and building. That may be well enough in theory, but it does not work out that way in practice. When one big company has the charter, it can play the dog in the manger to the fullest extent, not building its own proposed road and yet preventing other railways from building. We have had that to contend with for years in my own constituency. One of the big companies, the Canadian Pacific Railway, has a charter. They will not build the road, but the moment the Canadian Northern, or the Grand Trunk Pacific, gets a charter, and proposes to build, the Canadian Pacific Railway will go on and grade a few miles. Only yesterday, in the Railway Committee an hon. member from British Columbia gave us an instance in which one of the big railway companies—the same company—in order to keep out the Jim Hill system graded a portion of the road and laid the rails, but as soon as they had shut out the building of a competing line they not only ceased working, but actually took up the rails they had already laid. Is that a state of things we ought to tolerate in this country? I claim that the time has come when some change ought to be made. The railway companies are doing exactly as they like. We have no say as to where they shall build the branch lines; in the western country at all events they do not consult the wishes of the people, but build with a view to cutting out competing companies. What we want is a law that will compel them, when they get a charter, to go on and do something with the road. I have understood my right hon. friend the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to state on several occasions that whenever the Railway Committee take a certain line of action, it is not his policy or the policy of the government to go contrary to the wishes of that committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) should confine himself to an explanation of his Bill as is customary on the first reading.

Mr. TURRIFF. Well, those, Mr. Speaker, are the reasons I have for introducing this Bill, and those are the provisions of the Bill. If it is thought desirable to send it to the Railway Committee. I have not the slightest doubt that the Railway Committee will do again this year as it did last year, pass the Bill and send it back here to be dealt with by the House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

CANNED MEATS FOR THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT.

Mr. HUGHES asked:

1. Has the attention of the government been drawn to the announcement that the British government has contracted for large quantities of canned meats for the army and navy, with firms in foreign nations?

2. Were efforts made by the British government to have these supplies furnished by Canada, Australia or South Africa?

3. Is it the custom of the British government to favour foreign nations with whom it wishes to cultivate friendship, and persons other than those loyal to Britain and her institutions, to the detriment and exclusion of those loyal and true to Britain and her institutions?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

1. The attention of the government has not been drawn to the fact that the British government has contracted for large quantities of canned meats for the army and navy with firms in foreign countries.

2. On this the government has no information.

3. The propriety of this question seems to be questionable, as it implies a censure on a matter which is not of the competence of this House. But this government has no doubt that in any business relations the British government would, wherever possible, favour British countries in preference to foreign countries.

COST OF WORK ON THE ASSINIBOINE RIVER.

Mr. MEIGHEN asked:

What was the actual cost per yard of the work on the Assiniboine river, near Portage la Prairie, done in September or October, 1908?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Twenty-two cents and a half per cubic yard.

IMPORTATIONS OF HICKORY AND ASH HANDLES.

Mr. ELSON asked:

1. How many hickory and ash handles for pitchforks, axes, hoes, hammers, etc., have been imported into Canada during the year ending March 31, 1908?

2. What were the quantities entered at the different ports?

3. What numbers of dozens, and the values of same, were imported by manufacturers on which the export drawback has been allowed?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). I regret that we are not able to answer all the questions on the paper. I have had a statement prepared which gives all we are able to afford in the way of reply. As it involves a great deal of detail, perhaps the hon. member will consent, with the permission of the House, that I hand this in to the 'Hansard.'

STATEMENT showing the Value of the undermentioned Articles, together with the Duty collected thereon, entered for Consumption at each Port in Canada during the fiscal Year ended March 31, 1908.

Ports.	D. Shovel Handles.		Ash Handles.		Hickory Handles.	
	Value.	Duty.	Value.	Duty.	Value.	Duty.
	$	$ cts.	$	$ cts.	$	$ cts.
Bridgeburg	16	2 40	.....	.....	45	11 25
Chatham	173	25 95	.....	.....	.....	
Collingwood	.....	.....	4	1 00	.....	
Galt	.....	.....	.....	.....	235	58 75
Gananoque	40,168	6,025 20	3,000	750 00	.....	
Goderich	3,266	489 90	.....	.....	.....	
Guelph	17	2 55	.....	.....	.....	
Hamilton	9,155	1,373 25	.....	.....	.....	
London	228	34 20	.....	.....	197	49 25
Ottawa	.....	.....	25	4 75	32	5 60
Paris	.....	.....	.....	.....	65	16 25
Peterboro	5,206	780 90	.....	.....	.....	
Port Arthur	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,404	351 00
Port Hope	.....	.....	105	26 25	.....	
St. Catharines	2,815	422 25	55,026	13,756 50	3,427	856 75
St. Thomas	.....	.....	83	20 75	.....	
Sault Ste. Marie	.....	.....	.....	.....	248	62 00
Toronto	109	16 35	23	4 85	833	208 25
Wallaceburg	.....	.....	15	3 75	.....	
Windsor	.....	.....	141	35 25	248	62 00
Quebec—						
Athelstan	2	0 30	.....	.....	.....	
Montreal	4,631	694 65	.....	.....	7,166	1,775 76
Quebec	21	3 15	.....	.....	.....	
Sherbrooke	114	17 10	.....	.....	.....	
Nova Scotia—						
Halifax	1,105	165 75	.....	.....	.....	
North Sydney	.....	.....	7	1 75	.....	
Yarmouth	.....	.....	.....	.....	71	17 75
New Brunswick—						
St. John	.....	.....	128	32 00	512	128 00
Manitoba—						
Brandon	5	0 75	207	51 75	42	10 50
Winnipeg	450	67 50	.....	.....	2,976	744 00
British Columbia—						
Prince Rupert	.....	.....	.....	.....	11	2 75
Grand Forks	.....	.....	.....	.....	241	60 25
Nanaimo	13	1 95	204	51 00	.....	
Nelson	125	18 75	929	232 25	.....	
New Westminster	.....	.....	.....	.....	247	61 75
Vancouver	14	2 10	.....	.....	16,011	4,002 75
Victoria	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,546	386 50
Greenwood	.....	.....	186	46 50	.....	
Saskatchewan and Alberta—						
Calgary	.....	.....	.....	.....	41	10 25
Edmonton	.....	.....	113	28 25	.....	
Lethbridge	.....	.....	578	144 50	.....	
North Portal	.....	.....	42	10 50	.....	
Regina	.....	.....	293	73 25	.....	
Dominion total	67,633	10,144 95	61,109	15,274 85	35,598	8,881 36

STURGEON PIER, P.E.I.

Mr. FRASER—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Were tenders called for enlarging and raising stem of Sturgeon pier, in Kings county, Prince Edward Island?
2. If so, who were the tenderers and what was the amount of each tender?
3. To whom was the contract awarded?
4. If no tenders were called for, how is this work being done, and who has charge of this work?

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

1. Yes.
2. Neil Campbell, Sturgeon, P.E.I., $4,100; Daniel Collings, Sturgeon, P.E.I., $4,971; F. S. Macdonald, Souris, P.E.I., $5,095; Thos. Campbell, Sturgeon, P.E.I., $5,300.
3. Neil Campbell.
4. Answered by No. 1.

ISSUES OF POST OFFICE ORDERS AND POSTAL NOTES.

Mr. MACDONELL asked:

What is the total number and amount of post office orders or postal notes issued in Canada payable in Great Britain and in Europe, during the calendar years 1905, 1906, 1907 and 1908, respectively?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General): The following statement relates to money orders only, as postal notes issued in Canada are not negotiable in Great Britain or Europe.

STATEMENT showing the total number and total amount of Post Office Money Orders issued in Canada and made payable in Great Britain and the undermentioned countries in Europe during the four calendar years ended December 31, 1908.

Country.	1905.		1906.		1907.		1908.	
	No.	Amount.	No.	Amount.	No.	Amount.	No.	Amount.
		$ cts.		$ cts.		$ cts.		$ cts.
Great Britain	205,660	2,229,253 61	280,956	3,045,392 29	426,968	4,593,955 04	435,467	4,210,662 08
Austria	23,202	651,445 21	32,349	1,027,811 38	52,019	1,765,045 47	50,495	1,541,534 43
Belgium	2,260	47,424 32	2,825	63,815 31	3,594	90,395 76	3,988	97,921 51
*Denmark	.....	.....	641	12,459 64	949	19,310 30	867	16,554 82
France	9,740	92,243 32	11,759	117,998 49	13,900	153,905 00	15,866	158,526 04
Germany	3,507	58,131 62	4,146	82,116 61	4,574	86,572 63	4,712	79,333 53
†Holland	.....	.....	303	4,837 99	1,375	21,342 59	1,480	22,177 45
Hungary	5,077	199,817 48	5,859	236,239 86	7,191	314,821 24	7,540	310,908 85
Italy	18,070	845,143 08	27,955	1,499,748 01	42,074	2,375,185 75	38,112	2,226,725 84
Norway	3,339	84,160 63	4,667	130,716 79	5,634	170,341 96	5,135	152,081 34
Sweden	5,391	137,736 47	6,863	203,592 64	8,333	276,797 90	7,524	240,593 89
‡Switzerland	870	13,396 86	835	12,740 14	1,054	26,100 06	2,771	103,841 84

* Commenced April 1, 1906. † Commenced July 1, 1906. ‡ Including Bulgaria and Servia.

TARIFF ON WOOD AND WOOD PULP.

Mr. JAMIESON asked:

1. Have any negotiations taken place or are any pending between the governments of Canada and the United States of America, contemplating the reduction of the American tariff on ground wood and woodpulp upon conditions prohibiting the imposition of an export tax upon such products by the government of Canada?
2. Is the government considering the imposition of an export tax upon ground wood and woodpulp?

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

1. No.
2. The government are not considering the imposition of an export tax on these articles.

ORIENTAL IMMIGRATION INTO BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR asked:

1. Has the government received from the government of British Columbia a resolution adopted by the legislature of that province, praying that application be made to the Imperial government for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the circumstances in connection with Oriental immigration into British Columbia?
2. If so, what was the date of receipt, what acknowledgment was made, and what action has been taken?
3. If no action has been taken, is it the intention of the government to deal with the matter?

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State):

1. No.
2 and 3. See answer to 1.

RAILWAY IN KINGS COUNTY, P.E.I.

Mr. FRASER—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

1. Were tenders called for the construction of a railroad from Harmony to Elmira, in Kings county, P.E.I.? If so were any tenders received?
2. What are the names of the tenderers, and the amount of each tender?
3. Was any tender accepted? If not, why not? If so, whose tender was accepted?
4. How much has been spent out of the appropriation of $31,000 voted last session for the construction of this railroad?
5. Is it the intention of the government to begin the construction of this road during the present year?

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

1. (a) Yes; (b) Yes.
2. Tender No. 1, D. R. Morrison and P. B. Clark, Summerside.
Tender No. 2, E. S. Reade and L. W. Reade, Ottawa.
Tender No. 3, Thos. Campbell, Charlottetown, P.E.I.
Tender No. 4, Wellington Mutch, Eldon, P.E.I.; Archibald McLean, Charlottetown; R. E. Mutch, Charlottetown.
Tender No. 5, James Camplong, Hudson, P.Q.
Tender No. 6, E. A. Wallberg, Montreal.
Tender No. 7, Whitehead Bros., Grand Falls, N.B.
Tender No. 8, Eustache Tremblay, Herbertville, Que.
It is not in the public interest to disclose the amount of each tender, as the matter has not been disposed of.
3. The matter is under the consideration of the government.
4. $3,077.91.
5. It is the intention to begin the work.

INTERNATIONAL WATERWAYS TREATY —FISHERIES IN NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John City). I would like to call the attention of the government, and especially of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to a statement which I see in the St. John 'Globe' of February 17. This is the statement:

In an Ottawa despatch to the Fredericton 'Gleaner' the position of the New Brunswick government is defined. Hon. Mr. Grimmer, Surveyor General, who represents this province at the conference, says:

'While he had no official knowledge of the nature of the proposed regulations he had been given to understand that they were applied to spawning grounds in the waters of Grand Manan and Petit Manan, and other points in New Brunswick sea waters which were fifteen miles and more from the international boundaries. He could not see how these could be described as international waters, and could see no reason for Canada's handing the management of them over to a commission in which the United States had any say.'

But this is the part to which I wish particularly to call attention:

In the original draft, as he understood it, it was proposed to give to the fishermen of each nation the right to come in and fish in the waters of the other nations as they were covered by the joint commission. He did not know how far this had been modified by the later changes in the regulations, but if it were put in force in that form it would hand over to Americans the best fishing grounds in Canada, while the American waters which were thrown open to Canadian were not worth mentioning. What he objected to was the principle of declaring waters to be international which were nowhere near the boundary line.

I would like to know from the government whether it is a fact that the treaty, and the regulations which are to be made under it, will permit American fishermen to enjoy the privileges of our inland fisheries in any of the waters which are embraced in this treaty; because if it does, it would allow American fishermen to come into the harbour of St. John and carry on fishing operations there, and fish all the way up the St. John river, notwithstanding that the harbour and the greater part of the river and many miles away from the boundary. I think it very important that the public should know whether that is the intention or not.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). In virtue of the treaty which was signed last year, it is provided that the fishery regulations of some of the boundary waters shall be uniform and under the control of a joint commission appointed by the Canadian government and the American government. This commission is composed of Dr. Jordan, as was stated the other day, on the American side, and Dr. Prince on the Canadian side. They are now at work preparing the regulations. I understand that a draft which has been prepared by the American commissioner got abroad and was published. I do not know whether the draft as published is correct or not. I am inclined to believe that it is not correct. At all events this draft has not been accepted by our commissioner and the regulations are the subject of negotiations now between the American and Canadian commissioners.

Mr. DANIEL. If the minister will excuse me, I think he did not answer the question which I asked whether the treaty, or these regulations would permit alien or American fishermen to fish in Canadian waters which are included in the treaty.

Mr. BRODEUR. I missed that point. It is formally stated in the treaty, if I remember it aright, that Canadians will have the exclusive right to fish on the Canadian side and Americans on the American side.

Mr. DANIEL. That is a very important statement, and if that is so I presume that Americans will have the right to come into St. John harbour and fish——

Mr. BRODEUR. No, no.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is the other way.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, my hon. friend did not understand me aright. I said that Canadians would have the right to fish on the Canadian side and Americans on the American side. There is no proposition, and I understand it will be contrary to the treaty for the Commission to give to American fishermen the right to fish in Canadian waters.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the minister one further question as to who will have the ultimate ratification or approval of these regulations made or to be made by Professor Prince and Mr. Jordan?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The two governments.

Mr. FOSTER. With or without the knowledge of parliament?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot say as to that, but I may state that some fifteen or sixteen years ago the American and Canadian governments had a commission to make regulations for the preservation of fish in boundary waters. They made a report suggesting certain close seasons and joint regulations to be approved by both countries. This report never was acted upon by the American government, although we are prepared to act upon it. The object of the present commission is to have a system of joint regulations applicable both in the United States and in Canada so far as close seasons and other matters are concerned, but neither country has surrendered its rights within its own waters.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask as to whether this treaty goes into effect without being presented to the Canadian parliament?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think it does.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Lunenburg). Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) a question which I must preface by a few words. I noticed by the press yesterday that regulations are now being framed under the provisions of the Waterways Treaty, and I understand that these regulations simply refer to international waters. Under the decision of the Privy Council in the fisheries case some years ago, or by virtue of that decision, there has occurred and is occurring a conflict between the federal and provincial governments respecting their several jurisdictions. Some year or two ago, I think, the government appointed one Mr. Bastedo, of the province of Ontario, as a commissioner to negotiate with the provinces and to obtain, if possible some settlement or understanding as to the extent of the jurisdiction of the provinces and of the federal authorities. I noticed by the press lately that Mr. Bastedo was removed from this position and that Professor Prince was appointed in his place. I would like to know if Professor Prince is carrying on the negotiations with the provincial governments, if he has reported progress and what, if any, information the Minister of Marine and Fisheries can give us. It is an extremely important matter and it is a very unfortunate thing for the fisheries of this country that, by reason of the decision of the Privy Council, there exists a conflict of jurisdiction. As far as the province of Nova Scotia is concerned, I am sure it would be quite willing to abandon any rights it may have as a province under that decision and transfer them to the Dominion government. I believe that in that province we would go as far as to amend the British North America Act to make it absolutely plain——

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid that the hon. gentleman is exceeding the limits of a question.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I am just finishing—make it absolutely plain that the control of our coast fisheries is absolutely within the control of the Dominion parliament. The question I desire to ask is what progress has been made with the negotiations with the provinces respecting this matter?

Mr. BRODEUR. There have been no negotiations with the provincial governments concerning the question of the fisheries except in a casual way in a conference which took place a few days ago between representatives of the New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario governments and myself. As there may be some misapprehension with regard to that conference, I may inform the House as to what has been done and as to the circumstances under which that conference took place. This conference had nothing to do with the Waterways Commission, as my hon. friend has stated, but it was held for the purpose of discussing with the provincial governments interested, that is to say, the governments of New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario, the regulations which are to be the subject of negotiations between the Canadian and American commissioners. I thought that before the Canadian commissioner should meet more formally the American commissioner he should have the benefit of the views of the provincial authorities. The three governments in question were, with the exception of the government of British Columbia, the only ones which were interested in the regulations which are to be made under the

treaty. The treaty provides for joint and uniform regulations in Passamaquoddy bay and in the St. John and St. Croix rivers in the province of New Brunswick; in Lake Memphramagog and Lake Champlain, in the province of Quebec, and within the great lakes and connecting rivers in Ontario, including the north channel. I thought that before Professor Prince should meet the American commissioner he should have the opportunity of meeting and consulting with the provincial authorities as to the regulations which should be accepted. The conference took place; while I am not at liberty to state what has been the result of this conference, I must say that it was conducted in the most harmonious way, and that we were very glad to have the benefit of the views which were expressed by the provincial governments.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. That is hardly an answer to my question. What I want to know is this: Some two years ago the government was in conference with the provincial governments as to the question of jurisdiction——

Mr. SPEAKER. The rules only allow the hon. gentleman to ask a question.

Mr. BRODEUR. There were no negotiations with regard to the question of the jurisdiction of the provincial authorities except in a casual way at the conference which took place the other day.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Are the negotiations still going on?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. I would like to ask the minister if, under the terms of the treaty, all the waters of the St. John river and its tributaries are placed under the control of the International Commission, or is the jurisdiction limited to the portion of the waters which constitute the boundary line?

Mr. BRODEUR. If I remember aright, the treaty includes the whole of the St. John river; the part in Canada as well as the part in the United States.

Mr. CROCKET. And all its tributaries ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The tributaries are not included.

Mr. FOSTER. As the minister has given us an opinion on two or three occasions as to what the treaty really means in certain points, I would ask him whether it is not competent for the government to make all the members of the House quite as wise as himself by laying that treaty on the table of the House.

Mr. BRODEUR. It was laid on the table of the House last year.

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to the regulations which are to be made by Professor Prince and Mr. Jordan and on which the minister has asked the views of representatives from the provincial governments, would he take occasion to consult with the members of the House before these regulations are finally adopted?

Mr. BRODEUR. I will be very glad to have the benefit of the views of the members of the House who take an interest in the matter; in fact I have already asked some hon. gentlemen to give me their views.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The regulations to be made would cover the whole of the St. John river ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the finding of these commissioners would not require to be ratified by parliament. Will the government have power to accept or reject that conclusion if they think fit ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In view of the observations made by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) a moment ago I think my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) will have every opportunity to look at the treaty and we will know what he has to say about it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have not a copy of it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It has been before the House for the last six months.

ORIENTAL IMMIGRATION.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I wish to call attention to what appears to be an inaccuracy in the reply given to-day to question No. 20 on the Order Paper. I asked whether this government had received from the government of British Columbia a certain resolution, and the answer was, no. I have in my hand a report of the proceedings of the British Columbia legislature on the 2nd inst., in which appears this communication from the secretary of the Lieutenant Governor of the province:

The 28th day of January, 1909.

At the Government House, Victoria, B.C.

Dear Sir.—In reply to your memorandum, of the 27th inst., with regard to a resolution having reference to oriental immigration, which was forwarded by His Honour to Ottawa on the 16th March last, the only correspondence thereon received from the Secretary of State was a letter dated the 23rd of March, informing His Honour that it had been submitted to His Excellency the Governor General in Council.

In view of this I would like to ask if the Secretary of State would be good enough to inquire further into the matter and give me a more complete answer to the question.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I presume that the Secretary of State answered from the information given him by his department, but I have already asked my private secretary to look through the correspondence of the Privy Council Department and I presume it may be found there.

FISHERY BOUNTIES.

Mr. ADAM B. CROSBY (Halifax). I want to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries a question which was put by me on Monday and Tuesday last, and which was put by the hon. the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) on Wednesday. Why is it that the fishermen in a number of the districts in Halifax county have not yet received the blank forms on which to file their claims for last year's bounty? This is an important matter and I wish an answer.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I was engaged on Tuesday and Wednesday at the conference with reference to the fishery regulations and was unfortunately unable to be present in the House, but I can answer the hon. gentleman now. Formerly the bounty claims were collected by Mr. Ogden who was in charge of the Bedford fish hatchery and who resigned in July or August last. These bounty claims are generally collected after the fishing season which would be about the end of November. I do not think the appointment covers the whole county of Halifax, but there was delay with regard to the district between Bedford and Nine Mile river in which Mr. Ogden formerly collected the claims. On the 3rd of December I made a recommendation to council for the appointment of another man, at a small salary, I think $75, to look after the collection of these claims. That recommendation had to go to the treasury board and unfortunately it was lost between the Privy Council and the Treasury Board. When my attention was called to this later on I made a new recommendation, and the new man has been appointed and I am informed the collection is being made. All those who have claims for bounties will be paid as promptly as possible.

Mr. CROSBY. Am I to understand that this gentleman is in his office now and collecting claims? I am informed by some fishermen that they have not yet had an opportunity of filing their claims.

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Venning informs me that Mr. Christian was fully instructed as to his duties and supplied with the necessary forms.

Mr. CROSBY. But they have not yet got to the fishermen?

Mr. BRODEUR. The fishermen will of course be paid later on.

INQUIRY FOR REPORTS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When will the concluding volume of the Auditor General's Report be brought down?

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State). I expect it will be ready to-morrow.

Mr. H. R. EMMERSON. When may we expect the report of the Department of Railways and Canals?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Early next week; it is in the hands of the printer.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Public buildings, chargeable to capital—Ottawa, new departmental buildings, $125,000.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). This sum is asked to make provision to complete payments for the purchase of properties on Sussex street and Mackenzie avenue as a site for the new departmental buildings. I gave very full information at the last session in regard to the cost of the land.

Mr. FOSTER. Has any additional land been bought since?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and we have expropriated the remainder. Between the first of April, 1908, and the 31st of December there was paid $49,394.30. I cannot give the actual dates of the purchases.

Mr. FOSTER. These are payments which were made in carrying out the purchases which were agreed upon, and which were explained to the House last session?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Has all the land been purchased and paid for that is necessary for these buildings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, not all paid for, because with respect to some of the properties, we have not been able to agree with the vendors, and proceedings have been taken in the Exchequer Court to obtain a valuation.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the total amount paid so far?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Up to the 31st December, 1908, $459,900.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the estimate of the amount required to secure the whole?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is expected that the present vote will cover the entire purchase.

Mr. FOSTER. That will make about $600,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Just about.

Mr. FOSTER. What is being done with reference to the buildings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Nothing has been done with regard to the erection of the buildings beyond obtaining the plans; but I think it is not unlikely that in the very near future a start will be made, not for the erection of all the buildings, but for the erection of a wing to afford much needed accommodation. As the estimated cost of the buildings is very considerable, we have not thought it well to proceed with the whole scheme at the present time.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the estimated cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $4,000,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is any portion of this to be devoted to building purposes?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not quite sure. It is just possible that if the expropriation valuation is not completed at a fairly early date, we may enter into a contract for the erection of a wing; and, if so, we will use part of the money for that purpose. I may say we are greatly pressed by the Board of Railway Commissioners for additional accommodation, and, instead of renting premises in Ottawa, we have thought it might be well to erect what would serve in the future as a wing of these buildings. I am not quite sure whether we shall do that or not; it is now under consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend would do well to add the words, 'purchase of site' to this vote, so that he would not use a portion of it to commence a wing. Let it stand for what it is intended for. What does my hon. friend think the wing will cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not yet had an estimate of the cost of the wing prepared. The chief architect is considering the matter. I may say that it is only within the last two or three weeks that it has been pressed on my attention by the Board of Railway Commissioners. They are greatly cramped for room, and they have asked us to rent a building to give them more accommodation. In considering what would be the necessary rental, I have thought that a good deal of money could be saved if we made a start by erecting a wing to afford the Railway Commissioners the accommodation they require, and to let the larger building stand for perhaps a few years. But this is entirely tentative. It will be some little time before the chief architect can give us the plans and estimates of cost of the building.

Mr. OSLER. Are the plans being prepared by the government architect?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Plans have been received, as the result of public competition, but they are being revised by the government architect, and we are considering whether we might not, with great advantage and economy, erect a wing which could be used for the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend cannot build that out of this appropiation. He cannot really take anything out of this appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We could let the contract.

Mr. FOSTER. Could you let a contract without having a sufficient amount of money voted, at least to carry on the operations for the year? The explanation of my hon. friend was that this would barely suffice to pay for the ground. We should have some definiteness if possible in our estimates. If this is for the purchase of a site, let it appear, and if my hon. friend proposes to go into the erection of a department building let him come down and ask for an appropriation. He may think it would be economy to build a wing, but I think he will admit that there are some other considerations to be looked at which might make it less desirable to go into any other large expenditure.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have given every consideration to the matter. To arrange for the erection of a suitable building would mean the erection by a private company of a building suitable for the purpose, and that would mean engaging to rent the building for a term of years, to which I am opposed as it would not be economy to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. For what department is this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For the Board of Rail-Commissioners. They are very much cramped now. Several clerks occupy one room, and some are in rooms which are very dark. Mr. Scott, the assistant chief commissioner, has a room entirely unsuitable, and I think the demand is reasonable. What I thought might be done is this. It is possible that these properties, in regard to which proceedings have to be taken in the Exchequer Court, will not be required to be paid for until next year. If we have this vote, we could erect a suitable wing, or a part of a wing suitable for the accommodation required for $100,000, and it might be economy to let the contract and have the building completed next year.

Mr. J. D. REID. When the minister was arranging for the building of these new departmental offices, did he consider the advisability of securing the block between the Post Office and the Langevin block? That is a block which the government could secure, and make that street opposite the parliamentary buildings all government property. In a few years that property will be much more valuable than now. I would like to see that building out there, or at least as much as could be used for a public building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have thought of that property, but as the government has such a large amount of property on Sussex street and Mackenzie avenue, I did not feel justified in entering into negotiations for its purchase at present.

Ottawa Parliament Buildings—additions and alterations, $93,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide for buildings during the coming year, the works in connection with the additions and alterations of the parliament buildings, such as the new wing and additions.

Mr. CROCKET. How much will that make the total cost of the new wing?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Including everything, $447,732.94. That will include the original contract, also the elevators, heating, plumbing, furniture, electric wiring, etc.

Mr. AMES. What was the amount of the original contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $237,433.

Mr. AMES. And the extras amount to as much more?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are not extras. They are things which were not provided for in the original contract. They include taking down walls, cementing walls, the renewal of wings, lumber, hardware, elevators, $17,-150, alterations and improvements in the different buildings, switchboards, radiators, etc.

Mr. AMES. Were not tenders invited for these additions? Were tenders invited for the elevators?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, we decided that it is very much better to instal the Otis-Fensom elevator, as we believe their system to be the best. We have had some experience calling for tenders in elevators, and it was very unsatisfactory.

Mr. AMES. Which of these items, not included in the original contract, were given out without tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I might give those for which tenders were called, which will no doubt suit my hon. friend's purpose. Alterations to window frames, $1,011.79; Speaker's quarters in the House of Commons, $4,567.19; additional work, $18,458.63; Tile and Marble work in the tiled rooms, $4,794.-92. I find, however, I am mistaken. My memo. says, 'tender accepted.' There were no public tenders invited except for the original contract.

Mr. AMES. Then all the other $237,000 were given out without tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Without public tender.

Mr. AMES. What line of action was followed in deciding to whom these should be given?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contractor for the building was asked to tender for the different works. It would be very much more convenient for him to do the other work; and upon his tender being received, the chief architect was instructed to go carefully into the cost, and on his certifying that the tender was reasonable it was accepted.

Mr. AMES. Are we to understand that this example is a fair indication of the manner in which government buildings are constructed? The original contract is let by tender for one-half the value, and the remainder given at prices arranged between the government and the contractor. Here is a building costing nearly $500,000, and the original contract let was for only $237,-000. The extras, subsequently arranged for with the contractor, amount to a sum equal to the original expenditure. There was no competition for about one-half the entire expenditure on the building. Is this the regular method adopted by the department ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not the regular method. It depends on the circumstances and the kind of work to be done. My hon. friend, who has had a good deal to do with the erection of buildings, will realize that if the contractor is a reliable man, and will do the extra work required at a price certified to by the architect as reasonable, it is better to give him that work, as it is likely to be much better done than if there were independent contractors for the different classes of work

Mr. AMES. The minister is correct, in some respects, in saying that I have had experience in connection with firms that have had large building contracts. But we have found no difficulty, when we wanted a large building, in finding an architect who would draw in advance the plans which would cover the whole building, so that it could all be let by tender and contract, and the extras would not exceed ten per cent of the whole. In this case, you have extras practically dollar for dollar of your original contract, which, I need hardly tell the minister, is a wholly indefensible proportion.

Mr. CROCKET. Were the plans drawn by the architect of the department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Does this amount include furnishing?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Were separate contracts given for the furnishing ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. With respect to a good deal of the furnishing, tenders were invited from the different firms.

Mr. FOSTER. What firms?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot give them at the moment, but I will undertake to send my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) a memorandum of them.

Mr. FOSTER. Were tenders called for by letter or by circular, or were public advertisements issued?

Mr. PUGSLEY. By letter.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the bill for furnishing amount to?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the memorandum before me there is an item for renewal of windows, lumber, hardware, furniture, &c., $40.555.04. There is also an amount due for furniture, glassware, silverware, &c., $9,000.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Was the original contract let on schedule prices?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it was a lump sum contract.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Then, how could it be extended ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was not extended.

Mr. J. HAGGART. I understood the minister to say that the work was given to the original contractor, which means, I take it, that the contract was extended.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not use the word 'extended.' When the plans were originally prepared, it was not known, and, I suppose, could hardly be known how the rooms would be divided up to accommodate the officials and members of the House. As my hon. friends know, there has been a good deal of difficulty, even since the opening of the session, in making this division. The contract did not provide for the partitions to divide up the rooms.

Mr. AMES. What did the original contract include?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I wish I had the contract here.

Mr. AMES. But the minister can give it to us in a general way.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect tells me that it included the walls, the roof, the floor, the stairs and such interior walls as were necessary to carry the roof and floors.

Mr. AMES. And were the subdividing walls, the tiling, the windows, and everything of that kind, which ordinarily goes to make a house—the plumbing and heating apparatus also—considered as extra and given out afterwards without tender or contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The tiling was included in the original contract. The plumbing and heating were done by the staff of the department. The subdividing walls were not included, because it could not be known with accuracy how the rooms were to be divided.

Mr. AMES. Messrs. McGillivray & Labelle, the original contractors, had a contract for $237,000. How much did they receive, all told?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They received, altogether, $381,507.52.

Mr. AMES. That is, about $150,000 was paid to the contractors in addition to their original contract for work which they did under arrangement with the department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I make it about $140,000, but my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) is substantially correct.

Mr. AMES. I think the minister will see that that method, if generally followed throughout the Public Works Department, is one open to very considerable abuse. The ordinary tenderers in competition tender with the expectation that they will have to do what their contract calls for, and that that will end the matter. If a tenderer expects to have $150,000 of extras besides, he can afford to figure low on the first estimate, in the expectation of being able to get a large margin on the balance. In that way, other tenderers competing against him who might aggregate something less, are shut out. The method is open to great abuse.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I quite agree that the method is one that ought not to be followed, and it is not followed. But this is an exceptional case. We did not know, at least I suppose my predecessor did not know when the contract was let nor until the building was pretty well erected, what would be required. My hon. friend from North Toronto I trust is reasonably well satisfied. The chief Conservative whip of course was consulted as to the number of rooms which we required.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The Conservative whip was not consulted until everything was laid out, and then he had simply to walk through and see what was done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was not my hon. friend consulted last session?

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. After the work was all done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was not done last session.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The partitions were all up before I was taken into the confidence of the government at all. Then I walked through the building with the ex-Speaker, and he told me what he intended to do about allotting these rooms.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understood that last session before the partitions were finally erected, the late Speaker was consulted, and I think he consulted with the leader

of the opposition, and I think also with the the chief whip of the opposition; and it was after careful consideration that instructions were given as to the laying out of the different rooms.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The partitions were all up.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They were not all up before the late Speaker was consulted.

Mr. CROCKET. When was the original contract signed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the 9th of January, 1907.

Mr. CROCKET. When was the arrangement made with the contractor for additions?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From time to time as the work went on and we knew what was required. I could give the dates to my hon. friend. One was on the 10th of September, 1908, one on the 22nd of October, one on the 3rd of October, one on the 10th of April.

Mr. CROCKET. They amounted to $150,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $140,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the amount chargeable to alterations or additions in the arrangement made on April 10?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will read the items. Taking down walls, and cement for walls, $4,990; renewals of windows, lumber, hardware and paint, $40,555.04; elevators, $17,150; alterations and improvements for ventilation, including motors, $32,516.75. That takes in the old building. Then radiators, $5,505.95; rubber tiling, $7,565.65; printing and advertising, salary of clerk of works, $3,924.87. The total expenditure up to the 31st of January was $314,038.94.

Mr. FOSTER. What did the extras amount to on the 10th of April?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To the difference between $314,000 and $201,830.

Mr. FOSTER. There does not seem to be anything in all these items which occurred gratuitously, or which could not have been foreseen, which were not in what you might call the stock parts of the work of constructing the building. Can my hon. friend point out any that were not? I do not see anything there that the late Speaker interfered with, as to what partitions should be put up, what rooms should be made, how many upon a flat, or anything of that kind. Can the minister point out anything which was done from the interference of the late Speaker, or of the whips, or of any member of parliament?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend has misunderstood me. I did not say that the late Speaker interfered, or that the chief whip interfered. What I tried to say was that when the original contract was let some of the plans for the laying out of the interior of the building did not appear to be feasible. The then Speaker was consulted with regard to that. I think the leader of the opposition raised a question as to the apportionment of the rooms, as to who would probably have to do with it, and it was the general opinion of the House that it should rest with the Speaker and the Minister of Public Works. We received some suggestions from the late Speaker. With regard to these items I am no table to point out any, where the suggestions of the Speaker would have changed the cost one way or the other. I am not able to say as to to what part of these works might have been provided for at the outset. Taking down the walls, that is a class of work which would ordinarily be done by the day. Then renewals of windows, lumber, hardware and paint—that was in connection with the old building, and would probably be done by the day. Then take furniture, carpets, matting, as to which prices were obtained from different trades.

Mr. AMES. Are we to understand that furniture, carpets and matting are included in the cost of the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the cost which I gave.

Mr. AMES. And are charged to capital account?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is all charged to capital account.

Mr. AMES. Does it not seem strange to charge carpets and matting that wear out in the course of a few years, to capital account?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has been the practice, I believe, ever since confederation to charge the original furnishings of buildings at the capital, to capital account.

Mr. AMES. A bad precedent need not necessarily be followed. I think a better business method could be introduced.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When I have to do with the erection of a building under my own administration, I will carefully consider the suggestion of my hon. friend.

Mr. CROSBY. I want to find out how this thing happened to be constructed. Why was it constructed at all?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was constructed with the authority and with the approval of parliament, which made an appropriation for the work two or three years ago.

Mr. CROSBY. Did they know what they wanted?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I presume they wanted additional accommodation.

Mr. CROCKET. Am I to understand from the minister that these additional works that he has mentioned were not made the subject of a specific contract and that the contractor was simply directed to go on and perform these works without any arrangement being made as to what they were to cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not say that. I said that public tenders were not called but that the contractor was invited to give a price at which he would do the work and, upon the chief architect going over the matter and certifying that the price was fair and reasonable, a contract was entered into for most of this work.

Mr. CROCKET. First there was a price obtained before the contractor was directed to proceed with the work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, in most cases.

Mr. AMES. Were any others asked to give figures for the same work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, only the contractors.

Mr. AMES. So that the prices of $150,000 worth of work were arranged between the department and contractor without competition of any kind?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is entirely right.

Mr. BARR. Was the same plan followed with regard to the carpets and heating; that is the chief architect got prices and made arrangements with whomever he chose, no tenders being asked?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No public tenders were called. Boilers, radiators and things of that kind were purchased at market price. The chief architect has had large experience in these matters and he would know whether the contractor's price was reasonable or not. In general my hon. friend is right; no public tenders were invited, but the chief architect satisfied himself in every case that the price was fair and reasonable.

Mr. BARR. If there is open competition there is always likely to be a reduction. In this case it seems that such was not the case. Evidently the contractor had it all his own way, or, at least, in so far as he and the architect were concerned, they could fix things up to suit themselves. No outsider had any opportunity of tendering.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister has given the details of the work that was arranged for on April 10. How many other arrangements of that kind were made?

Mr. FOSTER. What was the next one?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot give them in the order of date. There was one on the 10th of September, 1908, the amount being $1,011.77.

Mr. PUGSLEY

Mr. FOSTER. What for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For alterations to window frames in the speaker's quarters and several other changes.

Mr. CROCKET. When was that arranged for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the 22nd of October, 1908.

Mr. FOSTER. What did that include?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That included certain changes in the work. They were very considerable in the Speaker's quarters, necessary by reason of the addition which was made. Certain windows were blocked up and other accommodation had to be given to the Speaker. Then there was another contract on the 3rd of October, 1908, for additional work amounting to $18,548.63.

Mr. FOSTER. What was included in that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sorry I cannot give that to my hon. friend at present.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a very large one.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, quite large. The chief architect tells me that is principally for division walls.

Mr. FOSTER. Was there a plan of the divisional walls drawn by the chief architect?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Everything was specified?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes in the contract entered into.

Mr. FOSTER. And it was entered into without competition?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. Then there was certain tile and marble work in toilet rooms and in the kitchen.

Mr. FOSTER. What date?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sorry the date is omitted.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the amount?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $4,794.92.

Mr. CROCKET. This all went to the original contractors?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. Then, on the 10th of April, 1908, there was a contract for a balustrade which was carried along the edge of the roof on the outside and which was necessary to give uniformity to the building.

Mr. FOSTER. Was not that foreseen in the original contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. FOSTER. What did that amount to?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $4,439.69. Of course, I am making a statement of what took place before I became minister, and the chief architect is my authority for this information. Then there was alteration to steel work and cutting floors and walls for plumbers' work and heating pipes amounting to $10,802. As to that there was no contract. Bills of cost were rendered by the contractor. The contractors have not been paid in full yet but $381,507.22 covers the original contract and also this additional work. Is there anything else you would like to have?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not get exactly what the furnishing cost.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not that separated; it is included.

Mr. FOSTER. There is none of it included in the items we have had?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, but it is included in my memorandum. For lumber, hardware, furniture, carpets, glassware, &c., there is a total of $40,555.04. I can get the cost of the furniture and give it to my hon. friend later on. There is $9,000 which is due for furniture, glassware, &c. I have not given the items which make the total of $447,000 yet. I was stopped. Perhaps I had better give them now. I gave the figures of the total expenditure down to 1909 as $314,028.94. The amount due on contract, additional work, is $79,617; due on elevators, $9,150; due for heating and plumbing, $9,308; due for furniture, glassware, silverware, &c., $9,000; due for electric wiring and fixtures, $3,180; due for fitting up the Speaker's quarters, $6,000; due for painting, $5,000——

Mr. FOSTER. What do you mean by fitting up the Speaker's quarters?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Painting, decorating, furniture, &c.

Mr. FOSTER. Who did the work ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The department did some by day labour with its own staff.

Mr. FOSTER. Who did the chief work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Bell, of Montreal.

Mr. FOSTER. How much was paid Mr. Bell?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He has not rendered his account yet. The chief architect tells me that the account will, including some of the furniture, be about $5,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Was there any contract with Mr. Bell?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Was he given carte blanche?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. He was held under strict supervision.

Mr. FOSTER. By whom?

Mr. PUGSLEY. By the chief architect.

Mr. FOSTER. In what way?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He was told to do so and so, and the prices were fixed for the different things.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister say that prices were absolutely fixed for the different parts of the work done by Mr. Bell? That there were plain and definite specifications and that Mr. Bell was instructed just what to do and not to do any more?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect tells me there was a description of the work and the price was fixed as closely as possible in work of that character.

Mr. FOSTER. That specification is in writing?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect tells me they have the price of practically everything in writing.

Mr. CROCKET. Were the arrangements for the additional work approved by the minister before the contract was closed between the architect and the contractor?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The authority was from the outset for the chief architect to make arrangements with the contractor if he would do the work at prices which he certified to be fair and reasonable. These were his general instructions. It was a departmental matter and the judgment of the chief architect in such things would prevail.

Mr. CROCKET. Is it the practice of the chief architect to make contracts involving such large expenditure without obtaining the approval of the minister or consulting him?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was consulted and gave the architect authority to make this arrangement provided the prices were fair and reasonable in his judgment.

Mr. CROCKET. Before the arrangement was closed would the approval of the minister be asked?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I take the chief architect's certificate as to the price.

Mr. CROSBY. Did the government have any estimate made of what this was going to cost; did they have any idea of that as a business man would have?

Mr. PUGSLEY. When the work was undertaken the chief architect estimated that it would cost for the building—which would not include the heating or the furnishing, or this work done in the old part—$275,000.

Mr. CROSBY. Surely the government knew what they were going to build and must have had an estimate made. Did the architect give an estimate merely for the bare walls without any heating or lighting or any props except a few props to keep the roof up? The people of Canada should know how it is that we came to spend half a million dollars on a new wing to this building, and I want to know all details from the minister so that I may be able to tell my constituents about it. If I tell them the story I am hearing to-night they will not be satisfied.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect estimated for the walls of the building, for the principal partitions which were necessary to support the roof, and the floors, and——

Mr. CROSBY. And the doors I suppose?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, exactly, for what was included in the contract. He estimated $275,000 and the lowest tender was $237,000, or about $40,000 less. If the hon. gentleman desires I will bring down the contract.

Mr. CROSBY. What was his estimate for the balance of the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect tells me that at the time his estimate was that the partitions, and the plumbing, and the heating, and the electric lighting, and everything of that kind, would cost about $125,000 more, without the furniture.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. My recollection is that when the late Minister of Public Works decided to make the improvement he laid on the table of the House a plan, and that plan showed all the rooms as they exist now. I do not see why the tender did not cover the completed building. It was known then that heating and plumbing would have to be provided for. The contractor went on with his work, and then the Public Works Department sent their men on to undo what the contractor had done, and to put in water pipes and heating pipes. Any business man would have attended to these in the first place; but with the department they were an after consideration, and the result was to increase the cost by 50 per cent. My recollection is that the first plan included everything.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, my hon. friend is in error.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. We had the plans on the table here, and they showed the building divided into rooms.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My information is that the plans simply showed the main partitions, but not the layout of the rooms, because I suppose the minister at that time did not know how the rooms would be divided up.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the partitions made of?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Terra cotta. The building, I should say, is as near fireproof as it is possible to make it.

Mr. DANIEL. I understood the minister to state just now that the architect had told him that the probable cost of this new wing, all completed, would be about $400,000. I wish to read to the minister and the House what the minister stated with regard to this matter last year. The estimate was: "Parliament buildings, additions and alterations, $150,000;" and the minister said:

The note which I have from the officers of my department is that this vote of $150,000 is asked to make provision for continuing the works placed under contract in connection with the additions and alterations to the parliament buildings, which consist in extending the northwest wing northward and the residence of the Speaker of the House of Commons westward, the construction of a new upper story and roof on the tower which forms a portion of the residence, the cubic contents being 745,000 cubic feet; also for alterations to the parliament buildings in accordance with the sub-joined estimate submitted by the chief architect. The amount paid to the contractors is $76,970; renewal of windows, furniture, carpets, matting, lumber, paints, labour, $7,300.30; alterations and improvements to ventilation system, speed motor, switchboard, Nernst lamps, &c. $21,567.75; contingencies, printing, advertising and salary of clerk of works, $1,939.92, making a total expenditure up to the 31st March, 1907, of $107,777.97. Then I have further information. The amount due on the contract work is $160,463; heating and boilers, $5,000; electrical wiring and fixtures, $5,000; furniture, $10,000, &c. The total probable cost of the additions and alterations to the parliament buildings is $322,247.97.

Now, the minister told us this afternoon that the architect had assured him that the probable cost was $400,000. Which of these statements is correct, and what will be, not the probable cost, but the actual cost when the work is finished?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend misunderstood me. I did not state that the architect had told me that the probable cost would be $400,000. He informed me that that was the estimate which he had given to the then minister. The statement that my hon. friend has read would be correct at that time, according to the progress of the work up to that date. I suppose that in the statement I gave there may not have been included certain things, such as the alteration and improvement of the ventilating system, the radiators, the elevators, the tiling and rubber tiling.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister's statement is this:

The total probable cost of the additions and alterations to the parliament buildings is $322,247,97.

The total cost, as I understand it, must include everything.

Mr. CROCKET. Did not the minister state that this $93,000 which he is asking for now is to complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the chief architect tells me that that will complete the work as outlined.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister said that would make the total cost of the building, including the furniture, $447,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and including upwards of $30,000 in connection with the old building—$447,432.90.

Mr. CROCKET. I would like to know if, after the contract was let, there were any alterations made in the original plans?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Nothing of any consequence.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me that, as I have listened to this discussion, there are two lessons that we may draw from it. One is as to the peculiar way in which the government carries out the principle of constructing public works by public tender and contract. Every possible rule with relation to that principle has been violated in this instance. The minister's first excuse was that there were so many complex, abstruse and unexpected things imported into this work that it was impossible to ask for tenders, and that consequently the only thing to do was to ask the contractor what he would do them for, and arrange with him to do them. But when he read the estimates, the moment he read them, we found that these added things were really stock articles, with the exception of taking down some old partitions and making some cuts between rooms, which could not be foreseen and provided for, and therefore I suppose could not be done otherwise than by day's work. With these exceptions there was nothing that could not have been put in specifications, and for which tenders could not have been asked. If there were any other things they were so very small that we might leave them out entirely in discussing the matter. Heating, electric lighting, plumbing, elevators, all these different stock things in the construction of a building are as well defined and as easy to be estimated and put in the form of specifications as any other part of the building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have led my hon. friend astray. Through an unfortunate error of the typewriter, the amount as paid to the contractor is put at $381,000 instead of $281,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Then we have a good deal more to account for.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it makes the contractors paid only $281,000, and the total paid was the difference between $237,000 and $281,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Then my hon. friend will take back some of his arguments ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will have to take back some of his criticism.

Mr. FOSTER. No, I have criticised on the statement of the minister. If only $45,000 to $50,000 is to be accounted for, he must account for the difference between that item of $281,000 and the $450,000, and he accounted for the difference between $381,000 and $450,000. But his statement remains that there was no competition for this difference, and that these extras were given the contractor without tender. Am I right or not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. His second point of refuge was that there were a lot of unexpected things imported into the matter by the whips and the ex-Speaker (Mr. Sutherland). Well, the ex-Speaker shakes his head and declares he is guiltless. The whip on the Conservative side, on whom we can thoroughly rely, declares that he had nothing to do with it until he came here and found the partitions all up, and then he had to endeavour to get a little accommodation for members on the Conservative side, though the other side having pretty well taken the whole thing before he appeared on the scene.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Conservative whip was well pleased.

Mr. FOSTER. So we have to eliminate certain partitions in the division of the room and that we might agree to, but they were all plain and simple, done by terra cotta work, easily put into specifications with their dimensions, and could have been as easily put up to competition as a wall on the outside of the building. In all those cases, we have had a denegation of the principle of tender and contract, as applied to a construction which has cost the people nearly $500,000. The next lesson to be learned from this is that, under the same Minister of Public Works and the same department and staff of architects we are going to undertake the building of great public edifices on a site which has been got at a very large expenditure. What will those cost, if this system is to be continued, which we have heard with astonishment

described by the minister, with his architect by his side, as the one under which public buildings have been constructed in the Dominion during these past years. In the Public Works Department which has been putting up buildings costing about $10,000,000, this has been the system carried on. Of that there cannot be any doubt, and there can be no doubt that this expenditure of $500,000 of the people's money does not show that value, judging from what we see in these rooms and this parliament building. No man would put $500,000 for himself into a construction which would show no more value than is shown here. Is that the way under which we are proceeding with our public works? I thought that the business of an architect was to draw plans and look after the construction, but the minister says that he is practically the man who arranged the terms upon which these things are done. I do not think that that is any part of the architect's branch. It is unwise and unfortunate that the architect's branch should be mixed up in the least with a department of the government which has to see what prices are to be paid and what amount of money expended. An architect is for the purpose of advising and having the specifications properly drawn and the plans properly made and putting information into the hands of the proper officers to call for tenders and award them. The advice of an architect is always good in these matters, but I do not think he should have been put in the position of making the best terms with the contractor. Here you have an original contract for $237,000 and a building when constructed costing $500,000, and practically the contractor has had, without competition, every bit of extra work at his own prices. Anybody knows, who has read the proceedings of the Cassels' Commission, that an officer of the department has no show for his life when there is a question between a contractor and the minister. The officer is used as the buffer, but the contractor gets about what he wants, and the architect and the officers who stand in between the two ought not to be placed in the position of the responsible minister who has to see what prices should be paid. That, however, has been the case during this transaction. Will the minister tell this House what we have to show for that $500,000 of the people's money?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I admire some of the qualities of my hon. friend and often wonder at the vast amount of information which he possesses. But as regards the construction of a building, he is deplorably ignorant. He says that, with regard to the prices for these different works, I should not have relied on the architect at all, but have fixed the prices myself. I venture to say there is no private individual who has ever erected a building, in connection with which he has had, during the progress of the work to do certain things not specified in the contract. It is the architect who makes out the estimates and specifications at the outset and fixes the prices. Why? Because his knowledge and experience enable him to form a judgment as to what are fair prices, and all contracts provide that if payments are made from time to time they are to be made on progress estimates certified to by the architect. It is the architect on whom the owner places reliance ; and I can well understand that if a minister had made certain payments to the contractor, without having the information from the architect as to what that work is worth, my hon. friend would have justly complained that the minister had no business to do that but should have relied on his architect.

Now, he has made the suggestion that the Cassels' inquiry has shown that the officials of the department have no independence, that they cannot exercise an honest judgment, but are obliged to do whatever the minister wishes them to do. He must know something of the character, reputation and standing of the chief architect of the Department of Public Works. That gentleman was appointed in 1871, some thirty-eight years ago, and I would not like to be the minister who would ask the chief architect to vary his figures by one iota to satisfy me or any other member of the government. While I have been minister—and no doubt, the same remark would apply to my predecessor, both of this government and of previous governments—the judgment of the present chief architect could be relied upon with a great deal of confidence. At all events, he is a man who will exercise his own independent judgment, and will not be influenced by any minister under whom he might serve. I have already called attention to an unfortunate error in the figures furnished me which caused me to overstate the amount actually paid to the contractors by about $100,000. The amounts paid to the contractors beyond the original contract were as follows:

Under the contract of Sept. 10, 1908.	$1,011 77
Contract October 22, 1908..	4,567 19
Contract October 3, 1908..	18,458 63
Contract for tiling and metal work (date not given)..	4,794 92
Stone balustrade..	4,439 69
Work done by McGillivray and Labelle, for which bills were rendered and certified by the chief architect..	10,802 00

That makes the total amount of additional work, including these partitions, about $44,000 instead of $150,000 as I unwittingly led by my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) to believe. I am sure that, looking over these figures, the hon. gentleman will see that, in view of

the class of work to be done and the difficulty which, apparently, the former minister, Mr. Hyman, had in determining what partitions were to be erected, and determining how the rooms were to be laid out, it was not unreasonable that the work should be done upon prices given by the contractor. And he will see that it could not be done by a separate contract that might be given to an outsider, because, in that case, the work of the two contractors would be likely to clash. The important question is whether the chief architect could be relied upon to determine what were fair and reasonable prices.

Mr. FOSTER. Then how does the minister explain the increase of $169,000 over the $281,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will find that the figures I have given do not alter the total previously given, $447,732.

Mr. HUGHES. If the minister will pardon me a moment, there is one matter of detail to which I would like to call attention. The room which has been allotted to the Conservative members is supposed to have upper double windows. If the minister will step around to that room, if he cannot give the architect a suggestion, I shall be surprised. The windows should be on hinges; bolted, they are no use.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect will make a note of that point.

Mr. CROSBY. The building will cost $447,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Including the furniture. I understand my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) to ask, 'What have you to show for it?' One has only to go through the building, including the upper stories, and to view the magnificent restaurant and the different rooms set apart for the accommodation, and I think any one of experience will say that we have received good value for our money.

Mr. CROSBY. It seems from what we have been able to ascertain from the minister that there is a difference of nearly $100,000 between the estimated cost of the building as made by the architect, and the actual cost. This is a very large difference. I understood the minister to say in answer to my hon. friend from North Toronto, that the architect was the man that did everything. But does any man in this country putting up a building allow the architect to make whatever arrangements he likes with the contractor? The man who furnishes the money does not allow the architect to go to the contractor and say he may do just as he likes. Of course, everybody knows that we must rely a good deal upon the architect, but not to the extent that has been done in this case. I am satisfied to spend a good deal of money in Ottawa, but I do not want to see all the money of the Dominion of Canada spent here; I want some of it spent in other parts of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the minister say what amount of space or what number of rooms provided by this expenditure, has gone to the accommodation of officers of the House?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That has all appeared in the 'Hansard,' to which I would refer my hon. friend.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I think the officials have more space than the members. I want to say in connection with the allotment of rooms to the opposition, that just before the prorogation of parliament last year the late Speaker invited the chief government whip (Mr. Calvert) and myself to go through the building, and he gave us what his plan was at that time, giving comfortable quarters to the leader of the opposition in old No. 6, also where he proposed making the Premier's room, and then a room for the whips. His plan was to give a certain proportion to the government side and a certain proportion to the opposition side. But that arrangement was not carried out. When I came down here after the allotment was made, I found that the plans of the late Speaker concerning a room for the opposition leader and the Conservative whips had been carried out. Then after some negotiations, we secured quarters for the balance of our contingent in the rooms that had been occupied previously by members supporting the government. According to the returns brought down, I think we got our fair share of the space, but we have not got our fair share of the new quarters.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In what I had to do with the matter I tried to make it as convenient as possible for our hon. friends opposite. There is some dissatisfaction among them, and there is dissatisfaction among our own friends, who feel they have not got the accommodation they would like. Even a minister of the Crown came to me not long ago and complained. But we tried to satisfy everybody who had claims for accommodation.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. An application is in and I hope it will be carried out soon, to give us Conservative members better seating accommodation. We have a lot of old dilapidated chairs there which ought to be stored. When we had a caucus this morning we had to send into the room of the Minister of Finance to get chairs.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chairs have been ordered.

Mr. BARR. It is a notorious fact that officials of this House are better provided for than the members, so much so that some of the officials are renting rooms.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What official is renting rooms?

Mr. BARR. Right downstairs there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be glad to deal with that matter when my attention is called to it.

Mr. BARR. I know that was the state of affairs formerly.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it must have been some time ago.

Ottawa Royal Mint, refinery, $30,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have put in this item at the request of the Minister of Finance, who says it is urgently needed. The building is expected to cost $30,000. Nothing has been done yet. It is intended to erect a building 35 x 60 feet, one story high, on stone foundations, fireproof throughout, and with strong vaults.

Mr. DANIEL. Will this include the refining machinery?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Only the building.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the minister prepared to state what the plant will cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a matter for the Finance Department rather than mine, for the officers of the mint.

Mr. DANIEL. What will this make the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total expenditure to the 31st of December last was $520,233.88. That includes the site for the building, the wiring, the machinery, tools and everything.

Mr. AMES. How much did the fence cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We heard so much about that last session that I hoped my hon. friend would not refer to it again. But my hon. friend forgets about the guard-rooms, there are very substantial guard-rooms embraced in the cost.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What size?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Go down and look at them. The total amount for this high iron fence, with the granite foundations and guard-rooms, was $43,529.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. When are the members going to be taken through the mint?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Any time they wish, when an arrangement can be made.

Mr. AMES. Were tenders called for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No public tenders, it was done by contract.

Mr. AMES. How was the arrangement arrived at by which the contractors charged that expenditure of $43,529 ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Plans were prepared for the work to be done and a tender was asked from the contractor. He submitted a tender which the chief architect thought to be fair and reasonable, and upon his certificate the contract was let.

Mr. AMES. So that no one else was given the opportunity to compete for the work although plans were prepared beforehand?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There were no public tenders called.

Mr. AMES. This is in no way a part of the building itself. There was no reason why the work of erecting a fence and inclosing the property could not have been put up to public tender and contract. What possible reason was there why this work was not thrown open to competition?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This was all arranged for before I became minister, but I am informed that the contractor had all his plant there, encumbering the ground, and it was thought inconvenient to bring in another contractor. The Master of the Mint was pressing for the erection these guard houses, and it had to be done as quickly as possible because they would not open the mint until these things were provided, and that is the reason why it was not put up to public competition.

Mr. FOSTER. Has anybody ever got over that fence?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is pretty difficult; he would have to be quite a jumper.

Mr. CROCKET. Was there one contract for the fence and the guard house?

Mr. PUGSLEY. One contract.

Mr. CROCKET. $43,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $43,529.

Mr. CROCKET. The question was asked a session or two ago and the statement was made that the fence cost $29,000 and the guard house $13,000 or $14,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was one contract.

Mr. CROCKET. Was not the price fixed separately for the guard-house?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it was one price.

Mr. AMES. In this work we have a repetition of what we had in the other case. While the contractors, Messrs. Sullivan & Langdon, have a contract calling for $263,000, the total payment to them is $325,000, so that we have these contractors receiving $60,000 over their contract price without any tenders being asked or without any opportunity for competition on the part of others. That is the same thing repeated in connection with the Mint that we have in connection with this addition to the parliament buildings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is something I would not justify unless there were very special reasons for it, and in this case there were special reasons.

Mr. CROCKET. There are always special reasons.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It apparently was not anticipated that a fence and guard-room of this character were required. It had been announced that the Mint would open at a certain time and the Imperial authorities required that the fence and the guard-houses should be built before they would allow the Mint to be opened. It was work which was very urgent, and it was deemed very much better to allow this contractor, who was a most reliable contractor, to do the work at what the chief architect thought was a fair and reasonable price.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it not a fact that the law states that the Minister of Public Works shall not expend any amount over $5,000 without calling for tenders?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, but there is an exception to the law. The law provides that he cannot do it except in cases of emergency.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This was a case of that kind.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to ask the minister where there is any condition about an emergency in the statute? I think not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it is in the statute.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. The statute provides that an order in council, signed by His Excellency and setting forth the emergency, shall be passed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am quite aware of the fact, and in this case the grounds of the emergency were set out and the order in council passed.

Mr. FOSTER. Was there an order in council passed in each of the cases in reference to this new wing in which work was given without contract or tender amounting to more than $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, as to the elevators, which I think is the only one that is over $5,000.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. There is one of $10,800 and another of $18,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot tell as to other amounts over $5,000, but I know that in the case of the elevators that was done.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister would not violate the law ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He would not intentionally.

Mr. FOSTER. Did he not know what the law was?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. And it has been violated?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My practice has always been in every case where it is over $5,000 to have an order in council setting forth the grounds of emergency.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister see if in these three cases there was an order in council?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Will the minister bring down the order in council because it certainly will be a curiosity to place before the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. For the guard-house and fence? I will be glad to.

Mr. FOSTER. And then afterwards we may take a vote to send it down to the archives.

Mr. CROCKET. I would like to ask the minister if the plan which has been prepared for the refinery provides for the complete building or just for the walls?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This estimate is for the complete building, but not for the refining plant.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I understood the minister to say that the emergency arose out of the fact that the Imperial government insisted that this guard-house and fence should be built before the Mint was opened. I would ask the minister if the Mint was not opened before the guard-house and fence were constructed? The guard-house was not finished before we went away from here last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My information was that the fence was completed.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The fence was, but not the guard-room.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps my remarks should be limited to the fence.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Then you broke the law with regard to the guard-room?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Possibly they are separate.

Mr. CROSBY. I would ask the minister to bring down all the orders in council or all the amounts that have been expended over and above $5,000 without tender and contract upon the new wing as well as upon the building under discussion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I stated to the committee that I thought there was one providing for the purchase of the elevators from the Otis-Fensom Company, but I was not sure whether there were any others. If there are I will bring them down.

Mr. CROSBY. If there were not, the expenditures would be contrary to law.

Ottawa, Victoria Memorial Museum, $400,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Many hon. gentlemen are familiar with this building. The vote is $400,000 and this is to continue the erection of the Victoria Memorial Museum. The chief architect estimated this building would cost $1,250,000 but the actual contract is only $950,000. It was let to Mr. Goodwin who is a very experienced contractor at some $300,000 less than the chief architect estimated. The contractor has gone ahead very satisfactorily with his work and I am much afraid he will not make much out of it.

Mr. CROCKET. How much has been expended up to the present?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Altogether, up to the 28th of December, $786,056.73 including $75,000 cost of site.

Mr. CROCKET. How much is required to complete?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Including the site, furniture, fittings, elevators, &c., it is supposed that the total cost to complete and equip will be $1,312,143.15.

Mr. BARR. When do you expect it will be completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In fifteen months or eighteen months.

Mr. AMES. Are you asking for this $400,000, expecting that it will completely finish the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We expect it will cost $100,000 more.

Mr. AMES. How much do you consider the building will have cost at the end of the present fiscal year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The actual expenditure will be about $812,000.

Mr. AMES. Then you only expect to spend $26,000, for the remainder of the fiscal year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. Perhaps I had better give the figures: Paid for site $75,000; incidental expenses, surveying, printing, advertising, clerk of works salary, &c., $13,306.73; laying of drain $4,500; paid to the contractor up to the 28th of December, $693,250; total expenditure to 28th of December, $786,056.73; amount due on contract work when contract is finished, $256,750; heating apparatus, boilers, &c., (estimated) $50,000; electric wiring, fixtures, (estimated) $25,000; elevators (estimated) $40,000; fittings, furniture (estimated) $100,000; carving (estimated) $15,000; superintendence, &c. (estimated) $29,000. That makes the total including, site, furnishing, fittings, &c., $1,312,143.15.

Mr. AMES. Is any of the money at present voted to go to other portions of the work that are not included in the contract of George Goodwin?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. AMES. Will the minister give us his assurance that there will be proper competition, and opportunity given to other people besides Mr. Goodwin to tender in connection with this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I would not like to give my hon. friend that assurance and I will tell you why: Mr. George Goodwin is as reliable a contractor as there is in Canada. He has taken this contract at about $300,000 less than the chief architect's estimate.

Mr. AMES. Did he build the Laurier tower which fell down?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know as to that. Mr. Goodwin is a splendid contractor and everybody will say that he has done a thoroughly good job on that museum. His tender was I think $275,000 less than the next lowest tender, but Mr. Goodwin is a man who is prepared to carry out what he undertakes. Now, my own view would be that there are advantages, in the case of a building like that, in having the contractor do the heating, and plumbing, and work of that character, and if Mr. Goodwin is prepared to do that work at a figure which the chief architect is prepared to say is fair and reasonable I will say frankly, that I would be disposed, if it can be done, to give that work to Mr. George Goodwin, the contractor. I do not say it will be done but I am not prepared now to give my hon. friend the assurance that it will not be done.

Mr. AMES. Here we have a distinct avowal in advance that once a contractor is in possession of the four walls and the roof of a building he practically has the absolute refusal of all the remaining work. He can do it without tender and by a simple arrangement between himself and the architect. That is just the way to pay the highest possible price for the additional work required on the building. If that is the fixed policy of the department we must expect to pay very high prices and oftentimes in excess of the real value of the work. That is not the way public establishments do their business, at least such as I have had to do with. Further, it is not fair to other contractors if it is

understood that if a contractor secures a contract even at a low figure he will have an opportunity of making very large returns upon his extras. If the government is favourable to the contractor he is given the opportunity to continue the extra work at a price to be arranged between himself and the architect and if the government is not favourable to him he is deprived of that chance to make money.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As a general proposition the contracts for all work on a building should be let by public tender and I have asked the architect in future, as far as possible, to let the contract in the first place including heating, and wiring, and all these things so far as that can be done.

Mr. FOSTER. That is fair.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But here is a very large and expensive building, one which has been built with great care and in the most satisfactory way by the contractor. As he is rushing along his work towards completion, it might cause great dissatisfaction to put in three or four sub-contractors, each acting independently and under no one control. Therefore, if I can be assured by the chief architect that Mr. Goodwin is prepared to do this work at a fair and reasonable price, I would have no hesitation myself in recommending His Excellency in Council to give the work to the contractor.

Mr. CROSBY. If I take the architect's estimate of the cost of this building, $1,250,000, and then take the contract price at which we are getting it built, $950,000, does it not mean that the architect is very extravagant in his estimates ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Take the next tender.

Mr. CROSBY. I am speaking of the estimate of the architect. I do not want to say anything against him, but it strikes me that it is not safe to allow him to name the price of anything that goes into that building.

Mr. SPROULE. We have had some experience in the past of architects and engineers certifying that prices are fair and reasonable. I could give a number of instances, but I need only mention the lighting of the Cornwall canal. When a dispute arose between the Auditor General and the party who was paid for the service, the account was cut down from $52,000 to $29,000, because the Auditor General would not agree to it, even though the engineer had certified that the price was fair and reasonable, and recommended the payment of the money and the Minister of Railways and Canals had assented ; and then the Auditor General declared that it was $10,000 too high still. We have brought a great many instances of this kind to light during the last few years. Is it any wonder that we should be a little suspicious in passing this matter over to the tender mercies of any architect ?

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. If I understood the minister aright, the contract for this building covers only the building proper, and other arrangements will have to be made for the fittings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the case of the Victoria Museum, the contract did not include heating apparatus, electric wiring, elevators, fittings and furniture and carving.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I also understood that it was the intention of the minister to give the contract for these works to the gentleman who had the contract for the building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I said I was not prepared to give an assurance that that would not be done.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. We gathered from the debate that that would probably take place.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Possibly.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. If that principle were generally accepted, a contractor could well take his contracts at a much reduced rate, with the expectation and strong probabilities of making good out of these later contracts. I presume that the heating, wiring, and so on will cost $100,000, and probably more?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The estimate is $85,000.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Then, it is not difficult to believe that they will cost $100,000. This is a principle to which I very much object—that a contract should be made for so large a building as this, with what looks like a full intention of giving the contracts for the fittings to the same party without tender. I do not think that is a businesslike way or one that will satisfy the people. I do not see why others should not have the opportunity of tendering if they desire to do so.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Schaffner) understood me correctly that I would not give assurance that this would not be done. And my present view would be that, if the contractor is willing to undertake the work at a price that the chief architect, in whose judgment I have the greatest possible confidence, certified to be fair and reasonable, I would be disposed to recommend to my colleagues, under the circumstances, that the present contractor should have the contract. My first

reason is because of the low figure at which he undertook the work of the building, and because I am satisfied that he has lost money, his tender being $300,000 below the estimate of the chief architect, and $275,000 lower than that of the next lowest tenderer. Another reason is the very satisfactory way in which he has done the work. Another reason is that it would be much more satisfactory to have the work go on under one contractor than under a separate contractor.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That may all be very true, but it is not a very good reason for the course which the minister suggests. The mere fact that the contractor has taken the contract at what is supposed to be too low a figure and has lost money is not sufficient reason for taking this particular means of making that money up to him.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Can't very well make up $300,000 on a contract for $85,000.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. If the trimmings cost as much more than the estimate as the building has done—

Mr. PUGSLEY. This building is costing much less than the estimate. The architect's estimate was $1,250,000 and the contract is $950,000.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It is not finished yet.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This was the estimate of only that part which was contracted for. It did not include the heating apparatus, the electric wiring, elevators, fittings and furniture and carving.

Mr. CROSBY. And, if I understood the minister correctly, he wants to throw $200,000 or $300,000 to this contractor, whoever he may be, because he took the contract at too low a figure—

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Crosby) does not wish to misunderstand me. The total estimate for these fittings is $85,000. I certainly am not throwing $300,000 to him.

Mr. CROSBY. The minister's anxiety concerning the contractor arises from the fact that the contractor is supposed to be losing money by this contract. There is just as much reason for us to conclude that the architect was out in his estimate. The very fact that he estimated $1,250,000 for the construction of a building, and that a contractor whom the minister describes as one of the best contractors in the Dominion offers to construct that building for $950,000 is strong reason why this committee should not accept him as the final authority in these matters when he is so extravagant in his estimates. I, for one, am not going to sit in this House and vote in favour of contracts being given in this way. Unless there is some indication that this work is going to be let by tender and contract, I shall not agree to such a vote without registering my strong protest against dealing with the public money in this manner.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. When we were discussing the last item, the minister said, as I understood him, that it was an exceptional case, but that if he had had control from the beginning, he would not have let the contract in the way in which it was let. But now, when we come to consider this item, the minister acknowledges that he is going to do exactly the same thing as his predecessor did; that is, notwithstanding that the original contract was let after tenders called, he intends to give the contract for the remaining portion of the work to the person who has received the contract and without calling for further tenders. This completely justifies the complaint that the opposition is making against a contract of this kind. Once a party tendering knows that when he gets a contract for a certain portion, he will get a contract for the balance of the works without tender that eliminates the principle of competition. It puts the other parties who tender, and who do not know that the one whose tender would be accepted was bound to get the balance of the work without competition, at a disadvantage; and it enables the one who knew this, to tender at a lower figure than he otherwise would, relying on increased profits in the additional work which he would secure without tender, so that in reality he is not the lowest tenderer. Whenever a vote is asked for an appropriation, the minister should be in a position to let us know what the work will cost altogether and call for tenders for the entire work, so that all who tender may be on an equal footing. It is not fair to the country to let a portion of the contract by tender and then give the balance without competition to favoured friends of the government. The minister tells us that the reason why he grants the remainder of the contract to the one whose tender is accepted is because his tender was the cheapest, but the reason why this man tendered at the lowest figures may have been because he knew that the minister was going to do what he has told us tonight he intended doing.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE. Who is the clerk of works?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. B. Cantlie.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Has he had any experience in supervising the construction of public buildings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About ten years.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Is he the gentleman who was the clerk of works on the Laurier tower?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. OSLER. I do not think it is possible to have a more vicious system than that which the minister has just explained to us. We know what it has led to in the department which has been under investigation and which is the only one in which there was a little lift of the curtain. This system of giving contracts for part of the work to one man, after inviting public tenders, and then giving him the balance without tender, is bound to result in great loss to the country and public scandal. I do not think we can condemn it in sufficiently strong terms, and I hope the minister will see his way to giving us the strongest assurance that no such method will be followed by the government in the future. I would ask him whether his architect has an absolutely free hand in giving the extras to whom he likes, or whether he must give them to those who are on the patronage list?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The patronage list has been abolished in my department and there is no question of patronage here. It is simply a question as to whether public tenders shall be invited for the fittings, or whether an arrangement be made with the contractor, provided he is willing to do the work at a price which our chief architect considers fair and reasonable. Some little time ago, after I became minister—and it has been impressed on my attention more recently because of the consideration I have given in this building and one or two others—I came to the conclusion that it is desirable, as far as possible, to provide in the original contract for all the different classes of work. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman who has just spoken that it is better to do that, and that is my intention. As far as possible, in letting contracts in future, I intend that the original contract shall provide for everything which can be reasonably foreseen.

An hon. MEMBER. Why not do it now?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot do it in this case because the building is nearly completed. Here is a very expensive building which, although not completed, is pretty well on to completion, and the wiring and heating ought to be going on simultaneously with the finishing up of the work. My experience is that if we have an honest contractor and can fix a reasonable price with him, it is infinitely better for him to do the work than have two or three sub-contractors whose men will be quarrelling together as to how the work will go along.

Mr. OSLER. Was the contract let without reservation on the part of the government that they could let other workmen into the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of course we can.

Mr. OSLER. Better delay the completion of the building for six months and let us have an honest tender for the work not under contract and remaining to be done, and not have the very grave suspicion aroused which a system of this sort is bound to excite.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think anybody can have any suspicion.

Mr. CROSBY. I am going to vote against this item unless we have some assurance from the minister that the work, not let by contract and yet to be done, will be open to public competition.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be very sorry if the hon. gentleman votes against it.

Mr. CROSBY. There will be a time when the minister will have reason to be sorry.

Mr. GOODEVE. What are the duties of a clerk of works ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He has to be on the spot constantly and see that the contractor carries out the plans and specifications and also the instructions and the directions of the architect.

Mr. GOODEVE. It seems to me that a man who will work for $3.50 per day is hardly capable of doing that work. When you let a contract involving a million dollars and then hire a man at $3.50 per day to pass on the technical work and stand between the contractor and the government, I should say that a man who will work for that wage is not capable of fulfilling these duties. If he were, he would command higher pay.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have an experienced architect on our staff who is there constantly in addition to the clerk of works.

Mr. GOODEVE. In that case the clerk of works is not required at all. Either he is capable of overseeing the work or he is not. If he is, you do not require an architect there with him; and if he is not, he is no use there at all.

Amherst, public buildings, Nova Scotia—improvements, $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision for the purchase of a tower clock and its installation and also for the re-wiring of the entire building. I may say that at the last session of parliament there was voted $2,500 for this purpose; of that amount $809 was available on the 1st of February.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. How big does the town have to be before it gets a town clock?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some cases have been brought to my notice where towers have been erected on the various buildings intended for a clock; in some cases towers

were erected ten or fifteen years ago for the purpose of a clock. In the case of Amherst, my attention was called to the fact that the building had an unfinished appearance, was unsightly, and I gave directions to have a clock put in the tower.

Mr. OSLER. I would ask the minister whether his attention has been drawn to a fact that quite recently a judgment was given in England against a man who had put up a public clock. As time went on the clock was neglected, it was not wound up, and some citizens sued the man, and I think got damages for misleading them as to the time of day. It was held that a public body who erected a town clock for the public good was bound to keep the clock in order. Now the minister sees the posibility that the government may be sued if it neglects to keep these town clocks in proper order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We will take the chances of that.

Bridgewater, public buildings, $6,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision for continuing during the coming years the construction of a public building in the town of Bridgewater. It is to be two stories, on a stone foundation, and intended to provide accommodation for post office, customs house, etc. The total amount of the contract is $23,500.

Mr. AMES. How much has been already expended on the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There has been paid to the contractor already $23,710. There has been some extra work.

Mr. AMES. After having paid the contractor the full amount of his contract, why do you want this $6,000 more?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The explanation of that is that subsequently to the contract being awarded it was decided to put a clock in this building, and to erect a tower for the purpose; consequently the contract was changed, and it was agreed to pay the contractors for that $2,882.

Mr. AMES. Where is the rest of the $6,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will give the whole statement. Amount paid for site, $5,500; for legal expenses, survey of site, printing, advertising and clerk of works, $1,042.62. There was paid on account for heating apparatus and for boiler, $594, and there is still due for heating apparatus, $656. Due on electric wiring and fixtures, $1,000; fittings, furniture, lock boxes, the estimate is $4,000; sidewalks and fences, $1,000; contingencies of various kinds, $2,000. The total estimated cost, with the site of the building, heating, electric wiring and fixtures, $14,539.80. The total expenditure to the 31st of December was $30,846.80. Assumed expenditure from 31st December last to 31st March, $2,692. The population of Bridgewater is nearly 3,000.

Mr. McCALL. Is it the intention of the minister to put a clock in every public building where there is a tower constructed for that purpose?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no settled policy. I have put clocks in several public buildings where it has been represented to me that they were desirable. But I cannot say that I will do it in every public building.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister gave as a reason for putting a clock in the public building at Amherst that there was a tower erected for the purpose, and it was unsightly without a clock. But in this case he seems to have decided to erect a public building without a tower, and afterwards changed his mind. Now when did he reach the conclusion that it was wise, after the contract was let, to change the plans and specifications and erect a tower and put in a clock?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was decided along in the spring of 1908. I may say that by reason of the location of the building at Bridgewater, it was strongly represented to me that a tower and clock would greatly improve the appearance of the building, and as the expense would not be great I yielded to the representations. I have plenty of precedents for that. When our friends opposite were in power many public buildings were erected in some of which clocks were placed, and others were left unsightly without clocks.

Mr. SPROULE. I have a distinct recollection that the principle of supplying clocks was strongly condemned by the hon. gentleman's friends when in opposition. It was declared to be extravagant, wrong and unjustifiable. Now the hon. gentleman, supported by his friends, comes forward and does the very thing which they so strongly condemned. Two wrongs can never make a right. If it was wrong for the hon. gentleman's predecessors to do it surely there is no justification for him repeating that wrong because, from his intelligence, he must have known better.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You would say that it was right then.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. In explanation of the purpose of putting a tower on this building, I may say that the building belongs to a new design introduced by the Department of Public Works about a year ago. It is a flat-roofed building. The appearance of the building is rather low and there were very strong representations made on behalf of the people of the town to alter the exterior appearance of the building by placing a tower upon it, or by mak-

ing some other change. It did add a little to the cost, but I may say that if any hon. gentleman saw the building he would feel that the department was strictly justified in putting on this tower.

Mr. SPROULE. How much did the tower and clock cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The tower cost $2,882 and the clock will probably cost $1,500 or $2,000.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. Is this a post office building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Post office and customs house.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. Have the government any settled policy as to where buildings of that description should be erected, having reference to population?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No rule has been laid down as to the exact number of people required in a place in order to justify the erection therein of a public building. Population does not always govern. Something may depend upon the trade that is done in a place, upon the customs receipts, upon the existing post office accommodation, upon the possibility or otherwise of renting suitable buildings for public purposes and sometimes upon whether it is a county town or not. There has been one rule laid down, not as a fixed rule, but it has been recognized and, I think, it was so stated by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), and that is that this government will be disposed to favour as rapidly as might reasonably be done, the erection of one public building in a county, that public building to be in the county town. But, of course, it can be seen that that rule cannot always be adhered to, because it sometimes happens that the county town may not be the most important town in the county.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. You think there should be one in every county?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that should be the ultimate aim to which we should look forward.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. Is Bridgewater a county town?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think it is.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. It is and it is not. There are two towns in the county of Lunenburg, each of which regards itself as a county town because each is the seat of courts. It is rather an important town, and I do not think that any gentleman can make any valid objection to this expenditure.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the population?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. About 2,000.

Mr. OSLER. What is the post office revenue?

Mr. WRIGHT. It was not large enough to be incorporated when the census was taken.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The post office revenue is $5,590, the customs duties, $4,448; money orders issued, $59,000, and money orders paid, $21,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. I just came in a few moments ago and I understood that the discussion was centring on public buildings in county towns. I desire to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that there is a county town in the county which I have the honour to represent and during the recent election campaign my opponent gave a very strong promise that a post office would be erected in the town of Milton, the county town. He gave a very strong assurance of what he would accomplish when he came here. Unfortunately for the people who wanted a post office, he did not come, but I trust it may not be so unfortunate after all, because I believe that if the Minister of Public Works made the promise that he would erect a post office in that town he would not hesitate to do it even if the gentleman who conveyed that promise to the people should not have been elected.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the population?

Mr. HENDERSON. The population, I presume, is 1,700 or 1,800.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Do you favour erecting one there?

Mr. HENDERSON. Certainly, I would favour the erection of a post office in Milton. We had the strong assurance of the government candidate during the election that a post office would be erected in that town. I can hardly assume that my opponent made that promise without having had some guarantee from the minister that the promise would be implemented, and I do not think the minister would go so far as to give that assurance only on the condition that my opponent would be elected. I believe he is too honourable. I think that if he gave the promise at all it should be implemented no matter who was elected. All I ask is that the promise may be implemented by the erection of a public building in Milton. We have no public building in the county of Halton. There are some five towns and villages about the same size as Milton, not one of which has a public building, and I do not think I am asking too much when I ask the minister to carry out the pledge which was given by my opponent to the people of Milton that a post office should be erected there in the event of his return. I would like the minister to say whether he made

that promise and, if so, is it his intention to carry it out and give us a public building during the current year ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say to my hon. friend that I do not call to my mind at the present moment whether I was communicated with on the subject of a public building or not. I do remember my hon. friend presenting, at the last session of this parliament, the claims of Milton so strongly that I am inclined to think that he almost persuaded me that Milton should have a public building, but I can say to my hon. friend, and it may do for the whole of this discussion in regard to public buildings, that he will not find that I have ever, since I have been Minister of Public Works, made a promise, or authorized anybody else to make a promise for the erection of a public building conditional upon the election of a supporter of the government. Wherever I have made a statement that a public building will be erected it is an unqualified statement. If I have made any promise with regard to Milton or with regard to any other public building it will be carried out at the very earliest opportunity. I can tell my hon. friend that so far as I remember there are no amounts in the estimates this year for public buildings other than those in respect of which tenders have already been called. In view of the state of the revenue we have felt obliged to postpone for another year the erection of a great many public buildings for which appropriations were made last session and which we have not felt in a position to go on with at the present time. I am afraid that the public building at Milton, if one is to be erected there, would have to stand over the same as the rest.

Mr. HENDERSON. There has been a discussion as to the erection of a town clock; may I ask the minister if he intends to put a clock in the Conservative members' room?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Considering the youth and character of my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) I think we should put a 'watch' there.

Mr. BLAIN. What will be the total cost of the Bridgewater building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Including everything to complete, it is estimated to cost $42,539.80.

Glace Bay, public buildings, $12,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete this building providing accommodation for post office, custom house, inland revenue, examining warehouse, weights and measures. The total cost including the site, heating, electric wiring, &c., is estimated at $54,859.85.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is the population of Glace Bay?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 7,000 by census of 1901. I am informed it is probably 15,000 now.

Mr. MADDIN. What is the estimated cost of this building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $45,000.

Mr. MADDIN. What was the contract price and how much has been expended to date?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract price $24,000; expended to 31st of December, $41,540 which includes $11,599 for the site.

Mr. MADDIN. Will this vote complete the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We expect it will.

Mr. MADDIN. Will this building have a tower and clock?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. MADDIN. It would appear to me that the necessity for erecting towers on these public buildings and providing them with clocks becomes very pressing on the eve of an election. For instance, there was no clock on the Sydney building for a great many years, but on the eve of the 1904 election a stipendiary magistrate Mr. A. G. Maclean and a jeweller by the name of Fred. Lighter were appointed a committee to go to the old country to select a clock. The jeweller might have been a very good man for the purpose but I doubt the qualifications of the stipendiary magistrate; anyhow the clock has never given satisfaction. I suggest with all deference to the minister that instead of providing these buildings with towers which in the case of Amherst cost $2,800, and clocks which cost from $1,500 to $3,000, it would be much better to dispense with these luxuries which are much like the fifth wheel on a carriage, and to apply the money to the Postmaster General's Department towards giving a better mail service to the people in the scattered districts of Nova Scotia.

Guysborough public buildings, improvements, $1,200.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete the installation of a clock and to provide an acetylene gas plant.

Mr. GEORGE GORDON. What is the population of Guysborough?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About 1,500 last census.

Mr. GORDON. What will these improvements cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $2,000.

Halifax, Dominion building, improvements, repairs, etc., $75,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This vote is for the purpose of remodelling the whole interior of the Halifax Dominion building, making it

fire proof and fitting it for post office purposes and assistant receiver general's offices The customs, examining warehouse and inland revenue offices have been removed to the new customs building, and it is found necessary to remodel this building to fit it for post office purposes.

Mr. AMES. It is being done by contract.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. AMES. Who has the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Keefe.

Mr. SPROULE. Will this vote complete?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it will require $70,000 more. The total probable cost including everything is $165,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the contract let for $165,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the contract, including the wiring, is let for $94,000. In addition, the heating and boilers, it is estimated, will cost $15,000, electric fixtures $1,500, fittings, furniture and lock boxes $25,000, vault lining of doors $10,000, contingencies and superintendence $19,500; total estimated cost $165,000.

Mr. AMES. Is this remodelling an old building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROSBY. When is this building to be completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the 18th of March, 1910.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Was the contract let by public tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Who are the contractors?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Keefe, of Halifax.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. What is the amount of his tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $94,000. The other tenderers were for $114,000 and $145,000 respectively.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. How much is the total work to cost, all completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $165,000.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Is it the intention of the minister to let the difference between the contract and the total cost, amounting to $70,000, by tender or to the present contractor?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My intention is to let that by tender, as far as we can do so.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. How does the minister propose to let this addition of $70,000 by tender and not the addition for the museum?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have endeavoured to explain that there are special conditions with respect to the museum which do not exist with respect to this building. At all events, I do not know any special reason why we should not ask for tenders for this work, as we have ample time to do it.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I fail to see what the special conditions are. The minister has given us no special logical reason why he should not let the remainder of the museum work by tender. In the construction of all large buildings there are many contractors for different trades working at the same time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman object to my letting this by tender?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. No, but I am asking why the minister has not done it in the case of the museum.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are now discussing the Halifax public building.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I am asking the minister if he can give me any special reason why he adopts the principle of letting the remainder of this work by tender when he does not adopt that principle in the case of the museum.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have already answered. The hon. gentleman will find it all in 'Hansard.'

Mr. SPROULE. Is there provision in this contract for other contractors to occupy the building at the same time, in the event of letting other portions of the work to other contractors?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Halifax—Immigrant Detention Building—Hospital, $2,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote. It is to provide for the erection of a stable in the immigration detention grounds at Halifax. It has been requested by the Superintendent of Immigration, and the estimated cost is $2,500.

Mr. AMES. Does that complete the entire outfit at the Halifax immigration detention building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

New Glasgow public building—improvements, $1,000.

Mr. MADDIN. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works what the nature of these improvements is and at whose request they are made?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This amount is for some alterations to be made in the building, and also for the purchase of a clock to be placed in the tower. The chief architect tells me that the Customs Department have applied for these changes.

Mr. AMES. From whom does the government purchase these Nova Scotia clocks?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Most of them are obtained in the old country; none of them are made in Canada.

Mr. S. SHARPE. How many public buildings in Nova Scotia have been supplied with clocks? I think the hon. minister is showing partiality to Nova Scotia. Only one was promised in Ontario—that was in Berlin.

Mr. MADDIN. Is the hon. Minister of Public Works aware that the 'Eastern Chronicle,' published in New Glasgow, and the organ of this government in East Pictou, last month commented editorially on this expense, pointing out that it was altogether unnecessary and uncalled for, and that, as the editor had seen the alterations, they were calculated to weaken the building by the cutting of rafters and beams? I would like to know whether the Minister of Public Works is aware that that is the stand taken by the organ of the government in East Pictou.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware of the stand taken by the paper referred to, nor am I aware that it is the organ of the government or that this government has any organ.

Mr. MADDIN. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) would hardly agree with the minister there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The expenditure is not very great. The total is only $3,000. The clock will cost $1,200 and the alterations of the building $1,495.

Mr. MADDIN. The amount may not look very big, but it is sufficient to supply a daily mail to Bauline, which has now only one mail a week, and it would give it a daily mail for two years.

Pictou Public Building—Renewals and repairs, $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of this amount, $1,500 is a revote. It is to make provision to replace the old galvanized iron roof, which was found leaking, also to re-cover the roof and repair the gable. The tender was for $1,900 and the contingencies $100, making a total of $2,000.

Shelburne Public Building, $19,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This was placed under contract February 12, 1908. The building is of stone. It is 39 by 54 feet, two and a half stories high, with a turret three stories high. It is required for a post office and custom house. The total estimated cost, including site, heating, wiring, etc., is $35,158.77.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What is the population of the town?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is one of the oldest towns in Nova Scotia. Its population was 1,445 seven years ago. Since then it has been connected by railway with other parts of the province, and is now progressing.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Was it in February, 1908 you decided to build that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract was entered into then.

Mr. CROSBY. What is the revenue?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The postal revenue is $1,669, customs duties, $1,471, money orders given, $29,439, money orders paid $19,000. The exports are $33,174.

Mr. CROTHERS. That amounts to $25 per head for every man, woman and child for the total population.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. That is a very expensive building for such a place with such a small revenue. I presume that the minister, as a business man, must have some kind of system governing the erection of these buildings in different parts of the country. I would like to know if other places with an equal revenue are equally entitled to a public building, and if places which have a revenue three or four tmes that amount will be given public buildings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Places with the population and of the importance of this would have very strong claims on the government. That is as far as my hon. friend can expect me to go.

Mr. HENDERSON. In whose riding is this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In that of the Minister of Finance.

Westville Public Building, $5,000.

Mr. S. SHARPE. How big is this place?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It had a population of about 2,300 in 1901 but has increased a good deal since. It is quite a mining centre.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the estimated cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The building site heating, electric wiring, &c., will cost $25,605.

Mr. MADDIN. From whom was the site purchased?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Acadia Coal Company.

Mr. STANFIELD. Is it the intention to put a side-walk along the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If a side-walk is required, I would favourably regard the suggestion.

Georgetown Public Building, Prince Edward Island, $7,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This building was purchased at a low price, and this amount is

required for alterations to fit it for a public building.

Mr. DANIEL. When was it purchased?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In March 1908. The price for building and site was $2,500.

Mr. JAMESON. From whom was it purchased?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From E. B. Hessian.

St. John Dominion Building, New Brunswick—improvements, repairs, &c., $4,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make repairs in the St. John Post Office and Custom House and West Side Post Office.

St. John Drill hall, New Brunswick, $12,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is estimated sufficient to pay for the property which the Crown is expropriating as a site for a drill hall. We do not intend this year proceeding with the building.

Mr. CROCKET. Why not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In pursuance of the policy of postponing for a short time the works with regard to which tenders were not called before the decision was arrived at.

Mr. DANIEL. What negotiations have taken place with regard to any expropriation of land in St. John for drill hall purposes?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Instead of negotiating we thought it better to file a plan of expropriation. In that locality many of the titles are somewhat uncertain, and it is not known who are the owners. It is thought better to file a plan of expropriation, and then negotiate afterwards. If we cannot arrive at a fair arrangement, we can let the Exchequer Court determine the value.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it the intention of the government, or the department, to put through these expropriation proceedings this year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Public Works—Chargeable to Income—Public Buildings, Quebec—Cookshire Post Office, $15,000.

Mr. AMES. Would the minister please tell us the particulars of this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This building is being erected on a lot of land given as a free site by the municipal council of the town. It is a fine lot with a frontage of 100 feet on Main street and a depth of 125 feet. The building will be two stories high, and will be of brick on a concrete foundation. The building is required for post office, customs and inland revenue. The total estimated cost, including heating, electric wiring, fittings and furniture, is $23,053.55.

Joliette Armoury, $15,000.

Mr. AMES. We would like some information about this.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The site upon which this building is to be constructed has a frontage of 100 feet with a depth of 100 feet. The bulding will be of two stories, of brick, on a stone foundation, with stone trimmings, the size being 56 feet by 47 feet. The total estimated cost, including heating, fixtures and furniture, but not including the site, is $21,719.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Has the contract been let?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN. When was it let?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the date here, but it was let quite recently. Six tenders were received in answer to an advertisement, the tenders ranging from $13,500 to $15,395. The lowest was accepted on authority of an order in council passed on January 18 last. But there was some delay in letting the contract.

Mr. MEIGHEN. That was subsequent to the determination of the minister not to proceed with any public works for which contracts were not let?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, not subsequently.

Mr. MEIGHEN. That is to say, then, the minister's policy on this subject was adopted subsequent to January 18 of this year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Tenders had been called for this building in 1908, and the decision that we arrived at was only arrived at in December.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Why the delay in deciding on the tenders?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will make inquiries. I think we called twice for tenders.

Mr. MEIGHEN. When was the last call for tenders?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My deputy tells me that I am in error in saying that there were two calls for tender. There was delay while we were making inquiry as to the responsibility and experience of the contractors.

Mr. MEIGHEN. How large a place is Joliette?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Seven or eight years ago it had a population of 4,200.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Is it about the same yet, or is it larger?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am told that it is about 6,000 population now.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The hon. minister will remember that in his estimates last year an appropriation was made for an armoury in the city of Portage la Prairie, a city with a population larger than even the population estimated by the minister for

Joliette. But I do not see any appropriation this year for that armoury although it was promised by the candidate who opposed me in the last contest that an armoury would be erected in the city of Portage la Prairie. The reason I asked the minister when that policy was decided upon is that I would like to get at what the reason was for calling for tenders for certain of these public works immediately prior to, or immediately subsequent to, the election, and not calling for tenders for others equally necessary or more necessary for the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A large number of buildings were provided for in the Appropriation Act of last year. My directions to the chief architect were to proceed as rapidly as possible to get the plans and specifications ready and to call for tenders just as soon as this was done. But the hon. member will realize that this work takes time, and that plans and specifications for all these public works could not be gone on with at the same time. No selection was made of one place more than another, so far as I am aware. The chief architect went on in the regular way, intending to get out plans in reasonable time and to call for tenders for all these works. The decision arrived at with regard to dropping a large number of the public works was arrived at when we began to prepare the estimates for this session, some time in December, and I think the latter part of December.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Many tenders were called for subsequent to the 26th of October and prior to the date in December when the policy of the minister was decided upon. Then, I can quite understand what governed the department in calling for tenders in some cases and not in others.

Mr. AMES. What military corps will probably use this Joliette armoury?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is headquarters for the 83rd Joliette Regiment and of A company.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. The minister tells us that the chief architect had instructions to make up the plans and specifications, but that all could not be made up at once. What system is adopted to decide which should be first? Did he commence in the west and go east, or in the middle, or how? Is there any system?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The practice is to follow the estimates that are voted, taking one after the other. Of course, we must first see that sites are obtained. Sometimes it happens that urgent representations are made by a member asking that the site be purchased as soon as possible, otherwise the option might be lost; or he might urge the erection of a building, and his representations would be heeded. In some towns the necessity of a public building is more urgent than in others. In some places there may be no accommodation for a post office or custom house. All these considerations necessarily weigh in deciding the action of the department.

Mr. AMES. To whom was the contract given for this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Simoneau & Dion, of Sherbrooke.

Mr. STANFIELD. After the Public Works Department has completed an armoury, how soon afterwards is it handed over to the Militia Department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In ordinary course it would be passed over to the Militia Department immediately on completion.

Mr. AMES. Who were the other tenderers, and what were the prices?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot give the names. There were six tenders, ranging from $13,500 to $15,095.

Mr. AMES. When was the land purchased, and from whom?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the name here, but I will get it.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Am I correct in understanding that in the matter of calling for tenders the minister exercises a discretion as to what public buildings tenders shall be called for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I repeat what I have said, that in the ordinary course the chief architect takes the votes as they appear in the appropriation. But sometimes it occurs that a member writes to me urging me to proceed as rapidly as possbile with the erection of a building in a certain place for which there is an appropriation, urging that it is very much needed. I would send a memorandum to the chief architect to hurry along the plans and specifications for the building in such and such a place.

Mr. MEIGHEN. If it is left to the chief architect, and he simply follows the appropriations, I do not think the government would be justified in adopting such an arbitrary line as has been adopted, namely proceeding with such buildings as tenders have been called for and leaving others; because it would result in this, that those provinces that happen to be first in the estimates would secure practically all their public buildings, and those that happened to be last would get none at all. Am I correct in understanding that many tenders were called for subsequent to the 26th of October, and prior to this day in December when the policy of the ministry was decided upon that has borne so harshly on many constituencies throughout Canada?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought I had made myself plain. In a number of cases I have been urged to see what was the cause of the delay in getting out plans and specifications. I have urged the chief architect to hurry along the work and the plans and specifications, but I never interfered with his proceedings or plans. He had a free hand for all buildings for which appropriations were made at the last session of parliament. Quite a number of tenders were called for during the summer. Parliament did not rise until the 20th of July; that accounts for delay in respect to a good many buildings. Later on when we came to consider the estimates and to weigh the revenue and expenditure for the coming year, we decided that in the public interest we would be obliged to drop a large number of public works. Now if I had undertaken to go through the list of buildings throughout Canada and determine which building should be carried on and which should be stopped, it would have been a very difficult task indeed, because when I put the items in the estimates of last year for these buildings I thought they were all necessary in the public interest, and that remark applies as well to buildings in constituencies which were represented by hon. gentlemen opposite as to buildings in constituencies which were represented by our friends. We thought the better way would be to draw the line as clearly as possible between buildings in regard to which tenders had been called for before we reached that decision, and those in regard to which tenders had not been called for. We did not feel that any great injustice was being done to those places with regard to which we were leaving buildings out of the estimates this year, because it did not mean, and does not mean, an abandonment of those buildings; it only means, as we hope, a postponment of them until next year. Parliament will meet in the ordinary course next fall, and then provision can be made, we hope, for the erection of buildings which were left out of the estimates for this year. I am sure that upon reflection my hon. friend, as other hon. members of this House, will see that we have adopted the wisest course. I was compelled, in yielding to the views of my colleagues, particularly my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, to drop some $8,000,000 from my estimates. I was sorry to do it. It has disappointed our hon. friend on this side more than it has disappointed my hon. friend who has just taken his seat. We had to do it. We thought we were doing it in the public interest and the public will justify it. We felt that the public would recognize that in taking this step public men are showing their willingness to meet conditions which have come temporarily upon us and which, we hope, will soon pass away. We feel that the financiers of the world will approve of the course which we have taken because it shows a determination on the part of the government to keep the expenditure within the revenue, and I trust my hon. friend will accept this explanation and allow this item to pass.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I quite understand the explanation of the minister, but that is no answer to the question I put to him. The question I put was: Were not many of these tenders called for subsequent to October 26, and prior to this date in December, when the policy of the minister was decided upon?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I told the hon. gentleman that some were, but I cannot tell how many.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I hope the minister will not think we are captiously taking up time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Because I, in common with many other members, four years from now, will be called upon to explain to the electors how it is that we did not succeed in getting these public buildings that were already in the estimates before we were elected, and when we say that the ministry decided upon a policy of economy owing to the diminution of the revenues they will answer us by saying that these revenues diminished a year ago. They will ask: How was it that the policy of the ministry was decided on one year after the condition existed, and when it should have been decided upon? I would be in a quandary to explain that decision to the electors. We would like to be able to offer some reasonable ground, but I am afraid that the explanation of the minister will be resented, because if the policy were adopted in December there was far more reason for it being adopted before any of us were candidates for the House at all, namely, a year ago.

Mr. BURRELL. Is it the intention to proceed with the construction of some of these buildings for which tenders were asked after October 26?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, as to some of them, but not all.

Mr. AMES. What principle has the minister followed in deciding what ones shall be gone on with and what ones shall not be?

Mr. PUGSLEY. With regard to those in respect to which tenders were called we also considered very carefully as to whether we might not postpone some of them until the following year, and that is

the principle upon which we went. Those which we thought were absolutely urgent we have proceeded with.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the principle?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The public necessities.

Mr. AMES. The minister has admitted that he found it necessary to strike out a great many items from the estimates providing for work that he would like to have done. On what principle did he proceed in deciding that certain items should be retained in the estimates and that certain items should be struck out?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought I explained that.

Mr. AMES. Not very clearly.

Mr. PUGSLEY. On a certain day we came to the conclusion that we would have to make a large cut in the estimates.

Mr. AMES. In December?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I think it was in December that we began to make up the estimates, and we decided to drop a very large amount. I decided to recommend to my colleagues in the first place to drop those public works for which tenders had not been called irrespective of their necessity. That rule was followed possibly with one or two exceptions. Then that left to be considered all those works in regard to which we had called for tenders. We went through the list again, applied the pruning knife and considered as to whether or not there might not be a few of these which we might drop. We also considered as to whether they were really of such urgent public necessity that they could not stand over for another year. In the case of some public works we concluded that they might stand over and we dropped them even though tenders had been called.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the minister give a concrete instance?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I can give one. There was the case of the Naufrage Pond, in Prince Edward Island. The constituency had been asking for this for a considerable time, but the amount was large, and although we had asked for tenders we concluded that we might allow that to stand for another year. The matter was referred to the chief engineer and he reported that he did not think the public interest would suffer if it were allowed to stand for another year.

Mr. FOSTER. What work was that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was a breakwater.

Mr. AMES. The minister has been unable to satisfy us yet as to the definite principle upon which he based his decision. Consequently, the only way we can determine that principle is to use our own powers of thought. I would like to ask the minister if he would be good enough to submit to the House a list of those works that were struck out in his first pruning and of those that he struck out in his second pruning in order that we may determine for ourselves what the principle was upon which he proceeded.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I hope my hon. friend, who has won a reputation for industry, will not allow that reputation to be lost by asking me to do what the hon. gentleman can easily do himself. If my hon. friend would take the estimates of last year and compare them with the estimates of this year he will see what has been struck out. Then I can give him the list of the others.

Mr. AMES. We cannot tell what items were on this original list which he says has been pruned so industriously to the extent of $8,000,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say to my hon. friend that the items on my original list were not new at all. They were only the works for which provision had been made at the last session of parliament.

Mr. AMES. Will the minister at least give us a list of those public works for which tenders had been called and which it was decided would not be gone on with this year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Now that is business; I will do that.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Will the minister also give us the assurance that those public buildings which were in the estimates last year and which now are unfortunately discontinued will be preferred and gone on with before other public buildings of a similar kind are initiated?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that is a very fair question. I feel that is the course that I should pursue as Minister of Public Works and will certainly recommend to my colleagues. Of course there may be cases arise, such as a public building being burned down or a wharf being carried away, which might create an exception, and we might have to include these new works, but as a general principle I am and would be committed to those works which parliament was asked to sanction last year.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I am very glad to hear that answer, and I hope that principle will be extended.

Mr. JAMESON. Does that apply to breakwaters and wharfs as well as to public buildings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. Of course if I were convinced that any work was not

necessary I would have to think the matter over, but as at present advised I would adopt that course.

Mr. JAMESON. I am referring to the items which were in the estimates last year and which are stricken out of the estimates of the present year and which of course would not be placed in the estimates last year if the ministry did not consider they were justifiable?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As at present advised I do not see any reason for changing my mind that all the works provided for last session are necessary public works. I think we are committed to them, and by every principle which ought to bind a public man I think I should recommend to my colleagues that they should be placed in the estimates next year or whenever the opportunity arises.

Mr. AMES. We may then take it as an expression of definite policy on the part of the minister that the items which have once been voted by this House but not proceeded with shall have priority in the estimates for public works next year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Speaking as a general principle, yes.

Knowlton Public Building, $12,000.

Mr. AMES. What is the total cost of this building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total probable cost, including everything, is $26,866.76.

Mr. AMES. Knowlton is a place of 800 inhabitants?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it is not a large place but it is a place of considerable importance.

Mr. AMES. Is there any special rule followed as to the size and magnificence of a public building in comparison with the size and importance of the town?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Where the place is small we try to give a comparatively small building.

Mr. AMES. When the town is represented by a cabinet minister does it have a large and better building than otherwise?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not as a rule, but of course it shows a higher standard of intelligence on the part of the people.

Lachute Public Buildings, $7,000.

Mr. PERLEY. What is the total cost of the building and will this vote complete it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is supposed to complete the building. The total estimated cost is $26,774.69. It is in the constituency represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Perley).

Mr. PERLEY. Perhaps the Minister of Customs will tell me whether he intends to make Lachute a port of entry seeing that he has now a building there to accommodate his officers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What do you say about the necessity for this building?

Mr. PERLEY. The building is a very good building, but it was put in the wrong place, and were I to speak about that it might take considerable of the time of the committee. When this building was first spoken of I went to Mr. Hyman, then minister, and begged him to erect it in the part of the town where it ought to have been put, but unfortunately he thought that political considerations forced him to erect it on its present location. Later on I may discuss the question from that point of view. However, for the present I merely say that I had the pleasure of speaking to the Minister of Customs on one occasion about making Lachute a port of entry and I now press my request on him again in view of the fact that this public building is specially designed to accommodate the customs service. Does the Minister of Customs propose to make a port of entry of Lachute?

Mr. PATERSON. We have not arrived at a definite conclusion as to that. After we have the money voted and see what we have on hand we will consider the necessities of the different parts of the country in that respect. In this year of economy we have not been able to meet the wishes of everybody, but the fact that quarters have been provided for customs in Lachute adds additional weight to the claim. The difficulty is that there are other towns asking for similar facilities which are not so well off as Lachute, but the matter will be given consideration.

Mr. PERLEY. Lachute is exactly in the same position as Alexandria, being half way between Ottawa and Montreal. It is a town of about the same size and yet Alexandria was made a port of entry some years ago. The minister told me then that one of the great reasons why Alexandria was made a port of entry was that a public building had been erected which contained accommodation for the customs. I hope the hon. gentleman will not permit the customs offices in the Lachute public buildings to go untenanted.

Mr. PATERSON. I did not ask to have accommodation for the customs in the Alexandria building, but it was done and it made it more difficult to refuse the demand. Otherwise I would have asked the Alexandria people to wait a little longer. Of course, the fact mentioned by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Perley) gives a little more strength to his request with regard to La-

chute, but should I yield, it will be a double argument for some other place and so I will need a little time to think it over.

Mr. FOSTER. The stable was built before you bought the horse.

Magog Public Building, $14,000.

Mr. AMES. What is the total cost of this building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total cost including everything is estimated at $35,626. It will be used for post office and customs house.

Montreal Eastern Postal Station, $10,000.

Mr. MONK. Is this a new building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of my hon. friend I will tell him that the site of this postal station is on St. Catherine east. The amount paid for land is $33,000. It was bought from Mr. Jeannotte, a good Conservative.

Mr. MONK. I think I must ask this item to stand until the Postmaster General is here to tell us what he intends to do about the reorganization of the postal service in Montreal. A great commercial city like Montreal is entitled to the fullest consideration of parliament with respect to matters of this kind, but we should know what policy the government intends to pursue with respect to granting postal facilities. I heard Sir Wm. Mulock, when Postmaster General, state in this House that the government would provide a postal station about midway between the great railway stations in Montreal in order to forward promptly to the central post office the mail matter arriving in the city. He gave reasons for declaring this as the policy of the government, but nothing has ever been done in that direction. But we find applied in the city of Montreal a principle which prevails everywhere, and which I think should be put a stop to. That principle is this: A man is elected to this House, and his sole object seems to be to have a public building erected within the limits of his constituency. I say without fear of contradiction that in the majority of cases he is a man we see very little of either in the general work of the House or in the very important work of the committees of the House; but he seems to think that if he gets a public building for his constituency that will make up for all his shortcomings; and that public building is erected to suit his caprice, very often in the wrong place, very often, we must admit, unnecessarily, and very often where the money might be spent more advantageously in a different manner. Take, for instance, the city of Montreal, the commercial centre of the Dominion, which contributes one-fifth, if not a larger proportion, of the total revenue of the country. While spending lavishly, if necessary, in that city, we should apply the money in the best possible way. We have in Montreal a port by far the most important of all the ports in the Dominion. Its income exceeds by an immense amount the income of any other port. For some years we have had there three excellent harbour commissioners, who are doing the best they can for the money they have, and for five years we have had before us the report of the Transportation Commission recommending, as among the foremost necessities of the country, the nationalization of the port of Montreal and the construction of a dry dock there as absolutely essential and urgent. That report, it is true, mentioned other ports which should be nationalized, but the chairman of the commission, in a letter sent subsequent to his report, insisted particularly on the urgency of the case in Montreal. We find at present—and the papers in the last few days have been full of it—that very far from Montreal becoming a free port, or the announcement being made by the government that the recommendation of that most important commission would be carried out, nothing has been done; and in order to carry out the improvements that are absolutely required in the port of Montreal, large indebtedness has been incurred, and to-day the commissioners find it impossible to continue their work without adding to the burdens of the port. Not only the people of Montreal, but I believe all the people of the province of Quebec, and very many people who are interested elsewhere, would say, if they were questioned on the subject, that the very first expense to be incurred should be in the direction of carrying out the recommendation of the Transportation Commission and making the port of Montreal a free port. With the competition of the American ports, the idea of adding to the burdens of the port of Montreal, embarrassing commerce and putting us on a retrograde march instead of enabling us to go forward, would be condemned by everybody. Quite lately the Board of Trade of Montreal has taken the matter up exactly as I have stated it to the House. The government seems to be indifferent to that very question. Therefore, it is important for us to know if the construction of all these postal stations is necessary. If it is, I have not a word to say. But this policy varies entirely from the policy of the government as I heard it laid down not many years ago by Sir William Mulock, speaking in this House on behalf of the government. In Montreal we have a somewhat strange phenomenon. The postal revenue of that city, the largest in the Dominion, is considerably less than that of the city of Toronto. What is the reason of that unexplained difference? To my mind it is attributable to this: That our

postal system in Montreal requires reform and requires additional expenditure. Our post office is properly manned. Our officers, whether the superior officers or those who have charge of the delivery of letters, perform their duties well; but they are absolutely insufficient in number; they are scandalously underpaid and they have not the means of giving us a proper service. I have made suggestions already, and I will make them again when the postal estimates come up, because I believe that if we applied ourselves to correct these deficiencies, and if we had in Montreal such a postal delivery as there is in other large cities—in London, in Paris, perhaps in Toronto—so that if a letter is put in a postal box at a certain hour it is sure to be delivered at a certain hour, the revenue of the Montreal post office would swell by leaps and bounds, and would soon equal if not surpass that of the city of Toronto. There is not that confidence at the present moment. Therefore, I ask is it wise for us to expend such a large amount of money in building postal stations, and could not the money be better applied in other ways? I think we should be informed by the Postmaster General if this way of spending money is the result of a settled policy of the government—the policy of erecting public buildings for the satisfaction of members representing different constituencies, in order that they may have the opportunity to show their electors that they have done something for their respective constituencies. It would be wiser for us to improve our postal system than to build large postal stations without improvements.

I think, in view of what is happening to our harbour commission, in view of the very large amount—an amount which I cannot understand, and which appears to be highly excessive—which we are spending on the central post office—a sum which, when we have finished with that post office, will amount to over $700,000—in view of these expenditures, it is wise for the committee to pause and ask the Postmaster General if this is the result of a policy and if we cannot make better use of our money than to build a larger number of these postal stations. What is essential to a postal service is not to build postal stations unless absolutely necessary in order to insure what is absolutely required in a commercial city like Montreal, namely, an efficient postal service.

Mr. M. Martin. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I wish to answer with a few words to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who has said a moment ago that the erection of a postal station in the constituency of St. Mary was perhaps to suit the caprice of the deputy representing that division. We have to bear in mind that this question is pending since about fifteen years, and that this postal station was required by all the electors of that constituency, whose number exceeds 48,000 inhabitants.

In that part of the city the postal business are of great importance. I will only mention the case of Mr. Filion, an apothecary, living in the north part of St. Mary's division who last year has made $93,000 in a small office of some square feet in size.

St. Mary's division forms one of the most commercial wards in the city of Montreal. St. Catherine street, from east to west; Notre Dame street from east to west, Ontario and Craig streets are nearly exclusively filled up with commercial firms. The large manufacturers are situated in that constituency.

Let me mention by the way, Sir, a few of those manufactures which are built there: A great number of breweries, some manufactures of shirts and glass works. We count also a manufacture of oilcloth, another one of engines, two of caoutchouc, a part of cotton mills, a manufacture of paints, without reckoning the largest tobacco manufacture of our Dominion, the Macdonald manufacture, and also the Dominion Tobacco Company. We have a few others more. A sugar refinery, some manufactures of cigars, thread, biscuits, shoes, sash and doors, with many others whose enumeration would be tedious.

If I have used every endeavour to obtain a postal station in that constituency it was not for the purpose of making easy my re-election, because the hon. member knows the majority which I won in 1906. If I have attempted to induce the government to give us that postal station it was because I knew it was indispensable. If the revenue of Ontario is considerably larger than that of Quebec—I mean the postal revenue—it is because the first one is better provided with postal stations which afford more facilities to the citizens in view of transacting postal business. I think my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier has been mistaken when he said it was a caprice of the member for St. Mary's. I will repeat again that I did not want that postal station in order to be re-elected. I have given sufficient proof of that. I want to add that the Conservative members are always ready to object to some estimate of the province of Quebec. It is not the same thing about the estimates of the province of Ontario.

Mr. AMES. (Translation.) Will the hon. member give us an idea about the site of that postal station?

Mr. MARTIN. (Translation.). Yes. It shall be situated on the corner of St. Catherine and Plessis. The owner of the land is Mr. Jeannotte, a good Tory. We could not buy other land without paying $45,000 or $50,000. The hon. member ought to know

the amount paid by the government when the land was bought for the post office on St. Catherine west.

Mr. AMES. (Translation.) Is it not true that a post office is now situated on Notre Dame east, No. 281? Another in St. Mary's ward and a third one on Ontario street, No. 1241?

Mr. MARTIN. (Translation.) They are auxiliary branches established in shops. As I have said a moment ago, Mr. Filion, an apothecary, on Fullum street north, has made $93,000 in postal business last year and there are fifteen or twenty others doing the same thing.

If I have endeavoured to get that postal station, I say again, it is because the citizens were urging for it and not myself, because I was not in need of it.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend entirely misapprehends me. He gives as reasons for the construction of these post offices that the division is a business one, that the land was bought from a Conservative, and that when we are asked to vote money for the province of Ontario, there seems to be no objection on this side. I do not think there is anything in the remarks I made to the committee which can give rise to such an interpretation. I am speaking for Montreal. My hon. friend entirely loses sight of the question I put to the Postmaster General, as to what his policy is regarding the expenditure of public money in that city where so much is required. My hon. friend from St. Mary's, who is unduly irritated, seems to think that that is not a fair question to ask. Well, I have given good reasons for it. I know St. Mary's division well. I know the whole eastern part of Montreal. I have lived there, and I know there are many important business interests and factories in that division and that it is a most important section of the city. But what I say is that what the people require in that part of the city is an efficient postal service. What they want is that the city should be properly equipped to fulfil the role it has to play in the Dominion; and if they were given their choice between a public building, not absolutely required, and the completion of those improvements, which have been time and again asked for from the government, they would not hesitate a moment. We have not at present as efficient a postal service as we should have. The fault is not with the authorities in Montreal, because their postal service is not sufficiently manned and the postal officials are not adequately paid. At certain times of the year it is impossible to carry out the work effectively because of the lack of sufficient hands to do it. Therefore, after what I have heard stated here by Sir Wm. Mulock, when he was Postmaster General, we are entitled to know, in virtue of what policy we are building these postal stations. And if my hon. friend from St. Mary's (Mr. Martin), and St. James Division (Mr. Gervais) will give us that policy and demonstrate that the money is absolutely required for that purpose and that all other purposes, however urgent, must give way to it, even though the failure to supply them places us in a very inferior position, I shall be perfectly satisfied. I am not asking that the money should not be voted; but when we are asked to vote nearly one quarter of a million dollars, I am surely entitled to ask whether that money could not be applied in a wiser manner to far more important wants, and surely it is not necessary to say that we are opposed to public expenditure in the province of Quebec. That is absurd. It is no answer to say that the site for the post office has been bought from a Conservative. Such arguments are childish.

Mr. GERVAIS. I agree with my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier in quite a number of the remarks he has made. We have been in great need for the last 15 or 20 years of large expenditure on improvements in the central post office and in great need of sub-postal stations in the eastern part of Montreal. My hon. friend from St. Antoine Division (Mr. Ames) will admit that the construction of a postal station in the heart of his constituency added a great deal of revenue to the postal department within the city of Montreal.

Mr. AMES. I do not object to sub-post offices that will add as much revenue as does sub-station A.

Mr. GERVAIS. Since then, I have succeeded in getting a sub-postal station, at a total expenditure of $5,000, which was built on the corner of St. Catherine street east and Amherst street. In the two or three years since that sub-station was established, I think, about $25,000 has been added to the revenue of the central post office in Montreal. I believe that when the government can see its way clear to construct two or three more postal sub stations, scattered over the eastern part of Montreal, fully $100,000 will be added to the general revenue. I admit with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that modern postal facilities have not yet been given to a large part of the city of Montreal. But I hope that within a few months—a couple of years at most—the best ten postal facilities will be given to the whole eastern section of the city. With regard to postal sub-station B, at the corner of St. Catherine street east and Amherst street, I may say that it affords all of the postal facilities to be had at the central post office. Letters are posted and received; letters can be registered; the business of the money order and post office savings bank branch is carried on; and there is a special and late delivery. I believe that this proposed expenditure of

$25,000 will be very useful. I must remind the hon. gentleman that east of St. Denis street and between Harbour and St. Louis streets you will find at least eleven bank offices. For example, you will find branches of the Molsons, Merchants, Royal, Banque Provinciale, Bank of Montreal, Quebec, and others. That shows that there is a great deal of business done in the eastern part of the city of Montreal. I think the government should have in the estimates not merely $25,000 for the purpose of purchasing a piece of ground at the corner of certain streets, but $150,000 to provide for several postal sub-stations such as that on the corner of Amherst and St. Catherine street east. I believe that the sub-stations should be connected with the central post office by pneumatic tubes, as it was intended to be the case in Toronto. And that was the policy of Sir Wm. Mulock when he was Postmaster General. I think the same thing should be done now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That plan was not carried out in Toronto.

Mr. GERVAIS. I believe that that is a policy that should be followed out. Well, at any rate with a special horse service, or a special electric car service between the central post office and the sub-stations, communication would be greatly facilitated. These sub-post offices which have been mentioned, and which are supposed to serve a large number in Montreal, are not of very great use. To improve our postal facilities, what we need to do is to build postal sub-stations. Hon. members understand that there is a great difference between a postal sub-station and a sub-post office. A sub-post office is a place where you can buy stamps and post letters. But a postal sub-station affords all the facilities of the central office. If, in Montreal, we can build five or six more sub-stations—not sub-post offices—you will probably add to the exchequer of the department about $150,000 of yearly income. I do not think the Dominion of Cainada is in such need of money as not to allow this House to vote that small sum of $25,000 for the purpose of building sub-postal stations on the corner of St. Catherine and some other street.

I admit, with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), that something should be done to make the port of Montreal a free port. For ten years we have been speaking of Montreal as the great national port of Canada. But it can never be a truly national port until it is made free, as Boston, Portland and Quebec are free. Instead of imposing new wharfage dues, or fresh pilotage dues, on those who wish to do business in and around the port of Montreal, we should try to abolish all these imposts. On that point I concur in the remarks of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. Several sessions ago, I declared myself against our present policy. I am aware that some railway companies are giving premiums and bonuses to shippers for the purpose of diverting trade from the port of Montreal to the benefit of Portland or Boston. That's a cold fact. So, instead of working for an increase of the wharfage dues, we ought to join hands to have those dues abolished once for all. I think that something should be done in this direction during the present session.

Mr. MONK. I am glad that my hon. friend from St. James, Montreal (Mr. Gervais), agrees with me in a good many things. He has, at any rate, absolved me from the very cruel imputations of my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Mary's (Mr. Méderic Martin). We would like to get more information. Is the delivery of postal matter in the city of Montreal started from any of these postal stations?

Mr. GERVAIS. Yes. From sub-stations A and B there is every kind of delivery just as from the central post office. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) knows very well that many manufacturers are establishing themselves near Craig and Amherst streets. They have been receiving, lately, from six to eight daily deliveries of letters. Private postal boxes have been established at Amherst street sub-station, University street sub-station, and Chaboillez Square sub-station. I repeat that every possible facility is given at these sub-stations that can be given at the central post office.

Mr. MONK. I would like to know whether there are different districts for delivery in Montreal. Do the sub-postal stations serve as centres of mail delivery?

Mr. GERVAIS There are three kinds of districts; there are the remote districts, which are supposed to get three deliveries per day; then there are the sub-postal station districts which are supposed to receive four to six daily deliveries; then there is the commercial centre of Montreal properly speaking, which is bounded by Craig street, the river, Wellington street and Bonsecours market, which district is supposed to get about an hourly delivery, that is about eight deliveries per day. In the northern part of the city, in St. Jean Baptiste ward, the neighbourhood of Mile End, and Mount Royal ward, I think there are at least three deliveries per day.

Mr. MONK. I do not quite understand my hon. friend. Are these sub-postal stations main centres from which delivery is made? I mean by that, is the postal matter conveyed from the central station to the sub-stations and there handed over to special carriers?

Mr. GERVAIS. Exactly. For example, in each sub-postal station there are head-

quarters for letter carriers. There are three groups of letter carriers. One will start every hour or two from the central post office; then from each of the sub-postal stations another group of letter carriers start about every hour, with the mail matter which has to be delivered over one-third of the city of Montreal; and there is another group serving the remote districts.

Mr. AMES. I think we are entitled to have some expression of definite policy given us in respect to these sub-delivery stations in the city of Montreal. At present it would seem as if these stations were built purely by favour, instead of the department endeavouring to take the entire city and district it, and then giving to each one of those separate districts one of the distributing sub-stations. So far as I can see, there are at least two of the three sub-stations to the east of St. Lawrence Main street, and now it is proposed to build a third east of St. Lawrence Main street; while the whole portion of the city lying to the south and west, including St. Ann's ward, St. Joseph's ward, and all that section, has no sub-station at all. Am I right?

Mr. GERVAIS. No.

Mr. AMES. Then why should the government at this particular time build a third distributing station in that part of the city which at the present time has the best possible facilities of that kind? You have only to look over the mails that come in from different postal stations throughout the city to understand something of their relative value. There are no less than fifty-two different stations under the control of the Post Office Department in the city of Montreal and the immediate suburbs.

Mr. GERVAIS. Postal stations and sub-post offices.

Mr. AMES. There are no less than 52 different places where work is done for the government, and which the government pays some one to do.

Mr. GERVAIS. $50 a year, on an average.

Mr. AMES. Various prices. For example, sub-postal station 15, of which the hon. member has spoken gave a revenue last year of $135, while the expenditure is $93.65. But the point I want to make is this, that if it is good policy to have in the city of Montreal, say, four or five sub-stations from which postmen shall distribute mail matter, then I think we ought to know just how the city of Montreal is divided, and when it is the intention of the government to build the remaining stations that will put the whole city, outside the immediate business centre, upon the same basis. For example, we have heard from the hon. member for St. Mary's (Mr. Martin) of the great advantage that comes from that Fullum street station, and yet the revenue for the last fiscal year was only $3,165. Now down on Chaboillez Square in the heart of a great business centre, there is a building being temporarily used, and the revenue derived there is $13,968. Now if we are to put up another building in St. Mary's division at the demand of the hon. member for that division, where the revenue is only $3,165, what about that great portion of the city served by the Chaboillez Square station where the revenue is four times as much? Even the station which the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Gervais) has been telling about, station C on Amherst street, only gives a revenue of $11,108. So the government, in building these sub-stations, is not building them in accordance with the needs of the district or with the revenue of the district, but simply by political favouritism, and in those sections of the city which need them least. My protest is this, that there should be adopted a regular and definite plan, and that where the business is greatest and the need is greatest, there a building should go up first, and that the other outlying sections with less business should not be served until the most important sections are served. I now enter this request of the minister and of the government generally, to the effect that if you are to endow the different sections of the city of Montreal with these postal distributing stations, the first district to be endowed should be the Chaboillez Square district, which gives to-day the second largest revenue of all the 52 stations.

Mr. GERVAIS. The question of distance for distribution is a very important one. What is the distance between Chaboillez Square and the central post office? Not more than three-quarters of a mile. We have some sub-postal stations that have only been in operation for one year and a half. I think it is a proof of its necessity if, after one year and a half we are getting now a revenue of over $11,000 from a sub-post office. Let me tell my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) that his constituency has been princely served, because the total cost of sub-postal station A, right in the heart of his constituency, has cost over $200,000. I may say that before a couple of years are past, the revenue of the sub-postal station B, in St. Catherine street and Amherst street will exceed the revenue of the sub-postal station in the district of the hon. member for St. Antoine.

The hon. member for St. Antoine will, I suppose, concede that there is a tremendous amount of business being done daily upon St. Catherine street, between Visita-

tion street and St. Lawrence Main. The grand total of the business in St. James division is as great as that on St. Catherine street within the boundary of St. Antoine division. The hon. member for St. Antoine should not expect to have his protest considered very seriously by this government. I do not know at whose request he has been enjoying the good will of the government to the amount of a quarter of a million dollars without any more benefit than the government is getting from the sub-station building at Amherst and St. Catherine streets. I understand that the government is not paying more than $1,500 rent for the building used as a sub-postal station at Amherst and St. Catherine streets, which is not to be compared with the interest which the government is paying on the quarter of a million it has spent for the building of the monumental sub postal station at University and St. Catherine streets west. I think, therefore, that this committee can well disregard any protest made on behalf of the hon. member for St. Antoine.

Mr. DOHERTY. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the whole question is a question of distance from the central post office and that the business to be attended to has nothing to do with it?

Mr. GERVAIS. Yes, it has.

Mr. DOHERTY. How does the hon. gentleman explain that this rented establishment that produces this income of $13,000 a year is to be treated as of less consequence than an establishment that produces $3,000 a year? He tells my hon. friend from St. Antoine that the government has spent $200,000 in his division. Does the hon. gentleman know that this particular post office producing this large revenue is in the division of St. Ann and will he tell us what monumental generosity the government bestowed upon that division?

Mr. GERVAIS. In St. James division the government has not spent more than $5,000 per year for the maintenance of Amherst street sub-postal station, although that sub-postal station has given as large a revenue as the Chaboillez Square postal station. The distance between Amherst street sub-postal station and the central post office is about double the distance between the sub-postal office and Chaboillez Square in St. Ann's division. I am not against the establishment or maintenance of a postal station on Chaboillez Square. I am in favour of the establishment of as many sub-postal stations as possible, taking into consideration the question of business and revenue.

Mr. AMES. Just one word more and that is to ask the minister if he will be good enough, in the course of this present year, and before he comes to the House again with further estimates for additional sub-postal stations in Montreal, to give to this matter of the sub-postal stations in our city some serious consideration as to where they should be placed, and determine that their location may not be based simply upon the needs of a single constituency or upon the demands of two or three members of this House. All that we ask is that the minister shall look upon the city of Montreal from a business point of view. Here lies a city stretching four miles in one direction by three miles in another. In the centre is the main post office. If we are going to have sub-distribution stations how many should we establish, three, four, five or six, or whatever number is necessary to meet the needs of the case? If we decide that we are to establish four, where shall we place them? Let there be a definite policy, so that it may be understood when we are building this one to-day that one will be built to-morrow, this one a year after, and that one in a subsequent year; so that we may feel that the entire city of Montreal, having an equal claim upon the government, is equitably treated and a complete system is evolved in consequence. Otherwise, we find that it becomes the practice for a member representing the division, particularly on the government side, to make before the electors great promises as to securing them a post office, and then, having secured the appropriation, he endeavours to put that post office in a place that will be most useful to that particular entourage without reference to the interests of the city as a whole. These post offices should be placed not with reference to ward boundaries, but with reference to the needs of the districts which they are to serve, and I hope the minister will take that matter up with the expectation of giving the city of Montreal four or five suitably situated postal sub-stations.

Mr. GERVAIS. That has been the policy of the government.

Mr. AMES. No, they have got them all in this half of the city.

Mr. GERVAIS. Because the business is there, always going more and more to the east of Montreal.

Mr. AMES. No, while they have done that the largest revenue with one exception comes from the Chaboillez Square section.

Mr. MONK. These stations are all built on the recommendation of the Postmaster General by the Department of Public Works, and that is why I think it would have been more satisfactory if we had had a statement of a general system adopted by the government and an explanation of

a plan applicable to the whole city of Montreal from the Postmaster General, because the Minister of Public Works is not in a position to give us that information. As far as Montreal is concerned there is no idea whatever of differentiating between the east and west. The hon. member for St. Mary's (Mr. Martin) will, I think, admit that readily. What we want is an efficient postal system. I think that in Toronto, they are more exacting upon that point. Our only desire is that we should have our rights in this matter. We ask that in the city of Montreal you will give us an efficient postal system with sure and certain delivery. Although the employees do their very best, and although they are most efficient, there is no certainty that a letter posted at an important business place in the eastern part of the city, at the Angus shops, for instance, will reach its destination in time.

Mr. GERVAIS. They have a sub-post office there.

Mr. MONK. There is no certainty, I say, that the letter will be delivered at Point St. Charles at a certain hour. The hon. member for St. James (Mr. Gervais) knows it very well. There are drop letter boxes and there is something marked on the boxes as to the hour at which the next collection will be made. That mark is almost always obliterated from the box. I have never seen it so in the city of Toronto. It is important, when you drop a letter in the box, that the signs should be there in order that you may know exactly when the last collection was made and when the next one will be made. These things appear to be trifling details, but my hon. friend knows they are very important and if we have a service there equal to what they have in Toronto you will see an increase in the postal revenue in Montreal which will carry us far beyond the revenue at present obtained in Toronto, which is the largest revenue in the Dominion. Does my hon. friend from St. Mary's (Mr. Martin) think it is unpatriotic to plead for that?

Mr. M. MARTIN. They are doing it in the province of Ontario through Mr. Ross and in Quebec now.

Mr. MONK. I am very glad to hear that. With regard to postal stations I may say that a suitable and ornamental sub-station could be erected cheaper than is the case under the present system, and if we are to have many of these we should see that they are all of the same model as is the case in the United States where you can recognize the sub-postal station buildings from afar. It should not be the rule that the building in St. Mary's division should be a very fine and costly one because the member representing that division is an influential and big man, and that another division just as important though not so influentially represented should have a smaller building. If the minister gives me the occasion to tender I will undertake to build such postal stations as I have suggested for far less money then he is now spending, and I shall be able to retire with a competency.

Mr. GERVAIS. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) is always eloquent but he has not explained the conditions in the central post office in Montreal. That post office has practically been doing the postal business of the greater part of Canada, and the officials there have been sorting the incoming European mail to the advantage of the employees of the Toronto office. Should the plan be carried out of sorting the European mail on the ocean steamers the officials of the Montreal post office will have more time to attend to local business. I think myself that the Toronto office should do the sorting and distribution for Winnipeg and the west.

Mr. MONK. Then there is something wrong in the system.

Mr. GERVAIS. I have no right to speak for the government, but from my point of view I think the present system is not a perfect one and can be improved.

Mr. MONK. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Gervais) is qualifying for the office of Postmaster General.

Mr. JAMESON. I was in Montreal last Sunday and I desired at six o'clock to mail a letter for the train which leaves Windsor station at 7.25, but I was informed that the mail had been closed.

Mr. GERVAIS. I would point out to the hon. gentleman that under the new Sabbath Observance law it is forbidden even to the officials of the government that they should work on Sunday, except on very urgent business.

Mr. AMES. Will the minister lay on the table of the House at his earliest convenience a statement showing the boundaries of the districts to be served by each of the two sub-stations for which a vote is asked in these estimates?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will be very glad to ask the Postmaster General for that.

Mr. GERVAIS. We must have a horse before we build a stable and the Post Office Department must wait for the business to grow before it erects post offices, so that it is idle to ask for a plan of what may be done in the future, in districts of the Montreal Island where there is no business today.

Montreal General Post Office—Enlargements, additions and alterations, including fittings, furniture, &c., $127,000.

Mr. AMES. Who has the contract for that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Peter Lyall & Sons.

Mr. AMES. How much was the original contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $487,537.

Mr. AMES. How much has already been spent on that contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total expenditure to the 31st December, 1908, was $640,302.70. This includes $200,000 paid for the site to the Montreal 'Gazette'; printing, advertising, supervision, architect's commission, $11,400; paid city of Montreal for right of passage over Fortification lane, $14,592, paid on account of heating apparatus, $2,700; blue stone side walks, $620; contractors, $410,990. The total probable cost, including the site, will be $780,554.70.

Mr. AMES. How much will be needed to complete the contract work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No more; this will complete everything.

Mr. AMES. What extras have been paid to Mr. Peter Lyall in connection with the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There were no extras at all.

Mr. AMES. There will be many of them before you are through.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no indication of it.

Quebec Post Office—Elevators, improvements, repairs and fittings, $13,000.

Mr. JAMESON. Is there a contract for that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Tenders have been called for and the order in council drafted recommending the contract, but I do not know that it is signed.

St. Johns Public Building, $6,000.

Mr. AMES. What is that for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A post office.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. Does this complete it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Sherbrooke Drill Hall, $45,000.

Mr. AMES. When will that be completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is expected to be completed, under the terms of the contract, on the 2nd of November, 1909.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington) wishes to know whether this drill hall will be large enough to accommodate the new company which is being organized there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not being the Minister of Militia I cannot say, but I assume that it would.

Three Rivers—New Public Building—To replace building destroyed by fire, June 22, 1908, $40,000.

Mr. AMES. Does the government place any insurance on any of its buildings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. PATERSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. PATERSON. The first will be the Bill that stands in the name of the Minister of Justice. Then we will go into Supply, and continue with the estimates of the Public Works Department.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, February 19, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of Railways and Canals for the year ending 31st of March, 1908—Mr. Graham.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 66) respecting the Abitibi and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Geo. Gordon.

Bill (No. 67) respecting the Alsek and Yukon Railway Company.—Mr. Wilbert McIntyre.

Bill (No. 68) respecting the Athabaska Railway Company.—Mr. Wilbert McIntyre.

Bill (No. 69) to incorporate the Fort Erie and Buffalo Bridge Company.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 70) respecting the St. Mary's and Western Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. G. H. McIntyre.

Bill (No. 71) respecting a patent of Thomas L. Smith.—Mr. Bickerdike.

RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Nanaimo) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 72) to amend the Railway Act. He said: The object of this Bill is to reduce and fix the hours of labour for telegraphers and despatchers on railways.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). In what way?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. At eight hours a day.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

GOVERNMENT INSPECTION OF VESSELS.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 73) to provide for the government inspection of vessels. He said: This Bill is to apply to vessels not now inspected under the Dominion Inspection Act. At present, all well found vessels are inspected, but barges, which have no motive power, are not inspected. Clauses 6 and 7 of this Bill provide that the present Inspection and Equipment Act shall apply to small steam vessels over five tons. The matter has been discussed by the divisional court of Ontario, as will be found in 120 Ontario Reports, page 154, Sturgeon vs. Port Burwell Fishing Company. The representatives of a man who was drowned were not able to recover from the steamer notwithstanding the fact that there was no boat or axe on board. The life buoy was fastened too securely for quick use. Had this vessel been equipped as others must be under the law, the life of the man would have been saved. Clause 8 of the Bill is to provide that vessels towing shall carry a rocket gun. At present, steel boats cannot get within reach of their tows which have broken loose, where the sea is very high. The American Steel Trust require all their vessels to carry rocket guns, not because it is provided by law, but for the protection of the Trust's own interests. Ocean vessels are required by law to carry these appliances. The cost is very small.

Mr. DANIEL. Would this apply everywhere?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes, all over the Dominion.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RULES OF THE HOUSE—ADDITIONAL STANDING COMMITTEES.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That Rule No. 10, Chapter 2, of the Rules of the House of Commons, be amended by adding after the words 'on Agriculture and Colonization' the words 'on Marine and Fisheries.'

He said: This resolution is designed to carry into effect the decision of the House reached some days ago on motion of my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). It simply gives legal form to the resolution proposed by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How will the rule read then?

Mr. BRODEUR. Rule 10, chapter 2, provides:

At the commencement of each session a special committee, consisting of five members, shall be appointed, whose duty it shall be to prepare and report, with all convenient speed, List of Members to compose the Select Standing Committees of the House, for the following purposes—

These, of course, include the Public Accounts, and others. It is proposed now that after 'Agriculture and Colonization,' 'Marine and Fisheries' be added.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). According to the understanding I had the other day on the motion made by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, I shall move to amend the resolution by adding the following words: 'Mines and Minerals, Forests, Waterways and Water-powers.' That is, we shall have besides the committees already provided for, committees on Marine and Fisheries, on Mines and Minerals and on Forests, Waterways and Water-powers.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee on the resolution.

Resolution reported as amended and read the second time.

Mr. BRODEUR moved that the resolution be concurred in.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The committees will be appointed this session?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Motion agreed to.

ASH WEDNESDAY ADJOURNMENT.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved that when this House adjourns on Tuesday next it will stand adjourned till Thursday next.

Motion agreed to.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. LENNOX. Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to ask the Minister of Public Works when we may expect the return as to the expenditure in the riding of Bonaventure. The order of the House was passed on the 1st of February, and nineteen days have now elapsed since it was passed. We desire to get it as early as possible.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the ordinary course the return would be prepared, but I am not able to say at this moment when it will be ready. But I will make inquiry.

Mr. LENNOX. I would also like to ask the Minister of Railways with reference to

a return to be made of the proceedings of the Railway Board, in reference to railway crossings, applications for improvements, alterations, and probable elimination. The order was made about the same time. The minister I think will appreciate the advisability of bringing it down soon.

Mr. GRAHAM. About what date did it pass ?

Mr. LENNOX. I have not looked up the date, but judging by the order of events, I think it would be about the 1st of February. I will look up the date and give it to the minister.

Mr. AMES. Now that the Minister of Finance has returned, I would ask him if he will be good enough to hasten the production of a certain return asked for on the 26th of January last. The order was for a return showing to date the statement found on page 15 of the budget speech of 1898.

Mr. FIELDING. I will be glad to draw the attention of the officials to it, and endeavour to expedite the presentation of the return.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I would ask the Minister of Railways when I may expect the return I moved for on the 1st of February, and which was put on the paper on the 28th of July. The minister said on the first occasion it would require a motion for a return, and the motion was passed on the 1st of February. It was in reference to wire fencing on the Intercolonial.

Mr. GRAHAM. It takes longer to produce the return in that case than if we had the information in the department, because we have to send to Moncton to get a good deal of it. The order was sent the next day. I will make inquiry.

SUPPLY.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY NEW STOCK.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Before that motion is carried and in view of the orders in council that were brought down yesterday in connection with the issue of capital stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, I must again trespass for a short time on the forbearance of the House. It is now apparent from those orders in council that the capital issued under the original charter of the Canadian Pacific Railway was $65,000,000; that in 1902 under the Act of parliament embodying an order in council, its capitalization was increased by $20,000,000; and in an Act of parliament, and in the order in council, provision was made, first, that the issue should not be for less than par; second, that the money was not to be used for any purpose other than contained in the resolution of the shareholders; and third, that this issue was to be excluded from the operation of what is called the ten per cent clause in the original charter. In 1904 another order in council was passed, increasing the capital stock by $25,000,000; that order in council was put through council by the present Minister of Finance, but for some reason or other the order in council is somewhat different. It provides certainly that the stock shall not be issued for less than par, it also provides that the proceeds of that stock shall not be issued for works outside of Canada; but it does not provide that that stock shall be removed from the application of the ten per cent clause. So far as I know, no Act of parliament was passed confirming the issue. In 1906 the stock was increased by $40,000,000. A provision for its issue at not less than par is in the order in council, and that the money shall not be used outside of Canada is in the order in council, it is also in the order in council that the stock so authorized shall not come under the ten per cent clause. Now in 1908 another order in council has been issued for an increase of capital stock by $50,000,000, making the total issue by this company of capital stock of $200,000,000. In other words, within the last six years the capital stock has been increased by $135,000,000. I cannot say whether in that time any bonds have been issued. But the significant thing is that within the last six years after the road had practically been constructed, after its transcontinental character had been assured, and when that had been done on $65,000 000 of stock, they have in the last six years increased that capital stock by $135,000,000, an annual increase of about $15,000,000 a year. If this stock is issued at par, as it has been, and it would bring on the average, as it would have brought, 165, or 65 premium, we have allowed the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway to distribute a bonus equal to $9,000,000 a year for the past six years, besides the dividends they have paid. If this is sound financing, this method will be continued, and year after year, we will have this great company issuing this stock, and 'cutting these melons,' as it is called, and distributing besides their dividends, over $9,000,000 a year among the shareholders.

Now let me explain to the House and to the country how these things work out, what follows on an order in council of this kind. The shareholders' capital was, until this last order in council passed, $150,000,000, and they were allowed to issue $50,000,000 of new stock. Now what takes place is this: As soon as they have this authority, this permission the Canadian Pacific Railway treasurer, or other official, sends a letter to every shareholder and says that in

view of the recent authorization the capital stock has been increased by $50,000,000, and that the shareholder is entitled, has a right to one new share for every three old shares. So if a shareholder happens to own three hundred shares of old stock he has a right to take up an additional one hundred shares at par, and this document which he receives from the railway company is technically called a right. And what must the shareholder do who has this right?

Does he go to the treasurer's office and say: I am entitled to this 100 additional shares and here is my cheque for $10,000? He hardly ever does that, he runs to his broker and says: Here is my right entitling me to 100 shares of Canadian Pacific; sell it for me to-morrow. The broker sells the piece of paper entitling the shareholder to 100 shares for from $6,500 to $7,500; the shareholder puts that money in his pocket, he does not pay even the par value of the stock, but the man who buys the right, after paying the $6,500 for the benefit of the shareholder, has to go to the treasurer's office and pay the $10,000 par value of the shares. Thus these documents, these rights, secure what is called the cutting of the melon and that apparently is the new kind of railroad financing we are to have in Canada in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, that every year or at the most two years, there is to be this melon to be cut, this increase of capital stock, this dealing in rights; and apparently it has been so profitable to the shareholder of the Canadian Pacific Railway that now they have ceased issuing bonds when they require capital for the purposes of their railroad and issue stock in this way, sell the rights and reap enormous profit from the transaction. To whom is this distribution, this $35,000,000 free gift made? Does it go to Canadians? No, most of it goes to men outside of our country, and Canada presents a spectacle of every year making a free bonus gift of $9,000,000 to shareholders in one of our propositions, most of whom live out of our country. We this year have only $100,000 to give to the sufferers in Italy, but every year we have $9,000,000 of free cash bonus to give to the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway. If this is good policy and can be justified, it will probably be continued. If there is nothing wrong about it we ought to continue it. No wonder the reputation of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the monetary centres of the world is very high. Any one's financial reputation can easily be maintained in that way if this kind of financing is allowed.

I wish now to go back to the original basis of the authorization of capital stock to railroads and see whether this practice, which has recently been introduced into Canada, is one that can be justified. My view of the position is that whenever and wherever parliament charters and grants a franchise to a railway company, it grants to that company certain powers for the purposes of the undertaking, either expressly or by implication. Among the powers so given is the right to issue securities such as stocks, bonds, debentures, &c. This power of issue is a trust that must be honestly and faithfully administered for the purposes of the undertaking and for all parties interested, including the public who are to be served by the railroad. In other words if we have created a railway company and given it power to issue certificates there is implied in the charter an understanding that these certificates shall be issued only for the purposes of the undertaking; these certificates are not to be used as a bonus for the people who happen to own the shares of the railroad. I say that is the underlying principle which should govern the incorporation of these companies, and I think parliament will still hold that view when it is brought clearly before them. Parliament undertook to regulate the amount and mode of issue of the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the original charter granted in 1881. In 1892, while the Conservatives were in power, the company was empowered to issue further shares of capital stock for any purpose for which the company required new capital, such issue being first approved by order in council, and the fourth section of the Act of 1892 provides:

> The proceeds of each issue of shares of capital stock shall be applied by the company exclusively to the purposes for which the shareholders authorized such issue.

In other words it is expressly provided in one of these Acts that the whole proceeds—and by proceeds I mean all that the security will bring—must be applied expressly to the object for which it was voted, for the furtherance of the undertaking, whatever it may happen to be. My contention is that the Governor in Council, as trustees for the people and for parliament, were bound before they approved of any issue of stock, to see that it would be issued to the best advantage of all parties concerned, the public included. That is to say, if the stock to be authorized would bring more than par, it should be so stipulated in the order in council. It was well known that these securities would bring more than par and that the underlying principle of parliament regulating and authorizing the issue of securities is that the proceeds of them must go to the undertaking. If that is so a mistake has been made, a wrong has been committed; this wrong ought to be righted and certainly it ought never to be allowed to occur again in this country.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Does my hon. friend say that there is any evidence that

the proceeds from the sales of these shares were not applied in the interest of the undertaking or the development of the enterprise?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Technically the hon. gentleman gets around my point, as the proceeds of the share may be really the $100 the man pays for it after the right has been melted and the $65 has been put in his pocket, and my hon. friend may have a nice point in arguing that the proceeds of the issue are only what goes into the treasury. I say the proceeds of the issue are everything that could be got out of it, and it ought all to be consecrated to the undertaking.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Does my hon. friend mean to say that he has any evidence that the proceeds of these shares were not applied for the regular purposes and in good faith in the interest of the organization?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes, I undertake to say that for every share of Canadian Pacific Railway that has been sold in recent years, while $100 went into the treasury, anything from $60 to $70 went into the pockets of the then owners of shares.

Turning to the question of tolls and capital actually expended in the road, the original charter of the Canadian Pacific Railway provided for the regulation of the tolls on that road. It also provided for the regulation of the profit and net revenue of the road. Clearly parliament provided for the regulation of tolls and this was based on what is called the 10 per cent clause. In other words, in the original charter, while parliament theretofore had reserved to itself the right to say that no railway shall earn more than 15 per cent on the capital invested, they said; in view of many concessions to the Canadian Pacific Railway we shall make a provision that its profits shall not exceed 10 per cent on its capital stock, and the moment it does exceed that somebody can step in, (then the Railway Committee of the Privy Council) and reduce the rates charged by the railway. And so parliament in the original Act expressly provided for the regulation of the rates and stipulated that in no case should the rates be such that the net profits of that road exceed 10 per cent on the money actually expended on the construction of the road.

The first great question to be determined in dealing with a railroad of this kind is whether the time has yet arrived for reducing the tolls which may be charged, and as far as I can gather nothing has yet been done although, according to the statement of the late Minister of the Interior, made in this House in 1902, an order in council was at that time passed for that purpose. I have asked the Minister of Railways to bring down that order in council, but so far I have not been able to get a copy of it.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Is the last order in council not down?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Not the one passed in 1902. The orders in council increasing the capital have been brought down, but the order in council mentioned by the late Minister of the Interior providing for an immediate reference to some tribunal to ascertain the capital actually expended in the road has not yet come down.

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not understand my hon. friend to ask for that order in council. He asked me about it and I told him I would make inquiry of the Minister of Justice concerning the situation of the case referred to the Supreme Court. If such order in council exists it can be brought down quite easily.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Then we may get it later on if the minister cares to give it. If the railway could show that it was not earning a fair return on the capital expended it could complain of any attempt to reduce its rates, and I am not arguing just now that the rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway ought to be reduced, but I do propose to assert that in view of that original provision we should know how much money has actually been expended by this road, notwithstanding the fact that the operation of that clause has been removed from a number of these recent orders in council. I go on the assumption, therefore, in order to secure the lowest possible tolls to the public who use the road, it is of prime importance that parliament or the Governor in Council who authorized or approved of the issue of capital (whether stock, bonds or other securities), should see that any and all 'capital actually expended in the construction of the road' is raised in the least expensive manner, is raised in the most provident manner; that not an unnecessary dollar of debt is incurred or of high interest-bearing obligation is issued as against a low interest-bearing obligation wherever possible, and that the highest possible value is obtained for any such security, and that the entire and highest possible proceeds of any such issue goes into the treasury of the road for the purposes for which it was authorized—that on no pretext whatever shall the best possible proceeds of these issues be diverted. To divert any of them is, I hold, criminal; it is to be guilty of malversation of funds, is a breach of trust and a violation of the sacred obligation on the part of the company to give the best possible and cheapest service in consideration of the many valuable things given it by the state, in the way of lands, money, exemption privileges, &c. If, therefore, $30,000,000 of stock issued at $165 would produce what it

will produce in the open market, namely, $50,000,000, and if the proceeds go into the treasury, the government was bound to authorize only that amount and to stipulate that it be sold at the highest amount it would bring. In other words the $50,000,000 could be got for $30,000,000 stock, the tolls charged on which could not exceed 10 per cent or $3,000,000 a year. Instead of this it will be on this last issue 10 per cent on $50,000,000 or $5,000,000 a year, or an unnecessary tax of $2,000,000 on the people of Canada. In other words $30,000,000 of stock issued at the market price would have produced $50,000,000, and as the dividend which would be allowed to the company would be 10 per cent on that $30,000,000, it would amount to only $3,000,000 a year, instead of which you have allowed them to issue $50,000,000 which is entitled to earn 10 per cent and which means $5,000,000 a year.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not at all.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him this question?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM. In the face of the order in council which says absolutely that the 10 per cent shall not be calculated on this amount at all, how does the hon. gentleman argue that it is to be calculated on that amount?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I am coming to that. The tolls of the company are limited to 10 per cent on its capital, and as a matter of fact to-day the tolls of the company are 10 per cent;—the net earnings of the company to-day are 10 per cent on the capital stock and the company is going to see that it always will be 10 per cent on the capital stock as long as it has the right to do so.

Mr. GRAHAM. On the original capital stock?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes. Now I come to the minister in this: That the company is entitled to a fair return on its stock issue or on any money put into securities of the road, and if $50,000,000 is to be earned upon, when $30,000,000 would do, I say an injustice is done to the people who use the road. That is a point I make against the minister; not so much that he has that provision in the statute as that I shall show that the charges upon the traffic of the road would have been much less if that stock had not been sold at par. But, before the government authorized the issue of any further capital I contend it was bound to do two things: first, to scrutinize the reasons advanced and the objects given for the request for additional capital, and second, to examine the treasury of the company and its resources with a view of ascertaining whether it could not provide for the new undertaking out of any resources then in hand, and any unexhausted portions of the immense money and land grants given to the company by the state, or out of the bond-issuing powers of the company as provided or as might be provided by law. Before ever they should have allowed the issue of additional stock, I say it was the duty of the government to examine into the purposes for which the money was to be used, but still more important to examine the treasury of the company and to see whether it had any other resources which could be applied to the object in hand. And the land, and the money grants which were given to the Canadian Pacific Railway were given for the purposes of the undertaking and are so set out in the original documents and were so stated in parliament. They were not given to be used as a hoarding or as a great reserve fund for the road, and they were not given for the purpose of injuring another company. And when the company asked for these powers to issue additional capital they should have shown to the government that they had little or none of these grants in hand. The fact is, on the contrary, they had 13,000,000 acres of land worth at least $150,000,000, and they had bond-issuing powers for a large amount at low interest, or they could get them. I do not know that the government made any such examination. They passed the request of Sir Thomas Shaughnessy on the mere stipulation of a stock issue at par. Now the company at that time, as I have said, had these 13,000,000 acres of land; they had a full treasury, and before they were allowed to issue the stock the government should have said to them: Have you exhausted the resources that parliament has given you already; if you have what have you done with all that money; what have you done, especially with that land? But the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were not asked for that; they were allowed to issue this new stock and to-day they are cutting this melon and they are dividing these profits amongst themselves, when at this very moment they have 13,000,000 acres of land out of their original land grant which have not been used. What are they keeping this land for? First of all they are keeping it as a reserve fund, which is improper, and they are using it—

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Before my hon. friend leaves that point—does he seriously intend to argue that the order in council should provide for the disposition of stock dependent upon the fluctuating value of the stock market which might be below par one day and above par the next?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes, I will come to that and I will give several specific instances. For instance, in the city of Toronto we have the so-called Consumer's Gas Company which undertook to be a partner with the city in the old days and gradually got away from that, but some time ago the city said to the legislature: Inasmuch as

the charges this Gas Company imposes upon the public are to be earned on the basis of 10 per cent on the stock issue, we want you to see that the stock is sold for the highest possible amount that it will bring in the open market. And legislation was passed to that effect, and it has worked out in this way, that whereas a few years ago the company used to sell its stock at $185 it is now selling it and sold it the other day in Toronto at over $200, which is a premium of $100 on every $100 share. That could be attained in Canada in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I venture to say that if you put an advertisement in the financial papers of London to morrow that bids would be received for $50,000,000 of Canadian Pacific Railway stock you would get 160 for the whole $50,000,000.

The government were bound for other reasons to investigate the use or lack of use of the land grant. This great Canadian Northwest, which now has ten members from Saskatchewan, seven from Alberta and ten from Manitoba, has been coming to this House year after year and making complaint of two things. It has been complaining first of the exemption of the lands from municipal taxation for twenty years after the Crown grant unless the lands are sold. None of these Canadian Pacific Railway lands in the west have to pay municipal taxes unless they are sold or until the twenty years have expired. As a consequence, the municipalities all over the west complain of this harsh treatment as a great grievance of the people. Another complaint made in the west against the Canadian Pacific Railway is that it is to-day refusing to sell the lands which it owns alongside of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern, in order that these two roads, which are intended to serve the country, shall have no local traffic to assist them in carrying out their undertakings. If that is true—and I leave it to the members from the Northwest to say whether it is true or not—that the Canadian Pacific Railway has still an immense amount of property under exemption and is refusing to sell its lands because these rival railroads might be benefited, it is the duty of somebody to see that that condition of affairs is removed. My contention is that not only should the company be compelled to sell these lands in order to raise money for its own needs, but that the government should have used that opportunity to compel it to sell them in order to do away with this exemption clause and prevent this refusal to sell lands because their sale might benefit the two rival roads. That is a question on which the people of the Northwest are the judges. So far as I can gather—I cannot quite gather it in this House—the people of the west believe that, before any power to increase the capital stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway should have been given, the company should have been compelled to exhaust whatever resources it had in its treasury for the construction of new lines, and should also have been compelled to sell these lands because that would remove the exemption clause and promote settlement along the new lines of railway.

I am not going into the political issue further than to say that I have read within the last two or three days a summary of the history of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as narrated in a book written by Mr. Willison; and it is set out there that one of the greatest grievances of the people in the west was this exemption clause and the hardship it brought upon the poor settler, in the fact that he was for ever tied up not only to a monopoly but to an unjustifiable system of exemption.

I contend still further that the government was bound to have ascertained, if money must be got for securities to be issued, what kind of securities would bear least on the traffic—bonds or debentures. Bonds can be issued at 4 per cent; and my contention is that if the company had to get money after it had exhausted its resources, then it was bound to obtain that money on securities which would have the least possible incidence on the income of the company. In other words, if freight rates must be regulated by the fixed charges, then it is the duty of parliament to see that the fixed charges are of the lowest kind and the charges that are of the lowest kind in connection with railway construction, especially in the case of a successful railway like the Canadian Pacific Railway, are bonds or debenture stock, and not common stock. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company can get all the money it needs at 4 per cent. Instead of that, it is issuing stock that can bear 10 per cent, and at the same time it is distributing $9,000,000 a year as a bonus among its shareholders.

But, some gentlemen say, bonds must bear their interest, and this must be paid, whether the road succeeds or not. There is something in that in the case of a new road; but in the case of an old road like the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is paying its dividends and fixed charges every year, and which can pay 10 per cent on its common stock, surely it can pay 4 per cent on bonds. Fifty million dollars of bonds would have provided the money needed. These would have required $2,000,000 a year for interest, whereas $50,000,000 of stock at 10 per cent requires $5,000,000 a year. The difference is therefore $3,000,000 a year, an unnecessary and perpetual charge on the public, which could be capitalized at $75,000,000. That is rather a serious loss to the people of this country who use the railroads. If this stock issue is justifiable, we

ought to continue it; and it is evidently the policy of the company to quit the issue of bonds, to withhold the sale of its lands, to cut a melon as often as the government or parliament will permit. If the government is right, it ought to have no hesitation in not only justifying what it has done, but declaring that it will repeat the authorization to-morrow, without condition, examination or departure from the past. What company will issue bonds that can cut a melon on stock every year in addition to a 7 per cent dividend? In other words, there is now 7 per cent interest on the stock and $9,000,000 a year as a bonus distributed among the shareholders. If that is right, it should be continued, and there should never be another issue of bonds on the road. but only common stock. And the surprising thing is that when the company is allowed to issue common stock in this way, how much it wants to issue. For many years it got along with $65,000,000; but $135,000,000 of additional stock has now to be taken care of by the traffic which goes over the road.

Another thing I want to point out. It has been in the newspapers, and a great deal of dust has been tried to be thrown in the eyes of the public, in the attempt to show that there is some connection between this issue of stock and the 10 per cent clause in the company's charter, and that therefore the exemption must be allowed to continue. There is no connection between the 10 per cent clause and the authorization of the issue of stock. The only stock that was authorized was the $65,000,000 in connection with the 10 per cent clause. That has long ago been exhausted, and the Act of parliament of 1892, under which this stock is issued by order in council, can be repealed to-morrow. It does not apply to the charter at all; and my question to-day is: Is that Act of 1892 to be repealed, and is this process of issuing stock in this way to be continued, or is it to be stopped; and is it to be laid down as the policy underlying the conduct of parliament hereafter, that the issue of all stock shall be a matter of trust and that it will be the duty of parliament or of somebody to see that the character of the security issued shall be such as will carry the lowest interest and therefore be the least burdensome on the traffic? If we can cut down the interest charges on the capital of railways to four or five per cent instead of ten per cent on a lot of it, can we not reduce their passenger and freight rates? If we tell the great Canadian Pacific Railway that they must sell all their land before they are allowed to issue new stock, they will have to sell those lands to the people and in this way we will get rid of these tax exemptions. If they are ordered to sell the lands they own, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern will have settlers all along their lines in localities where there is at present not a settler for miles, but the Canadian Pacific Railway refuse to take $20 per acre for land alongside the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern. We must not forget that this Canadian Pacific Railway charter is not altogether a holy thing which cannot be touched. It has been changed a good many times in this House under conditions of one kind or another. The principle was laid down in this House some years ago and with good reasons, that if concessions are to be given the Canadian Pacific Railway, some concessions ought to be exacted from them in return. If they are to be allowed to increase their capital stock, why should they not be ordered to sell their land, and why should they not be compelled to give the people of Canada a two-cent per mile transportation rate, just as they give it to the people of the United States and to the traffic over their lines which originates in the United States? If they give that concession to Americans, why should they not not give it to Canadians as well? But there is to be no two-cent a mile rate for Canadians, who have to sweat in order that millions should go every year to the foreign shareholders, and that will continue just so long as the people of Canada are willing to submit to that kind of thing. Any one who wishes to get further history of the finances of the Canadian Pacific Railway and how they were handled, had better read this book to which I have referred? Mr. Blake was able to point out in this very House, in one of the early discussions on the charter, that of the $65,000,000 of the capital stock issued, only $31,000,000 was realized by the company. And of their $31,000,000 $24,000,000 was paid back to the shareholders in dividends before a dollar had been earned by the road. In other words, Mr. Blake describes how these original owners of the Canadian Pacific Railway got for many a year twenty-four per cent and then twenty per cent on their investment in that original stock.

That stock had to be sold at less than par. It was sold for fifty per cent less than its face value. Why then, in the name of all that is just and fair, when that stock has gone to a premium, when every $100 of it can be sold at $170, should not that premium go into the Canadian Pacific Railway treasury and be there used for the reduction of its tolls instead of being given to the shareholders for their own aggrandizement. If the original stock was sold at this sacrifice, surely it is fair, when the tide has turned and the road proved a great success, that the whole proceeds of any new stock issued should go into the Canadian Pacific Railway treasury for the benefit of the undertaking.

I am not prepared just now to say how much further I shall go into this matter until I see this order in council which has been referred to. In a certain sense, it

does not bear on the issue. We are under no obligation, by the original charter to continue this practice of allowing this great railway corporation to distribute these bonuses among its shareholders, but I would like to see it settled once for all what the money actually expended, under the original contract, amounted to. The day has come when we ought to reduce railway tariffs. The Canadian Pacific Railway can now afford to reduce them and ought to be compelled to do so. The day has come when the Canadian Pacific Railway ought to be compelled to give up these exemptions if it can be made to do so. The day has come when public policy ought no longer to tolerate this company holding its lands in the west and refusing to part with them or refusing to allow settlers to settle on them. Certainly no further privilege should be given it until it abandons that policy. My contention is that both these things are against the public interest and if new concessions are to be given, other concessions on behalf of the public ought to be exacted in return.

I have spoken already three times on this question and have tried to find out what is the feeling of the west with regard to it. So far I have not been able to ascertain that feeling from anybody in this House, but I have read the newspaper opinion in that country, and the opinion, as voiced by the three newspapers in Winnipeg, is altogether against the Canadian Pacific Railway being allowed to issue its stock at par. The people of the west are of the opinion that as long as they are allowed to do this, the extra tariffs of the company entailed thereby must come out of the people who use the road. If money can be obtained by the company by the sale of low interest bearing securities instead of by the issue of new stock, the company should be compelled to take the former course; or if the company be allowed to issue new capital stock, the market price of that stock should go into its treasury, instead of the advanced price at which it may be sold above par going into the pockets of the shareholders. If that should be done, the amount of capital stock would be kept down, the fixed charges reduced, and that would enable the company to lower its tariff rates. The people of the west and also the people of Ontario and throughout Canada are of the opinion that this practice of issuing new stock at par to the shareholders should not be allowed to continue. If that, however, be not a good practice, let us do away with it. If it be a good pratcice, let us wipe out the right to issue bonds which we now give to railway corporations, and tell the great Canadian Pacific Railway that parliament has no interest in this issue of new stock, as we have been told in this House. That is not the opinion in the United States where the people have a great transportation problem on their hands. Wait until the fourth of March and see if there will not be a deliverance from the new president of that country to the effect that the day has come when the regulation and control of the capitalization of railway companies is of great importance as bearing on the rates of traffic which these companies may charge. The two questions go together. If you keep down the capitalization and restrict the railway companies to the issue of securities bearing low interest instead of allowing them to issue new capital stock at par, you will be able to reduce their tariff charges in proportion. There is an intimate relation between the two, and therefore I contend that it is the duty of parliament to scrutinize every security issued in connection with our railways in order to see that they shall only issue them on such terms as will secure to the Canadian people, who have to pay the traffic rates, the best possible treatment. We hear a great deal about this company which raises money and does this, that and the other thing for our country. Well, I give it all the credit to which it is entitled. I have no antagonism to these great companies, but I do raise my voice against the man who uses these railways being charged a cent more for that use than he ought to pay. And you cannot keep the tariff rate down unless you keep the capitalization down for the benefit of those who use the road. I shall leave the companies here for the present. I have extended my argument somewhat further than I did on the two occasions I spoke before, and may have a little more to add when we get that other order in council to which I have already referred.

I think I am doing a public duty in standing up here, even if I stand alone, to say that the day has come when we must stop this practice of allowing the great Canadian Pacific Railway Company, at least, to issue securities at par when those securities can be sold on the open market for a premium of almost 75 per cent. It is not in the interest of the public, it is not in the interest of the great Canadian Pacific Railway itself. People say we are turning to socialism in this country, and they denounce socialism and the socialists. But these are the things that are producing this public calamity, if it be a public calamity. To use the words of President Roosevelt, the public ought to get a square deal. I stand here for the square deal for the people of the Canadian west and the Canadian east. I stand here to protest against this distribution of bonus stock amongst the shareholders that is about to take place, and such as has taken place in the past. I want to see this stopped once and for all. And, if I succeed in this, I shall have justified my presence in this House.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia). The question brought up by the hon. member

for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) is, in my judgment, the most important question that will be discussed in this House during the present session. At all events, so far as the western prairie provinces are concerned, there will be nothing discussed here that will be of equal interest to the people. While we want lower duties when we can get them, the question of duties and tariffs fades into insignificance as compared with the question of freight rates, so far as the people of the west are concerned. Representing, as I do, a large, old-settled, well-populated district in the province of Saskatchewan, all clear, open prairie, where a great deal of wheat is produced and where many of the settlers are a long distance from a railway, I may be excused for taking up a small portion of the time of the House in discussing this matter. When the question was brought up some time ago and publicly discussed, different reasons were advanced why this order in council should have been passed authorizing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to increase their capital stock by the issue of $50,000,000. One reason given us was that it was the best managed railroad on the face of the earth. Another was that it was necessary to keep the credit of the railway company in good standing. Another was that if the company made a further issue of bonds it would have a bad effect, probably, on the stock that has already been issued, and holders of that stock might find that it was not worth so much. Let us look for a moment at these reasons to see whether they justify in any respect the course that is proposed. Nobody was objecting to the management of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think it is a fairly well managed company, taking it all round. I do not think its management is ideal; in some respects, in my opinion, it is anything but well managed. If the other companies are all worse managed than the Canadian Pacific Railway, then I can only say God help the others. Take, for a moment, the question of building branch lines. I do not want to be understood as making any attack on the Canadian Pacific Railway in particular, for the Canadian Northern is just as bad, and the Grand Trunk Pacific, I expect, when they are a little older, will get on to the ropes and will do as the others have done. I am not saying that there is any choice in that respect. But what do the Canadian Pacific do about the building of branch lines? Do they consult the interests of the people of the country? No, they consult their own interest only, and that not in relation to the earning of dividends, but with a view to cutting out their opponents. While the people may be suffering fifty miles from a railway, they will build a line within five or ten miles of an existing road, where they think they can cut out traffic from the Canadian Northern or the Grand Trunk Pacific. In that respect, I say, the Canadian Pacific Railway is not a well-managed line. If, as has been said, we are, in a sense, partners in this great railway enterprise, then I think we ought to be given some consideration in deciding where these branch lines should be built. In my own constituency, as an example, we have the spectacle of two railroads paralleling each other for eighty miles at one end of my constituency, so that it is almost unsafe for a man to go in there so strong are the objections of the settlers to these railways having been allowed to do that sort of thing; and, in the other end of the district, the farmers are suffering through being forty or fifty miles from the railway and having to draw their wheat for that distance to point of shipment. And I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, and to tell the members of this House, that no man can grow wheat at a profit and draw it with horses forty or fifty miles to a market. And there are dozens and hundreds of settlers in that country who, if some remedy is not found, if railways are not compelled to toe the mark better in the future than they have done in the past, will surely pull out of that country. Has this House no responsibility in this matter? I say there is no possibility of this government or this House of parliament divesting itself of its responsibility. In the future we may rail at the railway companies, but we shall not be able to say, if this sort of thing is allowed to go on, that the railway companies are to blame; the blame must be put where it belongs, on the shoulders of this House of Commons. The railway companies of the past have been doing simply what they liked to a very large extent. They have been walking over us. But when they come to this House and want consideration, they should be dealt with at arm's length and made to give concession for concession. The question of the land grant of the Canadian Pacific Railway has been discussed by my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean). Every word he has said on the subject is absolutely true. He could have gone further and still have been within the mark. We have in that country the spectacle of the Canadian Pacific Railway, with millions of acres of land that was given them for nothing as a bonus to build the original Canadian Pacific Railway, ready to sell that land at a moderate price where it is tributary to their own lines, but, where it is tributary to the Grand Trunk Pacific, assuming a wholly different attitude. And, remember, the Grand Trunk Pacific is being financed by this country, by this parliament——

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. And queered in London by the Canadian Pacific.

Mr. TURRIFF. We are helping all the way through, and the Canadian Pacific

Railway is holding them up, playing the dog in the manger, retarding the development of the western country and injuring the credit of Canada just as much as if the country owned the Grand Trunk. Have they any right to do that? I say that it is the duty of the government and of this House, when the Canadian Pacific Railway come here for special permission legislation, as they have done in this case, to say to them: If we grant you the privilege you are asking, you must give us privileges in return. And what better opportunity could there be to say to the Canadian Pacific Railway: 'Give up your right to exemption for twenty years.' If it were not for that right of exemption do you think the Canadian Pacific Railway would put a flat price of $25 an acre on their lands, or, in some cases, withdraw it altogether from the market?—simply because by settling that land it would give trade to the Grand Trunk Pacific or the Canadian Northern. Do you think they would dare to do that? Do you think they could afford to do that? If the school districts and municipalities were able to get at them and tax their land at the same value and at the same rate as the farmers tax themselves, that land would be put on the market, to come under cultivation; the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern would get traffic, and the people would go in and settle on these lands. They do not do it. Not only do they hold that land up, but they also hold the homestead lands up, because men will not go into a part of a country where the odd sections cannot be brought under cultivation and settled on, for the simple reason that they cannot have as good facilities for organizing school districts and giving their children an education as they can in other parts of the country where the odd sections are available for purchase, as they ought to be, and at a fair price. So this is a golden opportunity to say to them: Put that land on the market at a fair price, or at all events, give back your right of exemption from taxation for the balance of the twenty years. If they do that, the rest will follow.

Now as to the argument that their credit would suffer if they sold some additional bonds. Well, I think that any one who advances that argument has not looked very closely into what the Canadian Pacific Railway has been doing of late. Why, only last week I saw an advertisement in the paper that they were paying half yearly dividends of 3½ per cent, 7 per cent per annum. They were paying all the fixed charges, paying everything that should be paid, paying a dividend at the rate of 7 per cent per annum, and in addition they would put to the credit of their rest account, for the six months only, over $4,880,000—enough money to have paid dividends at the rate of 12 per cent. The Canadian Pacific Railway could to-day, out of their earnings, pay 10 per cent per annum on their stock, pay 12 per cent on their common stock, after paying all fixed charges, and still have a reasonable sum to augment their account. Is that not doing well enough? But it is said that by issuing bonds they would reduce the value of the present stock. Carry that argument to its logical conclusion, and what does it mean? It means that the Canadian Pacific Railway, who can borrow its money at 4 per cent at the highest, cannot put that money into branch lines in the prairie country—because the reason is given that this stock is issued more particularly to build branch lines in the western country—it means that they could not put that money into branch lines in the west and earn 4 per cent on the cost of these lines. A more absurd statement could not be made. They can earn 4 per cent, and double 4 per cent by building branch lines, if they would build them where they ought to go in reference to the needs of the country and where they would get the most traffic, if they chose to eliminate from their ideas the building of branch lines to cut out opposing railways. Sir, I do not think that the reasons given for allowing them to sell this stock at par are good reasons.

It might be well for a moment to consider what the Canadian Pacific Railway got originally. They got $37,000,000 worth of completed road handed over to them; they got 25,000,000 acres of land handed over to them; they got no less than six or seven million acres of land in connection with the charters for the branch lines that they purchased; and they got $25,000,000 in cash as well. So when you come to consider the capital on which they had to earn, you must bear in mind that they did not put all the money into that railway that built it; this country put in a great part of it. Therefore, why, on an occasion of this kind, when they are coming for special favours that they cannot get without the authority of this parliament, why should they not be made to toe the mark and do the decent thing for once? When the original orders in council that my hon. friend read to-day were passed, and it was stipulated that they should not sell their stock at less than par, stock was not selling at 175 to 200 in those days. Why should they be allowed to sell that stock at par to-day to their shareholders? Here is one thing that follows, to my mind: The Canadian Pacific Railway do not want to pay over in cash the immense dividends that they are earning to their subscribers. Why? Because the moment they do that, the people of this country would understand the question a great deal better than they understand it now, and there would be such a howl and a kick put up from the Atlantic to the Pacific, that they

would be forced to reduce their freight rates and their passenger rates. Therefore they take this method, as my hon. friend has pointed out, to divide up $9,000,000 a year in an extra bonus over and above the 7 per cent per annum that is paid on their stock. And remember, Mr. Speaker, that a great deal of that stock on which the 7 per cent is paid, was sold to the men originally connected with it, at 25 cents on the dollar; so that in the years past they have been drawing 24 per cent to 28 per cent on their money not 7 per cent; and their stock to-day is worth several hundred per cent higher than when it was when they bought it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, don't you think that is doing well enough? Don't you think that is fair enough? Don't you think they have got enough. Why should we turn to now and hand them over between $25,000,000 and $30,000,000 to be divided up among their shareholders? Because, though you may argue it this way and argue it that way, the fact remains that you cannot argue away, that when you issue that stock the people of this country who pay passenger rates and freight rates, one way or another, have to pay and provide the dividends to pay for that stock, the proceeds of which do not go into the coffers of the company, but go directly into the pockets of the shareholders, and the people of this country will be compelled to pay extortionate rates to pay these extra dividends that should not be paid at all, and do not need to be paid. Why should this $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 be taken out of the funds of the company? Why should it not go into the treasury of the company? Think what this extra $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 would do. It would build 1,250 to 1,500 miles of railway in those prairie provinces; it would equip those lines thoroughly well, and at the same time would earn dividends to a legitimate extent for the shareholders. Therefore, why should the money be surreptitiously taken out of the funds of the company and put directly into the pockets of the shareholders?

We have heard a good deal in the past about the Jim Hill system. It is very close to us up there in my constituency. The Hill system comes up to within a couple of miles of the boundary. What is the result, Mr. Speaker? Thousands and hundreds of thousands of bushels of wheat every year are drawn across the boundary line and sold in the American cities. Do you imagine, or does any one in this House imagine, for a moment that when a farmer goes across into the United States and sells his wheat and gets the money for it, he does not buy his goods there to a large extent? If you imagine that, you are mistaken. They do it every day of the week. From one little town of 700 or 800 inhabitants in my constituency, last fall 150,000 bushels of wheat tributary to that town went down into the United States; and the merchants lost the traffic, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company lost the freight hauling, and the country lost the business. Why? Because the Canadian Pacific Railway has another charter there that they have held the last seven or eight years; and when I tried my utmost two or three years ago to have a clause put in their charter compelling them to build 25 miles each year, I was not listened to.

They have not built the road, and I do not believe they will until it suits them unless they are compelled to. In the meantime the country is losing the traffic and the business, which is going down into the United States. If this sort of thing continues every man in the country will welcome an extension of the Hill system all through the country, even if it involves the diversion of traffic through the United States rather than longer tolerate the existing conditions. I do not agree with the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in his advocacy of government ownership and operation of railroads. I have never agreed with that; I believe that any company that is running a road in Canada can do it better than this or any other government. I believe the railroads of this country should be built and operated by companies. But I want to warn the Canadian Pacific Railway and other railway companies and the government and this House that if there is no better control over the railroad companies in future than we now have the people of Canada will be driven to government ownership and operation.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

Mr. TURRIFF. I think it would be a mistake, but something has got to be done, and here is an opportunity such as we may not have again. It would be well worth the while of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways to go over this matter again, to look into it very closely and to find out what the people of the country think about it. If the people of Canada understood this question, no parliament would dare to give the Canadian Pacific Railway authority to issue that stock at par. The trouble is the people do not understand it, they do not understand what bonuses, what dividends are being drawn by the holders of the Canadian Pacific Railway stock. If they did there would be a change. The minister should thoroughly examine the whole situation and see if something cannot be done to improve the existing conditions.

Let us consider what we might get if the $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 did not go directly into the shareholders' pockets, but

went where they should go, directly into the funds of the company.

First, we might get a lower rate of freight all around.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

Mr. TURRIFF. The railroads could cut their freight rates 25 per cent all round if they had this $25,000,000 to use for the benefit and interests of the country.

Second, we might get a lower passenger rate. I had some little part, some two or three years ago, in securing a reduction in railway passenger rates; we succeeded in having the rates reduced from 4 cents and 3½ cents to a flat rate of 3 cents per mile on every mile of railroad from the Rockies east to the Atlantic. What was the argument of the Railway Commission? That in some cases higher rates possibly were necessary. We have a Railway Commission who deal with these matters; they are doing first-rate work, and we are giving them plenty of work to do, but there is one point we should not forget, that we cannot shelve all our responsibility on that Railway Commission. This Commission will not take into consideration many subjects that we have to deal with in this parliament, they will take matters as they come before them, and, as a rule, they do not go over the country and order this or that railway to lower its rates. What they do is to take up any matter of complaint that comes before them. There may be one hundred cases of overcharging of freight rates for one that is brought to the notice of the Railway Commission. We have a good commission; it has its work to do; it is doing its work and doing it well, but we cannot divest ourselves of our authority and our responsibility in this matter.

Third, we might obtain the abolition of the exemption from taxation of lands held by the railway. If their lands were not exempted it would not matter what price they put upon them, they would have to sell them, because the higher price they put on the land the more they would be taxed by municipalities or school districts.

Fourth, we might secure the right to say where they will build roads instead of leaving them the discretion they now have.

Fifth, the $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 would rid the country from one end to the other of the deadly level-crossings of which we have heard a great deal.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

Mr. TURRIFF. Why should we not make them do it? I say it is up to the House to make these railway companies treat the public fairly. The Canadian Pacific Railway is not the only sinner; in many respects the Canadian Northern is a great deal worse, and I intend to take a turn at them later on, but at present we are dealing with this company, which is no worse than others. I do not think that under any circumstances a company situated like the Canadian Pacific Railway should be allowed to issue stock at par. Would any railway company in the old country situated as this sell their stock at par?

Mr. LANCASTER. The directors would go to jail if they did.

Mr. TURRIFF. They would not dare. Look at our banks. They sell their stock at market value and put all the money into the treasury. That is all we ask these people to do. Is it any hardship to compel them to put their money into their own treasury and expend it in building their roads? It must be remembered that while Canadian Pacific Railway is to-day selling at from $173 to $175 it is intrinsically worth at least $200, and the man who has 300 shares and is awarded 100 shares of new stock is in reality getting 100 per cent of a bonus on the stock he holds—and we are the people who are allowing this to be done.

These are some of the reasons why I agree absolutely with what the hon. member for York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has said—and in voicing these sentiments I have the absolute certainty that I voice exactly the sentiments of 100 per cent of the 40,000 people whom I represent in this House—there is no exception. So I say it is up to this government and parliament to do something to bring about a better state of affairs. If they do not take some action they will be taking the very best course in the world to force the people of this country to go in for government ownership and operation of railways.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). As some of the questions which have been under discussion are matters with which I have some acquaintance, I may be permitted to make some explanations in respect to them in the hope that those who are interested in these questions, at all events in this House, will have an opportunity of knowing more accurately what the facts are.

I ought to premise, I suppose, that I do not consider myself any defender of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; I do not speak in that capacity at all. I am not financially interested in any way in the undertakings of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; I do not consider that I or my political friends owe that company anything politically. I am one of those who think that the bargain which was made with that company, as contained in our statute-books, was a bargain so advantageous to the company and so disadvantageous to the Dominion of Canada that it ought not to have been entered into. But while I say that, I think none the less that

a contract is so sacred a thing that those who have the advantage of a good bargain are entitled to that advantage and entitled to have that contract carried out in its entirety and according to its true intent and meaning.

The question of authorizing an increase of the capital stock of this company is presented for consideration. Now, the question whether that increase ought to be sanctioned, whether the increase of money which the company is hoping to raise by this means is money that the company needs; and the question of what disposition is to be made by the company of the new stock in order to raise the funds they want, are two entirely different questions, and ought not to be confused. With regard to the first question, which was presented to the Governor in Council for consideration when the company came applying for sanction to its proposed increase of stock, I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) who opened this discussion would not contend that there was anything wrong, illegitimate, against honesty or good morals, in the company if it needed $50,000,000 more of money for its lawful undertakings and for carrying on its operations in this country, proceeding to obtain that money by means of increasing its capital stock and disposing of that capital stock in open market. That is a fair, a proper, a legitimate way by which any company may raise additional capital if it needs additional capital. And in this case, although the capital which the company already had reached the enormous amount of $150,000,000, the very needs of the country which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) who has just taken his seat has so eloquently discussed, demonstrate the propriety of putting that company into a position where if by an increase of its capital stock it can obtain the necessary additional funds it needs, it certainly should not be prevented from doing so by the government of the country refusing its sanction to the desired increase. The increase of the capital stock which was asked seemed to be needed in the interest of the country quite as much as in the interest of the company, and the purpose for which the money to be raised by this increase of capital was to be required was a legitimate and laudable purpuose, viz., the extension of the company's lines, the constructing of new branches and of new works, betterments in every way, to increase the facility with which the company can do its work of transportation. Every object for which this additional capital was needed was a legitimate and a laudable object in regard to which if there had been obstruction thrown in the way of the company it would have been a step which the parliament of this country would have condemned rather than have approved. If I understand correctly the newspaper discussions which are taking place in certain parts of the country on this question and the objection which is being brought forward by the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean), the only thing of which complaint is made in regard to the increase of the capital is the disposition which the company proposes to make of the additional number of shares by distributing those shares among their shareholders at a figure less than the present market price of Canadian Pacific Railway stock as bought or sold by the public. Now, that is a question in regard to which it seems to me unnecessary that I should express any opinion one way or the other. I shall not discuss it beyond stating this: That no device of this nature which a company can apply to its financial affairs will enable that company to increase the amount of its wealth. It has a certain amount of property before the increase of the capital stock, and it has that same property in specie, in railway real estate, or in whatever shape you please after the increase of its capital stock. Before the last increase the capital stock of the company amounted to $150,000,000; there were so many shareholders of the company, each holding his share of $100 par value, and the proposition is to increase the capital stock of the company to $200,000,000 and to increase correspondingly the number of shares. It is the property of the company which it had before the increase that is represented by the number of shares which existed before the increase, and it is that same property plus whatever is paid for the new shares which the company has after the increase, and the company is neither richer nor poorer after the increase except by the amount which it receives for the additional number of shares. Now, take the position of any individual shareholder; he receives of course a benefit if he is permitted to purchase for every three shares which he held before the increase one share of the new issue at any figure less than the market price. Assuming that the value in the market of Canadian Pacific Railway shares before the increase was $170, every three shares would be worth, to buy or sell, $510. If a man bought three shares, paying out $510 for his three shares and then being entitled to one new share for $100 paid his $100, he would have become possessed of four shares for $610, and the four shares would have cost him $152.50 each. That measures exactly the extent of any benefit which this proposition of issuing one new share at par to each holder of three shares, gives to that shareholder; he makes $52.50 on the purchase of his new shares if the market price before the increase was $170. The shares of the company decrease in value immediately upon the issue of new stock being put upon the market and decrease in value exactly in proportion to the number of new shares which it issues, and the property which

these shares represent has not been made either more or less by the transaction. So that what we have as a result of this transaction to the individual shareholder comes simply down to this: that each owner of three shares, if the capital stock was worth $170 in the market, has made on his three shares $52.50 by the transaction, or in other words, he has got a special dividend of seventeen and a half per cent. Well now, if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or if any company, instead of adopting that means of giving to each one of its shareholders a special dividend of seventeen and a half per cent had had the funds to distribute among its shareholders, had had the property in money or in money's worth, and had chosen to declare a special dividend to that amount, I do not suppose the newspaper editors of the country would have thought there was any such highly immoral or improper transaction as that which in this other shape the railway company is proposing to enter into and which is now being so vigorously denounced. If any company is in a position, if it has made money so that it is able by its operations to pay a special dividend of seventeen and a half per cent and it does it, it is simply a distribution of the assets of the company in which the public as a whole is in no manner or way concerned.

Now, that is as I understand it the position of any ordinary trading company, any company incorporated for the purpose of gain. If the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or any other company operating or enjoying a public franchise is by that circumstance under an obligation to the public which precludes it from taking a course it otherwise might wish to take with regard to its shareholders, that is an entirely different story. If the bargain which this company made with the country, when it undertook to build this railway, has so bound its hands that by reason of the privileges which it then obtained and which it still enjoys from the people of Canada, it is not in a position to deal with its shareholders as a company which was free from such obligations might see fit to deal with them, that is an entirely different story, and the whole question of the morality or the immorality from a business point of view of what is proposed seems to me to bring itself down simply to the question whether or not the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is living up to its contract. If it is, then I cannot see how any man in this country has any right whatever to complain of the course the company is taking. If it is not, then it ought to be compelled to do so. I fully agree with any view which my hon. friend may express or which any other member of this House may hold, that if the company is not carrying out its obligations to Canada it ought to be made to do so. In this regard let us remember for a moment just what the measure of its obligation is. It is a bargain; it is a contract which parliament in 1881 sanctioned. It was debated enough at that time, it was entered into by the country with the eyes of the country wide open, and this is the letter of its terms—the general Railway Act at that time provided that no railway company might earn, one might say, more than 15 per cent upon its capital cost of construction without being liable to have its rates reduced by the parliament of the country. When the Canadian Pacific Railway presented its contract to parliament that 15 per cent limitation was lowered to 10 per cent and the obligation of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was to that extent so much the more burdensome upon the company. The limit which the parliament of Canada provided by the general Railway Act was altered to such extent that the tolls of the Canadian Pacific Railway should not produce more than 10 per cent per annum profit on the capital actually expended in the construction of the railway, instead of not less than 15 per cent, as generally provided.

The question, then, which fell to be considered when the company was proposing to increase its capital stock in 1902, was whether or not its revenue produced 10 per cent per annum profit on the capital actually expended in the construction of the railway. An order in council was passed in January, 1902, authorizing the increase of the company's capital from $65,000,000 to $85,000,000. It was an express stipulation in that order in council that the $20,000,000 extra stock which was then being sanctioned was not to affect the cost of construction of the railway upon which the 10 per cent was to be calculated under the terms of the contract. The interests of the people of this country were safeguarded by the presence in the order in council of that provision, and the $20,000,000 of increase which was then authorized was not to be taken into account one way or the other in fixing the actual amount expended in the construction of the railway for the purpose of calculating the 10 per cent. In the discussion which then took place, the desire was expressed in many quarters that the opinion of the Supreme Court of Canada should be taken on the question whether or not the amount of capital actually expended in the construction of the railway had yet reached such a figure as had made the time arrive when the rates of the company were liable to be reduced, and it was thought better that that should be referred to the court. In the January and February of 1904, the matter was placed by the then Minister of Justice in my hands on behalf of the government, and I was engaged for some two or three months in almost daily conference with the late Mr. Christopher Robinson, who was counsel in that matter for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company,

in the effort, which ultimately was successful, to arrange the terms of this reference to the Supreme Court. It was a very troublesome, difficult piece of work. There were a great many considerations to be taken into account, and the outcome was satisfactorily reached only after many propositions and counter propositions; but ultimately we succeeded in getting to an agreement as to the terms of the reference which was to be made to the Supreme Court of Canada. The case was entered for hearing at the May, 1904, term of the Supreme Court, and it was ready for argument, and no doubt would have been argued but for an arrangement which as counsel for the government I at that time understood had been entered into with the railway company. This was a piece of litigation upon which, if one were going to enter, it would behoove him to count the time and the cost. It was a case of such magnitude and importance, and such difficulty as well, that certainly it was not to be expected that either party would be content without an appeal to the Judicial Committee. After the principles upon which the accounts between the company and the public were to be taken had been settled by the decisions of the courts, the trouble would begin—the actual taking of the accounts, the actual going to work and determining, before some officer of the court, in the light of the decisions which the courts might have pronounced upon—I was going to say the almost innumerable points involved—upon the dozens of questions which were raised to be considered, what had been up to that time the actual amount expended in the construction of the railway. This would certainly have been the work of years. From the standpoint of the practising lawyer the prospect was certainly a charming one. Here was the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on the one side and the Dominion of Canada on the other, engaged upon an inquiry to ascertain what amount of money had actually been expended in the construction of the railway during what was then 25 years or thereabout. That would have been, as I say, undoubtedly the work of years, and it would have been undoubtedly a very expensive operation. The late Mr. Christopher Robinson, the Hon. Edward Blake, and other counsel of distinction in this country were representing the railway company. It would have been something in regard to which there would have required to be a very substantial expenditure of money on the part of the company as well as on the part of the government. Next there is to be considered what would have been the position if the government had succeeded to the full in its contention at the end of a long taking of accounts. If the government, at the end of a long litigation, had succeeded in demonstrating that the revenue of the company amounted to more than 10 per cent on the capital actually expended on the construction of the railway, what then? Why, then, the rates would fall to be reduced. If the government failed, if the company showed that it was not making 10 per cent, then of course the government would have lost its case, and would have been out of pocket whatever it had invested in the inquiry. If it succeeded, the full extent of its success would have been to show that it was entitled to have the rates brought down to a figure which would make the income of the company not exceed 10 per cent on the amount actually expended in construction; and if that were the case, how would the actual amount of those rates fall to be settled? We had then not long before established the Board of Railway Commissioners, a board charged with the duty of deciding just such questions of rates in regard to other railway companies, but not having that control over the Canadian Pacific Railway Company which it would have secured if at the end of the litigation I have described the government had succeeded in demonstrating that the 10 per cent limit was being exceeded, and that the rates of the company would therefore have to be considered by this tribunal. In that position of matters the company came forward to the Minister of Justice of that day, saying: This prospect of litigation is terrifying, and rather than go on with that reference, we propose to leave the case standing entered for argument before the Supreme Court, in a position where it can be resumed at the wish of either party any day; and leaving it standing there as it is, we propose to submit ourselves, for the present at any rate, to the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners, and leave them free to control our rates. That was done. The company has from that day to this gone on allowing its rates to be controlled by the Board of Railway Commissioners, submitting itself to their jurisdiction in regard to its rates in exactly the same way that any other railway company in this country is obliged to submit itself. In the meantime the interests of the country have not suffered in any respect, so far as the litigation in question is concerned. It stands exactly where it did in the month of May five years ago. It is entered for hearing before the Supreme Court. Either party can take it up at any term of that court; and if it be the will of this House that that litigation should be entered upon, it is in no worse position than it was when it stood over in May, 1904. It can be taken up at once exactly where it was dropped and can be pursued to the end. But when it is at an end, when ultimately, after the expenditure of thousands of dollars and of years of time, the litigation is decided, and if the government prevail in its contention, the position, so far as the company is concerned, will be identical with that

which it occupies now. What object there can be, in those circumstances, in pursuing that litigation, so long as the company continues to submit its operations and tariff to the decision of the Board of Railway Commissioners, I am entirely unable to understand.

But one word more with reference to the different increases which have taken place in the capital stock of the company since 1902. Starting with the capital stock of $65,000,000, that was increased by $20,000,000 and then there was another increase of $25,000,000 in 1904. In 1906 there was a further increase of $40,000,000, and in 1908 a final increase of $50,000,000. In each of these three cases an order in council was passed. In the latter two cases 1906 and 1908, the order in council contains exactly, in each instance, the same protecting provision as the order in council of 1902, namely, that the increased capital which the company was being authorized to expend in the way of construction should not be taken into account, either in favour of the company or against it, in computing the cost of construction upon which the ten per cent profit was to be based. The order of 1904 did not contain that provision, through some inadvertence or lack of attention apparently in the preparation of it. There was at all events the assurance given by the solicitors of the company, that the omission, so far as they were concerned, was entirely due to inadvertence; and I have in my hand a letter from the solicitor of the company, written with authority, he says, in which the company's solicitor undertakes, as he had previously stated to me by word of mouth, that that order in council of July, 1904, should, for all purposes and at all times, be considered as though it did contain the ten per cent clause in the same language as the other three orders.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What is the date of that ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. It is of recent date, but the conversations which preceded it stated exactly the same thing as the letter does. I asked that the assurance should be put in writing and the letter is dated the 15th February inst. There never has been any other position taken by the Canadian Pacific Railway from first to last; and so far as the disposition of the proceeds is concerned, so far as regards what has been done with the various increases of capital from time to time—this statement is given by the president of the company, the accuracy of which we have no reason to doubt—not one penny of the capital authorized in excess of the $65,000,000 is to be taken into question in estimating the cost of construction under the terms of clause 20 of the company's contract with the Dominion government. And although it goes without saying, (Sir Thomas Shaughnessy adds) that these vast expenditures for increased facilities and greater developments are very great factors in the growth of the company's net revenue.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. I have been very much interested in the discussion and particularly in the speech made by the hon. the Minister of Justice. In that speech the minister says that the original bargain between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian government, which has entailed so many hardships on the people of the west, is sacred and that so long as the company carries out faithfully its side of the compact, we have no right to interfere with it. He also assures the House that the ten per cent on the stock is not a hard and fast rule to day, but that the company, in the revision of its rates, has to take the ruling of the Board of Railway Commissioners. That is an assurance which will be very well received by the House and the country at large. But there is one thing on which I would like to have a little light and that is what the Board of Railway Commissioners would consider a fair basis on which to reckon the contract rate. In other words would they not take into consideration the fact that in the extra issues of stock the rate of interest has been materially reduced. I am not saying that it binds them down, as in the original bargain, to ten per cent interest on the stock, but I ask whether, in all fairness, it would not be reasonable to suppose that they would take into consideration the amount of stock issued and the interest thereon.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. But if we must leave that out of the question, if the issuance of the extra stock does not interfere in any way with the rates of the company, if competition and the control of the Railway Commissioners are to bring about a better state of affairs, there is one thing which must be evident to everybody. When the Canadian Pacific Railway come to this House, they must be coming for favours; and when they are coming for extra favours, it ought to be the duty of this House, in view of certain hardships that are entailed on the country by the original bargain, to see that these hardships are in some way relieved.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. If they ask us for one favour and another. if they want us to put them in the position of watering stock to some extent or issuing it at par, then let us curtail some of the enormous advantages they have secured over the public in western Canada. Of all the questions that give rise to the most irritation concerning the Canadian Pacific Railway and its operation to-day—and I have no fault

to find with the Canadian Pacific Railway and its operations, I will go as far in my admiration of the operations of the Canadian Pacific Railway as the Minister of Railways, and admit that it operates as well as and perhaps better than any railway in the world—there are certain conditions in that original contract which our people most resent and which it is the duty of parliament to use every legitimate means to have done away with, and of those things the main one is that the lands of the company may be held by them exempt from taxation.

If I may be pardoned, I will go briefly over the history of this arrangement. In 1881, the bargain was made that the lands of the Canadian Pacific Railway should be selected from a twenty mile belt and should be exempt from taxation for twenty years. But the railway company came back here and asked for additional favours. They did not like the land within the twenty-mile belt and they were given free selection throughout that western country. In my constituency, whose extreme southern boundary is a hundred miles north of the Canadian Pacific Railway, for all practical purposes every odd section was selected by the company. The twenty years of exemption would have expired in 1901. But the Canadian Pacific Railway patented its land only as it was sold. And, in 1901, when the provinces said: Now your exemption has expired, their answer was: Our exemption extends from the patenting of the lands twenty years. And they were asked to select their lands. A great portion of that land was not selected until 1906. Twenty-five years from 1881 and twenty years from 1906 make forty-five years' exemption for which these settlers in the west must pay. I ask any man in this House who is fair-thinking how the people in the older provinces would like it if they had to pay taxes not only every man on his own farm, but on the farm adjoining.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. And the Canadian Pacific Railway cutting up melons of nine millions a year.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. Apart from that argument, I would ask any hon. member: How would your constituency behave if your people had twice the taxes to pay that they should pay? How would they like it if no improvement was going on on the land adjoining theirs? But that is not all. We have a provincial law in that country that the maximum taxation per acre for school purposes is ten cents. Schools sections are formed, and, though the settlers are struggling with the difficulties of pioneer life, they want their children educated. They form their school section, but the odd sections of land are in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Placing on the maximum of taxation they attempt to build the school. They issue debentures, they make short loans for furniture, and they pay their teacher. But the second year comes. Now, their short loans come due, the payment of interest on the debentures comes due, and the teacher's salary is no less than before. I have two instances in my constituency where these people found that, even with the maximum of taxation, they could not possibly support their schools in the second year. I ask any hon. member here: What would your constituency say if they had to close up their school when paying maximum of taxation, leave the building standing idle and no opportunity afforded for the education of their children? Don't you think that this would become a burning question. Don't you think you would make such a noise in this House that the government would have to act? And if the Canadian Pacific Railway came here for a favour, don't you think the first question would be: What are you going to do about that exemption? This question is, in my constituency, a burning question. These lands bear no taxation for roads, but the expense of improvements must be borne in its entirety by the owner of the adjoining land. The settler goes in there. He has no money to buy the land. He tries the best he can to improve the roads, but he gets no help from half the land there. He is increasing the value of the Canadian Pacific Railway land with every improvement he makes, and with his efforts improving the productiveness of the country. Yet he gets no help from the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. And they cutting a melon every year.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. I say that, when this matter comes up for consideration before the government, it is the duty of the government to ask favour for favour; when the Canadian Pacific Railway ask for one favour, the government should demand a favour in return. If you will take away the exemption, and compel the Canadian Pacific Railway to sell their lands, you will settle one of the most vexing questions with which we have to do. It is said, this bargain is a sacred one, that we cannot set aside the bargain for the company have carried out their side of it. I do not know anything about law, but I will leave it to the judgment of any man here, if, when that bargain was made in 1881, it was not the intention of parliament that that bargain should expire in 1901? I say we are paying taxes for twenty-five years beyond that bargain, and, dear only knows, the bargain was bad enough in the first instance. This bargain is a sacred one; but the duty that we have to perform is also a sacred one. We are here to represent

the people. The company have vested rights, but so have the people. If the Canadian Pacific Railway Company wishes to go through certain territory, the laws of this country are such that they can take the land from the man who has the patent for it on giving him a fair price. It seems to me that if this bargain is sacred, we should use every possible endeavour to do away with what is one of the greatest evils of our country, and one that is retarding the settlement of western Canada to-day.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Did I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilbert McIntyre) to say that the bargain was a sacred one, and that the government were compelled by that bargain to authorize all these issues of stock at par when the stock is selling at a higher rate?

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. I will put my point in one sentence: When the Canadian Pacific Railway comes to us to ask for favours, we should try to relieve the friction points by asking them to grant us the favour of doing away with these restrictions.

INTERNATIONAL WATERWAYS TREATY.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the attention of the House for a few moments to certain reports which have come to hand of statements made in the Senate of the United States with regard to the ratification of the Waterways Treaty now under consideration between the two countries. I refer particularly to despatch in the 'Montreal Star' of 17th instant:

New York, Feb. 17th.—A Washington despatch to the 'Tribune' says: The prospects for the ratification of the Canadian Boundary Waters Treaty at this session of Congress are growing constantly less, and it now seems inevitable that the convention will have to go over until next session. Even then it may be amended.

And further on:

At the hearing which the Committee on Foreign Relations gave to Senator Smith, of Michigan, yesterday, he made a clear-cut argument in support of his contention that the treaty ought to be amended so as to ensure to his state as large a portion of the waters of St. Mary's river as it now enjoys, while his presentation of his contention that the treaty would deprive his state and this country of a part of those waters made considerable impression on the members of the committee.

Senator Smith maintained that the treaties of Ghent and Paris and the Webster-Ashburton treaty all defined the boundary, and that during all the intervening years it had remained undisputed. He maintained therefore, that the argument made against his contention—that the committee provided for in the pending convention would have power to fix the boundary—fell to the ground.

He argued further, that the treaty ratified last year did not alter the boundaries, but merely authorized a commission to erect the proper physical monuments. He said that at present two-thirds of the water of the St. Mary's river ran on the Michigan side of the river, while under the treaty pending the commission would unquestionably divide these waters equally between the United States and Canada. This, he maintained, would be a serious injustice to his state and to the United States.

Following that, we read in the newspapers to-day that it is impossible, on account of objections that have been raised by Senator Smith, of Michigan, on these grounds, that the convention treaty can be ratified during this session of Congress, the consequence of which will be that it will have to go over to another year. Now, I do not desire to enter upon a discussion of the terms of that treaty. Unfortunately, by a mysterious procedure, and one which does not commend itself either to the Prime Minister or the leader of the opposition, we are practically in the dark in this House with regard to the terms of the treaty. But this we do know, that we had an International Waterways Commission, which commission was constituted and endowed with certain functions and powers. It went to work at considerable expense to investigate our water supply and our waterways, the commission being composed of representative gentlemen appointed by both governments. The report of that Waterways Commission was, with regard to the St. Mary's river, that the power from those falls should be divided equally between the two countries. That report has been adopted so far as it could be adopted by this House. That report is fair in every respect, and has been made after examination by the commissioners of all the water supply and the water sheds on both sides of the river.

Now, I desire to urge upon the right hon. gentleman who leads this House that there should be no disturbance of the conditions on the boundary between Canada and the United States, as found to exist by that independent report of a joint commission appointed by both countries, and that the efforts of the hon. senator for Michigan to block the treaty in order to get better terms, to get encroachments on the boundary, to get water franchises of a very valuable nature properly belonging to Canada, found to belong to Canada, known to belong to Canada, conceded to belong to Canada, and vested in Canada by treaty rights for many years, enjoyed and possessed by Canada to-day—that that hon. gentleman shall not be permitted, by holding up the ratification of that treaty in the United States Senate, to wrest from Canada something which Canada has a right to keep, and which I pro-

test, as a Canadian representative against Canada giving up at all. What is to be the result, I leave it to the right hon. gentleman who leads this House to say. I do not know what negotiations, if any, are taking place. But I now rise for the purpose of setting forth the situation and placing it before the government, namely, that the people of Canada, and especially the people who are immediately benefiting by the water supply from the St. Mary's river as well as those benefiting by the supply of the Niagara river, shall not be deprived of their rights, and that the right hon. gentleman shall see to it, in further negotiations, that there is no leverage made by the blocking of that commission to take away from Canada that which belongs to Canada. There was a lamentable incident in connection with one of our treaties with the United States, so far as territorial boundaries were concerned, there was an arrangement whereby, at the last moment, by a lamentable circumstance or coincidence, a portion of that territory which we honestly belived to belong to Canada, was taken away from Canada by measures which we did not approve, and which the people of this country did not approve. I therefore urge upon the right hon. gentleman to keep a watchful eye on the proceedings of the United States, and to see that no leverage, no holdup, is made by any one on the other side of the line in order to wrest from Canada any part of our waterways, or any part of our territory which has been agreed upon and found to be Canada's by right, and that the treaty shall not be varied or changed to our disadvantage by gentlemen in the United States Senate.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I do not think that there is any cause for misapprehension on the part of my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) by reason of what has transpired, so far as we know, in the Senate of the United States. The newspaper reports which I have seen, I believe, are not very accurate, and in those reports two treaties are confounded the one with the other. The treaty which is now before the Senate, the Waterways Treaty, is eminently fair to both countries. The fact that objection is taken to its terms by a senator in the United States Congress, a gentleman interested on the other side of the line, is perhaps evidence that after all the treaty cannot be objectionable to the people of this country. I would not prejudge it at all. There is another treaty which was passed last year, and which referred to the international boundaries, as to which a commission has been appointed to fix, not new boundaries, not to determine new boundaries, but simply to fix the boundaries already existing by treaty, which has now been in existence for forty or fifty years. The commissioners have no power to depart in any way, under that treaty, from what has been in existence, and is now in existence; their task is merely to confirm metes and bounds, marking present boundaries, and nothing else. It is premature, I think, to discuss that treaty, or the treaty which is now before the Senate committee. As I understand, it has now been put over to another session. I may say that I have the authority of His Excellency the Governor General to state that we are endeavouring to get authority from Great Britain to lay the treaty before parliament as soon as possible.

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

Public Works—Ontario—Belleville Armoury $60,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the Ontario buildings there are no new items. These votes are simply to carry on to completion buildings regarding which provisions were made in the last parliament. I spoke to the chief Conservative whip and he was good enough to say that he would be able to arrange to save the necessity of giving details as to these different buildings because the officer who prepared the estimates was not quite ready with the details. He asked to have the Toronto buildings stand. I undertake that if any hon. member wants specific information in regard to any building I shall furnish it.

Mr. J. HAGGART. The minister promised to bring down an order in council yesterday.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I have it here.

Mr. J. HAGGART. If the minister would just read the part setting forth the urgency.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is with reference to the fence around the Mint. The clause in question reads:

That the Deputy Master of the Mint has on behalf of the Imperial authorities, called the attention of the Department of Public Works to the absolute necessity for the erection of a fence around the Mint building, before minting operations are proceeded with. That this was a matter quite unforeseen by the Department of Public Works until the demand of the Imperial authorities was made. It is submitted therefore, that this is a case which may quite reasonably come within the exceptions provided for in the Revised Statutes, chapter 39, section 36 (a) of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interests, and that the Minister of Public Works may properly dispense with the calling for public tenders.

That the Chief Architect of the Department of Public Works has prepared plans and a specification which were submitted to, and approved by Dr. Bonar, Deputy Master of the Mint, upon which, the contractors for the Mint building, Messrs. Sullivan and Langdon, were asked to give a price.

Mr. J. HAGGART. That is not the one.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, that is the one.

Mr. J. HAGGART. In connection with the addition to the House of Commons the minister spoke of an order in council setting forth some urgency.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my hon. friend not remember that he was speaking of the contract given to Contractors Sullivan & Langdon for the fence and guard-house at the Mint. I promised the hon. member for North Toronto to give the order in council.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Was there an order in council for the expenditure in connection with this wing setting forth an emergency?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Only as to one of the elevators in regard to this building. The $44,000 paid to the contractors in that case is made up of different items of work done without an order in council.

Mr. BLAIN. Could the minister furnish the committee with a list of Ontario public buildings for which estimates were passed last year, but which do not appear in the present estimate ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I stated yesterday that by comparing the estimates of this year with the Appropriation Act of last year it will be seen what has been omitted. Then I was asked if I would prepare a statement of the buildings or works in regard to which tenders had been called, but which had also been omitted, and I said I would do that. I have that list here. It is as follows:

Works for which tenders were called and received but on which no action was taken, it having been decided to defer their construction for the present. Three Rivers Coal Dock; Ste. Emilie, P.Q., wharf; West Advocate, N.S., wharf; Devil's Island, N.S., wharf extension; Vancouver, dredging; St. André, P.Q., wharf extension; Long Point, P.E.I., breakwater; Providence Bay, wharf; St. Alexis, Ha! Ha! Bay, wharf; Michipicoten, wharf; Vernon, B.C., public building; Tenecape, N.S., wharf extension.

Mr. BLAIN. In the general election held in October the estimates passed at the last session of parliament were used on behalf of government candidates in many counties in Ontario. It was pointed out to the electors that if they supported certain candidates these buildings would be erected and large amounts of money expended in certain counties.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did I understand my hon. friend to say it was pointed out that if the electors elected certain candidates this would be done?

Mr. BLAIN. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to give the name of the gentleman who referring to what had been placed in the estimates made it a condition that the candidate would be supported?

Mr. BLAIN. I do not propose to be put in the witness box by my hon. friend on details, because I could very well put my hon. friend in the witness box and refer to special cases in his own constituency.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In my own constituency there was no promise of any kind or description which was contingent upon the government candidates being supported.

Mr. BLAIN. If we wish to broaden out this discussion there is a gentleman sitting within my hearing whose opponent published a list of the amounts of money that were expended in his county and because of that argued that they should return him again to support the government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is another matter. My hon. friend said that the promise was made by candidates that if they were returned these works which were provided for in the Appropriation Act would be undertaken, but making it a condition that such and such candidates would be returned. I asked my hon. friend to point to a single instance in which that was done. Then he referred to St. John, and I told him that in no case was any promise or assurance in regard to the carrying on of a public work made contingent on the election of a particular candidate.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend will not venture to say that his government did not adopt the policy of using the promise of public works with the electors to induce them to support their candidates. I could give specific instances, if I chose but I shall not. Perhaps the minister would like me to, so that he could instance some county and point out some member of the opposition who objected to it and was anxious to bring the case before parliament. In last year's estimates were found a great number of items for the construction of public buildings and public works; on these no money was expended last year and they have disappeared from the estimates this year. What I want to know from the minister is the cause. Last year the minister told us there was no fear that the revenue of the country would continue to increase, but he now tells us our revenue has decreased and that the government is short of money. I want from the minister a list of the public buildings in Ontario which were provided for in the estimates last year and on which no money was spent and which are not to be proceeded with under these estimates.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That will entail some clerical work which I will have done and I will submit the result to the hon. gentleman later. As I have already explained we cannot save eight million dollars unless

we cut off public works here and there and we have done so all over the country without distinguishing between constituencies represented by supporters or opponents of the government. I do not expect that this postponement of public works will last long. The works were provided for last session in good faith and as we deemed they were necessary in the public interest, I shall consider it my duty at the earliest possible moment to have these works reinstated in the Appropriation Act so that they may be proceeded with.

Cornwall Public Building—Alterations to fittings, $1,400.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. What are these alterations and who has the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. These are for ordinary post office fittings, new steps to the building, &c. The Berlin, Ontario, Hardware Company has the contract.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Is there pressing public necessity for these alterations ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would not have undertaken them were it not that the Post Office Department made an urgent request.

Mr. DONNELLY. In the estimates of last year there was an item of $5,000 for the erection of a post office at the town of Chesley. I suppose that the same reason that the hon. minister has given for striking out the other items would apply to the striking out of that item.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The same reason would apply, but I may say that we have decided to purchase the site, so that we shall be ready to proceed with the construction of the building as soon as the necessary provision is made.

Mr. DONNELLY. Did the hon. minister or his department send any official or agent to Chesley during October last for the purpose of purchasing or arranging for the purchase of a site for the proposed post office building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I gave instructions to the inspector to go there for the purpose of looking into the question of the site, but just when he went there I do not know.

Mr. DONNELLY. Then the hon. minister did send an inspector just previous to the election?

Mr. G. TAYLOR. That looks suspicious.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A little bit, but things are not always what they seem.

Mr. DONNELLY. I may say that during the recent election campaign considerable capital was endeavoured to be made for the government candidate out of the fact that the people of the town of Chesley were to receive a new post office building, and the argument was freely used that it would be suicidal policy on the part of the electors not to elect a supporter of this government, as the result might be that no post office would be built. Now, the result appears to me to show that the parties who advanced that argument must have had good ground for it. I would like to have the assurance of the hon. minister that in striking out the item for the building of a post office at Chesley, he was not influenced in any way by the fact that the riding did not return a supporter of the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can give my hon. friend that assurance in the most positive terms. I may say that in leaving out the public buildings in regard to which tenders had not been called, we drew the line irrespective of whether a supporter of the government or an opponent of the government had been returned.

Mr. DONNELLY. I would like to call the attention of the minister in a general way to the fact that the people of the inland constituencies of western Ontario, being large purchasers and consumers of imported goods, contribute largely to the revenue of this country, while they receive a very small return in the way of the erection of public buildings. I wish to say to the hon. minister that the town of Chesley is a thriving and progressive town, fast becoming quite a manufacturing centre, and I would like to have his assurance that, as soon as the finances of the country will be in such shape that he can go on and erect public buildings, he will then take up the matter of the Chesley post office, and have it provided for in the estimates at an early date.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can hardly be expected to give that assurance in respect to individual buildings; but I give it to my hon. friend in general terms, which ought to be satisfactory. I may say that when the gentleman who formerly represented the constituency in which Chesley is situated, urged its claim for a public building, he used the same argument that my hon. friend does now, in regard to its being a thriving and progressive town and it was in consequence of his very strong representations that provision was made for a building in the town of Chesley. The item was put in the estimates in good faith, and it is in exactly the same position as other items which have been held over. But I can assure my hon. friend that as early as possible the buildings provided last year will be proceeded with, including the building in the town of Chesley.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. Was the site purchased?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The site has been purchased.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I would like to ask the minister if this work will be gone on with before the next election?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That depends on when the election will take place.

Glencoe—Public Building, $26,000.

Mr. BARR. Is this a post office?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A public building, including a post office and custom house.

Mr. BARR. What is the size of Glencoe?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In 1901 the population was betwen 1,000 and 1,100.

Mr. BARR. It is not any more now; it is going back; and yet we find $26,000 voted for a public building there. Was the promise of this building the reason it gave the government the big majority it did? It looks very much like it. We find that $1,250 was paid for the site, although land is very cheap there. Were any other sites offered?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, there was an opportunity to purchase several others, but this was regarded as the best and the cheapest.

Mr. BARR. What is the size of the lot?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 100 feet by 165. It is a corner lot.

Mr. BARR. I find that the legal expenses in connection with the purchase amounted to $33.02. Will this finish the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to finish the building.

Mr. BARR. Has the contract been let?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BARR. Is there a tower and a clock to be put on that building? I have it on good authority that these were promised before the election.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, there is to be a small and somewhat pretty tower on the building.

Mr. S. SHARPE. When were the tenders advertised for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some time last fell.

Mr. S. SHARPE. In what month?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is one of the particulars I have not got. The contract was let on the 11th of September. Tenders were called probably a month before that.

Mr. BARR. Can the minister tell us how many tenders there were?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I have not that with me.

Mr. BARR. Was this the lowest?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This was the lowest.

Mr. BARR. I would like to know who were the parties who tendered?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will have that this evening.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. In the list of tenders asked for and given by the minister, I did not hear that tenders were invited for the dam at Montreal river. Is it not a fact that tenders were asked for the construction of a dam at Montreal river last fall previous to the election?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That will come up on harbours and rivers, when I shall give full details.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. Was there a tender for the dam at Latchford?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will find a sum in the estimates for the dam at Latchford.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o clock.

EDMONTON AND SLAVE LAKE RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE (Strathcona) moved that the House go into Committee on Private Bills.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I wish to say a word about this first Bill, respecting the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company. I recognize that it will not result in any immediate action being taken; at the same time I want to put distinctly on record the position taken by some of us with respect to Bills of this character. This is a Bill for the renewal of a charter granted many years ago. The first clause provides that it shall have five years for the completion of the railway. I have no objection to their having five years for the completion of the railway, but, in the Railway Committee, I objected to having it so put that they shall have five years in which they may actually do nothing We have a pretty well recognized rule that whenever a company applies for a renewal of a charter, there should be a provision that they shall commence and, within two years, spend at least 15 per cent of the capitalization, and shall complete the road within five years. It was alleged that, in the case of this particular company, something had been expended upon the railway——

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. Over 15 per cent.

Mr. LENNOX—but nothing had been expended for as much as two years. I submit that the fact of expenditure having been made two years ago has no great bearing upon the matter of a renewal of charter, and that we should at least insist upon the ordinary condition that they would expend not less than 15 per cent within two years.

As I say, I recognize that I cannot make this effective at the present time. But I enter this as a protest against this measure, and the same step will be taken as to the renewal of a charter considered in this House the other day. The difficulty is that these things are quoted as precedents, and we are compelled very often to abandon the salutary rule which we adopted some time ago.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 24) respecting the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company.—Mr. Wilbert McIntyre—reported, read the third time and passed.

SALISBURY AND HARVEY RAILROAD COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Salisbury and Harvey Railroad Company.—Mr. Emmerson.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) in charge of the Bill to change the name of it. I understood well why this is called 'Railroad' company instead of 'Railway' company, because they are using the franchise of a company which is extinct by insolvency, and they want to have a difference between the two institutions. But I would point out to the hon. gentleman that the word 'Railway' in the Railway Act has a special construction put upon it by the interpretation clause, and it is very bad legislation for us to use the word 'Railroad' and expect the courts to determine that it means the same as 'Railway', when this latter word is given an interpretation which, in certain cases, manifestly, 'Railroad' does not have. I would suggest that it be called the 'Great Salisbury and Harvey Railway Company,' or the 'Eastern Salisbury and Harvey Railway Company,' or anything else you like. The word 'Harvey' might be omitted, and some other name used. It is important that we should not have the word 'Railroad' in the Bill.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is much force in the point taken by my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) and I concur in his views. So strong has been my feeling with respect to the matter that I wrote to the parties in the city of St. John who are interested, and made a suggestion as to a change in the name. I think, under the rules of the House, the title of a Bill can be changed on its third reading. Therefore, I would suggest that we might put the Bill through the committee leaving the question of the name open.

Mr. LANCASTER. I thought this was the time to mention it.

Mr. EMMERSON. Of course, the use of the term 'railway' is uniform in the statute, and the Railway Act is framed and phrased with the idea that all companies of that nature shall be termed 'railway' companies, and not 'railroad' companies. It would not be well to have an exception.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would suggest the striking out of the word 'and' and the inserting of a hyphen. Make it 'Salisbury-Harvey Railway Company.' That will distinguish it from the old company.

Mr. EMMERSON. Having submitted the matter to the parties interested, I feel that we ought to give them an opportunity to select the name. From my knowledge of the geography, I would say that a better name would be the 'Salisbury and Hopewell Railway Company,' for these are the two points connected. As a matter of fact, Harvey is not connected with Salisbury by this railway.

Mr. LANCASTER. There is no object in keeping it in then.

Mr. EMMERSON. No material object, but the railway as first operated, under legislation of this parliament, went by the name of the 'Salisbury and Harvey Railway.' I think they wish to retain the word 'Salisbury,' and perhaps it would be more agreeable to them to retain the name 'Harvey' also.

Mr. LANCASTER. You might call it the 'Great Salisbury and Harvey.'

Mr. EMMERSON. But it is no greater than it was. You could not impress the public with that.

Mr. LENNOX. Let it go through committee except as to that point, and remain in the committee for further consideration.

Mr. EMMERSON, I think that would be better.

Progress reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 13) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 26) respecting the Kootenay Central Railway Company.—Mr. Geo. Taylor.

LAKE SUPERIOR BRANCH GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC.

House resumed adjourned debate on proposed motion of Mr. Turriff for the second reading of Bill (No. 30) respecting the subsidy from the Ontario government to the Lake Superior branch of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Possibly we might let this Bill go to committee. I notice that there has been a good deal of comment on it. Hon. gentlemen who have looked

through it will see that it contains several clauses which I think will need a great deal of discussion, possibly we will not be able to pass them. It strikes me from reading the Bill over that they will interfere with our control of Dominion railways. It was an Act passed by the Ontario legislature giving this company some aid, to which certain conditions were put in, and one of the conditions was that the company should endeavour to get a Bill passed by this House confirming the agreement which forms part of the Act. The agreement contains one or two clauses as to rates and another clause as to amalgamation. I am afraid that these clauses of the agreement would conflict with the jurisdiction that we ought to have over our own roads. However, I think it will be well to send it on to the Railway Committee, because there may be some parts of the Bill that we ought to confirm. It is with no desire at all to do anything that would permit the railway company to get out of keeping its agreement, but it is with the sole object that we do nothing in this House to pass any railway that is chartered by ourselves out of our own jurisdiction by confirming an agreement with any other body. I have no objection to its going to the committee. We will prune it down, and if there is anything in it that we can confirm, we will be glad to do so.

Mr. LENNOX. I think the minister is right in allowing it to go to the committee. But it appears to me that this Bill will have to be confirmed or passed in its entirety, or not at all. It is simply an agreement between the provincial government and the railway company, and there will not arise any question about it on the part of the railway company, because they do not get any money unless they obtain the sanction of this House to this agreement. However, we can discuss all that. There are some advisable provisions in this Bill regarding the carriage of road material for municipalities on certain favourable terms.

Mr. GRAHAM. Discriminating against other townships, which is against the law.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not think so, for the reason that they must carry for all municipalities that are upon the line of railway. Of course they can carry it beyond the line of railway. I do not suppose the local legislatures are very particular. They have their money yet and must either have this agreement or retain their money.

Mr. GRAHAM. The situation is that they have not their money.

Mr. LENNOX. They ought to have.

Mr. GRAHAM. The other people have most of the money. They have a portion of their money which has not been paid over, but the neglect of this House to pass such an Act does not prevent the company from keeping its agreement.

Mr. LENNOX. I would like to have them bound.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The per contra of the minister's argument might be that there are companies chartered in Ontario who have obligations with municipalities there; these companies come here under the jurisdiction of the federal authorities and try to evade these obligations and if something can be done to define the spheres of the federal and provincial governments so that these obligations whatever they may be could be preserved, it would be a good thing. Perhaps that will come up in this case.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is our railway.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the second time.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 40) to incorporate the Great West Permanent Loan Company.—Mr. A. Haggart.

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Montreal Terminal Railway Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 50) to incorporate La Compagnie du Chemin de fer International de Rimouski.—Mr. Ross.

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the British Columbia Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Cowan.

Bill (No. 56) respecting the Canada Life Assurance Company.—Mr. A. H. Clarke.

Bill (No. 59) to incorporate the Victoria and Barkley Sound Railway Company.—Mr. Ralph Smith.

Bill (No. 61) respecting the Burrard, Westminster Boundary Railway and Navigation Company.—Mr. Ralph Smith.

Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Neely.

Bill (No. 63) to incorporate the Royal Canadian Accident Insurance Company.—Mr. Ames.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Glencoe Public Building, $26,000.

Mr. S. SHARPE. In making the purchase of the site for this building was an agent of the department sent to get options on lots or how was the site purchased ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot tell exactly, but if my hon. friend desires I will get the information. My recollection is that the usual course was pursued, that is we send our representative, a very experienced man, to the town, he looks over the different available sites, gets the prices, makes an

examination of the lots, endeavours to ascertain at what prices they changed hands in recent years, according to his instructions from the department, and makes his report to the department. I think I can assure my hon. friend that that was done in this case.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister states that he has abolished the patronage system in his department. Does this apply to advertising for tenders for public works? I mentioned last year that in calling for tenders for the construction of a post office at St. Marys, Ontario, the department advertised in 33 papers in that section of the province at a cost of $607.35. I pointed out then that the department advertisement was not inserted in the leading newspapers in that section of the province.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No change has been made so far as advertising is concerned. As I said to my hon. friend last year, we are careful to see that ample notice is given so that all likely contractors would have the opportunity of tendering for public works. In asking tenders for smaller contracts, such as furnishing supplies, or erecting buildings costing $2,000 or $3,000, we do not advertise as widely as with respect to important public buildings. We would not go to as much expense as for a more expensive work. We endeavour to select newspapers that have considerable circulation, but I have not yet felt bound to ignore the rule which has prevailed that we give a preference to papers which are friendly to the administration.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman continues to advertise in newspapers supporting the government and in no others.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not exactly, there are some exceptions.

Mr. BLAIN. I have here 33 newspapers containing advertisements for tenders for the work at St. Marys, and I would like my hon. friend to say if any of these are not supporters of the present administration?

Mr. PUGSLEY. You are pretty nearly corect.

Mr. BOYCE. You have abolished the patronage system?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not as to newspapers.

Mr. BLAIN. In western Ontario an advertisement goes into 33 different newspapers for tenders for a small work to be done at St. Marys, and the newspaper with altogether the largest circulation in that section of the province, the London 'Free Press,' is not included.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the 'Advertiser' of that city had it.

Mr. BLAIN. It has a much less circulation than the London 'Free Press.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the Toronto 'Globe' had it also.

Mr. BLAIN. I think the Toronto 'Globe' would be on the list. A little change in that particular would be in the interest of the public, and I am sure it would be along the line of diminishing the patronage list. Does not the minister think that in this case too much money was spent in advertising for tenders.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The work was not so very small. The cost was between $25,000 and $30,000. The amount for advertising was considerable, but if we were obliged to insert the advertisement in the opposition papers as well the cost might be double.

Mr. BOYCE. What is the need of so large an expenditure for a public building in such a small place as Glencoe, which, I believe, has a population of about one thousand souls? There is equal necessity for the establishment of public buildings in other towns of larger population and of more commercial importance where there are less facilities than in this interesting and no doubt progressive town of Glencoe. For instance, there is the town of Steelton, near Sault Ste. Marie, where there are very many important industrial works, and where the population are now suffering for the want of those public facilities which it is the duty of the minister to supply. The minister said to a representative deputation from Sault Ste. Marie, Steelton and that district that the strongest possible representations had been made in regard to the interests of that place and that it must be taken into the serious consideration of the government. That place has no postal facilities commensurate with the needs of the population. I would therefore ask the minister why he discriminates in this manner and establishes a public building at an expense of $26,000 to serve a small population like this, and leaves a town of wider commercial importance with practically no facility at all notwithstanding the fact that he has admitted publicly that the strongest possible representations have been made as to the necessity for increased accommodation.

Mr. D. A. GORDON. After hearing the numerous complaints from the other side of the House, one would suppose that they have all the grievances upon their side. In that regard I think they are entirely wrong. The minister in his wisdom has seen fit to deny us one or two buildings that are very important and on the whole we are inclined to give the government credit for using good judgment in this matter and trying to keep house within their resources. The town of Dresden has not adequate postal facilities and although an appropriation was made for a post office in that town it was deemed wise to not build one there for the present. The hon. gentleman from

North Lanark (Mr. Thoburn) referred to a town in his locality that wants a public building, but I may say that there is a town in my district that has probably contributed more revenue to the Dominion exchequer during the past two years than his little town has contributed since confederation, and we have absolutely no adequate postal accommodation there. I, however, shall feel disposed to press the minister quite as strongly as some of the other hon. gentlemen a little later on, and I hope with success. I express myself as being more than delighted to see that the government are practising a policy of retrenchment, and I hope that when they feel they can spend money generously again, a policy will be pursued that will make appropriations something in keeping with the needs of the various communities, and that the small communities will not get double what they ought to have and the larger ones much more than is necessary.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Did the hon. gentleman plead with the government for retrenchment when he sat in the House last July, as he pleaded to-night ?

Mr. D. A. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am delighted at the remarks of the hon. gentleman from East Kent (Mr. Gordon). Did he not come from a town where they manufacture sugar to such a large extent I would scarcely have expected such a very sweet speech. He has been able to congratulate the minister and to find fault with him at the same time, and he has sat down fully satisfied that he has done justice to his constituency. There is no doubt a very large revenue derived from the town the hon. gentleman lives in and when the minister comes to know of that he will no doubt meet the wishes of the hon. gentleman and do it with as much grace as my hon. friend (Mr. Gordon) has shown in the manner of his asking.

Mr. BOYCE. I was not speaking jocularly and I would be obliged to the minister if he would give me an answer to my question.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We were pressed very strongly to provide a public building for Glencoe. It was represented to us that Glencoe was the centre of a very rich agricultural district, an important railway centre that several industrial concerns have recently located in the town, that the population was increasing, that the post office and customs office was inconvenient and entirely inadequate, and that Glencoe was the headquarters of a company of the Middlesex Light Infantry which had no place to store its arms and accoutrements, and that a room should be provided in the public building for that purpose. We yielded to these representations. The plans were prepared shortly after parliament rose last summer, tenders were called for and the contract entered into before we arrived at the conclusion we would have to cut off a great many of these items.

Mr. BOYCE. The contract was let just before the election.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It had to be let before the election if it was to be done at all last summer. Just one other word, and I say this for the information of our friends on this side of the House whose feeling has been so well expressed by the hon. gentleman from East Kent (Mr. Gordon). There was an appropriation for a building in the town of Grand Falls in my own province put in the estimates last year on the strong representation of the hon. gentleman who represents that constituency and we have omitted it this year although the constituency of Madawaska and Victoria gave to the government candidate a majority of 1,500. Fairville, in my own constituency, is a very thriving and prosperous town adjoining the city of St. John, and it gave me a splendid majority, but I have dropped the appropriation for it from the estimates also. In the city of St. John I have postponed the building of a drill hall which has been promised for years.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. They wont give you a majority next time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes they will, because the people of St. John appreciate our efforts to curtail at the present time and they know we are doing the right thing in the public interest. In Kings and Albert where a victory was won by my hon. friend (Mr. McAlister) which was surprising to a great many of our friends opposite we had an appropriation for the thriving town of Hillsborough and that has been stricken from this year's estimates also. I mention this to show that we are treating constituencies which returned government supporters in the same way as we are treating those constituencies which returned Conservatives. Last session we provided for a good many public buildings and wharfs throughout the country which we thought were necessary, and for that policy we were criticised by hon. gentlemen opposite very strongly. The lieutenant of the leader of the opposition in the province of Quebec took the ground last year, as he took it only yesterday, that many hon. members apparently come here with the sole idea that they must get a public building for their constituents. I hope that remark will not apply to my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce). The same gentleman told us also that those gentlemen who are asking for public buildings are never found in the committee rooms doing the work which devolves properly on members of this parliament, but that their sole object appeared to be to get

a public building. I trust that remark does not apply to my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce). I take a different view altogether; I believe that gentlemen who represent the great cities of Canada ought to look with a favourable eye upon the efforts of the government to give public buildings costing reasonable sums of money and affording ordinary accommodation to the smaller cities and towns throughout the Dominion. That was the policy which the government recognized in submitting the estimates last session. I can tell my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) that if I remain Minister of Public Works I shall regard the claims of Milton favourably, as I shall regard also the claims of other cities and towns to which my attention has been called. But we cannot do everything at once. We find our revenue is limited this year and we have been forced with great reluctance to curtail expenditure. I have been constrained at the instance of the Minister of Finance to cut off the very large sum of $8,000,000 which I had hoped would be placed in the estimates for the purpose of carrying out the obligations entered into last session of parliament when these appropriations were made. I trust this declaration will be sufficient for our hon. friends and that they will recognize the sincerity of the statement I make again, that so far as I know not one of these items was placed in the estimates last year for the purpose of influencing the electors.

Mr. CROSBY. No one would not think of charging that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We placed the appropriations in the estimates because we believed these works were necessary in the public interest. Will any one of these hon. gentlemen rise in his place and say that any one of these public buildings is not reasonably required in the public interest? The most hon. gentlemen opposite do is to say: If you are erecting a building in that town give it to the town I represent. My hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) whom I am always glad to hear, pleads for a public building in Milton and properly so, and when the time comes, as no doubt it will come, when we can give a public building to Milton my hon. friend will be able to say to his constituents: See what I obtained for you as your representative, send me back again to Ottawa in order that I may get further favours for my town.

Mr. HENDERSON. I cannot allow these pleasant remarks of the Minister of Public Works to pass without notice. I must congratulate him on the admirable statement he has made with regard to his general policy. It is extremely plausible on its face; it certainly seems to be extremely fair and unbiassed. The difficulty is that when the hon. gentleman comes down to particulars, he departs entirely from his general policy. I agree with him very largely on his general policy; but when he tells this committee that the village of Glencoe, of which I have some knowledge, having been there time and again, is entitled to a public building because it is in the midst of a rich agricultural country, I ask, what better agricultural country can you find than that surrounding the town of Milton? He says Glencoe is a railway centre. I believe there is one line of railway passing through it, with a spur to another village. But both the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific pass through the town of Milton. He says Glencoe has some industries. So has Milton, some very important industries, and it has recently added others. In the village in which I live, in the same county, there is one industry employing 300 men, and another employing from 100 to 150 persons, and it has a population nearly double that of Glencoe. But these minor considerations, to which the hon. gentleman made reference, do not seem to weigh with him in deciding the location of a public building. The special reasons assigned on behalf of Glencoe are applicable to very many towns throughout the province of Ontario, and I have no doubt to very many towns in other provinces which have received no consideration from the minister. However, in this instance I suppose we shall have to allow the general policy to prevail, because we know that the majority in west Middlesex on the 26th of October was very small indeed.

Mr. COWAN. I have listened in vain for an answer from the minister to the question put by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Boyce); but while I was listening I was delighted to a certain extent to hear from the minister what we may consider to be a specimen brick of the political virtue of himself and his party. I am learning the business of politics. I find that the proper policy is to make an appropriation immediately before an election ; and when the minister gets a large majority, as he did in certin constituencies in New Brunswick, he tells us with unctuous declamation that he withdraws that appropriation, intending of course to use it again at the next election. I have picked up this little piece of general information as to the political policy of himself and his party, but I have waited in vain for an answer to the very reasonable question put by the hon. member for Algoma : why is Glencoe to be accorded a building at the cost stated, although it has a population of only 1,000, while a place like Steelton, with a population of 3,000, whose claims the minister recognized before the election, is discriminated against? Steelton is entitled to say that the minister is bound to recognize its claim if he

is not distributing the public moneys for the purpose of doing favours instead of advancing the interests of Canada. Why is Algoma not treated as it is entitled to be treated because of the solemn promises and representations made by the minister?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There were no promises.

Mr. COWAN. Strong representations he has made here to-night. I heard him say that he led that delegation to suppose that they had made a good claim. Another place without nearly so good a claim is given a public building. I have heard no answer justifying this discrimination. I have only heard that the public moneys of Canada are being played with by the party opposite for the purpose of its political advancement in the constituencies.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. How often has this public building been promised to Glencoe before the election? Is this the third or fourth time? In how many elections before has it been promised?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware of any.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. There is another question. The question of advertising which has been raised by my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) is a very serious one. When this matter of advertising arose and the question was asked the minister, why he did not distribute his advertising amongst the papers of both parties, he said with a great show of rectitude that he had abolished the pernicious patronage list. Why does he not follow the example of the Tory government in Toronto, and distribute the advertising among both the Reform and Conservative papers? How can he expect the people of this country to believe his solemn assurance that the patronage list is abolished when any one who picks up a Reform paper and a Conservative paper will see a government advertisement in the one and not in the other? He must necessarily come to the conclusion, if he has any eyes or judgment at all, that this story of the abolition of the patronage list is mere moonshine.

Mr. ARTHURS. I would like to call the attention of the minister to the necessity of providing at the earliest possible moment a public building for the town of Parry Sound. I heard him announce that the policy of the government was to provide for those towns which had a certain population and whose necessities were most pressing. The town of Parry Sound has a population of between 3,000 and 4,000. It is one of the principal ports on the Georgian bay, is a large manufacturing centre, is the county town of the county, and has a large postal revenue. According to last year's returns, the postal revenue of those towns in Ontario which have been favoured with public buildings is as follows: Renfrew, $6,919; Parkhill, $3,364; Glencoe, $2,871; Leamington, $4,833; Markham, $2,143; Simcoe, $7,908; Whitby, 4,320; whereas the town of Parry Sound had a revenue of almost $9,000. Then in the matter of post office orders, I find that the total amount issued by these seven towns, which have been so favoured is $132,000 while those issued by the town of Parry Sound alone amounted to $290,000. I find also that the customs revenue for Parry Sound amounted last year to $53,567, which is much larger than that in any other of the towns for which we have been asked to vote an appropriation. And when this matter is brought before the minister, I would ask him to consider very carefully the claims of this town—a town which has three railways connecting with it and the finest harbour on Georgian bay, and which has been neglected to the present in this respect.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What was the cost of the land?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $1,250.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What was the total of the successful tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Geo. A. Proctor, of Sarnia, tendered for $16,228, which was the lowest tender and he was given the contract.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When did the work begin and when is it likely to be completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contractor has to begin in the spring. The contract has been let and the building must be completed the first of October next.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the amount of the contract cover the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There will be fittings and heating and lighting in addition.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the estimated total cost of the building and the fittings ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $27,000.

Mr. BOYCE. I have no desire to obstruct the hon. gentleman's estimates, but when questions are asked him which are reasonable we are entitled to a satisfactory reply and consideration. The answer he gave the proposition I submitted was most pathetic and unctuous but not all satisfactory. In it he deprecated the lavish expenditure of public money on public buildings, especially just before the elections, and desired that his followers should be more moderate in their aggressive demands on his department. What a contrast to one of his predecessors who, when criticised for his very lavish expenditure replied : 'Wait until you see what we will do next

year.' But after the pathetic appeal of the present minister, one cannot help concluding that it must indicate a decline in the power of this government, since it admits that the means by which it has held power is shrinking in its hands. The minister stated that as our revenue began to decline. so should our expenditure on public works. But he knew that last session. Why did he not then practice that policy? Of course the elections were then at hand. And how is he expending the money he asks us to vote? As a Minister of Public Works, he is bound to see that the expenditures are made where they will do the greatest good to the greatest number; and if any cutting down be necessary, it should be done at the expense of the least important and not of the most important centers. But he has followed the opposite policy. He has starved the important centers and expended immense sums on public works where he thought they would most benefit his party, regardless of the principle I have just expressed and which no one can controvert. He has been extravagant in the smaller places and starved the more important ones. Take for instance the town of Steelton, which is of much greater importance than the town of Glencoe. It has a population three times as large. The capital employed there is 25 to 50 times that invested in Glencoe, and representations were made to the government as to the urgent necessity of a post office in Steelton long before there was any question of building one in Glencoe. Yet we have the minister telling us that although he found it necessary to cut down expenditure because of our declining revenue, and although there was not enough money to go around, he has decided that there must be an appropriation for the town of Glencoe, small as it is, and the claims of Steelton are to be utterly disregarded. What can be the reason? How is it that we find this utterly unjustifiable discrimination made by a minister who tells us he has abolished the patronage list? The reason is no doubt that the county of West Middlesex has elected a supporter of the government for two or three parliaments and is expected by the minister to do so for still another parliamentary term. What the minister was looking to was political expediency and his object was to expend the public money where it would benefit his party most, regardless of public necessity. Consequently what the hon. minister thought was a reasonable demand on the part of the town of Steelton before the 8th of June last, he now utterly ignores, and finds it necessary instead to benefit the town of Glencoe, and in this way help his supporter, the hon. member for West Middlesex, to keep his seat.

Now, I wish to say to the Minister of Public Works that his unctuous utterances with regard to retrenchment will not satisfy the people of Canada that he has done, or is endeavouring to do, that which is absolutely square in the expenditure of these appropriations. Where he does see the necessity for retrenchment—where he finds his government crippled by a falling revenue—he must see that the only way to win the public confidence is to show the people that he is capable of presiding over his great department with fairness and impartiality, which he should exercise absolutely without regard to political exigencies, and taking account only of the public demands and necessities. In that case, the town, irrespective of the political complexion of the member from the district, should receive the expenditure of public money according to the needs of the public service. At the risk of taking up the time of the committee, I think I am entitled to more reasonable and fair answers than the hon. gentleman has so far given. I would like the hon. gentleman to say whether or not he subscribes to the proposition I put, that, when he finds himself in the pathetic position in which he is, and in which he has asked for the sympathy of the House and of the whole country—the position of not being able to supply all the public works he led the people to expect—does he not think that he should supply first those of greater necessity? And let him then say, if he can, having regard not only to his utterances, but to his correspondence, that he would prefer, from the point of view of the public convenience, public interest and public demand, to give that appropriation to the village of Glencoe instead of to the town of Steelton.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Stripping his question of verbiage, will the hon. gentleman be good enough to repeat it?

Mr. BOYCE. Apparently, from being unctuous, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) thinks he can get over the question by being jocular. I have stated my proposition three times. But perhaps he wants time to think over his answer. I ask the hon. gentleman this: Whether, when, as he has stated, he is called upon to retrench and as he calls upon the members who follow him to accept retrenchment, he does not think he should make curtailments where expenditures are less needed in the public interest rather than where they are more needed in the public interest?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am glad to answer the hon. gentleman's question. I think he refers to certain representations which were made to me with regard to the town of Steelton. First, I made no promise to the representatives of the town of Steelton that I would place in the estimates an amount for a public building there. They made very strong representations to me.

Mr. BOYCE. That is not answering my question.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I wish to explain this before proceeding further.

Mr. BOYCE. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) pardon me if I interrupt? Does he mean to say that he never made representations that there would be an amount in the estimates for the construction of a public building at Steelton?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman says I made such representations, no doubt he is correct. I would like him to produce the letter—does he say they were made in a letter?

Mr. BOYCE. I have asked the hon. gentleman a question.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not recall at present having made such representations. If my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) says I did make them, I should feel bound to accept his statement as a member of this House. All that I can recall to mind with regard to Steelton is that I was waited upon by certain gentlemen who urged very strongly the claims of the town in regard to better postal accommodation in the erection of a public building. I was much impressed with their claims, and my recollection is that I told these gentlemen that I would take the matter into my careful consideration. I think that is as far as I went. If the hon. gentleman has a letter containing anything stronger I should be obliged if he will produce it. In the last session of parliament a large number of buildings were provided for. The claims of various towns and cities were pressed upon my attention. No doubt Steelton was not provided for because it was felt that we could not ask for further appropriations. No doubt its claim stood over for full consideration later on. I have no doubt that such is the case. Last session we all hoped that the falling off in the public revenues would be but temporary. For my part, I did not dream that there would be such a falling off during the present fiscal year as there has been, that during the eleven months of the present fiscal year there would be a falling off of $10,000,000 or $12,000,000. When, in December last, we were called upon to determine what retrenchments we would bring into effect, as I stated yesterday, and, I think, repeated to-day, we drew the line sharply between those public works in regard to which tenders had not been called for and those in regard to which tenders had been called for before this decision was arrived at. Glencoe was one of those in which tenders had been called for. Parliament had voted the money, and it was up to me to proceed according to the authority of parliament and engage in the work. I could not, in December last, choose as between Steelton and Glencoe, because there was no appropriation for a public building at Steelton. I think that is the best answer I can give my hon. friend, further than to say that, as a general rule, there is no doubt that the cities and towns having a larger population are more entitled to public buildings than those of a small population. But that rule cannot always prevail. In some towns and cities considerable federal expenditures have been made for other purposes than public buildings. It may be that wharfs have been constructed, or harbours have been dredged. In others the construction of a public building would involve the only federal expenditure likely to be made there. As a general proposition, the larger towns are entitled to the first consideration. But it must be borne in mind also that the places in regard to which appropriations were made were pressed very strongly upon my attention by the members of parliament. They came to confer with me and to present the claims of the towns situated in their constituencies. I cannot recall that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) pressed the claims of Steelton on my attention on more than one occasion. He may have done so, but I do not recollect it. And hon. members on the other side were rather disposed to resent an appropriation for public buildings in different constituencies and to suggest that the construction of a public building was an attempt to bribe the constituency. It may have been—I do not say that I recall that it was—my tender solicitude for my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) that prevented me looking towards his constituency, fearing that it would be represented as an unworthy attempt to bribe his constituency and prevent his election as a member of this House.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it the intention of the Minister of Public Works to devote this $8,000,000, which he is retrenching this year from the public expenditure, to the erection of new buildings and new wharfs instead of those that were promised last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I made a statement on this subject last evening, perhaps the hon. member was not present. I said that when these estimates were submitted to parliament they were submitted in good faith, and in the belief that these various works which were provided for were necessary in the public interest. In leaving the amounts out of the estimates this year we had not the slightest idea of abandoning those works, but simply of postponing them for a short period. Speaking as a general rule, I would say that the works which were provided for by parliament last session, should I be the Minister of Public Works next session and the revenues are in a good condition, as we expect them to be, I would

regard it as my duty to propose that provision should be made for the various works which were provided for at the last session, but which are not provided for in the estimates of the present session.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it the policy of the minister to grant post offices costing about $27,000 to places where the population is only 1,000 or so, as he did in Glencoe?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I hope to get the expenses for public buildings in small towns cut down to a sum considerably below that.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The minister has stated that last December he came to the conclusion that it would be necessary to retrench the expenditure to the extent of some $8,000,000. To-night he has gone a little further and says that it was by reason of certain representations made to him by the Minister of Finance. Now, the Minister of Finance, speaking in July last, said that he expected a continuous fall in the revenue for some time to come, and that for the following year the people would have to face a falling revenue. Therefore, the conditions existed in July, and even prior to July, which would necessitate retrenchment. Now I want to ask the Minister of Public Works whether anything in the nature of a collapse or an accident happened to the finances of this country in the fall or immediately prior to that date in December when this government decided on this retrenchment, or was it simply a continuous fall in the revenue such as was predicted by the Minister of Finance?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can say to my hon. friend that so far as I am concerned, speaking as the Minister of Public Works, I did not expect so large a falling off in the revenue as has taken place. I hope that the turn has come now.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I asked if anything had taken place in the nature of a collapse or an accident?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware of it.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The minister will remember that when asked in this House last July where he would procure the money with which to erect all these public buildings that he was dangling before the electors, he made reply that there was no need for concern on that point; his information was to the effect that there was no need at all for concern. In volume 7 of last year's 'Hansard,' page 13330, my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) asked this question:

How does the hon. gentleman propose to get all the money to pay for these public buildings? I notice that the revenue is falling off at the rate of a million a month.

Mr. PUGSLEY—My information is that we need not have any fear on that score; but if by any accident the money is not available, the work will not go on.

Now the minister assures us that there has been no accident, simply the falling off in revenue that was anticipated. In July that same condition of affairs existed, and was pronounced by the Finance Minister as likely to continue for many months to come, so that the country has no reasonable explanation why the retrenchmet was made in December. Now, the attack of the opposition is directed, not so much against the fact that appropriations have been made, or that retrenchment has been adopted, it is against this state of affairs, that two or three months before the elections last year the minister proposed various appropriations of money throughout the country, and led the country to believe that these buildings would actually be erected, and by reason of those appropriations which he dangled before the electors, the government was able to carry the country. The minister assures us now that no intent existed in his mind, or on the part of the government, of carrying constituencies by those means. I wonder with what anguish of soul the minister must have witnessed his own candidates in the last election so utterly and so basely misrepresenting the motives of the government throughout this country when they appealed to the electors to vote for the candidates of the government because of these very appropriations that had been promised. Will the minister deny that either he or other ministers of the crown stood on platforms in this country and faced wide streamers requesting electors to vote for the Liberal candidate and a post office?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I never heard of such a thing.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The minister could not hear the streamers but he might see them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I never saw them.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Will the minister deny that some of his colleagues in the cabinet did not speak in the presence of streamers of that kind, without protest and without correction and without any effort on their part to represent those pure motives of the government so innocently portrayed by the Minister of Public Works to-night. It may possibly be that the government has acted fairly between the parties in the matter of appropriations for buildings that have been gone on with and those which have not, but the minister knows and the country knows that the government very discretely allowed two months to elapse between the date of the elections and the date of this determination, so that they had two whole months within which to adjust the bounty of the government to met the exigencies arising from the vote of October

26. In the third place, I would ask the minister to submit to the committee a list of the advertisements that were published for the first time between the 26th of October and the present date.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Do I understand that the minister will not answer my other two propositions ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have answered them.

Mr. MEIGHEN. If the minister thinks that he has said anything which would lead one who desires frankness, to think that he has reconciled his reply to the hon. member for Peel on July 16, 1908, with his statement to the House to-night, I am afraid he is greatly mistaken. It will not satisfy me.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am very sorry.

Mr. MEIGHEN. If the minister would be kind enough to come to my constituency next election I will show him it will not satisfy the people there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have heard something similar to that before.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The minister declines to answer my first two propositions.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I don't want to be discourteous to the hon. gentleman but I have answered them.

Mr. MEIGHEN. No one on this side of the House complains of the discourtesy of the minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Do you mean to complain of my want of courtesy.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Not at all, but we are gradually coming to the conclusion that the minister is a very astute politician.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is that a compliment or otherwise.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I understand that the minister will bring down a list of all the advertisements that were actually published after the 26th of October, with the amount opposite each one of the appropriations for this year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be very glad to do so.

Kingston—Royal Military College—Additional accommodation, $57,000.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. What is that for ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Quarters for the subordinate staff.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The departmental report of the minister says "Servants Quarters." Here, the government has built sixteen, five room cottages at a cost of $77,000. Is not that extravagant ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Public tenders were called and the work was awarded to the lowest tender. I cannot believe that the price was excessive because the competition was quite keen. I think there are more than five rooms in each dwelling.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Your own departmental report says there are five rooms in each dwelling. These servants who are drawing from seventy-five cents to $1.25 per day are supplied with houses worth $5,000 or $6,000. There are a great many workingmen in this country who would like to be treated as well as that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am free to say that I never was thoroughly satisfied that the expenditure for these buildings ought to have been so large as it is, but the plans and specifications were prepared before I became Minister of Public Works. The requisition was made upon us by the Militia Department for these quarters. They are not for what might be called servants but for the subordinate staff; the instructors and teachers in connection with the military college and school. The plans do provide for quite nice dwelling houses, and I am rather inclined to think that it would have been better had plans of a more simple design been prepared. I cannot but believe that the cost of these buildings built as they are is reasonable. I remember I had some hesitation in regard to the matter and I provided that half of them should be erected last year and half during the present year. There is no way to get out of it; the buildings are completed and this amount is to pay the balance. It may be, as I have said, that if the design of the buildings had been more simple, a few thousand dollars might have been saved; but we have good apartments for the staff, the buildings are substantially constructed, and we have received good value for what we have paid.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. If my hon. friend will allow me, I will read the description of these buildings in the report of the Department of Public Works, at page 22:

On January 15, 1908, a contract was entered into for the construction of two buildings, each 167 feet long by 33 feet broad, placed on two opposite sides of a square, facing outwards, with yards in rear; each series separated by a lane which bisects the square.

Each block consists of eight dwellings of two stories in brick with stone dressings and on a stone basement.

The division walls, the partitions in basement, the lining of basement walls and the chimneys are of brick; the partitions, floors and stairs of first and second stories and the roof are of wood; the floor of basement and verandahs in rear are of concrete, and the front entrance steps are of stone.

Each dwelling has, in basement, a cellar, a laundry and a store-room; on the ground floor a living room, a kitchen, an entrance hall, a vestibule, a stairway hall and a verandah,

and, on the first floor, two bed-rooms and bath-room.

These are the rooms of an ordinary everyday five-roomed or six-roomed cottage, which could have been built, I should judge, from my knowledge of building, for about $1,500 apiece; and yet we find that the minister has paid the sum of $55,000 last year and $57,000 this year for these paltry terraces. If there were modern fortifications hidden away in the basement, or something of that kind, we could understand the item; but no one who knows anything about the ordinary building trade would justify such an enormous expenditure for two small blocks of five-roomed cottages. I would like to have some more satisfactory explanation of this.

Mr. PUGSLEY. All I can say to my hon. friend is that the requisition was made by the Militia Department and that plans were prepared by the chief architect's department. When my hon. friend says that these buildings could be erected at a cost of $1,500 for each dwelling, my answer is a perfect answer—that tenders were called for by public advertisement widely circulated in the various newspapers, that four tenders were received, and that the lowest was $77,939 and the highest $85,000, for sixteen dwellings in two terraces, eight dwellings in each.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. Why do you ask for $112,000 if the buildings cost only $77,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is for the buildings alone. Heating, boilers, electric wiring, fixtures, furnishings, sidewalks, &c., are in addition.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I think the hon. minister might gracefully accede to our request to let the item stand, and bring down the plans and tenders. I supposed, from the statement of the minister as to the cost of these buildings, that they must have been trimmed inside with marble, the walls frescoed, and supplied with electric chandeliers and all modern improvements; but now I find that the improvements are extra.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no objection at all to bringing down the plans and specifications and the tenders for the information of the committee. The item may stand.

Mr. PRICE. May I ask where these sixteen servants were housed before?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are members of the subordinate staff, part of the permanent force. They were in Toronto, and were brought from there to Kingston, as I am informed.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I live in Toronto and have a knowledge of military matters there, and I never heard anything of that kind in regard to the Toronto garrison.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that was the statement of the Minister of Militia last year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why should the servants be in Toronto while those they were serving were in Kingston?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I presume they must have been doing the work in Toronto.

Mr. GEO. GORDON (Nipissing). I am glad to find the hon. minister so candid and frank in stating his policy, and I am glad that that policy is that public buildings should only be erected in places where the revenue is overflowing and where such facilities are most urgently required. The reason I say that is because in the district of Nipissing foundations have been laid for five of the greatest cities that we shall perhaps have in the Dominion of Canada and they conform in every respect to the condition stated by the minister in regard to both population and revenue. The first of these young cities is Sudbury. I need not mention its population, because it is increasing every day; but I might mention that it has a suburb with a population of over 3,000 inhabitants and one of the greatest nickel works in the world. Yet Sudbury has not a public building fit for any person to go into. A friend of mine remarked not long ago that he had gone into the post office and could not turn around to come out, but had to back out. The next young city is Sturgeon Falls, the population of which is probably greater than that of any of the towns to which public buildings have been given to-night, with the exception of the cities. It has a very large water-power and immense paper mills and a fine agricultural country around it. Then, going up to Cobalt, we have there the foundation of one of the largest cities that Canada will perhaps ever see. If the hon. minister has not already been there, and would go up with me and see silver being practically shovelled into cars, he would I am sure come to the conclusion that a place which possesses such wealth should not be left with the insignificant little shanty it has for the people to do their public business in. Going north a little further, we have another young city called Haileybury, which is in the mining country and is doing an immense business, and where the revenue and population are up to the requirements of the minister. Right within three miles, we have the town of New Liskeard, which is also in the same class and in the midst of a very important agricultural country; and I should judge, from the policy the minister tells us he intends following with regard to public buildings, that he will see the propriety of giving to each of these places a suitable public building.

Mr. PRICE. I understand the Minister of Public Works has stated that these

houses will cost $87,000. I notice that a vote was asked last year for $55,000 and that we are now asked to vote another $57,000, making $112,000 for these 16 houses or $7,000 a piece. Is that correct?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the estimate now.

Mr. PRICE. Who are to occupy them?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The subordinate staff.

Mr. PRICE. I presume that means the sergeants and officers' servants?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Principally the instructors.

Mr. PRICE. The sergeant-major and sergeants—how many?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Sixteen.

Mr. PRICE. And these subordinate instructors are to have houses built for them at a cost of $7,000 a piece. I call that disgraceful and ridiculous. I am surprised that the Minister of Public Works, after protesting this evening his desire to take the greatest care in expending the public money, should sanction an expenditure of this sort. I am a new member, this is my first session in parliament, and possibly I am more surprised than I will be later on that such utterly absurd and extravagant expenditure should be allowed by any minister of this government.

Kingston—Royal Military College—Barrack accommodation for stables, $15,000.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe). I would like to point out to the minister that Kingston is a fortress which has existed for years and has accommodation for these men. When the fortress was first built, accommodation was provided for some 3,000 or 4,000 men, and I cannot understand why we should require to spend $15,000 for stables. How many horses will have to be lodged in these stables?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The building is 35 feet by 41 feet and two and a half stories high.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. What is the one and a half story on the top floor for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot say at present. Public tenders were invited and it is expected that $15,000 will be required to pay the balance due on the contract and also for the necessary fittings and furnishings.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. How many horses will the stable accommodate?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the absence of the Minister of Militia, I cannot give the information.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The minister has had the plans and his staff should know. It is he who is asking for the money and not the Minister of Militia.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As I said before recess, I am taking up the Ontario items without having the full details, as the gentleman who prepares them is not quite ready. By the indulgence of the committee I was allowed to go on. I am willing to allow this item to stand and the Kingston veterinary hospital and will later give all the information.

Leamington—Public Building, $23,000.

Mr. BOYCE. When were representations made as to the necessity for this building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was a petition in 1907 urging that there should be a public building there.

Markham—Public Building, $10,000.

Mr. WALLACE. When were tenders called for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The date of the contract is May 20, 1908.

Mr. WALLACE. What was the cost of advertising? I see that $633 was the amount voted for advertising in the case at Glencoe.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total amount of legal expenditure, printing and advertising was $133.21.

Mr. WRIGHT. What is the population of Markham?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 5,000.

Mr. WRIGHT. Not at all, it is only about 1,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The statement given me says 5,000. It is probably an error of the typewriter.

Mr. WALLACE. When were the plans prepared? And is the minister aware that in December, 1907, the plans for that public building were exhibited throughout that constituency by Mr. Archie Campbell, who then represented it? Did he do this by the authority of the Minister of Public Works or on his own responsibility? He had the plans of the post office in 1907.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That might be.

Mr. WALLACE. Was that done as a bribe by Mr. Campbell and with the authority of the Minister of Public Works?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I know nothing about it.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the total cost of this building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The original contract for the building was $6,900. Taking the cost of the site, the heating, fittings, including letter-boxes, sidewalks, &c., the total cost was between $15,000 and $16,000.

Mr. WALLACE. I have no objection to the expenditure, but only to the way it was

brought about, by Mr. Archie Campbell going into the constituency after he had resigned from this House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He may have been consulting some of the people——

Mr. WALLACE. Was he authorized by the minister to go there in December, 1907, with a plan of the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Never heard of it.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there to be a clock in this post office?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. BLAIN. While we are on that question, I would direct the minister's attention to the fact that special men are employed to look after these clocks where they have been put in. For example, at Ingersoll we paid for the care of the clock for one year $25. In London, we pay $50. And it appears that we paid for the same gentleman who takes care of the clock, for cleaning and repairing, $100, besides the year's salary. In Hamilton, Thomas Lee is paid $65 per annum for the care of clock. Each of these buildings has a caretaker at a reasonable salary. As these are eight-day clocks, could not the caretaker wind them up without employing a special man at $50 or $60 a year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the hon. gentleman is misinformed as to the salaries of the caretakers. The salaries paid those who take care of these small buildings amount to $300 or $400, and nobody would say that was a large salary. We have found it necessary to make payments to persons to look after the clocks in these buildings, and the salaries range from $25 to $50, as a rule. The clocks require careful looking after.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Would it not be better to increase the salary of the caretaker and have him spend ten minutes every week in winding the clock?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In some cases we do allow the caretaker an extra amount for his services. I have in mind now such a case. No doubt, it is desirable, where the caretaker is able to do it.

Mr. WRIGHT. Where a public building has been erected, I do not think it is asking too much of the municipality to bear the expense of taking care of it.

Mr. BEATTIE. The minister is right. The caretaker, as a rule, is not competent to wind the clock. The clock has to be wound and cared for by a practical clockmaker. In London, since the man who had it in charge refused to wind it, the clock has been allowed to stop. There is no use in the government putting in good clocks and not looking after them, and to pay a man $50 is not too much for that service. I have listened to a good deal of talk on this side of the House this evening. Part of it was with regard to Glencoe. Glencoe is in Middlesex county, which is one of the very best counties in this country, and it is the one I have the honour to live in. One hon. member said that Glencoe had only one railway. I did not want to contradict him, but, as a matter of fact, they have the Grand Trunk, the Wabash and also the Canadian Pacific Railway. Glencoe is a smart little town in one of the best districts in Ontario. Glencoe is deserving of a post office. And I understand it is to have the military building also in connection?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. member who made reference to Glencoe is not in his seat. But the hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie) must not forget that the minister has already stated that the policy of the government is, in many towns, to employ the caretaker and increase his salary by a few dollars.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I said that was done in a few cases where the caretaker was competent.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman said it required a competent clockmaker.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the kind of man we do employ.

Mr. BLAIN. As to the salaries of caretakers, I do not wish to say they are excessive, but, in the average town of 3,000 or 4,000 population, the caretaker of the public building is paid $500 a year. In my own town, for instance, the salary is $500, with free house, free heating, free lighting and some other things I could mention. And the caretaker took an active part in the elections.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How large a town is it?

Mr. BLAIN. About 4,000 people.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the smaller towns, the salary is from $300 to $400.

Mr. BLAIN. I have a list before me, and if the hon. gentleman will look at it, he will see that the figures are correct. I am directing attention to this one case. The caretaker of this place is an active politician, so active that he drove around and collected the ballot-boxes in my county after the election was over.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. Did not they store the boxes in the post office?

Mr. BLAIN. They occupied a room in the post office—that is correct. But that has nothing to do with the caretaker. I did not assume that his duties were to drive to every polling subdivision in the county to gather up the ballot-boxes. If it is so, we would all like to know it. The policy of the government has been stated to be, in accordance with the resolution of this

House, that these employees may vote, but are not to take an active part in the elections. May I ask the minister, on the clock question, whether it is the policy of the government to engage competent watchmakers to wind up these clocks?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, that is the policy. I had in my mind the case of Moncton, where the caretaker has been engaged to do that work. I think there are other places where the same thing is done. But the general rule is to employ practical jewellers.

Ottawa—Building for testing of fuel by Department of Mines, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This building is for the purpose of testing the commercial value of peat for producing gas. The machinery is being brought from the old country, and is being installed under the direction of Dr. Haanel. A requisition has been made upon my department by the Minister of Mines for the erection of this building. We have purchased a site, and we now ask for $15,000 for the purpose of completing the building. Of this $15,000, $8,000 is a revote.

Mr. PERLEY. Where is the building to be put?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have bought a lot of land, about half an acre, on Concession street, in the southwestern part of the city.

Mr. PERLEY. I suppose that when a demand is made on the Department of Public Works by another department the minister has nothing to say, but he must grant the request.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could refuse, as Minister of Public Works, but the hon. gentleman will see that it is my duty to pay the greatest respect to a requisition from another department. I wish to reply to the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) with regard to these caretakers. In Amherst we pay $400, in Antigonish $400, in Annapolis 400, in Arichat $150, in Baddeck $250, in Canso, $350, in Dartmouth, $250. Another is $400, another $50.

Mr. BLAIN. Are there any higher than $400?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some are as high as $500, in two or three instances they run up to $700.

Mr. BLAIN. Where a salary of $400 is paid, does that include a house, heating and lighting?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. PERLEY. How much does the minister expect this new building for testing peat will cost, including everything?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We expect $15,000 will cover the entire expense, not including machinery.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I was going to suggest to the minister to let this item stand. I would like to discuss it at some length, but the hour is getting late, and I have to leave at 11 o'clock. I wanted to enter my protest against this expenditure being made at all, because it is a well known fact that in Europe people have been using peat successfully as fuel, and to produce gas, for the last twenty years. There is nothing new at all in this suggestion of the director of the Bureau of Mines. There is no need for this government to be paying out good money to repeat experiments that have been going on in Europe for years. I would like to have information as to what the government wishes to do in this matter, how they are going to expend the money; I would like full details.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This question could more properly be discussed when we come to the estimates of the Minister of Mines. The hon. gentleman will then be afforded full opportunity.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. There are 500 gas producing plants now at work in Canada. I do not wish to let the item go through without full discussion. I think the government should strike that item out.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are committed to this. We have bought the property, and we must ask the item to pass.

Mr. PERLEY. It seems to me my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Currie) has a perfect right to ask that this item be allowed to stand if he objects to it, and wishes to discuss it later. Surely that is what this committee is for.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman can go right on and discuss it now if he wishes.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I am asking for some information.

Mr. PERLEY. If the hon. gentleman requires information about this matter, surely he is entitled to it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Parliament has already expressed its approval of this enterprise last session, without a dissenting voice. The land has actually been purchased, the machinery has actually been purchased, and I presume it is now in Ottawa ready to be placed in the building. Therefore my hon. friend must see that no matter what might be his persuasive powers, I would have to ask this committee to pass the vote because we are already committed to it. I would again suggest to my hon. friend that he can discuss this question when the estimates of the Minister of Mines are taken up, or he can discuss it this evening.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) asks for some information that the minister has not in his possession at the moment. I would like to know who is responsible for that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not want to be unreasonable about it. How long would my hon. friend like the item to stand?

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Until Monday.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am willing.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I intended asking many questions about gas producer tanks and other things that the minister might not understand and it would be an advantage if he had all the information.

Mr. TODD. This $15,000 is for use in the testing of a system of gas peat production. The question of obtaining a cheap fuel has been a live issue in this country, especially in Ontario, for many years. Many attempts have been made to manufacture peat into fuel, and it was discovered that a German inventor has the best producer gas plant for using peat known. This government, I am glad to say, has already purchased one of these producers and this $15,000 is to erect a building for it. The machinery is all ready, and I think this will be one of the best investments that Canada has made in many years. I feel that in a year or two through these experiments we will find the means of obtaining cheap power and fuel in this northern country where we have no coal.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If the hon. gentleman will investigate the workings of Mr. Haanel at the head of the Mines Branch he will think that he is rather an expensive man, judging from the propositions he makes in connection with new inventions and processes, and that it might be well to allow the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. J. A. Currie) to put his numerous questions and see whether there is any wisdom in taking up this proposal. We have had some very expensive propositions of this gentleman taken up which it might be worth while discussing in this parliament.

Ottawa—Departmental Buildings—Fittings, &c., $50,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for fittings for the departmental offices. It is about the same as for other years. Latterly we are endeavouring to put in steel fittings which are fire proof and very much safer. This appropriation is likely to be continued until the last trumpet shall sound.

Mr. PERLEY. The fittings appear to be nearly all supplied by one or two companies. Are tenders called?

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Only two firms in Canada manufacture these goods. The chief architect made inquiry at Washington, where they have adopted these very generally, and acquainted himself with the price there, and from time to time tenders have been invited from these two companies for the different fittings. Prices have been got from them and they have been accepted where the chief architect from his experience thought they were fair and reasonable.

Ottawa—Departmental Buildings—Improvements in lavatories, plumbing, &c., $10,000.

Mr. PERLEY. Why is not this in item 138?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is rather special work.

Simcoe—Public Buildings, $20,000.

Mr. CROTHERS. The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. A. McCall)has asked me to inquire as to the cost of the site and building here.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The site cost $2,050. The whole lot is 80.3 feet by 102. It seems very moderate. The estimated total cost is about $38,000.

Mr. CROTHERS. Is it intended to erect a tower and put a clock in it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think not; it is not intended to do so.

Mr. CROTHERS. Why is it that the people in Nova Scotia in these little places, Amherst, Bridgewater, Guysborough and New Glasgow, all require towers and clocks, and in Ontario they do not seem to require any?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In some towns they want one class of buildings, in others a different class. The people of Simcoe desired a building of a classic design; it is one story building with cut stone trimmings, and they did not ask for a tower.

Mr. CROTHERS. Is it the policy of the minister to erect these buildings in whatever style some people in a town suggest.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As a rule we confer with the member representing the constituency and with the leading men who take sufficient interest to come to Ottawa to make representations. We are glad to receive suggestions from any respectable citizen. Of course where we have a large lot and the building can be set back from the street it may be desirable to adopt a different design from that which would be adopted if the building were built close up to the sidewalk. All these things must be taken into consideration.

Mr. CROTHERS. I dont see why you require a clock and a tower in one place and why you do not in another

Mr. PUGSLEY. Do you ask for a clock on this building ?

Mr. CROTHERS. Can you tell me what person in Simcoe suggested there should not be a tower and clock on this building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Do you complain there is no clock ?

Mr. CROTHERS. I am asking you the question.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I don't know.

Whitby—Public Buildings, $28,000.

Mr. BLAIN. How much did the site cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $5,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Is not that a high price for a lot in a small town like Whitby ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The lot is exceedingly well situated with a frontage on one street of sixty-five feet and on another of 150 feet. The inspector made a very careful inquiry and interviewed citizens on both sides of politics and his information was that $5,000 was a fair and reasonable price.

Mr. WRIGHT. What will be the total cost of the Whitby building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $33,000 estimated.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister bring down a list of the newspapers in which an advertisement was inserted for the buildings in the towns of Welland, Whitby, and Simcoe, with the amount paid to each paper ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall.

Mr. BLAIN. Would he also state what are the politics of each paper.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will leave that for you to judge.

Some resolutions reported.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Part O of the Auditor General's Report. —Mr. Fielding.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 22, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY ON SHIPS.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 74) respecing wireless telegraphy on ships.

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

Mr. LEWIS. The Bill is very simple, and provides that ships of over 500 tons carrying passengers, shall have a wireless telegraph apparatus on board, and an officer who can manage it, and a freight ship of over 1,200 tons shall be similarly equipped. Bill applies to sea-going and coasting vessels registered in Canada.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ASIATIC EXCLUSION—FALSIFICATION OF A TELEGRAM.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called, I rise to a matter of privilege that I have already mentioned to this House. I promised the House that if any further information came to me from the 'Colonist' newspaper of British Columbia, touching the alteration of a telegram, sent by me to that paper on the 24th of October last, I would communicate it to the House. The following document has been sent to me by the management of the 'Colonist,' to whom apparently it has been delivered by the Bishop of British Columbia. It reads as follows:

To whom it may concern,—

After hearing a full statement in the nature of a confession from the man who altered a telegram sent to this city by Mr. R. L. Borden, so that the telegram was read to the public and published on a basis of untruth, I have been requested by this man to make public the fact that this telegram was handed to him by the telegraph editor of the 'Colonist' to be delivered at a public meeting;

That instead of going directly to the meeting he went into an office, copied out the telegram as altered by him, and destroyed the original, and had this altered telegram sent to the meeting, passed on to the platform where it came into the hands of those in charge of the meeting, and was read to the public and published.

The man guilty of the act had no confederate or confidant. No one knew of his act, or had any reason for suspecting him, and the only reason for making this public is to remove all suspicion from the management of the 'Colonist' newspaper and from members of the executive of the Conservative party, at whose meeting the telegram was read. It was an individual act arising from misguided political zeal, and not due to any incitement or persuasion.

W. W. COLUMBIA.

February 5, 1909.

CONVENTION BETWEEN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES RE FISHERIES.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Lunenburg). I desire to ask the government when the proposed convention between the United States

and Canada respecting a reference to the Hague tribunal, will be laid on the table. I understand it has been approved by the United States Senate.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I have no information to give my hon. friend. It will have to pass through the usual process, and go through the foreign office before we receive it.

CIVIL SERVICE SALARIES.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to call the attention of the ministers to the fact that the Public Works orders in council and the Interior Department orders as to increase of pay to civil servants, have not yet been brought down, and that a similar request which was put in the form of an order for a return of all the other departments has not been honoured. I hope the Secretary of State will get after his colleagues, and have that information brought down.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State). Has my hon. friend inspected the last return that was handed in ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, all that have been handed down. The Postmaster General still remains delinquent.

Mr. MURPHY. The Postmaster General has supplied a supplementary.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). I laid a statement on the table the other day.

Mr. FOSTER. I expected to get these through the records office. They have not come there.

POSTAL FACILITIES AT GOW GANDA.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I desire to ask the Postmaster General what is being done with reference to postal facilities in northern Ontario, in what is called the Gow Ganda region. I think the subject has been mentioned before, and I only mention it now because I have been requested to do so by a gentleman who is interested in that region, and who says that post office facilities are very much needed. I have no doubt it has already engaged the attention of the Postmaster General.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). Yes, it has been engaging the attention of the department for several weeks. The absence of roads to Gow Ganda has delayed the formal appointment of a postmaster and the establishment of a post office. But I hope to be able in a very few days to inform my hon. friend that the postal facilities have reached Gow Ganda.

QUESTIONS.

CARILLON AND GRENVILLE CANALS.

Mr. PERLEY asked:

1. What was the average number of men employed in every capacity in the working, maintenance and repairs of the Carillon and Grenville canals during each of the following months: July and August, 1906 and 1908, September and October, 1907 and 1908?

2. What was the total outlay for wages and salaries, and also the total expenditure of every kind in connection with the said canal during each of those months?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). If my hon. friend (Mr. Perley) will make this a motion for a return I will have it brought down without delay.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a motion for a return.

INTEREST AND SAVINGS BANK DEPOSITS.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM asked:

Is it the intention of the government to increase the interest on the money deposited by the Canadian people in the Government Savings Bank until said interest will be equal to that paid by the government to others?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I had intended dealing with this question in the Budget Speech, but as the honourable gentleman has put the question, I shall state at once the view of the government. The question implied, I think, a misapprehension as to the actual state of affairs. The government does not borrow any money from others on the conditions which apply in the case of savings bank deposits. Therefore there can be no fair comparison between the two classes of transactions. The 3 per cent paid to depositors does not represent the full cost of the money to the government. Something must be added for cost of management, and account must be taken of interest on the gold reserve which the government holds against savings bank deposits. The rate paid by the government to others varies from time to time, being sometimes above the savings bank rate and sometimes below it. It is not the intention of the government to increase the rate of interest on savings bank deposits, which are practically money on call. But the government is arranging that any depositors who wish to do so may convert their deposits into Dominion stock bearing interest at a higher rate. I may refer to the matter in the Budget Speech.

PURCHASE OF WOOD ALCOHOL.

Mr. MILLER asked:

1. What number of gallons of wood alcohol did the government purchase during the last

fiscal year, from whom, and at what prices?

2. What percentage of wood alcohol does the Department of Inland Revenue use with grain alcohol in the manufacture of denatured alcohol and sold by the department for commercial and other purposes?

3. What is the actual cost per gallon to the department for the manufacture of denatured alcohol, in addition to the cost of the material?

4. What prices did the Department of Inland Revenue pay for grain alcohol during the last fiscal year?

Hon. W. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. 20,891·89 proof gallons—12,405·37 standard gallons at $1.29 per standard gallon. Bought from A. D. Gall, Montreal.

2. In the manufacture of a special grade, supplied to hospitals, 10 per cent. In the manufacture of grade No. 1, supplied to varnish manufacturers and other persons engaged in the mechanical arts, 25 per cent. In the manufacture of grade No. 1, when containing benzine, 10 per cent and 1 per cent of benzine. In the manufacture of grade No. 2, 10 per cent; but in this case it contains a large percentage of aldahydes and other impurities.

3. 14½ cents per proof gallon.

4. 25 cents per proof gallon, or about 41 cents per standard gallon.

DREDGING AT INDIAN POINT, MAQUAPIT LAKE, NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. CROCKET asked:

1. What was the total cost of the dredging done at Indian Point, Maquapit Lake, New Brunswick, last summer and fall?

2. Who was the contractor and what was the contract price per cubic yard?

3. Did the Department of Public Works have an estimate before letting the contract of the cost of the work? If so, what was the estimated quantity of material to be removed and what was the estimated cost per cubic yard?

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

1. Paid contractors..	$48,247 68
Paid inspector..	528 96
Total expenditure..	$48,776 64

2. (a) The Maritime Dredging Company.

Scow measurement—
Rock or boulders exceeding 2 cubic yards, $17.00.
Other materials, 50 cents.

Material cast over—
Rock or boulders exceeding 2 cubic yards, $19.00.
Other materials, 50 cents.

3. (a) Yes; (b) 65,385 cubic yards in situ; (c) No estimated cost per yard, as work was to be let by public tender.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked:

1. How many miles of the western division of the National Transcontinental Railway are completed and in operation?

2. What amount has been paid to or received by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company out of the proceeds of bonds guaranteed by the government in respect of such mileage so completed and now in operation?

3. What amount has been paid to or received by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company out of the proceeds of bonds guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company in respect of such mileage so completed and now in operation?

4. What was the average cost per mile of the mileage so completed and in operation?

5. What was the net price received for the bonds mentioned in the second and third paragraphs respectively of this question?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). In reply to this question, my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) will remember that a few days ago I gave an answer to No. 1 which has disappeared from the Order Paper. I wish to correct that answer and enlarge it as follows:

1. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company are operating under construction that part of the line from Winnipeg to Wainwright, a distance 667 miles, but no part of the western division has been finally passed by the government engineer as completed.

2. The government has paid out of the proceeds of the 3 per cent government guaranteed bonds on account of the prairie section the sum of $10,335,482.92.

3. The proceeds of the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company on account of the prairie section known as 'series A' and which were authorized to be issued to the amount of £2,100,000 par value, are exhausted.

4 Answered by No. 1.

5. (a) Government guaranteed 3 per cent bonds, 92½ per cent; (b) Grand Trunk Pacific 'series A' 4 per cent bonds: £646,000 at 95 per cent; £454,000 at 90¾ per cent.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY BONDS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked:

1. What amount of bonds has the government guaranteed in respect of the construction of the western division of the National Transcontinental Railway?

2. What amount of such bonds has been actually sold or issued?

3. At what net price were such bonds sold or issued?

4. What are the net proceeds of such sale or issue?

5. How and for what purpose and to what amount have such proceeds been used or disposed of?

6. What amount of bonds has the Grand Trunk Railway Company guaranteed in respect of the construction of the western division of the National Transcontinental Railway?

7. What amount of such bonds has been actually sold or issued?

8. At what net price were such bonds sold or issued?

9. What are the net proceeds of such sale or issue?

10. How and for what purpose and to what amount have such proceeds been used or disposed of?

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

1. £3,200,000.

2. All.

3. 92½ per cent.

4. $14,385,600.

5. The sum of $10,335,482.92 has been paid on account of work done on the prairie section; $2,150,852.30 on account of the mountain section; and the balance, $1,899,264.78, is deposited in bank to the credit of the Receiver General.

6. In respect of the prairie section 'series A' bonds to the amount of £2,100,000, and in respect of the mountain section 'series B' bonds to the amount of £1,354,000.

Certain debenture equipment stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company has also been guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

7. Prairie section, series A bonds, all.

Mountain section, series B bonds, £1,354,000.

8. Series A, £1,646,000 at 95 per cent, and £454,000 at 90¾ per cent.

Series B, £1,354,000 at 90¾ per cent.

9. Series A, £1,975,705.

Series B, £1,228,755.

10. The whole of the proceeds of the 'series A' bonds, viz.: £1,975,705 have been expended in connection with the construction of the prairie section.

The sum of £128,662 out of the proceeds of the 'series B' bonds has been expended in connection with the construction of the mountain section.

DETECTIVE H. A. JUDGE.

Mr. BEATTIE asked:

1. Is one H. A. Judge, a detective, still in the employ of the government?

2. When was he employed by the government, where did he come from, what was his salary and the nature of his duties?

3. Was the said Judge convicted of an offence under the Indian Act in supplying liquors to Indians on the Muncey reserve?

4. If so, who were the convicting magistrates and what was the punishment imposed?

5. Is there a right of appeal from any such conviction? If so, did the accused avail himself of it?

6. Was the said Judge afterwards committed to prison? If so, how long after conviction? If any, what was the delay?

7. Was the said Judge released from prison? If so, when and upon what grounds?

8. Is it the intention of the department to pay the cost of the prosecution and the share of the fine imposed, payable to the prosecutor?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. No.

2. Judge was never employed by the government. In August last the Department of Indian Affairs had reason to believe that the Indians of the Caradoc and Oneida reserves were being freely supplied with intoxicating liquors and authorized a detective agency in Toronto known as The International Detective Bureau to make investigation and endeavour to ascertain the guilty parties. The department is informed that one A. J. Judge was sent by the International Detective Bureau to do this work, but has no knowledge where Judge came from or what was his salary.

3. On complaint of one of the Indians, Judge was convicted on two charges of bringing and supplying intoxicating liquor into the Oneida Indian reserve.

4. W. H. Chittick and John Hodgins. $50 fine and costs on one charge; $100 fine and costs on a second charge and in default six months' imprisonment with hard labour in each case.

5. (a) Yes. (b) No.

6 and 7. The department is not informed, but payment of the fines and costs were remitted.

8. No.

SOULANGES CANAL—WHARFS AT ST. ZOTIQUE AND THE CEDARS.

Mr. LORTIE asked:

Referring to the wharfs at St. Zotique, in the river Beaudette, in the villages des Cedres and La Pointe aux Cascades, in the county of Soulanges,—

1. What amounts have been spent in repairing the said wharfs?

2. What is the name of the person who superintended these works in each locality, respectively, above named?

3. Who was charged with selecting the men employed on these works in each place?

4. What salary was granted to the superintendent or foreman, and what was the pay of the men?

5. During what months were these works carried on?

6. Is the government aware that these works lasted during the whole period of the last federal election, and that they were stopped exactly on the next day after the voting?

7. Is there in possession of the department a report of the operations above named, and a detailed statement of the cost of these works and the price of the materials used?

8. What is the name of the engineer who had charge of making the plans, estimates and specifications of these works?

9. If there was one, has he made a report of his operations?

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

1.—

St. Zotique, $3,053.31.

Cedars, wharf on Soulanges canal, $970.84.

Cedars, wharf on River St. Lawrance, $578.25.

River Beaudette, Pointe aux Cascades—No work done at either of these places.

2.—

St. Zotique—Foreman, Alfred Bissonette.

Cedars (Canal wharf)—Foreman, Trefflé Poirier.

Cedars (River wharf)—Foreman, Trefflé Poirier.

3. Resident Engineer, J. L. Michaud.

4. Wages of foremen in each case, $2.50 per day. Wages of mechanics in each case, $2.00 per day. Wages of labourers in each case, $1.50 per day.

5 and 6. St. Zotique, commenced October 1, suspended December 29, 1908. Cedars (Canal wharf), commenced September 18, ended November 28, 1908. Cedars (River wharf), commenced June 26, ended July 31, 1908.

7. Yes.

8. Resident Engineer, J. L. Michaud.

9. Yes.

COINAGE AT CANADIAN MINT.

Mr. MACDONELL—by Mr. Worthington—asked:

1. What was the last year in which Canada imported silver coinage for circulation in Canada from the Royal Mint?

2. What was the amount of such coinage?

3. From what date has the Canadian Mint been coining silver?

4. What was the total amount of silver coined at the Canadian Mint during the year 1908, and what is its capacity?

5. What is the estimated circulation of American silver in Canada at the present time?

6. When was the order in council passed for deportation of American silver, how long was it in force, and what was the reason for discontinuance?

7. What is the estimated profit to the government, having regard to the present value of silver, on the coinage of each dollar of silver circulation, making the estimate as reasonably near as possible, and having in view the issue of 5-cent, 10-cent, 25-cent, and 50-cent pieces?

8. What is the estimated profit of the American government on the present silver circulation of American coinage in Canada, making this estimate on the estimated circulation in Canada, and having regard to the present value of silver, and what would be the profit to Canada if this silver was coined at the Canadian Mint?

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

1. 1907-8.

2. $600,000.

3. The first silver coin was struck January 2, 1908. The general striking of silver coins commenced on February 19, 1908.

4. $313,338.35. The machinery in the Mint is capable of producing 20,000,000 coins per year.

5. There is no data available upon which an estimate can be based.

6. July 6, 1905; in force until June 30, 1906. The appropriation provided to meet the expenses of deportation was exhausted, and, as it was thought the quantity then remaining in circulation was not large, no further appropriation for the purpose was taken. An item appears in the estimates now before parliament to provide for further operations of this kind.

7. Approximately 49 cents.

8. In view of the answer to No. 5 this question cannot be answered.

WINNIPEGOSIS FISH HATCHERY.

Mr. CAMPBELL—by Mr. Bradbury—asked:

1. Up to date and for all purposes, including cost of construction, supplies of all kinds, wages of all officials and men employed, fish spawn, &c., what has been the total expenditure on the Winnipegosis Fish Hatchery?

2. Were supplies for the hatchery bought by tender? If so, from whom, and who were the tenderers? If not, why not?

3. What has been accomplished for this expenditure of money?

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

1. $18,754.56.

2. Supplies were bought by tender from the General Supply Company of Canada.

The tenderers were: The General Supply Company of Canada, McKenzie, Milne Co., Sarnia. Where small quantities required, supplies were bought through the purchasing branch for the lowest prices obtainable.

3. An up to date hatchery, with all fittings, caretaker's cottage and a dock, have been constructed.

FISHERIES LICENSES, MANITOBA LAKES

Mr. CAMPBELL—by Mr. Bradbury—asked:

1. Is it the intention of the government to renew the fishing privileges granted under lease on lakes Cedar, Moose, Clearwater, Cumberland and Namew?

2. Is it the intention to allow fishermen to fish in open water in Lake Winnipegosis this coming summer?

3. Is it the intention of the government to grant any special fishing privileges on Lake Winnipegosis to any firm or firms this coming summer?

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

1. Not as at present advised.

2. It is not the intention to make any change in the fishery regulations for Lake Winnipegosis this season.

3. Not as at present advised.

WHITEFISH SPAWN, LAKE WINNIPEGOSIS.

Mr. CAMPBELL—by Mr. Bradbury—asked:

1. Was a contract awarded to any person or firm for the taking of whitefish spawn for the Lake Winnipegosis Hatchery?
2. If so, how was it awarded, and to whom?
3. What was the monetary consideration and how much was paid?
4. What quantity of spawn was contracted for, and what quantity was delivered?
5. Why has the spawn so collected been thrown out?
6. Has the hatchery been closed? If so, why?

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

1. Yes.
2. By exchange of correspondence agreeing to conditions. Capt. E. D. Coffey.
3. $15 per million eggs. Nothing yet paid.
4. Quantity not specified, but the object was to fill the hatchery. 16,000,000 eggs delivered.
5. It was found to be unfit for successful hatching.
6. Yes. Season too late to secure a further supply of egs.

LAKE WINNIPEG, INDIAN DEPARTMENT STEAMERS.

Mr. BRADBURY asked:

What steamboats had the Indian Department employed on Lake Winnipeg during the summer and fall of 1908, names of boats, from whom hired, what amount was paid for each boat, and what services were they supposed to render?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The steamer 'Fisherman' was chartered from the Dominion Fish Company, Limited, for a period of five months and three days at a cost of $4,964.02. The company supplied the boat, crew, fuel, sleeping accommodation and board of four government officers for that time. The steamer was used for annuity payments in the Norway House agency and in connection with the removal of the St. Peter's Indians to the new reserve at Fisher river transporting supplies, &c.

LIGHTS, LAKE WINNIPEG.

Mr. BRADBURY asked:

Does the government realize the great necessity in the interest of life and property, that a light should be placed on the docks at Gimli, Hiransa and Gull harbour, Lake Winnipeg, and is it the intention of the government to furnish lights for these docks?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). This matter is receiving consideration.

Mr. BRODEUR.

CENSUS AND STATISTICS BULLETIN. FRENCH TRANSLATION.

Mr. BOYER asked: (Translation).

Are the Census and Statistics Bulletins of each month, and all correspondence relating thereto, published every month, translated into French monthly? If so, by what department is the work done?

Hon. CHAS. MURPHY (Secretary of State. (Translation). Yes, by the Department of Agriculture.

ARRIVAL OF IMMIGRANTS IN PRESENT FISCAL YEAR.

Mr. MACDONELL—by Mr. Boyce—asked:

How many immigrants have arrived in Canada since the completion of the last fiscal year on March, 31, 1908, up to the first of February, 1909?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). 125,661.

Mr. MACDONELL—by Mr. Boyce—asked:

1. What are the names and addresses of the several immigration agents in Canada whose duty it is to locate or settle immigrants upon their arrival in Canada?
2. What salary or remuneration has been paid to each such agent for the fiscal year 1908 and up to the first of February, 1909?
3. Are they paid on a salary basis, or do they receive so much per immigrant located?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I would ask this to stand as a notice of motion for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion.

SOULANGES CANAL.

Mr. LORTIE—by Mr. R. L. Borden—asked:

1. What amount has been expended on the Soulanges canal for repairs during the months of June, July, August and September, 1908?
2. On whose recommendation were the men engaged on the aforesaid works on the line of the canal in the county of Soulanges?
3. For how many months was Mr. Alfred Sauvé, the superintendent of the Soulanges canal, suspended from his duties, and was his salary cut off during that time?
4. Has he been paid since he was reinstated in his position, and who asked for his reinstallation?
5. What is the number of persons appointed to purchase the goods and material required on the canal?

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

1. Expenditure on repairs Soulanges canal:—

June, 1908	$ 1,280 22
July, 1908	5,217 24
August, 1908	5,749 77
September	8,946 12
	$21,193 35

2. They are put on when required, by the overseer, who is responsible under the superintending engineer, for their efficiency.

3. For four months from March 3, to July 7, 1908, with salary for 5½ months (from July 7 to December 22, 1906) without salary.

4. He has been reinstated at his former salary.

5. Goods and materials are generally purchased by tender. Upon requisition approved of by the superintending engineer, in emergency cases, the overseer has been permitted to select same.

PAYMENTS TO IMMIGRATION AGENTS.

Mr. URIAH WILSON asked:

1. What are the names and addresses of the salaried immigration agents in Great Britain and Ireland, the continent of Europe, and the United States of America?

2. What salaries, bonuses or other sums are paid to the said agents, respectively, for immigrants secured by them for this country?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior).

Name and Address.	Salary.
1. Great Britain and Ireland.	
J. Obed Smith, London, England	$3,000
A. F. Jury, Liverpool, England	2,000
G. H. Michell, Birmingham, England	1,400
L. Burnett, York, England	1,500
H. M. Murray, Exeter, England	1,500
F. O. Chapman, travelling agent, England	1,500
M. McIntyre, Glasgow, Scotland	2,000
J. McLennan, Aberdeen, Scotland	1,500
J. Edgar, travelling agent, Scotland	1,800
H. Kerracher, travelling agent, Scotland	1,200
J. Webster, Dublin, Ireland	2,000
E. O'Kelly, Belfast, Ireland	2,000
G. Robinson, travelling agent, Ireland.	1,200
Continent.	
P. Wiallard, Paris, France	3,000
A. Geoffrion, Paris, France	2,000
P. Foursin, Paris, France	1,000
D. T. de Coeli, Antwerp, Belgium	1,500
J. J. Beldfell, Iceland	1,200
United States.	
M. V. McInnes, Detroit, Michigan	1,980
C. A. Laurier, Marquette, Michigan	1,620
E. T. Holmes, St. Paul, Minnesota	1,980
Chas. Pilling, Grand Forks, N.D.	1,680
T. O. Currie, Milwaukee, Wisconsin	1,680
J. MacLachlan, Watertown, S.D.	1,620
Jas. Grieve, Spokane, Washington	1,980
J. S. Crawford, Kansas City, Missouri	1,620
W. H. Rogers, Indianapolis, Indiana	1,620
G. A. Hall, Pittsburg, Pennsylvania	1,500
W. V. Bennett, Omaha, Nebraska	1,620
H. M. Williams, Toledo, Ohio	1,620
C. J. Broughton, Chicago, Illinois	1,680
B. Davies, Great Falls, Montana	1,620
A. Ayotte, Great Falls, Montana	900
T. Hetherington, Boston, Mass.	1,200
T. Duncan, Syracuse, New York	1,800
E. Gingras, Providence, Rhode Island.	1,000
J. B. Carbonneau, Biddeford, Maine	900
Dr. G. W. Elliott, New York, N.Y.	2,400
R. Laurier, Boston, Mass.	1,000
D. Gauthier, St. Anne des Plaines, Que.	2,400

2. These agents are not paid anything more than their salaries for immigrants secured by them for this country.

UNDESIRABLES DEPORTED TO CANADA.

Mr. HERRON asked:

1. Is the government aware that certain European countries expend large sums of money annually for the deportation of their undesirable and criminal classes to foreign countries?

2. Is the government aware that a certain percentage of such undesirables are continually coming into Canada, bonuses for whom are paid by the government?

3. If the government is not aware of the above, do they intend to take steps to acquaint themselves of the fact and apply a remedy?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. No.

2. No.

3. Inquiry will be made, and if the fact is found to be as stated a remedy will be applied.

IMMIGRATION INSPECTORS.

Mr. HERRON asked:

1. What are the names and addresses of the several inspectors of immigrants employed by the government?

2. What salary or remuneration has been paid to each such inspector during the fiscal year 1908 and up to February 1, 1909?

3. What is the manner of payment, are they paid so much per immigrant, or are they paid on a salary basis?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I would ask to have this stand as a notice of motion for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as notice of motion for a return.

IMMIGRATION BONUSES TO SOCIETIES.

Mr. LANCASTER asked:

1. What society or societies have been paid bonuses by the government for securing of immigrants for Canada during the fiscal year 1908, and up to February 1, 1909?

2. What amounts have been paid the society or societies respectively, during the above period?

3. In what country or countries are the said societies situated?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

Names of Societies.	Where Located.	Amounts paid during Fiscal Year 1907-8.	Amounts paid from April 1, 1908, to Jan. 31, 1909.
		$ cts.	$ cts.
Bristol Emigration Society	England	12 00	
Miss McPherson's Homes	"	170 00	168 00
Dr. Barnardo's Homes	"	898 00	1,282 00
The Sheltering Home	"	6 00	182 00
Middlemore Home	"	222 00	212 00
Self Help Emigration	"	527 60	204 97
Mr. Fagan's Homes	"	170 00	
St. Patrick's Orphanage	"	40 00	
Marchmont Home	"	82 00	
Liverpool Boys' Home	"	10 00	
Catholic Emigration Association	"	252 00	
Miss Rye's Home	"	176 00	
Childrens' Home and Orphanage	"	22 00	
Church Army	"	469 90	19 47
Church Emigration Society	"	221 43	347 97
East End Emigration Society	"	1,576 81	410 43
British Emigration Tourist and Colonization Association	"	1,946 66	
British Women's Emigration Society	"	1,533 00	695 93
Central Unemployed Board	"	75 43	24 33
" " Body	"	1,647 37	231 17
Fairknowe Home	Scotland	350 00	316 00
Ottawa Valley Immigration Aid Society	Ottawa	Can. 1,500 00	2,500 00
Union Nationale Française	Montreal	Can. 1,000 00	1,000 00
Repatriation Society of Quebec	"	4,000 00	4,000 00
Quebec and Lake St. John Railway	Quebec	Can. 8,000 00	
Canada West Publicity Office	Chicago	U.S. 6,250 00	3,750 00
Salvation Army	England	28,222 59	11,920 93

IMMIGRATION BONUSES TO AGENTS.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM asked:

What commissions were paid to immigration agents in Great Britain and Ireland, the continent of Europe, and the United States of America for the fiscal year 1908, and up to February 1, 1909?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

Fiscal year 1907-1908.

$140,657.97 made up as follows:—

$ 5,976.50 commissions on settlers from United States.

2,412.00 bonuses on children sent out by philanthropic societies.

50,375.99 British bonuses.

41,893.48 continental bonuses.

1st April, 1908, to 31st January, 1909.

$45,453.57 made up as follows:—

$ 3,384.50 commission on settlers from United States.

3,020.00 bonuses on children sent out by philanthropic societies.

34,016.96 British bonuses.

5,032.11 continental bonuses.

Note.—The British and continental bonuses are paid through the London, England, office, and as the last statement from that office was only up to the 31st December last, this statement only shows the payments for these bonuses up to that date.

TEMPORARY LOANS.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

What temporary loans were held, at what rates, and for what periods, make up the details of the $20,606,333, returned in the 'Canada Gazette' as current January 31, 1909?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The temporary loans referred to were as follows:

—	Discounted.	Due.	Days.	Rate.	Amount Currency.
				.c.	$ cts.
Bank of Montreal, London	Jan. 25, '08.	Jan. 25, '09.	367	4¼	4,866,666 66 (£1,000,000 stg.)
Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien	Feb. 7, '08.	Feb. 7, '09.	366	4	1,000,000 00
Banque de Paris et des Pays-Bas per Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien	" 7, '08.	" 7, '09.	366	4	1,000,000 00
Banque de Paris et des Pays-Bas	June 15, '08.	June 15, '09.	365	3¼	3,873,000 00 (20,000,000 frcs.)
Bank of Montreal, London	" 5, '08.	" 5, '09.	365	3½	4,866,666 66 (£1,000,000 stg.)
Bank of Montreal, Ottawa	Jan. 2, '09.	Mar. 2, '09.	59	4	5,000,000 00
Total					20,606,333 32

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER asked:

1. What sum was voted for the outside service of the Department of Agriculture in Ottawa for salaries to clerks for the fiscal year 1908-1909?

2. What was the total number of clerks employed therein on April 1, 1908, and what amount was necessary to pay their salaries for the year 1908-9?

3. What was the total amount involved in the increases granted since April 1, 1908, to these employees and also, for new appointments made thereto prior to September 1, 1908?

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State):

1. No sum was especially voted for the outside service of the Department of Agriculture in Ottawa for salaries to clerks for the fiscal year 1908-9. Such salaries were paid out of the general appropriations made to the several branches in which such clerks respectively served.

2. 193, including 21 paid out of Civil Government contingencies, $206,450.

3. $8,364.50. The total amount of the annual salaries attached to appointments made between April 1, 1908, and the 1st September, 1908, is $9,600. During this interval one of such salaries was increased $200.

RAILWAY CATTLE GUARDS.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE asked :

1. Is the government aware that the railway companies have failed to erect suitable and sufficient cattle guards as required by subsection 3, of section 254 of Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 37?

2. Is the government aware that the uniform pattern of cattle guards now in use on all railways, viz: slanting slats in a frame placed on the ground, is absolutely useless for preventing cattle and other animals from getting on the railway?

3. In view of the great destruction of cattle and other animals in Canada by railways resulting from the want of suitable and sufficient cattle guards, is it the intention of the government to take proceedings before the Board of Railway Commissioners to compel the railway companies to comply with the law in respect to this matter?

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

1. The board has no information on this point, other than special complaints have been made from time to time in regard to the failure of railway companies to supply suitable guards, and when such complaints have been made, has had the matter investigated and compelled the company to comply with the requirements of section 254 of the Railway Act.

2. The board has no special information to give in reply to the inquiry. All that subsection 3, of section 254, requires is that the cattle guards shall be suitable and sufficient to prevent cattle and other animals getting on the railway. No particular form of cattle guard has been adopted as far as the board are aware, the matter being left to the company to select whatever cattle guard it thinks best suited for the purpose, subject to the requirements of subsection 3, of section 254 of the Act.

3. The board has no answer to make to this question other than to refer to the requirements of subsection 3, section 254, of the Railway Act.

CAUGHNAWAGA-IROQUOIS INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. BOYCE asked:

What returns of fine for wood stealing, and infraction of the liquor law, have been made by Indian agent John Blain, in connection with the Caughnawaga-Iroquois Indian reserve, during the years 1906, 1907 and 1908?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Indian Agent John Blain made return of the following fines for the year 1908: $5.00 liquor fine imposed on Michael Jacob; $20.00 for stealing wood, imposed on James Taylor; no returns were made by Agent Blain for 1906 or 1907.

Mr. BOYCE asked:

1. What portion or portions of the Caughnawaga Indian reservation has been disposed of for church purposes, and when were the grants made respectively, and for what consideration?

2. Has title been granted by the government for the portions of land so occupied or conveyed for church purposes? If so, when and to whom?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER Minister of the Interior):

1. No Crown grants have been issued for any portion or portions of the Caughnawaga Indian reserve for church purposes.

2. Answered by No. 1.

Mr. BOYCE asked:

1. Is St. Nicholas Island included within the territory and limits of Caughnawaga-Iroquois Indian reserve?

2. If so, is this island still held by the government of Canada in trust for the Indians of that band?

3. If not, when, how and to whom, for what consideration and upon what terms was it disposed of, and for what reason was disposition made, and by whom?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. St. Nicholas Island is claimed by the Department of Indian Affairs as forming a portion of the Caughnawaga Indian reserve.

2. The island is still held by the government in trust for the Indians.

3. Answered by No. 2.

THE 97TH ALGOMA RIFLES.

Mr. BOYCE asked:

1. Have the regimental headquarters of the 97th Algoma rifles been removed from Sault Ste. Marie to Sudbury? If so, upon whose representation, for what reason, and at what date was the removal affected?

2. Is the government not aware that all the exigencies of convenience and national defence require the maintenance of the regimental headquarters of this force at Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario?

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

1. Yes, on the recommendation of the officer commanding the regiment and of the officer commanding the western Ontario command, and it was authorized in general orders on April 1, 1908.

2. In the selection of the location for the headquarters of the 97th regiment, it was considered that, as compared with Sault Ste. Marie, the balance of advantages was, from the points of view both of defence and convenience, in favour of Sudbury, where, it may be added, the commanding officer resides.

THE ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. NORTHRUP asked:

1. How many men are now employed in the Ross rifle factory at Quebec?

2. On what principle are the rifles now inspected, and what is the seal standard rifle, written instructions, value as weapon, &c.?

3. How many have been rejected in inspection in the past year?

4. Where are the bayonet scabbards inspected, and by whom?

5. How many, if any, have been rejected?

6. Has the government taken any steps to prevent an action or to reduce the damages in an action should one be brought by the Ross Rifle Company for the improper rejection of rifles?

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

1. The Ross Rifle Company state that the number of their employees is about 325 at present.

2. (a) Rifles are inspected with the aid of specifications, drawings and gauges as heretofore.

(b) The original sealed standard rifle was Mark 1; but rifles have been manufactured in conformity with a model tentatively agreed upon and known as Mark 11.

(c) The specifications.

(d) A board of expert officers has reported that the Ross rifle has features which are a positive advantage over the Lee-Enfield.

3. This information has already been furnished to parliament this session in reply to a previous inquiry by the honourable gentleman, (vide revised 'Hansard' of February 1, 1909, page 329).

4. The scabbards are inspected, so far as the leather and work thereon are concerned, by Lieutenant-Colonel Brown, inspector of harness and Saddlery at Ottawa, and in the finished state, by the inspector of small arms, Quebec.

5. No scabbards have been rejected as a whole. When a scabbard does not pass inspection when first presented, it is returned for correction and then again presented for inspection.

6. A complete record of the inspection of all rifles, is carefully kept by the inspector of small arms.

EMPLOYMENT OF H. E. VAUTELET.

Mr. NORTHRUP asked:

1. What sums have been paid to H. E. Vautelet, architect, for professional services in each of the past five years, and for what services were such payments made, and the amounts of each?

2. What payments have been made him for plans or for travelling expenses to enable him to prepare plans for works not yet commenced, or for works in which the part for which his plans were prepared has not yet been commenced?

3. When were such payments made, what amount has been paid in each of the past five years for plans, to whom were such payments made, and what amount was paid to each?

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

So far as the Department of Railways and Canals is concerned, the answer is as follows:

1. In so far as the Department of Railways and Canals, is concerned Mr. H. E. Vautelet, civil engineer, was appointed to the position of chairman and chief engineer of a board of engineers acting under the department for the purpose of re-designing and preparing the working drawings for the re-constructions of the Quebec bridge. Salary, $1,000 per month and expenses. During the year 1908-9 was paid the sum of, up to January 31: for salary, $5,483.87; for expenses, $694.31; total, $6,178.24.

2. Answered by number one.

3. Answered by number one, so far as plans are concerned; but as inspector of bridge manufacture and material for the new shops at Moncton he was paid by the Intercolonial Railway as follows: For the year ended June 30, 1905:

For inspecting material for bridges	$ 255 25
Inspecting material for new shops at Moncton	6 05
Year 1906, inspecting bridge material	1,151 13
Year 1907, inspecting bridge material	427 73
Inspecting material new shops Moncton	80 17
Year 1908, inspecting bridge material	192 74

Inspecting material for new shops Moncton	235 69
Year 1909, inspecting bridge material	751 44
Total	$3,100 20

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

For the Department of Public Works:

1. 1904-05—

Bryson bridge, plans	$ 500 00
Coteau Landing wharf, plans of steel beams	90 00
	$ 590 00
1905-06—	
Bryson bridge, inspections, &c.	250 00
Victoria memorial museum, checking strains	1,795 65
	$ 2,045 65
1906-07—	
St. Andrews rapids lock and dam, on account plans	14,000 00
Quebec harbour, account plans	3,000 00
	$17,000 00
1907-08—	
Quebec harbour, balance plans, &c.	9,250 00
Victoria memorial museum, inspection at steel works, checking plans, &c.	1,079 73
	$10,329 73
1908-09—	
Montreal harbour, preparation of plans, specifications, &c., fire proof sheds	12,000 00
St. Andrews rapids, on account plans	4,000 00
	$16,000 00

2. Payments in connection with preparation of plans for steel immigrant sheds on Louise embankment, Quebec, construction of which has not yet been commenced: Commission 3½ per cent on $350,000, estimated cost $12,250.

(No travelling expenses).

Payment (as per special vote, session 1908) for preparation of plans for steel freight sheds at Montreal, $12,000.

Note.—Although these sheds have not been proceeded with by this department, it is understood that they, or some equivalent structures have been built by the Montreal Harbour Commissioners.

3. Paid November 29, 1906 .. $ 3,000 00
Paid April 1, 1908 .. 9,250 00
Paid August 15, 1908 .. 12,000 00

No payments for plans in connection with any of the above mentioned works other than those shown above.

CHILLIWACK POST OFFICE.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR asked:

1. Is the public building proposed to be erected on Young and Victoria streets Chilliwack, intended for post office purposes?
2. Have plans been prepared for whatever building it is proposed to create?
3. Is it the intention to call for tenders for the erection of such building? If so, what is the expectation as to the time when tenders may be called for?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. Yes.
2. Nothing done further than preparation of sketch plans and their submission for approval to the Post Office Department.
3. No vote has been included in main estimates for 1909-10.

MANITOBA POST OFFICES.

Mr. ROCHE asked:

1. How many post offices have been transferred in the province of Manitoba since November, 1, 1908?
2. Who were the former postmasters and who are the present postmasters, and the names of offices?
3. What are the reasons assigned for the transfers?

Mr. SPEAKER, Stands as a notice of motion.

IMMIGRATION AGENTS IN FRANCE.

Mr. ECREMENT asked:

1. How many persons are employed by the Federal government in France for immigration purposes?
2. When were they appointed, and for what period?
3. Have they made a report of their work? If so, what is the last?
4. Has the government received the resignation of Mr. J. E. Cyr, one of those agents? If so, is it the intention to appoint a successor to him?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Seven, besides the steamship booking agents, who are paid by commission.
2. 1st September, 1903; 22nd March, 1905; 4th October, 1907; 1st April, 1908; 1st October, 1908; 1st December, 1908. Five permanently; one for occasional trips, beginning in 1904; one for a definite period of three months.
3. Yes. They make individual reports, some weekly, others less frequently.
4. Yes. The question of appointing a successor will receive consideration, Mr. Cyr's resignation being very recent.

STREET CARS—SUNDAY TRAFFIC.

Mr. BEATTIE asked:

Is the question of the operation on Sunday of the cars of an Electric Street Railway Com-

pany incorporated by a statute of the province of Ontario in any way affected by Dominion legislation? If so, by what legislation, and in what way?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). The question is one of law upon which opinions may differ, but section 9 of the Railway Act (R.S.C., chapter 37), and section 3 of the Lord's Day Act (R.S.C., chapter 153), may be referred to as Dominion legislation relating to the subject.

MR. WM. GRIFFITH.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR—by Mr. Boyce—asked:

1. Has William Griffith, of the town of Brockville, been appointed immigration agent? If so, to what country, and what salary is he to receive?
2. Is he to be allowed moving expenses for himself and family from Brockville to the country to which he is going?
3. When is he to commence operations, and when does his salary begin?
4. Was Mr. Griffith formerly caretaker of Hon. Clifford Sifton's residence on the St. Lawrence river?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Yes. Appointed temporary agent in Wales at a salary of $100 per month, for three months.
2. Is allowed travelling expenses for himself only.
3. Is now en route to Wales. Salary dates from 17th February, 1909.
4. The government has no knowledge as to this.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY AND PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY EARNINGS AND EXPENDITURES.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Perley—asked:

1. What were the earnings and expenditures of the Intercolonial railway and of the Prince Edward Island railway for each month during the calendar year, 1908, and for the month of October, 1907?

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

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Statement of Revenue, 1908.

January	$16,265 23
February	20,503 31
March	22,706 36
April	20,220 38
May	26,045 12
June	26,365 84
July	33,328 19
August	33,350 59
September	30,777 40
October	30,566 50
November	29,655 98
December	24,519 75
	$313,304 65

EXPENDITURES—WORKING EXPENSES.

January	$31,559 48
February	27,993 64
March	34,184 06
April	30,193 09
May	30,376 93
June	33,097 68
July	33,676 99
August	34,806 53
September	37,251 96
October	39,555 24
November	34,120 25
December	35,509 99
	$402,325 84

Earnings October, 1907	$27,659 60
Expeniture October, 1907	36,511 38

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Statement of Revenue, 1908.

January	$656,883 30
February	606,024 92
March	742,038 95
April	740,576 43
May	689,736 62
June	703,251 85
July	803,143 53
August	789,765 10
September	793,541 67
October	759,521 09
November	696,897 56
December	654,712 25
	$8,636,093 27

STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURE, 1908.

(Working Expenses).

January	$840,181 17
February	780,990 63
March	699,722 04
April	740,851 01
May	781,086 18
June	841,442 32
July	819,139 12
August	787,003 43
September	796,301 04
October	801,582 62
November	746,326 74
December	754,267 88
	$9,388,894 18

Revenue, October, 1907	$803,017 13
Expenditure, October, 1907	751,754 78

MONTREAL HARBOUR DUES.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Perley—asked:

1. Is it a fact known to this government that the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal intend to increase the harbour dues of that port?
2. What amount of interest is due by the said commission at the present time, and has the government recently made any demand upon the commissioners for the payment of said interest?
3. What sums are due, as interest due and overdue, by the Harbour Commissioners of the ports of Quebec and Three Rivers?
4. What measures is the government taking to secure the payment of the moneys referred to in paragraph 3?

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

1. We are aware that the matter is being discussed in the press, but we have no official information.

2. To 31st December, 1908, $525,871.63. Under date of 7th January, 1909, a statement of interest due was forwarded to the secretary of the commission at Montreal.

3. Quebec Harbour Commission, $2,786,-368.77; Three Rivers Harbour Commission, $91,104.04.

4. No specific measures are at present being taken.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY STAFF.

Mr. C. A. WILSON—by Mr. Talbot—asked:

1. Is the government aware that the number of prisoners in St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary is to-day said to be over five hundred?

2. What is the number of employees in the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, including officers, foremen and guards?

3. Does the government consider that the present equipment is sufficient for the good administration of the institution?

4. Is it the intention of the government to increase the personnel of the administration of this institution?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

1. Yes.
2. 77.
3. Yes, for the present.
4. Not at present.

TURTLE MOUNTAIN SQUATTERS.

Mr. SCHAFFNER asked:

1. What are the names of the squatters who have been removed from the Turtle mountain timber reserve?

2. To what point have they been transported?

3. What amount was paid by the government by way of compensation to the squatters, and the amount paid each squatter, removed, and by whom the amount was paid?

4. Have all the squatters been removed?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Mrs. Wm. Foster, Benjamin Pagels, Wm. Hunter, Jas. T. Tomlinson, Wm. Cox, Frank Chisholm, John Kelly, J. W. Foster. There were also a number of half-breeds as follows: Alex. Mann, Louie Mann, Jerome Morreau, Wm. Gosailin, Joseph Lizotte, Rousselin Pelletier.

2. Wm. Cox was taken to township 19, range 10, west of the 1st meridian; the half-breeds went to Wood mountain, and the remainder to Lake Benito district in townships 34 and 35, ranges 30 and 31, west of the 1st meridian.

3. Mrs. Wm. Foster, $540.05; Benj. Pagels, $110.10; Wm. Hunter, $309.69; J. T. Tomlinson, $316.30—advances of lumber, building material and provisions supplied through the immigration agent at Dauphin. Wm. Cox, $200—paid by A. Knechtel, inspector of forest reserves.

4. No.

VANCOUVER POLL CLERKS.

Mr. COWAN asked:

1. Have the persons who acted in the recent Dominion elections as poll clerks in Vancouver City electoral district, all been paid for so acting?

2. If not all, how many, and why have the others not been paid?

3. Have the persons who acted in the recent Dominion elections as deputy returning officers in Vancouver city electoral district, all been paid for so acting?

4. If not all, how many, and why not all?

Hon. CHAS. MURPHY (Secretary of State). On the 10th October, 1908, an advance of $1,000 was made to the returning officer. No accounts have yet been received from the returning officer.

CUSTOMS DUTIES IN HULL.

Mr. DEVLIN asked:

1. What amount of customs duties are collected yearly from importers in the city of Hull?

2. Have representations been made to the government of the necessity of a custom office in the city of Hull? If so, has the government any intention of establishing such office?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. From a compilation made last year it was ascertained that the values of imports entered at Ottawa by residents of Hull, for two years ending 30th April, 1908, were as follows:

	Value of imports year ended April 30, 1907.	Value of imports, year ended April 30, 1908.
Dutiable goods....	110,609	146,282
Free goods..	54,849	60,969
Total..	$165,458	$207,251

As there are in this year $146,282 dutiable goods imported, the duty will probably be in the neighbourhood of $40,000.

2. Representations have been made for opening a customs office in the city of Hull, but in view of the proximity of that city to the customs house at Ottawa, the government has not as yet decided to establish a customs office in Hull.

PROVINCIAL TELEPHONES—CONTROL BY RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. DANIEL asked:

Has the Railway Commission any control over the rates and tolls of a telephone company working under a provincial charter? If so, to what extent?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). This seems to involve a question of law about which it would be inadvisable to express an opinion.

SANDY COVE BREAKWATER.

Mr. JAMESON asked:

1. What amount has been paid by the government towards the construction of the breakwater at Sandy Cove, in the county of Digby, Nova Scotia?
2. Has the government released the contractors and returned the deposits? If so, when, and what amount was so returned?
3. Is the government aware of any amount yet owing to the contractors for labour and for materials? If so, how much, to whom, and when did the government first learn of it?
4. Has the government paid any sum beyond the amount of the contract on account of labour or materials? If so, when and how much?
5. Is it the intention of the government to pay the outstanding liabilities of the contractors? If so, when?
6. What was the estimated cost of the work?

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

1. $13,829.48.
2. Security deposit of $800 released 3rd December, 1904.
3. For labour—

Chas. Beyea and 30 others..		$1,221 77
For materials—		
D. G. Kirk..	$2,085 51	
22 others..	637 80	
		2,723 31
Total..		$3,945 08

On 28th March, 1905, the contractors admitted liabilities greater than the balance due them; on 20th June, 1905, two claims were filed; others followed at various dates down to 21st October, 1906.

4. Nothing beyond the amount earned by contractors, including contract and extras, viz., $13,829.48.
5. The matter is under consideration.
6. $14,200.

SEED WHEAT FOR SASKATCHEWAN AND ALBERTA.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE asked:

1. How many bushels of seed wheat were bought for Saskatchewan and Alberta for the season 1908, who was it bought from, at what price, and what grade was it?
2. Was the wheat so bought cleaned for seed?
3. Was the wheat so bought all used as seed? If not, who was it sold to, and at what prices?
4. What was the total lost in connection with the wheat so bought?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Mr. Speaker, I would like this question to stand as a notice of motion for return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as notice of motion for return.

Mr. DANIEL.

SEED OATS FOR SASKATCHEWAN AND ALBERTA.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE asked:

1. How many bushels of English oats were bought for seed in Saskatchewan and Alberta for the season 1908, and at what prices?
2. Were the oats cleaned before or after they were bought?
3. Were these oats all used for seed? If not, who were they sold to and at what prices?
4. What was the total loss in connection with the oats bought in England, and was there any complaint about them?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I would like this also to stand as notice of motion for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as notice of motion for return.

PROPOSED ORGANIZATION OF IMPERIAL GENERAL STAFF.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT moved:

For a copy of orders in council, correspondence, letters, despatches, memoranda and communications, between the Imperial and Canadian governments relating to the organization of an Imperial General Staff.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). So far as these papers are not confidential, they will be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing how many heads of stock there are on the respective experimental farms, and what they consist of; the estimated value of the different kinds, and for what purposes they are utilized; how many acres there are in each experimental farm; how many acres there are under cultivation on each farm.—Mr. Staples.

For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, and communications, with reference to the complaint against and conviction and fine of F. Macdonald Jacobs, of Caughnawaga reserve, for cutting cordwood upon territory occupied by him on the reserve and to have refund of dues or fine.—Mr. Boyce.

1. For a return showing the approximate area of coal and timber lands, respectively, in each of the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, (a) owned by private individuals or companies, (b) leased by the government to private individuals or companies; and the approximate area in each province on which mining or lumbering operations are actually being carried on.

2. The approximate amount of revenue collected by the government between 1st of January, 1906, and the 31st of December, 1908, on account of (a) payments for coal lands; (b) coal royalties, (c) bonuses and rentals on timber lands; (d) timber dues; (e) hay lands; (f) grazing lands, and (g) irrigation areas within each of the above provinces.—Mr. Lake.

For a return showing the final estimates on the contract entered into on August 22, 1906, between J. D. McArthur and Smith & Pren-

dible on the National Transcontinental Railway, for work from station 9370 to station 9480; and the contract entered into on November 21, 1908, between the same parties on the same railway for work from station 9260 to station 9370.—Mr. Alexander Haggart.

For a copy of all evidence, reports, correspondence, writings, papers, and documents in possession or control of the Department of Inland Revenue, including all correspondence and written statements between the department or its officials or agents, and the government of Manitoba, or the Attorney General or other officials or agents of that province, in reference to the quality of coal oil sold in Manitoba, and accidents caused by coal oil there during the year 1908, and connected with recent investigations into the cause of these disasters.—Mr. Schaffner.

For a copy of the treaty between St. Peters' Indians and the government; and of all correspondence, papers, instructions, and documents relating to the aforesaid treaty.—Mr. Bradbury.

For a return showing how many acres have already been taken up in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, respectively, by homestead and pre-emption, by railway lands, by Hudson Bay lands; by other corporations or persons; by waste, swamps or mountainous land unfit for tilling; by lake areas, including Winnipeg, Winnipegosis, Manitoba, Big Quill, Birch and Beaver; and the area in square miles of each province above named. —Mr. Hughes.

For a copy of all correspondence, documents or other communications whatsoever, since the 28th of January, 1908, between the government or its representatives, and the railway, telephone and telegraph companies or their representatives, respecting the use of French equally with English in the province of Quebec, for services of public utility, under the supervision, direct or indirect of the government.—Mr. Paquet.

ABOLITION OF THE SENATE.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved:

That a humble address be presented to His Most Gracious Majesty the King, as follows: MOST GRACIOUS MAJESTY:

We, your Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada in parliament assembled, beg leave most respectfully to represent—

That in the year 1867 by Act of your Imperial parliament commonly known as the British North America Act, the then existing provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were federally united and formed into one Dominion under the name of Canada, and the constitution of the legislative authority of such Dominion provided for and the nature of its executive government declared, and since the said Act other provinces in British North America have also been federally united to the said Dominion and now form part thereof, with representation in this House of Commons, pursuant to the provisions providing therefor in the said British North America Act and amending, and other, Acts subsequently enacted;

That by the said British North America Act the executive government and authority of and over Canada is declared to continue and be vested in Your Majesty and Your Heirs and Successors, Kings and Queens of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and Your Majesty is represented in Canada by a Governor General;

That by the said British North America Act there is also a council to aid and advise Your Majesty, styled the King's Privy Council for Canada, the members of which council are from time to time chosen and summoned by Your Majesty's said Governor General and may be from time to time removed by the said Governor General;

That by the said British North America Act the Parliament of Canada consists of Your Majesty, and upper House styled the Senate and the House of Commons, but with powers not to exceed those at the passing of the said Act held and exercised by the Commons House of Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland;

That by the said British North America Act it is also provided that Bills for appropriating any part of the public revenue or for imposing any tax or impost shall originate in the House of Commons and that no such Bill or vote, resolution or address for such appropriation or tax or impost shall be adopted or passed that has not been first recommended to that House by message of Your Majesty's said Governor General in the session in which such Bill, vote, resolution or address is proposed;

That by the said British North America Act it is also provided that where any Bill passed by the House of Parliament is presented to Your Majesty's said Governor General for Your Majesty's assent he shall declare according to his discretion but subject to the provisions of the said Act and to Your Majesty's instructions, either that he assents thereto in Your Majesty's name, or that he withholds Your Majesty's assent, or that he reserves the Bill for the signification of Your Majesty's pleasure, and that where he assents to a Bill in Your Majesty's name if Your Majesty in Council within two years after receipt thereof by the Secretary of State thinks fit to disallow the Act such disallowance shall annul the Act, and that a Bill reserved for the signification of Your Majesty's pleasure shall not have any force unless and until within two years from the day on which it was presented to Your Majesty's said Governor General for Your Majesty's assent he signifies to the Houses of parliament or by proclamation that he has received the assent of Your Majesty in Council;

That by the said British North America Act legislatures for the various provinces constituting the said Dominion of Canada are also established, each governed by a lieutenant governor appointed by Your Majesty's said Governor General in Council for five years, and whose salaries are required to be fixed and provided by the parliament of the Dominion of Canada and such provincial legislatures are empowered exclusively to make laws in relation to a large number of matters and subjects of great importance, subject to disallowance by Your Majesty's said Governor General in Council within one year, but not in any way subject to consent also by the said Senate;

That in regard to all matters and subjects not within the said exclusive power of the

said provincial legislatures it is provided by the said British North America Act that all laws to be made by the said parliament of Canada must be consented to and passed by both the Senate and the House of Commons, before being presented to Your Majesty's said Governor General for assent and the members constituting the said Senate are appointed for life and not subject to election or rejection by the people, and the members of the House of Commons are elected by the people every five years or at any less period at which Your Majesty's said Governor General may dissolve the parliament;

That during the forty years since the said British North America Act has been in force much dissatisfaction has been caused from time to time to Your Majesty's loyal subjects in Canada by the actions of the Senate in regard to matters dealt with by the House of Commons and the rejection of laws sought to be made by the people through their representatives in the House of Commons and passed by the House, and by reason of the heavy expense and burden of taxation placed upon the people to provide the maintenance of that two-fold system of dealing with the making of laws by the parliament of Canada;

That in view of the many other provisions heretofore referred to for guarding against and disallowing any ill-advised or improper legislation which might by any possibility pass the said House of Commons, and of the aforesaid dissatisfaction of the people and heavy burden of expense involved and of the great advance made in education by the whole people of Canada since the passing of the said British North America Act, this House is of the opinion that the Senate is no longer required or advisable for the properly carrying on of responsible government in Canada, or safeguarding of Your Majesty's full rights and prerogatives; and that the abolition of the said Senate would greatly conduce to the welfare of the Dominion of Canada and promote the interests of the British Empire.

We therefore respectfully pray that the said British North America Act be so amended as to provide for the abolition of the said Senate.

He said: Although the form of the motion is new, the subject dealt with by the motion cannot in any sense be said to be new. At the outset, let me say that my object in making this motion is that the matter may be discussed freely, fully, and in a way entirely untrammelled by considerations of party politics. There is no reason why this should be dealt with as a party question; there is every reason why it should be dealt with in the very opposite way. It is a matter in which the interest of all Canada is involved; it is a matter upon which the leaders of all political parties ought to try to agree. Even the most humble member of this House should try to find a solution of what is known to be a serious difficulty and great embarrassment in this country. Therefore, I ask every hon. member who is in the habit of voting with me on party questions not to feel bound to do so on this question, but, if he speaks upon it, to declare what he freely thinks the best interest of the country demands. Likewise, I ask my hon. friends on the other side—who are in the habit of thinking, more or less, that the proposals that I bring forward are suspicious or not to be adopted by the party now in power—to forget that to-day, and if they are really in favour of this resolution, not to be afraid to say so, so that the matter can be dealt with in a manner entirely free from party politics.

Now, Sir, dissatisfaction with regard to the other Chamber ns no new thing in Canada. I will briefly mention some of the evidence of dissatisfaction. Fifteen years ago this dissatisfaction had reached such a point that one of the political parties in this country, the one now in power, put into their platform, upon which they appealed to the country, a demand for the reform of the Senate. That party attained power, and from time to time public men on both sides of the House have raised the question of reforming the Senate. We were very much indebted to a supporter of the government, in the year 1906—I refer to the present Deputy Speaker of this House, the member for South Perth (Mr. McIntyre)—for a very able address and the discussion which followed his address, calling for a reform of the Upper Chamber. Again last session we were treated to discussions of this kind by other members of this House. The member for South Perth brought in a measure for the reform of the Senate, the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) also brought in a motion, which practically agreed with the motion I am about to make.

The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Lewis) also brought in a motion having the same object in view, but in a manner less direct than my motion. All these gentlemen brought forward much useful information, they showed a lot of research and care in endeavouring to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion in regard to the matter. But their motions and addresses all ended in nothing, that is to say, they were followed by no concrete action on the part of this House. In this respect my motion differs from all others that have been brought forward. My motion is a practical motion and leads to some action if adopted. The other motions, if I may be allowed to say so without offence, were merely academic, they were merely discussions of the question, and accomplished nothing. Even if they had been adopted, they would have not brought us any further on our way towards the desired goal. Therefore I have had the temerity, in drawing this motion, to ask this House to vote for a practical resolution, a matter of concrete action, that goes right to the foot of the Throne with a petition to the King, asking that the British North America Act be amended by the Imperial parliament so that the Chamber known as the Senate of Canada may be abolished. Of course if we are ever to have

an abolition of the Senate, this is the only course that we can take. We must apply for an amendment of the British North American Act, which Act constituted the Senate as it now exists. If any of these preceding motions had been carried, or if we could agree upon a measure of reform, even then we must have an Imperial Act of parliament passed to change our constitution. So it is absolutely necessary to approach the Imperial parliament, and I know of no better way of doing so than to petition the King in the words of this motion.

Now in the course of these discussions that have taken place I have noticed the absence of one very important point, which has never been mentioned so far as I know. Hon. gentlemen who have discussed this question have all assumed that the Senate of this country bears the same relation to our House of Commons that the House of Lords bears to the House of Commons of Great Britain. I cannot see the matter in that way. Hon. gentlemen seem to have forgotten that the constitution of this country provides for a veto power ultimately vested in the King in Council, whether you have a Senate in this country or not. It is generally assumed that we have the same safeguard in this country against hasty legislation by the Commons, as there is in Great Britain against hasty legislation by the Commons there. But there is a considerable difference. If the Lords and Commons of Great Britain agree on any legislation, it seems to me that His Majesty the King would find himself in a serious constitutional difficulty if he did not assent to that legislation. That is not so here. If the House of Commons and the Senate of Canada, or if the House of Commons alone, assuming we had no Senate, pass a legislative measure, and that measure receives the assent of His Excellency the Governor General, even then the measure may not finally become law, because it is subject to the veto power of His Majesty in Council, who may disallow any Act of the Canadian parliament. So that we have a veto power that may be exercised by the King in Council, even though we had no Senate in this country. For instance, supposing the Senate were abolished, that we had no second Chamber to pass upon our legislation, and supposing a piece of legislation was passed in this House which a large body of people in this country, or very important interests in this country, contended was injurious to them, they would not be without a remedy, even if we had no Senate, because they could appeal to the King in Council and ask that that legislation be disallowed. They would be doing no strange thing, they would be simply acting within the provisions of the British North America Act. There is therefore in the British North America Act a distinct limitation, that after His Excellency has agreed to any measure passed by the parliament of Canada, still it does not become binding if the King in Council chooses to disallow it within two years. So I say that if any interest in this country or any portion of our people felt aggrieved at legislation passed by this parliament, they would still have no need to bemoan the absence of a second Chamber, supposing we decided to abolish it; they would not be remediless, for they could approach His Majesty in Council by petition and might be able to get a disallowance of the Act. This, at least, is my opinion, and before this debate closes hon. gentlemen will perhaps discuss that particular point and enlighten me with their views upon it, if they do not agree with what I am saying, namely, that the Senate in this country does not exist as the sole necessary check on hasty legislation, and is not, in the last resort, a protection of minorities or any other interest that may feel aggrieved, because such minority or such interest will have a remedy by appeal to Great Britain within two years, and there would be no wrench of the constitution given us by the British North America Act.

Some people say that it is all very well to be wise after the event, but I ask every hon. gentleman in this House, in discussing this matter, or before he votes for or against this resolution of mine, to seriously ask himself the question if he were one of the fathers of confederation, or if he were making suggestions to Great Britain for the re-drawing of that Act, if he would seriously say that a second chamber was necessary. I do not wish to be understood as saying that if, forty years ago, I had been assisting to make that constitution, I would not have made it as it was, and I am not saying that our forefathers did not do what they thought best in the interests of the country. They had no experience in Canada to guide them. They naturally would look at other constitutions and it probably occurred to them at once that as there was a House of Lords in England over the Commoners to check their legislation, it would be a good thing to have a similar body in Canada. But while I might at that time have thought that, if those very able politicians and public men who had a lot to do with the formation of the constitution, who were known as the fathers of confederation, and who were doing the best they could for the future of the country, had had forty years of experience in the government of this country and could have known then all that we know now, I believe that in view of the great safeguard I have mentioned—the veto power of the King in Council—against any hasty legislation, they would have said that in the beginning of the twentieth century it was not necessary to have a second chamber. There are great differences be-

tween the country as it was then and as it is now. Take, for instance, the question of education. Would any one seriously say that the commoners elected in this country are not now as well educated as the senators are? Would any one seriously say that any constituency does not produce and does not insist upon electing the highest types of men obtainable in the country? Forty years ago education was sparse, so to speak in this country. The fathers of confederation, forty years ago, might very well entertain the thought that they could not always be sure that the House of Commons would contain a majority of members sufficiently well educated to conduct the affairs of the country properly without any check upon them at all. They might have been afraid that some matter of emotion or some radical movement might arise in the country and that from want of a higher standard of education, such as exists to-day, they would not be safe in entrusting this work to an elective body at the mercy of the great body of voters throughout the country. Am I not justified too in saying that the education of the people of the country to-day is of itself a safeguard against improper legislation by this House? What would happen if any solid interests in this country were affected by legislation passed in this chamber, assuming that there was no Senate? Has it not happened here over and over again, within the memory of every one who sits in this House, as it has happened during the last eight years to my own personal knowledge, that business men would come down to Ottawa, that those interested would send delegations here, that representations would be made, that the case would be presented in the ablest manner possible, and has it not occurred that legislation proposed in this House has been amended because of the representations coming from various intelligent interests in the country? Is any commoner going to be returned when he goes back for re-election if he has been merely sitting here and has not been attending to the interests of the country? If he takes an extreme position upon any question, if he becomes unreasonable and if he does not protect the interests of the country and of his constituency, is he not at once set aside by the electors as being unfit to represent that particular constituency because he is not broad or big enough for the job? In my humble opinion if the standard of education as we have it to-day had been equally as high forty years ago, I do not think that the fathers of confederation would have thought it necessary to have a second chamber, call it a Senate, or anything you like. That, of course, is only my own opinion and I submit it to the House for what it is worth.

The next matter I would point out is this: Supposing the commoners are hasty, supposing that they make mistakes, supposing that their judgment is poor, supposing, in other words, that they are not up to the mark demanded by the intelligent electorate, the electors may punish them when they return for re-election inside of five years. If they have been unreasonable in their conduct or judgment they are at the mercy of the electors every five years or less. But, supposing the Senate makes a mistake. Supposing the Senate refuses to consent to a Bill which is manifestly in the interests of the country, what happens? They block legislation. Can anybody reach them? There are no electors, there is no power that can punish them or that can make them account for their wrong-doing, or exercise any discipline over them. So that we have this position that an elective body representing the people to whom the government itself are responsible, can have their will thwarted by the Senate and the Senate need not care whether they are on the popular side of the question or not. The right hon. gentleman leading this House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) last session, when the motion of the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. McIntyre) for the reformation of the Senate was being discussed, pointed out, in line with what I am saying, a very serious trouble as the matter stands, or a trouble that might arise at any time. The right hon. gentleman pointed out that if the Senate refuses to pass a supply bill which the commoners have introduced there may be a deadlock in the country and there is no remedy under our constitution for it. I agree with him and what the right hon. gentleman said is in itself a strong argument in favour of my motion. But, I say that that very matter standing alone ought to be some reason, at all events, for some amendment to the constitution and, in the absence of a better one, for the abolition of a body that can cause such havoc in the country. A supply bill cannot be introduced anywhere but in this chamber. I am not saying that the right hon. gentleman said that last session or not, but I apprehend that he will not dispute that that is so. What the hon. gentleman pointed out was that if there was a deadlock in regard to the supply bill there is no remedy under our constitution for it. Although the British North America Act puts it out of the power of the Senate to introduce such a bill, although it is a bill that must emanate from the Commons, yet, if they refuse to pass it, they can prevent all business being carried on, and there is no remedy under our constitution for that state of affairs.

Manifestly then something must be done; manifestly if we could agree upon some measure of reform which we could submit to the Imperial authorities as an amendment to the British North America Act,

we ought to agree upon it. For forty years and more, particularly the last few years, the people of Canada have shown that they are opposed to the Senate as it is now constituted, and we are in the peculiar position that there are probably not two public men in the country who agree upon any remedy as suggested. If the people all insist that the Senate is defective and is not working properly, while public men all admit that this is so, then if we cannot agree on a proper remedy the next best thing would be to have it abolished, because if an institution is defective and we cannot devise and agree upon a remedy, surely it would be best for the country to abolish it. The Senate themselves of late years have realized and admitted that their House is not what it ought to be and stands in need of reform. We know from the newspaper reports that the ex-Secretary of State, the Hon. R. W. Scott, has publicly stated what he believes to be the proper remedy for the existing unsatisfactory conditions. His opinion cannot be regarded as extreme; it is the admission of a senator of many years' standing, of a cabinet minister and a student of constitutional matters. Whatever reform is agreed upon an amendment to the constitution must be made, some petition must go to the Throne in Great Britain. If we cannot agree as to the proper remedy to apply, but admit that a remedy is necessary, we ought at least to petition the imperial authorities to inquire into the matter and pass such an amendment as they in their opinion, assisted by our advice, think would be best for Canada.

Personally, I believe there is no longer need of the Senate in this country. There may have been a need for it thirty or forty years ago, but there is not to-day, and I believe the majority of the Canadian people are of the same opinion.

The Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in a very instructive speech last session upon the motion made by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. G. McIntyre) told us his views. He said that the only remedial measures he would suggest were the reduction of the number of senators and the term of their tenure. What good will it do to reduce the number and to place the veto power over the acts of 220 commoners elected by the people and in close touch with them in the hands of fewer men than it is now? The commoners come in close touch with the people who are developing the country; during their elections they hear the grievances and the ideas of all classes and all sections, and I would think, with all humility, that the argument in favour of reducing the number of those who hold the veto power would logically lead to the abolition of the Senate.

The Prime Minister also contended last session, and in this I agree with him, that it would not be wise to have senators appointed by the legislators in the same manner as the American Senate is chosen. The hon. member for St. John city (Mr. Daniel), who also spoke last session, took the same view, and I quite agree with both of them. From the nature of our constitution the question of provincial as opposed to federal rights must always be a delicate and difficult one. If we should have our senators appointed by the provinces, and the House of Commons of Canada felt obliged, in carrying on the affairs of this country, to insist on federal rights contrary to the wishes of some provinces, then the Senate could be used by the provinces to completely override the will of this House on federal matters. This would be a most dangerous, improper and unfair condition. I would refer also to a speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) in 1896, just before the Liberal government came in power. He then declared in Toronto that the Senate, in his opinion, was a millstone around the neck of the Canadian people and he prayed Providence to remove it soon. He maintained that the Senate was so mendacious and contrary to the interests of the people that he prayed for its removal. The hon. gentleman I believe is still of the same opinion. I understand he has lately admitted that he does not think the Senate is what it ought to be, and that he more or less sympathizes with my motion to have it abolished.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. More or less.

Mr. LANCASTER. Or less or more. However, the Minister of Trade and Commerce is an eloquent and able man whose knowledge of Canadian history and affairs is not excelled, and we have that hon. gentleman saying lately that the Senate was still liable to great danger and capable of great harm, and he a member of the Senate for several years.

One more witness I will call, and then I will sum up upon that evidence. The late much-respected Sir Oliver Mowat in 1903 said:

> We are agreed as to the necessity of fundamental reform of the Senate, if for any reason it must or should be retained.

He qualified his opinion that the Senate should be reformed by saying that that was always on the assumption that it must or should be retained. If you want an argument or an opinion in favor of abolition expressed in plain and simple terms, you have it there. I agree with that statement of Sir Oliver Mowat—the first thing we should ask ourselves before we trouble ourselves about the way we should reform it, is: Is it necessary to have the institution at all? With that mass of testimony, with expressions of this kind from that array of public men, with the fact that one of the two great

political parties, representing about one-half of the people of the country, in going before the people and asking them to put them in power to carry on the affairs of the country, pronounced in favour of the reform of the Senate fifteen years ago, with these various opinions in the same direction expressed since that time, with no measure of reform brought forward in the meantime, with no petition sent to the British government to ask for any particular measure of reform, and with no evidence of the institution having worked properly in the meantime, what might we as practical ment be expected to do, except to petition the King to abolish the institution as not being necessary? I put the question to any man of common sense in any walk of life. If he were a manufacturer and had some expensive machine in his factory which was not working well, and which no inventor or patentee could improve upon but which all admitted was deteriorating the quality of the goods sent out, what would he do? The answer is obvious: he would put the machine out of the building and use it no more. If there were any possibility of improving the institution and making it useful by reform, I would agree to it; but as we cannot find any measure for reforming the Senate that can be agreed upon by thoughtful men in this country, we ought certainly to ask the home authorities to amend the British North America Act, and have it removed. The hon. member for South Perth (Mr. G. H. McIntyre), the present deputy Speaker of this House, in discussing this question last session, made use of an expression that caught my attention. I took no part in the debate of last year, nor did I in the debate of 1906, and I do not mind telling the House the reason. I had pretty strong opinions on this question, but I did not want to declare them until I felt sure that I was right. I wanted to feel absolutely certain in my own mind that abolition was the proper thing before I expressed myself upon it in this House. Therefore, I sat still for instruction, and I was instructed. I obtained a lot of information from the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. G. H. McIntyre), the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. H. H. Miller), and the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. E. N. Lewis), for which I thank them; and having listened to the speeches of these hon. gentlemen and others, and having cogitated upon them, I was confirmed in my opinion that the only practical remedy which can benefit the country and the remedy that the country wants is abolition. The hon. gentleman for South Perth (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) used the expression that the Senate must be either amended or ended. No practical suggestion has been made for mending it; and although the hon. gentleman himself, as he told us, was not in favour of abolition, he gave no good reasons in support of his view that abolition was not the proper remedy. At the same time, he did say, you must either mend it or end it. Now, no step has been made to mend the Senate; and, applying the alternative of the hon. member for South Perth, are we not in a position to-day to petition the home authorities to end it, instead of indulging in merely academic discussions as to the proper form of mending it, when no two men can agree as to what that proper form should be? The hon. member for South Grey, I have no doubt, will vote for this motion Last session he expressed his opinion that abolition was the proper remedy, and he, more than any one else in the House, convinced me of that. It is true, I was willing to be convinced; but the hon. member for South Grev advanced so many sound reasons that he confirmed my opinion that abolition was the proper remedy. The hon. member for West Huron, however, came the nearest of any to a practical result. His motion was for a plebiscite. The other motions made heretofore have only been academic. They have only been motions brought forward for the purpose of discussion, and, even if carried unanimously, would lead to nothing. They would only express the opinion of the House, and bring no concrete result. But the motion of the hon. member for West Huron was that a plebiscite should be taken, and that the people should be asked to vote on two questions—whether they were in favour of or against abolition, and whether they were in favour of or against reform. His motion was not voted upon, the debate having been adjourned. The motion of the hon. member for West Huron sruck me as being the only practical resolution of those three, because he was advancing a step towards attaining some result. If he had got a plebiscite, it would have been a long step towards getting the government in power to approach the Imperial Parliament to get the will of the people as expressed in that plebiscite carried out. Of course, a plebiscite can be of no good unless the government in power is sympathetic with it. If the government would put a question before the people in the form of a plebiscite, that might be taken as an evidence that they were sympathetic with it, and to carry out the will of the people as so expressed. We had a plebiscite once before, and the government, for reasons satisfactory to themselves, saw fit not to carry out the vote of the people. But if there was a strong pronouncement on the part of the people in favour of the abolition of the Senate, we would naturally expect that the government in power, whatever government it might be would carry if out.

Before we can do anything with a plebiscite, we must have the sympathy of the government in favour of what the people would happen to vote for. Unless the gov-

ernment declared itself in favour of that it is useless to talk about a plebiscite. But the House of Commons as a body, apart from party, entirely untrammelled by any question of party loyalty or disloyalty, has the right to petition the King. It has that right as a concrete body, and the members of that body also have it as individual members, and the essential thing to do is to petition the King to amend the British North America Act by abolishing the Senate, because, after all, as far as plebiscites go, that in itself would be a pretty good plebiscite. Nothing could be done at once. Every one knows that even if such a petition were voted by a large majority of this House or even unanimously, it would not be acted on hurriedly. Other representations would probably be made, but sooner or later, probably in a few years, the petition would come to a concrete result. No decision would be come to hastily, and the members of this House would find out very quickly, if they voted in favour of this motion of mine, whether they had made a mistake and had not thereby properly represented public opinion in their constituencies. I am not posing as an authority on that point.

I do not profess to know the popular opinion of one-half of the country; but so far as I can understand the will of the people, so far as I have had communication with them, so far as I have come in contact with them in travelling through the country—I am not now speaking of my own constituency of the public opinion in which I claim to be a fairly good judge—my impression is that the vast majority of Canadians are in favour of the abolition of the Senate. However that is something which we would soon find out by voting on this resolution. If any one should vote to petition the King to have the Senate abolished and if in so doing he did not carry out the opinion of the majority of his constituency, they would soon make him aware of that after this session is over. So that practically, we would in course of a year or two have in this way the equivalent of a plebiscite. The question is one of such significance in some parts of the country and of such interest all over the country that every constituency would take care to tell its representative in this House whether he had voted as the majority desired he should. In that way therefore we would practically anticipate a plebiscite, and would know, before any action were taken in Great Britain, whether the course we adopted had the support of our people or not. But it might be said, suppose we voted for this resolution and then found out on our return home, that our constituents expected us to vote differently. Well, that is not at all likely to happen. Members on both sides know pretty well what their constituents want in this matter, and there is a very small portion of the electors in any constituency who would be at all likely to find fault with the vote their representative would give. There has been so much discussion on this question during the last eight or ten years in this country that the people have practically told all of us what they think about it, and but a very small proportion of the members of this House run any risk whatever of voting differently from what their constituents want, if they apply their own judgment and common sense to the matter.

There is another argument in favour of abolition, which I have not heard discussed in this House. Possibly that was due to my not having noticed any such argument, but certainly, I have not heard it advanced. It is this one. Under our constitution our government is responsible to parliament. Nevertheless it had the appointment of the whole of one branch of parliament. That certainly is not responsible government. The people elect the members of the House of Commons and the government is responsible both to the House of Commons and the Senate; but the government which has a majority in the House of Commons ratifying what it does, knows that it is doing right. The people, who express their will through the House of Commons, are thus supporting the government. Then the government needs fear no trouble in the Senate, because that body is appointed by them. But suppose the representatives of the people in the House of Commons reject any measure of the government. They have as much right to reject it as to approve; and should they reject, the government are bound to carry out the will of the people as expressed by parliament and change their policy, but the Senate, composed of men who are the appointees of the government, might veto that change. They might refuse to vote for the change called for by the House of Commons. What a ridiculous state of affairs ! It is on a par with that condition of which the right hon. the leader of the House spoke last session when he pointed out that it was quite possible for the Senate to throw out the Supply Bill and starve the country, and thereby force the Lower Chamber to do something to which it was opposed although, being the creature of the people, it knew that the action of the Senate did not meet with the popular approval.

Let me now point out that, as a matter of practical result, the Senate does not originate legislation. We find that body every session adjourning from time to time, for a month or so, and the reason given is that it is waiting business from the House of Commons. The only legislation practically which it initiates is the divorce Bills, and that could be done by the Commons if necessary. And I notice, by the way, that my hon. friend

from West Hastings (Mr. Porter) has upon the notice paper a resolution asking this parliament to pass upon the question of establishing a divorce court. Personally I am opposed to divorce; but if we are to recognize it at all, much better have divorces granted by the courts in a proper and regular way than by any legislative body. However that is not the issue to-day, but I simply wish to point out that on the Order Paper there is notice of a motion which, if adopted, would take from the Senate the only legislation they really initiate.

The question of protecting minorities is the only one which has given me any trouble in this matter. The argument is frequently made that a Senate is needed for that. Everybody admits that the Senate must be reformed, and the only difficulty is whether you need it for the protection of a minority. Well, I have looked back into history and I cannot find that the Senate has ever given any protection to minorities in the last forty years. You may perhaps say that that is no argument because it might be called upon to do so at any moment. But how could there be any protection to a minority if the majority insisted on carrying out something to the disadvantage of that minority. The strongest argument ever made in that connection is that some little province, having its representation in this House decreased according as population increased in the other provinces, would need some counterbalancing representation in the Senate which would give force to their argument and protection to their rights. But practically what could the Senate do? The smallest province would have the smallest number of senators. The other senators would come from the other provinces and, applying all the rules of human nature, would not be likely to support the smallest province against what they considered was for the general good of the country. Would they not represent the territory from which they come? Would there not be the same tendency of senators to vote against the senators from the small provinces? And would not that merely mean that the appeal of the small provinces would be beaten in two Houses instead of in one? The argument that the Senate is needed for the protection of small provinces seems to me to be one quite without foundation. The real protection, as I have said, is in the power given by the British North America Act to go to the King in Council in Great Britain for a veto of the legislation complained of. Those who complain of injustice can thus go to the very fountain-head of justice for the empire and plead the merits of their case. And all this can be done without any need for amending the British North America Act as it now is. I contend, therefore, that the abolition of the Senate would bring about the very strongest protection of minority, a much more effective protection than that which can be afforded by any second Chamber.

Now, I desire to make one newspaper quotation—from the 'Daily Star' of Toronto. That newspaper, to use the ordinary expression, has not much use for me as a politician, but it has made a nice argument in favour of my motion, and I am going to quote it. On January 23, 1909, the 'Star' said:

Lancaster, M.P., would abolish the Senate. And this is all the stranger because in ten years Mr. Lancaster may be wanting to go to sleep himself.

The 'Star' evidently thinks that the Senate is not a place to work in, but a place to go to sleep in. It seems to me that is the strongest argument in favour of my resolution. I must say that it seems to me the 'Star' might have given me more credit for sincerity than it has given. At least it might have assumed that if I could not provide for myself, or if my children could not provide for me, a nice place to go to sleep in, the good people of Lincoln would provide such a place for me without making it necessary for me to seek a place in the Senate for whose abolition I move in this year of grace 1909. While the 'Star' evidently wants to have a little fun at the expense of the member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) it still, consciously or unconsciously, presents the very strongest argument in favour of the abolition of the Senate. On February 14 the 'Star' followed up its first utterances. We all know that the 'Star' is not capable of being hasty and that it supports the government loyally and is not politically friendly to me. This is what it said:

As the matter now stands, the Senate is simply an addition to the patronage in the hands of the government. Patronage in the Civil Service we have learned to endure through custom, but surely it is unwise to extend the system of patronage to the appointment of those who make the laws of the land. Responsible government means the responsibility of the government to parliament, but who can speak seriously of the responsibility of a government to a portion of parliament appointed by the government itself?

The plan laid before the Senate by the Hon. R. W. Scott is good in so far as it proposes to substitute election for appointment. An elected Senate dealing independently with the measures sent up by the House of Commons, including government measures, might occasionally serve a good purpose. It is doubtful whether such a body could work in harmony with a system which requires that the government of the day should have a parliamentary majority for the support of its measures, but if it were found unworkable it would probably be a half-way house on the road to abolition, which, to many, seems to be the logical solution of the problem.

I commend that to the gentlemen who

are in the habit of reading what they think are words of wisdom in the Toronto 'Star.'

Now, this institution, the Senate, costs something. The cost of maintaining the Senate would be no reason for the abolition of that body if it were doing good work, and would not then be an argument even though it cost ten times as much as it does. But when we find that it is very doubtful that the Senate is needed in the present state of things, the question of what it costs is one to be considered in the public interest. I find by the Auditor General's Report for the last year that the indemnity and transportation of members of the Senate cost $209,000, and salaries and contingencies, $94,000; Speaker, $4,000. This makes a total of over $300,000. This amount does not represent all that the Senate might have cost, or even all that it probably will cost this year. There were twenty-six senators who were absent for more than fifteen days. Had they been present the expenditure on indemnities would have been increased by $9,000; making a total of $317,000. Thus we see that in ten years the Senate will have cost practically three and a quarter millions of dollars. That would do a lot toward providing a better postal service. It would do a great deal towards nationalizing and improving the telephone and telegraph service. And, last but not least, it would pay a pretty good share to help the railways to abolish the deadly level crossings that kill so many people in this country. I put the question squarely to this House: Here is an institution that costs this much money, and here are these other matters, which, it is admitted, are of importance to the people; it is doubtful if the taxpayer can easily find at present all the money to cover these expenses. Not for a minute would I say that if the institution cost even ten or twenty times as much as it does that alone would be sufficient reason for abolishing it. But when we know what can be done with that money, we ought to consider seriously whether the expenditure upon this institution should be continued. An hon. friend near me points out that there is expense for printing and other matters which I have not included. Of course, there is much of this that would not be saved even if the Senate were abolished, because the printing would still have to be done and the clerks would have to be hired. The amount to be saved in that way may be open to argument. I have given a minimum.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken longer than I generally do upon any matter in this House. My apology for doing so is the importance of the matter as it appears to me, and has appeared during the last five or six years, and my desire to do my duty as a representative of the people.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (North Oxford). In considering the resolution moved by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) I desire to consider for a moment the necessity of a second chamber in this country. We know that frequently agitations arise in the country and are carried on, both by newspapers and by the people, that are of sufficient weight to influence members of this House, and to be embodied in legislation. There is therefore the possibility of hasty legislation, and that is I presume, why the fathers of confederation provided for a second chamber. I have carefully searched to see whether there is any instance, either under a constitutional monarchial or a republican form of government, where a second chamber does not exist, and I have failed to find any such instance. Now, the first question we have to decide is whether we require a second chamber or not. These popular agitations I have spoken of are usually not carefully thought out, they are often found to have no sound foundation, and if it were not for a second chamber the probabilities are that the members of this House might pass a measure in obedience to a spasmodic agitation that would not really be in the public interest. Of course we do the best we can, but we are all liable to be swayed by the popular opinion of the moment. In the comments I propose to make I wish to say nothing in disparagement of the House of which I am a humble member. At the same time, we must not pride ourselves on knowing everything, we must not be too sure that we are the only people that are capable of passing wise and proper legislation.

The hon. member for Lincoln has told us that even if we did abolish the second chamber, that is the Senate, the people would still have recourse to the King in Council. Now I am not much of a lawyer, in fact none at all; but at the same time, does not the King in Council perform the same functions as our Governor General in Council? After all, is the King in Council not the Imperial Cabinet, like our Governor in Council? I think it was Chief Justice Marshall of the United States supreme court, who, in comparing the British constitution with the constitution of the United States, said that the reason why the United States constitution would last longer than the English constitution was that under the United States constitution every person was protected by law, that no person or corporation could be interfered with except by due process of law, and due compensation whereas under the British constitution parliament was supreme, and could do anything. That want of protection that the United States constitution has, as against our constitution, is a very serious fact. If parliament is supreme then it is all the more necessary that we should have a second chamber for the protection of the individual or corporation. The hon. mem-

ber who just sat down said that we had recourse to the King in Council, but, even if it were not true that parliament is supreme, how long would we, as Canadians, submit to our legislation being interfered with by the King in Council? Would not that raise a very dangerous question in this country? I do not think that we can consider that because it would be too dangerous an expedient to try.

Why is this cry raised against the Senate? I think that nearly all those sayings we hear against the Senate are largely thoughtless. People do not consider after all of whom the Senate is composed and what the Senators do. You remember that all sorts of quips and quibbles are indulged in with respect to the mother-in-law, and likewise, all the quips and quibbles are in order as far as the Senate is concerned. I, myself, when I came here, was prejudiced against the Senate because I had always heard that it was no good, that it was useless. Some people call the senators old ladies. If they were supposed to be good old ladies I do not know of anything that could illustrate their perfection of character more than to make use of that term with regard to them, because, if there is any one who represents all that is desirable in humanity it is a good old lady. But some people may say that they are not good old ladies. I remember very well the story of the Yankee who came over here to visit a friend belonging to the House of Commons. The friend was showing him the curiosities of this Ottawa of ours, and he said: Now, I will show you our great system of wax works, and he showed him the Senate. He said: This is the most wonderful thing you ever saw; you would actually think they were alive. The Yankee stood looking at them for a while and then said: Upon my word, you are right; they are wonderful; I would have thought they were alive. I came here imbued with just such thoughts as I have referred to, but as I met members of the Senate singly and collectively I began to ponder over the question as to whether there was any basis of truth in the criticism of the Senate. When you come to consider the personnel of the Senate what do you find? Some people say, again reverting to the old lady story, that they are too old. I am one of those who have always had a profound respect for men of older age than myself. I have got to an age when I consider how little I know and how much less I knew twenty-five years ago. I have great respect indeed for men of older age. What is the use of growing old in years if we do not grow old in knowledge? I do not wish to make distinction as between members of the Senate, but, for the purpose of showing you the kind of men who belong to the Senate I propose to name a few of them. Take Senator Cox, Senator Ross, Senator Dandurand, Senator Jones, Senator McKay of Montreal, Senator Wm. Gibson, Senator Kerr, Senator Edwards, Senator Jaffrey and Senator Cartwright as illustrations. Could we pick out in this House, which wants to rule everything, names as honoured in this country as are those which I have mentioned? I think not. Supposing that one of us desired to organize a great corporation and wanted to select directors for the same; do you think that we would go to any other place in Canada, or do you think we would come to this House for our directors? Do you think we would go anywhere in Canada and find a board of directors as capable as could be taken from that Senate of ours? When you talk about abolishing the Senate remember what it is composed of. I have great respect for men of older age, but in addition to that these are men who have had experience. The mere fact of introducing this resolution is a reflection upon this House itself for the simple reason that a great many members of the Senate were educated in this House and they are men who grew old in experience in this House. It is a reflection upon the House itself to say that men could grow old in experience here and still know more than when they entered it. I hope that in a year or two from now I will know more than I do to-day, because I realize how little I know now. As to appointments to the Senate, I have no quarrel with the present system. I do not want to reform the appointments to the Senate particularly. It is said that it is politically appointed. Why should it not be? I ask you in all fairness, why should it not be? When you say it is politically appointed, and you mean that the party in power appoint its members from their political followers, why should they not? When you come to look over the field you want a man who is capable, a man who has merit. Do you not suppose you could find a man who is qualified and a man who has merit in the Liberal ranks as well as in the Conservative ranks? Supposing the situation were changed and our hon. friends on the other side of the House were in power; do you mean to tell me that they could not find just as well qualified men in the Conservative ranks as in the Liberal ranks? I think they could. There is no great difference after all between the abilities of men in either party. I do quarrel with the appointments to the Senate for purely political rewards. That is a political exchange, as it were, for party service rendered without regard to the qualification and merit of the individual. I do quarrel with that type of appointment, but that is not what I call a political appointment because the political appointments I mean are those that I have just described. I do

not see why we should change the source of appointment.

As to the Senate itself I quite agree with the hon. member for Lincoln when he says that they should not take these long adjournments. I quite agree that they should attend to their duties. I think also there are many things they could initiate in the Senate. They could initiate one Bill, for instance, that we want very badly in this country, and it is a general corporation Act, a general company Act, and where could it be better initiated than in the Senate composed of men such as I have named? They could also, I think, initiate a general bankruptcy Act for which there is great need in Canada. They could devote a great deal of time to work of that kind in place of taking a holiday during the time they are not engaged with business sent to them by this House.

But I think this House could take an example from the Senate with great advantage. This Senate of ours, which we are so fond of abolishing, would go through more work in a day than we would in a week. They would revise the work we do in a week in a day or half a day. Why is that? Because of the irrelevant questions and discussions in this House and its committees, because of the practice of talking to constituencies and to the newspapers in this House. That the senators do not require to do and that fact strengthens my objection to an elected Senate. An elected Senate would be no better than ourselves in this respect, and surely there is a great deal of talk here that we could do without and still obtain just as good results. The Senate take up a question as the board of directors of a business corporation would. How long would it take us to pass much of our legislation if we went at it like business men, like a board of directors worthy of the name? We would find out weaknesses in any proposed legislation and strike them out in a moment.

Another reason why I oppose the abolition of the Senate is that I believe it to be a protection not only of the minority in this country but sometimes the majority from themselves. There is always a danger of sensational legislation being rushed through this House. I do not claim to be any better than any one else, but I believe that measures are adopted by the Commons that might be very wisely opposed by the Senate. There has been no serious complaint against the Senate for blocking legislation that has passed through this House. I do not think that they have done any harm in forty years of our national existence, but I believe they have done a great deal of good. The Senate is composed of very capable men, and I believe they should reform themselves to the extent of doing more work which they could probably do more capably than we could in this House. I think the abolition of the Senate would be a national calamity and I for one will not vote for it. If any little reforms are required in the Senate, such as a change in the method of appointment, we have in our beloved leader the Prime Minister (Rt. hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) a man strong enough, capable enough and courageous enough to bring them about.

Mr. O. TURGEON (Gloucester). Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to follow the hon. gentleman from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) in the arguments which he has advanced in support of his motion for the abolition of the Senate. I have admired the language and the tone of his address and would have expected, knowing as I know the strong convictions which the hon. gentleman always displays in this House, that he would have made perhaps stronger arguments or used stronger language in his endeavour to abolish one part of the representation of the Canadian people in the Canadian parliament. I was surprised that he did not dwell more strongly upon the usefulness of the Senate as a protection for the smaller provinces and for minorities in this country. I lay stress upon this point to show my people and this House my consistency to the expressions I have already uttered in reference to the British North American Act. Last session I expressed my profound admiration for our constitution, and I uttered the hope that its fundamental principles would never be altered, more particularly in reference to representation in this parliament which I believe to be the base upon which this parliament has been erected and without which there would have been no confederation. When I consider the position of the Senate in reference to the protection of minorities and of smaller bodies in the Dominion of Canada I realize that it has made possible the confederation of which we are so proud, and the parliament of Canada, both House of Commons and Senate, of which every Canadian is proud. If we were to abolish the Senate to-day the people of the smaller provinces as well as the minorities would not have the representation in parliament to which they have been given the right by the fact of their coming into federation. If it had been proposed that the parliament of Canada should consist of the House of Commons alone with representation by population, confederation could never have been brought about. The representatives of the smaller provinces of the east, the maritime provinces, would never have consented to the framing of the constitution upon such a principle. They would not have found in one House with representation by population, the protection to which they are entitled, owing to the preponderance of the west, of which they were as sure then as we are now and therefore we must retain, for the protection

of the smaller provinces, smaller bodies and minorities, the Senate which to a great extent has been created for that purpose, or at least so framed as to meet that particular purpose with others.

I do not say it has been created simply and solely for the minorities, but I do say that the constitution of the House of Commons, such as it is to-day, would not have been accepted by the people of the smaller provinces had not the fathers of confederation given them protection in the Senate, against the dangers by which they would be faced in the future in the House of Commons, and a guarantee of permanency of this constitution in the future. The representation of the Canadian people is not solely representation in the House of Commons or in the Senate, it is a dual representation connected together by the terms of confederation in which the minorities or bodies not able to get the necessary protection in this House have been shown and told they would get it in the Senate. The fathers of confederation, Sir Leonard Tilley himself, who represented New Brunswick and brought it into confederation on the condition that the Intercolonial Railway was built, would have come back from Quebec and London without the Intercolonial Railway if representation by population had not been qualified by equal representation in the Senate.

My hon. friend from Lincoln says that we are not better represented in the Senate than we are in the House of Commons, but it is a fact that the smaller provinces have to-day as much representation in the Senate as the larger provinces. The fathers of confederation gave the maritime provinces twenty-four senators, the same number that they gave to the large province of Ontario and to the province of Quebec; and if you abolished the Senate you would deprive the smaller provinces and the minorities in this country of that representation and protection. For that reason, and that reason alone, I would stand firm for the retention of the Senate. I would not say that some reform of the Senate may not be necessary, but the reforms that are generally proposed by the newspapers and by a certain section of public opinion do not commend themselves to my mind. It has been proposed that the Senate should be made elective rather than appointive. I believe the appointive system is the only system which can properly and judicially express the desires and sentiments of the fathers of confederation. It is the only system to ensure having in the Senate a body of men in whom sentiments of wisdom and charity can be found combined. Make the Senate elective and you will call upon the people to have elections every two or three years instead of every three or four years as at present. The views of the Senate would then be subject to the opinions and sentiments of their electors as well as the views of the House of Commons. We could not then expect from the senators the same wisdom and mature judgment that we can from men who are not subject to the sentiments of their constituents. My hon. friend seems to have sufficient confidence in his own judgment to propose a radical change in our constitution, but I consider, Mr. Speaker, that the constitution that governs the Canadian people to-day is the result of greater wisdom than the constitutions of many nations with much greater population, and I say again that if you make the Senate elective you do not meet the wishes nor the designs of the fathers of confederation, nor do you meet the requirements of the country for the future.

Again, in making the Senate elective, you do away with the very object the fathers of confederation had in view in establishing the Senate, namely, the protection of minorities and of the smaller provinces. It would be difficult, in an elective Senate, to obtain representation of the rights of minorities by the very men who could best represent those rights; whereas under the present system that power and responsibility rests upon the government. It seems to me that it is better to leave that burden upon the government of the day than it would be to place it upon the people, and thus avoid cause for the discussion of questions of race and religion during the elections when the people should be called upon to elect the best men as their representatives without consideration of such questions. It would perhaps be impossible under the elective system to secure a Senate in that happy position with reference to the representation of minorities that our present Senate has reached. I remember some years ago reading a very happy speech of Sir Richard Cartwright, Minister of Trade and Commerce, in which he spoke of the representation of minorities, and explained that up to that moment the province of Ontario, with a large Catholic minority, had never been able to send to the House of Commons a sufficient number of members to represent that minority with dignity and justice, but that the government, by means of their appointive power, had been able to give the Catholic minority of the province of Ontario that representation, and, therefore, that protection to which they were entitled in the Senate. If you made the Senate elective, the minority in Ontario and the minorities in other provinces, as well as the smaller provinces of the Dominion, would be deprived of the representation and the protection which we are now striving to maintain. I do not wish to occupy the time of this House further than simply to make that point, that if only for the protection of the smaller provinces and the minorities in this

country, I shall certainly have to vote against the resolution of my hon. friend.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, I propose to make only a very few remarks upon this question. I do not intend to argue either for or against the resolution to any great extent, beyond expressing my own personal views after an experience of some years in parliamentary life. The question which we have before the House to-day is one which has been discussed more than once in this chamber, but I have always noticed that the principal speakers who take part in the discussion have been the younger members of the House. The question of the reformation of the Senate has been discussed in the Senate more than once, and a great deal of valuable information has been collected and put on record there, which I think might be read with interest by the members of the Commons and by the people of the country as well.

The hon. gentleman said that his resolution led to something. No doubt it does. It leads to death, to extinction, to abolition, to annihilation. But we all learn by the experience of the past; and if history has taught us anything in the last two or three centuries, it has taught us that every intelligent, civilized country in the world, which enjoys constitutional government in any form has two legislative bodies. That, to my mind, is a very strong argument. At the time of confederation, even in my early youth, I regarded the institution of the Senate as one of the best features of our Confederation Act. Take up any of the treaties on this question and what is the information you will there find? Take the list of those countries which have two Chambers. We have first Austro-Hungary, undoubtedly a great country. Then we have Belgium, Denmark, Germany and the principal states of the German empire. Then we have Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Roumania, Spain, Sweden and Norway, Switzerland, France—that ancient and chivalrous country—the United States and practically the British empire, including the Dominion of Canada. Of the countries which are an example to the contrary, there are only one or two. Surely such an array of leading countries, with the wisdom of centuries crystallized in parliamentary government, ought to have some weight. Surely their example ought to appeal to us with some force as an argument in favour of a form of government such as the one we have adopted, and which during the past forty years has been apparently a great success. It has been said, and correctly said, that our Senate has not fulfilled all that we expected of it. But that, to my mind, is not an argument for its abolition. Many of the best laws on our statutes have not accomplished the objects for which they were enacted. But would that be a reason for abolishing them? Not at all. It is a reason for amending them and making them adequate to meet the situation, and that is the course we should follow in this instance. Why not do the same with the Senate? Why not reform the Senate and bring it in conformity with the spirit of the age and the sentiment of the country? Let us apply ourselves to the amending rather than the abolishing of the Senate. The hon. gentleman said he was rather attracted by the trite saying given utterance to in the Toronto 'Star': 'Either mend or end.'

Mr. LANCASTER. I did not take it from the 'Star.' It was said by the hon. member from South Huron.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, that has rather a uphonious sounding poetical rhythm, and appeals to us as does an attractive musical symphony, but it certainly cannot appeal to any one's sound judgment. My hon. friend is in favour of a plebiscite. To my mind, a plebiscite is contrary to the very spirit of the British constitution. The plebiscite supposes that the parliament does not represent the people, but that there is outside of parliament a people which is hostile to it and which may be appealed to on every act parliament does at any moment during the parliamentary term. To my mind that is a reversal of the principle of constitutional government. We in parliament represent the people during the term for which we are elected, and no one has any right, outside the constitutional limits, to set parliament aside and appeal directly to the people on any issue. The principle of plebiscite has never been recognized in the British form or monarchial form of government. Once the people send their representatives to parliament, then it is the duty of the government to submit its policy to the representatives of the people in parliament, and the decision of parliament is that of the people, who have given them their mandate, and there can be no appeal to the general body of the electors, except as provided by the constitution.

We are told that the sentiment of the country is opposed to the Senate. Well, the Hon. Mr. Blake said once in this House that a plebiscite would amount to very little unless it were accompanied by such arguments, information and collection of data as would enable the electors to pronounce a reasoned judgment on the question at issue. But what have we from the country to-day? We have not a reasoned judgment, we have but the accidental expression of opinion due to one incident or another, and not a matured judgment following out a well understood line of reasoning. The more I see of the conduct of the Senate, the more I am convinced that what is required is not abolition but reformation in order to bring it into harmony

with present conditions and the needs of the situation to-day. What has been the greatest objection to the Senate from its inception? It has been its tendency to yield to the exercise of party influence, to be a political rather than an independent body. The Senate is valuable in proportion as it leaves politics out and gives its impartial judgment, regardless of political leanings or feelings. And to the extent that it fails to do this, its usefulness is destroyed. When the senators take part in party caucuses, when they unite with their political friends in this House in devising ways and means to defeat the other party, they are helping on their own destruction. We should keep the Senate entirely distinct and separate from any party affiliations with this House. As soon as a member of this House or a gentleman in any walk of life has been called to the Senate, he should cast aside his party politics and exercise his best judgment to work out the problems of state, without regard to the political party to which he was formerly allied. Hon. gentlemen who to day represent the government, were wont to declare years ago that the Senate was a useless body and that when they got into office, they would either reform or abolish it. Surely the right hon. the leader of the government is strong enough and capable enough and sufficiently resourceful to amend the Senate so as to make it useful. I can only say that, while he told the people twelve years ago that he would do that, he is very slow in proposing his remedy, especially considering that he has shown the absolute need of it and is declared to be so able and so resourceful. It is no wonder that there is a clamour among the people for the abolition of the Senate, when they find that the great man, with all his satellites around him, is unable to propose an adequate remedy for existing evils. These hon. gentlemen themselves are responsible for the present position of the Senate in public esteem. They have appointed only politicians to the Senate, and very poor ones at that. As soon as politicians on that side have been discarded by the people, as soon as they have been declared unworthy to represent the people in this chamber, they are thrust into our Canadian House of Lords. And this hon. gentlemen opposite call 'reforming the Senate.' If we can find no better use for the Senate than to make it a refuge for politicians discarded by the people, it would be better to abolish it altogether. But I am very far from accepting this view: I believe that we can reform the Senate and make it a useful and a popular body. After watching the Senate carefully for thirty-one years from a place in this House, my strong conviction is that it would be an unfortunate day for Canada when the Senate was abolished. What we need is to reform the Senate so as to bring it into harmony with public sentiment and fit it to meet the needs of the country. When this is done, there will be no more clamour for the abolition of the Senate.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey.) A little over a year ago, in this House, I placed upon the Order Paper a resolution in favour of the abolition of the Senate, and spoke to that resolution. When I thus spoke I did not do so thoughtlessly, but after having given to the matter a great deal of careful consideration. I had listened attentively to every argument and expression of opinion that I had been able to hear, either within this House or without from men of great experience, from wise men, and from men with perhaps less experience and men not so wise; I had read everything easily obtainable in the newspapers or in books bearing on the subject, and weighing carefully all the arguments pro and con, I concluded that it would be to the profit, to the advantage of the people of Canada to do away with our second chamber. Naturally a subject in which I took so much interest at that time has not been absent from my mind in the year that has intervened. I have thought of it considerably since then, and I am to-day of the opinion, as I was a year ago, that it would be to our advantage to do away with the Canadian Senate. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) speaking to-night, said that with his long parliamentary experience he had observed that the members of parliament who from time to time have advocated either some reform of the Senate or its abolition, have been among the younger members of the House of Commons. That may be true, yet I call the attention of that hon. gentleman and of the members of this House generally, to the fact that the Hon. John Bright, in Birmingham in 1884 speaking upon this matter, said:

> When I was young I read books on this question and was strongly in favour of two Houses. I confess that without now having a very strong opinion one way or the other, I am not so bound up with the belief in the necessity of two Houses.

There we have at least one illustrious exception to the rule that it is the younger and inexperienced men who are in doubt as to the necessity of a second chamber. I think it will be generally admitted that we are not in favour of the Senate as we have had it since confederation, and as we have it to-day; I think it is the general opinion of the Canadian people that the Senate ought to be amended, if not abolished. But is it not somewhat significant that no two persons seem to agree to-day upon

the method that should be employed in amending the Senate? They may agree that there ought to be an amendment, that there ought to be some change, but no two persons seem able to agree upon what change should be made. Nay, I can go further than that, I think that no one person appears to advocate any method of reforming the Senate with any degree of assurance and confidence. Falteringly, hesitatingly, men will come forward and suggest some amendment, not guaranteeing, in so far as men can guarantee, any thing of the kind, that it will be satisfactory, but suggesting it as something that may perhaps be better than that which we have. Men seem to go rather upon the principle that we ought to choose the lesser of two evils, and that possibly what they suggest may prove to be better than that which we have.

It may be said, it has I think been said to-night, that the Senate is all right constituted as it is, if those who have the making of the appointments would be more careful than they are in their choice. I will admit that perhaps appointments to the Senate are not always the best that could be made. I am willing to admit that sometimes perhaps men are appointed to the Senate under the present system that are not the best available men. I am not here to-night to show any feeling of animosity either towards the Senate or the senators, and I am not here to say that any large number of the senators are incapable men, or men that ought not to occupy places in that House, if there is to be a second chamber. I was very glad to listen not long ago to a speech from the hon. the leader of the opposition in which that gentleman, while finding fault with some of the appointments that have been made under the present government and the present administration, agreed that the large number of appointments had been of gentlemen eminently well qualified to fill the positions to which they were called; in fact, I think he said that he agreed that the majority of the appointments that had been made had been good appointments. I think that if the Senate is objected to today, it is not largely, or in the main, because of the character or qualifications, or lack of qualifications, of the persons appointed.

If we to-day are not satisfied with the Senate as we have it, it is equally obvious that in Great Britain they are dissatisfied, and have long been dissatisfied, with the second chamber they have. It may be said that we ought not to act rashly, hastily, in this matter, that we have only had a Senate for some 42 years, and that 42 years is after all a short time in the life of a nation. That is true. Yet having had a Senate for that length of time, having been able to watch them at work, having been able to weigh their acts, we ought surely to be able intelligently and in a sane way to come to a reasonable conclusion as to whether the Senate has been to us an advantage or a disadvantage, whether it has been to us a profit or a loss. As I have remarked, if we are dissatisfied with our second chamber as we have it, in Great Britain they are equally dissatisfied, and have been for many centuries, with the upper chamber they have had. I noticed two or three days ago a despatch in our Canadian newspapers under the heading, 'To abolish the Lords,' and it reads:

> Plymouth, Feb. 13.—Mr. Pease, Chief Liberal Whip in the House of Commons, in a speech here last night announced that the government would appeal to the country before many months for a mandate to abolish the veto of the House of Lords.

It goes without saying that if in Great Britain they abolish the veto of the House of Lords, they abolish the House of Lords itself, in so far as it is or can be a factor in the government of the country. I think it means much that the chief whip of the Liberal party of Great Britain announces in a public speech that the great party to which he belongs, the party entrusted for the time being with the government of the country, is contemplating an appeal to the people by whose votes they are in power, for a mandate to abolish and do away with the House of Lords.

But I am told that the second chamber in Great Britain, the House of Lords, is very different from our Canadian Senate. It is true, there are some points of difference. Yet I contend to-night, and I think I am right in saying, that the points of similarity between our second chamber and the second chamber of Great Britain are much more striking than the points of difference. The hon. gentleman for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) speaking to his resolution to-day, pointed out one difference. He said that if we should do away with our second chamber there is still a check upon the House of Commons, that there remains the veto power in the King in Council in Great Britain. I do not attach very much weight or very much importance to that argument, while I agree in the main with the hon. member for Lincoln. It is true that theoretically and upon paper there is the veto power existing in the Sovereign of Britain.

But that veto power has not been exercised in the past to any extent and it would be better, safer and wiser that it should not be very much in evidence in time to come. I point out, however, that there is another difference between our second chamber and the House of Lords in Britain, as I pointed out in a speech on this subject that I delivered a year ago. There is more elasticity in the House of Lords than there is in our Canadian Senate. If a measure pass the House of Commons

in Britain it may be possible for the House of Lords to thwart the will of the people and check the legislation of the House of Commons, as it is possible with our Senate to do the same thing in Canada, only that in Britain they have this source of relief that they can increase and add to the number of their peers in order practically to make them carry out the will of the people and concur in whatever is done in the lower House. I cited an instance when I spoke on the subject before. Let me cite it again. In 1832, when the Reform Bill was before the British House of Commons, Earl Grey, then Prime Minister of Great Britain, refused to assume the leadership of the party to which he belonged and to take control of the Commons until the sovereign, His Majesty the King, then reigning in Britain, had given him the assurance that he would, if necessary, give his consent to the addition to the number of peers until the House of Lords would concur in whatever the House of Commons would do in the matter.

I have said that the points of similarity as between the Upper Chamber here and the Upper Chamber in Britain are greater than the points of difference. Mr. Charles G. D. Roberts, in his history of Canada, says:

> In the constitution of the Senate it was sought to make it correspond with the House of Lords as far as was possible in a purely democratic country like Canada.

I have no doubt, in fact, I think it is conceded, that the fathers of confederation tried to give us a Canadian Senate as nearly as possible the counterpart of the British House of Lords.

If then, there is a general discontent and dissatisfaction with the Senate as we have it, what shall we do? Obviously we can do one of three things. We must retain our Senate as we have it, or we must seek to reform it if we can and if it is impossible to reform it the only thing remaining for us to do is to do away with it altogether.

We, as sensible, progressive men, having the interests of the country at heart, if we conclude that the Senate as it is is not as it ought to be, will seek to end it or mend it. Shall we end it? Shall we do away with the Senate? If the decision of the matter were left to the vote of the people unquestionably the people would vote for the abolition of the Canadian Senate; but again I agree with my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that unless we have an educational campaign in which this whole question would be argued before the people they would not be in a position to intelligently vote upon the question. I anticipate that a majority of the members of this House will not to-day vote, if we are to have a vote, in favour of putting an end to the Senate. I believe that the vote to-day will be in favour of retaining the Senate; and why? I spoke a few days ago to one of the most experienced, to one of the most intelligent and to one of the most honest members of this House, if there be any degree of honesty among members of the House of Commons, and he said to me: I must admit that I am too much of an old Tory to advocate the abolition of the Senate. I spoke to another member of this House, not of quite such great experience, but a man of just as great intelligence, a man of just as great honesty, and he said: I am not radical enough to vote for the abolition of the Senate. Now, Sir, is it not true that whether we call ourselves Grits or Tories, Conservatives or Liberals, the real reason why so many of us will vote against the abolition of the Senate is that old feeling of Toryism, whether we placard ourselves as belonging to one party or the other, that old feeling of conservatism, that dread of letting go the things we have had and of replacing them by things that we have not tried? If we amend the Senate, how will we seek to amend it? Will we seek to amend the Senate by making it less active than it is; surely not. I do not agree with those people, with those newspapers that say that the Senate is a place in which people may comfortably go to sleep. I do not believe in the remark which, I think, is, may I say, a silly remark, that the Senate is composed of a lot of old women. I think that is not an argument, that these are not expressions that the facts warrant. Yet, I think, that no one will argue that there should be less of activity and more of lethargy than there is in our present chamber. If we then will not seek to amend the Senate by making it less active shall we seek to amend it by making it more active, by giving to it more life, more energy, more vim and vigour and shall we undertake to amend the Senate by giving to it a greater consciousness of the power it possesses or greater power to be conscious of? I hope that no rearrangement or reform of the Senate will be a reform along that line. Let me quote the opinion of the late Hon. Lord Salisbury in that connection. Lord Salisbury said:

> It is because most of those who sit in the House of Lords do not themselves select the profession of politics as a thing which they love but come to it by the operation of external causes, that we have a body that brings to the consideration of political matters a feeling which is described as one of languor, but which I would describe as one of good nature and easy-going tolerance, which enables them to accommodate themselves to the difficult part of playing second to the House of Commons.

As I have said before, it may be contended that the House of Lords in Great Britain differs considerably from our Canadian Senate, but that does not make any

difference to the argument. The state of affairs in one chamber is exactly similar to the state of affairs in the other; that is, there is in each one of these second chambers that feeling of languor, described by Lord Salisbury as a feeling of good nature and easy going tolerance that enables the Upper Chamber in either case to play second to the House of Commons. Realizing that to be the case, what did Lord Salisbury advocate? Did he advocate a reform by which there should be an Upper Chamber, the members of which Upper Chamber should be imbued with greater life, greater energy and greater activity? No, on the contrary, he deprecated any such change and advocated a continuance of things as they were. Listen again to his words when he said:

Depend upon it, if you ever succeed in so altering the character of this house that it consists of determined politicians, who always attend all debates and attach the same weight and importance that are attached to their opinions by those who sit in the House of Commons, you will have pronouced the doom of our present system of government, you will be imposing upon the House of Lords a place in the constitution which will be fatal to the constitution as it exists.

I beg humbly to concur in this opinion expressed by so experienced, so able a parliamentarian as the late Lord Salisbury. I say that if you amend the Senate to give to it a greater degree of energy, of vigour and of life you create a second chamber that is not enabled longer either by good nature or otherwise to play second to the House of Commons and you will then have two chambers that will be actuated by a feeling of rivalry, a feeling of jealousy, each one endeavouring to take precedence over the other and you will have them as combatants.

But, it is said: We will reform the Senate by electing the senators rather than by appointing them for life.

The fathers of confederation have been spoken of to-night. As we review the history of the past forty-two years we cannot but admire the sagacity, the intelligence, the forethought, the wisdom, the political ability of the fathers of confederation. How little there is in all the great work they did which we can adversely criticise? The constitution of our Canadian Senate was considered by them with great attention. It is true that some of the fathers of confederation, notably Hon. Edward Blake, were opposed to life appointments, and yet, after giving grave and careful thought and attention to the whole question, the fathers of confederation decided that we would have the best possible upper chamber if its members were appointed rather than elected and the appointments were for life. It is now sought to have this House declare that the framers of our constitution were wrong in this conclusion, and that it would have been better to elect than to appoint members of the Senate. Let us consider well before making such a change. What benefit will we achieve by it? You tell me it will be better to elect than to appoint our senators because then they will be responsible to the people. But, Sir, I believe the idea of the fathers of confederation was to create a Senate that would not be responsible to the people, and I believe that one and the main thing that has led the people of Canada to look with whatever degree of favour they have looked on the Canadian Senate was the very fact that the Senate was independent of the people, and they have been happy to believe and to think that, we have in the Canadian Senate a body of men not responsible to the people but independent of them and that if any sudden gust of popular passion, any great and sudden wave of public feeling should precipitate legislation that might perhaps afterwards turn out to be rash and unprofitable, we would have this great independent body between the public and ourselves, legislating for that which would perhaps not be acceptable for the moment but would be best for Canada in the long run. Elect your Senate and you take away that last remaining vestige of strength, that last remaining virtue in the upper chamber as a part of our constitutional system. Again you elect your Senate and your House of Commons; you have one body sitting in one chamber and another in a separate chamber and these two elected bodies are to make our laws. They are elected by the same people, why then place a partition between them? Why not put them in the same chamber? They have power and position from the same source, it seems a strange inconsistency to maintain the two chambers similarly situated and deriving their being from the same source of life. But you say we will elect the senators not for four or five or even ten years but for fifteen years and from larger constituencies. If it be better to elect members of your Senate for ten or fifteen years, why would it not be better to elect the members of the House of Commons for a longer term, for ten or fifteen years. But then you say we will elect them for larger constituencies. Again I ask what benefit will result from that? And of necessity, if you are to elect your senators, you must elect them from larger constituencies or you will have the same number of senators as members of the House of Commons. which would not be tolerated. It is said that there is a great deal of corruption attending the election of members to the House of Commons. I refuse to believe, I do not believe that there is anything like the amount of bribery and corruption in our elections that we are sometimes told and that many people believe. I believe that by far the larger number of

members on both sides of the House secure and retain their seats not as the result of corruption, bribery or dishonesty, but as the result of the wishes and honest votes of honest people, honestly given. But, be that as it may, we will admit that there is some degree of corruption sometimes and in some places in the election of members to the lower House; it is not necessary for the sake of my argument to decide whether that corruption be more or less, but if there be any corruption in the election of members of the House of Commons is it not likely and does it not follow as a matter of course that in electing members for ten or fifteen years for larger constituencies, you would open the way and create temptation for a much greater degree of corruption and bribery? A man seeking election to the House of Commons, be he never so bad, is limited in the amount that he can spend corruptly because he knows that if he remains in public life he will have to run another election in four or five years. But if he is seeking election for a term of ten or fifteen years, he knows that if he wins one election he will not have to submit himself to the votes of the people for a much longer period; he will know what his indemnity or emolument will be for the longer period and will be so enabled to spend a great deal more than he would in an election for a shorter period of time. Again in a large constituency the man or men seeking the votes of the people will necessarily not have the advantage of a personal acquaintance with the people and the people will not have the advantage of personal acquaintance with the candidate. Wherever there is a less acquaintance there is less interest, and where there is less personal interest in the candidates the people are much more susceptible to the influence of corruption.

But, Sir, I see a greater possible evil from larger constituencies. Be a man never so honest, be a man never so inclined to run his elections with perfect honesty, as a matter of necessity he must be a man with large leisure and means who can afford to carry on an election campaign in a district three or four times as great as the constituencies for the Commons, and as a result we would have a Senate composed almost exclusively of wealthy men. I have no feeling of antipathy to wealthy men. I believe it is essential that we should have in the House of Commons and the Senate while we have a Senate a certain number of men of large means. I think it well that in either chamber we should have some men who are able to look upon every question from every standpoint. We have in this chamber men who are able to look at questions from a certain standpoint because of locality, others able to look at them from another standpoint because of their vocation, others from a different standpoint because they are men of moderate means; and it is necessary also that we should have men in our law-making bodies who will be able to look at certain questions from certain standpoints because they are men of large means. There is a personal experience and knowledge that can come to men only from the fact that they have made and taken care of and invested large funds of which they are the possessors. But if we have a second chamber composed exclusively of men of means, class legislation must inevitably be the result. The man of wealth, I care not how he acquires his wealth, whether by inheritance, the sweat of his brow, or the labour of his mind, is by the very possession of his wealth removed from and kept out of touch with the man of moderate means, the ordinary citizen. The man of large wealth is a man of different interests, of different sympathies from the ordinary citizen of Canada, and therefore I say it would be a disaster and a calamity if we should resort to any means of establishing a Senate composed exclusively or almost exclusively of men of large means.

It has been suggested that our senators be appointed by the legislative assemblies of the different provinces. Again I ask, what advantage would result from making that change? It is sometimes said that our Senate is too partisan, that party feeling is too evident in our upper chamber that our Senate ought to be judicial in its character and our senators ought to bear more the character and the demeanour of judges than of partisan politicians. I admit that under the present system of appointing senators, men as they pass into the Senate do not divest themselves of the feeling of partisanship that has characterized them in their earlier life. But I would like to know how this would be remedied by having senators appointed by the various local legislatures. A legislature in which the Reform party was in power would be likely to appoint Reformers or a majority of Reformers, and a legislature in which the Conservative party was in power would be likely to appoint Conservatives or a majority of Conservatives; and these men would carry with them the same partisan feeling as the men appointed to the Senate under the system we have to-day. It is true, we are not likely to have at any one time the legislatures of all the provinces of one political complexion. We are likely to have some with the Liberals in power and some with the Conservatives in power; and under that system we would not have so large a partisan majority in the Senate as we have to-day. But that would make little or no practical difference. Have your senators elected by the local legislatures, and you will still have partisans and a partisan majority. Though the majority may be smaller, the party feeling will only be more intense and acute than it is to-day.

Again, if you appoint your senators through the local legislatures, you will create and perpetuate here at Ottawa, in connection with our federal government, a provincial feeling. Sometimes in this House of Commons, and it may be sometimes in the Senate, we are divided too much along provincial lines; we become too provincial. It is better that we should come to realize that we are more than a bundle of provinces, that we are a federacy, that we are a great Dominion, and that provincial feelings should be as much as possible subdued. But we should be perpetuating that very provincial feeling which we ought to avoid by appointing our senators through the provincial legislatures.

It has been suggested too that we should appoint some of our senators from the universities. I have no doubt that if we did so, we should secure some very excellent men; and yet I ask if there would not be a danger that such men, while very excellent theorists, would fail as practical men of affairs.

It is urged again that we require a Senate for the protection of the weaker provinces and for the protection of minorities. The hon. member for Lincoln pointed out that never in the history of Canada since confederation could we cite an instance of the Senate having been a protector of the rights either of minorities or of the weaker provinces. I will go further and say that not only have we no instance of the Senate having acted as such a protection, but it is impossible, utterly impossible, that the Senate, constituted as it is to-day, or constituted in any way that I have heard anybody propose to amend or reform it, could protect the rights of minorities or the rights of the weaker provinces. I say again that the protection of the weaker provinces and of the minorities in this country must be found in that spirit of fairplay which commonly prevails in the House of Commons—British fair play, or Canadian fair play,—which is composed of exactly the same elements as British fair play.

Why do we want a Senate? One member of this House with whom I was talking on this subject a few days ago, said: 'I would vote at once for the abolition of the Senate if it were not for the fact that every other civilized country in the world has an Upper Chamber;' and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), to-night, in the short speech which he addressed to the House, gave that as the strong point of his argument. I think the hon. member to whom I have referred was right. When we begin to investigate and consider this great subject, it behooves us to realize that every other civilized country has an upper chamber, and for that reason we ought to approach the subject with great caution. We ought not rashly to conclude to do away with an upper chamber in this country while other civilized countries retain theirs. And yet, if after 42 years of knowledge of the effects of our Senate, we investigate this question through and through, from side to side, from top to bottom, we ought to be able to come to a reasonable and logical conclusion as to whether or not the Canadian Senate, on its merits, has been of advantage to us or not, and should not be guided in our action by what other countries have or have not done. I would be willing, Sir, that this Canada of ours should sometimes lead, and not always be content to follow. I am willing that Canada shall sometimes set an example rather than always seek to follow the example of some other country. If we lead in this matter, it will not be the first important matter in which Canada has led and set an example to the world. On the great question of the abolition of slavery, Canada set the example to Great Britain and the United States so long ago that I believe only a small proportion of our people are aware that slavery ever existed in Canada.

It is said that we require a Senate as a wholesome and needed check upon the hasty legislation of the House of Commons. I ask again the question which was asked by the hon. member for Lincoln: what is there that makes the Canadian Senate competent to put a check on the hasty legislation of the House of Commons? If we are rash, if we are hasty in the laws we pass, what advantages do the members of the Senate possess to make them competent persons to revise and improve our work, to make perfect our imperfect legislation? Have they any superior merit, by reason of birth, of the greatness of their possessions, or of education, to give them the right or the competency to amend the legislation passed by this House? I am glad to be able to agree on this point with so eminent, shrewd and sagacious a statesman as the right hon. gentleman who leads this House, who in a recent speech delivered in this Chamber said that he attached no importance or very little importance to the Senate as a needed check on the legislation of the House of Commons. I believe that the abolition of the Canadian Senate, if that would make any difference at all, would tend to make the House of Commons more careful. If we realized that there was no check by virtue of the Senate over us, no excuse, no blame which we could attach to any other body, and that we alone were responsible for the laws we enacted, that would be a great incentive to greater care in our legislation. Mr. Willison, in his biography of the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, says:

'Moderation is the keynote of all his career and the secret of all his achievements. He learned at the threshold of his public life that a statesman must resist popular clamour

and stand impervious to momentary gusts of popular passion, and that all enduring achievement must be based in the reason rather than in the emotions of the people.'

I submit that a leader of the government, having his characteristic moderation, his fairness, his force of character, enabling him to resist any sudden gust of popular passion and clamour, is a greater protection against hasty, rash and unwise legislation than we can possibly find in a second chamber; and I trust that whatever party may be in power, it will be the good fortune of Canada to have a man of these characteristics, this ability and strength of character, to lead the government. But the strongest check we can possibly have upon hasty legislation in this House must be the strong check of public opinion. And that is more potent against hasty, rash and unwise legislation to-day than it ever has been at any previous time. Public opinion will be a more potent check a year hence than it is at present, just as it is more potent to-day than it was a year ago. Why is it a more effective check to-day than it was in years gone by? First, because of the superior education of the people, because of the better system of public schools, because our people are growing more prosperous and financially stronger, because the fathers and mothers of the boys and girls of Canada to-day are able to send their children to school more regularly and for a longer time than in previous years. We have to-day not only our young men and women better educated than were their fathers and mothers, but we have public libraries in every large centre and circulating libraries in almost every neighbourhood and in connection with almost every public school. With a better education of the people, with a ready access to printed books and newspapers more widely read than ever before, cheaper in their subscription price and more common in their distribution ; with greater transportation facilities and a better mail service, what happens in the House of Commons to-day is known and discussed by the people at their breakfast table to-morrow morning. All these things tend to arrest public attention and to create public opinion and make it the most healthy and potent check we can possibly have on hasty and unwise legislation.

I am not going to say that the Senate has never accomplished anything for good, that it has never done anything for the weal of the Canadian people. It would be an unwise and untenable position to take, to say that a Senate composed of some eighty or ninety men of education, experience and ability, and enjoying all the power they do, can have accomplished nothing for the good of the people. That is not a contention I would make, but what I simply say is this, that the benefits we have obtained from our Senate have not corresponded with the cost and disadvantage of maintaining it. Let me not be taken to mean that I am putting the financial cost of maintaining that body against the good we have received from it. I do not take that ground, because if, as a result of the existence of a second chamber, it can be clearly and unmistakably proven that we have better laws on our statute-books for the protection of the rights, liberties and privileges of people, the better guarding of life and better protection of property, the question of cost is one comparatively insignificant. When you tell me that we have better laws but that it has cost us so much to make them better, and then ask me to point out what is the profit or loss balance, I say that is too difficult a problem for any one to undertake. If you prove that, aside from its financial cost, the Senate has been a benefit to the country I have nothing more to say, but when we show that it has not been of any advantage, then we have the right to consider the matter of its financial cost.

In the arguments to which I have listened in favour of a second chamber, I have heard no one say: Look at what the Senate has acomplished; look at what it will do. The arguments in its behalf consist mostly of this: Think of what might have taken place if we had not had a Senate, and think of what may possibly take place in the future if we do away with it. These people appear like a cowardly man, afraid to take a journey in the dark lest something evil might cross his pathway. He knows of no such evil. He knows of no enemy whom he is likely to meet, but he hesitates lest some misfortune might overtake him, without having the slightest idea whence or how it might come. It seems to me that such is the position we take when we fear to abolish our Canadian Senate. I suggested, when I spoke on this question twelve months ago that we do not abolish our Senate by one fell swoop, but that we make no further appointments until the number of senators decreases by death or resignation or otherwise until the number should be reduced to say fifty. Then abolish that body completely and allow the remaining senators to retain their title for life with an annuity of say $2,000. That, however, is a mere question of detail. It seems to me that we are in the position of a boy on the brink of a stream. He hesitates to take the plunge. He knows the exhilirating, wholesome influences that will follow, but rather than take the plunge he stands shivering and faltering on the bank. In like manner we suffer injury while we stand halting and shivering instead of taking the plunge which will be to the people of Canada a decided benefit.

There are certain arguments which appeal to me in favour of continuing the Senate. They are the pleasant faces and the fine characters of some of my friends

on this side of the House and on the other, some of whom I would like to see enjoying the honours and privileges of a seat in that body. These sentiments appeal to me, not only because of mv friends on both sides of the House but because of many men outside who have fought the battles of their country, who have suffered, it may be, for their country's sake, who have lost their business connections and made great sacrifices for their country. Such men as these I would like to see enjoying the honours, profits and privileges of a place in the Canadian Senate, but to harbour such thoughts and be influenced by them, I would be allowing my feelings and sentiments to get the better of my judgment; and considering the matter carefully, weighing all the arguments pro and con, I am strongly and decidedly in favour of the resolution for the abolition of our second chamber.

Mr. JOHN BARR (Dufferin). Mr. Speaker, the question now under discussion is one which has attracted the attention of parliament almost since the time of confederation. There have been times when it seemed that it would be possible for us to accomplish something in relation to this matter, but at other times there has been little prospect of accomplishing anything. But, as we had this agitation in the last parliament, and as it seems probable that it will continue in the present parliament, I think it is the duty of the representatives of the people to place themselves on record that their constituents may know where they stand. I venture to say that no question to come before the House during the present session will attract more attention than the one which we now have under discussion. This question was agitated not only during last parliament, but during the recent election, and it is the subject of general discussion in the country at the present time. The people believe that the Senate has not accomplished the work that was expected of it at the time of confederation. Holding that view, a view I have held for a long time, I am entirely in accord with the mover of this resolution. I hope the hon. gentleman will stand to his guns and that all hon. members will be ready to declare their position, if not by voice, then by vote, that the electors may see their record and know what position they hold on this question.

The fathers of confederation showed great wisdom in handling the problems with which they had to deal. This is proven by the fact that only in two or three respects would we alter the British North America Act, even if the duty were committed to us of enacting it again at this time. I believe that it should be provided that parliament should run for five years, thus depriving the government of the power to bring a parliament to an end at a time to suit their own interests regardless of the interest of the country. Of course, safeguards would be required in case of a government not being able to carry on the administration of public affairs for the full term of parliament. In such a case the Governor General should have power to dissolve the House. I believe that this could be done without danger to the public interest. Our political experience shows that it is not the strong Liberal or the strong Tory, the man who votes according to his party, whose influence dissolves the House; it is the independent voter whose influence decides these matters. Therefore, I believe it would be better that we should petition the Imperial parliament to so amend the British North America Act as to provide for a full five-years' term for parliament. Another change required is in respect of our second chamber. At the time of confederation the great statesmen who prepared our present constitution—and I think we may safely say they were all great statesmen—differed widely in their views on this question of a second chamber. George Brown, the advanced reformer, believed strongly in an appointive Senate. Mr. Blake and many other reformers held different views. The Conservatives also were much divided on this question. After much deliberation a decision was reached in favour of an appointive Senate. I believe that, if we review the record of the Senate, we can come to no conclusion but that that body has not met the requirements of the situation or come up to the expectations formed by the people of the Dominion. I believe that if the work were to be done over again, opinion would be overwhelmingly in favour of trusting our affairs to one chamber composed of men elected by and responsible to the people. I believe that the people to-day regard the decision reached by the fathers of confederation in relation to the Senate to have been a mistake. We are told that practically every civilized nation has a second chamber. I can well believe that; in the older countries of Europe it was thought wise to have a chamber whose members could be trusted to be true to the Throne and which would be less easily moved than the majority of the people. I can imagine that even in Canada, nearly half a century ago, a second chamber might have seemed necessary. But I believe that the people as a whole are quite satisfied to-day that the affairs of the country would be safe in the hands of a legislature composed of only one chamber. They believe that if the people were left to elect their representatives they would be more careful, and, as a result, we should have better legislation, legislation better fitted to meet the requirements of the mass of the people than we have to-

day. If we look at the history of the Houses of Lords in England we find that reforms have in many cases been wrung out of that second chamber by the representatives of the people. We find that many measures which were opposed at the time by the Lords are to-day the laws of the land, proving beyond a doubt that the people can be trusted. So I say that to-day it would be an evil if the Senate of Canada were to be in a position to make laws to govern this country, and if the Senate could not with advantage rule the country, then they are not necessary, and should be done away with.

Looking back over the history of our country since confederation we find the political parties changing their position with regard to the Senate. There was a time when the Liberal party at present in power were very much opposed to the Senate, there was a time when one of the chief planks in their platform was the abolition of the Senate. Some years ago when I had the honour of a seat in the provincial house, and when I took part in elections, I found that the representatives of the Liberal party at that time made the abolition of the Senate almost their entire stock in trade. In every county they denounced the Senate as unnecessary, as something that was out of date, as one of the mistakes of the fathers of confederation. But a great change came over that party when they reached power, and to-night we have heard that the Senate might be a very good thing, that it might be a great advantage to the country if we could only eliminate politics from the appointments. But I want to say that if political influence is ever eliminated from the appointments it will be in the dim and distant future. We have been told to-night that it was forty-two years since the Senate came into existence. Has there been any progress in eliminating politics from appointments to the Senate? Decidedly not. When Sir John Macdonald was in power I think he did appoint one Senator that was not a Conservative, a Mr. McDonald, of Toronto. Since the present government came into power they have appointed a large number of Senators, and not one of them has been a Conservative.

Now I ask the question, what will the result be in a short time? When the present government came into power the Senate was largely Conservative, and there was a conflict. There is danger of a conflict at any time. When the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie ruled the destinies of Canada there was a conflict between the Senate and the House of Commons. The Senate vetoed a Bill passed by the Commons in connection with a railroad in British Columbia. The proposition was made by Mr. Mackenzie to increase the number of senators in order that he might appoint a number of Reformers and thereby get a majority in that body. That proposition however was not carried out, fortunately I think for the country. Now here is the position we stand in to-day. We find to-day a very small number of Conservatives in the Senate. It is very unlikely that this government will remain in power after the next election; all signs point to their defeat when the people have another opportunity of pronouncing their opinion. Now when a Conservative government comes into power and finds an enormous Liberal majority in the Senate, is there not great danger of a conflict? The Senate will then stand as a menace and a danger to the country. The result would be that Bills passed by the popular chamber would be rejected by the Senate, and consequently an agitation would spring up throughout the country in favour of a drastic reform of the Senate, or its abolition. Under these circumstances, therefore, I think it would be wise on the part of this government to take some steps to redeem the pledge they made when in opposition to reform or abolish the Senate. They have redeemed one of the pledges of their famous platform in connection with the voters' lists, and I think they might now well redeem their pledge regarding the Senate.

Now the question arises, shall we amend or end the Senate? As I have already said, every decade the Senate costs this country over $4,000,000, and I believe the country is of the opinion that we receive no value for the money. It has been suggested that we give the people an opportunity to express their opinion on this question, and I think that is the proper thing to do. Let the people be asked, first: Do you approve of the Senate? Second: Would you abolish the Senate? and thirdly: Do you desire a reform of the Senate? I believe that scarcely a corporal's guard would vote to retain the Senate; I am of the opinion that a vast majority of the people would vote to abolish it altogether.

We will not only have the saving, but if we do not feel that we are properly represented we can increase the number of representatives as we have done in the past and as we will be forced to do whether we keep the Senate in operation or not. I am aware that probably the eastern provinces will oppose the abolition of the Senate, because, under the agreement by which the representation in the various provinces in this House is fixed, the basis being sixty-five representatives for Quebec and the other provinces being represented proportionately, the lower provinces find that their representatives have been decreasing every decade and they feel that they have not been receiving justice. The Senate remains the same and some of these little provinces have as many representatives in the Senate as they have in this House. They may be, afraid that with the abolition of the Senate they may not receive justice at the hands

of parliament. But, we might ask the representatives of these provinces what the Senate has done for them? The people of Prince Edward Island claim that, according to the British North America Act, they are entitled to the construction of a tunnel connecting with the mainland, and I believe they are if it can be built for any reasonable amount of money. But, what have the four senators from Prince Edward Island done or attempted to do for this province? What have these other provinces received from the Senate? Their representatives in this House obtained several concessions from the government, but they did not feel that they had received all that they should have obtained. But what have they received from the Senate? Go over the records of that body and you will find that the senators from these provinces have, like those from other parts of the country, been asleep to a great extent, that they have accomplished very little and that the Senate is of no advantage as safeguarding the interests of the lower provinces.

But, the representatives of the people can be increased in number and with one body composed of 220 representatives the Dominion of Canada is perfectly safe without a Senate. At confederation the question was raised as to how many of the provinces should have a second chamber. The second chamber was advocated by a number of the fathers of confederation. It was proposed that Ontario even should have one, but Ontario was opposed to the second chamber and it has got along very well without it. But, we know that other provinces have a second chamber, and we know that they have had great difficulty in abolishing the principle of the second chamber, that it has only been by appointing men who are pledged to vote for the abolition of the second chamber that any progress along that line has been made. Quebec has one at the present time, but it could not have remained in existence in Ontario for five years if the principle had been established there. If Ontario, one of the largest provinces in the confederation, having almost half the representation in this House, sees no advantage in its second chamber, and if it is not deemed advisable to establish it in other provinces, must we not come to the conclusion that it is not a necessary part of the parliament of Canada? I believe that if the problem of confederation were to be worked out again to-day there would be no Senate, that the people would be quite willing to leave the legislative power to their representatives in the House of Commons, and I can assure you that with the intelligent voting population that we have in Canada to-day this Dominion and the provinces which compose it would be perfectly safe. We have, every four or five years, a Dominion election and the people can change their representatives at any time they choose to do so. That is the greatest safeguard that any people could have, and I believe that the Senate has been a curse rather than a blessing. I do not believe that appointing younger men to the Senate would be an advantage nor do I believe that the appointment of more aggressive, active and energetic men to the Senate would commend itself to the wisdom of the country. It has been said that the government have been very careful in the selection of senators and the argument has been advanced that one of the greatest safeguards was that the government had not appointed aggressive men, but, mild, quiet, easy-going men to occupy seats in the Senate. It is true that there are some brilliant lights, but usually the men selected for seats in the Senate are those who have been rejected by the electors or who have not been called upon to run again and, if we look at the last appointment, we must say that there is not much hope of improvement. There we find that the gentleman who was appointed to the Senate was not able to secure the convention of his party. It was necessary for him to give way to another candidate in order that the government might carry the election and he received his reward in the shape of a senatorship. He never was any bright or shining light in this House such as we might expect to be called upon to fill that position. The Senate is also utilized as a means of finding places for ministers of the Crown that do not succeed in obtaining a seat. If such a state of affairs continues we have no hope of any reform. I believe the best course we can pursue is to abolish the Senate. One of the strong reasons why I hold that belief is this: We have a Senate to-day such as we never had before, in that a large number now occupying seats in the upper chamber are prepared to change the constitution of the Senate and assist the Commons in carrying out the wishes of the people in that regard. We have heard leading men, many of whom have grown gray in the service of their country, and men who, I believe, are conscientious in what they say, stating publicly and openly that they believe the time has come for either abolishing or amending the Senate. We have that old statesman and politician, the Hon. Mr. Scott, coming out with a scheme which probably would be a good one, and which, at least, would be a great improvement on the present state of affairs. That is to continue the appointment of one-third of the members and have two-thirds elected by the people.

That would give something in the neighbourhood of fifty-four or fifty-eight representatives of the people. I admit the objection to these large constituencies, but even that would be small compared with the existing disadvantages and dangers. So long as we have representatives of the people, by the people and with the people, the

country is comparatively safe, but if we had a conflict between the Senate and the House of Commons confederation might be in danger and with two-thirds of the Senate elected that danger would cease. The other third might be appointed. I believe to-day that if our Senate was altogether composed of politicians who had long served their country it would be better and more in accordance with the interests of the people. The greatest danger is the younger element put in in the hope that they would live long after a change in popular feeling shall have brought in a Conservative administration. If we are not to abolish the Senate we should amend it in a way to give the provinces a voice in the elections. Suppose that one-third of the senators were elected as at present, one-third elected by the different provinces and one-third by the electors, the objection of the last speaker is in my opinion one of the strongest points in connection with this legislation. It is that probably no time will occur in the history of Canada in which all the provinces will belong to one political stripe, whether Conservative or Reform. It is true that now over two-thirds are Conservative, and from appearances they are likely to remain so for some time unless this government should mend its ways in connection with graft and other things of that kind. But suppose they were of a different political stripe from this House would that not be a strong argument why a number of them should be appointed by the different provinces. We would then have continued mixing and no matter whether a Conservative or Reform government were in power, we would always have a number of the opposite party appointed which would greatly help to solve the problem. It is admitted that one great danger in Canada is the encroachment of this government upon provincial rights. Unfortunately at the time of confederation questions which are now of vital importance and whose solution presents the greatest difficulty were comparatively trifling. I refer to such matters as water-power, gas wells, &c., which in the near future will be of great importance to provinces. This House has been encroaching upon the rights of the provinces. It is unfortunate that these questions are not all settled, but if we had these different provincial governments making appointments to the Senate to the extent of one-third of its membership, the wishes and desires of the provinces would be represented in the Senate and they would see that justice was done to the provinces. By such a system we would have a mixture of politics in the membership of the Senate and have a much safer body than now. I must therefore come to the conclusion that no better solution than the one suggested can be found and I should be pleased to endorse it. It has been suggested that the work of parliament should be divided between the two Houses, and that senators should carry through one-half of the legislative programme, which would come to us for revision as our work now goes to them. But we must not lose sight of the fact that we the representatives of the people, coming from the people, being of the people, know the wants of the people better than the senators do. We have all noticed that Bills coming from the Senate are in many cases of such a character that they would not pass this House if originally introduced here and subjected to the criticism of our committee. Bills favouring corporations and granting charters to companies that would not be accepted in this House have in the last four years been introduced in the Senate and have then passed through this House without receiving the degree of consideration they otherwise would. The result is that many Bills have slipped through this House that would not have passed if they had been introduced here. All the bad Bills that we have had in the last four years have emanated from the Senate. It is well known that the Senate favours corporations more than this House does because the senators have not their constituents to consider, and the result is that railroads and corporations have more faith in the Senate and in this way dangerous legislation has been passed. Under these circumstances I hope that if we are to have a Senate it will not be an aggressive Senate. I believe that a sleeping, quiet Senate such as we now have is not dangerous. The general feeling throughout the country is that the principal work of the Senate is in connection with divorces, and I must say they do occupy a great deal of their time in that way and I have no doubt it amuses them very much. But if we look over the divorces granted we must conclude that the senators do not attach that importance to their decisions that they should and that in many cases applicants succeed in influencing the senators to a greater extent than they could influence the representatives of the people in this House. I am opposed to divorce and divorce laws if we can get on without them. But I believe a divorce law would be preferable to the existing system. These Bills emanate from the Senate and when they come here no consideration is given to them. Would not a judge be much more capable of weighing the merits of a divorce case, and better able to judge right from wrong than the senators if we are to measure their future by their past decisions. If we take away from the Senate the trial of divorce cases, which my hon. friend proposes to do, what is there left for them to accomplish? I believe the time has come when we could do without the Senate, and by so doing save a large amount of money to the country year after year.

Mr. HONORE GERVAIS (St. James, Montreal). Mr. Speaker, I have been for a great many years looking for an opportunity to join in such an important debate as the one that is going on to-night. I know quite well a number of senators who have been for a long time waiting for a ticket of leave for they have been thinking, not of the Notre-Dame or Beechwood Cemetery but of reforming that upper house which is called the Senate of Canada. I am not unmindful of the great role which has been played all over the world by upper houses of legislation. For the last four centuries, in about every country in the civilized world, except in Hungary, an upper house and a lower house have been in existence and are still in existence. Mr. Speaker, you know quite well, that three great social interests—the aristocracy of wealth, the aristocracy of knowledge, and the aristocracy of lineage—have been instrumental in establishing and maintaining those houses which are styled by social writers upper houses. It is not my desire to-night to give my views on the usefulness of maintaining our Senate. It is a moot question whether or not our Senate could be reformed in any shape or form. I am not prepared to-night to say just what degree of concession should be made to those who demand the reformation of our Senate, because I have not yet gathered all the necessary information or data. I am waiting for this information and data to come to me, both by cable and by mail, and until I get it, I do not feel able to give to this House the benefit of my views on this great question. Before resuming my seat, I must say that while listening to this debate, which evidently was inspired by some remarks already made in the Senate, I could not help recalling the old fable, 'when the devil was sick, the devil a monk would be.' Might I quote here, as a word of advice, the phrase, 'let the dead bury the dead,' and the living govern the living. Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

THE GOVERNMENT ICE-BREAKING STEAMERS.

Mr. A. B. WARBURTON (Queens, Prince Edward Island), moved:

For a copy of all reports, memorials, documents and correspondence in possession of the government with regard to the superannuation and to making provision for the superannuation of officers and members of the crew of the winter or ice-breaking steamers owned or in the employ of the government.

He said: Mr. Speaker, before this motion is put, I would like to say a few words on behalf of a very deserving class of men in the employ of the Government. The Government of Canada at the present time, has, I believe, five ice-breaking steamers in its employ. Of these the two which are perhaps the best known, because they have been the longest in the service and have been most often mentioned in this House, are the two engaged in the ice-breaking service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. The other three are now and have been for some three or four years in service in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. I refer to the 'Montcalm,' the 'Lady Grey,' and the 'Champlain.' The officers and men on board of these vessels are engaged in a most arduous and difficult employment, in which they are subject to much exposure and hardship. I have no personal knowledge of the conditions which prevail in that service in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, but I have a somewhat intimate acquaintance with the hardships connected with the work done by the 'Minto' and the 'Stanley,' which are engaged in the winter service between the mainland of Canada and my own province of Prince Edward Island. The senior captain of those vessels, Captain Finlayson, has been in that employ for nearly thirty-five years. He was in command of the first steamer owned by the Dominion government which was put on that route, the old 'Northern Light.' He has been in command of the 'Stanley,' which is still there, and later has been in command of the 'Minto,' the last vessel built for that route, and still employed there.

Captain Finlayson has been in the service nearly thirty-five years, Captain Brown for 10 or 12 years, and it is difficult for any member of this House to form an adequate idea of the difficulties and hardship these men have to undergo. The ice-boat service is hard enough as we have it in Prince Edward Island, but it begins in the morning and ends at night, and the men rarely have to work more than seven or eight hours at a time. In the case of these steamers, however, it frequently happens that they are tied up in the ice and in the straits for weeks at a time. Some three or four years ago one of these steamers got into a jam and drifted up and down the straits during sixty days. She lost her propeller blades; the other steamer had to go to her assistance, and she also lost one of her propeller blades, and it was only after sixty days that they got clear. The captain had of course to stand by his ship. I do not know that there was any special danger, but the experience was a very trying one and a severe test on the nerves of the strongest men. Captain Finlayson has been nearly thirty-five years in this trying service; he has to fight his way through ice floes and rafted ice, as I know of my own experience, for I have crossed some fifteen or twenty times on such occasions and found the experiences very trying ones. I have seen that vessel stuck on the ice off Pictou for thirty-six hours at a stretch. I

have seen one of these steamers stuck inside the harbour for 59 days while the other was shut outside. And during all that time these captains were responsible for the management of their ships and men and subjected to the most unreasoning and querulous criticism from the people and from a portion of the press which ought to have known better. I am using as strong language as I can because I have seen a lot of this kind of thing and I sympathize deeply with these men. What do these men get? Captain Finlayson, who is the senior captain, gets, after this long experience, but $1,500 a year, which is but a little less than the pay of a second-class clerk who has not quite reached the maximum of his class. And this man has been only receiving this salary the last few years. During a great part of the period he has been in the service he received less than $1,000 a year, but gradually worked up to $1,200 a year, and finally a few years ago he got $1,500. This pay for a man holding that responsible and nerve-destroying position is utterly inadequate. However, that is not the chief point I want to bring before the House. It is well known that when men are employed in very trying positions they cannot stand the wear and tear for any length of time. I am not a railway man, but I am informed that in our great fast railway service, in which the express trains are run at great speed, their conductors and engineers cannot stand the strain for more than four or five years, and no company will keep them longer in these positions because even the strongest among them are bound to give way. But what are we to think of a man in the position of Captain Finlayson, who has been thirty-five years in charge of a steamer going through the ice, having the responsibility on his hands of the lives of his passengers and crew during the winter season, in all sorts of stormy weather, through heavy rafted and floating ice and harbour ice, under perhaps the most difficult conditions which prevail in Canada, receiving such small compensation. And besides, what is still a worse feature, these men can make no provision for the future, for it must be evident to every one that no man in Captain Finlayson's position can save out of his pay any kind of a competence for the future. If there were anything to look forward to, the case might not be so bad. But here you have a man over seventy years of age who when he retires, as he must before long, will have no superannuation allowance to fall back on. Surely if a judge of the land is entitled on retiring from the bench to a pension, or a clerk who has served in a comparatively easy service, such as in these buildings, or in the outside service of the government, and who, at the end of a number of years, when he is still perhaps in the prime of life has the privilege of retiring on an allowance sufficient to keep him in at least moderate comfort, surely the men who conduct the difficult service to which I have referred ought to be entitled to at least as much consideration. Surely these men, when the time comes when they must retire from the service, should receive some superannuation so as to keep them in comfort during the remainder of their days.

My object in moving for this correspondence is to bring this matter to the notice of the government and hon. members on both sides, feeling sure that when they recognize the position in which these faithful and devoted servants of the people are placed, they will judge their case favourably and take some steps to remedy this anomalous state of affairs. In the British service, in the army and navy, every man has the hope of retiring on some allowance which will at least support him, but there is no such hope for the men who go into the ice-breaking service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland and also in the river and gulf of St. Lawrence. I have said, Mr. Speaker, sufficient to bring the case of these men before the government and the House. This is a matter in which I have for years taken a great interest. Ever since I began to cross in these boats and have seen the work these men have to do, I made up my mind that if I ever should have a seat in this House I would bring their case before it, and in doing that, I believe I am only doing my duty.

Mr. A. L. FRASER. (King's, P. E. I.) The subject which is now before the House is one of deep interest to a large number of people in the province from which I come. Captain Finlayson, to whom the hon. member from Queens (Mr. Warburton) has referred, has been in this difficult and dangerous service for thirty-five years. During a great part af that time he received a very small salary and is now receiving but $1,500 a year. He has devoted his whole life to this service, perhaps the most dangerous on the North American continent, for certainly the most difficult and dangerous navigation to-day is that of the Straits of Northumberland. During all this time he has conducted this navigation without an accident, without the loss of a life or anything else. This alone ought to entitle his claim to the favourable consideration of hon. members on both sides. If there is any man in the Dominion who has well earned his superannuation, it certainly is Captain Finlayson. This man has shown himself to be well qualified for the position. The other captain is not so long in the service, and I do not know so much about him, but he also bears a good reputation. We of Prince Edward Island, when crossing in the boats, know that all that prudence and care can do

to ensure our safety will be done by the two captains in charge of the winter boats. And though we may sometimes feel that the boats are delayed, we feel also that our lives are safe with Captain Finlayson and Captain Brown. That is one of the reasons why I think they should receive the favourable consideration of this House. And I have no doubt that when the government takes this matter up and considers what Captain Finlayson especially has done during the last thirty-five years in the navigation of the straits, it will see its way to recompensing him as he should be recompensed.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I may say to the hon. member for Queens (Mr. Warburton) that there is no objection to the papers being brought down. I am not aware whether there are any papers in the hands of the department or the government concerning the superannuation of the two officers whose names he has mentioned, Captain Finlayson or Captain Brown, or of the captains of the other ice-breakers run by the government. I am aware, however, that there are memorials which have been presented to the department in relation to the captains of Dominion vessels generally. I shall be glad to bring down these papers also because they touch upon the question under discussion. I am glad to avail myself of this opportunity to add my voice in support of the sentiments expressed by the two preceding speakers concerning the services rendered to the country by Captain Finlayson and Captain Brown. Captain Finlayson has been in the service for many years—I believe the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Fraser) stated, more than thirty years. It would be impossible to eulogize these captains too highly. The services they have rendered to the country are meritorious services. They have discharged their duties faithfully. We are glad to know that during their long service no accident has happened to any vessel under control of these captains. The work they have to perform in the Straits of Northumberland is certainly most difficult work, but because of their caution and because of their skill in the discharge of their duties, they have been able to avoid accidents, a result which has been very satisfactory to the department. The question of superannuation of the officers on government vessels is one which is engaging the serious attention of the department. We have adopted in the department the plan of making appointments in the service by promotion. For the last year or two all appointments of officers made, with the exception of one, I believe, have been made by the elevation of men from the ranks. The results of this policy, I am sure, will be good. At the same time, it may be opportune for us to consider very seriously whether we should not give to these captains some gratuity or superannuation. Last year, we had an old officer, Captain Graham, who had been on the 'Osprey' or some other of our vessels for many years, and who, on account of his age, had to be retired. No superannuation allowance could be given him, and we had to give him some little employment in the dockyard at Halifax in order to show our appreciation of the services he had rendered. This question should be dealt with not in connection with the officers on the ice-breakers alone, but in connection with all the captains in the service of the government. I can only repeat what I have already said that this question is engaging the serious attention of the department.

Motion agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken up to-morrow ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will take the Bills on the paper and then go into Supply.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. What Supply ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Public works.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, February 23, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Auditor General, 1908, Vol. II.—Hon. Mr. Paterson.

OFFICAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. HONORE GERVAIS (Montreal, St. James) moved:

That the first report of the Select Standing committee on debates be amended by striking out of the third part the words 'deferred until the close of the session,' to be replaced by the following words, 'to be printed and published as usual' and that the said report as amended be concurred in.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the object of this report which is being made by the Debates Committee is to do away with the criticism which has been made against the committee with regard to the delay in the publication of the French edition of our 'Hansard.' Complaints have been made since 1893 against the delay in the publication of the French 'Hansard.' One of the causes of the delay arises from the fact that the

French edition of the 'Hansard' has to be made up from the revised English edition. The consequence was that nobody could obtain a copy of the French edition of the 'Hansard' until fifteen days after the unrevised edition of the English 'Hansard' had been issued. These complaints were well grounded because, as a matter of fact, the newspaper men in the province of Quebec, as well as the French speaking citizens of Canada, have been deprived of what they are entitled to, that is, the French edition of the 'Hansard' at the same time that the English edition is issued. More especially have the members of the House of Commons complained of this delay. The object of this report is to go back to the condition of affairs that was in existence in 1893 when the French version of the 'Hansard' was made from the daily or unrevised edition of the English 'Hansard.' By adopting this report the result will be that, within twenty-four hours after the issue of the English edition of the 'Hansard,' everybody who wishes to have the French edition will be able to have it because the French 'Hansard' will then be out. The revised edition both of the English and French 'Hansards' will be published as usual at the end of the session and everybody will receive bound volumes. By the adoption of this report the House of Commons will get rid of many of the criticisms and complaints that have been made against the Debates Committee. I might assign as another cause of the delay some unwillingness on the part of certain officials of the Printing Bureau to facilitate the publication of the French edition of the 'Hansard,' an unwillingness which has proved to be, as regards one portion of the population of Canada, offensive and sometimes oppressive. It is to do away with that condition of affairs that this report is presented to the House. Now, let us examine the question of expenditure. There will be practically no increase of expenditure, except, perhaps, that the committee will have to appoint another translator, involving an expenditure of $2,100 a year. That is the total expenditure which will have to be incurred should this report be adopted by the House. The translators will have to work from 8.30 a.m. until late in the evening, as they do now. The two proof-readers now employed will be quite sufficient to do the proof-reading and extra assistance will not be necessary. The daily unrevised edition will be published every morning as usual and the translators will make their translation from that edition so that the printing of the French edition can be done during the next day or during the night. Therefore, twenty-four hours after the issue of the English 'Hansard' the French edition will be circulated and the French speaking members of the House will be quite satisfied with that. It is proposed to increase the issue of both the French and English edition of the unrevised 'Hansard' and no extra expenditure properly speaking will be entailed by that. The King's Printer and Mr. Shipman, the able foreman of printing, as well as the very clever chief translator, Mr. Larose, attended the last meeting of the Debates Committee and they assured us that work will be carried out as I have explained, that the present printing machinery is sufficient, and that satisfaction would be given to the French-speaking community in this respect. I trust the House will adopt this report without any further delay, and when it is adopted there will be no further complaints against the Debates Committee.

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER (Two Mountains). I see that it is proposed to amend the report by substituting the words 'be printed and published as usual,' for the words 'deferred until after the close of the session.' I was not aware that any meeting of the Debates Committee had been called since the adoption of the report at which this amendment was agreed to, and this is the first intimation I have had of this amendment. I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Gervais) what is the real meaning of the words 'be printed and published as usual.' If I understand it aright it means that we will have an issue of the unrevised French 'Hansard' and also of the revised French 'Hansard.' If that is so I have nothing to complain of, but I do not think it was the intention of the committee to impose that burden upon the Printing Bureau, or upon the translators, or upon the finances of the country. If the idea is to publish an unrevised edition of the French 'Hansard' as well as a revised edition, as at present, I will concur in it notwithstanding that the amendment has been somewhat of a surprise to me.

Mr. GERVAIS. When the report of the committee was presented, some of the English speaking members said that it might cause a delay in the publication of the revised English edition of the 'Hansard.' I admit that was the case, and in consequence of their representations the report of the committee was amended in the direction I have indicated. The amendment will remove any cause of fear on the part of the English-speaking members that there will not be an expeditious publication of both editions of 'Hansard.'

Mr. SPROULE. There are serious objections to the proposals contained in this report and I do not think it should be concurred in by the House. One proposal is that instead of the English revised edition being distributed to the public and the press as at present, a sufficient number of copies of the daily unrevised edition should be circulated. To this I take exception. It is not proper to hold members responsible for what appears in the unrevised edition of

'Hansard' when they have had no opportunity of correcting any errors which may have crept in from one cause or another. This proposal means that the unrevised edition uncorrected will be circulated and published in the press of the country, and that members may be held responsible for statements which were never made by them. That is an injustice to the members and it is misleading to the public. That system has been found in the past not to work well, and I do not believe it should be resorted to again. The report also says that the debates be translated into French from the daily unrevised edition which means that the errors in the unrevised English edition will be translated into the French edition. That would be very unfair to the French members, and it would be unfair to the English members.

Mr. GERVAIS. I may assure the hon. gentleman that the French members will be quite safe and satisfied with the adoption of the report. Let the French-speaking members manage their own business. They are ready to relieve him from the care and trouble of protecting their own interests.

Mr. SPROULE. If they are satisfied the English-speaking members still have a very strong objection to it because if the unrevised edition is translated they might be made to say in the French edition many things which they did not say, but which would be used against them in the country. It is bad enough to hold a man responsible for what he did say, but let him have an opportunity of confirming the record of his utterance and do not attribute to him something he never said. It would mean the translation of an incorrect copy and that would be bad for both parties, bad for the House, bad for parliament and misleading to the country. As to the proposal to defer the publication of the revised version in English and French until after the close of the session—

Mr. GERVAIS. I am doing away with that objection by the amendment I am now proposing to this report.

Mr. SPROULE. That amendment I now see omits the provision deferring publication and declares that a revised edition shall be printed and published as usual. That does away with the objection I raised to that part of the report, so of course I have nothing further to say upon it. I understand there is another proposal in it to appoint another translator.

Mr. GERVAIS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. As I understand we may create an office, but neither the committee nor the House has any right to report in favour of any particular person to fill an office because that will be the duty of the Civil Service Commission in the future. Therefore it seems to me it would be quite out of place to recommend it here.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. The committee were induced to make this report owing to the continued cry from our French friends that they were not in possession of the debates for a week or ten days after the occurrence of a debate in the House, and after consulting with the officials of the translating staff and the King's Printer, we came to the conclusion that we could not provide them with a daily 'Hansard' without adopting the course recommended, and by adopting this course our French friends will get the speeches within twenty-four hours after the English edition is delivered to the English-speaking members. To meet that view of the case we decided to report as we have done.

Then the revised edition is what now goes out to the public press. I consider this simply a waste of money because there is not a newspaper that makes any use of it; they get the revised edition when it is a week or ten days old, and if you go into any newspaper office in the country you will find the 'Hansards' in the waste basket. If they are supplied with any report of the debates let them have it fresh from the House, the day after it is published. That was the view I took and the view taken by the committee generally. The revision of speeches will go on as usual, the members will make corrections inside of twenty-four hours; the revised edition will then be printed, but the bound volume will not be printed until the close of the session. I think the course adopted is the best in the interests of the House and the country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as the unrevised edition is concerned, it is perfectly clear that up to the present time there has been practically no French edition whatever. As both languages are used in the House it seems to be a fairly reasonable proposition that there should be a French unrevised 'Hansard' as well as an English, and from that standpoint I would be inclined to concur in the report of the committee. So far as distribution to the press is concerned there is something in what my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) has urged, that some hon. member may occasionally be put in an unfortunate position through the inadvertant alteration by the 'Hansard' reporters of something that he has said. For example, he may have used the word 'not.' It may happen in the hurry of debate, in the confusion that very often arises in the House, that word may escape the attention of the reporter and in that way he may be made to say precisely the opposite to that which he did say. However, I would think difficulties of that kind would be only very oc-

casional and I would suggest to the Committee on Debates that when the unrevised 'Hansard' goes out to the press and the country—as a matter of fact it goes out to the press and the country to-day because every enterprising newspaper gets a copy of the unrevised—but when it goes out in this formal way it might be worth while to put a note at the commencement of each day's 'Hansard' explaining that it is subject to correction and has not been revised by the different members who have spoken. If that were done it would probably minimize the objection of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule).

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS—FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 75) respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 76) to incorporate the Imperial Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. A. Haggart.

Bill (No. 77) respecting a patent of the Submarine Company. Mr. Proulx.

Bill (No. 78) to incorporate the Superior and Western Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Conmee.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE moved that the Public Accounts and Volumes 1 and 3 and section O of the report of the Auditor General for the fiscal year ended 31st March, 1908, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Acccounts.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. I understand that Volume 2 of the Auditor General's Report was laid on the table of the House to-day and I would suggest that the motion be amended so as to include it.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. I would be very glad to include everything that is before the House.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

ILLICIT OR SECRET COMMISSIONS.

House in committee on Bill (No. 31) to prevent the payment or acceptance of illicit or secret commissions or other like practices.—Mr. Aylesworth.

On section 3,

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice.) When this Bill was in committee, a week ago, its various provisions were considered, and the question now remains of the preamble. Since then I have had the opportunity of giving some consideration to the views that were expressed by various members, and I must say that my ideas with regard to the procedure under this Bill, should it become law in its present shape, are entirely in accord with those expressed by my hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie). I think that the provisions of our Criminal Code, as regards the procedure of all criminal cases, would apply to the procedure under this measure, without any necessity for special mention; but there can be no objection to that being made abundantly clear if, in the opinion of the committee, or of any hon. member, that is desirable. That can be accomplished by adding to the Bill a section providing that this Act shall be read as if its provisions formed part of the Criminal Code.

With regard to the responsibility which the Bill casts upon a single magistrate in case a prosecution for an infraction of it were to be disposed of summarily, my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Crothers) seemed to think it would be an anomaly to give power to a single magistrate, on summary conviction, to sentence for even six months. But if reference is had to our Criminal Code, it will be seen that there are many offences, specifically mentioned in that Code, as it has stood now for nearly seventeen years, of at least equal importance to minor offences under this Bill; and some of the offences that I have in mind in the Code are of even greater importance than perhaps a serious infraction of this measure would be, with respect to which the same provision is made as to the method of trial, namely, either upon indictment or upon summary conviction. Let me refer to one or two, and there are at least a dozen, as showing what important matters have been dealt with and what serious punishments have been, in some instances, imposed under these provisions, without, so far as I am aware, any one considering that any danger has been incurred. Under section 409 of the Criminal Code, any one who is guilty of personation at an examination for the Civil Service is liable, either on indictment or summary conviction, to one year's imprisonment or a fine of $100. There you have power given to a single magistrate anywhere in Canada, on summary conviction, to sentence an offender to one year's imprisonment. My hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Crothers) was under the impression that in no case had a single magistrate the power to inflict imprisonment for a longer term than six months, but I have cited one instance in which he may, in his discretion, impose imprisonment for twice six months. Then there are several instances in the Criminal Code in which offences, such as in this Bill may be punished on summary conviction, may be tried before one magistrate only. For instance, section 208, prohibits the production upon the stage of immoral performances, and every one guilty of such an offence is liable to punishment on indictment or summary conviction; and if convicted on indictment is liable to one year's imprisonment, with or without hard

labour, or a fine of $500 or both; and if on summary conviction, to six months' imprisonment or a fine of $50 or both. That is an offence against public morals at least as serious as a minor offence would be under this Bill. Section 440 is another instance of several in which the punishment is prescribed, in the same language as in this Bill, upon indictment or conviction, and where one magistrate may try the case and has power to impose six months' imprisonment with or without hard labour. That is the section which makes it an offence to buy or deal in seaman's property, where the danger, I suppose, is that it may not be the property of the seaman himself, so that these are at all events, two instances in which for years past we have had legislation in identical words with those in this Bill, and with regard to which I have not heard any complaint or suggestion of amendment. I would think therefore that we could adopt this Bill as drawn, but I am not wedded to the exact language used; and if in the opinion of hon. gentlemen it would be better that we should not allow a summary conviction under this measure to be proceeded with before a single magistrate, it is easy, by inserting two or three words, to secure that there shall always be two magistrates sitting on a prosecution under this Bill.

I have no objection to that being done if it is preferred. But with regard to the difficulties which were felt by my hon. friend from Carleton, New Brunswick (Mr. Carvell), I must say that I do not see how we could properly upon the face of any legislation undertake to discriminate between magistrates. The fear that my hon. friend expressed was that a prosecution under this statute might be brought before some magistrate who was not really qualified, who ought not to have been appointed and that the interests of the person charged might therefore suffer. Well, I am afraid that that might be the case with any other charge levelled against a man under the Code as we have it. It is not the function of the central government to appoint magistrates throughout the Dominion, and we must, I think, give credit to the local authorities that they will only appoint as magistrates men who are qualified for the discharge of their important duties. As I said a week ago, a judge is a judge, and a magistrate is a magistrate; and if he has been placed upon His Majesty's commission of the peace, and has qualified himself to act in accordance with the requirements of the local laws, I do not see how it is possible for us to discriminate between individuals or to place upon the statute-book of the Dominion any legislation which would seem to imply that there may be magistrates acting in the country who are not properly qualified by education or by common sense to discharge the important duties of their office. If we require that a prosecution under this statute be heard before two justices of the peace, we have at least the additional guaranty that two would give, and the chance that one of them at least may not labour under the disqualification which my hon. friend from Carleton is afraid of.

Mr. PORTER. I would like to inquire from the hon. minister whether he has considered the suggestion made to him of amending this Bill in such a way as to give the accused the right to select the form of his trial—whether before a justice of the peace, or upon an indictment before a jury?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I expressed my views as to that when the Bill was last in Committee. I would not think it desirable that the accused person should have any greater right of election as to the manner of trial upon a charge under this Act than he would have under the general law. Under the general law he has certain rights, and, if he prefers to go before a jury, he would have identically the same rights under this statute.

Mr. CROTHERS. When this matter was before us last week, some of us had not looked carefully into it, and amongst that number seems to have been the Minister of Justice himself. I was speaking at that time from memory, and I think now that the sections to which my hon. friend has reference, to illustrate cases that could be tried by a single justice of the peace, are modified by other sections in the Act. Perhaps my hon. friend has not looked at section 707, which provides:

> Every complaint and information should be heard, tried, determined and adjudged by one justice or two or more justices as directed by the Act or law upon which the complaint or information is framed or by any other Act or law in that behalf.

So that if this Bill were left as first presented to us, one justice of the peace under that section would have jurisdiction to determine the question. However, if my hon. friend is right, that under these other sections one justice of the peace could dispose of the matter, I submit that we should not extend such cases. I do not approve at all of giving an ordinary justice of the peace the right to determine a matter of so much importance as this, involving a sentence of six months' imprisonment. If the committee will allow me, I would like to say a word or two on the general principles of the Bill. I understood my hon. friend the Minister of Justice to say the other day that this Bill was not at all necessary for the protection of the government; and I think he was quite right in that. As long ago as the year 1891, very extensive provisions were made in the Criminal Code for the protection of the government in such transactions. Then, is the Bill neces-

sary in any transaction? I do not suppose my hon. friend would claim that this section ought to be applied in a case where a vendor of goods induced an agent of a purchaser to purchase from him at regular prices and of as good quality as he could get from any one else, the bread, say, that he might need for a year, and gave him a present of five or ten dollars at the end of the year. That would not be corruptly done, I fancy, because the employer would not in any way be defrauded or lose anything. The only case that occurs to me in which this Bill might be applied in private transactions would be where the agent entered into an arrangement with the vendor to pay him say a cent a pound more for bread or meat or any other articles than he could buy it for elsewhere, agreeing to pay him a certain sum of money if he would carry the arrangement out. But this Bill is not necessary at all in a case of that kind, because that would be a conspiracy between the agent and the vendor, for which there are ample provisions in the Criminal Code today. So that, as this Bill is not at all necessary for the protection of the government, and as it meets no case between private individuals which is not already met by the provisions of the Code, this Bill is absolutely unnecessary.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Of course, whatever effect section 707 of the Code has upon other sections of the Code, exactly the same and the like effect it would have upon the provisions of this Bill, because this Bill is to be read as a part of the criminal law. The subsection of section 707 to which the hon. gentleman has referred is simply a provision that if there is no special direction in any Act requiring a complaint to be heard before more than one justice, then it shall be heard before one justice. That is what I have been pointing out. I am quite content, if my hon. friend from Elgin thinks it would better this legislation, to insert in the Bill a provision that a summary prosecution under the Act shall be heard only before two justices. That can be secured at once by inserting the words 'before two justices' after the word 'conviction,' in the fourth line of section 3. All one has to do is to add the words 'before two justices' and he accomplishes that purpose. Otherwise, certainly one justice would have jurisdiction. I do not see any danger myself in allowing one justice of the peace to try an information under this Bill, but I am quite content that it should be limited to two.

Mr. CROTHERS. What would my hon. friend say as to the necessity of the Bill at all?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. As to the necessity for this legislation, I had thought that every one in the House and out of it was well agreed, and I suppose the fact that it has passed its second reading is a very clear intimation that this House considered the principle of the Bill unobjectionable, if not necessary. I might say to my hon. friend, since the question has been raised, that I have had, I think, at least half a dozen applications from wholesale manufacturers and wholesale firms of long standing in the business community of this country, since the Bill was under discussion here a week ago, asking for copies of the Bill, and expressing in every instance their strong approbation of the principle of the measure, and their hope that its language might be made wide enough to extend to cases of commercial immorality or dishonesty which, in their view, tended to lower the standard of ethics, if that word is not inappropriate, in the trade of the wholesale dealer or manufacturer. I think there is every necessity for legislation of this character, and that the insidious effects of secret commissions are permeating every business and every trade and calling in this country. I can only say to my hon. friend that even the honourable profession to which he and I have the pride to belong, is not entirely free from the effects of just this sort of thing. I have in memory at the present time a case where a man to whom a little advertising had been given for a client, in the course of the legal business with which I had been for a good many years connected, came to the office with two bills for his advertisement, one substantially larger than the other, and offered to take payment of the smaller, producing the other as the one that should be shown to the client and charged up against him. I think any man guilty of that sort of thing was simply offering a bribe, and that the man who would be willing to accept such an offer to the disadvantage of his client, ought to be punishable under the criminal law.

Mr. CROTHERS. Would not that case be fully covered by section 444?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. My hon. friend refers to a section making it an indictible offence to conspire to defraud. I think my hon. friend's experience will agree with mine that a charge of conspiracy is a flexible kind of charge which sometimes it may be convenient enough to bring, but which, generally speaking, is difficult enough to establish. I would not be willing to leave to a prosecution under a general section relating to conspiracy to defraud, the kind of thing I have just been referring to.

Mr. MADDIN. I commend the object of this Bill in every particular. But I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice the fact that in 1892 the criminal law of this country was consolidated and codified. Under the present administration in 1906 all the amendments to the criminal law of this country were revised and brought down to date. This is

only as it should be, in order that the whole criminal law of the country may be found in one volume. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if he could not find it convenient, instead of introducing a Bill such as he has here, and in regard to the operation of which some members of the committee anticipate some difficulty as to whether a case should be tried before one justice of the peace or two—could not the minister, instead of introducing this Bill, attain his object by adding one single section, namely, section 3 of this Bill? If that were done, the Criminal Code would be complete with regard to the machinery for administering the law, and there could be little uncertainty with regard to it which would be a preferable course to taking one section, and putting it in the statutes apart from the Code, where magistrates and justices of the peace whose duty it would be to administer this law, might have some difficulty in finding it. For instance, if the Minister of Justice will look at section 158 of the Code, under part 4 'offences against the administration of law and justice' subsections (e) and (f) of that section provide for the punishment of this identical offence where it is committed against the government of the country. Now, if the Minister of Justice would add this section 3 to that section, or would put it in as section 158a of the Code, then it would serve the purpose while still preserving the consolidation of the criminal law, and we would have the machinery in that identical volume for its administration. There is another aspect of the matter. It seems to me that there is an element of uncertainty in regard to the enforcement of this Act as it is now proposed. Section 3 says:

> Every one is guilty of an offence and liable, upon conviction on indictment, to two years' imprisonment.

It does not say that the offence is an indictible offence, but is an offence, and the person is liable. Further on it says 'and on summary conviction.' Now if the minister will look at section 707 which was read by the hon. member for Elgin, where power is vested in one justice of the peace to try under summary conviction, and if he will then look at part 16 of the Code which is entitled 'Summary trial of indictable offences,' there may be some difficulty for a justice to determine whether he should proceed under part 15 of the Code or under part 16, whether the summary conviction referred to in section 3 of this Act would have reference to summary conviction under part 15 or to summary conviction under part 16. I submit that a conviction made under either one of these conditions would be a summary conviction—one a summary conviction, of that which would not be an indictable offence, and the other a summary conviction of what would be an indictable offence. Under section 16 of the Code the jurisdiction is vested in the court absolutely in certain cases which are outlined there. This may be made one of those cases so that the accused would not have the privilege of electing as he has the privilege of electing under that section if, in the opinion of the Minister of Justice, the prisoner should not have the right of electing. Unless such a provision were made he could, under section 778, have the right to elect if they were proceeding against him by indictment.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it would be wisdom on the part of this committee to add a section to the Criminal Code instead of having a small Bill of this kind stuck into the statutes of 1909, and which will not find its way into the Criminal Code until the next revision. It will mean that every time a prosecution is brought under this Act every justice of the peace will be obliged to have a copy of the statutes of 1909. As the matter stands now, when amendments are made to the Code, notice of the amendments is sent to justices of the peace and stipendiary magistrates in different parts of Canada. If this were put in as an amendment to the Code it would preserve the consolidation and solidarity of the criminal law and it would be incorporated in one volume so that the tribunal which had the administering of it would know where to put its finger upon it when the occasion arose. With regard to the objects of the Bill, I think, with the Minister of Justice, it is wise that the provisions of it should go through. Section 444, as quoted by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Crothers), would not cover the case outlined by the Minister of Justice, because there would have to be two persons charged with the offence in order to convict of a conspiracy and unless both were convicted you could not convict either. I think that is a matter of law that is well recognized.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I have no doubt that if this legislation had been a part of our law at the time of the revision of the statutes it would have been placed by the revisers in the Criminal Code as an additional subsection to section 158. When considering the shape which it would seem best to give to this legislation before introducing the Bill that view presented itself and was one of the things to be taken into account. There would have been no harm certainly, and I think identically the same legal effect would have been accomplished, if this Bill had been introduced as an amendment to the Criminal Code by inserting in it the provisions of section 3 immediately after the present section 158. But, in my own mind, I thought the course which I have adopted was the better. This was a measure which was passed in England a few years ago after long discussion and after attracting a great deal of public attention. It was considered there

so important as not only to be the subject of a special or a separate Act but also to receive rather extended notice in the speech from the Throne. I thought it certainly would do no harm to follow the same course in this country and that it would have at least this good effect that it would attract more general public attention to the legislation than possibly it would have received had it been introduced amongst a number of other amendments to the Criminal Code. If the Bill is to be read as part of the Code, as I think should be the case, and as I am proposing now as a special enactment, the legal effect will be precisely the same as if it had been introduced by way of amendment, and when the law comes next to be revised this Act will no doubt be incorporated in the Code by those who are revising it.

Mr. DOHERTY. I understand that even with the additional clause providing that this Act is to be read as forming part of the Criminal Code, and that all the provisions of the Criminal Code as to the trial shall apply, still there would be nothing in the provisions of the Criminal Code that would operate to give to the accused any option under any circumstances as to the tribunal which would try him. He may be proceeded against under the provisions here by summary conviction. I understand that he may be tried under part XV of the Criminal Code by one magistrate. It would be only in the event of the magistrates determining to treat the matter as an indictable offence that it would then possibly come under the operation of part XVI of the Code and, if I understand it rightly, the only effect of that would be that if the magistrate were proceeding to treat it as an indictable offence the accused would be entitled to the option of being tried before the magistrate by his own consent. I am speaking subject to correction, of course, not claiming to have carefully examined the whole Criminal Code, but it appears to me that if this Bill passes in its present form there will be no option given to the accused by which he may avoid trial by the magistrate or a justice of the peace, or by two justices of the peace, if the Bill be amended to make two justices of the peace to be necessary. I might say that I do not feel that there is any great improvement in providing for a trial by two justices of the peace, because if the state of mind of this House is that one justice of the peace is not a person to be trusted to conduct this trial I do not think there is very much more guarantee in getting two gentlemen neither of whom is to be trusted to try the offence. But even assuming that to be an improvement, it does not seem to me that you are getting a situation where the accused will ever have any option by which he will secure a trial before a superior court of criminal jurisdiction, but that the matter will rest with the magistrate or justices of the peace and with them only. While I understand that the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) says that the passing of the second reading of the Bill implies the approval of the principle of it, it does seem to me that there are some considerations bearing directly on the desirability of the legislation, which should move us to be particularly careful in securing to the person charged under this novel legislation the advantages of a trial by a superior court. It is to be pointed out that the effect of this legislation is to make a criminal offence something which, in itself, is a violation of a contractual obligation, and therefore something which in its nature is a proper matter to be dealt with by a civil court.

I do not want to be understood as saying that there are never cases in which the violation of contractual obligations may take such form or be accompanied by such circumstances as to make them proper to be constituted criminal offences by legislation. But what I desire to point out is that when we take this thing which in itself is only a violation of a contractual obligation and consequently in its nature proper to be dealt with under civil legislation and by civil courts, and make it a criminal offence, we should at least be particularly careful to see that we entrust the trial of it to a tribunal which we can be absolutely satisfied will be competent to deal with the questions which may arise. I do not know that I need justify my proposition that the act itself, dealt with by this Bill is a violation of a civil obligation. If so, it were only necessary to point out that the reason the taking of the commission under the circumstances provided by this Act is objectionable at all, is because there exists between the person taking the commission and the person for whom he is acting the contractual relation of principal and agent. If that relation does not exist there is no offence under this Act. Therefore, as a first essential of this being a criminal offence there must exist a contractual obligation between the person taking the commission and the person in connection with whose business he takes the commission. Now, whether or not such a relation does in reality exist may become in any trial of this kind a very doubtful question. Those of us who have had occasion to know something of the litigation in civil courts, know that very frequently it is an exceedingly delicate question to decide whether or not the relation of agent and principal does or does not exist between two persons. Whatever the court that may be called upon to try an offence under this Act, it will have as a first question to decide whether or not the relation of agent and principal existed between the accused and the person in con-

nection with whose business the accused received the commission. I do not at all dispute that in the great majority of cases that may be a very simple question, but cases may arise in which it may become a very delicate matter to decide, and in view of that we should take particular pains to make sure that if the accused and his advisers should feel that justice will not be done unless they are enabled to have that question passed upon by a court of superior jurisdiction, it should be within the power of the accused to secure that right. Personally I feel so very strongly impressed with the idea that such things should more properly be dealt with by civil law and by civil courts, that I am inclined to very seriously doubt the desirability of transferring them to the criminal courts at all. It seems to me that even though there may be a considerable evil existing in this connection, the providing of an adequate remedy might very well be left to the provincial legislatures which are charged with legislation on civil matters. Under the civil law the agent who takes a commission of this sort is already liable to his principal for the amount he receives, and I would think you would find an adequate remedy for this abuse by a provision of the civil law that would make the person giving the commission jointly and severally liable with the agent of the principal. Nor do I think you would be going beyond the scope of the civil law if you provided that as a penalty, or as a species of liquidated damages he should be made liable for a larger sum than the amount of the commission, say the double. If the civil legislation can find an adequate remedy it would seem to me that it is much more desirable that the matter should be left to be so dealt with. As a general principle it is not desirable to create or to invent new crimes. No doubt practices which up to a certain date have not been looked upon as criminal may very properly be made the object of criminal legislation when they become more prevalent and when they constitute a danger to society. I am not disputing that proposition, and I am ready to assume that the Minister of Justice has information which justifies him in considering that this particular offence may have reached that stage. But admitting that to be the case, when we come to create this new crime and when there are involved questions of the contractual relations of the parties towards each other, then I think that when we are transferring offences of this class over to the Criminal Code we should at least be careful to see that the persons accused under this legislation shall have an opportunity of having the matter passed upon by a tribunal which this parliament feels confident would be competent to deal with the very complicated questions which may arise.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). I certainly entertain the most sincere respect for any opinion, especially upon a legal question, which the hon. gentleman from St. Anns (Mr. Doherty) would express. But I cannot agree with his view that the civil remedy which now exists, and which I suppose has always existed, would be adequate for an offence such as is struck at by this Bill. If my agent for the purpose of negotiating any business arrangement with another man receives from that other man a secret bribe, it is the law now, and I suppose it always was the law, that on my discovering that fact I would have by civil proceeding the right to compel my agent to hand over to me the amount he had so received as a bribe. It was always an illegal thing on the part of the agent to do such an act at the expense of his principal. But surely it cannot be seriously contended that recovery by the principal of the amount which his agent may have received as a bribe is any adequate punishment upon the faithless agent, or any adequate redress to the man whose agent has been bought and whose interests may have been sacrificed by that agent to many times the amount of the bribe. The whole purpose and intent certainly of this legislation is to make such conduct on the part of both briber and bribed a criminal offence. It seems to me very necessary that that should be done, and I can only say that I have assumed the House had unanimously concurred in that necessity in affirming the principle of the Bill by the passing of the motion for its second reading.

Bill reported, read the third time, and agreed to.

SUPPLY—TREATY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe). Before the motion for supply is adopted, I wish to make a few remarks on a subject of great importance and as a young member would crave the indulgence of the House in what I am about to say. The subject which I wish to discuss is the boundary treaty between Canada and the United States. It is not necessary for me to go at any great length into this question of treaties between this country and the United States. All students of history and the children in the public schools are well aware of the fact that since the War of Independence Canada has lost territory and ground continually. After that war Canada contained an area which is now a portion of the United States, consisting of the states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota and Michigan. By treaty we lost this, the richest portion of the United

States. It is unnecessary for me to discuss the various means and methods by which we have lost at various periods portions of this country by treaties. The result has been that there is a spirit of antagonism amongst Canadians against the negotiation of treaties on our behalf by Great Britain. Recently the treaty-making power has been vested in the Canadian government which has been consulted in the preparation of our various treaties. As soon as the treaty-making power was vested in the Canadian government that government proceeded to carry on and make treaties with other nations. One of the first treaties made was the Japanese treaty and it strikes me that this treaty was made rather hurriedly and that Canada suffered by its terms.

Another treaty that was concluded was the boundary treaty between Canada and the United States. There are still two treaties hanging in the air, the French treaty and the waterways treaty with the United States. My reference will be particularly to the treaty concluded with the United States with reference to the boundaries. I had an idea that possibly our government would be as shrewd and as wide awake in treaty making as the American government. We all know how we have been 'euchred' in respect to these various treaties, how by tricks of phraseology and terms and the substitution of maps in the making of treaties, we have lost territory. It struck me as very strange indeed if on this occasion the same thing had not occurred if we had not been gold-bricked in some way. A close perusal of the drafts of the treaty discloses to me the fact that we have been gold-bricked. The first draft, November 26, 1907, in article 5, contains a reference to the boundary between Canada and the United States from the mouth of the Pigeon river to the Lake of the Woods. You will find there that the boundary shall be a water line and shall not intersect islands along its course. That is identical with the wording of the Ashburton treaty. When the Ashburton maps were prepared, a line was drawn on the map by the commissioners of the two powers. One side of this line was shaded red and the other blue, and there was a matter of give and take in regard to the islands along this boundary line. The first draft of this treaty of 1908 followed the idea and spirit of the Ashburton treaty. The second draft treaty was prepared on March 9, 1908, and that second draft is identical in wording with the first draft in providing that—

The line shall not intersect islands lying along its course.

The reason for the provision that the line should not intersect the islands was that there is one very large island, probably twice the size of the county of Carleton, which occurs in the river along this boundary line, Hunter's island. About fifteen years ago the state of Minnesota set up a claim to this island. Prospectors and diamond drill operators had ascertained that it is very rich in iron ore, being a continuation of the Vermilion range, one of the richest in the United States, and it is also rich in timber. Minnesota claimed that as the river ran around this large territory the island or at least a portion of it should belong to that state. At that time the public discussion went as far as Washington and the Washington authorities, on consulting the Ashburton maps, ascertained that the boundary line was south of Hunter's island. Now we find in the last draft of the treaty, a copy of which I have here printed by order of this House, that the word 'not' has been dropped from that clause of the treaty which now reads:

The line shall intersect islands.

The result is that about one county of this province will be given to the state of Minnesota or to the United States. The consequence will undoubtedly be dissension and trouble. I do not see why there should be this wild rush to negotiate a treaty with the United States about the boundary. The Ashburton treaty should have been the last word on that question. As far as we are concerned, we should have as little to do with the United States in the making of treaties as possible, because any loss we have made has been incurred by virtue of such agreements. What I would like to find out from the right hon. the leader of the House is whether the intention of this treaty is to be found in the exact wording of it as published in the sessional papers, and whether it is the intention to change by this treaty the Ashburton line, to make the boundary line intersect these islands, and give a vast and valuable portion of the province of Ontario to the state of Minnesota and the United States?

I am not in favour of treaties being made by this government for the reason that when we enter into diplomatic negotiations with other countries, we must do so without having at our disposition men who are trained in the highest art of diplomacy. Had we men who knew their business, had we men fitted to conduct these negotiations, such deceptions, as we have been forced to submit to, would not have risen, and we would not have found this country rushing madly into trouble as it has been doing during the past four or five years. We all regret the treaty we made with Japan, but we forgave the government for that because we felt that they were inexperienced or would do better the next time. But now we have a treaty under which this country is going to lose a vast amount of territory, if the wording of that treaty, as published in the sessional papers, be accurate. I have nothing further to say except to express the hope that the published version of that treaty is not correct. In my opinion, when the treaty

lines are drawn, we will have no difficulty with the United States whatever. We do not wish to have any difficulty with the United States or Japan, because those of us, who watch the current of public affairs, know that the mother country has at present the shadow of a great war hanging over her, and we, as loyal Canadians and sons of the empire, should do everything in our power to facilitate peace between Great Britain and every other nation for the next four or five years at least.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). My hon. friend will permit me to express my regret that he did not give us any notice of his intention to bring this question before the House. He will readily understand that when no member of the government has had the opportunity of looking at this treaty for the last six or seven months, it will not be possible to give an answer to the question he has put, but I shall have an opportunity of refreshing my memory and looking over the documents on another occasion and then be able to give him the information he seeks. But let me tell him that I think his criticisms are not warranted by the facts. Had he been here last session he would have remembered that when we made the treaty with Japan we had an understanding about immigration, which was for the moment forgotten, but which, when brought to the attention of the Japanese government, was at once accepted and has been lived up to ever since. Under the circumstances his criticisms are hardly warranted, and no one regrets our treaty with Japan supplemented by this understanding. That treaty has preserved to us the trade of the countries and has given to our friends on the Pacific coast what they are looking for, namely, a restriction of Japanese immigration. With regard to the waterways treaty, that treaty has to a certain extent leaked out, and the public is now pretty familiar with its main provisions, and it will be found, I believe, in the opinion of all impartial men, that it is a fair and reasonable treaty, not an agreement in which one party has tried to take advantage over the other, but in which each has endeavoured, as far as possible, to give even justice to both. On a later occasion I shall endeavour to give my hon. friend the information he has sought.

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

Ottawa buildings for testing of fuel by Department of Mines.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I have some information furnished me by the department which is rather interesting. It is a memorandum re fuel testing plant, by Dr. Haanel, and which, with the permission of the Committee, I shall have published in 'Hansard.' The memorandum is as follows:

Ottawa, December 9, 1907.

Memorandum *re* Fuel Testing Plant.

The high prices of imported coal in the middle provinces of Canada, the depletion of our forests together with the increasing value of the forests for other purposes and the suffering induced on account of scarcity of fuel in recent years consequent upon labour conditions, are causes which have again prominently brought forward the question of utilizing our peat bogs and lignite deposits for the production of marketable fuel and other purposes.

The estimated area so far reported distributed over the different provinces of the Dominion is 37,000 square miles. The following table shows the areas covered by peat bogs in the different provinces:

	Square miles.	Depth. feet.
Nova Scotia	250	8 to 10
Prince Edward Island ..	10	8 to 10
New Brunswick	250	8 to 10
Quebec	500	8 to 10
Ontario	10,450	5 to 8
Manitoba	500	6 to 10
Alberta and Saskatchewan..	25,000	5 to 10
British Columbia and Yukon Territory..	No data.	
Approximately ..	37,000 sq. miles.	

Further investigation will undoubtedly prove that this estimate represents but a fraction of the total area of available peat.

The comparative fuel value of coal and peat is: 1.8 tons of peat are equal to 1 ton of coal, and a peat bog one square mile in area and of six feet depth, if all were suitable for peat fuel, would make about 774,000 tons of peat fuel, equivalent to 430,000 tons of coal. The province of Ontario alone, if all its peat bogs were suitable for the manufacture of peat fuel, would yield an amount equivalent to about three billion tons of coal.

The recent improvements in gas producers and gas engines have opened up a new field for the utilization of peat and lignite. Fuels which have proven very inefficient when burned under boilers have given excellent, economical and efficient results when used in a gas producer for the production of gas for power purposes.

The diagram below will serve to show the many uses to which producer gas can be put:

- General uses of Producer Gas
  - Power purposes
    - gas engines
    - firing steam boilers
  - Firing kilns
    - brick kilns
    - tile "
    - pottery "
    - muffle "
    - lime "
    - cement "
  - Metallurgical operations
    - forges
    - steel furnaces
    - muffle "
    - glass "
    - roasting "

Although several attempts have been made to manufacture peat fuel, especially in Ontario, they have as a rule resulted in failures,

due principally to lack of knowledge. The successful working of peat bogs and manufacture of the raw peat into marketable fuel depends on:

1st. The proper classification of the different peat bogs, since the peat occurring in one bog might be suitable for peat fuel manufacture while that from another might not be.

2nd. The treatment of the raw material and the apparatus used for its combustion either for domestic or industrial purposes.

These facts, upon which the whole success of the industry depends, can be determined only by experiments carried out on a commercial scale and in an intelligent manner.

In several European countries peat and lignites are largely used both for domestic and industrial purposes with satisfactory and economical results and as conditions in Canada are quite as favourable for the manufacture of peat fuel and the use of lignite, there is no reason why, with the employment of proper methods and latest ideas, peat fuel manufacture and the use of lignite cannot be successfully introduced into Canada.

To accomplish this, a government testing and experimental plant should be established where the values of these fuels could be demonstrated and investigations made as to the machinery and apparatus best suited for their utilization.

This plant should be under the supervision of special officers who can give to this work their undivided and continuous attention. The functions of such a plant would be:

1st. The determination of the best methods and machinery to be employed in working in the different bogs.

2nd. Investigation of the most efficient means of manufacturing the raw peat to be used for domestic or industrial purposes.

3. The investigation of the most economical method of using peat and lignite for domestic or industrial purpose.

4. To make complete analysis and fuel value determination of the different peat bogs and lignite deposits.

5. To distribute the results obtained.

Upon the completion of the tests now being carried on at McGill University on about fifty Canadian coals, this plant, which is the property of the government, will be transferred to Ottawa and will be used to test the new coals which may be from time to time discovered.

The United States government has established a fuel testing plant where all kinds of fuels are tested and their suitability for various purposes ascertained. This plan constitutes a branch of the Geological Survey, called the 'Fuel Division', and is under the supervision of special officers.

The investigations so far have demonstrated that an enormous waste of fuel takes place and that by suitable arrangements and the adoption of proper methods this waste can be materially decreased. So important is this question considered to be, that the United States government appropriated $250,000 to continue the experiments started at St. Louis during the Louisiana Purchase Exposition and for which work $60,000 were appropriated, making a total appropriation to date of over $300,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Assistance given to the peat industry by the different European Governments.

Sweden.

The coal production in Sweden is insignificant and the coal mined is of inferior quality. This country is, therefore, practically dependent on foreign nations for its supply of coal. The question of utilizing the peat bogs, which occur in abundance, has in later years received much attention from the government and the manufacture of peat fuel, moss litter and peat mull is steadily growing.

The government now employs one chief engineer, one engineer and two assistant engineers under the dirction of the Department of Agriculture. The duties of these engineers are to investigate and report on all new processes referring to the peat industry, to assist manufacturers with plans and investigations of peat bogs and to advise the government on the advisability of giving loans for the erection or enlargement of peat plants, or assistance to inventors of promising processes, in order to enable them to carry on experimentation. The Swedish Parliament in 1901 voted 100,000 kronor* to be used for the encouragement of the peat industry and in 1902 a fund of 1,500,000 kronor was established, from which loans on liberal terms are given to peat manufacturers. This fund was in 1907 further increased by 2,000,000 kronor. In order to find out the possibilities of manufacturing peat fuel in the northern part of the country, where the summer is short and drying conditions consequently less favourable, an experimental plant was erected at Koskivara, situated at a latitude of 66° 39'. The results were quite satisfactory. The government has also undertaken to make official tests with peat machinery, in order to find out the most suitable machinery and methods. Two such tests have so far been made in 1903 and 1907 and the results published by the Department of Agriculture.

The peat society 'Svenska Mosskulturföreningen' in Jönkoping receives a yearly grant of 20,000 kronor from the government and additional grants from the municipal boards.

The peat school established at Markaryd under the direction of Mr. A. Anrep receives a yearly grant of 7,000 kronor. The object of this school is to train and educate foremen and superintendents for peat plants. In large drainage works, which can benefit a greater area, the government as well as the municipalities concerned generally assist with a part of the cost.

In 1900-1901 a commission of two engineers was appointed to study the peat industry in Europe and the report* of this commission was published in 1902.

*1 krona=27 cents.

Norway.

This country possesses no coal deposits and the peat question is therefore of great importance. The government employs one engineer, who in 1901 was sent out to study the peat industries in Europe and Canada.** The peat society 'Det Norske Myrselskab' in Christiania receives a yearly grant of 8,000 kronor.

Denmark.

This country possesses no coal deposits and very few forests. The use of peat fuel has, therefore, been introduced, and on account of

favourable drying conditions and suitable methods of manufacture the peat industry in Denmark is on a good economical basis.

The society 'Hedeselskabet' in Aarhus received in 1901 76,500 kronor and 'Moseselskabet' (formerly Moseindustriforeningen) receives a yearly grant of 8,000 kronor.

Finland.

This country possesses no coal deposits but wood is still fairly abundant and cheap. The peat fuel manufacture has so far not reached any magnitude, but the consumption is slowly increasing. The society 'Finska Mosskulturforeningen' in Helsingfors receives a yearly grant of 36,500 f. marks† and employs one special engineer for investigation of peat fuel manufacture and its possibilities.

*Am bränntorfindustrien i Europa, by Alf. Larson and Ernest Wallgren.

**Torvdrift in Kanada m. fl. lande, by J. G. Thaulow.

†1 f. mark=19.5 cents.

Russia.

Russia has the largest peat industry in the world, with some 1,300 machine peat plants in operation. The government itself owns and operates a number of such plants and also a large peat-coking plant erected at Redkino at a cost of 1½ million marks.‡

A committee presided over by the Minister of Agriculture decided in 1900 that:

1. Private persons should be allowed to work peat bogs owned by the government.
2. Assistance should be given for investigations of the peat bogs.
3. Instructions in the simplest methods of working the peat bogs and in the use of peat products should be given to peasants.
4. Assistance should be given to facilitate the transportation of peat.
5. The railway tariff for peat should be lowered.
6. A fund should be established from which peat manufacturers could obtain loans on easy terms.
7. Peasants should be allowed to work peat bogs owned by the government, paying a rent of 0.45-0.90 cents per square yard.

The Russian government, especially from a military point of view is anxious to make Russia independent of imported fuel and gives, therefore, to private persons or companies erecting peat plants in Russia a loan of 40 per cent of the cost of the plant. This loan can be paid back in peat-products. It is also stipulated that manufacturers of machine-formed peat can have their peat coked at the government plants at a cost of $1.37 per ton peat coke. The government buys, if desired, this coke at a price calculated on the basis of the fuel value of Newcastle coal at $4.42 per ton, so that the peat coke is paid for more or less according as it is inferior or superior in fuel value to this standard. The production of peat fuel in Russia in 1902 was some 4 million tons and it is increasing yearly.

‡1 mark=24 cents.

Germany.

In Germany the peat question is of less importance on account of its coal and lignite resources, but in certain parts of this country a very extensive peat industry is also established and much credit is due several German inventors of machinery and processes for the utilization of the peat bogs. The German government operates several experimental farms for moor cultivation and gives a yearly grant to the society 'Verein zur Forderung der Moorkultur im Deutschen Reiche' in Berlin. In certain districts the railroads have a special tariff for peat and lignite and in other districts canals have been built and cheap freights thereby made possible.

Austria.

The experimental farm at Vienna has since 1901 a special branch for moor cultivation and peat manufacture. Other experimental farms are established at Sebastianberg, Laibach, Klagnfurt, Admont, Sterzing, &c., where free education is given in moor cultivation and peat manufacture. The society 'Deutsch-Osterreichische Moorverein' has its headquarters at Staab bei Pilsen.

Holland.

In Holland peat fuel has been used for centuries and at present the production is over one million tons per year. The worked out peat bogs are excellent for agricultural purposes and annually about 1,000 acres of such land are gained.

During the last 50 years some 250 miles of shipping canals and 500 miles moor canals have been built. The cost of these canals has been $4,800,000 and for maintenance and improvements of older canals a further sum of $4,480,000 has been spent. The government has for these works contributed $2,891,600 and the provinces $4,369,200. In order to be independent of foreign nations for fuel the government has always a certain amount of peat fuel stored for military purposes in case of war, and also uses peat fuel in its buildings.

The cost of peat fuel in Holland is considerably higher than that of coal, which can be cheaply imported from England and Germany, but notwithstanding this fact peat is largely used for domestic purposes.

Ireland.

In Ireland the Department of Agriculture and Technical Education is encouraging the peat industry by giving assistance with investigations of bogs and information regarding new methods and use of peat products.

Memorandum re Fuel Investigation.

The fuel question, which every year is growing more important is at present receiving considerable attention from the department.

During 1907-1908 extensive tests with coals from the various mines in the Dominion have been carried out at McGill University. (See letter from Professor Porter or Durley.)

The question of utilizing the low grade fuels such as peat and lignites has also been taken up.

The first step was to investigate the status of this industry in countries where these fuels have been advantageously employed. For this purpose Mr. E. Nystrom was sent over to Europe, and the results of his investigations are published in his report 'Peat and Lignite, their manufacure and uses in Europe,' issued 1908.

A systematic investigation of the Canadian peat bogs was started last season, with a view of ascertaining their areas, depths and the

qualities of the peat. The results obtained will be published from time to time and it is hoped that these investigations will help to place the peat industry in Canada on a sound basis and prevent the useless spending of large amounts of money, which in several cases already has been done on bogs more or less unsuitable for the purpose in view.

Parties desiring to have their bogs investigated, or the peat analysed, can have it done by applying to the director.

In order to demonstrate the practical use of ordinary air-dried or briquetted peat fuel for power purposes, a gas producer plant is now under erection in Ottawa. At this plant, which will consist of a 60 h. p. gas producer and accessory apparatus and a gas engine of Gebrüder Korting's type (see plan), interested parties can ascertain for themselves the suitability of such an installation.

Lately power plants combined with necessary apparatus for the recovery of by-products, especially ammonium sulphate, are coming to the front. Such plants, however, can only be run with a profit in large units and at the present time such an installation cannot be undertaken by the department.

The advisability of having an experimental plant for the production of the peat fuel itself in charge of the department has been strongly urged, and if satisfactory arrangements can be made the establishment of such a plant is probable. The object of such a plant will be not only the manufacture of sufficient peat fuel for the gas producer plant already under erection, but also for the testing of promising methods and machinery invented from time to time, and to ascertain their practical value.

In view of the enormous deposits of peat which exist in Canada, and in view also of the fact that it seems to have been pretty well demonstrated that it will be possible to utilize peat, lignite and other kinds of fuel which are not now marketable, even certain kinds of wood, for the production of gas, which can be used economically in the operation of gas-producer engines, the Department of Mines seems to have been moving in the proper direction. The matter was brought before parliament last session, and an appropriation was made for the purpose of procuring land and erecting a building for the purpose of these experiments. We have gone thus far that we have purchased half an acre of land on Concession street in the southern part of the city, and Dr. Haanel has purchased the plant, which is on the way to Ottawa and will be ready to be installed as soon as the building is constructed. I therefore hope that the committee will approve of the amount which is being asked to complete the building and to get it ready for the reception of the plant which the Department of Mines proposes to establish.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. When this item came before the committee the other evening, I asked the minister to defer the discussion of it until the members had an opportunity to examine further into the question. I may say that every member of the House who has given the matter any study is satisfied that it is essential that efforts should be made by the government to test various fuels. The importance of the gas engine and the producer-gas engine is to-day greatly pressing itself upon the attention of the Canadian people, owing to the fact that fuel is becoming dearer all the time. The question simply resolves itself into this, whether it is better for the government to expend this money for an experimental plant to be operated by the Geological Department of the government, or whether it might not be more satisfactory for the government to use the money in having these tests carried on in the technical departments of some of our universities, such as Queen's and Toronto, or in the technical school of Nova Scotia. The government spent a large amount of money to test the question of the manufacture of steel by electrical power. That demonstration has been made possibly to the satisfaction of Dr. Haanel and his assistants in Ottawa; but these tests should be carried on for many years, and the best place to have the work done would be at one of the technical schools, where the machinery would be in constant operation, and where it would not cost the government anything to operate it. It is well known to everybody connected with fuel industries that peat has been used for the manufacture of producer-gas for many years in Germany.

There are two or three remarkable problems that remain unsolved in reference to the manufacture of producer gas, and it is becoming very important to Canada, with its vast areas of soft coal, that these problems should be solved. It is an easy matter to manufacture producer gas from hard coal. There are thousands of horse-power now in operation in England and in Europe, and also in Canada, operated by producer gas from hard coal. The difficulty is to eliminate the tar from the producer gas, made either from peat or from soft coal, and various devices have been suggested and are now in operation in Europe, whereby the tar is fixed and made into gas without any difficulty, and is used in engines, I have no doubt that the minister is doing what he thinks best, and that the government, with the best intention, is giving large sums of money to Dr. Haanel to squander on these experiments. To my mind they are useless, because an experiment conducted in this way must be useless to Canada, or to the working people who have to operate these plants. I would therefore suggest that if the minister—of course the item being in the estimates I suppose it cannot very well be withdrawn—but I would ask the minister to consider if it would not be better to have that machinery installed at the new technical school in Nova Scotia, and use it permanently there for testing fuel gas of various kinds, that would become useful to

Canada as a whole. The Geological Department in Ottawa has a great deal of other work to do, besides spending money on these tests. McGill University, I understand, does a great deal of work for the government in connection with the Intercolonial, and I think the government could wisely extend its generosity to the technical schools by granting to each of them yearly $25,000 or $50,000 for experiments in connection with the various departments of scientific industry. One school might deal with experiments in electrical science; another might deal with fuel, and this school in Nova Scotia might be devoted to that purpose; another might deal with textiles and dyes, another with electrical apparatus, and other matters of that kind, that would help to improve the industrial condition of the people of Canada, and keep us up to date in technical science and knowledge with other countries. To my mind it is worse than useless to squander this large sum of money on experiments, and on a plant here in Ottawa which will be not readily accessible to students of technical science, except at large cost in fares coming here, and which, moreover, may prove a total failure. A cheap machine has not yet been devised to manufacture producer gas from peat or soft coal that will do this work successfully. Expensive plants can be built and operated to do the work. They are in operation, such as Monde plants, that can manufacture fuel without any doubt, and cheap producer gas from lignite, or from soft coal, or from peat, but they take a large sum of money for gas tanks and various other apparatus to clear the tar out of the gas. I have thought it necessary to make these criticisms of the proposals of the government to spend money for testing fuel, and I desire to remind the minister that if anything of this kind comes up again, to remember that we have technical schools and colleges in this country, attended by thousands of students, where any tests of this character would be beneficial to students and the money should be spent at these schools and not on the Geological Department in Ottawa.

Mr. BRADBURY. Before this item carries I would ask the minister if he is aware that we have a large peat plant situated in the eastern part of Manitoba? There is a plant thereon which I think the promoters have spent about $80,000. I do not desire to criticise this expenditure at all, I think perhaps it is wise that something should be done to make a test of this fuel. But I would ask the minister if it is not possible to give some assistance, by lending the services of Dr. Haanel or some one else, to go out there and advise them how to operate this plant successfully. There has been a large amount of money spent there, they have a large peat bed, and I think if a government official who is qualified and understands the manufacture of peat into fuel, was sent out there to lend his assistance, the minister would be doing a public service.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be glad to bring the suggestion of my hon. friend to the attention of the Minister of Mines, on his return. I shall also be glad if, when the items for the Department of Mines come under discussion, my hon. friend will call the attention of the Minister of Mines to his present request. The suggestion is worthy of consideration, and I am sure, in view of the interest that is now being taken in the question of utilizing peat for fuel, the Minister of Mines will be only too glad to do anything he can to stimulate that industry in any part of Canada.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. The suggestion which was made a few moments ago by my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Currie) is well worthy of consideration by the Department of Public Works. It will be a difficult matter to make technical schools in Canada successful for some years to come, owing to the fact that there will not be sufficient original work for students to do, and it will be difficult for them to obtain opportunities to carry on original research work with advantage to themselves and the country. Nova Scotia will shortly be equipped with a splendid technical school, and if work of this character could be assigned to that school, I heartily concur in the suggestion that it should be done. It would be a considerable encouragement to the students, and the interest of the Department of Public Works would be as well served there I think as by making a separate and special expenditure at Ottawa.

Mr. AMES. I understand the minister has purchased a plot of land for the erection of this building. Would he tell us where it is situated, who was it purchased from, and at what cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was purchased on Concession street, in the southwestern part of the city, from the Ogilvie estate of the city of Montreal. I cannot give the price just now, but I think it was in the neighbourhood of $2,500 for half an acre of land.

Mr. AMES. Generally speaking, I think it is to be regretted that the government has not adopted the principle of laying out its buildings according to some fixed plan. The practice of purchasing sites all over the city of Ottawa, here, there and everywhere, on which to erect public buildings, is not calculated to make Ottawa, the capital of the north, from an architectural point of view such as we would like to see it. I hope the minister will tell us whether his department has in view any general scheme whereby the buildings that will be erected from time to time can be grouped

in one locality, and so arranged as to make their cumulative effect and their general appearance a beautification to the city of Ottawa. We are spending a great deal of money in purchasing lots in different parts of the city and erecting buildings that no one who comes here ever sees unless he makes it a special point to find them out, whereas, if some such method as has been adopted in Washington, where a distinct plan is being followed year after year, and where with each succeeding year, the number of beautiful buildings that can be seen from a given point is increasing, were followed, we would be working for the future of Ottawa better than we are to-day.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am afraid that my hon. friend is rather influenced by a feeling, which, I am sorry to say, influences a great many of us; we are apt to think that things away from home are better than they are right here. My own idea is that the arrangement of public buildings in Washington is not one bit better than our arrangements here. I think that some of our buildings are more striking than they are in Washington. In Washington the buildings are not all grouped together; they are scattered over the city. Even the building which has been most recently erected seems to have been erected as if it were the only building there. It is by itself and does not form part of any group of buildings. But there, as here, regard must be had to the purpose for which the building is to be used. As far as this building is concerned, we could not put it near the parliament grounds. There were several things which we had to keep in view. In the first place we wanted railway connection. We wanted it to be right close to the railway so that we could have a siding where cars of peat could be brought at the least possible expense. As there would be considerable smoke, we wanted to put it in a part of the city where there would be the least objection from that cause. But, speaking, generally, I think that the buildings in Ottawa have so far been built and located with exceedingly good judgment. Nothing could be better than the location of this building. The same applies to the east and west block, to the Langevin block, and in continuation of these buildings a large tract of land has been purchased upon the other side of Major's Hill park. That building will have two fronts, one upon the park and one upon Sussex street. It will be quite convenient to the parliament buildings and to the other departmental buildings, and I am sure that the building, which is to be of a very superior character and of very handsome design, will add materially to the beauty of the capital. The Museum and the Mint might possibly have been brought nearer to the parliament buildings, but I am of the opinion that the location of these buildings is very good. With regard to the observatory, we could not very well have it anywhere else than where it is. We wanted to locate it where there would be plenty of room, where it would be separated from other buildings and where there would be a considerable elevation. I am inclined to think there is no good ground for criticism as to the past and I shall heed the warnings or suggestions of my hon. friend in future.

Mr. AMES. It seems to me that in this particular case the explanation of the minister is quite sufficient. The necessity for a railway siding and for putting this building where the smoke will not be a nuisance to the residential portions of the city may be a sufficient excuse for erecting this building where it has been put. But, speaking in a general way, I think there has been too much scattering here in Ottawa, not only with regard to some of the buildings which we own, but with regard to many of the buildings which we have rented, and I believe that it would add to the facility with which business could be carried on as well as to the beauty of Ottawa were the plan to be followed of as far as possible erecting new buildings in the same neighbourhood, keeping in view a general scheme, and the architectural features of the buildings themselves.

Toronto Drill Hall—additional accommodation for new corps and armouries, $25,000.

Mr. MACDONELL. Will the minister explain that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. An addition was made some time ago to the large armoury in Toronto and this vote is to put in all the fittings.

Mr. MACDONELL. Will this complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it is expected this will complete it.

Mr. U. WILSON. What is the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total expenditure up to the 31st March, 1908, was $203,000. It was then estimated to take $259,000 to finish it.

Mr. MACDONELL. Is that the new work or the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total cost of the extension. The contract for that was $218,994, and, in addition to that, there are heating apparatus, electric wiring and some other work of a minor character.

Mr. MACDONELL. Will the minister tell us to whom the contract was let and if tenders were asked for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract was let to the firm of Wm. Langdon and M. Sullivan, Kingston, on the 18th April, 1906. Then there were some additional contracts. There was a contract for heating apparatus let

also to Messrs. Langdon & Sullivan; for additional heating apparatus to the same contractors, and for electric wiring to the firm of Keith & Fitzsimmons, Limited.

Mr. MACDONELL. Were tenders called for this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, for the large work.

Mr. MACDONELL. What was the cause of the delay in completing it? It is nearly three years since the contract was let.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The building is all completed and this is for the completion of the fittings. They had until the 15th August to complete their work. They are not very much behind.

Mr. MACDONELL. Have they finished it yet?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand the building is finished as far as their contract is concerned. The chief architect tells me they completed it before the 15th August.

Mr. MACDONELL. Were the subsidiary contracts for lighting, heating and wiring advertised, and to whom were they given?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the contractors were asked to give a figure. That was submitted to the chief architect and on his reporting it as reasonable the contracts were made. The amount of the first heating contract was $4,890, and of the additional heating contract $890. The contract for electric wiring was $3,579.

Mr. MACDONELL. Were tenders asked for these small contracts?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Tenders were asked for the electric wiring.

Toronto Meteorological Observatory, $44,000.

Mr. MACDONELL. Will this complete?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. MACDONELL. Who were the contractors?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Brown & Love. Only one tender was received after advertisement and the amount of the contract, including heating and wiring, was $91,800.

Mr. MACDONELL. Is the building completed yet?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Toronto Military Buildings, Magazine, $1,500.

Mr. MACDONELL. The Minister of Militia is not present, but I would ask the Minister of Public Works if he is aware of the intention of the government as to the erection of the new barracks at Toronto? Just previous to the elections of 1904 we were promised new barracks and a site was purchased but nothing has been since done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am informed that the matter is under careful consideration by the Minister of Militia. I am unable to say just how soon the work will be undertaken.

Mr. MACDONELL. That is a very unsatisfactory statement. We have been told just the same thing since 1904 and we should now know if the government seriously intends to erect these barracks in Toronto.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot go on with the work when there is no appropriation.

Mr. MACDONELL. Is the minister aware that the government is spending more than $14,000 every year in renting temporary quarters at Toronto as barracks? The accommodation there is absolutely inadequate; it is not sufficient for more than half the force and the soldiers and officers are housed in private quarters throughout the city for which the government is paying a large rental. It is high time for the government to announce their intention in this matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am told that the Minister of Militia is very desirous that this work shall be proceeded with at as early a date as possible. The expense will be quite large and as the hon. gentleman knows we are spending a good deal of money in Toronto in improving the harbour and other public works. My hon. friend must be patient.

Mr. OSLER. I do not think the government made any rash promises in Toronto this year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think they ever made any rash promises.

Mr. OSLER. Oh yes, every previous election they made promises but they knew it was useless in Toronto last year.

Mr. MACDONELL. Perhaps the Minister of Public Works can tell us something about the new post office in Toronto which we were also promised before the elections of 1904?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend may possibly have some ground for the exercise of his imagination in regard to that matter, because it has been under consideration for some time. The idea was to erect a distributing post office close to the railway station. Since then the railway company has purchased the contemplated site and now there is some talk about utilising a part of the new railway station for postal purposes. I am not prepared to say whether that will come to pass or not.

Mr. OSLER. The post office will merely be a subsiduary office to the Grand Trunk station.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will be a distributing office to facilitate the handling of the mail that comes by train.

Kingston Royal Military College—additional accommodation, $57,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have the plans and specifications here with reference to these buildings. The tenders received were as follows:—M. Sullivan, Kingston, $77,930; Doran & Devlin, Ottawa, $78,500; McKelvey & Birch, Kingston, $83,000; Elliott Bros., Kingston, $85,000. The department accepted the tender of Mr. Sullivan which was the lowest.

Mr. EDWARDS. What was the tender of Elliott Brothers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $85,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. Are these the residences for the men which have cost over $100,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, my hon. friend can look at the plans.

Mr. LANCASTER. I don't want to look at the plans for I have seen the buildings themselves, and I think it would be a good thing for the country if the Minister of Public Works took a look at these buildings himself, for I believe he would come to the conclusion that not more than one-half of the money should have been expended. I know from repeated visits to Kingston that some buildings were required there, but to spend such a sum for sixteen little residences is altogether out of proportion to the value obtained. I saw them on Sunday afternoon, and while they are substantially built two story houses, no one would ever suppose they could have cost anything like $100,000. When I heard on Monday of the enormous cost of these buildings I was as astonished as I have been at anything this government has yet done. A dozen residences were required for non-commissioned officers, &c. If you got value for the $100,000 I would not find any fault, but when people are paying a price of $6,000 or $7,000 for a building they ought to have the equivalent of a building worth more than $3,000.

Mr. EDWARDS. Did the tenders of McKelvey & Birch or Elliott Brothers, of Kingston, include anything more than the building, the plumbing or fixings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Nothing but the construction of the buildings, it was the same with all the contractors' tenders. I am glad my hon. friend admits the necessity for these buildings, that of course puts us forward a considerable distance. As to the cost, I do not know that we could have gone about any better way of getting the buildings constructed as cheaply as possible. We advertised for tenders quite widely, inviting the attention of contractors and received tenders from four different contractors, ranging from $77,000 up to $85,000. We accepted the lowest tender. We might have been severely criticised if we had made a private contract with any one of these firms to erect the building, but we went about it in the usual approved way and having received tenders that in the opinion of the chief architect were reasonable, we awarded the contract.

Mr. EDWARDS. The contract given to Sullivan was for $77,739, for a building which is to cost $112,000, the extra cost being to cover the putting in of the heating, &c. Was any of this $34,000 extra done by tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Tenders were called for the electric lighting and wiring. The work of heating was given to the contractor at a figure he furnished which the chief architect certified to be fair and reasonable.

Mr. EDWARDS. The minister said he would be open to censure if the work had not been given by tender, but according to his own statement a considerable part of it was not given by tender. I take the view that the tender of $77,000 was for a complete building. Sullivan, who had the contract for putting up the building, is a contractor. McKelvey & Birch and Elliott Brothers are hardware merchants and plumbers, and I am a little surprised that these men should put in tenders for this work if their tenders did not cover something along the line of their own business. I am also surprised at the cost of this building. I visited it last Saturday and was more astonished than ever. I would ask the attention of the minister to the cost of some of the prominent buildings in Kingston. The old Queen's Arts buildings, erected 30 years ago, cost $50,000. The new Arts building cost $60,000; Grant Hall, $45,000; Ontario Hall, $80,000, Fleming Hall, $50,000; new Medical Hall, $50,000. Here we have 16 cottages costing $112,000 to accommodate the civil subordinate staff. At P—61 of the Auditor General's Report it is said they are for servants' quarters. Either the Auditor General is wrong or the minister is wrong in his answer to me. I want to enter a protest against this reckless waste of public money. This is not the only instance we have had of reckless waste of money in the neighbourhood of Kingston for military purposes. You are asking $15,000 for stables and $15,000 for a veterinary college. You erected some three years ago a stable at the entrance to the Military College grounds and there has not been a horse inside that stable; it is standing there and the hinges are rusting on the doors. I think this extravagance should be condemned for it cannot be called anything else than reckless extravagance.

Mr. BRADBURY. The difference between the cost and value of these buildings is very striking. Has not the minister on his staff some official who makes an approximate estimate of the cost of a building when he calls for tenders? It is no use to say the

contract is given to the lowest tenderer, as there may be collusion between tenderers. I presume the department is not bound to accept the lowest tender, and somebody in the department should be responsible for the cost of the building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend may rest assured that in the Public Works Department, which has been established since confederation, we have men who do know the value of buildings. The chief architect has been there for 30 odd years under the various governments we have had during that time. He is a man in whose judgment I and my predecessors have had every confidence, and until I have something more than the opinion of gentlemen who, I suppose, have not been through these buildings and know nothing about the interior work and details, I shall continue to hold my faith in the judgment of the chief architect.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Did your architect estimate on the cost of this building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, Mr. Ewart estimated the cost to be $96,000. That was before the contract was let.

Mr. EDWARDS. Is that for the building complete?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Has the minister an itemized estimate there of material, &c., required?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I have not the items of Mr. Ewart's estimate, but I have no objection to bringing it down. My hon. friends sought to draw a comparison between this and certain buildings in Kingston, but you cannot compare one building with another unless you know something about the interior of the buildings, how many partition walls there may be, the number of bathrooms, heating apparatus, plumbing, &c. In some cases the chief architect thinks the lowest tender is too high and new tenders are called for, but in this case he considered that the amount for the building was reasonable and recommended that the contract should be given to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. BRADBURY. It appears that the cost of each one of these dwellings to the government will be $7,000 for a two-story building with only the end walls, so to speak, practically all one building. An ordinary man erecting such a building could not find any way of spending that much money in it.

Mr. EDWARDS. For the information of the Minister of Public Works, the buildings to which I referred were all in connection with Queen's University at Kingston, and as they are divided into a great many classrooms, &c., they are not an inexpensive type of structure. These dwellings, which cost $7,000 each, contain upstairs, two bedrooms and one bath-room, and down stairs a kitchen, living room, hall and vestibule. If you divide the number of rooms into the cost you will see that each room costs $1,500 or $1,600. The whole thing is indefensible and absolutely ridiculous. It is an evidence of the most reckless extravagance ever indulged in by any government in any civilized country.

Mr. CROSBY. I am not here to try to obstruct public buildings because I believe that public buildings should be constructed and we are here for that purpose; we are here to construct public buildings wherever we can. But it is our duty to see that the moneys of the country are judiciously and well spent. We have the statement made by the Minister of Public Works that the contract for these buildings, which were estimated by the architect to cost $96,000, are now costing us, under present methods, $112,000, or 16 per cent over the estimate. I am interested somewhat in real estate and I know something about the construction of ordinary small buildings such as these, and I say that $3,000 each would be a high price for these buildings. Reference has been made to the subject of advertising for tenders. The minister has stated that in this case the department advertised very widely, and perhaps they did, but while he said the other day that he had decided to abolish the patronage system, he said at the same time that he was going to continue to advertise in the Liberal papers.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I said the best papers.

Mr. CROSBY. I suppose he will admit that the best papers are the Liberal papers. Is that what he means?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would admit that.

Mr. CROSBY. The minister has been driven into many corners, but he cannot get out of this corner in that way. I want to ask the minister a fair question. I am standing here as a representative from the eastern part of Canada trying to find out if I can how this country is being governed. I do not care how it has been governed in the past; I am here to look after the present and future. If the minister wants to give the country an intimation that he is going to abolish the patronage system he can do that in no better way than by advertising in all the papers, whether Liberal or Conservative. In that way he would show the public that he meant business, that he meant what he said. Everybody knows that in the city of Halifax the 'Morning Herald,' which is an independent paper, claims to have the largest circulation of any morning paper in Canada published east of Toronto, and would it not be wise on the part of the minister when he calls for tenders in that part of the country to have an advertise-

ment put in that independent paper? Then, if the Minister of Public Works announced that he was doing away with the patronage system, the people would say: That is true, because he is advertising in other papers besides Liberal papers. I have no fault to find with him for advertising in the Liberal papers if he advertises in other papers as well. If that had been done in this case, we might have had better tenders for this work than the one we are discussing. I simply arose for the purpose of intimating to the Minister of Public Works that if he desired to inspire the people of Canada with confidence in his statement that he is going to do away with the patronage system, there is no better way of doing that than by advertising for tenders in all the influential papers in the various towns and cities, no matter what party they may support, and especially the independent papers.

Mr. PRICE. I really feel very sorry for the Minister of Public Works, because last Friday he informed us that he was not satisfied with this expenditure himself, but that he could not help it because the estimates had evidently been made under his predecessor. This discussion is rather hard on the Minister of Public Works, because we know from the speech he has made in this House, that he takes the greatest care of the money of this country. Not long ago there was a resolution before this House, introduced by the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) in regard to the opening of tenders, and the Minister of Public Works told us then how carefully he would supervise the opening of tenders and what his subordinates would do. Here is one of those cases. These tenders may have been opened quite properly, but it appears to me that there is an appearance of collusion on the part of the tenderers. Here are sixteen houses built in two terraces, each house, without heating or lighting, costing roughly $5,000. Anybody who knows anything about the building of houses knows—he need not be a contractor—that $5,000 for that kind of house is simply absurd. Moreover, the cost of heating and electric lighting for these houses practically amounts to $2,000 per house. In other words, these houses are costing $7,000 apiece, and I believe we have not heard the end of them. I believe that next year we shall have a further item in the estimates, one for extras. It seems to me that estimates and tenders do not really amount to much, because there are always extras, and under the present regime what do extras mean? They mean a great addition to the cost, from the little I have seen. I want to say strongly here that the expenditure of $7,000 each for these houses, making up a total expenditure of $112,000, is a disgrace. It is something the government ought to be ashamed of. I think that in future they should look better after the expenditure of the people's money. We do not want to obstruct or impede these estimates, and if we felt that the people's money were being properly expended, there would be very little opposition to them. Nearly all the opposition to the government is due to the fact that we feel that the money of the people of Canada is not being properly expended. It is time for a change in this respect, and, by Jove, if there is not, you will see that your party will be out the next time.

Mr. BURRELL. I would like to ask the minister what rate of pay do the men get who are going to occupy these houses?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I cannot say at the moment the exact rates of pay, but I am having a list made up, and this evening I will be able to give the rates of pay. I may say that the name 'servants' quarters' is altogether a misnomer. The people who are occupying the buildings are teachers and instructors, with the rank of non-commissioned officers, and some of them are civilian instructors in connection with the Royal Military College. These men are getting from $1,000 to $1,600 each, possibly some of them more.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall have the information to-night. But before we rise at six, I want to say that all the excavation for these sixteen buildings was made in solid rock. Kingston, as we know, is a limestone city. Then all the floors in the basement were cemented. In every dwelling part, there is a bath room, and the buildings were made as near fireproof as possible All the partitions are of solid brick, as the chief architect tells me, and the walls are nine inches thick.

Mr. EDWARDS. Are the division walls upstairs of brick as well?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the partition walls all the way up between these 16 different cottages are of brick, nine-inch walls. Then on the first floor there are many other walls similarly of brick, as the architect tells me.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is a distinction between the partition walls of the houses and the walls between the rooms?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The partition walls between the rooms are not of brick.

Mr. AMES. I desire to call the attention of the minister to the fact that on the 18th of February he promised to supply us with certain information, which we have not yet received. As he will find in 'Hansard,' page 1348, he promised to give a list of those public works for which tenders had been called, and which it was decided would not be gone on with this year. Has the minister taken steps to procure that information?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I gave that on the very same evening I promised it, and that appears in the 'Hansard.'

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at 8 o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SALISBURY AND ALBERT RAILWAY COMPANY.

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Salisbury and Harvey Railroad Company.—Mr. Emmerson.

Mr. EMMERSON. This Bill stood over for the purpose of consulting those interested in it with respect to the title. I have a communication from the promoters in the city of St. John who have suggested the title of the 'Salisbury and Albert Railway Company.' I gave notice of an amendment, having filed it with the clerk. I would therefore move:

That in line 26 of sec. 1 the words 'Harvey Railroad' be struck out and that in lieu thereof there be inserted 'Albert Railway.'

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. SPROULE. You will have to change clause 8 because the name appears there again.

Mr. EMMERSON. Clause 8 should not be amended because it will be borne in mind that it was originally the Salisbury and Harvey Railway Company whose rights were foreclosed and were purchased by the incorporators under this Bill, who now seek to operate the railway under the title of the Salisbury and Albert Railway Company. They want to retain in this Bill the provisions which would enable them to exercise the rights, properties, privileges and franchises of the old company.

Bill reported, and read the third time.

Mr. EMMERSON moved:

That the Bill do now pass and that the title be 'An Act to incorporate the Salisbury and Albert Railway Company.'

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 66) respecting the Abitibi and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Gordon.

Bill (No. 67) respecting the Alsek and Yukon Railway Company.—Mr. W. McIntyre.

Bill (No. 68) respecting the Athabaska Railway Company.—Mr. W. McIntyre.

Bill (No. 70) respecting the St. Mary's and Western Ontario Railway Company—Mr. G. H. McIntyre.

Bill (No. 71) respecting a Patent of Thomas L. Smith—Mr. Bickerdike.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have here the information asked for the other evening by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) with respect to the advertisements for the public buildings in Whitby, Welland and Simcoe. It is a very long list and perhaps I might hand it to 'Hansard.'

Mr. BLAIN. So long as it appears in 'Hansard' that will suit me.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will give it to 'Hansard' The following is the list:—

Advertisement issued September 3, 1908.

Whitby, Ont.—Post Office.

Whitby 'Chronicle', Ont. County.. ..	$ 6 75
Whitby 'Gazette', "	6 75
Uxbridge 'Journal', "	6 75
Oshawa 'Ont. Reformer'. "	6 75
Pickering 'News', "	6 75
Port Perry 'Standard', "	
Port Perry 'Star', "	6 75
Bowmanville 'Statesman'..	6 75
Port Hope 'Guide'..	9 00
Millbrook 'Mirror'..	6 50
Barrie 'Examiner'..	6 75
Barrie 'Gazette'..	6 75
Lindsay 'Canadian Post'..	9 00
Belleville 'Ontario'..	9 00
Brantford 'Expositor'..	9 00
Brockville 'Recorder'..	8 10
Chatham 'News'..	9 00
Guelph 'Mercury'..	9 00
Hamilton 'Times'..	17 50
Hamilton 'Herald'..	5 00
Kingston 'British Whig'..	13 95
Kingston 'Freeman'..	9 00
London 'Advertiser'..	15 00
London 'Echo'..	9 00
Ottawa 'Free Press'..	18 75
Ottawa 'Danebrog'..	4 50
Peterborough 'Examiner'..	10 00
Peterborough 'Times'..	6 00
Stratford 'Beacon'..	9 00
Sarnia 'Observer'..	9 00
St. Thomas 'Journal'..	9 00
Toronto 'Globe'..	22 50
Toronto 'Star'..	22 50
Toronto 'North Ender'..	5 00
Windsor 'Record'..	9 00
Woodstock 'Sentinel Review'..	9 00
Ingersoll 'Chronicle'..	4 50

3 insertions in dailies.
2 insertions in weeklies.
Peterborough 'Times', 1 insertion.
Total paid to date, $337.55
One account not yet received.

Advertisement issued August 5, 1908.

Welland, Ont.—Post Office.

Welland 'Tribune'	$ 5 40
Niagara Falls 'Review'	6 75
Beamsville 'Express'..	5 40
Niagara-on-the-Lake 'Times'..	5 85
St. Catharines 'Journal'..	9 00
Caledonia 'Haldimand Banner'..	6 75
Cayuga 'Haldimand Advocate'..	5 85
Dundas 'Banner'..	6 25
Dundas 'Wentworth Light'..	6 75
Paris 'Star Transcript'..	5 00
Dunnville 'Monck Reform Press'.. ..	4 50

Dunnville 'Chronicle'	
Ingersoll 'Chronicle'	9 00
Brantford 'Expositor'	9 00
Brockville 'Recorder'	8 10
Belleville 'Ontario'	9 00
Chatham 'News'	9 00
Chatham 'Le Canadien'	5 00
Guelph 'Mercury'	9 00
Hamilton 'Times'	17 50
Hamilton 'Herald'	15 00
Kingston 'Freeman'	9 00
Kingston 'Whig'	13 95
London 'Advertiser'	15 00
London 'Echo'	10 00
Ottawa 'Free Press'	18 75
Peterborough 'Examiner'	10 00
Peterborough 'Times', 1 ins.	6 00
Stratford 'Beacon'	9 00
Sarnia 'Observer'	9 00
St. Thomas 'Journal'	9 00
Toronto 'Globe'	22 50
Toronto 'Star'	22 50
Toronto 'Contract Record'	5 00
Toronto 'North Ender'	5 00
Windsor 'Record'	9 00
Woodstock 'Sentinel Review'	9 00

3 ins. in dailies; 2 ins. in weeklies.

Total paid to date $340.80.

One account not yet received.

First advertisement issued July 30, 1907.

Simcoe, Ont.—Post Office.

(Norfolk County.)

Simcoe 'Reformer', Norfolk	
Waterford 'Star', "	6 75
Aylmer 'Sun'	5 40
Port Burwell 'Packet'	
Dutton 'Advance'	5 20
St. Thomas 'Journal'	9 00
Caledonia 'Haldimand Banner'	6 00
Cayuga 'Haldimand Advocate'	5 85
Dunnville 'Monck Reform Press'	3 60
Dunnville 'Chronicle'	
Embro 'Courier'	6 75
Ingersoll 'Chronicle'	9 00
Ingersoll 'Sun'	5 40
Tilsonburg 'Liberal'	6 75
Paris 'Star Transcript'	5 00
St. Catharines 'Journal'	9 00
Brantford 'Expositor'	9 00
Chatham 'News'	9 00
Guelph 'Mercury'	9 00
Hamilton 'Times'	18 55
Hamilton 'Herald'	15 90
London 'Advertiser'	15 99
London 'Echo'	9 00
Stratford 'Beacon'	9 00
Sarnia 'Observer'	9 00
Windsor 'Record'	9 00
Woodstock 'Sentinel Review'	9 00
Toronto 'Globe'	23 85
Toronto 'Star'	23 85
Toronto 'Christian Guardian'	10 60
Toronto 'Catholic Register'	5 30
Wiarton 'Echo'	6 75
Walkerton 'Telescope'	4 50
Beamsville 'Express'	4 50

3 ins. in dailies; 2 ins. in weeklies.

First Advertisement.

Total paid to date, $285.40.

Three accounts not yet received.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Second call for tenders—Advertisement issued November 13, 1907.

Simcoe, Ont.—Post Office.

(Norfolk.)

Simcoe 'Reformer', Norfolk	$ 6 90
Waterford 'Star', "	6 90
Aylmer 'Sun'	5 52
Dutton 'Advance'	5 52
St. Thomas 'Journal'	9 20
Caledonia 'Haldimand Banner"	6 00
Cayuga 'Haldimand Advocate'	5 98
Dunnville 'Monck. Reform Press'	4 60
Dunnville 'Chronicle'	
Embro 'Courier'	6 90
Ingersoll 'Chronicle'	9 20
Ingersoll 'Sun'	5 52
Paris 'Star-Transcript'	5 00
St. Catharines 'Journal'	9 20
Brantford 'Expositor'	9 20
Chatham 'News'	9 20
Guelph 'Mercury'	9 20
Hamilton 'Times'	18 55
Hamilton 'Herald'	15 60
London 'Advertiser'	15 60
London 'Echo'	9 20
Stratford 'Beacon'	9 20
Windsor 'Record'	9 20
Woodstock 'Sentinel Review'	9 20
Toronto 'Globe'	23 40
Toronto 'Star'	23 40
Toronto 'Christian Guardian'	10 40
Toronto 'Toronto Sat. Night'	5 20
Bobcaygeon 'Independent'	6 90
Milton 'Reformer'	6 90
Parry Sound 'North Star'	

3 ins. in dailies; 2 ins. in weeklies.

Second Advertisement.

Total paid to date, $276.79.

Two accounts not yet received.

I have the following information which was asked for and which I shall give to 'Hansard':—

LIST of public buildings in Ontario which were provided for in the estimates last year and on which no money was spent and which are not to be proceeded with under the main estimates for the fiscal year 1909-10.

	Apropriation for 1908-9.
Chesley public building, site being purchased	$ 5,000
Dresden public building, site being chased	5,000
Dundas public building, site being purchased	5,000
Elora public building, site purchased.	5,000
Essex post office, site being purchased.	5,000
Fergus public building, site being purchased	5,000
Gananoque post office—Addition to building and alterations to fittings.	4,000
Goderich public building—Addition	5,000
Harriston public building, site being purchased	5,000
Kemptville public building	5,000
Kingston Artillery Park—New guardhouse, offices, &c.	2,000
Kingston military buildings—New hospital for 'A' and 'B' batteries	2,500
Kingston military buildings—New magazine	750

Kingston post office—Addition to building and alterations to fittings	$8,000
Listowel public building, site being purchased	5,000
London military buildings—Magazine.	750
London military buildings—New gymnasium	1,250
Mitchell public building, site being purchased	5,000
Mount Forest public building, site being purchased	5,000
Niagara Falls armoury, free site	10,000
Ottawa—Departmental buildings—Renewal of skylights	6,000
Ottawa—Military buildings—Armoury for one section field telegraphs	875
Ottawa military buildings—Additional stores building	1,750
Ottawa military buildings—Gun and wagon shed	1,750
Port Arthur armoury	10,000
Sarnia armoury, site being purchased.	6,000
Sarnia public building—Alterations and additions	5,000
Seaforth public building, site being purchased	5,000
Sturgeon Falls public building, site being purchased	7,000
Sudbury public building, site being purchased	15,000
Tilsonburg public building, site being purchased	5,000
Toronto—Military buildings—Barracks for permanent corps to replace property sold to the city	50,000
Toronto—Union postal station	50,000
Uxbridge public building, site being purchased	8,000
Walkerville public building, site being purchased	8,000
Waterloo public building, site being purchased	8,000

I have also the following information asked for by an hon. gentleman opposite:

WORKS advertised from October 26, 1908 to February 22, 1909.

Name of Work.	Date Advertised.	Amount in Main Estimates, 1909-10.
	1908.	$
Ottawa, Ont., Residence Chief Astronomer	Nov. 6.	14,000
St Roch, P.Q. Postal Station (Quebec East)	" 12.	50,000
St. Johns, P.Q. Pub. Bldg., fitting	" 24.	6,000
St. John, N.B. Military Store Building, Heating	" 25.	Nil.
Calgary, Alta. Post Office, Fittings	" 25.	Nil.
Medicine Hat, Alta. Post Office, Customs and I. R. Fittings	" 25.	Nil.
St. Alexis Baie des Ha, Ha, P.Q. Extension to wharf	" 26.	Nil.
St. John, N.B. Dredging York Pt. and Ballast Wharf	" 27.	*475,000
Tennycape, N.S. Breakwater extension	Dec. 2.	Nil.
Lower Caraquet (St. Paul) N.B. wharf	" 3.	15,000
Kingston, Ont. Royal M. College, Pier widening, &c	1909. " 7.	$ Nil.
St. Johns, P.Q. Cavalry Stables, Elec. Light fittings	" 9.	Nil.
Ottawa, Ont. Parliament Blds., additions elec. fixtures	" 11.	93,000
Kingston, Ont., Quarters for stable establishment, R.M.C	" 12.	15,000
Selkirk, Man. Post Office, alterations to fittings	" 14.	Nil.
Woodstock, Ont., Post Office, alterations to fittings	" 23.	Nil.
Guelph, Ont. Armoury, heating, app. for addition	" 23.	Nil.
Ottawa, Ont., Museum Exp. Farm, wiring	" 23.	†10,000
Hamilton, Ont. Post Office, alterations for new lavatories	Jan. 7.	Nil.
Smith's Falls, Ont., Post Office Fittings	Jan. 7.	Nil.
New Glasgow, N.S., Post Office	" 7.	1,000
Customs and I.R. Building, wiring	" 13.	
Maple Creek, Sask., Post Office, Heating	" 14.	10,000
Dauphin, Man., Public Building, Heating apparatus	" 14.	24,000
Cape Bald, N.B., Breakwater	" 16.	15,000
Victoria, B.C., Immigrant Building (Detention) Heating	" 20.	43,000
Roberval and Peribonka, P.Q. Imm. Bldgs, Supplying firewood	" 23.	‡125,000
Markham, Ont., Post Office, Heating apparatus	" 27.	10,000
Saskatoon, Sask., Public Buildings, Fittings	Feb. 4.	32,000
Westville, N.S., Post Office	" 4.	5,000
Simcoe, Ont., Post Office, Heating apparatus	" 3.	20,000
Two Centre Hopper Wooden dumping scows, Dredge 'Richelieu' St. John, P.Q.	" 8.	§150,000
Renfrew, Ont., Post Office, Heating apparatns	" 10.	16,000
Winnipeg, Man., Examining warehouse, wiring, &c	" 10.	175,000
Ladysmith, B.C., Public Building Heating apparatus	" 10.	17,500
Shelburne, N.S., Post Office, Customs & I.R. Bdgs., Fittings	" 12.	19,000
Dauphin, Man., Post Office, elec. wiring	" 18.	24,000
Windsor, Ont., Post Office, elec. wiring	" 18.	Nil.
Quebec, P.Q., Custom House, wiring	" 18.	Nil.

* St. John, N.B. Harbour Improvements.
† Exper. farms, new bldgs. and improvements.
‡ Dominion Buildings—Heating.
§ New Dredging Plant, (Ontario and Quebec.)

Mr. HENDERSON. The Minister of Public Works stated the other evening that those public works for which an appropriation had been made and which had not been gone on with, would receive the first consideration of the government when it was felt they had money enough to proceed with the erection of public works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Speaking as a general rule.

Mr. HENDERSON. Now, there is no doubt that a great many of these public works were promised for purely political purposes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. HENDERSON. Oh, yes. The minister cannot deny that; it admits of no denial and therefore we will take it for granted. Now that the elections are over and the purpose for which these promises were made served, I do not think it would be fair to give the preference to these buildings which were promised because of a reason which was not in the public interest. It would be only fair to disregard the fact that appropriations had been made to all these towns and commence afresh, placing those places for which no appropriation had been made on exactly the same plane as those named in the Appropriation Act. In that way we would have a better distribution of public money; if we left political feeling out of consideration we would find plenty of other towns larger, more important, and producing more revenue than the ones enumerated that would deserve consideration from the minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am surprised beyond measure at my hon. friend's ideas of political morality.

Mr. HENDERSON. Do not be surprised.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend, as an old and experienced member of the great Conservative party, intimates that in my position he would absolutely ignore the appropriations made last session, suggesting that these appropriations may have had an effect on the public mind and that we should not carry out the promises made by the Appropriation Act. If he were in my position I am sure he would not attempt to humbug the electorate in that way. I honestly believe, whether rightly or not, that every public work provided for in the estimates of last year was necessary and in the public interest, and I would be ashamed as a minister to say that no weight should be given to the fact that parliament last session made appropriations for these various works. As I have said I feel there is a solemn obligation resting on me to carry out these works for which appropriations were granted last parliament. In my constituency, and I think I can say the same thing for my friends throughout Canada in every constituency in which public buildings were promised, there was no contingency with respect to them; the public was informed, through the Appropriation Act and the estimates brought down to parliament, that these different works were regarded as reasonably necessary in the public interest and the good faith of parliament was pledged to the carrying out of these promises. Therefore I say, speaking as a general rule, that I would feel bound to continue the public works for which appropriations were made, regardless of the constituency in which they were situated. It may be that I may get further information. If my hon. friend knows of any work in his constituency that is unnecessary in the public interest, he might present his views to me. If any member thinks that a public work which has been provided for in his constituency should be dropped he has only to call my attention to the fact, and I will weigh carefully the reasons advanced.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have listened with pleasure to the jocular remarks of the minister, whose smiling countenance showed that he was merely seeking to create a pleasing impression. I thought a mistake was made when the minister was asked to carry out an undertaking which had been promised. It is all very well for the minister to say that the political exigencies are not considered in these matters. I do not think even his own political friends will give him credit for entire sincerity in that statement. No public buildings in my riding will be left out of consideration, even although he does not adhere to the rule laid down, because there were no appropriations for any, nor has a public building ever been erected in it, so I am absolutely free to speak on this matter. The minister may think my criticism was severe, but I am satisfied that members felt last session when these appropriations were going through the House, that many of them were made simply in view of the approaching election. I believe a fair plan would be that all appropriations dropped by the minister this year should be considered as having lapsed, and when the minister takes up the matter again and money is sufficiently plentiful to go on with the construction of public works, he should begin afresh, leaving out of consideration everything that had been promised before and giving all towns and villages throughout the country an equal show.

Mr. LALOR. Is it the intention to carry out a promise made by the government candidate in my county as to the erection of a post office in Hagersville? In that village a remarkable vote was cast for the government candidate, which was wholly attributable to the fact that he was able to promise a beautiful post office to be built on a beautiful site in the village of Hagersville. I am quite anxious that such a post office should be built there, and I hope the minister will carry out the promise made by the candidate in the last election. The site selected is an admirable one, nicely located in the centre of the town, which is a thriving centre, and I hope that my opponent in making that

promise, did so with the assurance of the government that they would carry it out. No doubt the minister assured him that if he were elected, that a post office would be built, and now that the county elected myself as an independent representative of the people, surely he will not for that reason go back on his promise. The labouring men there are most anxious to get work on this particular post office, as they were told they would be paid very high wages, and for that reason they voted for the government candidate.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Lest my silence might imply that any such promise was made, I rise to say that I have no recollection of it.

Mr. LALOR. It seems to have been the rule for government candidates throughout the whole country to make these promises. Are we to understand that they were made without any assurance from the government that they would be carried out? But if these promises were made by the candidates in good faith and not merely to deceive the electors, the government should carry them out, or else take the stand that they repudiate them and say that their candidates had no assurance whatever on which to base them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman has not gone so far as to say that he is personally aware of any such promise having been made. He says he understands that it was. All I can say to that, so far as the government is concerned, no promise of the kind is registered in the Appropriation Act of the last parliament.

Mr. J. D. REID. I am about in the same position as my hon. friend who has just spoken. A promise was made by my opponent that a post office would be built in the village of Kemptville.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is in an entirely different position because an appropriation was made and the site purchased.

Mr. J. D. REID. I did not know that. It must have been done a short time ago, and I am very glad to hear it. I suppose I can assure the people that we will have the post office.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will not be necessary for you to give that assurance because the post office will be built any way.

Mr. J. D. REID. And I suppose at an early date?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As early as possible.

Mr. J. D. REID. And this year it will be in the estimates?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not in the estimates of this year.

Mr. J. D. REID. As regards these public buildings, I can hardly agree with the department in the way it proceeds. I see that for the installation of electric works and heating, one firm in Ottawa last year supplied $106,949.49 worth of work on different buildings without tender.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Which firm was that?

Mr. J. D. REID. Ahearn & Soper. Here are some of the items. On page V-20 of the Auditor General's Report, for the Dominion Archives building, $808.69; V-23 and 24, Ottawa Royal Mint, $33,887.86; V-27, Ot- Parliament Buildings, $6,103.50; V-67, Ottawa Printing Bureau, $11,917.40; V-108, $25,083.78. And other items, V-143, $10,-428.20; and V-332, $3,898.20, a total of $106,-949.29. Had tenders been invited for the work necessary for any one of these items, the government would have had it done much cheaper. I am quite satisfied that had tenders been called for, there would have been $25,000 in the treasury to-day saved out of that $106,947. I do not see why tenders should not be called for these works just as for the building itself. As I understand it, the system has been to invite tenders for the building. Then the heating and electric work is extra, and word is sent to this firm to go and do this work. In this way it must cost a good deal more than if tenders were called for.

Mr. HERRON. I was rather surprised at the innocence of the present minister regarding the promises of public works. He is perhaps wiser in his day and generation than were some of his predecessors. In my former election, promises were made that certain works would be carried out in my constituency, but when I appealed to the department, I was deliberately told that it was only an election promise.

Mr. PUGSLEY. By whom were you told?

Mr. HERRON. By one of the hon. gentleman's predecessors in his own department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A former minister?

Mr. HERRON. Yes, and I have witnesses to prove my statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He must have been a younger politician than I thought.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE. Are we to understand that all contracts in excess of $5,000 must be let by public tender unless you have the authority of an order in council?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As a rule, in the case of a contract which involves an expenditure of $5,000, tenders must be called for, or the facts submitted to the Governor in Council. I feel myself bound either to call for tenders or to submit the facts to the Governor in Council. But there may be cases such as the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D.

Reid) referred to, in which a number of small items amount in the aggregate to over $5,000. But the rule of the department is to call for tenders whenever the amount exceeds $5,000. I do not know that that applies to fittings, which perhaps can hardly be called a public work.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. I understood that the minister promised to bring down the orders in council in regard to contracts amounting to over $5,000 in connection with the addition to the parliament buildings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I told the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) I would bring down were the orders in council with regard to the building of the guardhouses and the fence in connection with the Mint. I then said that I understood that there was only one order in council with respect to the addition to the parliament buildings, and that was in reference to the elevators. I have made inquiry, and find that there was no order in council for any other work apart from the original contract.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister's statement in regard to what I said is hardly correct. Take this item of $33,887 spent on the Royal Mint. That was for the electric work on one building. In a case of that kind, I should think that tenders should be asked for, because the chief architect of the department must know that a very large amount of that work would have to be done, and various firms should be able to estimate what they would do the work for. In every case in which the cost of the heating and lighting is likely to amount to more than $5,000, I think tenders should be asked.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say that I have been making inquiry into this matter, and I have given directions to the chief architect that when tenders are called for, they should as far as possible include plumbing, heating, wiring and everything else. I should say, in regard to the equipment of the Mint and the Printing Bureau with motors, that the master of the Mint selected a certain class of motor for the running of the machinery there; I think it was the Westinghouse, which is supplied by only one concern. In such a case it would be difficult to call for tenders, as the price would differ according to the quality of the machine to be supplied. There is a good deal more difficulty in that case than there would be in regard to plumbing, heating and electric wiring. At all events, the rule which my hon. friend thinks should be adopted, I also think should be adopted as far as possible, and I have already given directions to the chief architect in respect to new buildings, as far as possible, to have the specifications cover everything, so that when the contract is let we should know as nearly as possible what the work is going to cost.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. CROTHERS. The other day the minister read a long list of public works for which appropriations amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars were asked for last year. I want to ask one or two questions in respect to that. The first is: Did the minister, at the time he asked these appropriations, intend to proceed during the year with all the works for which they were asked? If he did not intend at that time to proceed during the year with all these works, did he indicate the works with which he did intend to proceed during the year, and those he did not intend to proceed with during the year? If there were any he did not intend to proceed with during the year, why did he ask for appropriations for them last year? If the answer be that he did intend to proceed with all these works, the next question is, why did he not proceed with them? If he did not proceed, was it because of the lack of funds? If it was because of the lack of funds, did he not know then that there would be a lack of funds for all these appropriations?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will have to put his questions in writing, because my memory, though pretty fair, is not equal to carrying them all.

Mr. CROTHERS. I will put them seriatim. The first is: Did you intend last year, when you asked for appropriations involving hundreds of thousands of dollars——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman will please take his seat. The hon. gentleman must address the Chair, and not any one in particular.

Mr. CROTHERS. I will then ask you, Mr. Chairman, did the hon. minister, when he submitted all these appropriations to the House a year ago, intend at that time to implement his promises? Did he intend at that time to proceed with these works, and with all of them within the year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think I can answer the hon. gentleman. When those amounts were put in the estimates, it was intended to proceed with the works as rapidly as possible.

Mr. CROTHERS. Within the year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes; and proceeding with them meant acquiring sites, preparing plans and specifications, advertising for tenders, going along just as rapidly as the officials of the department could fairly proceed with the work.

Mr. CROTHERS. That answers the first question. The hon. gentleman has answered that a year ago; when he asked for those appropriations, he honestly and sincerely intended during the year to proceed with all the works for which appropriations were asked. The next question is: Why did the hon. minister not during the year proceed

with those different public works? I could understand very well that the hon. minister could not perhaps proceed with the whole of them, but we have scores of them——

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought the hon. member wanted to ask a question.

Mr. CROTHERS. If you will please sit down, I want to address the Chair. The hon minister having said that at that time he intended to proceed with the whole of the wcrks, I now desire to ask him why he did not proceed with any of those in that long list?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The answer is that he did proceed.

Mr. CROTHERS. The hon. member gave us a long list of those which he asked appropriations for and did not proceed with. The hon. minister will probably admit that there is a long list of public works for which he asked appropriations, and in respect of which he has done nothing since.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My deputy tells me that he does not think there is any work in respect to which something has not been done. In respect of some, the preliminary sketches have been dropped; in respect of some, the sites have been examined, and in many cases the sites have been selected and purchased. In some, plans have been prepared and specifications have been drawn up, so that we are ready at any time to ask for tenders. But in respect to all of them, preliminary work was done in the direction of calling for tenders, and in respect of others tenders were actually called for.

Mr. LALOR. When were these preliminary sketches made? Was it during the past year just previous to the general election?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The work was begun immediately after the prorogation of parliament, immediately after the appropriations were made. General instructions were given to the officers of the department to proceed with as reasonable speed as they could.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I think the minister has dealt very unfairly with the public, because for months many promises had been made throughout the country, and great expectations were raised among the people that these expenditures would be made, and merchants and others began to make preparations to meet the demand for carrying on these works. Now, people have a lot of material on their hands and the business of the country is gradually coming to a standstill. Now we are told that something is wrong. There is something undigested, apparently the Department of Public Works has not digested these supplies that were given to them by the last parliament. The result is disastrous to the country. Contractors were prepared to furnish material, manufacturers of various articles had begun to prepare them, and everybody was getting ready for the large expenditure that had been promised. And now for the government to reverse their policy and break their promises is a very serious matter to this country. A little over a year ago we passed through a serious crisis, and passed through it successfully. Now another crisis is at hand in the United States, and it is essential for this country that the wheels of commerce should be kept moving in some way. I do not think there is any public work that was suggested previous to the last election in which drawings were not made, and I trust that all these works will be gone on with this year.

Mr. CROTHERS. The Minister of Public Works has told us of the preliminary work that was done in connection with many of these projects. I would like to ask him if a promise made by a government candidate is considered one of these preliminary works.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. I would like to ask the minister if a sketch was made of the Uxbridge post office in the county of Ontario, or what other preliminary steps were taken?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We purchased the site.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. When was it purchased?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Previous to the election.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. When will the buildings be proceeded with ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. When parliament provides the money.

Mr. HUGHES. I understood the minister to say that he had furnished the House with a list of the public works for which moneys were voted last year, but which are not to be proceeded with this year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, for the province of Ontario.

Mr. HUGHES. Why are these expenditures not being proceeded with?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think I have stated half a dozen times the reason why they are not being proceeded with. Last December, when we came to consider these estimates, it was brought forcibly to my attention that it was desirable to cut down my estimates for the coming year to as low a figure as possible. The appropriations which were made for buildings were not sufficient to complete them, and if they had been gone on with that it would have been necessary to ask for further appropriations.

Mr. HUGHES. What was the object of cutting them down?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To do what every prudent man and every prudent government should do who wish to keep the expenditure within the revenue. It became necessary for me to cut off from the estimates of the Public Works somewhere in the vicinity of eight million dollars. Now, I was not prepared to go through these estimates item after item and select those which we should proceed with and those which we should drop, so I decided that the better way was simply to postpone the construction of a certain number of public works for another year; at all events, we drew the line sharply between those works in respect of which there has been no commencement, in regard to which tenders had not been called prior to the time we took this decision, and in that way we cut off this large amount from the estimates. Then we also cut off a number of public works in regard to which tenders had been called for, but in respect to which there did not seem to be great urgency for the present year. My hon. friend will find for the province of Ontario a list of those in respect to which tenders were called for, but the actual carrying on of which will have to stand over.

Mr. HUGHES. Owing to the hard times?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Owing to the revenue being smaller than we had anticipated.

Mr. HUGHES. Owing to the general business depression the minister has put off many millions of expenditure that were deemed proper a year ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not say the depression; I said owing to the decline in the revenue.

Mr. HUGHES. The policy of the government then is still further to encourage hard times by turning a lot of labour idle on the labour market. Is that the policy of the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is an argument rather than a question.

Mr. HUGHES. May I ask the minister why so many thousands of men have been turned idle on the labour market by the government at a time when there is business depression, when the industries of the country are in a state of depression, and why is the government still further intensifying the depression by turning those men idle on the country?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is an argument. If my hon. friend will ask me a question of fact I will answer him.

Mr. HUGHES. I want to know why the government has seen fit to turn these men, these bread winners, idle at the present time, at a time when the business interests of the country are in a state of depression? Does the minister justify that policy? Does the minister justify that expenditure?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is an argument which might appeal to some, but I know there are others who take a very different view. Whether rightly or wrongly the view which the government took was that the revenue having fallen off, it was the part of prudence to curtail the expenditures and endeavour to keep them within the income. Whether that is a wise course or not, my hon. friend, as well as others, must form their own judgment. My own opinion is that we did the wise and prudent thing and that the country will approve the course we have pursued. As far as our turning people out of work is concerned, we have not done that. We simply have not gone on with public works for which we did not feel we had the revenues available at the present time. We are sorry we have not been able to give more employment on these public works though it is not our fault. We are placed in a condition which we were required to meet in a proper and prudent manner and I submit that we have met it in that way.

Mr. HUGHES. Was the minister not aware last June when these estimates were voted that there would be a deficit?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was aware that the revenues were not as buoyant as they had been, but the estimates of last session were made up before the close of the last fiscal year. I did not anticipate that the depression would continue as long as it has.

Mr. CROSBY. The minister has stated that plans have been prepared for certain public buildings for which appropriations were made last year and that is proof that it is the intention of the department to proceed with these works. I would like to know whether or not the preparation of plans is conclusive proof that the government will go on with certain work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all. The best evidence of whether we will go on with certain work is the fact that parliament has made the appropriation. If, as the result of the appropriation, plans are proceeded with, my hon. friend may rely with confidence, taking the appropriation and the preparation of the plans together, that it is pretty good evidence that we intend to proceed with the work and that in the ordinary course tenders will be called and contracts made.

Mr. LALOR. Is it the intention of the minister to build a post office at Port Perry, in South Ontario?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think there is no appropriation for that.

Mr. OSLER. I am afraid I cannot very well agree with my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) in objecting to the government exercising a little economy. They have committed themselves to such wild, reckless extravagance——

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is spoiling all you said before.

Mr. OSLER. No, I do not think so. I say I do not think I can blame the government for exercising economy now. They have in the past committed the country to such wild, reckless extravagance, without having looked forward to the possibility of a setback, that we are face to face not with a cutting down of the estimates for this year but, I think, that for years to come the pruning knife will have to be applied to meet the terrible outlays that the government are committed to. The government have been reckless to a degree. They have made promises in every possible direction and they have committed this country to wild expenditures. The minister is very profuse in his promises that in future contracts will be let so that the country may get the benefit of reasonable competition, but he refuses to apply his remedy when he has a chance. In connection with this museum in Ottawa a contract was let for the skeleton of the building. There is not very much more than half or two-thirds of the whole cost covered by contract.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. OSLER. What are the figures of the original contract and what is the building going to cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract is $950,000, and the total esimated cost is $1,250,000. That includes fittings, furniture and everything.

Mr. OSLER. The public building here is what I refer to.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The original contract for the new wing of the parliament buildings was $237,000, and the additional work that was given to the contractor was $44,000.

Mr. OSLER. What is the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total cost of the new wing including the improvements to this building, elevators and the ventilation system is $447,000.

Mr. OSLER. The minister is very pleasant and profuse in his mild condemnation of the way in which contracts have been let hitherto when the government let a skeleton contract and then left it open to permit inside contracts to be given by the department without tender. The minister condemned that system and said that he hoped he would let the whole contract to one contractor. In connection with these houses in Kingston we found the same thing. Four men tendered, of whom one was a builder and the others were plumbers.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was an Ottawa firm—were they not contracors?

Mr. OSLER. I do not know who they were.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The firm of Doran & Devlin are contractors of large experience who have done a large amount of work.

Mr. OSLER. A contract was let for a skeleton building leaving it open to the department to let separate contracts for plumbing and heating not by public tender, but at the prices which the architect or the government gave to the original contractors. The contractor of the museum building took his contract at what the minister said was a very low price, namely, $900,000, and there is extra work amounting to $400,000 remaining to be done. We are told that this extra work is not to be tendered for. These are sub-contracts and it is in these sub-contracts where fraud is committed and where the country is robbed. There is no man of sense in this country who would carry on that work as the government proposes to do in this case. I do not care what the minister promises for the future; I say it is his duty to commence now by showing his good faith and by having all the extra work on the museum, not included in the first contract, thrown open to public tender and competition. If the minister does that he will give us some assurance that he is trying to reform his department which needs reform badly. The minister speaks of economy this year and he says he hopes that next year he will be able to go on with many of these public works, but I tell him that the chances are that next year he will have a harder time and that he will have to reduce his appropriations still further. On account of the exposé in the Cassels report the people of Canada are hoping that each department of this government shall be operated on purely business principles and that there will be no reason for accusation in future against the government or any of its employees as was the case in the Marine Department. I have very little confidence in the minister's promise of future reform unless he lets this extra work on the museum by public tender.

Mr. MARSHALL. Last session I brought to the attention of the government the necessity for a public building in Aylmer, in my constituency. We fully expected the minister would be up there during the recess to look over the ground and we were disappointed he did not come. I find that he proposes to build a post office at Glencoe with a population of 1,200, and in Leamington, which has a population of 2,500, about the same as Aylmer, and I would like to

know why there is no appropriation for a post office in Aylmer.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did make inquiry into the claims of the town of Aylmer and I was impressed with what my hon. friend (Mr. Marshall) said and with the other information I obtained. I regret there is no appropriation for that purpose this year. It will have to stand over with others which are equally deserving.

Mr. HUGHES. I regret exceedingly that the member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) does not see eye to eye with me on the question of public expenditure under present conditions. I can tell the hon. gentleman that economy and retrenchment are two different things; and I can tell him also that extravagance in the expenditure of public money is not economy. On the assurance of the Minister of Public Works we solemnly voted a year ago large sums of money for certain buildings which were declared to be absolutely necessary in the interests of the country. It is sound policy, and it is the policy in England and in France and in every civilized land that when there is depression amongst commercial enterprises, the government which has the credit should come to the relief of the people by erecting public works. That is the policy that carried the Tory party through the stormy times of 1893 and succeeding years. There was a wing of the Conservative party then which went in for lopping off the mouldering branches but there was a stronger wing which held that in times of business depression the government should go on with public works and afford employment to the people. A time of stress is on us now and if these works are necessary in the interests of the country this is the time for the government to go on with them so as to afford useful employment for those who are out of work. That is a principle which will not stand contradiction for one instant among business men. If these public works were necessary before the elections, they are doubly necessary now and it is the duty of the government to go on with them and alleviate distress and suffering.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Minister of Publis Works misunderstands my position with regard to this matter. I did not ask him to abandon all the public works he has proposed; I simply asked that they should be put on the same level as to their necessity with other public works in other communities for which no appropriation had been made. As a member of the Conservative party, I desire to say, before I resume my seat, that I do not feel myself committed to the policy laid down by the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes).

Mr. PUGSLEY. I wish to say, in reference to some information which was asked by my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Currie), that it will take some days to prepare it and when it is ready I will give it to 'Hansard.'

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. We will have permission to discuss it at some other opportunity.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. I understood from the minister that four tenders were received in connection with the servants' quarters. Two of these were from men in the contracting business, Sullivan and Doran & Devlin, of Ottawa. The tender of McKelvey & Birch could not be considered as a tender, as no cheque accompanied it. The tender of Elliott Bros. could hardly be considered a tender because they were not in a position to carry out the contract, not being contractors, and the specifications say that a contractor shall not assign or sublet this contract or any part of it. They were hardware merchants and plumbers and incapable of carrying out the work for which they had tendered. How much of the work represented by that $34,000 was for the heating and lighting fixtures?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could not give the information at this moment.

Mr. EDWARDS. That is a large proportion of the total, $112,000. $34,000 of that is unaccounted for in the original contract. I think we ought to have some information as to the proportion of that amount that was tendered for.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend will give me a memorandum of what he wants I will submit it at some convenient time and place it in 'Hansard.'

Mr. BURRELL. The Minister of Militia undertook to bring down the figures in connection with the salaries of these men.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have the information. The salaries were for instructors: One at $3.00 a day, one at $2.25; sergeants, one at $2.45, two at $1.35, two at $1.65, eight at $22.00 a month, one at $1.50 per day, one at $2.00 per day. Rations of course are in addition.

Mr. BURRELL. I have checked over these items in the Auditor General's Report. I understood that these people were the subordinate staff. Last year there were just 22 men on this list of the subordinate staff. The pay of five sergeant instructors averaged $2.03 a day. I understood the Minister of Militia to say that the pay of these men ran from about $1,000 to $1,600. One bugler gets $321 a year, one storeman gets $420 a year and one labourer gets $420 a year. Then we have twelve servants at $22 a month and two butlers at $35 a month. I must confess that that answer does not help the situation as far as the Department of Pub-

lic Works goes, because we have here absolute evidence that a good many of these people inhabiting these $7,000 houses are of the servant class at $22 a month. In the western country we consider that a man is doing fairly well if he can build a $5,000 house and it seems extraordinary that people whose salaries average from $22 to $35 a month should have built for them by the people of this country houses costing $5,000 and costing as much for wiring and heating as we would require to build a whole house. I cannot believe it is anything but gross extravagance in the expenditure of public money and I think the people of the west will so regard it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I hope my hon. friend will not think me discourteous if I do not feel called upon to reply to his observations, because I have already said all that can be said. I have explained that the basement had been excavated out of the solid rock and the fireproof character of the building.

I shall now refer to the item of barrack accommodation for stables. That means accommodation for the 25 or 30 non-commissioned officers and men of the permanent corps who look after the horses provided for the cadets. The stables have already been built and this is for the accommodation of the men who look after the horses.

Mr. EDWARDS. This is a kind of annex to the servants' quarters.

Mr. HUGHES. Are the stable men to reside in this building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. Where are the buildings located?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the Royal Military College grounds.

Mr. HUGHES. How many horses has the Royal Military College attached to it for the present?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About twenty-five.

Mr. PRICE. What kind of a building is this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is built of brick—41 by 35 feet, two and a half storys high.

Mr. HUGHES. When were the horses added to the college?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are to be taken from the horse artillery.

Mr. HUGHES. What are the salaries of these 22 stablemen?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The sergeants about $1.65 and the men $1.50 per day.

Mr. BARR. Do they receive their rations?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. Then there has just been a detachment of artillery moved to the barracks?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, with their horses, to instruct the cadets.

Mr. HUGHES. Will they be on the pay of the Royal College?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a matter for the Minister of Militia to decide.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I do not think that any opposition would be made to the erection of these buildings at Kingston if we were satisfied that they were intended for permanent barrack purposes and could be readily used at any time to accommodate from 500 to 2,000 men. But on looking over the plans I find that they have all been built with the view of the one purpose to which they are being put, and there is no reason why such expensive buildings should have been erected. I do not say that the Minister of Public Works is so much to blame because he has a lot to bear on his shoulders, but I trust that when anything of this description comes up again he will see that any building of this kind of a permanent character should be erected with a view of being utilized for general purposes of the barracks or police or quarters for the men. These are not intended for that purpose, but only for the one use, and while I would like to see the men have good quarters, I do not think the country should be charged to provide such luxurious quarters for men whose pay is so low.

Kingston Veterinary Hospital, $15,000.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Is that accommodation for the stables?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it is a hospital for the horse artillery.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Are you building a mansion of $15,000 for this purpose?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is what it costs.

Mr. BARR. Are we to understand that there are only 25 horses to be accommodated after all this outlay, and of course that $15,000 will not finish the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are about 300 horses in Kingston altogether, and this hospital is intended for those which are sick.

Mr. HUGHES. Is this to be an isolation hospital?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, but not necessarily so.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the Whitby public item been passed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. What was the cost of the site; who recommended its purchase, and is it not a fact that an area of ground on the opposite corner, fully as large, if not a little larger, with a splendid building on it, was purchased about the same time for less than the cost of that vacant lot?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It comprises part of lots 15 and 16. It has a frontage on Barclay street of 55 feet with a depth on Dundas street of 150 feet, and the amount paid was $5,000. We had it examined and it was reported very suitable. It would appear from the notes I have that the site was recommended by the Whitby Board of Trade. I have here a resolution of the board of trade which recites that a suitable site is available, and no doubt this is the site.

Mr. HUGHES. Do they recommend $5,000 as the price for it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They do not mention any price. It was purchased from Mr. Barclay.

Mr. HUGHES. Why does it not appear in his name in the Public Accounts? It appears in the name of the Society of the Sons of Scotland.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I never heard that before.

Mr. HUGHES. I may tell the minister that a corresponding site on the opposite corner, better located than this one, and not a vancant lot, but having a three-story brick building upon it, was sold at about the same time for about half the money that this site cost; but it had not the same motive power behind it that this had.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. The minister will find the item on page V—74:

Purchase price of site—Sons of Scotland Benevolent Society, $5,000.

I wish to endorse what the hon. member for Victoria has said. There was an adjoining property, with a brick building on it, which was sold for less than half the amount this vacant property was purchased for. The department was certainly very extravagant in the price they paid for this lot. You could purchase nearly half the sites in the whole village for that price. It certainly was a most extravagant price to pay, and met with the condemnation of all reasonable men in that vicinity.

Mr. FOWKE. The hon. member comes from North Ontario, and is not in a position to know what the value of this site in the town of Whitby is. It is a matter of which I know something, as it is in the county town of the county from which I come; and I wish to say that it is the most eligible site in the town of Whitby, that it is a corner lot on the main thoroughfare of the town, that practically every business man in the town was consulted by myself in relation to the value of that property and its eligibility for the purpose to which it was to be devoted, and that Conservatives and Liberals alike said that if it were in their possession they would not part with it for the price which the government paid for it. I have this to say in addition, that the town council and the board of trade of the town of Whitby joined in affirming that opinion as being correct, and in declaring the site to be a proper site for the purpose, and said it was cheap at the price the government were paying for it.

Mr. HUGHES. I venture to say that the hon. member cannot produce one man in the town of Whitby, much less the board of trade, who will state that that was not too high a price. He cannot produce one honest man in the town of Whitby who will say that it was a proper price. We are not condemning the site, but we are condemning the exorbitant price which my friend engineered for it. He knows that the opposite lot on the same thoroughfare, with a three-story brick building on it was sold about the same time for about half the sum that the government paid for this site. My hon. friend is an adept at engineering prices. We shall have something to say later on of the Oshawa harbour deal, which was engineered by my hon. friend in connection with this same riding.

Mr. FOWKE. My hon. friend says that no honest man in the town of Whitby can be got to say that that was a proper price. I have only to say that perhaps the honesty of men there is not of the same quality as that of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. They are plain, blunt, honest men in the town of Whitby, who say what they mean and mean what they say. I went to them for information as to what would be a proper price in the circumstances, and I took them at their word. I took the board of trade at its word, and the town council as well; and I had the co-operation of private individuals and public bodies in saying that the government would be warranted in paying $5,000 for the site. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken came into my riding and made himself very industrious in opposition to my candidature, and no doubt made very good use on the public platform there of the representations which he has made here to-night, and the people expressed their estimate of his judgment and his opposition to myself by returning me with the largest majority given to any candidate in South Ontario since confederation.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. I would like to ask the hon. minister by what authority the hon. member for South Ontario was parading around the constituency looking for lots for post offices and other public buildings for the department? It is only in accord-

ance with the policy generally pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite, who took every opportunity to promise public buildings to the constituencies in order to secure a majority in this House; and it ill becomes the hon. member from South Ontario to show that assiduity in regard to corner lots in Whitby in order to put himself right with the electors of South Ontario. I would say, for the information of the Minister of Public Works, that the name of the gentleman from whom this lot was purchased does not appear in the Public Accounts at all. It is stated there that it was purchased from the Sons of Scotland. Why was not the name of the man from whom it was really purchased placed there? The reason was that he was an active political supporter of the hon. member for South Ontario, who busies himself with the voters' lists. In view of this fact, we can see why the government paid such an outrageous price for this vacant lot.

Mr. HUGHES. The hon. member for South Ontario has referred to the honour of the people of Whitby. I again make the statement that I spoke to a great many of the prominent men in Whitby, and while they were delighted to get a post office, they one and all laughed at the price, and said that it was the result of a deal with my hon. friend from South Ontario, similar to the deal that had been made with him with regard to the Oshawa harbour, when the government were induced, by misrepresentations——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. HUGHES. Absolutely in order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The point of order having been raised, perhaps I should rule of it. I do not understand the hon. member to be charging dishonour to any hon. member of the House, and in that case I do not rule him out of order.

Mr. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman who now misrepresents South Ontario——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That I think is not in order.

Mr. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman who now represents South Ontario in this House induced this government to purchase the Oshawa harbour, and the charge was made upon every platform in the riding, and was not successfully contradicted, that he had done it by misrepresenting the tolls of the harbour which he controlled, and thereby induced them to pay a large price for it. As soon as he unloaded, instead of bringing his coal in through the harbour, he brought it in by rail to the town, and dumped the harbour on the government. That is the charge that is made by the electors of Oshawa, and throughout that riding. That is the charge, and the hon. member came up and went through the town of Whitby——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman is wandering away from the subject, which is the Whitby public building.

Mr. HUGHES. I am speaking of that building. The hon. member came up to the town of Whitby and passed around from person to person, and everybody was naturally delighted to get a post office. But the board of trade have not stated that they endorsed the price paid for the site, the town council have not stated that they endorsed the price, nor has any public man in the town of Whitby. All of them look on it as a rake-off from start to finish.

Mr. LALOR. I would ask the Minister of Public Works who it was that constituted the member for South Ontario (Mr. Fowke) a commissioner to purchase a lot for this government in the town of Whitby. He was not then a member of this House, he was not representing the county; the county was represented by an enirely different individual. How came it that the present member for South Ontario went through that county picking out lots for this government? This post office was not the only one the member for South Ontario promised to the electors of that county, and did this government appoint him as a commissioner to make those promises? Why should he take it upon himself to buy a lot in the town of Whitby for this government, if this government had not appointed him for that purpose?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend from South Ontario, I presume, as a public man and as a candidate, had a right to do what he did. When it was contemplated by the government to purchase a lot in the town of Whitby for a public building, he had a perfect right to inform himself with regard to the value of the different sites which were spoken of, he had a perfect right, for the protection of his own interest as a candidate of the Liberal party, to inform himself as to whether the price for this lot was fair and reasonable, and I commend my hon. friend for having taken the trouble to ascertain if the price was fair and reasonable. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen opposite to deal with rumours; it is all very well for people who are dissatisfied because they did not succeed in selling their property, to disparage the property that was sold. But we have the word of the hon. member for South Ontario, whose judgment, I for one am prepared to place great reliance upon; more than that, we have the report of our own inspector, a man of large experience. He went there, as I am informed, and examined the various sites, questioned people who had lots to sell as to what they would take for their property, and after carefully considering the relative values of the different sites, he recommended that this property should be purchased.

Mr. HUGHES. Would the minister kindly give the price recommended by the other inspector, and who was the inspector?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My deputy informs me it was Mr. C. H. Hunter, a man of large experience in these matters. In the department we always adopt the course of requiring the most careful examination to be made into all the properties available. We asked our agent to find out at what prices properties had been recently changing hands for two or three years back, to get the assessed values of the properties, to furnish all the particulars which would enable the chief architect and the minister to form a correct judgment as to the propriety of purchasing a property which is recommended to the department.

Mr. LALOR. Do I understand the minister to say that he sent two inspectors there to value the property?

Mr. PUGSLEY. An inspector, Mr. C. H. Hunter.

Mr. LALOR. I think this is a serious matter that the minister has brought up. He says he upholds the member for South Ontario, that he had a perfect right to pick out this lot. The member for South Ontario states that he was the man who selected the lot. As I understand, it was he who interviewed the different parties; he was, so to speak, the whole push in connection with the selection of this particular site. The minister lays down the principle that it is proper to place in the hands of a candidate for parliament the power to select lots for post offices. If that is the case, we should know it. That seems to have been the policy followed by the government throughout the country. They authorize their candidates to give promises of post offices wherever they like, and the member for South Ontario seems to have been favoured in that respect also. The principle is entirely wrong. If the member for South Ontario had any authority from this governmen we should know what that authority is.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the minister the report of the inspector on that site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not.

Mr. HUGHES. Nobody in Whitby condemned the site, the only thing they condemned was the rake-off in the extra price that was paid for this lot over and above the fair market value.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to know from the minister who was the owner of the property when the transfer was made to the government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say to my hon. friend that this item passed some days ago, and as I did not suppose it would come up again to-night I did not bring with me the papers in connection with the site. But I could get the papers and bring them down for the information of my hon. friend. The real owner, I presume, would be the Sons of Scotland. Possibly Mr. Barkley had a mortgage, but the Department of Justice would attend to the title, that would not come under my supervision. When we decide to purchase a property we transfer the papers to the Department of Justice, and if the title is found good, the cheque is made out to the agent of the Minister of Justice to pay the owner. In this case I presume the Sons of Scotland were the owners of the property.

Mr. HUGHES. Who was the agent of the Minister of Justice ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Would the member for North Ontario tell us who was the owner of this lot?

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. My information was that it was a political supporter of the member for South Ontario, Mr. L. T. Barkley. Would the minister kindly say whether the member for South Ontario had any authority from the department, either to recommend or to inspect the various lots in the town of Whitby?

Mr. PUGSLEY. By looking up the papers I could ascertain if there was any communication in reference to the matter, but I have not the papers with me to-night. But so far as the action of the hon. member for South Ontario is concerned in this matter, I thoroughly approve of it. I approve of the hon. gentleman having taken an interest in securing a public building for the town of Whitby. I think it would be entirely within his right as a public man seeking the suffrages of the people, to interest himself to the extent of seeing that a suitable location was secured for a public building. I think he was entirely within his right in ascertaining the value of the various properties, and to satisfy himself that the price asked for the lot in question was a fair and reasonable price, so that the government might not be criticised, and that he himself as a supporter of the government might not be criticised, in respect to the purchase.

Mr. HUGHES. Would the Minister of Public Works give us the name of the agent of the government to whom this cheque was made payable?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will be very glad to do it, but I cannot do it to-night.

Mr. S. SHARPE. I do not think this committee should agree with the principle laid down by the Minister of Public Works. That principle is a most vicious one, a most reprehensible one and one which is capable

of the greatest possible abuse. If candidates for the government can be empowered by the different departments to go around towns and municipalities and represent themselves as the accredited agents of the government it is capable of the greatest possible abuse. I am surprised to hear the minister lay down a doctrine of that kind because it is demoralizing to the whole community. A practice similar to that was carried on in the town of Uxbridge in South Ontario. The day after the writs were issued we had an accredited agent of the department around with the friends of Mr. Grant, my opponent in the election, taking options on all the corner lots in the town, holding out inducements and raising the expectations of the electors that if my opponent were elected an expensive post office would be erected in the town. Now we have the minister allowing this option to lapse and doing nothing although there was $8,000 in last year's estimates for this work. The principle enunciated by the minister is a most vicious one and one worthy of the most severe condemnation.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Is my hon. friend old enough in politics to let us know what policy his party followed previous to 1896?

Mr. BLAIN. I would like the minister to read the communication from the Board of Trade.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is the resolution:

Whereas a suitable site satisfactory to the whole community is at present available. The Whitby office is a distributing centre for a considerable and important district. Whitby is the county town of one of the richest counties in the province; and as the various court sittings and the sessions of the county council are held here the offices of the general government should be in keeping with the other public buildings.

If a government building were erected the customs and postal services could be combined under one roof, instead of being carried on as now in two buildings poorly equipped and a considerable distance apart.

The cost of constructing such a building would not exceed the capitalized rental of the present buildings.

The expenditure in the present case could be amply justified by the existing and pressing need as being in the public interest.

Be it therefore resolved that the attention of the Dominion government be called to this matter in the hope that steps may at once be taken to secure the erection of a new customs and post office, suitable to the present and advancing needs of the town of Whitby and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Premier, the Postmaster General and the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. HUGHES. That is not the resolution that the minister referred to. We want the resolution endorsing this site.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is the resolution.

Mr. HUGHES. There is no site referred to there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It says 'Whereas a suitable site satisfactory to the whole community is available.'

Mr. HUGHES. That meant any site.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I told my hon. friend that this resolution did not name the site, but I presumed that it referred to this site.

Mr. HUGHES. The minister gave the committee to understand that a resolution had been passed by the board of trade endorsing the site selected by the hon. member for South Ontario. The minister inferentially lets the committee believe that they have endorsed the site and the price. They do not say so and the member for South Ontario finds himself in rather an unfortunate position.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I regret that my hon. friend's memory should be so fickle.

Mr. HUGHES. My memory is all right and 'Hansard' will bear me out.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will remember that I stated distinctly that while the resolution did not mention the particular site selected, it referred to the fact that there was a suitable site then available and I presume that referred to the site which was actually purchased.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Does the minister say that Whitby is a customs port?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The application was for a customs house and post office as well. I am unable to state whether it is or not.

Mr. OSLER. What is the date of that resolution?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is dated March 6, 1907.

Mr. OSLER. By whom was it signed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. John Waugh, secretary.

Mr. OSLER. At what date was the purchase made?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was an order in council passed on the 25th October, 1907, for the purchase and I presume the purchase would follow shortly after that.

Mr. OSLER. How much is the new building in Whitby to cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am afraid I have not that information to-night. This item passed three or four days ago and I did not bring the papers back.

Mr. OSLER. I understand that $43,000 has been appropriated. It will cost about

$50,000. The resolution says that the interest capitalized is not going to amount to more than the present rental. What rental is being paid?

Mr. PUGSLEY. At that time it was $330.

Mr. OSLER. Interest on $50,000 would be about $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the board of trade were rather within the mark.

Mr. OSLER. They were talking through their hats when they made that statement in the resolution.

Public Works—Chargeable to Income—Dauphin Public Building, $24,000.

Mr. STAPLES. I would like to ask the minister whether or not he has been able to carry out all the pledges that were made in the province of Manitoba? How many public works promised last session and voted have been dropped? If he will give us that list we will then be in a better position to discuss the items as they come up.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I take it that my hon. friend is not very busy at the present moment and if he will take the Appropriation Act of last year, then take these estimates and subtract one from the other he will see exactly.

Mr. STAPLES. I admit that I have not been very busy and that I have been sitting here listening to the discussion of these items. The minister took the trouble to make a list for Ontario and I am not asking anything more than he did in the case of Ontario.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will do it a little later; I cannot do it at this moment.

Mr. STAPLES. I think the minister should give us that information before we begin to deal with these estimates.

Mr. BRADBURY. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that there was an appropriation last year for a post office at Elmwood, Man. Previous to the election the county was visited by my opponent, Mr. Jackson, and he called a meeting of the Liberals of that town to select a site. I understand that a site was selected and I was told by the minister that the site was bought on the 6th October. The promise was given by my opponent, Mr. Jackson, that the building of a post office would be proceeded with immediately and I would like to ask the minister if it is his intention to implement that pledge? I presume that when the vote was made it was the intention of the government to proceed with the work. I also presume that my opponent, Mr. Jackson, had full authority to make the promise he made to the electors of Elmwood that a post office costing $40,000 would be proceeded with immediately. What has caused the government to change its policy in this regard, because I see that the vote for the Elmwood post office is dropped out of the estimates this year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I suppose I will have to explain it to my hon. friend again if he will not take the trouble to read 'Hansard.' The appropriation for the public building at Elmwood last year was put in the estimates upon the earnest solicitation of the late member, Mr. Jackson, and it having been voted by parliament Mr. Jackson would have perfect authority for informing the people that the government had decided to erect that building. The fact that a site had been purchased would I presume justify him in stating that it was the intention of the government to proceed with the building without delay. That was the intention of the government when the appropriation was made, but for the reason that the revenues have declined and that we feel it prudent in the public interest to keep our expenditure within our revenue there is no vote for the Elmwood post office this year. We have treated Elmwood no differently from scores of other places throughout the Dominion. We do not treat it differently because it has, shall I say the bad fortune or the good fortune, to have my hon. friend (Mr. Bradbury) as its representative. My hon. friend can rely that having purchased the site it simply means a postponement of the building for a reasonable time.

Mr. BRODER. I would point out to the Minister of Public Works that when these very items were being voted for public buildings last year the Minister of Finance had announced in his Budget Speech that he anticipated a falling off of $6,000,000 in the revenue, and in face of that announcement the government voted these appropriations.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are providing this year for dredging rivers and harbours and for the erection of a large number of public buildings, and in view of the shrinkage in revenue being double what the hon. gentleman says was anticipated, I think we are doing very well that we have kept over one-half of our estimates for public works in the appropriations for this year.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I quite understand that the Minister of Public Works has to answer the same questions over and over again, but if there were any consistency in the position assumed by him it would be less difficult for him to explain it. If we could discern a thread of logic running through his argument we would not be so insistent in our demand for information. As we pointed out last Friday evening, the Minister of Public Works stated in July last,

in reply to the hon. member for Peel, that there absolutely need be no concern about the erection of these public works, and that there was no cause for alarm that any accident would interfere with their being proceeded with. The logical result of this statement was that these buildings for which appropriations were taken would be erected. On looking into the matter I find that the very month that the minister made that assertion to the House was the month in which the revenue of the country fell to the largest extent below the revenue for the corresponding period in the previous year. I find that for the four months of the fiscal year, commencing on the 1st April and ending with the month in which the minister made that statement, the revenue of the country fell off by some $6,789,589.35, or at the rate of $1,697,397.34 per month. Now, from the end of July to the end of the current year, the falling off in the revenue diminished, so that commencing with the 1st of August, 1908, and ending with the very month when the minister decided on a retrenchment of $8,000,000 the revenue declined at one-half the rate of the previous period, or $933,577 per month.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The hon. gentleman has called me to order, but I really think I am closer to the point than many hon. members on this side of the House have been, or than the minister himself has been throughout this debate.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That has been discussed so often.

Mr. MEIGHEN. This has never been discussed before.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. This is the fifth or sixth time we have heard your speech.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. As the point has been raised, I think that in discussing Supply the opposition is entitled to a great deal of freedom and I have not felt that the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen) are out of order on the vote for public buildings in Manitoba.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I have endeavoured to show that the reasons given by the minister for the policy entered on by the government in December last are not logical, and particularly so in the light of the fact that in July last, when these estimates were voted, not only was July the month of the largest decrease in our revenue over the corresponding period of the previous year, but the fact stands out in strong contrast that the very month in which the ministry arrived at the decision that there must be retrenchment, namely, two months after the election, was the only month in the year 1908 in which the revenue exceeded that of the corresponding month for the preceding year. The revenue for December, 1908, was $7,183,355.94. The revenue for 1907 was $7,093,530.87, so that there was an actual increase in the revenue for December, 1908, of some $933,000, or about $3,000 a day over the corresponding month of the year before. Thus the logic of the minister amounts to this, that when the revenue is falling off at the greatest rate he has cause to assure this country that there is no cause for concern, that he will be able to erect all the structures that he dangles before the electors and just as soon as the revenue resumes its equilibrium and reaches or surpasses the revenue of the year before, the minister in his logic arrives at the conclusion that he must retrench. It will be difficult for the minister to convince the House that that is the real position or the real reason that animated him. The Minister of Finance apparently was the monitor. It was at his suggestion that this decision was reached in December, 1908. I am glad to see him at the right hand of the Minister of Public Works to-night. We are justified in concluding that if the Minister of Finance was the monitor in December, 1908, he was the monitor also in July, 1908. Some three months before that the Minister of Finance, speaking on the 17th of March, assured the House that he anticipated the revenues would fall off by some six and a-half millions and probably by more than that amount. By the time July had arrived the revenue had fallen off by more than that amount, so that if the Minister of Finance were the monitor in December and also in July he surely must have told his colleague that he was only deceiving the public by saying it was possible to go on with this work because the revenue had already decreased by over $6,500,000. On the whole there is every ground to question the reason which the minister has given to-night and other nights, every reason to look back and to say that it is to meet the exigencies of the election that these two months elapsed and that the minister just at the time he had the only reason he ever had to go on with these works, on the contrary decided that he would abandon them for this year at least. I cannot accept the reason of the minister at all and I do not think the country can. I asked last Friday for a return relating to advertisements.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I brought that down this evening.

Mr. BRADBURY. From whom was the Elmwood site purchased?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would my hon. friend allow me to give him that to-morrow?

Mr. ROCHE. How much has been expended for Dauphin public building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. When the estimate was made up $8,000 had been paid on the contract over and above the site.

Mr. STAPLES. I insist on the minister giving me a list of the works abandoned in Manitoba just as he gave a list to the members from Ontario. I think we are entitled to it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I trust my hon. friend will not be unreasonable. He could not expect me, while going through with these items, to sit down and do what my hon. friend would be able to do, that is to take the account of last year and these estimates and subtract one from the other.

Mr. STAPLES. I presume the minister has that information?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I have not it with me.

Mr. A. HAGGART. Would the minister give the particulars of this contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract price is $20,330, including the building, but not the heating, wiring, fittings or fixtures.

Mr. STAPLES. What did the site cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $6,000.

Mr. STAPLES. What will the building cost when completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $32,000. The lot is 75 x 132 feet on Burrows avenue.

Mr. STAPLES. Is it a corner lot?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think so.

Dominion Public Buildings, renewals, improvements, repairs, &c., $10,000.

Mr. BRADBURY. Will that item include the furnishing of the Selkirk post office?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We expect the furnishing to be finished before March 31 and paid out of the appropriation for the present fiscal year.

Mr. STAPLES. I would like an explanation about the public building at Emerson.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is being built on a lot 60 by 140 feet, required for post office and customs purposes. The site cost $1,000. Estimated total cost of building $34,000, including furnishing, fittings and fixtures.

Mr. STAPLES. Will this complete the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Winnipeg Customs Warehouse, $175,000.

Mr. ALEX. HAGGART (Winnipeg). In connection with the expenditure, I find in the Auditor General's Report, V—77, an item, 'purchase price of additional land for 'site. J. H. Kern.' The other day a question was asked regarding the terminals. Kern, it appears, was the man from whom these terminals were purchased. He was planted in there at a very convenient time between the former owner and the government, and the report was that he got a rake-off of $122,000. This man Kern is a very agile person. We find that he is transplanted here between the owner and the former owner of the land in the purchase of the site of this warehouse. Is this the same Kern mentioned in the other case from whom the land was purchased for the terminals ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is that for the new examining warehouse?

Mr. A. HAGGART. Yes, he is a hotel-keeper at Moosejaw.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This land was bought before I became minister. My impression is it was purchased from Mackenzie and Mann.

Mr. A. HAGGART. There were two portions. This was for an addition to the site. The original portion was bought from Mackenzie and Mann.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There may have been a small piece bought from Kern.

Mr. A. HAGGART. $35,000 paid to Kern is a pretty considerable item. There will be a chance for a benefit to him here in addition to the benefit he got from the other transaction. When the government have such reliable inspectors and agents, it will be proper to call this matter to the attention of the inspector. I may tell the minister, for his information, that this Mr. Kern is not there for his sole benefit. The people of Winnipeg know, or soon will know that either the government or some friend of the government, or some mutual friend of the government and Mr. Kern succeeded in putting him in there as a stool pigeon for a certain purpose, and perhaps not the most laudable purpose.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman say that the price paid was too high?

Mr. A. HAGGART. I think that $35,000 for a little piece of land on a back street was a little too high.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How much land was there?

Mr. A. HAGGART. I do not know. We are here for the purpose of ascertaining that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The information I have is that the land was purchased from Mackenzie and Mann for $88,125.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. How much was bought from the other man?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no memo of land bought from any one else.

Mr. A. HAGGART. We would like this cleared up because it was the subject of very common conversation among the business men of Winnipeg.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman is speaking of a different building altogether. There was some land purchased from Mr. Kern for an immigration building which is a different item. This is for a customs warehouse.

Winnipeg Post Office Building—Fitting up ground and first floors, $25,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is an old building. We had built a new post office.

Mr. STAPLES. That brings to my mind the question of some litigation as regards the ownership of the old building. Now that you have vacated it as a post office, I have seen articles in the press stating it is going to revert back to the original owners.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have heard nothing about that. The building is still to be occupied as a public building for Customs purposes and Inland Revenue and Assistant Receiver General.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it be convenient to have that used as a custom house when the examining warehouse and the other buildings are so far from it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The examining warehouse adjoins the old post office building.

Mr. SPROULE. It must be at least a quarter of a mile from the present examining warehouse. Is it the intention to move all the customs business to that locality?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Customs Department have asked for this accommodation, and we are giving it to them. I do not know whether they intend to move the entire business there or not. I understand that the Department of the Interior will use the old customs house for a land office.

Mr. ROCHE. If the hon. minister looks up the records of his department, I think he will find that there are communications in reference to the matter referred to by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples). I remember hearing that matter discussed in the House in the time of the hon. gentleman's predecessor. I think a gentleman named Ballantyne owned the site in question, and donated it on the condition that it should be retained by the government as a post office site. When the matter was brought before the hon. minister's predecessor, he admitted that there were communications to that effect, and promised to bring them down at an early day, but failed to do so.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will have the matter looked up, if the hon. member will call my attention to it at some later day.

Mr. STAPLES. I do not see any provision in the estimates this year for the post office north of the track in Winnipeg. Is that completed?

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

Mr. STAPLES. What did that building cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the papers at present, and cannot say.

Mr. BRADBURY. Can the minister inform the House who are the contractors for the fixtures for the north-end post office and the Selkirk post office, or was a contract let? My information leads me to believe that a contract was let for the fixtures of those two post offices, and that a man very high in the service of the post office is a large shareholder in the company furnishing those buildings. I am told in Selkirk that that accounts largely for the delay in opening the Selkirk post office. Although the building has been completed for at least six months, I do not think it is furnished yet.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As I am not asking tonight for a vote for either of these buildings, I have not the papers with me regarding them. If my hon. friend will put the question in the House, I will with pleasure get the information in regard to both of them.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE. I would like the minister to explain why the appropriations for Manitoba are cut down to such a very large extent this year, while those for other provinces are not cut down nearly so much. The appropriations for Alberta, Saskatchewan and Northwest Territories are cut down by $305,000, while those for Manitoba alone are cut down $346,876.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend, on reflection, will see that, adopting the rule which I said we had adopted with regard to postponing public buildings, there might be an undue proportion cut off from one province as compared with another. For instance, take my own province of New Brunswick ; the appropriations for public buildings have been cut down from $134,100 last year to $21,500 this year. Those for Nova Scotia have been cut down from $282,300 to $132,600. The appropriations for Quebec have been cut down from $1,571,249 last year to $525,600 this year, only one-third of what they were. The appropriations for Ontario have been cut down from $1,453,175 to $605,367, a reduction of more than fifty per cent. So that there is no rule in regard to the matter.

Mr. A. HAGGART. There may not be the same inducement this year that there was two or three years ago, when it was said that a post office valued at nearly half a million was built as an annex to a large printing establishment on Portage avenue owned by an ex-minister.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The figures given by the minister in his answer should be taken in conjunction with the figures of the amount unspent in each province. If that is done, they show a marked disparity against the province of Manitoba.

Public Buildings—Saskatchewan, Alberta and Northwest Territories, $252,000.

Mr. HERRON. I wish to bring to the attention of the minister a very urgent case in my constituency. A very small amount was asked for in the estimates of last year to protect the town of Macleod. I have already spoken to the minister personally on the subject, and I would like to impress upon him the importance of that work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is that the protection work?

Mr. HERRON. Yes, the protection of the banks of the streams.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would ask the hon. gentleman to leave that until we come to the harbours and rivers. We are now on public works.

Lethbridge—Custom House and Dominion Lands Office, $4,000.

Mr. MAGRATH. In the estimates of last year there was $6,000 for this work. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman why the work did not proceed. I happen to know that there was every reason for it to be gone on with, because the Dominion Lands office, which occupies part of that building, is sorely in need of further office room. The court house in the upper part of that building has been vacant for a year waiting these improvements.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the reason why it has not been proceeded with more rapidly; but $2,000 has been expended upon it, or will be before the close of the fiscal year.

Mr. MAGRATH. I do not think there has been any money expended at all. Up to the 10th of December, when I left, not a dollar had been spent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We expect to expend $2,000 before the 31st of next month, and we are here asking for a revote.

Mr. MAGRATH. Does the minister intend that this work will be proceeded with in the spring?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. MAGRATH. I would like some assurance, because, as I say, better facilities are absolutely required. In the Dominion Lands office there is only a space in front of the counter about the size of the table before us. People have to stand out in the street.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The engineers have instructions to push these improvements in the spring.

Mr. MAGRATH. I wish to bring another matter to the attention of the minister, although it is not in the estimates, and that is the necessity of a post office building in Lethbridge. I want to enunciate here the position I take in connection with the expenditure of public money. I do not believe that any town is ever going to make headway merely through the expenditure of public money therein. I do not think it means any advancement to a town to have government moneys spent there just for the purpose of getting a large building, and while I am in this House I do not mean ever to advance any such argument. I do not subscribe to the policy that is pursued in this country in reference to the erection of public buildings. Go through the country from one end to the other and you find post offices costing many thousands of dollars in small places where there is no necessity for such costly buildings, due, I suppose we may frankly admit, to political pressure. I hope that I shall not be found advocating expenditures with the hon. gentleman on any such ground. Lethbridge has to-day a population, I have been told, of 7,500, but I will call it 7,000. I have a letter from the Post Office Department which says in reference to a post office:

> **Practically the only way the difficulty can be overcome is by the erection of a public building.**

The post office there is in a rented building and the post office authorities know that the facilities are not at all adequate. As I am interested in the question, I have been looking up statistics, and I find that the Postmaster General last March stated that there were ten post offices built since 1904, and 31 post offices under construction. I made a list of some of these post offices, which I submit to the committee:

List of Some Post Offices Built Since 1904:

Place.	Population.	Postal Receipts in 1908.	Cost of Building.
		$	$
Canso, N.S.	2,567	2,195	20,690
Hawksbury, Ont.	4,150	3,593	22,230
Wingham, Ont.	2,392	6,301	31,800
Prince Albert, Sask.	6,000	12,875	103,965
Sandwich, Ont.	1,450	1,392	20,043

List of Some Post Office Buildings under Construction in 1908:

Place.	Population.	Postal Receipts in 1908.	Contract prices of building.
		$	$
Chicoutimi, Que.....	3,826	4,405	22,472
Lévis, Que.....	7,783	3,509	22,000
Knowlton, Que ...	760	2,156	26,000
Bridgewater, N.S....	2,900	5,500	23,500
Kincardine, Ont.....	2,077	4,239	29,000
Maple Creek, Sask...	1,500	3,911	32,000
Fernie, B.C.	6,000	9,933	43,750
Lethbridge, Alta.....	7,000	14,541	.....

I want to get these figures before the hon. gentleman so that there will be no question next year about making provision for Lethbridge. I find in the province of Manitoba that there are only three offices yielding a larger revenue than Lethbridge; in Saskatchewan, three; in Quebec, three; in Nova Scotia, four; in New Brunswick, three; in Prince Edward Island, one; in Alberta, two; in British Columbia, four. Between the great lakes and the Pacific ocean there are thirteen offices yielding a larger revenue than the place I refer to. I think these are very strong reasons why there should be some relief given to Lethbridge in the shape of a post office. If there was a building in the town sufficiently large that could be rented and used, then I would say let us have it. But I know of no building in the place that is suitable for that purpose. I sincerely trust that the hon. gentleman will give this matter consideration when he prepares his next estimates. There are two other questions I would like to refer to in connection with Medicine Hat. In the last year's estimates there was a sum of $40,000 for the Strathcona Horse barracks. I have heard the hon. gentleman's statement in reference to cutting off eight million dollars from the public works expenditures contemplated last year, and I appreciate the situation. I understand he is going to have all these various items brought in again, and that he proposes to go on with these works at some future time. I would like the hon. gentleman's assurance in connection with that. I also want his assurance in connection with another matter. I have here an extract from a paper printed in Medicine Hat referring to these barracks:

For the first time in the past five years the vote of '$40,000 for Strathcona Horse barracks' does not appear in the Dominion Estimates. For several years we had reason to believe that this vote was intended for buildings at Medicine Hat. Probably recent events have something to do with the withdrawal of this vote from the general estimates. When we have said we don't want these things, it is quite natural to assume that they won't be thrust at us—pressed upon us.

The insinuation being that because those people saw fit to send a representative here who is not a supporter of this government the governmtnt is not going to give them what has been promised for five years past. I have heard the hon. gentleman refer to similar questions before and he stated that he had not been guided by such influences. I would be very glad if he will say so with respect to this.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not see that it makes it any stronger if I say so three or four times. I have made my statement to the committee. I cannot give my hon. friend any assurance with regard to any individual building. I have stated that I would recommend to my colleagues—there may be exceptions—that as a general rule public works for which appropriations were made last parliament should have precedence and be proceeded with as early as possible. With regard to the Strathcona Horse, we have omitted that amount of $40,000 from the estimates. But, I want to correct one misunderstanding under which my hon. friend seems to labour. He assumes that that is promised to Medicine Hat. That never was promised, in so far as I am aware, either by the appropriations or in any other manner. It was put in with the miscellaneous items in a general way and was not limited to any particular locality. It was supposed that the barracks, when erected, would be erected in the Northwest, either in Saskatchewan or Alberta, but the place where they would be erected was never agreed upon or stated in the appropriation.

Mr. MAGRATH. This paper——

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am speaking of the appropriation and not of any paper.

Mr. MAGRATH. This paper supports the party of the hon. gentleman. They make the insinuation that it was promised to them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are in error.

Mr. MAGRATH. And that because they had sent me here they were not going to get it. Of course that is one of the features of an election that it is not agreeable to refer to, namely, those political wire pullers who travel through the country holding out features of that sort to the public to buy them with their own money, something that I do not endorse and something I am sure hon. gentlemen on either side of the House regard in the same way as I do. There is another question that is not referred to in these estimates but which I want to bring to the attention of the hon. gentleman. We are inviting people into that country and

we should have proper means for taking care of them. Medicine Hat at one time had an immigration hall. I believe it was burned down. There is a necessity for such a building there to-day. I do not believe the matter has been brought very prominently to the hon. gentlemen's attention. It has been in the hands of the Minister of the Interior, but I want to bring it to the attention of the hon. gentleman now, and I trust that it will be kept in view when the next estimates are prepared. When we invite people into the country we must look after them.

Prince Albert—Saskatchewan penitentiary, $65,000.

Mr. ROCHE. Is the contract let ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not yet. We have bought the land.

Mr. ROCHE. Will the minister tell us from whom the various portions of land were purchased?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was all stated last year. There was a long list of the persons from whom the land was bought, and these purchases were made at a very low price, at the price almost of farm land although the land is situated within the limits of the town.

Mr. ROCHE. The list was not given when these items were up for discussion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can give quite a number of the names of those from whom land was purchased: R. S. Cook, 183·7 acres at $30 per acre; W. E. Gladstone, 165 acres at $47.50; Mrs. Montgomery, 125 acres for a lump sum of $5,500; S. McLeod, 174·72 acres at $60, making a total expenditure up to the 31st March for land of $29,430.80. After that we purchased 200 acres, less the reserve for cemetery the right of way of the Canadian Northern Railway and the highway, 190 acres at $55 per acre, and we also had to buy the buildings on the site, ten in number for $5,000.

Mr. ROCHE. How much was purchased from Gladstone?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 165 acres at $47.50 per acre.

Mr. ROCHE. He is a government official.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know, I am sure. It seems to be a low price.

Mr. ROCHE. You do not know how long he owned it?

Mr. FIELDING. It is a good name—W. E. Gladstone.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What business will be taken up on Thursday?

Mr. MAGRATH.

Mr. FIELDING. The motion for supply will be made, and, in supply, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) will ask the attention of the House to his canal estimates. If these be disposed of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) will follow.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 25, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

SPECIAL COMMITTEES ON NATURAL RESOURCES.

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

That the Special Committee appointed to prepare and report lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of the House, and who have already reported, be revived and have power to prepare and report, with all convenient speed, lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of the House for the following purposes:

On Marine and Fisheries.
On Mines and Minerals.
On Forests, Waterways and Water-Powers.

And that that portion of rule 10 limiting the number of members of the said committee be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery certificate of the election and return of Edward Kidd, Esq., for the electoral district of Carleton, Ontario.

Edward Kidd, Esq., member for the electoral district of Carleton, Ontario, introduced by Mr. R. L. Borden and Mr. Richard Blain.

QUESTIONS.

BUILDINGS LEASED BY GOVERNMENT.

Mr. PERLEY asked:

1. What buildings or parts of buildings in the city of Ottawa are leased by the government, including the National Transcontinental Railway Commission, and all other branches of the public service, at an annual rental of over $1,900?
2. What is the rental paid by the government in each case, and how much does it amount to per superficial foot for the space occupied, excluding the halls, corridors, stairways and elevator space?
3. What amount of city taxes does the government pay in each case?

4. In which of these buildings is (a) the heating and attendance, and (b) the cost of running and taking care of elevator, paid for by the government, and what is the cost of the same in each case?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). The following contains the answers to Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4:

Building.	Rental per annum.	Rate per sup. ft.	Taxes paid 1908.	Paid by Government.	
				Heating and Attendance.	Elevator and Attendance.
	$ cts.	cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Imperial building, Queen St	4,200 00	34·76	.....	.....	†120 00 p.a.
Interior Dept., Cor. Metcalfe and Slater Sts.	3,000 00	30·6	467 02	972 50	.....
Trafalgar building, Bank and Queen Sts	9,066 00	78·8	.....	.....	.....
Seybold building, Sparks and O'Connor Sts.	6,500 00	45·43	*927 87	1,077 50	931 20
Corry building, Rideau St.	10,200 00	98	614 57	.....	.....
Canadian building, Slater St	42,536 90	56·14	2,943 61	5,195 96	3,312 00
Militia building, Slater St	25,777 00	47·4	2,439 64	3,659 00	2,208 00
Railway Commission, Queen St	5,300 00	47·22	622 29	1,700 00	1,224 00

* For 8 months. † Freight elevator.

CARILLON DAM WATER-POWER.

Mr. BOYER asked:

1. By whom are sold or granted under any Act of parliament whatsoever the hydraulic powers furnished by the rapids and dam in the Ottawa river opposite Carillon and Point Fortune?

2. If these hydraulic powers are simply leased or in possession of one or more persons or companies, under any Act of parliament whatsoever, what are these Acts, and up to what time does the privilege extend?

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

1. The water-power available at the Carillon dam is under the control of the Department of Railways and Canals.

2. Leased under the usual conditions for a term of 21 years, renewable for two terms more of 21 years each, at $2 per horse-power, for all horse-power used.

POINTE-AUX-TREMBLES WHARF.

Mr. C. A. WILSON asked:

1. Is the government aware that the wharf at Pointe-aux-Trembles, Montreal Island, is said to be in a very bad state of repair and ruinous condition, so that it is impossible for boats to tie up there and do any unloading whatever?

2. If so, is it the intention of the government to have this wharf immediately repaired, in order that it may be fit for use on the opening of navigation?

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

1 and 2. When this question appeared on the Order Paper, inquiry was made of the department's engineer in charge, Montreal district, who reported that the wharf at Pointe-aux-Trembles, Montreal island, is in a very bad condition, estimated cost of rebuilding, $4,500; further that said wharf is the property of the municipality.

POST OFFICE INSPECTOR AT NORTH BAY.

Mr. GEO. GORDON asked:

What is being done with regard to the appointment of post office inspector at North Bay?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). The question is under consideration.

GRENVILLE-HAWKESBURY BRIDGE.

Mr. TURRIFF asked:

1. Does the government intend to assist in the building of an interprovincial bridge between Grenville, Quebec, and Hawkesbury, Ontario?

2. If so, when can the people of those localities expect the work to begin?

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

1 and 2. The government has caused an examination to be made for an interprovincial bridge between Grenville, Quebec, and Hawkesbury, Ontario. The engineer's report on the matter is not completed; a preliminary estimate of cost is now under study.

THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. TURRIFF (Assiniboia) asked:

1. What are the names and positions of the thirty-five members of the Civil Service who receive no increase of salary under the recent amendments to the Civil Service Act?

2. What is the reason that these gentlemen do not benefit from the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission, which were supposed to apply to all classes of the service?

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State:

1. Department of Agrciulture. — Fred Montizambert, First 'A', $4,000; Wm. Saunders, First 'A', $4,000; A. Blue, First 'A', $4,000; J. G. Rutherford, First 'A,' $4,000.

Department of Finance—Henry T. Ross, First 'A', $4,500.

Department of Inland Revenue—T. Parent, Third 'A', $1,200; T. Burgess, carpenter, $900; Jas. Hagan, warehouseman, $900.

Department of the Interior—A. Kilmartin, Third 'B,' $800; A. Devlin, Third 'B,' $800.

Department of Justice—E. R. Cameron, First 'A', $4,000; T. Morris, Third 'B', $800;

Library Department—F. X. Desloges, messenger, $900.

Department of Mines—E. F. Goodman, Third 'B', $800; D. A. Esdale, carpenter, $939.

Department of Printing and Stationery—G. Randall, Third 'B', $800; A. LaFleur, Third 'B', $800; W. Emond, Third 'B', $800; J. Foley, Third 'B', $800; J. Foran, caretaker, $1,000.

Department of Public Works—J. B. Charleson, First 'B', $2,800; P. Canty, Second 'B', $1,642.50; Louis Belanger, Second 'B', $1,600; A. Dostaler, Third 'A', $1,200; T. G. Bell, Third 'A', $1,200; T. D. Caldwell, Third 'A', $1,200; O. Belanger, Third 'B', $800; Mrs. E. Lemoyne, Third 'B', $800; F. O. Hamel, Third 'B', $800; M. Laframboise, Third 'B', $800; Mrs. M. L. Roy, Third 'B', $800; A. Valade, Third 'B', $800; J. G. Kennedy, Third 'B', $800; A. Bray, messenger, $850.

Department of Railways and Canals—John Kerr, Third 'B', $800.

Privy Council—C. Schreiber, First 'A', $6,000.

2. All having been at or above the maximum salary of their respective subdivisions.

CANAL NEAR MONETTEVILLE.

Mr. GEO. GORDON asked:

1. What expenditure has been made on the proposed canal between Lake Nipissing and a small lake near Monetteville?
2. What is the estimated cost of this work, and is it being done by contract?
3. When will it be completed?
4. What draught boats is this canal proposed to accommodate?

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

1. $2,893.03.
2. (a) $6,300.
   (b) Day's labour.
3. With favourable conditions, work can be completed during the present year. Matter of further grant to complete the work is under consideration.
4. Six feet.

POST OFFICE PAYMENTS IN NEWMARKET AND AURORA.

Mr. WALLACE asked:

1. What is the salary of Thomas Somerville mail carrier, of Newmarket, Ontario, and what is the extent of his duties?

Mr. MURPHY.

2. How much did Thomas Fardy, of Newmarket, receive for repairs to mail bags for the past fiscal year, and how much since 31st of March, 1908, to date?
3. How much did William Willis, of Aurora receive from the Post Office Department for the last five years, and how much since 31st March, 1908, to date?
4. How much did Fleury & Sons, of Aurora, Ontario, receive from the Post Office Department for the years 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907 and 1908, and since 31st March, 1908, to date?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. Mr. Thomas Somerville of Newmarket is not in receipt of a fixed salary from the Post Office Department. Contracts have, however, been entered into by him with the department for the performance of the following mail services: Newmarket and Pine Orchard, $1 per trip; Newmarket and Grand Trunk Railway station, $200 per annum; Newmarket and Sutton West, $1,000 per annum, and $1 per box per annum for making collections from and deliveries to seventy-five rural delivery boxes; Newmarket and Toronto and York Radial Railway, fifty cents per day; Glenville and Newmarket, $120 per annum.

2. Fiscal year 1907-08.. .. ..$919 75
   Present fiscal year to February 1, 1909.. .. .. 977 00
3. Fiscal year—
   1903-04.. .. ..$3,446 75
   1904-05.. .. .. 3,367 05
   1905-06.. .. .. 3,563 53
   1906-07, (9 months).. .. .. .. 3,098 61
   1907-08.. .. .. 5,229 34
   1908-09, (to date).. .. .. 6,813 93
4. Fiscal year—
   1903-04.. .. ..$3,438 50
   1904-05.. .. .. 2,384 50
   1905-06.. .. .. 6,612 30
   1906-07, (9 months).. .. .. .. 4,719 39
   1907-08.. .. .. 6,976 55
   1908-09, (to date).. .. .. .. 8,277 85

INCEPTION OF GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

Referring to the Toronto 'Globe' of the 22nd February instant, in which is reported a speech made by Mr. Wainwright, of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, at the Board of Trade banquet, Montreal, it says:—'Other interesting inside information furnished by Mr. Wainwright was to the effect that the Grand Trunk Pacific idea originated in the brain of Mr. Charles M. Hays. When Mr. Hays returned from the Southern Pacific in 1902 he broached the subject to Mr. Wainwright. On Sir Wilfrid Laurier's return from England, Mr. Wainwright was sent by Mr. Hays to see Sir Wilfrid, and it was at this meeting that the subject was first brought to the notice of Sir Wilfrid.' Is Mr. Wainwright's statement of this matter correct?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The government has no information as to what may have passed between Mr. Wainwright and Mr. Hays. The pro-

ject of the National Transcontinental Railway was first broached between the government and the Grand Trunk in the fall of 1902.

HALIFAX AND SOUTH WESTERN RAILWAY SUBSIDY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked:

1. Referring to a subsidy provided by the Acts of 1903, chapter 57, section 23, for a line of railway from a point at or near Caledonia to Liverpool, not exceeding 29 miles, has this subsidy lapsed or is it still available?
2. Has the government or Minister of Railways entered into a contract with any person, firm or corporation for the construction of this line of railway or any part thereof? If so, with whom?
3. If the subsidy has lapsed, when did it so lapse or cease to be available?
4. Have there been any negotiations with any person, firm or corporation respecting the construction of this line? If so, with whom, and what negotiations?
5. What has been done by the government in respect to the construction of this line of railway, or any part thereof?

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

1. Part of it was revoted in 1907.
2. Yes. With the Halifax and Southwestern Railway, which contract lapsed in 1905.
3. Answered by No. 1.
4. No.
5. The usual subsidy was voted as above stated.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY FREIGHT CLERKS' REQUESTS.

Mr. STANFIELD asked:

1. What answer did the Minister of Railways make to the Intercolonial freight clerks' request for certain betterments, in view of the fact that the Committee of Conciliation representing both parties, reported unanimously, chiefly in the employees' favour?
2. Has the finding of the committee been put into effect? If not, why not?
3. If not, is it the intention of the department to put such recommendation into effect and when?

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

1. The finding of the Board was accepted, it is doubtful if the report was chiefly in the employees' favour, as it advised a reduction of the staff and suggested that if this were done the money would then be available for granting an increase to those retained in the service.
2. It is under consideration. The classified list of employees only reached the department recently, and the necessary action will be taken in due course.
3. Answered by No. 2.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

On the orders of the day being called.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to call the attention of the Finance Minister to a number of returns ordered by the House with reference to loans with a view to having them brought down as soon as possible.

Mr. FIELDING. I have already given instructions that the returns shall be expedited and hope they will be brought down without much delay.

Mr. FOSTER. I would call the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the fact that in response to an order of this House I have received through the Secretary of State a return of the orders in council by which the increases spread over four pages in the 'Hansard' of February 4, 1909, were authorized. The return comprises nine orders in council but they take in a very small number of employees. Is the return defective or were these other increases made without the authority of order in council?

Mr. OLIVER. I will make inquiry. I could not answer at this moment.

SUPPLY—TREATY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall avail myself of this opportunity to reply to the inquiry made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. J. A. Currie) on Tuesday with regard to the treaty signed at Washington on the 11th of April last for the marking of the boundaries between Canada and the United States. The hon. gentleman stated that in the last draft of the treaty there was a departure from the wording of the Ashburton treaty. I have to say to the hon. gentleman that the parliamentary paper from which he cited contains a misprint. The article in the treaty says that :

> The line shall not intersect islands lying along its course.

These are the terms of the treaty as negotiated in 1900. In the parliamentary paper brought down on the 19th of May last, paper No. 54-A, there is a misprint. The word 'not' was dropped, but in all the other papers the word 'not' is included. Sessional paper No. 54-B with regard to the same question, brought down in June last, has the wording correctly. The word 'not' is in and the treaty reads :

> The line shall not intersect islands lying along its course.

That is exactly the wording of the treaty as it was signed at Washington and therefore all the apprehensions of my hon. friend are absolutely without foundation.

INTERNATIONAL WATERWAYS TREATY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In connection with the Waterways treaty, which has not yet been presented to this House, although

what purports to be a copy has been published in the press of the country, I would point out that the treaty seems to have been discussed by one of the commissioners instrumental in negotiating it, Mr. Gibbons, at a recent meeting in the province of Ontario. I observe by the Toronto 'Globe' of the 23rd inst., that Mr. George C. Gibbons addressed the Canadian Club at Toronto and in the course of his address spoke pretty definitely of some of the terms of the treaty. It does seem to me under the circumstances that the Prime Minister should expedite the presentation of that treaty to parliament. The terms of the treaty have been made public not only in the United States but in the press of our own country. In addition to that, one of the commissioners who negotiated the treaty feels himself at liberty to discuss its terms. It is little better than a farce that the treaty should not be presented officially to this parliament. I trust that there will be no great delay. I do not know that any great discussion in parliament will be necessary; I assume there will be some discussion, but I merely desire to emphasize the point that parliament ought to be in a position to discuss the treaty when it is being discussed in the press of the country and even by a gentleman who, acting on behalf of this government, was instrumental in framing its terms.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I can inform my hon. friend, by authority, that the treaty has not been communicated officially by the United States to Congress. It has been, of course, submitted to the Senate, which body, under the terms of the constitution, must pass upon it; but it has not been officially communicated to Congress itself. We have been pressing, as fast as we can, to have authority to put it at once upon the table of the House, because I agree with my hon friend in saying that there is no reason that I can see why this should not be done. But he knows that in this matter we are bound by certain rules which we must follow. We are pressing it and hope to have the matter decided at an early day.

Mr. FOSTER. How about Mr. Gibbons?

Sir. WILFRID LAURIER. He is discussing the treaty as he finds it in the press, I suppose.

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

Railways and Canals—Chargeable to capital—Canals—Lachine canal—To complete wharf and basins, $150,000.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). This item was discussed at some length the other night. The money is to provide better facilities for shipment. The business men of Montreal, shippers and forwarders realize the necessity for it. The vote was taken last year, but only $40,000 was spent. The form in which the item appears in the estimates is a little misleading, as I explained the other night. This total vote of $150,000 is entered as a revote. The position is that $300,000 was voted last year, but only $40,000 spent as I have said. We expect to spend $150,000 this year. Some hon. members asked me for the names of the tenderers. They were as follows: Quinlan and Robertson, George Goodwin, Canadian General Development Company, Doheny and O'Brien and Michael Connolly. The contract is dated October 24, 1908. The lowest tenderer was the Canadian Development Company, $236,989.75. The expenditure for the current year $40,000 was all for cement. I was asked for the names of the tenderers for cement. They are as follows:

Lakefield Portland Cement Co.	1.27
International Portland Cement Co.. ..	1.40
Vulcan Portland Cement Co..	1.22
Belleville Portland Cement Co..	1.43
Canadian Portland Cement Co..	1.30
Schuster Cement Co., for Lehigh Portland Cement Co..	1.36 & 1.46 Net.

Mr. LENNOX. I would call attention to the statement made the night before last as we were adjourning. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) told us that we should go into Supply, and that the Minister of Railways and Canals would ask the attention of the committee to his canal estimates. I do not know whether other hon. gentlemen apprehended that as I did, but I understood that we should probably have the pleasure of listening to an address by the Minister of Railways and Canals on the subject of canals, and in that way, we should have the advantage of knowing, perhaps, what is the general, up-to-date policy of the department upon the development of our canal system and other matters connected with that general question.

Mr. GRAHAM. It has been the custom, I believe, for the Minister of Railways and Canals to make a statement concerning the Intercolonial Railway before we go into Supply. I am not asking to-day for any supply for the railways branch, and will not do so until I am prepared to make a statement to the House. Last year, in discussing the question of transportation, I dealt with the canals incidentally, and, in the few remarks I may make again, I shall mention them.

Mr. LENNOX. For years it has been customary for the minister to make a statement on the subject of the Intercolonial. But, the other night, the Minister of Finance specially spoke of the question of canals, and I thought a new departure had been made, and, as the question of canals in Canada is a very important one in connection with the whole problem of trans-

portation, that the minister had determined, on this occasion, to give us interesting information as to what he proposed in reference to the canal system. There are some very interesting features in connection with that question, and some very large promises have been made. I do not know how the other members view the matter, but I should have been glad if the minister had made a general statement.

Mr. J. HAGGART. We must have a statement, especially as there is a recommendation by the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals in regard to our canal transportation system. He tells us in this report what he thinks is the best system of water communication. We also had a statement from the premier when he was in Welland of what he intended to do in reference to canals, not only to deepen the Welland canal into Lake Ontario, but in the near future he was going to build the Georgian Bay canal. But the deputy of the department, no doubt voicing the opinion of the department, has proposed a policy. This may not be the proper time to discuss the statement of the minister, but certainly we may expect a statement of the policy of the government.

Mr. GRAHAM. The House may remember that I gave at some length my opinion on the question of water transportation the other night when on some other estimates. It is well understood, however, that for the present at least, the policy of the government has been pretty well decided on, and it would be unwise to change it in reference to any new undertaking. Those works that are under way will be proceeded with. But I am not retracting from anything I have said as to the desirability of extending our transportation facilities by water. The policy of the government will scarcely be to undertake any new work this year which would mean a large expenditure of money. I may reiterate what every person knows to be true, that the great safety valve for our transportation is the development of our waterways. We have the best waterways in the world, and they are capable of the highest development of any waterways in the world. My own opinion is, and I have often expressed it in this House before, that with the Welland canal deepened or a new Welland canal, which would be still better, we can favourably compete with our friends across the line in the carrying trade from the west to the east and in a large measure from the east to the west. That is a large problem. The question of the Georgian Bay canal has been before the House for years, and while opinions are somewhat divided, there seems to be a strong opinion in important circles that that would solve the problem of the carrying trade from the west to the east. However, while I in no way detract from anything I have said, for the present at least the government policy will be not to undertake any of these great works that will call for a large expenditure of money.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that policy of progress for the future near at hand, or is it a little less remote than it was in October last?

Mr. GRAHAM. By the efflux of time it gets closer.

Mr. FOSTER. But the ministerial idea does not seem to be as clear as it was in October.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mine is.

Mr. BLAIN. The Minister of Public Works, when he was introducing his estimates stated that a new rule of economy was adopted in his department. I wanted to know whether that prevails in other departments, and perhaps my hon. friend will be able to advise the committee on that point.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Department of Railways and Canals has always been pretty economical so far as I know. As to details, I was not here when my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works made his remark. But the Department of Railways and Canals is conducted on the most economical lines consistent with the efficiency of the service and the interest of the country.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The Minister of Railways has made an explanation in reference to the contract for cement. Will he explain how it comes that he paid, as shown by the Auditor General's Report, W—9, the Canadian Portland Cement Company, limited, for 5,000 barrels of Star cement at $2.62½; to W. McNally & Company, Portland cement, 2,500 barrels at $2.40. Were these purchased by tender?

Mr. GRAHAM. They were all purchased by tender. In our department no cement is purchased in any other way.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Has cement fallen so much in the last year?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think cement has never been so cheap in Canada as it is at the present time.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. What is it worth?

Mr. GRAHAM. $1.12 to $1.20 net, when sold in quantities. By net I mean 10 per cent off when the bag is returned.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the minister abandoned the patronage list, like some of the other departments? I do not need to remind the House of the trouble we had last year in this regard.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have no recollection of trouble in my department about the patronage list. I think my hon. friend has got mixed up. As a matter of fact, in some

instances we purchased from a list, on invitation by circular letter. We have notified our various branches that any person who desires is at liberty to tender for any of our goods. If any member of the House knows of any person that he would like us to ask to tender for any materials that we buy, where the amount is not large enough to warrant us to advertise, we would be delighted to give him a change to tender.

Mr. J. D. REID. When did that plan originate?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have always had on that list men of both political parties.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does the minister intend to do his advertising only in Liberal papers, or in the press generally?

Mr. GRAHAM. As long as men are human—and I agree with Judge Cassels in this—everything being equal, it is natural to express confidence in those who have implicit confidence in us so long as the country gets full value for its money. That we insist on in every case.

Mr. BARR. Could the hon. gentleman give us one instance where a Conservative got a contract? It might be a relief to us if we knew of one case where a Conservative sold goods to the government.

Mr. GRAHAM. I can give my hon. friend one instance. Perhaps I should not take liberty with the name, but as he has asked me so pointedly I may say that only a week ago I got a verbal reminder that I had given a large contract for ties to a gentleman who ran against the hon. member for Westmoreland. He got the contract on strict business principles.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Who tendered for this cement on page W—9, where you paid $2.62 for 5,000 barrels?

Mr. GRAHAM. What work is that on?

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The Lachine canal. It seems strange that you would pay $2.62 when you could have purchased it for $1.85 in Ottawa.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is not correct. $2.62 would probably be the gross price anyway.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Would the minister explain how it is that he requires $40,000 worth of cement on a $250,000 contract? It seems an enormous sum.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am advised by the engineer that that will not nearly do the work.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. In a $250,000 contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. A large share of the work is concrete work.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. If the minister will turn to page W—14 of the Auditor General's Report, he will find that he purchased from the Colonial Portland Cement Company 2,000 barrels of cement at $1.80, the same year, less 10 cents for sacks; from the Lakefield Portland Cement Company, 2,500 barrels at $2.30; from the Lakefield Portland Cement Company, 212 barrels at $2.30; and yet he paid $2,62½ at the Lachine canal, close to where the cement is made. It appears that this cement is all bought just on the job plan, no tenders being invited but simply a circular letter sent out to one or two of the friends of the government.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will agree with me that a year ago cement was much higher than it is now, but I assure him that the cement is all bought by tender, and we give the contract to the lowest tenderer in every instance.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Who tendered when this contract was awarded at $2.62½?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a year ago; I will have to look it up.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. There was a purchase made at the same time at $1.80.

Mr. GRAHAM. Not at the same time.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Within the same year.

Mr. GRAHAM. That may be.

Mr. BARKER. When the minister asks for tenders for a very large quantity of cement and gets bids, such as he got here of $2.62½, does he cause inquiries to be made whether other large buyers of that article are paying as much as the price mentioned in the tender that he has received, or does he go it blind and, when he gets four or five tenders, just take the lowest?

Mr. GRAHAM. The department keeps pretty close track of prices by watching the markets and making inquiries, and we think we are buying as cheaply or a little more cheaply than most people do.

Mr. BARKER. How are these inquiries made? For instance, you have a tender for $40,000 worth of cement; do you inquire what large buyers are paying at that moment, and, if you make these inquiries, are they made by letter?

Mr. GRAHAM. My deputy informs me that he makes inquiries from big dealers and contractors to see what they are paying; and that he keeps himself posted all the time as to the prices they are paying. He assures me that he is constantly buying cement as cheaply or cheaper than the large buyers.

Mr. BARKER. Are these inquiries made verbally, or are they made by letter, and, if by letter, has the minister any objection to the committee seeing them?

Mr. GRAHAM. My deputy tells me that he does not recall whether he has done that

in writing or not, but he assures me that it is a fact.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Where is the Canadian Cement Company located?

Mr. GRAHAM. At Marlbank and at Port Colborne. The difference in freight charges might make some difference in prices.

Mr. J. D. REID. Will not the cement companies have uniform prices throughout Canada?

Mr. GRAHAM. Last year they did approximate closely to a uniform price, and I assured one of the large dealers and so informed the officials that if there was any evidence at all that these men are combining to charge us unduly for cement we would ask for tenders from outside; we would not be held up, but on investigation, I believe we are buying cement this year as cheaply as any one and perhaps a little cheaper.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. I suppose you are very careful to see that the cement is of the quality specified by the department?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, we have it tested.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. There was to be a reason given why these amounts were chargeable to capital instead of income.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is practically new work.

Lachine canal—To stop leaks on north bank at Côte St. Paul, $29,000.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Is that a new wall or the repairing of an old one?

Mr. GRAHAM. A new concrete wall.

Soulanges canal—Erecting a fireproof building, $800.

Mr. GRAHAM. This will be built by our own regular staff.

Soulanges canal—Stopping leaks, trimming slopes, &c., $160,000.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. That may be necessary, but why charge that to capital after the work is finished?

Mr. GRAHAM. I might as well make an explanation. These banks have proved not to be entirely safe. What we are doing is practically making a new portion of the bank of concrete in order that it may be absolutely safe. We propose to put a concrete slab 18 inches thick in front of these walls. The break in the Cornwall canal has led me to say to the deputy minister and chief engineer to take no chances of such a thing occurring again if it is in our power to prevent it. Wherever we find that a canal bank has been leaking we put a slab of concrete along the bank to prevent such a thing happening again.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who has the contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. Quinlan & Robertson, the contract price being $174,400.

Mr. J. D. REID. At schedule prices?

Mr. GRAHAM. Schedule prices.

Mr. J. D. REID. Was it advertised?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. Were they the lowest tenderers?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. How was it that only one tender came in?

Mr. GRAHAM. The reason of that is that they are practically the only firm in the vicinity with a complete equipment to do this work properly.

Mr. J. D. REID. There must be other contractors in Canada qualified to do that work.

Mr. GRAHAM. They devised a plan for this particular work on the Lachine canal.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the price so much per cubic yard, and if so, what percentage of cement is required per cubic yard?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend refers to the consistency of the concrete?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM. One of cement to three of sand and five of gravel.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no facing of cement; is it all the same?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is all the same.

Mr. SPROULE. How much is the price per yard?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. When was the contract made?

Mr. GRAHAM. On December 12, 1908.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Has the department taken any means of ascertaining whether the price is reasonable?

Mr. GRAHAM. We always insist that our own engineer shall make an estimate in order to ascertain whether the price is reasonable or not before we accept a tender. Our chief engineer is our authority for saying the price is reasonable before it is approved.

Mr. J. D. REID. When was this contract advertised and when were the tenders to be in?

Mr. GRAHAM. Advertised on 14th October; tenders to be in at 16 o'clock, Thursday, 22nd October.

Mr. J. D. REID. It looks suspicious to have all these tenders received two or three days before the election.

Mr. GRAHAM. We were trying to do this work at the close of navigation; it had nothing to do with the election.

Mr. BARKER. I should think the minister would be too busy about that time to attend to these matters.

Mr. GRAHAM. So far as I am personally concerned I was.

Mr. BARR. The 22nd of October might be considered a bargain day for contracts.

Mr. J. D. REID. I should think the minister would be very busy at home just then.

Mr. GRAHAM. Not at home, but elsewhere.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the nature of the foundation?

Mr. GRAHAM. They make a trench in the clay bank and they fill in from that trench the 18-inch slab along the face of the wall.

Mr. SPROULE. The foundation does not go below the bottom of the canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. Just sufficient to cut off any leakage.

Mr. SPROULE. Could not this work be done when the water was out of the canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not like to say it too loudly, but it would be a very dangerous experiment to unwater the Soulanges canal; the chief engineer has reported it must not be done.

Mr. J. HAGGART. It is a clay bottom and when the water is out there would be danger of the clay coming up?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Chambly canal—St. Johns harbour improvements, $44,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. There were eight tenders; the contract is dated December 15, and it went to the lowest tender.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who was that?

Mr. GRAHAM. John G. Poupore & Co.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Will this vote finish the work?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is schedule rate; the approximate sum given in the contract is $35,282. The engineer would not be positive this will complete the work but he thinks it probably will.

Mr. J. HAGGART. I suppose the increased traffic from St. Johns on the Chambly canal necessitates this work?

Mr. GRAHAM. It has been asked for years. Complaint was made to me that the harbour was so crowded that they simply could not do the business they had to do. We had difficulty in getting a title to the property or it would have been done before.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Ontario—St. Lawrence canals—District office, $7,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. Where is that?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is not the staff that has charge of the canal. This is the staff that has had charge of the construction of the new canals and improvements on the St. Lawrence river. N. L. Rheaume is in charge, and they have an office, with electric lights, telephone, &c., and they are making the final estimates.

Mr. J. D. REID. As I understand, the works on the St. Lawrence canals are practically through, with the exception of one little work at the head of the Galops canal. Yet this office has been kept there for years, with the same staff. How long will they be kept there?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have put all our men in this office. The winding up does seem to be an arduous process, but we hope shortly to get the final estimates made.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is this vote for building an office for them?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, we are not building any office. It is just for the salaries of the men.

Mr. J. D. REID. The final estimate for the Cornwall canal must have been made a year ago. All the works on the St. Lawrence canals must have been completed and paid for. There is only one work going on yet. I cannot understand what that staff is there for.

Mr. GRAHAM. It depends altogether on the meaning we attach to the term final estimates. What we are requiring of these men is to make not only a final estimate as to cost, but a record of everything in connection with these canals, consisting of drawings in full, detail of the finished structure, to which we can refer, and which will give us a clear insight into every part of these canals at any time in the future.

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. minister knows that the men made these records from time to time as the work went along, and when the final estimate was made they had the plans and everything completed in the most minute way. In addition, I understand, the measurements were sent to the department here, where there are engineers making plans for future reference. I think that all the information the hon. minister refers to is here in the department.

Mr. GRAHAM. My deputy informs me that the plans are not all made here. The engineers use the plans and specifications in the construction of the work, and when that is done they are required to make re-drawings of the completed structure, which are put in bound form and sent to the department. For instance, in the case of the Soulanges canal, the men who were

engaged on it are all dead and if we had not a complete record of that work in the form of the plans and specifications we would have been in a predicament now in regard to that canal. This is costing a little money, but we are getting a complete and accurate record of all these canals.

Mr. J. D. REID. I admit that it is absolutely necessary to have a complete record; but it should not take more than a year for that staff to make such a record as the hon. minister refers to. The Cornwall canal has been completed for three or four years, the Williamsburg canal has been completed for six or seven years, and the other canals have also been completed a long time. I am not finding fault with an expenditure for the purpose of getting such records as the hon. minister refers to. In that respect I believe he is absolutely right; but it is common talk along the canal that there are a number of men there who are really not required, and who are simply drawing their pay. I am not mentioning this for the purpose of having these men dismissed from the service of the government; but there are many places, on the Transcontinental Railway and elsewhere, to which they could be removed, and where they would have something to do to earn their salaries. If the minister told these men that they would have to get these records completed in three months, they would do it, provided they were sure of a position somewhere else in the department. But so long as there is nothing in view for them, so long will they remain where they are.

Mr. J. HAGGART. It must strike the hon. minister's common sense that it is somewhat difficult to explain the keeping on of engineers who have drawn the plans of works for which the contracts have been finished and the final estimates made. He is keeping a staff of five or six men after the work is completed, for what purpose? Recording the manner in which the work was constructed, or the plans or estimates for it? There is no necessity for it whatever. I am in a different position from my hon. friend. These parties have votes in his riding.

Mr. J. D. REID. No, they are not in my riding at all.

Mr. GRAHAM. They were, but they are not now.

Mr. J. HAGGART. They are very near it. I cannot understand the necessity for keeping these men on.

Mr. BARKER. I think the trouble arises from the misleading form of the item. This is not an estimate at all according to the minister. The work is all completed and this is a charge for making up a record of the work already done.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am inclined to agree that without an explanation the words 'final estimate' would not explain to the committee just what was meant. My deputy has visited the office in Cornwall on several occasions. It is a mistake to say that the work is all completed. Mr. Rheaume has charge of the work going on in the north channel as well as this, but has not been altogether engaged in this work. We hope to get it concluded and we are urging it as rapidly as possible.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is the $30,000 asked for the removal of the shoal at the upper entrance a final estimate?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is difficult, as my hon. friend knows, to tell just when you are through with a piece of work of that kind. A boat finds another boulder and the work keeps going on.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is there any estimate for the dam at Adam's island?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have no estimate for that

Mr. BLAIN. What is the explanation of the entry at page W—92 of the Auditor General's Report, 'employees whose duties were materially reduced by the closing of navigation on December 5, 1907'?

Mr. GRAHAM. Some of the men engaged on the locks in the summer are dropped in the fall. They are not really permanent employees although they are all there every year. If we want a man for instance to watch a weir we utilize one of these men in the slack season.

Mr. J. D. REID. What are the duties of the collector of tolls on the Galops canal and what are his powers?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not think he is called collector of canal tolls. The services of such men are utilized to keep complete records of the canal statistics.

Mr. J. D. REID. While they do not collect the tolls as formerly they still issue passes to steamers.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is his duty to be there all the time during navigation.

Mr. J. D. REID. This man is also collector of customs, and his office as such collector is two miles away. He is supposed to be in regular and constant attendance there. How can the minister expect one man to fill these two places?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know the particulars of the case referred to. This officer's work seems to have been done satisfactorily, for we have had no complaints. However, I will make inquiry.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. He is drawing two salaries and doing nothing.

Mr. GRAHAM. Both make one salary.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister knows that for forty years the two offices were at one point, at the locks. But lately the canal office has been moved up about two miles. Of course, a great deal of fault has been found in the county of Grenville at one man occupying two positions when it is impossible for one man to perform the duties of both. There is complaint especially among the Liberals who think that two offices for one man is too large an allowance. The minister says that the salaries are small. The collector of canal tolls has always had a salary of $750 a year, besides this the collector at Cardinal is allowed $1 a day for a horse to drive him up to his office, two miles away. This makes at least $250 a year additional. So, this collector has a higher salary than has been paid since the canal was built. There was another officer who had the position of subcollector of customs at a salary of $400. But when this subcollector of customs was superannuated, the man who held the office of collector of canal tolls was appointed to this office also. As the offices are two miles apart, there is no question that the duties of one position or of the other must suffer. I am not finding fault with the officer at all, but I think the minister should call upon him to make a choice of one office or the other.

Mr. GRAHAM. So far as the records furnished me show, the salary is $700 a year, and there is no allowance for horse-hire. It seems that this man was the officer of the Railways and Canals Department and that afterwards the other position was given him. It is not unusual, where the government has two small positions to appoint one man to fill them both. One salary, especially that from the customs would be rather small. I suppose the reason the canal office has to be further west than before is that the cut-off has been made into the river.

Mr. J. D. REID. Formerly, the boats had to go through the lock at Cardinal, but, since the new work was built, there is no lock now between Iroquois and the head of the canal. In the case of boats going down the canal, the officer is supposed to issue passes, and, to do this, he needs to be in his office. Otherwise, you do not get a complete record of the commerce through the canal. It can easily be shown whether the records in this respect have been kept in complete form or not. Every vessel from the west passing down to Montreal, and drawing fourteen feet of water, must pass through that lock. They cannot go through the Galops—at least they do not. Of course, a vessel going to Montreal, if no pass is issued at Cardinal, can have a pass issued at Cornwall. But I am satisfied that the work of both these offices is not being properly done. Either the government is losing money in the customs collection, or it is losing in the efficiency of its record of canal business. As to the question of horse-hire, for this officer, I am confident that I have seen it in the Auditor General's Report. I have not the figures under my eye at the moment, but I will look up the record and will refer to it later.

Mr. GRAHAM. I agree that what the department is interested in is having its work well done. It is only just to the official who has been referred to that I should say that there has been no complaint from vesselmen of any lack of attention.

Mr. J. D. REID. Of course, even if the officer is not at the canal office when a vessel goes through, you will get the record at Cornwall, or, I suppose, it could be had at the Soulanges canal. At the same time, it should be taken at the Galops. I understood the minister to say that he was interested in seeing that the work only of his own department is well done. I think that he is interested as a member of the government in seeing that the work of all the departments is well done. I believe the minister should say to this officer: Either take the position under the Department of Railways and Canals, and drop the other, or else take the position in the Department of Customs and we will appoint another man to carry on our business. I would ask the minister to look into that, to have that matter put right, so that next session when it comes up again I will not have to draw his attention to the fact that there is one man filling two positions two miles apart.

Mr. GRAHAM. We are inaugurating a new system of keeping these records that I think will detect in a week any neglect of duty.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like the minister to promise me this: If he keeps the collector of canal tolls at Galops canal, he will see that the man is there in person while the canal is open. If he does that, the Minister of Customs will have to have another officer there; and, if he does, I will prove that the revenues will not be received right unless they have a proper officer there.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will promise to see that this officer does his duty faithfully.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is it to be done by himself, or how?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not see how we could well do it by any one else. It does not make any difference whether you divide this office into two under one man, or give it to two men. I am only interested in seeing that this man gives us absolutely correct information and does the work for which he is paid. I cannot tell if he sends some one else half a mile

or quarter of a mile to do anything for him; I will be satisfied if he does his work accurately.

Mr. J. D. REID. I want to call the minister's attention to page W—138: Lock at Cardinal, $1,041. This includes statistical officer, 12 months, $700; sundries, 534 hours at 20c.; conveyance to office, 229 trips at $1. There are 26 days in a month, that would be over eight months. I took it for granted you were allowing him $1 a day for driving two miles up to the office.

Mr. GRAHAM. My accountant informs me that he had in his hand the winter paylist when he gave me the information a moment ago. He does get a $1 a day for the summer conveyance.

Trent Canal, $1,000,000.

Mr. PORTER. I would like to ask the minister if the contracts that are being let by numbers on the Trent canal number from the south or from the Bay of Quinté end, north or west; that is, No. 1 contract would be at Trenton, No. 2 above, and so on. I would like to know to whom the contract for the construction of No. 1 division was first given.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is an English firm, I can get the name.

Mr. PORTER. I would like to know the amount of deposit made by that firm with their tender, and what was the amount of their tender?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not those papers here, I was using them for a return that the hon. gentleman moved in the House. But I have sent for them.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. I would like to know if this million dollar expenditure on the Trent canal has anything to do with the North York extension, which is known as the Aylesworth canal, or the Mulock canal. Under what heading are the expenditures on the canal in North York made here?

Mr. GRAHAM. I imagine the Newmarket canal is the one my hon. friend refers to, it is called the Holland River canal. This million dollars includes all the work on the Trent canals this year, and the Newmarket canal is a portion of the Trent valley work.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. What has North York to do with the Trent canal? Does it extend down to North York?

Mr. GRAHAM. There are few men, unless they have made a study of this question, who appreciate the extent and importance of the Trent Valley work. It not only involves the large project of constructing the canal but it includes branches leading from Lake Simcoe and from the canal. Notwithstanding that there is considerable fun poked at this feature of the work let me point out to my hon. friend that the whole Trent Valley canal scheme had as much fun poked at it as has this portion now. But any person who has seriously inquired into the Trent Valley project will agree with me that it is going to be a valuable aid not only to that section of the country but to the country as a whole. There may be differences of opinion as to the branch to which my hon. friend refers, but my engineer has made a report which indicates that even the Newmarket branch will be a very useful adjunct to the trade of the country.

Mr. J. D. REID. Where are you going to get water from?

Mr. GRAHAM. There are things we cannot see perhaps because we are not engineers, but competent engineers tell me that there will be a sufficient supply of water by storage and otherwise to make that branch of the Trent canal practicable. Persons living along the canal will understand that it is one continuous system of storage by dams in order to make a sufficient supply of water available for the canal.

Mr. WRIGHT. What portion of this vote is to be for the Newmarket portion of the system?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is a little difficult to make the division. We have certain contracts under way. We expect to continue the work now going on, and, except in a smaller degree, we will not undertake any of the larger works this year for reasons that I stated when I began.

An hon. MEMBER. There is no election on now.

Mr. GRAHAM. No, my hon. friend is mistaken about that. There is a difference of opinion as to whether we ought to curtail even in view of the financial position. The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) is very strongly of the opinion that the government ought to branch out rather than curtail. However the policy of the government has been to not discontinue any work that has been undertaken, possibly to undertake some smaller ones, but as far as the larger expenditures are concerned not to launch upon any new ones this year. I think that business men will see the wisdom of that course.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think this estimate ought to have been put in separately. This is a separate work and entirely distinct from the Trent canal. Three hundred thousand dollars were put through originally for this canal, and what I want to get at is whether that has already been absorbed and whether more is being appropriated in this general vote for the Trent canal.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will give my hon. friend all the information as to the expen-

diture, contracts and everything else. We keep all the contracts separate, but we take one large vote for the Trent Valley canal, as all theese works are included in that system. You cannot very well make them separate works in a large undertaking of this kind. Now, in reply to my hon. friend from West Hastings (Mr. Porter), I will read a copy of an order in council as I think it will give him all the particulars that he requires. It is as follows:

Feb. 18, 1908.

On a memorandum dated Feb. 13, 1908, from the Minister of Railways and Canals representing that under the authority of order in council dated the 5th November, 1907, a contract for the construction of section No. 1 Ontario—Rice Lake division of the Trent canal, was awarded to Mr. Louis P. Nott,—

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. What section is that?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is the section beginning at Trenton.

His schedule rate prices, extended on approximate quantities, aggregating the sum of $866,679; his tender being the lowest out of the six received by the Department of Railways and Canals, which ranged from $866,679 to $1,159,775; the superintending engineer's estimate of cost was $1,074,313. The minister further represents that on forwarding to Mr. Nott a draft of the formal contract to be entered into with him for said work in which was embodied a fair wages schedule, prepared as usual, by the Department of Labour, he has refused to sign it with the 'fair wages' schedule. The minister, under these circumstances, it being the settled policy of the government to require the insertion of such schedule in all construction contracts, recommends that he be authorized to accept the next lowest tender received, namely, that of Messrs. Larkin & Sangster, of St. Catharines, whose prices, extended on approximate quantities, aggregate the sum of $969,237.75, the chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals having advised that they are experienced contractors, have the requisite plant and are sufficiently close to the estimate to carry on the work in a satisfactory manner.

The information would not be complete if I stopped there. The next step taken was this: Mr. Nott asked for the return of his deposit and I refused to return it.

Mr. PORTER. What was the amount?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will send for the figures. I refused to return the deposit.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Why?

Mr. GRAHAM. Because he put up a forfeit; he sent a marked cheque with his tender. I refused to return that, saying I believed he ought to forfeit that deposit for refusing to sign the contract.

Mr. PORTER. Was not that a condition of his tender?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, it was a condition of his tender that he would carry out the contract.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Was the fair wage clause also a condition of the tender?

Mr. GRAHAM. There was the cause of the difficulty. After certain communications, some written and some verbal, the Minister of Justice advised us that under the conditions we could not successfully withstand an action in the Court of Exchequer and that we had better return the cheque. Under that advice we returned his deposit. Why could not we keep the cheque or why did the Minister of Justice give us the opinion that we were not entitled to keep it? It was based upon the ground that the advertisement did not contain a clause saying that the contractor must accept the fair wage schedule in making his contract. That had never been inserted in any advertisement because all our contractors fully understand it. It has been in all our contracts and Canadian contractors understood that if they made a tender for any work they had to accept a fair wage clause in their contract. This being a foreign company they did not know of the requirement, and it not being set out in the advertisement the Department of Justice advised us we could not resist an action which had been taken in the Court of Exchequer, and we returned the deposit.

Mr. PORTER. Before his tender was accepted did he not have access to the form of contract required to be entered into?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. PORTER. The advertisement required the contract to be entered into upon the form prescribed by the department so that he had ample opportunity of seeing the form of contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. It was my contention that he had absolute opportunity to inform himself on that point; that it was his own fault if he did not, and that the cheque should not be returned. But he started his proceeding in the Exchequer Court, and the Department of Justice advised us officially that we could not resist it and that we had better return the cheque.

Mr. PORTER. Then we are to understand that although the contractor had full opportunity to know the conditions of the contract before tendering, and the Department of Railways and Canals believing, such being the case, that his deposit should be forfeited, the Minister of Justice in the face of these facts advised that the deposit should be returned.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is pretty nearly correctly stated except that we did not hold he had absolute knowledge; we held he had full opportunity to get the knowledge.

Mr. PORTER. He was willing to undertake the construction of these works for $866,000, and no objection was raised by him on the ground that he had taken the contract too low?

Mr. GRAHAM. Had he raised that objection it would not of course have been a legal excuse for getting back his deposit. My department is of opinion that he discovered his tender was too low and that that was the real reason why he refused, although technically another reason was given.

Mr. PORTER. Nott & Co. are a well known firm of English contractors and have ample means to carry out any contract they undertake?

Mr. GRAHAM. No doubt about that.

Mr. PORTER. The department had no fear on that ground?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. PORTER. Then the only objection was to the fair wage clause being in the contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. The department believes that having found his tender was too low he sought for an available way to honourably get out of the contract, and he took the legal stand that the fair wage clause not being in the advertisement he could not be held. On that ground the Deputy Minister of Justice advised that we could not resist the action. I may mention that this tender was $200,000 less than the estimate of our own engineer, and having found that he looked for a means——

Mr. PORTER. To get out of his contract.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, to put it in plain English. He no doubt consulted some good lawyer like my hon. friend (Mr. Porter), who apparently discovered that he could legally get out of his contract on this plea and the Department of Justice upheld the contention. I may say that in future all advertisements will contain a paragraph saying that the contractor must accept the fair wage clause and hence difficulties of the kind will be obviated.

Mr. PORTER. When did the department decide to return the cheque?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know the date, but it was not returned until the Deputy Minister of Justice gave his opinion and I think that was after the action had been instituted.

Mr. PORTER. It was not returned until after the present contract had been accepted?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not sure as to that. Of course the only penalty we could impose was to keep the cheque when he refused to enter into his contract.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. There is $1,000,000 included in this item, and I would ask the minister to separate from that lump sum the amounts required for each section of the canal.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is great difficulty in dividing these items as the hon. gentleman suggests. We want to do the best we can, and if we voted a certain amount for a certain section we could not vary the estimate in any way, and we would not get the full benefit of the $1,000,000 which we intend to expend. If we were to spend two and a half million dollars as the engineers wanted me to do, the suggestion made by my hon. friend (Mr. Currie) would not be difficult, but perhaps on one section I would not want to spend all the money voted for it, and on another section I would want to spend more, and if the estimates were given in detail, as suggested, we could not do that. We will distribute the money as well as we possibly can, and we will not delay the work on any section more than is necessary.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. On what sections is it intended to do work? There is no use trying to cover a multitude of sins with one vote; let us get down to business.

Mr. GRAHAM. Sections 1, 2, 3, 5, and 7 are the sections on which we will do work.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Will the hon. minister designate the sections by name ?

Mr. GRAHAM. No. 1 runs from Trenton about three miles up the river. No. 2, the next section, runs up to the vicinity of Frankfort. No. 3 is from Frankfort to the foot of Bradley bay. No. 5, is the section above Campbellford running as far as Crow bay. No. 7 is from below Hastings to Rice lake. The Newmarket canal is called No. 1 of the Holland river section. The other is the Ontario-Rice lake division.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. So that the canal is divided into divisions—the Holland river division and the Ontario-Rice lake division.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Can the minister state how this vote is to be divided between the two divisions ?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have expended this year to date on the Holland river section $182,795.18 and on the Ontario-Rice lake division $852,188.77. The work will be carried on next year in approximately the same proportions between these two divisions.

Mr. PORTER. Did the hon. minister ascertain the amount of the deposits of Nott and Company?

Mr. GRAHAM. It was an accepted cheque of $20,000.

Mr. PORTER. The advertisement required a certain proportion upon the tender, did it not ?

Mr. GRAHAM. They put in a certain amount with their tender, and the balance must be put up when the contract is entered into.

Mr. PORTER. Before the contract was let for the construction of No. 1 section, were tenders advertised for again ?

Mr. GRAHAM. No. We considered, as I think it was fair to do, that this man had not practically a tender in at all. We accept the next lowest, but would not have accepted it if it had not been approximately near to the engineer's estimate.

Mr. PORTER. Does it not appear to the hon. minister that that was not quite fair, when the tender of Nott and Company was accepted ? It was then known generally what the tender of each party was. Nott and Company, a very old and reliable firm of contractors, having tendered for the construction of this work for $866,000 odd, and having put up their cheque for $20,000, would it not appear to the hon. minister, under these circumstances, that it would have been wise to call for new tenders ? Does it not appear to the hon. minister that it would have only been fair to those who did tender to have the same opportunity of tendering as this first man, who practically had two tenders ?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, he had not.

Mr. PORTER. He had only one tender, but he had two chances, whereas the others had only one chance.

Mr. GRAHAM. No, they had only the one chance. The difficulty of that would have been that every person would have known what every other person's tender was. If I were building a house and called for tenders, and my architect told me confidentially that one of the tenders was too low, and if the tenderer backed out, I would not think of asking for new tenders if the next tender were from a reliable firm and were considerably lower than the estimate of the architect. In this case, there was so much diversity in the tenders that there could not possibly have been collusion. I want to correct the statement I made to my hon. friend. These people not only sent in their first cheque with the tender, but when they were notified that they had the contract, they sent in an additional amount making a total of $43,333.

Mr. PORTER. Before the second payment was made on their deposit had their attention not been called to the fair wage clause in the contract? I understand it had, that they had full knowledge of it at that time.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. GRAHAM. Of course we cannot speak from their standpoint, and I would not like to say that they had, but our opinion was that they had every opportunity of having full knowledge of it.

Mr. PORTER. Was that fact brought to the attention of the Minister of Justice?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think all the facts in our possession were placed before the Justice Department?

Mr. PORTER. I understand that the Minister of Railways and Canals would feel bound to act on the opinion of the Minister of Justice. Does it not appear on the face of it that there was here every opportunity for collusion between these parties? Nott & Company, as the minister says, sought for some means of escaping from this contract, and after having tendered or agreed to enter into it withdrew and as the policy of the department was to accept the next lowest tender in such a case was there not every opportunity for Larkin & Sangster, the second lowest tenderers; to make a bargain with Nott & Company by which the additional amount of nearly $150,000 might be divided between them? Larkin & Sangster might be sure that they could construct this work for at least as small a sum as Nott because they were right on the ground with their plant established, old contractors. Would it not seem as if the wise course for the government would have been to call for tenders a second time and afford every tenderer an equal opportunity and thus protect the interests of the country? Is there any check on the contractors to see that they observe the fair wage clause?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, the fair wage officer of the Labour Department. The fair wage clause is included in every contract now and if the men employed make a complaint it is the duty of the fair wage officer of the Labour Department to investigate it and if possible adjust the difficulty.

In reference to the advisability of taking the next tender instead of advertising for new tenders, it would be only suspicion that there was any collusion, and after thinking the matter over I concluded that under the circumstances there was no collusion and it would be safe to do this. Our chief engineer gave an estimate of $1,074,000 while Larkin & Sangster tendered for $969,-237, so that their tender was away below what our chief engineer said the work would cost. If we took the view of my hon. friend that every tenderer knew what the others were bidding there would have been an opportunity for a great deal stronger collusion than before. The chances are it might have cost the country $500,000 more.

Mr. PORTER. But you were not obliged to accept any tender?

Mr. GRAHAM. But we wanted the work done and accepted the lowest tender. After consulting with the engineer we concluded that we would not get any lower tender, and as we had received another tender still many thousands less than our own estimate, we decided we had better accept the next tender.

Mr. PORTER. Some of these other tenderers who were higher than Larkin & Sangster think they were not treated fairly and that they should also have had two chances?

Mr. GRAHAM. Larkin & Sangster had only one chance. If the other contractors had been in their place one of them would have got the contract.

Mr. PORTER. The matter has been brought seriously to my attention by complaints of men in the employ of the contractors on section 1 of the construction work of that canal. I am told that notwithstanding the fair wage clause the contractors have been paying the men a less rate than would be considered a fair rate under this clause of the contract and less than men similarly qualified and employed were receiving on other portions of the canal. Although complaints were made no redress was given and when the complaint of the men became too strong for the contractors to stand, a large number of these men were dismissed from the work. It seems to me that if the fair wage clause in the contract is to have any effect and to be of any advantage to the workmen, the department ought to see that it is fairly enforced.

And, if the contractor is violating it, as I am instructed this contractor has done, it should not depend upon the men making a complaint; the Department of Labour should act, having an officer whose duty it is to see that in all public contracts this clause is fairly and properly carried out. One can readily understand that a man who is in the employ of another would hesitate before making a complaint that might have the effect of losing him his job. This provision was enacted by this parliament for the benefit and advantage of labouring men, and the onus ought not to be put upon them of seeing that it is carried out. The officer appointed by the government ought to make it his business, by visiting, consultation or in some other way, to ascertain the facts, and, if necessary, to bring proper pressure to bear upon the contractors to cause them to live up to this clause of the contract. I understand that, in this case, men living in the immediate vicinity of the works on No. 1 division, who were given employment in the first instance, were promised that, after the works got fairly started, the wages would be increased to the rates that would be considered fair wages under the contract. But when the elections were over, they were told they might go back to their homes and quietly remain there for the length of time it was supposed to be necessary to construct the Trent canal, because the contractors could get Hungarians and Italians to work for wages they wanted to pay. This is a direct violation of the contract, and the government should make serious inquiry into it; and, if the facts are as I have been informed they are, should take immediate steps to remedy this wrong.

I would ask the minister also if any policy has been laid down or any determination reached, as to how this canal shall be looked after when construction is completed? That is, will it be divided into divisions as it has been for the purposes of construction, and a superintendent placed over each division, or will there be one superintendent for the whole system?

Mr. GRAHAM. Of course, it is a little difficult to speak so far ahead. Not that I mean to say it will be a long time before this canal will be constructed, but it has been in progress ever since 1833, I believe, and if a man had been asked about the policy then——

Mr. PORTER. But everybody is in earnest now.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes; to be serious, my opinion now would be that one superintendent ought to be able to look after the canal as a whole, with one overseer of each division. I would not like to lay that down as a policy, but it strikes me that that would be sufficient.

Mr. PORTER. I may tell the hon. minister (Mr. Graham) for his own information—it may not be of much advantage to the government—that in October and early November last, in the town of Trenton, there were at least twenty-five individuals who were to become superintendent of No. 1 division of the Trent canal. I would like to know if the minister had authorized the candidate who opposed me in the election to make promises to these twenty-five or more men I have referred to?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am a very careful promiser.

Mr. PORTER. I have no doubt of it. But that does not alter the fact that the promise was made by the candidate of this government in the elections. Before concluding this inquiry, I would like to ask if there is any clause in the contract which compels the contractor to work continuously until the work is completed?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is not. Conditions might arise under which we could stop the contractor in his work. There is no clause compelling him to go on with his work continuously, but there is a time limit for

completion of the work, and, as a matter of fact, we do keep him working continuously.

Mr. PORTER. The minister should see to it that candidates for election in support of his party are better instructed, for the promise was made, based upon the assertion that there was a clause in the contract which compelled it, that the contractor would work continuously and that work would be furnished to the labouring men around Trenton all winter. But, again, as soon as the elections were over, the work was stopped—to be commenced again in the spring, I suppose—and the men were laid off. I do not know whether that was the only inducement held out to these men to vote, but that was one of them in the last election.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. I should think that it was a misnomer in these estimates to speak of the appropriation for the work on the Holland river as part of the Trent canal. I cannot understand why it is not set out separately to show exactly what the intent of the administration is in going on with the construction of the Holland river section. I am sure that hon. members on this side were pleased to see the sudden change that came over the ministers in reference to the Trent Valley canal. Prior to 1896, the friends of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Graham) condemned the Trent canal on every platform on which they spoke. This expenditure on the Holland river is the most indefensible appropriation asked for in these estimates. I have the honour to represent a constituency adjoining that of the Minister of Justice, and I venture to express the opinion that if a cabinet minister had not been the representative of North York, there would have been no such expenditure in connection with the Holland river. Ministers, apparently, are vieing with one another in getting large appropriations for their several constituencies. Just before election, a large number of men were employed on this work merely 'from' considerations of political exigencies, and not because the work is a defensible one or is required in the public interest. If the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) has any regard for his reputation as a minister he will discontinue the expenditure on the Holland river canal. The work is meeting not only the condemnation but the derision of all men who have 'any' idea 'as to how' money should be spent in the public interest. I have a letter from a gentleman who resides in New York, at Newmarket, which is supposed to be the dead end of the canal. It is dated February 20. The writer says :

The only sensible thing which is said about it is that it would have been much cheaper if the government had presented William Cane & Sons with several hundreds of thousands of dollars, as they will be the only people who can possibly profit by the canal.

Now Wm. Cane & Sons are manufacturers in Newmarket, and are prominent workers in the Reform party. They desire an outlet to bring in some raw material in connection with their business, and were it not that Wm. Cane & Sons are prominent Reformers I do not think that this vote would appear in the appropriations, either this year or any other year. Not only are all reasonable men strongly against this expenditure, but the newspapers of the country condemn it, and laugh at it. Every newspaper you pick up, whether Conservative, Reform or Independent, condemns this as a useless expenditure of public money. I desire to direct the attention of the minister to an article that appeared in 'Saturday Night' just previous to the last general election. As the minister knows, 'Saturday Night' is a paper with independent leanings, neither Conservative nor Reform, and it is a pretty well informed paper. On September 12, 1908, it had this editorial:

It is almost a pity that the work on the new canal to Newmarket—the new canal which is almost to make Newmarket an ocean port—could not be screened off from view from the car windows until it is finished. Passengers on the trains discuss the enterprise with levity. They speak of it as a canal on which nothing but votes will be floated. They express doubt as to where the water will come from to supply the canal, until one passenger explains that the difficulty has been solved by an arrangement whereby it will be hauled in carts from Lake Simcoe. People who know nothing about engineering should not presume to discuss in this fashion a great public work, and in order to prevent this flippant discussion, a screen should be built to shut away the view from passing trains until the elections are over and the frosts of winter cause operations to cease for the present.

Now I appeal to the judgment of the minister if he does not think it proper in the public interest to discontinue an expenditure of this kind. It is absolutely useless. It is only put in the estimates for the purpose of fulfilling some pre-election pledges made on behalf of friends of the government. It does not serve any useful public purpose. Under these circumstances I cannot but condemn the appropriation. Then there is another newspaper in Orillia which deals with this matter. Orillia is situated on Lake Simcoe, and the paper has consequently accurate knowledge of the facts. The article is too long to read. I would refer the minister to this extract which appears in the 'Orillia Packet' of February 18, 1909 :

In answer to a question by Mr. Currie, the Minister of Railways submitted to the House a table of gaugings made at Newmarket in 1907 relative to the flow of water over the weir. The measurements had to do with the

construction of the proposed canal, and showed that from July to November the average flow was about 540 cubic feet a minute. It ranged from 313 cubic feet in August to 885 in November.

When one remembers that the average water-wagon contains about 150 cubic feet, the terrific intensity of the roar created by this appalling cataract may be understood. The wisdom of the government in passing the appropriation for this canal before taking the gaugings cannot be too highly commended. Perhaps if the gaugings had been taken first the vote would not have been made and the political interests of North York would have suffered.

The mere fact that there is not enough water to fill the canal might be embarrassing to an ordinary administration, but the Laurier government is not ordinary. It laughs at impossibilities. Mr. Graham says that storage reservoirs will be required to utilize the spring freshets as a feeder during the summer months. How many storage reservoirs will be required no one says. But no matter how many, they must be built. The transportation requirements of the country demand that Newmarket be made a seaport, and the political requirements of the Minister of Justice demand a canal of some kind wherein the glad electors can fish for mudcats and meditate on the glories of the government.

This, no doubt, is a charming picture, but it is subject to amendment. Even with storage reservoirs the mud-cat might find the going rather hard. Some person might throw a salmon can into the canal and cause a shoal whereon many virtuous fish might run aground. A good deal may be said in favour of the Newmarket canal by those who do not know what they are talking about. It certainly will have one great advantage. No bridge will be needed. If a North York elector has occasion to cross this noble waterway he can put on his rubbers.

Now I say again, in view of these protests made, one by an independent paper and the other by a paper situated on Lake Simcoe, with full knowledge of the facts, I say the minister should satisfy himself of the urgency of this expenditure before he asks us to vote hundreds and hundreds of thousands of the people's money. It is a shame and a scandal that the public moneys of Canada should be spent in this way, in order to advance the political interests of a member of the government. I say further that an appropriation of this kind should not be allowed to go through. We do not know what expenditure is going to be involved on this Holland river division, nor on the Trent canal division. It is put in here under the broad heading of Trent canal, and has absolutely nothing to do with the Trent canal. And why they disguise the appropriation under the heading of the Trent canal, I cannot tell, except it be that the hon. gentleman is probably 'preparing' a way to defend past appropriations for the Trent canal. He says the Trent canal is a useful public expenditure. That is not what the hon. gentleman and his friends said prior to 1896. But now he is willing to defend this canal, and consequently he makes the Holland river division, or the Aylesworth division ditch, as it is called in that region of country, a part of the Trent canal in order to cover up the whole enterprise. I say the policy of the government is worthy of the severest condemnation of this committee, and it should not be allowed to go through without a division, in order that the government and their supporters may go on record. The minister does not say what the work is going to cost, he does not say where it is going to end. He laughs at the whole project, and says it was started away back in 1830 and he does not see an end to it. When are we going to see an end of the Holland river canal, or the Aylesworth ditch? Even the honest Reformers of North York are condemning this expenditure. There is not a reasonable Reformer in North York that would justify it. The Minister of Justice is losing his influence in consequence of his advocacy of this ridiculous expenditure. We find that there are men in every town in North York who have public contracts from the government in consequence of this expenditure; we find the government expending $300,000 or $400,000 in order to ensure the return of the Minister of Justice. I say the Minister of Justice is losing his influence in his own constituency in consequence of this expenditure. He came into my constituency and spoke on one occasion, with the result that his influence proved less than nil, because the Conservative majority was increased threefold, showing that he is losing his influence. Now I appeal to the good judgment and fair common sense of the minister to withdraw this appropriation for the Holland river division. I may say frankly that I have always had a great respect for the good judgment of the Minister of Railways and Canals. He is only inheriting the sins of his predecessors, because I do not think that he himself would have initiated a scheme of this kind. But he now feels it incumbent upon himself to continue an expenditure that was inaugurated by his predecessors. I would say with that gentleman who wrote that letter from Newmarket that the expenditure is unjustifiable, and it would be a good thing for the country if the government would hand over to Wm. Cane & Sons a bonus of $350,000, and stop this work. I submit that the minister should give us the details of what he proposes to expend on this canal next year, before he asks us to adopt this vote.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the estimated cost of this part of the Trent Valley canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. We spent about $183,000 on this portion of the canal last year, and we spent $800,000 on the other portion. I told my hon. friend that the expenditure

this year would practically be in the same proportion. We are taking a small vote for the entire work, and I want to have every dollar available without absolutely tieing it up to any particular section. One contract is made for this portion and there are contracts for three other portions, and the money will be expended probably in the same proportion that it was last year. We spent a trifle over $1,000,000 last year, and the same amount of money will probably be expended this year.

Mr. WALLACE. I wish to make a protest against this useless expenditure in North York. I agree with the remarks of my hon. friend from North Ontario (Mr. S. Sharpe); I think this item should be stricken out of the estimates. This is an absolutely useless expenditure, and I do not think the vote should go through.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The minister did not answer the question of my hon. friend from Centre York. What is the estimated cost of the whole canal when it is completed?

Mr. GRAHAM. Of the whole Trent canal?

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Of the Newmarket section.

Mr. GRAHAM. The estimated cost is in the vicinity of $600,000, I think.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Does that include storage dam and reservoir?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. How much of the $600,000 has been expended?

Mr. GRAHAM. About $200,000 has been expended altogether.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Has the minister caused any inquiry to be made as to the possible tonnage on this canal? What is the tonnage arising from the town of Newmarket?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have no such report. We have no such report on any part of the Trent canal although we are spending millions upon it.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Does not the minister think that in a case of this kind, where it is a branch of a canal, and not merely a link in the system, it would be advisable to ascertain the possible tonnage arising in that section ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have an engagement which will require me to leave after six o'clock. I thought that the hon. gentlemen would allow this item to go through and have any further discussion which they desire afterwards.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Let it stand.

Mr. PORTER. What is the length of this section of the canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. About ten miles.

Mr. PORTER. Where does it start and end?

Mr. GRAHAM. It starts in Cook's bay, Lake Simcoe and goes to Newmarket. I suppose you will allow this item to go through?

Mr. HENDERSON. I think it is too serious to allow it to go through. I think the minister should allow time for further consideration as to the propriety of voting this money.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. If the minister will take the Brockville 'Recorder,' his own paper, and read the criticisms that were made with regard to an impovement that was made a few years ago on an important canal—the Rideau canal—when connection was made with the town of Perth he will see how determined was the opposition offered to that work. In the literature sent out every election reference was made to the expenditure on the Tay canal. It did not amount to half of the sum that my hon. friend proposes to devote to the digging of this ditch, and I am sure that when he comes to read his own paper and to reflect upon the speeches he has made condemning the government for having made that expenditure connecting the Rideau canal with the town of Perth he will withdraw this vote. If there ever was a useless expenditure proposed by the government this certainly is the most useless.

At six o'clock committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Residence of Yukon Commissioner, Dawson, $19,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to repair and to furnish the residence which was destroyed by fire some time ago.

Mr. TAYLOR. How much did it cost altogether?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $39,000.

Mr. BLAIN. How much of that for furnishings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $10,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Will this be let by contract and tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. An estimate was made by the chief architect and it was thought better to have it done by days' work. There are not many contractors in the Yukon, I suppose, and besides it is difficult to let these repairs by contract.

Mr. LENNOX. Do we supply the Yukon Commissioner with a residence and furnish

it for him, and do we pay him a living allowance in addition to his salary of $9,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not sure about the latter; I will inquire.

Mr. CROCKET. What was the estimate made by the chief architect?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $21,000 for the reconstruction of the building, but that did not include heating and fittings of various kinds and plumbing and electric wiring.

Mr. LENNOX. There is not much discrepancy there. Did the chief architect visit the place?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. Our representative who examined the buildings made an estimate of the probable cost and that was passed upon by the chief architect.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the minister think it is a proper principle to furnish the residence of such an official as this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not prepared to say to the contrary.

Mr. LENNOX. Unless the minister can say that this is a proper expenditure, we ought not to be asked to sanction it. It seems to me that the principle of providing residences and then furnishing them for officials is a very bad principle, except perhaps in the case of the Speaker of the House of Commons and the Governor General.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why except these?

Mr. LENNOX. As far as the Governor General is concerned, it is well enough. I am not going to say that I particularly approve of the other, but I am not going to object to it because I have not made up my mind.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What about the lieutenant governors of the various provinces?

Mr. LENNOX. I am not going to branch off to that question. The question I now propound to the minister is whether we should build a residence and furnish it for this gentleman. I submit that we should not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If called upon to justify it, I would be quite prepared to do so, because it is in line with what has been the practice of this country ever since confederation. The lieutenant governors of all the provinces have been furnished with residences and also with the furniture for them. That applies to every province of Canada except New Brunswick, where it was the case until along in the eighties, when the provincial government, led by the Hon. Mr. Blair, did away with the government house as an official residence. When the provinces came into the confederation all the government houses were furnished, and the renewals from time to time have been provided, not by the lieutenant governors themselves, but by the respective provinces. When Manitoba came into the confederation, a government house at Winnipeg was erected and also furnished by the federal government. In the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta the government houses were also provided by the federal government. The Yukon is a territory of the Dominion, and in pursuance of the same line of policy the government house there was erected and furnished by the federal government. It must be borne in mind that a governor—and the commissioner of the Yukon is in the same position—holds his office only for a comparatively short period; and I presume that the reason for furnishing residences is that it would be a hardship on the governor to have to furnish a residence in the style in which he is supposed to live, because at the end of his term he would have to either sell his furniture or take it away with him, and his successor would have to furnish it all over again. I do not believe that I am called on to defend a practice which has always been recognized and held without question to be a reasonable and proper practice.

Mr. BARNARD. Did I understand the minister to say that the Dominion government built the government houses in Saskatchewan and Alberta?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, when they were territories.

Mr. BARNARD. Has that been the case in the maritime provinces and Ontario?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, they were all erected by the various governments before confederation. In Manitoba the government house was erected and furnished by the federal government.

Mr. BARNARD. Can the minister recollect the date when that was done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In 1881.

Mr. BARNARD. Has the minister any recollection of a new government house in Ontario and Quebec or in any of the maritime provinces having been built by the federal government since confederation?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There have been no new government houses built in these provinces since confederation, so far as I am aware. The lieutenant governors are occupying the same residences that were built and furnished by the various governments before confederation.

Mr. BARNARD. The reason I am asking the question is that in the province of British Columbia the government house, which I think was in existence before confederation, was burnt down a few years ago, and a new government house was erected at considerable cost by the provincial govern-

ment. Was any application made to the federal government in regard to that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware of any.

Mr. BARNARD. In the event of an application being made by the provincial government to the federal government to be reimbursed and to be put on the same basis as the other provinces in this respect, I presume that a deaf ear would not be turned to them? Do I understand that the minister does not wish to answer the question?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not prepared to answer it.

Mr. LENNOX. It appears to me that the minister has not made a very strong defense of this item, in citing the cases of the lieutenant governors of the various provinces, and comparing them with that of a commissioner in a territory which yields a comparatively unimportant revenue.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Before proceeding with the reconstruction of this building the government made full inquiry, and I personally inquired as to the likelihood of the Yukon being a permanent mining district, and the information that I got was that owing to the very large expenditure which was being made by capitalists in introducing machinery for hydraulic mining and in view of the quartz discoveries, it was likely to be permanent, and that the wealth of the Yukon was very great. I conferred with Dr. Thompson, the representative from the Yukon in the last parliament, and he said that in his judgment, which I am sure would have great weight with those who knew him, from his knowledge of the country, he had not the shadow of a doubt that the district would be a permanent district, that there would be for all time a considerable population there and that it was in every respect desirable that the government house should be reconstructed. That had some weight with me, but it was not that alone which had weight, because I received information from other sources upon which I felt I could rely.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Is the minister not prepared to admit that the revenue in the Yukon now, is only about 20 per cent of what it was in 1901?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I know it has fallen off, but they are going into permanent mining, and it is expected that next year the output will approach the output of the most successful years.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the minister state the cost of the commission appointed to investigate into the cause of the fire? They reported that they were not able to ascertain the cost.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That report was made before I was minister and I have not the statement with me to-night. I shall be glad to bring it down.

Public buildings generally—construction of armouries, $50,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a vote which it has been the practice to take every year for the construction of small armouries in various sections of the country, costing from $5,000 to $15,000, or perhaps up to $20,000 or $24,000. It is for armouries in regard to which there are no special appropriations.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. Where is the money to be expended?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Last year the contracts were: Medicine Hat, contract $16,000; Strathroy, contract $13,461; Durham, contract $6,000. These are the only ones which are now under construction which will be paid out of this vote. They are not completed and we will require $50,000 to complete them, and to undertake such others as the Minister of Militia may ask. It is expected the total amount will be expended by the 31st March.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there any retrenchment along this line?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think there will be this year.

Mr. HUGHES. Why?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot answer more fully than I have done already.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the minister the list of armouries to be covered by this vote?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. HUGHES. What was this vote last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $80,000.

Mr. HUGHES. Why the reduction?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Because we are economizing.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Would the minister explain the general principle governing his department in the charging of items to capital or income?

Mr. PUGSLEY. All the public buildings in Ottawa are charged to capital account. That has been the practice since confederation and is convenient for purposes of comparison. In my department there are a few of what might be called national works, chargeable to capital account. Hon. gentlemen will see that a few of the harbour and river improvements are chargeable to capital, but none of the public buildings throughout Canada, except those in Ottawa, are so charged. The practice has been, in the past, to charge these others to income, and we have continued that practice. Per-

haps, so far as works in some of the large cities are concerned we have gone further in charging the expenditures to income than we might have done. In Montreal, for instance, last year, for the examining warehouse, we bought a property costing $405,000, charging it to income. I think we might have charged that to capital, but it would be inconvenient for purposes of comparison, and so we have thought better to charge all these buildings to income account except the buildings at Ottawa. At page 58. hon. members will see a number of works are chargeable to capital, including Port Arthur and Fort William harbour, Quebec harbour, Red River—improvements at St. Andrews rapids—St. John harbour, Tiffin harbour, and Victoria harbour. These are very important works, connected with the national transportation system. For instane the works at Fort William and Port Arthur are part of the Transcontinental system, and it is upon that theory they are charged to capital account. The same is true of Quebec harbour. As to St. Andrew's locks, this is a very large work, running up to about $1,000,000. St. John harbour is the eastern terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway and its winter port. The business is very rapidly increasing; I think that last year, the tonnage in the port of St. John was second only to that of Montreal and about half the tonnage. The exports last year during the winter amounted to upwards of $20,000,000, and we expect this year they will probably run $25,000,000. Therefore we have felt that the port of St. John belongs now to the Transcontinental system of Canada, and expenditurs on that harbour are properly chargeable to capital account. The same is true of Tiffin and Victoria harbour. These harbours are being developed as a part of the national transportation system. They are not intended for the receiving of the grain of the west for local distribution, but as a means of forwarding the grain eastwards to the ports of the St. Lawrence for shipment in the summer and to the ports of the maritime provinces for shipment in the winter season. As a result of the great improvements being made there by the government in conjunction with the railway companies, we look forward to a revolution in the grain trade of the west. We expect that it will not be very long, after these harbours are completed and connected with the railways, when millions of bushels of grain which now go through Buffalo and Atlantic United States ports will be diverted to the ports of the St. Lawrence and the maritime provinces. The railways are providing the lines to connect with these harbours, one with a maximum grade of 3-10ths of one per cent, and the other with a maximum grade of 4-10ths of one per cent, thus making them almost level. We have felt, therefore, that these improvements, a part of the national transportation system, may be charged to capital. Other harbour improvements, dredging works, public buildings and other things of that kind, we have charged to income.

Experimental farms—new buildings and improvements, renewals and repairs and seed in connection with existing buildings, fences, &c., $10,000.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. How much of this is for the experimental farm at Agassiz?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sorry, I cannot give that information. The practice has been to spend this $10,000 at the different farms as required. We have quite a large expenditure at Ottawa, which will be taken partly out of the vote for the current year and partly out of this vote. The balance of this vote will be distributed amongst the several experimental farms.

Mr. BRODER. What is the special outlay at Ottawa?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Additions to the museum and offices, mainly. The amount of that contract was something like $12,000. There is also $1,000 for heating, $1,500 for electric wiring, $1,000 for fittings and furniture, and $2,500 for contingencies and superintendence. Thus we have the total of about $18,000.

Mr. BRODER. I have been informed that the government intend to make arrangements to have the street railway system of Ottawa run out to the Experimental Farm.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That has been provided for.

Mr. FISHER. It is done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I understand that is completed.

Mr. LENNOX. I notice that the vote under this head for the current year was $25,000 as against $10,000 for next year. I suppose that the government, pursuing the same general policy that has been referred to so often in this House, is cutting down the expenses as much as possible? I see the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) is here, and he will be able to explan.

Mr. FISHER. For some years this vote has been $10,000. But, for the current year, we asked for $25,000, because we found it absolutely necessary to make considerable additions to the office buildings of the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa, the work of the staff there having greatly increased and there being urgent need of more room.

Mr. CROCKET. How many experimental farms are there?

Mr. FISHER. Five regular experimental farms. Lately, the policy has been adopted of establishing subsidiary stations for particular experimental work, but not called exactly experimental farms. Two of these have been established, and a third has just been acquired.

Mr. CROCKET. Any of them in New Brunswick?

Mr. FISHER. No; we hope that will come.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. To return to the experimental farm at Agassiz, in which I am greatly interested: I am sorry to hear that Ottawa is to monopolize the greater part of this vote as well as that for salaries. Has the minister considered the need of improving the housing accommodation for the staff of the farm at Agassiz?

Mr. FISHER. That has been under consideration once or twice. We have not reached any definite plan with regard to it. If there is a pressing need for it, the amount necessary will have to be taken out of this vote.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I am glad to hear that from the minister, because there is a pressing need indeed for accommodation at Agassiz for the men employed on the farm. They now have to put up with the most temporary accommodation at a hotel, at great expense to themselves and considerable detriment to the community; because, while there is no accommodation for them on the farm you cannot get a class of labourers who would be willing to stay there such as you could get if the government would treat them as they do the employees at other places and provide them with comfortable houses in which to live. While I am on my feet, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works also how much of this vote for experimental farm buildings generally will be available for the new farm in Comox-Atlin?

Mr. FISHER. I will have to answer my hon. friend that the votes for new farms are a separate vote and will appear amongst the votes for arts and agriculture statistics which will come up later in the session. This vote is a vote on the part of the Public Works Department to prepare and deal with the buildings of existing experimental farms.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. It has nothing to do with new buildings?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Rents, repairs, furniture, heating &c., $1,340,500—Ottawa Public Buildings—Elevator attendants, $24,000.

Mr. LENNOX. How many elevators have we, and how many attendants?

Mr. CROCKET.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are 30 elevator attendants now, and we are installing a new elevator in the Western Block which will require two attendants. We are also installing three new elevators in this block of which one is now running. The total amount of salaries of the elevator men now employed is $19,980. That makes a difference of something over $4,000 which will be required for the purpose of paying additional salaries. The highest salary we pay is $65 a month, but that is paid to only one man; the others get $55 a month:

Mr. LENNOX. This item, I suppose, represents the elevators in all the departmental buildings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. And the House of Commons, including the rented buildings.

Mr. LENNOX. Does it include in all cases two attendants a day, or only in some cases?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Generally we have only one attendant for each elevator. Here in the House of Commons, where parliament is sitting at night, we have to have two attendants at each elevator. In some other cases we have two where the hours are long.

Ottawa Public Buildings—Gas and electric light, including roads and bridges, $45,000.

Mr. LENNOX. What is the meaning of 'roads and bridges'?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have to light certain roads and bridges in Ottawa. We light the Chaudiere bridge, the road towards Rideau Hall, and the road to the experimental farm.

Grounds—Ottawa Public Buildings, $12,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is an increase of $2,000. It has been found that the vote last year was not quite sufficient to cover the expenditure. The work is under the direction of a superintendent.

Mr. BLAIN. I would ask the minister if he does not think this is a department in which a little economy could be exercised, in these times of retrenchment.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thoroughly agree with my hon. friend that this is an item with respect to which all possible economy, consistent with the proper taking care of the grounds should be exercised. That economy we will exercise, but for the credit of the country we must keep the grounds in fairly good condition. We find that we cannot get along with a less expenditure than is provided for in these estimates.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister will see that the economy does not show itself in the estimates and that is what the public are interested in.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I hope the minister will see to it that the grounds are better kept next year than they were last year. The grounds last year were a disgrace to the capital.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They became very beautiful a little later in the season after parliament rose.

Ottawa public buildings—heating, including salaries of engineers, firemen and watchmen, $110,000.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does this include the heating of the new building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. How is it that it costs $9,000 more to light the building, while it does not cost anything more to heat it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Coal is a little cheaper than it was last year.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. What was the price of coal last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot give it to my hon. friend at the moment, but at present the price is $6.10.

Mr. HENDERSON. The minister, in these estimates, is making provision for the coming year. Has he a prospective idea of the value of coal in the next twelve months?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have to begin getting coal in for the heating after the 31st March.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Do you manufacture electric light.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, we purchase it from the Ottawa Electric Company.

Ottawa public buildings—Major's Hill Park, $8,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is there no reduction on account of the corner being cut out?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think there should be. Are we expected to care for the corner that has been cut off the grounds?

Mr. WRIGHT. Is the minister going to paint the other side of the fence?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not part of our work.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. In connection with this fenced off portion of Major's Hill Park, there is a monument inside of that fenced enclosure. I notice that there is a board fence put around the monument so as to entirely obscure the inscription and render it valueless for the purpose for which that monument was put there. When, during Paardeburg week, we are doing so much to celebrate what our militia men have done for Canada, it is particularly fitting that we should take notice of this fence and have same statement as to why it is permitted to continue there, as I understand it has continued for two years or more. I remember distinctly when that monument was placed there, the depth of appreciation felt in Ottawa with regard to the sacrifices of the volunteers who met death at Cut Knife in the Northwest Rebellion of 1885, and I am sure there was no person, who participated in the placing of that monument there, who anticipated that the time would come when, by the order of the government of Canada, in whose service these volunteers were, that stone would be obscured by the fence that is now allowed to exist and to blot out the monument from the public gaze for two years. This is something to which prompt attention should be given. I, for one, would like to see the Minister of Public Works give an order, which he certainly has authority to give, for the taking down of that fence forthwith.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The reason why the fence was put around the monument was that it might be protected from any defacement while the workmen were engaged in the construction of the new hotel. It was put there simultaneously with the fence which was put around the lot which we agreed to sell to the Grand Trunk Railway Company. There have been delays in connection with the construction of the hotel, but I understand that the company intend proceeding with the work of construction this spring. I may say that only yesterday I received a letter from the vice-president of the Grank Trunk Railway Company asking that the contract for the sale of the site of the hotel should be completed. There have been delays, for reason which it is not necessary to state to the committee, but I received that letter yesterday. My own view is, and I am sure that members of the committee will agree with me, that while the work of construction is going on it is desirable that the monument be preserved from any possibility of defacement, and every person will see that it is proper that it should be inclosed by a fence until the hotel is completed, when the fence will, of course, be removed, and when we hope the monument will be in as good condition as it is at the present time.

Mr. LENNOX. I am perfectly amazed at the statement of the minister, although he has made some very ingenious and remarkable statements within the last few weeks. That monument is inclosed within the enclosure in which the building is to be put up. That monument stands in that portion of the property that we are to sell to the railway company. It stands within the inclosure where the work is to be done and it is not fenced in, as the minister must know, for the purpose of protection. The minister must think we are very credulous or very easily deceived.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What do you suggest it is fenced in for?

Mr. LENNOX. It is fenced in because the park proper is to be shut off from that which we are selling to the railway company. It was explained here in the House of Commons during last session that the monument would be removed and the government have failed to remove it. It was to have been removed out of the position in which it stands and the company have put around a fence for their own convenience and they have not put it around for the sake of inclosing the monument.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, there is a separate fence around the monument.

Mr. LENNOX. No, I beg the minister's pardon.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it is a separate fence.

Mr. LENNOX. What does the minister mean?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a fence surrounding the whole lot and inside that is the monument and still another fence around the monument.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, but this fence is only around the portion that has been set apart for the company. We were assured six or eight months ago that the monument would be removed to another place and the government has neglected to do that. If the monument is to continue to stand where it is it should not be inclosed in the general inclosure at all and the minister knows that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not remember what was stated last session by others. Certainly I do not know that that was said by me.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not know whether it was said by the minister or not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The information given to me by the chief architect is that the monument will stand about fifteen feet from the hotel. It may be desirable to leave it there under an arrangement with the hotel company or it may be thought better to remove it to some other part of the park. But, in the meantime, it is desirable that it should be inclosed so that it may not be defaced while the work is going on.

Mr. HUGHES. When is this hotel going to be constructed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The information I have is that the company intend to commence the construction of the hotel this spring. I had a letter from the vice-president of the company waiving some objections which he had to a clause in the deed which has been prepared by the Department of Justice, and asking that the conveyance should be completed as soon as possible with the view of the company proceeding with the construction of the hotel.

Mr. HUGHES. There is a well-grounded rumour that the hotel is not going to be built by the Grand Trunk at all; has the minister heard any thing of that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. HUGHES. He does not want to hear it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well I am indifferent one way or the other about hearing it.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Does the minister not think it a mark of disrespect to the memory of the volunteers, that this monument should have stood boarded out from the public view for over two years? Now that we have been trifled with so long by the persons who secured this valuable park for the purpose of erecting a commercial undertaking, does the minister not think it his duty to interpose and to see that at an insignificant expense—two or three dollars will do it—this fence should be taken down. This week when we are celebrating Pardeberg, I appeal to the minister to show that we are in earnest in paying respect to the memory of the brave men in whose honour that monument was erected.

Mr. HUGHES. I heartily endorse the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. J. D. Taylor). It may not be known that that monument commemorates the memory of the comrades of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) who fought in the Northwest rebellion in 1885; he himself being one of the men who took an active part in that campaign. The Minister of Public Works would do well to take into serious consideration the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for New Westminster.

Mr. LENNOX. How much of this $8,000 voted last year has been expended?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Up to the 20th of November the expenditure was $6,305.

Removal of snow, including Rideau Hall, $4,000.

Mr. LENNOX. Assuming that the average spent for this purpose annually is $4,000, on account of the climatic conditions this year I should not think that more than one quarter of it would be required. We have had such rapid thaws that practically there has been little snow removing to be done this year. I wish to have from the minister a memorandum of the details of this expenditure for this year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will have that prepared.

Ottawa public buildings—repairs, including ventilation and lighting, furniture, &c., $175,000.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does this include the cost of the chairs in the Conservative rooms?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are coming.

Mr. G. V. WHITE. How much of this vote was expended last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Up to the 1st of November, $21,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I presume that when the new building is furnished such a large vote as this will not be required.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is more or less furnishing to be done every year.

Mr. HENDERSON. The main building, the East, and West Blocks, and the Langevin Block originally cost about $5,000,000, can the minister say how much it costs every year to keep these buildings in re pair?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $175,000 year in and year out.

Mr. HENDERSON. A very considerable portion of this $175,000 is for ventilation, lighting and furniture; what I want to every year to keep these buildings in repairs to the buildings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for repairs to the furniture, ventilation, &c., and the chief architect tells me that taking one year with another the expenditure is about $175,000 for repairs to the buildings.

Ottawa public buildings—telephone service, $16,500.

Mr. DANIEL. I notice an increase of about $2,000 in this item over last year. Will the minister tell the House how many telephones there are in this building, and give us some idea of where they are placed? Are they all in the offices of officials, or are any of them in the private rooms of members, and, if so, how many ? The minister might give us some idea of the mode in which he has placed these telephones.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for the whole telephone service of the various public buildings in Ottawa, including all the departments as well as the House of Commons. I am not able to say at this moment in what rooms telephones have been installed. They are in the rooms of different officials, the rooms of ministers, and I presume the rooms of the whips of both sides of the House. I do not think they are installed in the rooms occupied simply by two or three members of the House on either side. I have had no requisitions to have them so installed.

Mr. J. D. REID. I see by the Auditor General's Report, at page V—108 that the price charged the government for telephones is $35. I understand that the regular price in Ottawa is $25.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot tell the exact price; but I made inquiry last year, and my information is that the government gets telephones at the same price as private firms.

Mr. SPROULE. I should think that taking so many they would get them for somewhat less than private individuals. Besides, many of them are used only for a portion of the year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Where they are used only for a portion of the year I think there is a reduction.

Mr. J. D. REID. I understand that the price for a residence telephone in the city of Ottawa is $25.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the office rate ?

Mr. J. D. REID. I am speaking now of residences. I see that for a telephone in the residence of Mr. McDougald the charge is $35.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is my hon. friend quite sure that the Ottawa rate for the residences of private individuals is $25 ? Because if it is, I would insist on the telephone company refunding. I certainly would not consent to pay more. I will make inquiry as to that.

Mr. J. D. REID. My authority is a member who is paying that rate for a telephone in his residence in Ottawa, which he is using the whole twelve months.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My information last year was the contrary of that, but my hon. friend having mentioned it, I will make it my business to look into it. I can assure the committee that we will not pay any more than is paid by private individuals.

Mr. BOYCE. Does the minister say that in paying out the public moneys of this country, he has never informed himself what rate the government is paying for telephones ? Does he have to ask members on the opposition side of the House what the rate is ? Instead of asking members what the rate is after he has paid the money, the situation ought to be reversed. The minister ought to be giving the House the information why he is paying $35 a year for telephones, apparently $10 above the rate any one else pays.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman know that ?

Mr. J. D. REID. I will assume the responsibility of saying that $25 is the regular Ottawa rate.

Mr. BOYCE. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman; that is my own experience, and yet the minister pays $35 a year, and makes no objection. He asks us to pass the item and when it is questioned lifts his eyebrows and asks information from this

side. I think the information should come properly from that side.

Mr. McMILLAN. I understand the rate for telephones in Ottawa for private residence is $25, but if that private residence has one boarder it is $45. The charge for an office phone is $35. Undoubtedly they have arranged a rate for the government offices. There must be some reason for paying $35.

Mr. J. D. REID. Here is a case, Clerk of the Crown in Chancery residence, $35. I do not think the government should pay $10 extra for any boarders in the house of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. Then Mr. McDougald, the Commissioner of Customs, pays $35. Does he keep boarders?

Mr. McMILLAN. It is $20 in a boarding house.

Mr. J. D. REID. I claim that the government should not pay more for phones in the residences of these officials than any private citizen would pay.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I quite agree.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister should see whether the government have been paying too much and make the telephone company refund.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman has not told me yet of any individual resident in Ottawa who has one for less.

Mr. J. D. REID. Mr. Porter and Mr. Perley each pay $25. These officials all have regular salaries and why should we make these extra expenditures? For the residence of the Minister of Finance they charge $50. Are they charging $25 extra for boarders that he keeps? He must have a lot of boarders. For the deputy minister, who does not keep as many boarders as the Minister of Finance, they charge only $25. For the private secretary they charge $40; he must have a boarder or two more than the deputy minister. In these cases the telephone company are not treating the government fairly and the Minister of Public Works should see that if the government are paying too much a refund is made.

Mr. BARR. Could not the minister bring down the facts?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be glad to produce a statement of the amounts paid for different telephones in discussing the item 'miscellaneous expenditures'. When my attention was called to requests for telephones after I became minister I had inquiry made as to the charges for residences in Ottawa and I was informed that the rate given to the government was exactly the same as that given to private individuals. Of course we know that if there is a duplication of the service, a wall extension or a table extension, there is an extra charge, and this may be the case at the residence of the Minister of Finance. I have a table extension which is necessary if I am to have a telephone at all.

Mr. J. D. REID. Last year $14,888 was paid for telephones in Ottawa alone. The minister will see that, in every case, where there is a telephone in the residence of an official, the charge is $35 per annum, except in the case of the ministers, where it is $50. I refer to the Auditor General's Report, page V—108. I see the telephone in the minister's house is charged $50. I do not know whether he is keeping boarders or not. The telephone in his messenger's house cost $35; the same with the census branch, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and others—in every case the charge is at least $35. In a few cases, like the ministers, they may require a telephone and an extension, but that is not required in the case of the messengers or most of these other officials. It seems clear to me that the telephone company are charging $10 more than they ought to charge.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the matter is one that ought to be inquired into. I am glad that my hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Reid) has called attention to it. I will allow the item to stand and make inquiries.

Mr. PORTER. Will the minister answer my inquiry as to the principle on which this payment is made at all. Why should a telephone be paid for in the house of an employee ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The theory is that these officials are liable to be called up on public business, and that it is not undesirable to allow a certain class of officials telephones in their residences. I think everybody will agree that it is reasonable that there should be telephones in the residences of the ministers as well as in their offices. I think the same would apply to the deputies and to the secretaries.

Mr. J. D. REID. And the messengers ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a question. It is a convenient thing for a minister to be able to call up his messenger to attend to a matter of public business. My own view would be that this would apply to one messenger in the department who would be liable to be called up at any time, but not more than one.

Mr. PORTER. I should think the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery would not very frequently be called up out of office hours.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is hard to discriminate.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not want the item to be held up, but I would like to have it understood that on some other item the

minister would explain exactly the position. And if I am right I want the minister to say that he will make the telephone company refund what it has been charging too much. And let us have the explanation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will undertake to do that.

Mr. SPROULE. How can the minister undertake to make them refund money paid in connection with a business transaction entered into with them ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not say I would undertake to have them refund; I said I would undertake to give the explanation.

Mr. J. D. REID. I understood the minister to say that if he finds the Bell Telephone Company have been charging $35 for a residence telephone when they charge others $25, he will make them refund the amount.

Mr. SPROULE. He goes back on that.

Mr. J. D. REID. I want that understood.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My deputy tells me that, in the case of offices they charge $45 but the government have a flat rate both for residences and offices——

Mr. J. D. REID. The office telephones are charged here at $50.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will undertake to have it looked into and get the information for the committee, and will give it when some other item is under discussion.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I understood the minister to say, both early in the debate and recently, that he would make the company refund any overcharge. And I was pleased to hear it. I think he should do that, particularly if this charge has been assented to under a misrepresentation. I will be glad to have him take that plank of the Conservative platform and enforce restitution.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If it appears, on full inquiry that the telephone company have charged more than they ought to charge, I think they ought to refund. I can only say I will look into it.

Mr. GEORGE GORDON. If any large corporation required as many telephones as the government do, I think they could get them at a more reasonable rate than the government seems to be paying. Since they promised to charge only $25, I think the minister will not be doing justice to the country if he does not cause them to refund the money. We have been held up in different parts of the country and told that public works could not go on, while money is being recklessly spent in Ottawa.

Mr. BLAIN. I find an item in the Auditor General's Report, page V—112, showing that taxes paid on buildings rented by the government is a little over $11,000. That seems to be a new item.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The government rents a number of buildings in Ottawa, and, up to quite recently, these were regarded as being free of taxation under the British North America Act as they were occupied for Dominion purposes. I do not say that that is the reading of the Act. The Ontario government recently passed a law expressly declaring that such buildings should be subject to taxation. Outside the statute altogether, I should have thought it proper that taxes should be paid on buildings occupied by the government. I do not see why if a building is subject to taxation being rented by a private individual, the mere fact of it being rented by the government should enable it to escape taxation. At all events, the Ontario legislature has passed a law on the subject, and we have recognized the validity of that law and are paying taxes.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not object to the principle; I rather agree with the minister that it is right. But, when the government is renting buildings in different parts of the city, merely because a change takes place in the law of Ontario, I do not see why the government should pay these large sums in taxation. It seeems to me the owners of the buildings should pay the taxes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman will see that the rental would be just that much higher.

Mr. BLAIN. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to say that, but I don't agree with him. Here are properties in this city receiving very large rents, a new law comes into force that puts the taxation on the owner of the building, and does the hon. gentleman say that the government are going to assume this taxation? I think that the government should see to it that the owners of these properties pay their own taxes.

Mr. SPROULE. On the other hand, if the government are going to pay the taxes, I think they ought to get the buildings at a less rental, because if the owner of the building rented it to any one else it would be taxed. The corporation of Ottawa is denied the privilege of that taxation. Now if the government commence to pay taxes it seems to me they should get a reduction in the rental.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That depends on circumstances. It seems in this case that the rental was fixed by the landlord on the theory that he would have no taxes to pay, he would charge so much as a net rent, based upon what he regarded as a fair return on his investment. That is usually the case. It is usually the cost of the pro-

perty and a fair interest on the amount invested which govern rentals. We do not think it is fair to compel the owner to pay taxes, because it would mean that he was getting much less for his property than he bargained for when he rented to the government. In the case of some other properties we agreed that we should pay the taxes.

Mr. BLAIN. The law in the province of Ontario, I understand is that where the landlord leases a property and there is no mention of taxes in the lease he is compelled to pay the taxes, and I am quite sure that it is the case under the government leases. I do not think it is fair, I repeat, that these property owners in the city of Ottawa who are receiving enormous rents for their properties, and where the government is spending large amounts of money, as they are in some cases, fitting up these properties, and when a change of law takes place, the government should assume all the taxes. It is unfair to the government, and it is a charge against the minister for defending it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think in mose cases the lease expressly provides that the government should pay what taxes there may be.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the minister will produce one of these leases?

Mr. CROSBY. In addition to producing the lease, it will be necessary to bring down the assessed values of the properties, and a statement showing the amount of rent we are paying on each property.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot bring down the assessed value of the property.

Rideau Hall — including grounds, improvements, furniture and maintenance, $35,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Was the full amount spent last year that was voted?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We anticipate it will be spent on the 31st of March.

Mr. EDWARDS. Would the minister give us some idea of the items that go to make up this $35,000, how much for furniture and how much for maintenance?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Plants, bulbs, trees, &c., $1,698.97; dry goods, linen, curtains, &c., $4,099.93; glassware, crockery, kitchenware, $3,562.66; lumber, $1,396.71; hardware, paint, glass, &c., $649.20; furniture, safe, flags, cleaning carpets, &c., $842.57; sand, cement, manure, &c., $93.90; paylists, salaries, &c., $17,226.21; sundries, $748.79.

Rideau Hall--allowance for fuel and light, $8,500.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. When we were passing the item of $110,000, I asked the minister how he was able to light the parliament buildings, including the new wing for the same sum as last year, and he replied that it was because coal was much cheaper this year. Now why has he not reduced this item for the same cause? Then I notice a little lower down a charge for heating last year of $90,000, and this year it is $125,000. Is the increase caused by the reduction in the price of coal?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some time ago it was thought better to make an allowance of $8,500 a year for the purpose of providing fuel and light to Government House, and if it costs more, His Excellency provides it himself. It was thought that would be about a fair allowance each year, and that is the usual allowance made by parliament. With regard to the heating of buildings, my hon. friend must remember that the number of public buildings is constantly increasing throughout Canada. Last year we had quite a number of new buildings, and that would account to a considerable extent for the increase. This item is for heating the buildings throughout Canada.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Have the public buildings in Canada increased 40 per cent since last year?—because the cost of heating has increased 40 per cent, though the price of coal has decreased. The minister is taking for at least 50 per cent more this year than he did last year, assuming that the price of coal was the same.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There has been a considerable increase in the number of new buildings, and we have installed modern systems of lighting and heating.

Mr. SPROULE. Do I understand the minister to say that we allow $8,500 to the Governor General for heating, and if it costs any more the Governor General pays it himself?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. That is a new departure?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has been the custom for some little time.

Mr. SPROULE. I am sure that was not the information given us a few years ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was the case ten years ago, with respect to lighting.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the Governor General been obliged to pay anything on that account?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, this is just an allowance made to him for that purpose.

Mr. SPROULE. If it costs more he pays it himself?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I hope the Governor General will not do as one of our Governors

General did before—go away and leave us with a lot of debts to pay.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no danger.

Dominion buildings—heating, $125,000.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The minister must have had some criterion upon which he based this increase of $35,000—something more than a guess.

Mr. PUGSLEY. None of these things are guess work.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I would ask him to name the buildings with respect to which this increase has been caused.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The actual expenditure to the 15th December, 1908, was $79,500. Then, there are accounts for coal not paid, $36,000 and contingencies, $9,500, making a total of $125,000. This estimate has been made up by the chief architect. The coal is all purchased by public tender, and we get it at the lowest price possible. Experience has demonstrated, with the new buildings which have been erected, and quite a number of new buildings have been erected during the last year or so, that it will cost $125,000.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. That explanation is not satisfactory to me. The new buildings which have been erected and which have caused this increase in the cost of heating, I suppose have been fitted up and supplied with furniture as well?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I presume so.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I would ask the minister how it is that he asks for the same amount this year for fitting and supplies, $80,000, and the same amount for furniture, although he asks for 50 per cent more for heating the same buildings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The buildings are all fitted up out of special votes and this amount is for additional fittings, what may be called maintenance, being additional fittings and supplies after the buildings have been put up. These estimates are based upon experience. The chief architect applies for a certain amount each year. Frequently a supplementary vote has been taken. It may be that a supplementary vote will be necessary this year in addition to the $80,000 voted last year. The experience of the chief architect is that during the coming year he will require $125,000.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Take a concrete case. You have in your estimates a certain amount for building a post office in Owen Sound. Is there anything included in that estimate for fittings and furniture?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, fittings and furniture will be included in a special vote.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I think not. I am told by the contractors that it is not so.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not in their contract, but it is included in the special vote for the building.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Can the minister give me a satisfactory reason why the heating of these buildings should be increased fifty per cent. upon one year's increase in the number of buildings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend did not hear the statement I made. My deputy informs me that there will be for this year an amount asked for in the Supplementary Estimates beyond that $90,000 voted last year. The chief architect has made up this estimate of $125,000 in the hope that that will cover the total expenditure during the coming year ending March 31, 1910.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. This $125,000 covers the supplementary estimates?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it has been found that $90,000 is not sufficient for this year.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister himself gave us items of expenditure for this year amounting to $125,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I was going to say that he was over-spending his vote a great deal.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the vote is overspent and we will have to ask in the Supplementary Estimates this year for probably $35,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. I noticed that the minister, in answer to a question, stated that they were paying $42,000 rent for what is known as the Canadian building in the city of Ottawa, and in addition to that they are paying for the heating and the service of the elevator, making about $50,000 a year for the rent of the building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, $42,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then there is heating, taxes and so on. It costs about $50,000 for the rental of this building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, about that. That includes elevator attendance.

Mr. J. D. REID. Well, take $42,000. The owner of this building receives $42,000 as a revenue and has nothing to pay out of it.

Mr. SPROULE. No taxes?

Mr. J. D. REID. No, the taxes are paid by the government.

Mr. SPROULE. That is what I say.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is straight rent. I do not believe that the building would cost an awful lot more than two or three times—

Mr. PUGSLEY. What would you call an 'awful lot'?

Mr. J. D. REID. I estimate it in this way. Let us see what the property is

assessed for. The assessors are sworn to assess these properties for what they are worth. I understand that property in Ottawa is assessed for its full value.

Mr. PUGSLEY. About two-thirds of its value I think.

Mr. J. D. REID. This property is assessed at $118,000 so that at the minister's own estimate it would be worth $150,000, and $42,000 a year is an enormous rent. I think property owners in Ottawa are generally satisfied to get a rental of from 10 to 12 per cent of the value. How did the minister come to pay such a rental for this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The lease was entered into before I became minister.

Mr. BOYCE. What is the term of the lease?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Five years, renewable at the option of the government.

Mr. BOYCE. When was it entered into?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Three or four years ago? The rental does seem high when you look at the total sum, but a fair way to determine its reasonableness is to remember that for this building you pay 56·14 cents per superficial foot and for the Trafalgar building which is owned by a private individual, 78·08 cents per cubic foot. It is true that for the Imperial building we pay 34·07 cents per superficial foot, for the building occupied by the Interior Department 30·06 cents per superficial foot, for the Seybold building 45·43 cents per superficial foot, but for the Corry building we pay 98 cents per superficial foot.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have not the least doubt that the minister will find, if he inquires, that the rental of similar buildings on the same street is much less than he is paying. If I rent an office down town I may pay 56 cents per square foot on the exact number of feet in the room, but when this building was rented to the government they measured the halls, the elevator shaft, and everything else around the building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How does the hon. gentleman know that?

Mr. J. D. REID. It has been reported to me and the proof is that judging by the size of the building I do not believe you could figure out such a rental unless they measured the hall.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. And the roof.

Mr. J. D. REID. Yes, and the cellar as well.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman has the unhappy faculty of assuming things to exist which do not exist in fact. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken in saying that the corridors were included in estimating the area. We have the most correct measurement of every room in the building. If my hon. friend will inquire from any real estate man he will be told that 56 cents per square foot is a reasonable rent and very much less than is charged for other buildings. The building is equipped with elevators and modern conveniences and is fire proof, which is a very important consideration. I have it from the deputy minister whose duty it is when it is proposed to rent a building to inquire carefully into the rental value of other buildings, that the owners of the 'Citizen' building on Spark street get $1 per square foot from their tenants.

Mr. SPROULE. Look at the difference of the value of land on Sparks street as compared with its value on the street where this building is.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But look at the fact that nearly 100 per cent more is charged for space in the 'Citizen' building than this building on Slater street, and I am inclined to think that for office purposes Slater street is pretty nearly as good as Sparks street although of course it would not be as good for stores.

Mr. BLAIN. What are the taxes on this building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $2,943.61.

Dominion buildings—lighting, $125,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Are you over expending that vote this year and to what extent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The actual expenditure for the present year to December 15 is $87,500, and to complete the fiscal year we estimate that it will take $35,000, making $122,500, with contingencies of $2,500, so that the actual experience of the present year is that it will take nearly $125,000. In the Supplementary Estimates of the current year we shall have to ask for $30,000 to cover the expenditure, and we are asking for the same amount for next year in the hope of avoiding any supplementary estimate.

Mr. MEIGHEN. In regard to the buildings which are said to rent at one dollar per superficial foot, and so on, are they rented on the basis of the tenant paying for the heating, lighting, general fittings, furniture, and so on?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For that one dollar per foot the landlord does the heating and lighting.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Did not the government put in the elevators in this Canadian building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, they were put in by the owner.

Dominion buildings—power for running elevators, stamp cancelling machines, &c., $12,000.

Mr. MARSHALL. Is this power for all the public buildings in Canada?

Mr. PUGSLEY. All except Ottawa.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. What are these stamp cancelling machines?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are used in the post office.

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

Mr. PUGSLEY. This item includes rents not only in Ottawa, but throughout the Dominion. It happens that in a number of towns where there is no public building, and which have arrived at the stage in their population and importance to make it desirable to have a post office, we rent a portion of a building and have it equipped as a post office.

Mr. GOODEVE. In regard to this question of rents, while at first sight the manner in which they are calculated, according to the area of superficial feet, seems to be eminently fair, yet when we consider the comparisons suggested by the minister himself, we see how utterly unfair it is. In the one case we rent the room in the 'Citizen' building, and have it heated and lighted, and have elevator service. In the other case I understand the government rent the entire building, and supply every service—heat, light and elevator—besides paying the taxes; and the ground value of the land is very much less. So that in every particular the comparison which the minister has advanced is eminently unfair. The only way in which you can get at a fair basis for rental is the one suggested by the minister himself, that all that a landlord can expect is a reasonable interest on the money invested, and the only way in which you can get at that is by ascertaining the assessed value of the building. In this case it is stated to be $118,000, on which a rental of $42,000 per annum is certainly a very high interest.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend says that in order to institute a correct comparison we have to remember that the building on Sparks street, for which one dollar a foot is charged, heating and lighting are included. In order to make the comparison absolutely fair, I have added the taxes, heating, lighting and elevator attendance in the case of the Canadian building, and I find that it all amounts to only 71·36 cents per square foot, which is about 30 cents per square foot less than is charged for the 'Citizen' building on Sparks street.

Mr. GOODEVE. If the minister wants to make a fair comparison, let him take the value of the land in the two cases, and he will find that on Sparks street it will be 10 or 15 times what it is on the back street on which the other building is situated. The land value which is very important was left out of the calculation. I understood that the buildings occupied by the government were actually altered and fitted up by it and all repairs and expenses of every kind are borne by the government; while in the 'Citizen' building or any other building the tenants would get rooms suitable for their purposes complete, and all these expenses would be borne by the landlord.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the minister any of the leases of the Ottawa properties with him?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, but I will undertake to bring them.

Mr. BLAIN. Were the bills for taxes presented in 1906 and 1907 paid without protest or was the matter referred to the Justice Department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The question was carefully considered, but it was not referred to the Justice Department. It seemed to be so eminently just that the taxes should be paid to the city that it was not deemed necessary to refer the question to the Justice Department.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the minister be willing to submit some of these leases to the Justice Department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no present thought of doing so and I am not impressed with the desirability of doing so.

Mr. BLAIN. Then money is so plentiful that when large bills like this are presented the minister says: Pay them?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The minister did not say that. If he authorized the payment of the bill it was because he thought it so just and fair.

Mr. BLAIN. In a province where the law provides in the absence of a provision in the lease, that the taxes must be paid by the landlord, I think the minister failed in his duty in not submitting the lease to the Justice Department for their consideration. In some of these cases the rents will pay for the buildings in four years. The owners are friends of the government. I shall take an opportunity of moving a resolution in order that we may have a discussion on this matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no objection to having it discussed at any time. Are the leases made subsequent to 1906 in Ottawa also required?

Mr. BLAIN. I am not particular.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be glad to produce them all.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have no objection to letting items go through if they are half

right or half decent. We have here an item of $200,000 for rents in Ottawa. I have no hesitation in saying that in paying $42,000 for that building on Slater street, the people of Canada are being publicly robbed of a certain amount of money to put into the pockets of the owners of the property. I would ask to have the item stand until we have the leases and have an opportunity of discussing it. I would not be doing my duty to my constituents or to the country if I let the item go through, feeling in the bottom of my heart that there is public robbery going on. I do not believe the minister conscientiously believes this is a fair or square deal in the interest of the people, and I ask him to let the item stand until we have an opportunity of seeing intelligently what we are voting on.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no objection to having it stand. The hon. member is in error in thinking I am of the opinion that there is something wrong. I made inquiry and my conclusion was that the minister was getting an excellent property at an amount considerably below the ordinary rent in Ottawa, some 30 cents a square foot less than what most landlords get.

Dominion public buildings—salaries of engineers, firemen, caretakers, &c., $208,000.

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase there of $12,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, due to the employment of additional men and to increases in salary.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that item being overspent this year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not very much.

Mr. MARSHALL. How many engineers are employed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can get that information, but have not it before me now.

Mr. BARR. What is the reason of the increase?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend (Mr. Barr) knows there are a number of new buildings put up every year making more employees necessary. Also there has been a pretty general demand for increases in salary, and where you make even small increases of $50 or $75, they amount to a considerable sum.

Dominion buildings—water, $22,000.

Mr. STANFIELD. I presume that this is water for the boilers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. And for general supply

Mr. STANFIELD. In the item for heating you allow an increase of over one-third. Burning that much more coal, you will need more water, yet there is no increase in this vote.

Mr. J. D. REID.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We hope to get along with this much.

Dominion cattle quarantine stations—renewals, repairs, &c., $20,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Was the vote of last year spent?

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

Mr. HERRON. Is the government still keeping up the quarantine stations on the boundary of Manitoba and Alberta?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot give that information. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) is not here, but perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Herron) will ask that question when some item of the Department of Agriculture is under discussion.

Yukon public buildings — rents, repairs, fuel, light, water services and caretakers' salaries, &c., $80,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. In the Auditor General's Report there are a number of items of charge for the commissioners residence which seem strange. I suppose the commissioner furnishes his own residence?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it is furnished by the government.

Mr. J. D. REID. I see there is a charge for a sewing machine. Is that supplied by the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps that would be for hemming the curtains.

Mr. J. D. REID. Telephone service costs $240.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is where telephones cost money.

Mr. J. D. REID. There is silver tea service—is the government supposed to furnish that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the government furnishes the building; it belongs to the government and is available for the commissioner.

Mr. J. D. REID. Can the minister tell me where, in the Auditor General's Report, I will find the figures showing what the water services under this item cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have them here: Charges for water and ice; government house $500, Post office, $240; court house, $200.

Mr. SPROULE. Do rents not come down in the Yukon? There has been a great decrease in the population in the last five or six years, and one would think that living would be cheaper, yet we appear to pay the same or an increasing amount.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Very little of this is paid for rent—I think the only item is $450. The total expenditure under this item up to November 26 last was $78,065.

Mr. SPROULE. You are going to have an over expenditure there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Last year we had a vote of $85,000, so there will be still about $8,000. We may get through with that.

Mr. BLAIN. The Yukon is a portion of Canada where the revenue and population are decreasing, but the government expenditure there does not seem to decrease. Has the minister thought of applying his rule of economy to that territory?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As long as we keep up the administration of the Yukon these expenditures must be incurred. We cannot avoid such expenditures as those connected with the administration building, the government house and the court house. This includes also the salaries of various officers of the government at several mining recorders' offices. I agree that it is desirable to keep down the expenditures as much as possible in view of the fact that there has been a falling off in population. But I am inclined to think that the falling off is in the floating population, and that there is a permanent population in the Yukon which will continue, and probably increase.

Mr. SPROULE. What is about the permanent population ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand in Dawson city there are 5,000 or 6,000, and in the Yukon altogether about 15,000 people. I understand that a wealthy company have been spending several millions of money in installing an up-to-date hydraulic mining plant, they have built a good many miles of canal system, and are going into mining on an extensive scale. That is in addition to the ordinary placer mining.

Mr. J. D. REID. Before we take up another item, I would ask the minister to instruct his deputy to send us over, or leave with the clerk of public accounts, copies of those leases for that Canadian building. Would he leave them with the clerk of the Public Accounts Committee ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think we can hardly get them copied in time, but I will send a clerk with the originals, and give my hon. friend time to examine them.

Mr. STANFIELD. Would the hon. minister allow me to say a word or two on harbours and rivers in Nova Scotia—as I have to go away ?

Harbours and rivers—Nova Scotia, $279,310.

Mr. STANFIELD. Some three years ago an item was put in the estimates for a wharf at Tatamagouche bay. During the by-election of 1907 there were $533 spent on this wharf. Last year another $1,000 was added to the appropriation to continue this wharf. I may say that last summer I got a letter from the engineer of the Public Works Department at Halifax asking me to recommend a foreman to take charge of this expenditure of $1,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did the hon. gentleman faint away when he got the request ?

Mr. STANFIELD. I recommended a man whom I thought was an honest man, and after I had sent the letter of recommendation I got a reply stating that I did not have the recommending power, but that belonged to another gentleman. A few days ago I asked some questions in the House with regard to this wharf. I asked for what purpose this money was expended, and received the answer that it was in order that the inhabitants might get on to this island for fishing purposes. I also asked what the depth of water was at high and low tide, and I was informed that at low tide there was no water, and at high tide there was five feet. Now I am glad the minister has left this item out, because it was a waste of money, and there has been a lot of money wasted in Nova Scotia. We want money spent down there on works that are useful rather than merely ornamental. I will send the minister a photograph of this beautiful wharf.

Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick—Beaver Harbour wharf, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This consists of a revote of $5,000 and a new vote of $5,000 for the purpose of proceeding with the construction of a wharf at Beaver harbour in the county of Charlotte. This is a place of a good deal of importance and a wharf is very much needed. Its construction has been pressed for a number of years. It has now been undertaken and is under contract.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the contract price?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $8,808.

Mr. DANIEL. Will this complete it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is expected this will complete it.

Mr. DANIEL. Is that the wharf that was partly washed away or was put in the wrong place?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was a provincial wharf which was partly washed away.

Mr. SPROULE. How did you spend all the money which was voted last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is all a revote.

Mr. SPROULE. Then you have not spent anything?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not yet.

Mr. SPROULE. But it was badly needed for several years?

Mr. CROCKET. When was the contract made?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The order in council was passed a short time ago and the contract must have been let within a week or ten days.

Mr. CROCKET. Was this one of the wharfs that the minister promised to the electors in the campaign?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was a vote passed for this wharf last session. Parliament promised this last session.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there any revenue from this wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There will not be until it is built.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the minister anticipate any revenue from this wharf after it is constructed and, if so, how much per annum?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I believe that this is a place of a good deal of importance. There are quite large industries there; among others, I think there is a large canning industry and I think that the steamer running between St. John and Charlotte county points call there. What the revenue will be it is quite impossible for me to tell. I am sure that no one will say that the construction of the wharf is not thoroughly justified upon public grounds.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister does expect some revenue?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, when these wharfs are passed over to the Marine and Fisheries Department wharfingers are appointed and wharfage dues are collected.

Buctouche—channel through beach, $2,500.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the minister explain what this channel is for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for the purpose of improving the harbour at Buctouche. There has been a large deposit of silt blocking the entrance to the harbour and this is to excavate a channel through the bar.

Mr. CROCKET. How much was expended last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $2,873.

Mr. CROCKET. Was that done by day labour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. Is this a dredging work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not a work done by an ordinary dredge but excavation work done by the day, using scrapers and shovels.

Mr. DANIEL. This is a channel through which water would pass so as to enable vessels to go in and out?

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. Why is it not done with an ordinary dredge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Because it is work which can be done by scrapers and horses at low tide.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the rise and fall of the tide?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know, but I suppose it will be ten or twelve feet, will it not?

Mr. DANIEL. It would not be more than about six feet, I should think, up there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to give a depth of three feet at low tide. If there is a tide of six feet it would give a depth of nine feet at high tide.

Mr. SPROULE. If you have a depth of three feet at low tide how can you do it without a dredge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They can do it with scrapers very well.

Mr. CROCKET. I notice in the Auditor General's Report there is an account of an expenditure of $3,500 for the last fiscal year under the head of 'Buctouche, N.B., Channel Through Beach.' I observe an item of 'legal services, R. A. Irving, Buctouche, $122.10.' Would the minister explain what that was for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am unable to do so; I have not the memorandum here.

Mr. CROCKET. I notice there is a purchase of a site for $500. I would like to know whether this is in connection with the searching of the title. It seems a pretty good bill for a small property like that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will have that looked into.

Mr. CROCKET. I notice also that the barrister's father seems to have done pretty well in connection with this item. J. D. Irving, for the use of an engine for 37½ days receives $8 per day and for the use of a scow for 40½ days receives $2 a day which with other items make $852.11.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I suppose that would be for a digger which would be operated by a steam winch.

Mr. CROCKET. Also I see that this barrister has been supplying stone as well as legal services for which he received $2.25 per cubic yard, amounting to $225. This appears to be a profitable undertaking for the Irvings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would depend on whether they were paid more than reasonable prices.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the minister know that they were reasonable?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall presume that they were in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Campbellton deep-water wharf—extension, repairs, &c., $25,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Is this expected to complete this wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am unable to say whether this will complete as the chief engineer is unwell to-night and not able to be here.

Mr. DANIEL. We should know how much has been expended and how much it will take to complete.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total expenditure at Campbellton to the 31st of March, was $150,514. The dredging cost $31,597 in addition, or a total of $182,139. The wharf is an extension 300 feet long and 45 feet wide; the dredging was required to give a depth of 25 feet at low water. It is crib work and done by contract.

Cape Bald breakwater, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a new work which is very much needed.

Mr. CROCKET. What will be the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is estimated at about $32,000.

Mr. BLAIN. In what county is Cape Bald?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Westmoreland.

Cape Tormentine breakwater, $5,000.

Mr. DANIEL. How much will this work cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The teredo worm causes great damage there and almost immediately after the brakewater was built, a number of years ago, repairs were found necessary from year to year. We are now using creosote timber.

Cummings Cove, Deer island, wharf, $23,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Will this complete?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. It is new work; it will be done by public tender.

Dover—wharfs on Petitcodiac river, $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total cost of this work will be $5,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the government build wharfs on the Petitcodiac river and pay the total cost of them?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. Then why is it that on the St. John river the government contributes only half the cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have undertaken the building of a number of additional wharfs on the St. John river solely at the expense of the government. The arrangement referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) was entered into when the Hon. Mr. Foster was Minister of Finance, and I do not know what reason there was for it.

Mr. CROCKET. It has been carried on for twelve years by your government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, except that we have extended quite largely the work which is done altogether at the expense of this government. In the estimates of this year there is an amount of $20,000, which has never appeared before, for the purpose of building wharfs on the St. John river at the entire cost of the federal government.

Harvey bank—wharf, cribwork, $4,500.

Mr. CROCKET. Is this a new wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes; it is to rebuild the old wharf. This is the total cost.

Heron island—wharf, $3,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Is this new?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it is to extend the wharf built by the provincial government.

Mr. CROCKET. What county is it in?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Restigouche. The estimated cost is $4,000.

Kouchibougouac harbour improvements, $3,700.

Mr. DANIEL. Will this complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Lameque wharf—improvements, $2,500.

Mr. DANIEL. Will this complete?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This will complete the improvements.

Leonardsville, Deer island — reconstruction of wharf, $14,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide for the reconstruction of an extension of a wharf formerly built by the provincial government.

Mr. DANIELS. Will this finish the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Lorneville breakwater—wharf, $29,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This will complete the work.

Mill's Point wharf, $3,800.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This will complete the payments.

Mr. CROCKET. What will the total be?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $20,800.

Mr. CROCKET. Was there a contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. The contractor was Mr. Fawcett, who was the lowest tenderer.

Moncton wharf—enlargement, $16,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Is that the whole cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It may take a little more to finish it, but not very much more.

Mr. DANIEL. There was nothing done on that last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was a commencement made by the contractor, but difficulties have arisen, and we shall have to ask for new tenders under a somewhat changed plan.

Mr. CROCKET. Was the old wharf built by this government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, by the Railway Department. It is a railway wharf.

Mr. DANIEL. When were these tenders called for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Last May or June.

Mr. CROCKET. In this connection I would like to remind the minister of a promise he made to some of the business men of Fredericton in regard to wharf accommodation there. I think that on the eve of the election he sent a telegram to a number of merchants in that city saying that he would do something toward the building of wharfs at Fredericton ; but I see that there is nothing for that purpose in the estimates. I would like to ask the minister why he is not carrying out that promise?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My attention was called to the desirability of assisting the city of Fredericton in giving wharf accommodation, and my hon. friend is quite right that I stated that I would recommend to my colleagues the taking of their request into favourable consideration. There is nothing in the estimates of this year, because that will be an entirely new work, and in accordance with our policy, we have postponed the construction of this wharf at Frederiction, as we have many other public works throughout Canada.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister, having said that he would take it into his favourable consideration, I suppose kept it in his favourable consideration until the 26th of October.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not changed my mind about it.

Mr. CROCKET. My we expect that this promise which the minister gave to the people of Fredericton will be carried out next year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend will look at my promise, and bear in mind what I said with regard to other public works, he will find that in due course my promise will be carried out.

Mr. SPROULE. Was the hon. gentleman in harmony with the government in that policy not to spend anything on new works in the coming year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of course, every member of the government is in harmony with the government in that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How does that comport with the promise he made to the people down there that he would recommend the expenditure to his colleagues?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I never said that it would be done this year.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman left the people with the impression that he was going back to recommend this expenditure to his colleagues; then he comes here and says that his policy is not to do it. He is not in harmony with himself.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that the hon. gentleman sent a telegram during the election?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I sent either a telegram or a letter, and, whatever it was, I have no objection to it being produced, and I may say that I have no doubt that it was read at the council meeting in the very terms in which it was sent, without any alteration.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend says it was read at a public meeting during the heat of the election?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know that it was. It was not sent for that purpose. It was sent in response to a request from the mayor of Fredericton. I received a letter from the mayor, and I wrote a letter in reply; I do not think I sent any telegram. My letter stated my views, and those views I am prepared to stand by irrespective of what representative is sent by the county of York to this parliament.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend will bring down the letter or telegram, I suppose?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If it is moved for, I will.

Mr. CROCKET. I understood the minister to state in his letter that he would recommend this appropriation to his colleagues. I would like to know if he has done that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon friend will produce the letter he will see what I stated.

Mr. CROCKET. The hon. minister said to-night that he had stated that he would recommend this appropriation to his col-

leagues, and I would like him to say whether he has done that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I stated that every new work for which tenders had not been called was postponed. That remark applies to a great many public works for which appropriations were made by parliament last session. My hon. friend can surely understand that having postponed these works, I would not think of asking my colleagues this session to provide for works for which parliament had not already made appropriations and in respect of which nothing had been done.

North Head, Grand Manan—breakwater wharf, $7,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is to continue that work.

Mr. CROCKET. How much will it cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A lot of the wharf was washed away in the great storm; it is expected to cost $46,000.

Pink Rock, wharf, Shepody bay—extension, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is to complete the extension. A contract will be let.

Pointe du Chêne—repairs to breakwater, $5,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Are these repairs required on account of the teredo?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not to the same extent as at Cape Tormentine, but we are using creosoted timber to avoid the teredo.

Mr. DANIEL. It would seem to be a waste of money to build a wooden breakwater if it is to be destroyed by the teredo.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Cape Tormentine breakwater was built a good many years ago, I think under the previous government, and we have to take it as we find it; it is the same with Point du Chêne.

Mr. DANIEL. Is creosoted timber an entire success in that respect?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Pretty nearly a thorough success.

Quaco harbour—part reconstruction and extension of east pier, $35,000.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the amount of the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $32,900. The contractor is Mr. Charleson, of Ottawa. A part of the existing wharf was carried away and that will cost $2,000 to replace.

Richibucto Cape—breakwater wharf, $10,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Is this new?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. Have tenders been called for or a contract let?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not yet. Some work has been done, we procured timber and began the work and have spent about $3,500 by day's labour.

Richibucto wharf, $3,000.

Mr. CROCKET. How much of last year's vote of $9,000 was expended?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The whole of it will be expended. This is to repair a wharf bought from the municipality and another wharf which we bought.

Mr. CROCKET. How much did you pay the municipality?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We paid $5,000 for one and $1,500 for the other.

Mr. CROCKET. To whom was the $5,000 paid?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think to Mr. Murray.

Mr. CROCKET. Is that the manager of the Kent Northern Railway?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think so.

Mr. CROCKET. And the government paid him $5,000 for a site for a wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For the wharf itself; it is an old wharf.

Mr. CROCKET. Did the department have a valuation?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, by the resident engineer. His valuation was that the property had cost about $15,000. He said it was cheap at $5,000. He also consulted a prominent firm, Messrs. A. & R. Loggie, who informed him it was fair value.

Mr. CROCKET. How long did Murray hold the title?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not many months.

Mr. CROCKET. From whom did he buy?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From Mr. O'Leary.

Mr. CROCKET. For how much?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $1,000.

Mr. CROCKET. And the government paid $5,000 to Murray for a property that he bought in order to sell to the government at $1,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know that, the hon. gentleman is putting in something that is not so.

Mr. CROCKET. But the minister knows that Mr. Murray bought the property during that season to sell to the government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have learned recently that he bought the property.

Mr. CROCKET. And the department paid $5,000 for that wharf just as Mr. Murray had bought it from Mr. O'Leary.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know as to that.

Mr. CROCKET. The department paid $5,000 for it ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, on the representation of the engineer, Mr. Geoffrey Stead. It appears that it is a property of 500 feet frontage and considerable depth. Mr. Stead reported that it would cost $15,000 or $16,000 and was good value for $5,000. He did not report what Mr. Murray had paid for it. The department had no knowledge of what he paid. When it was brought to my notice what he had paid, I wrote to the engineer pretty sharply and ascertained the information on which he had reported as to the value of the property. He reported that the parties had wanted $10,000, which he thought too much, but, on going fully into the matter, he was confident that it was good value for $5,000, and so recommended the purchase.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the minister know that this very property was offered to the department for $1,000 ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I know to the contrary. I have had a search made and find no record of any such offer.

Mr. CROCKET. To an officer of the department ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware as to that. I am aware that Mr. O'Leary made the statement that he had offered it, not to an official of the department who had anything to do with wharf construction, not to the resident engineer, but to another official of the department who did not communicate with the department at Ottawa.

Mr. CROCKET. The gentleman to whom he says he made the offer is still in the employ of the department ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. But having nothing to do with wharfs.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the minister communicated with this gentleman, Mr. Waterbury ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. CROCKET. Did the minister communicate with Mr. Murray in regard to the matter ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. CROCKET. Are properties of this kind purchased by officers of the department without consultation with the minister ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not customary, certainly.

Mr. CROCKET. Was the minister not consulted in this matter ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The minister was consulted by the officials of his department.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the minister say he was not consulted by Mr. Murray ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no knowledge of being consulted by Mr. Murray.

Mr. CROCKET. I would like to have the minister's own idea of the price paid for that property—does he think it was excessive ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A few months ago my attention was called to the fact that the property had been purchased from Mr. Murray at a less sum than the government had paid, the sum mentioned being $1,000. I at once wired to my deputy to delay the completion of purchase until I had had an opportunity to make further inquiries. I received a telegram that the purchase had been completed through the Justice Department and the title had passed. I at once wrote to the resident engineer, Mr. Stead, calling his attention to what I had heard, and asking him to give me full particulars of the facts on which he relied in giving an estimate of the value. I also called his attention to the fact that the department had not been informed of the previous transfer and gave him direction that, in the future, I wanted him clearly to understand that whenever a property was purchased the department must be informed of all previous transfers in recent years so that we could form a judgment as to the value, and also any other facts that might assist the department in arriving at a full judgment. The engineer wrote me very fully and very frankly. He said he had heard that, some months before, the property had been purchased at $1,000. He regarded that as an absolutely ridiculous price for the property. He made inquiry and was led to believe that the previous owner had parted with it because he had no use for it, having other property. He also wrote that he had made inquiries of Messrs. A. and R. Loggie, who are among the most reputable business men in the lower provinces, or in all Canada, and they had instructed him that if they owned the property they would not think of parting with it for $5,000. He also reported that he had examined the property and the material in the wharf must have cost at least $15,000.

Mr. CROCKET. It was all sawdust.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He says not. He says there is ballast of stone and gravel and probably a million cubic feet of cribwork, not new, of course, but a million feet must have cost a considerable sum. He said he could not get the property for less than he had, and that, in his opinion, the valuation was not a high valuation, but a low one.

Mr. CROCKET. Had the minister received any representation that this wharf was necessary ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. From whom ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From different people there.

Mr. CROCKET. Was there any public body in the county which made representations to the department ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot state as to that now. I know that we were urged to get additional wharf accommodation there. It appears that the Kent Northern Railway goes to the water, and there was no public wharf there, and the accommodation was very limited. There is no doubt we have a very valuable property and one that it was necessary we should have. In connection with the railway, it will be a great advantage to Richibucto.

Mr. CROCKET. How much is it intended to spend ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $3,000 at present.

River St. John — including tributaries, $6,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the minister state what he intends to do with this vote ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a vote for blasting rocks, building wing dams and otherwise facilitating navigation of the river. I am inclined to think that we will expend a sum of money this year in improving Grand Falls. There are difficulties in the way of navigation so far as floating lumber is concerned. I think a few thousand dollars could be expended there with great advantage—right at the falls and a little above.

River St. John and tributaries—construction of wharfs in tidal waters, $20,000.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like the minister to state where he is going to build these wharfs.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could not state exactly, but we have applications for quite a number of wharfs, both in the counties of Queens and Sunbury, and some in the county of Kings. There is one at Oromocto, another at Scotchtown, and another I think at Burton. There are quite a number which are urgently required in the public interest. I will get a list later if the hon. gentleman wishes.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister stated some time ago that many public works had been proposed but had to be abandoned, but he did not intend to abandon those which came under one of three categories, and one of those categories was cases where tenders had been called for. Now, I wish to remind the minister that tenders were called for no less than nine wharfs in the county of Queens and Sunbury. I have here a clipping from the 'Daily Telegraph' of St. John, dated October 13, 1908, which reads thus:

Nine new wharfs in Queens and Sunbury—On representation of Colonel McLean, Minister of Public Works calls for tenders—List of places where wharfs will be built.

The Department of Public Works, Ottawa, as will be seen by reference to another column, are calling for tenders for nine new wharfs in Queens-Sunbury. These will prove of great benefit to the residents of the localities and have been procured—

They had already been procured.

—through the representations of Colonel H. H. McLean, the Liberal candidate in Queens-Sunbury, to Hon. Mr. Pugsley, Minister of Public Works.

This was dated 13th October, little less than a fortnight before the elections.

The places where the new wharfs will be located are as follows:—

The Range, Parish of Waterborough, Queens county, N.B.

Burton, Parish of Burton, Sunbury county, N.B.

Newcastle, Parish of Canning, Queens county, N.B.

Barker's, Parish of Sheffield, Sunbury county, N.B.

McAllisters, Parish of Chipman, Queens county, N.B.

Young's Cove, Parish of Waterborough, Queens county, N.B.

Ironbound Cove, Parish of Chipman, Queens county, N.B.

Scotchtown, Parish of Canning, Queens county, N.B.

Lower Jemseg, Parish of Cambridge, Queens county, N.B.

Tenders for these wharfs will close on November 12.

As tenders had been called for in respect to all these wharfs, I think they should be included in the estimates of work to be done this year. I have here a copy of the advertisement:

Tenders for wharfs on St. John river and Grand Lake, N.B.

Then it gives the nine places I have just read. That advertisement is signed by 'Nap. Tessier, Secretary.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my hon. friend say that he approves of my going ahead with these wharfs ?

Mr. DANIEL. Certainly, I do.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, I intend to do so.

Mr. DANIEL. Then why are they not included in the estimates ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have got a vote of $20,000, $5,000 more than last year.

Mr. DANIEL. Will that build nine wharfs?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It should.

Mr. DANIEL. Is my hon. friend the member for Sunbury and Queens (Mr. H. H. McLean) satisfied with that?

Mr. H. H. McLEAN. $20,000 is pretty good.

Mr. DANIEL. I am speaking on behalf of the people of Queens and Sunbury, who, I was afraid, had been deluded by these promises made previous to the election. I call the attention of the minister to the fact that these promises have been made, and naturally the people expect him to carry them out.

Mr. H. H. McLEAN. I am delighted that my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel) is giving me his assistance in obtaining these necessary public works. I am also highly pleased to hear him state this evening that he thoroughly approves of the policy adopted by the Minister of Public Works in erecting these wharfs, because I understand he joins with me in believing that these wharfs are absolutely necessary for the proper navigation of the River St. John. But I want to remind my hon. friend that he has changed his opinion this session from the opinion he held last session. I want to remind him that when the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) stated on the floor of this House that it was a vicious principle to erect at the public expense wharfs in rivers or lakes, and that the public money should only be expended on wharfs in harbours or on the sea coast, my hon. friend heard that statement and he did not dispute it.

Mr. DANIEL. I never heard the hon. member for North Toronto make any such statement, either in this House or out of it.

Mr. H. H. McLEAN. I have an extract to prove what I say, and if my hon. friend wishes I will give it to him, because I used that extract in speeches in the county of Queens and Sunbury and I used it on nomination day. The statement cannot possibly be denied. As regards the statement made by my hon. friend that he was not present when the hon. member for North Toronto made that statement——

Mr. CROSBY. Mr. Chairman, is this in order? Are we here for the purpose of doing business?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman rises to a point of order I must, of course, ascertain what it is.

Mr. CROSBY. The point of order is that the hon. member for Sunbury and Queens is not discussing the question under consideration. Surely you know that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. member for Sunbury and Queens is in order and may continue his speech.

Mr. CROSBY. I only want the ruling of the chair.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CROSBY. I will wait until he gives it so that we will know what he wants.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must not comment on the ruling of the Chair. He must withdraw such observations.

Mr. CROSBY. I simply say that if that is your ruling we will know it in future.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understood the hon. gentleman to go farther than that. If he does not, his remark is not out of order.

Mr. H. H. McLEAN. I was only endeavouring to answer the remarks made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel). I am glad to know that he thoroughly approves of the principle laid down by this government and that is that every necessary public work, every necessary wharf in tidal waters and in navigable waters, will be constructed at the expense of the government of Canada. I was also delighted to know that this principle meets with his approval and, of course, meets with the approval of all hon. gentlemen of the opposition. I want also to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that this principle has been opposed in this House by hon. gentlemen on the opposition side. It has been opposed by the hon. member for North Toronto and by other speakers on his side. I also desire to say that we give credit to the Minister of Public Works for inaugurating that principle and carrying it forward.

Mr. DANIEL. I am very pleased to hear the remarks of my hon. friend. Although he was a little inexact in some of his statements I quite exonerate him from any intention of being wilfully inexact. But I would like him and the members of this House to understand that in so far as I am concerned I am entirely in accord with any government that provides proper means for transportation and the carrying on of the business of this country whether it is on the sea coast or on the inland lakes and rivers. I never lifted my voice against the expenditure of money for any such laudable purpose and I do not propose to. I shall not do so for one reason, that, in the city, that I come from, we are looking for some expenditure for purposes connected with the great transportation interests of this country. I would not feel like advocating expenditures for that purpose in my own constituency if I were not willing to advocate them in the constituencies of other hon. gentlemen whether on this side of the House or not. While my hon. friend from Queens and Sunbury would like to have imparted a little irony or sarcasm into his remarks I do not think they apply in any degree whatever to the member for the city of St. John.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the department made an estimate of the cost of these nine wharfs in Queens and Sunbury before calling for tenders.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The department prepared plans and called for tenders which we thought would be the best guide as to what these wharfs should cost, but, when the tenders came in, with respect to several of them, we thought that the price was too high and we also thought that the plans might be simplified so as to reduce the cost very materially. My own view, based on an experience of a good many years in connection with the building of wharfs on the St. John river when I was a member of the provincial government, is that we ought to get suitable wharfs on the St. John river at a cost of from $1,200 to $3,000. We are now having new plans prepared with the view of getting a cheaper wharf, one which will answer all practical purposes just as well and we hope to get the cost of the construction of these wharfs down to from $1,200 to $3,000, according to the length of the wharf, the depth of the water and the difficulty in making the approaches to the wharfs.

Mr. CROCKET. What was the total amount of the tenders that were received?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They ranged between different amounts. Some were as high as $7,000.

Mr. CROCKET. On the plans that had been drawn?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, that had been drawn by the engineers at St. John. We thought the cost was greater than suitable wharfs should cost and we gave directions to reduce and simplify the plans.

Mr. CROCKET. After the elections were over the plans were simplified.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister did not state whether he intended to build these wharfs or not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the object of the vote.

Mr. DANIEL. And it is expected to build them?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. Is the work to be done on all these wharfs during the present year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We hope to be able to proceed with the work on all of them as soon as we can get the plans and have the tenders called for.

Mr. BLAIN. What county are these in?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Queens-Sunbury and King's.

Mr. BLAIN. How many wharfs are there in the county of Queens-Sunbury?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon friend from the county of St. John read the list. We hope to construct all of these.

Mr. BLAIN. That will be nine in one county.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are two counties.

Mr. BLAIN. We are to understand that nine wharfs are to be constructed in one constituency represented by my hon. friend?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is right but the water stretches are very large. They take in St. John river, Grand lake and Washdemoak lake.

Mr. BLAIN. All on the recommendation of my hon. friend?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the request of the hon. gentleman on the urgent request of the people in the various localities.

Mr. BLAIN. Was the Minister of Finance consulted about these large expenditures?

Mr. FIELDING. These nine wharfs seem not to be very extravagant in their cost. I do not think that even the whole amount of the tenders represents a very extravagant expenditure. I think it is within the reasons of economy that have been laid down.

River St. John—wharfs in tide water—contribution to the local government not to exceed one-half the first cost of wharfs built by it, $5,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Are you buying wharfs from the local government or what?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would like, with the consent of the committee, to strike out the words 'River St. John' because for some reason or other, the contribution to be made to the provincial government is limited to wharfs in the tidal waters of the river St. John. The provincial government have built a wharf upon a tidal river in the northern part of the province and they have urged that we should pay one half the cost of it. I do not see why the rule was limited to the St. John river. It is better for us where we can, to get the provincial government to see its duty to pay one-half the cost rather than that we should pay the whole of it. I move that the words 'River St. John' be struck out. It does not add to the liability but enables us to distribute it to other rivers.

Mr. CROCKET. It just takes that much away from the River St. John?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It may.

Mr. CROCKET. As a representative of one of the St. John river counties I object most strenuously to the proposition of the minister. Last session other representatives of these river counties as well as myself protested that these counties were not treat-

ed equitably in regard to the appropriations for wharfs. We pointed out that there were thousands and thousands of dollars spent upon the rivers in the province of Quebec—the Saugenay river was especially instanced—where this government paid the entire costs of the wharfs and that on the important river St. John the government contributed only one-half the cost. The decision of the Minister of Public Works now to interfere with that pittance is an injustice to the people of these counties. I strenuously object to the proposition of the minister which will result in reducing the appropriation for the River St. John. I have pointed out that this government has paid the whole cost of the wharfs on the Petitcodiac river, and it is certainly very strange that after his professions of generosity to-night the minister should now propose to reduce even the beggarly half-cost contributions to the construction of wharfs on the river St. John. If the minister wants to aid the construction of wharfs in other parts of the province then his proper course would be to take an extra appropriation for that purpose and not divert money that has always been applied to the St. John river. It is the duty of the government to pay the whole cost of the wharfs on tidal rivers in the province of New Brunswick as they do in all other provinces of the Dominion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The striking out of the words 'River St. John' will not in any way affect the money that would go to the St. John river. For the first time in the history of the country we have a vote of $20,000 for wharfs on that river. This is purely a question between my department and the government of the province of New Brunswick, because unless they build the wharfs we cannot contribute half the cost. The provincial government through the Chief Commissioner of Works has requested me to change the wording of this resolution and I would ask the committee to allow me to do so.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Is this in the nature of a subsidy for wharfs already built?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We pay one half the cost of the wharfs which the provincial government has built.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. How is it that when the provincial government of British Columbia applies to this government for a subsidy for works which are usually subsidized by the federal government the answer made to British Columbia is that there is constitutional objection to paying subsidies to any provincial governments; that they can only pay subsidies to private owners, but when we come to the province of New Brunswick (the minister's own province) we find that another yard stick is applied and that there the Federal government can pay subsidies to the provincial government, when there is, it is said, a constitutional obstacle to paying them to the provincial government of British Columbia. That is a matter which ought to be explained.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman has been misinformed. The Dominion government has contributed one-half the cost of works upon the Fraser and Columbia rivers when those works would not ordinarily fall to the federal government, they not being connected with navigation. But by reason of the importance of the work and the extent of the damage that otherwise would be done, this government has on more than one occasion actually contributed one-half of the cost of protection works in the constituency of my hon. friend. I have never heard this government raise the constitutional objection that it could not assist a provincial government with regard to works towards which the federal government might fairly contribute. Some fifteen years ago the Dominion government agreed to contribute one-half the cost of the wharfs on the tidal waters of the St. John river which the government of New Brunswick might build. That practice has been continued all these years and all the New Brunswick government asks now is that, instead of paying this amount to them for wharfs on the St. John river, it may be extended to other tidal rivers.

Mr. CROCKET. If the minister makes the change he proposes, does he not think he ought to increase the amount of the appropriation?

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. The Minister of Public Works has, as usual, an ingenious answer to the question I put, but his answer does not meet the case at all. In the instances on the Fraser river to which he has referred the Dominion government did very reluctantly and after a great deal of pressure make contributions towards works which we claimed in British Columbia we were not responsible for, but to which, in our devotion to the public interest, we consented to contribute one-half in order to avoid the damage to property that would have been caused by the neglect of the federal government to do their plain duty upon the Fraser river. The federal government resisted the claim we made, and in every instance in which they helped us on the Fraser river they repudiated responsibility and stated they did so as an act of grace and not as a matter of right. Why, no later than to-day, in answer to an application I made to the Department of Public Works for the continuation of certain works which we were able to get this government to undertake on the Fraser river at Langley, the minister sent me a letter over his own signature entirely repudiating any responsibility for the work which his

department had undertaken and left in an incomplete state. He stated in his letter to me that this work was a matter of provincial and not Dominion concern. When I said that he had one yard stick for British Columbia and another yard stick for New Brunswick I referred more particularly to the doctrine laid down by this government in connection with the bridge over the Fraser river at New Westminster. The answer to our application for a subsidy was that if we would hand over that bridge to a private corporation to exact toll from the people of the Fraser valley for ever. then this government would give a subsidy amounting perhaps to $300,000 for the bridge, but because it was owned by the province, and we proposed to keep it in the public ownership of the people of the province, this government had not a cent to give us. They told us that there was a constitutional objection to giving any bonus to the province except a bonus authorized by the several Acts of confederation, while now we find them giving a direct subsidy to the province of New Brunswick towards the creation of public works. I am not objecting to that subsidy, but I am objecting to one rule being applied to the provinces of eastern Canada and another rule to our disadvantage being applied to the province of British Columbia.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. In regard to the amendment proposed, I fear it might mean a change in the destination of the vote, and I am not sure of the right of the committee to make a change.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In that case I withdraw the motion.

River St. John—survey between Fredericton and Woodstock, with a view of improving navigation, $5,000.

Mr. CROCKET. There was an appropriation of $5,000 for this last year. Is that all expended?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. And this is an additional $5,000 to continue the work or to pay for the work already done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To pay some balance, and to continue the work.

Mr. CROCKET. Can the minister say how much the survey of September and October last cost the country?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The expenditure to November 30, 1908, was $2,976.27. We expect that the further expenditure, I suppose for the payment of the balance, will be $2,023.63. The accounts are not all in yet. That would make a total of $5,000 expended before the close of the fiscal year. The surveys are not entirely completed, and we want to continue the work.

Mr. McALISTER. If not out of order, I would like to call attention to a statement which I understand was made on the hustings during the election campaign in regard to that survey by the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket). He said:

The Grits had had several fake surveys on land up and down the valley of the St. John; but now they were making a fool survey on water.

I would like the hon. member to state what he means by a fake or fool survey.

Mr. CROCKET. If the hon. member for Kings and Albert will consult his friend, the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., (Mr. Carvell), I think he will be able to gratify his curiosity as to what was meant by the references to the 'fake survey of the land' and also to the 'fool survey of the water.' The hon. gentleman no doubt still has a recollection of the survey for the Transcontinental railway which was conducted along the banks of the St. John river during the election campaign of 1904 and of his strong denunciation of the character of that survey at the last Liberal convention at St. John. On that occasion the hon. member for Carleton declared that the survey was no survey at all, that there was not so much as even a profile of it to represent the thousands of dollars which it cost the people of the country. This is what I called and what the people of the St. John valley called 'the fake survey.' The expression seemed to sum up the views of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) in short metre. I hope my hon. friend from Kings-Albert now understands the reference. As to the fool survey of the water that was applied to the survey of the river between Fredericton and Woodstock which was made in a tow-boat during the last campaign under the management of a young man named A. E. Hanson, and which the minister has informed us will require another five thousand dollars in addition to the five thousand dollars which was voted last year to pay the bills.

Mr. McALISTER. I would like to ask the hon. member if it was not at the request of two Conservatives, Shaw and Bull, that this dredging was to be done?

Mr. CROCKET. I am not aware.

Mr. McALISTER . I am informed that the hon. gentleman is aware of that fact.

Mr. CARVELL. As I do not have any public works in my constituency, and do not ask for any, I did not suppose that I would have to take a hand in these debates about public works in New Brunswick. But as the hon. mmber for York (Mr. Crocket) seems to be somewhat excited over this matter of the survey of the River St. John, I would like to point out to him, what I have pointed out within a year in this

House, that this survey of the St. John river was done at the request of a public meeting in Woodstock, attended by a number of influential people from his own constituency, including the board of trade from his own city, who came to Woodstock, and joined the board of trade of that town in passing a resolution asking me to use my influence with the government to have this survey made in order to ascertain if it would not be possible to have water communication between Woodstock and Fredericton during a longer period of the year. I brought the matter before the Minister of Public Works and his department, and they went into it; and I think it comes with poor grace from the hon. member for York to refer to this as a fake survey. No man knows better than he does that there never was a more genuine attempt made to secure a public improvement. The hon. gentleman has referred to Mr. Hansen, who was employed in the work. He would not say to Mr. Hansen's face what he has said to-night; and he would not say with regard to another gentlemen—and a good Conservative at that—Mr. Miles, who was employed on that survey, what he has said to-night; and I do not think he would say in his own constituency what he has said to-night.

Mr. CROCKET. It was the hon. member for Kings and Albert who stated that I had said it.

Mr. CARVELL. It is not very often that we bother calling the hon. gentleman down, but there are times when even the patience of a long-suffering man like myself is exhausted. My hon. friend knows the necessity of that work. He knows that if we succeeded in demonstrating to this government that we could extend the water communication down the river St. John three or four months in the year, it would be one of the greatest boons that could be conferred on that part of the province. I happen to know the nature of the report of one of the gentlemen who made this survey, and he is very hopeful that navigation to a depth of eight or nine feet can be obtained by the expenditure of a very small amount of money. I commend the Minister of Public Works for continuing this investigation, and hope he will succeed in demonstrating that by dredging the river we can have at a reasonable cost the navigation we desire. While my hon. friend from York may not wish to see anything done by this government that will gain credit for it in the eyes of the people, I can assure him that if the Liberal representatives from New Brunswick can do anything to benefit the people, we will do it, regardless of whether the hon. member from York likes it or dislikes it.

Mr. CROCKET. I believe that when this vote was proposed last year, the hon. member from Carleton made a statement

somewhat similar to the statement he has made to-night in regard to the proposal of this survey being made by the boards of trade of Woodstock and Fredericton. It is quite true that these bodies were very much interested in the improvement of the navigation on the St. John river between Fredericton and Woodstock. I urged that matter several times in the House; but that was the first intimation we had that these boards of trade or any responsible people had asked of this government to make an appropriation of $5,000 or $10,000 to survey the water between Fredericton and Woodstock. I think that the members of the Fredericton Board of Trade will be very much surprised to learn it. There are eight or ten places in the river where dredging is required, and these were just as well known as the post offices along the river. I had correspondence myself with the Public Works Department, which show that they have had for years reports on the matter, sent in by Mr. Shewan, of St. John, a competent authority, these reports gave the department all the inforamtion that could possibly be attained or that was reasonably necessary for the purpose of determining what appropriations would be necessary. I do not withdraw one word of what I said with reference to the perfect foolishness of this vote. It was the subject of laughter during the election campaign wherever referred to by the people living along the river and the people in Fredericton, so much so that the gentleman in charge to whom my hon. friend has made reference, became known to his friends as the hydrographer. The money was expended, and that seems to be the only object to whom my hon. friend has made reference. If we had one or two of the bars and obstacles dredged from the channel between Fredericton and Woodstock, we would have had some benefit from the expenditure, but to pay out such a sum in such a moment, for the purpose of getting information that the department has and has had for years on the file, is certainly the height of folly.

Mr. CARVEL. The hon. gentleman has only to talk about five minutes to show his absolute ignorance of the subject under discussion. When the work started and the engineers got their instructions from the officials in St. John they were directed to do the very thing he has advocated, to take ten or twelve spots along the river and make a report. I recommend a prominent engineer and he spent a week on the work. He then said: I might as well stop the work and save money unless I am allowed to make a thorough survey and give information of some value. He said that if he surveyed the six or seven places pointed out to him they would have no knowledge of the condition of the river between these two points, would not know whether there were three feet or sixteen

feet, and at his solicitation I took up the matter with the Minister of Public Works and orders were given to make a thorough survey. It is just as well that my hon. friend and the people should know this. I have seen the plans and profile of the upper 25 or 30 miles of that work and there are three or four dozen places in this 24 miles that required the survey without which the department would have no knowledge on which to come to the conclusion as to the dredging of the river. If my hon. friend would spend as much time trying to find out the facts of each case, as in reading a paper called the 'Gleaner,' published in Fredericton, which throws insulting terms at everybody employed by this government to do anything, he would know more about the subject than he has given evidence of to-night.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Has it ever occurred to my hon. friend to have a branch of the Trent Valley canal built down the St. John river?

St. Andrews wharf, $18,000.

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

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $18,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Was any work done last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the contract is just being let.

St. John harbour—improvements, repairs, renewals, $25,000.

Mr. DANIEL. What does the minister expect to do with that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The ordinary work that goes on, of repairing a breakwater and other work which might not be considered as a part of the national work. There is work at the Partridge Island pier.

Mr. DANIEL. Has this anything to do with the work of the dredge 'Fielding?'

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Seal Cove, Grand Manan island—breakwater pier, $32,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Is that a new work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Partly. It is to extend the breakwater, part of which was swept away in the great storm.

Shippegan harbour—improvements in Shippegan gully, $3,500.

Mr. CROCKET. There was an expenditure of $5,691 on this account last year. Among the items I see Loggie, W. S., rope, $21.89; spruce, $17; shingles, $13.75; hardware, $75.04, a total of $127.43. Is that the hon. member for Cumberland?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would suppose that must be some mistake because W. S. Loggie is not carrying on business. There is the W. S. Loggie Co.'y, Limited.

Mr. DANIEL. Is Mr. Loggie a part of it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the company was incorporated twenty years ago.

Whitehead, Grand Manan wharf, $5,400.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that will complete it.

Mr. CROCKET. Is there a contract or is it day's work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A contract, $4,851.

Welchpool (Campobello island) wharf, $24,000.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. This is another item that looks large to us in British Columbia who get appropriations in such small chunks.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend speaks of small chunks. Look at the improvements on the Fraser river. The hon gentleman forgets all these. The total probable cost of the wharf is $24,000. This is a very important wharf, as a large business is done at Campobello. The wharf will have a length of 314 feet, measured on the centre line, with a stone approach. It will be built of ordinary cribwork. We called for the tenders and the lowest tender has been accepted. I am satisfied, from the report of the engineer, that the price is fair and reasonable.

Mr. DANIEL. Is this work being built of creosoted timber?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. DANIEL. Why not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Because the teredo worm is not so harmful along the Bay of Fundy coast as in some other places.

Mr. DANIEL. I am confident that the minister is mistaken about that. In Eastport, Maine, the wharfs are very seriously injured by the teredo.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think that such is the case along the Charlotte coast. The hon. gentleman knows that the teredo is not injurious in the St. John harbour.

Mr. DANIEL. The fresh water running into St. John harbour makes it impossible for the teredo worm to live there, as it lives only in salt water. But in the Bay of Fundy, and around Grand Manan, I am confident the teredo is injurious. The minister seemed to think he had made such an improvement over the former government's policy by using creosoted timber, that I thought he would not use anything else in this case.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are not building with creosoted timber around the Bay of Fundy.

I think my hon. friend is mistaken as to the destructiveness of the teredo worm there.

Mr. DANIEL. The teredo is at Eastport. and if it is there it is in the harbours of Grand Manan.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. The minister overlooked my question. I congratulate the people of Welch Cove on this wharf. But I would like to know, for purposes of comparison, how big a place it is.

Mr. EMMERSON. The absurdity of that question would be apparent even to my hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Taylor) if he knew where Welch Cove was. This harbour is on an island in the Bay of Fundy, whose only means of communication with the mainland is by vessel. The wharf will be used by many more than merely those at the place where the wharf is built. The wharf is very necessary in the public interest.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I have to thank the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) for the courtesy he has shown in addressing this lecture to me, and for the language with which he opened his polite address. But, while I appreciate his kindness, I would like to renew my question to the minister who has charge of this appropriation. I ask the question because I desire information. I could lecture the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) to more effect, perhaps than he can lecture me. But that is not the purpose of this committee. I am addressing what I believe to be a proper question to the Minister of Public Works, and I think I am entitled to the information, for purposes, as I have said, of comparison.

Mr. PUGSLEY. At Welch Pool Cove, where the wharf is built, there is a population of about 600. Campobello is a very rich island, and one to which many people resort in the summer. There are two large summer hotels. The town has a number of stores, a lobster cannery employing 25 hands, and a boneless herring cannery employing 50 hands. Besides the summer hotels, there are many summer cottages. mainly occupied by people from the cities of the United States. Five steamers call there and a number of sailing vessels make Campobello their headquarters.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. We will resume in supply, the Postmaster General presenting his estimates. If these be finished the Minister of Public Works will resume.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.45 a.m.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, February 26, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 79) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. W. McIntyre.

Bill (No. 80) respecting the Kootenay and Arrowhead Railway Company. — Mr. Geo. Taylor.

Bill (No. 81) respecting the Manitoba and North Western Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Cash.

Bill (No. 82) respecting the Monarch Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Beattie.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

MUNICIPAL RIGHTS OF MONTREAL AND 'LA PRESSE.'

Mr. L. A. A. RIVET (Hochelaga). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I wish to call the attention of the House, and at the same time enter my protest against an editorial published in 'La Presse,' yesterday, February 25, entitled, 'Les Surprises d'un projet de loi,' which states. partly at least, as follows:

The hon. member for St. James, Mtre Honoré Gervais, has rendered a signal service to the city, in drawing the municipal authorities' attention, before it was too late, on the Bill of the 'Canadian, Liverpool and Western Railway Company' now before parliament for sanction.

And further:

'La Presse' has more than once contended that the parliament at Ottawa had no control whatever over the streets of a city, a matter which is altogether under provincial jurisdiction. Montreal has every interest to watch the Bills which are presented either before the provincial legislature, or the federal parliament. Is that done to-day with sufficient diligency?

The city of Montreal could organize, easily and with profit, a vigilance service which is needed to-day. Special agents—most probably these would be lawyers—should reside permanently during sessions either at Ottawa or at Quebec, so that the city could be notified of any measure being presented in which she would have interests of some sort.

But this service should be conducted with the utmost regularity, as a detective agency. We submit the idea to the wisdom of our aldermen; it rests to them now to perfect it and put in operation.

As I have said in the beginning, I think it my duty to protest in my own name and in behalf of my colleagues of the metropolis, who are particularly aimed at in that

editorial, against the false and unjust assertions against the hon. members of this House and of the Railway Committee.

In justice to the promoters of the proposed bill, to the members of the Railway Committee, and particularly to those who in that committee are more directly charged which the interests of the city of Montreal, I must protest against the double injustice of this article.

It is not true, as it is asserted, that the interests of Montreal have been at a particular moment in a serious and imminent danger, that if it had not been for the intervention of the hon. member for St. James, these rights and privileges would have been sacrificed. Every member of the Railway Committee knows what are his rights and duties, and I must immediately state that on the very first time that this bill came before the committee, Tuesday last, the promoters were disposed, in compliance with the request of several members, to add to their bill a clause having for object to safeguard the autonomy, not only of the city of Montreal, but of every municipality through which the company intended to construct its lines and distribute electrical energy.

It was thus entirely unnecessary and supremely unjust to say, as some Montreal papers, and especially 'La Presse,' did say, that the rights of the city of Montreal were in danger.

I protest once more in the name of the members of the committee against the false assertions of 'La Presse' and other papers in which appeared sensational articles upon this question. I will add only one word as to that part of the editorial of 'La Presse' where the creation of a vigilance service is suggested. For my part I state here that I am opposed to it. As a representative of the city of Monteral I know well enough my duties and the interests of the city of Montreal to dispense with this sort of guardianship to watch over me.

I believe that the interests of Montreal will be well guarded by the hon. members from that city whenever it will be necessary.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Post Office—Outside service—Salaries and allowance, $2,737,856.25.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). There is an increase in this item of $375.47. I shall be ready to give any details that the committee may desire, but I may explain the increase generally. In the post office inspector's division, there is an increase of $10,342.60, made up of the following:—38 increases of $50 each, $1,900; two increases of $78.25 each, $156.50· one increase of $46; one increase of $40; 11 additional clerkships. These increases are statutory increases.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister please state who the new appointees were with their offices and salaries?

Mr. LEMIEUX. In the post office inspectors' offices, we have appointed eleven additional clerks. In the Nova Scotia division, Mr. J. H. Kennedy, junior second-class clerk was transferred from the Auditor General's office to the Halifax post office at a salary of $1,000. In the Ottawa division, Mr. L. E. Johnston, appointed fourth-class clerk at $400, transferred to the London, Ontario, division. E. Stevenson and L. Hamilton Strong, appointed fourth-class clerks at $400 a year each. In the Manitoba division. D. I. Bailey appointed fourth-class at $400. In the Calgary division. T. Humphries was transferred from the post office in Toronto at $1,000, and C. E. Duncan was transferred at $700.

Mr. FOSTER. That is, at the same salary as before?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, except that, in the west, we make a special allowance of 15 per cent. We sometimes transfer clerks from the inspectors' offices in the older provinces. because experienced officers are needed for new districts in the west. At present in the west, they have very good staffs. Sometimes, a clerk desires to be transferred from the west to an eastern office, or vice versa. This accounts for these transfers. In the Edmonton division, R. C. Ferguson, senior second-class clerk, transferred from the inside service at $1,100. C. Watson, junior second-class clerk, transferred from Toronto post office at $950. That makes $2,050 for the Edmonton division. In the Vancouver division W. F. Tracey, senior third-class clerk, transferred from junior third-class clerk at $800. A. L. Reid, senior third-class clerk transferred from the railway at $860. a total of $8,010. These represent the salaries of the 11 additional clerks in the inspectors' branches.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the total amount of the salary increases? The minister explained the statutory increases and that is all he has explained so far.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have given the figures for the inspector's office, $10.342. In the railway mail service the figure is $117,553. In the post offices the increase is $247,581.25.

The second part of my hon. friend's question is what proportion of this increase is made applicable to the statutory increases. in the railway mail service the increase of $117,553 is made up as follows:

No. of Increases.	Amount.	Total.
3	$100 00	$ 300 00
23	78 25	1,799 75
1	30 00	30 00
327	50 00	16,350 00
86 additional	.....	43,970 00
12 mail transfer agents	.....	5,624 00
1 additional messenger	.....	469 50
Increase in mileage allowance paid to the railway companies		40,000 00
Increase in provisional allowance		10,000 00
Total increase mail railway service		$117,553 25

Mr. FOSTER. If there are any exceptions to the statutory increases the minister might let us know later.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I know of none. The amount is made up chiefly of statutory increases with the exception of the additional clerkships. I have given my hon. friend particulars of where these additional clerkships have been created. I come now to the additional clerkships. Mr. E. E. J. Evanturel was transferred from the Quebec office to the office of the superintendent of railway mail service in Quebec at $1,200. Mr. H. M. Harris was transferred from the Calgary post office to the office of the superintendent of railway mail service at Calgary at $670. There were nine new appointments at $400 and 75 new appointments at $500 Shall I give the names?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not asking for the names. How are the new appointments divided?

Mr. LEMIEUX. They are divided between Halifax, Montreal, Quebec, Ottawa and Toronto.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister might give the number in each division.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The numbers are as follows:

Railway mail service division—

	No.
Halifax	6
St. John	2
Quebec	5
Montreal	15
Ottawa	9
Toronto	8
London	2
Winnipeg	10
Moosejaw	4
Calgary	9
Vancouver	5

Mr. FOSTER. Are all these railway mail clerks?

Mr. LEMIEUX. In the railway mail service, travelling on postal cars.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the necessity for the large increase in number?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The mileage of railways has increased. The moment a railway is built, application is made in the district for the establishment of a railway mail service. We have two systems, there is a baggage car service and a postal car service. If it is a baggage car, we pay the railway company 4 cents a mile; if it is a postal car, we give the company 8 cents a mile.

Mr. FOSTER. What facilities do you get on the baggage car?

Mr. LEMIEUX. A postal car is a post office on wheels, and clerks are stationed in that car to sort and distribute letters, and deliver them at the several stations where the train stops.

Mr. FOSTER. I asked what were the accommodations given you on a baggage car for which you pay 4 cents a mile?

Mr. LEMIEUX. We are supposed to get from the railway companies sufficient accommodation in a special baggage car for our mails, and they are delivered in bags at the stations.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any sorting in the baggage car?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, only accommodation for bags. Sometimes the company does the work itself, and has a side service from the station to the nearest post office where the mails are distributed.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister tell us how many post office inspectors there are in the Dominion?

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is one at Halifax, St. John, Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto, London, Winnipeg, North Bay (to be established shortly), Vancouver, Calgary, Moosejaw, Kingston, Saskatoon, Edmonton and Victoria.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister explain what is meant by the inspectors' offices, on page S—2 of the Auditor General's Report, where $119,000 has been expended?

Mr. LEMIEUX. That includes the salaries paid in that branch throughout the country, and the sixteen inspectors cover the whole district. Let not any hon. gentleman be surprised at the increase in the number of employees in that branch, because the country is expanding, and the moment a new railway is built we are bound to extend the system to that railway.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister tell us how many men are employed in looking after the rural mail delivery service, outside and inside?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No new employee has been added to the Post Office Department for that branch. We have selected Mr. Ross, of Toronto, the superintendent of post offices in the Dominion, as the chief

organizer of the rural mail system. But we keep the same organization, the same inspector in each district, who will receive petitions, and these are sent to the department at Ottawa. The petitions are sent direct from the people in the country to that inspector, and he will himself advertise, as he does at present, for the opening of new stage routes, and will establish the system himself. We do not need any new employees for the rural mail service So that it will not cost the country one cent more.

Mr. DANIEL. I would ask the Postmaster General what treatment he intends to give to the letter carriers in respect to their salaries. I presume it is the intention of the government to give them some increase, and perhaps the hon. gentleman might indicate to what extent? I know that in some places the letter carriers are very hard worked. I do not know that they get any extra pay for extra work, but I do know that for ten days during the last elections, the letter carriers in the city of St. John were kept at work until 11 and 12 o'clock at night, delivering Liberal literature, party literature. I do not know that it was very successful, because when the people were roused out of bed at that unseemly hour of the night and came downstairs to take in letters, and found only some little brochure relating to the Liberal party, they were not filled with thanksgiving towards the Liberal party. That is by the way. But I would like to hear from the minister how he proposes to deal with the letter carriers in so far as their remuneration is concerned.

Mr. LEMIEUX. As regards the extra work which may have been added to the letter carriers, either during the election or at any other time, for instance at the time of the centennial at Quebec, or during the exhibitions in Toronto or Ottawa, of course, they are paid extra. But under no circumstances should the letter carriers be employed for doing one party's work exclusively. He has to distribute the literature of both parties, my hon. friend knows.

Mr. DANIEL. I quite understand that.

Mr. BARR. I do know, from what occurred in my own riding, that my opponent had his address sent down to Ottawa and it was franked back.

Mr. LEMIEUX. By whom?

Mr. BARR. The initials J. S. F. are used for the frank. I cannot find these initials in the list but such is the case. I find that in many other ridings there are similar cases. By what authority were these addresses franked? There were 6,800 franked in the county of Dufferin.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am very glad that my hon. friend called my attention to that fact. I am not responsible for the abuse of the franking system in the House of Commons. That is permitted by law and the post offices in the parliament buildings are under control of the Speakers of both Houses. I have nothing to do with this part of the service. Last year some complaints were made as regards the service in this House. I am glad to be relieved of responsibility for that service by the Speakers of both Houses and the committee on internal economy. But, nobody has the right to so misuse his frank as to send for outside parties, literature, letters or parcels. Members, I know, as a rule, confine themselves to their own mail, but my attention has been called this year by one firm in Toronto to the fact that envelopes containing circulars were coming from the House of Commons under the franking privilege. I could not believe my eyes, but I was unable to ascertain whose initials they were. Again, I may tell hon. members who are new in this House that the franking privelige is strictly confined to the members of the House and that it is therefore personal to them only.

Mr. BARR. After ten days have elapsed members of the house have no authority to frank.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. BARR. Surely the Postmaster General does not pretend to divest himself of responsibility and to throw the whole blame on the Speakers of the two Houses? It is a notorious fact that what I have described occurred. In my own riding 6,800 of these addresses were received by the electors. I received one myself. Therefore, I think that the hon. gentleman must hold himself responsible for that state of affairs. This is only one of the many other cases. Yet, no Conservative could avail himself of that privilege. Not only was ordinary literature transmitted, but here was the address of my opponent sent from this House and franked with the initials J. F. S. This is a palpable abuse. It occurred some ten days before the election and three days before the nomination. These addresses were sent around broadcast and not only that but the electors got tons and tons of literature. That is not British fair play. It is the reverse, and the Postmaster General cannot throw the burden upon some one else. He is responsible for it, he is at the head of the department, and if the Speakers of the House have allowed that to take place, I think there should be an investigation. I do not think it is quite fair that literature should be sent in that way from this House when the Conservative candidates had not the same privilege. Here is a concrete case

that should receive the attention of the minister.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It might happen that as last session was well known to be the last session of the parliament a good deal of mail matter might have accumulated.

Mr. J. D. REID. No one knew that but the hon. minister.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not know; it may not be true.

Mr. J. D. REID. No, but the minister knew that it was the last session.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The post office in the House of Commons is not under my control. It is under the control of the Speaker. I do not appoint a man in the post office. I have no authority over the officials in the House of Commons post office, but I was assuming that if literature was sent to my hon. friend's riding after the session was over it might have accumulated here with other literature. At all events I do not wish to condone the action of the owner of the cabalistic letters J. S. F. The initials 'J.F.S.,' had no success in Dufferin. My hon. friend has been returned and we are all pleased to see him here.

Mr. BARR. If the literature had borne fruit as they expected it would there might have been a different result. But my hon. friend says it might have accumulate. No, the time has passed for that; my opponent was not in the field, he had not issued his address and therefore it would have been utterly impossible for him to have sent it down here in time to have it franked during the session and sent back. I care not who is responsible, whether it is the Speaker or not; he ought to be brought before the bar of this House and we should know whether that state of affairs is going to continue.

Mr. HENDERSON. My experience in the late election was somewhat like that of my hon. friend from Dufferin (Mr. Barr). My opponent used the mails very freely and used the frank of some person whose frank is recognized in the House of Commons post office. The county of Halton was flooded with campaign literature having stamped upon it the 'Compliments of Dr. W. S. Harrison.'

Mr. LEMIEUX. That was your opponent?

Mr. HENDERSON. That was my opponent. These envelopes, as the minister will observe from one I have caused to be laid on his desk, were passed through the House of Commons post office and franked by some one whose initials look like B. F. C. Who is B. F. C.?

Mr. J. D. REID. The Minister of Customs.

Mr. HENDERSON. No, I think it is not the Minister of Customs nor yet is it the Postmaster General, but I believe there is no doubt that it is some one in the service of the government. We know that between sessions no member of parliament has the right to frank literature. The moment the gun fires, or, at any rate within a few days afterwards, the right of every member of the House to use the frank ceases and he is unable again to use his frank until he has been returned and within ten days again of the opening of the next session. I think it very peculiar that a gentleman who had never been in the House of Commons, who had never represented the county, should have a privilege from the government that was denied me. I did not have the privilege of franking letters at that time because this all took place between two sessions of parliament. These envelopes reached my county about ten days before the election and were circulated in very large numbers. The postage would be six cents each on these letters, or $60 a thousand, and there being 5,000 electors in my county the post office revenue has been robbed of at least $300 in that one county. I do not accuse the Postmaster General of having any guilty knowledge of this, nor do I accuse any officer in his department, for I think they are too careful of their duties to do such a thing. But no doubt there is some person in the employ of the government whose frank is recognized by the postmaster in the House of Commons and who either used this frank or permitted it to be used for the benefit of Dr. W. S. Harrison, my opponent. I am not complaining about the character of the literature sent out; it was very tame; it did not amount to much. One portion of it was intended as a tirade of abuse upon the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), but that hon. gentleman is held in so high esteem in Halton that it had no injurious effect on him and it certainly did not hurt me. Some more of that literature had reference to the prosperity of Canada under Liberal rule.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, the people of Halton had been reading the newspapers and they understood more about the prosperity of Canada than they could learn from this literature which was sent out in a fraudulent way a week before the election. Dr. Harrison had a perfect right to circulate campaign literature in the county of Halton, but he had no right to circulate it at the expense of the country, because it was fraudulent, it was robbing the revenue of the country, it was pure graft. As I told the people in Halton, the very fact that a man seeking their support should come before them in such a manner, grafting and dredging the treasury, to endeavour to secure his election; well, is it any won-

der that the people would not give their confidence to a man who would be party to such a thing. I most strenuously complain that any officer of the government should be permitted to do such an act. I do not ask that that official be dismissed, for that might be too harsh treatment and perhaps he did it in his zeal for the cause in which he felt a warm interest, but he certainly ought to receive such a strong rebuke as would deter him and others from doing that kind of thing in future. The Postmaster General, if he takes the Civil Service list, will be able to trace out who the guilty party is, and I think it is his duty to do so. I am quite sure there was no authority in law for this.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am glad the minister assents to that.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON. I produced these envelopes in the county to show how my opponent was dredging the treasury, and I stated that I would draw the attention of the Postmaster General to it in the House of Commons, so that he might take steps to protect the revenue of the country. In every shop, in every village throughout the country there were a number of these envelopes to be found in the waste paper baskets, showing that the people paid very little attention to the literature. But the point I make is that the revenue was robbed and that some measures ought to be taken to prevent its recurrence in the future.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. I don't want the hon. member for Halton to attribute any blame to the postmaster of the House of Commons.

Mr. HENDERSON. I did not do so.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. If the hon gentleman looks at the envelopes he will find they were mailed at the city post office and not in the House of Commons post office.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there a frank on it?

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. There is a frank on it and the Postmaster General knows who it is. Now, this being mailed from the city post office who else than the minister has the right to frank a letter from that post office? As I understand it, it is only the minister and his secretary who can frank at that post office, and it is the duty of the Postmaster General to go to the city post office and ask why the official there allowed this mail matter to go out without this frank.

Mr. PERLEY. I corroborate what has been said by my hon. friends. The Liberal literature circulated throughout my county was mailed at the city post office and the initials used for the frank were very difficult to decipher. I took one of these envelopes to the city post office and the official there told me he knew the frank and that it was perfectly good, but he did not tell me the name. These envelopes containing Liberal campaign literature were circulated all over my county, and inside was a typewritten slip bearing the legend: 'with the compliments of P. R. McGibbon.' This gentleman never was a member of the House of Commons, but nevertheless he was able to use this frank to send out his literature to appeal to the electors to vote against me.

Mr. BARR. If the Postmaster General will look at the envelope he will find that it was franked with the initials only, and not the full name of the person who franked through the mails. Liberal campaign literature was similarly circulated throughout my county and my opponent, who was a very decent fellow, admitted at the nomination that he was asked from Ottawa to send down anything he wished to have franked through the mails and he regretted very much that he had done so. He said he did not understand the state of affairs or he would not have allowed this mail matter to go through the post office in a surreptitious way. The fact is now clear that these envelopes were not sent through the city post office, and so the Postmaster General himself must assume the responsibility. I do not blame the Postmaster General. I know that he is a man far above doing such a thing, knowing that it is contrary to the law. But it is up to him to investigate this matter and to let us know who is the culprit, and then punish him for what he has done.

Mr. HENDERSON. My attention has been drawn to the fact that I made a mistake in reading the name of the post office on these envelopes. In examining the envelope more closely, I find that the stamp is the Ottawa post office instead of the House of Commons post office; so that the matter would come within the duties of the Postmaster General. I make this correction, because I do not wish to impute anything improper to the postmaster of the House of Commons.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am informed by the deputy that this was sent through the Ottawa post office, and not through the House of Commons post office, and therefore I must say that it was wrong.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. What are the initials?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The initials are not very plain.

Mr. FOSTER. Here is one on which the initials are very plain—"R. F. C."

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am informed by the deputy that when there is an accumulation of mail matter at the House of Commons, it is usual, in order to expedite its transmission, to send it direct in bags to the Ottawa post, where it is stamped. My hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Geo. Taylor) will remember that during the session of 1904 the corridors of the House were simply jammed with literature which was being sent out by both sides of the House, as we all expected the elections, and it took several weeks after the session to get that literature sent. We had to provide special cars for it, and it is only just to my predecessor, Sir Wm. Mulock, to say that he offered every facility to my hon. friend from Leeds to expedite the sending out of that mail matter.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Tons of it were never delivered.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not think that is the testimony of the hon. member for Leeds. At all events, let me state my own case, and the House can judge from it. Of course, the frank of the Postmaster General is accepted at any post office, wherever he may be. However, during the last campaign I was not in Ottawa, but in Quebec, and I paid the postage at the Quebec post office on each letter and each circular I sent out, and gave instructions to my secretary to see that that was done. Of course, the ministers enjoy the privilege, while in office, of franking their own mail matter.

Mr. BARR. Can they extend the privilege to others?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I must say that they must not, and, speaking for myself, I would not. The franking privilege of members of the House of Commons is in the same position. Members of the House of Commons must not abuse that privilege.

Mr. BARR. I think we ought to have a promise from the minister before we pass this item that he will investigate this matter.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly. Notwithstanding what the hon. member from Leeds has stated, I certainly could not say what are the initials on this envelope. At all events, these initials at that date, and the stamp of the Ottawa post office on the envelope make the matter look rather suspicious, and I will have it investigated. Certainly, subject to the explanation I have just given I would not approve of it.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. What are the initials of the deputy Postmaster General?

Mr. LEMIEUX. "R. M. C."—Robert Miller Coulter. These are not his initials.

Mr. PERLEY. Will the Hon. Postmaster General read the law on the subject?

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Sections 75 and 76 of the Post Office Act are as follows:

75. All letters and other mailable matter addressed to or sent by the Governor General, or sent to or by any department of the government, at the seat of government, shall be free of Canadian postage under such regulations as are, from time to time, made in that respect by the Governor in Council.

76. Letters and other mailable matter addressed to or sent by the Speaker or Clerk of the Senate or of the House of Commons at the seat of government shall be free of Canadian postage, and letters and other mailable matter addressed to or by any member of either House at the seat of government, during any session of parliament, or to any of the members at the seat of government as aforesaid, during the ten days next before the meeting of parliament, shall be free of Canadian postage.

Mr. PERLEY. According to that, the minister would have no right to frank anything except matter on the business of the department?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, the official business of the minister.

Mr. PERLEY. Then, I would ask the minister what he would say if a minister of the Crown franked out during election time matter for other people?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would not do it myself.

Mr. PERLEY. What would the minister say and do under these conditions? Because I think I have in my office an envelope that was franked and used for this purpose.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In such a case, I would severely reprimand the minister.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) referred to the fact that in the session of 1904, preceding the election, the whip of the Conservative party franked out a large amount of literature——

Mr. LEMIEUX. If my hon. friend (Mr. Geo. Taylor) will allow me. I did not wish to find fault with that; he was acting within his right in franking that literature out during session. But I said that the whips of both parties had franked a great deal of literature, and there was a large accumulation of it, as the hon. gentleman remembers, in the corridors of this House. That literature was sent out long after the session was over. What I said was in explanation of this case.

Mr. PERLEY. The minister does not mean to suggest that these envelopes of which we have spoken were franked and mailed in this House during last session?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I did not say that.

Mr. PERLEY. But that is the suggestion. The hon. gentleman referred to four years ago This case has nothing to do with four

years ago, because these envelopes had in them typewritten slips which were marked as coming with the compliments of candidates of the Liberal party who were not nominated until weeks after the session was over. Why should the Postmaster General refer to the case of four years ago, and try to make the suggestion that possibly these envelopes were posted in this House last session, when he knows that that could not have been the case?

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I am glad the Postmaster General has referred to this case of four years ago, and has quoted the law, and stated that I was within my rights in franking out literature during the session. But he will remember the discussion that took place in the press, and he will remember that every Grit paper in the country hounded me as a violator of the Independence of Parliament Act for having franked out this literature.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It did not hurt my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor). He is still here, and as young as ever.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The Postmaster General of that day, knowing that we were sending out literature, refused to have it sent down to the post office. That is why it remained here to block the corridor—it was simply to deprive us of the opportunity to get our literature out. The hon. gentleman said that I remained here after the session until it was gone. Nothing of the kind; I went home as soon as the session was over. The literature was sent down to the post office and was ultimately sent out, but even then, in many of the post offices throughout the country it was not delivered. But the case we are now discussing is a different case entirely. This matter was not mailed during the session under the frank of a member of parliament. As has been pointed out, it was sent out with the compliments of men who were not nominated until long after the House was prorogued, and it was mailed at the city post office and not at this House of Commons. I have no doubt that the work of addressing this literature was done by civil servants and paid out of the public money. The Postmaster General should ascertain who franked this matter and should make them restore to the treasury the money thus unjustly taken. Unless the Postmaster General does this, he will not be discharging his duty faithfully. I am sure he knows whose frank is admitted to the post office.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Will the hon. gentleman say what initials were used ?

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The Postmaster General must know whose frank it is. If not, then the postmaster at the city post office will know. The postmaster here can inform the Postmaster General why he accepted that stuff, and sent it out at the country's expense. He certainly would not do that except on an order approved by the Postmaster General or his deputy.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I assure my hon. friend (Mr. Geo. Taylor) that, since I have been Postmaster General, no officer of the department has been authorized to take upon himself to let any political mail matter pass free through the Ottawa post office to please the party. I would not do it myself, and I would not allow my subordinates to do it. I challenge my hon. friend to name one single instance where this has been done by the post office authorities.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Hon. members here to-day have stated that this material has gone through.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I cannot distinguish the initials of the frank, nor can my hon. friend. I have stated that I will investigate this case. But I cannot make out the initials.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Then, better let the item stand until the minister makes the investigation and is ready to report to the committee.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will investigate.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I say that this is the most outrageous case that ever took place in this House since I became a member of it. And yet I have had to take abuse for doing that which the Postmaster General himself admits was within my rights. But I do not mind, for the more abuse I get, the more my majority increases. I think it is the duty of the Postmaster General, in the interests of the country, to ascertain who is at fault in this matter.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will.

Mr. BRADBURY. As our Ontario friends have called attention to this matter, I would like to have the Postmaster General understand that Ontario is no exception. The province from which I come was flooded with this stuff. In my own county, three days before the election, this stuff was delivered in thousands of copies through the post offices. I attribute my success in the county largely to this literature, therefore, I am not going to protest against it. But it is an outrage that a private individual, one not a member of this House, should be allowed to frank material through the mail out of session and within a few days of election. I hope there will be an investigation, and, if it is proven that this was done without authority, that the parties responsible will be punished. I may say that the Conservative organizer in Winnipeg had dozens of these envelopes brought to him.

Mr. FOSTER. Without postage ?

Mr. BRADBURY. Yes, and the initials on the envelopes I make out to be 'B F C.'

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Is the franking of unofficial matter an offence punishable under the Act ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. We have never made it a penalty. We have always thought that those enjoying the privilege would remain strictly within the privilege. But I am afraid we shall have to take severe measures if these are not forged names. Of course, a forgery comes under the criminal law.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I can tell the minister of a case in which there is no difficulty in recognizing the name used. I have seen literature circulated in my riding, in session and out of session during the past two years, campaign literature of the Liberal party, and bearing the frank just as distinct as the address upon the letter, 'J. B., Sol. Gen.' I am sorry the Solicitor General (Mr. Bureau) has just left the Chamber. I wished to speak about this matter when he was present. After the session the frank is changed, so that it is evidently not a mere oversight, and the person sending it recognizes that the sessional frank does not carry in the recess. All through the recess the weekly circular letter of the Liberal party goes out in printed envelopes addressed to the Liberal press of this country and bearing the frank 'J. B., Solicitor General.' There is a clearly defined case on which the Postmaster General may work.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would not condone any abuse of the franking privilege by even the Solicitor General, but I may frankly say that it happens sometimes that I send to some of my friends speeches delivered by the Minister of Finance or by the Minister of Customs. The Finance Minister may deliver a speech on the financial condition of the country which I judge should be read by some of my electors. and I would not consider it an abuse of privilege to send such a speech under my frank It is my official correspondence with the people in my county.

Mr. FOSTER. We are not discussing that.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If the Solicitor General sends clippings to twenty-five or thirty papers in British Columbia each week, I would not consider that as an abuse. I do not know if the statement is true, although I do not challenge my hon. friend's assertion. The Solicitor General has entered the Chamber and is now in his seat and he will explain himself. I was Solicitor General myself and inquired if I was on the same footing as the ministers. I do not consider that an abuse. To send out tons of literature might be an abuse but to distribute twenty or sixty circulars to newspapers explaining the policy of the Liberal party does not appear to me an abuse.

Mr. BRADBURY.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. It may be because I am only a tyro in parliamentary affairs but I cannot subscribe to the doctrine of the Postmaster General. When this matter came to my attention I regarded it as an aggravated instance of petty graft, about as bad as any graft I had observed. As the Solicitor General is now in his seat, I shall repeat what I said, that during the past two years, in session and out of session, the weekly circular letter of the Liberal party, a letter devoted to the most scurrilous abuse of the Conservative party and its leaders.

Mr. BUREAU. That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. That is a matter of opinion, as the hon. gentleman says, and it is my opinion, and I have a right to state my opinion. This letter, devoted to scurrilous abuse of this side, goes out during session and during recess, bearing the frank of 'J. B., Solicitor General.' The letter is in print. It is not got up by the Solicitor General himself, or representing the product of his literary talents, but is a circular prepared outside, and printed outside as far as we can see and must be carried into the department. Every week 200 or 300 of them are sent out, all with that frank, and to my mind, 200 or 300 offences are thus committed each week against the postal laws to save the paltry sum of $3, which would carry these circulars through the mail. The reason this seems an aggravated and a contemptible piece of graft, is that if the post office officials catch a private citizen in the unintentional act of putting a small piece of paper in a newspaper, they hale him before a magistrate and mulct him. Who would direct this prosecution ? Yet we find the Solicitor General, who would prosecute a private citizen, committing 300 offences every week and the Postmaster General saying that because this is party warfare, he sees no offence in it. I do not subscribe to that doctrine and feel that the House will not subscribe to any doctrine so monstrous as that.

Mr. BUREAU. I have no apology to make. I am not surprised at the harangue of my over scrupulous friend from New Westminster. I heard him insinuate the other night that I was in collusion in letting out Bill Miner. I claim that in franking this literature there was no crime and no offence.

Mr. HUGHES. Was it no crime to let out Bill Miner?

Mr. BUREAU. I do not know but my friend had something to do with Bill Miner.

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That expression would not be in order.

Mr. BUREAU. I take it back, I do not want to connect my friend with Bill Miner; I will let him connect others. I did not misuse the post office for any purpose. That literature notwithstanding the judgment of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. J. D. Taylor) is sound literature. I have read some of it, and I think it contains sound principles, and if the people of British Columbia had followed it more closely they would be better off to-day than they are.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. I would like to inform the Postmaster General of what took place in the district of Nipissing. Tons of this stuff were sent out franked in that way. The distribution was so general that even the Conservative candidate got a copy.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What frank was it?

Mr. GEO. GORDON. I have not got any with me now, but I can get some. Tons of that stuff was sent there franked, and went through the mails. Now the hon. gentleman from Halton (Mr. Henderson) figured out a little while ago that the loss to the Post Office Department was something over $300 in his constituency alone. Taking the 221 constituencies in the Dominion of Canada, you have a loss of $66,000 in the revenue of the Post Office Department. Now, if a man wipes the mark off a postage stamp and the country only loses 2 cents by it, he very soon finds himself before a police magistrate and receives severe sentence. I think the Postmaster General will not be doing his duty if he does not institute at once a thorough investigation into this whole matter, and see that the law is carried out according to what he read a little while ago. I think this is one of the most scandalous and disgraceful acts that could be perpetrated upon any people; and if he will investigate this outrage he will not only please the people of Canada, but please the majority of the members on his own side.

Mr. TURRIFF. So far as my constituency is concerned, I did not see one piece of literature franked by any Liberal during the whole campaign, or any kind of franked literature. The hon. gentleman says there was a loss of $66,000 throughout the whole Dominion by this means. Well, if you have a loss of $66,000 through the use of franked literature, and still have a surplus of $1,500,000 or $2,000,000 to what an extent must the Conservatives have used the franking privilege in their time when they had a deficit every year of half a million dollars?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I hope the minister will not only investigate this subject himself, but that the Public Accounts Committee will bring before it some of these men and make a thorough investigation. The western part of the province of Ontario was flooded with this literature, practically every riding. I was in a great number of ridings myself, and everywhere I found the ridings flooded with this literature, franked from Ottawa, tons of it. Listening to the statement of the minister with regard to the position that the Post Office Department in the House of Commons was in shortly after the close of the session, I could not help thinking that at least some person in his department was well aware that this literature was being sent out after the 16th of September, because I have a piece of literature in my hand, explaining the wonderful boon of the rural free mail delivery which the minister promised to the people of Canada. This was sent into my riding.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Sent from the Post Office Department? Is it a general pamphlet?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes, a general pamphlet under the same stamp as mentioned by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain).

Mr. LEMIEUX. Does the hon. gentleman mean that it was sent from the Post Office Department at Ottawa?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I cannot help thinking that some one in the Post Office Department had something to do with placing in the literature 'Free rural mail delivery of Canada.' giving the explanation of it that the minister did in that wonderful speech of his at Niagara. This may not be an occasion to pursue the matter further, but I sincerely hope that I shall be given an opportunity to explain what I think the position of the minister was in regard to the stand he took on that occasion.

Mr. MADDIN. I have here a postal card which was mailed to the leader of the opposition at Halifax, delivered there through the mails, and I would like to submit it to the Postmaster General. It bears no frank at all, but it bears the Halifax-Campbellton stamp. I gather from that that the postal card was mailed on the train, and that the postal mail clerk was in collusion with the party whose ends were to be served. You will notice that it depicts the right hon. the leader of the government endeavouring to pull the hind leg off a horse, and on the front of it, in red type, it asks the people to support Mr. Reid and the greater Campbellton. This is not a more flagrant boast of a right to hold in contempt the legislation with regard to the Post Office Department than that offered by the Solicitor General. If the Postmaster General properly read the law a few moments ago, sections 75 and 76 of the Post Office Act, then I submit that the Solicitor General was guilty of a breach of that Act. If, in making his admission before this House he had exhibited any extenuating circumstances, or had shown that he repented or was sorry for what he had done, we could have some consideration for him; but he could not in a more flagrant way have exhibited his utter indifference and disregard

of one of the most important laws on our statute-books.

Mr. BUREAU. Prosecute him for a breach of the laws.

Mr. MADDIN. I think it is the duty of the Postmaster General to see that all the laws regulating his department are lived up to, especially by officers of the Crown. While on this subject I would draw the attention to the Postmaster General to what occurred on declaration day following the election in the county of Gloucester. A newspaper clipping from the Moncton 'Daily Times,' containing a letter dated the 13th of November, has been placed in my hands by a reliable authority, and I will read an extract from it for the benefit of the Postmaster General:

Election day may be past, but not so far past but what all can recollect it quite clearly and as declaration day came a week after we are able to recall that event clearly also.

One thing which aids us in recalling the latter occasion and which has caused considerable discussion among our townspeople since was the illumination of the public building on Monday evening the 2nd inst.

This building contains the post office and customs office, and on the evening above mentioned every window in these two departments and also in the janitor's apartment was illuminated with lighted candles placed therein.

This piece of work, the like of which probably did not occur in any other public building from Sydney to Vancouver——

Mr. LEMIEUX. Would the hon. gentleman pardon me for interrupting him? I do not wish to unload my sins on any other man's shoulders, but I wish to remind my hon. friend that post offices and customs houses, all public buildings, are under the charge of the Public Works Department and not under mine. Every public building is under the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. MADDIN. Then I will not read any further from the letter. The Minister of Public Works may take cognizance of it. I will bring this aspect of the matter up at some other time because I have no desire to embarrass the Postmaster General with matters that do not come within his jurisdiction. But, I would like to emphasize the fact that the reading of the Post Office Act a few minutes ago by the Postmaster General is enough, on the voluntary admission of the Solicitor General, to show that he has violated that Act.

Mr. BUREAU. I want the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maddin) to correct that statement. I never admitted that I violated the Act; I said that I had not violated the Act. I do not want it to go upon 'Hansard' that I admitted that I had violated the Act.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. A declaration by an hon. member as to what he said must be accepted.

Mr. MADDIN.

Mr. MADDIN. I have no desire to misquote the hon. gentleman. I will put it this way.

Mr. BUREAU. I want the hon. gentleman to take that back.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maddin) is stating it within order. I presume that is his intention.

Mr. MADDIN. Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is my intention. I submit that on the admission of facts voluntarily made by the Solicitor General he has been guilty of an infringement of this Act, and that it is the duty of the Postmaster General to institute a prosecution against him.

Mr. BUREAU. I never made that statement. I say I am not guilty of an infringement or of a violation of the Act, that I kept within the Act.

Mr. MADDIN. I said that upon your admission of the facts—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not understand the hon. member for South Cape Breton to be charging that the Solicitor General admitted a breach of the Act. I understand him to be stating that the facts that the Solicitor General mentioned consitute a breach of the Act in his opinion.

Mr. MADDIN. Exactly. That is all I do say and that is all I wish to convey. I submit that upon his admission of facts here this afternoon it becomes the duty of the Postmaster General, who is the special guardian of this piece of legislation, to see that it is lived up to.

Mr. LEMIEUX. As regards that post card, it might happen that when post cards and ordinary envelopes are stamped some may escape the attention of the postmaster. During elections especially, or at any time, when there is a large mailing process going on it may happen that the stamp is forgotten upon one envelope. In the large offices in Halifax, Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto and Winnipeg, there are machines run by electricity for stamping envelopes and the absence of stamps sometimes escapes the attention of the stamper. In this case I have no hesitation in saying that if the postal card was knowingly mailed without a stamp, not only the sender but the stamper who passed it was guilty of an offence. I do not wish to justify the action of any guilty party but it quite often happens in ordinary business that a man may fail to detect the absence of a stamp on a letter or card. The very fact of sending an unstamped card to the leader of the opposition on a political question shows, it seems to me, that the sender could not have been acting in bad faith, and that it was a mistake. I would not defend a guilty act.

Mr. PERLEY. I am very glad to hear the Postmaster General say that he does not think that a minister of the Crown has a right to frank out, during recess, election literature for the benefit of candidates who are put forward by the Liberal party. I have obtained the envelope that I referred to. It is addressed to Mr. Murdoch McRae, Harrington East, Que. It contains a speech delivered by Mr. E. M. Macdonald, M. P., Pictou, N. S., and inside there is a typewritten slip with the 'compliments of P. R. McGibbon.' It was mailed at the city post office on the 30th September and marked 'free.' I took it to the city post office and asked about the frank which seems to be in blue pencil, and they told me that it was 'S.A.F., M. A.' I am glad to see that the Minister of Agriculture is here, and I believe that it must be his frank. I would like, under these circumstances, to ask the Postmaster General to reprimand the Minister of Agriculture right here now, while we are all present.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the Minister of Agriculture be good enough to say whether it is his frank or not.

Mr. FISHER. I cannot say whether it is, but it is quite possible.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I can only add the evidence afforded by what has taken place in my riding to what has already been said by many hon. members on this side of the House. I do not at all object to a member using his franking privilege himself and perhaps overstepping the mark a little, but I certainly object to any person using the frank which is the special privilege of members of this House and of Cabinet Ministers. I think we have proof that somebody has been using a frank which he has no right to. We must not forget that we on this side of the House represent more than forty-five per cent of the electors of Canada, and I say it is not right for the government, or any one on behalf of the government, to use the special machinery of the government for the purpose of distributing campaign literature to the injury of forty-five per cent of the people. We have a concrete case of somebody having made use of the stamp which is the special privilege of a member of this House, and having passed the matter through the post office. There is no doubt that tons of that literature have been passed through the post office with that frank upon it, and the postmaster should have known that it bore the frank of somebody who was not entitled to use it. I want to ask the Postmaster General what he is going to do with the person who absolutely and without authority uses that stamp for the purpose of transmitting tons of literature through the mails, as has been done during the past year? I have noticed that it is a favourite way for ministers to dispose of a question by saying, 'I will inquire into it,' and then the interest drops, but, assuming that it is proved that this gentleman has used that frank without authority, what is the Postmaster General going to do? Is he simply going to administer a severe reprimand? If that is all he is going to do anybody will be justified in using the frank. If the Post Office Act does not provide some penalty for a man who unjustly uses the franking privilege it is high time that an amendment was brought in to make it a criminal offence for any person to use the franking privilege who has no authority to do so.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I may say at once that the supposed franks which have been exhibited this afternoon reveal a state of things which I will not tolerate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have no hesitation in saying that the envelope just produced by my hon. friend (Mr. Perley) does not bear the initials of the Minister of Agriculture. I know the initials of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. PERLEY. What are they?

Mr. LEMIEUX. 'S. F.'

Mr. ARMSTRONG. He admits it is his frank.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Oh no, he does not. My hon. friend insinuated a moment ago that the initials B.F.C. were the initials of a member of the government, but that is not clear to my mind. At all events I say that this state of things cannot be tolerated because the Post Office Department must have the respect of all parties in the country, and I intend for the future to see that the spirit and the letter of the law shall be carried out.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In the past we may have been a little lax in framing regulations, trusting that those who enjoy the franking privilege would use it prudently and not indiscriminately. We will frame such regulations as in the future only purely official business bearing the frank of ministers and members of parliament will go through the mails. I may say that since the beginning of the session I have received complaints from certain firms in reference to the abuse of the franking privilege. I attribute the reason for these complaints to the fact that it was done by new members of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the Postmaster General mean to interpret the Act so as to prevent a member of parliament from franking any mailable matter unless it is of a business character?

Mr. LEMIEUX. A member of the House has a right to frank all his business letters —I mean business letters in connection with the public business of the country. But, the other day I received from a firm in Toronto an envelope bearing the frank of one of the new members of this House who sent broadcast through the country circulars inviting the public at large to subscribe to shares in a certain mine in the Gowganda district. That was clearly an abuse of the privilege. The franking privilege is given to enable a member to correspond with his constituents, and with his family, and with the public generally on public affairs, but it is not given to enable a member to send thousands and thousands of circulars inviting persons to take shares in a mine. That is an abuse of the privilege. It seems to me it it is a mere matter of common sense.

Mr. CARVELL. Now that the Postmaster General has so clearly defined his view of the law and the attitude he intends to assume in the future, it seems to me there is one very important omission, because the Postmaster General has not stated the punishment he intends to mete out to the culprit who franks these documents in this way. I would imagine from the evidence given by so many hon. gentlemen opposite that there must have been a large number of these documents sent to different parts of Canada, and some punishment should be dealt out to the culprit. I would suggest to the Postmaster General that if in the first place he can find out who the official is, he should send him to the Bishop of British Columbia and get him to make a confession and I have no doubt the bishop would treat it as an absolute secret, and his name will not become public, and I dare say the bishop would very kindly assure us that there is no politics in it, and possibly His Lordship would be willing to absolve even the Solicitor General.

Mr. SPROULE. With regard to the franking privilege, I quote from the Post Office regulations, page 21, which, referring to the Cabinet Ministers says:

All letters and other mailable matter from the public departments at Ottawa and franked as being of an official character.

That is the only right the ministers have to frank, and when the Solicitor General says he had a perfect right to do what he has done, I am not surprised at the interpretation of the law which we sometimes get from the Justice Department of Canada. The Postmaster General says that the private member of parliament has only the right to frank letters on the business of the country, but the regulation does not say that; it says:

Letters and other mailable matter addressed to or by any member of the Senate or of the House of Commons whether on public business or on the personal affairs of such member.

That shows the interpretation of the law is broader in the case of a member of parliament than it is in the case of a minister.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What is meant by 'personal affairs.' ?

Mr. SPROULE. I presume it is his own personal business. I do not know anything about the instance the Postmaster General has referred to, but if that member of parliament were engaged in mining it would be his personal business to send out these circulars, and the regulations would appear to justify him in that.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will take my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) as my witness. Taking the regulations which he has just read and assuming that letters written to his family or to his constituents or to the public on public questions constitute his personal business as the word 'personal' is generally understood, now would the hon. gentleman take it upon himself to send broadcast thousands and thousands of circulars under his frank, asking the public to subscribe to shares in a mine? He would not

Mr. SPROULE. I would not.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He would not, and every one knows he would not do it, and in not doing it he would be guided by his own conscience, his own sense of honour, and common sense.

Mr. SPROULE. What I wished to draw attention to was the fact that a private member of parliament has a greater right to the use of the franking privilege during the session than a minister of the Crown, if I correctly interpret the hon. gentleman's own regulations.

Mr. BURRELL. It seems to me that it is time that a protest was put in against the remarks made by my hon. friend from Carleton, New Brunswick (Mr. Carvell). Eighty or ninety of us are new members, and I think it is fair to assume that the majority of us have come here with an earnest desire to do the best we can for this country, very often regardless of political affiliations. I am aware that hon. gentlemen opposite, and those on this side, are working along different lines, and unfortunately on many occasions there is too much party recrimination and bitterness. Now, the present discussion involves a principle, and I want to express my satisfaction with the way in which the Postmaster General has dealt with this question. He has recognized that there is a principle at stake, and has shown a manly and honest desire to rectify the abuse referred to. But when these matters are under discussion, and an hon. member opposite gets up and introduces totally irre-

levant matter, for the purpose of flinging a cheap jibe at the opposite party, I think it is time for any member who has a sincere desire for the progress of this country along right lines to enter a protest against the irrelevancy and the levity of his remarks.

Mr. PERLEY. We have gained a great deal when we have got from the minister a promise to try to rectify this evil. This frank is in plain blue pencil, and anybody might have made it, whether he had any authority or not. I was told at the post office that these were the initials of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and I wish to ask that hon. gentleman whether he gave anybody authority to frank literature of this kind with his frank in blue pencil on the envelopes, or whether he knew it was done?

Mr. FISHER. I did not give authority to anybody to frank with a blue pencil in any way or shape, and did not know it was done.

Mr. FOSTER. The question that has been discussed this afternoon is a little more important than probably the Solicitor General, from the way in which he met it, may think it to be. I consider it to be a very important question, because, as my hon. friend from British Columbia has said, there is a principle underlying it, and the Postmaster General has in that respect come face to face with it in a manly way and has acknowledged that there was an evasion of the Act, and has given the assurance to this House that, whether it was done by a colleague or by an outsider, he proposed to take what measures are necessary in order to prevent it occurring again. He went a little further: he proposed to investigate the matter and find out if he could what had been done, and what punishment or remedy could be enforced. If it was done with the authority of the Postmaster General or that of any of the ministers of the Crown, and if it was done with the authority of any of the ministers of the Crown after the session was over, they themselves would be responsible for the pecuniary damage and for any violation of the principle of the Act, if that were proved to have happened. But the fact is, and it is plain enough, that somebody has been robbing the public treasury. That is exactly what it means. If a man had gone into a country post office in the dead of night and abstracted from the till of the postmaster money belonging to the postal revenues, would he be a thief, or would he come before this House and say, I did it, I glory in it, and I am not going to make any apology for it? It is plain what it means; and if $20 or $2,000 has been kept in the pocket of the man who by the law ought to pay it into the Consolidated Fund of Canada for the service Canada did in carrying his mail matter, is it any less robbery of the public treasury? I do not think my hon. friend the Postmaster General will deny that it is exactly the one and the same thing as the other. In the one case your man comes and takes the money out in stealth by night; in the other case he robs the treasury just as effectively, because he either uses a power which he has no right to use or surreptitiously gets his carrying done without paying anything therefor. Now, we have three cases. We have the case of a private post card. No private post card can go through the postal service of this country without a one cent stamp upon it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. This private post card is only one; but as long as there is the one which contravenes the law it is serious. When the hon. Postmaster General comes to investigate it, if he does, he might find out whether it slipped in between two others or not. Somebody must have posted it, and, prima facie, the man who posted it intended to defraud the revenue. No court or judge before whom the matter was tried would say that is probably how it happened. It is not the business of the judge and it is not the business of the Postmaster General, to suggest how it may have slipped in. There is the incriminating charge, and it is his business to suppose that his revenues have been defrauded, and to go as far as he can in tracing the fraud. That post card apparently was not posted at a post office, but was put into a postal car on the railway between St. John or Campbellton and Halifax and sent to a gentleman at that time in the city of Halifax. There is one case; in how many cases was the same thing done? In the other case, what happened? The Solicitor General, if I understood him aright, took the ground that the matter that went out was good.

Will the Postmaster General examine that for a moment? If a man has defrauded the mails by putting a letter inside a news paper and so avoiding letter postage, is it any answer for him, when he is brought to book, to say: 'But there were fine sentiments in that letter? Such an excuse would not be taken. Evidently, then, it is no excuse for the Solicitor General to say that the matter he sent out without paying the country's postage, as I believe he should have paid under the law, was good matter. This is not the kind of excuse that increases very much our respect for the Justice Department of this country. Here is a man to whom we pay some thousands of dollars a year and his travelling expenses; he represents justice in this country; before this House and this country he takes a position which I doubt if any other representative of a justice department has ever taken—that if the stuff is good stuff it is no harm to send it through the mails without paying the proper legal postage. Here is a case in which the frank

is plain; the Postmaster General himself cannot cavil on that ground. If there is anything in the law on this subject, it is intended to preclude members of parliament or ministers from franking extraneous matter through the mails when the House is not in session. Extraneous matter, I say. I would not carry the prohibition too far. If a minister during recess wishes to write a letter to the firm of which he was a member, or to pay a bill, I would not object to his franking the letter. That is a point that no one would raise in this House. Every minister does it, I dare say, and no one would cavil at it. But has the minister a right to take my correspondence and save postage for me by franking it through the mails? He has not. Where, then, is the defence of the Solicitor General? What was this matter that was being sent out? Was it anything connected with the business of the Department of Justice? No. Was it anything connected with Mr. Aylesworth's personal business? No. Was it anything connected with Mr. Jacques Bureau's personal business? No. Carry the case a little further. Mr. Aylesworth might have been writing to his constituents asking them to vote for him and to fight against Armstrong or whoever was going to be nominated against him. He might frank that letter; I would not find fault with that. But here is an organization that is conducting political warfare against nearly half the people, and it is so high-toned and so high-minded that it employs its Solicitor General to beat one of the departments that the government is trustee for, the Department of the Post Office, out of the petty postage on its letters. This weekly letter is an engine of the Liberal party; it is a part of its propagandist machinery, and is a matter entirely outside the personal business of Mr. Aylesworth or Mr. Bureau. It is posted every week of the year, in session or out of session, and is franked by the Justice Department. Does any one deny it? The solicitor General says that he has no apology for it. He might just as well frank the merchandise of the C. Ross Company on Sparks street. The great Liberal party ought to be more able than a private company to pay such expenses, and ought to be quite as manly to bear it. Will the Postmaster General inquire what the Liberal committee in the city of Ottawa were doing all last winter and up to the very day of election? If he does he will learn that tons and tons, millions and millions of copies of brochures and pamphlets were sent away from Ottawa under frank and scattered over every constituency in this country. I have here a statement by the secretary of that organization in the city of Ottawa stating exactly what was being sent out—so many copies of this or of that, to go into the several constituencies before election day.

Mr. FOSTER.

Did the Liberal party pay any of that postage after the House was prorogued? That is worth inquiring into. If this postage was not paid a wrong was done, somebody has robbed the treasury, and somebody should be punished for it. But there is worse than this, and I ask the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) to pay attention. All this would be bad enough, but there is still more in it. Here is a Liberal-Conservative running in the county of Argenteuil. He gets up his own literature and pays for it. While he is a member of parliament he has a right to frank anything he likes into his county by way of propaganda—that is a matter between him and his constituency. But one day after the close of the session he has no such right. A Mr. McGibbon opposes him in his county—whether he was a candidate before the House closed or not I do not know. It would be bad enough for members of parliament or cabinet ministers to frank literature through the mails after session, but it appears that, again and again, those who never were members of parliament, who were not even nominated for parliament until after the House closed, sent their literature under frank, or had it sent in some way first to Ottawa and from Ottawa throughout the constituency. His Majesty's post office paid the bill; the public revenue loses that much. The frank of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) was used to defraud the revenue of a large amount. Here are two things, one of which is unfair and the other absolutely dishonest. It is unfair that the Liberal-Conservative candidate should have to bear his own expense, while the Liberal candidate, by reason of his party being in power, should be able to send his literature without expense, taking the money from the taxes of the Liberal-Conservatives as well as from those of the Liberals of this country. The Minister of Agriculture has not denied that he franked literature after the House was closed; he said it was possible that it might be his frank. I would be loath to believe that any one would have the gall to put the initials 'S.A.F.,M.A.' on envelopes and send them through the post office. I should be inclined to think, under the admission of the Minister of Agriculture, that he himself had so franked this literature, or had authorized it to be done. He will not deny that it may be his own; I cannot deny that it may be a forgery of his name. If Sir Richard Cartwright or Mr. Fielding makes a speech in parliament I have no objection to their sending them out by the thousands under frank. But I do not believe that they have the right to take up the campaign of Mr. McGibbon in his constituency and frank his literature. This matter cannot rest here. If it were treated by every one as it has been by the Postmaster General

we could leave it to him, but the Department of Justice has said that what they did was absolutely right and that they had no apology; they flaunted defiance in the face of this House. The matter must be tried out and we must know whether the government is going to put its imprimatur on a doctrine like that. I do not believe the government will. I give them credit for long consciences sometimes, but I do not think they will father that doctrine. I am sorry the Justice Department put itself in a position like that before this House and before the intelligent fourth estate I see before me, especially on this side of Mr. Speaker's chair, and before the country at large.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friends have referred to what appears to be my frank on certain literature that was sent out during the political campaign. I may be wrong in my interpretation of a minister's privilege in franking outside of the session, but I have always supposed that he has the same privilege as members of parliament have during the session of parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. Right.

Mr. FISHER. Members of parliament during session were able to frank anything whatever it might be which they wished to send out connected with their public position as members of parliament. I believed that as a minister I had a right to frank anything I sent out relating to my public position as a minister. I do not know whether that was my frank or not; I certainly never gave authority to put a pencil frank in that way on any envelope. I do not know what the contents were. I do not think I should send out literature sent to me or my department by any one else under my frank. I think that would be improper, but I have always felt that I had a perfect right to frank during the recess such matters as members have been franking during the session. I have been acting upon that principle. If my interpretation of my privilege has been wrong, I am prepared to bow to the proper and legal interpretation and to forego such privilege in the future. I have acted upon that principle for many years, and I know that my predecessors in this and every other government have done the same thing. I know that members have franked tons of literature in each of the last three sessions. I am willing to stand by what I have done in the past, as I know that I have simply been following the practice of all other ministers.

Mr. M. CLARK (Red Deer). I rise to endorse in a very few words what I consider was a noble appeal to this House, and to the new members on the part of the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell.). I am certain he will get the ear of a large portion of this country when he asks the members of this House to cease from mutual recrimination, and devote themselves to more important work by example and by precept, of raising the public life of the country, and attending to the legislative and administrative business they were sent here to do. I thought when the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) rose to his feet and referred to the member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell), that the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo had sown his seed upon ground where we might not have expected it to bring forth very good fruit, but where it had brought forth very good fruit, for the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) endorsed, as I understood in his opening words, the proposition laid down by the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell). He said quite truly that there is a principle at stake in this thing, and the minister faced the principle nobly, boldly, and honestly, and promised that he would do his best to see that no abuse of this kind occurred. I take it that the response of the minister to the appeal which had been made to the whole House by the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) was perfect. But after this commencement what do we find the hon. member for North Toronto doing? I could not describe his speech better than by saying it was the most magnificent example of what had been described by the member for Yale-Cariboo in the term mutual recrimination How much further forward are we going to get by talking of one another as robbers and thieves? If that is not the language of recrimination, I do not know the meaning of the word. He appealed, as I understood him, to the great Liberal government as he described it, to show some high-mindedness. Wherever the Liberal government goes for its lessons in high-mindedness, the last place I should go is to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster).

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. M. CLARK. For the matter of that I do not think that if I did go I should be followed by many of his friends on that side of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. M. CLARK. I am thoroughly in agreement with the logic of what has fallen from the lips of the Minister of Agriculture. I think the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was not only wrong in taste in not following the very good advice given him, but that he was hopelessly weak in his logic. If members are to be allowed to break the law during the session, he may rely upon it that ministers will break the law during the recess. The whole weakness in the case of the opposition in this matter is to be found in a remark of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Middlebro).

He said that he would restrict the franking privilege to members, or would even allow them to go a little over the mark. Well, we all go over the mark. Will the hon. member for North Toronto rise and say that he has never franked a letter for some one which, strictly interpreting the law, he had no right to do? I notice that he loes not rise. If I wanted to imitate his picturesque and forcible style of oratory, I should point my finger at him and say that he was a robber and a thief; but I abstain. Now, I would like to give the Postmaster General every encouragement to go along the line he has promised to pursue. After all, I wonder that hon. members on the opposition side of the House do not see that in all these discussions about political purity what they are really doing is aspersing their own country—that is what it amounts to in the end, they are aspersing their own country. They are attacking the morality of the people and of the nation to which we belong, because the practice of this government has just been endorsed by a majority of the people of this country. I do not think that the most pharisaical man opposite would rise in his place and say that all the political morality of Canada is on the opposition side of the House of Commons. I do not believe that even the hon. member for North Toronto would be equal to that bold statement. They are attacking the people of this country, they are attacking the political morality of this country. The way to cure the evil is for ministers to face criticism such as this, boldly and honestly; it is for the House of Commons to respond honestly, as individuals and as a corporate body, to such appeals as the member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) has made to-day. I have responded to these appeals because I have fought two elections in this country; one of them I lost, and one of them I won. So far as I was personally concerned they were pure elections; I was not in a position to buy votes even if I could, and I would not buy them if I was able to do so. Let the electors be good enough not to be bought; let the candidates be good enough not to buy them, and you will soon see an improvement in the political morality of the country. With regard to the logic of this thing. I think my hon. friend is hopelessly wrong. If we are to have improvement in this matter, the franking right must be restricted to the utmost possible extent. You cannot break a law in little pieces. That would be the last word I would like to utter on this occasion.

Mr. PERLEY. I must say I like the way in which the Minister of Agriculture spoke about this matter, and also the Postmaster General ; but I cannot understand how he could interpret the regulations in the way he says he did. Section 114, which refers to this subject, seems to me to be quite plain. Referring to mail that is sent out from Ottawa, it says:

All letters and other mailable matter posted from the public departments at Ottawa and franked as being of an official character.

That is all it says. When it refers to mail matter coming into Ottawa it says:

—all correspondence addressed to the ministers in charge of the said departments or to their private secretaries or to the deputy heads or secretaries

comes free. But in reference to mail matter going out, the language is distinct, that the frank only covers matter of an official character. Now I cannot see by what stretch of imagination the Minister of Agriculture can claim that this campaign literature sent out all over the country, was a document of an official character. I do not suppose he will suggest that, so I cannot understand by what method of reasoning he reaches his conclusion. As I understand the regulations, during the session of the House we are all supposed to be on an equality. We are two parties in this country. Last session when we were sending out literature, we received every civility and service from the post office authorities here, everything was done to give us fair play, to gentlemen on this side equally with those opposite. Now during the session we are all on an equality, we all have a right to frank literature to our respective counties, or to any other county. But as I read this section 114, the moment a session of parliament is over, ministers of the Crown have no longer this right which belongs to members during the session; they then come back to their official right, which is limited strictly to the official business of this country. Now how can the Minister of Agriculture argue that that right extends to them during the recess ? I submit it would be exceedingly unfair during an election. We are all supposed to be on an equality. Opposition members have to pay postage on their literature during recess, and why should not their opponents pay postage also? I do not know how this was done whether the literature was sent in by the government candidates to Ottawa and franked out from here, or whether the Liberal party had an office here in Ottawa with a staff of clerks engaged in writing those mystic letters on these envelopes. But it was not fair play to the Conservative side. I would like to know how the Minister of Agriculture can imagine that section 114 of this Postal Guide gives him any authority to frank letters during recess to other counties than his own?

Mr. FISHER. I confess I have never carefully read the law. I knew what the practice had been from time immemorial,

and I followed it, supposing that my predecessors during their administration had followed the law.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The whole subject was discussed at great length in this House about ten years ago, and the distinction which has been pointed out by the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) was clearly and forcibly pointed out at that time. During a session a member of parliament, as I recollect the regulation—I have not got it under my hand—is at liberty to send out literature, any documents, whether of a public or private nature, under his frank. I suppose the reason for that is obvious; it would be impossible in the post office to make any distinction between documents of a public character sent out by a member and those of a private character. At all events there is the language of the regulation, and you cannot put any restriction upon it so long as it remains as it is. But when you come to the power of a minister of the Crown outside of a session of parliament, the language is very different; a minister's power to use his frank is restricted, as I have always understood it, to documents of an official character. Therefore, there is no confusion or lack of logic, as has been suggested, in the position taken on this side of the House. I do not think my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture was complying with the law in doing what he has acknowledged that he did on this occasion. The regulation with respect to a member of parliament, is in these words:

Letters and other mailable matter addressed to or by any member of the Senate or of the House of Commons while at Ottawa, during any session of parliament, or to any such member at Ottawa, during the ten days next before the meeting of parliament, may pass free of postage.

Now with regard to ministers of the Crown, the case is entirely different.

All letters and other mailable matter posted from the public departments at Ottawa and franked as being of an official character——

Shall pass through the post office free. Campaign literature can not properly or legally be franked as being of an official character; the Minister of Agriculture will recognize that at once. Thus, there is this very important difference, a difference which ought to be recognized and adhered to by a minister of the Crown so long as the regulations are in the form in which we find them at the present time.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have followed very closely this debate and I reiterate the statement that some regulations should be framed so as to draw the line between use and abuse. In this matter, we have trusted to the personal honour and sense of propriety of members of the House. I will not go so far as to say, as did my hon. friend from North Toronto, that, because there was some literature franked during the recent campaign, some of the heads of these departments should be accused of theft and robbery. I say that might have been an abuse, but I would not go so far as to say that it was a crime. At all events, the regulations must be made clearer and I intend to frame them in such a way as will, in the future, not lead to the imputation of motives to either side of this House. Before the end of the sesion I may have occasion to discuss this question again and I hope everybody will find that justice will be done to both parties.

Mr. BUREAU. I do not want the idea to go abroad, as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has sought to convey it, that I have been engaged in robbing the country ever since I have been Solicitor General. The hon. gentleman has had his innings now and he is always happy to give me a crack when the opportunity offers, and I suppose he now feels satisfied. When he got up he had in his mind one of two things, either that he wanted to heap some abuse upon myself, or else he felt that he was standing by a principle and desired to have an evil corrected. As my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) has said, the hon. gentleman has himself franked a letter for another, but it does not follow that he is a public thief, and ought to be branded as such in the country. If I franked this weekly letter I did not do it to save money. I am not so close or stingy. I did it because it had been done before, as I well knew, because I have in my possession papers and other documents that were franked by ministers of the Crown under the old regime addressed to myself and my father. It may be that under a strict interpretation of the regulations I was wrong, but when I said that I had no apology to make I said so with a full appreciation of my words. I never thought the hon. member for North Toronto was getting so careful of the public treasury and was becoming so close that all of a sudden he would make a crime of it. This is a usage which has prevailed for years which is now stronger, not only than the regulations but than the law itself. It has been done for many years, and if so where are you going to draw the line? I made the statement that I thought I was not violating the law and I repeat that I never thought I was violating the law, because I never thought that for years and years and years such a violation could take place without a remedy being provided. I franked this letter because it was in accordance with the usage, and now my hon. friend wants to convey to the country the idea that I have set up as my justification the claim that it was good matter. I never

made any such statement. My hon. friend with all his volubility of language and his wonderful imagination, can take out of my words, maybe misplaced, what I never meant, in order to put an improper interpretation upon them and to impute a wrong purpose. I made this statement because the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. J. D. Taylor) said that this letter was something that was indecent, and should not go through the mails.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I object to be misrepresented by the Solicitor General. I never made any such statement.

Mr. BUREAU. How did you qualify that letter?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman says that he did not make that statement you must not insist.

Mr. BUREAU. It may be that I am mistaken. I do not want to misrepresent the hon. gentleman, but he did qualify it. Have I not the right to ask him how he qualified it?

An hon. MEMBER. Scurrilous.

Mr. BUREAU. Thank you. He called it 'scurrilous' matter; that is no better. I do not want it to be said that I stood here and bragged that I had done it. I said that I had no apology to make for what I have done, and I repeat it. My hon. friend does not expect me to run across the floor, cross my hands, get down on my knees before him and say: Oh thou, the only virtuous man on earth, forgive me! I will not do it. I did only what has been done for years and a thing which would not justify anybody in holding it up to the country as a threat against the welfare of Canada. If we have robbed the country, notwithstanding all our thieveries the Postmaster General is able to come here to-day and make the statement that the Post Office Department, instead of having a deficit, as it had in years past, finishes the year with a surplus, and I will leave it to the people to judge if the exercise of the franking privilege has been the cause of a less efficient service, or of deficits. I do not want to incriminate the hon. member for North Toronto, but I know that he used to carry stamps around with him all the time to post letters to his family when he was a minister of the Crown. I do not want the hon. member for North Toronto to make an unjust attack upon the Minister of Justice, for whom I know he has a special love, because I said that I had no apology to make for what I had done. I speak for myself and myself alone.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a playful habit for some of my good friends on the other side of the House, if they are new members, to immediately lead an attack upon the member for North Toronto. He seems to be a form of ladder on which to climb towards a sudden notoriety if nothing more in the House. I do not know how to explain it. There may be some natural explanation; I am not quite sure. I suppose a fly would rather make its onset on the horns of the ox than be flittering around the dust heap or something of that kind. There may be a principle in human nature that thinks that nobility comes out of that kind of thing. It is also the playful habit of some hon. gentlemen to impute to me what I did not say. The Postmaster General came very close to doing that. I was drawing a lesson, I drew it properly, I drew it in very plain, definite language so that any man could understand what I said, and I declared that there was no shadow of difference between the man who went into a post office at the dead of night and by stealth and secrecy burglarized the post office, and thus robs the treasury, and a man who surreptitiously and wrongfully put mail matter into the service and had it carried at the instance of the country thereby making the country pay the bill; it was robbing the revenues just the same. When you discuss a principle and try to make two things equal, you are not under any conscious knowledge, until you are taken up a moment afterwards, that you called the Solicitor General a thief, that you called the Postmaster General a robber and that you called the Minister of Agriculture a burglar or anything of that kind. Some class of minds may reason that way; I am not responsible for every class of mind that there is in this country, and I suppose I have to be under a disability on that account. Now, my hon. friend grew rather dramatic—it is allowable to him—and he figuratively crossed the House, dropped on his—I am afraid not very hardened—knees, and apostrophized the member for North Toronto as the only virtuous man. That is a lovely little failing the members on the other side of the House have. They think it is a manly way of making a statement which they do not care to make on their own responsibility. My good and recently acquired friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) started out nobly and had he only stopped where he started he would be farther ahead than he was at the end, because he started with the enunciation of the principle that we were not to have recrimination in this House and he did not go far before he wondered whether he would come to the member for North Toronto as an example of high mindedness.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK. For lessons in high mindedness; quote accurately.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, for lessons in high mindedness. Now, what did my hon. friend mean by that? Did he mean to start out on the principle of brotherly amity that was enunciated by my hon. friend from Yale-

Cariboo (Mr. Burrell)? He may have thought he was on that skating rink but it seemed to me he was floundering on ice far away. He went on to make two or three other allusions; what did they mean? Had they anything to do with this argument? Starting from his hypothesis he should not have used them because they introduced the principle of scrap between the parties, and that was a thing his soul abhorred. Now my hon. friend, was I not right in saying that had you stopped where you started your ground would have been more logical than it was at the end?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK. It would have been better for you.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I suppose that remark is on the principle that the fly that jabs at the bull's horn thinks he is doing a tremendous piece of battle, and if it pleases the fly and does not hurt the bull, I suppose there is no great harm in it; it is just a question for the onlooker and the outsider who is not prejudiced either way to form a judgment upon. Now, the whole thing is simply this: The member for Three Rivers, although he may not realize it—sometimes we think he has not quite realized it—is a little more than simply a member of the House; he is the Solicitor General of Canada. He is a part of the Justice Department of this country, and he can hardly make a statement such as he has made this afternoon and disassociate himself from his department and from his position. We look to the Department of Justice—whether it is the minister or whether it is the Solicitor General, we look to him as an exponent of the law, and I allowed myself in an unguarded moment to make a query as to whether one who seemed to have come so far short of a proper definition of this law would shed lustre and brilliance upon the department to which, for some reason or other unknown to most of us, he has been for some years allied.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CANADIAN, LIVERPOOL AND WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

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

On section 2,

The works of the company are declared to be for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. BARKER. This raises a question which has been suggested in this House before and which was discussed at some length in the Railway Committee—the propriety of putting such a clause as this into Acts of parliament without reference to the truth of the statement thus made. I raised the question in committee. I do not question, nor has anybody ever questioned, so far as I know, the constitutional power of this House to declare a work to be for the general advantage of Canada. Nor does anybody question the fact that, when parliament makes this declaration concerning any given work, then, under the clause of the British North America Act, the work becomes legally one for the general advantage of Canada. I do not wish to occupy the attention of the House at length, but I desire to protest formally and strongly against the idea apparently entertained by members of this House that there is no question to be considered in reference to inserting such a provision in a Bill as to whether the statement thus made is true or false. Some hon. members seem to think that because parliament has the power to declare a work to be for the general advantage of Canada, that settles the question, and that if we exercise our powers that makes it all right. What I contend is that the constitution intended and requires that before the House expresses such an opinion by Act of Parliament, it should satisfy itself of the truth of the statement; it should be convinced that the work is really one for the advantage of Canada as a whole. I am convinced, from what passed in the committee the other day, that the question whether this work is or is not one for the general advantage of Canada was not considered. This subject has been before the House again and again, and with all respect to the House, I say that the matter has been dealt with without regard to the truth or falsity of the statement made, that this declaration that a work is for the general advantage of Canada has been put into Acts of Parliament when, in my opinion, it was actually false, and without hon. members considering for one moment whether the statement was true or the very opposite of true. We have spent hours and hours in discussing such questions and without much result. But I do not propose to let a Bill of this kind pass this House without entering my protest against the practise that I have just mentioned. The constitution intended that the provinces should control certain works within their confines, but it gave to this parliament the power and right, when it found a case to warrant it, to declare a work, even though within provincial limits, to be a work for the general advantage of Canada, and therefore one to be controlled by this parliament. I protest against such a statement being put into a Bill of this kind without due consideration, and against any hon. member voting in favour of inserting such a statement in a Bill unless he is convinced that the statement is true.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not directly or indirectly interested in this Bill, except as a member of this House and a member of the Railway Committee. Nor do I take exception to the argument of my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker); in fact, I quite concur with him on the question of principle. I believe that, unless there is within the scope of the corporation objects that are interprovincial or international in their character, we should not attempt to incorporate such a body or give it any powers. This Bill was very fully considered by the committee. I know nothing with respect to the objects of the company or the gentlemen who seek to be incorporated except what appears in the Bill. In the Bill certain objects are set forth, and it is clear that it is the intention of the incorporators to do a transcontinental and export business, to place themselves in a position to make connection with through railways and steamships and to have steamships of their own. My hon. friend (Mr. Barker) need only refer to clause A of section 8. Or, if that does not satisfy him, let him refer to section 13, wherein it is stated that these gentlemen who seek incorporation desire to form a company that can enter into agreement with transcontinental railway companies, the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian Northern of Quebec, showing clearly that the object of this railway is to do an interprovincial, transcontinental and even international traffic. There is also clause A of section 10 which covers the right to engage in a navigation enterprise in connection with their railway, clearly having in view an export business. Now, I quite appreciate this fact —that, unless upon the facts we can declare that the work is for the general advantage of Canada we should not listen to the prayer of the petition. But if they desire to have power to do business that is beyond the limits of one province and so come within the jurisdiction of this parliament, it seems to me that in such a case it is for us to give them their powers, because they cannot get them elsewhere. The moment we are not able to declare that the works of a company are for the general advantage of Canada, we are without jurisdiction and have no power even to enact such legislation; it is ultra vires of this parliament. A provincial legislature could incorporate these gentlemen, but could not grant them the powers asked for under sections 13, 10 and 8 of this Bill.

Mr. BARKER. Is there any doubt that a provincial legislature can authorize its own creation to make any contract with another company that has powers partly from the legislature creating that company?

Mr. EMMERSON. That would have to be ratified by this parliament.

Mr. BARKER. Not at all.

Mr. EMMERSON. However, that is entirely begging the question; they could not get the powers asked in section 13. These jealousies that are stirred up as between the provincial and Dominion government are, I think, not in the best interests of either the province or the Dominion. Wherever a transportation company can come within the scope of the Dominion parliament, I think it is in the interests of transportation in this country that they should come here and that we should incorporate them. It is all important in the interests of transportation that the Railway Commission should have jurisdiction over the companies, certainly over railway companies seeking to make traffic agreements with other railroad corporations in other provinces, so that the railways may be subject to the orders of the commission. In the case of a purely local or provincial corporation the company should not come within the scope of the Dominion Railway Commission. I do not take issue with my hon. friend in his theory. All that he has said is very true, but it is not applicable to the circumstances of this Bill. That is why I supported the Bill in the committee. I would hesitate to support the granting of a Dominion charter to any railway, purely provincial in character. I am just as zealous in that regard as is my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker). I speak for myself as one member of the committee, and only for myself.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member (Mr. Emmerson) argues strongly that a provincial railway could not take advantage of the provision of clause 13, could not enter into agreements in regard to the handling of freight, &c. The Ontario and Northern Railway, which is entirely provincial, has entered into agreements with Dominion railways, and no trouble has resulted. This is done with many railways.

Mr. EMMERSON. Would the Railway Commission have power to exercise any jurisdiction over that provincial entity?

Mr. SPROULE. There are two Railway Commissions, the provincial and the Dominion, and the provincial commission has jurisdiction over provincial railways just as the Dominion has over Dominion railways. This company professes to desire to carry on transportation by navigation, but we find it is too frequently the case that companies ask for rights of this kind, or the right to build storehouses or elevators, or to navigate inland waters, which in all probability they will never do, but abandon these rights of their charters and depend on the other features of their charters. We had a Power Bill before the House a few days ago. It originally applied to three rivers, the Rainy river, which

was international, the Nipigon which was navigable, and the Pigeon, which was neither navigable nor international. The Pigeon river was dropped from the Bill this year. I believe that the other two streams were taken in in order to get away from the control and jurisdiction of the provinces, on the grounds that one was a navigable river and the other an international stream. When a work is to be declared for the general advantage of Canada the promoter should be made to show that it is in reality for the general advantage. That phase in a Bill should not be a mere allegation without any tangible foundation. This railway is all in the province of Quebec and the Quebec legislature could incorporate the company and give them power to do anything they desire to do. We had a representative of the provincial government come before our committee and protesting in the strongest way that it was an invasion of provincial rights, and would likely lead to trouble if it was continued. Surely we ought to have some respect for representatives of provincial governments when they come before us and tell us that we are invading their rights. We should have the strongest ground for doing so, otherwise we will be doing what the hon. gentleman says we ought to avoid, that is, creating difficulties between the provinces and the federal government. That is what we are doing here, and when we have representatives from the province protesting against it, saying that they have a right to give all the powers requisite to enable this corporation to carry out the purposes of its undertakings within a province, and in face of that are we going to usurp their authority by stating in this parliament that it is a work for the general advantage of Canada, and take it under our own control, and deprive the provinces of the control they are entitled to exercise? I think we should go very slowly on this question. As my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has said this question has been argued over and over again, and we have not been able to make our opinions prevail. The question is becoming more intense every year. The province of Ontario comes down here from time to time; there are several Bills on the paper of a similar character in which that province is interested. Last year they sent down their representatives, and I am told will do the same this year, to remonstrate against the invasion of provincial rights. The province of Quebec is doing its best to avoid the difficulty, the province of Ontario is putting forth all its influence to avoid it, and if, in face of these facts, we do over and over again invade provincial rights, we must in the end provoke a contest that will lead to no good results. I think we would be well advised if we took an early opportunity of ascertaining what the respective rights of the provinces and the Dominion are, so that we may keep within our rights, and not always be infringing upon the rights of the provinces. The more we do so the greater will be the trouble. and the more difficult will be a settlement in the future when this question comes to a climax, as it undoubtedly will some time.

Mr. CARVELL. I agree somewhat with the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) when he claims that there should be a principle laid down to guide us in matters of this kind. We have had this question before the Railway Committee many times during the last three or four years, in fact there is hardly a Bill coming before the Railway Committee asking that a work be declared for the general advantage of Canada, on which we have not heard the question of provincial rights discussed. I do not intend to discuss the reasons why I should vote for this Bill, because I am willing to adopt the reasons advanced by my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson). I think he has stated sufficient reasons to justify us in voting for the Bill. But I want to go further than that. There seems to be a doctrine advanced by many hon. gentlemen, especially those from Ontario, that we have no right to grant legislation or to create an entity if it be wholly within any province of Canada. Now I want to refer the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and also the member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker)—and they are both reasonable men, the hon. member for Hamilton is no doubt a good lawyer—I want them to be fair, and tell this House whether, in their opinion, section 92 of the British North America Act did not contemplate just such legislation as is being proposed in this Bill, if it did not contemplate that this parliament should have the right to create a corporation for the purpose of doing business entirely within the province. Take clause (c) of subsection 10 of section 92, you will find that it especially exempts from the jurisdiction of provincial legislatures such works as, although wholly situated within the province, are, before or after their execution, declared by the parliament of Canada to be for the general advantage of Canada, or for the advantage of two or more provinces. Therefore the British parliament, when the British North America Act was being put through, specially contemplated that the federal parliament of Canada should have the right to create corporations for the purposes of carrying on works wholly within the province so long as that work was to the general advantage of Canada. But now the question arises on what principle should this parliament proceed in order to decide when any particular proposition is or is not for the general advantage of Canada? It seems to me that is an important thing for this parliament to consider, that is a thing we have been dis-

cussing in the Railway Committee ever since I have been a member of parliament and it is being discussed more and more every year. I believe with my hon. friend from East Grey that the time has arrived when a clear definition should be made, not of what are our rights, because we have all the rights possible, but when we should exercise our rights, and when we should refrain from exercising them. I think that is a fair proposition.

Now probably I would go further than the hon. member for Hamilton, I would go so far as to say that a Bill, having for its purpose the incorporation of a railway company to connect with any other railway company operated by steam, should be incorporated by this parliament and not by the provincial legislature. I put forward that proposition for this reason: To my mind the greatest function which the Railway Commission ought to have in Canada is the regulation of rates and the preservation of life and property. Now I make the statement. I know my hon. friend from Hamilton will agree with me, that the Railway Commission has no power to regulate traffic rates over a railway created by a provincial legislature; therefore, in order to give the Railway Commission any control over the rates of a railroad we must have it created by the federal parliament and not by a provincial legislature. My hon. friend can see the difficulty he will be met with the very moment that a railway created by a local legislature attempts to do business with a railway, or make connection with a railway which is of a Dominion character. This petition asks for the right to build a railway from a point on the Transcontinental Railway to other places. It starts from a connection with a Dominion railroad, necessarily, when it is completed, it must come in contact with the Canadian Pacific Railway, with the Canadian Northern of Quebec, and probably with the old Grand Trunk Railway. Now if a man living on the line of this railway wishes to ship goods to any other portion of Canada he has got to get a rate from this road in conjunction with the other roads; or if he wants to bring goods from any portion of Canada into any other portion of Canada, he must get a through rate from the point of shipment to the point of distribution, and that means a rate over the Dominion road as well as over the local road. My hon. friend will agree with me that the Railway Commission has no power to control those rates, if this railroad is incorporated by the province of Quebec.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me for asking him a question? Is the hon. gentleman aware of the fact that the Federal Railway Commission has power to control through rates on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that a portion of that railway running through the United States is under the insterstate law? But the Federal Railway Commission all the same takes into account the rates through that portion of the United States, right through to the coast, and makes a through rate all the same.

Mr. CARVELL. Certainly, but that does not affect the proposition I am putting forward. We will suppose that a man wants to ship goods from the city of Montreal to Lake St. John. If he goes by the Canadian Pacific Railway there is no doubt the Railway Commission has a perfect right to say what the Canadian Pacific Railway shall charge from the city of Montreal to the point of intersection with the provincial railroad, but their powers end when they get a provincial charter.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Is it not a fact that the Railway Commission governs freight rates on the Temiscaming and Northern Ontario Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway? I am a shipper over that road and I know that the schedule is printed and approved for both roads by the Railway Commission.

Mr. CARVELL. I do not know. I am not a shipper, but I will tell my hon. friend and he knows it if he knows anything, that if this Railway Commission does control the rates it is by agreement and not by authority. I dare say there will be agreements, and I dare say many of these local companies are anxious to carry out the wishes of the Railway Commission. The hon. gentleman must know, if he knows anything of what he is talking about——

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Excuse me; the hon. gentleman asks me to state a fact——

Mr. CARVELL. I am not asking the hon. gentleman anything. I repeat that the Railway Commission has no power to control rates over any railway created by the province of Quebec. For these reasons I think this Bill should pass, and I think there should be a declaration by this House as to what character or class of undertaking we should declare to be for the general advantage of Canada. Personally I believe that such legislation should extend to all railways which intersect any other railways operated by steam.

Mr. EMMERSON. Not merely intersect, but make a junction with them.

Mr. CARVELL. Make a junction with or have an interchange of traffic. When we get down to street railway, it is a purely local enterprise. It has no necessity of making freight rates or having an interchange of traffic with other roads. Therefore, I think these street railways should be entirely incorporated by the provinces. But in so far as this road is concerned,

and all others of a like nature, I contend that this parliament and this parliament alone ought to govern.

Mr. W. B NANTEL (Terrebonne). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, as I am responsible for the bringing up of this question before the railway committee yesterday, I may be allowed to say a word.

Whatever may have been the mode of procedure followed heretofore, and altogether the words 'work for the general advantage of Canada' may have been in most cases inserted in Bills of a similar nature, I do not think that the constitution of our country has been modified in consequence. I, for one, consider that the whole matter turns on the question as to whether we have the right and authority required for inserting that clause in such Bills.

In turn, I may be allowed to read the article of the constitution just quoted by the hon. gentleman for Carleton (Mr. Carvell), though I am bound to give it a different meaning:

Sec. 92, paragraph c., 'Such works as, although wholly situate within the province, are before or after execution declared by the parliament of Canada to be for the general advantage of Canada or for the advantage of two or more of the provinces.'

It will thus be seen that such works should before or after their execution be declared to be for the general advantage of Canada. In a charter like this statements of all kinds may be inserted. For instance, I may request authority to build a railway in the city of Ottawa, with power to extend the line into the United States; but my requesting such authority does not in itself, to my mind, suffice to endow the Dominion parliament with the enabling power required. It frequently occurs that people who ask for charters for such undertakings have no great assurance of being in a position to carry them on very far, and the idea seems to be that the inserting of such a clause will give this parliament jurisdiction. That is not my belief. To my mind, some evidence of one's intents and means is required. Yesterday, before the committee, no attempt was made to show that this undertaking was for the advantage of Canada. That is where such evidence should have been adduced, as it is known that when such a Bill is referred back to the House, such proof is supposed to have been made. Inserting in the Bill this or that statement does not give parliament jurisdiction. In the present instance, no attempt even has been made to show that this undertaking was for the general interest of Canada.

All these clauses inserted in Bills, as for instance those in Section 13, which empower the company to enter into arrangements with the Grand Trunk, Canadian Pacific Railway and other railway companies, are no evidence at all, and often have for their sole object to enable the promoters to sell out to other companies. These gentlemen might just as well have asked for a grant of all the franchises mentioned in the revised statutes, so as to be in a position to sell them at some time or other. Very often things are managed just in that fashion.

If such a principle were to be accepted, provincial rights would be utterly destroyed, and there would be no sense in a local legislature granting charters, since the Dominion parliament would have control over everything I understand that when a railway has been created under a provincial charter, and it becomes necessary, on account of its extension, to declare it a work 'for the general advantage of Canada,' the Dominion parliament may so declare it; but I maintain that such a step may be taken only after the undertaking has been carried out. On the other hand, if it should be found desirable to make such a declaration before going on with the undertaking, some evidence as to its truth should be required. This is precisely what was omitted before the committee yesterday.

I protest against the habit of inserting into all such Bills a general clause of this character, without any attempt at all at proving that such works are for the 'general advantage of Canada.'

Mr. SEALEY. In this connection, I have as much respect for provincial rights as any man in the House. I believe they should be respected but in the matter of railways I do not think there is room for any two opinions as to whether all railways in Canada having an interchange of commerce and traffic should be under the direction, control and influence of the Dominion Railway Commission. We have, in our neighbours to the south of us a striking illustration that we should not follow. There all the great railways endeavour, if possible, in their connecting links, to get a short road that is operated by a State charter, that is beyond the influence of the Interstate Commerce Law, because on these short branches, they are able to collect extortionate tolls on traffic that passes over them. In fact, the great roads of the United States all have short lines of railway and they invariably, if at all possible, route traffic over these lines, explaining, in many cases where they have parallel or alternative lines, that they have no working arrangement with the lines that they directly control, but that they have working arrangements with the lines which they own and hold by trustees for their own good and welfare. For that reason the Interstate Commerce Commission has no jurisdiction and shippers are charged extortionate rates. Surely, if it is at all possible to prevent it, we should not create a condition of that kind in Canada. As has been said, those

railways which are strictly within the province should be chartered by the province and should be under the control of the province. If they limited their business entirely to the province, and did not come in conjunction with the general railways of the country the objection possibly would not be so great, but there is no railway, long or short, that proposes to do a business at all but has to have arrangements for the interchange of traffic with other railways and when they begin to do that, and they cannot exist without doing it, they should certainly come under the direction and control of the Dominion Railway Commission.

The Temiscaming and Northern Ontario railway has been held up as an illustration, but I know from my own experience and from correspondence with officials of that road and of the Grand Trunk Railway that we are unable in many cases to compel them to quote rates because it does not come under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission. It can, as I understand only be compelled to make traffic arrangements with the other railways by the good will of these other railways. I believe that the Temiscaming and Northern Ontario, good and all as it is in this province, ought by some means or other be brought under the Dominion Railway Commission. The province of Ontario has a provincial railway commission and they can control certain matters, but it is seldom that two commissions with different authority will agree, and so the best results cannot be obtained. Freight originating in the western provinces and shipped to the seaboard or on a through rate to the old country would lose not only the advantage of railway competition but of ocean competition as well, because under the arrangement which the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway have with the ocean liners, the through rates to the old country are fairly steady and settled. This railway, with perhaps new terminals in Montreal and Quebec that will accommodate tramp steamers and all kinds of carriers which give lower rates for the heavier and coarser traffic, would be in a position to absorb all that difference and notwithstanding that the trunk lines would give as cheap rates from Vancouver and the west through to a junction near Montreal or Quebec, this little junction railway would be outside the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission and in that way they could extort a toll that would leave very little if any advantage for the shipper by reason of this alternate route. There does not seem any sound reason why any strip of railway should be permitted to do interchange of traffic business unless it is brought under the direction of the Dominion Railway Commission. While, in many matters it is perhaps right to stick to the provincial rights idea to the letter it is not a consideration at all, to my way of thinking, in the matter of railways doing a general interchange transportation business.

The hour for private bills expired.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 23) respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.—Mr. McIntyre (Strathcona).

Bill (No. 28) respecting the union station and other joint facilities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Midland Railway Company of Manitoba at Portage La Prairie.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—Mr. Dubeau.

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Tilsonburg Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Schell.

SUPPLY

The House resumed in Committee of Supply.

Mr. HENDERSON. I take very strong objection to the position laid down by the Minister of Agriculture as to the right of a minister to frank mail matter outside of what appertains to the business of his own department during the recess of parliament. When I noticed the large circulation through the mails of this campaign literature in my county, I drew the attention of the people to the manner in which the revenue of the country was being defrauded in the interests of the government candidate in that country, and I naturally argued that the man who would do that sort of thing was not the man to send to parliament. I believe that was a fair and proper argument. The Minister of Agriculture has now argued that he considers that a minister has the right during the recess to frank any mail matter that he sees fit, notwithstanding that it may have no reference whatever to the business of his own department. I raise my protest against the statement of the Minister of Agriculture because I feel that if I allowed it to go unchallenged, the argument I made during the campaign would be unfounded. I believe that the Postmaster General is quite in sympathy with my contention, that no minister of the Crown has the right to frank such campaign literature. On examining the frank on this envelope I believe it to be the frank of a minister of the Crown—I will not mention his name—who occupies a seat in another house, and I fear it is but a repetition of what occurred years ago. Again I protest against this unfair and illegal use of the franking privilege by a minister. It would be monstrous if a minister of the Crown could, during

the parliamentary interim, frank everything and anything he thought fit, by the ton or the hundred tons, contrary to the regulations, which are explicit and clear that he has the right to frank only matter that has some connection with his department. I have said this in order to justify myself, and not to leave unchallenged the statement that was made this afternoon or to leave my people to suppose that I had raised a point during the election which was not tenable.

Mr. DANIEL. This afternoon I asked the hon. Postmaster General a question in regard to the salaries of letter carriers. I may remind him that his superintendent made certain recommendations to the Civil Service Commission in this matter, and in the Civil Service Act of last session I believe the salaries of the class to which letter carriers belong were placed at from $500, as a minimum, to $800, as a maximum. The recommendations of Mr. Ross, I think, put the salaries on a per diem basis instead of a yearly basis, and included some other recommendations, especially one relating to superannuation. I would like the minister to tell us whether he intends to adopt any of these recommendations of Mr. Ross, and if so, when?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I had not forgotten that question. My hon. friend, and indeed all the other members of the House, are very anxious that something should be done not only for the inside service, but also for the outside service. However, it is not a question of sympathy; it is a question of business. Whatever may be the sympathy of the incumbent of the Post Office Department, he has to submit to the wish of the government as a unit. Being myself a son of a poor civil servant, my sympathies, of course, go towards the outside civil servants. I am not at liberty, however, to place an amount in the estimates to give an increase to the letter carriers and the clerks in the post offices. I am governed by the Post Office Act, which establishes different grades and fixes the salaries of the different classes. Since I have been acting as Postmaster General I have received delegation after delegation, and I can claim a little credit for having myself asked for the appointment of the recent Civil Service Commission. I have read the whole of the report, including the evidence given by each of the very able employees of the department, such as the deputy Postmaster General, the acting Deputy Postmaster General, and the chief superintendent, who are in daily contact with the employees. I have my own views on the subject, and although I cannot take the House into my confidence just now, as to what will be done in the near future, I may say that the acting deputy minister has prepared with myself a report which will be before council very shortly, on this very question of salaries for the outside service in the Post Office Department. All I can say at present is that the matter is engaging the attention of the government.

Mr. LAKE. The minister this afternoon made the statement that the moment a railway was built, advantage was taken of it to carry the mails by the trains. I do not think that has always been the case. I have just had letters from two small towns in my constituency, Odessa and Davin, which are situated on the Brandon and Regina branch of the Canadian Northern Railway, asking that they should have regular mail service carried by the trains. A train is run each way every day, and yet these places are receiving their mails only once a week, by means of the overland stage route. I imagine it likely that these would not be the only places along the line which are in the same position. If the Postmaster General will go into that question, and take advantage of the daily train service to provide a daily mail for the people, it will be very much in the interest of the country.

Mr. LEMIEUX. These two towns are on the main line of the railway, and I see no reason why they should be deprived of the railway mail service. If my hon. friend will make the usual application, the department will certainly look with favour on his request.

Mr. LAKE. I heard that they had already applied to the department.

Mr. LEMIEUX. These things take time. There is a little red tape, but we try to avoid delay as far as possible. I see no reason why they should not have a daily mail.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I regret the conclusion the Postmaster General has come to with respect to the remuneration of the letter carriers, and I feel that he also regrets the stand that he is obliged to take. It seems to me that no work of the post office is more important than that of those who are delivering the mail, either a letter carrier or railway mail clerks. We ought to pay our officials in that capacity remuneration equivalent to that paid those similarly situated in other countries. For instance, in the United States men engaged in this work are very much better paid than in Canada. The work done by these men is onerous; it calls for men of education, strong men both in mind and body. In addition, the railway mail clerks take their lives in their hands when they engage in their work. The letter carriers perform an excellent service and receive small remuneration and enjoy few privileges. I had thought to raise this question when the Civil Service Bill was under consideration, but this seems a favourable opportunity. I would call the attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that the earning power

of his department is very large. Take, for instance, Toronto, which yields a large postal revenue, quite the largest of any city in Canada. It does seem to me that the men who perform there the work of letter carriers should receive something more than $1.25 or $1.50 a day. The statute, it is true, limits the minister's powers in this matter. But there is surely a way to amend Acts of this kind, and it is for the government to take the initiative in relieving the hardships of government employees wherever they exist. No one would oppose the appropriation of a reasonable sum to remunerate these men for services performed. I urge upon the minister very full consideration of this matter. The subject is one upon which the public feel deeply. Unfortunately, we see occasionally accounts of men in the post office service who betray their trust. In all such cases there is a public sentiment for the man who is receiving a mere pittance of $1.25 or $1.50 a day and is tempted to pilfer a letter. These men are trustees of money as well as performers of an important public service. I do hope that the minister's statement that this matter is under consideration is something substantial, that he means that the matter is to be dealt with in a way to give satisfaction to the public. After all, it is public service and the public pay for it. The Post Office yields a large revenue, and I do not think it is expected by the public that the Post Office is to be made a taxing department; we are satisfied if a good postal service is given and the department makes both ends meet. The public wants the best service they can get, and they want to pay fairly for efficiency. I am not one of those who believe that it is wise to ring a bell in the public street and call upon those who will undertake to work at low rates to enter the service. The men who do this work should be treated as the rest of the service are treated. They should not be regarded as being in the outside service; they are in the service of the country, in the service of the King, and they should be given a fair day's wage for a fair day's work. The minister will not hear any cavil on this side if he improves the condition of the men of whom I have been speaking, men whom the public believes to be entitled to more than they are receiving.

Mr. G. V. WHITE. I desire to say a word especially upon behalf of the railway mail clerks. I agree with what my hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) has said, that these men occupy a very hazardous position—I may say the most hazardous position in the public service. If any men in the public service deserve an increase, they are the railway mail clerks. By way of illustration, I may refer to an accident that happened a short time ago in my own constituency. The local train carrying the mail between Pembroke and Ottawa ran into a light locomotive. On that train were two railway mail clerks, and both these men were injured, not to any great extent, I understand, but one of them so seriously that he has been unable to resume work up to the present time. I should be very glad to see an increase given to these officials.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Is there a minimum salary for country postmasters?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, $35.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Are there any cases in which they are paid a merely nominal sum --less than the minimum?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. MEIGHEN. How long has this minimum been in force?

Mr. LEMIEUX. In 1896,—speaking of the new era—the minimum salary of rural postmasters was $10. This applied to postmasters whose offices yielded almost no revenue. In 1897, or 1898, Sir Wm. Mulock increased that minimum to $25, and at the same time he increased the percentage given to the postmasters on postal notes and money orders. This was a good thing for the accounting offices. The small offices that do not sell postal notes or issue money orders are called non-accounting offices. Two years ago, I increased the minimum to $35 a year. I made another scale which I have not under my hand, of percentages for the sale of money orders and postal notes. I also made a larger allowance for rent, fuel, and light. On the whole the increase has been found satisfactory. The scale of increases is fully explained in this circular to postmasters:

Post Office Department, Canada,
Ottawa, September 17, 1907.

Postmasters are informed that the Postmaster General, after careful consideration of representations made by those postmasters whose salaries are based on the revenue of their offices, has decided on the following scale of remuneration.

Salary.

Fifty per cent on the first $1,000 of revenue, 30 per cent on all over $1,000 and up to $10,000, and 20 per cent on all over $10,000 of revenue, the minimum salary to be $35.

Allowance for Night Duty.

An allowance will be paid for night duty when a postmaster is required to be on duty after 9 p.m. or before 7 a.m. The minimum allowance will be $10, and the maximum $100, according to the time employed, and the work done.

Allowance for Forward Duty.

The rate of remuneration will be 12½ per cent on the revenue of the offices for which direct or indirect forward duty is performed.

Allowance for Rent, Light and Fuel.

This allowance is to be increased by 35 per cent. Therefore, if a postmaster is now receiving $100 under this head, he will receive $125 under the new scale.

Compensation for the transaction of Money Order, Savings Bank, and Postal Note Business.

Money Order Business.

Four cents for each money order issued, and one cent for each order paid. Formerly postmasters were paid ¼ per cent on the amount of all orders issued, and ¼ per cent on the amount of foreign orders paid. This scale operated unfairly. For instance, while the work involved in the issue of a $100 order is no greater than in the issue of a $5 order, the commission the postmaster received from the $100 order was 25 cents, whilst for the $5 order only 1¼ cents. The system of paying so much a piece for the issue and payment of order is fairer in that the remuneration follows the work, and the rates above proposed will give the postmasters a somewhat better commission than they receive at present.

Savings Bank Business.

The rate of remuneration will remain as heretofore.

Postal Note Business.

One cent for each note sold.

The general revision of postmasters' salaries and allowances will be made as soon as possible, but as there are over 12,000 offices to be considered, it will take some time to complete the work. The salaries and rent allowances will be revised first, and each postmaster will be duly notified of any increase that he may be entitled to. The revision of allowances for forward and night duty will follow immediately after that of salaries.

All increases, either in salaries or allowances, will take effect from April 1, 1907.

R. M. COULTER,
Deputy Postmaster General.

I have here a scale of rent allowance to take effect from 1st of April, 1907:

Revenue. From	To	Ontario and East. Allowance.	Manitoba and West. Allowance.
up to $	100	0	0
$ 100 to	200	6	6
200 to	300	13	13
300 to	400	19	19
400 to	500	25	25
500 to	600	31	31
600 to	700	38	38
700 to	800	44	44
800 to	1,200	50	94
1,200 to	1,600	75	125
1,600 to	2,000	100	156
2,000 to	2,500	125	188
2,500 to	3,000	150	219
3,000 to	3,500	175	250
3,500 to	4,000	200	281
4,000 to	4,500	225	313
4,500 to	5,000	250	344
5,000 to	5,500	275	375
5,500 to	6,000	300	406
6,000 to	6,500	325	438
6,500 to	7,000	350	469
7,000 to	7,500	375	500
7,500 to	8,000	400	531
8,000 to	8,500	425	563
8,500 to	9,000	450	594
9,000 to	9,500	475	625
9,500 to	10,000	500	656
10,000 to	10,500	525	688
10,500 to	11,000	550	719
11,000 to	11,500	575	750
11,500 to	12,000	600	781
12,000 to	12,500	625	813
12,500 to	13,000	650	844
13,000 to	13,500	675	875
13,500 to	14,000	700	906
14,000 to	14,500	725	938
14,500 to	15,000	750	969

Mr. MEIGHEN. I have here a cheque given in payment of the salary of the postmaster at Makaroff in Manitoba. The other information which I have in connection with this case was furnished me by the member for Dauphin, who, unfortunately, is not here to-night. The postmaster there, according to my information and according to a cheque which I have here, receives from the government a very small salary. His duties consist of attending to the arrival of the mail on the train at 11 o'clock at night and 4 in the morning the year round. He also attends to the distribution of the mail. For that he is paid one dollar per annum.

Mr. LEMIEUX. As mail courier probably.

Mr. MEIGHEN. They pay him quarterly in more senses than one, and I have here a cheque of 25 cents in payment of his salary for the quarter ending December, 1905, as postmaster at Makaroff station. He presented this cheque in the usual course, the bank charged him on each cheque 25 cents so the government can figure out what his annual recompense is.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I said a moment ago that the minimum salary paid to postmasters throughout Canada is $35. Sometimes we are asked to establish a temporary post office, perhaps for a club of business men at a summer camp, and to oblige them so that they will not be deprived of their mail, we appoint a postmaster, generally the caretaker, but of course we do not expect to pay him. As to the small payment to mail courriers our policy is to call for tenders and to give the mail contract to the lowest tenderer, but even when the amount is very low, we always find some one ready to offer his services at a lower figure. In the county of Nicolet which I represented for two sessions, there is a place, St. Grégoire, where the service for years between that point and Nicolet, three or five miles, has been carried at 99 cents a year. The reason

is that the mail carrier also operates a stage and as the people know he must be at the station at certain times to deliver the mail, he gets practically all the patronage of the whole district, and while he receives only 99 cents as courier, he makes $600 or $700 on account of his privilege of carrying His Majesty's mail. This is a very old cheque, January, 1906.

Mr. SPROULE. Are not your government cheques payable at par at any bank?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The bank returned it to him. I may explain that Makaroff is a purely country post office on the Canadian Northern road. It could not possibly be for the purpose of business men, because there are very few business men there permanently. I am informed there are 23 farmers, at a minimum, using the post office the year round.

Mr. LEMIEUX. According to the last report of the department the revenue of Makaroff, in the county of Marquette, is $98.88, and we pay a salary of $87.83. We pay the postmaster besides $12 a year for office allowances.

Mr. ROCHE. Makaroff is in the local constituency of Dauphin.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Since 1906 many of these little villages on the Canadian Northern have grown into towns or cities.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I would like to call the attention of the Postmaster General to the needs of the people of North Toronto, a large and populous town contiguous to the city, for a letter carrier delivery. Until recently the town of West Toronto, which is now a portion of the city, had a letter carrier delivery, so also had the town of East Toronto. These two towns have now gone into the city, and are the district of the hon. member for North Toronto. The people of North Toronto think now that inasmuch as they are contiguous to the city they ought also to have a letter carrier delivery like West Toronto and East Toronto had before. I wish the minister would look into that and see if he cannot give this large town of 4,000 or 5,000 people a letter carrier delivery.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Do they elect aldermen?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes, it has a regular municipal organization, with a mayor and council. While I am on my feet, I would like to direct the attention of the minister to another matter, and that is a postal service for the new mining camp of Gowganda. The most active centre of business in all Canada to-day is in Elk lake and Gowganda. The minister has been good enough to give a service to Elk lake, and also I believe to South Gowganda. But Gowganda proper, which is now being created a town by the legislature of Ontario, has for weeks been trying to get a postal service. The minister says he has taken it up and he is waiting for it to be erected into a town by the legislature of Ontario. But in the meantime it is an immense business centre. There are some days a hundred teams of traffic on the road to Gowganda. There are three banks now, there are hotels and stores being built every day, many capitalists are going up there, a telephone wire is being put in, and the people greatly feel the need of improved postal facilities. It is true it will cost a little more money, perhaps $5 or $10 a day, to establish a first-class courier service from Earlton and Elk lake, but there is so great a business there that it would pay the government to make an extra effort to give them a first-class accommodation. The revenue the customs house is taking in from the consumption of dutiable goods in Gowganda and in that northern country, I fancy, is larger than the revenue derived from cities of 20,000 persons. It is the centre of a great industry, and in view of these facts the government ought to follow the enterprise of those people and give them an excellent postal service. If the minister does that he will gain the approval not only of that portion of Ontario but of the whole country. There are men coming in there now from New York, from Montreal, from Toronto, from the old country, they are driving in there, they are on the trail now, for navigation to open to get in, and there will be a rush there in a short time. That being the case the place is worthy of a good postal service. I understand the minister has delayed action until the Ontario government has established the town site. But there are lots of houses there which would be glad to take care of the post office and give every reasonable accommodation.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am glad my hon. friend has again brought this matter to my attention. As he is aware, we have called for tenders between Earlton and Elk City. Although during the season of bad roads we are paying $25 a day and for the remainder of the year $5 a day to the present service, yet the department has not hesitated for a moment to undertake that expense for the benefit of the people at Gowganda. At another point I have just established a tri-weekly service which is quite sufficient for the present. We are now paying $30 a day for only a few people in that country, but as soon as the tenders are in and the Ontario government have settled where the town site will be, the postal service will be established. But I do not think it would be fair to the Ontario government if we were to locate a post office outside the town site, I think it is only fair that we should wait the action of that government. The Ontario government are doing their utmost to meet our wishes.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I think the town site was defined yesterday in a Bill in the legislature.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I would like to say a word with reference to a free mail delivery for the town of Owen Sound. I forwarded a communication to the minister, but he has not yet answered it. The town of Owen Sound, as the minister may have noticed, is about to be incorporated into a city. It has a population at present of about 13,000, and it has lately annexed a portion of the adjoining village of Brooke. According to the last report of the Postmaster General, it had a revenue in 1908 of $23,000; and I think I am safe in saying that after the annexation of the town of Brooke it will have a revenue of $25,000 or $26,000. The number of post office orders issued last year was 3,116.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend need not go any further. If they have that population and revenue they are entitled to free mail delivery within the city.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Thank you very much. Will the Postmaster General kindly inform me what steps are necessary to secure free mail delivery?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The city clerk sends officially to the department a statement as to the population of the new city of Owen Sound, because, I understand, you have made additions to the city. Then the city must undertake to number the streets in order to facilitate the delivery of letters. When that is done we send our inspector to organize the delivery, we appoint letter carriers and we give notice to that effect to the citizens.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Will the minister kindly send me a communication to that effect?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Very well.

Mr. SMYTH. I understand that the hon. the Postmaster General this afternoon made a statement that some of the members on this side of the House had been abusing the franking privilege by sending prospectuses in connection with some enterprise in Gowganda through the mails. As a member from that northern part of the country and being engaged in the mining industry to a certain extent I felt that perhaps it was a reflection upon myself.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, it is not the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SMYTH. I think the hon. gentleman surely then should have been as frank in his statement as hon. gentlemen on this side of the House were with him, because they named the parties who were doing the franking. I feel that it is a reflection upon myself and I rise to say that I am not guilty of using the franking privilege in that way. But while I am on my feet I might just say that I know whereof I speak, because, within a very few days of becoming a candidate for the House of Commons, I had the honour to be one of your humble servants in being the postmaster at a town in the district of Algoma, and I was astonished at the quantity of matter that was franked through that office, notwithstanding that it is only a small country office, under the frank of several gentlemen on the other side of the House. It was sent all over the constituency and it was nothing more or less than political literature. I think that some portraits of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) were franked through my post office, and one person had the—I might say—gall to want to take one of these portraits of our honoured leader, and have it posted on my store window to show the good qualities of our worthy Prime Minister. Of course, I objected to that, but I just want to say that there was a great deal of franking done through that small office and judging from the amount of matter that went through that office I am sure it must have been sent through some of the larger offices in that district by the ton weight.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I did not have in mind the hon. gentleman this afternoon when I referred to the use which had been made of the franking privilege to spread broadcast circulars concerning Gowganda shares. What I said was that I had received from a firm in Toronto a complaint that a gentleman in the House, a new member probably, was using his frank to send circulars through the country. The firm which complained was in the same business as the member who was using the frank and it was a matter of rivalry between the two firms.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. As I have the honour to represent the constituency in which Gowganda is situated, and since the minister has been good enough to clear the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Smyth) of the charge made this afternoon, I would ask him to say that I am not the person referred to either. I have not abused the franking privileges in any way, nor shall I do so as long as I am a member of this House. I thank the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) for impressing upon the Postmaster General the advisability of giving postal facilities to Gowganda just as quickly as he possibly can. I would have said something before this upon the subject, had I not had the assurance of the Postmaster General that he was doing all he could and that he would have a post-office there within a very few days.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend was not the member mentioned nor intended to be mentioned. Therefore he is not guilty.

Mr. MADDIN. I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. the Postmaster

General the fact that the city of Sydney, in the constituency which I have the honour to represent, has a population, as nearly as it could be enumerated a year ago, by the clergymen of the different denominations, the school teachers in the city, and the assessors under the direction of the city council, of 14,800 plus and that for the last two or three years the question of free mail delivery has been mooted down there. Some three years ago the city numbered the different streets in order to comply with that part of the regulations. I would like to ask the Postmaster General now what further steps are necessary to be taken in order to have the free mail delivery system inaugurated in that city. Whilst I am on my feet there are three other little matters which I desire to mention. I am sorry to be delaying the passing of these estimates, I have no objection to them, I may say, and I feel quite satisfied the Postmaster General is endeavouring to do his very best under the circumstances. I am not criticising the expenditure. There is a new town called Waterford and at this place two coal mines were opened up about 15 months ago. There are residing at that place over 200 families, and as the mine goes deeper and its development and output increase this population will grow. A year from the incoming spring they will have anywhere from 500 to 600 men employed at mines Nos. 12 and 14. For the last eight or nine months mail matter directed to that place has been carried to the employees and people living there in the houses erected by the Coal Co. by merchants who truck their goods from Sydney, and the adjoining towns of Glace Bay and Dominion.

A post office was promised to Waterford and several local people were told they would be appointed postmaster, so that the Postmaster General will have no difficulty in selecting somebody for the position. It is absolutely necessary that a post office should be opened there when we consider that there are over 200 families who are dependent on the present altogether inadequate mail service. Then again, there is a stretch of twelve miles of rich farming country along the Myra river extending from Marion bridge to Salmon river, which is without a post office. There is a post office at Marion bridge and another at Salmon river but in the twelve miles between there is none, and in view of the fact that the Post Office Department had a surplus last year and that the estimates for this year include an increase of $193,000 for the mail service, I press upon the Postmaster General that he should open a new post office within that twelve miles of country. I would also direct the attention of the Postmaster General to another matter. If the hon. minister was present when the resolution of the hon. member for Guysborough was being discussed early in the

Mr. MADDIN.

session, he will remember that I pointed out that it would greatly assist the isolated fishing villages round the coast if they were granted better postal facilities. The constituency I represent has an extensive coast line and so my constituents are greatly interested in this matter. The mail for Bauline is made up at Main-à-Dieu and despatched to Bauline once every week on Friday. Now, the mail for Little Lorraine is also made up at Main-à-Dieu and goes to Little Lorraine three times a week. Little Lorraine and Bauline are equi-distant from Main-à-Dieu where the mail is made up and the mail carrier in going from Main-à-Dieu to Little Lorraine is obliged to pass within a mile or a mile and a half of Bauline, so that the Postmaster General could very easily provide that the people of Bauline should have a mail delivery three times a week. These people are all settled very closely together in a little cove thrust out on the Rocky shores of the Atlantic, and although they are only thirty miles from Sydney, so far as the mail service is concerned they are as far away from that city as if they lived in Vancouver. These are the only matters in connection with the Post Office estimates which I wish to bring to the attention of the Postmaster General, and I trust he will give them the consideration which I think they deserve. As to free mail delivery in the city of Sydney, the Postmaster General has stated that if there was a population of over 13,000 in a city it was entitled to this privilege.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And a revenue of over $20,000. I am told that the revenue of Sydney is $22,000 so that it comes within the rule.

Mr. MADDIN. Yes. I may take it for granted then that the free mail delivery system will be extended to the town of Sydney.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My answer to the hon. gentleman from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) covers the city of Sydney. If there are over 200 families at Waterford I am surprised they have not already applied for a post office. How far are they from the nearest post office?

Mr. MADDIN. The nearest post office is at Lingan, five miles away. The Postmaster at Lingan has a son who runs a store at Waterford and he goes home nearly every day or his brother comes over to Lingan and the mail is handled by them in that way. I know for a fact that a request for a post office at Waterford was submitted to Mr. Johnston who represented this riding in the last parliament and he gave his personal pledge that a post office would be established. In fact this young man Burke, the son of the postmaster at Lingan who does business at the new town

of Waterford was promised the appointment of postmaster and so far as I am personally concerned there would be no objection to his appointment because he is doing his work pretty well now.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will look up the papers in these cases.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. We would like very much to have the post office at New Westminster made a city post office. What are the requirements for a city post office?

Mr. LEMIEUX. There are three grades, the ordinary post office, the city staff post office, and finally the city post office. The New Westminster post office has not yet reached the dignity of city staff standing. New Westminster is entitled to free delivery and that will lead to the other grade in a few months probably. The other day we wrote to the New Westminster authorities and within five or six weeks we will probably have a free city delivery, but my hon. friend must not be too ambitious to begin with. We are chary about establishing city post offices because they will come under the Civil Service Act and that will entail quite a large expenditure, so that the revenue from such offices must be correspondingly large. It is only the post offices in Toronto, Montreal, Winnipeg, Vancouver, London, Hamilton, Quebec, Halifax and such large cities that are city post offices.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I appreciate very much what the Postmaster General is going to do in giving us free city delivery, but I would impress on him that the business of the New Westminster post office is very congested.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What is the revenue?

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. $22,000 according to the last report.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There are offices yielding a revenue of $60,000 which have not reached the dignity of city post offices, but that will come in time.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. What we want in New Westminster is that the government shall take the responsibility of administering the office and provide a sufficient staff to do the work. At present the postmaster controls the office and pays his assistants, and he claims that the revenue does not permit him to engage sufficient men to provide the service to which the city is entitled; because, in addition to attending to the city service, the office is the distributing office for the district. The people of New Westminster will be very much disappointed to know that they are only getting half measure from the department, because they supposed that when they got free delivery, they would get what usually goes with it. I may say that New Westminster has been growing very rapidly of late. Within a few years its population has doubled, and the conditions which were all right a few years ago have become almost intolerable, and it will be a source of great embarrassment to the people if the post office does not keep up with the march of progress made by the city.

Mr. BRADBURY. I would like to draw the attention of the minister to the fact that about a month ago I made application for a post office at Hazel Ridge, on the Molson cut-off of the Canadian Pacific Railway, about twenty-five miles east of Winnipeg. There is a station there, so that the expense would be very small. At present people have to travel five miles to get their mail, and sometimes the roads are impassable. I hope the minister will see his way to provide that post office.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If the petition has been sent, it is probably now in the hands of the inspector, and I am awaiting his report.

Mr. BRADBURY. I hope the report will be favourable. If not, I hope the minister will see it is made favourable. I have also sent a letter to the minister in regard to the need of improved mail facilities between Selkirk and Winnipeg.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I received the letter this morning, and the hon. member will get the answer to-morrow.

Mr. BRADBURY. The Selkirk people are labouring under great disadvantages at the present time, and I trust that the minister will see his way to giving them the improved facilities they desire.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I want to say a word in support of the position taken by my hon. friend from New Westminster. I never could understand why a postmaster in a city office and the men employed under him should not be directly employed and paid by the government. In offices where this is not the case, the tendency is to increase the salary of the postmaster and get inefficient labour at small salaries to assist him.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The policy of the department, since a year or fifteen months ago, has been, wherever we are justified by the revenue of the post office, to fix the salary of the postmaster at a point and pay the officers under him.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Is there a fixed revenue?

Mr. LEMIEUX. We have adopted the $20,000, but if the revenue is close to that figure, we do not exact the pound of flesh. At the same time, we give the city the benefit of free delivery.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. My point is that if you employ a postmaster to supervise

an office, with a revenue of $20,000, why do you not do the same for an office with a revenue of $15,000? I think the postmaster should be put on salary, and the employees under him should be paid and supervised by the department in both cases.

Mr. HERRON. Complaints are made that the accommodation for the post office of the town of Pincher Creek, where I live, are very inadequate. It is a little place six feet by ten to accommodate a town of 1,500 people; that is the exact size, because I measured it, and there is only one wicket for all the business of the office. However I have no complaint to make about the way the business is conducted, including money orders and postal notes. I am sure the Postmaster General himself will admit that this is not the kind of mail service that should be given to the people of a town of that size. About a month ago I put in an application for a post office at Spring Ridge, which is in the direction of the Kootenay river. Has the minister arrived at a decision in regard to it? I think generally we should have better mail service in that country than we have. I believe we are entitled to tri-weekly mails where now they are only weekly. There are mail routes there that have been established for ten or twelve years, well settled throughout their whole length and yet with only one mail a week. The people are complaining, more particularly in view of the fact that the Postmaster General is able to report a large surplus. One other point: complaints have been made to the Postmaster General, either through myself or direct, of the condition of the post office at Macleod. I am sure that the Postmaster General will admit that the accommodations there are not sufficient. Macleod is an important centre of commerce. The post office service there is not fit for a place one-fifth the size, and the Postmaster General knows it. There are other complaints that I need not mention here.

Mr. LEMIEUX. As to the Macleod post office, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Herron) has already called my attention to the matter outside this House, and it is now engaging the attention of the department. This is the first time my hon. friend has told me of the unsatisfactory accommodation of the post office at Pincher Creek.

Mr. HERRON. I was not complaining of the postmaster——

Mr. LEMIEUX. I quite understand, it is a question of the accommodation. I take a special note of the hon. gentleman's complaint. I suppose he is simply re-echoing the complaint of the public, and we will notify the postmaster to provide the necessary accommodation. As regards the increase in the mail service from weekly to tri-weekly and daily, I may say that we have been making these increases quite freely for the last few years. In this year's report of the department, the hon. gentleman will see that the number of miles which the mails have been carried by railway, water route and ordinary land route was 1,129,779 miles more than the previous year. Of course, the railway and water routes account for a great deal of this, but still there is a large increase in the land route system also. I do not at all refuse to increase the service when there is the least justification for doing so. I have stated before, when my estimates were before the House, that where there is a population of, say, 25 or 30 people in the Northwest, I never refuse to open a post office. When the distance is not extraordinarily long I usually begin with a tri-weekly service. That is my policy for the west, and when the railways run near by and settlements extend, I increase the mails in many cases for tri-weekly to daily.

Mr. HERRON. I have in mind now a route running south from my town through thickly-settled country for twenty miles or more, a route that has been in existence for ten years or more, and still only one mail a week. That is one case, and I believe you can find dozens of others in my own constituency. I do not know whether these people have been making requests for a better service—they have not been making them through me. But the facts are as I have stated. There are three or four hundred families on a route, and they come twelve miles for their mail to the different post offices along the route. I do not think that is a proper service.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not, either.

Mr. BARNARD. Has the minister any recent communications from the letter carriers of Victoria requesting to be placed on the regular Civil Service staff? I had occasion to discuss that question with them at some length when in Victoria, and it seemed to me the argument they made was a very good one indeed. They claimed that the care they are required to take in connection with the registered mail required just as much education, and just as much attention to duty and just as much responsibility as is required of many of the second and third-class clerks in the regular Civil Service. I would bespeak from the minister favourable consideration of this request, and I would ask him to tell me if he has come to any conclusion on the matter or whether it is still under consideration.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend (Mr. Barnard) was absent from the House a moment ago when that matter was discussed. I explained my position. Briefly, I stated that a report is being prepared by the acting deputy Postmaster General, Mr. Laschinger, which I am submitting to coun-

cil. In fact, the question is before the government and is engaging the serious attention of my colleagues. More than that I cannot say, except that the letter carriers and the outside service generally know where my sympathies are.

Mr. G. V. WHITE. I would like to ask the Postmaster General with regard to a petition I presented to him about a year ago, asking for a post office at Graham station. So far I have not had any word from the department though I have been led to believe that a report was made.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will take that up to-morrow. I have been away.

Mr. McALISTER. It is rather late now, and I feel ashamed to retard the passage of these estimates. But with regard to franking I wish to say a word. I may inform hon. gentlemen opposite that nothing of that kind was done in Kings and Albert. Our postage cost us between $500 or $600. I wish, however, to call the attention of the Postmaster General and hon. members on both sides of the House to a little matter that may or may not be of importance. We have a large number of postmasters in Kings and Albert, and I am safe in saying that three-quarters of them are Conservatives. That is all right——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McALISTER——so long as they behave themselves. We paid for our postage, and I am sorry to inform the House that in certain localities a considerable quantity of campaign literature was not distributed by the postmasters and never reached its destination. I think the minister in those cases should take some action. I can produce men to whom papers were addressed who never received them, and these postmasters protested because their attention was called to the non-delivery. To hear hon. gentlemen opposite talking to-day one would suppose that everything that went wrong occurred on this side of the House.

Mr. BARR. Hear, hear.

Mr. McALISTER. I do not think that is the case; I think we are fairly equally divided in that respect.

Mr. ROCHE. Has a post office yet been opened in Pope, on the Grand Trunk Pacific? Up to two weeks ago it had not been opened. The minister informed me that he was waiting for the recommendation of a postmaster. Many people there have to go several miles for their mail although there is a tri-weekly train service through the place, all because the defeated candidate who has the patronage has been careless or apathetic in making a recommendation. The people have petitioned for an office, naming a postmaster. This system of appointment should be amended and after a certain length of time, if the person controlling the patronage does not act the department should act on the petition of the people.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will see that the appointment is made as soon as possible. My hon. friend will understand that in matters of this kind we have to act on the recommendation of some one in the constituency, and the candidate is, of course, a respectable man in good standing whose advice is likely to be valuable. I shall have the appointment made as soon as possible.

Mail services, $193,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister explain the system of rural free mail delivery which he has established?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have already explained to the House during the last session the plan I would favour for the Dominion as regards rural mail delivery. I then said that I would not favour the system adopted generally in the United States because it was beyond our means. Without taking too much time to quote the figures of the American postal authorities, I may say there are two systems of delivery in the United States of mail matter addressed to persons residing in rural districts; first the rural free delivery and second the star route system which we have adopted. The former is widely known and need not be described particularly. The latter is incidental to the transportation of the mail over star or stage routes. The contracts for it include an obligation to deliver mail into boxes erected along the lines of such routes. Rural mail delivery as they have it in the United States to-day has been in operation for over 12 years. Starting as an experiment in 1895, on 93 rural routes, the number of routes increased in 1896 to 148, in 1899 to 391, in 1900 to 1,276, and from that on by leaps and bounds until at the close of the fiscal year June 30, 1908, there were 39,277 routes in operation. The expenditure—and this is the future which justified the department in adopting the present very conservative system of rural mail delivery— the expenditure for rural mail delivery in the United States, which in 1897 was only $14,840, in 1898 $50,241, in 1899 $150,012, and in 1900 $420,433, had at the close of the fiscal year June 30, 1908, reached the stupendous total of $34,360,463. It is out of the question for Canada, having the same territory with the climate she has—and of course the climate affects the routes—for the small population compared with the population of the United States and with a much smaller postal revenue to adopt the system which cost the United States annually $34,360,463.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does the minister think that the United States pretend to furnish the mails in the sparsely settled districts of that country by the free mail delivery system?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Suppose the United States do not deliver the mail free in the sparsely settled districts, then if it costs so much money in the settled districts, what will it cost in our own districts where we have the same territory to cover? Listen to this:

The average annual salary paid to a rural carrier for the year ending June 30, 1893, was something over $178; for the year 1899, over $383; for the year 1901, over $406: for the year 1903, $532; for the year 1905, $650. In 1907 the rural mail carrier in the United States received an average salary of $711 a year, and for the year 1908, $877.88, and the end is not yet in sight.

Say the postal authorities of the United States. So it is out of the question for us to adopt the system of the United States. It would mean the ruin of the Post Office Department; it would mean wiping out of our total revenue. Now, we have adopted a system which is fairly described in this booklet which I intend to distribute to the members of the House. The Post Office Department has decided to undertake the delivery and collection of mail matter to a number of persons residing in rural districts along and contiguous to the line of travel of our existing stage routes, of one mile and upwards in length, upon receipt of a properly signed petition for such services from the residents of each of the rural districts traversed by such routes. Petition forms will be obtained upon application to the post office inspectors, or to the Post Office Department, mail contract branch, Ottawa. Now, who are the persons entitled to the privilege of a rural box? I cannot give a better definition of the system than by reading what the department is spreading through the country.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Perhaps the minister will allow this one item to stand over and pass the other two. I fancy this discussion will take an hour or two, there are several gentlemen who wish to speak on it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would prefer to pass the whole item. Supplementary estimates for this year will be laid on the table shortly, and the whole question can be resumed then. In these estimates which will be laid on the table within five or six days I have a similar item, not so large, under which this same discussion could take place. We need this money in the department. This discussion can take place at any time on the other items; in fact, I will arrange with my hon. friend the whip (Mr. Geo. Taylor) to have the discussion then.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that will be satisfactory.

Miscellaneous, $545,500.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. My hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) wanted to say something about miscellaneous in the next item.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The very same items will come up in the supplementary estimates, but for lesser amounts, and I will arrange with my hon. friend the whip for a special debate. When these supplementary estimates are before the House all these questions may be brought up then.

Mr. BURRELL. I was going to ask the minister if he could not hold over this item till next week as I have to go away and may possibly be absent for several days.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will not take up the supplementary items until my hon. friend gets back.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I would suggest that that pamphlet on rural mail delivery be distributed to each member.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 1, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CARRYING OFFENSIVE WEAPONS.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron). Moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 83) respecting offensive weapons and capital offences. He said: The Bill which I desire to introduce is designed to diminish the criminal offences now unfortunately occurring so frequently in Canada. It is of a preventive nature, not of a penal character. The first five clauses refer to weapons which are commonly carried by criminals. The first is designed for the protection of immigrants arriving in this country. As we are all aware, around the terminals of the railways, and the wharfs where steamships land, are a great many pawn shops and shops of second hand dealers where revolvers are exposed for sale: strings upon strings of same in the windows. Now, immigrants who come from southern Europe and who are accustomed to carry stilettos, knives and other implements with which to avenge their fancied wrongs, when they come to this supposed wild western country and find exposed to their view these murderous weapons, they naturally think they require them for their protection, and purchase them.

Sir, poisons are kept under lock and key and sold only by permit. I seek to provide.

under the first section of this Bill, that revolvers and pistols are to be in the same category, so that the one who sells them must have a permit from a judge or police officer. Under present law, persons are prohibited from carrying revolvers; why, then, should these weapons be exhibited for sale? The last clause of the Bill refers to punishment for capital offences. Under the Canadian law, a person found guilty of a capital offence is sentenced by the judge to be taken from the place from which he came, kept there for a certain time—generally, two or three months—and there hanged by the neck until he is dead. Under section 1064 of the Criminal Code, it is provided that the person condemned to death shall be hanged inside the jail in which he is confined on the day of execution. The clause that I propose in this Bill requires that a prisoner sentenced to death shall be immediately removed to the nearest penitentiary where the last penalty shall be inflicted upon him. In this we shall only be following the present law of the state of New York. Capital offenders being hanged or electrocuted at Sing Sing. And as long ago as 44-5 Victoria—that is, 1881—the British parliament passed a law under which a judge sentencing a person to capital punishment, may, if he sees fit, order his removal to the penitentiary or central prison, and this is generally done. Under our present system, where a crime is committed in a small village or town, the condemned remains for two or three months in the local prison awaiting the execution of the sentence. In the meantime, the whole community is stirred up, all the morbid curiosity and mawkish sentimentality of the people is aroused, and the result is that one murder often leads to two, because crimes are epidemic. I have spoken to a great many people of different classes about this clause, people who were interested in the matter, such as officials of the law, as well as citizens in various walks of life, and I have yet to find a single one—excepting one gentleman, a member of this House to whom I spoke this morning—to disagree with my belief that such a clause as I here proposed should be put upon the statute-book. Another point in favour of this proposed measure is that the prisoner will be saved the refinement of cruelty, for, while he may not hear the nails being driven into his coffin, he does hear them being driven into his scaffold when confined in a common jail and frequently he sees the gallows being erected for his excution.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may remind the hon. member (Mr. Lewis) the practice is merely to explain the provisions of the Bill on first reading, not to debate it.

Mr. LEWIS. I move the first reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmoreland). I desire to ask when we may expect the printed report of the commissioners appointed to inquire into the branch lines connecting with the Intercolonial.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The report was ordered printed by motion of this House. I have no more information than my hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) has concerning the printing of it. But I will make inquiries.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I would again call attention to returns which, I think, ought to be down by this time. There are the returns with reference to the dredging industry and the financial returns. One wants a little time to look these over, and the preparation of them ought not to take long. There is also the return of the armouries to be brought down by the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden). It is quite a long time since the motion for this order was passed.

Mr. H. B. AMES (Montreal, St. Antoine). I would like to remind the Minister of Finance that a week ago we asked for certain returns and received a promise that they should be brought down shortly. They are not down yet. It is six weeks since these returns were ordered.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Many returns apparently simple involve the examination of books and papers over an extended period. I have every disposition to bring these returns down as quickly as possible, and have ordered accordingly.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—FORT WILLIAM JOINT SECTION.

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 25) respecting the joint section of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company at Fort William, Ontario—Mr. Turriff.

On section 1.

Mr. GRAHAM. There are two Bills of similar nature and in order to expedite their passage through the committee we appointed a subcommittee who went over them very carefully and made certain amendments which the Railway Committee as a whole approved of, making one change in this section by striking out the reference to every party mentioned except the two making the agreement. The original draft says 'all other parties.' We struck that out and left it binding only on the parties who made the agreement.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

CANADIAN, LIVERPOOL AND WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

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

On section 1.

Mr. LENNOX. As the Minister of Railways knows this Bill has been the subject of a good deal of contention and I believe it was discussed pretty fully on Friday night. The member for Quebec West (Mr. Price) is absent and the people of the Quebec district are very much interested in this Bill. I have also had a communication from a gentleman representing the Union of Canadian Municipalities, requesting that the Bill be allowed to stand over. It is suggested that if it stands over a discussion now going on will probably lead to an amicable arrangement satisfactory to all parties. I would move that the committee report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. GIRARD. I do not see why the suggestion of my hon. friend should be concurred in. I was not here for the discussion on Friday night, but I do not understand that the member for Quebec West (Mr. Price) intends to oppose the Bill, I do not believe he is so strongly opposed to it that he would come before the House and ask to have it stand. There are members present from Quebec who would be able to discuss the Bill and I believe it should pass as it is on the Order Paper.

Mr. LENNOX. There is no great reason why it should not stand. The union of Canadian municipalities is a very strong and important organization, and they have asked to have it to stand. The member for Quebec West (Mr. Price) of course represents an important section on this side of the House, and I submit that no inconvenience will result from allowing it to stand.

Progress reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 46) respecting the Crawford Bay and St. Mary's Railway Company, and to change its name to 'The British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba Railway Company.—Mr. W. McIntyre.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 76) to incorporate the Imperial Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. A. Haggart.

QUESTIONS.

MOTOR CARS ON INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. STANFIELD—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What has been the total cost of construction of motor cars Nos. 225, 226, 227?

Mr. GRAHAM.

2. What date were these cars put in operation by the Railway Department and on what roads?

3. What is the total revenue to December 31, 1908, also cost of maintenance of said cars to same date?

4. Are these cars running now? If so, where? If they are not what is the reason?

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

1. $55,800.00.

2. One car was placed on the run from St. John to Hampton and return, August 5, 1907, the second car was placed on the run from Halifax to Windsor Junction and return, 9th October, 1907, the third car being used as a spare one while the others were being worked into shape. More or less minor difficulties, incidental to all new enterprises were encountered, but are being gradually remedied. During the year 1908, one car was on the River Ouelle Branch and gave good satisfaction. One was running between Levis and Chaudiere and one between Halifax and Windsor Junction.

3. The revenue has not been worked out, the cost of maintenance for the three cars to date was $4,669.11.

4. One between Halifax and Windsor Junction. Two in the shops for general repairs in order to be ready for next summer's business.

Dr. J. S. RUTHERFORD.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. Has Dr. J. S. Rutherford, veterinary director general, tendered his resignation?

2. If so what are the reasons of said resignation?

3. Has said resignation been accepted? If not, what has been done in regard to it?

4. Does Dr. Rutherford fulfil duties beyond those generally attached to his position of veterinary director general?

5. What is his salary as veterinary director general?

6. Does he receive any other emolument?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

1, 2 and 3. Dr. Rutherford did some time ago tender his resignation, but has since withdrawn it.

4. Yes. He is Live Stock Commissioner and is also charged with the administration of the Meat and Canned Foods Act.

5 and 6. For all his services he receives a salary of $4,000 a year.

'DEBATES,' COST OF PRINTING.

Mr. G. BOYER asked. (Translation):

What was the cost of printing 'Hansard' for the last session of the preceding parliament, including the composition of the matter on metal, the printing and paper?

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State). (Translation.) Daily edition, English version, one hundred and forty-eight

copies (148.) Sixteen thousand and thirty five dollars ($16,935.) Stitched, two thousand one hundred and one (2,831) copies, seven volumes (7), fourteen thousand one hundred and forty columns (14,140)—Nineteen thousand, five hundred and ninety dollars and six cents ($19,597.06.)

Total—Thirty six thousand five hundred and thirty two dollars and six cents ($36,532.06). Stitched, French version: Five hundred and seven (507) copies, seven (7) volumes, fourteen thousand five hundred and thirty four (14,534) columns. Twenty six thousand six hundred, ninety three dollars and fourteen cents ($26,693.14).

QUEBEC TERCENTENARY.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What amount of money was subscribed by government and private individuals, respectively, to the tercentenary battlefields celebration of last year, and what amount thereof was spent on the celebration?

2. What amount was spent out of the permanent fund for additions and improvements of the battlefields, and of what did they consist?

3. What amount of the permanent fund is still held by the trustees?

4. Who is the permanent secretary of the commission, what salary has he been paid, and out of what appropriation?

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

1. There are two funds, the Battlefields fund and the Tercentenary fund. The amount subscribed by the governments of the provinces and private individuals to the 31st January towards the Battlefields fund was.. .. ..$450,488 79
And from the sale of materials on the Pierre Cauchon property.. 391 90

$450,880 69

Towards the Tercentenary fund from the Dominion government.. .. ..$300,000 00
Sales of tickets for pageants.... 32,280 88
Refunds, sales of effects, &c.... 3,557 32

$335,838 20
Amount spent on the celebration. 321,168 69

$ 14,669 51

2. To the 31st January last, for printing, telegrams, cables, notaries' services for searching titles, surveying fees, travelling expenses, &c.. .. ..$6,608 03
For purchase of Pierre Cauchon property on Ste. Foye road.. .. 7,846 55

$14,454 58

3. $436,426.11.

4. No permanent secretary has been appointed.

DEBATES—STAFF OF TRANSLATION OFFICE OF 'HANSARD.'

Mr. G. BOYER asked. (Translation).

1. Of how many persons is the translation office of 'Hansard,' French version, composed, comprising the translators and all other persons co-operating in this work?

2. What was the total amount of salaries paid to these employees last session?

Hon. C. MURPHY (Secretary of State): 1 and 2. The number of persons employed in the translation office of 'Hansard,' French version, is 12, all of whom are translators or proof-readers. In addition there is a caretaker of the building in which they are employed. These employees are not paid by the session, but by the year. The total sum received by them during the fiscal year 1908-9 was as follows:

Translators and proof-readers....$22,500 00
Caretaker.. .. .. 300 00

Total.. .. ..$23,800 00

In addition to the above there is a sessional messenger of the House of Commons detailed to act as messenger between the French 'Hansard' translation office, the House of Commons and the Printing Bureau.

COLLAPSE OF THE QUEBEC BRIDGE—TRANSLATION OF REPORT OF COMMISSION OF INQUIRY.

Mr. G. BOYER asked. (Translation).

1. Is the report of the commission of inquiry relating to the Quebec bridge catastrophe, given out to be translated into French? If so, who is charged with this translation, and is he a civil servant already under salary?

2. When was it given out, and how many pages are now translated?

The Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). (Translation.)

1. The report of the commission of inquiry relating to the collapse of the Quebec bridge has been translated into French and the French version is now being distributed. The translation has been done by Mr. Ulric Barthé, of Quebec, who is not in the Civil Service and therefore does not receive a salary from the government.

2. That the report was given out to be translated in November last. The translation is now completed. The minutes of proceedings of the investigation which will be appended to the report of the commission of inquiry have been translated and are now under print.

RICHMOND RIFLE RANGE.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR, asked:

1. Have representations been received by the Militia Department of danger from shooting on the Richmond rifle range, because of

insufficiency of protection afforded by the stop butts?

2. If so, will steps be taken before target practice season opens to secure safety?

3. If not, will the department communicate on the subject with the clerk of Richmond municipality and with the officer commanding the 6th Regiment?

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

1 and 2. No such representations have been made to headquarters.

3. The District Officer Commanding has been called upon to furnish a report.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—HOURS OF WORK.

Mr. STANFIELD—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. On what date were the employees of the Intercolonial Railway classed as mechanics, put on 8 hours a day and 8 hours pay?

2. Was this done as a retrenchment in view of a deficit?

3. If so, is the deficiency chargeable to that branch of the service?

4. If not, why was this reduction put upon the employees of that branch of the service?

5. Is it the intention of the government to continue that 8 hours a day, 8 hours pay in that branch of the service for all time to come? If not, for what length of time?

6. How many employees are affected by the reduction from 10 to 8 hours?

7. What is the saving effected monthly by the change?

8. Has there been any curtailment made in the official staff of the road? If not, why not, in view of the deficit?

9. Has the government received any communications from the men affected in respect of the matter?

10. If so, what is the nature of the communication?

11. If any were received, what reply did the government make to the same?

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

1, January 1, 1909.

2. Largely because of the hours of daylight, and it did effect a saving.

3. A statement concerning the business of the road will be made later.

4. Answered by number 2.

5. Orders were given for full day of 10 hours to be resumed March 1.

6. 1665.

7. $16,700.

8. No.

9. No.

10. Answered by number nine.

11. Answered by number nine.

GOVERNMENT SAVINGS BANK.

Mr. S. SHARPE asked:

1. What were the amounts on deposit in the Government Savings Department on October 1, 1889, October 1, 1896, and October 1, 1897 and 1898?

2. How many officials were employed in connection with the management of this fund in the years 1888, 1890, 1898, 1900 and 1908?

3. What was the cost of management of this fund in the years 1888, 1890, 1898, 1900 and 1908?

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

If the hon. gentleman will put his question in the form of a motion for a return the information will be furnished as early as possible.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion for a return.

EXPENSE OF NEGOTIATING GOVERNMENT LOANS.

Mr. S. SHARPE asked:

What expense, including commission and brokerage, were incurred by the government on the various loans negotiated by the government since the year 1896 at a rate of interest in excess of 3 per cent?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The charges of the financial agents in London on the issue of loans since the year 1896 have been the same as those which were established for some years prior to that time. The charge for the sale of stock and bonds is ⅛th of one per cent.

In case of redemption, no charge therefore is allowed to the bank where it has the issuing of a loan to retire the bonds redeemed, but if no loan is issued by it ⅛th of one per cent is paid to the bank for redemption.

The bank is also paid the necessary out of pocket expenses for stamps, advertising, printing, brokerage, &c. The only new condition in connection with the business is that since 1904, to meet the established practice arising out of the changed conditions in the London money market, it has been deemed expedient to pay commission for underwriting. These commissions to underwriters (including brokerage) vary from one per cent to 1¼ per cent.

CATTLE-GUARDS AT RAILWAY CROSSINGS.

Mr. S. SHARPE asked:

1. What special complaints, if any, have been made to the government in regard to the failure of railway companies to supply suitable cattle-guards, which have been investigated by the government and what defects were discovered?

2. What steps did the government take to compel the railway to comply with the requirements of section 254 of the Railway Act?

3. What remedies, if any, were applied by the company, to remove the cause of the complaints regarding the inefficiency of their cattle-guards?

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

1. There have been from time to time filed with the board individual complaints

against railway companies for failure to furnish suitable cattle-guards, and these have been dealt with specifically by the board in every instance. It will, however, take some time to go over the records of the board for the past five years to ascertain what these special complaints were.

2. Whatever complaints have been made to the board, it has taken the matter up with the railway companies, and had suitable guards provided in accordance with the provisions of section 254 of the Railway Act.

3. See answer to number two.

CIVIL SERVICE SALARIES.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

What are the names, date of first appointment and present salary of the clerks in the Civil Service at Ottawa who under the present law and its proposed amendment will receive no increase?

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

Department.	Name.	Date of Appointment.	Division.	Salary.
				$ cts.
Agriculture	Fred Montizambert	May 11, 1866	First A.	4,000 00
	Wm. Saunders	Aug. 1, 1900	"	4,000 00
	A. Blue	May 1, 1882	"	4,000 00
	J. G. Rutherford	Mar. 23, 1901	"	4,000 00
Finance	Henry T. Ross	Nov. 1, 1906	"	4,500 00
Inland Revenue	T. Parent	May 1, 1891	Third A.	1,200 00
	T. Burgess	Feb. 10, 1889	Carpenter	900 00
	Jas. Hagan	Dec. 15, 1892	Warehousem'n	990 00
Interior	A. Kilmartin	" 3, 1902	Third B	800 00
	A. Devlin	Oct. 22, 1903	"	900 00
Justice	E. R. Cameron	July 2, 1898	First A.	4,000 00
	T. Morris	Nov. 16, 1903	Third B.	800 00
Library of Parliament	F. X. Desloges	July 1, 1907	Messenger.	900 00
Mines	E. F. Goodman	Oct. 5, 1896	Third B.	800 00
	D. A. Esdale	Nov. 19, 1883	Carpenter	939 00
Printing and Stationery	G. Randall	April, — 1896	Third B.	800 00
	A. LaFleur	" — 1902	"	800 00
	W. Emond	" — 1892	"	800 00
	J. Foley	Aug. — 1908	"	800 00
	J. Foran	June — 1882	Caretaker.	1,000 00
Privy Council	C. Schreiber	May 1, 1864	First A.	6,000 00
Public Works	J. B. Charleson	Oct. 28, 1896	First B.	2,800 00
	P. Canty	July 5, 1898	Second B.	1,642 50
	L. Belanger	March 16, 1902	"	1,600 00
	A. Dostaler	June 28, 1887	Third A.	1,200 00
	T. G. Bell	Oct. 6, 1902	"	1,200 00
	T. D. C. Caldwell	May 7, 1900	"	1,200 00
	O. Belanger	April 1, 1906	" B.	800 00
	Mrs. E. Lemoyne	May 18, 1897	"	800 00
	F. O. Hamel	Aug. 3, 1907	"	800 00
	M. Laframboise	Jan. 20, 1908	"	800 00
	Mrs. M. L. Roy	Aug. 15, 1902	"	800 00
	A. Valade	Oct. 11, 1901	"	800 00
	J. G. Kennedy	April 17, 1905	"	800 00
	A. Bray	Jan. 21, 1882	Messenger	850 00
Railways and Canals	John Kerr	July 3, 1906	Third B.	800 00

1	$6,000 00
1	4,500 00
5	4,000 00
1	2,800 00
1	1,642 50
1	1,600 00
4	1,200 00
1	1,000 00
1	939 00
3	900 00
17	800 00
36	

MR. JOHN LAMBERT PAYNE.

Mr. McKENZIE asked:

1. Is John Lambert Payne a member of the Civil Service of Canada?

2. If so, is he of the inside or outside service?

3. In which department of the Civil Service is the said John Lambert Payne employed, and at what salary?

4. What are the office hours of the said John Lambert Payne?

5. Is the said John Lambert Payne authorized by the government to engage as public prosecutor against persons at Ottawa alleged to be lending money at unlawful rates of interest?

6. If so appointed, at what salary, for what period and to which department does he report?

7. How much of his time did the said John Lambert Payne devote to said prosecutions since his appointment or since January 1, 1908?

8. Was there any reduction made from the ordinary salary of the said John Lambert Payne for time devoted to said prosecutions? If so, how much?

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

1. Yes.
2. Inside service.
3. Department of Railways and Canals, at $2,800.
4. The same as all members of the Civil Service.
5. No.
6. No.
7. The department is not aware that any of his official time was taken up with the prosecutions referred to.
8. No.

BRITISH COLUMBIA RAILWAY BELT LANDS.

Mr. GOODEVE asked:

1. Are the public lands in the railway belt of British Columbia Dominion lands within the meaning of section 3 of the Dominion Lands Act?

2. If so, why have settlers not received title?

3. If not within the meaning of that Act, why not and under what authority are they administered?

4. Have any homesteaders in that belt received Crown grants from the Dominion? If so, how many, and under what authority?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior.)

1. No.

2. See answer to No. 1. Settlers have received title under the regulations prepared by authority of the Governor in Council, and patents have been issued to homesteaders from time to time on proof of the completion of required duties. These regulations are based upon the provisions contained in 'An Act Respecting Certain Public Lands in British Columbia,' being Chap. 59 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906 (formerly Chap. 56 Revised Statutes, 1886.)

3. Clause 4 of the Dominion Lands Act excludes the lands in the Railway Belt of British Columbia from the operation of the Dominion Lands Act. Regulations for the administration of lands in the railway belt in the province of British Columbia are provided by order in council of the 17th of September, 1889, and amending orders.

4. Yes, 1740, under the authority of the regulations for the disposal of Dominion lands within the Railway belt in British Columbia.

SUMMER FISHING—LAC DU BONNET.

Mr. CAMPBELL (by Mr. W. H. Sharpe) asked:

1. Is it the intention of the government to open Lac du Bonnet for summer fishing? If so, on whose recommendation?

2. Is a lease being granted to any person, firm or firms?

3. If so, what are his or their names, and on what terms is the lease being granted?

4. Have tenders for the summer fishing been called for? If not, why have tenders not been called for?

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

1. Not as at present advised.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Answered by No. 1.
4. Answered by No. 1.

CANADIAN IMPORTS.

Mr. SINCLAIR asked:

What percentage of Canadian imports entered Canada during the year 1908 by way of Canadian ports?

Hon. Wm. PATERSON (Minister of Customs.) I presume the question means Canadian seaports. We have arrived at the answer by a process of deduction which is the only way the information can be given.

The total imports of the Dominion for the year ended March 31, 1908, for consumption were $358,428,616.

The goods entered for consumption from the United States amount to $210,652,825.

Leaving imports from countries other than the United States $147,775,791.

Goods from other countries imported through the United States, value $27,431,412.

Balance imported through Canadian seaports, value $120,344,379. Per cent 81½.

SANDY COVE BREAKWATER.

Mr. JAMESON asked:

Adverting to Sandy Cove breakwater, what are the names and addresses of the persons to whom money is yet owing, and what are the respective amounts due to each for labour performed on the work, and for materials used in construction, respectively?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). No money is owing by the government, but the department is informed that the following amounts are owing by the contractors:

FOR LABOUR.

Charles Beyea, Sandy Cove, N. S.	$	51 76
Botsford Beyea, "		71 56
Charles Burns, "		2 13
William Cromwell, "		2 13
Barlow Cromwell, "		44 87
Edward Cahoon, "		48 14
Ralph Crowell, "		8 52
Maynard Cossaboom, "		13 42
Solomon Dakin, "		128 13
Amasa Eldridge, "		48 41
Hay Eldridge, "		2 36
Charles Ellis, "		15 62
Charles Graham, "		51 65
Delancey Graham, "		5 68
Thomas Gribbins, "		14 87
George Harrington, "		104 23
L. J. Leblanc, "		77 81
Slater Mitchell, "		33 66
Daniel Morehouse, "		45 24
Arnold Morehouse, "		50 91
Désiré Leblanc, "		48 14
John Merritt, "		2 84
Eddie McKay, "		4 73
Frank Saunders, "		51 97
Ingraham Saunders, "		42 18
Watson Saunders, "		51 83
Oron Wagner, "		51 12
J. W. Albright, "		45 80
Henry Griffith, "		6 34
Orie Morehouse, "		39 20
William Bent, "		56 52
Total	$	1,221 00

FOR MATERIALS.

Howard Anderson, Digby, N.S.		17 33
Alfred Boutlier, Centreville		46 35
John E. Crowell, Sandy Cove		17 33
Courier-Newspaper, Digby		1 00
Coran Cossaboom, Sandy Cove		1 75
Solomon Dakin, Centreville		13 35
W. H. Eldridge, Sandy Cove		88 15
Amasa Eldridge, Sandy Cove		35 45
Eddie Gaudet, Comeauville		20 81
Insular SS. Co., Westport		2 80
D. G. Kirk, Antigonish		2,085 51
Lewis & Son, St. John, N.B.		100 00
Hugh Cann, Yarmouth, N.S.		70 00
Teseline Leblanc, Comeauville		17 01
J. H. Morehouse, Sandy Cove		22 00
C. E. Morehouse, Sandy Cove		13 75
G. A. Morehouse, Sandy Cove		7 20
Holland Outhouse, Tiverton		6 63
B. A. Roney, Digby		1 00
F. A. Robinson, Digby		9 90
Watson Saunders, Sandy Cove		27 17
W. E. Van Blarcom, Digby, N.S.		1 00
W. W. Hayden, Digby, N. S.		117 82
Total	$	2,723 31
Grand Total	$	3,945 08

MARINE DEPARTMENT—BOOK-KEEPING.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

1. Has Mr. Kenneth Falconer done any work upon or in connection with the books or book-keeping of the Marine and Fisheries Department since the investigation into his accounts in the Public Accounts Committee last session?

2. Has the work undertaken by Mr. Falconer been completed? If not, why not?

3. What is the date of the latest services rendered?

4. What is the total of Mr. Falconer's claim, how much has he been paid, and has he an unsettled claim?

5. What is the expense occasioned by change of methods in the department as the result of Mr. Falconer's work?

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

1. Mr. A. T. Doud, of Kenneth Falconer's firm was employed from the 5th June to the 10th August, 1908, inspecting the work established by the firm in the agencies. Mr. Doud was only paid his travelling expenses.

2. Yes.

3. From the 5th of June to the 10th of August, 1908.

4. $42,223.17. Mr. Falconer has no claim against the department.

5. The establishment of a new system of book-keeping did not necessitate the increase of the staff.

Mr. LENNOX. What I meant by the fifth question was the expense of getting new books and all other such expense, not necessarily the change in the staff.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will get that information.

BANFIELD CREEK LIFEBOAT.

Mr. BARNARD asked:

1. What was the cost of the Banfield Creek lifeboat and when was it purchased?

2. Has the government made any inquiry into the circumstances surrounding the wreck of this lifeboat? If so, what was the result of such inquiries?

3. Upon what duty was the said lifeboat engaged when the wreck occurred?

4. Is it the intention of the government to have said lifeboat repaired? If so, what is the estimated cost of such repairs and when will same be completed?

5. Is the government, pending such repairs, making provision for protection of life from shipwreck in the west coast of Vancouver island? If so, what protection?

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

1. $10.900. Contract made in May, 1907, delivered in November, 1907.

2. Reports were obtained from T. Gillen, coxswain in charge of the station, and from the agent of the department at Victoria. As a result of these reports the coxswain was discharged and the crew paid off.

3. The boat was at anchor in front of the station when the storm arose which destroyed the boat.

4. The matter is engaging the attention of the department.

5. The agent at Victoria has been instructed to place the Clo-oose lifeboat at Banfield and to obtain a proper crew for the boat.

UXBRIDGE POST OFFICE.

Mr. S. SHARPE asked:

When was the site for the Uxbridge post office purchased, what site was selected, at what price, and from whom purchased?

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

An order in council was passed on February 8th, 1909, authorizing the purchase from L. H. Hutchinson, for $1,200, of lot 4, block G, corner Brock and Spruce streets.

CARIBOO MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. BURRELL asked:

1. What payments have been made since 1890 in connection with the mail service in Cariboo, and to whom were these payments made?

2. On what date was the last public tender called for in respect to the Cariboo mail service?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. Payments made for the Ashcroft station. Clinton and Barkerville mail service. From 1891 to 1897, British Columbia Express Co, $163,165; from 1898 to 1902, Kilgour & Miller, $116,187.45; from 1903 to 31st Dec., 1908, British Columbia Express Co., $158,539.82. Total, $437,892.27.

2. April 2, 1897.

WEEKLY MAIL—NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. SINCLAIR asked:

What number of post offices in the provinces of Nova Scotia are accommodated with only weekly mails?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

134.

HUMBOLDT ELECTION OFFICIALS

Mr. LAKE asked:

1. Have the accounts of the election officials who acted in the general election of the 26th of October last for the electoral district of Humboldt been sent in to the government?

2. If so, have they been paid, and to whom was the money sent? If not, what is the cause of the delay?

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State):

1. These accounts have not been received by the Auditor General.

2. A letter, dated 19th February, from A. K. Thom (presumably the election clerk) addressed to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and which was transferred to the Auditor General on the 27th, states that some enumerators' and deputy returning officers' accounts are included in ballot box forwarded by express to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on the 19th February, and that other accounts will follow in a few days.

No payment has been made in connection with the expenses for holding the election in Humboldt.

BANK ACT.

Mr. MACDONELL asked:

Is it the intention of the Minister of Finance to introduce this session an amendment to the Bank Act or a revision thereof, containing renewals of the bank charters which expire in 1911, with a view to affording the public an opportunity to consider any proposed amendments which may be thought desirable, between the present session and the next session of parliament?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). No.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE STABLES.

Mr. EDWARDS asked:

1. When were the stables at the entrance to the Royal Military College grounds erected and by whom?

2. Were tenders called for, and what was the amount of the original contract?

3. What was the total cost of the stables?

4. What are the dimensions of the building, and how many horses was it designed to accommodate?

5. Has the building been in general use since its completion? If not, why not?

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

1. (a) Date of contract, May 9, 1905.
   (b) H. W. Watts.
2. (a) Yes.
   (b) $6,990.
3. $8,573.69.
4. (a) 96 feet by 38 feet.
   (b) 22 horses.
5. (To be answered by the Department of Militia and Defence).

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

1, 2, 3, 4. Appertain to the Department of Public Works.

5. No use has up to the present been made of these stables, because the quarters being erected for the accommodation of the men who will look after the horses are not yet completed.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE COTTAGES.

Mr. EDWARDS asked:

1. What is the estimated total cost of the 16 cottages constructed for the accommodation of the civil subordinate staff at Kingston Royal Military College including fittings, furnishings, &c.

2. What portion of the work, in addition to the original contract, has been let by tender, to whom and at what price?

3. Has any of the work been let without tender? If so, what, to whom and the amount in each case?

Hon WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1. Original estimated cost, $96,000.
2. Alterations to main drain and lowering basement and inside drain, M. Sullivan.....$1,777.00
   Change to pressed brick..... 1,700.00
   Electric wiring and fixtures, Halliday Electric Company.. 3,550.00
   Outside connections, Halliday Electric Company 145.00
   Heating, Mr. Sullivan 2,750.00
3. Hot water boilers purchased from Cluff Bros. for $1,230, regular market price.

COST OF ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE STABLES.

Mr. EDWARDS asked:

1. What are the dimensions of the building at Kingston Royal Military College, referred to in the estimates as barracks accommodation for stables?
2. From whom were tenders received for construction of same, and amount of each?
3. When and to whom was the contract awarded, and what did the contract cover?
4. What is the cost of the building to date and what is the estimated total cost of the building, fittings and furnishings complete and ready for use?
5. Has any of the work been let without tender? If so, what portion, to whom, and to what amount in each case?

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

1. 35 feet by 41 feet; two stories and basement.
2. M. Sullivan, $9,490; W. H. Godwin, Jr., and Enoch Godwin, Jr. $9,890; W. T. Chapman, $10,500.
3. (a) M. Sullivan, on January 15, 1909.
   (b) Excavation, mason work, brickwork, carpenter work, plastering, galvanized iron work, plumbing, painting and glazing.
4. (a) Nothing paid to date.
   (b) $15,000.
5. No.

RIVER DESLISLE FISHWAY.

Mr. BOYER moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, reports of inspectors and engineers relating to the position of a fishway at the entrance of the river at Deslisle, Soulanges.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister Marine and Fisheries). I have no objection to bring down the correspondence with regard to the construction of the fishway, but as my hon. friend is aware the matter is now before the courts, and it would not be advisable to bring down the reports of the inspectors and engineers.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing: 1. At what work the Translation Branch of the House of Commons is employed.

2. The number of permanent translators in this branch.
3. The total amount of salaries paid to these translators.
4. The documents, reports and other matters which have been translated in this branch in the last twelve months, not including the pages already translated in the preceding year and repeated for the purposes of the report, nor the tables already made and translated and repeated for the purpose of completing these reports and documents, which have been most recently translated.
5. The total number of pages translated by the permanent translators.
6. The number of persons, outside of the Translation branch, to whom has been given translation work.
7. How much this outside work has cost, and how many pages have been translated in this way.
8. What Blue-books, if any, and other matters, excepting 'Hansard,' are translated in other departments other than the Translation branch of the House of Commons, and in what departments.—Mr. Boyer.

All prepared correspondence between the government and the government of British Columbia with reference to the reduction of Indian reserves in that province proportionately to the decrease of Indian population as provided for by order in council.—Mr. Barnard.

For a return showing the average number of men employed in every capacity in the working, maintenance and repairs of the Carillon and Grenville canals during each of the following months: July and August, 1906 and 1908, September and October, 1907 and 1908; and the total outlay for wages and salaries, also the total expenditure of every kind in connection with the said canal during each of those months.—Mr. Perley.

For a return showing how many bushels of seed wheat were bought for Saskatchewan and Alberta for the season 1908, who it was bought from, at what price, and what grade it was; if the wheat so bought was cleaned for seed; how the wheat so bought was used; who it was sold to, and at what prices; the total loss in connection with the wheat so bought.—Mr. W. H. Sharpe.

For a return showing how many bushels of English oats were bought for seed in Saskatchewan and Alberta for the season 1908, and at what prices; the condition the oats were in before and when they were bought; if used for seed or sold; who they were sold to and at what prices; the total loss in connection with the oats bought in England, and any complaints there were about them.—Mr. W. H. Sharpe.

For a copy of all correspondence, documents and papers relating to the construction, or proposed construction, of a line of railway from a point at or near Caledonia to Liverpool, not exceeding 29 miles referred to in the Acts of 1903, chapter 57, section 23d, and all orders in council, reports, contracts, agreements and other papers relating to the same matter.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a copy of all correspondence since January 1, 1907, between the government and the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, Quebec and Three Rivers, respecting interest due or overdue on advances made by way of loans to these bodies by the government.—Mr. Ames.

For a return showing the names and addresses of all half-breeds living in the United States who have been allotted scrip since January, 1902, and to whom said scrip was sent or delivered.—Mr. Bradbury.

DISALLOWANCE OF COBALT LAKE ACT.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE (South Essex) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, orders in council, papers, and other documents relating to the disallowance, or application therefor, of an Act of the legislature of the province of Ontario, intituled: 'An Act respecting Cobalt lake and Kerr lake,' being chapter 15 of the statutes of 1907.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this motion is one which I think calls for some remarks in this House, owing to the widespread interest which has been taken in the Act in question—an Act which has been described as one of confiscation of private rights, which has been described by one of the ablest judges in the province of Ontario as a violation of the eighth commandment, 'Thou shalt not steal;' an Act which has been condemned in the most severe terms, not only by party papers, but by independent newspapers and financial papers in this country, and by some of the leading financial papers of the motherland. The Act is one of paramount importance to the parties immediately concerned, the Florence Mining Company, because, if the contention of that company is correct, one of the fundamental bases of constitutional government has been violated. If the position of that company is correct, the Florence Mining Company was entitled to a valuable claim in the township of Coleman, in what is commonly known as the Cobalt district; if their contention is correct they were, by virtue of discovery, by virtue of survey, by virtue of all the formalities required to comply with the general statutes of the province, entitled to the valuable property which shortly afterwards was conveyed by the government of the province of Ontario for a large sum of something over $1,000,000. It may be good policy from a financial standpoint to take away the property of people in order to increase the revenues of the province; it is all very well for most people to look on complacently and see the government confiscate the property of certain individuals in order that they may share in the spoils, but it is not much fun for the people whose property is thus taken away. It is not my intention to go into the merits of the case pro or con. What I say is that this company has been deprived by an Act of the legislature of Ontario, not only of what they say is their property, but of their privilege which any citizen has to go into the courts and establish their right to that property.

Now, what are the facts of the case? Under an Act of the province of Ontario, the General Mines Act, any person who makes a discovery of any property open for exploration, surveys it, marks it out and complies with the conditions prescribed, has a vested right in that property; the statute gives him a right to hold that property, a right to work that property, a right to obtain his title in due course. That is the position which they take. The dispute has been as to whether this property was open for exploration. Undoubtedly up to August, 1905, it was open for exploration. About that there is no dispute. By an order in council passed on August 14, 1905, by the Ontario government, the Cobalt lake and some other properties were withdrawn from exploration; about that I think there is no dispute. Shortly afterwards the whole township of Coleman, in which these properties were situated, was withdrawn from exploration. But an order in council was passed in October, 1905, the effect of which, it is claimed by the Florence Mining Company, to be that the township of Coleman was again open to exploration. That was the state of the case in December, 1905, when Mr. Green took it into his head, with Major Gordon and some other associates, to explore the bed of the Cobalt lake. They went to Haileybury; they went to the recorder's office; they went to the Crown Lands office in Toronto; they say they were furnished with maps; they were furnished with particulars which assured them that this township was open for exploration. They went to a considerable amount of expenditure; they obtained a diamond drill, and on the 7th of March, 1906, after prospecting for some time and after a great deal of expense, they made a valuable discovery as a result of their operations. Accordingly they then became entitled to get a patent, to get a registration of their claim. They went to the proper authorities and made their application, and then they were told that, notwithstanding what had happened, they were not entitled to their claim, that this property was not opened for exploration at that time. They contest that issue. They say it was open for exploration. They say: We went to your department; we got the land from your department; we were going on exploring, and it is not fair now for you to say after all this that it was withdrawn from exploration and that we have no rights in it at all.

Mr. FOSTER. At what date was it they alleged they got that information?

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. Along some time in December, 1905, or January, 1906. The order in council was made in the previous October, which, they say, opened it for exploration. The matter went on; they said they would bring suit. First of all, they said, we will establish our claim; we will prove to you that it was open for exploration; the maps that were made showed it was open for exploration. But instead of

accepting the issue, instead of giving them a hearing, the result was that by an Act, chapter 12 of the statutes of 1906, assented to on the 14th of May, the order in council was set out, and it provided that:

Notwithstanding that at or before the time of the passing of such order in council, a discovery or discoveries was or were made, or was or were alleged to have been made on such lands or any part or parts thereof, and notwithstanding that some claim or claims to the mining rights, mines or minerals therein or thereon was or were at or before such time pending.

So this statute does not authorize the sale of the property, it simply says that the rights acquired by discovery or otherwise shall be set aside and shall not be rights at all.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. What was the date that the discovery was filed with the department?

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. On the 7th of March, 1906; that is when the discovery was made, and registration was applied for immediately afterwards. Notwithstanding that fact, the Florence people pressed their contention and they have pressed it to the present time. The next step, I think, was when action was brought by the Florence Mining Company on the 26th of December, 1906. That action was brought against the Cobalt Mining Company to whom the government had in the meantime sold the property, as I have said, for something over $1,000,000. That action had been commenced about the time the patent was granted. But if that were not enough, surely if they had the right to do that, it was not necessary to follow it up by an Act of the legislature to confirm it. But in the following April another Act was passed, which was assented to on the 20th April, 1907, which confirmed the sale which the government had made, and declared the property to be vested in the purchasers:

As and from the date of the said sales absolutely freed from all claims and demands of every nature whatsoever in respect of or arising from any discovery, location or staking.

Nothing stronger could be stated in an Act of parliament to take away the rights, if they were rights, of those people who had made the discovery, and who claimed they were entitled to this very valuable property. The Florence Mining Company, so strong in their claim of right, exhausted every constitutional means to maintain the right to their property. I understand they applied to the Lieutenant Governor to refuse his assent to the Bill. That attempt not succeeding, they petitioned His Excellency in Council to disallow the Act. In the meantime the case was coming on for trial. Three or four times it came up, and no decision upon the petition for disallowance had been made, the trial was postponed in order to see the result of the petition for disallowance. Finally, I think it was in April 1908, a report was made, and His Excellency decided not to disallow the Act, and that is my excuse for bringing the matter up in this House. If the ground for refusal to disallow had been that His Excellency agreed with the reasons given for passing the Act, then I think that this House ought to censure the government which advised such a course. If, on the other hand, the reason for disallowance was that it was a matter entirely within the jurisdiction of the provincial legislature, whether right or wrong, whether confiscation, or robbery, or theft, as has been suggested, then it may be that the Dominion government was right, and that we should not interfere with provincial matters. Certainly we have the power to interfere, certainly I think His Excellency has the prerogative right to disallow, whether it is because an Act is beyond the jurisdiction of the province or whether, in the interest of the whole country and as a matter of political expediency, it ought to be disallowed. I understand that the reason given for not disallowing was that it was a matter within the jurisdiction of the province. The case came on for trial before Mr. Justice Riddell. Notwithstanding the refusal to disallow, the plaintiffs say that the principles of Magna Charta have been violated, we will go to the foot of the Throne and see whether, under the constitution of Canada, any government has a right to take away the property of people without compensation. The case came before Mr. Justice Riddell upon trial. He said that the 8th commandment, 'Thou shalt not steal,' does not apply to the local legislature, that they have a right to steal the property of other people if they wish, there is nothing except what is physically impossible they cannot do, and he said they must seek other remedies in order to get justice on account of the claims which they are making. He said they did not intend to speak on the merits of the case; he said he did not pass on the question whether or not at the time of the discovery the property was open for exploration, or whether, as contended by the government in Toronto, the property had been withdrawn from exploration. But the fact remains that no person disputes that that Act did take away from these petitioners the right they had to go to the courts, the right that any other person would have to vindicate, and press, and prove the right which he claimed to have. The proposition was made, during the controversy, it is alleged, that the matter should be referred to the Court of Appeal, and that the Court of Appeal should decide whether or not the property was open for exploration, the parties to be bound by the decision. That also was refused. I am not questioning the good faith

of the Ontario government, though their conduct was such as to cause comment, and here is the fact that they did refuse even such a reasonable offer as this. The Act of 1906 barred the claims of the Florence Mining Company, and the whole three readings of that Bill were put through in one day. I do not know why this was done. I do not say that the provincial authorities were not acting bona fide, but I am sincere in saying that all the conduct of the Florence Mining Company in the matter indicates that they believe that they were given these rights and that this Act of the province of Ontario has, beyond doubt, taken away from them a property worth more than a million dollars without compensation, property to which they are entitled by virtue of the general law of this province. The case has gone to the Court of Appeal, and stands there for judgment, and it will probably go to the foot of the Throne. Whether they will succeed or not, we cannot foretell. But, in view of the strong interest that is being taken in this by financial concerns, let me read a comment upon it from the Toronto 'Financial Post' of January 15, 1909:

The whole matter is the subject of considerable discussion. One writer points out in a very able argument in the current number of the 'Canada Law Journal' that 'the numerous judgments recently given which uphold the doctrine that there is no appeal from the action of a provincial legislature so long as it confines itself to subjects committed to it by the British North America Act have created a widespread feeling of alarm among men concerned with financial affairs. The well-grounded idea that the rights of property are less secure in Canada than in the United States and Great Britain, or as one eminent financier puts it, than even in Mexico, is not calculated to encourage the flow of capital to this country. On the contrary, it puts us at a decided disadvantage as regards every kind of investment and industrial enterprise. The capitalist looking for investment sees that in the United States legislatures are not allowed to make or enforce any law which shall prejudice the privilege or immunities of the citizen of the United States, nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the protection of the law. Coming to this country, he finds that the courts have concluded, contrary to the plain intention of the framer of our constitution that, in dealing with the rights of property concerning which they have exclusive jurisdiction, our provincial legislators are not bound to regard the provisions of Magna Charta or that still earlier code the Ten Commandments.'

The Canadian Manufacturers' Association have dealt with the matter. The council of that association discussed it, and made the following recommendation:

Pending the appeal to the Privy Council in the above case no action need be taken, but your committee are strongly of the opinion that should the Privy Council uphold the action of the Ontario legislature, prompt measures should be taken to provide a remedy, even though it require an amendment to the British North America Act.

This, so far as I can see, is the general sentiment of the independent press. Although, in one sense, it may be an advantageous thing to take away the property of people to enrich the treasury of the province, still, if that is done to-day in one case it may be done to-morrow in some other case, and the security which has heretofore been enjoyed in respect of property and civil rights will become a thing of the past. Fortunately, these things do not happen very often. But I certainly think this return ought to be made in order that the public records of the House may show that in refusing the petition for disallowance His Excellency in Council did not countenance the character of legislation contained in the Act I have referred to.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe). I desire to ask the hon. member (Mr. A. H. Clarke) if this matter has not been dealt with by Mr. Justice Riddell, and, if so, will he not quote Judge Riddell's opinion?

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. Probably the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. A. Currie) did not hear me? What Mr. Justice Riddell said was that, so far as the courts are concerned, they had no authority to grant the relief asked for; that it was a matter for the legislature to answer to the people and to the authorities; that, so far as the courts were concerned, the legislature had the right to take away the property of people and violate every principle of honour, and the courts could not interfere. For that reason, I say, some other relief ought to be granted, so that the rights of people may not be taken away from them in so summary a fashion.

Mr. C. A. WILSON (Laval). I am thankful to my hon. friend from Essex for stating the facts of this case in the fair manner he has done. I understand that in March, 1905, one Green discovered, at the bottom of Cobalt lake, a silver mine, that he registered his claim in the recorder's office, and afterwards transferred his interest to a company known as the Florence Mining Company. Then a law was passed confirming the title of another company known as the Cobalt Lake and Kerr Lake Mining Company. Legislation has been passed by the Ontario government confirming the second-named company in their title, notwithstanding the claim or rights of the Florence Mining Company. We are now called upon in this House to express an opinion whether His Excellency the Governor General was right in refusing to disallow or rather in refusing the petition of the petitioners asking for the disallowance of that law. I do

not think it is necessary for the moment to enter into the merits of the cause of action accompanied by an injunction of the Florence Mining Company against the Cobalt Lake and Kerr Lake Company. A decision has been passed upon this case by His Lordship Mr. Justice Riddell. Could my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. A. H. Clarke) give me the date of that decision?

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. The decision was given June 15, 1908.

Mr. C. A. WILSON. I read with great interest the judgment of Mr. Justice Riddell and especially the quotation already cited by the hon. member for Essex 'Thou shalt not steal,' and I quite agree with his lordship. I do not think the law passed by the Ontario Legislative Assembly was a right and true one. But this is not the question for the moment. Reviewing the history of confederation, I find that the provinces which entered into the compact of that union, a contract which they signed freely, deprived themselves of the rights which they had enjoyed during the union and before. I understand that the King is the King within the provinces as well as here in Ottawa, that his power is the same, that the King can do no wrong here in this House of Parliament and he can do no wrong when he is advised according to the opinion of his ministers and acts through the ordinary work of either the parliament of the Dominion or the legislative assembly of any one of the provinces. The jurisdiction of the provinces is limited to their territory, and their power of legislation is confined to that territory. If an Act or a Bill has been assented to, has been discussed in the legislative assembly, has been authorized by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor of that province, it is a law. If that law is intra vires, it does not come within the scope of this parliament to advise disallowance. If that Act is ultra vires then it is for the courts of this country to decide upon it and to have it so declared. After confederation, I would rather say one year after the confederation had been adopted by the imperial authorities, many cases of disallowance had already been sent up to Ottawa to be commenced or disallowed. The Rt. Hon. Sir John Macdonald, then Prime Minister of this country, thought it proper, necessary and useful, in order to give the parliament then sitting, coming parliaments and coming generations a true and right interpretation of clauses 56 and 90 of the British North America Act, to lay down a dictum that would be the rule in the future. What was that dictum? What was the rule then laid down? I shall quote from that state paper the very rules that are now dictated to us to follow, so that we may well understand the duties we are called upon to perform in relation to the disallowance of a provincial law.

Cases which the minister may consider

1. As being altogether illegal or unconstitutional.
2. As illegal or unconstitutional in part.
3. In cases of concurrent jurisdiction as clashing with the legislation of the general parliament.
4. As affecting the interest of the Dominion generally.

These are the rules then laid down by Sir John Macdonald, the then Prime Minister, on June 8, 1868. Are we to understand that this Act passed by the parliament of the province of Ontario is totally illegal and unconstitutional? I would respectfully submit that this is not my view of the Act. I understand, and in this I have been convinced by the different precedents that were decided since confederation, and mainly by the precedent of a case coming from the same legislature which had passed an Act to protect the public interest in rivers, streams and creeks, the famous case of McLaren and Caldwell. This case was the subject of an interesting debate in 1882, and I would consider is much in common with the present case, because it related to private rights in a creek on some timber limits, the property of Mr. McLaren at the time. Mr. McLaren had erected certain works in order to hold back the water to float his timber during the spring, summer and autumn freshets. In rear of the timber limits of Mr. McLaren, Mr. Caldwell bought some limits, and when in the spring Mr. Caldwell started to float his logs there was an objection on the part of Mr. McLaren, who contended that he had certain private rights in the dam he had erected across the stream to float his logs.

An action, known as the case of Caldwell vs. McLaren, was taken to define the right of a party to float his timber down to market. The case came up exactly as the present, before Mr. Justice Proudfoot. The judgment then rendered was a judgment ab inconvenienti, to use a legal expression. Mr. Justice Proudfoot rendered judgment in the sense I have just mentioned in order to give an opportunity to the unsuccessful party to have a decision from the court of appeal. After the decision of his lordship was rendered there was a law passed and that law was, as the preamble says, to protect the public interest in rivers, streams, and creeks. This Act came up for the approval or disapproval, as the case might be, of His Excellency the Governor General in Council. The Act was disallowed for the reason that a judgment had been rendered and then this law was enacted ex post facto. The case went to appeal after the decision of Mr. Justice Proudfoot and while the appeal was pending the law was passed by the legislative assembly of Ontario and came up here for approval. The Act, as I have said, was disallowed, and the judgment of the court of appeal rendered. The law was no longer in existence

when the judgment of the court of appeal was delivered. This is the dictum of his lordship who pronounced the judgment of the court.

Having reached the conclusion that all streams are by public authority dedicated as highways to at least the extent essential to the defence in this action, I have only further to remark that when the obstruction which stood in the way of the enjoyment of the legal right is removed, when the traveller by land or lumberer seeking to float his lumber down a stream, finds the highway unobstructed, he is at liberty in my judgment, to make use of it without inquiring by whom, or with what motive, the way has been made practicable. He finds the rock on the road allowance blasted, or the chasms that crossed it bridged, and he pursues his journey along the highway thus improved; or he finds that the freshet covers all obstacles with a sufficient depth of water, and he floats his logs down the highway thus made useful. If may be in appearance and perhaps in reality rather hard on the man at whose expense what was a highway only in legal contemplation becomes one fit for profitable use, has to allow others to share in the advantage without contributing to the cost. That is, however, a matter for his own consideration when he makes the improvements.

This question is one of private rights and, according to subsection 13 of section 92 of the British North America Act, the provincial authority is the only authority to deal with these matters. We are not here to sit as a court of appeal but we are here to respect the authority and autonomy of the provincial government. This might be the proper time to ask under what circumstances, when, how, and why His Excellency the Governor General, under the advice of his ministers, may disallow Acts of provincial legislatures. As I remarked at the start, I understand that the local legislatures have the power to pass legislation within the scope of their jurisdiction; that is to exercise powers within the limits prescribed by the British North America Act. If the province undertakes to legislate in such a way as to affect the rights of another province, it would be illegal and unconstitutional, and under such circumstances the Dominion government may intervene and disallow the legislation. Now, take another instance. If a province should undertake to enact legislation which would deprive a company holding a federal charter of the right to exercise its powers and privileges within the different provinces that might be an occasion to intervene. Then, take another case. The legislation of a province might clash with the legislation of another country, with the legislation, for instance, of our neighbours the United States; that might be a case where it would be proper for the federal government to intervene. But it is not the case nor is it any remedy for the harsh and unjustifiable situation in which Mr. Greene and the Florence Mining Company find themselves. But, I respectfully submit that there is one remedy: Let those who have sinned repent in due time. I do not quite agree with my hon. friend from Essex when he states that all legal means have been exhausted. If I were the counsel for the Florence Mining Company I would advise them to go to appeal, because I think the court of appeal might render a decision quite different from the one that was rendered by the judge in the first instance, without commenting in any wise on the judgment of his lordship, Mr. Justice Riddell. As to whether all legal means have been exhausted, or as to whether the time for appeal has expired, I would not like to risk an opinion because I am not familiar with the law of procedure of the province of Ontario. The last resort which has been indicated by my hon. friend from Essex, that is that the case may go as far as the foot of the Throne, may be a very efficient one, but there is a simpler way. The remedy lies with the legislature of the province of Ontario. The parties who have been aggrieved may seek a remedy from the legislature, may ask for redress, and have no doubt if their claim is a just one they will be heard, their representations will be weighed and justice will be done.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (Algoma West). I cannot allow this motion to pass without saying a few words in reply to the very caustic criticisms to which my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Clarke) has subjected the measure which the Ontario government saw fit to pass and which has not been disallowed. My hon. friend indulged in invectives with regard to the effect of the measure; he seemed to roll like a sweet morsel round his tongue the idea that there was an interference with private rights, a stealing of some lands, a taking away from somebody that which belonged to that somebody, or, depriving somebody of a right which by law that somebody possessed; a right whether inchoate or vested. I submit in the first instance that in his conception of the position of matters under this Act, my hon. friend (to whose legal ability I would pay the highest tribute) has taken a mistaken view of the whole situation. What was the situation as it presented itself at this time to the Ontario legislature? Why, there is no doubt at all that it was clearly within the jurisdiction of the Ontario legislature to make laws, and within the right of the government to pass orders in council with reference to the mining regulations of the province of Ontario, and particularly to make special regulations with respect to withdrawing territory found upon inquiry to be rich in minerals. Now, the regulations had been made at this time and were in force when the staking took place in Cobalt lake upon which the Florence Mining Company base their claim. But over and

beyond that, in order to preserve a portion of the territory to Ontario which was supposed to be more than usually rich in mineral, the Lieutenant Governor in Council saw fit to pass an order in council on the 14th August, 1905, withdrawing from exploration for minerals that portion of the district of Nipissing in which lies the bottom of Cobalt lake. In the preservation of any mineral area in an excited period of prospecting there must be heart burnings and there must be disappointment. The Florence Mining Company, a speculative company having absolutely no vested rights,—my hon. friend to the contrary notwithstanding—went into that field as a speculator, acquired what they believed to be speculative rights from prospectors and built upon these speculative rights, to run up against an order in council duly passed in pursuance of the legislative jurisdiction.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. What about the order in council of the 30th of October which opened up that territory for prospecting?

Mr. BOYCE. Whether it was the order in council of the 30th of October or that of the 14th of August, it made no difference because the Ontario government had the absolute right to close or to open that territory as they saw fit.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. You don't understand me.

Mr. BOYCE. If there was a staking by any one in the meantime, that staking did not take place under any law of the province of Ontario or any regulations made under law dealing with the mining rights of the province. Such staking could not under the law give the right to any one to claim a piece of land as against the government.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. You do not catch my point. I quite agree that by the order in council of August the property might have been withdrawn from exploration. My question was: What do you do with the order in council of October following which opened it, as it is alleged, for exploration. The opinion given by two or three leading lawyers, Mr. Ritchie being one, was that that order of October again opened up the territory for exploration.

Mr. BOYCE. My hon. friend will bear in mind that that order in council did not apply to this territory.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. It applied to Coleman township.

Mr. BOYCE. It did not apply to this territory.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. That is their claim; they say it did.

Mr. BOYCE. I am dealing with facts; I am instructed and I believe I am correct in stating that that order in council of October did not at all touch the area in question, which remained closed.

Mr. CONMEE. Would my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BOYCE. Certainly.

Mr. CONMEE. Cobalt lake is within Cobalt township. Suppose it did cover Cobalt lake, what is the hon. gentleman's answer then?

Mr. BOYCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Conmee) must pardon me if I decline to soar into the heights of hypothesis with him. He is such a visionary gentleman himself with regard to some of his legislation and some of his questions in this House that I do not desire to attempt to cope with him in his flights of imagination. Any gentleman whose imagination can soar so high as to believe that the Nipigon river is an international waterway, far excells me in any flight of imagination I could hope to take. I will not discuss an hypothesis with him, but I shall deal with the argument of my hon. friend from Essex. My hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) must know, as a lawyer, that the question with regard to the right of the applicant under the Mines Act of Ontario to obtain a patent has been tested time after time. Even though the applicant proceeds to the fullest extent under the regulations he must come to the point at which he has got to ask the government to give him a patent, and then comes the question as to whether he is entitled to insist upon a title to his patent and whether he has the right to compel the government to give to him of the public domain. My hon. friend must also see that there is always the right in the Crown to withdraw for the public good any part of the public domain. That was what the Ontario government did, and the Act of which he complains was merely a confirmation of the order in council which did withdraw that land and which was not subsequently put back by order in council, as I am instructed, and as I believe to be the fact. The disposition of public lands, as my hon. friend well knows, is a matter of discretion; it is not a matter of absolute law. It cannot be enforced as against the Crown, and therefore the Crown had discretion to withdraw, and it did withdraw this land from sale. I do not know that the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) as to this being such a tremendous outrage on the people of Ontario are very well timed. I do not know that they would appeal very strongly to the right hon. the Prime Minister. I fancy the right hon. gentleman may imagine that some invidious comparisons might be made as between the position taken by the Ontario government in this connection and that taken by this federal government in multitudinous other connections. For instance, here was a case where the Ontario

government in the exercise of its right over the public heritage had the temerity and the courage to pass an order in council to preserve for the people of this province an area of land of undoubtedly great value. And for what purpose did the Ontario government do this? Was it to give it away to a few speculators, a few grafters, a few bogus companies of political friends, a few gentlemen closely in connection with the department who knew how to manipulate and to get land, valuable lands, for nothin? Oh, no. The Ontario government held this land in order that the revenues of the province of Ontario might be strengthened and increased by the opening of that land to public competition in the fairest and most honest manner possible so that the full value of that land might be obtained in the open market and placed to the credit of the whole people in the provincial treasury.

Is that stealing? Was it stealing, in the exercise of the right of the Crown, to get $1,080,000 for that which under the old regime the government would have got a few paltry hundreds for? It may be an outrage on the policy followed by this government; it may be a very great shock to the consciences of those hon. gentlemen who were witnesses to the exposure of the timber deals of last session, that the Ontario government was so absolutely wanton as to save for the people of Ontario a million dollars where somebody close to the government might otherwise have received the same land for a few hundreds. Sir, the doctrine which my hon. friend has rolled as such a sweet morsel under his tongue, 'Thou shalt not steal,' is hardly applicable in this connection. The keenest critic of the mining policy of the Ontario government cannot but see that in every step in a difficult position, in dealing with large interests, the Ontario government has endeavoured in every respect to conserve the interests of the people of Ontario, and to preserve for the people, and not for the speculator, the political hanger-on or the grafter, the resources of that province. The mining policy of the government of Ontario has been submitted to the people of Ontario, and the people of Ontario, by a somewhat emphatic, perhaps a somewhat exaggerated, expression of opinion, have approved of that policy. One of the strongest objections raised to a renewal of the confidence of the people of Ontario in the Whitney administration during the last election was this very question in regard to the interference of the government with private rights in Cobalt lake, and the people almost unanimously—there were very few derelicts left from that storm—approved of the government's policy. My hon. friend contends that there should still be some interference from here. Well, the matter has not only been before the people of the province of Ontario, but it has been before an impartial judge, the Minister of Justice, who has examined this legislation, doubtless bestowing upon it that critical examination which his high legal abilities and attainments specially qualify him to give it. I do not suppose for an instant that the hon. Minister of Justice, in that examination, would be prejudiced or biassed one way or the other. I certainly do not think he would be prejudiced or biassed in favour of continuing the legislation if there was a doubt in his mind of its constitutionality. If there had been such a doubt in his mind, I would rather suppose that my hon. friend, from motives of public policy, would under the circumstances lean in the direction of the disallowance of the legislation, from certain comments which have been attributed to him in the public press before the matter came under his consideration. I have only this further to say to my hon. friend, that I think that upon reconsideration he will see that his strictures upon the morality of the measures are quite out of order—that the only motive appearing to underly it was to carry out that wise policy of conserving the resources of the province of Ontario that was introduced shortly after the present Minister of Lands and Mines came into office, and has been since adhered to and carried out to the great enrichment of the province of Ontario. This is a class of cases of which we have had numerous instances. My hon. friend will doubtless remember the case of Dwyer vs. the town of Port Arthur in which some particular legislation was referred to in order to validate a by-law as to which certain proceedings had not been taken. The legislature passed an Act allowing the by-law as if the necessary proceedings had been taken. They were proceedings for the preservation of the rights, not of one individual, but of the public generally. The legislation dispensed with them, litigation arose, and the courts decided in favour of the statute. The Act upon which my hon. friend has bestowed his comments was certainly an Act for the preservation of the rights of the people as against the rights of the speculator. It was an Act passed on the lines of a wise policy; a policy which has been inaugurated by the present Ontario government in the administration of the magnificent mining areas of the province, and I think very little fault is to be found with the legislation, having successfully passed through the examination of the Minister of Justice, and having received the universal approval of the people of Ontario as wise and economical legislation.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words on the interesting question brought up by my hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Clarke), the question of disallowance. I take the facts as stated by him. He states that under

an Act and regulations of the Ontario Government, a certain party went and prospected on a certain mining property, performing all the conditions of the Act and of the regulations, and made application for the property; that subsequently the Ontario government passed an order in council annulling its former regulation by which the lands were opened for settlement. I am taking the particulars as stated by my hon. friend, for I know nothing about the matter myself. His statement is that the party in question complied with the law, and was therefore entitled to a patent for the mining section. There is no doubt that he was, and that the courts would order a patent to issue to him. There is no doubt that under the British North America Act the jurisdiction over civil rights and property is vested in the provinces.

The province rightly or wrongly — my hon. friend from West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) contends that the province was right, and my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Clarke) says it was wrong—the province, by an order in council withdrew these lands from sale, or virtually annulled, as far as they could, the right these parties had to the property. Now, the question arises whether they had jurisdiction under the section of the British North America Act giving them control of property and civil rights. My hon. friend said he would like to see this question decided by the courts, but I think perhaps they would decide that, where jurisdiction is given to the provinces over property, they only have the right to legislate in regard to the same. My hon. friend thinks that Judge Riddell in his judgment hinted as much. It has not been finally decided by the Privy Council, although in the case of the Temporalities Fund their judgment was strongly in that direction; it went this far, that the corpus, or the power that the British government had to deal with property, was given to the province, and, if they gave it to the provinces, then they have the absolute disposition of the property, they have the right to take it from one individual and give it to another without compensation. That question has not been clearly decided by the Privy Council. I think the question of disallowance, which the hon. gentleman mentions, is an interesting one. Why was this right of disallowance given to the Dominion government? It was absolutely given to us. Our contention long ago was that it was for the purpose of protecting private property as much as anything else. The argument made at the present day is an entirely different one, it is on the lines laid down by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Wilson), that is, that where disputes arise between the provinces which might affect the rights of one or the other in reference to the Dominion, in reference to international questions, in reference even to the raising of taxes which could interfere with the Dominion revenue—in all these, I suppose, the Dominion government has a right to exercise its powers of disallowance. So the question is not whether we are interfering in what a province has absolutely jurisdiction over. But my hon. friend from Essex follows the doctrine which was laid down by his friends long ago. He has no right to complain of this disallowance. I remember in this House hearing the Hon. Edward Blake laying down the doctrine, that if a province had jurisdiction over the subject they had a right to do wrong if they liked, and it was none of our business to interfere. It is then none of the business of the hon. member for Essex to complain if they have done wrong in disallowing this Act.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. I want the papers in order to show on what grounds they put it.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Why has not the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. H. Clarke) the same influence with the government as the hon. member for Laval (Mr. C. A. Wilson), who read the order in council with the reasons——

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. They are not public.

Mr. J. HAGGART. They are public now. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. H. Clarke) has no right to complain. The doctrine which he now opposes was laid down by the Reform party when in opposition—that if a province had jurisdiction over a subject, the Dominion government had no right to interfere. I am not dealing with the merits of the case, whether this disallowance is or is not in the interest of the province. But I may say that, if I had my way, wherever a province interfered with the sacred right of the individual, that individual should have the right to apply to the Dominion government and ask for a disallowance of the law. I held that doctrine in reference to the Streams Bill. I am glad to find that some hon. members on the other side of the House who held contrary views to mine at that time are now disposed to agree with me.

Hon A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). As I do not intend to offer any opposition to the motion of my hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. A. H. Clarke), I might, I suppose, without impropriety, leave to the coming down of the return asked for the answer to much of what the hon. gentleman has said in regard to the reasons which impelled me to give to His Excellency in Council the advice which I did give in this matter. But the question is of so much general interest, and so directly and intimately affects the principles of the

constitution under which we are carrying on the government of this country, that it seems to me I ought to say a few words before this motion is put in regard to the difficulties which arose in the consideration of this matter. In the first place, I wish to add an item to the circumstances as detailed by the hon. member who moves this resolution. There was not only the application for disallowance, to which he has referred, by those who were the assignees and successors in title of the man who said that he had made a discovery of valuable minerals under Cobalt lake in March, 1906, but there was an additional and independent—so far as appeared—application for disallowance made by one Henry Dreany, who asserted that he had recorded a claim in accordance with the requirements of the Ontario statute to a part of the bed of Cobalt lake on the 17th to 18th July, 1905, at a time when there never was any dispute but that this location was open for purposes of prospecting and exploration. He asserted that fact, at all events. His right, whatever it may be, as fixed by the actual step of recording his claim, was one of the rights which, under the legislation which has been referred to, were taken away, and his claim, as well as that of Green, or of the Florence Mining Company, who had bought from Green, were absolutely divested from him and from them and vested in the purchasers from the government, the company now claiming to own the property. So, in considering what advice ought to be given with reference to this legislation, there were the two claims to be taken into account. And I want it to be understood that, in coming to a conclusion as to the advice or recommendation I ought to give in the matter, I did not attempt in any way to pass upon—even in my own mind to pass upon—the justice or stability or validity of the claims in question; that, I think, is something with which no person is concerned except the parties directly interested. A much larger question, it seems to me, arises here. One of these claimants was asserting that he possessed the right and litigating that question in the courts. He or his company have demonstrated already by the expense to which they have gone that they have faith in their claim, that they are, in good faith, asserting that claim, that they are presenting it to the regular, constituted, judicial tribunals of the country for adjudication, and that they are prepared to back it up and establish it if an opportunity is given them to do so. So far as the other claimant is concerned, he has not, that I am aware of, entered upon litigation at all. Perhaps he has thought that it is too big a task for one man to undertake. He would have—as the litigation which is on foot has demonstrated—not only to fight a company, able, at all exents, to pay over $1,000,000 for the property involved, but to fight as well all the strength and all the financial resources of the Ontario government itself. And perhaps it is not to be wondered at that Dreany has not entered upon litigation with such a prospect as that before him, but that he simply asserts that the records show that he had made a discovery, and had recorded himself as entitled to the benefit of it, months before this property was in question at all or any order in council had been passed by the local government seeking to withdraw it from exploration and location. Now, application to disallow a piece of legislation which purported to vest property, to which there were adverse claims, in some other person or some other purchaser presented itself for consideration. And, in what I have to say upon the subject to-day, I want, so far as possible, to discover the point of view which should be taken, I think, by any one occupying the position I have the honour to hold, and the point of view from which these matters may properly be looked at by a citizen and resident or property owner of the province of Ontario. The two are standpoints, which, I feel, necessarily differ very materially, and I want first to speak of this matter entirely from the standpoint of the official of this House, of the member of the government who is called upon to advise as to the course which His Excellency ought to take in a matter of this character. The large question of principle which was presented for consideration was simply whether or not the provincial legislature has the power, without control, to take one man's property and give it to another and to take away from the person injured any right of redress in the courts. It is sufficient to say without passing upon the validity in any way of the claim which was made by the man who says he was wronged, that he had a claim which in good faith he was presenting to the courts, and that the legislation in question, in so many words, took from him the right to litigate and declared in unmistakable language that the courts must award the property in dispute to his antagonist. Now, I think I may safely say—and especially in view of the remarks which have just fallen from my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart)—that if this identical question had arisen before 1896 this legislation would have been disallowed. I think it is simply the misfortune of the applicants for disallowance that this occurrence did not take place before 1896, because, up to that time at any rate, the rule in such matters, so far as I am able to gather that rule from the records of the Department of Justice, and from the public records of this country, had been in accordance with the views which have to-day been enun-

ciated by the hon. member for South Lanark. And I will say at once that I believe that was the intention with which the framers of the British North America Act provided the right of disallowance in the statute. I am old enough to have a memory of the days before confederation, and dissever the point of view which should to remember as current events the views discussed in the newspapers of the time of the purposes and ideas and intentions of those who assembled at Quebec and framed the resolutions and what the earlier ideas of the relative positions of the provincial legislatures and Dominion government were, in the days before 1870. Speaking from that memory, as well as from the reports of the opinions that we have, I express the view here that, beyond doubt, the idea with which the power of disallowance was conferred upon the Dominion government was that it might be exercised upon principles such as have been stated by the hon. member for South Lanark this afternoon. Not only do I say that as a matter which I hold as within my own recollection, but I am fortified in more respects than one by official utterances to the like effect. In 1873, there was in question in the province of Ontario a very famous piece of litigation known as the Goodhue will case, in which the provincial legislature had passed an Act to make a new will for a very wealthy gentleman named Goodhue then not long deceased. On that measure coming under consideration of the Ontario courts, Chief Justice Draper, speaking in 1873, and speaking as a man who was not only at the time a distinguished and experienced judge and Chief Justice of the Court of Appeal for the province, but also in the light and knowledge of an eminent statesman of the parliament of the two Canadas in the days before confederation, used this language:

Such Bills are still subject to the consideration of the Governor General, who, as the representative of the Sovereign, is entrusted with authority, to which a corresponding duty attaches, to disallow any law contrary to reason or to natural justice and equity.

That language is to be found in vol. 19 of Grant's Ontario Chancery Reports, at page 384. And no more distinct judicial utterance describing the purpose of the power of disallowance could well be found. These views then obtained. And, a few years later, in discussing the proposed disallowance of what is known as the Rivers and Streams Bill, passed by the Ontario legislature, Sir John A. Macdonald, in 1881, used this language in recommending disallowance:

I think the power of the local legislatures to take away the rights of one man and vest them in another, as is done by this Act, is exceedingly doubtful; but assuming that such right does in strictness exist, I think it devolves upon this government to see that such power is not exercised in flagrant violation of private rights and natural justice, especially when, as in this case, in addition to interfering with private rights in the way alluded to, the Act overrides a decision of a court of competent jurisdiction by declaring retrospectively that the law always was and is different from that laid down by the court.

But those views, expressed in 1873 and in 1881 were not the views merely of the earlier years of confederation, they were substantially repeated as lately as 1893 by the Hon. J. Aldric Ouimet as acting Minister of Justice. In referring to an Ontario statute then under consideration he used this language:

Assuming the statute to have the effect which the railway company attribute to it, the case would appear to be that of a statute which interferes with vested rights of property and the obligation of contract without providing for compensation and would therefore, in the opinion of the undersigned, furnish sufficient reason for the exercise of the power of disallowance.

So that not only in the earlier years of confederation but as late as 1893, we have the most distinct statement by the minister of that day that if provincial legislation interfered with rights of property without providing compensation that circumstance afforded sufficient reason for the exercise of the power of disallowance. Speaking for myself I say at once that, perhaps from the influence of earlier education or perhaps from the consideration of maturer years, I entertain in all honesty and sincerity the view that it is of vital consequence to the well-being of this Dominion that the rights of the provinces to legislate within the scope of their authority should not be interfered with, and that every provincial legislature, within the limits prescribed for it by the terms of the British North America Act, is and ought to be supreme. I believe that this is a principle of greater importance to the welfare of this Dominion as a whole than even the sacredness of private rights or of property ownership. I am willing to go thus far in the enunciation of the views I am stating to this House, that a provincial legislature, having as is given to it by the terms of the British North America Act, full and absolute control over property and civil rights within the province, might if it saw fit to do so, repeal Magna Charta itself. I know no difference between that most sacred bulwark of liberty and of property to every British subject and any piece of legislation. I take it that no one would dispute the power of a provincial legislature to repeal the Habeas Corpus Act or any other charter of liberty which Englishmen possess; and in precisely the same view I take the ground that rights of property are subject only to the control of provincial legislatures within Canada. Having that view it seemed to

me in considering this legislation that I was not, as advising His Excellency in Council called, upon to think at all of the injustice, of the outrageous character it might be of the legislation, but that my one inquiry ought to be whether or not there was anything in the legislation itself which went beyond the power of the provincial legislature to pass a law referring alone to property and civil rights within the province. In that view I had the help of opinions which had been expressed by my immediate predecessors in office, the Hon. David Mills and the Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick, and I found in instances in which they had been called upon to consider legislation of somewhat similar character, an assertion of the principles to which my mind adhered and therefore, what I considered a safe resting place in precedent, even if I had not been prepared to make, if necessary a precedent for myself and to depart from the course which had been taken repeatedly before 1896. In 1901 the Hon. David Mills, in reporting upon legislation of a somewhat similar character, used this language:

The undersigned conceives that Your Excellency's government is not concerned with the policy of this measure. It is no doubt intra vires of the legislature and if it be unfair or unjust or contrary to the principles which ought to govern in dealing with private rights, the constitutional recourse is to the legislature, and the Acts of the legislature may be ultimately judged by the people. The undersigned does not consider, therefore, that Your Excellency ought to exercise the power of disallowance in such cases.

In the same year, speaking, with reference to legislation of the province of British Columbia which was then under consideration, he said:

The undersigned bases his refusal to recommend disallowance upon the fact that the application proceeds upon grounds affecting the substance of the Act with regard to matters undoubtedly within the legislative authority of the province and not affecting any matter of Dominion policy. It is alleged that the statute affects pending litigation and rights existing under previous legislation and grants from the province. The undersigned considers that such legislation is objectionable in principle and not justified unless in very exceptional circumstances; but Your Excellency's government is not in any wise responsible for the principle of the legislation, and as has been already stated in this report with regard to an Ontario statute, the proper remedy in such cases lies with the legislature or its constitutional judges.

A year later Mr. Fitzpatrick, reporting upon British Columbia legislation, used these words:

It appears that litigation was pending between the government and the petitioners, at the time of the passing of the Act, with regard to the peitioner's liability to pay these royalties; and no doubt a very strong case is made out by the petitioners in support of the view that the legislature should have allowed the existing law to operate and should not have undertaken to legislate so as to diminish or affect existing rights.

The undersigned cannot help expressing his disapprobation of measures of this character, but there is a difficulty about Your Excellency in Council giving relief in such cases without affirming a policy which requires your Excellency's government to put itself to a large extent in the place of the legislature and judge of the propriety of its acts relating to matters committed by the constitution to the exclusive legislative authority of the province.

I share these views. I believed, as I still believe, that this is the true spirit of our constitution. We have advanced since the days of 1867, or even of 1881 or 1893. The doctrine of provincial rights, which has always been, I am glad to think, the peculiar property of the political party of which I am a member, has of late years found strong supporters even in the ranks of our political opponents. We welcome this accession to the principles for which the Reform party in Canada has fought ever since confederation, and, acting on these principles and because I was brought up to believe in them and because I do sincerely and honestly think it is best for this country that each provincial legislature, within the sphere of its authority and jurisdiction, should be supreme and amenable only to its constitutional judges, the electors of its own province, I concurred in the opinions expressed and precedents laid down by my immediate predecessors. I shared their views and I acted upon them in this case. I advised my colleagues and, through them, His Excellency that this power of disallowance which was vested in us was one which, in the interest of the commonwealth, it was better should not be exercised even though the Act which was sought to be disallowed went the length of taking my farm from my possession and handing it over without any compensation to my neighbour, or, it might be, to my political opponent. These are considerations entirely for the provincial legislature. It represents the people of the province; its members are elected by the same electors who send us to this House, and I certainly seek to put every provincial legislature, within the scope of its jurisdiction as laid down in the British North America Act, upon an absolutely level footing with the parliament of Canada itself so far as its legislation is concerned. I know no difference and can see no distinction to be drawn from the true reading of the language used in the British North America Act. Both this parliament and the different provincial legislatures have limits placed by that legislation upon their jurisdiction and legislative powers and it is of equal importance that each should keep and be kept entirely within its own

limits. It would not be proper, in declaring some provincial measure to be one which ought to be disallowed, that this parliament or its representatives, this government, or its Minister of Justice, should transgress the limits of the jurisdiction which the British North America Act intended to confer upon them. My view was, and is, that any measure of this sort is one in regard to which the only appeal from the provincial legislature ought to be to the people who elect that legislature, and who, if they please, may dethrone the government of the day and deprive it of power. This was a question, it seemed to me, to have been fought out at the polls. This was not a question which it was right to relegate to the Minister of Justice or the government of the day at Ottawa, and ask that minister or that government to decide and, acting upon that view and no other, I gave the advice which I did in this matter.

Before taking my seat I want to say just one word, and I shall be extremely brief about it, with regard to this legislation looked at from the standpoint of the voter in the province of Ontario. I do not blink in the least degree the importance of the principle involved. I wish to state it in the plainest language at my command. It simply means, in my judgment, speaking as a voter of the province of Ontario, that our present provincial government, that our recent provincial legislature, have arrogated to themselves the right to say to any citizen of the province: You shall not litigate; it makes no difference how just you think your claim, we have the right to decide it and to deny you the open door of the courts; we have the right in this particular instance and we choose to exercise it. Of course, in this matter, the Minister of Justice did not act without sending to the representative of the Crown in Ontario, and, through him, to the provincial government, a copy of the representations which were made in asking the disallowance with the invitation that they should make any observations they might see fit in the way of an answer. When the papers come down the House will be possessed of the observations which the government of Ontario saw fit to make in regard to this legislation. I shall not go into that more than to say that one, at all events, of the principal grounds upon which the propriety of the legislation in question was rested was that it affected the revenues of the province. No doubt it did. There was a million dollars hung up before the eyes of the voters of the province of Ontario, and because the Ontario government had secured from this operation the magnificent sum of $1,000,000 the voters of the province were asked to ratify what they had done and to say that it was a proper and legitimate transaction. I wonder if it occurred to any of my fellow electors that the government of Ontario could at any time make a good many millions of dollars if they pleased for the revenues of the province by confiscating farms enough and by legislating those farms into the possession of anybody willing to pay for them. That exactly was the principle upon which this legislation was defended before the people of the province at the polls. My fellow voters, or a majority of them, seemed to have been content. I only trust that the day will never come when they may see reason to regret from personal experience that they did not condemn at the polls, as it ought to have been condemned, this manifest encroachment upon the rights of property and the right to resort to the courts of the province.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). I just want to say one word in view of the very extraordinary speech of the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) in giving his reasons for not disallowing this Bill. I am bound to commiserate the minister upon being in the minority in two particulars. He is not only in the minority as a voter in the province of Ontario, but he is in the minority in his own party with regard to this question of provincial rights. In view of the strong statements he has made as to what caused him to advise the non-disallowance of the Act in question, I take this opportunity to urge upon the Minister of Justice to hold a special caucus of his party so that he may say these things emphatically to his supporters in this House and urge them to once in a while vote for provincial rights in the Railway Committee. The Minister of Justice is, I believe, himself a member of the Railway Committee; his name is called over and over again, and every time it is called there is silence. As these are the doctrines he is so anxious that parliament should carry out, I hope the Minister of Justice will during the session favour us with his attendance in the Railway Committee once in a while, and see that his followers there do not vote against provincial rights every time a railway charter involving provincial rights comes up for consideration.

Mr. GEORGE GORDON (Nipissing). I did not intend to speak on this motion but as a shareholder in the Florence Mining Company I think I ought to say something. I am a new member of this House, but already I have been surprised to find how time is frittered away by hon. gentlemen talking a great deal on things they know nothing about. I venture to say that the member for Essex who brought this question up to-day does not know whether discovery was made of mineral in place by the Florence Mining Company in Cobalt Lake, or by the party who turned it over to them. Does the hon. gentleman know that?

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. Do you know?

Mr. GEORGE GORDON. I am pretty sure I do know. I was a shareholder and I am a shareholder in the Florence Mining Company and I want to tell my hon. friend that the courts did perfectly right and treated the Florence Mining Company justly when they threw out their case. I do not believe the Florence Mining Company had a case at all. I do not believe there was a discovery of mineral in place, but I do believe that the Florence Mining Company had nothing upon which to back up their claim. When people who know nothing about a subject interfere, they are pretty certain to get into trouble. I say here to-day that I candidly and honestly believe that the Florence Mining Company never had a discovery of mineral in place, and never were entitled to the rights in that lake. And when the Minister of Justice speaks about the Ontario government as he did this afternoon, I want to tell him, so that he may understand the independence and honesty of the Ontario government, that the four names which were on the petition were the names of four prominent Conservatives. That, I believe, was done to endeavour to influence the Ontario government in some respect, but it resulted in failure. I am sorry to say that my name was put down on that petition and obtained in a manner it should not have been by any person who wanted to do the right thing. I was told that if I subscribed to the Florence Mining Company and put up $100 the same as the others were doing we would stand to make something very big, and that at the most we could only lose $100. I did not know at the time what they were driving at. I gave the money over and pledged my word to go in with these people before I knew what it was all about. I did not know what they were after, but I asumed that the gentleman who offered me such a prospect was doing something that he need not be ashamed of, and so I signed my name. But, afterwards when I found out what it was, and when I read the evidence, I came to the conclusion that they never had a discovery of mineral in place, and that they were not entitled to the property. I believe that the people who are justly entitled to that propery have it today.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I rise for a moment to a question of privilege. I understand that the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) has said that he has heard mv name called time and again in the railway committee of which, he said, I am a member, and that I have not been present to assert provincial rights. I beg to inform the hon. gentleman that I am not a member of the railway committee.

Some hon. MEMBERS Hear, hear.

Mr. GORDON.

Mr. LANCASTER. As explanations are in order, I would ask the Minister of Justice to reorganize the management of that committee, and to see that his name is not called by the clerk of the committee every day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). It would have been better if the Minister of Justice after delivering his very able and instructive speech upon this subject, had concluded without attempting to make an absolutely unwarrantable attack upon the Ontario government. This is not the place for that. In the previous portion of his remarks the Minister of Justice stated most distinctly that he was not called upon as Minister of Justice to pronounce either upon the justice or injustice of the legislation which had been passed, and having put himself in that position before this House, and speaking still as Minister of Justice he saw fit to indulge in very strong invective against men who are not here in place to defend themselves. To say the least such language was unwarranted by the occasion. I do not know any of the circumstances of this legislation, or of its allowance, but I am bound to say that any man who considers himself injured by legislation of that kind has always the right to go back to the legislature, make his arguments there, and ask that the injurious enactment be repealed. I had occasion to do that once myself in the legislature of Nova Scotia when certain legislation had been passed affecting rights which were then in litigation. I went to the legislature of Nova Scotia and after a very hard fight I succeeded in obtaining for my clients what I believed in that case to be justice. But I would like to say something more to the Minister of Justice. If the refusal to permit litigation of claims against the government is an outrage, as the Minister of Justice has declared, I would point out to him and to the Prime Minister, that in no less than in 30 or 40 cases arising in connection with the Post Office Department the government of Canada absolutely refused to certain men the right to litigate their claims. And, I would ask the Minister of Justice to begin his invectives against that administration of which he is a member, in view of his declaration this afternoon that a claim against the Crown whether in the right of the province or of the Dominion ought to be put into litigation when once that claim is made. I myself rose in this House not fewer than four or five times and I asked that a fiat should be granted in justice to the men whose contracts had been rescinded by the Postmaster General of the day upon the assumption that he possessed the authority in connection with these contracts, which authority was controverted bv the men with whom these contracts had been made. And, notwithstanding my repeated protests in this House and

notwithstanding that over and over again these men not only by petition to the Crown but on the floor of this parliament, have presented these claims, they never were permitted to be put in litigation, and to this day the claimants remain without the privilege of recourse to the courts of the land. It cannot be possible that the Minister of Justice is ignorant of all this. I would suggest to him that at the earliest possible occasion when he meets his colleagues in council he will use on them some of these forcible expressions to which he has this afternoon given voice, and insist, upon peril of his own resignation as a Minister of the Crown, that that right so long denied to these men shall be at once conceded, and these claims referred to the Exchequer Court of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

TELEPHONE RATES IN CANADA.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe) moved:

That in the opinion of this House the experience of the provinces which have taken over the telephone system and the evidence collected by a special committee of this House appointed to inquire into the question of telegrams and telephones more than four years ago, establish the fact that the people of Canada, outside the zone of provincially operated lines, are paying far higher rates for telephone service than they should be called upon to pay.

That i tis the immediate duty of the government to initiate and carry out such measures as will remove long existing abuses in this regard and secure to the people of Canada, other than the people of Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba, a rate of service at least as moderate as, having regard to local conditions, prevails in countries where a national telephone service is maintained.

He said: Mr. Speaker: This is a business proposition, and I propose, in my activities in this House, to limit myself as far as possible to business propositions, and to endeavour to bring about, as far as I can, better conditions for the people generally. The question of an amelioration of our condition as regards telephone service is, comparatively speaking, new. It did not occur to our people perhaps as early as it did to the people of the United States, that we were not enjoying as good conditions in this respect as we were entitled to. Even in the United States, down to the year 1894, the Bell Telephone Company had practically a monopoly of the service in that country, and it was only about that time that the people began to awake to the fact that they could do better than to allow this monopoly to continue. It was considerably later than that before it began to dawn upon us that we also were entitled to a better condition of things. Perhaps it was not until about the beginning of this century that we began to realize that we were paying too much, and not getting as good a service as we were entitled to; and from that time onward the feeling has been gradually growing stronger in Canada that we should do something to rid ourselves of the monopoly of the Bell Telephone Co. But, although there was a good leal of agitation on the subject in the House, no definite action was taken until 1904, when Sir Wm. Mulock moved the resolution which resulted in a special committee being appointed to investigate the matter. This government was certainly not more alert than it ought to have been in appointing that committee. Now, I would suppose that that committee was appointed for some business object, and that object, as I understand, was to ascertain whether or not we could put ourselves in a better position; and if the result of that investigation was to show that the conditions were not satisfactory, some action would be taken. From that time down to the present no action has been taken; nothing has been done to relieve the people of Canada from the conditions under which they were suffering. There are many men in this House far more familiar with telephonic conditions than I am, and better able to stir up the government to get a move on in this matter, but in the absence of anybody else taking it up, I took it upon myself at the beginning of this session to place this resolution on the Order Paper with a view of righting the wrongs which the investigation of the committee of 1904 showed to exist in the Dominion of Canada.

Now my resolution aims at two things. My first proposition is that we are paying too much for our telephone service, and I may add that our telephone service is not as complete or as good as it ought to be. My second proposition is that we are entitled to have as cheap a service as those countries where national telephones have been established. The members of this House are very familiar with these propositions. When we talk of nationalizing our railways or any of our public utilities, the answer from the honourable gentlemen opposite is this—and I have heard it from the right honourable the leader of the government down—that we can get a cheaper service and a more efficient service from a company service. Now, we have a company service, and according to the decision of the government we are to continue to have a company service, and that being the case, it is for us to see to it, as far as possible, that a company, being able to give a cheaper service than a government can, shall give us at least as cheap a service as

is enjoyed in countries where a government service is given. At the time the investigation took place, the committee took evidence from various important bodies as to what they thought was the best system for Canada. There were two classes of advocates: One was for the ownership by the government of the entire telephonic system in Canada, the other was for the ownership by the government of the trunk lines only, with the branch lines and local services in the hands of companies or other parties. Among those who advocated complete government ownership were the Toronto city council, the Owen Sound board of trade, the county council of Bruce, the city of Nanaimo, the town of Simcoe, the township of Pickering, the town of Port Perry, the Regina board of trade, the Montreal chambers of commerce, the Stratford board of trade, the town of Morris, Man., the municipality of Pipestone, Man., the municipality of Batiscan, Que., the municipality of Matsqui, B.C., the municipality of Jordan, B.C., the municipality of Maple Creek, N.W.T., the municipality of Rama, the county of Essex, the town of Hespeler and the councils of the towns and county, the trades and labour councils and the boards of trade of the county of Waterloo.

Among those who advocated government ownership of long distance lines, were Kelowna in British Columbia; the Ontario Municipal Association; the Union of Canadian Municipalities, which is an important body representing the matured thought of the entire municipal bodies of Canada, which I think is not an unimportant element in the discussion of any public question in Canada. There was the town of Peterborough; the Winnipeg Printers' board of trade; the retail merchants of Ontario, 5,000 strong; the Guelph board of trade; town of Orangeville; town of Neepawa; town of St. Andrew's, New Brunswick; Union Telephone Company, Florenceville, New Brunswick; municipality of Gormley, Ontario, county of Elgin; township of York; town of Weston; Halifax county, Nova Scotia; town of Sarnia. I have said that the government pronouncing judgment in this House and repeating it everywhere, that we can have a better and more efficient service by leaving it in the hands of companies than we can by having it operated under government authority, directly by the action of a minister or indirectly through the action of a commission, it is up to the government, if I may use that expression, to see to it now that we have at least as cheap a service, as efficient a service, as they have in those countries where nationalization has been established. Now, the House will remember that in the course of that investigation we employed an eminent expert, a Mr. Dagger, who was expected to collect material and boil it down, as it were, to crystallize it and to present it to the committee. That being the case, I venture to read a line or two of his report, at page 16 of the evidence of the select committee I have referred to. He says:

On sechule 'F' to this exhibit will be found the long distance fees charged in the principal countries of the world. From it will be seen that the charges in the United States and Canada are the highest of all, being double the British rates and four times as much as the German. There would appear to be no satisfactory reason for this, as it is well known that the cost of the English trunk lines is very much greater than those upon this continent for the following, among other reasons—

1. Much heavier copper wire is used, the main lines weighing 800 pounds to the mile as against about 200 pounds here.
2. Poles have to be imported and creosoted whereas here native cedar is used.
3. Porcelain insulators and iron bolts are used in England, glass insulators and wooden pins here.

I am satisfied that the present rates in Canada could be cut in two and still leave a satisfactory profit on the working.

State ownership is, however, the only way to demonstrate the truth of this assertion.

Now I am not going to argue to-night either for or against state ownership. I take it that the government has pronounced their policy to be a policy of company ownership and government control. But taking it that way, I am here to urge upon the government to act now, and to see to it that we shall have at least as cheap rates as they have in countries where a national system has been established. Now I refer hon. gentlemen, though I will not read it, to a schedule found on page 33, being the schedule 'F' referred to in the evidence I have just read; it gives a comparison of the rates in various countries where national ownership exists. I will not read it, because it is a somewhat complicated table and hard to follow, but I will deal with it in another way, because I propose to use some figures contained in that schedule. Now, I want to give another quotation from this volume, it is the statement of the chairman of the committee, Sir Wm. Mulock, and it establishes so far as his view of the matter is necessary to establish it, that we are not getting in Canada as cheap rates, or anything like as cheap rates, as the countries in which a national system exists.

THE CHAIRMAN, Sir Wm. Mulock. (Referring to exhibit No. 2, schedule 'F') the rates for Canada and the United States are apparently the highest in the world. There is nothing to compare with them.

Mr. MACLEAN. These are the charges for three minute conversations, are they not?

Mr. DAGGER. Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. Three minutes in the day time and half the rate at night. These are day rates, are they not? A. These are day rates.

THE CHAIRMAN. The rates, according to this schedule, in Canada and the United

States are the highest in the world, being 100 per cent higher than in Great Britain, and more than that in comparison with other places, as you will see when you analyse the schedule. But it is sufficient for the people to know that at present we have the pleasure of paying 100 per cent more in Canada and the United States than in any other part of the known world.

Now, Sir, that is the view that the chairman of that committee enunciated, and I am not going to say why it was not carried out. out. We know of the common rumour which may or may not be true, that he parted company with hon. gentlemen opposite because he could not get that desirable policy carried into effect. I am not going to argue whether the nationalization of our telephones would be desirable or not, I am arguing, though, that for four or five years before that investigation took place, and for four years since it took place, it was the duty of the government to do something to relieve the people from paying the very heavy and unfair prices which they were obliged to pay by reason of the monopoly which exists in Canada. Now I wish to refer briefly to a few figures that ought to be interesting to the representatives of the people of Canada. And let me say here that I do not feel, Mr. Speaker, that it is necessary for me to elaborate my argument tonight, for the reason that I have, to a great extent, succeeded already. We passed an Act last year, but nothing was done under that Act, and so I put my notice upon the Order Paper. I have, however, the satisfaction of knowing that since I put my notice upon the Order Paper the government have begun to get busy, and they have taken action on the Act of last year within the last couple of weeks. Not only have they taken action, but having referred the matter to the Railway Board, the board has issued its order for the telephone companies to file their tariff of fees, and so we may expect, I think, some amelioration of the condition under which we have been suffering far too long. But all the same, although part of the benefit has been obtained, yet I feel that it is of importance that the government having requested the Railway Board to act in this matter, should give the Railway Board some indication of their policy as regards the tariff rate that shall obtain. So I have every faith that this resolution will be accepted by the government, and will be the policy adopted by the government upon which the Railway Board is to act in determining the rate that the company shall be allowed to charge the people of Canada.

I wish to give the rate in different countries for a three-minute conversation for sixty miles or over. These figures are taken, to a very considerable extent, from the records of the committee to which I have referred. In other cases they are obtained from an expert whom I have consulted, and I believe they are all absolutely correct according to the records of the various countries referred to:—

Rates—3 minute conversations 60 miles—Comparison by Countries.

	Cents.
Canada..	35
Russia (55¾ m.)..	26
Australia (up to 75 m.)..	24½
Germany (up to 80 m.)..	24
Spain (up to 120 m.)..	24
About two-thirds of our rate.	
France (up to 120 m.)..	20
Belgium (up to 160 m.)..	19½
About five-sevenths of our rate.	
Great Britain..	18
About one-half of our rate.	
New Zealand..	12½
Bavaria..	12
About one-third of our rate.	
Switzerland..	10
Norway..	9½
Denmark..	9½
Sweden..	8
About one-quarter of our rate.	
Finland (80 m.)..	4½
Less than one-eighth of our rate.	

Yet, Canada is the home of the telephone, the place where the telephone was invented. If there is anywhere any country in which you would expect an up-to-date telephone system and reasonable rates, it would naturally be in the country of the telephone's origin. Now, I have referred to Australia, and as that country is a country of long distances, like our own, and we might expect telephones to be as expensive there as with us, it may be worth while to give some details. Here are some figures of local and long distance:—

Australia—Local and long distance rates.

Distance miles	First 3 minutes.	Each additional 3 minutes.
Under 15..	$0 04	$0 04
15 to 20..	0 06	0 06
20 to 25..	0 08	0 06
25 to 50..	0 16	0 12
50 to 75..	0 24½	0 18
75 to 100..	0 32½	0 24½
100 to 150..	0 45	0 32½
150 to 200..	0 57	0 42½
200 to 250..	0 69	0 51
250 to 300..	0 82	0 61
300 to 350..	0 96	0 69
350 to 400..	1 05	0 80
Up to 600..	1 22	
Up to 600 after 8 p.m..	0 61	

Let me give some further comparisons:

Rates—3 minute conversations—Comparison by countries.

For 300 miles.

Canada..	$1 65
Great Britain..	0 86
Australia..	0 82

About one-half our rate.

Russia	$ 0 62
Less than one-half our rate.	
Denmark (up to 400 m.)	0 54
Bavaria (up to 280 m.)	0 48
Less than one-third our rate.	
Norway	0 33½
Less than one-fifth our rate.	
Belgium	0 19½
Sweden (up to 400)	0 20
Less than one-eighth our rate.	
Switzerland (up to 240 m.)	0 15

Exactly one-eleventh of our 300-mile rate.

For 160 miles.

Wurtenburg charges 10c.; Canada, 96c.
Finland charges 9c.; Canada, 96c.

For 200 miles.

Finland, 11c.; Canada, $1.20.

For 240 miles.

Norway-Sweden, Finland, 13c.; Canada, $1.44.
Switzerland, 15c.; Canada, $1.44.

For 400 miles.

	Cents.
Spain	72
France	66
Austria	60
Denmark	53
Norway	44
Germany	36
Sweden	20

Canada, $1.50 to $1.65.

For 600 miles.

Great Britain	$1 80
Austria	1 22
Spain	1 00
France	0 96
Holland	0 36
Sweden	0 27

Canada, $3.60.

Canada pays double the British rate, three times Australia, ten times the French rate and nearly fourteen times the rate paid in Sweden.

Some European rates for comparatively short distances are as follows:

Great Britain, Germany and Switzerland, 20 miles for 6 cents.
Norway, 120 miles for 7 cents.
Finland, 20 miles for 2¼ cents, or 40 miles for 2½ cents, or 80 miles for 4½ cents, or 120 miles for 6 cents.

This is sufficient for illustration and sufficient to give a clear and reasonable idea of the conditions existing in other countries.

It is well known that independent telephone lines have been established in the United States and the result has been very beneficial to the people. As I said the monopoly was first invaded in 1894 and I shall read just a line or two from the evidence collected by the committee in reference to one state, Indiana. This evidence is to be found in the proceedings of the committee. The passage is headed—

Mr. LENNOX.

What happens when the people and not a monopoly control the telephone situation.

The passage proceeds:

The independent telephones of Indiana number 166,255.
The annual exchange rentals for these telephones amount to $3,048,885.
The same number of telephones, at the rates charged by the monopoly, before the independent movement began, would cost the people of Indiana annually $7,275,300.

The independent telephones, therefore, save the people of Indiana to-day:

Annually	$4,226,415
Quarterly	1,056,603
Monthly	352,201
Weekly	88,050
Daily	12,578

Besides all this the independent movement has covered the field.

In the reign of monopoly there were only 7,000 telephones in the state of Indiana, or one for every 350 of population, and not one in the house of a farmer.

Now there are 166,255 independent telephones, or one for every 16 of population, and 30,000 of them in the houses of farmers.

The new Long Distance Telephone Company has, upon its own lines, within a radious of 50 miles of Indianapolis, 61,286 subscribers, who use no other than independent telephones.

It will be seen what the people of the United States were losing. The question is how much are we losing, how much are we losing to-day and how much will we be losing as long as we continue to have the state of things the government are permitting to exist. It is not an entirely irrelevant inquiry, how much have the people lost in the four years the government have sat quietly doing nothing since this subcommittee developed the fact that something ought to be done by the government in order to better the condition of the people of Canada in this respect. The result in Indiana is that they now have one telephone for every sixteen of the population. It is hard to ascertain exactly what we have in Canada. I have seen it stated by some persons that we have one telephone for every 65 of the population, but as in Ontario we have only one for every 89 and in Quebec one for every 102 of the population, I am inclined to think we have not so good a showing for all Canada as one for every 65 of the population. What the independent companies are doing in the United States will be found at vol. 2, page 766 and following pages and what they are doing in Canada will be found at page 738 and following pages, but I shall not take time to refer to that to-night.

I wish to refer to just one other matter by way of comparison. At page 20 of vol. 2, will be found evidence showing the differ-

ence in charges between the company owned system and the independent telephone companies. The figures for a number of cities in different states of the Union are as follows:—

City.	Bell rates.		Independent.	
	Bus.	Res.	Bus.	Res.
Columbus, Ohio..	72	36	40	24
Elizabeth, N.J..	100	54	36	30
Erie, Pa..	60	30	40	28
Grand Rapids, Mich..	36	24	30	18
Indianapolis, Ind..	72	48	40	25
Mobile, Ala..	48	30	30	18
Rochester, N.Y..	60	40	40	30
St. Joseph, Mo..	50	36	40	30
Wilkesbarre, Pa..	72	57	28	24

That is perhaps sufficient for illustration and the question arises, can we lower the rates and can the government by adopting the resolution I have put forward effect that beneficial reform for our people? I submit that we certainly can, for while according to the doctrine of the government a state-owned system cannot be as economically managed as a company-owned system, in all those countries where the telephone is operated by the nation as distinguished from operation by companies, we have the undisputed fact that the rates are enormously below the rates we are paying in Canada. We could state it better by saying that our rates are outrageously above the rates they are paying in other countries where the telephone system has been nationalized. We had a very recent example in the case of Manitoba. I shall not go minutely into the Manitoba figures because that is a matter which is right on the surface.

Every one sees that in his morning paper. I am trying to bring before this House something that is not altogether on the surface, that might have escaped the vigilance of some hon. members. In the case of Manitoba they have a surplus of $380,000 odd for the eleven and a half months in which they have been operating. They have added 1,468 miles to their long distance lines, they have established 2,168 new stations and, by increases in their system, they have added to their expenditure over $80,000. Yet they have, as the result of eleven and a half months' operation, $380,000 surplus.

Mr. BRODER. They have not changed their rates yet.

Mr. LENNOX. Have they changed their rates yet.?

Mr. BRODER. No.

An. Hon. MEMBER. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. The other night, in the House at Winnipeg, Mr. Rogers made an announcement as to what they would do, what the method of operation in future would be and he announced very considerable reductions, which will be seen in one or two items that I propose to refer to:

	Present rate,	Reduced rate.
Winnipeg.		
Joint users, business..	$25 00	$15 00
Single line, residence, unlimited service..	30 00	25 00
Two party line, residence, unlimited service..	24 00	18 00
Joint users, residence..	15 00	5 00
Extension rates in residence, wall or desk..	12 00	6 00
Brandon and Portage la Prairie.		
One party, residence, unlimited service..	$25 00	$20 00
Two party, residence, unlimited service..	21 00	15 00
Residence extension sets, desk or wall..	12 00	6 00
Small Towns.		
Single line, business, unlimited service..	$24 00	$20 00
Single line, residence, unlimited service..	18 00	15 00
Farmers' Lines.		
	$24 00	$20 00
	30 00	25 00

There are other reductions. I have just picked out a few of those that appeared to be very substantial and decided.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether that surplus in Manitoba is a surplus after paying interest on cost or not?

Mr. LENNOX. I understand it to be a clear surplus.

Mr. DANIEL. After paying interest?

Mr. LENNOX. I have not analysed it sufficiently.

Mr. SPROULE. After paying $61,000 interest on cost.

Mr. LENNOX. What I want to say in reference to Manitoba is this, and it is only because it is a matter that is not in everybody's mind that I refer to it at all. Manitoba has not as yet had a reasonable opportunity of demonstrating what it can do in this line. But we do not need to appeal very much to Manitoba in order to fortify our argument because we have such ample fields to afford us evidence in other countries where this system has been in operation for many years. I merely referred to Manitoba in passing. We have established the fact that they are giving a vastly cheaper service in other countries than in Canada. Now we come to the point of how these other countries are doing it. Are they doing it out of the general funds of the state or out of the earnings of the business? We find that Russia, which has already been referred to and which performs its service at one-third of our rate shows large profits, that Norway which has been furnishing the service at a cheaper rate than Russia had a surplus at the time the evidence was taken

by this committee of $137,484, that Germany was shown to have had large profits and we shall refer more in detail to Germany later on; that Bavaria, in 1903 showed a net profit of $355,166; the Transvaal Colony a profit of $114,445; Rotterdam, in 1904, a profit of $26,824.86; Tasmania, $28,026.85; State of Victoria, $34,284.80; Straits Settlements, $4,034.04; Guernsey, $1,338; Portsmouth, $9,603.64; Swansea, $3,615. These figures show that after setting aside a sufficient sum to cover depreciation in plant, to pay incidental expenses and to pay interest upon the investment, a substantial profit has been realized. We have again, as contained in the report of the evidence of the committee, New Zealand showing a surplus of $38,756.46; or 2.69 per cent, on the capital expenditure after paying 5 per cent. interest on debentures; and we have the Secretary of State in Germany, stating in his report shortly before the evidence was taken by the committee that:

Since 1880, 5 per cent has been paid on the capital expenditure for the entire telephone system. (Ottawa evidence.)

Belgium—Profit on whole system, $153,923. The Minister of Railways, Post and Telegraphs, states that the interest paid by the government amounts to 3 per cent on the capital expended; also that the cost of the lines is paid off in 15 years, and the cost of the apparatus in 10 years. (Ottawa evidence.)

Russia—The St. Petersburg-Moscow line, 411 miles in length, which cost $492.40 per mile for two circuits earned a surplus of $36,050 in 1904. The rate for 3 minutes conversation being 77 cents. (Ottawa evidence.)

Great Britain, it was said at the time that the committee sat, was operating at a loss. At the time of the last report available, when the evidence was being taken, the Postmaster General pointed out that it was not fair to count the British system as being operated at a loss because a large portion of the investment had not got into the position of earning money, but in the subsequent report which I have he shows that the condition of things is changed and therefore I may refer to a subsequent year. In 1905-6 the Postmaster General's report shows that the earnings, after the payment of all expenses of operation, were £396,605, and that after setting aside interest and depreciation amounting to $353,492 there was a net surplus of £43,113. If you add to that the fact that at that time they were earning a royalty from their telephone system it shows that for that year they made a net profit out of their telephone system of £386,545. The figures for 1907 show a net surplus in that year, of £19,305 sterling after setting aside the necessary funds for depreciation. For the year ending 31st March, 1909, the report of the Postmaster General has not of course come to hand, but I find in Hazell's Annual that the suggestion of the Postmaster General that things would begin to show a different condition as soon as the capital investment was in a position to earn money, has been verified.

Now, it is a good thing to stop when you are done, but if I were to say all I think I ought to say upon this question I would not have done. However, I think I have said enough to lead me to hope that the government, having taken some action during the present session, will see that active measures are followed up by the Board of Railway Commissioners to ensure that we shall not have to continue to pay such high telephone rates as we have been paying in the past. My resolution is not directed in any way to embarrass the government. It is a friendly resolution; in fact, this session I have in many ways been co-operating with the government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear.

Mr. LENNOX. I have been trying to go with them hand in hand, as it were, and I hope I shall be able to do them a great deal of good. This measure which I advocate in my resolution is one which affects almost every person in Canada. Take a telephone rate of four cents for fifteen miles in Australia and of 4½ cents in some countries for 120 miles, and you can see that if we can get telephone rates on anything like the reasonable basis in effect in these countries where they have nationalized their system, we will be extending a great boon to the people of our rural districts. It is the rural districts in which I am most concerned. I feel that what is driving the young man away from the farm is that he has not the modern conveniences and advantages which are possessed by his relatives in the cities, and if you want to get the young man back to the land you have to make rural life more comfortable. I hope that when we conserve our water-powers and by their means carry the electric light into every barn and the dwelling of every farm in Canada, and when we bring the telephone and the telegraph at reasonable rates to every farm home, and when our postal facilities give a daily mail service to almost all parts of the country, then will our young men be encouraged to live upon the farm, and then will a great step be taken for the betterment of Canada.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Lunenberg). The closing words of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) remind us that when the millennium comes we will be a happy people living in a happy world. We are told by the hon. gentleman that his resolution is moved in a spirit friendly to the administration, and I will allow that statement of his to pass without comment, further than to say that if it was intended to be friendly its language is certainly deceptive. The first part of the resolution contains the premises upon which the hon. gentleman bases his conclusion, and a portion of it reads:

That in the opinion of this House the experience of the provinces which have taken over the telephone system establish the fact that the people of Canada, outside the zone of provincially operated lines, are paying for higher rates for telephone service than they should be called upon to pay.

The language employed there is certainly not very clear, but I assume the hon. gentleman intended these words to mean, that in the three prairie provinces in which they have assumed the ownership and control of the telephone system, there has followed a reduction in rates, which causes the existing rates to be lower than the rates in other provinces. If there is any efficacy in an argument based on that portion of the resolution, the hon. gentleman must have failed in his proof because the telephone rates in the three prairie provinces are not lower than they are in any of the other provinces of Canada. The resolution was placed upon the Order Paper on January the 21st last, and it is hardly fair for the hon. gentleman to claim that by reason of its publicity at that date he forced the government of Manitoba to make some slight reductions recently. The conclusion of the resolution is based upon another statement of fact, which, as is the case of the former portion of the resolution, is not correct. It says:

"That the evidence collected by a special committee of this House appointed to enquire into the question of telegraphs and telephones more than four years ago, established the fact that the people of Canada, outside the zone of provincially operated lines, are paying far higher rates for telephone service than they should be called upon to pay.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, I assume that when the hon. gentleman undertakes to state that in any one province of Canada we are paying higher telephone rates than we should, he means that the private or company owned and operated telephone lines are earning more than a reasonable profit. I can quite understand that the telephone rates in certain European countries are lower than they are in Canada, but surely the hon. gentleman must see that he has failed to give to the House a scintilla of evidence to show that in any one province of Canada the people are paying a higher telephone rate than they should, although I am not going so far as to say that in some cases, that may not be so. My contention is that by citing the telephone rates prevalent in European countries the hon. gentleman does not prove that the rates in any portion of Canada are higher than they should be.

Mr. hon. friend, in commencing his remarks, referred to certain statements made some years ago by one Mr. Dagger, before a select committee of this House. If I am not wrong, it was upon the statement of Mr. Dagger that the premier of the province of Manitoba promised a reduction in the telephone rates of that province anywhere from 100 to 200 per cent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not see how any tolls can be reduced 200 per cent.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. That is right—50 per cent. On one occasion the premier of Manitoba made the public declaration that the telephone rates in the province of Manitoba would be materially reduced by reason of representations made to him by the same gentleman, Mr. Dagger. Now, in that portion of Mr. Dagger's evidence to which my hon. friend for South Simcoe has referred, I find this statement:

I am satisfied that the present rates in Canada could be cut in two, and still leave a satisfactory profit on the working.

The man who makes that statement is not one whose judgment respecting telephone rates and telephone operations in this country should be accorded the smallest measure of credit. The experience of every telephone company, the experience of every individual who knows anything about telephone operation in this country, would stamp that statement as being so absolutely absurd as to deprive any opinion offered by Mr. Dagger on this subject of any value whatever. Mr. Dagger, on page 12, makes the following statement respecting the experience of the city of Glasgow in municipal telephone operations:

Before the establishment of the Glasgow municipal exchange the rates were $48.70 in the city, and $97.40 to $121.75 in the suburbs. The telephone area of the municipal system is 143 square miles, and the rate is $25.60.

Now, it is very unfortunate that while Mr. Dagger presented that statement to the committee as evidence of the ability of a municipality to give lower telephone rates than a private corporation could do, very shortly afterwards, the corporation of Glasgow went out of the telephone business. I will give a resume of the experience of the city of Glasgow in the telephone business from a book entitled 'Public Ownership and the Telephone in Great Britain,' by Mr. Meyer, as follows:

The corporation of Glasgow embarks in the telephone business, expecting to install a plant for about $95 per subscriber's line. In May, 1906, its expenditure had been $183 per subscriber's line. The corporation lays its wires under the streets; at the same time denying the National Telephone Company all public way-leaves. It expects to destroy the company's business in Glasgow; but it is beaten 'to stand-still.' In September, 1906, the corporation sold its plant to the post office for $1,525,000 that is, at a net loss of $58,980.

Mr. LENNOX. Why did the Post Office Department buy it?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Because the city of Glasgow could not operate the plant at all, and asked the Post Office Department to take it off their hands; that is the only reason. (Reading):

Shortly afterward the Postmaster General announced that he would have to reconstruct the main exchange, as well as replace every one of the 12,800 subscribers' telephones in use. Those operations probably will cost from $500,000 to $750,000.

That is the case to which Mr. Dagger referred as proof of the wisdom of municipal ownership and operation of telephone lines. The city of Glasgow expected when they went into the business very materially to reduce the rates to subscribers, but after a year or two's experience they found that they could not give the rates promised, or even the rates given by the National Telephone Company, a company which was operating under very serious disadvantages, and they were obliged to sell their plant to the Post Office Department.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Have the rates been increased since they sold to the Post Office Department?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I do not see that that would be important at all. Now, the hon. mover of the resolution has given to the House the rates charged in various European countries. Of course, that is very interesting information, but it is not necessarily conclusive; it does not necessarily substantiate the allegations made in his resolution. In many of the countries to which he has referred, particularly Great Britain, Germany, France, Holland and several others, since the evidence was taken before the select committee of this House there has been a complete change in the telephone rates. At that time there was a flat-rate service in most European countries, but that has since been changed to a measured-rate service, under which the subscriber pays a certain amount for every call, and there are now many restrictions in these countries which did not then exist.

Again, on the opposite page from which my hon. friend quoted the evidence of Mr. Dagger, he might find some remarks respecting the characteristics of the telephone service in many of those countries presented to the committee by the same Mr. Dagger. For instance, in Bavaria he says they have a bad rural intercourse, and the heart of my hon. friend is particularly warm towards people living in the rural districts. In Wurtemburg he says the rural intercourse is very poor. Respecting Great Britain he says the regulations are unfavourable to develop communications with the outside towns. In Holland the rural intercourse is bad; in Belgium the rural intercourse is indifferent; in France we find bad rural intercourse; the same in Spain, the same in Italy, the same in Russia. So that this same Mr. Dagger says that the service in those countries is not adequate.

Now, surely some attention must be paid, and some thought must be given to the adequacy of the telephone service given in these various countries. The people of Canada are willing to pay a certain figure for a good service, I think I may safely say that the people of any country are willing to pay a higher figure for a more efficient service. But I think I may safely say that in no part of Europe can you find a telephone service at all equal to the service in Canada. Surely nobody in Canada would like to see installed in this country a telephone service so inadequate, so useless, I might say so disliked by the people, as is the telephone service in Great Britain. My hon. friend should remember this, that the cost of the installation and maintenance of a telephone service, as well as the maintenance and installation of any public utility, must in some degree determine what shall be the charges made to the public. For instance the weather conditions in France are much more favourable to telephone operation than in Canada and consequently upon that ground, if on no other, could we expect higher rates here. Then the cost of labour in many countries abroad is very much lower than it is in Canada. If my hon. friend will look in volume 2 of the report of the select committee, he will find that the salaries and wages paid to employees by telephone companies in European countries very much less than the wages and salaries paid by telephone companies in this country. Then my hon. friend referred to Australia. It is true that the telephone rates in that country are considerably less than they are in Canada, but they are not given in Canada. There telephone systems are less expensive to maintain, and the cost of operation, including the rate of wages paid, is very much less in that country than in Canada. Now I am referring to this case in a general way, because my hon. friend has drifted off into a line of discussion I did not anticipate; and I trust that some hon. gentlemen who will follow me will go more carefully into that aspect of his remarks, because I am sure they can be more fully answered than I am doing. While the hon. gentleman was speaking I was looking over volume 2 of the select committee report, and in it, I find a report by Mr. John Hesketh, the electrical engineer in the Postmaster General's Department, Queensland, on matters investigated by him during a recent tour in America and Europe. At page 653 I find he makes some observations respecting telephone companies in European countries as well as the United States, which are rather important, and I will ask the House to bear

with me while I read a few extracts therefrom. He presents a schedule of rates in this report to his government, and he says:

I beg to ask that the present schedule be read with the greatest caution. The rates themselves in many instances appear most attractive, but they are one side of the picture only.

I may remark here that my hon. friend the mover of the resolution was looking solely on one side of the picture when he dealt with European telephone rates.

As indicating the effect of local conditions, Stockholm may be instanced. Here operators receive 50 kr. a month, or, say, £36 per annum, as compared with £110 in Australia. The tariff being arranged on a measured service basis, the calls per subscriber are reduced, and each operator is enabled to attend to 250 subscribers; two and a half times as many as in Sydney, or over three times as many as in Melbourne.

He then refers to the cost of labour and construction in Australia, and he finds it considerably higher. He then proceeds to make some unfavourable comments on the figures given by the Swiss government respecting the cost of telephone operation there, and he states that these figures are very inadequate and misleading. Now I wish to read that gentleman's statement respecting the charges made by independent telephone companies in the United States. My hon. friend referred to the charges made by independent telephone companies in the United States, and compared them with those made by the Bell Telephone Company, and certainly there was a great difference. I would like to read to my hon. friend what this expert has to say respecting the difference in rates between telephones operated by the Bell Company and independent companies in the United States:

The American independent movement is now suffering from the effects of having fixed the rates too low. In only one independent company was I told that the rates were adequate, and in this instance they were higher than the competing Bell Company. In all the other cases there was a movement in favour of higher rates, as those now in force did not allow the class of service required to be maintained. Even the post office London rates have been fixed by considerations of policy, and not finance.

Now respecting the figures quoted by my hon. friend in connection with the charges made by independent telephone companies in the United States, I want to say first that the character of the service which they give to the public is not as good as that given by the Bell Telephone Company and I wish further to say that the figures which he gave this evening, and which were quoted from the select committee of this House which sat a few years ago, are not the figures in force to-day; and whatever force the argument of my hon. friend might have, if those figures were correct, is now entirely lost. Coming back to the resolution, as I stated in the beginning, my hon. friend in effect asserts that the telephone rates in the prairie provinces are lower than in all the other provinces of Canada, and that they have been lowered by reason of the fact that the governments of those three provinces have become proprietors of the telephones, or most of them, and are to-day in control of them. Now if that is the fact, if that allegation in the resolution is correct, my hon. friend has not endeavoured to sustain it.

Mr. LENNOX. I call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that there is no such allegation in the resolution whatever. The fact is that these three provinces are dealing with the matter provincially, and therefore we cannot deal with it. Any person who will read the resolution can see that.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. It is difficult to understand what the resolution means, and the hon. gentleman cannot find fault with me for so saying. It is difficult to explain it to the House. I do not mean to say that my hon. friend deliberately made this resolution beautifully vague so as to give ample opportunity of dancing all around the green, and drawing any conclusion he cared to. It looks very much like that. My hon. friend says that the experience of the provinces, mainly the prairie provinces, established the fact that the people of Canada are paying too high a rate to-day. Now that may mean something in my hon. friend's mind, but surely no other conclusion can be drawn than that there has been a reduction of rates in these three provinces by reason of the fact that the governments have taken over the telephones in these provinces.

Mr. LENNOX. It does not mean anything of the kind.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. It would take my hon. friend too long to make that clear to the House. I am not trying to misconstrue the resolution of my hon. friend, but I do in all sincerity submit that it is not capable of any other construction.

Mr. LENNOX. Does not the hon. gentleman know that these three provinces, because they found the rates were excessive, took over the lines themselves? Is not that the obvious meaning of the resolution?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Then my hon. friend goes on to say that therefore Canada should do something in the same line.

His argument is ineffective, unless he shows that there has been some improvement of conditions in these provinces. Otherwise what is the good of referring to these cases? What is the good of making

these allegations? I do not propose to argue against the naturalization of telephones. My judgment is that it would be a very unfortunate thing for Canada to engage in it; I hope that no gentleman on either side of this House would affirm such a policy. The experience of other countries of the world would be against it, but particularly in Canada, I believe would it be an impossible policy. Once in a while, a province does become the proprietor of the telephone system and engages in its operations. I fear, however, that the motive prompting provincial governments to engage in this work is not so much commercial as political. I think that is fairly true of Manitoba. Two or three years ago, the government of Manitoba embarked upon this work. The leaders of the government promised the people reductions in telephone rates. I could read to the House, but it is not necessary to do so, the statements of Mr. Roblin and Mr. Rogers promising tremendous reductions. Perhaps it might not be out of place for me to give the substance of a statement by Mr. Campbell, the Attorney General of the province. Referring to the telephone system in Grand Rapids, Mich., he stated that there the house telephones cost $24 and business telephones $36, against $30 for house and $50 for business in Winnipeg; and he made the specific statement that the cost of a telephone for Winnipeg should not exceed $16, and that for that sum a most satisfactory service could be given. This statement is almost as ridiculous as that made by Mr. Dagger when he said that telephone rates in Canada could be reduced fifty per cent and still leave a handsome profit to the operating company. They had a similar experience in Great Britain. The Duke of Marlborough organized a company called The New Telephone Company. In a series of letters addressed to the London 'Times,' he promised that, if the post office would give his company a license to operate a telephone system, he would give to the five millions of people in the London metropolitan district a metallic circuit service at $50 or $60 a year, very much less than the rates charged by the Post Office, or by the National Telephone Company, the chief telephone company of England. He had an experience of one year and found that he could not give the telephone service at anything like the rate he had led the people to expect. He sold out his plant to the National Telephone Company, and, later, he admitted, in a letter to the 'Times' that in talking about $50 and $60 telephone rates he certainly had 'done a great deal of bleating.' And I think that Messrs. Rogers, Roblin and Campbell, of Manitoba, have 'done a great deal of bleating' in promising the telephone reductions they have promised to the public. The provincial government of Manitoba purchased the Bell Telephone system in that province, promising to the people great reductions and I have no donbt——

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. K. Maclean) allege that they have not given very substantial reductions? Does he venture to say that the figures I read are not correct?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. It is true that, in the last few hours, forced to it either by my hon. friend's resolution, or by political expediency, or something else, they have made a reduction. But I intend to argue that there was no justification for that reduction, there were no business reasons for it, and they did not have enough telephone experience to warrant them in making reductions.

Mr. LENNOX. They have a surplus.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I have no hesitation in making the prophecy that not many years will elapse before they will not merely restore the rates the Bell Telephone Company had when they were operating the system, but that in many cases they will increase the rate. The provincial government were not long the proprietors of the system when they increased the rates, the amounts paid for telephones by medical men, veterinary surgeons and nurses were very much increased. The cost of telephone connections to the farmers was also increased, for the government obliged the farmers to furnish the poles to make connections between their residences and the line along the highway, whereas the Bell Telephone Company had always supplied the farmers with poles. They also made a regulation that long distance calls requested for the night but made in the day must be charged for at day rates. And in no instance did they make a reduction of the rates.

Now, my hon. friend said, and has repeated while I have been speaking, besides referring to it modestly in his own address, that Manitoba is now reducing the rates. I have said that there was no business reason for Manitoba making a reduction. Every hon. member will agree with me that if it can be shown that the Manitoba government operated the telephone system without producing a surplus they had no right to make a reduction in the rates. It is of very little use to make a reduction if the people have to pay for it at some other time or in some other way.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the hon. gentleman deny that they have a surplus?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. They have a surplus on paper.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the hon. gentleman deny that they have a surplus?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I deny that, according to the methods of book-keeping employed by all well managed telephone companies that they have any surplus, and I believe the Manitoba government are fully aware of the fact that they were not justified in making reductions.

Mr. ROCHE. Does the hon. gentleman know that the control of the telephone system is not with the government, but with a commission of former Bell employees?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I am aware that the telephone system is operated by the commission. But I am also aware that, so far as policy is concerned, the commission is under control of the government, and the revenues received by the commission are paid over to the provincial treasury. The rates are certainly controlled by the government, and not by the commission, otherwise we should not find Messrs. Roblin, Rogers and Campbell making such great promises to the public of telephone reduction. The statement issued the other day by the Minister of Telephones and Telegraphs, of the province of Manitoba gave as total receipts from telephones, $722,612, of which——

Mr. SPROULE. That was for eleven and a half months only. Add the other half month.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. That is for the year from Jan. 8.

Mr. LENNOX. It is for 11½ months.

Mr. SPROULE. You should add the other $27,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. The Bell Telephone Company disposed of their telephone system I think on January 8, 1908. The statement given the other day to the provincial parliament at Winnipeg, was up to Dec. 31, 1908.

Mr. LENNOX. It began Jan. 15.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. The total receipts as I have already said were $722,612, which included $62,698 of uncollected tolls. However, I make no point of that. This statement includes unearned rentals, but the statement does not give any particulars and it is impossible to tell how much of that total revenue was for unearned rentals and I am sure the mover of the resolution and every hon. gentleman in the House will agree that that statement should not have included for the year 1908, unearned rentals.

Mr. LENNOX. I will send the full account to my hon. friend if he would like it in detail.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I have it, but will my hon. friend tell me if that statement included unearned rentals.

Mr. LENNOX. I will send the statement to my hon. friend and he can examine it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. That takes considerable time and if the hon. gentleman knows, he will answer my question.

Mr. LENNOX. I have not looked at it to-day; I think it does.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I take it for granted my hon. friend does not know because evidently the government of Manitoba do not know or they would make it public, and unless my hon. friend has private advice from them he does not know.

When the Bell Telephone Company sold its assets to the government of Manitoba, they paid to the government $108,000 for unearned rentals. I think it is fair upon this to base some figures as to what the unearned rentals would be on the 31st Dec. last. The telephone system during 1908 increased very largely in Manitoba, in Winnipeg as well as in the rural districts, and if $108,000 was the amount paid by the Bell Telephone Company to the government of Manitoba on Jan. 8, for unearned rentals at that time, surely I may fairly conclude that $120,000 to $125,000 would be the amount of unearned rentals included in the statement issued by the government of Manitoba the other day. Therefore this would leave a total revenue for 1908 of about $600,000. The statement issued the other day by the government of Manitoba also states that the gross expenditures were $530,161. That includes debenture interest upon the bonds given to the Bell Telephone Company in payment of the system they acquired. This would leave a surplus of $70,000 and I am sure no gentleman can successfully contradict my statement that the very best you can make of the year's operation in the province of Manitoba would be a surplus of $70,000 and not a surplus of over $200,000.

I say that the statement does not even disclose a surplus of $70,000, and if the government of Manitoba employed the system of book-keeping that all good telephone companies in the world do and should, they would disclose to the public a deficit. They make very little allowance for depreciation in the telephone plant. This of course varies, different telephone companies employ different methods of calculating depreciation. Some assign values for depreciation of the plant divided up into ten or twelve portions, the wires are given a certain period of life and the poles a certain period; some telephone companies write off ten per cent and some five per cent, but I think that in most cases eight per cent would be considered a very fair amount to write off for depreciation. The government of Manitoba spent $104,000 for

maintenance of their telephone system in 1908, and they did not write off anything in addition for depreciation. The question of telephones in Manitoba was inquired into before a special committee of the legislature of that province in 1906. The Hon. Mr. Campbell, attorney general of the province, questioned the general manager of the company with relation to the amount that should be written off for depreciation of the plant as follows:

Q. What would you say of the evidence of Mr. Moulton of the Twin City Company (a previous witness) when he says that 5 per cent is sufficient to write off for depreciation in any one year?—A. From our experience of a year in the business we still think a company is justified in charging at least 10 per cent.

Taking the figures given by Mr. Moulton to that committee, viz., five per cent, the telephone system cost the government of Manitoba say $4,000,000. They paid more for it. Five per cent of that would be $200,000 a year, and surely that is a very low estimate. There is probably no telephone company in the world which provides less than five per cent for depreciation. The Manitoba government provided nothing whatever for depreciation unless it was included in maintenance, and that amounted to $104,000 so that in addition there should have been written off in that statement some ninety odd thousand dollars for depreciation. Figuring maintenance and depreciation at $200,000, you completely wipe out the surplus which the government of Manitoba have presented to the public. Therefore I say to my hon. friend that the Manitoba government did not operate its system at a profit, and I say further that they were not justified in making a reduction in the rates. It was not done for commercial or economic reasons, the motive was purely political exigencies and considerations.

The Bell Telephone Company wrote off for depreciation the following percentages of its revenue:

Year.	Depreciation.
1900..	38 per cent.
1901..	42 "
1902..	36 "
1903..	38 "
1904..	34 "

Whereas the government of Manitoba simply provides for maintenance. They provide 17 per cent of their revenue for maintenance, figuring nothing for depreciation. I wish to quote the opinion of the Manitoba 'Free Press,' a paper not friendly to the Manitoba government, with regard to this statement. It deals with it in a fair and able way; I think able, because the writer has apparently reasoned out his statement well. I see no objection to it. The figures employed are incontrovertible.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN.

I would like to just read to the House the conclusions contained in this, and I challenge any hon. gentleman opposite to successfully contradict or weaken anything in it. The 'Free Press' says this:

1. That considerably over $100,000 of receipts is improperly charged to 1908 as this amount is in payment for services which the province could not render until the year 1909.

I presume no person could successfully contradict that. I cannot see how any person possibly could.

Mr. STAPLES. Will the hon. gentleman tell the House whether that is an editorial or a statement by some member of the local legislature?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. It is an editorial, but if it is based upon fact, and if the conclusions which this editorial render to the public are true, it does not matter very much who wrote it. I have read one of the conclusions from the editorial and if my hon. friend will point out wherein he thinks it is incorrect I will be very glad to give him my opinion upon it and possibly I may correct some error which may be lurking in his mind.

2. That the outlay upon maintenance is equivalent only to two and a half per cent of the value of the telephone plant, whereas the minimum estimate of depreciation is five per cent.

That is absolutely proven by the statement which is issued by the government.

3. That, whereas the Bell Telephone Company sets aside not less than thirty-four per cent of its ordinary income for maintenance, the province last year set aside only seventeen per cent.

4. That the outlay upon maintenance for telephones in the city of Winnipeg last year was not more than one-half what it was in the year 1904, when the telephones were owned and administered by the Bell Telephone Company.

5. That the surplus, upon the figures as set forth in the statement of the government, is $70,000 and that this amount has only been obtained by expending on maintenance an amount equivalent to only half the minimum estimate for depreciation.

6. That, putting the maintenace at twice the amount given in the figures, that is, at $208,000 in place of $104,000, the Manitoba government telephone system was operated last year at an actual loss of between $30,000 and $40,000.

I say that the last statement, according to the financial statement issued by the Manitoba government is absolutely correct. I challenge any person to controvert that in the slightest degree whatever, and I repeat what I have already said, that the result is not favourable to the administration and that the telephone system in 1908 in Manitoba was operated at a loss. I deny that my hon. friend who moves this resolution

can obtain anything from the experience of the province of Manitoba to justify the conclusions which he asks this House to affirm. Then, there is this to be remembered: The government of Manitoba have been in charge of the operation of this system for but one year, and I think it is fair to say that they have not yet had that experience which would warrant them in embarking upon the policy of rate reduction. I submit that the people of Manitoba would have justified the government in abstaining from any reduction of these rates for a further period at least. Again, it should be remembered that Manitoba is a growing province, and that it is a peculiar thing that the telephone business is different from almost all other commercial businesses in that as your volume of business increases your profits do not necessarily grow, and there comes a period in the telephone business when, if you receive a certain number of subscribers, you commence to lose money. In most other businesses the greater the volume the greater the profits. This is rather an important point, and I wish to read what a telephone paper called 'Public Service' says in answer to a question asked upon this point. This question is often asked concerning the telephone business. Take, for instance, the city of Brandon. It is a young and growing town. The average length of wires in that town to-day is half a mile. This town will grow in all directions and what change will this effect? They will have to increase the length of the wire lines per subscriber, and consequently there will be a greater initial cost per station and a larger maintenance cost. In the second place, the increased number of subscribers increases the number of calls at the central office, and this necessarily increases the labour in connection with the central office. Of course, it also means an increase of rates. Now, I wish to read one of a series of answers given to a question by a correspondent of this paper, the question being: Why are telephone rates higher in a large city than in a small city or town? The writer who answers this question says:

As the number of subscribers increases, the number of calls per station increases correspondingly, and, as an operator can only handle a certain number of calls per hour, extra operators are required. This item of expense in a large exchange, as compared to the same item of expense in a small exchange, is very large. By way of illustration, and to account for the increase in the number of calls per station with the increase in the number of stations, it can readily be seen that in an exchange of 1,000 stations a subscriber can only call 999 other subscribers, whereas a subscriber in an exchange of 10,000 subscribers can call 9,999 other subscribers, and being able to do this it is natural to suppose that the calls per station will be materially increased with the addition of other subscribers.

The above reasons are only a few of the many that can be advanced to show the necessity for charging higher rates in a large city than in a small one. It is now a generally well known fact that the telephone business is altogether unlike any other, for where cost is usually decreased the bulk of business increases in any commercial business, the reverse is true in the operation of a telephone plant. As the number of subscribers increases, the cost of installation and operation increases proportionally, which necessarily compels the charging of higher rates from time to time as subscribers are added to the exchange.

The hon. gentleman in his resolution refers also to the other provinces, of Alberta and Saskatchewan. He does not mention them, it is true, but in general terms he refers to them, as I assume they are included in the prairie provinces. My hon. friend attempts to draw some conclusions from the experience of these prairie provinces and, as he asks hon. gentlemen to base a judgment favourable to this resolution upon that experience, I beg to say there is nothing in the experience of the province of Saskatchewan to justify anybody in supporting his resolution because in that province they have had no telephone experience as yet. At the last session of the legislature the government of that province took power to instal and operate trunk lines, to empower municipalities to engage in the telephone business and to aid farmers' lines to the extent of giving them free poles. I therefore say that the hon. gentleman can find nothing in the experience of Saskatchewan to sustain his resolution, and consequently his resolution is, at least to the extent of one-third of it, absolutely vitiated. I might at considerable length give the result of telephone operation in the province of Alberta, but I wish to be brief, and I will simply say that there has been no reduction whatever in rates in that province since it took over the Bell Telephone system. Neither the government nor any member of the government has made any promise to the public that the rates would be reduced, and indeed I may say that the telephone rates in Alberta are higher than they are in the county represented by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the honourable gentleman say that his friends in Alberta and Saskatchewan were wrong in taking over the telephone system?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. If the honourable gentleman wants my own personal opinion, I will answer that I believe it was a bad policy. I say that the telephone rates in all the western provinces are no lower to-day than they are in any town or city in Ontario of corresponding size. There has been no reduction of rates in Alberta, and on the authority of statements made by the Calgary newspapers and the Calgary

Board of Trade, I say that the province of Alberta is not giving to its subscribers as good a service as was given by the Bell Telephone Company. The honourable gentleman says that Canada is suffering from a telephone monopoly and that we are in an inferior position to other countries with respect to the telephone service, but he also tells us that he offers no argument for or against government ownership. As I have pointed out it is not fair to compare telephone rates in this country with the rates prevailing in France or in Italy or in Australia. The question is: Are the private telephone companies in this country giving as good a service as they possibly can, and are they giving that service at as cheap a rate as they can consistent with maintaining their plant efficiently and allowing themselves an adequate return on the capital employed? I do not think that Canada is prepared at this stage to assume the enormous financial burden of taking over the telephone systems. It would be a serious matter also to add to the Civil Service list of the country the employees of the telephone service. Successive postmasters general and chancellors of the exchequor in Great Britain have given as a reason against the taking over of the National Telephone Company that it would be a menace to the country to add its employees to the already over burdened civil list. The experience of the British post office is that they cannot get the same efficiency in the unit in the telephone service as the National Telephone Co. gets from its operators. However, assuming for the sake of argument that there is a grievance against the telephone companies, is there not a better remedy than nationalization of the telephones? After the evidence was taken by a select committee of this House some years ago the government no doubt took this matter into consideration and last year the Railway Act was amended by placing telegraphs and telephones under the control of the Railway Commission. By that Act of last year the Railway Commissioners are given control over the rates of telephone companies within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada; all telephone tolls are made subject to the approval of the board; tolls may be dealt with in the same manner as standard freight rates; the telephone companies are compelled to file with the board the tariff to be charged from time to time; the railway board can compel the company operating a long distance system to grant connections to any telephone system owned and operated by any company, province or municipality; the board can compel that company under terms to make provision for the use of connections; the board is authorized to apply the provisions of the Railway Act with respect to joint tariffs to the interchange of business between telephone companies, and all working agreements between telephone companies as to interchange of business are to be approved by the board. Now, the question is, does not this legislation put the telephone companies of this country sufficiently under the control of the Board of Railway Commissioners to ensure to the people due and ample protection as to telephone rates? I submit that it does, and I submit that the policy at present contained in our legislation in this regard is the proper policy. The Railway Commissioners have already taken a great deal of evidence concerning telephone rates in this country, and they should be given ample opportunity to study this question, and no doubt in due course they will make such regulations as to rates as will afford ample protection to the public. The Railway Board has, I think, secured a reputation for business which is commendable to itself and is satisfactory to the people of this country generally; and if the telephone companies operating in this country are doing an injustice to their subscribers and to the public generally, as the mover of this resolution suggests, I think we may well hope that ample relief will be accorded by the Railway Commission. I do not wish to delay the House further on this matter; but in closing, I desire, seconded by Mr. Sinclair, to move this amendment:

That all the words after the word 'that' in the first line be struck out and the following substituted: 'This House re-affirm its approval of the legislation recently passed by the Canadian parliament placing telephone companies under public control through the Board of Railway Commissioners, and expresses its opinion, that until such times as the remaining provinces of confederation follow in the footsteps of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba in the acquisition of the business and property of telephone companies within their limits, such government control is ample to protect the interests of the public both as to telephone tolls and service.'

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean), whose splendid ability in placing a case before the House I have often admired, but from the manner in which he floundered around to-night in the attempt to say something to offset the arguments of the hon. member for South Simcoe, (Mr. Lennox) I am sure he will agree with me that the arguments that he has advanced in support of his position are not such as will meet with the general approval of the people of the country. He tells us that the western provinces do not give lower telephone rates than the provinces of the east. The hon. gentleman knows that the statement issued by the Manitoba legislature within the past few days is sufficient to convince any fair minded man that the government of that

province have succeeded not only in showing a surplus of $250,000, but in giving to the people of Manitoba a substantial reduction in the annual rate for phones. I desire to congratulate the hon. member for South Simcoe on the able manner in which he has presented his case to the House. We cannot sufficiently appreciate the efforts which that hon. gentleman has put forth to obtain for the users of telephones in the Dominion of Canada a substantial reduction of rates and, judging by remarks of the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. A. K. Mclean) I would be inclined to think that the reduction of rates in Manitoba by the legislature was due to the observations of the hon. member for South Simcoe. I want to remind the hon. gentleman that it is the Conservative party in the province of Manitoba that has reduced the rates within the last few days, and I have no doubt that when the good Liberal governments in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan come to investigate their systems and place them on a proper basis, they will, like the province of Manitoba, be able to give the people of those provinces a substantial reduction in rates.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. member for Lunenburg has no faith in them.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is quite true; he is more conversant with the telephone conditions in the western provinces than the people of those provinces, who are most enthusiastically in favour of establishing provincial telephones, managed and controlled by the provincial authorities, with national trunk lines to connect with the provincial systems. There is no doubt in my mind that the day is not far distant when the trunk lines of this country will be controlled by the Dominion parliament. With regard to the reduction of rates in the province of Manitoba, I may say that the rate to joint users, businesses, in the city of Winnipeg, now $25, are reduced to $15; single lines, residences, unlimited service, now $30, reduced to $25; two party line, residence, unlimited service, now $24, reduced to $18; one party line, residence, and two cents per outcall, $15; joint users, residence, now $15, reduced to $5; extension rates in residence, wall or desk, now $12, reduced to $6. These men have been able to give to the people of Manitoba not only an efficient service, but a substantial reduction in rates. The hon. gentleman said that there was nothing for depreciation of plant, but finally admitted that 2½ per cent was set aside for that purpose.

Mr. MACLEAN. I did not admit that at all.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If he did not admit that, will he be kind enough to listen to this statement that comes from the legislature of Manitoba:

The maintenance and efficiency of the plant, equipment, long distance and farmers' rural lines have been kept up during the year by the expenditure of $98,699.99 for material, travelling expenses and labour.

All the telephone companies, municipal systems and others in the province who are doing business independently of the Bell Company, have been accorded connection with the government system, thereby adding to the value of all telephones which now comprise a system of over 20,000 subscribers. The independent companies in the eastern provinces want similar connections with the Bell Company but can't get it.

The hon. gentleman lives in a province inhabited by progressive people, and I am satisfied that many of the independent telephone companies in his province would be glad if the Railway Commission would compel the Bell Telephone Company to connect with the independent lines. I could show him in the western part of Ontario many telephone companies, who have been doing the expensive work of telephone building, and are begging and pleading to-day at the doors of the Railway Commission, to grant them connection with the Bell telephone lines.

Take one instance in my own riding. Only a few days ago it was my privilege to go to some members of the Railway Commission and show them that the Bell Telephone Company, in delivering messages in that district, would go to work and hire a horse and carriage and charge it up to the farmer who had an independent telephone in his house, and he had put his hand in his pocket for $2 to pay a man to deliver the phone message, when that same Bell Telephone Company could have transferred it in a moment to the independent telephone company's line, and it would have been delivered to the farmer. I only hope that the Railway Commission will take into consideration the importance of this question of independent telephone companies throughout our land. They are the men who are building up companies composed of farmers, and who find it impossible to get the Bell Telephone Company to put in their lines at any reasonable figure. I would like to take you into a township I have in mind at the present time. On the one side the Bell Telephone Company is charging the farmers $20 a year and compelling them to subscribe for three years, and to furnish enough subscribers to build a line several times over before they will begin operations; while on the other side of the township is an independent telephone company with some 200 subscribers, and they only charge $6 per annum, and are able to show a splendid surplus at the end of the year. I have in my possession the annual statement of that independent company and it shows that these men, through good business

management, had been able to develop a splendid telephone service that covers a great deal of territory and are able to give to the people in those rural districts that service for $6 per annum, and show a surplus at the end of the year.

Now my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) is simply urging upon the government the necessity of investigating this important question. Four or five years ago we had a great deal of useful information placed before that Telephone Committee, information that has never been given to the public except through the medium of the speeches of my hon, friend for South Simcoe. What we need is a more progressive policy along the line of telephones and telegraphs in this country. From what I was able to gather when I was over in the old land in regard to telephone and telegraph systems, I am satisfied that with proper business management and government control of these public utilities we could make them paying concerns, and at the same time cut the prices in two. The hon. gentleman from Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean) gave us the example of the city of Glasgow; he said the city of Glasgow had turned over the independent telephone company to the Post Office Department. But he had to tell us at the same time that the reason they had a deficit was chiefly owing to the fact that they were fighting the National Telephone Company in that great city of Glasgow. No other reason can be brought forward to show that if they had exhibited reasonably fair business abilities, they would have had a surplus at the end of the year.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. The city of Glasgow had a tremendous advantage over the National Telephone Company, because the corporation of Glasgow would not allow the National Company to put its wires under ground. They were obliged in many cases to string their wires from housetop to housetop. It was sheer inability on the part of the municipality successfully to operate a telephone company.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. At the same time the government turns round and buys it out, and to-day what do we find in regard to the management of telephones in Great Britain? It was my privilege only last year to show to the Prime Minister, answering a statement of his in regard to telephones and telegraphs in Great Britain that I do not think he would attempt to repeat to-night, that instead of the companies not being paying investments there, they are paying investments, and they are giving a most satisfactory service to the people of that country. I agree with my hon. friend from Lunenburg that a few years ago the telephone system of Great Britain was anything but satisfactory, and we would not like to see in the Dominion of Canada the system they had there at that time. But I want to tell my hon. friend that that system has been wonderfully improved, and that to-day it is getting to be almost as perfect a system as you can find anywhere.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I would like to remind my hon. friend of this fact also, that Great Britain is only in the telephone business to preserve her telegraph business. They know they will always lose money by the telephones.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Well, I shall have to quote the British Postmaster General in 1906-07, and read some words that he used with regard to the telephone business which I think will be sufficient to convince the hon. gentleman of the truth of my statement:

The number of telephones in connection with the post office of the London telephone system increased during the year from 24,000 to 32,000.

Is that not a reasonable and substantial increase? Does that look as if the telephone companies were taking away all the business from the telegraph companies?

The growth of the system is still rapidly proceeding, additional subscribers being connected at an average of about 160 a week. New exchanges at Epsom and Ealing were opened early in the year. . . . It is satisfactory to know that a balance is now shown after paying all working expenses and after providing for interest and for a sinking fund for the repayment of capital. It must, however, be remembered that the revenue in previous years has been insufficient for these purposes, and that a considerable deficiency remains to be met out of the balances in future years.

I merely read these statements to show that in Great Britain they are making wonderful strides, not only in the telegraph but in the telephone as well. The hon. gentleman seems to think that the figures given by my hon. friend from South Simcoe were not of sufficient interest to the people of this Dominion when they were gathered some four years ago, and that since that time conditions have changed to such an extent that a very different state of affairs exists to-day. However, let me give a few quotations. The charge in Canada for a three minutes' conversation over 60 miles is as follows:

	Cents.
Canada	35
Great Britain	18
New Zealand	12½
Norway	9½
Denmark	9½
Switzerland	10
Bavaria	12
Belgium	19½
Russia	26
Australia	24½

Let me remind the hon. gentlemen of this fact, that a great many foreign countries are deeply interested in the telephone system and they are making a success of it. Among these I might mention Great Britain, Denmark, and Belgium. Great Britain operates the trunk lines and some local systems. Denmark operates the long distance lines, Belgium the entire system, Germany the entire system, Austria the entire system, also Bavaria, the State of Victoria, the State of Tasmania, the Commonwealth of Australia. New Zealand owns the long distance system, Cape Colony the long distance system and local exchanges, Norway the greater number of the trunk and lines, Holland the interlocal lines, Switzerland and Russia, nearly all the trunk lines, Glasgow, Brighton, Hull, Portsmouth, Swansea, Sweden, Strait Settlements, and Natal.

Pratically every one of these countries or cities has been able to show a substantial surplus. The Bell Telephone Company, up to the present time, will not heed the cry of the people living in the rural parts of Canada. I hope that the government will decide to follow the resolution presented this evening by the hon. member for South Simcoe and impress upon the commission the necessity of seeing to it that the independent telephone companies are fairly dealt with. But, if the postion taken by the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. K. Maclean) is the position of the government, it is evident that the government are not anxious to see the rates reduced in Canada, and that they are not going to put forth any effort to that end. The Bill was passed about a year ago, and until within the last few days the government apparently had not taken any action. I have a copy of the order in council which shows that it was passed only within the last few weeks, empowering the commission to go on and do its work. If the government have neglected this matter for the last ten or eleven months, are we not justified in urging upon them the necessity for dealing with it definitely and emphatically? The questions involved are important, not merely to the cities, towns and villages, but to the people living in the rural districts as well. We in this House, I believe, are not paying sufficient attention to the people living in the rural districts. We have in this chamber 221 members of parliament, only 23 of whom represent purely city constituencies. The constituencies represented by the other 198 members are largely rural. And yet we do not, to my mind, devote sufficient attention to the people of the rural districts. The one fact we cannot afford to forget is that Canada is distinctly an agricultural country, and we cannot make her anything else. We are proud of her fisheries, and I recollect that only a few weeks ago we heard the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. K. Maclean) say that the income from our fisheries amounted to $40,000,000. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) made a statement the other day that our income from timber amounted to $52,000,000. Our mines yield us about $80,000,000 or $90,000,000. We are glad to know that the output of our manufactories is several hundreds of millions. But the farming industry last year produced no less than $700.000,000 worth of goods. And when you consider the time and attention given by this House to the development of this great industry, you cannot help but feel that agriculture is not being developed as it ought to be and that we are lagging behind other nations in our progress in this great industry. I say this not with a view to discuss that question in itself, but as giving a reason why more attention should be given to the welfare of our agricultural population. I urge upon the government the necessity of accepting the resolution that has been presented. I feel satisfied that if they will do that they will help to improve the position not only of the people living in cities and towns, but also of the people living in the rural districts.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.). I have listened with great interest to the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), in fact I always listen to him with much interest, because he prepares his speeches well and is usually fair in his presentation of his facts. I have listened also to the somewhat impassioned appeal of the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) on behalf of the farmers. I think many of those on this side, as well as those opposite, can join in that very laudable aim. In so far as these hon. gentlemen are asking the government to take steps to make sure that the people of this country get their telephone services as cheaply as possible, I am heartily in accord with them, as also, I am sure, is every hon. member on this side. I am hardly at one, however, with my hon. friend from South Simcoe in his interpretation of the meaning of the first part of the resolution he has moved. As I understand this resolution, it asks this House to declare that the result of the operation of telephones in those provinces of Canada in which they have been controlled by the government is that the people receive their telephones cheaper than do the people of those provinces in which the telephones are not controlled by the government. If that be the case, I must say that I do not agree with him. I can speak very intelligently so far as one province is concerned, and I think I can speak with some intelligence so far as another province, the province of Manitoba, is concerned. I am not going to follow my hon. friends in their statements concerning telephonic affairs on the continent of Europe.

I have not been there to examine into the subject, and, so far as I know, neither have the hon. gentlemen who have spoken. I read the evidence taken before the Telephone Committee with a great deal of interest, and have listened with interest to the quotation of it by these hon. gentlemen. But I would point out that that evidence was given four years ago, and that in the four years that have elapsed there have been a great many changes in the telephone business. The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean) referred to the fact that Glasgow, one of the cities put forward as a model from a municipal standpoint, has gone out of the telephone business because it could not make the business pay. And I would point out that, notwithstanding that there has been a very serious agitation for better control of telephones all over Canada and the United States in the last four years, in nearly every part of Canada and the United States telephone rates have increased rather than decreased. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Lunenburg, the more the telephone business increases the greater in proportion will be the increase in the cost. It is different from other public utilities or other businesses. In my own town four years ago we were getting business telephones for $10 and residence telephones for $5, and those long distance telephones at that. Five years ago we were able to talk from Woodstock to St. John, 140 miles, for 25 cents. To-day we pay 55 cents. All over Canada you will find the rates have been increased. In any province of Canada, so far as I know, five years ago the long distance rate was based on a five minute conversation; to-day it is based on a three-minute conversation in every province except Manitoba, where it is two minutes. I point this out only to show that, notwithstanding the agitation that has been carried on in the country, telephone rates have been going up and the municipalities have not been taking control of this public utility or going into the telephone business. The only province in Canada which has gone into the telephone business with anything like thoroughness has been Manitoba.

It is not my purpose to deal with telephone matters in European countries. I need not point out that the conditions in Europe are very different from those in Canada. In the first place we know that wages are much higher here than in continental Europe, that you can operate a telephone system, so far as wages are concerned, in most European countries for fifty per cent of what you have to pay in Canada. I can apply almost the same percentage to Great Britain.

Mr. SPROULE. Would that apply to Australia?

Mr. CARVELL.

Mr. CARVELL. No, I do not think so. I want to be fair and I think that in all the arguments put forward by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) to-night the Australian proposition looks to be the cheapest telephone communication we have discussed. But I want also to point out that my hon. friend did not state the capital involved in Australia, whether or not there was a deficit or anything with regard to the maintenance of the telephone system there, for instance the amount set aside for depreciation.

Mr. LENNOX. If I recollect I read out what the service was in Australia.

Mr. CARVELL. Then I did not catch it, but if the hon. gentleman did give that information I stand corrected. My purpose is to discuss this subject from a Canadian standpoint. It is not to my mind a question of what they have done in England, in France, in Bavaria, in Sweden or in Norway. Conditions are different in these countries from what they are here. The important question is what have we done in Canada up to the present and what can we do in the future? I again assure my hon. friends that although I am somewhat interested in the telephone business in one province, I am as anxious as my hon. friends to see the people of Canada get telephone communication at a proper rate. My hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) spent some time discussing the iniquities of the Bell Telephone Company. I hold no brief for the Bell Telephone Company. I am willing to admit that in many cases all over Canada the Bell Telephone Company have been monopolists and I dare say they have many sins to answer for. I am not trying to excuse or exculpate or even to apologize for them, but I wish to discuss for a few moments the actual conditions of the telephone business as they exist in Canada to-day. It has been said here to-night, and I presume will be again by my hon. friends on the other side of the House, that the experience of the province of Manitoba in the last year has justified the statement made so many times by hon. gentlemen opposite in the last three or four years, that all public utilities should be owned, operated and controlled by governments and municipalities, and not by corporations; or in other words the doctrine of public ownership.

Mr. LENNOX. Oh, no.

Mr. CARVELL. I am glad my hon. friend says 'oh, no,' because the only logical conclusion of the argument we have heard to-night is that the government should take control of these utilities and operate them themselves.

Mr. LENNOX. No one on this side has made any suggestion, and I distinctly said I was not arguing the question of public

ownership pro or con. I was saying we should have as cheap a service in Canada as having relation to the conditions existing in other countries where they have a national system would be possible.

Mr. CARVELL. The hon. gentleman has correctly repeated what he said earlier in the evening, but I again repeat that the logical conclusion of his argument is that we must have public ownership because the only instances he has given where they have cheaper telephones than in Canada are in those countries where government ownership is in existence and telephones are owned and controlled by the government.

In Manitoba the government have been operating their telephone system for a year and as was pointed out by my hon. friend they had a surplus in that year of something like $380,000. I think he was wrong in that, that he was including in it $161,000 which should have been paid for interest.

Mr. LENNOX. I think my hon. friend is right in that statement; I looked it up afterwards.

Mr. CARVELL. So it should be $220,000 or $230,000 instead of $380,000. But I make the statement here to-night, and I propose to prove it, that instead of the Manitoba government showing a surplus of $230,000 in their year's operation they had actually shown a deficit. I know my hon. friends opposite will not say 'hear, hear' to that statement but I shall give a few figures which will prove it. In the first place I am quoting now from a speech made by the Hon. Robert Rogers, in the legislature of Manitoba, on Thursday last, as reported in the 'Winnipeg Telegram,' a paper not unfriendly to the local government of Manitoba or to hon. gentlemen opposite. He stated that the total receipts of the Manitoba telephone system in eleven months and a half were $722,612. It is true he stated that at the same rate they would have received $27,000 for the remainder of the year which would have brought the receipt up to almost $750,000. But while they would be receiving $27,000 in receipts, they would also be expending a large amount in operation and management and therefore for the purpose of my argument I am confining my remarks to the actual receipts and expenditures in eleven months and a half. According to the same statement I find that they expended in operating $186,436; in maintenance $104,478; in general expenses, $35,107; and in miscellaneous, principally insurance, $16,589; or a total of $342,610. If you arrange these figures a little differently I would say that the total cost of management instead of being $186,436 is $238,132 and these are the figures used by Mr. Rogers because these were operating expenses, general expenses and miscellaneous. Therefore we have $238,132. I lay it down as an axiom in the management of telephone companies, and there is no telephone expert in or out of Canada, no man who knows any thing about telephones, who will not state that you should pay as much in every year for maintenance and depreciation as for operation.

The Manitoba government admit they have spent $238,130 for operation. Therefore, if you take the result of the cost of maintenance and add to it another $238,000 you will have about the proper amount which will have been paid out for operation, maintenance and depreciation. I want to go back and take it in another way. If you take the items of expense and add them together you get $342,610 and, taking that from the total receipts, you have the seeming result of $380,000 to the good. But, it is admitted by my hon. friend that out of that you must take at least, $161,000 because that is the interest on the debentures as stated by the Minister of Public Works for the province of Manitoba. Then, you must take out of that sum an amount for unearned rentals. I want to discuss that question of unearned rentals for a moment because I may say that this is one of the most misleading, one of the most unfair, and, if I were speaking in the presence of the man who made the statement, I would almost be justified in saying the most dishonest portion of his statement. But, it might not be fair to so characterize it in the absence of the man who made the statement. When the Manitoba government took over the Bell telephone system a little more than a year ago it was admitted that they should receive $108,000 from the Bell Telephone Company as unearned rentals. There is probably not a gentleman in this chamber to-night but who is the user of a telephone and I do not believe there are very many gentlemen who have not to pay their telephone rental in advance, some three months, some six months and some a year. I am saying what every hon. gentleman knows to be the truth. I know that the custom prevails in Manitoba and I know that at any time the Manitoba government have in their hands not less than $100,000 in money which they have not earned or paid for. I find from an analysis of the statement issued by the Minister of Public Works for the province of Manitoba, about the 22nd or 23rd of February, that last year they received from rentals—and that means what we, as subscribers all over the country will pay for having a telephone in our house—at least $535,465. Now, to be fair you have to take away from that $100,000 or $120,000 in order to ascertain what the actual receipts in rentals for that year would be which would bring down the actual receipts to $415,000 or $420,000. Assuming that you are only paying three months in advance, you have

one quarter, or $100,000, of this amount paid in advance every three months. At no time in the year would they have less than $100,000 in their possession, representing rentals that had not been earned. But, if in January, 1908, they had $108,000 in their hands, it is only fair to assume, if they obtained 2,000 additional subscribers, that they should have $120,000 in their hands at the end of the year, and therefore I am going to assume, when they made up this statement and when Mr. Rogers made this statement in the legislature of Manitoba that they had in their possession $120,000 which they had not earned. Any person must admit that that should be deducted from the gross revenue of the province for that year.

Now, that brings us to another question and that is the question of depreciation. I do not have to argue to any hon. gentleman in this house nor to any gentleman in the country, farmer, or merchant, or telephone manager that there will be a depreciation every year in a telephone line. I can tell you what the experience of the New Brunswick Telephone Company has shown that our poles, which are always 25 feet long by 6 inches at the top, have to be renewed every twelve or fifteen years on the average, and that cross arms which cost about forty or forty-five cents each have to be renewed every seven or eight years on the average. That is what is called depreciation. I can point out to you more than that. There is not a telephone company in Canada that has not, in the last twenty-five years, been compelled, practically to discard every switchboard in its service. They have been compelled to discard the Blake transmitter and the short distance transmitter by the thousands and tens of thousands all over Canada. Go to the Bell Telephone Company, the Nova Scotia Telephone Company, the New Brunswick Telephone Company, or any big telephone company in Canada or the United States and they will show you whole warehouses almost filled with discarded telephone instruments. They have been compelled to put in long distance equipment and in less than ten years they will be compelled to discard the present apparatus and put in some other arrangement. These are some of the incidents that go towards depreciation in plant which must be provided for by any well regulated telephone company. There are various items which go to make up the amount that should be set aside to provide for depreciation. The New Brunswick Telephone Company consider that they must set aside eight per cent of the total cost of the investment in order to provide depreciation. Some companies go as high as ten per cent and some companies as low as five per cent, but in no company is it possible to get along with an expenditure of less than five per cent for depreciation—not maintenance. My hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) will pardon me if I tell him that he is a little mixed as to the meaning of these terms. The word 'maintenance' means ordinary little expenses that have to be incurred every day in the week and every month in the year in keeping your line in fairly good working order. It means that if a cross arm breaks you must put it up again, it means that if an insulator breaks, as thousands and thousands do in the year, it must be repaired, it means that if you have a sleetstorm, such as we had a month ago by which tens of thousands of dollars worth of wires and poles are broken down to the ground. they must be repaired. All of these things are incidents in the operation of every telephone company which must be provided for every day and every week and these are the incidents which go to make up the maintenance. When we speak of five per cent for depreciation we do not mean this at all. We refer to a sum of money not less than five per cent on the cost of the investment which is actually necessary to replace a pole that becomes rotten, to replace a cross arm when it becomes rotten, to replace a switchboard when it becomes obsolete, or in other words to keep the whole telephone system in such a condition that it will be a well working concern. If you add to the statement of the Manitoba government the sum of five per cent for depreciation you make an addition there of $165,000. There is no telephone man on earth who will say that you can keep the Manitoba telephone system up to a proper state of repair, system costing $3,300,000, for less than $165,000 per annum and if you add these sums together you have a total of $446,000 and your total balance. after subtracting expenditures from receipts will be only $380,000; or, in other words, if these figures be correct the operation by the Manitoba government of the telephones lines for eleven and a half months. instead of showing a surplus of $232,000, shows a deficit of $55,998.

I am prepared to meet any actuary or any practical telephone man whom the province of Manitoba may appoint and go over these figures with them, and I am satisfied they will not differ with me to the extent of $10,000. I have stated that no telephone company would for a moment hope to get along by expending for maintenance and depreciaion a less amount than for operation, and if you take the operation at $238,000, and the depreciation and maintenance at a like amount, and the unearned rentals at $120,000, and the interest at $161,000 and add these together you have $757,264 as against a total revenue of only 722,612, or a deficit of $34,632. I therefore repeat that instead of having a surplus of $232,000, by any mode of intelligent figuring which they possibly can devise there

must be a deficit of anywhere between $25,000 and $50,000 in the operation of the telephones in Manitoba last year. I state here to-night, and I think I can prove it to the satisfaction of the House, that the proposed reduction foreshadowed by the Minister of Public Works in Winnipeg on Thursday night are in reality no reductions at all. The hon. gentleman from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) read a statement to the effect that they had reduced the joint user telephone from $25 to $15. But, does the hon. gentleman realize what joint user in telephone means. I doubt if there is a gentleman in this chamber who ever knew of the joint user of a telephone. I do not know of one in my own town; if there are any in New Brunswick they are very few, and I venture to say that there are not one hundred joint users in the whole city of Winnipeg. Joint user of a telephone means that once in a while in a big city you will find, say a collecting lawyer and an insurance agent occupying adjoining rooms as offices and they both pay a certain amount for the telephone they use in common. I doubt if you will find one hundred such in Winnipeg, and yet this is one of the lemons that the Manitoba government throw out to the people and say: look what we are doing for you. And, as the joint user in residences; where will you find two families using the same phone.

Mr. LENNOX. You will find hundreds, perhaps thousands of instances in Toronto where families occupying flats use one telephone and contribute jointly to the rental.

Mr. CARVELL. That would be in an hotel.

Mr. LENNOX. No.

Mr. CARVELL. That would be what we call P.B.X., or private branch exchange.

Mr. LENNOX. We get a telephone in Toronto for $50 and all the people in that house use it.

Mr. CARVELL. Meanwhile the telephone company is getting $5 for the telephone.

Mr. LENNOX. You can tell the company that two families will use the telephone in a private house and instead of charging $30 each they charge $50 and there are hundreds of cases of that kind.

Mr. CARVELL. That is so, but does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the government of Manitoba will allow two families to have a telephone in their house and charge them only $10.

Mr. LENNOX. My opinion is that the government of Manitoba will allow two families the joint use of a telephone in a private residence for $10.

Mr. CARVELL. That is what you mean?

Mr. LENNOX. That is what I understand.

Mr. CARVELL. Then I simply say I don't believe it.

Mr. LENNOX. And the last announcement of the Postmaster General in England provides for the same kind of joint user.

Mr. CARVELL. We are discussing Manitoba, not England, and I do not believe the government of Manitoba will give two families the right to use a telephone for $10, when they will charge one family $24. If my hon. friend can find any comfort in a reduction of that kind he can have it, but there is a great big nigger in the wood pile somewhere in this proposed reduction of the Manitoba telephone rates.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a reduction from $24 to $18.

Mr. CARVELL. I am willing to admit that there is a genuine reduction of from 15 per cent to 25 per cent in the residential telephones according to the statement of Mr. Rogers, but outside this residential reduction and the farmers' lines there is practically no reduction at all. This talk about joint user is only a delusion and a snare because people do not go in for joint user. This two party reduction is another delusion and a snare because business men will not use a two party line. A farmer will use a two party or a four party or an eight party line because he cannot help it, but fancy a banker or a lawyer or a doctor or a professional man of any kind using a telephone with another man on the same line; for a two party line means that one can listen to what the other may be saying. In the city of Winnipeg or in the city of Montreal or in any large city there are no two party lines to any extent. I have asked from my friends here about the conditions in Winnipeg and so far as I can learn there are no two party lines in that city. I may be wrong about that, but that is the informaiton I have obtained.

Mr. ROCHE. What about the reduction of rates in the towns?

Mr. CARVELL. As I understand it the rate is reduced to $39, and I can tell my hon. friend that in the city of St. John and in the city of Halifax we get a single line for $45, and in the city of Ottawa which is probably as important as the city of Winnipeg, you get a business telephone for $45.

Mr. LENNOX. What about the extensions; is there not a reduction there?

Mr. CARVELL. Once in a while you will find a man who has a telephone in his hall or his library and he wants another in his bedroom, and he has an extension set put in and that means another

telephone on the same line which will ring at the same time as the main telephone, but the reduction on the extension sets is another delusion and a snare. I do not suppose there are more than two or three gentlemen in this chamber who have in their residences extension sets.

Mr. LENNOX. All the government people have them.

Mr. CARVELL. I do not think so. I know something about the telephone business, and I can say that not one per cent of the telephones in this country are extension sets; so that when the government of Manitoba tells the people that it is reducing the extension rates from $12 to $6 they are merely deluding them. They charge for business telephones $25 and 2 cents per outcall. Let us see what that means. I do not suppose that any man who uses a telephone in his business makes less than five calls a day; that is 10 cents a day or $30 a year. That means $55 a year for his telephone service, whereas he can get the straight telephone for $50 a year. That is what they call a reduction. Then, to carry this thing to the point of absolute nonsense, they say they will give a residence telephone for $15 and 2 cents an outcall. Now, is there any man whose wife would not use the telephone more than three times a day? That is 6 cents a day or at least $21 a year for outcalls and $15 for rental, which brings the residence telephone up to $36 a year, whereas you can get a general residence telephone for $24 a year. And they call that a reduction. Now, we will come to the smaller towns of Brandon and Portage la Prairie, and there the same policy is carried out. They give a two-party line for unlimited business service for $27. They give a one-party line for $17.50 and 2 cents per outcall. For five calls per day this would bring the cost of the telephone up to nearly $50, or nearly twice as much as the regular telephone would cost. The whole thing is simply an attempt to hoodwink the people. Next, we come to the small towns. The rate for single lines, business, unlimited service, is reduced from $24 to $20, and for residence from $18 to $15. But they have never touched the big source of revenue, the big tax on the users of the telephone, amounting to 60 per cent of the total receipts of the telephone companies by way of rental, that is, from the business telephone. In Winnipeg the business telephone was $50 under the Bell Telephone Company; it is $50 to-day under the Manitoba government. In the cities of Brandon and Portage la Prairie the rate for the business telephone has not been reduced one cent. Now, I make the statement that the farmers' lines and residential telephones all put together do not yield more than 40 per cent of the total rental revenue of the province of Manitoba, and I want to show this House what amounts to, figured out from a telephone the whole reduction standpoint. Mr. Rogers states that his total revenue for twelve months has been $750,000. I say that is not true. My hon. friends will admit that you have to take off $120,000 for unearned rental, which brings your revenue down to $630,000. Sixty per cent of this would be for rentals and 40 per cent tolls. The 60 per cent would amount to $378,000. You have again to take 60 per cent of this as representing business 'phones, which will amount to $226,800, leaving $151,200 as the total receipts of the government of Manitoba last year from residence and farmers' telephones, and these I will admit they have reduced about 20 per cent. Twenty per cent of that $151,200 amounts to the magnificent sum of $30,000. I challeng any telephone man to contradict the statement I make, that the total reduction proposed by the Manitoba government through Mr. Rogers last Thursday in the Manitoba legislature will not amount to $30,000 in the next twelve months, and I am prepared to prove that the increases which the Manitoba government have imposed on the users of telephones since they took power amount to more than $30,000. When that government took power the users of telephones for doctors, veterinarians, nurses and people of that class were only paying $40, and they at once put up the rate to $50. When they took power the service for long distance 'phones was for a three-minutes' conversation, and they immediately reduced it to two minutes. I submit to any business man that he cannot carry on any kind of satisfactory conversation over a long distance line in two minutes, and a conservative estimate, based on the experience of telephone companies, is that this amounts to at least 25 per cent of increase in the rate on long distance telephones. Last year the Manitoba government received in tolls for long-distance service $164,000, and if to that you add 25 per cent for this reduction of time, it amounts to $61,000, twice as much as they will save by the cut on farmers' lines and residence rates. And they claim that they have cut the telephone rates in two, for which they are entitled to credit, and hon. gentlemen opposite want other provinces and the Dominion of Canada as a whole to adopt the same policy as the province of Manitoba. Now, I want to give some figures which are rather interesting. You would think to hear hon. gentlemen opposite talking that the Manitoba government were giving telephone services away. I tell you that there is not a province in Canada that is not to-day getting a cheaper telephone service than Manitoba. Let me give you a few figures in proof. In Halifax the rates are, business, $45; residence, $30; in London, Ont., the rates are

$45 and $25; in Hamilton, Ont., $45 and $30; in Sydney, Cape Breton, $40 and $30; in St. John, N.B., $40 and $23.50. Our friends in Manitoba would go crazy if they could get telephones as cheaply as we are getting them in New Brunswick where the New Brunswick Telephone Company controls practically all the business of the province. And these are all single, individual lines—no three or four-party lines. Now, let us come to some of the smaller places. But you will please remember that in Winnipeg the rates are $50 and $24.

Mr. ROCHE. What is the population of Winnipeg?

Mr. CARVELL. I suppose around 100,000.

Mr. ROCHE. Add about half more to it.

Mr. CARVELL. The hon. gentleman may be pardoned, because that is the true western spirit. But we are going to talk facts for a while to-night. Now I want to show what the Manitoba government are charging compared with a village which they won't say is about one half the size of Winnipeg. Let me give first some of the smaller towns of Eastern Canada. Sydney, $34 business and $27 residence; Guelph, $30 business and $25 residence; Moncton, $30 business and $25 residence; Fredericton, $25 business and $25 residence; St. Stephen, $25 business and $25 residence. Now those we may place against towns like Portage la Prairie and Brandon which are not half the size of the towns I have named, in many cases not one third the size. In Brandon, I am told, the rates are $35 and $20 under the new rate. But there is hardly a city in eastern Canada twice the size of Brandon and Portage la Prairie which does not get telephones at the same rate. Take a few more comparisons. In Manitoba, under the new rate, the city of Winnipeg has 7,000 subscribers, and pays $50 for a business phone and $25 for a residence phone. The city of Ottawa with the same number of phones, 7,000, pays $45 and $25, or $5 less than Winnipeg taking the two instruments together. Now coming to Brandon with 700 users, the business phone is $35 and the residence $30. Chatham has 780 users, and the business phone is only $30 and the residence $25, or $5 cheaper than it is in Brandon for the two instruments. Then come down to Portage la Prairie, 500 users, $35 and $20; Brockville, 535 users, $30 and $25, again $5 less than in Manitoba for the two instruments. Take Manitou, 125 istruments, $20 and $15; Arnprior, 160 instruments, $20 and $20; Alexander, Manitoba, 32 instruments, $20 and $15; Colborne, 60 instruments, $20 and $20. And yet, Sir, hon. gentlemen from Manitoba are horrified when I tell them that in New Brunswick, in a dozen towns with 5,000 or 6,000 population, we do not pay as much as they do in Manitoba under the new schedule. Why, we give an unlimited single line service in towns of that size in New Brunswick for $20, and we give them a great number of lines for $18; we give them a residence phone on a single line for $18, and a party line for $15. I want to tell my hon. friends more than that. In the province of New Brunswick we have in those towns nothing but the very best up-to-date telephone. Not only have we a central energy system in all our small towns, that is, the same as they have in Ottawa; but I doubt if they have in Manitoba, in any of these towns, anything like copper metallic circuits. I am told that in most towns of Manitoba they have only iron circuits, in many circuits not even metallic circuits, they are simply grounded systems, and in New Brunswick our telephone rates are at least 20 per cent lower, and in many cases 50 per cent lower, than they are in Manitoba under the new schedule.

Now I want to speak for a few minutes on the question of the long distance telephones. My hon. friends opposite when dilating upon the virtues of the Manitoba government and the virtues of public ownership as exemplified by the operations of the Manitoba government, took good care not to refer to the question of tolls. I am going to refer to that for a few minutes, and I make the statement here that the Manitoba government to-day are charging the same tolls which they charged last year, and which the Bell Telephone Company charged, and they are charging ten per cent to 15 per cent more than they are charging in any other portion of Canada for the same service. Let me give a few instances showing a comparison between Manitoba and New Brunswick—I take New Brunswick because I am best acquainted with that province. I will admit that the service under ten miles is similar in both provinces, 10 cents. When you go above that, beyond 10 miles, there is not a solitary rate in the province of Manitoba but is at least 10 per cent higher than in the province of New Brunswick, or anywhere else in eastern Canada. Now take a few illustrations. In Manitoba, over 10 miles and not exceeding 15 miles, the rate is 15 cents. In New Brunswick I will give a concrete example, namely from St. John to Westfield, a distance of 14 miles, where the rate is only 10 cents. I have here a statement which I will let my hon. friends examine if they care to, showing the rates from the city of St. John to Woodstock and a hundred other points in the province of New Brunswick, and they can figure the distance for themselves. Moreover, the distances in New Brunswick are air lines, and not lines which follow the roads. I do not know whether they figure air lines in Manitoba or not. Now from 20 miles to 35 miles, in Manitoba the rate is 25 cents; while from St. John to Hampton, 22 miles, the

rate is 20 cents. From 45 to 55 miles, the rate in Manitoba is 35 cents, while from St. John to Apohaqui 39 miles the rate is 25 cents. From 85 miles to 130 miles, in Manitoba the rate is 50 cents, while from St. John to Moncton 90 miles the rate is 45 cents. From 130 to 160 miles, in Manitoba, 60 cents; from St .John to Woodstock, 140 miles, 55 cents. From 185 to 200 miles, in Manitoba, 80 cents, from St. John to Andover, 190 miles, 70 cents. From 260 miles to 285 miles, in Manitoba the rate is $1.10; while from St. John to Campbellton, 276 miles, it is $1. Those Manitoba rates are all for a 2 minute conversation, ours are for a 3 minute conversation. And yet our friends opposite hold up the results of government ownership in Manitoba as a sample which we should follow in the other provinces of Canada. God forbid that we should ever follow the pace set by the Conservative government in Manitoba in respect to a telephone service.

Mr. BURRELL. What is the rate for a 5 minute conversation on the Dominion government owned system, for about 50 to 100 miles?

Mr. CARVELL. That is a very intelligent question and requires an equally intelligent answer. I may surprise my hon. friend to tell him that the Dominion government does not own a telephone line, that I know anything about .

Mr. BURRELL. I may inform my hon. friend that the Dominion government he supports is operating and owning a telephone system.

Mr. CARVELL. Now that I think of it, there are two, I think, in Canada operated by the government. I am told there is one somewhere on the Pacific coast going toward the Yukon, and another away down the St. Lawrence river, somewhere on the Labrador coast.

Mr. BURRELL. Allow me to correct the hon. gentleman. Allow me to inform him that there is a system owned and operated by the Dominion government extending a good distance down the riding of Yale-Cariboo. And I think that, as they have adopted the principle of government ownership, the House should have some explanation about the operation of that system and its result.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend (Mr. Burrell) will have a chance, so far as I know, to give all the information he wishes to. But, to be fair, I would say that the Dominion government is not in the telephone business to such an extent that we can even discuss it at all. What is the use of men talking nonsense and bringing in little quibbles, when we want to deal with facts? I know the Dominion government are operating a telephone line on the Labrador coast. And I suppose my hon. friend would want me to go into an elaborate discussion in which the operation of that line in Labrador would be compared with the operation of the lines in the great city of Winnipeg.

Mr. BURRELL. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) is using rather strong language——

Mr. CARVELL. If the hon. gentleman wishes to ask me a question, let him ask it.

Mr. BURRELL. I desire to make the statement——

Mr. CARVELL. Never mind your statement. Ask your question.

Mr. BURRELL. Does the hon. gentleman know how far this line runs and how the telephones——

Mr. CARVELL. No, and I don't care. I am talking telephones, not quibbles. There are a number of questions I wish to discuss before I leave this important matter. I stated earlier in my remarks that I would attempt to prove that so far as Manitoba is concerned, they have not shown a surplus but a deficit, and have not reduced the rates; and I am willing to leave it to the judgment of this House whether or not I have substantiated my statement. I think I have substantiated it, and I think my hon. friends opposite will get but cold comfort from the consideration of the report presented by the government of Manitoba after their first year's experience in the operation of the telephone. My hon. friend from South Simcoe referred to the remedy, and stated that, in many instances, independent telephone lines have come in and have been able very materially to reduce rates. I admit that four or five years ago, and even as long as ten years ago, there was a great boom of independent telephone lines all over Canada and the United States. And there is no reason why they should not exist to-day. In my own constituency, we have three independent telephone lines, all doing a splendid business. My hon. friend from Lambton thought it a most remarkable thing that an independent telephone line could exist giving a telephone service at six dollars. In my constituency, hundreds of farmers' telephones cost only seven dollars, eight dollars or nine dollars. But, alongside of these, the New Brunswick Telephone Company are getting fifteen dollars for farmers' lines. If hon. gentlemen will take even a few moments to consider it, they will see that a farmers' line can be run at a very cheap rate. But you have perhaps twenty or even thirty subscribers on a line, and a cheap iron wire at that——

Mr. TALBOT. And fastened to a picket.

Mr. CARVELL. Yes, to anything. But it is an accommodation to the people, and while I have some interest in the New Brunswick Telephone Company, I have encouraged the incorporation of farmers' lines as far as I could. In less than three years, I have had a hand in incorporating two of them. They are a good thing. The farmers are able to have their social gossip. But the man who tries to do business over the line must allow for the fact that every one else knows what he is talking about. And there cannot be a social function any where in the country but every one knows about it. The farmers can get the state of the market, can learn what hogs, potatoes, or oats are worth, the line is a good thing for them. But, when you come to talk about telephone business, the comparison is not at all a fair one. For, in order to have a telephone business, you must have exchanges, you must have long distance connection and every thing else that makes a telephone service. I suppose there is not a switchboard on any farmers' line in Canada that costs $100. But the central switchboard in a town of 4,000 or 5,000 people will cost from $5,000 to $10,000. So, when the hon. gentleman talks about farmers' lines at five dollars or six dollars a year, his discussion is not germane to the subject. There is a big question staring us in the face—are we in Canada paying too much for our telephone service? I must say that the evidence furnished by the government of Manitoba does not prove that the government telephone service is an ideal condition of affairs. How are we to get the rates reduced? My hon. friend from South Simcoe says by independent companies. I say, all honour to the independent companies. I like to see them go ahead and do all they can. But, I must say, the result of the experience of the independent companies has been anything but favourable from a financial standpoint. I have in mind the case of an independent company started in Portland, Maine, six or seven years ago. They put in what is called the automatic system. Under this system, no central is required; by the manipulation of a portion of the instrument you make your own connection and your own call. At first the company gave ridiculously low rates Afterwards they increased their rates to almost what the old line was charging, but, at the end of five years, they went into a receiver's hands and the shareholders lost about half a million dollars. We find another illustration in Red Deer, Alberta. The Bell Company were charging thirty dollars for business telephones and twenty dollars for residence telephones. A gentleman named Morte came along from the United States, and claimed that he could give them telephones at about half of what they were paying. The municipality gave a franchise and made a contract, and the system was installed. The rates charged were so low that the Bell Telephone Company got out and left the place entirely to the municipal system—municipal in effect because it was run under municipal control. They started in to give a service at twenty-five dollars for business telephones and ten dollars for residence. After running for a year or two, they found they could not possibly carry on the business at these figures, and gave notice to the municipality under their contract that they would apply for arbitration to fix the rates. The arbitrators, I should judge, were men who would be competent to deal with the matter. One was Mr. Roland Winters, of Lethbridge, the second Mr. R. S. Kelsch, the well known electrical engineer, of Montreal, and the third William Cousins, the mayor of Medicine Hat. After hearing the evidence and taking every thing into consideration, the arbitrators gave their award, which allowed the company to fix its rates at twenty-three dollars for residence telephones and thirty-five dollars for business telephones —about ten or fifteen per cent more than the Bell Company had been charging before the independent company went there at all. Now, let me give a few figures illustrating what independent companies have done in the United States. I state that not an independent company has been doing a telephone business—I differentiate between a telephone business and a farmers' line—for ten years, or even five years, that has not been compelled to increase its rates :

City.	Original rate.	Present rate.
St. Louis..	$60—$36	$72—$48
Cleveland	48— 36	72— 48
Pittsburgh..	48— 36	72— 58
Toledo..	44— 26	52— 32
La Crosse	30— 18	36— 24
Madison..	24— 18	33— 21
Galesborough	30— 18	36— 24

I have another list of 201 different companies organized in the different states and every one has been compelled to raise the rates in the last five years from twenty-five to sixty per cent. It only illustrates the truth of my statement that they cannot do telephone business for less than it costs—neither can the government of Manitoba. neither can the government of British Columbia and neither can a corporation.

I find I have still a good deal of matter to discuss and as it is getting late I would beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. LENNOX. I rise to oppose the adjournment of the debate except on some

reasonable terms. We have sat here hour after hour listening to hon. gentlemen opposite speaking well, speaking eloquently I admit, but not speaking to the question we should be discussing, not speaking to the question I brought forward. The government have a duty to perform in this matter, but they have not made any statement as to what course they intend to pursue. The country will expect us to debate this matter and dispose of it in some reasonable way. I ask the right hon. gentleman who leads the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he will say that he will give an opportunity of continuing this debate. In that event I have no objection to its being adjourned; otherwise, I must insist that we should either dispose of it by vote now, or decide upon the question of adjournment as the rules of the House provide.

Righ Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). In the few words just uttered by my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) there are many things to which I could take exception. He said the question has not been debated on this side. In my humble opinion it has been well debated. In so far as the government are concerned, I may say we are disposed to accept the amendment moved by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean). I will not undertake at this period of the session to say whether it will come up again; perhaps it will, perhaps it will not. My hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) has had at least six or seven different opportunities of bringing up this question before to-day.

House divided on the amendment to the amendment that the debate be now adjourned (Mr. Carvell).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,
Aylesworth,
Beauparlant,
Bickerdike,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Boyer,
Brodeur,
Bureau,
Calvert,
Carrier,
Carvell,
Cash,
Champagne,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Chisholm (Inverness),
Clark (Red Deer),
Clarke (Essex),
Currie (Prince Edward),
Delisle,
Demers,
Dugas,
Ecrément,
Emmerson,
Fielding,
Fortier,
McCraney,
McGiverin,
McIntyre (Perth),
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McKenzie,
McLean (Sunbury),
McMillan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Martin (Regina),
Mayrand,
Meigs,
Michaud,
Miller,
Molloy,
Murphy,
Nesbitt,
Papineau,
Parent,
Paterson,
Pickup,
Proulx,
Pugsley,
Rankin,
Reid (Restigouche),
Richards,
Fowke,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Girard,
Graham,
Guthrie,
Hodgins,
Hunt,
Kyte,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lavergne,
LeBlanc,
Lemieux,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
MacNutt,
McAlister,
McCoig,
McColl,
Rivet,
Robb,
Ross,
Roy (Montmagny),
Rutan,
Savoie,
Schell,
Sealey,
Seguin,
Sinclair,
Smith (Middlesex),
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Stormont),
Sutherland,
Talbot,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Turcotte (Nicolet),
Turcotte (Quebec County),
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Warburton,
White (Victoria, Alta),
Wilson (Laval).—101.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,
Arthurs,
Barker,
Barnard,
Barr,
Blain,
Borden (Halifax),
Boyce,
Bradbury,
Broder,
Burrell,
Currie (Simcoe),
Doherty,
Edwards,
Elson,
Goodeve,
Haggart (Winnipeg),
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes,
Jameson,
Kidd,
Lake,
Lennox,
McCall,
Magrath,
Middlebro,
Northrup,
Owen,
Perley,
Reid (Grenville),
Rhodes,
Roche,
Schaffner,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Sharpe (Ontario),
Smyth,
Sproule,
Staples,
Stewart,
Taylor (Leeds),
Taylor (New Westminster),
Thoburn,
Thornton,
Wallace,
Wilson (Lennox and Addington).—47.

Amendment (Mr. Carvell) agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business may we expect to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will take the Bills which are on the Order Paper, that is if they are printed, and afterwards we will take Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In their order?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. What Supply?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Canals.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 2, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN, member for the electoral division of Comox-Atlin, introduced by the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier (Prime Minister) and Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance).

DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State) moved that the House go into Committee on Thursday next to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient that there should be a department of the Civil Service of Canada to be called the Department of External Affairs, over which the Secretary of State of Canada shall preside, and that the Governor in Council may appoint an officer to be the deputy head of such department, at a salary of $5,000 per annum, and such other officers and clerks as may be requisite for the due administration of such department, at such salaries as, under the Civil Service Amendment Act, 1908, are appropriate to the divisions and subdivisions of the service to which such officers and clerks may be assigned.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 84) respecting the Athabaska Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 85) respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company. — Mr. George Taylor.

Bill (No. 86) respecting the Cobalt Range Railway Company.—Mr. Hodgins.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE — THE BUDGET.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before the orders of the day are called, I desire to ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) if he can tell us when he expects to bring down the Budget?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance.) I cannot make an announcement at present, and some days must elapse before I can do so. There are some matters engaging my attention, which, though not more important, are more urgent.

SUPPLY—ESCAPE OF CONVICT BILL MINER.

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

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Three weeks ago, I brought to the attention of this House certain matters in connection with the British Columbia penitentiary, matters of especially grave moment because of the fact that they involve an interference with the prerogative of pardon which, under our constitution, is the personal prerogative of His Excellency. I charged on that occasion that there had been serious defects in the connecting links between the penitentiary and the Department of Justice, that material information respecting transactions within the penitentiary had not been communicated to the department by the inspector whose duty it is to visit that institution and make periodical reports to the government. We had the promise on that occasion that the government would institute an investigation into the facts thus brought before the House; but, in connection with this promise, we had the embarrassing fact that the head of the department had volunteered a certificate of character to the person involved in these charges, that is, the inspector whose duty it was to have made reports which I charged —and I think substantiated that charge by evidence produced in this House—had not been made, and by that certificate of character so given the government had placed themselves in the embarrassing position of sharing in whatever condemnation might be subsequently found attached to the conduct of the inspector. The first certificate of character was given by no less a person than the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) when, in the following week, he answered a series of questions placed upon the Order Paper by my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen). The answers to these questions revealed that whereas there had been paid a series of visits to the convict known as Bill Miner, as to whom this discussion in the House had arisen, and these visits were recorded in the books of the penitentiary, no permission had been given by the department for these visits, and that they were directly contrary to the regulations of the Department of Justice, and therefore should have been reported by the inspector to the Department of Justice on the occasion of his first visit to the institution after they had been recorded in the book. I would like to recall that the facts before the House showed that the inspector visited the institution in July, 1907, that the escape took place in August, 1907; that all these visits were recorded on the books during several months prior to July, 1907, one of them so late as June of that year, and that none of these visits were reported to the Department of Justice here, as shown by the answers made by the Minister of Justice to the member for Portage la Prairie to the effect that the department had no knowledge of the matter and had given no permission for these visits.

It was also stated in this House, in con-

nection with this inquiry, that the reason certain detectives were permitted to visit Miner was that he was supposed to have taken certain bonds, the product of the hold-up near Mission in the year 1906. Now, in the answer made by the Minister of Justice in reply to the inquiry whether the department proposed to follow up that clue and find out whether there had been a recovery of those bonds subsequent to the escape of Miner, I would like to point out that nearly 18 months had elapsed, so that there would have been ample time for these bonds to have reached their destination in Australia, and there would have been ample opportunity to inquire whether the officers had fulfilled their duty, and had pursued this subject by inquiries in Australia, or wherever else it might have been thought proper, to ascertain whether the bonds had been returned there, and so establishing a connection between the departure of Miner and the recovery of these bonds. The answer made by the department was that they had not made any inquiry, neither did they intend to pursue any inquiry in that direction. So much for the departmental side of this matter. But after the ventilation of the subject in this House, the public in British Columbia commenced to take an interest in it. I propose to read an extract from the Vancouver 'Province,' a most influential and independent newspaper published at Vancouver, a paper I may say of the highest respectability and responsibility, and which I am sure would not publish a paragraph of this kind except on the most unquestioned authority. I read from the Vancouver 'Daily Province' of the 12th of February, this statement appearing in black type so as to emphasize it and add to its importance, and to show that it is not a mere casual paragraph brought in by a reporter but has received the attention of responsible persons in the office:

An official who is in a position to speak authoritatively on the subject of Bill Miner's escape from the penitentiary at New Westminster this morning made the following statement for publication:

At the time of the investigation into the escape made by Inspector Dawson I could have told him, had I been called upon to testify, that Bill Miner did not escape from prison by crawling under the fence through the hole through which it was alleged he went. No man ever crawled through that hole for two good reasons. The first was that the hole was not large enough; the second, because the hole was made only for the purpose of covering the letting out of Miner. The story of the loss of fifty thousand dollars worth of bonds or money by the Canadian Pacific Railway or any one else in the robbery, and that it had been cached by Miner, was an invention in the interests of the robber himself. No one ever lost that sum; no bonds were ever stolen. Miner's friends on the outside called on him and conducted fake negotiations for his so-called escape and the securing of the cached money. Certain persons made it possible for Miner to escape, apparently on the understanding that he would divide up on the booty. These facts can easily be proved if the government makes an investigation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a statement involving an arraignment of the Department of Justice, and is of a most serious nature, a statement so serious that I do not remember ever to have seen its parallel in the press of this country or of any other country, without an immediate inquiry being set on foot by the department indicted, in order, either to absolve the persons mentioned from complicity in the escape if they were innocent, or to punish the persons who were guilty of circulating so mischievous a story. I am surprised that nearly three weeks have elapsed since the publication of that indictment of the Department of Justice, without the slightest notice being paid by that department to the arraignment made by this official, who says that he was in a position to tell how this man left the penitentiary if he had been called by the inspector who was sent there and spent four months conducting this inquiry. But he was not called by the inspector, and was not given any opportunity to testify in this connection, and although his statement has been before the public for two weeks or more this House has been allowed to remain in ignorance whether or not the department of Justice have given any attention to this information. But, Mr. Speaker, matters did not rest there. While the Department of Justice were seemingly oblivious to what the public might say about this, seemed to have lost any interest in Bill Miner, and had apparently no concern as to whether he escaped or was handed out, the public in British Columbia were not indifferent. The persons in British Columbia charged with interests much inferior in degree to those with which the department stands concerned, would not rest quiet under the indictment. One of these persons was the Canadian Pacific Railway detective, Bullick, who was mentioned in this House in connection with the transaction, and as to whom we were told by the Solicitor General that he had been permitted to visit the institution because, as that hon. gentleman said, he desired, on behalf of the railway company, who were prompted by the express company, to find out what became of these bonds. We find Bullick submitting to an interview in the 'Daily Province' of February 18, and saying:

I never had an interview with Bill Miner at the penitentiary in New Westminster, but I was present when Jake Terry interviewed the train robber there; I accompanied Terry to the penitentiary to see if he and Miner were acquainted, and though I was present

when the two men met I said nothing to Miner beyond correcting a statement he attributed to me in reference to the reported death of his sister. Warden Whyte was present at the time.

I certainly therefore never could have promised Bill Miner a pardon if he would surrender to the Canadian Pacific Railway any bonds which he was credited with having stolen at the Whonnock hold-up. I never made any such promise to Miner or even discussed the subject with him notwithstanding any statement made to that effect by Miner to Instructor McKenzie of the penitentiary, and by him reported at the Dawson investigation into the escape of Miner.

This statement was made to-day by Mr. Robert E. Bullick, inspector of the special service department of the Canadian Pacific Railway in reference to the information given out in parliament yesterday by Hon. A. B. Aylesworth when questioned concerning the unsavoury escape of the train robber and three fellow-prisoners on August 8, 1907.

There never were any bonds stolen in the Whonnock hold-up by Bill Miner or any one else so far as I am aware, continued Mr. Bullick. The story of the theft of bonds was invented by Jake Terry, of Bellingham, a former pal of Miner's in San Quentin penitentiary. Terry spun the bond yarn to Mrs. Wellman, a sister of Miner's, who was living in Bellingham after the Whonnock hold-up, in the hope that he would be able to excite her cupidity and so learn from her the whereabouts of the robber who was then in hiding. Terry thought Mrs. Wellman would have some knowledge of her brother's location. Finally Terry while intoxicated gave the story to the Bellingham press in an attempt to substantiate the accounts he had been giving to Miner's sister. That was the origin of the bond fake.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am reading all this because the story is essential. You will observe there is a direct contradiction here between the statement made by the Solicitor General in this House that the reason this man was allowed to see Miner was that he wished to secure a trace of the bonds alleged to have been stolen, and the statement of the man himself, who comes forward and says that there never were any bonds, that he had no instructions from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was not authorized by the express company to act, and that the whole thing was a fake. But he proceeds now to a subject which does concern us, and as to which we have had no proper answer from the Department of Justice. He says:

The most peculiar circumstance in connection with the escape of Miner has not yet been brought up in parliament, and that is how it happened that when Miner got away his upper lip was adorned with a moustache and his hair was unclipped. Following the alleged escape, days elapsed before it became known that Miner was not close cropped and clean shaven—had the true description of the man been given out he would have been arrested as he was met not far from the mouth of the Fraser river by a policeman who recognized his features but was confounded at seeing such a growth of hair and moustache which he knew could not have been grown during the few days which had at that time elapsed since the escape.

It is suggested that perhaps the federal government hesitates about making any statement in this connection, as it would be merely furnishing evidence of the loose manner in which its penal institutions are managed.

Now completing the story, I find in the New Westminster 'Daily Columbian' which arrived in the mail to-day, a singular statement by Mr. D. D. Bourke, ex-warden of the penitentiary, a statement dealing with the report made to this House by the Minister of Justice and by the Solicitor General. I wish to call attention mainly to the concluding paragraph, but I think it is essential to the record, and lest any person should say that I had not read the full letter, that I should read the whole of it although it is the concluding paragraph to which I wish to direct special attention. The letter proceeds:

The Vancouver 'World,' of the 23rd inst. has an editorial headed 'That Borden Telegram,' in which it states that the conduct of the bold wretch who tampered with the telegram committed a treasonable crime. He misled the state. Equally guilty of treason is the man who misleads the Crown and he who misleads a minister of the Crown misleads the Crown itself.

As my telegrams regarding the escape of Bill Miner have been discussed in the House and as they may be discussed again when the deferred item for British Columbia penitentiary is brought up, I think it advisable that the hon. the minister as well as the public should be correctly informed in this matter before the discussion is resumed.

The minister is reported in 'Hansard' (unrevised) of Feb. 11 as follows:

After referring to my telegram of the 8th Aug. the minister says (page 971):

'But the extent of the message which then came, and which for the first time gave the slightest hint that Miner was one of those that had escaped, was a telegram which Mr. Bourke despatched on the 11th of August. When it reached Ottawa it was not addressed as it ought to have been, and as I understand Mr. Bourke says his original message was addressed, to the inspector, but it was addressed to Mr. Dawson individually. On receipt at Ottawa, instead of being delivered to me, or to Mr. Stewart, or to the department, it was repeated to Mr. Dawson at Kingston.'

Here are the facts as I know them.

On the 8th of Aug. Bill Miner and three other convicts escaped. Immediately I wired the department that four convicts had escaped. Seeing we had not recaptured these men I wired the department again next morning, 9th Aug., and gave the name of escaped convicts and asked permission to offer a reward. A child can understand even an hour's delay in such cases counts in the convict's favour. All day of the 9th I looked

anxiously for a reply but none came. Several days having passed and getting no reply from the inspectors I had given up hopes of the department taking any action when I noticed an item in the Vancouver 'Province' of the 15th stating that Chief Chamberlain had received instructions to offer $500 reward for Miner. As this was only an item I looked carefully over the Vancouver papers for a day or two to see if an official notice had been given, but there was none. I then went to Vancouver and asked the chief why he had not offered the reward, officially, as no one would venture his life with Miner on the information in the news item. The chief replied that he had no instructions to do so, and showed me the telegram from Col. Sherwood which simply stated the fact but gave no advice. A day or two later I had a telegram from Col. Sherwood saying Detective McLeod, of Vancouver, would call upon me in regard to the Miner case, and a few hours afterwards he with Chief Chamberlain and C.P.R. detective Bullick called on me. As Mr. McLeod assured me it was all right to allow the chief and Mr. Bullick to hear all I had to tell him, all three were present during the interview. As I am not aware of the reward being officially announced at any time, this interview was the first made here by the department of which I am aware for the recapture of Miner—about a fortnight after Bill Miner escaped.

Here is where it begins to be particularly interesting:

When Mr. Dawson began the inquiry some days afterwards he worked himself up to a passion because of the delay in getting my telegram of the 9th of August asking permission to offer a reward. He said I addressed the telegram to him instead of to 'The Inspectors.' That he was then at Dorchester and that the telegram was forwarded to Dorchester, that he had left Dorchester for Kingston before the telegram arrived there, and after arriving at Kingston he went to the country for some days and when he returned to Kingston and got the telegram several days had elapsed, and that had I addressed it 'The Inspectors,' Inspector Stewart would have got it at once and taken some action on it. I said I addressed it 'The Inspectors.' He then went to his papers and took therefrom a telegram such as I sent but addressed 'G. W. Dawson.' I still insisted that I addressed the telegram 'The Inspectors,' but he pretended not to believe me and charged me with bringing great trouble on the government. That evening I wrote the telegraph operator of this city for a copy of the telegram which he sent me. It was addressed 'The Inspectors.' I handed it to Mr. Dawson. When I was in Ottawa a year later I called at the telegraph office there and asked for a copy but was told at the telegraph office that such papers are always destroyed after being held six months. As my telegram of the 8th was addressed 'The Inspectors' and received all right, and as my telegram of the 9th was addressed all right to 'The Inspectors,' the only conclusion that can be drawn from Mr. Dawson's version is that it fell into some hands at Ottawa who saw, in thus falsifying it, a better chance for Miner to escape and as a consequence for my resignation.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR

It would be interesting to know what action Mr. Dawson took to find out the guilty party. When I handed him the copy received from the operator, Mr. Wilson, and when he saw it was addressed 'The Inspectors' he said: 'What further action are you going to take about it?' I replied that I felt my share was done, as the message left Westminster all right.

It would only cost a trifle for Mr. Dawson to wire to Ottawa for a copy of that telegram, and settle the matter there and then. Indeed had I anticipated so much trouble arising over the matter or had I known Mr. Dawson as well then as I learned to know him during the course of the inquiry, I should have wired for a copy at my own expense.

I fear that unless this telegram transaction is cleared up satisfactorily a crime of greater magnitude than the escape of Bill Miner will stain the reputation of our fair Dominion.

(Sgd.) D. D. BOURKE.

I submit that this statement, added to the facts brought out in our discussion of this matter three weeks ago, shows that there is urgent necessity for some action being promptly taken in reference to it and I think the government will be derelict in its duty if it leaves the inquiry of this matter in the hands of the inspector who was accused by Mr. Bourke in the first statement, which I read in this House and is again accused in the letter which I have just now read. That this government which has been paying so much attention lately to the matter of forged telegrams, which has held itself up to public applause for the horror it has expressed that any one should attempt to tamper with a telegram between its despatch and delivery, should sit silent and allow the charge to be made that a telegram addressed to the Department of Justice was forged, just as much as any other telegram was forged, somewhere between the departure of that telegram from New Westminster and its receipt in Ottawa by the changing of the address of the inspector, who, on his own statement, was a thousand miles away and could not possibly receive it until the lapse of several days and then the object for which the telegram had been sent here was defeated. I submit that this is a most serious matter and one which calls for more urgent attention by this government than has been given to it, as is shown by the fact that three weeks have elapsed since this charge was first made in this House and that the government has sat absolutely silent under it during that period.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice.) Mr. Speaker, there is, in connection with this matter, one feature upon which I think we will all be agreed and that is that it is most unfortunate that a subject of the kind has to be made a matter of trial in the newspapers and that perhaps it is equally a misfortune when one

of the newspapers which engages in such a trial happens to be the personal or particular organ of any hon. gentleman in this House.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I would like to correct the hon. Minister of Justice and to say that the newspaper with which I am connected has not engaged in this warfare except to publish a signed statement from a responsible citizen.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I think a very good illustration of the misfortune which I have referred to is furnished by this affair and by one, at least, of the incidents in connection with it. When the matter was first discussed, while in committee of supply on the 11th of February last, I gave as full and as frank a statement as I was able to give from memory of all that had occurred in connection with the events of now nearly two years ago. I understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) to express himself at that time as pleased with the fullness of the explanation that was given. A few days afterwards, however, a question was put upon the Order Paper designed—to cross examine shall I say—I will prefer to say designed to bring out more fully all possible facts in connection with this particular escape. To that question I gave as full an answer as, I venture to think the circusmtances of the case admit of, on the 17th of February last, and I have but to refer hon. gentlemen who desire any information in connection with this matter to the pages of 'Hansard' at 1228 and 1229 in which they will find as precise and as complete a summary of the official file in this matter as it was possible for me to frame after going over that file myself from beginning to end for the purpose of giving the answer which is there set down. Now, that answer was given on the 17th of February ult.; it was telegraphed to the British Columbia newspapers and among others to which that answer purported to have been telegraphed was the newspaper with which the name of the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Taylor) is connected.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I will have again to correct——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I will have again to correct the Minister of Justice.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member rises to a point of order; he has the right to be heard.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have corrected the hon. minister and I notice he did not accept my correction. I understand the reason for that but I do not think the statement should be repeated by the minister even under the disabilities. I would like to say now that this report——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I am in order. My point of order is that the minister says that the report was telegraphed to my newspaper. I have to say that that report was not telegraphed to my newspaper. My paper does not take the associated press telegrams and this despatch was copied from the Vancouver 'News-Advertiser,' which does take that service.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is customary to accept an hon. member's statement.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The observation which I made Mr. Speaker, was that this answer given by me in the House, or the substance of this answer, was telegraphed to British Columbia and appeared in various newspapers there, among others in the newspaper with which the name of the hon. gentleman is connected. That statement is literally true and may be verified by any hon. member who cares to take the trouble to examine the files in the library and to refer to the issue of the 'Columbian' of the 18th of February last. Now, I may repeat what I said at the outset that in matters in which an hon. gentleman in this House takes a particular interest it is sometimes a misfortune that that same hon. gentleman should have a newspaper at his disposal. For this reason my answer to the question as to interviews of detectives with Miner, and in particular as to statements with regard to bonds which it was supposed Miner knew the hiding place of, was very distinct and exact in saying that the first the department or any official of the department at Ottawa ever heard of even the existence of such bonds was when, after the escape of Miner and during the investigation of the circumstances of that escape held by Mr. Inspector Dawson, one of the witnesses, namely, Instructor Mackenzie had stated in evidence that Miner told him that a certain man named Bullick had come to the penitentiary to see him (Miner) in regard to the existence of those bonds. That answer having been given to this House on the 17th of February, in the issue of the 'Columbian' on the following day on the front page and under the heading: 'The department was unaware; Aylesworth in Commons gives names of visitors to Bill Miner in captivity; no permission given; no records made of interview with Bullick and Terry; names registered;' there appears the statement that I gave to this House the name of chief constable Macintosh as the man who had given the evidence in question before Mr. Dawson and who had given to the officials of the department the only information on this sub-

ject which they had. I had mentioned in my answer in another connection altogether the name of Chief Constable Macintosh, but as to this particular point my answer is distinct and specific in giving the name not of Chief Constable Macintosh at all but of Instructor Mackenzie. Now, in each of the other newspapers in British Columbia the answer is correctly printed—

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I am sorry to have to say that the statement just made by the minister is not correct.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is not a point of order.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I rise to this point of order: that the hon. minister is imputing dishonourable motives to me—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have not noticed that the minister has done so.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. In each of the other newspapers of British Columbia the answer is correctly given——

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. No.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The telegram in every other newspaper read that the person who gave this evidence was instructor Mackenzie, as I said, but by some misfortune, by some alteration let us suppose in the transmission of the telegram to this particular newspaper office in British Columbia, by some possible forging of the telegram shall I say——

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I rise to a point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member (Mr. Taylor) rises to a personal explanation he should be heard.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I would like to ask whether it is in order for a minister of the Crown to charge or to insinuate that a member of this House has connived at the forging of the telegram.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is allowed to give a personal explanation.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that the Minister of Justice is entirely wrong.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. The minister says that this telegram originated in the 'Daily Columbian' and as I have already informed the House it originated in the Vancouver 'News-Advertiser' which takes the despatches which the 'Columbian' does not and it was copied from the 'News-Advertiser' by the 'Columbian' word for word.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Of course, I am not able to enter into the secrets of the hon. gentleman's sanctum in British Columbia. I must naturally take things as I find them, and on the front page of this Daily 'Columbian' of New Westminster of February 18, 1909, I see this remarkable evidence of the enterprise of that great organ of public opinion. I see that there is a telegraphic despatch from Ottawa direct to the Daily 'Columbian.'

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I ask for your ruling, Mr. Speaker, whether the Minister of Justice, having been informed that he is wrong, is permitted to continue to insult me as he is doing ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. In this paper——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. J. D. Taylor) is permitted to make a personal explanation. The minister is now referring to an article in a newspaper, which is quite a different matter.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I find on the face of this newspaper article, Mr. Speaker, no indication that it is copied from any other organ of public opinion, no credit given to the enterprise of the other newspaper, which may have been at the expense of having this message sent across the continent. But a despatch dated Ottawa, February 18, appears in the issue of the 'Columbia' of the same date. It appears as if it were a special despatch sent to that newspaper—not, it is true over any special or private wire, but an ordinary piece of telegraphic news due to the enterprise of that newspaper itself; and but for explanations which I understand have been given to the contrary, I certainly would have supposed, I certainly did suppose when I read that article that it was what it professed to be, and that it was truthfully purporting to give to its readers the understanding that that newspaper had a special correspondent at headquarters in Ottawa to whom it was indebted for this information. Be that as it may, however, that article came to be published in the Daily 'Columbian,' the point is precisely the same. Whether or not there was an error in telegraphing, whether or not there was something taken out of the telegram after it reached the Daily 'Columbian' and

something else put in instead, whether or not that message was improved by someone, influenced by motives of misguided political zeal, however it was, this newspaper published the statement that the Minister of Justice was driven to say that Mr. Chief Constable Macintosh was the person who had conveyed that information to the department which the department ought to have known from the beginning. Nor is this all, Mr. Speaker, because side by side with the telegraphic despatch to which I have referred, in the adjoining column and under equally staring headlines, we have the result of another piece of enterprise on the part of this newspaper, in the form of interviews purporting to have been had on the day in question with Chief Constable Macintosh and with Mr. ex-warden Bourke. May you understand exactly, Mr. Speaker, the enterprise of this newspaper and the way in which public opinion is worked up on this great question in British Columbia. There is a telegraphic despatch, which, when it comes to be published in a newspaper, is unaccountably erroneous, and which attributes to Chief Constable Macintosh the giving of information to the department with which Chief Constable Macintosh had never any concern in the world. Immediately thereafter the industrious reporter sets out for Chief Constable Macintosh to interview him, and not unnaturally Chief Constable Macintosh gives the whole story an utter repudiation, saying that he had never testified anything of the kind. Then the newspaper tells you:—That is a sample of the kind of statement you get from your Minister of Justice, and accordingly a half column is built up of rosy phrases in which the Minister of Justice and his department are held up to the scorn of an outraged British Columbia, because statements of this notoriously untrue character are actually made by the Minister of Justice of Canada from his place in the House of Commons. Nor does the enterprise of this newspaper stop at this point. Not only have we the effect of an interview with Mr. Chief Constable Macintosh, but we have also the effect of an interview with Mr. ex-warden Bourke, who, according to the newspaper says: 'now the public of British Columbia can see what reliance can be placed on the information which the Minister of Justice receives from his subordinates in regard to penitentiary matters in British Columbia.' And again the moral is pointed, and again the newspaper drives home to its readers the great truth that the whole management of public affairs under this administration is rotten to the core and ought to be changed; that no dependence whatever can be placed on the officials of the department. This is a sample, this is an illustration; and upon such foundations is built the whole edifice which the hon. gentleman has erected with regard to the escape of this convict Miner. No sooner had this newspaper published statements purporting to have been made by ex-warden Bourke as to what disclosures he could make if he saw fit than a letter was written to him, which appears on the pages of 'Hansard,' in which he was asked to say what statements he could make which he had not made at the time he was sworn to tell the truth and the whole truth in regard to this matter; and promptly there came by way of answer from Mr. Bourke this letter, written in his own hand,

New Westminster, B.C.,
Feb. 6, 1909.

Mr. G. W. Dawson, Esq.,
Inspector, Ottawa.

Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 30th ult., requesting information I may have regarding the escape of Bill Miner, that I have not already disclosed, and in reply I wish to say that, so far as my memory serves me, I gave you at the investigation and in my previous reports all the facts of which I was in possession.

Yours truly,
D. D. BOURKE.

If Mr. Bourke did, as it was his sworn duty to do, give all the information he possessed in regard to this matter, at the time he was sworn to do so, in the fall of 1907, and while the facts were fresh within his recollection, there remains nothing new to be added, and the whole substance of the information he was able to give, or that any other person connected with the penitentiary, inside or outside of it, who testified, was able to give, is contained in the answer to which I have already referred In that answer it was stated, as I said on the 11th of February in the Committee of this House, that through the improper direction of the telegram which Mr. Bourke sent announcing the escape of Miner, there was a delay of at least 24 hours at this end of the line. That telegram, as it was received from the telegraph office at Ottawa, is upon the files of the department. It has not been interfered with in any degree since it left the custody of the company. That telegram is not addressed to the inspectors of penitentiaries, but to Mr. Dawson and to Mr. Dawson accordingly it was delivered. Mr. Dawson was not at the time in Ottawa and as a result of the telegram following him and not getting back to Ottawa till after it had been received by him and transmitted by him to his colleague in the inspectorship, there was that delay which I have mentioned at this end of the line. Now, it is said that Mr. Bourke states to some newspaper or other that when he despatched that telegram it was correctly addressed,

that it was addressed by him to the inspectors of penitentiaries and not to Mr. Inspector Dawson by his personal name. I cannot say as to that; Mr. Bourke's statement may be perfectly true, I am not in a position to contradict it, and I do not desire to be understood as casting the slightest doubt upon it. Unfortunately the alteration of telegrams in transmission seems to be too common, especially when British Columbia is concerned; and just as there was this error in the newspaper to which I have already referred, in getting the name of Mackenzie changed to Macintosh by some inadvertence in copying on the part of either the telegraph company or of some newspaper copyist, so there was a difference between the address of Mr. Bourke's telegram in this instance when the copy of it in Ottawa was delivered and the condition in which Mr. Bourke says that message was when he wrote it and delivered it to the telegraph company in British Columbia.

What possible blame can be attached to the officials of the department in that connection I am unable to fathom. I am not seeking to cast any blame in the matter upon Mr. Bourke. I have never made any attack in this matter upon him; on the contrary Mr. Bourke has been, as I think I pointed out previously in this House, dealt with at all events leniently on the part of the Department of Justice and of the government. Notwithstanding all that took place in that summer, Mr. Bourke was allowed to resign and received to the full his superannuation or retiring allowance calculated upon his full actual period of service. I cannot think that he has anything to complain of and hon. gentlemen will bear me out in the memory that when this matter was under discussion three weeks ago Mr. Bourke's own language was quoted that he had no complaint against either the government or the Minister of Justice but that his quarrel was with the penitentiary inspectors. Into that quarrel, if there be a quarrel or if Mr. Bourke fancies he has a quarrel, I have no desire to go, it does not strike me that it is a matter in which the public interest of this country is concerned, and except for the exigencies of newspapr warfare, I am not able to understand any principle upon which this matter is resumed from time to time on the floor of this House. Miner escaped. No person in this country can regret the fact of his escape more than I do. I fancy I regret it more than any other hon. member in this House. What is to be done about it? What can be done? Every exertion that I was able to think of was made at the time to capture the man. Only the other day one of the four men who escaped with him was recaptured and is now in custody. At any moment, any day, Miner may be recaptured. Whether or not he ever will be I no more can tell than the hon. gentleman himself. But this I say and say without fear of successful contradiction that there was no stone left unturned by the inspectors of penitentiaries or by myself, to secure the recapture of that man from the moment we received the first intimation that he had escaped from the penitentiary.

On the former occasion on which this matter was discussed, the hon. gentleman indulged in other things. I do not know if they have been repeated to-day but I wish to say while on my feet one word in regard to at least one of the statements then made for which the hon. gentleman promptly took me to task. I stated when on my feet before, although I was speaking without any previous opportunity to refer to the files, and eighteen months after the event, that that was not the first escape that summer from the penitentiary of British Columbia. The hon. gentleman at once challenged me and no sooner had I taken my seat than he thought to put the Minister of Justice in a hole by referring to the official report which stated there were six escapes during the year from that penitentiary and that the other two were subsequent to those of Miner and his three companions. The explanation was simple. Of course the hon. gentleman was not aware of this and I have no doubt he was speaking in perfect good faith, but we take no account in our annual reports of escapes which have not been successful, of escapes which are followed by recapture before the end of the year when the report comes to be made. There had been escapes previous to this from the British Columbia penitentiary as I stated. I remembered the circumstances perfectly when I was speaking and I remember them still. I can give the hon. gentleman, if he wishes, the name of the convict; I can tell him all the circumstances of the escape and I can tell him that we recaptured that convict within forty-eight hours and therefore he did not appear in the report at all. But the circumstance was there, the fact was that when Bourke reported Miner's escape that was not the first escape that summer, and this second escape as it then was, coming so close upon the heels of the former escape, prepared me to believe just what was officially reported by the inspectors as the result of the investigation, that the discipline in the penitentiary at British Columbia had been too lax. Do not the facts which I laid before the House three weeks ago and which are spread upon 'Hansard' demonstrate that? You have interviews taking place with convicts contrary to the regulations upon the sole responsibility of the warden or

of the deputy warden without any reference to the inspectors or to the minister at Ottawa. Simply upon their own 'say so' we have them admitting people to see convicts, interviews taking place and those interviews not entered in the register, never known until in the course of an investigation months afterwards one of the witnesses says in evidence that the escaped convict told him there had been such an interview. These things, it seems to me, show exactly what the report in question stated, namely that, though there had been the most honest and best intentions on the part of the late warden, who is now dead, and on the part of the deputy warden, they had been remiss, they had not lived up to the instructions and directions which had been put before them for their government; they had chosen, of their own will, to take upon themselves the responsibility of committing breaches of these regulations, these breaches had been followed by escapes, and they were accountable and responsible, as it seems to the department, that these escapes should have taken place.

Now, I do not know that there is anything more I have to answer in the statements which have been made by the hon. gentleman on this occasion. I can only repeat to this House that, from first to last of this matter, there is nothing the department had to conceal, nothing in regard to which the department—the Ottawa end of it, as distinguished from its officials in British Columbia—has to apologize for. In regard to these officials, I have to repeat that I think the extent to which they are blamable is that they did not obey the regulations that are put before them, but preferred to exercise what they thought a sound discretion. They took the risk, and after the event has happened, one of them who now survives, seeks to throw the responsibility for the result upon his superior officer, and to show that it was because his methods of administration were not earlier found out that he was allowed to go on in the unfortunate course, which, during that summer at any rate, he was pursuing. I admit, as the hon. gentleman has said, that these interviews, which I stated in my previous answer had taken place, were held without my authority. If I am responsible for the disobedience of instructions on the part of a warden or a deputy warden of a penitentiary, and if I am accountable for their refusal to obey my orders,—which is simply what the circumstances here amount to—then I am in the judgment of this House whether or not I should be condemned. I can do nothing but state the facts; and, in regard to the facts, I have put before this House on the previous occasion in the answer I have referred to, and again in what I have said to-day, the very fullest information which I myself possess.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) began his remarks with a statement which must have been carefully considered, and which was designed—I submit to the judgment of every member of this House—to cast discredit upon the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. J. D. Taylor). I do not think that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice would have the courage himself to deny this. The purport of that statement was this: That in the British Columbia newspaper, published in the city of New Westminster, the answer given by the Minister of Justice on the 17th of February in this House, had been wrongly set forth, although it had been properly and correctly set forth in every other newspaper in British Columbia. Now, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice whether he adheres to that statement or whether he withdraws it.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. My authority for the statement is not a personal examination, but a statement made to me that in every other British Columbia newspaper, the answer had appeared as in 'Hansard.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think it would have been more becoming the position of the Minister of Justice in this House, before he undertook to make a statement of that kind, obviously levelled at my hon. friend from New Westminster for the purpose of discrediting him, to have made a personal examination. I wish to inform the Minister of Justice that the statement he made in this House this afternoon in that respect is absolutely unfounded and unwarranted. I have under my hand the 'Daily News-Advertiser,' from which the paragraph was copied into the columns of the 'British Columbian,' as stated here this afternoon by the hon. member for New Westminster, and it will be seen that the inaccuracy to which attention has been called by the Minister of Justice (in the very fair manner that has characterized his remarks this afternoon) is to be found in the columns of the 'News-Advertiser' exactly as my hon. friend from New Westminster déclared. I will read it in order that there may be no mistake on the subject:

> There was no record of Bullick or Terry's visits in the visitors' book, although there were records of all the others. The department first became aware that the visit of the detectives was to locate or secure information as to certain stolen bonds when, at the investigation conducted by Inspector Dawson, Chief Constable Macintosh said that Miner told him that Bullick said he (Miner) would be pardoned if he surrendered the Australian bonds. Macintosh said he repeated Miner's statement to the warden, who knew about it. Inspector Dawson wrote to Bullick, who re-

plied that the only time he had seen Miner was when he visited the penitentiary in the company of Terry, at which time the warden was present.

This is exactly the same inaccuracy of which the minister complains. I think that it is to be regretted that a gentleman holding the position in this House of the Minister of Justice should have ventured, without more care than the hon. gentleman seems to have taken, to make a statement designed, obviously and plainly designed, for the purpose of casting discredit upon an hon. member of this House. But these eccentricities on the part of the Minister of Justice are not uncommon. We heard him yesterday declaiming—though he said he had no right to declaim—against certain action of the Ontario government——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Very good. I might refer to that by illustration properly within the rules of this House. And I may remark, there is no hon. gentleman who transgresses that rule more frequently than the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself. I may say, in this connection, that it is indeed a matter of surprise to us to find a Minister of Justice holding a portfolio in this government which has refused a fiat to a very large number of men who assert that they have a valid claim against this government in respect of its Post Office Department. It is a surprise to hon. gentlemen in this House who have listened to recent debates in which the Minister of Justice expressed himself very strongly on this point.

But these are all matters by the way: the real point of this case has not been touched by the Minister of Justice, and every hon. member who has listened to him knows that the real point has not been touched by him. The point of the case is this; what explanation has the government, what explanation has the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth), what explanation has the Solicitor General (Mr. Bureau), for the fact that a convict was permitted to escape in broad daylight from one of the penitentiaries of this country, and up to this time that man has not been recaptured? What is the meaning of these rumours depending on evidence—if the statement of responsible men reported in the newspapers are to be regarded as evidence—that this man, at the time of his escape, had been permitted to have his hair grow to the ordinary length, like any citizen of this country, and his moustache to grow as well, so that he would escape recognition as a convict.

Has my hon. friend the Minister of Justice touched upon that point this afternoon? Every one knows he has almost carefully evaded it. I leave to any hon. gentleman in this House who reads the discussion which took place on the 11th February, who examines the statements made then by the Minister of Justice, and the utterly inconsistent statements as they seem to me, of the Solicitor General, I ask hon. members of this House if they will say that up to the present time any true and reasonable explanation of this matter has been given? What is the meaning of it all? What is the meaning of the extraordinary apologetic attitude assumed in this House by the Minister of Justice towards this man Bourke? Why, he told us on a previous occasion that he had made a demand on this man—he had made a demand, with theatrical gesture and loud voice he said he had made a demand upon him that this information should be forthcoming; and when we came to examine that letter, why, Mr. Speaker, we saw that the Minister of Justice, when he addressed himself to Mr. Bourke, was roaring it as gently as any sucking dove. And this afternoon he has been at great pains indeed to assume a remarkably apologetic attitude towards Bourke. What does it all mean? This man has been charging, by direct implication, if not in express terms, and I am inclined to think in express terms as well, though I have not the context under my hand—this man has been charging conspiracy in connection with the escape of the convict Miner—let that be understood—and he has been charging that officials for whom the Minister of Justice is responsible in this House have connived in that escape. What does the Minister say? He says, will you please give to me, the Minister of Justice, any information that you have on this subject? And he stands here in the House this afternoon and regards the situation as absolutely solved to his satisfaction, because he has received a somewhat curt letter from Bourke informing him that he has no further information than that which has already been given. Why then did Bourke state on previous occasions, over his own signature, that he had such further information? Should 24 hours be lost before a committee of this House was appointed to bring that man Bourke before the committee and take his evidence on oath? Sir, that is not the attitude of the Minister of Justice. The attitude of the Minister of Justice is absolutely a departure from what we would expect of a gentleman whose management of a department in this important respect had been challenged in the public press over and over again. He beseeches the grace of Bourke, because he has made no attack upon Bourke in this House, and he flatters himself that Bourke has made no attack upon him. Bourke has made a direct attack upon the management of an institution for which the Minister of Justice is responsible Further, I say that when the Minister of Justice boasts in this House as to the treatment which he accorded to Bourke after that

escape had taken place, in superannuating him exactly as if the discipline in that penitentiary had been all that was required, treating him as if no escape had taken place—I say that when the Minister of Justice boasts of that, he boasts of something of which I think he has absolutely no reason to be proud. It is in my belief the bounden duty of the government to see what that man has to say on that subject under oath. It is true, he has given his evidence already. I have already stated in this House that I would not be inclined to give much credit to the assertions of a man who, having once given evidence on oath, declares afterwards that there are circumstances within his knowledge which would throw new light on this subject. But we cannot afford to have the administration of justice in this country thrown into contempt and disrepute. When we have reflections such as have been made by this man Bourke and by other men in British Columbia, indicating that there was some collusion or conspiracy, it seems to me the bounden duty of the government not to let the matter stand where it is. Instead of attempting to cast discredit upon an hon. member of this House who brings these matters to the attention of the government, I would think that the Minister of Justice should welcome the aid of any member of this House in trying to bring about a better condition of affairs than seems to exist in the administration of the penitentiaries.

Hon. J. BUREAU (Solicitor General). I did not intend to take part in this debate, nor to say anything more after the explanations of the Minister of Justice. But I see there is an inclination on the part of our hon. friends opposite to misinterpret his words, and to endeavour to impute to him motives which he has not. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition greatly surprises me when he says that this debate was brought up wholly for the purpose of drawing from the Department of Justice some explanation of the escape of Bill Miner. He says the Minister of Justice has not answered the questions put by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor), because he has not explained the escape of Bill Miner. Well, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition what more can the Department of Justice do, or what more can the Minister of Justice do, than to hold an investigation, to call the officers who were supposed to know anything of the circumstances of the escape, and examine them under oath, to take their evidence and come to a decision thereupon?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is a fair question; will my hon. friend permit me to answer it? Will he tell me, in the first place whether the circumstance with regard to the growth of this man's hair and moustache before his escape, had been investigated, and if it had not been investigated, does he not think in all fairness it should be investigated?

Mr. BUREAU. Well, the leader of the opposition asks me a fair question. As he knows, I am not charged with the administration of the penitentiaries. But I was informed after the debate that took place on the 11th of February that the then warden of the penitentiary, as has been stated by the Minister of Justice, had certain weaknesses in regard to this matter, and I told him I was informed that at the time of the escape, the officers reported that Bill Miner's hair had not grown three-quarters of an inch—if I am not mistaken that is the answer I made.

Mr. CALVERT. What about his moustache?

Mr. BUREAU. About that I have no information. The leader of the opposition has accused the Minister of Justice of casting a slur upon one of the members of the opposition. Now, Mr. Speaker, my attention was called to the articles of the 'Daily Columbian' when the Minister of Justice cited these editorials of the 18th of February. I ask now, is there any man sitting in this House who reads newspapers, or any man outside of this House, when he sees a despatch in a daily paper of the importance of the 'Daily Columbian,' a paper whose importance is enhanced by the fact that a gentleman interested in it sits in this House—is there, I say, any man in this House or out of it who is going to write or telegraph to the editor of that paper, or to the manager, to find out whether a certain despatch is genuine, or whether it was copied from another newspaper. I submit in all fairness to the members of the opposition that when the Minister of Justice saw in that paper a report purporting to have been telegraphed from Ottawa, he was perfectly justifiable in thinking that the report had been telegraphed from Ottawa, had been telegraphed in the regular course of business, as happens in all newspaper offices which wish to keep their readers posted upon the proceedings of this House. This paper says in so many words that Chief Constable Macintosh was the man to whom Miner reported that Detective Bullick had been at him and had offered him his liberty if he would give back the bonds. The report of the minister speaks of the instructor, Mackenzie, not only in one place but in different places. Here it is at page 1228 of 'Hansard':

During the investigation conducted by Inspector Dawson after Miner's escape and on 13th September, 1907, Instructor MacKenzie stated in his evidence that after the interview with Bullick and Terry, Miner had told him that Bullick said Miner would be pardoned if he would surrender to the Canadian Pacific

Railway Company certain Australian bonds which the company believed he (Miner) had taken from their express car on the occasion of the robbery at Mission. MacKenzie further deposed that he had reported Miner's statement to the warden, who said he knew about it. No record of the interview of Messrs. Bullick and Terry with Miner is entered in the convicts' visitors book.

I submit that under the circumstances the hon. member for New Westminster should see that his readers are properly, rightly and correctly informed that they should know the truth about this deal. He cannot accuse the Minister of Justice before he writes a word to correct the statement which appeared in the 'Daily Columbian,' because, in justice to the Minister of Justice and to himself, that correction should be made.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I wrote that word several days ago to Chief Constable Macintosh.

Mr. BUREAU. My hon. friend may have written a letter but the paper does not speak about it. His private correspondence does not affect us very much in this transaction. We are more concerned in what the paper published. The matter was published in the newspaper and the correction ought to be made in the newspaper. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) seems to make it a crime that the Minister of Justice did not immediately send a constable or detective after Mr. Bourke and bring him down here that he might be brought before the bar of the House to answer any questions that any hon. member of the House might see fit to put to him. He makes it a reproach to the Minister of Justice that he wrote to Mr. Bourke: Will you please give me the information? Mr. Speaker, I do not know that a superior, writing or talking to one who has been an officer of his, whether he may be still in the service or out of the service, has to bully him when asking anything of him. The leader of the opposition is not justified in finding fault with the Minister of Justice because he has written a civil letter. He also says that the Minister of Justice ignores the rules of the House that the Minister of Justice is trying to heap abuse on some body, that he his trying to get after the hon. member for New Westminster, that he his trying to get after the government of Ontario, and in the same breath finds fault because the Minister of Justice has written a polite letter and makes it a crime that is a crime.

Mr. HUGHES. As I understand it the Minister of Justice stated, in very loud tones that he had demanded of Mr. Bourke an explanation and when the demand was brought down it was found to be a veritable sucking dove sort of letter.

Mr. BUREAU.

Mr. BUREAU. Of course, it is only natural, I suppose, that my hon. friend the member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) never demanded what he got. We remember the whole history with regard to that hon. gentleman and we know that he got more than he demanded sometimes. When my hon. friend the Minister of Justice says that he demanded, the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton may endeavour to impart a meaning to his words by adopting the tone to which we have just listened. My hon. friend is a military man, he must be a good sport and if so will he in all fairness tell us what he wants the Minister of Justice to do?

Mr. HUGHES. I want the minister to be honest when he comes to this House and not say that he demanded something when he only asked for it in a very humble tone.

Mr. BUREAU. I challenge my hon. friend to point out any dishonest statement made by the Minister of Justice. Here is a fair question and a fair question requires a fair answer. Show me any statement made by the Minister of Justice that is dishonest.

Mr. SPROULE. I——

Mr. BUREAU. I am asking the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton. I will keep on my feet if he does not desire to answer my question.

Mr. HUGHES. The statement that I spoke of in this connection is that the Minister of Justice stated that he had demanded of Mr. Bourke when he did not demand of Mr. Bourke, but very tamely and very humbly took his hat in his hand and asked Mr. Bourke to be good enough to give an explanation. Mr. Bourke seems to be master of the situation.

Mr. BUREAU. If that is the only crime committed by the Minister of Justice and the Department of Justice the country can be safely trusted to place a proper value upon the accusations of hon. gentlemen opposite. I see that the warrior spirit has invaded the other side of the House. The other night the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) wanted me to show him my burglars' tools with which I was to burglarize the country post office where the postmaster happened to keep a few cents in a tea cup and he declared that because I franked a few letters that I sent through the mail I was to be condemned. To-day he wants the Minister of Justice to walk up to Mr. Bourke pistols in hand and say 'your money or your life.' If that is the only charge against the Minister of Justice all well and good. The leader of the opposition ought not to be so bitter against the

Minister of Justice as he is. I ask now in all fairness what other steps could have been taken to recapture the convict Bill Miner whose escape we all regret? Hon. gentlemen cannot say that we have been derelict in our duty in the Department of Justice. As soon as the news came action was taken to try to find the convict and bring him back. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) tried to show that there was a mistake in the telegrams. In his speech on the 11th February the Minister of Justice explained, as Mr. Bourke explained himself, in his letter, that the telegram had been sent to Mr. Dawson instead of being sent to 'The Inspectors,' that the telegram had gone to Dorchester, then to Kingston and then back to Ottawa, that Mr. Dawson had got it in Kingston and had sent it back to Mr. Stewart upon its receipt and that immediate action had been taken on the matter.

The leader of the opposition also states that in view of the rumours which are going around, the government ought to take immediate action. I do not think that my hon. friend is serious when he makes that statement. If we were to make an investigation, if we were to appoint a committee of the House upon every rumour that we hear we would be constantly sitting with a special committee investigating and trying matters. As my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) states we might as well have this House sitting as a committee on rumours because they would keep it busy.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I know my hon. friend (Mr. Bureau) does not wish to misquote me, but my chief basis for the suggestion that there should be an inquiry was the statement that Mr. Bourke made over and over again in the press.

Mr. BUREAU. How does my hon. friend want us to act after Mr. Bourke has been heard under oath? Subsequently Mr. Bourke made statements in the newspapers. We ask Mr. Bourke to tell the government all he knows about it and he gives this information as it is his bounden duty. Here is a man that had performed his duty as acting warden in the penitentiary, and when we write him he says he has nothing further to disclose than that which he did disclose at the time of the inquiry made by the inspector. I should think that at the time of the escape and at the time of the inquiry made by the inspector the facts were vivid in Mr. Bourke's mind. He knew exactly what they were. He was then at the head of the penitentiary and when he came to give his evidence under oath I am satisfied that, the man being honest, as I believe he is, told the facts and I do not attach as much reliance upon any statement of fact which Mr. Bourke made eighteen months or two years after Bill Miner's escape as the lapse of time, might, under certain conditions, make him forget the facts and cause him to believe that they had another aspect than that which presented itself to his mind at the time of the occurrence. In view of all the circumstances, it is absolutely unfair to charge the department with negligence, or to charge that there was conspiracy between the government or any of the officials of the government in Ottawa, looking to the escape of Bill Miner. There is nothing in Bourke's statement, there is nothing even in the rumours that have been published, there is nothing anywhere to give ground for such an insinuation. The hon. gentleman read from a newspaper the statement that a man high in office knew that Bill Miner did not escape through the hole in the fence as alleged, but that the hole was put there as a blind. Well, if this matter is really brought up in parliament in the public interest why do these people not come forward and state exactly what they know to the Department of Justice?

Mr. HUGHES. Why not bring them forward?

Mr. BUREAU. Why is not the name of this gentleman high in office given?

Mr. HUGHES. The paper will give it if you demand it.

Mr. BUREAU. But the paper publishes a mere rumour.

Mr. HUGHES. The paper is responsible to the Solicitor General and he can bring that paper up if he wants to.

Mr. BUREAU. We cannot bring to account every newspaper that publishes a mere rumour. This newspaper says it is reported that some one high in authority knows a certain thing; it publishes a mere rumour and it takes that rumour as a basis for attacking the government. Now, what can you do in such a case? What means is there to hold a newspaper responsible for such a publication? The department has done everything that it could do in this matter; the Minister of Justice has made a fair and full statement to the House as to all the circumstances, but notwithstanding, every now and then the hon. gentleman from Westminster produces the 'Daily Columbian' to read certain statements and to base on them an attack upon the government. I submit to hon. gentlemen that such a proceeding is not fair play. I submit also that there is no warrant for saying that the Minister of Justice has endeavoured to cast any slur on the member for New Westminster. I submit further, for the consideration of the House, that

the action of the 'Daily Columbian' newspaper in this matter, using an incorrect statement about Chief Constable Macintosh and endeavouring by interviews based on that incorrect statement to stir up the feeling of the people of British Columbia, is intended to unwarrantably cast disrespect on the administration of justice and is not such conduct as one would expect from a journal which would be supposed to be devoted to the public interest.

Mr. MARTIN BURRELL (Yale-Cariboo.) This being a question which has been much agitated in the province of British Columbia, and in view of the sarcastic remarks which have been made by hon. gentlemen on the government benches as to how public business is conducted in British Columbia, I think I should say a few words. I have not the honour or the advantage or the disadvantage whichever it may be of being a lawyer, and not having a trained legal mind, it may be that I am unable to see that it makes any material difference to the question at issue whether in a telegram of 700 words the word the name 'Macintosh' was incorrectly substituted for the name 'Mackenzie.' What has that got to do with the principle at stake? The Solicitor General has not denied the charge made by the leader of the opposition, that the Minister of Justice had attempted to discredit the hon. gentleman from New Westminster because of his connection with the newspaper which gave publicity to this matter. As the leader of the opposition clearly showed this despatch was printed in good faith word for word by the 'Columbian' as it appeared in one of the leading newspapers in Vancouver. In view of that fact, I do not think we have yet had an adequate retraction of the charge made against the hon. member (Mr. Taylor) by the Minister of Justice. Is it any great misfortune that a member of this House should be connected with a newspaper? I do not know what the affiliations of other hon. gentlemen may be but I dare say there are some on the other side of the House who are connected with the press. They are not to be blamed therefor, nor should there be criticism of this sort directed to the hon. gentleman who opened the debate. What point was the Minister of Justice trying to make against my hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Taylor) because he was connected with a newspaper and because he has succeeded in running it after an up-to-date fashion? If we are to believe the Solicitor General it would be the duty of the 'Columbian' to make no reference whatever to the escape of Bill Miner or to the management of the penitentiary What is a newspaper for if it is not to keep the public in touch with what is going on and what more interesting and important piece of news could the 'Columbian' publish than this very peculiar incident in connection with a great public institution situated in the city in which it is printed? The 'Columbian' simply did its duty in putting the public in the possession of the fullest information in regard to this whole affair. and that it did so reflects credit on the management of that newspaper. Now, although we have had explanations over and over again both by the Minister of Justice and by the Solicitor General, there are several matters which have not been cleared up. Inspector Dawson was apparently in New Westminster inspecting the penitentiary in June and July and it has been shown that he knew of five or six visits which had been paid to this convict Miner previous to that date and it is apparent that he did not report them to the department. One would think that this was of sufficient importance to be reported by Mr. Dawson to his superiors. We have also the statement that in this letter of Bourke which has just been published, he says that Mr. Dawson saw an authentic copy of the telegram as it left New Westminster addressed to Inspector Dawson, and that has not been explained by the Solicitor General. Without going into the question in any critical way, I may say that what the people of British Columbia and what the people of Canada want to know is, whether this whole thing is not of sufficient importance to call for a thorough investigation in the interest of the administration of justice in Canada. I believe I am voicing the opinion of a great many members not only on this side of the House but also on the opposite side when I say that in view of the statement made by the Solicitor General in this House some time ago in connection with the bonds which were stolen and in view of the fact that there was no action by the department to see whether the bonds were accounted for in Australia, and when we have in addition the fact that a notorious criminal has escaped without being recaptured, there is sufficient to call for a strict inquiry. The capture of this convict was a credit to the police system of the country and his sentence strengthened the confidence of the public in the administration of justice in Canada, and, now that he has escaped, and in view of the discussions in the press, and in view of the elaborate statements made by the Solicitor General and the Minister of Justice in the House, and in view of the unrest in the public mind about the circumstances of the escape of this notorious criminal, is it not time that we should have an impartial inquiry not an inquiry at the hands of Inspector Dawson who is hopelessly mixed up in it, but a thorough inquiry conducted by some impartial tribunal. I believe that the Department of Justice will not justify itself in public opinion and that it will not promote in the eyes of the public the highest respect for the administration of justice

unless it causes this whole thing to be probed to the bottom.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (E. Grey). The Solicitor General defied any member on this side of the House to point to any inaccurate statement made by the Minister of Justice. Only a few minutes before, when it was drawn to the attention of the House, the Minister of Justice said distinctly that the mistake which appeared in the 'Columbian' was absent from the reports in all the other papers in British Columbia. That is shown to be inaccurate.

Mr. BUREAU. Was it dishonest?

Mr. SPROULE. It was not founded in fact, and that is sufficient to discredit a great deal of what the Solicitor General says. Then, the Minister of Justice says that when the department first received the report of the escape on the eighth day of the month, the names of the prisoners were not given, and that they got no information as to their names until the 12th; yet Mr. Bourke says he telegraphed the names on the following morning. There is a discrepancy there, and yet neither the Minister of Justice nor the Solicitor General desires to go any further either to verify or to refute that statement. Then, we have the facts of the prisoner's hair and moustache being allowed to grow, so that his identity could be hidden when he got out into the world, and no explanation is given of the reason for that. I thought that either the Minister of Justice or the Solicitor General would have referred to that fact; but both of them, I was going to say purposely, avoided it. The country would like to know what was the cause of it, who was responsible for it, for what purpose it was allowed to be done. It was in violation of the rules of the prison. With all these rumours and more than rumours, and all this circumstantial evidence before the country, the impression is left on the public mind that there was some connivance between the department and this prisoner to account for his escape; and when the Department of Justice refuses to inquire into the matter any further, the country will come to the conclusion that they have something to hide which they are afraid will come to light. The very pleading reference made by the Minister of Justice to Mr. Bourke was in itself very suggestive that he would like to keep the friendship of that gentleman. It was quite in contradistinction to the statement he made before in the House, that he had caused an imperative demand to be made upon Mr. Bourke. There must be something behind all this. If there is, this House would like to know it. The apathy of the government and their opposition to any further inquiry will force on the public mind the impression that there is something behind which they desire to prevent coming to light; otherwise they would take the first opportunity to have the fullest inquiry made before this House and the world in order to refute the many charges which are levelled against the Department of Justice.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP. Mr. Speaker, I think no one can have listened to the debate this afternoon without feeling that the escape of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. J. D. Taylor) was about as easy as that of Bill Miner and apparently a great deal more regretted by the government. We are perhaps liable to lose sight of what is after all the main feature of this interesting and important case. I remember that a few years ago, under somewhat similar circumstances, charges were made against another department of this government. It was at first insinuated and then charged that the Department of Marine was not all that it should be; and I remember with what indignation hon. gentlemen opposite decried any reflection on that department from this side of the House, and how every one of them was prepared to raise his hands to Heaven and swear that a more immaculate department than the Department of Marine and Fisheries had never existed. And yet as time went on investigation was made into that department first in part, by a committee of this House, afterwards by the Civil Service Commission and still further by Mr. Justice Cassels, and it would be cruel to point out all the derelicts that now lie stranded along the course of those investigations. Charges are now made against another department of this government, and an opportunity to investigate them is refused. Every member of the House, on whatever side he may sit, will, I think, feel that it is a pity that, whenever the suspicion is expressed that any department of this government is not properly conducted, the supporters of the government should refuse an investigation into that department. But even when we have had suspicions of other departments, I think everybody, not only in this House, but in the country has had the feeling that there was one department on which we could implicitly rely, and that was the Department of Justice. I ask if any greater misfortune could befall any country than to have the administration of justice befouled; and it is almost as bad to have a suspicion in the minds of any number of people that that department is badly administered. Now, there are certain facts in this case which are beyond all dispute. Nobody disputes the fact that Bill Miner escaped. Nobody disputes the fact that he received remarkable treatment while in the penitentiary. The rules of the penitentiary forbade certain interviews. These were wilfully and deliberately ignored by the officials of the penitentiary, none of whom apparently have been punished for that. Miner was

given privileges which were given to no one else, and certain prison disadvantages to which other prisoners were liable did not befall him. When he escaped and the message announcing his escape was sent to Ottawa, although his name was not mentioned, one would have thought it would have been enough to put the department on the qui vive, especially as there had been a number of other escapes during the summer. When the despatch only came on the fourth day after the escape, could any one have believed that so discreet and alert a department as the Department of Justice, would have sat down for four long days without inquiring who the prisoners were or anything about the magnitude of their offence, waiting like Micawber for something to turn up? And when the telegram did come on the evening of the eleventh day. it was, according to the statement of Mr. Bourke, properly addressed to the Inspector; and we have from Mr. Dawson the statement that the telegram was addresed to himself. It is perfectly clear that either Mr. Bourke made a false statement or that Mr. Dawson, or some other official, forged the address, and tried to deceive the public. Somebody is lying. Either Mr. Bourke or Mr. Dawson has wilfully lied and tried to deceive the country. There is another significant fact. The rumour is that Miner was allowed to escape. The story goes that some £50,000 of bonds were stolen and that he was allowed to escape because he was willing to tell where the bonds were—in other words, that he was willing to pay his way out of the penitentiary in that way; and when the question is asked of the government if they have taken steps to inquire what has become of these £50,000 of bonds, the government are compelled months after to say that they have made no attempt whatever to find out what has become of them. In the face of all this accumulated evidence against the Department of Justice, when this afternoon an hon. member from British Columbia, who comes from the very neighbourhood of the penitentiary, rises in his place to call the attention of the representatives of the people to the statements made, which, if true, reflect on the Department of Justice, and, if untrue, should be disproved as soon as possible, we have the melancholy spectacle of the Minister of Justice, the one minister who, above all others, should be absolutely judicial in his utterances in this House and free from partisan bias, when his honour and the honour of his department are at stake, standing up to make a defence which consists entirely of a violent personal attack on the hon. member who raised the question, and even that based on a state of facts unhappily found not to exist. I think I am justified in repeating what I said at the outset, that it seems to me that it would be a sad day for our country if charges of this kind could be made, and the one great department of the government in which we should have confidence, be unwilling to allow a full and complete investigation to ascertain whether or not there is anything in these charges. It is idle to say to any hon. member of this House: make a charge on your responsibility as a member; because of course we cannot know anything of these matters except what we have learned from the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite and the utterances of the press. But, Sir, I think we are justified in saying that we do know that a feeling of suspicion has been aroused. It is impossible to understand why a department which has done absolutely nothing wrong would not welcome the opportunity of brushing aside the imputations cast upon it, instead of acting in such a way that no matter how innocent it may be it of course arouses suspicion and tends to lower the confidence the people of this country rightly have in the administration of justice in Canada.

Mr. G. H. COWAN (Vancouver City). I agree with the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) in regarding the administration of justice as of far greater importance to this country than any partisan advantage to either of the two great parties of Canada, and therefore I can enter into this discussion for a moment, I think, without imputing any sinister or improper motive to the members of the government—just for a moment. As I understand it, since the investigation that took place, very important and material evidence has come to light. It has become known that certain visits were made to Bill Miner in the cell, in violation of the rules of the penitentiary. I understand that that fact was not reported by the person who made the investigation. I understand that that material fact was not reported, that Inspector Dawson did not report to the Minister of Justice or the Department of Justice that he himself had been derelict in his duty and had failed to advise the department that although he knew improper and illegal visits had been made to Miner, he had kept that knowledge locked up in his own breast. I understand further that this same Inspector Dawson, to whom had been deputed the sacred task and duty of preserving intact and pure the administration of justice in this matter, is directly contradicted when he says he received a telegram addressed to him, G. W. Dawson. It is also a new and unreported fact that this Bill Miner was allowed to grow his whiskers and his hair. The Solicitor General says, as if he had made an actual measurement of the man's whiskers, that they were not longer than three-quarters of an inch. I do not think the administration of justice is dependent on whether these whiskers

were allowed to grow three-quarters of an inch, an inch or a foot, they were allowed to grow contrary to the penitentiary regulations of Canada. If I understand the Department of Justice aright, that fact was not brought to the attention of the department. In the light of all this new evidence, of all these material facts discovered since the investigation made by the man against whom all circumstantial evidence points as the man who was derelict in his duty, since this investigation was made by the culprit in the case, according to the circumstantial evidence in the case, surely no government in Canada will dare to ignore these important and material facts freshly discovered. Surely no man impressed with the importance of preserving pure and undefiled the administration of justice in Canada will dare to say: We will not accord an investigation. If we are reduced in Canada to the condition that men, fearful of their partisan advantage, fearful of the exposure of their own officers, fearful of I know not what else, refuse to permit an inquiry, then the administration of justice in the United States, at which we have been in the habit of pointing the finger of scorn, is away and above our own, our own which will set free a man convicted of the most serious crime in the calendar, a crime which has no parallel in the criminal annals of this country. I cannot believe that the government of Canada, impressed with the great obligation that is upon them, will dare in the light of these new facts to sit quiescent and refuse an investigation.

Mr. S. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). But for the evident attempt of the Minister of Justice to place the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in an improper light before the House, I would not have uttered a word to-day. The offence of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. J. D. Taylor) is that he has unearthed the very suspicious circumstances connected with the escape of this man, Bill Miner, and forsooth, because the hon. member's paper chanced in copying from another paper to get the name of Macintosh instead of Mackenzie, we have the tirade against our friend which we have just heard. What is the object of all this bluster? Is it to so intimidate our friend from New Westminster that he will sit quietly in his seat like a good little boy the rest of the session and not dare to further seek to expose the gentlemen who have had charge of the management of this institution and of this particular case? The statements made by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. J. D. Taylor) were that Bill Miner's moustache was allowed to grow. It transpired that this was the case. Might I ask that the Minister of Justice follow this matter up to see by whose authority the order was given which allowed this poor man, whose eyes were affected to grow his moustache? Is it or is it not true that the electric light in his cell so affected the nerves of the brain of the poor fellow that he could not sleep, and that after inquiry an order was given that Bill Miner's hair should be allowed to grow? We have it on the authority of the Solicitor General that it was at the time of his escape three-quarters of an inch long.

Mr. BUREAU. I said less than that.

Mr. HUGHES. Is it true that the orders of the Justice Department were deliberately violated in allowing this man to go from the inner inclosure into the brick yard where life prisoners are never allowed? Is it true that poor Bill Miner's feet got sore walking around on the hard floor of the inner inclosure, and that by some authority he was allowed into the brickyard where his feet might rest on mother earth and his corns might not cause him sleepless nights? Is it true that all these things followed the sercet interviews of these detectives? Is it or is it not true that immediately after the escape of Bill Miner the deputy warden who was acting as warden because the warden unfortunately was ill, wired the Department of Justice that four prisoners had escaped? Is it true, or is it not true, that the very following morning Bourke again wired the department that four prisoners—naming Miner among them—had escaped, and asking authority to offer a reward for their recapture?—this telegram addressed, not as the Minister of Justice has said, to one of the inspectors by name, but, according to Bourke's solemn statement to the Inspectors. If these facts be true, and if they have been produced subsequent to the inquiry, then if the Minister of Justice is anxious to allay public feeling, and if he dare cross the path of this man Bourke, there is only one way to proceed, and that is to order an investigation. We have all seen in the advertisements the contrasted pictures, 'Before taking' and 'After taking.' We had a picture of the Minister of Justice standing in the House telling us that he had demanded, instantly demanded, of this man Bourke to produce his evidence. We have the other picture now of the minister standing hat in hand and saying: Please, Mr. Bourke, will you give us whatever data you have in connection with this affair that have not been brought out. The case strikes the public as very strange and very suspicious. The public want to know how it happens that Bourke is the master of the situation. Another point on which the Minister of Justice is in error, in addition to those pointed out by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is this: he endeavoured to make a point against my hon.

friend from New Westminster (Mr. J. D Taylor) by saying that escapes had occurred that year previous to Bill Miner's. The records do not show it. And the minister explains his mistake by saying that recaptures were not reported. Well, let us see. I have the minister's report before me, and at page 2 I find a statement that, in 1904-1905, there were three escapes and, at the foot is a note stating that one of those who escaped was recaptured. In 1905, two prisoners escaped and it is stated that both were recaptured. The minister talks a little too fast, and not by his own book. A trifling mistake in a name—between Macintosh and McKenzie, both good Scotch names,—was not sufficient to justify the Minister of Justice in reading the Riot Act, as he has done, to the member for New Westminster. If the Minister of Justice considers his own personal and political credit, if he values the administration of justice in this country and has any desire to satisfy an honest public, and if he is not under the thumb of this man Bourke—I say that advisedly, if he is not under the thumb of this man Bourke—then, to my mind, there is only one course open to him, and that is to bring these parties before a committee of this House and have a full and fair inquiry so that these rumours may be set at rest and the truth may be made known.

Mr. A. S. GOODEVE (Kootenay). Answering the hon. member from New Westminster (Mr. J. D. Taylor) the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) seemed to make much of the fact that the escape was investigated by Mr. Dawson the inspector of penitentiaries. At the time Mr. Dawson was appointed to make this investigation, Mr. Bourke was the superintendent of the prison at New Westminster, and it was under Mr. Bourke, as superintendent, that the prisoners had escaped. After the investigation had been made and after—according to the Minister of Justice—Mr. Dawson had reported that there was no blame attached to the superintendent of the prison, we find that the superintendent was superannuated. And the Minister of Justice, referring to this superannuation made very much of the point that, notwithstanding the fact that he had been negligent of his duty and had openly violated the rules of held, Mr. Dawson was Mr. Bourke's superior annuated at the full allowance for his term of service, and the minister seemed to put that forward as a reason why no complaint should be made by the superintendent of the prison. But when the investigation was held Mr. Dawson was Mr. Bourke's superior officer, and he, Mr. Bourke, had reason to believe that if the explanation he gave was satisfactory to Mr. Dawson he would be maintained in his position and it was only after he had been superannuated at lesser salary than he thought he was entitled to that he made the various statements that had been published from time to time. That is most important. The Minister of Justice writes, not demanding anything from Mr. Bourke, but, as the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has said, in a somewhat pleading strain, asking Mr. Bourke if he had stated all the facts in the investigation prior to his superannuation. And Mr. Bourke, as has been pointed out, rather curtly replies that he had done so. But, in his signed statement in the newspapers of the province, Mr. Bourke has stated that, if asked to do so before an independent commission appointed to investigate this question, he could tell many things that he had not told previously. And the minister makes a complaint in regard to this; he pleads that it is very unfair on the part of a man treated so well by the government to make statements of this kind. But the real question is that raised, by the leader of the opposition: These statements are either true or not true; if true, they call for an investigation, and Mr. Bourke is still a servant of the people in that he is in receipt of pay as a superannuated servant; if not true, he should declare before an independent tribunal that these statements are not correct so that the Department of Justice may be free from suspicion. It has been truly said that the whole government of our country hangs on the purity of our administration of justice. If we fail in that, all our government fails. This is not a small matter, and I am surprised that the head of the Justice Department, should, on a question of this kind, declare that he has given all the information necessary and that he sees no cause for further investigation. I do not intend to go further into this subject, but I think the two points, the real points at issue, are those raised by the leader of the opposition, and that this House should demand a full investigation by an independent authority into the escape of this prisoner.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). My hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. J. D. Taylor) is a new member of this House, and perhaps he will not take it amiss from me, who have had more experience than he in parliamentary practice, if I tell him that, in view of the discussion he wished to introduce and the information he wished to elicit, it would have been preferable if he had followed the usual practice when a matter of this kind is to be brought under discussion, and had notified the parties interested of his intention, so that they might have been prepared with the documents to meet any statements that he might make. As I understand, he did not take that pre-

caution, and therefore the discussion cannot be as complete as it would be otherwise. Had we had notice of his intention, we could have had documents at hand to meet the views he presented to the House. I may say that a good deal of matter has been brought into this discussion which seems to me absolutely irrelevant to the question. The question which interests the country—and the only question in which the country is interested—is, whether there has been any connivance on the part of anybody in the escape of Miner. No more dangerous criminal, I think, was ever in the clutches of Canadian justice.

It was a fact for which we took some credit that when one of these American desperadoes came to Canada, thinking to play with impunity in this country the pranks he had been playing on the other side of the line, he was arrested, tried and convicted. It was a shock when we heard, and we heard it with a good deal of shame also, that he had subsequently been allowed to escape from the penitentiary. If the discussion had been confined to these facts I would have more sympathy than I now have with the manner in which it has been brought to the attention of the House. I think a good deal of the matter brought forward has been irrelevant. I agree with the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) that it is not of much importance that, in despatches which are sent to British Columbia newspapers, the name Macintosh had been substituted for the name Mackenzie. That in itself would be of no consequence, but it is of some consequence in this matter. I would say to my hon. friend from New Westminster that since he is the responsible editor of the paper in which the mistake occurred, and if he intended to bring the matter before the House, it would have been perhaps better and more in accordance with the courtesy, with the etiquette and the amenity of public life, if he had taken the opportunity of correcting that mistake. Telegrams, in transmission from the sender to the receiver, may get distorted, we have had evidences of that before; but I think it is due to the person who has been misrepresented that the editor should take the opportunity of correcting the error. In this case my hon. friend did not choose to do so, and so I say the substitution of the name Macintosh was not without some importance in relation to the matter under discussion, because the fact that the name Macintosh was introduced in this telegram gave to the newspaper an opportunity of going to see Mr. Mackenzie and getting from him what I cannot characterize otherwise than a tirade against the Department of Justice. Therefore it would have been better, in the interest of the administration of justice generally, and in the interest of truth, if the error had been corrected there. It was not corrected.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the date?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. 18th of February. My hon. friend, in the course of his observations, tried to cast a slur upon the investigation which took place—at all events I assume that was his intention, from the statement he made later on. He wanted to give the impression, an impression which seems to prevail on the other side of the House, according to the speeches we have heard this afternoon, that the investigation which has taken place had not been as full and as complete as it might have been. He read from a newspaper—I am sorry I could not hear very well what he read, but I understood him to read from an interview in which some one stated that if he had been called upon he would have shown that Bill Miner had not escaped through a wall, and that he would have shown how he had escaped. Now, Sir, I ask my hon. friend, and I ask the House generally, what importance or what reliance can be attached to such a statement as that? Hon. gentlemen have tried to show that the investigation which took place at Dawson into the manner in which Miner had escaped, was not as complete as it might have been, because a certain man had stated that if he had been called upon he could have thrown light upon the manner of the escape. But if I understood my hon. friend aright, the extract which he read did not give the name of that man. Am I right?

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. It said a high official, without naming him.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, how are we to know who this high official was? It is contended that there should be a new investigation. On this point I express no opinion, the matter is new to me. But it is not possible to come to a conclusion on a vague statement of that kind. If a newspaper says that somebody is able to give certain information, surely nobody would pretend that such a statement is a sufficient basis for a further inquiry. Now I appeal to hon. members on both sides of this House whether it is advantageous to the administration of justice, advantageous to the administration of any other department of the government, that we should have these slurs cast from one side of the House or the other; I say that at least we should have some responsible name put forward as a basis for any further investigation. If we are shown any reason to suppose that the investigation was not as complete as it possibly could be, that further facts might be discovered to show how this man escaped, then I would be willing to go very far in order to find that out. But it is not possible for any reasonable man to come to any other conclusion than that we have ob-

tained the whole truth in regard to this matter, so far as it can be obtained. I wish we had more information. So far as I can see, the administration of justice in that respect was loose, and the department has, I understand, taken the precaution to put it in better hands. I do not know what mistake has been made, but I am ready to agree with the hon. member for New Westminster that the administration of the penitentiary was not what it should be, it was carried on in a manner that called for correction, and it has since been corrected. But so far as I can see, I put it to the good sense of the House whether any case has been made for another investigation. I think that charges most unfair have been made against the minister himself, who is a painstaking official, and a credit to the administration of justice in Canada, and who could have nothing but a stern desire to meet any deficiency that was found to exist in the administration of the penitentiaries under his charge.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). The Prime Minister has very cooly and dispassionately discussed the question for a brief period, and I suppose that we may with equal coolness and dispassionateness discuss what the Prime Minister has said. He commenced by lecturing a new member. New members do not know the order of the debate as well as older members, and they ought to be excused for not adhering strictly to its forms. So I think the Prime Minister might have excused the member without parading the offence. It is right that when you are going to bring up an important matter, the minister who is in charge of the department affected should be informed of it, with a view of eliciting the utmost information. My hon. friend from New Westminster, a new member, forgot that; but I have known even older members to forget it and to bring up matters without notice. Of course it is not absolutely a rule of the House, it is a courtesy which is generally observed, because it ends by forwarding the purpose had in view. So much with reference to the lecture which was read to the member for New Westminster. Then the Prime Minister deplored irrelevant matter having been introduced into this discussion. It was deplorable, there is no doubt about that. But who is the man that introduced that irrelevant matter? The man who introduced it, and added all the acerbity that has been imported into this debate, sits exactly behind the Prime Minister. Here is my hon. friend from New Westminster, why should he have been reproached by a Minister of Justice with having undue relations with a newspaper, and using it—well, to say the least, somewhat dishonestly. No other inference could be taken from the words of the Minister of Justice. It is certainly no disgrace, it is no dishonour, and I do not think it is any great disadvantage to a man to represent in this House his constituency and at the same time be the editor, or proprietor, or owner of a newspaper. But the gravamen of the charge that was made by the Minister of Justice, made with malice aforethought, was that this hon. gentleman having a newspaper here, indited a telegraphic despatch to that newspaper intended to and which actually did misrepresent the Minister of Justice, and that, on this basis of misrepresentation, the newspaper published interviews and comments which were derogatory to the Minister of Justice and to the management of his department. I ask the Prime Minister if he can get any other meaning from the words that the Minister of Justice used? There is no use in labouring that point. That is actually what the Minister of Justice said, and his statement was as plain as a pikestaff, that this was wrong in that paper whilst in other papers it was correct.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. In all other newspapers?

Mr. FOSTER. Whether he said all newspapers in the province or not I will not say but he said that in the other newspapers the despatch was correct. When the Minister of Justice, instead of adhering closely and dispassionately to the facts of the case, starts out to try to injure a member who, in the course of his duty, brings up the matter, when he does this on a wrong basis of facts and, when as he afterwards acknowledged, he had not himself taken the precaution to verify these facts, he did something that he was not justified in doing. That is where the trouble arose in this debate. The Minister of Justice is prone to do that sort of thing. Yesterday furnished an example, other days have furnished other examples and it would be well for the department and more in keeping with its traditions if the Minister of Justice would leave a little of his petty partisanship to one side and treat his political opponents with more fairness. It was a shock and a shame, said the Prime Minister, to learn that Bill Miner had escaped as it was with joy and pride that they learned that Canadian officers and Canadian courts had been instrumental in catching such a noted desperado and afterwards, by the machinery of the law, in landing him in prison for life. The position of matters was well defined. The Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister were glad that Bill Miner the desperado, had been landed within the penitentiary at New Westminster. The Minister of Justice knew that Bill Miner, a noted desperado, was in the penitentiary, he knew that the discipline was bad in the penitentiary, he knew that just previously to his receiving certain information one, two, three prisoners had escaped therefrom.

All this he knew when he received, on the 8th day of August, notice that four prisoners had escaped out of the New Westminster penitentiary. The Minister of Justice, with all that pre-added knowledge and consciousness, did not take enough interest in the matter to immediately inquire about the names and the circumstances. Four days elapse and still he had not inquired. What is the mildest name that one could give to inaction of that kind? I think that there was an initial negligence and a lack of that proper promptness which should characterize the department under such circumstances as those. Now, we go a little further. The Prime Minister says that my hon. friend should have corrected his mistake. My hon. friend, the member for New Westminster, was in Ottawa city. The telegram went to the paper in British Columbia. On the 18th it was published in that paper. My hon. friend did not see that paper again until certainly a week and maybe more had passed. He had no data for correcting the mistake at least until the paper came within his hands. I do not know how many days after the 18th it did come. I do not know the date of the publishing of the paper but the probabilities are that he would not see this paper until four, five, six or seven days after his telegram appeared. Then, my hon. friend says that he communicated with the man himself, Mr. Macintosh, and told him that it was a mistake. It might have been quick and prompt if the man and the newspaper had been on the same street. It was absolutely impossible to make it either quick or prompt with half a continent intervening between the two. Now, the Prime Minister says that we have nothing upon which to base a renewed investigation. Why? Is there any good reason why, if there is a scintilla of new evidence, it should not be followed up? Circumstances that have been detailed here to-day in reference to the bonds, the lax discipline, the visits against the various rules of the department, the fact that these visits were known to the inspector of the department, and that they did not come, by way of a report from that inspector to the department, calls for an investigation. This is a fact, if I understand the facts correctly. I will leave myself to be corrected with regard to that but that is the way I understand it. Am I wrong in that?

Mr. BUREAU. I do not know if I understand my hon. friend. Does he mean to say that the inspector was aware of the visits before he held the investigation in New Westminster? The inspector only learned of these things after he had held the investigation, as I am informed.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the only point about which I was uncertain and that is why I made the inquiry. Then, as I understand it, these visits are recorded in the books at the penitentiary.

Mr. BUREAU. Some of them are in the book, as was stated by the minister in his answer which appeared in 'Hansard' on the 17th of February. All those that are entered are mentioned there. I am informed that four are entered and one is not.

Mr. FOSTER. Some of the entries of visits refer to visits to Bill Miner?

Mr. BUREAU. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, as I understand it, the inspector was there and if he inspected anything he would inspect the books. If he had inspected the books he would have found the record of these visits, he would have made some inquiry about them and he would have reported that inquiry back to the department. But, those visits were not reported by the inspector. These then are the facts. The escaped prisoner has not been taken. And now there come up two pieces of evidence. Reference has been made to the name of an official of high authority, who has been quoted by a newspaper as having definite information, which, if he had been aksed for it, would have thrown a very different light upon this question. The man's name is not given, but the paper referred to is the 'Province,' which is, I understand, a responsible and very reputable paper.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not understand that there is any name given in the newspaper.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that the name is there; I stated that the statement appears in the newspaper and that the newspaper stated that he was a high official. Does not the Prime Minister think that something to go upon especially in a case like this? Is the minister of the department to take no cognizance of that at all by way of a communication with the newspaper publisher asking him for the name of that high official? As it stands it is a blot and an aspersion upon the name of that particular penitentiary. A statement made in a reputable newspaper that a high official is in a position to give further evidence and make further disclosures, is a thing that the Department of Justice should follow up. The Department of Justice says it will not do so because it cannot take cognizance of an anonymous statement, but if the Department of Justice wants to follow it up I have no doubt a method can be found to do so. More than that, Mr. Bourke is your own official; he was there at the time of the escape; it was he and the late departed warden who allowed the rules to be transgressed; he is cognizant of these negotiations if any went

on, and his latest statement is that he is able to give information which will put a very different light upon this matter. We are not inclined to make a partisan question of the administration of the Department of Justice or the discipline in one of our great penitentiaries. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) did not start out in that way. He was fallen foul of by the Minister of Justice, who in most excited language and stentorian tones belaboured the member for New Westminster for bringing the matter up at all. It is that which added the spice of bitterness to this debate and but for that there would have been nothing partisan about it. We will forgive the Minister of Justice—it is his failing perhaps more than his fault—but desiring as we do on both sides of the House that the matter should be cleared up, is there not good ground now for further investigation? If the idea goes abroad that prisoners may escape from our penitentiaries that is bad enough; but, if the idea goes abroad that they can escape by connivance that is worse, and if in addition there is a suspicion in the public mind that that connivance was built upon financial or moneyed interest that makes it still worse. It seems to me it is necessary to pursue this investigation in view of the added evidence. Bring Mr. Bourke before a competent examining authority and get from him the new evidence he has or make him show he has not got it. Get, if possible, the high official who is said to have communicated with the 'Province' newspaper and let us, as far as we possibly can, have the matter set at rest. It is of so much importance and means so much for the good name of our administration of justice in Canada that in my opinion it cannot be left where it is.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). The discussion this afternoon must have struck any one who listened to it with any degree of care as one of those peculiar occasions which sometimes, during the last three or four years, have developed in this parliament when gentlemen on the other side have started discussions based upon mere newspaper rumour. I am afraid that the Minister of Justice rather stirred up hon gentlemen on the other side by his references to the unreliability of the telegrams which are published in certain British Columbia newspapers, and hence we have had all kinds of forebodings and all kinds of suggestions about wrong-doing and the necessity for an investigation into this and into that. But let us look at the question calmly. Bill Miner escaped from the British Columbia penitentiary in August, 1907, the man in charge of the penitentiary being the deputy warden, the warden being ill at the time. There is some question as to the non-delivery of a telegram which was addressed to Inspector Dawson at Ottawa, and some hon. gentlemen have endeavoured to cast so much suspicion on Inspector Dawson, that you would think Inspector Dawson was in British Columbia conspiring for the escape of Miner. At all events, owing to a peculiarity about these British Columbia telegrams, there was a non-delivery of the message announcing that Miner had escaped. But as soon as Mr. Dawson did receive the information he proceeded to British Columbia, held an investigation into the facts; an investigation similar in all respects to that which was held by every Minister of Justice when the Conservatives were in power and when they also had escapes from the penitentiaries. I am reminded by the Minister of Justice that under the Penitentiary Act which has been on the statute book for a great number of years, the inspector was the official who alone could conduct an investigation into the matter. That investigation was held, and as a result of it the inspector recommended that the deputy warden who was in charge of the penitentiary at the time should be allowed to retire and that the guard should be retired. The government accepted these recommendations. Now, the hon. gentleman from New Westminster has on two occasions precipitated discussion with regard to this matter without the slightest reason. You would think to have heard these hon. gentlemen opposite this afternoon that some one of them had moved for the papers and had them brought down and that the official record of all the proceedings had been placed upon the table of the House, so that every hon. member, and the country, and the newspapers might at least know what had been done in the matter. But my hon. friend from New Westminster has not done that.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Will the hon. gentleman permit me to say that I moved for these papers and the motion was carried about two weeks ago.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Then my hon. friend, in the style of so many other members on that side of the House, proceeded to discuss the subject before the papers were brought down and without knowing the facts. Had he only waited until the official documents in regard to this matter were laid on the table of this House and he in common with every other member of the House had an opportunity to read them, then it would have been possible for us to give the matter the serious and practical consideration that it deserves.

Mr. LANCASTER. Do those papers change the facts as stated by the Minister of Justice?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My hon. friend was one of the gentlemen who applauded most vociferously when his hon.

friends talked about an investigation. Like him, I have no knowledge of what the papers contain, but I am prepared to wait till they come down before I take the responsibility of saying what should be done. My hon. friend the Solicitor General informs me that there is no record of the motion which my hon. friend from New Westminster states he made. But he can take that matter up at another time.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to order. I have made the statement that a motion of mine was carried in this House, and the hon. gentleman quotes the Solicitor General as flatly contradicting me. My statement is perfectly correct, and the Minister of Justice made an address to this House on the motion.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. For the purpose of my argument it is of no importance whatever whether the hon. gentleman made the motion or not, because if he did, he should have paid some deference to the intelligence of the members of this House and waited till the papers should be brought down before discussing the question, so that every hon. member should know what he was discussing.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Retract.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Allow me to rule on the point of order that has been taken. I do not think it is well taken. There is a difference of opinion as to whether or not a certain motion is on the records of the House. I do not think the personal word of the hon. member for New Westminster was called in question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I ask the hon. gentleman whether he did not understand, as I understood, the Minister of Justice this afternoon to state that every scrap of information upon the files of the department with respect to this matter had been embodied in the answer which he gave on the 17th of February?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I did not so understand the Minister of Justice. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition knows very well that the answer which the Minister of Justice gave could not by any possibility cover in detail the evidence that was given in the investigation or the details of the report made by the inspector who was the official investigator of this matter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I only speak of what he said.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. We are in this position, that the Department of Justice is in possession of papers which can fully and clearly inform this House and the country of every step taken in this matter up to the time when the investigation was completed and the report was made; and we have the hon. member for New Westminster precipitating this discussion prematurely. We have hon. gentlemen stating that whiskers and hair were allowed to grow on the prisoner, and that many other things occurred. All these things were investigated by the inspector. Then we have my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), whose particular function is at all times to make facetious speeches about imaginary refusals to grant investigations, dropping into the old song when there was no refusal, and talking about the honour of the Minister of Justice being in question, when he knew that none of the hon. members of this House who have spoken on this subject have ventured to suggest that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice was in any way connected with or had any previous knowledge of this escape. I submit, under these circumstances, that this whole discussion is premature. If the hon. member for New Westminster has moved for these papers, this House should wait until they are brought down. If hon. gentlemen opposite then think there are reasons why there should be a fuller investigation, and place those reasons before the House in a proper way, I am sure that the Minister of Justice will follow his duty, as he probably more than any other member of the bar in this country knows how to follow it; because no matter what hon. gentlemen opposite may say about the partisanship of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, none of them can question the high position he attained at the bar of this country or the position he has held for many years as the leader of the bar of the whole Dominion of Canada. I repeat that if my hon. friend the Minister of Justice had not said something about British Columbia and the frequent occurrence of mistakes in telegrams, I do not think we would have had this discussion this afternoon. These repeated occurrences of errors in telegrams to and from British Columbia are rather unfortunate. Some of my hon. friends from British Columbia, perhaps my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. J. D. Taylor) might put a motion on the Order Paper asking that this House should direct an investigation into the telegraphic service to and from British Columbia not only in regard to the telegrams which are sent with reference to reports to inspectors of penitentiaries, but also in regard to telegrams which are sent to and from leaders of political parties on the eve of an election with a view to obtaining political support.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

CANADIAN LIVERPOOL AND WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

House went again into committee on Bill (No. 44) to incorporate the Canadian, Liver-

pool and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Girard.

On section 2.

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) I move that section of the Bill be struck out. There is nothing before us which would warrant parliament in inserting it.

It should be entirely left out.

Mr. TURCOTTE (Quebec). (Translation.) I would like to hear on what grounds the hon. gentleman can rest his proposal ?

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) I have given them to the committee the other day.

Mr. TURCOTTE. (Translation). I do not see any harm in going over them again.

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) The other day I said in Committee of the Whole, that this committee had no evidence that this was a work for the general advantage of Canada, and that it was not sufficient to make such a statement in order to confer jurisdiction upon this parliament. In fact, we have nothing but the statement embodied in section 2, to the effect, that this work is for the general advantage of Canada, although we have no evidence to warrant it. In my opinion, the promoters of this Bill should have produced sworn declarations stating their purpose and the means at their disposal for the carrying out of this work, but they utterly neglected to do so. Moreover, I contend that even if it is implied by the whole Bill barring this section that the incorporation of this company is really for the general advantage of Canada, such a section would be entirely useless. But, I hold the opinion that we must not add this section, for the mere purpose of conferring jurisdiction upon this House.

Mr. TURCOTTE. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss to understand why this section should be struck out. The mere fact of this Bill being before the House, after having been sent to the Railway Committee, and of its asking that civil and legal rights be conferred upon a railway, is a prima facie evidence that this parliament is entitled to legislate upon this matter. It is incumbent upon those who oppose this section, to show that the whole Bill or some part of it does not come within the province of parliament. However, I believe that it is in the public interest and conducive to the proper management of the affairs of the Dominion that such a clause be inserted in all the bills.

The hon. member for Terrebonne, is apparently of the belief that this is a new clause inserted in charters incorporating companies. On the contrary, it is the usual clause, and whoever is familiar with judicial matters is perfectly aware of it. There is no need for its justification. The British North America Act, distinctly states that whatever is outside the exclusive jurisdiction of the provincial legislature, falls within the scope of the powers of the Dominion parliament. It is incumbent on the opponents of this clause to show that the Bill deals with a matter exclusively within the scope of the powers of the legislature. If that is not shown, jurisdiction is implied. It has been stated that no proof had been given, that such an enterprise was for the advantage of Canada as a whole. Such evidence has not been asked for by any one. The law does not require it. The clauses inserted in the Bill are in themselves sufficient evidence that it falls within the scope of the federal authority. Were similar clauses inserted in a Bill submitted to the Quebec legislature, there would be sufficient ground for warranting its cancellation.

Let us take, for instance, clause 13, which reads as follows :

> 13. Subject to the provisions of sections 361, 362 and 363 of *The Railway Act*, the Company may, for any of the purposes specified in the said section 361, enter into agreements with the Transcontinental Railway Company, The Grand Trunk Railway Company, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company, or any of them.

To my mind, that power of entering into agreements with railway companies which are under the control of the Dominion government, implies that of establishing connections between those various railroads and gives parliament jurisdiction.

It is alleged that this company asked authority to build and run a railway wholly within the limits of the province of Quebec. My answer is that it is not solely the territory covered by the railway which should be considered, when the question of jurisdiction is to be decided. It is necessary, besides, that the powers applied for by the company should be such as the legislature has authority to grant. Whenever the powers, rights or privileges dealt with are not exclusively under the control of a legislature, the Bill falls within the scope of federal authority.

There is no need for my quoting any further from the Bill, since all its clauses are known to hon. members, who have made a study of it, as for instance, that relative to navigation and commerce. How could the Quebec legislature be called upon to legislate on such questions ?

After carefully studying this Bill, I am bound to say that it does not concern some vital interests of the province of Quebec only, but that, considering the territory it runs through and the powers which the company requests this parliament to grant, the work may be stated to be for the general advantage of the Dominion. Nor shall I stop at that : I say that this

parliament has not only the right, but has for its duty to grant to the company the act of incorporation which they have applied for, and that it is in the interest of Canada that we should not be debarred from passing such legislation.

It would be a very dangerous precedent for us, as representatives of the people of this Dominion to assume an attitude of indifference towards such legislation, to refuse dealing with it and refer it back to the legislature of Quebec, it would amount to stating that all the clauses in this Bill are within the exclusive scope of provincial legislature. The discussion which has been carried on just now, has an interest far exceeding that of the mere incorporation of a railway company. It is a principle which we are about to lay down. I wonder whether our parliament is going cheerfully and deliberately to proclaim its lack of powers, without even having gone into the clauses of the Bill submitted to us, for it is a fact that we have reached the second clause only, out of a total of thirteen. Should some of the following sections deal exclusively with provincial matters, nothing prevents us from cancelling them or inserting a proviso safeguarding the rights of the legislature. In following a different course, we would, to my mind, be evading our duty and aiming a slur, as it were, at this parliament. As I said a moment ago, it would be creating a dangerous precedent, and I hope the House will not take such a responsibility.

Mr. MONK (Jacques-Cartier). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, if there is any slur aimed at any one, it is to be laid down to those who are anxious to infringe on provincial rights. Were the argument of the hon. member (Mr. Turcotte,) to be accepted, we might at any time, in connection with undertakings entirely under the scope of the provincial legislation, interfere with their business and assume all the rights belonging to them under the constitution.

The hon. member seems to think that our parliament has only to declare an undertaking to be for the general advantage of Canada, to authorize our assuming, on no other grounds but that declaration, control over legislation appertaining to the provinces.

We have had many interpretations of those rather puzzling words inserted in the British North America Act, whereby we are enabled to declare a work to be for the general advantage of Canada. That construtcion of the words has on many occasions enabled us to invade provincial rights. However, I have never heard of any court finding that we were entitled to make such a statement without proof. I was not present at the meetings of the Railway Committee when this Bill was under consideration, but I believe that one of the strongest arguments brought forward against its acceptance was to the effect that no evidence had been adduced to show that such legislation was of interest to Canada as a whole; and it seems to me that the position taken by the member for Terrebonne, in whose opinion proof should be furnished beforehand as to the character of the undertaking, in order to give us jurisdiction, cannot be controverted. The mere reading of the Bill shows that this railway is a purely provincial concern.

I listened carefully to the arguments of the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Turcotte). He has not denied the fact. The whole territory through which this railway is destined to run is situated within the bounds of the province of Quebec. If such be the case, it comes within the definite clause of the constitution which vests the full control of such an undertaking in the provincial legislature. Therefore, I say that before interfering in provincial matters, before infringing on provincial rights, we should have been perfectly well satisfied that such undertaking concerns Canada as a whole.

What evidence has the hon. member brought forward to show that such work is for the general advantage of Canada? He quoted a section of the Bill wherein the company asks for authority to enter into arrangements with companies incorporated by the Dominion parliament, such as the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Canadian Northern, the Canadian Pacific Railway, and other railway companies which are under our control. He has drawn the conclusion that this railway—essentially a provincial concern—must be of interest to Canada as a whole. I do not think such an argument will appeal very strongly to hon. members.

To my mind, Mr. Speaker, we have for some years past, dealt too highly with applications of this kind. If, as stated by the hon. member (Mr. Turcotte), that Bill affects some vital interests of the province of Quebec, if that railway is wholly within the bounds of that province, what right have we to legislate and to grant incorporation to such a company? What right have we to extend our jurisdiction over it when there is not a single argument to show that such jurisdiction is ours? Evidence as to that should be supplied in the first place, and I think it would be wise to refer back the Bill to the committee, with a view to obtaining such evidence.

Mr. GIRARD (Chicoutimi and Saguenay). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I shall state a few facts for the information of the hon. member from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), who has just contended with great force that the Bill under consideration, if passed, would be an infringement on provincial rights, as it tends to grant to a private

company authority to build a railway through a territory situated wholly within one province. While maintaining strongly that contention, he nevertheless acknowledged that in days bygone the Dominion government had, under similar circumstances, created many precedents. In this connection I may be allowed to submit a list of Dominion charters exactly similar to this, numbering forty-two, which have been granted during the last parliament from 1904 to 1908, and consequently with the co-operation and approval of my hon. friend, who was then a member of this House and of the Railway Committee as well. Of these forty-two charters, there is one for an undertaking of an exclusive provincial charter, authorizing the construction of a railway twelve miles in length, from Brandon, Manitoba, to a point on the Grand Trunk Pacific; said charter having been renewed by this House only a few days ago. The motive which actuated parliament in granting this charter, and the only one stated, is that the proposed road will be a connecting link between two roads incorporated under Dominion laws, and that in consequence the Dominion parliament alone is in a position to grant the required authority.

The argument brought forward by the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Turcotte) to the effect that provincial legislatures have not the power to authorize a private company to enter into agreements, under circumstances such as these, with companies created by Dominion charters, that argument has been unhesitatingly accepted in the past by this parliament, whenever the powers applied for in the present Bill have been sought.

Let us suppose that the Dominion parliament should have in the past, as it is requested to do to-day under similar circumstances, refused to grant such applications, the promoters would have been obliged to apply to the provincial legislatures in order to obtain such charters as these legislatures are in a position to grant, that is to say very incomplete; then, they would have been obliged to come back to this parliament in order to get these charters ratified, extended and completed. All of which would necessitate a heavy expenditure and cause delays which are always injurious to undertakings of such great utility in the public interest. The mode of procedure adopted by the Dominion parliament in the past, and which we are still following is more businesslike, more rational and does not in any way interfere with provincial rights.

My hon. friend from Terrebonne (Mr. Nantel), contended that the good faith of the promoters had not been established before the committee; he went so far as to rebuke them for not having laid before that committee affidavits setting forth the truth of their statements. Let me tell him that before the Railway Committee, complete plans have been filed showing the location of the proposed railway. A long and animated debate ensued, which ended in a vote whereby the committee, by a majority of 30, declared itself favourable to the Bill. Will my hon. friend undertake to say that this majority took that stand without realizing its responsibility, and have erred in their appreciation of the fact. I cannot believe his contention to be such. Considering that the House, as a rule, stands by the conclusions of the various committees, my hon. friend should not attempt to induce it to go back on the decision given by the Railway Committee approving that Bill.

How could a provincial charter grant to the promoters of this Bill the powers which they are seeking?

Mr. MONK. What powers?

Mr. GIRARD. (Translation). Among others the following: To start a line from any point along the Grand Trunk Pacific, incorporated under the Dominion Act; to cross and enter into arrangements with the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian Northern, the Quebec and Montmorency, all incorporated under the Dominion Act; also to establish lines of steamships between Canadian ports over waters under the control of the Dominion parliament, and foreign ports. All will admit that this is an absolute impossibility. It then becomes necessary to apply to the Dominion parliament. That is, no doubt, the reason why my hon. friend during the last parliament, voted in favour of forty-two charters exactly similar to those I have just mentioned.

Of course, I do not contend that my hon. friend (Mr. Monk), in that speech which he has just made, was trying to satisfy the committee that he had committed the same unfortunate mistake forty-two times in succession, that is, every time he voted in favour of the Bills referred to. I prefer believing that he spoke oblivious of the past; otherwise, I would be forced to admit that forty-two times in succession he erred in a lamentable way. From what I know of my hon. friend I am sure he would be averse to going back on his past career in parliament; I prefer believing that he was joking a moment ago.

The Bill as amended by the Railway Committee and reported to the House, affords ample protection to provincial rights; and there is no justification for the plea made on behalf of these rights. I think it better to close my eyes to what is going on behind the curtains. It has been insinuated that no evidence had been submitted as to the responsibility and good faith on the promoters; my hon. friend from Terrebonne would even have gone so far as to require affidavits establishing those facts. Had my hon. friend been an old parliamentarian, he would not have shown himself so exacting;

for he would have known that it is not usual here to compel people to make public their private affairs, either in the shape of inventories or other similar statements. The Railway Committee in this connection has acted in exactly the same way as they had done on previous occasions, that is to say, they have accepted as evidence of the good faith and financial responsibility of the promoters, statements made before them in that respect

I trust, therefore, that all opposition to the Bill on that ground will cease and that my hon. friend will withdraw his motion.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe). This Bill involves a question of provincial rights and has caused great discussion and loss of time in this House. It appears, as near as I can understand, that a few men can get together, chip in a few dollars, and having raised $300 or $400, they can come here and ask for a Bill giving them greater powers even than the provinces have. This is an omnibus Bill. In the first place, it is a railway charter, and I see no particular reason why, so far as that is concerned, the Bill should not pass. But there is added also a shipping clause, and this is added in order to have some argument to carry through the most dangerous clause in the Bill, namely, the water-power clause, under which the company may develop power and dispose of electrical energy. I think it is time that this House took a stand on this question, and, when gentlemen come here and ask for Bills of this character, we should compel them to separate the various powers asked for and then consider, straight and fair, each one as a separate Bill on its merits. Why is this water-power and electric light and power clause incorporated in a railway charter, seeing that it is recognized that these matters appertain to the province ? The reason, I take it, is that there is no expropriation power for these companies under provincial legislation. They come to this parliament for these expropriation powers, for the purpose of seizing water-powers which are now or will soon be, valuable. This is the most dangerous thing that can be asked. Why ? Because we give them power to invade private rights and even to seize and expropriate provincial properties. If I understand this Bill aright, it empowers these gentlemen to seize every water-power in the province of Quebec from Lake St. John to Montreal. Even though a water-power may be twenty miles away from the track and owned by a private individual, they can take it from the owner by expropriation. Even if the province of Quebec owns a water-power fifty miles away from the railway, there is nothing to prevent the company seizing it and using it for their own purposes. It is not even provided that the railway must be built before these powers of expropriation can be exercised by this company. I had an evidence of the apparent power behind this Bill in the Railway Committee. I realized for the first time what it was to have a lobby there in support of a Bill. I had been told before I came to this House that when a dangerous Bill was to be put through there was a strong lobby, and it was generally composed of members from the province of Quebec. I did not believe it until I saw the lobby behind this Bill with my own eyes. We saw some of these gentlemen from Quebec strenuously forwarding this Bill which takes away the right of their own province, rights which the province, through its representatives before the Railway Committee asked us not to interfere with by passing this Bill. I, as a representative from the province of Ontario, feel keenly on this subject, because the rights of my own province have been violated on a number of occasions by Bills of this kind. It is said that one of the most valuable undeveloped water-powers in Ontario has been expropriated—in fact, it took three or four railway charters from this House to cover all the available powers on a certain river in Ontario—in this way. It is high time when gentlemen ask for such powers as are proposed to be given under this Bill, that they should be called upon to give evidence of good faith. And, further, if representatives of the province of Quebec come here laying violent hands on the rights and property of their own province, they cannot expect the representatives of other provinces to have much sympathy for them when rights of even a more delicate character are in danger. They are establishing a dangerous principle. Every member of this House, no matter on which side he may be, should stand up for the rights of his province and of other provinces in matters of this kind. There is nothing very great at stake in this Bill. The promoters do not tell us: 'We have $3,000,000 or $4,000,000 in the bank ready to go on with this work.' It is purely a speculative paper charter. And when these gentlemen ask us to give them power to expropriate provincial water-powers and properties, they are going beyond the mark. The province of Quebec has no coal; in that respect, it is in the same position as the province of Ontario. In a few years, the wood will be gone. Coal will always be a high-priced article in the province of Quebec. How are you going to turn the wheels of your factories? How are your intelligent hard-working population, the best class of artisans in the world, to get employment in the province of Quebec, if you are going to give away your water-powers and tie them up in monopolies in this fashion ? It is clear that this Bill involves a very dangerous principle

and this House should reject it. Not only can they seize water-powers even from the province itself, but they can go into any city and deliver power.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. A. Currie) tell me under what section that power is given?

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Under section 10, as I understand it.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I am not interested in the Bill, but I wish to understand the hon. member (Mr. J. A. Currie).

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. That point came up before the Railway Committee, and the promoters of the Bill said they would accept an amendment. But what was the amendment? It was that they were not to be allowed to deliver power in any municipality without the consent of that municipality. Well and good. But what happens when we come to apply the powers given? They can pass a line through a municipality, and, though that municipality may have a power of its own, or may be taking power from a private corporation, they can compel the municipality or that private corporation to give up that power to them by unjust competition and by lowering the rates. We have an example in the province of Ontario, where the rights of the people in a city have been given away direct by aldermen refusing even to vote according to the will of the people on power questions.

Mr. RIVET. Name it.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The city of Hamilton, if you want one; the city of Brantford, if you want another. The people of those cities voted by overwhelming majorities in favour of accepting provinicial power and the aldermen would not carry out the will of the people.

Mr. RIVET. These are Ontario municipalities.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I do not wish to have Quebec municipalities placed in the same awkward position as some of those in Ontario have been placed in by any action of this parliament. Let the province of Quebec deal with its own questions of water-power and electricity. Let us deal with this as a railway matter and strike out the power clauses. It is bad enough for hon. members to ask us to swallow the pill; why do they call upon us to swallow the box? If the promoter of this Bill will withdraw the power clauses, there will be no difficulty in the adoption of the measure.

Mr. L. A. A. RIVET (Hochelaga). As a member of this House from the province of Quebec, to which my hon. friend (Mr. J. A. Currie) has just referred, in terms which, I hope, he will not dare to repeat in our own province—

Mr. LENNOX. What terms does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rivet) refer to?

Mr. RIVET. I protest most energetically against the language that has been used by the hon. member towards the members from the province of Quebec, who understand their duties as well—I will not say even better—than the hon. gentleman himself does I say, as a member from that province, that I resent the language which has been used to qualify the conduct of Quebec members on the committee. The hon. gentleman says that after coming to this parliament he has had an opportunity of observing that the Quebec members were, to use his own words, purely and simply lobbyists, taking charge of whatever piece of legislation might come before the committee, and doing the work which ought to be performed by the promoters themselves in pushing those Bills through the committee and afterwards through the House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I say there is not the least foundation, there is not the least excuse, for the language the hon. gentleman has used to-night. Every one of the members of my province resent that language, and feel it their duty, through my humble voice, to make a most energetic and formal protest against it. As members of the Railway Committee, hon. gentlemen coming from the province of Quebec, as well as from the other provinces, understand that there is only one thing to do when a Bill is brought before the Railway Committee, and that is to study the Bill upon its merits, and if they find it based upon a just and sound principle, to support it irrespective of every other consideration. The hon. member has just hinted, in fact he has plainly intimated, that other considerations than those of public interest actuate the members from the province of Quebec in studying any piece of legislation that comes before the Railway Committee and the House. Well, I can only repeat that there is not the least ground for such an accusation as the hon. member has seen fit to make to-night.

Now, coming to the Bill which is before us, I, as a member of the Railway Committee, took some part in the consideration of this legislation when the Bill came before the committee for the first time. I thought that it was one that fell properly within the jurisdiction of this parliament, not only because in clause 2 the works of the company are declared to be for the general advantage of Canada, but because many other provisions of the Bill bring it within the jurisdiction of this parliament. Irrespective of any other consideration, looking at the object of the Bill from a public standpoint, I said to myself, as every other member of

the committee should say to himself, that it was my duty to support it and to see that it was adopted by the committee and by the House. Now I will not go over the arguments, which have been pretty well set forth by members who have previously spoken. But I can say that I feel at perfect liberty to vote for the Bill for the reasons which have been given by my hon. friend from Quebec, and by my hon. friend from St. Johns. Finally, I desire to say once more that the members of my province resent the imputation made by the hon. member, which was altogether unfounded, and I protest against such language, not only on my own behalf, but on behalf of all the members of the Railway Committee coming from the province of Quebec.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the evidence that the hon. gentleman thinks would warrant us in saying that this is a work for the general advantage of Canada?

Mr. RIVET. The 8th clause of the Bill provides for the building of a line which is to be connected with other lines under the jurisdiction of this parliament. Under clause 13 of the Bill, the promoters of the company ask for power to enter into agreements with the Transcontinental Railway Company, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, the Grand Trunk Railway Company, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company, or any of them. All these companies have been created by this parliament, and it is obvious that the promoters of this Bill require authority from this parliament to enter into agreements with these other companies, because their line starts from a point on one of them, the Transcontinental Railway. There are other clauses which justify the promoters coming before this parliament for incorporation. It seems to me that the opposition which is offered to the Bill is not inspired by motives of public interest. We know very well what hon. gentlemen think when they talk about provincial autonomy.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln). In reference to what the hon. gentleman says, I am not so touchy about dealing with this subject as he appears to be. I would say that the last statement the hon. gentleman made was entirely unwarranted, when he insinuates that any member of this House is actuated by other than public motives. However, I do not care what he says about it, because it does not make any difference. I would point out that section 8 of the Railway Act is ample security, for all they want to get in a provincial charter. They have in the Railway Act that section which provides that the jurisdiction of the Railway Commissioners shall apply for all necessary purposes, and even to provincial railways which connect with Dominion railways. That is why I asked the hon. gentleman where was the evidence which would warrant us in deciding the question of fact. Now I am not like other gentlemen in the Railway Committee, who assume at once, whenever a charter is asked for in this House, that the work is for the general advantage of Canada. By the way we have been acting for the last few years we have got that principle turned upside down. We keep on deciding without any evidence whatever that the work is for the general advantage of Canada, whereas before we have any constitutional right to incorporate a company, the onus is on the promoters to present us with the evidence. We keep on in the Railway Committee, that is the majority of us, and I do not belong to the majority, deciding without a tittle of evidence that the work is for the general advantage of Canada. No other tribunal would decide any such thing, the onus being upon the applicants to convince us as a parliamentary committee that there is an exceptional reason why a certain matter cannot be dealt with under the clause of the British North America Act which gives the provinces jurisdiction, forgetting, and wilfully forgetting, apparently, that under the British North America Act railways are primarily within the jurisdiction of the provinces.

It is only when we have evidence before us which is substantial, which is convincing, that a provincial charter will not serve the purpose sought for that we have the right to decide that the work should have Dominion incorporation and be declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada. I did it in the last parliament, and again I am going to enter my protest against this sort of thing. We are shirking our duty; we are undertaking to decide a fact to be in the affirmative without any evidence of it. Hon. gentlemen seem to confuse the questions of power and duty. Over and over again it is said in the Railway Committee, and sometimes in this House, that we have the power, if we declare this work to be a work for the general advantage of Canada, to incorporate a company. Nobody says we have not the power, but the question is: Have we exercised the power properly and judicially in making that declaration, and have we the evidence to wararnt us in deciding that question? In this case there is not a particle of evidence to warrant us in coming to that conclusion and without evidence to show that this is a work that cannot be properly dealt with by the province of Quebec we should not sanction this incorporation. I care not which province may be concerned. I cannot help it if hon. gentlemen from the province of Quebec are going to get angry because this happens to come from their province. They must not do that and expect us to sympathize with them. We say the same thing with regard to protecting any other province in the

Dominion. We are consistent at all events upon this question. Whether this comes from Quebec or any other province the fact is the same, that if there is no evidence to warrant us in coming to such a conclusion as would justify us with any sort of a judicial mind in deciding that it is a work for the general advantage of Canada I am not prepared to vote for the Bill.

Mr. MONK. There is one thing that I would like to be enlightened upon and that is how the language used this evening by my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) has insulted the members from the province of Quebec. The hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Rivet) takes the position that any one claiming for the province of Quebec the right to control its own railways, the right to legislate where it has exclusive jurisdiction and the right to control its own water-powers is insulting the members from the province of Quebec.

Mr. BUREAU. That is not what the hon. member for Hochelaga says at all.

Mr. MONK. Yes, I do not see that my hon. friend from North Simcoe in taking the position that a member for the province of Quebec——

Mr. RIVET. I rise to a point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MONK. I have the floor.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. RIVET. The hon. gentleman has put words in my mouth that I never uttered.

Mr. MONK. That is what I understood from the hon. gentleman, and that is what most hon. gentlemen on this side of the House understood. Hon. gentlemen, in order to repeat to-morrow in the press, the old story that the members of the opposition in this House from the province of Ontario have declared their enmity to the province of Quebec——

Mr. RIVET. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. MONK. It is to protest against that——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. RIVET. I rise to a point of order, and ask permission to correct the statement made by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. LENNOX. That is not a point of order.

Mr. MONK. Pardon me.

Mr. RIVET. The hon. gentleman says that I have protested against the language used by the hon. member for North Simcoe because we are opposed to the position which hon. gentlemen opposite have taken. I protested against the language which he used because he charged members from the province of Quebec with being lobbyists.

Mr. MONK. There is no point of order in that, and I did not hear the hon. member for North Simcoe utter any such language as that. Any man who, in this House, wants to safeguard the rights of the province of Quebec in a matter of this kind and to assure to that province the control of its important water-powers, for the reasons indicated by my hon. friend from North Simcoe, is entitled to the credit of the province, and if he displays some heat in advocating these rights he may rest assured that those who realize what the needs of our province are will be thankful for it. I desire to refer for a moment to what was said by the hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Mr. Girard), who stated that on forty-two different occasions, to his own knowledge, I had been a party to such legislation and approved of it. I was not aware that the hon. gentleman had followed so carefully my delinquencies in this House. Upon that score I have a very tranquil conscience, because, if I sinned forty-two times I sinned in company with my hon. friend. I am free to confess that what has been stated here to-night by one member of this committee, that in the past we have been a great deal too lax in matters of this kind, is well founded. It has been so for a long time and I think it is time to see to it that the rights of the provinces are safeguarded. There is the instance of the railway on the Island of Montreal. Upon what proof was this declared to be a railwav for the general advantage of Canada, confined as it is to the Island of Montreal and therefore falling under the jurisdiction of this parliament? I question very much indeed if it is to the advantage of the city of Montreal or of the province generally. Has there been any proof adduced that this projected company is a company in the general interest of Canada? That is the only clause in the whole charter that gives us any jurisdiction. Is there a member of this committee who will say that if there has been no proof of that, this parliament is not committing a rash act in incorporating this company? What proof, have we, Sir, that in view of the protest which was lodged before the Railway Committee by the province of Quebec, through its authorized attorney, who said that they did not wish to see this legislation passed, this company has not come here because it knew that the parliament at Quebec would not grant the privileges it is claiming for us? We are arrogating a jurisdiction to ourselves, and the point raised by my hon. friend from North Simcoe is a particularly interesting one for us in the province of Quebec. If we assume jurisdiction and give to this company the power which is mentioned in clause 38 of expropriating water-powers for the development of electricity we will place

the province of Quebec, which has no coal and which has such a wealth of hydraulic power, in the most unfair position which will give rise to trouble later on. Under these circumstances, it seems to me that we should at least refer it back to the committee in order that ample proof should be secured of the general interest which has been alleged by speakers in favour of this Bill, but of which no proof whatever has been given.

SUPPLY—ESCAPE OF CONVICT BILL MINER.

The hour for private Bills having expired, the House resumed debate on the motion to go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. J. W. MADDIN (South Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, before coming to this House as a representative I had a full recognition of the great differences dividing the political parties on matters of policy and such like, but I had to wait until today to find that an important matter such as the escape of a life sentenced desperado like Bill Miner would be a subject upon which the political parties in this country would differ. This matter is of too great significance to be dealt lightly with, and in view of its great importance I submit that the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Taylor) who initiated the debate is not open to the censure visited on him by gentlemen opposite. I find in a recent edition of the Ottawa 'Free Press,' an organ of this government the following:

AN INQUIRY MUST BE HAD.

The conditions at the British Columbia penitentiary, which have been the subject of parliamentary comment within the past month should be investigated either by a committee of the House of Commons or by a judicial commission. That there is something radically wrong in that institution is proven not merely by the rumours and counter-rumours in circulation respecting the escape of Bill Miner and his accomplices, but also by the fact that the past week has seen a repetition of the jail breaking as a result of which two convicts got away, one of whom is still at large. That such a thing could happen after the experience with Miner, and especially after the re-organization of the penitentiary staff, shows that there is still need for more reforms.

Discipline is the first essential in a successful penitentiary, but discipline seems to be a much lacking commodity at New Westminster. The record of the past few years, including the escape of Miner, an insurrection or two among the convicts, several suicides, the practical dismissal of the former deputy warden and his replacement by a hospital steward, as well as the self-confessed trafficking in tobacco and other luxuries between the guards and the convicts—all this certainly justifies a searching investigation. The government has everything to gain and nothing to lose by a full and impartial investigation and we trust that the Minister of Justice will soon see his way to ordering such an investigation.

I deplore, Mr. Speaker, that the conditions which in this country surround a question such as we are discussing, differ so greatly from those which would obtain in Great Britain. In the mother country, if an imputation went abroad that anything was wrong in the administration of justice all political parties would put their heads together and a full and thorough investigation had. And when, in his speech this afternoon the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) expressed surprise that Bill Miner has escaped in August, 1907, and that not until this late date was the matter brought up in the House of Commons, perhaps the explanation of that is that the members of the administration now in power in Canada do not relish full and proper criticism of their departments, and when it is borne in mind that until last October there was a solid phalanx of government supporters from British Columbia it is not surprising that the matter has not been brought to the attention of parliament until the present day. It is certainly not the custom with this government to allow its supporters to bring up for discussion matters which are calculated to embarrass or to annoy them. The Department of Justice is the most important department of government. We can afford mal-administration in other departments; we are less than 7,000,000 of people occupying a country which can bountifully supply a population of one hundred millions; we are rich in natural resources and the appropriation of even hundreds of square miles of coal areas without adequate compensation to the country, and the exploitation of our forest resources by friends of the government, and the uncompensated depletion of our fisheries to supply the markets of the United States' cities are not so grievous after all because we have still enough left and to spare for our own supply. But, when it comes to the Department of Justice, that bulwark which stands between the citizens of Canada and all attacks on their liberties and rights, that department should be as Cæsar's wife above suspicion. It is the duty of the Justice Department to investigate in the fullest manner anything that is calculated to reflect upon its administration, and even though the cloud hanging over it be but the size of a man's hand, it is incumbent on that department to endeavour to dispel it. Whether it be based on idle rumour or whether it be based on common gossip there is no doubt that suspicion has seized hold of the mind of the people with regard to the escape of the convict Bill Miner. The facts are briefly these: In 1906 the Canadian Pacific Railway as common carriers took charge of £50,000 of bonds to convey across this continent. The train

was held up at Mission Station on the Canadian Pacific Railway and was looted, and rumour had it that these £50,000 of bonds were stolen. Subsequently another train robbery took place and afterwards Bill Miner and his accomplices were arrested. It was to the credit of the administration of justice in Canada that he was tried, sentenced to a life term and incarcerated in the penitentiary at New Westminster. Now, rumour further says that the detectives of the Canadian Pacific Railway discovered that Bill Miner was the man who appropriated these £50,000 of bonds in 1906, and reasoning as ordinary men would they said: If we can approach this life term convict and get him to surrender these bonds or tell where they are concealed we will have accomplished a meritorious act. And so, one of the Canadian Pacific Railway detectives visited the penitentiary as also did a detective from the United States, and an ex fellon was taken in with Mr. Bullick and Bill Miner was interviewed in the penitentiary. Now, rumour further has it that when the proposition was put to Miner he answered: If I were out of here I could locate the bonds, and so arrangements were quietly made by which he left the penitentiary. It is further said that before his alleged escape his hair and his moustache were allowed to grow, and while the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General have told the House that his hair did not exceed three-quarter inches in length, there appears to be no positive statement from these hon. gentlemen with regard to the moustache. At all events the statement is made that Miner was enabled to step without the penitentiary and to hand over these bonds to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) paid the Minister of Justice a flattering compliment; he spoke in glowing terms of the high position held by that hon. gentleman at the Bar, and I have pleasure in agreeing with everything that has been said as to the legal attainments of the distinguished gentleman who is Minister of Justice. But Sir, the Minister of Justice paid small credit to that intelligence when, after telling us how he investigated the matter, he asked us: What more could I do? I submit that the ordinary business man, with the facts as rumour and gossip have placed them before the country, to take no more reliable source, would have worked on the conclusion back to Bill Miner. He would have found whether or not it was a fact that £50,000 of bonds were transported across this continent, whether these bonds had been stolen in transmission, and whether they had been restored. If these facts had been established, and if the telegram which Mr. Bourke said he sent to Mr. Dawson as inspector was changed, it is to be borne in mind that it came to Ottawa over the wires of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and if it was the object of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to compass the discharge of this man from the penitentiary in consideration of the return to them of the bonds, it would easily be a part of the scheme that any telegram sent to the Department of Justice over their wires would be intercepted.

Some hon. members have found fault with the hon. member who initiated this discussion this afternoon. That hon. member read from the Vancouver 'Province,' a paper which he said was independent and was published by reliable people, an imputation in heavy black type on the editorial page against the Department of Justice. I submit that an act of so grave a character as is involved in this case, which is nothing more or less in substance than an effort to usurp the pardoning power of the Crown, is something to be reprobated by both sides of this House. I regret that it is not viewed in that light by the members of the government, and that the Minister of Justice does not take it upon himself to investigate this matter to the fullest extent. As the party organ in Ottawa says, he has nothing to lose by doing so. If I drew the attention of the Postmaster General to a charge of dishonest conduct amongst the officials of the post office in Ottawa, and I told him that it came from a reliable source which I was not in a position to divulge, and if he took the matter up and discovered that something was wrong, it would be no reproach upon him or his administration. But if he hesitated or refused to investigate the matter, then I would say it was a reproach upon him—that he became a party to it. The Minister of Justice has pointed out that in all cases except those of capital offences, when pardon was sought, it was granted on the advice of the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice is a man above reproach, and I would not for one moment connect his name with this so-called conspiracy; but I do wish to point out that unless he takes the matter up and investigates it, there will be a lack of confidence in his department. The hon. minister pointed out that in the Brothier case this pardoning power was exercised by the Governor General on the recommendation of the Minister of Justice. Seemingly this could not be compassed by those who wished to get Bill Miner outside, and the conspiracy which is talked about did not extend to the heads of the department at Ottawa, but was fully worked among the officials of the penitentiary at New Westminster, with the result that Miner was permitted to escape.

Now, the path of duty in this case is quite clear. It becomes the duty of the Minister of Justice, under all the circumstances, to institute proceedings, to find out to what extent there is truth in the

statement that those bonds were stolen and that they have been restored, and if it be a fact that those bonds were stolen by Miner and restored by him, I think there is such a case of circumstantial evidence to submit to any jury that they would not be slow in finding that there was a conspiracy between the officials of the penitentiary and the friends of Miner on the outside.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my hon. friend from South Cape Breton (Mr. Maddin) on the very eloquent manner in which he has presented his views to the House. My hon. friend is not without experience in the courts of this country or without knowledge of what is evidence and what is not evidence. My hon. friend speaks as if there had been no investigation of this matter at all. If the circumstances of the case, as presented from both sides of the House, had been without investigation up to this time, we would all say at once that certainly there should be an investigation. I do not know the terms of the Penitentiary Act in respect to discipline or in respect to investigations into matters of this kind; but it has been stated to-day by gentlemen who know, that that Act provides for an investigation in cases of this kind by the inspector. If that be the case, I take for granted that an investigation of such a character has taken place in this instance; and, if so, it has the same force as an investigation before a judge, because the officer is constituted a judge in such cases by the Act. Therefore it is no light matter to set aside as of no consequence the findings of that official. If my hon. friend would reverse the order of things and would say that gentlemen on the opposition side were content with what had been done by the inspector, and the Minister of Justice were coming here and asking for the consent of this House to a re-opening of the investigation, I can well imagine the storm with which he would be met, particularly by my hon. friend from South Cape Breton, to produce the evidence on which he based his request. Where is the evidence in this case? The opposition in this House is led by a distinguished lawyer, and there are a good many other lawyers in the opposition, and they speak with great flippancy of evidence. Where is the evidence? There are rumours in newspapers; are they evidence? If the hon. gentleman presented himself before any judge of this country to ask for a new trial of a case that had been tried, and the judge asked him, where is your new evidence, and my hon. friend would say, I have not a word of new evidence, but a certain newspaper publishes rumous that a certain official in a certain place said that if he were questioned he would tell something; would any judge or court allow the case to be re-opened? The judge would certainly tell him that he had no grounds on which to base any such application, and it would be summarily refused. That is the position here. An investigation has been held, every man who had anything to do with the penitentiary has been examined and there is not a particle of evidence, as far as appears here—there may be when the papers are brought down—that will connect Bourke or any other official of the penitentiary with aiding and abetting this man in his escape. But so far there is no such evidence, and I think it only fair to conclude that a proper investigation has taken place, and we must conclude that a proper decision has been reached, that nothing wrong has been found against the management of that penitentiary, except what has already been corrected by the suspension or dismissal of the acting warden and by the dismissal of some officials of the penitentiary.

Mr. LANCASTER. What does the hon. member say about the well-established fact that the inspector who made the investigation is himself accused of having allowed surreptitious visits to be made to this man?

Mr. McKENZIE. The superintendent or warden of the penitentiary has been examined on oath and we must assume he was properly examined, that every fact that could be elicited from him and every thing he knew was declared before the officer of the law who heard that evidence. He has been asked since the appearance of this newspaper story whether he had anything further to say. Does it make any difference what style of language was used in asking him if he had anything further to declare to his country in respect to the escape of these men? His reply was read here this afternoon, that he had nothing further to say. My answer to my hon. friend is that when a man declares upon his oath that he has fully and freely disclosed everything he knows about a certain fact, and he is asked afterwards, if there is anything in the rumours abroad that he has anything further to say and in reply to that inquiry he says: No, there is no truth in it, I have told you already on oath all I know of this matter, therefore it is quite unnecessary, in my judgment, to call upon him to give any further evidence——

Mr. LANCASTER. The Minister of Justice in answer to questions stated that surreptitious visits had been made with the consent of this very inspector to Miner before he escaped. Does it not occur to my hon. friend that this was not the right kind of inspector to pass judgment ?

Mr. McKENZIE. I know of no evidence to that effect.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Minister of Justice said that.

Mr. GRAHAM. Did he say that ?

Mr. McKENZIE. I did not understand that there was any alleged conspiracy between the officer who held the inquiry and any person in connection with the investigation. If there is I will ask my hon. friend to produce it or an evidence of it.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not produce it in the shape of using the word 'conspiracy.' I pointed out that the Minister of Justice said in answer to questions that a number of visits had been made improperly and that they should only be made with the consent of the inspector.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. The Minister of Justice did not make the statement attributed to him, and if the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) will look at 'Hansard,' page 1227, where the whole statement of facts from the Justice Department is contained, he will find a direct denial of that statement.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is that to-day's 'Hansard' printed already ? I heard the Minister of Justice say it to-day.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. He did not make the statement to-day either.

Mr. McKENZIE. I have followed the answers of the Minister of Justice with a great deal of care and I am satisfied the position I took here is perfectly clear, that nothing of a wrong character has been brought home to the official who held the investigation. There was nothing that would disqualify him in my judgment or that should disqualify him in the judgment of this House or render him not a proper tribunal to try the charges in connection with that institution. Had there been, I certainly would not place any weight or base any argument on the investigation which he held. But I submit again that this investigation having been held there is nothing here presented that would justify us in asking the case to be reopened and a new trial to be held—and I submit that this investigation is more important than many a new trial would be.

I fully agree with the hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Maddin) that it is a deplorable fact that party strife or squabbles should take place in this House or anywhere over the administration of justice. We are all proud of the administration of justice in Canada, we are proud of the respect which our people have for the law. It is one of our proud boasts, and I am sure no person should attempt to make cheap political capital out of this matter even if a mistake had been made in connection with the administration of justice. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken said that the blame if blame there be does not come within a thousand miles of the Department of Justice or the learned gentleman who is to-day at the head of that department. That is the statement he has made. But supposing there was something wrong, there is not contention that the Department of Justice is in the slightest way implicated. It is said that officials of the penitentiary in British Columbia should not be called upon to do anything towards the capture of this individual. Miner, until they had instructions from Ottawa. I think that is a very unfair assumption to make, and it is dangerous to have a report go abroad from this House, that all we expect officials to do is to sit down and do nothing until directed from Ottawa. I take it that very much the same relationship exists between the Minister of Justice and the officials of the penitentiary as exist between the Attorney General of a province and the jailer or sheriff of a county. What would you think of a jailer or sheriff of any county in Ontario who would sit down and twirl his thumbs if a prisoner escaped from a jail until he heard from the Attorney General of Ontario or got his directions ? We have a right to suppose that every penitentiary is well equipped with officers and that they have men to act in emergencies. Why should there be any necessity for communicating with Ottawa in order to capture this man? There were officers on the spot whose duty it was to take immediate action, and the officials of the penitentiary had at their beck and call all the resources of the government of British Columbia, who are interested equally with the government of Canada in the administration of justice. Therefore there is no point in saying that some time may have elapsed between the sending of the telegram and its receipt here. I submit there is not a particle of evidence upon which to base a further inquiry. We on the government side, as far as I know, have nothing to conceal. If any gentleman has evidence of a reliable and substantial character to lay before the government or the Minister of Justice, let us have it.

And, after that is done, if the Minister of Justice will not act upon it, there is some ground for fault finding. But, until that is done, I submit, an investigation having been held, the department is satisfied, and the House, I think, should be satisfied, too, that everything has been done to ferret out the truth, and this question should not be made a means of gaining party advantage. The hon. member for South Cape Breton

(Mr. Maddin) declared that this should not be made a party question. He is a fairly regular attendant in this House, and knows how the party spirit was imported into the question. He knows that this was made a party question by his friend from New Westminster (Mr. J. D. Taylor) when the Solicitor General (Mr. Bureau) was putting his estimates through this House ten or twelve days ago. The hon. member from New Westminster knows that it is not a difficult matter to stir up party feeling in a body such as this House where the party lines are clearly marked. It is said that in the west there is a breezy honesty and sense of fair play. I am glad to know it. But I must say that I have not discovered any extreme measure of it in the hon. gentleman who has been bringing up this question from day to day. It is a well-known principle of British justice that no man may be attacked in our courts without giving him some notice of what is to be charged against him. I can tell my hon. friend from New Westminster that it is not fair to attack a man without giving him intimation so that he may have an opportunity to answer. We are told that the administration of justice outside this House must be extremely pure. I do not know that there is one kind of justice outside this House and another inside this House. I submit that if the reputation of a man is valuable outside this House, it is equally worthy of defence here. I submit also that if a man would be laughed out of court for presenting a case based upon an old newspaper and on a humdrum story and using this means to taking away the reputation of another man, he should be all the more laughed out of this House when he attacks the reputation of a minister of the Crown and a department of government on such evidence. The hon. member for South Cape Breton said that if a matter of this kind arose in England in connection with the Department of Justice, hon. gentlemen on both sides would get together and quietly inquire into the matter. We have strong men on both sides of this House. We have a competent lawyer leading the opposition. and we have a competent Minister of Justice. There should be no difficulty, according to the rule laid down by my hon. friend. for these two gentlemen to get together and quietly discuss this matter and find out if there is anything to investigate. I am sure that if the leader of the opposition would, in this quiet way, convince the Minister of Justice that there was something wrong. there would be no difficulty in getting an inquiry. But I submit, without impugning the motives of any person, that this would not suit the purpose at all. This could not get flaring headlines in the papers of Nova Scotia; we could not have the Jekyll and Hyde act in the newspapers and in this House if this quiet way were adopted. It suits the purpose very much better to carry on the talk that we have heard. We have not been allowed to wait even until the papers come down. If the papers were down and we had the facts before us, possibly it would be found that there was nothing to talk about. The great thing is to make a great hullabaloo about the matter and work up a lot of newspaper notoriety, get the matter before the public regardless of considerations of fairness; and hoping it will have some injurious effect upon the administration of justice and upon this government generally. My hon. friend from South Cape Breton knows very well the trick of the jury lawyer who tells his story to the judge: 'I want to prove so and so; I want to get in such and such evidence.' He knows that the judge will tell him that he cannot get in that evidence, but his object in telling the story is that the jury may hear it, and, no matter whether the judge admits it or not, the story will have more or less effect upon the minds of the men in the jury box. That is the scheme of these gentlemen—to get this story before the public right or wrong,—truth or falsehood does not make so much difference, so long as the story may have some effect on the jury and make a little cheap political capital.

Mr. GLEN CAMPBELL (Dauphin). Unfortunately I am not a lawyer, as are many of the gentlemen who have discussed this question, but, as this is a question relating to the west, I may be forgiven if I say a few words upon it. I shall not take up time in discussing the legal points involved. But, in fairness to the hon. member from New Westminster, I take exception publicly to the usage that the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Taylor) received at the hands of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth). The Minister of Justice arraigned the hon. member for New Westminster on the strength of some articles that appeared in a paper published in British Columbia. The hon. member for New Westminster rose in his place and corrected the minister, yet the Minister of Justice did not have the justice to acknowledge—'decency' is the word suggested by a friend beside me, did not have the decency to acknowledge—the fact that he had made a mistake. An apology was due from the Minister of Justice to my hon. friend from New Westminster. But the minister did not offer it. I hope the hon. minister will think again, and, later on, will tender to the hon. member for New Westminster the apology he owes him. The right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) took it upon himself also to reprimand the hon. member for New Westminster. It was a reprimand worded as such a reprimand can be worded by only one man in this House—the Prime Minister himself—in the most courteous terms possible. It showed the steel hand in the

velvet glove. But even such a reprimand was not due from the First Minister of the great Dominion to a new member of this House. The First Minister accused the hon. member of discourtesy to one of the ministers in not officially notifying him that this discussion would be brought up. He left the impression that a rule of the House had been broken by my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor). I want to tell him and to tell this House through you, that no rule of this House was broken, there is no rule of that kind. If the First Minister wants to shield himself by any supposed rule of that kind, let him amend the rules of the House and provide that when a discussion of this kind comes on notification must be given. There was no notification necessary, because the last few weeks this matter has been a live question in the House. It was brought before the Solicitor General on the 11th of February last, and he showed on that occasion that there was one Bureau at least in the government of Canada where one could apply for information and not get it. Therefore I say the question is not new, it was something that the Department of Justice already had in hand. A motion had been passed by this House at the instance of the hon. member for New Westminster, calling for the papers pertaining to this inquiry to be laid on the table. That motion was passed over two weeks ago, and yet the Solicitor General to-night stated, through the mouth of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) that there was no motion for papers. Why, Sir, he cannot be attending to his business, because it is his duty as Solicitor General to prepare those papers when they are asked for by the House.

I was somewhat surprised to hear the defence which the hon. member for Pictou made of the Minister of Justice. He told this House that the Minister of Justice was the greatest lawyer in Canada, the finest lawyer in Canada. Well, Sir, if beclouding the real facts of the case by a display of verbosity constitutes a great lawyer, then I want to tell the hon. member for Pictou that I absolutely agree with him; but if that is the duty of the greatest and finest lawyer in Canada, I have only to say that thanks be, I am only an old farmer. The hon. member for Pictou found fault with the members on this side of the House discussing this great issue before the papers that were called for had been brought down. I suppose he acts on the old axiom that the exception proves the rule, and therefore he went to work to discuss the question himself. But in his discussion of the question he showed, I think, in the opinion, not only of the members on this side of the House, but in the opinion of the members on the other side, that if any man in the House had no right to get up and discuss this question it was the hon. member for Pictou himself, because he showed absolute ignorance of it. Let me point out to that hon. gentleman that in future when he desires to discuss a question that is brought up in this House, it would be well for him to be in his place looking after the interests of his constituents, instead of running round the country doing all the mischief he can. The very fact that the hon. member for Pictou was called upon to deliver the speech he did to-night shows conclusively that he was called in as a forlorn hope. He has always been called upon as the leader of a forlorn hope, in committees and everywhere else, the last two sessions. I hope this House will take his remarks at their true value, and take that particular matter into its consideration.

I do not intend to speak at length on this question, as it is one relating to a criminal matter that is foreign to me. My only object in rising is to pour oil on the troubled waters. The facts, as I understand them, are these: This man Miner was captured, tried and sentenced to the penitentiary for life, for one of the gravest crimes that had ever been perpetrated in Canada. After being incarcerated for a certain length of time, he escaped. An investigation was held, and as a result of that investigation, one of the minor officials was fired, or perhaps I should say suspended, for since then he has been taken back to work. Another man, as the hon. member for Pictou improperly said, was suspended, or was asked to send in his resignation. I said 'improperly,' and I use the word advisedly. This man was not asked to send in his resignation, he sent it in of his own accord. He asks for superannuation and gets it. Nobody has been punished, among the officials of the penitentiary at New Westminster, for inefficiency and neglect of duty. Nobody in this country, whether Liberal or Conservative, doubts for one moment but that some one was to blame. If any member of this House, in the conduct of his private business, finds an employee to blame, he punishes that individual. It is up to the government, it is up to the Department of Justice, to punish some one in regard to this matter, because the worst criminal that Canada has had in the clutches of the law for the last decade, has escaped, and nobody has been punished. The government supporters are handing out boquets to every official who could be blamed. The man who was in charge, this man Bourke, was allowed to resign and got his full pension; the government did for him all that it could do to any man who had performed his duty with the utmost fidelity.

Now what are we asking on this side of the House, and what every decent man in Canada ought to be asking is: that the truth shall be made known. An investigation was held and held by an official who

is the object of a certain degree of public suspicion, who held the investigation himself, who tried his own case and who was practically his own judge and jury. That investigation has resulted in nothing, looking at it from the standpoint of justice. Certain things have come out since. There are rumours possibly but there never was smoke without fire. Certain rumours have come out. There is more perhaps than mere rumour. The deputy warden, who was allowed to retire and who was superannuated as if he were the finest official in the service of the government, has come out in different papers over his own name with a specific statement, amounting almost to a charge, to the effect that if he were brought before an impartial tribunal he would give evidence which has never been adduced and would do something to clear the atmosphere in this regard. It has been proved that the hole in or under the wall, through which this man Miner was supposed to have escaped, would not have accommodated a man of his size, and that it was absolutely impossible for him to have made his escape in that way. It has come out further that this man Miner has been permitted against the law, that is administered by the Minister of Justice, to grow a moustache—somebody said whiskers—and also hair to the length of three-quarters of an inch in a limited time. Three-quarters of an inch is a respectable growth of hair particularly on the top of the head, and I will submit to the judgment of the hon. Solicitor General upon that point.

Mr. BUREAU. What about the Minister of Justice?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would tell my hon. friend that in my youth I was taught to respect gray hairs and even if the gray hairs are not on the top of the head I still have to respect the hon. Minister of Justice, and therefore I shall not refer to them. But those are facts that have been brought out since this so-called investigation was held. On this side of the House we take no exception to what was brought out at that previous investigation, but what we say is that the points that I have brought forward were not disclosed at that investigation and that all western Canada, and British Columbia particularly, believes that there was some collusion or that the intervention of influential corporations or parties, led to the letting out of this man Miner. These points have been brought out, but they were not brought out at the investigation, and we ask the government to give us an investigation, or some kind of independent tribunal, that will go into these matters and see whether or not there is any truth in them. On behalf of the government themselves I appeal to them to adopt this course. I want to tell the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that the suspicion is all over Canada to-day that there is something crooked in this matter, and on behalf of the Canadian people and also on behalf of the great Liberal party, it is up to him to insist on having a free, independent tribunal that will bring Bourke before them and will not only bring Bourke before them but will bring one of these three convicts who escaped along with Miner and who has since been recaptured, as I heard it stated in the House, and who will give evidence to show how he got out and whether there was any collusion. We only ask it in the spirit of fair play. We only ask it to clear and not to damn the fair name of the Minister of Justice. We want the minister to have his name as clean as it ought to be and as I believe it would be did he give us this investigation. I have here, sir, if it will be any benefit to the House, a picture of Bill Miner. I understood the other night that the Solicitor General said that about a month ago they had news of the whereabouts of Bill Miner? Am I right?

Mr. BUREAU. I beg your pardon.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I understood the Solicitor General, on the 11th February, sitting on the front benches, to say that he had news of the whereabouts of Bill Miner and expected to get him in a few days. Has he anything further in reference to that to communicate to the House?

Mr. BUREAU. I said I was informed that it was expected that they would capture him.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In closing I just want to make this appeal, and I want to make it to the right hon. First Minister. We are not speaking here to-night, we have not done so to-day or upon any other occasion when the matter came up, for partisan purposes. We are all Canadians, whether we be Liberals or Conservatives. There is a blot of suspicion on the fair name of Canada with reference to the administration of justice. It is a little matter, a matter of very little moment with regard to the question of expense, it would not cost much to appoint a committee, or whatever you like to call it, an independent tribunal, who will investigate, who will bring this man Bourke, who will bring this prisoner who was taken the other day before them, get from them whatever information can be got and clear up this business for ever and a day. It is only justice that we are asking.

Motion agreed to and House went into Committee of Supply.

Trent canal—Construction, $1,000,000.

Mr. WALLACE. As I understand it the appropriation for the work on the Holland river is included in this vote for the Trent

canal, although the former work has nothing to do with the Trent canal at all. I do not think those two votes should be put in a lump sum, but at all events we should have some information as to how much it is intended to expend on the Holland river.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). In including these two votes in the one appropriation we are following the precedent of last year. We will spend about $200,000 on the Holland division. I have stated that it would cost $600,000 but I believe that it will cost much more than that before it is completed.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I do not want to delay the passing of the estimates, but this is going to be a contentious matter and as there are several returns on the Order Paper with respect to it which have not yet been disposed of I would ask that this vote be deferred.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not think there is any return asked for, but there is a question on the Order Paper with regard to it.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. And it was asked that that question should be put in the form of a return.

Mr. GRAHAM. Perhaps I can give the information now.

Mr. WALLACE. I have asked for the following information by question number 8 on the Order Paper.

1. How much money was spent on the Newmarket canal on the Holland river, before 31st March, 1908?
2. How much money was spent in April, May, June, July, August, September, October, November and December of 1908?
3. What contracts were let since 31st of March, 1908, and the amount of such contracts?
4. Were tenders asked for?
5. Who are the contractors?

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The Minister had ample time to answer this question before, but he asked for his convenience that it should be put in the form of a motion for a return and now he says he can give the information right away.

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not ask that the question should be put in the form of a return.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE. There is a deeper principle than that involved. Here is an appropriation for $1,000,000 in which two independent and separate works are included. The Holland river is 30 miles away from the Trent canal, and yet we are asked to allow this vote to slide through without obtaining detailed information. We would not be doing our duty to our constituents if we did not learn how much is to be expended on the Holland river and how much on the Trent canal and where the work is to be done. If this vote goes through the Minister can spend the whole one million dollars on the Holland river if he wishes to and not one cent on the Trent canal. It is a reasonable request to ask that this item should stand until we get the information which will enable us to discuss it in an intelligent way.

Mr. FOSTER. While my hon. friends here are directly interested in this matter I have a general interest in it, and early in the session I asked for the complete papers as I wanted if possible to find out whatever in the world set this Holland river work going at first and what were the representations that ever induced a sane department to undertake to build the Newmarket canal. I have not obtained that information, and if the government is going to spend a lot of money on that work we ought to know something about it. The minister will make more progress if he allows this vote to stand till we get full information.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I do not know whether I can give any information as to the manner in which this work came to be undertaken, but I can at least disclaim any right to the honour that the hon. member for North Ontario sought to do me the other evening when he said it was the custom in that part of the country to couple my name with this work. That was a piece of news to me, as I imagine it was to everybody who heard it. I think it was a compliment. I should be very proud indeed to have my name connected with any public work in the constituency of North York which the people of that constituency took an interest in or that was for the welfare of the community. But I do not want to sail under false colours. I do not claim any credit for this undertaking; I have never done so, either in this House or out of it, for the simple reason that I had nothing whatever to do with it, and have no right to take any credit for it. I entered this house, as hon. gentlemen mostly know, in the fall of 1905. At that time there had been a vote of $100,000 passed by this parliament in the previous session. I have always understood that the way in which that vote came to be passed was that a very numerous and very important delegation of the principal men of the county of North York came to Ottawa during the spring of 1905 and made representations to the government and to the Minister of Railways and Canals, as the result of which it was determined to undertake this work.

I have lying before me a list of names of some of those who came specially from North York at that time for the purpose of urging their views upon the government. In that list are such well known names as those of Mr. T. H. Lennox, M.P.P., the pre-

sent member for North York in the legislature of Ontario; Mr. F. W. Daville, who has since then been made sheriff of the county of York; Mr. T. H. Brunton, a well known member of the Conservative party, I think at that time and probably still president of the association for the riding; Mr. Archibald McCallum, who was at that time I think reeve of the township of King, who was the gentleman I had the honour of opposing at the by-election in the fall of 1905, a man of the highest standing in the community, and a man whom I need not say I hold personally in the highest esteem and respect; Mr. A. McMurchy, a member of the township council of King and also a leading Conservative of the county; and I might go on to give other names simply to show that there was absolutely nothing political, and not the slighest thought of politics, in the matter. This was literally the body of the county of North York, whatever that might be worth, and it was just as much a Conservative undertaking as it was a Liberal undertaking. Everybody in North York knows that, and I should welcome the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. S. Sharpe) if he would now or at any time pay a visit to the riding of North York, and make any attack upon this undertaking or upon the men who initiated it and believed that it was for the good of Canada. I certainly should not ask for any better assistance towards that waning of political influence which the hon. gentleman attributed to me when he was addressing this committee last week, and which he said was due to the fact that I had originated or advocated this scheme. Let that political influence continue to wane if my hon. friend's efforts to identify me with it has anything to do with accelerating it towards the vanishing point. I can only assure him that the more opposition he will offer to the construction of that canal, in that locality, the more he will feed the popularity of the man who has the honour to represent that constituency at the present time. That of course is but natural. I suppose that whenever any public work is desired in any locality, the men who live there, and who think it will be for the benefit of the business centres of the locality, unitedly and generally, favour it, with regard to political considerations. I think that the hon. member for North Ontario would not object to the construction of the public building in his own home town of Uxbridge, for which there is a vote in the estimates. I think he would be very glad to take it, and I am quite sure that the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) has on more than one occasion in this House urged the building of a branch of this very Newmarket canal up to the village or town of Bradford, a few miles to one side in his constituency. The very deputation which came here originating this scheme and urging it upon the government contained representatives of his constituents—I know nothing of their politics—from the town of Bradford and the township of West Gwillimbury; and because they thought they would be served by the construction of the branch which the hon. member from South Simcoe has advocated in this House, they were in favour of this work and united in urging it on the government of that day. But without any reference to what the origin of this work was, the question before this committee is whether or not public money should be voted towards carrying it on, and I want to address myself very briefly to that question. Some $200,000 or $300,000, I suppose, has already been put into the work. Now, if no more money is to be voted for it, it stands uncompleted and the country loses the money that has been put into it. I fully admit that if the work will be absolutely valueless, if it was abject folly to have undertaken it, the best thing we can do is to abandon it, notwithstanding what has been done by the people who came here clamouring for it, and by the people here who were weak enough to yield to that clamour and to undertake the work for them. It was not this parliament, it was not your humble servant who now addresses you, who had anything to do with it. It was our predecessors, and I am by no means prepared to say that they made any kind of mistake in doing what they did. A good deal of fun has been poked at this enterprise by the newspapers. I have not the slightest objection to that. I have enjoyed as much as anybody a great many cartoons that I have seen about it in which I figure. I do not any the less enjoy a good joke because it is at my expense, and I have no objection to the cartoonists exercising their art with me as a subject if they think it of any consequence to do so. But if it comes to be a serious question in this House, and if hon. gentlemen here seriously present for consideration to the committee the contention that this canal, when it is finished to Newmarket, will not have water wherewith to float any boat or be of any practical service to this country, that is another story altogether; and it is seriously that I want to say a few words with reference to this undertaking, assuming that any one who criticises it or thinks it cannot become a valuable means of transportation to Newmarket and to the adjoining villages, is dealing with the subject in equal seriousness.

This is no question of law, it is not one upon which I am in the least degree competent to form an opinion for myself. If it were a legal question and I had any strong view about the law of the matter I would be prepared to back that view at any rate as far as the Privy Council, before I would come to the conclusion that I had been

wrong. It is not that kind of a question. Being a purely engineering problem, I am not competent to deal with it, but I am prepared to place exactly the same confidence in the opinion of a distinguished engineer, that I am egotistical enough, if you like, to say I would place in my own opinion if it were a matter of law. I have known the gentleman who is now the deputy minister and chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals since he and I were boys side by side on the shores of the Bay of Quinté. I have seen him rise higher and higher in his chosen profession until to-day I believe there is no man in the Dominion of Canada who stands higher as an engineer than he; and having in his engineering opinion as absolute confidence as I honestly think he would have in my opinion upon a purely legal question, I am prepared to rest my satisfaction with the proposition to construct this work upon his opinion as a matter of engineering, that there is ample water supply for all the working purposes of that canal when it has been constructed.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. When was that opinion given?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Mr. Butler's opinion has been given to me in private conversation on more than one occasion. I have asked him if he had any doubt about it, but he says he has none upon the information he has received of the surveys. I am not competent to go into the figures or test at all the correctness of his view.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. When was that opinion given, and was it put on paper?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. As recently as this afternoon. I asked him this afternoon if there was any question about it in his mind. It was never put on paper to me, he and I are too well acquainted to deal with each other on the footing of a piece of paper. I rest my confidence in the practicability of this work upon the opinion of the gentleman to whom I have referred. If other members of the House have not the same confidence in him, that is a matter in regard to which each must form his own opinion.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Was the opinion of the deputy minister based on personal inspection or on the reports of other engineers?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. My hon. friend will have to obtain that information from the department. I am not able to tell him whether Mr. Butler has made a personal inspection or not. I asked him on the subject as an old friend, and as the man in charge of that department of the public service, and because of these repeated gibes or jokes about the great waterless canal that the country was building. I am of course, discussing it altogether on the supposition that this is not an impracticable work, not a work that will have no water wherewith to float a barge after the canal is completed. If I am wrong in that supposition I quite agree with hon. gentlemen that the work should be stopped. No one will propose seriously to construct a ditch to serve as a canal that will have no water after it is finished. It seems to me we ought seriously to consider whether or not this undertaking, supposing it to be practicable, is for the benefit of the country to the extent of the amount of money that will be put into it. As to that, let me remind hon. gentlemen who represent that part of the country—I think I see pretty nearly all of them opposite me, I think I have the honour to occupy an oasis of fertile territory surrounded by a vast desert of Conservative. shall I say of unfertile country—let me remind these gentlemen who represent that part of Ontario, of the departed glories of Holland Landing and Holland river. Long before I had any acquaintance with that part of Ontario, Holland Landing received its name. How did it get it? How else than that it had its wharf, its landing place, and was the port for Lake Simcoe? In the old days before the advent of railways, barges and scows, I do not know of what draught, but vessels of some kind or other, were continually brought up the Holland river as far as Holland Landing. They used the landing for commercial purposes of transport, and although that village has now the air very much of a deserted village, I admit, it shows, in the buildings which still remain and the works or their remnants along the river, evidence of the prosperity that once visited it when it was literally one of the lake ports of Ontario. If traffic by water was possible, as it undoubtedly was a hundred years ago or fifty years ago, prior to the construction of railways, if it were profitable to navigate the river from Lake Simcoe as far as Holland Landing, why would that navigation not be profitable again if the silt and sand which in course of time has filled up that stream below Holland Landing is removed? The first half of the work which this vote proposes to provide for was the cleaning out of the natural bed, the straightening of it in places and the making of that river once more navigable as far to the south of Lake Simcoe or Cook's bay as Holland Landing. That was the head of navigation naturally and up that far boats could now go if there was a dredging and deepening of the natural stream and all the better if there were a straightening of the river where it was too winding in its course. That is the first branch of the work that was undertaken in section 1, I think, of the Newmarket or Holland River division of this canal. And no one, I say, could successfully contend that there is not ample water for navigation purposes in that part of the stream.

What is the condition above it? Newmarket is the principal town in the constituency, and has a population, I suppose, of 4,000 or 5,000 people. It is some three miles—possibly not more than two and one-half miles by direct route—further up the natural stream than Holland Landing. The stream would not be navigable for any economical purpose any further up than Holland Landing so long as it remains in a state of nature. At Newmarket there is already a dam thrown across the stream, and a pond in consequence created. I do not know how many feet in depth that pond may be, but the dam, I should say, from personal observation, must be twenty-five or thirty feet high. I suppose there is at least that volume of water behind it, covering perhaps some eight or ten acres in the present pond, and this, without any attempt at conservation, storage or utilizing to best advantage the water which by nature will come to that water-course or stream. I am not pretending to argue whether or not it is practicable, I only know that any one who passes up and down along the railway or drives about Newmarket can see these things for himself. And, if engineers, having made their survey, report to us, and if the deputy minister and chief engineer of the department, upon his responsibility as head officer of that department tells us that it is in his judgment a practicable work, I am content, I am prepared to take the responsibility of voting public money for the doing of this work upon his confidence that it is a perfectly practicable scheme. The building of this canal from Holland Landing to Newmarket is, of course, not a dredging operation, it is the ordinary construction of a canal, which will replace the natural stream which now runs from Newmarket to Holland Landing. As to the commercial value of the work when it is completed, I entertain no kind of doubt. Newmarket is to-day as great a business centre as many of the towns along the line of any of our canals, a larger place than many of the towns on the St. Lawrence canals, than many of the towns along the line of the Trent canal, than many of the towns along the line of the Welland canal, a place of at least equal importance, I should say with the county town of Lincoln, with which the hon. member (Mr. Lancaster) from that constituency is well acquainted. The Welland canal, of course, a great national undertaking for through traffic between the lakes, is not to be compared to something of local concern such as this either in the expenditure it involves to the country or in its importance to the country once it comes to be constructed. But my contention with regard to this canal is simply this, that just as any other public work into which you might put an equal amount of money is for the benefit of that locality primarily, so this public work, once it is completed, will be very greatly to the benefit of the riding of North York and the adjoining riding of South Simcoe. The Holland river is the boundary between the townships of East Gwillimbury which belongs to North York and West Gwillimbury, which belongs to South Simcoe, and each of these townships and the locality generally will reap the advantage of this canal when it comes to be completed. With regard to the advantage of it to the people there, I venture to say to the hon. gentlemen who are criticising it, hon. gentlemen representing the adjoining constituencies, that there are, in the riding of North York at all events, no two opinions. I have not at any time made the construction of this canal a political question in that constituency. It would be idle for me to attempt to do so because the people there know equally well with myself—in fact, much better than I do—how that work came to be initiated. They have heard and seen in the newspapers periodical attacks upon this work, attacks to which, I have always thought, the city of Toronto contributed, possibly, more than any other portion of the province. Although Newmarket, as compared with the city of Toronto, is a small place, it is not without the usual local jealousy. There is already, and has been for years, an agitation in the north end of the county of York for separation, a desire to set up a separate county for themselves, with Newmarket as the county town. There have been continual attacks, I may say, from the public platform upon this undertaking on the part of members of this House from the city of Toronto. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) it seemed to me, could scarcely make a platform speech without denouncing the horrible outrage of this waste of public money in the Newmarket canal. That is good politics for me in North York, I am willing to admit, but other than in that sense, there are no politics about it. On the public platform, on nomination day, last October, my opponent referred to my course during the last parliament as representing North York and asked what I had done for the constituency. He did not pretend to say: This man has brought us the canal. If he had done so, I suppose, he would have answered his own question. In that connection, upon that occasion, I said from the hustings that, while I had had nothing to do with it, and had never, so far as I was aware, asked for one dollar of expenditure in North York, I thought that those who attacked the expenditure upon this canal could be found, in every instance, among the ranks of our political opponents, and that those who defend it were, perhaps necessarily, upon the side of those who were

making the expenditure. But it was only in that sense that the question, so far as I can see, had the least element of political significance in it. I remain entirely of this opinion. That work never was of political significance, it was simply a piece of local work which the people of the locality, without regard to politics, united in wanting, and, so far as I know, unite in wanting still And, exactly as the inhabitants of any other town in the province would like to see public money expended in their midst, so the people of North York would be very much dissatisfied, I am sure, if anything were done to interfere with the completion of this work.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT (Muskoka). I think the Hon Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) intended to leave the impression with the newer members of this House that the last parliament had been unanimous in voting a sum of money for this canal. I wish to say that the members on this side, when this was originally introduced, objected just as strongly as they do to-night, and that just as strong exception was taken by the members acquainted with the locality as on the present occasion.

Now we are told that the people from that riding, of both political stripes, came down here and petitioned the government to spend a sum of money on this canal in North York. Now I do not suppose there is any riding in Canada that will raise a strong objection to half a million of money being spent therein, whether it serves a useful purpose or otherwise; the people derive an immediate benefit from the expenditure. Now with regard to the canal itself, I took strong objection to it when the scheme was first proposed. A great deal was said with regard to the water supply. I thought then, and I think now, that it is of very little importance, because the canal will be just as useful dry as it will be wet. There is nothing to sail up or down it, so it is no concern of this parliament whether there is ever a drop of water to supply the canal or not. Now we are told there are institutions in North York that will benefit by this canal. I am somewhat familiar with the situation, and with some of the people there, and I know of no institution that will benefit to any appreciable extent, with the exception of one or two particular pets of this government. I believe there was another enterprise which was carried on a few years ago down on the Holland Flats, catching frogs. But I believe that enterprise has lapsed somewhat of late, and if this canal is constructed it will perhaps revive it. I do not know of any other good purpose that will be served by building the canal. Perhaps down in lower stretches towards Lake Simcoe, it may be partitioned off and the farmers along there may utilize it for raising ducks or geese. Perhaps the upper stretches might be used for sheep pens, or pig pens, where the land is a little dryer. But I do not know of anything else that can be done with it.

Now, Sir, I take exception to the amount of money that is being sunk in an enterprise of this kind. I want to remind the minister, and I want to remind this committee, that it will not be only the original amount of money we put into it that this country will have to furnish, but there will be large sums required annually for the upkeep of this useless enterprise. The gates on the locks will rust on their hinges, and will have to be renewed from time to time. A large number of employees will have to be paid annually. We are loading upon the country, not only the original sum, but an additional large sum yearly to keep up the appearance. In the riding I represent we have a good deal of navigation, and we have vainly appealed for the last two or three years to this government for some works that are badly needed there. Last year a small estimate was put through for a little wharf, I think somewhere about $4,000, but this year that is cut out altogether; on account of hard times the government can't afford to go on with it. I want to say here, realizing what I am saying, that in the town of Gravenhurst, where this little grant was made for a wharf, there will be as much navigation in one year as there will be on this Holland river enterprise for all time to come. Now I want to put this thought particularly before the minister, that if this $200,000 or thereabouts that he proposes to put into that canal next summer, were spread over those northern waters where they need accommodation very badly, and where there is a number of steamers to land, he would be doing a great deal of good to that northern country, opening up and developing it. But down there where there is nothing and never can be anything for a steamboat to do, this money will be wasted. I feel strongly on this matter, and I would ask the minister carefully to consider it. I want to say that when this vote was first introduced it was distinctly destined for this canal, and was not coupled up with any Trent Valley matter whatever. I do not know of any reason why the minister should mix up the Holland River canal with the Trent Valley canal, unless it is to put us in the position that if we object to the one we should have to object to the other. I do not object to going on with the Trent Valley canal. I am not much enamoured with the enterprise, but it has been accepted by both sides of the House and it was commenced a great many years ago when the prospects were more promising than they are to-day. In any event, both sides of the House are committed to the Trent Valley project, and we must carry it through. But we are not commit-

ted to this Holland river enterprise, at least on the opposition side of the House. We have objected to it from the first, and I think the minister ought to deal with the two enterprises separately. Now the Minister of Justice thinks there is only one opinion in North York with regard to the enterprise. I heartily concur with him. I have talked with people in North York, and I have yet to find a single individual, man, woman or child, who thinks this enterprise will be of any use in North York outside the temporary expenditure of money in its construction. I think the minister would fail to find a single ratepayer in North York who would say, over his own signature, that this work will be of any benefit to the people after it is built. I will not say any more on the question at present. This matter will come up again, as the minister is going to make an announcement upon it, and I reserve any further remarks until then.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe). I wish to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the Minister of Justice has not given the history of this transaction exactly as it occurred. He was good enough to introduce my name, and that is one reason why I wish to say a word or two. I happened to be here at the time when this project was first broached in the House. Let me inform the committee that it originated in a meeting at Newmarket, at which Sir Wm. Mulock was present as the representative of that riding, the riding of North York, and that Sir Wm. Mulock was then an active promoter of the scheme. That all originated before the meeting of that deputation to which the hon. gentleman referred to-night. The enterprise, so far as I can ascertain by the records, was virtually originated by Sir Wm. Mulock. Sir Wm. Mulock was the father of the scheme, and made it a stepping stone in the election which was then pending. I made that charge on the 17th of February, and it was not denied. I referred to it as an election scheme. Sir Wm. Mulock had brought forward this scheme of deepening the creek between Newmarket and the Holland river, and expending a large sum of money. I referred to an article which appeared in the 'Witness,' and I said:

Let me read a word or two from the Bradford 'Witness,' which is a paper not altogether published in the interest of my hon. friend, but published in the riding he formerly represented.

The article is dated February 9 and it is headed 'The Trent Valley canal extension':

Our readers will remember that a public meeting was held in Newmarket last September to consider the advisability of steps being taken to deepen the east branch of the Holland river via Holland Landing, Newmarket and Aurora and the west branch to Schomberg, in order to make these waters available for commercial purposes in connection with the Trent Valley canal system which will shortly be continued to Lake Simcoe. Sir Wm. Mulock, the Hon. E. J. Davis, Mayor Kane, of Newmarket——

Another good supporter of my hon. friend. —Mayor Daville, of Aurora, spoke in favour of the scheme——

'Scheme' is the very word.

—and a large committee was appointed to promote this great undertaking.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Was the Postmaster General (Sir Wm. Mulock) present at that meeting?

Mr. LENNOX. He was the chief spokesman in favour of this scheme to promote the general interest and prosperity of Canada through his own riding and through his own supporters. The hon. gentleman (Sir Wm. Mulock) seems to have been the chief person on that occasion, as we would naturally expect him to be.

Since that meeting government engineers have made careful survey of the territory——

Mark you, my hon. friend, the Minister of Justice tells us to-night that this scheme originated in a deputation coming down and waiting upon Sir William Mulock in the city of Ottawa, but I will point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that Sir William Mulock on this occasion, invites me to attend with the deputation.

It would need to be careful if it favours the putting through of this canal.

The Minister of Justice seemed to think that I used to be in favour of this scheme. I thank God I never was.

—and, although no official report has yet been made, it is pretty well understood that the engineers will report favourably upon the matter.

They have their instructions, in other words, I need not take up much time over the intervening part. I appreciate that it might be said that this newspaper item may not be correct. Surely it cannot be that the engineers were actually on the ground surveying it before the deputation came down at all. Let us see as to that. Turning over a few pages I find this:

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman is very funny.

That was referring to Sir William Mulock.

He tries to get away from the point. Does the hon. gentleman deny, as is stated in the paper, that he was present at the meeting and spoke in favour of the scheme? I read it, not only in the paper but I read it in other papers, amongst them the Newmarket 'Era,' I think.

The Newmarket 'Era' was a liberal paper.

While I was travelling on the train I met a gentleman who had just come from the meeting. I know it was discussed broadcast

throughout the last general election, and I am calling attention to it here because I think it does not become a cabinet minister, on the eve of an election, to make promises to the electors which may influence their votes.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. An abstract declaration of principle may be a very good thing. I attended the meeting in question, I addressed myself to the meeting as other citizens did, and I was saying what I am saying now, that the district would be advantaged by the construction of such a work, but the question of its cost and the question of its feasibility were matters entirely in the future, and the determination of the work must depend upon these considerations. That is my view to-day. I hope the result of the inquiry will show that the work is feasible, and that the prices come within a reasonable figure or as reasonable as will commend itself to support at the hands of this House.

Mr. LENNOX. Is it a fact that engineers or surveyors were put on?

Sir William Mulock does not evidently want to answer that question because he says:

When we come to discuss that question, the way it happened to come up at that time will be made clear.

I assert here and now that the way that the matter happened to come up was that Kane Bros., the most influential men in the riding of Sir William Mulock, wanted it to promote their own industry, and that they were the originators of this scheme. Continuing Sir Wm. Mulock said:

It grew out of the decision of the Railway Commission seriously affecting a great enterprise in our district. The people were seriously intending to move away because of the railway freight rates. The matter came up in that way, and the people of our district were extremely uneasy lest this large enterprise should move away on account of the rates of freight charged by the Grand Trunk Railway Company on the commodities used and exported by that enterprise.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman has not answered me, but probably he will tell me now?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. About the engineers?

Mr. LENNOX. Yes.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The engineers have been in the field ever since, and I think they are in the field yet.

Mr. LENNOX I do not want to prolong this matter; if the hon. gentleman will tell me now, that is an end of it—what large enterprise was it that was about to leave?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Messrs. Kane & Sons.

Mr. LENNOX. Of Newmarket?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Of Newmarket.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, the gentleman who is named in this paper as the promoter of this scheme.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. He is one of the firm.

Mr. LENNOX. By what authority were these engineers sent into the field?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. By the authority of the Minister of Railways.

So we have it established as clear as anything can be established that this transaction originated in the way that it is here described. Then we go on and discuss the matter and Sir William Mulock tells me that a deputation is coming down within three or four days from the riding of North York; he understands that some of my own constituents will be here with that deputation and he invites me to attend it. I did go and listen as he had invited me. He said that I would be convinced, but I was not convinced, and I am not convinced yet. I think I will not be convinced as the time goes on because it has demonstrated more and more the utter uselessness and absurdity of the scheme. The Minister of Justice thought it was worth while to refer to the personnel of that deputation. I cannot say that I am surprised at the Minister of Justice. I have been here since 1905 when he came in and I am not a bit surprised that he thought it magnificent argument to put up, that T. Herbert Lennox, representative of the riding, at the request of people who wanted money expended in the riding, came down as one of the deputation. Where have we drifted since then? What was the amount that was said to be the total expenditure for the scheme? I understood from some members of the deputation that it was then said that it would cost $350,000. What is it to cost now? I do not know whether it was for the purpose of influencing votes during the last election, but it was reported during the election that there was going to be $3,500,000 expended upon the work. The Minister of Justice has thought fit to refer to the fact that I have advocated the digging of a trench from the Holland river proper up to the railway station at Bradford. In that he is entirely mistaken. My constituents at Bradford have felt that inasmuch as the government carried away the wharf which they should have built in South Simcoe and put it across on the other side of the river so that they have to cross the river in order to get to the wharf which should serve them on Holland river, they were entitled to have a cutting made up to the railway station and they sent in a petition in regard to the matter. As representative of that riding I had the honour to present that petition, as I shall be happy to accede to any proper request which my constituents make to me. The hon. gentlemen will not find that I have advocated the scheme further than to represent the wishes of my constituents in that regard. But, there is a thousand miles of difference between that scheme of cutting a trench up to the railway station, if it can be done for a moderate expenditure, and this mad-cap scheme of

spending one million dollars or two million dollars for a cutting which has already demonstrated itself as an absolutely indefensible scheme. Last summer in going through that county two or three times a week in the dry season—and I want to say that it was a particularly dry season last year and could not be taken as a fair average—but in going through that district last year I never could detect that any water was escaping beyond the pond or dam in the village of Newmarket. In other words, all the water of that stream appeared to be evaporating from the surface of the pond, and scores of people passing up and down noticed the same fact. This is an absolutely indefensible expenditure of public money and notwithstanding the fact that so much money has been squandered already on it I believe it would be wise at this point to stop.

Mr. GRAHAM. The request of my hon. friend to allow the item to stand until the return is brought down is a fair one and I am ready to accept it.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Will the minister divide the appropriation so that we will know the expenditure on the different parts of the work?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will tell my hon. friend approximately what will be expended on each.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. It is not what the minister purposes doing but what he will do when he gets the item through that we would like to know.

Mr. GRAHAM. I hope my hon. friend does not mean that insinuation.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. I did not intend to reflect on the minister and I do not want factious opposition to the item, but we surely should have that information.

Mr. GRAHAM. I told my hon. friend the other night how the expenditure was to be divided, but I will make it more explicit when the vote comes up again. I also gave the reasons why the two were considered the one scheme.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. If there are any engineers' reports in connection with this scheme I would ask the minister to bring them down. I would also ask him to bring down any information in possession of the department with regard to the levels, the tonnage which originates in that section, the rainfall of the area drained by this enormous river and so on.

Mr. GRAHAM. I placed that information on the table some time ago.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. We would also like to know the depth of these artesian wells.

Mr. LENNOX. And how much the pump cost.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. It is important to know if any engineer of standing has made a report as to the utility or the feasibility of this canal. We have heard that engineers were going to report but we have never got the concrete fact. If the minister has any written reports he should bring them down.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have them here to-night but we are going on to consider another item.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the minister taken into consideration the question of lighting these waterways. On the Scugog river from Sturgeon Lake to Lindsay there is a great deal of traffic and the river is not always properly lighted. A good part of it could be lighted by electricity but I am informed that possibly it could be lighted more cheaply by acetylene gas.

Mr. GRAHAM. When the work on the canal is completed the question of the proper method of lighting it will have to be considered.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the minister bring down the report of the deputy minister upon which the Minister of Justice this evening justified the proceedings? I would also like to have a difference made between the feasibility of the mechanical construction and the utility of the work, as well as the commercial data upon which the department concluded it was wise to spend this money.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know if we have all that information. I have the report made by Mr. Walsh, a prominent engineer in 1906, and I have a later report by Mr. Grant one of the best men in Canada. I have no written report from my deputy or chief engineer. The statement of the deputy was based on what the engineers have reported to him.

Mr. FOSTER. It would have very great weight with this House if the substance of the information which was communicated to the Minister of Justice were communicated to us who are to criticise and to vote for this expenditure. The Minister of Justice to-night argued on what he said was the information given to him by the engineer whom he lauded so highly, and I am not saying anything against the laudation.

Mr. GRAHAM. The information made to the Minister of Justice was practically the contents of these reports of engineers in whose judgment the chief engineer has confidence.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the Minister of Justice as usual was wrong.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am explaining what occurred. I have both these reports here to-night.

Mr. FOSTER. It was not, then, the report of the deputy minister, but the report of these engineers. The Minister of Justice represented that it was the report of the deputy minister.

Mr. GRAHAM. The deputy minister based what he said on the reports of these two men. The report of Mr. Wash was what this House acted on, I suppose. He endorsed the scheme before Mr. Butler was chief engineer.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The hon. minister will note the unfairness of the argument of the Minister of Justice, who informed the House that he was willing to stand by the report of one of the ablest engineers in the country, that is, the deputy, Mr. Butler, and that that gentleman had reported to him that everything connected with this canal was satisfactory, virtually leaving the inference that the chief engineer had made the report on his own knowledge after having looked over the work. I think it is up to the Minister of Justice to square himself with the House after trying to shoulder any responsibility for this canal and its non-success on an engineer of such standing as the deputy minister. If I were an engineer, I would not tolerate it for one minute unless I had made the report.

Welland canal—electric lighting and power plant, $8,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. What does it cost to operate this electric plant?

Mr. GRAHAM. This work is not quite completed yet, and it is difficult to tell just what the cost is. All the locks except No. 27 are now operated by electricity.

Mr. J. D. REID. What I want to see is how the cost compares with the cost on the Cornwall canal.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will try to get that for my hon. friend. I think it is very much less.

Mr. FOSTER. Does this $8,000 finish the work?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

To widen canal near Welland, $40,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is being done there?

Mr. GRAHAM. The work that was undertaken was quite a large work. It was to enlarge and widen the canal—really to make a basin. There has been expended on it up to date about $47,000. The total estimated cost is $87,000.

Port Colborne improvements, $65,000.

Mr. FOSTER. We would like to have an explanation of where we are going to.

Mr. GRAHAM. This work has been under way since 1900. A number of tenders were received, and the contract was made with Messrs. Hogan & McDonald. We are trying to make a clear navigation of 20 feet depth.

Mr. FOSTER. What have we now at Port Colborne?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have 20 feet of navigation right up to the piers.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is the elevator completed?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, and we put 350,000 bushels through it last season as a test, and it worked very satisfactorily.

Mr. LENNOX. During the election?

Mr. GRAHAM. No. We wanted to try it before the season of navigation closed. The vessel was the 'Midland Prince.'

Mr. HUGHES. What is the capacity of the elevator?

Mr. GRAHAM. The storage capacity now is 800,000 bushels. It has foundations for 2,000,000 bushels.

Mr. J. D. REID. The 'Midland Prince' came down two or three weeks before the election. I would like to know why there was not more grain put through that elevator last fall. As I understand, it was built in order that the freight rates from Fort William and Port Arthur to Montreal might be reduced. Do the minister and his department believe that it will be operated from this out, and if so to what extent, and will it result in cheapening freight rates? I opposed the building of the elevator at Port Colborne; I have always believed that the better plan would be to deepen the Welland canal so as to permit vessels to come through to Kingston or Prescott. That would materially cheapen freight rates from Fort William to Montreal. What does the minister expect to happen in the coming year on account of the elevator being ready?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a large order. I do not know just what is going to happen, I hope the elevator will be busy. It has been suggested, and this is perhaps worth considering, that we ought not to be content with waiting to see what it will do but should engage some person on commission or otherwise, to induce shipments via that elevator and see if we cannot have a large volume of grain pass through it this year. The elevator is ready for business and experts say it is one of the best equipped on the continent for its size and capable of doing its work. I have been considering for some time whether it would be better just to say to the public: The elevator is there, go on and use it, or to send some person representing that elevator perhaps to the board of trade at Winnipeg to induce them to ship grain by that route and give it a

full test. I would be glad of an expression of opinion on this point.

Mr. HUGHES. Does not the minister think that shippers will soon realize if the elevator is any use ?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is a difference of opinion on that. Some say the elevator will not be used unless we send some one to induce shippers to send grain through it.

Mr. HUGHES. Will the country be responsible for the contract ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Oh no, if we sent a man west we might give him a certain commission for every bushel of grain he sent that way.

Mr. HUGHES. Why should you rival other routes ?

Mr. GRAHAM. We built the elevator to be of some use and want to impress the public with its usefulness. I think if the public would use it one year they might be convinced of its usefulness. I agree that we could, with a larger Welland canal, rival the transportation system of any country for grain to the sea-board.

Mr. HUGHES. We were told it was something like Castoria, that the children cried for it.

Mr. LALOR. The building of the elevator at Port Colborne seems to me to be a useful piece of work. Large boats that are unable to pass through the canal with a full cargo can unload part of their cargo at Port Colborne and so pass on to Montreal, but it would seem to me that to make the system practicable there should also be an elevator at Port Dalhousie so that the boats could take on their full cargoes there. The opinion in Port Colborne of men who are well qualified to speak is that the elevator is badly located, and that good judgment was not used in its erection. Many items under the Welland canal are very familiar to me, because during the last general election in that county our good friend the member for that county (Mr. German) issued a circular letter to his constituents in which he took credit for all the expenditures included here upon the Welland canal in addition to post offices and armouries in Welland town and Niagara Falls. I notice one item here widening the canal near Welland, $40,000. In the circular letter it was stated that one of the reasons why Mr. German should be returned was that he had succeeded in getting the government to spend $40,000 in widening the canal at this particular point for the use of a steel plant located there. The expenditures may be wise, I am not criticising them, but I think the elevator scheme is a good one if it is properly carried out, although the opinion there is that the elevator is not well located.

Mr. J. D. REID. Although that elevator was built with the expectation that it would really complete the system between Fort William and Montreal, and that vessels would then be able to carry the grain between these two cities at a minimum cost, still I do not believe it would have that effect. I still believe that the whole solution of the question of the transportation of grain between Fort William and Montreal is to deepen the Welland canal. But we have the elevator now at Port Colborne and it will take years to deepen the Welland canal. I think every thing should be done in order that the grain from the Northwest provinces should go through via Montreal, and in addition to that any grain that we can bring from the western states via the St. Lawrence route. If the government collects charges at the elevator of any large amount it will certainly prevent grain going through that elevator and the result will be that the elevator will stand there doing nothing. I would suggest that the elevator be made practically a part of the Welland canal system and that grain should be put through that elevator at cost price. In other words, if a vessel comes there with a cargo of grain the actual cost of unloading the grain and putting it into other vessels for transportation to Montreal is all that should be charged. I could name a number of vessel owners in Canada, one of them the St. Lawrence and Chicago Forwarding Company of Toronto, which has several large vessels carrying between 200,000 and 300,000 bushels. These large vessels can go to Port Colborne and the company have several other vessels which could carry the grain from Port Colborne to Montreal. If they could put it through the Port Colborne elevator at the cost price of elevating and putting it back into their own vessels, I think it would encourage the carriage of grain from Fort William to Montreal. I would suggest that the elevator be made practically a part of the Welland canal system and that you should say to the St. Lawrence and Chicago Forwarding Company, or to the Montreal Transportation Company: If you will bring the vessels to Port Colborne and load into the smaller vessels there for transport to Montreal, we will put the grain through the elevator for just what it costs us to do the work. In this way, you will encourage bringing the grain down the St. Lawrence, instead of allowing it to go by Buffalo. These large vessels have to go to Buffalo, unless they come to Midland and send the grain by rail; if it goes by water it must go by Buffalo. I do not say finally that this would be advisable, but, I believe that it would be a good policy to pursue, to make the proposition to these transportation companies of which I have spoken.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I heartily endorse the remarks of the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid). From my knowledge of this business, I have no hesitation in saying that the minister will not be disappointed so far as the elevator is concerned, for there is sufficient work of this character coming to fill all the available channels. Anybody conversant with the traffic on the great lakes knows that the additional vessel room required every year, even for mooring, for loading and unloading, amounts to virtually three-quarters of a mile. The tonnage is growing at a rate quite unknown to those who are not familiar with this business. When it comes to the last week in the fall, every port on Georgian bay and Lake Huron is congested and vessels have to be moored three and four deep and await unloading. I am heartily in accord with any expenditure that will give to this tonnage, which is growing and bound to grow like a snowball in larger percentage each year, the accommodation that it requires. I would like the minister to give me information, the next time his estimates are before us, as to the policy of the government in expenditure on these harbours and canals. Whether the expenditure is to be confined to the harbours named by the commission appointed some years ago by the government. That commission narrowed down the expenditures at the east end of the great lakes to three harbours—Parry Sound, Midland and Port Colborne. To my mind, these gentlemen, who were not experts on transportation on the great lakes, did a great injustice to other harbours, altogether apart from the fact that if the government built piers and spent all the money they could on all the harbours, they could not keep pace with the growth of that traffic. I think that any one who takes a thoughtful interest in the welfare of the west will say that every one of these expenditures made for the accommodation of this traffic will take care of itself and will yield benefit to the country at large. Consider, for instance, the enormous terminals being built at Fort William. Up to a few years ago, you had only the Canadian Pacific Railway there. Within the last four or five years great terminals have been arranged by the Canadian Northern. In two or three years you will have the terminals of the Grand Trunk Pacific—three transcontinental lines bearing the wheat down to Port Arthur and Fort William. About $5,000,000 has been spent on harbour facilities to put the grain into the vessels. But how are you taking care of the lower end of the spout? That is a matter the government will have to consider. The engineer of the department has given this subject a great deal of thought, and the reports of the department call attention to the question involved. I would urge the minister to consider the advisability of putting in the supplementary estimates items necessary for other points. The estimates this year had been cut down to Parry Sound, Midland and Port Colborne. Parry Sound has virtually ceased, in a sense, to be a great centre for a railway. It is true it has a fine harbour. But the Grand Trunk owns Parry Sound, and it owns Midland also, and I understand that their policy is to send the traffic by way of Midland. Let some of the other places have a chance to develop as terminals as well as these places. The government have done a great deal, but not more than this enormous trade demands. The traffic of the northwest and the United States is tending our way. Our port of Montreal to-day is a greater port for grain shipments than New York. That is something to be proud of. We must make every effort to perfect every link in this chain of communication. Let us deal with things as they exist. Let us not go into airy schemes and theories which may work out eight or ten years from now, through the building of a railway to Hudson bay or something of that kind, but let us take this up as a practical, existing business question and deal with it in that spirit. I had not intended to make these remarks, but I have every sympathy with the minister and the department, and I hope that when we next consider these estimates I shall be given the information which I have asked for.

Mr. J. D. REID. Has the minister ever asked the Dominion Marine Association what they would suggest as to the working of this elevator? It seems to me that if he were to ask them how grain could be brought to this elevator and so to the St. Lawrence route, they would be able to make some suggestions that would be of value.

Mr. GRAHAM. The suggestion of my hon. friend I will take up in a more thorough way, to see what these companies suggest.

Mr. WRIGHT. Is railway connection provided with this elevator at Port Colborne?

Mr. GRAHAM. If my hon. friend will look at the next item to be taken up, he will see that I am asking $21,000 to provide connection with the Grand Trunk sidings.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Is it intended to keep that switch so that any railway may use it? We are building it ourselves, and will let any railroad use it that wants to.

Mr. G. V. WHITE. Has the minister estimated the cost of deepening the Welland canal system, and also of deepening the whole St. Lawrence system?

Mr. GRAHAM. In the next item I am asking for a small amount to go on and

complete the surveys commenced last year, so that we could make an estimate of what the new canal will cost.

Surveys, $10,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have been for some little time engaged in surveying the route, an alternative route, and trying to get what the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) asks for, an estimate of what it would cost to deepen the Welland canal or build a new one.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I would ask the minister to consider that in the Welland canal he will have to cut 12 to 14 miles of living rock, and when vou come to consider the great cost of moving that rock, which runs up to about $2.50 per cubic yard at the very least, as compared with moving clay at 8 cents, he should well consider the alternative route, in view of the modern engineering science.

Sault Ste. Marie canal—construction, $50,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. The value of the work done there up to November 30 was $166,347. The tender was given to C. S. Boone, of Toronto, the lowest tenderer, for deepening and widening the channel at the upper end. It is under construction now. This is all above the locks.

Mr. BOYCE. How much do you expect it will take to carry it through?

Mr. GRAHAM. The tender is $253,657, probably it will take more money than that.

Mr. BOYCE. What I would like to see done there is a little straightening of the channel between the government dock and the entrance to the canal. I think the minister has that well under consideration.

Mr. GRAHAM. That will have to be done.

Mr. BOYCE. I know he has been giving a great deal of consideration to us up there, which we very much appreciate indeed, and I ask that he will generously continue the good work.

Sault Ste. Marie canal—rebuilding north entrance pier, including dredging, $68,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. That has to be dredged out and rebuilt. We propose to advertise for tenders and let the work to the lowest tenderer. That is the north entrance pier, which is simply rotting away. I was up there on some other business last fall, and I took a look at it. It really has to be done for the safety of navigation. I think we cannot make any mistake in not letting these things go too long where navigation is concerned.

Mr. BOYCE. How much dredging is there to be done?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have not got the detailed estimate in time to give it to the House. I am asking for $68,000 to start the work. We will make a concrete pier, a permanent work.

Quebec canals—remarking boundaries, surveys. &c., to complete, $5,500.

Mr. J. D. REID. Didn't I see something a short time ago in the papers where some deputation from New York wanted to use these canals right through?

Mr. GRAHAM. Really what they wanted was for us to rebuild the Chambly canal up to the Richelieu river, to give them connection between the port of Montreal and the state of New York. But that has not yet been agreed to.

Lachine canal—wall north side of Basin No. 2, $70,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who has the contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. Quinlan & Robertson. This work can only be carried out in the spring time when the canal is unwatered. The date of the contract is April 20, 1908, and the work is required to be completed next October. There were two tenders, those of Quinlan & Robertson and Mr. Wallberg.

Mr. REID. What happened that Wallberg did not get it?

Mr. GRAHAM. He only gets it when he is the lowest tenderer and this time he was not. The contract price is $114,019, and the total estimated cost is $184,000. This is for a concrete wall on the north side of Basin No. 2.

Beauharnois canal—

Building stone protection for clay dyke..	$ 1,500
Macadamizing road, Hungry bay dyke..	11,000
Extending protection wall at Hungry bay..	15,000

Mr. J. D. REID. I understand that the Beauharnois canal was leased to some parties for a water-power and that the government have practically nothing more to do with it.

Mr. GRAHAM. These three votes are practically in connection with the protection of land that would otherwise be drowned. This is a dyke that has been there for years. It is to build a stone protection and to macadamize the road. This work was found to be necessary and last year we had to do some temporary work to keep the land from being flooded by water.

Mr. J. D. REID. Are the government keeping on the lockmen and maintaining the canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is leased and we do not pay any of these expenses.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. How much do you get out of it?

Mr. GRAHAM, $12,000 a year.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. How much do you get out of the Cataract Power company?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will give the exact figures to-morrow. I do not like to give them from memory.

Mr. REID. I see in the Auditor General's Report at page W—83 a payment of $7,032.31 for staff last year.

Mr. GRAHAM. That was before the lease was executed. We do not pay anything now.

Mr. J. D. REID. Will the minister tell me whether all of the lockmasters have been dismissed?

Mr. GRAHAM. The lessee has taken them all over; we do not pay for them.

Mr. PAPINEAU. Since the canal was leased the lessees are paying all of the men except the overseer. This dyke which is at the head of the Beauharnois canal was built in 1852. After the canal was completed the engineers discovered that they had made a mistake in calculating the level and that instead of getting 9 feet of water they had only five or six feet. They proposed the construction of the dyke between Grand Island and the shore of the St. Lawrence at the entrance to the Beauharnois canal. This is the dyke that the minister is now asking authority to repair in order to keep the water at its proper level.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then this dyke is being built for the benefit of those who have leased the canal?

Mr. PAPINEAU. It was bought in 1852, and it has been repaired ever since to keep the water at the proper level.

Mr. J. D. REID. Exactly, but the canal was leased in the condition it was at that time. The government leased it to a company to be used for water-power only. Now they find that they have only five or six feet of water and they want to have this dyke repaired. They ask you to spend this money in order that you may give them nine or ten feet of water.

Mr. GRAHAM. This has nothing more to do with lessees of the Beauharnois canal than it has to do with Timbuctoo. The same lake supplies our Soulanges canal and we must have the same level of water for it. This matter was threshed out in the House last year. There were a great many petitions received asking that the property of private individuals should be protected. If we do not repair this dyke we may spend twice as much to compensate people for land which may be drowned or flooded.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why do not the lessees do that?

Mr. GRAHAM. This was built fifty years ago.

Mr. LANCASTER. They have leased the property and why should they not keep it in repair? It is they who get the benefit.

Mr. GRAHAM. This dyke was built under a judgment of the court. We examined this question very closely and there is no question about the necessity of the work unless we are prepared to accept the responsibility for drowning out very many acres of land.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is right that some one should repair it, but why should the government lease this property to a lessee and then repair it at its own expense? Why should not the lessee keep it in order?

Mr. GRAHAM. This has nothing to do with the Beauharnois canal lease at all.

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. gentleman that sits behind the Minister of Justice said that it was to increase the level.

Mr. PAPINEAU. The hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Reid) misunderstood me. This dyke was built when the canal was opened but it was not until they had raised the level of the river that these lands were flooded. The government was sued by the Hon. Edward Ellis and condemned to pay £16,000. They built that dyke to prevent the flooding of the farms in a part of Beauharnois and Huntingdon.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is it part of the Beauharnois canal system?

Mr. PAPINEAU. It begins two miles above the end of the Beauharnois canal.

Mr. J. D. REID. It is outside of the canal system?

Mr. PAPINEAU. Yes.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is not the way we understood it.

Mr. J. D. REID. Last year you spent $13,019.76 on the Beauharnois canal; was this expenditure prior to the execution of the lease?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then there will be no more repairs?

Mr. GRAHAM. We do not pay any repairs or any staff except the overseers who look after the locks and the repair of the lock.

Mr. J. D. REID. This item will not appear again?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Some resolutions reported.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Fisher, House adjourned at 12.05 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 3, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

PAYMENTS TO INSIDE CIVIL SERVICE, OTTAWA.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

What was the total payment in 1896 to the permanent Civil Service employees of the inside service at Ottawa, and of those employees not in the then Inside Civil Service, who were paid out of lump votes and Civil Government Contingencies, respectively, in the branches and departments added to the Inside Civil Service by the Act of 1908, and what is the sum estimated for the similar divisions for the year 1909-10?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). We are collecting the information, it is not yet ready. I would ask that the motion stand.

LEVEL CROSSINGS ON GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

1. Referring to press reports accrediting Mr. Hayes of the Grand Trunk Railway as saying that there are 50,000 level crossings on the Grand Trunk Railway system in Canada, and to the return brought down to the House on the 16th instant gave 14,999 as the total number of level crossings in Canada on the 30th June last, (a) are the figures of the return correct, (b) what is the number of level crossings on the Grand Trunk Railway system in Canada, (c) how many of these are said to be protected, (d) in what ways are they protected, and how many of each class?

2. Of how many of these crossings (a) protected, (b) unprotected, have the government or Railway Board plans, drawings or photographs?

3. Of Grand Trunk unprotected crossings, (a) how many according to the company's statements to the board, require protection, (b) how many have the board claimed to require protection or (c) has the question been taken up at all between the board and the company?

4. About what amount is said to be the cost of installing a set or pair of gates at a railway crossing, say in Ontario or Quebec, (a) in a city, town or village, (b) on a country highway or elsewhere, and (c) what is the ordinary average annual cost of up-keep, exclusive of attendance?

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

1. I am not prepared to say how many crossings the Grand Trunk Railway Company have in Canada, but I understood Mr. Hays to make the statement that there are about 3,000. It seems to me that it would be comparatively correct The Board of Railway Commissioners have not the plans of the Grand Trunk Railway system. These plans were filed many years ago, probably with the government, and long before the board was in existence. The only plans that the board has are locations made by railways since 1904. Plans previous to that date are with the Department of Railways and Canals.

2. Submitted herewith is a list of the plans of the larger cities and the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway Companies are supplying the smaller ones at the present time showing what crossings are protected and unprotected in the cities.

3. No statement has been furnished by the Grand Trunk Railway Company to the board as to what crossings they think require protection, and while a large number of orders have been made ordering protection, it does not appear that the question of general protection has ever been taken up by the board with the company.

4. The average cost of installing a gate is about $600. That would be approximately $700 in a city where the street is wider and a tower is used and $500 on a crossing in the country. With a watchman, fuel for his equipment, oil for his lights, shovels, etc., the average up-keep for a gate operated in day time only would be $600 per year. If operated day and night $1,200. This would cover all contingencies for ordinary repairs to the gate.

List of City Plans, Eastern Lines.

Belleville, city plans, shows crossings.
Guelph, city plan, shows crossings.
Hamilton, city plan, shows crossings.
Ingersoll, city plan, shows crossings.
London, city plan, Canadian Pacific Railway plan, shows crossings.
Montreal, city plan, shows Canadian Pacific crossings; Canadian Pacific plan shows Côte St. Paul; Grand Trunk plan of terminals, crossings; Canadian Northern Quebec Railway location city.
Ottawa, city plan.
Quebec, Canadian Pacific Railway plan.
Toronto, city plan, showing Canadian Pacific crossings.
Toronto, city plan showing Grand Trunk crossings.
Woodstock, Grand Trunk partial plan.
Niagara Falls, Grand Trunk street crossings.
St. Catharines, Grand Trunk street crossings.
Brantford, Toronto, Hamilton and Brantford location, city.
Edmonton, city plan.
Medicine Hat, city plan.
Regina, Canadian Pacific Railway yards.
Vancouver, city plan.
Winnipeg, Canadian Northern Railway yards.
Winnipeg, Canadian Pacific Railway yards.

Fort William, Canadian Pacific Railway yards.

Port Arthur, Canadian Pacific Railway yards.

EXPENDITURE ON NEWMARKET CANAL.

Mr. WALLACE asked:

1. How much money was spent on the Newmarket river canal on the Holland river, before March, 31, 1908?
2. How much money was spent in April, May, June, July, August, September, October, November and December, 1908?
3. What contracts were let since the 31st March, 1908?
4. Were tenders asked for?
5. Who were the contractors?

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

1. $31,444.26
2. April.. .. ..$ 440 06
   May.. .. .. 10,330 00
   June.. .. .. 12,168 72
   July.. .. .. 10,073 26
   August.. .. .. 10,962 50
   September.. .. .. 26,986 50
   October.. .. .. 43,218 48
   November.. .. .. 22,145 73
   December.. .. .. 20,548 40
3. Contract section 2, with John Riley 12th February 1908, and assigned to the York Construction Company, Limited, on the 3rd April, 1908, $652,009.50.

Contract with the Lakefield Cement Company on the 7th July, 1908, for 5,000 barrels cement at $2, $10,000, less $2,000 for empty sacks returned value of contract, $8,000.

Contract with the Hamilton Bridge Company on the 10th October, 1908, for three bridges as follows:

Greenlane..	$ 6,482 00
Yonge street..	5,655 00
2nd Con. Road..	5,655 00
Total..	$17,792 00

Contract Lakefield Portland Cement Company, February, 1909, for 15,000 barrels cement at $1.60 per barrel less bags, amount of contract, $18,000.

4. Tenders for all work now under contract were asked for.
5. The York Construction Company for section 2. The Lakefield Cement Company for cement. The Hamilton Bridge Company for bridges. Section 1, is not under contract.

POSTMASTER AT SOURIS, MAN.

Mr. SCHAFFNER asked:

1. Has J. Dolmage been dismissed as post master at Souris, Manitoba? If so, when?
2. Were there any complaints made against Mr. Dolmage as postmaster? If so, what was the nature of the complaints?
3. Was any investigation made into the manner in which Mr. Dolmage conducted the office? If so, when and by whom?

Mr. GRAHAM.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. Yes. Instructions were given to inspector on the 15th January, 1909. The office was transferred to the new postmaster on the 28th January, 1909.
2. The removal of the postmaster at Souris was directed upon the ground of political partisanship.
3. No formal investigation was considered necessary.

WALLACE BRIDGE WHARF.

Mr. RHODES asked:

1. Was the wharf which was constructed at Wallace Bridge, N.S., during the year 1908, built by contract or by day labour?
2. If by contract, (a) what was the amount, (b) to whom was it given, (c) was it let by tender? If so, was it let to the lowest tenderer?
3. Who were the tenderers, and what was the amount of the various tenders, respectively?
4. If constructed by day labour, (a) what are the names of the several persons employed, (b) what rate per day did each man receive, and (c) what total amount?
5. If any horses or teams were employed, from whom were they engaged, at what rate per day, and what is the full amount paid to each person in this connection?
6. From whom was the site for the wharf purchased, when was it purchased, and what was the price paid?
7. If the wharf was built by day labour, (a) what prices were paid for the materials used in its construction, (b) what quantity of each kind of material was used, (c) from whom were the various materials purchased, and (d) were they purchased by tender?
8. If by tender who were the tenderers and what is the amount of each tender?
9. What is the height, length and breadth of the wharf?
10. At what date did actual work begin at the site of the wharf, and when did it cease?
11. What is the total cost to date, and is the wharf now completed?

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

1, 2 and 3. Day's labour.

	(a)	(b) Per day.	(c)
4.	Arthur W. Scott	$2 50	$107 50
	Mark Harpell	1 50	61 50
	George Scott	1 50	39 00
	Simpson Langville	1 50	37 12
	Manson Meade..	1 50	20 63
	James Patreguin	1 50	57 00
	Alexander Slack	1 50	33 75
	James Sullivan..	1 50	45 38
	Roy Sullivan..	1 50	33 00
	James Langville	1 50	27 75
	Isaac McBurnie..	1 50	27 75
	Edgar Sullivan	1 50	41 25
	Avard Woodland	1 50	11 25
	Fred. Battye..	1 50	8 25
			$551 13

5. George Scott	2 25	3 37
Manson Meade	2 25	18 00
		$ 21 37

6. Site is being purchased for $50 from Mr. J. L. McKim.

7 and 8. (a and b).

3,471 feet logs, 9 inches at top, at 9 cents per foot	$312 39
24 feet logs, 9 inches diameter, at 8 cents per foot	1 92
450 feet logs, ballast poles at 2 cents	9 00
20 ballast poles at 60 cents each	12 00
634 feet logs, 6 inches at top, at 6 cents per foot	38 04
94 lineal feet square timber, 10 by 12, at 16 cents	15 04
200 tons of stone at 50 cents per ton	100 00
737½ tons of stone, undelivered, 20 cents per ton	147 50
16 loads of stone at $1 per load	16 00
Smithwork	15 35
Hire of scow	10 00
Hardware	65 80

Wallace Bridge, Nova Scotia.

7.

(c) Arthur W. Scott	$ 47 10
J. B. Woodland	282 88
Manson Meade	29 50
Norman F. McFadden	20 00
M. P. Slack	28 00
H. A. Betts	15 35
Edgar Henderson	25 00
Fred. Battye	41 92
James Annis	31 02
McDonald Brothers	51 57
J. L. Kun & Company	160 70
George Thompson	10 00
	$743 04

(d) Materials were procured by foreman in usual manner, at market prices.

9. The wharf consists of a rock bank 32 feet long, 24 feet wide and 11 feet high, and of solid cribwork, 85 feet long, 15 feet high at the outer end and 20 feet wide on top, with the exception of 30 feet of its length which is 40 feet wide.

10. Commenced 7th October, 1908; ceased 30th November, 1908.

11. (a) $1,315.54; (b) Portion constructed is complete and small vessels can use it.

DREDGING AT ST. JOHN, N.B..

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What dredging work is now being done in the harbour of St. John, New Brunswick, by whom, at what points, and what dredges are employed?

2. Is this work being done under contract after public competition? If so, what tenders were received, and when, what is the date of contracts, the quantity to be removed, and the rates paid therefor?

3. What dredges are being employed, of what dipper and depth of capacity?

4. Were adequate surveys and borings made of the portions now being dredged? If so, when and by whom?

5. If the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company is doing any part of the work, who are the principal men connected therewith?

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

1. At the Ballast wharf, by Mr. J. S. Gregory, with orange peel dredge 'Asp'. At the Beacon Bar, by the Maritime Dredging & Construction Co., with the dipper dredge 'Iroquois'.

2. (a) Yes.

(b) Ballast Wharf—
- J. S. Gregory, received December 17, 1908.
- Maritime Dredging & Construction Co., received December 18, 1908.

Beacon Bar—
- Maritime Dredging & Construction Co., received October 5, 1908.
- Dominion Dredging Co., received October 5, 1908.
- G. S. Mayes, received October 5, 1908.

(c) Ballast Wharf—Date of contract, February 8, 1909.

Beacon Bar, contract not yet signed, order in council passed February 16, 1909.

(d) Ballast Wharf—Estimated quantities, 32,272 cubic yards, scow measurement.

Beacon Bar, estimated quantities, 2,193,000 cubic yards, scow measurement.

(e) Ballast Wharf—Towed to dumping grounds, rock, $5.00; other materials, 30c.

Beacon Bar—Scow measurement, rock or boulders exceeding two cubic yards, $4.90; other materials, 39½c. Cast over—Rock or boulders exceeding two cubic yards, $3.00; other materials, 30c.

3. Orange peel dredge 'Asp', 1½ yard dipper, reach unlimited, capacity 100 cubic yards per hour. Dipper dredge 'Iroquois', 3 yard dipper, reach 27 feet, capacity 250 cubic yards per hour.

4. At Beacon Bar—In 1898, surveys by Engineer E. T. P. Shewen; borings made under direction of Mr. C. P. Brown, division engineer of the C. P. R., in December, 1906, and adopted by Engineer Shewen; further surveys made by Engineer J. K. Scammell in September, 1908.

4. At Ballast Wharf—Surveys made under direction of Engineer J. K. Scammell, in August, 1908.

5. The only information in possession of the department is that the tender is signed as follows: 'The Maritime Dredging & Construction Company, per John E. Moore, manager.'

PURCHASE OF OSHAWA HARBOUR.

Mr. HUGHES—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

1. When did the government purchase Oshawa harbour?

2. From whom was the harbour purchased?
3. What was the price paid?
4. Who conducted the negotiations on behalf of the harbour?
5. To whom was the cheque made payable?
6. If the money was paid to a company, who constituted the company?

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

1. April 8, 1901.
2. Oshawa Harbour Company, Limited.
3. $7,500.
4. Representations were made to the government for the purchase and improvement by Messrs. L. Burnett, M.P., Wm. Ross, M.P., the mayors of Oshawa, the town clerk of Oshawa, the municipal clerk and the reeve of East Whitby.
5. Oshawa Harbour Company, Limited.
6. No information in the department.

DEPARTMENT OF MARINE—BOOK-KEEPING.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

What is the expense occasioned by change of methods in the Department of Marine and Fisheries as the result of Mr. Falconer's work?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The initial expense of buying books to instal the Falconer system in the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the various agencies was $2,916. A part of this expense would have had to be incurred for ordinary renewals or for books required by the extension of the agencies. The annual expense since that time has not shown any increase.

IMMIGRANTS COMING INDIRECTLY

Mr. LENNOX asked:

How many immigrants, British subjects, who have come to Canada otherwise than by continuous journey from the country of which they are natives or citizens and upon through tickets purchased in that country, have landed in Canada and settled here since 27th of May, 1908?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). 1,556.

GOVERNMENT TELEGRAPH STATION SUPPLIES.

Mr. BURRELL asked:

1. Who are the contractors for the carrying of the supplies of the government telegraph stations, north of Quesnel?
2. What are the terms of such contract, and on what date was it let?
3. Were tenders for this work advertised for in the usual way?
4. Did the contractors purchase from the government a pack train for this work? If so, what was the precise nature of such pack train and equipment, and what was the price paid?

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

1, 2, 3 and 4. In the course of and up to the time of completion of the construction of the Yukon telegraph the freighting of the material and supplies was effected by means of pack trains employed by the department. After the completion of the line in 1901, however, there was no need for the all-year-round maintenance of the pack train; the only requirement then being the once-a-year distribution of provisions, &c., to the several stations along the line, which distribution, it was thought, might very well be dealt with incidentally by the general freighters. Accordingly, in June, 1902, the department's intention was publicly announced at Hazelton through the agent there, and, of three offers received, the one from Messrs. C. Barrett & Co. (viz.: $75 per head purchase price for the pack animals and a flat rate charge of 17½ cents per pound for deliveries between Quesnel, Hazelton and the Ninth Cabin, the next station south of Echo lake) being the best and considered advantageous, was accepted and a contract entered into, and has since been annually renewed.

At the same time (June, 1902), a contract was entered into with Mr. J. F. Galbreath (the only freighter operating in that district) for the section of 287 miles between Echo lake and Nakina, the prices charged ranging from 3 to 25 cents per pound according to distance. This contract, being considered fair and just by both parties to it, has likewise since been annually renewed.

The distribution of supplies along the line beyond Nakina to Dawson is done by the water and rail facilities at the regular rates of transportation without contract.

ORIENTALS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. RALPH SMITH—by Mr. Gutherie—asked:

1. How many Orientals were there in British Columbia on January 1, 1909?
2. How many of these were Chinese, Hindus and Japanese, respectively?
3. How many Orientals have been naturalized as British subjects up to the above date?
4. How many Orientals came into Canada during the month of January, 1909?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Number estimated, approximately, 38,258.
2. Chinese, 17,297; Hindus, 5,131; Japanese, 15,848.
3. Up to June 30, 1908, 7,442 had been naturalized. No later returns.
4. 55.

WEEKLY CIRCULAR TO LIBERAL PRESS.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR asked:

1. With the respect to the weekly letter to the Liberal press, declared to have been passed through the mails during the recess of parliament free of postage under the frank of

'J. B., Solicitor General,' during what periods has this circular letter been so franked?

2. Is the letter printed by the order or at the expense of any department of the government, or at the Government Printing Bureau? If so, what department?

3. Is the matter of the letter prepared by the order or at the expense of any department of the government? If so, what department?

4. If not prepared or printed by official authority, by whom are the letters presented to be franked?

5. What has been the average number franked each week, as nearly as can be stated in case no record has been kept?

6. Is the franking privilege of the Department of Justice being applied to any other matter of this nature?

Hon. JACQUES BUREAU (Solicitor General):

1. From April 28, 1907, to November 27, 1907, and from July 21, 1908, to January 19, 1909.

2. No.

3. No.

4. The mailable matter in question was never presented by anybody to be franked. It was delivered by the printer to Mr. Bureau, and by him distributed upon his own responsibility.

5. On the average from seventy-five to one hundred.

6. No.

EXPENSES RE LOANS.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE — by Mr. W. H. Sharpe—asked:

1. What expenses under the following heads (*a*) bank commission, (*b*) underwriting charges, (*c*) brokerage, and (*d*) advertising, were incurred by the government on each of the following loans, and to whom were the several amounts paid, viz.:—

	£ s. d
1874 loan extended to 1911, 4 per cent	1,753,830 4 10
1875-8 public works guaranteed loan, 4 per cent	3,200,000 0 0
Loan of 1884, 3½ per cent	5,000,000 0,0
Canada reduced 1885, 4 per cent	6,443,136 2 9
Loan of 1885, 4 per cent	4,000,000 0 0
C.P.R. land grant loan 1888, 3½ per cent	3,093,700 0 0
4 per cent loan of 1908-12, 4 per cent	1,379,600 0 0
3½ per cent loan 1908, (February issue) 3½ per cent	3,000,000 0 0
3¾ per cent loan 1908, 3¾ per cent	5,000,000 0 0
3½ per cent loan 1908, (October issue) 3½ per cent	5,000,000 0 0
3¾ per cent loan 1909, 3¾ per cent	6,000,000 0 0
Payable in Canada—	
Reduced loan of 1883, extended 3½ per cent	$1,425,800 00
Dominion stock issue—	
A reduced in 1897, 3½ per cent	58,899 67
B reduced in 1897, 3½ per cent	325,900 00
C reduced in 1897, 3½ per cent	49,066 34
E extended for 10 years, from July 1, 1906, 3⅔ per cent	2,500,000
Dominion stock issue 1891, 3½ per cent	404,202 00

3. $5,000,000 for one month; Bank of Montreal, Ottawa, March 2, 1909, 4 per cent.

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

As the answer to this question will be voluminous I would ask to have it stand as a notice of motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion for a return.

MILITARY BUILDINGS AT KINGSTON.

Mr. EDWARDS moved:

For the production of the original tenders received in response to advertisement calling for tenders for the erection of the building at Kingston, R.M.C., intended for barracks accommodation for stables, and also for a return showing the advertisement and the papers in which inserted.

Mr. EDWARDS also moved:

For the production of the original tenders received in response to advertisement calling for tenders for the erection of the Veterinary Hospital at Kingston, and also for a return showing the advertisement and the papers in which inserted.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). There is no objection to these motions provided they be amended according to the arrangement of last session: That these tenders be simply laid on the table and then returned to the department so that they may not become permanently a part of the records of the House.

Motions amended agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing in respect of the government steamship 'Stanley' the following information for the years 1894 to 1908, inclusive:—The total yearly wages of officers, engineers, seamen and other hands aboard; the total wages paid for handling freight at Pictou and at other ports; the total wages paid for loading coal at Pictou and at other ports; the total quantity and cost of coal; the total quantity of meats and poultry used, and cost of same; the total quantity of fresh milk used, and cost of same; the total quantity of evaporated or condensed milk used and the cost of same; the total of other provisions used and cost; the total number of trips, winter service; the total number of passengers carried and fares collected; the total number of meals served and cash collected for same; the total freight carried and charges collected for same; the total amount paid for repairs to hull; the total amount paid for repairs to machinery, furniture, &c.; the total amount of men, work, machinery, furniture, &c.; the total expense of steamer for each year; the total salary of agent at Pictou and at Charlottetown, respectively; the total number aboard of officers, engineers, seamen and other hands, respectively. The same information in respect to ss. 'Minto.' —Mr. Maddin.

For a return showing how many post offices have been transferred in the province of Manitoba since November 1, 1908; who the

former postmasters were and who the present postmasters are, with the names of offices; and the reasons assigned for the transfers.—Mr. Roche.

For a copy of all tenders received for the construction of the following sections of the eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway, together with the itemized schedules of the engineer's estimates of quantities on which the award of contracts was based, the sections referred to being those mentioned in the answer of the Minister of Railways and Canals in the House on the 13th April, 1908, as follows:—

STATEMENT No. 1.—COMMISSIONERS—EASTERN DIVISION.

Mileage from Moncton.		Description.	No. of One Miles.	Amount of Estimate on which Contracts were let.	Date of	
From	To				Contract.	Completion.
				$ cts.		
0·00	50.00	Moncton to near Chipman	50·00	989,895 90	Mar.14,'07	Sept. 1, '08
50·00	58·55	Near Chipman easterly 8·55 miles	8·55	289,190 62	Aug.23,'07	Aug. 1, '08
58·55	97·60	Near Chipman westerly to I.C.R. crossing	39·05	767,434 95	Mar.28,'08	Sept. 1, '10
97·60	164·00	I.C.R. crossing to Mile 164	66·40	1,898,124 21	" 28,'08	" 1,'10
164·00	195·80	Mile 164 to Grand Fall	31·80	1,646,253 65	" 28,'08	" 1,'10
195 80	256·68	Grand Fall to New Brunswick boundary	60·88	1,385,941 09	" 9,'07	" 1,'10
256·68	309·74	N.B. boundary to 150 miles east of Quebec Bridge	5 143·06	2,377,409 00	" 28, 08	" 1, '10
309·74	459·74	From Quebec Bridge 150 miles eastward Quebec Bridge link (not included in estimate)	8·89 1·11	5,011,346 50	" 9, '07	" 1, '09
459·74	509·74	Quebec Bridge westerly 50 miles	50·00	1,489,537 92	May 15,'06	" 1, '07
509·74	609·74	50 miles west Quebec Bridge to 150 miles west	100·00	3,807,719 54	" 15, '06	" 1, '07
609·74	654·74	150 miles west Quebec Bridge to near Waymontachene	45·00	1,691,073 41	Mar.13,'07	" 1, '08
654·74	656·07	To be included in this contract	1·33			
656·07	877·75	Near Waymontachene to near Harricanaw River	221·68	Not let.		
877·75	1,027·75	Near Harricanaw River to Junction T. & N. O. Ry	150·00	3 386,901 42	" 14,'07	" 1,'09
1,027·75	1,127·75	Junction T. & N.O.Ry. for 100 miles west	100·00	3,936,566 00	" 28,'08	" 1,'10
1,027·75	1,171·85	100 miles west of Junction T. & N. O. Ry. to west end of District 'D'	44·10	Not let.		
1,171·85	1,334·35	West end of District 'D' westerly	162·50	"		
1,334·35	1,409·35	From 19½ miles west of Mud River, easterly	75·00	2,101,499 88	" 28,'08	" 1,'10
1,409·35	1,429·76	From 19½ miles west of Mud River to west end of District 'E'	20·41	Not let.		
1,429·76	1,557·80	From westward District 'E' to Lake Superior Junction	128·04	"		
1,557·80	1,804·66	From Lake Superior Junction to west bank of Red River	246·86	13,010,398 92	May 15,'06	" 1,'07

—Mr. Lennox.

For a return showing the various quantities of work of each description or class actually executed by the several contractors and certified as correct by the engineers and paid for up to 31st December, 1908, upon the several sections of the eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway, where the sections have not been completed the various chief engineers' estimate of the quantities of the various class of work remaining to be executed, together with an estimate of the cost of completing the same, based on the contractors' prices attached to each tender.—Mr. Lennox.

For a return showing, with respect to leases granted since 30th June, 1896, for timber on Dominion lands in British Columbia, the names and addresses of lessees, the date, term and acreage of each lease, and the bonus received for the same.—Mr. Taylor (New Westminster.)

For a return showing, with respect to prosecutions since 1896 for violation of postal law, the nature of each offence alleged, the place of residence of person charged, and the result of each trial and penalty imposed.—Mr. Taylor (New Westminster.)

For a return showing the amount on deposit in the Government Savings Department on October, 1, 1889, October 1, 1896, and October 1, 1897 and 1898; how many officials were employed in connection with the management of this fund in the years 1888, 1890, 1898, 1900 and 1908; the cost of management of this fund in the years 1888, 1890, 1898, 1900 and 1908.—Mr. Sharpe (Ontario.)

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS ASKED FOR EASTERN QUEBEC.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska). (Translation.) Moved:

That in the opinion of this House it would be in the interests of agriculture that new experimental stations should be located at certain places removed from those now in existence, where the conditions of climate and soil are different. That especially an experimental station should be established and put in operation in the eastern part of the province of Quebec.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the resoluton I have the honour to submit to the consideration of this House calls for the discussion of a question that is of vital interest to the most numerous and important class of this country.

Agriculture is the main source of wealth of Canada. I need no statistics to establish that Canada is above all an agricultural country and that the farming population exceeds considerably the combined population of those engaged in industrial, commercial and professional pursuits. The annual value of our farm products largely exceeds the collective value of the products of all our other industries.

Things being so, agriculture must take the first place in the minds of the economist and the politician of this country.

The future of Canada rests largely upon the place that we shall occupy as far as agriculture is concerned.

In other countries, the farming industry is far from being inactive. Several countries are actually competing on the markets of the world; they are perfecting their methods; they are developing and enlarging their cultivated areas; they are growing products of a better quality and they are making every effort to remove all competitors.

Canada cannot afford to look passively at that struggle. But if we want to see our country take active part in the struggle, if we want our farmers to compete successfully with those of rival countries, they must be aided in their efforts by all the advantages that are to be derived from scientific knowledge, observation and new methods, without which no real progress can be obtained.

If the majority of our farmers whose daily toils give to the soil its productive value were to be shut out of the achievements of modern science, Canadian agriculture would be doomed.

The population as a whole must be in such a position as to take advantage of scientific discoveries, and to attain that end in a practical way, the special conditions of each section of the country and the distinct fitness of the people inhabiting these sections must be taken into consideration.

By the establishment of experimental stations in different parts of Canada, the federal government has taken a step in the right direction.

These experimental stations are designed to bring under the observation of our farmers the results obtained by the most perfected methods of farming in each region, to show them how the yield in wheat, vegetables, &c., can be increased by a judicious choice of manures, of seed grains, by the use of a new agricultural implement.

When a farmer living in a district where the yield in wheat is scarcely five bushels to the acre, can see a nearby field yielding 15 or 20 bushels to the acre, if he can be convinced that extra charges for seed and manure, in obtaining that result, are considerably less than the value of the increased yield, he cannot but return from his visit to the experimental station with the conviction that it is possible for him to do better than what he has been doing in the past.

It has been said that agriculture is a school for common sense, observation and practical notions. If it is so, no better means can be devised to supplement our agricultural wealth, than to materialize the scientific formulas and give the actual proof of possible achievements by the comparison of two fields, one yielding fifteen bushels of wheat, and the other, in the neighbourhood, yielding one-half or two-thirds more, and that without the aid of any theory.

Every country the world over has realized the vital importance of establishing experimental stations in different parts of the farming districts, and of increasing the number of these stations from year to year.

The United States are unquestionably in the lead. Under the terms of the Act of Congress of the 2nd day of March, 1887, the American government pays annually $15,000 for an experimental farm in each state and territory in the union. Special Acts also provide for the establishment of such farms in Alaska, Hawaii and Porto Rico.

In 1904, they had in the United States, 60 experimental stations, of which 55 were receiving $15,000 annually from the federal treasury. There are also, in the United States, several branch stations.

The total amount these farms could dispose of in 1904 was $1,508,820.25; of that amount the federal treasury contributed $719,999.67. The balance of $788,820.58 consisted in allocations from the different states, in the sale of farm products, in fees for analysing samples, and in different other sources. In the year 1904, 795 people were employed for the administration of these farms and the carrying on of the experiments.

Besides the scientific reasearches of general interest, or special to the district in which they are carried on, these institutions are specially interested in the distribution of seeds imported from Europe, in

the study of diseases in vegetables, of objectionable insects, and of the best means to prevent damages of all kind to plants, &c.

They have also a large number of experimental stations in Germany—80. The allocations to German stations are far behind the allocations received by the American stations; those allocations are drawn from the same sources, the greater part being paid by the national government.

In France there are 71 experimental stations with a budget still less than the one alloted to the German stations.

If the total allocations given to experimental stations in these three countries are divided by the number of stations in each country, we have, in round figures, the following result:

United States	$23,000
Germany	8,000
France	3,000

The same policy prevails in all agricultural countries. Here is a statement that I have compiled concerning several agricultural countries:

Country.	Area Sq. m.	Number of Farms.
Germany	208,830	80
France	203,687	71
Austria-Hungary	261,030	61
United States	2,970,000	60
Sweden	172,876	26
Italy	110,659	22
Belgium	11,373	15
Japan	174,000	15
Norway	124,100	12

The purpose of those stations is the same everywhere:

1. The cultivation of agricultural plants, not only those already grown in the district, but also those that could be grown, having regard to the nature of the soil and the climatic conditions:

2. Experiments to bring into cultivation plants fit for fodder, selected from the local vegetation or imported from countries where climate conditions are smilar;

3. Experiments to test the effect of manures in different soils;

4. Experiments in irrigation of plants;

5. Experiments and investigations in stock raising, in view of obtaining the best results for local agriculture;

6. Geological and biological studies of the region as regard the climate, the soil, &c., in order to fulfil the purpose of the station.

Mr. Speaker, the data I have just quoted shows that a great deal is yet to be done in Canada if we want to be in a position to compete successfully with other countries in the field of agricultural progress.

With a territory of 3,600,000 square miles, yet the number of our experimental stations is limited to seven (7).

The province of Quebec, with a land territory of 341,750 square miles, an area larger than that of Germany, of France and all the other countries I have mentioned, with the exception of the United States, has not one single experimental station for all that territory, notwitstanding that no country has a greater variety of climate and soil.

I am quite ready to admit that our experimental farms are of great service to the country but they are not in sufficient number to effectively represent the varied conditions in all the important parts of Canada.

In his report on Experimental Farms for 1896, Mr. Wm. Saunders, the superintendent, says, page 5:

When in October, 1886, the first step was taken towards the organization of experimental farms in Canada by the appointment of the director, the first undertaken was a careful study of the climatic and other conditions which influence agriculture in different parts of the country; and to find out where the several farms which it was proposed to establish could be placed so as to confer the greatest benefit on the farmers, the intention was that the sites chosen for these institutions should be located as to cover the more important climatic conditions prevailing in this country, and at the same time minister to the needs of the existing agricultural population.

In his report for 1895, Mr. Saunders says, page 6:

As the experimental farms are too few and too widely separated to fully represent all the different climates and other conditions affecting agriculture throughout the Dominion, the endeavour has been made to enlist the cooperation of farmers everywhere in the useful work of testing varieties by distributing among them, for this purpose, samples of such products as have proved most valuable at the experimental farms.

So, the officers of the Department of Agriculture expressly admit that the experimentall farms already established cannot be of great service to the agricultural class in certain distant parts of the country where the climate is quite different.

In a pamphlet published by the Department of Agriculture, in 1905, for the Liege Exhibition, and entitled 'Le Canada, son histoire, ses productions et ses ressources naturelles,' and prepared under the direction of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, I see:

Canada is blessed with a marvellous variety of climate. Its most southern part is as near to the equator as Rome, while its most northern part is quite near the Arctic Circle. Between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts lie about 3,000 miles of land and inland waters. Therefore, it is quite evident that Canada rests under as large a zone of atmospheric conditions as the whole of Europe.

At page 85 of the same pamphlet published under the direction of the hon. minister,

we can see the following statement relating to the province of Quebec:

The climate differs considerably between the different parts of the province.

I can ask for no better authority to establish that the Ottawa Experimental Farm. which is supposed to provide to the agricultural needs of the two great provinces, Ontario and Quebec, does not represent the climatic conditions of a large portion of the latter province.

When the Experimental Farm was established in Ottawa for the special advantage of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, four other farms were established in order to promote agricultural interests in the other provinces.

One of them at Nappan, Nova Scotia, near the boundary line between that province and New Brunswick, was intended to minister to the wants of the farming community in the three maritime provinces. Another farm was established at Brandon, Manitoba; a third one at Indian Head, Saskatchewan; and the fourth at Agassiz, in British Columbia.

I may be allowed to point out that the two farms at Brandon and Indian Head are only 182 miles apart by rail, and that the reasons given to justify the establishment of two farms so near to each other were the differences in climate and soil.

On page 10 of his report for the year 1888 Mr. Saunders makes the following statement about these two farms:

Some differences of climate, soil and situation are abundantly sufficient to warrant the establishment of the two farms, and with experimental operations in agriculture, horticulture and forestry carried on at each, a vast amount of useful and practical information will soon be gained which will be of great value to farmers in every part of that country and meet in large measure the varying conditions to which they are individually subjected.

Is it not surprising, Mr. Speaker, that the same considerations did not lead to the establishment of an experimental farm in the eastern part of the province of Quebec where the weather conditions are so utterly different from those prevailing in Ottawa, especially if it is considered that the farmers of that district must cover from three hundred to six hundred miles to reach the central farm.

In 1906 two new farms were established by this government—both in the province of Alberta. These two stations are 261 miles apart, following the railway line.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture, answering a question which I had put to him, stated on February 10 last that a new farm was being established at Rosthern in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now, I sincerely commend the establishment of these new farms in a district which is progressing rapidly and where new settlers will have to be assisted and instructed so as to make a successful start, but I think it my duty, Mr. Speaker, as the representative of a farming constituency in the district of Quebec to ask of the government our share of the funds set apart for the promotion and expansion of agriculture.

The farmers of the St. Lawrence valley have been the first tillers of the soil in this country; they have had a share in the progress of every other district, and to-day the government should put them in a position to successfully compete with their fellow countrymen in the other provinces.

Mr. Speaker, the climate of this eastern section of our province is utterly different from the cliamte of Ottawa and the western part of Quebec. All you have to do to satisfy yourself about it is to refer to the reports of the different meteorological stations.

The climate of our district is affected by the elevation of the ground, its topographical situation, the vicinity of large areas of water and of forests, the inequality of the soil and the direction of the prevailing winds.

The winter season lasts much longer in the Quebec district than in the other regions; our farms are still covered with snow when the lands in Ontario and in the Montreal district are in full growth.

The summer season is much cooler in our district than it is in Ottawa. Let me inquire about it from the numerous citizens of the capital, who, in June, leave their own town in order to get the benefit of the change of temperature they can enjoy on the banks of the St. Lawrence.

On account of the length of the winter season, the period of vegetation is much shorter than in Ottawa. The following operations must be promptly attended to, and our farmers can devote but very litle time to the improvement of their lands which a century or two of farming has exhausted and whose productivity is probably not what it ought to be.

Another disadvantage arising from the protracted winter season, is the necessity of keeping our stock in the stables during seven months or seven months and a half, and consequently of growing large quantities of fodder.

During the winter of 1907, a number of farmers in the county of Kamouraska, had to undersell many heads of farm cattle, on account of the dearth of fodder which they could not buy at a reasonable price. Fodder plants suitable to our district and hardy, should be selected and put to a trial, and thus invaluable advantages would be gained.

Formerly, the farmers in the rural counties east of the city of Quebec, harvested enough wheat for the local consummation and for the export trade. Lately, one of

them told me that a bushel of seed often yielded a crop of twenty-five bushels. At present, the ordinary yield does not exceed between five and eight bushels. Result; our farmers cannot compete with the western farmers and they have in a great measure ceased to grow wheat.

The advising of the farmer in the selection of the most profitable and germinative seeds, the practical teaching of a system of rotation, the suggesting of the means of improving land which has been depleted, such is the purpose to be fulfilled by the establishment of an experimental station in the district of Quebec.

How many farmers in the district of Quebec have thus lost large sums of money because they undertook to grow fruit trees that had been sold to them by American agents, or came from the province of Quebec, the varieties supplied by those agents not being hardy enough to withstand our climate. The fruit trees of northern Europe seem best suited to our local conditions, but practical tests only, such as might be carried on at an experimental farm would have sufficient authority to induce our farmers to devote themselves to this important branch of agricultural pursuits.

Mr. Speaker, the district for which I claim an experimental station contains a large number of farmers and covers a wide area.

Such a station would be greatly beneficial to the following counties: Gaspé, Bonaventure, Rimouski, Témiscouata, Kamouraska, L'Islet, Montmagny, Bellechasse, Lévis, Dorchester, Beauce, Lotbinière, Mégantic, Athabaska, Quebec, Portneuf, Champlain, Montmorency, Charlevoix, Chicoutimi and Saguenay.

According to the census of 1901, the counties I have just mentioned, had a population of 534,366 inhabitants. The area occupied was 6,516,428 acres, and the number of settlers upon farms, 66,785.

At that time, the following statistics were collected in the different provinces:

Provinces.	Settlers upon Farms.	Acres Occupied.	Population.
British Columbia..	6,739	1,497,419	178,657
Manitoba.....	32,495	8,843,347	255,211
New Brunswick....	37,583	4,443,400	331,120
Nova Scotia.....	56,033	5,080,901	459,574
Prince Edward Island.....	14,014	1,194,508	103,259
Ontario.....	224,127	21,349,524	2,182,947
Quebec.....	159,599	14,444,175	1,648,898
N. W. Territories..	23,098	6,569,064	158,940
	544,688	63,422,338	

Those statistics show the immense importance of the agricultural lands of the Quebec district so far as area and population are concerned.

The establishment of an experimental station in our district has been asked for for many years past. Recently this question has been often discussed before the public and this important improvement is sought for by the exponents of public opinion.

Last year the board of trade of the city of Quebec unanimously passed a resolution asking the government to render that measure of justice to the farming class. It would be useless to quote that resolution which is no doubt in the hands of the hon. Minister of Agriculture. However, I must say that I do not approve that paragraph of the resolution which states that the proposed experimental station should be established in the vicinity of the city of Quebec.

The sums voted for the establishment and maintenance of experimental stations are purely agricultural appropriations to be expended in the interests of the whole farming community and not for the sake of a particular section of the country.

This question is of such a vital importance that it must not be considered as local and the experimental station of the Quebec district should be established at the most central point where the climate and the soil are fair samples of the conditions generally prevailing in the district.

Mr. Speaker, I leave it to the House to pass judgment upon my resolution. I ask for no favour, but I claim justice for our province and our district. I sincerely hope that this debate will not be merely academic and that we shall soon have the occasion of witnessing its happy results.

Mr. MARTIN BURRELL (Yale-Cariboo). Mr. Speaker, I regret that I have not been able to follow the argument of the hon. gentleman who has preceded me in the French language. I have no doubt that there are very cogent reasons why the system of experimental stations should be extended and if such extension is justified by facts in the province of Quebec, the proposal will have my hearty co-operation and support. It is a matter of congratulation that a resolution of this kind is not controversial. There are some who think that nowadays governments are too paternal, that they interfere too much with the liberties of the subject, and undertake to do things for the subject which he would be better able to do for himself. I think, however, that there are very few people at this time of day who will deny that within the sphere of governmental operations there rightly comes assistance of a scientific character to the great basic industry of agriculture, the immense importance of which to this country need hardly be suggested. One of the greatest problems facing

all governments and all people at the present time is the conservation of great natural resources. I think I am not far astray when I add that an equally great problem is the adoption of methods in connection with agriculture that will assist the agriculturist is making more in the way of production out of a given area than he does at the present time; because, after all, the day is not very far distant when, in spite of our immense areas of land in in this country, speaking at all events in a general way, it will be of vital importance to us that we should be able to sustain a much larger population on a given area than we do at the present time. This is a problem which has to be faced by other countries, it is true, of less extent than ours and with older civilization. We have to follow in the footsteps of countries like Belgium and Denmark which, with much smaller areas support much larger populations by the practice of intensive farming, a practice which has been very largely assisted by the governments of those countries. We have had various instances of the effect on the economic problems of the world of either a greater or a lesser production in the work of agriculture. I need only instance how a couple of years ago the great shortage in the grain product of the west practically meant a panic in the financial world of Canada, and we know with what palpitations of heart and what intense anxiety the other great industries which are associated with this country's development awaited the announcement of the condition of the coming crop. I do not think I need say any more in showing how agriculture, of all industries, deserves the most sympathetic consideration of a government, especially on the scientific side, because it is a practical impossibility for the average agriculturist or horticulturist to carry on experiments of a scientific kind. To do so would absorb all his time and energy, and he has not sufficient scientific training. There is great justification, therefore for the government taking proper steps along those lines, in the fact that the scientific results achieved by trained men mean increase not merely a hundred fold but a thousand fold the products of our country. I would point to the great benefits that have been derived from the establishment of agricultural experimental stations in the United States. It is hardly necessary for me to show to those who are at all familiar with the subject that the establishment of the great experimental stations at Cornell and in a great many other parts of the United States, with the assistance of the federal government, have been productive of improved methods in agriculture and horticulture that mean untold millions to the economic advantage of that country. The establishment of experimental farms, either agricultural or horticultural, to my mind lies more within the sphere of federal than provincial jurisdiction. It is true, in some respects the provinces may well take hold of this what one might call educational work. No one will deny, for instance, the admirable character of the work done in this country in the establishment of the farmers' institutes in Ontario and similar institutions in other provinces. We have a great many small experimental stations throughout the province of Ontario. I know something of this matter, having had an intimate connection with one of these stations some years ago. While the province can do something, there are obvious limitations to its operations in some cases. I am glad to pay a tribute to the excellent work carried on by the central experimental station in Ottawa, and to express my belief that that work, in the various departments —agricultural, horticultural, chemical, etc., —is yielding results of inestimable value to the whole country. I want now to speak more particular of a sister industry—that of horticultural or fruit growing. That industry is intimately connected with agriculture; but though carried on upon a smaller scale in Canada, it is in some respects of more importance to the country. In the first place being a more intensive form of agriculture, it will sustain on a given area an immensely larger population than ordinary agriculture. I think I am fairly safe in saying that on ten acres of orchard thoroughly cared for we can have a production as far as freight goes, equal to that produced by the same effort from 100 acres of grain. I may add that it leads to an immensely larger employment of labour. Those of us who have had any experience with horticultural work, know that acre for acre we employ probably five or six times the amount of labour that is required in ordinary agricultural operations. Therefore in the way of building up a largely increased population in this country horticulture deserves the particular regard of the governmental authorities.

Then I might also add that this not only leads to the establishment of a lot of important subsidiary industries, but it also proves, probably, one of the best advertisements to the outside world of the climate and fertility of the soil of Canada that we could possibly have. Let me point out the enormous good that has been done by governmental experimental stations both here and in other countries, and I refer especially now to Canada, in the way of the immense saving effected by the giving out to the country of the proper method of fighting various pests which knock so large a percentage off the products of horticulture and agriculture. Let me give you one instance of the case of a most destructive pest: That is, the codlin moth which attacks the apple. It will be a surprise to

some hon. gentlemen who do not know to what extent that one insect will shorten the financial proceeds of one branch of horticultural work. I speak from memory, but I think fairly accurately of what took place in the state of Illinois alone, a large apple growing state, where, upon statistics being collected some years ago, it was found that the ravages of this one insect in the state had lost two million dollars to those engaged in the industry of apple growing. If that is a fair sample of what one insect will do, when we extend the illustration to the various fungus diseases we can at once see that there is an enormous economic loss to this country, affecting not only agriculture and horticulture, but every line of industry in the country, because it is a well known fact that to a greater or less degree they depend upon agriculture and horticulture, and the loss runs up to untold millions. Here again, I think, we have a strong argument for governmental help and assistance. I might refer more particularly to my own province because I know there are hon. gentlemen here who are able to speak with reference to the province of Quebec and to point out its special needs. I wish to direct the attention of the House more particularly to the needs of the particular province from which I come, and to try to present to the government and the minister who represents that particular department the reasons why I think the federal government should take a somewhat larger view of the situation with regard to experimental stations. I am not going to deal with the statistics of Canada at large, although I might point out that horticulture now has arrived at the stage where it may be properly described as a national industry. Although in British Columbia we have not an industry which can bear comparison with that of the older provinces such as Quebec, Ontario and Nova Scotia, we are making rapid progress, a fact which will be appreciated by the House when I state that it was actually within my own lifetime that the first fruit tree was planted on British territory west of the Rocky mountains. Because of the difficult character of the country, due to geographical and other reasons, development and settlement went on slowly, and we have had to solve the great problems of clearing land and overcome other obstacles. This development went on slowly, until in the year 1900 we had an acreage in fruit of 7,000 acres. It was about the year 1900 or 1901 that we began to understand the immense possibilities in commercial horticulture that really lie within the limits of our great province owing to its climate and soil. These possibilities have been grasped by a large number of people and the development has been so marked within the last eight years that we have now over 75,000 acres in orchard. We apprehend that we have about one million acres adaptable for the production of high-class fruit of all kinds in what we call southern British Columbia, and, speaking very broadly, a large portion of this area, certainly several thousand acres, is situated in what we call the semi-arid belt. It includes the districts of the Okanagan valley, the Thompson river, the Kettle river, Nicola valley and other portions of the country where the mighty Fraser river receives the waters of the Thompson at Lytton. At the present time the experimental station which the government has now under its charge in British Columbia and which it established some years ago, is of no practical use for all these great interior plateaus, which are not only being developed quickly, but which will present tremendous value to the country within the next ten years. I am not now discussing the point so much as to whether the government, through its officers, was well advised or ill-advised in picking upon that particular place to establish an experimental station. Of course, we know that the experimental work carried on at this station is good for very many reasons, one being for the testing and propagation of varieties, and another the determining of the proper means of fighting various diseases, in which lines we must admit that the station at Agassiz can do fairly good work. But one of the chief things for which the experimental station should be of value to the great fruit-growing district of British Columbia is not only the determination of the proper way of fighting fungus diseases, but also of attacking the great problem of irrigation. The station at Agassiz is situated in a valley which is very humid in character and which is almost at sea level; so nearly, at all events, that we might call it at sea level. It is in a humid country in which there is an excess of rainfall. and the consequence is that the conditions presented by the work of the experimental station at Agassiz have absolutely no applicability to the problems which will be presented for solution in these hundreds of thousands of acres which are going to constitute the great district for commercial horticulture in British Columbia. For instance, a very large proportion of the acreage under orchard is situated at an altitude from 1,000 to 2,500 feet above sea level. I may say once more that as far as the Agassiz station goes it is of little value to us in the interior country. I do not want to go into too many details, but I would like to give a concrete illustration of how this great industry of horticulture has developed in our province. I will take the case of the Okanagan valley. It was only in the year 1872 that the first fruit trees were planted in the Okanagan valley. These trees were brought in by the Mission fathers, who established a mission on the east side of Okanagan lake and

who brought the trees in under incredible hardships over the difficult and dangerous mountain trails from the coast. There are a few of these trees alive at the present time. Nothing was done in a large or commercial way until, by the foresight or enterprise of a former Governor General of this country, Lord Aberdeen, a large tract of land was purchased in the centre of that great Okanagan valley and horticulture was gone into on a somewhat large scale. The efforts of Lord Aberdeen in that direction showed what could be done, but up to the year 1893 or 1894 practically nothing was done in the Okanagan valley, in which today we have 18,000 acres in orchard, nearly 5,000 acres of which are peaches, and the whole of which is practically under the vital necessity of irrigation because of an insufficient rainfall. I would like to give some idea to this House of the value of irrigation in connection with agriculture and horticulture. I do not suppose that many of those who are not connected with this industry realize how intensely important irrigation is to successful horticulture or agriculture.

The science of irrigation is practised in every part of the world, and it has been a feature of agriculture for thousands of years. There are the remains of great irrigation works in Egypt and in parts of Asia which are at least 2,000 or 3,000 years old. At present, the science is carried on to an extent known to few people. For instance, in India millions of acres are under irrigation by means of canals, and other millions of acres by systems of pumping from wells or reservoirs. This means not only tremendously increased production but also an immense saving of life. In Italy, we find that in practically the whole southern part of the country, the work of agriculture is carried on with the assistance of irrigation. In Egypt and China the same thing is true. In the United States there are 4,000,000 acres under irrigation which means that practically all this land has been reclaimed from the desert and is now producing food. Careful computation shows that there is something like 40,000,000 acres in the world under irrigation, which, but for irrigation, would be partially or wholly unproductive.

The point I wish to press upon the Minister of Agriculture is that there is a need which, perhaps, the government, up to the present time, have hardly realized, for an experimental station in what is called the semi-arid belt of British Columbia. Because, it is impossible for us, the individual operators, to gain what the true value of water is, how to use it, how to distribute it and so on. This means that there must be an immense quantity of water now going to waste which, if economically used, would mean the reclamation of many thousands of acres. If we had proper scientific experiments to inform us how much water to use and how to use it, it would mean an immense addition to the quantity of land, now sterile, that could be brought under cultivation. While the governments of the United States and the governments of other countries also have been going into this question in a thorough way to find out what the value of water is in connection with agriculture and horticulture our government has done practically nothing. In regard to the value of water, the customary standard of measurement throughout the world is becoming the cubic foot per second, and what is called the duty of water, is the area over which this quantity can be distributed with the best results. In Alberta, where the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have carried on the largest irrigation works in Canada, if not in America, it has been estimated that, for the culture of wheat and grass, one cubic foot per second is enough for 100 acres. I think they are now fixing that duty at 150 acres. In other parts of the world, the duty of water varies according to conditions. In California, where they have done a great deal of this work, and where the land, without irrigation, is absolutely sterile, being in the arid belt, and where they realize every drop of water, they have extended the duty of water to 250 acres. Taking the average of 100 cases of the whole world, it will be found that one cubic foot of water per second has a duty of 117 acres, exclusive of the culture of rice, where much more water is required.

Mr. BRODER. The quantity of water required will depend upon the evaporation.

Mr. BURRELL. These figures apply mostly to countries in which the evaporation is very rapid. Now, I do not wish to take up the time of the House, but I would like to say that this whole question of the application of water for the reclamation of great tracts of otherwise sterile lands in the arid or semi-arid districts is an immensely difficult question. Our present imperfect methods cause needless waste of water. We are groping in the dark as to what we should do for the development of our resources. Not only that, but a shortage of water in a very dry country means heart-burnings and quarrellings; it means the division of communities into hostile camps; it means the neglect of proper methods to reclaim even some of the areas that might otherwise be reclaimed. I would strongly urge upon the Minister of Agriculture to take into consideration these facts and to realize that in British Columbia we have an industry of great value to the country as a whole and an immense acreage that can be reclaimed and made to afford room for population

and greatly increase the wealth of Canada. I trust the minister will see his way, at an early day, to look into this matter, not to put it by year after year, but to take it up in a whole-hearted way and establish an experimental station somewhere in the arid or semi-arid districts of British Columbia, where it can render benefit to the whole province.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). I appreciate very much the efforts of the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) in bringing this subject before the House at this time. It is a subject of great importance, not only to Quebec but to every province of the Dominion. For years, we have been urging the necessity of establishing experimental stations throughout the Dominion, not merely stations for the development of the grain-growing industry, but in connection with the fruit industry, and I hope the efforts put forth by hon. members from Quebec and others will have definite results with the Minister of Agriculture. For some years past, we have been urging upon the minister the need of establishing an experimental tobacco station in the western district of Ontario. I do not need to remind the Minister of Agriculture of the importance of establishing such a station, of the extent of the industry or of the splendid work that such a station could accomplish. I would urge upon him the necessity of establishing another experimental station in the western peninsula of Ontario. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, in that peninsula we have a very mild climate, much milder, for instance, than that of Ottawa, at which the Dominion Central Experimental Farm is situated, or even of Guelph where the Ontario Experimental Farm is established. A large portion of that western peninsula is gradually being developed for the growing of different kinds of fruit. I have for some time been urging on the minister the necessity of investigating that western district with reference to this important question, because we cannot expect that the experiments that are carried on here at Ottawa, or at the other experimental farms in Ontario, can accomplish what we would like to see done in that district. The minister has been urged to afford help to establish a farm in the Niagara district. I know he is fully alive to the importance of such a step, and while the Ontario government are making wonderful strides in the establishment of experimental farms, and in giving valuable information to the farmers, yet I cannot help feeling, as the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) has so well said, that it is nothing but right that the federal parliament should take a deeper interest in the establishment of these experimental farms, not only in the province of Quebec, but throughout Canada. I am glad indeed to see that the members from Quebec are taking up this question in earnest. I am satisfied that experimental farms are needed in the west also. Take for instance, the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta, no one can estimate the amount of good that could be accomplished by farms of this kind in that western country. I well remember reading two or three years ago, in the report of the Minister of Agriculture, what was said with regard to the extra amount of grain that could be grown on farms if we were only able to add one bushel to the yield of each acre of land sown; it would bring into the pockets of the Canadian farmers over $12,000,000 a year. The advantage therefore of these farms is evident, and I am satisfied that the question having been brought up from year to year, and now that both sides of the House are united upon it, the minister will give it a great deal more attention than he has done in the past.

Mr. E. PAQUETTE (L'Islet). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I beg to express my thankfulness to my friendly neighbour, the member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe). He has ably pointed out the usefulness as well as the need of the establishment of an experimental farm in the eastern part of Quebec. Therefore, I have so much more ready willingness in associating myself to his labours and in seconding his motion.

My friend has gone over all of the agricultural field. Statistics demonstrate that experimental stations have been affording the highest and most valuable services to the farming community in Europe, in the United States and in our own country. All civilized countries put themselves to heavy pecuniary sacrifices towards the erection, improvement and perfection of experimental farms. In our work of nation building, it lies with us to go into all of those expenses which are calculated to be indispensable to insure eminence and prestige for the farming class.

Experimental farms along with our several farming institutes have largely contributed to the progress of agriculture, the very foundation of our national wealth and prosperity. The exports of our farm products amounted to $13,000,000 in 1891. In 1901 they had reached the figure of $24,000,000. The experimental farm is the farmer's true school. It is consequently of high moment to secure and place a good model under his keen observation. For instance, the nursery at Aulnaies village, for many years under the management of Mr. Dupuis, has done a great deal for the advancement of horticulture in the county of L'Islet. We are conscious of the happy influence exercised by the St. Hyacinthe school over the dairy industry. The establishment of an experimental farm in the eastern section of the province would perforce bring about some needful reforms

requisite for progressive scientific farming. Our farmers might be shown around it, they could study it, take an interest in the manifold experiments carried on, and they could avail themselves of them. This would mean a standing lecture and wonderfully satisfying results could thus be derived.

Our soil and climate differ from those of the Ottawa district. We want an experimental farm to test the different qualities of the soil. The building of the Grand Trunk Pacific or Transcontinental opens up new sections to both settlement and farming. The analysis of the soil of that country is of the utmost importance. This great work will be apt to be perhaps neglected if we remain too far away from our experimental farms.

This experimental farm might be made an experimental station for agricultural purposes. Our farmers are too far away from the Ottawa farm to derive the full benefit of it. I am aware of the stringency of our finances, but this work is urgently needed by our farmers and we must endeavour to find the money to further the progress of agriculture. The hon. Minister of Agriculture knows the needs of our district. He should be satisfied that the establishment of an experimental station for agricultural purposes in the eastern part of the province of Quebec would serve the interest of a territory the possibilities and the development of which are worthy the attention of this parliament and government. This experimental farm might be made an experimental station for agricultural purposes, might also help the cattle raising industry, and in short, it might further the progress of agriculture.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT (Bellechasse). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I could hardly allow this opportunity to pass without congratulating and at the same time without thanking the hon. member for Kamouraska for the very interesting remarks which he has just made in moving his resolution. And I think I state in this not only the sentiments of the farmers of the great county which I represent, and which is part of the district whose welfare my hon. friend has so much at heart, but also of the farmers of the whole province of Quebec. I will take the same opportunity to thank the Minister of Agriculture who, on all occasion, has shown us so much kindness, to us members of the province of Quebec and to our electors, every time we applied directly to his department or to the experimental farm, he always gave satisfaction to every one who has had to deal with him. I think this is a splendid opportunity to ask him to extend further the field of his operations in so far as practical farming is concerned.

Every one will admit that the farmers in that part of the province, which I belong have made wonderful progress in the last fifteen or twenty years, especially in dairying. But in certain respects, I have to own with regret, we are still deficient. It is true that our farmers have to put up nowadays with the impoverishment of the soil, due mostly to the neglect of our forefathers. The province of Quebec has a magnificent soil under a very favourable climate, but it has lost somewhat of its fertility as far as production is concerned. If there be any thing practical for the whole country, it is surely agriculture. I recognize that the lectures organized by the Minister of Agriculture throughout the country have had very good results, but more so theoretically than practically. It is a recognized fact to-day, not only in the province of Quebec, but, I dare say, in the world at large, that the farmer has a great calling, and that he is the very foundation of the wealth and progress of every country. These lectures have educated him to the importance of his calling, and in this respect the work performed in Ottawa is most satisfactory. But the experiments conducted at the model farm here do not all apply to the province of Quebec owing to the different climatic conditions. Much good will derive from the establishment of an experimental farm in our province, for instance in the way of drainage. Good drainage generally stimulates the natural action of the soil, so that crops may be at least a fortnight earlier than would otherwise be. We are also behind in the selection of seed grain. Our soil does not produce as much as it could. Certain quantities of seed grain are sown but do not bring proportionately as much as in other provinces. An experimental farm in the province of Quebec would result in the practical demonstration of good drainage.

The farmers of the province of Quebec have also to be stirred up to the advantages of improving their stock. Much has been done already, and the government of the province of Quebec has done their share, but in this also we are somewhat deficient. I acknowledge that much improvement has been accomplished in that direction in such counties as Kamouraska, L'Islet, Bellechasse and others. For instance in my own county, where a man had from six to eight cows ten or twelve years ago, he has to-day between thirty and forty. But the breed is lacking. A branch of the Ottawa farm would surely be of immense advantage in this respect in that part of the country. Farmers as a rule love to hear lectures. They cherish what is told them, but there is nothing so useful as things practical, and I believe that the establishment of an experimental farm would alone give the best practical results.

As it is to-day, the government of the province of Quebec spend certain sums of

money as encouragement to a number of agricultural schools. I had occasion several years ago to be one of the commissioners appointed to investigate these schools, and out of the four, we condemned two. I hold that to-day the four or five thousand dollars which the government grant to the school at St. Anne de la Pocatière is money absolutely thrown away. If this money was pooled with what amount this government would be willing to give, I think these four or five thousand dollars would bring many times the results which are derived from them to-day. I hope the Minister of Agriculture will accept in a friendly manner the suggestion contained in the resolution, and will give this very important question all the consideration it deserves.

Mr. MAGRATH (Medicine Hat). Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret not to have understood the speeches made by the hon. gentlemen who preceded me upon the important question of agricultural interests. I wish to say a few words in support of this resolution, because I know that a new country cannot be successfully settled without the aid of experimental work. Experimental work has contributed greatly towards the successful settlement of northwestern Canada. The Indian Head farm has been in operation for many years and it has been of great benefit. At one period the territory immediately surrounding Indian Head was not being settled, and I believe that the great change that has taken place in that section of the country is largely due to the experimental work conducted by the Minister of Agriculture. I feel that it is impossible to say too much in support of the work being done by these experimental farms. I am sorry we have not an experimental farm in the northern portion of Quebec, along the line of the National Transcontinental Railway. In a few years our prairie country will be largely settled and we will then have to locate people in the wooded areas. I see no reason why we should not direct attention to the country say 25 or 50 miles north of this city. That work, however, can never be taken up successfully until some experimental work is done further north in that province. I take pleasure in supporting this resolution and I sincerely trust that the government will see its way clear to give the province of Quebec at least one experimental farm and possibly two, because I believe we cannot have too many of them in the various sections of this large county

Mr. A. S. GOODEVE (Kootenay). I am glad to say a few words in support of this resolution. In the Kootenays we have felt greatly the want of an experimental farm. As you are aware, we are situated in the mountains under peculiar conditions, and we are anxious to know the best kinds of fruit to grow and the highest altitude at which fruit can be successfully matured. This question has been taken up by various boards of trade in that district and at a recent meeting of the Associated Boards of Trade, at which thirteen boards were present, a formal resolution was adopted in regard to this very question of having more experimental farms in that western country. I well remember that when cheese and butter factories were first started in Ontario the successful marketing of the product presented great difficulties to the farmers and others interested. The government then came to the rescue, and owing to the work done by the Agricultural Department a large and profitable industry has been built up in the province of Ontario and other portions of Canada. That is one phase of the question that appeals to us as fruit men. We have already learned by experience that almost any kind of fruit will grow in the valleys surrounding the rivers and lakes of British Columbia. We have in my own particular district several large valleys, particularly the Windermere, Pend-Oreille, Kootenay and Arrow Lake valleys. These have been largely advertised, many settlers are coming in, and the land is being taken up for agricultural purposes. Going through that district last fall I found that in many instances a good deal of the smaller fruit had been allowed to go to waste. This was partly due to the fact that some of the varieties cultivated there were not suitable for marketing, they were of too soft a nature. Then too, in many districts where the fruit was perfectly suitable for the market, there was not a sufficient quantity to enable the growers to get rates and accommodation to send it to their markets. I know that experimental farms along the line suggested by previous speakers would be of great advantage to us in that portion of the country. The officials of such farms would be able to tell the ranchers not only the best fruit for the particular altitude in which they were situated but also the best fruit for marketing. As has been said by the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) it was not until Lord Aberdeen, in the Okanagan valley, established apple growing on a large scale that we were able to market successfully. That is one difficulty. A rancher in one valley will grow one kind of apple, cherry, pear, peach or small fruit, and his immediate neighbour will grow another variety coming in a few weeks earlier or a few weeks later, with the result that neither can market his fruit in the best condition or in the quantities necessary to obtain the best prices. In that way there is no doubt that an experimental farm would do a vast amount of good and would hasten the time when the horticulturists of that district will be able to add materially to the wealth of Canada. I heartily support the resolution so far as it

applies to the further establishment of experimental farms in the various provinces. No doubt the arguments advanced by the hon. gentlemen from Quebec have been such as would impress the minister and the government, and I think that the arguments we can advance and have advanced in regard to the western provinces will also be of weight. I trust that the Minister of Agriculture will take this question, as he has taken other questions, into his serious consideration, and that he will grant such assistance in this matter as will hasten the time when we will have a large amount of fruit in the various provinces of this Dominion.

Mr. W. S. LOGGIE (Northumberland, N.B.). Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unable to follow the remarks of the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution. I was, however, able to sufficiently follow the remarks of the hon. member for Dorchester to know that he complimented the hon. gentleman from Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) upon the manner in which he presented the resolution. I am very glad that I am able to heartily support the sentiments set out in the resolution. From the remarks made by the hon. gentlemen who have spoken, there is no question in the mind of any gentleman present as to the great benefit which has accrued to the agricultural interests of this Dominion from the operation of experimental farms. This idea is set out in the resolution and it is also set forth that if we had more of these farms they would still more benefit the agricultural interests of Canada. The reasons advanced in the resolution for asking for the establishment of a new farm in the eastern portion of Quebec are that the conditions of soil and climate are different from those at the experimental farms now in operation. We can easily realize that this is so. I understand that we have but two experimental farms under the administration of the Dominion in eastern Canada, one in Ontario and one in Nova Scotia. I wish to say on behalf of my own province that there are differences in the seasons, in the soil and in the climate between Nova Scotia and the northern portion of New Brunswick. It seems to me that it would be in the interest of agriculture in the province of New Brunswick that an experimental station should be established in that province, either in the north-east section or the north-west section. I may say for my own county that agricultural interests have advanced very materially during recent years; but in some departments, especially in dairying, we are still very far behind, and if we had an experimental station within reasonable distance, and at a point where the climate and soil are different from what they are at Nappan in Nova Scotia, I am sure it would add materially to the agricultural interests of New Brunswick, in which all of us feel a deep interest.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure indeed in joining my congratulations with those of other hon. gentlemen to the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe), who has introduced this very excellent resolution, a resolution in the sentiment of which I am sure hon. members on both sides of this House will join. What undoubtedly is wanted in the agricultural sections of this country are experimental farms; and the value of these experimental farms is undoubtedly proportionate to the manner in which they are managed. I do not rise for the purpose of indicating generally the localities where one of these farms should be established; but I do rise, as a member coming from that portion of Ontario known as New Ontario, for the purpose of suggesting to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, that that portion of Ontario needs a little more of his fostering care than it has received in the past. If the hon. minister would direct his attention to that very rich portion of Ontario, having regard to the maintenance there of one of these experimental farms, I fancy that he would do a great deal of good. Such an institution would be a means of instruction to farmers there who are labouring under rather rigorous climatic conditions and other disadvantages which are not met with in other portions of the province of Ontario. It is just to that class of territory, which is somewhat different in its nature and climatic conditions from the rest of the Dominion of Canada, that the hon. gentleman refers in the first part of this resolution. The northern parts of the province of Ontario are known to be agriculturally rich; but what they are capable of producing under more favourable conditions, which can only be ascertained by scientific investigations and by continued research and experiment, has never yet been demonstrated. I therefore thought this would be a favourable opportunity to suggest to the hon. minister that he should consider that portion of Ontario, with the idea of establishing in the most suitable part of it, the part where it would give the greatest good to the greatest number, an experimental farm, so that the people engaged in agriculture in that country might have the advantage of instruction with regard to what the land is capable of producing, what fruits can be grown there and to what extent, and other questions affecting the agricultural industry. That experimental farms are of the greatest possible utility especially in a new country is too much of a truism to admit of any question, and I think the establishment of one or more in these northern districts would be of the greatest uti-

lity. We have a splendid experimental farm in Ottawa, which is of great benefit to the more thickly settled portions of Ontario and Quebec; but the conditions in New Ontario are so different in many respects to what they are here, that the establishment of an experimental farm there would undoubtedly stimulate agriculture and tend to the increased settlement of the country. I earnestly commend this matter to my hon. friend's consideration, and trust that he will give effect to the suggestion I make.

Mr. J. P. TURCOTTE (Quebec). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker. This debate brought by the resolution of the hon. member for Kamouraska, is one of the most interesting that came before the House. Not only is the resolution asking the government to safeguard the interests of the agricultural classes of our country, but it seems to me that it will have the further result of creating provinces, every one of them endeavouring in the future more than ever to take lead in the development and progress of agriculture.

If I am not mistaken, we must to-day be well informed as to what goes on concerning the agricultural questions in the old and new provinces. The art of agriculture is relatively easy in the new provinces ; the land is virgin and consequently more productive ; the farmers settling on these farms bring with them knowledge acquired elsewhere, new ideas, and they work in a manner which is entirely unknown in our old provinces. So that if it is necessary for these new provinces to receive help from the government to be more prosperous, I will say that the old ones need also that help in order to free themselves of the old routine of method which were probably good formerly, because they were answering the needs of those generations, but which are to-day old-fashioned and no longer adapted to our times.

The hon. member for Kamouraska did well to call the attention of this House to this important question, and to beg the government to get more interested in the fate of the agricultural classes in the different parts of the country, and to state precisely, as he did, that it is on the province of Quebec that its care should be spread. Why ? Because this province being the first that has been settled, the agricultural customs which were developed, customs which have created these sound and industrious populations which we all admire, are not, however, in a position to correspond to the needs of our times. They must have a guide to show them the defects of their methods, and what should be done for the general benefit of the province of Quebec and the whole country.

If the government has at heart, as I believe, the agricultural interests and wants to protect them, they will gladly accept the proposition of the hon. member for Kamouraska, whose object is to do away with the routine of which suffered the province of Quebec. The government would accomplish this an intelligent useful and pressing work.

It has been said that the difference of climate and soil in our province asks for different modes of cultivation; this is elementary and it does not require much experience to be proved, but when we pass from theory to practice, it becomes very important to have some men trained by study and experience to guide us, if we want to make good work. This is not the duty of individuals, but of the government. Just as the agricultural classes support in the great electoral contests the program of reform of the government, just the same these classes have a right to look for help when it comes to reforms and progress of which they shall benefit.

Some years ago, Mr. Speaker, a great movement was set on foot to give to the province of Quebec a model experimental farm. My predecessor in this House, Hon. Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, was at the head of this movement ; he wanted this farm to be established in the county of Quebec. Whether it pleases or not, my hon. friend from Kamouraska it seems to me that it is the right natural place for a farm of this kind. It was around that the first farms were cultivated at the virgin of the colony. I am not one of those who say that we must put aside all that was done by our ancestors. Experience proves the contrary, and presently we find in the county of Quebec the most beautiful farms of the province, some being valued as much as $75 to $1000 an acre. For instance, I will mention the farm of the Quebec seminary, the farm of Mr. Gustave Langelier at Cap-Rouge, upon which he spent lots of money, principally in the improvement of the cattle. At every exhibition, Mr. Langelier always won first prizes.

I believe that the efforts that have been made to bring the government to establish an experimental farm in the limits of the county of Quebec, must be continued, and as a representative of this country, though not being a farmer myself, I believe that it is my duty to continue the work begun. No doubt the financial question must be considered. I understand that the government which has great work on hand cannot apply considerable money for new undertakings, but it seems to me that it is sufficient to appeal in the name of the class which is most interested, the farmers, to urge upon the government to make new sacrifices. When we see at the head of the Department of Agriculture a man who represents so well the agricultural interests, it is to be hoped that in a near future another experimental farm will be established, and that the government will put it in the county of Quebec.

There is no jealousy in the population. It does not concern who will win the medal. It is not neither a question of party between the two sides of this House ; we all love the farmers, and the government has to look upon the agricultural classes for the progress of the country.

I believe that we all agree upon that, and whatever preferences each of us may have, if the government should establish another experimental farm in the county he chooses, we will all applaud.

Mr. ANDREW BRODER (Dundas). I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate upon the important question of government experimental stations, and I desire to say only a few words with reference to it. I am at a loss to know how my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture will be able to find locations for all the additional experimental stations which he has been urged to establish.

An hon. MEMBER. What about Dundas?

Mr. BRODER. Dundas is able to take care of itself. I would be in favour of further equipping and developing our existing experimental farms before going too far in establishing additional experimental stations. I believe the experimental farm at Ottawa ought to be one of the best equipped farms in the world, having a staff of the most capable and the most experienced scientific men available. But, there is this difficulty with scientific men. Science is a fine thing but it will not go alone in this world. The scientists should get down to the struggling masses and learn the philosophy of new experience. Every year we take important evidence before the Committee on Agriculture. A year ago we received such evidence, but this evidence is not in the hands of the people yet. I do not say that the minister is to blame for this. It is attributed simply to the system we have had in vogue for years. Evidence which was deemed to be of the greatest importance to the people has not reached them yet. There should be some system adopted by which this evidence may be put in the possession of the people with very little delay. When one takes up evidence that was given over a year ago he says that it is out of date and he will take no interest in it. I do not believe in building experimental stations to fight conditions, but I believe in establishing experimental farms to suggest what is best adapted to each particular locality, following along the lines of least resistance. You do not want to undertake to raise wheat scientifically where wheat is not intended to grow. Follow along the lines of least resistance and give to the country what is best adapted for each particular locality. While some people say that we used to raise good crops when we had none of these farms, that is very true, but the farmer is met by a hundred enemies to his crop to-day when he did not have one fifty years ago. He is met by a hundred difficulties when he did not have one fifty years ago. The farmer has to fight all along the line. He has to fight bugs and he has to fight lice—we might as well talk plainly —which attack his crop. Every day that he gets up something is attacking his crop, his apples, his potatoes, his hay. What the experimental farms want to do is to suggest to the farmer, not to carry him on their back and let him act upon their suggestions. I believe that much could be done to improve conditions, speaking of Ontario alone. I am not referring to Quebec, and I know a great deal about Quebec because I was born and brought up there. I know that in some sections it is a great apple country and, I want to say, that millions of dollars could be added to the value of the apple crop every year if it were properly taken care of. Now the question is whether it would not pay this country to do the experimenting even at considerable expense. I believe that the localities that are suffering because of lack of knowledge in this respect could be easily reached if proper means were adopted to do so. What has been said about British Columbia is of the very greatest importance. I believe that an experimental farm would do a great deal of good in Quebec and the people of Quebec would eagerly use it if it were placed amongst them. They have done a great deal in their province. I was reading, last night, documents issued by the government of Quebec, which indicate a line of work that it would be well for the province of Ontario to copy in many respects. In these documents suggestions were made to the people for beautifying their homes and farms, and prizes were offered for the best kept farms and homes. If the minister will take this matter up and carry out some of the suggestions which have been made this afternoon I am satisfied that his efforts will meet with the hearty appreciation of the people of this country.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright). Mr. Speaker, I want to add a few words before this debate ends, in connection with the resolution which is proposed by my hon. friend the member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe). It seems to me that the resolution can be divided into two parts, first:

> That in the opinion of this House it would be in the interests of agriculture that new experimental stations should be located at certain places removed from those now in existence where the conditions of climate and soil are different.

Then, again, referring more especially to the province from which the hon. gentleman comes, he advocates that:

> Especially an experimental station should be established and put in operation in the eastern part of the province of Quebec.

I am not speaking upon this subject as a practical farmer. I have been allied with the farming classes for a great many years and I take a very deep interest in farming, though I cannot say that I ever really worked upon or worked a farm. But I take sufficient interest in the Dominion as a whole to understand the importance in this country of agriculture. I do not think that any sum of money is too great to be expended by this parliament in the interest of the farming community of Canada. I believe sir, that the time is not far distant when Canada will depend almost entirely upon its agricultural resources for the aggrandizement of the country and I believe that due importance should be shown to the farming classes. It is fortunate for this House and for this country that we have at the head of the department a man who is eminently qualified to act as Minister of Agriculture. It is fortunate, I say, that we have watching over the interests of the department which is more particularly concerned with the agricultural classes, a man who takes a deep interest in the farming community, a man who has studied the question in all its aspects and a man who never loses an occasion to show farming communities that he is fully competent to judge their needs and to cope with their difficulties. So far, our government has done a great deal which is of benefit to the agricultural classes. The government has expended large sums of money towards the improving and almost perfecting of the cold storage system. We have in this country elevators which are second to none upon the continent and which are of great benefit to its farmers in enabling them to export their wheat, grain and other products. If I may be permitted to say a word on behalf of the province from which I have the honour to come I would advocate as strongly as I possibly can the earnest consideration of the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Kamouraska. It is true, that we have here, in the city of Ottawa, an experimental farm. It is true that in the distribution of grain throughout Canada and in the education of the agricultural classes the experimental farm is doing a wonderful work. Owing to the enlightened efforts of the Minister of Agriculture the fame of Central Experimental Farm has been spread throughout the world. And while that is true I do think the provinces, more especially those which are far distant from the capital, have a just claim for the establishment of experimental farm stations. I believe myself that a very appropriate place for an experimental station of not too great magnitude would be across the river in the county of Wright, but I shall not enter into the family quarrel which seems to exist between the hon. member for Quebec county (Mr. Turcotte) and the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe). I might perhaps be induced to waive my claim if either of those gentlemen should succeed in obtaining what he so earnestly desires. I do not think we should be selfish in this matter, and so I am free to endorse the suggestion that the farmers living on the St. Lawrence river below Quebec, in Kamouraska and Temiscouata and these other counties, should have the benefit of an agricultural station in their vicinity. The Minister of Agriculture would do well to give this resolution his earnest consideration and I trust that the House will generously vote a sufficient sum for the establishment of at least one experimental farm station in the province of Quebec.

Mr. A. B. McCOIG (West Kent). The section of Canada in which my constituency is situated is not only the most important agricultural district in the province of Ontario, but in the Dominion of Canada, and so it behooves me to say a word for the agriculturists of southwestern Ontario. The farmers of the counties of Kent and Essex have probably more money invested in the agricultural industry than have the farmers of any other section of a like area in Canada. The fruit industry in that district is of increasing magnitude, although I must confess that there has been to some extent neglect in the furnishing of means to the fruit growers for the protection of their fruit trees. We have been unfortunate enough to have had experience of the San José scale pest, and while some assistance has been rendered by the provincial government that assistance has not been adequate. In this connection I would suggest to the Minister of Agriculture and to the government that they should allow the necessary spraying apparatus for the prevention of the San José scale, and which is largely manufactured in the United States, to come into Canada free of duty. If assistance were given in this direction we would be able to raise a larger fruit crop and to export this fruit in greater quantities than at present to other parts of Canada, where there is a profitable market for it. It is well that the House should remember that in the counties of Kent and Essex we are blessed with a climate and a soil which enable us to produce crops which cannot be produced in other parts of Canada. For example, last year the sugar beet crop of these two counties was over half a million dollars in value, and the corn crop amounted to at least probably three million dollars' worth. I need not tell hon. gentlemen that the culture of tobacco is also an important industry with us. Hon. gentlemen will readily see how advantageous it would be to the farmers of these counties if there were established in the vicinity of

Chatham an experimental station which would supply information as to the most approved system of cultivating these valuable crops which are largely peculiar to that district. A short time ago there was a corn convention in the county of Essex and had the Minister of Agriculture been able to be present he would have been justly proud of the samples of corn exhibited there. I do not wish to draw an invidious comparison, but nevertheless I think the newspaper was not far astray, which stated, that the samples of corn exhibited from other parts of Canada were as but nobbins compared with the samples from the counties of Kent and Esssex. Then again, as a corollary of the large production of corn in Kent and Essex, there is a very extensive hog raising industry in these counties, and I am safe in saying that three million dollars would not buy the hog products which have been sold from Kent and Essex. I must compliment the Minister of Agriculture that he has done many good things to encourage the hog industry but something yet remains to be done. The hog trade is not only of importance to the farmers of this district but it is of almost equal interest to the people of the other provinces who to a very large extent buy their dressed hogs from these two counties. I have every confidence in the Minister of Agriculture that he will give us every assistance within his power to enable us to profitably pursue that valuable industry. Then, I endorse all that has been said in favour of a large free circulation of bulletins in the different sections of the country, and I would specially suggest that an effort should be made to distribute these bulletins with particular reference to the kind of crop which is most successfully grown in any given district. These bulletins should be sent not only to the few on the subscription lists of the agricultural colleges but they should be distributed in all the schools of Canada so that the children might learn, and so that they might take home to their parents this information and instruction as to the most modern and best means of pursuing the agricultural industry. I have felt, Mr. Speaker, that when a motion of this kind was submitted to the House, I would not be doing my duty as the representative of the most important agricultural county of Kent were I to refrain from saying a few words upon a question so interesting to my constituents.

Mr. JOHN BARR (Dufferin). Representing, as I do, an agricultural constituency, I desire to express my views on the question now before the House. It is gratifying to know that there are questions upon which we can unite for the common good, divesting our minds of all political feelings. That is as it should be. For, when we come to consider the great subject of agriculture, we cannot but realize that it is to the agriculturists that we must look for building up this country of ours. Though we have only seven millions of people at the present time, we have land to provide farms for a hundred millions. We should dig broad and deep the foundations for this great industry of agriculture. It seems to me that the successive governments of this Dominion have not given to this subject the consideration that it deserves. I say this without referring to one government more than to another. We have never given a fair proportion of our expenditure to the benefit and encouragement of agriculture. When we consider that nine-tenths of the inhabitants of Canada are of the agricultural class, and when we consider how little of our public expenditure goes to the development of agriculture, we cannot feel that we are doing our whole duty. It is true that the government has done much in this line, but there is very much more still to be done. There are only three or four experimental farms in the Dominion. The present resolution is in favour of establishing such farms in the eastern part of the province of Quebec. We have our Central Experimental Farm on the border between Ontario and Quebec, and that farm has done good work, and we are proud of it. But we know that conditions of soil and climate vary greatly in different parts of the Dominion, and, therefore, I contend we should have not merely an experimental farm on the border between Ontario and Quebec, but one in the eastern part of Quebec and one in the western part of Ontario. Instead of spending half a million in this service, we might well spend two or three millions. Agriculture is very different from what it was half a century ago. At that time we had but to tickle the soil and put in the seed and Providence would do the rest. Now, we have all sort of enemies to contend with. It is impossible for any farmer alone to learn how his farm can best be handled under the conditions that obtain to-day. With experimental farms in different parts of the Dominion the best means of meeting the enemies that the farmer has to contend with would be discovered and the farmers could be educated in these methods as they are introduced. There are great new areas of the country being opened up which could be developed more quickly if experimental stations were established to learn how agriculture can best be carried on under the existing conditions. Some years ago we saw exhibited in the provincial legislature of Ontario wheat that was grown on the other side of the height of land, and beautiful wheat it was. It was grown by one of the then members for Ottawa on a large farm he had in that country. Hundreds and thousands of people are going into this new country which is being opened up by the

Temiscaming and Northern Ontario and Grand Trunk Pacific Railways. I believe we should have an experimental farm there for the benefit of those who are taking up farming in that country. The results would be beneficial to all Canada, for that country is rich not only in minerals, but, I am quite confident, in agricultural resources also. We should have experimental farms in the several provinces, and should spend large sums for the purpose of educating the farmers. I believe also that we should have agriculture taught in our schools. Our provinces are doing good work, but the Dominion ought to lead, not lag behind, in experimental work for the advancement of agriculture.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE (South Essex). I desire to say a few words on a question which, while not strictly in line with the resolution, is of great interest to the fruit-growers of the district I represent, and, therefore, I ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments. The matter to which I refer has been spoken of by the hon. member for West Kent (Mr. McCoig)—the question of protecting the fruit trees from pests. For, we may have experimental farms and encourage agricultural industry, but it will be in vain unless we protect the product we already have. There is great complaint in my part of the country that sufficient encouragement and assistance is not given by the government to the extermination of the scale and other pests which affect fruit trees. Special complaint is made that paris green and other spraying materials furnished in this country are not effective, and these materials are brought from the United States. The Horticultural Society and the Fruit Growers' Society have passed resolutions asking that the duty be taken off spraying materials in order to encourage the farmers to get rid of the scale and other pests that are doing so much to destroy the orchards of southwestern Ontario. I am sorry that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who has to do with the question of duties, is not in his place, but I hope this matter will be brought to his notice and that something will be done to assist in protecting the fruit trees from these pests.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). This debate has taken a wide range, and I shall ask permission to advert for a moment to some of the side questions that have been brought in. I am glad to hear the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. A. H. Clarke) speak of the necessity of securing the best spraying materials to assist the horticulturists of this country in getting rid of the pests that destroy the profit of their industry. The other day a petition was presented to the government asking that certain spraying materials should be placed upon the free list in order to give to those who have occasion to use them a better article. The allegation was made that a proper spraying material was not produced in Canada. If that is the case it is the duty of the government to place such articles on the free list. That is in accordance with the policy inaugurated in 1878, where an article was not produced in this country it should be given to the people of Canada at the lowest possible price. I have here a circular issued by a company at Niagara who are manufacturers of spraying materials. It states that this article is manufactured by the Niagara Spraying Company, of Middleboro, New York, U.S.A. I understand that the product of this factory is a desirable article, and I draw the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to it. I am sorry the Minister of Finance is not here, because I think if he were to take note of it he would at once assist by the free admission of that article, for the destruction of the various pests that trouble the horticulturists.

We talk a great deal about benefiting the farmers by experimental farms and thus enabling them to carry on their operations to much greater advantage, and to produce larger crops. The hon. member for East Kent (Mr. McCoig) a few moments ago made a reference to the hog industry of the country and to the large amount of hogs produced in his county. To my mind the very best experiment that the government to-day can adopt with regard to agricultural products is an experiment along the line of securing the greatest market we possibly can for the Canadian people for what they do produce and the better way to do that is to make sure that we prevent the large invasion of American products into this country. This invasion is an injury to our farmers, inasmuch as the American products monopolize a large part of the market which ought to belong to our Canadian people. That is another matter to which I would direct the attention of the Minister of Agriculture. I do not think he can better help the hog industry than by doubling the duty and keeping out the American product as far as possible, giving all the market we have to the Canadian people. This might apply to other lines of agricultural products as well. It is useless to expend money to increase our production unless we safeguard our market for the production when it has been made. Along that line I think the government can use their energies and ability with very great advantage to the people of Canada.

Mr. J. A. DUBEAU (Joliette). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of unduly prolonging this debate, but as the representative of a largely agricultural constituency, I consider it my duty to support the motion of the hon. member for Kamouraska.

I will take advantage of the opportunity to remind the House that last year, in the course of a debate on the best means of favouring the development of the Canadian tobacco industry, I requested the hon. the Minister of the Interior to amend the Inland Revenue Act in such a manner as to issue the same license to all Canadian tobacco manufacturers, whether they handle foreign, mixed or purely Canadian leaf, instead of obliging them to take out three different licenses for these different branches of industry.

I also requested that the system of variously coloured stamps which manufacturers were obliged to place upon their goods, according to the origin of the leaf, be done away with. The government granted my request and so amended the Inland Revenue Act as to issue the same license for the manufacture of all tobacco whatever may be their classification, while according to the new departmental regulations, a uniform stamp is now issued to all. For this I tender my thanks to the government. These changes have rendered and continue to render great assistance to the Canadian tobacco industry, which is being very notably developed in the province of Quebec. I believe, however, as I had occasion to remark when the question was debated last year, that we will be obliged to follow the example of other countries, and establish, in the midst of the planters, experimental stations under the charge of experts who are able to guide them in the proper industrial treatment of the leaf, in order to produce an article suitable to the requirements of trade. May I therefore express the hope that the hon. the Minister of Agriculture will be able to place in the estimates a sum of money for the establishment of an experimental station in the district of Joliette. This would enable us to improve our tobacco to such an extent as to make it a staple article of export. Some days ago, a deputation composed of the members of the Tobacco Planters' Association of the district of Joliette, waited upon the government for the purpose of expressing the necessity of the establishment of an experimental tobacco station in that district. The hon. the Minister of Agriculture being at that time absent in Washington, I desire to call his attention to this fact, and I hope that he will give the request of the planters his most favourable consideration.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I must congratulate my hon. friend from Kamouraska, not only on the substance of the resolution he has introduced, but also on the manner in which he supported it. He has shown us that he has thoroughly studied the question, not only in its application to the Quebec district, but also to the whole Dominion. I have great pleasure in accepting the resolution, and hope that it will meet with the unanimous concurrence of the House. The resolution is in line with what was proposed two or three years ago.

Two or three years ago we put into the estimates a sum of money for the purpose of establishing branch stations on the experimental farm system. We have already acquired three such stations since that time, and I have been in negotiation with proprietors in other parts of the country with the object of securing suitable locations for other branch stations. I want to say that the requests which we have received from hon. members here to-day, and requests for such stations in different parts of the country, involve very large expenditures, and show great eagerness for the establishment of these stations. In deciding where we shall first do this work we have kept this principle in view, that the experimental stations should serve the largest number of people in a district which was a fair sample of a large area of country, rather than to establish stations in districts which should serve an area for a small population, or as a model of work of a restricted and peculiar character.

Mr. MONK. Would the minister say where the three stations are now ?

Mr. FISHER. One is in the semi dry district of southern Alberta, one is in the northern part of Alberta, and one in the northern part of Saskatchewan. Since the question has been asked, I will say why it was that these localities were first chosen for this work. In the original establishment of the experimental farm system, there were five farms established. There was the Central Experimental Farm here at Ottawa, which was expected to serve the purpose of Ontario and Quebec, lying as it does on the boundary line between them. One was near the boundary line between the province of New Brunswick and the province of Nova Scotia and within easy reach of Prince Edward Island, to serve the purposes of the maritime provinces. One was established in the then comparatively new province of Manitoba at Brandon; a fourth was established at Indian Head in the then new territory further west, and a fifth was established in the great province of British Columbia. The idea was that these stations should serve the provinces mentioned. When, however, a few years ago we established two new provinces in the Northwest, we found that the province of Alberta had no farm which seemed to serve the needs of that great agricultural province. The question was how we could meet these needs, and instead of establishing a branch farm at some central point for the whole province, as was done in the earlier scheme

of organization, we thought better to establish two smaller stations, one in the south part, which is dryer, and one in the more central part of that great agricultural province, nearer the northern region, where farming must necessarily be of a mixed character, and where conditions are different from those at Lethbridge, where the southern farm was established.

Mr. STAPLES. How many acres were acquired for the experimental farm in the northern part?

Mr. FISHER. I will not go into details of that kind just now.

Mr. MONK. Perhaps the minister will tell us when these new farms were established?

Mr. FISHER. As soon as possible after the establishment of the province of Alberta. I think I acquired the first one about two years ago, and the second one a little over a year ago, immediately after the province of Alberta was established. Now a third farm was established in the northern part of Saskatchewan, very much for the same reason that the two farms were established in Alberta. The farm at Indian Head, in Saskatchewan, is in the southern part of the province on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, where the land is altogether prairie, where the climate is rather dry, and where farming consisted in wheat growing. We wish to establish another farm in the northern part where wood land is mixed with prairie land, and where the syle of agriculture will be necessarily different from that in the southern part. For that purpose we have bought a farm at Rosthern, between Saskatoon and Prince Albert. I have been in negotiation with the provincial governments of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island with a view to their purchasing a farm each, and placing it at our disposal for this work. We have not yet been able to fix upon the exact location, but I believe that before long these governments will be able to place at our disposal for the purpose of carrying on such work as this, one farm in the fruit-growing district of Nova Scotia, and another in the centre of Prince Edward Island. I have had many applications for the enlargement of this system, and I wish to continue in the line that we have begun. I may say that I have already promised that a farm shall be established on the island of Vancouver, in British Columbia. The conditions there are very different, from an agricultural point of view, from the condtions on the mainland, and it seems only fair and right that that great island should have a model station where experiments and illustrations of the best agricultural methods can be carried on. My hon. friend from Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve), and my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell), have spoken of the interior or dry belt of the province of British Columbia. Here let me say to those gentlemen from British Columbia that no district in the Dominion has been given more careful consideration and study than the mainland of the province of British Columbia, both on my own part and on the part of my officials.

Most of us know pretty well the general character of that great province, but probably none of us realize its immense agricultural possibilities. The beauty of its scenery is famed the world over, as are the richness of its mineral resources and its wealth of fisheries, but I venture to say that in the future it will be the agriculture and the fruit growing of British Columbia of which Canada will be most proud, and from which it will reap the greatest advantages. I dare say it is a surprise to many to learn that there are 75,000 acres of orchard land in that province, and while many of the trees are not yet bearing, still so great has been the profit accruing that in recent years there have been thousands of acres of fruit trees planted and the experience already has proven that those who have engaged in the industry have been wise in their generation. There is a difficulty in the way, however. The country is divided by mountain chains and ridges, and the crop which is suitable to one valley may not be suitable to any very wide area. It is therefore impossible to find one central spot in the interior of British Columbia where an experimental farm or illustration station could be established to serve the whole of the interior. Until the time comes when such stations will be numerous, we will have to proceed on the principle of selecting a site which will serve the largest area and the greatest number of agriculturists within reasonable reach of the centre. In most other parts of Canada an illustration or experimental station will serve a very large area and to begin with it is well that we should place them where they will be of benefit to the greatest number of people. I have been guided as much as possible by this consideration in the order in which I have taken up the placing of these experimental stations. I would like to go much further in this direction than I have gone. Let me tell hon. gentlemen who have not been many years in this House a little bit of history. In the year 1899 I came forward with a proposition in regard to illustration stations somewhat smaller than those branch experimental stations, and I desired as time went on and as I was allowed to have money enough to do it, to establish such a station in every county of the Dominion. And after eight years experience of the results of that proposition not having been given effect to, I have no hesitation in saying that the loss has been enormous to the agriculturists of Canada. But, the House of Commons was opposed to my

proposition and it had to be withdrawn, and from that day to this I have not undertaken to reintroduce it. I hope, however, that my idea will be amplified as time goes on, until, if not in every county of the Dominion, at all events in every part of the Dominion where an experimental station may serve a large number of agriculturists, we shall have one established. I am glad to hear my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) and other hon. gentlemen approve of the stations already established. I can endorse what my hon. friend from South Alberta (Mr. Magrath) said as to the effects of the experimental farm at Indian Head. The district of Indian Head is probably to-day the most productive of that great wheat growing region, and I only speak what I have heard said by hundreds and hundreds of the best judges in the Northwest when I say that the fact that the Indian Head district is to-day so much in advance of most parts of the Northwest is due to the establishment of the experimental farm station there. I venture to say that everybody who knows the great wheat growing prairie area between the great lakes and the Rocky mountains will endorse my statement that Mr. McKay, the manager of the Indian Head farm, has done more to educate the farmers of the Northwest in the proper methods of wheat growing than any other dozen or perhaps any other hundred men in the Dominion of Canada. His work in that direction has been largely assisted by the fact that at Indian Head he has been able to carry on careful experimentation and observation, the results of which he has for a long term of years placed before the farmers of the Northwest. I believe that the same can be said for the experimental farm at Brandon and other farms throughout the country. My hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder) spoke about the value to the farmers of the evidence taken before the select committee on agriculture and he seemed to complain that this literature was not as freely circulated as it might be. Well, that is for the Committee of Agriculture and the Committee on Printing to deal with, because the taking of that evidence and the distribution of it is entirely under the control of the members of this House, and the Department of Agriculture and the Minister of Agriculture have nothing to do with it. If the evidence is not sent out to the farmers of Canada it is because the members of the House do not take the trouble to send it out.

Mr. BRODER. The difficulty is that such a long time elapses before it is printed.

Mr. FISHER. That defect can be remedied by the Committee on Printing and the Committee on Agriculture. I have no more control over that as Minister of Agriculture than my hon. friend has. I have inveighed against it, and urged the Committee on Agriculture to take steps with regard to it, but effective steps have not yet been taken.

Now, let me say a word with regard to some remarks of my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell). He spoke of irrigation and said that nothing had been done by the Department of Agriculture to measure the water that was required for the irrigating of certain lands. Let me say that in the establishment of the experimental station at Lethbridge a little more than two years ago that very work was taken up. Mr. Fairfield, the manager of that station, is an expert in irrigation work, and one of the first things that was laid out for him was that he should establish gates and measures on the irrigation canals of that farm, and watch them and take notes, and find out as quickly as possible the very point my hon. friend asked for. It is true, these gates and measures and sluices have only been built a little less than a year. They were erected as soon as possible after we acquired the farm, and therefore we have no results yet which we can place before the public; but just as soon as it is possible to obtain the results, they will be made available for those who wish to carry on irrigation work. Nobody appreciates more than myself the immense value of irrigation work in semi-arid or dry parts of our country. That has been impressed upon me for years, both in regard to that large area of land in the interior of British Columbia and that large area in southern Alberta and southern Saskatchewan, which until quite recently was thought to be too dry for agricultural experiments. I am glad to say that discoveries have been made by which to-day it is well known that much of that dry land can be cultivated, under methods which any farmer can carry on, and that excellent crops are assured in those parts of the country without irrigation. Irrigation is a splendid adjunct and help to that kind of dry farming. On the station at Lethbridge just that kind of work is being experimented with, and just as soon as we have any results that are assured, that information will be given to the public. If there is one thing in connection with the experimental farm system of Canada of which I am proud, and of which everybody connected with agriculture in Canada may be proud, it is that Dr. Saunders, who is at the head of that system, is a man of scientific attainments, well trained in scientific agricultural experimental work, a man who hesitates to jump to conclusions, but who, as soon as the conclusions have been scientificially proved, is well able to put them clearly and concisely, so that the ordinary farmer can understand them; and it has been the glory of that system, that what has been concluded as the results of years

of experiment, and what has been put before the public, has been universally acknowledged to be correct and well founded. Dr. Saunders and his staff have never yet been obliged to withdraw any point that they have put forward, and have never been found out in hasty or incorrect conclusions. I congratulate Canada, and I congratulate myself as the minister in charge of that particular work, that we have a man of scientific training and attainments on whose word we can thoroughly and absolutely rely as to the results of his experiments.

Let me say, too, in reply to my hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder), that while he is correct in saying that science must be joined with practice, still without science—and science to be of any use must be full and clear—the work of the practical farmer would be much less efficient than it is to-day in Canada. It was only a few weeks ago that in this city of Ottawa, and in these buildings, there was held the annual meeting of the Seed Grain Growers Association, and I regret extremely that more members of the House did not take part in that meeting. Dr. Robertson, the head of the McDonald Agricultural College at St. Anne, delivered an address in which he put before the meeting the fact that if the fields of grain in the province of Quebec generally had produced as much per acre as the fields of grain on the McDonald College farm, they would have produced $100,000,000 worth more than the grain crops of Quebec last year amounted to. That was not the quantity raised on the experimental plots, but was the quantity raised on some two hundred acres of the McDonald College farm. This is a statement of startling importance; and I venture to say, in reply to the hon. member from Dundas, that scientific knowledge is the handmaid of practical agriculture. Without scientific knowledge practical agriculture cannot make those advances in our country and on this continent which its importance justifies. The farmers of Canada today, partly through the experimental farm system, partly through the operations of the other branches of my department, and partly through the work of the different branches of agriculture in the various provinces, have an abundance of knowledge at their disposal which they do not make full use of. If they would make use of one-tenth of it and carry one-hundreth part of it into their everyday operations, the results would amount to tens of millions of dollars more from agricultural produce than there is to-day. It is the farmer's slip-shod methods in this country which is the limit of our agricultural production. We are fortunate in Canada in having established a reputation in the world's market for a fine quality of agricultural product; and today the market of Great Britain and Ireland is reaching out and demanding more of our finished agricultural products than we are sending to it, and the prices we get for these articles which we do send are such as to give the farmers of this country who raise the goods and export them splendid profits and splendid results, and the only pity is that the farmers of Canada are not doubling and quadrupling their exports every year. If they do not do it, it is not for lack of teaching or for lack of knowledge; it is for their lack of interest in their work, their lack of industry, and largely, I believe, for the lack of that labour which is necessary in the carrying on of our farming operations.

Sir, the experimental farm system has, for twenty odd years back, been laying before the farmers knowledge of an inestimable value. Many have taken advantage of it, many have improved their methods as a result of it; enough have done so to be a leaven that is working through the whole system of agriculture in the country. There has been enormous progress, there has been great improvement and the agriculture of Canada to-day is infinitely ahead of what it was twenty years ago when the experimental farm system was first established. This is largely due to the example and model of these farms. It is largely due to the experiments which have been carried on, the principal results of which have been sent broadcast among the people through reports and bulletins, that this progress and improvement are so great. I venture to think that we can safely and wisely multiply the number of illustration stations so that the farmers who do not read and do not quite apprehend all that they do read may be able to go easily to these stations and see what they can do. Then I think they would be more willing to go home and try to follow up what they have seen. I would be glad, if, within seeing reach of every farmer in the Dominion, there was an experimental plot, or rather, I would like to call it an illustration plot, where he could see the best methods in regard to those crops which are best adapted to the region in which he lives, so that the eye, as well as the comprehension in reading, will teach him what to do. It is a big and broad subject and the undertaking is too much to be accomplished in one year or perhaps in ten years, but we ought to work towards that end, and the resolution which my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) has introduced is a confirmation of my own opinion and an encouragement to me to go on and try to carry out as much as possible of the system which I had already inaugurated and which I would like to amplify.

Let me say just one word in regard to a point that I had in mind. Different sections of the country have organized excursions to the experimental farms in other parts of the country as well as to the ex-

perimental farm here. A very good thing. We have had some of the most interested and most intelligent bodies of farmers coming from the province of Quebec to the Central Experimental Farm, among them men who have come as far as 400 or 500 miles and spent three or four days on the trip so as to be able to have an opportunity of seeing the work on that farm and of going home with a better understanding of what farming is in a scientific way. I may say that I have had abundant evidence of this fact. I have letters by the score and by the hundreds from these people congratulating the Department of Agriculture on what was being done at the Central Experimental Farm, letters, which have, in consequence of these visits, even anticipated my hon. friend from Kamouraska and other hon. gentlemen who have asked for the establishment of other experimental stations. This is the best evidence of the value of these experimental stations, and I am glad to know that these excursions have taken place in different parts of the country. In Nova Scotia, Cape Breton and Prince Edward Island farmers have organized excursions to Nappan, out in the west, in the province of Manitoba, excursions are held to Brandon; in Saskatchewan and Alberta to Indian Head, and I believe also in British Columbia there are excursions of those interested in the fruit growing industry to Agassiz.

Let me say one word in reply to the remarks of my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) in that connection. He spoke of the work there as being no use to the interior dry belt. I agree with him that it is of very little use. It happens that Agassiz is a very wet place and the result is that the work of fruit growing there is of very little value from the experimental point of view to the dry belt of British Columbia. The farm is so situated that it is almost impossible to keep live stock on it successfully and well. The result is that the farm has not been of that advantage to British Columbia which was expected, and which, I think, a farm of that kind ought to be. That is one reason why I immediately decided that I would put a farm on the Island of Vancouver and why I have been groping and trying to find the right place to put an experimental station in the dry belt of the province. An hon. gentleman spoke about protection against insect pests and diseases which attack fruit trees, &c. Our farm system has been working on that ever since its inception. Let me here say that one of the very best officers of the experimental farm system was the late lamented Dr. Fletcher, entymologist and botanist of the experimental farm. His reputation and work extended far beyond the limits of Canada. He inaugurated economic botany and entymology, which is the true application of these two great natural sciences to the practical work of the farm, and his work has told so well that Canada is to-day freer of insect pests than any other country, which produces so much fruit and has so many trees. It is true that in a small portion of Ontario the San José scale is planted and established. That occurred some years ago, but our measures to shut out nursery stock and seedlings coming in from the United States, which is infested with this scale without fumigation, have been so successful that this pest has not been introduced into any part of Canada where it was not then in existence. It is true that it is spreading a little in that portion of Ontario where it has existed for so long. Efforts have been made to control it and reduce its evil effects. The provincial government has been acting in this direction and I believe to-day that while the work has not been altogether successful it is largely due to the efforts of the provincial government that the pest has not spread much more widely and that it has not covered those parts of the province where the fruits which it affects are produced. We must beware of other pests. Just at this present moment Dr. Saunders and his staff are watching and fighting against the introduction into parts of Canada where it is not yet known of an insect which is known as the brown tailed moth, a pest which has attacked the great state of New York and other states on the border and is creating the utmost havoc amongst fruit and other trees. That pest is known slightly in our own maritime provinces. We are taking steps to stimulate its extermination there and we are watching and examining every entry of fruit trees and seedlings coming into Canada from those countries where this pest exists, so as to make sure that the pest will not be introduced into this country. That is but one instance of the work that the farm system is doing to protect this great fruit growing industry.

My hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) said a few words a little while ago about spraying materials. I commend his views with regard to the free entry of spraying materials, and I can only congratulate him, myself and the House on the fact that so ardent a protectionist as he is is willing to reduce the duties or remove them from any item. I am glad to hear it and I can assure him that he has my entire sympathy. I have spoken perhaps too long, but I feel very strongly on this subject. I think that I am in a better position than most men to know what has been the advantage of such work as the experimental farm stations and similar stations can do in this country. I have no hesitation at all in saying that what little expenditure Canada has made in this way has been returned, not only to the farmers,

but to every man, woman and child within the boundaries of the Dominion, ten and twenty times over in the results which have been achieved; and I am satisfied that any further expenditure, even running into large sums if we are able, with the present declining revenue to spend, the money will be equally well returned to the whole country. Do not imagine for a moment, Mr. Speaker, that this is a question which affects the farmers only. It affects the whole country; it affects the transportation interest, the mercantile interests, the export trade and the import trade. If, in any way, we can accomplish even one-tenth of what Dr. Robertson said could be accomplished in the province of Quebec simply in one part of the work of improving agriculture—the improvement in the seed grain—we shall deserve well of our country, and I am sure that future generations will arise and call us blessed.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, we have just heard a most interesting debate and I am not surprised, I admit, at the promise which has just been made on behalf of the government. I expected a precise statement from the hon. the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), for although this question may appear a new one in certain respects. in others it is not so. I well remember having referred to it in this House during the last parliament and having laid before the government the same request as that made to-day by the member for Kamouraska, for the establishment in the province of Quebec of a very unpretending experimental farm, not nearly so extensive as the central farm at Ottawa, but sufficient nevertheless to supply our farmers with that information which it is difficult for them to obtain from our central station. I entered into no details as to its situation or extent. I stated before the House that we had spent much for the experimental farms so far established and that in view of the various conditions obtaining throughout our vast territory, this expenditure, great though it had been, was yet inadequate to the wants of the different provinces. I requested the minister to establish in the province of Quebec a model farm which would be within the reach of all the inhabitants of that province, and so conducted that farmers speaking the French language might be enabled to reap every possible benefit therefrom.

It is a great satisfaction to me to find that the minister has considerably altered his views concerning such stations, for when I made that request, urging practically the same arguments and giving the same statistics which have been to-day adduced before the House, I could not secure his approval. I predicted that he would become a convert to public opinion and I now find that he has been reclaimed.

No doubt, I would have desired more explicit explanations on the part of the minister as to the location of the farm to be built in compliance with the wishes of the hon. member for Kamouraska. The question being one of long standing and having been several times submitted to the Minister of Agriculture, who now admits that the step is necessary, we had a right to expect from him something more positive concerning the establishment he intends to create in the eastern portion of Quebec.

After the harmonious debate of this afternoon, I have certainly no intention of striking a discordant note, but I will say that in view of the great development of experimental farms in the Northwest, we are entitled to require a little more than this for the province of Quebec. There are already three experimental farms in that region of comparatively recent development. The minister has to-day declared that he has considered it necessary to establish no less than two new farms in Alberta and one in Saskatchewan. He informs us that another will soon be in operation in British Columbia. Now what arguments are we in a position to bring up in support of the motion now before the House? Have we not the Lake St. John region, containing at least a million acres of farming land upon which hundreds of rich and prosperous parishes might be built up? Have we not also the ancient valley of the St. Lawrence, concerning which our data are very general and vague and which is generally supposed to be so poor that the farmers living there scarcely reap a sufficiency? Nothing could be more removed from the truth, the region being exceedingly rich, but its various climates require to be studied. It is well known that fruit-growing has been undertaken with excellent results to the east of the city of Quebec. Have we not, moreover the valley of the Metapedia, where settlement is well advanced and which would be benefited by an experimental farm in eastern Quebec?

I am gratified to find that opinions which I claim as having been the first to express them here, are to-day unanimously accepted, even by the minister who some years ago had not attained the conviction which he has proclaimed to-day. Shall we have that experimental farm, and when?

There seems to be, I regret to find, some difference of opinion, even among the representatives of the region, as to the proper location of the experimental farm. The member for Quebec claims it for his constituency.

Mr. TALBOT. (Translation.) He is not serious.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) And one of them made statements which are to be regretted when he said that the farmers of his county were wedded to routine. This is often said of our French Canadian farmers and it is untrue. Let our farmers be given the same opportunities of progressing, let means of education be extended to them as generously as they are to others, and I am convinced that that exceedingly intelligent portion of our fellow countrymen will be even more prompt in taking advantage of them than many other portions of the population of Canada. I have acquired this conviction while travelling through the province of Quebec.

I would advise my friends in the Quebec district to elect a few more members to sit on the opposition side of the House. That would perhaps help them in obtaining experimental farms of which the government is so profuse in the west. How can the thing be explained unless by the indifference of the government? My hon. friend may indeed desire to punish those whom he loves and according to the principle of the Good Shepherd, he may be willing to leave the faithful flock, to go off in search of the stray lambs. I cannot tell; but apparently it is to the advantage of certain portions of the country not to pay too humble a court to the powers that be.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I will add but a few words to the speech of my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture. As to the somewhat acerb remarks of the member for Jacques Cartier, I may pass them over in consideration of the cordial support he has given to the motion submitted by the nember for Kamouraska.

The latter deserves to be congratulated upon the eloquent and instructive speech he has delivered, a speech showing that he has seriously studied the question. My hon. friend's success has been the more remarkable that opinions are generally so sharply divided here. He has rallied every representative in this House from Halifax to Vancouver to the idea that we have so long entertained of establishing an experimental farm in the district of Quebec. Montreal cannot object to such a request which is of more or less local interest. Indeed Montreal is within three hours journey of the excellent experimental farm we have here in Ottawa. Moreover, the whole Montreal region will reap especial benefit from the great agricultural school lately founded in the province of Quebec by that distinguished Scotchman, Sir William McDonald. The Oka school also will be of great use to the district of Montreal. But Quebec is far removed from Ottawa and from those schools. The climate of Quebec, as is well known, differs from that of Montreal. Even within the Quebec district important variations of climate may be observed. Thus, in Gaspé and Bonaventure, the winter is longer than in Quebec, but milder. Summer and autumn lasts three and sometimes four weeks more.

We of Bonaventure and Gaspé have no present intention of claiming an experimental farm. The Quebec district proper should, we think, take precedence; that is one of the clearest results of the motion made this afternoon by my hon. friend from Kamouraska.

The member for Jacques Cartier does not seem convinced of the government's good faith in this matter. He even claims that if the district of Quebec should obtain an experimental farm, it will be due to his own efforts. I know that during the last session certain questions were asked concerning this, but I think I am not mistaken when I say that during the last election the people of the Quebec region themselves delivered to their representatives an imperative mandate to have so important a question definitely settled.

The member for Kamouraska deserves our thanks for having taken this matter in hand, and also our congratulations for having succeeded in carrying conviction to both sides of the House. He has been through out the spokesman of the district of Quebec and has obtained from the Minister of Agriculture the equivalent of an official promise that his views will be promptly carried out.

ADJOURNMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Bill of the Secretary of State (Mr. Murphy); then the Bill respecting the Civil Service, if it is ready, if not, Supply, Railways and Canals.

House adjourned at six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 4, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 87) To incorporate the Arnprior and Pontiac Railway Company.—Mr. Hodgins.

ASSAULTS AND OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 88) respecting assaults and offences against the person.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, this Bill has reference to crimes that now, unfortunately, are too prevalent throughout the whole of Canada. There is no one within sound of my voice but will admit that there has been a strange laxity in the punishment of offenders against the person while those frequently found pilfering a small sum of money with which to purchase something to eat are punished too severely. The purpose of the Bill is to increase the punishment of tramps or others who commit offences against the person and to take proper care of persons dangerous to be at large. We must recollect that twenty years have elapsed since the Criminal Code was first made law in this country. Times have changed, our circumstances have altered and our population has increased. Throughout this fair Canada of ours crimes against the person of a very objectionable character are rampant. The murderer, the burglar, ravisher, the assaulter, gets off with a small punishment. Unfortunately there is a practice prevailing which is not calculated to mitigate this condition. A tramp who is arrested in a certain county is allowed his liberty by the magistrate on condition that he goes into another county within so many hours.

In the recent Stratford case, where the negro broke into the house and murdered a woman after assaulting her, the negro had been arrested three times within one week before the murder, but had been allowed to go by different magistrates on condition that he removed into another county. The seventh clause of this Bill prohibits a magistrate from allowing a criminal, a vagrant, an idle or a dissolute person to go free on condition that he leaves the county. It also provides that where a vagrant, an idle or a dissolute person has been convicted a second time he shall be sent to a prison or penitentiary provided by the province in which he is charged, there to be detained at hard labour until the inspector certifies that from his course in the penitentiary or from his having learned a trade there, he is, in the opinion of the inspector, able and willing to earn an honest living and not be a menace to his fellows. Where a prisoner, after being liberated, in that way, commits another offence, then in addition to the punishment for that offence, he shall be sentenced to from five to ten years in the penitentiary. Tallack, on the Law of Crime, distinctly lays down that the first act of violence predisposes to a criminal disposition, and that where a person has been convicted three times he should be treated as incorrigible and kept where he will not be a menace to his fellow men. Clause 6 authorizes the police to search tramps, idle and dissolute persons for weapons and prescribe punishments

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

GOVERNMENT HARBOURS AND PIERS ACT.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 89) to amend the Government Harbours and Piers Act.

He said: The object of this Bill is to provide for the leasing of breakwaters, wharfs and piers which are under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, to municipal corporations or railways or shipping companies. The existing law provides that municipal corporations may become the lessees of wharfs. There is no provision as far as shipping companies and railway companies are concerned, and it has been thought advisable that they should have the power to lease wharfs. As a matter of fact such a power exists before the wharfs and piers and transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. There is a provision in the Public Works Act declaring that these wharfs and piers may be leased to shipping and railway companies and to municipal corporations. The present Bill is simply an extension of this power granted under the Public Works Act to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

The second clause provides for the commuting of wharfage rates. The collection of the small wharfage fees on some of these minor wharfs becomes a very serious difficulty for the department. We think that if we had the power to commute the fees with the shipping companies it would give us a larger revenue than we now receive.

Motion agreed to, and the Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

OSHAWA HARBOUR, REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE.

Mr. HUGHES asked:

1. Who is the collector of customs at Oshawa harbour, and what is his salary?
2. What revenue has been collected at the port of Oshawa each year since it was taken over by the government, and from what sources was the revenue derived?
3. In addition to the salary of the collector, what other expenses have been incurred by the government each year in connection therewith since taking over the port?
4. What representations were made to induce the government to invest in the harbour?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. George F. Blamey is Collector of Customs at Oshawa. Salary $1,200 a year.

Mr. HUGHES. Will the balance of the question stand?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

KITSILANO INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. COWAN—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Did the hon. the Minister of the Interior on or about the 18th of October, 1908, receive from W. W. B. McInnes a telegram in the words or to the effect of the words following:

'Indian reserve at Kitsilano is within city limits. Have assured electors government would consent to transfer reserve to city for park purposes if other parties consenting. Please wire me if you will consent.'

2. Is so, did the minister reply to the above telegram in the following words:

'Yours of 18th received. Will be glad to arrange as desired regarding Kitsilano reserve provided arrangements can also be made with Indians and provincial government.'

3. If not, what is his reply?

4. Is the government still willing to transfer Kitsilano reserve to the city of Vancouver if arrangements are made with the Indians and the provincial government?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Answered by No. 2.
4. In view of the more recent action of the provincial government in contesting the right of Indians to the land comprised in reserves in that province, it is not considered advisable that any promises should be made at present as to future action by the Dominion government as guardian of the rights of the Indians.

CAPT. D. McPHAIDEN.

Mr. COWAN—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

1. Has Captain D. McPhaiden, shipping master at the port of Vancouver, resigned or expressed desire to resign?

2. Has the department requested his resignation?

3. Has the department had applications for his position? If so, how many and from whom?

4. Does the hon. minister intend to retire him ?

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

1. No.
2. No.
3. No.
4. The question has not been considered.

MARINE DEPARTMENT PURCHASES.

Mr. COWAN—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

1. What system has been substituted in the Marine and Fisheries Department for the patronage system?

2. Are tenders always invited? If so, by whom and before whom are these tenders opened?

3. If in any case no tenders are invited, in what cases, and what method is adopted?

4. When tenders are invited, do the notices thereof fix the date of opening?

5. Has the patronage system been discarded in the publication of these notices?

6. If so, what principle governs the choice of newspapers in which to publish?

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

1. The system at present in vogue is that adopted by all large industrial concerns, which results in goods being purchased at the lowest possible rates, quantity and quality considered.

2. Yes. By the deputy minister and purchasing and contract agent. When the value of the supplies required exceeds $5,000, tenders are publicly advertised for and are opened in the presence of the minister and deputy mininster. When supplies to the value of less than $5,000 are required tenders are invited by the purchasing and contract agent from the leading wholesale houses and these tenders are opened by him.

3. Tenders are always obtained for construction work and supplies except when the supplies do not exceed the value of $10 to $20.

4. Yes. When publicly advertised for.

5 and 6. Notices calling for tenders are placed in a sufficient number of the leading journals to insure competition.

THE LIGHTHOUSE BOARD.

Mr. COWAN—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

1. Is it intended that the lighthouse board shall be a permanent institution?

2. If so, has it been reorganized since the report of the Commissioners Fyshe and Bazin?

3. Is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries now a member of it?

4. Who are now the several members of that board?

5. Are any engaged directly or as agents in the shipping or fishing business?

6. To whom are they responsible, to what extent and under what regulations?

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

1. No change is contemplated at present.
2. No.
3. No.
4. Acting deputy minister, G. J. Desbarats, chairman.

Lt.-Col. W. P. Anderson, chief engineer, member.

Commander O. G. V. Spain, wreck commissioner, member.

Acting commissioner of lights, Mr. J. G. Macphail, member.

Hugh A. Allan, Montreal, member, representing shipping interests generally.

Capt. J. W. Troup, Victoria, B.C., member, representing shipping interests on Pacific coast.

Mr. W. H. Noble acts in the absence of the acting commissioner of lights.

Mr. H. H. Fraser, assistant chief engineer, acts in the absence of the chief engineer.

The presidents of the pilotage districts of Montreal and Quebec are ex-officio members of the board when matters affecting their districts are under consideration.

5. Yes. Hugh A. Allan and J. W. Troup are interested in the shipping business.

6. The functions of the lighthouse board are advisory and not administrative. Their recommendations are addressed to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who takes such action upon them as he deems proper.

DEPORTATION OF IMMIGRANTS—EXPENSE.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. Does the government keep a special account of the expenses incurred in connection with the deportation of immigrants?

2. What is the amount expended by the government in deporting immigrants for the last four fiscal years, respectively?

3. How many immigrants have been deported since the end of the last fiscal year?

4. What has been the total sum expended by the government in connection with the deportation of immigrants since March 31, 1908?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Yes, since 1st July, 1906.

2. 1904-1905
1905-1906
See answer to No. 1.
1906-1907. $3,086.55.
1907-1908. $12,988.30.

3. 1467. To January 31, 1909.

4. $27,284.36.

THE 'MINTO' AND 'STANLEY.'

Mr. RHODES asked:

1. Were any of the officers and crews of the government steamers 'Minto' and 'Stanley' laid off duty between the 12th and 17th of February, 1909?

2. If so, on what days were they laid off and for how long were they laid off?

3. At whose request were they laid off and for what purpose?

4. Were any substitutes provided for the men laid off?

5. Were the officers and men paid, or will they be paid for the time that they were off duty?

6. If substitutes were provided, are they to be paid by the government?

7. Did the steamers or either of them make a regular trip or trips without the officers and men who were laid off?

8. Could the work of the steamers be carried on properly and safely without the services of the men laid off?

9. Have the men all returned to duty? If so, when?

10. What are the names and positions of the officers and members of the crew laid off?

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

1. The captains' daily reports show that the 'Stanley' did not make her daily trip on the 12th but remained at Georgetown; and that on the 16th, owing to a blinding northeast snowstorm neither vessel left her dock, the 'Stanley' remaininng at Georgetown and the 'Minto' remaining at Pictou. On the other dates referred to the regular trips were made, excepting the 14th which was Sunday. It may be added in this connection that, following the usual custom and the practice in Great Britain with regard to Royal Navy Government ships, the officers and men of both the 'Stanley' and 'Minto' who were entitled to vote in the election in Pictou county on the 16th had permission to do so.

2. None of the officers or crews were laid off.

3, 4, 5. See No. 2.

6. No necessity for substitutes; none employed.

7. See No. 1 and 2.

8, 9, 10. See No. 2.

ORIENTAL IMMIGRATION INTO BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, on the 18th of February the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. J. D. Taylor) asked the following questions:

1. Has the government received from the government of British Columbia a resolution adopted by the legislature of that province, praying that application be made to the imperial government for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the circumstances in connection with Oriental immigration into British Columbia?

2. If so, what was the date of receipt, what acknowledgment was made, and what action has been taken?

3. If no action has been taken, is it the intention of the government to deal with the matter?

These questions were answered in the negative by my hon friend the Secretary of State. My hon. friend was not in the government last year, and he was not aware that a resolution of the kind referred to had been received by the government last year—I think in the month of April—requesting this government to ask the imperial government for such a commission. I have to inform the hon. gentleman now

that no action has been taken upon this petition, and that it is not the intention of the government to deal with it. The reasons for this course are: First, because this is a matter with which this parliament has power to deal. Second, because action has already been taken under authority of this parliament which has resulted in effectually controlling immigration from the Orient, as follows: first, immigration from China, by Act of this parliament; second, immigration from Japan, by diplomatic action; third, immigration from India, by representations from this government to the Indian office and Indian authorities.

THE FRENCH TREATY.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the orders of the day are called, might I ask the Finance Minister when we may expect the revised French treaty to be brought down?

Mr. FIELDING. I could bring down the treaty itself immediately, but as it has been in substance already communicated to the public the treaty itself would add nothing to the store of information, and as there is considerable correspondence connected with it, I thought it would be more convenient to have the correspondence and the treaty brought down together. I will try to have them brought down within a day or two.

LEVEL RAILWAY CROSSINGS.

Mr. LENNOX. Can the Minister of Railways inform the House when we shall probably have legislation introduced dealing with railway crossings. The minister, I presume, is working on it, and it is important that we should have it as soon as possible. I would like also to call the attention of the minister to a minor point. In answering questions yesterday he said:

I am not prepared to say how many crossings the Grand Trunk Railway Company have in Canada.

I would like to call the attention of the minister to the fact that in a return brought down on the 15th or 16th of February last it was stated that the total number of level crossings in Canada was 14,999, and that some 3,000 of these are protected. Mr. Hays is reported to have made the statement, which may have been incorrectly reported in the press, that they have 50,000 crossings on their lines. In one or two papers it is stated that he said 3,000, which is probably in the neighbourhood of the right number. If the minister has the total number of crossings on all the railways in Canada, it seems to me that he could give the information I ask—how many are on the Grand Trunk system and how many of these are protected. I am anxious to have that information for this reason: Mr. Hays estimates the cost of carrying out on the Grand Trunk system the suggestion made in parliament at $50,000,000, which means $16,000 odd for every crossing on their system.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will note that I laid on the table a memorandum of the engineer of the Railway Commission, so that when I used the pronoun 'I' it was his 'I' and not mine. I will make inquiry again. As to the introduction of legislation, it is not any easy problem to work out. I expect to introduce something of the kind in a very few days.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. HERRON. On the 1st day of February I obtained an order of the House for information as to how much money the Manitoba 'Free Press' had received from the government in a number of years, and I have heard nothing of it since.

Hon. CHAS. MURPHY. Instructions were given to prepare that information. I will see that it is brought down at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. LAKE. I wish to ask the Minister of the Interior if he will kindly expedite a return which was ordered by this House on my motion on the 22nd of February relative to the areas of certain coal and timber lands in the prairie provinces and other information in that respect.

DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.

Hon. CHAS. MURPHY (Secretary of State) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient that there should be a department of the civil service of Canada to be called the Department of External Affairs, over which the Secretary of State of Canada shall preside, and that the Governor in Council may appoint an officer to be the deputy head of such department at a salary of $5,000 per annum, and such other officers and clerks as may be requisite for the due administration of such department at such salaries as, under the Civil Service Amendment Act, 1908, are appropriate to the divisions and subdivisions of the service to which such officers and clerks may be assigned.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that the Bill to be founded on this resolution does not involve any serious constitutional change. It aims merely at an improvement in the administration of that class of public affairs which relate to matters other than those of purely internal concern. As the House is aware the Government of Canada holds all its official communications extending beyond the bounds of the Dominion, whether with the Secretary of State for the Colonies, with the various sister dominions, or with His Majesty's

ambassadors to foreign countries, through His Excellency the Governor General; and I might say for the information of the House that it is not proposed to effect any change in this regard by the legislation that is now proposed.

The House is also, I take it, aware, that despatches bearing on all questions of an external character come through His Excellency the Governor General. They are by His Excellency referred to the Privy Council and by the Privy Council they are in turn referred to the particular department which is supposed to be specially concerned with the subject matter of the communication. In due course the minister at the head of that department reports on these despatches to the Governor General in Council and that report, if agreed to by council and approved by His Excellency, is transmitted as the answer of his government. Now, this plan looks simple and in the early days of the Dominion it may have worked satisfactorily. These days however are passed, and with the development of the country and the increase in the number and complexity of its international relations it is felt that the old system is inadequate to meet the existing requirements. Those members of the House who are also members of the Privy Council know that official correspondence does not always lend itself to the simple treatment I have outlined. Sometimes it is difficult to tell at first sight to what department a despatch may relate; sometimes a despatch may relate partly to one department and partly to another or to several departments; and it frequently happens that where despatches of a series are referred to a particular department others of the same series may later on find their way to another department which having no knowledge of the earlier correspondence will be at a loss to decide what shall be done. The government feel that it would be a great advantage if all such communications were sent to a common centre where they could be dealt with according to a uniform system; where there would be a small staff of officials trained in the study of these questions, and where at all times it would be possible to ascertain not only the present position of a question but its history from the very beginning. It is with the object of attaining these results that the present resolution is submitted to the House and that the Bill to be founded upon it later will be introduced.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Secretary of State has not made one thing manifest to my mind, and that is the most important thing of all: Why is it that the Department of the Secretary of State cannot be the common centre to which the hon. gentleman alludes; why cannot that department do all the work that has been outlined in the very brief remarks of the Secretary of State ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The Secretary of State has I think given the reasons why it is deemed advisable at this stage of our national development to have a department of external affairs. All governments have found it necessary to have a department whose only business shall be to deal with relations with foreign countries, and in our judgment Canada has reached a period in her history when we should follow the example of other countries in that respect, as, for example, the Commonwealth of Australia. In the Department of the Interior we have a department which deals with interior affairs and we have also a department which deals with Indian Affairs alone, it having been found long ago that the dealings with our aborigines required the attention of one department. So it is in the Department of Marine and Fisheries where we have practically one department dealing with marine affairs and another dealing with questions appertaining to our fisheries. I suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) that we have now reached a standard as a nation which necessitates the establishment of a Department of External Affairs. It is not unnatural that the hon. gentleman should ask, why the machinery of the Department of the Secretary of State is not sufficient for the purpose. We have given this matter a good deal of consideration and the conclusion we have arrived at is that the foreign affairs with which Canada has to deal are becoming of such absorbing moment as to necessitate special machinery. Look at the volume of business of an external character which has been transacted during the past year. We had the French treaty negotiated by us, of course with the concurrence and approval of the imperial authorities; we had another treaty dealing with the long pending question of the interpretation of the treaty of 1818 in relation to our Atlantic fisheries. For the last forty or fifty years this has been a source of contention between the United States and Great Britain although luckily during the last ten or twelve years we have had no serious difficulty with our neighbours in regard to it. However, our fellow subjects in Newfoundland have not been so fortunate and as we know they have had during the last four or five years some very acute differences with the American authorities on the subject of the interpretation of the treaty of 1818.

And, as a consequence, an arbitration has been determined upon to settle the points of difference between Newfoundland and the American authorities. We have been drawn into this contest; we have gone into it, not because we had any controver-

sy of our own, but simply because our fellow-subjects in Newfoundland were in it, and we thought it our duty to give them all the assistance we could in their difficulty. Then, we have had another treaty, also negotiated at Washington, with reference to the fisheries in the inland waters. We have another treaty to mark again the boundaries between Canada and the United States,—not to create any new boundary, but simply to place new land marks to show plainly where the boundary is. Then, we have had another and most important treaty which is now engaging the attention of the American Senate, which, I hope, will come before the Canadian parliament before many days are over, that is, a treaty to settle in a friendly spirit all difficulties which may arise in the boundary waters between Canada and the United States. Then, the House is aware that, from time to time, we have had informal negotiations with Germany in relation to the tariff difficulty we have had with that country. Now this alone will show to the House that Canada has reached a position where foreign relations have assumed a very important character. That is not surprising. We have now a population which cannot be less than six millions and is probably more; we have an annual revenue of $80,000,000 and more; our trade last year grew to the very large figure of $600,000,000. Under such circumstances, I repeat, it is not extraordinary that the volume of foreign affairs has assumed such proportions as to make it indispensable that we should have officers, trained for the purpose, whose business shall be to deal with such questions and such questions alone. Let me call the attention of the House to the character of the communications we received and which are to be classed as belonging to foreign relations. All our communications pass through the colonial office or the ambassador of His Majesty at Washington or elsewhere, and then come to the Governor General. From the Governor General, they are sent to the Privy Council—

Mr. FOSTER. The Secretary of State is it not?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, to the Privy Council. It is not our intention to disturb that. It is better that the representative of the Sovereign should receive all communications relating to foreign affairs, and it is natural that by him they should be sent to the Privy Council. At present, from the Privy Council, they are sent to the department to which they relate.

Mr. FOSTER. How is that distribution made? Through the Secretary of State?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, by the Privy Council itself. All the despatches are sent from the Governor General to the Privy Council; the clerk of the Privy Council places them before the council, and by the council they are assigned to the department to which they relate. But this is done sometimes in a hurry, and therefore it happens that despatches may go to the wrong department. For, my hon. friend will understand, ministers sitting at the council board have not the time to look into these matters themselves, and must depend upon their officers. The intention is that we should have a department which will be a department of Foreign Affairs and will deal with nothing else. All the despatches will be sent by the Privy Council to that department.

Mr. FOSTER. They will come first to the Governor General, then to the Privy Council, then to the department?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, the Department of External Affairs. There they are docketed, they are digested and prepared.

Mr. FOSTER. How prepared?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. A memorandum is made—that is how I would work it out.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They would be abstracted—a precis made.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Very good, they would be abstracted, then sent to the proper department for information. The Department of External Affairs would receive this information, digest it and draft an answer to be sent to the minister and by him submitted to the council for its action.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask one question. Will this department take up despatches, let us say, relating to a fisheries question, and prepare an answer to them and submit it to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No. Suppose that a despatch relating to some foreign affair comes to the Privy Council—suppose that it relates to this very fisheries question, of which I spoke a moment ago—the Atlantic fisheries. That despatch will go to the Department of External Affairs. I would like to have a history of every question made and kept up from day to day, so that the minister in charge, might, in a moment, understand what the question is and be prepared to advise the Governor General as to the policy that ought to be followed. If it is necessary to get information from the Department of Marine and Fisheries, it will go to that department. The Department of External Affairs will thus get all the technical details upon which to base a conclusion. It will also prepare a memorandum or draft of despatch, or answer, to be laid before council, on which a

policy can be adopted. Take, for instance, a question that was familiar to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) when he was in office—the question of the seal fisheries of the Pacific ocean. This is a most complicated question, one which comes to the front from time to time and may come up again. Suppose we receive from the British Ambassador a despatch on this question. This despatch will be referred to the Department of External Affairs. All the information upon the question is collected, so that we can deal intelligently with the proposition which may be made to us. It may be, it will be sent to the Marine and Fisheries Department to get the information needed to deal with it. And when the matter is in proper shape, the Department of External Affairs will prepare a memorandum for the minister.

Mr. FOSTER. Which minister?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Secretary of State, the head of the department. He will bring it before council and by council the matter will be dealt with. This is the only reasonable way in which we can deal with these matters. At present, these questions are carried to different departments, there is no department in which we can collect a history of the several questions, and no officers trained to give us the advice we need in order to deal with these questions. When I was in England some years ago, I took pains to learn how these things were dealt with there. I found that in the Colonial office and in the Foreign office there are officers especially trained to keep up all the information needed to deal with the questions that may arise, keeping up the history of each question from day to day, so that, in a moment, the ministers may know where they are. I may be asked—I take it that such is the effect of the question asked by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden): Why not have this done by the Secretary of State's department? Why have another department? I have simply to answer that, in such experience of the government, as I have had leads me to believe that we have attained such development as a nation that in order to deal with these matters, we must have a department for the purpose. It is not intended it shall be a very numerous department, a very heavy department; I think the officers at present in the service can do the necessary work. But I think it is essential that we should have this department by itself, with nothing else to do but to give their special attention, and all their attention, to these matters alone.

Mr. FOSTER. I have been listening to the Prime Minister for information. What I want to get at, if possible, is the modus operandi which it is proposed to employ, and something of the extent and cost which that modus operandi will involve. From the remarks made by the Secretary of State, who did not go into it very extensively, I could not get into my mind just the method which it was proposed to proceed upon to accomplish the object. The Prime Minister has gone more into detail, and he has opened up what appears to him to be the method which should be pursued. Now, no one is more happy than myself, than the members on this side of the House, in common with every other citizen of Canada, at what may be the indication of Canada's extending business, not only internally, but with foreign countries, with the sister colonies, and with Great Britain. But the Prime Minister must not try to make us believe that there never were any external relations of importance until within these last few years. Canada has seldom been without her outside vexing questions, that have been from time to time of greater or less importance. It is not necessary to mention them, they come to the mind of every person who has had 25 or 30 years experience in public matters in this country. We have such questions now, we always will have them, and it is natural to suppose that they will be more extended in proportion as we grow, and the means of communication with the world becomes more rapid.

Now let us see what my hon. friend proposes, and inquire whether his idea will work out or not. It is not proposed to make any constitutional change; we are thankful for that. The despatch, when it enters Canada, will go to the Governor General as at the present time; the Governor General will then put that despatch into the possession of the Privy Council as quickly as possible, doing that because the head of the Privy Council is the premier of the country, who should first have notice of these despatches. They go to the Privy Council under the present and the past method of action. It has been the duty of the Privy Council to send these particular despatches each to the Minister of the department which was concerned. It is not a difficult matter surely for the ministers around the table in the Privy Council almost immediately to decide as to whether such and such a despatch affects the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or affects the Department of Agriculture or affects any other department. It shows on its face the subject matter, and the moment subject matter is shown, it goes by consequence to the minister in charge of the department in which those matters are carried on. It may take a little time, it may call for a little discernment, but I do not think the difficulties in that respect are at all large. Under the proposed plan, the Prime Minister will be rid of all that difficulty, of having any initial discussion or investigation with regard to despatches that come in, by immediately bundling

them off to the Secretary of State. There may be an advantage in that in one way, there may be a disadvantage in another. It is an advantage that every member of the Council should have a constant and current knowledge of whatever is coming in from external sources affecting the business of Canada, that it should enter the Privy Council, and after it has passed through this process of digestion, come again before the Privy Council for ultimate decision. It may be some disadvantage that the matters which will receive the least consideration first will be sent as a matter of course and form to the Secretary of State, and therefore the ministers individually will not become cognizant of them, or have the curent knowledge of which I speak.

Now you get a despatch with reference, we will suppose, to the Pacific fisheries, and you send it off without consideration to the Secretary of State. What has this new department under the Secretary of State to do with it? The minister says it must be docketed, registered, an abstract made of it then it is to be sent—by whom? By the Secretary of State. Where? To the proper department. Is the Secretary of State a better judge of the department to which each despatch should be sent than would be the Prime Minister and the Council hearing the despatch and becoming cognizant of it? There does not seem to be much advantage gained in that respect. But there are despatches coming in which are confidential, which belong primarily to the Prime Minister alone, which sometimes never go beyond the purview of the Prime Minister, or may be one or two of his most responsible colleagues. What is to be done with those despatches? Are they to be bundled off to the Secretary of State, put into the hands of his docketers, and abstracters and registered? Then what becomes of their confidential nature? Does not the Prime Minister see that neither he nor his Council can divest themselves of the necessity of looking at those despatches in the first instance, in order to separate, if nothing else, what are purely confidential and what are partly confidential, from those which are matters of course? But let that pass. Now that the Secretary of State has had them docketed, and bracketed and abstracted, he looks them over and says, I am of opinion that this goes to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or it goes to the Department of Agriculture, or it goes to the Minister of Justice—some matter of international law, or something of that kind; and he takes it upon himself to decide. The mistake, if there be one, is the mistake of one man, the judgment being the judgment of one man; in the other case, the judgment being the judgment of the Council, the mistake would be more rare in the occurrence. Can your Secretary of State be at the office always? What happens? As in every other department, it happens that one or two men in the department are the men who will actually direct affairs, they will be the persons who will do the distribution, and who will consequently send these things on their way, rightly or wrongly.

But having got that far—and I am anxious just to carry it out and see where it ends—having got that far, what does the Secretary of State say? His boss man, with $5,000 a year, tells him: This is to go to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, it is a very important matter with reference to the seal fisheries of the Pacific, and it must go to that minister. What does it go to the minister for? Does the Secretary of State say to the minister: Here is a very important despatch about the seal fisheries; I want you to give me all the information of your department with reference to that matter, get your men to work, give me the abstracts, send me the papers, I want them here as quickly as possible, the Governor General is in haste to have an answer. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries does—what? Puts himself into the hands of his officers, sets his clerks to work, gathers together all the information he can, bundles it up, and sends it over to the Secretary of State. But the Secretary of State knows no more about it than the man in the moon, comparatively speaking. He bundles it over to his $5,000 officers and their clerks. They are the men who are to write the despatch, says the Prime Minister. I do not believe they are the men who ought to write the despatch. It strikes me that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who knows the business from the foundation up, historically and otherwise, in whose department are all the facts as well as all the history, is the man who has to determine the policy and is the man who has to lay down the tenor of the despatch and submit it to his colleagues. Now it is proposed that he is not to do it. He is to send over the information and these experts in the Secretary of State's Department are to prepare the despatch in answer to the one that was received and lay it before your Privy Council. That is the programme, as I understand it. If that is the programme what must you have? You must have a replica of every department of the government in the Department of the Secretary of State, men who are as able as the ministers of the departments are, men who are just as well up in their history as the ministers of the departments; consequently you are to have, if you are going to have an effective service, a very costly and numerous service. But even though you have that, a minister says I am the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I have studied my department, I know

its history and its circumstances and consequently I would feel as though I were the one who was to go to council with the kind of despatch which should go in answer to the despatch which had come. Now, I am simply to be told to send my material over to this new bureau, and if one of these gentlemen wants to know something that he does not know, tote over there, coach him up and tell him how things are, what rocks he has to avoid, and what clear water he has to take as he sails along in this despatch business. I believe that difficulties and practical difficulties will be encountered in that respect which I doubt if the right hon. gentleman has thoroughly weighed. The objection I have to this system is that it is not effective unless you make a most thorough, expensive and expert system, and have in the department some man who knows as much about every department in the government as does the responsible minister himself in reference to its history and circumstances. The despatch comes back from the Secretary of State but it is not gotten up by the Secretary of State. He comes and goes. He is here to-day and there to-morrow. It is the permanent man who will do it, it will be the bureau man who will do that. When that despatch comes before the Privy Council there sits the minister whose department is concerned. The despatch is read, he has had no guiding hand in it and he may not have been consulted. He may say: I do not think it is a proper reply to be made; I do not think this bureau man has got the spirit of this matter. What is to be done? You cannot pass it against the minister. You will do what you might have done at first much better, it seems to me; that is, you will put it in the minister's hands, then as you will necessarily have to put it in the minister's hands in the last resort and let him take hold of it and give you the idea of the department. No outside bureaucrat can have the atmosphere of the department who has not been brought up to the work and who does not know the history of it. I think that will go without any contradiction at all. It is impossible to live in South Africa and have an appreciation of the air of Alberta or of Saskatchewan. You cannot do it, and no simple clerk, no extra well paid clerk in the bureau can have the atmosphere of the department such as that which clings to it for fifty years and is the product of the experience, history and the knowledge of its men during that time. When I came, a boy almost, into the Department of Marine and Fisheries, I knew nothing of the department more than its name. Upon whom did I depend? At that moment I leaned strictly on one of the most capable deputy ministers we ever had. He had his faults, as every deputy minister has. That was our late lamented friend, Mr. Wm. Smith. He had the whole history of the Department of Marine and Fisheries in his head. There was not a subject you could bring up in regard to which he could not at first give you his version and point to the material relating to it which carried out his version of it. You never can have your expert in this bureau with the head on him, with the atmosphere and with the amount of knowledge that the man brought up in the department for fifteen or thirty, or it may be, forty years has; and so that is why I think that this matter will not come to a good conclusion in the end. Yes, we want system. Everything that refers to the Department of Marine and Fisheries should be registered, docketed, bracketed in the Minister of Marine and Fisheries own department, to be at his right hand when he wants it for any purpose whatever. Everything that you want docketed in reference to this matter can be done by two expert men in the Privy Council, attached to the Prime Minister himself who can keep what is necesary to the Privy Council—a record of all the transactions under that head. That can be done by two or three good business-like, expert men in the office of the Privy Council as well. In this I am not opposing our extension; no one wants to do that. I am not saying that these matters are not multiplying, but if they are multiplying they are multiplying by additions in each department, each taking its quota of added burden, but each department is well able to do this work and the Lord knows every one of them has a pay-roll big enough to do it. So, I repeat what I said at first. It seems that you add but another to the percolating media through whose hands this business would run, through which it would retrace itself until it came out at the same point at which it went in. You have a more simple, economical and thorough manner of dealing with this matter if you attach a little body of expert clerks to the Privy Council, put them under the Prime Minister, where, I think, these things ought to be and let them do all this work of keeping the records so that the Prime Minister and council, when they want to know the history of an affair, shall have the records and the abstracts under their own hand to show them what they need to know instead of having to hunt through the different departments to find this information. I just state these things because I want to see what we are going into before we go into it, and to see whether it will be a change for the better or not.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words upon this question before it goes through.

The record that is to be found in the library of parliament is rather interesting when contrasted with the proposal which is being made to the House to-day. I remember very distinctly that years ago there was, from this side of the House, a strong attack made upon the Conservative government of the day because of the number of the departments we had in the Canadian government. The example of the United States was set before us of a country with something like 65,000,000 or 75,000,000 people running the government with only six departments, or seven at the outside, one of which was supposed to be an artificial department, while they said that in Canada we had to have eleven or twelve. I remember Mr. John Charlton vigorously attacking the government for it, and I remember some hon. gentlemen who are to-day in the House doing the same thing and saying that for the size of the country we were entirely too extravagant, that we were burdened by too much government, that we were not economical, that we were spreading out and that we were making the government very much more expensive.

That debate occurred upon a proposal to establish the two controllerships of customs and inland revenue, which resembled, in one respect, under-secretaries of state in the imperial parliament. The controllerships did not carry the full rights or salaries of ministers of the Crown. It was proposed that the controllers should be paid $4,000 each, but that proposal was denounced as unwarrantable extravagance, the country was told that the government were spending money at a most reckless and unjustifiable rate. The present government, however, had not been long in power before they raised the two controllerships to full-fledged departments with a minister of the Crown at the head of each, and with full departmental staffs, with highly paid officials. Then they established the Department of Trade and Commerce, which they claimed was justified because of the expansion of business in the country. It is now proposed to establish practically another department to be called the Department of the Exterior, to carry on correspondence with foreign countries and perhaps with the mother country relating to business that ought to be carried on through the various existing departments. It is only a year since we were told there was need for some one, who might be regarded as an expert, to look after this foreign correspondence, and Mr. Mackenzie was proposed by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself as a suitable person. Within a year the same right hon. gentleman informs the House that it is desired to create a new department to do that work. What is going to become of Mr. Mackenzie? This is the very work, as I understood, that he was to do. It was necessary to have an expert and he was the man of experience who might be regarded as an expert. Has Mr. Mackenzie not fulfilled the requirements of the situation? All we have heard about him is that he has been fully equal to his task, in every respect. Is the Secretary of State so busy that he cannot attend to this work, that his department is overburdened? I have always understood that it was an ornamental or supernumerary department, not having very much to do. Yet the Secretary of State is to have another staff under him to carry on this work. Before this government came into power they said that the ten or eleven departments then existing were too many, but to-day they have fourteen departments and one or two sub-departments, and they propose to create another, entailing increased expense which cannot be justified. The expense that they denounced a few years ago as entirely unjustifiable is now, they say, absolutely necessary. If it is necessary to have a new department to carry on that correspondence, then the existing departments must be overworked. Are they? The country do not think they are. Some, I think, are overworked, but there are many others that are not, and it is generally understood that the Department of the Secretary of State is not one of those which are overworked.

Another grave objection to this proposal is that the heads of the existing departments will not be in a position to properly answer inquiries by members of this House in reference to their departments, because correspondence which should be conducted by the heads of the various departments will be conducted by the head of this new department. Thus, for instance, if we ask a question of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, he will say: Oh, that information is not in my department, it is in the possession of the Department of the Exterior. The head of the new department will really have the right to lay down the policy of the other departments, to become the diplomat of the government. I understand it will be the duty of the head of the new department to prepare a reply to any communication from abroad and that that reply will be submitted to the Privy Council, without being submitted to the minister of the department concerned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It goes to the Privy Council.

Mr. SPROULE. And not to the department.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Then I cannot understand how any minister of a department can keep in touch with the line of policy in his department, for which he is responsible, if correspondence relating to it is to

be answered by some one else on lines suggested by that other person's judgment. I think it will result in confusion and will stultify the ministers in their administration. When a new minister enters a department he sometimes proposes changes in its policy; he may be more enterprising than his predecessor and lay down a distinct line of policy, the result of mature deliberation, as has been done by the Postmaster General in several lines, and by the Minister of Railways. My contention is that he cannot keep in proper touch with his department under the system now proposed and cannot be in a position to properly answer questions relating to his department that may be put to him by members of this House. To summarize, the creation of the new department will give rise to confusion and prevent the existing departments from being as valuable as they are to-day. It will mean a new department, an increase of expense, a new staff of highly paid officials and will involve an acknowledgment that the departments that are to-day charged with the responsibility of that work are not equal to the task imposed upon them. I do not think that is very creditable to the government. It means discrediting the man the government got authority to appoint only a year ago to carry on the foreign correspondence, and keep in touch with it, and be prepared to give any department information as to any business that might come under his notice. Mr. Mackenzie's business is to be done away with and the Privy Council is to be shorn of a good deal of its important work. The clerk of the Privy Council and the assistant clerk were in the past supposed to be valuable men, but they will not be so in the future. Taken all in all, this is another evidence of the extravagance of the present government, of that expansion which a few years ago they declared was entirely unjustifiable. It is an evidence that there is something wanting when the affairs of this government cannot be carried on by fourteen departments and one or two supernumeraries, and they want to appoint another to help them to do it.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). Mr. Speaker, I suppose that on this occasion, in considering the resolution which has been proposed, the principle involved rather than any question of detail is the subject of discussion, though necessarily details must also be taken into account. Of the necessity for some step of this nature I am entirely satisfied. The necessity for it has been impressing itself upon my mind for more than two years past, and I think a consideration of one or two actual incidents of public business will convince any one that some such course must be taken if the business affairs of this country are to be carried on in proper or even in orderly fashion. The relations which subsist between the Department of Justice, or the Minister of Justice of the day, and other departments or other ministers are very similar to those which subsist between an advising counsel or solicitor and his clients. Of necessity the Department of Justice is consulted about many matters of daily routine or of ordinary business in the different departments of the country's service, and on that account, in the disposition which is made of despatches such as has been outlined by the Prime Minister, it is very frequently the case that a despatch relating to some question of a legal character must necessarily go not only to the department which is acquainted with the facts of the matter to be dealt with, but also to the Department of Justice. For that reason it was not long after I had taken charge of the Department of Justice, two years and seven months ago, that different incidents connected with external affairs of Canada came to my knowledge, which impressed me with the feeling that there ought to be and must be some change made in the present manner of conducting business of that character, if our business was to be properly carried on. Let me mention one of the incidents to which I have alluded. Every one knows of the seizure some years ago of a Canadian ship by the government of Uruguay. The 'Agnes Donahue' was seized by that republic upon a charge of poaching within territorial waters, and the men on the vessel were imprisoned for some time. A special messenger, a legal gentleman of the province of Nova Scotia, from which province the ship's owners and the ship's crew in the main came, was sent specially by this government to South America in an effort to arrange the matter and secure some kind of settlement, with the result that the ship's crew were liberated. But the ship's owners have not to this day received any compensation for the seizure of their ship, and there is in consequence a claim for such compensation against the government of that republic being still promoted by the government of Great Britain urged thereto under representations from the government of Canada. Despatches in relation to that matter are continually passing through the British Foreign Office and Colonial Office to Canada. The matter involved is necessarily of legal character. These despatches very frequently, two years and a half ago, were being referred to the Department of Justice simultaneously with a like reference of the same despatches to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The Department of Marine and Fisheries, so to speak, was a client, and the Department of Justice was its legal adviser. When endeavouring to take up the matter and get acquainted with the details, so as to be in

a position to advise upon it and deal with it, I found what I might without impropriety call an enormous file of correspondence and documents of one kind and another with reference to it already accumulated in the Department of Justice. After acquainting myself with the circumstances as well as I was able, I was in a position to frame some sort of recommendation or answer to the reference that had come to me from council. When that recommendation was brought up in council and discussed, I found that it did not altogether meet the views of my colleague in charge of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. A consultation took place between us in consequence, a consultation which, if it was necessary, might just as well have been had beforehand, and after we had come to an agreement in the matter, we thought we could unite upon a recommendation as to the course which ought to be taken. In the course of that consultation, I ascertained that there was a file of at least equal size in the Department of Marine and Fisheries on this subject, and some remark led to the discovery that in the Department of the Secretary of State there was a third portentous file, which in the course of the months had grown up about this affair. If these despatches seemed to be merely of a formal character, not calling for determination of any line of policy and not involving any question of doubt they might be referred simply to the State Department, and might be answered from that department as a matter of routine business, without going to any other department at all. The result was that in that matter, which after all was simply a good sized lawsuit, there were no fewer than three files in three departments each of which had to some extent been engaged with it. It struck me that was not business-like and that it ought to be changed. Since then I have been discussing this situation with my colleagues and in that spirit urging that some such steps as now proposed should be taken.

Let me mention just one other occurrence of entirely different character but which illustrates the imperfections of the present system. Emergencies arise; during the absence of the First Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries at the Colonial Conference in 1907 there arose an occurrence of serious danger, I think I may say, out of the seizure of a ship in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. It was in midsummer; the only ministers here were the Minister of Trade and Commerce and myself on the day that necessity for action took place. It was certainly a serious enough situation that faced us. Neither of us knew anything of similar occurrences which had taken place as we afterwards found out and which of course would be well known to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. There was necessity for prompt action; it was a situation involving a very great deal of anxiety at the time. Happily all went well, perhaps more by good fortune than by good management. I am thankful to say the situation never even came to the knowledge of the industrious newspaper reporter, and nobody knew anything about it. Now, if there had been a department of external affairs with a permanent secretary or staff acquainted with all business of a nature such as I have in mind, the difficulty which then was of most serious character would have been to a very large extent obviated. There would have been some one who would have known the current of affairs in connection with matters of that sort and who would have knowledge of precedents which would have been most useful to guide. In this case the only thing to be done was to get all the knowledge possible by personal application to different clerks in different departments and to go, as I did go, from department to department trying to find out things without letting anybody know why I wanted the information. It was a matter that I felt it was of utmost importance should not become public property, and the going from clerk to clerk in different departments to gather piecemeal bits of information without letting it be known what the difficulty was that had sprung up, was I believe not in the interest of the public business of the country. The matter directly involved foreign relations ; it directly involved circumstances which if there had not been friendly relations existing might very well enough have led in our dealings with other countries to an actual rupture of friendliness. Under these circumstances I became strongly impressed with the necessity of some such step as is now proposed. So far as I was able to follow the observations of the hon. member (Mr. Foster) I did not gather that he objects to the proposal in itself, but rather that he thinks the details of the scheme so far as outlined might be improved upon if a small staff of expert assistants were attached to the First Minister himself. I may say at once that so far as I am concerned that step would meet with my entire approval. That is however, the merest question of detail. The one important thing in the scheme now proposed is the permanent head who by this resolution is to be appointed with a salary of $5,000, the same as any other deputy. He will, of course, like any other deputy, be acting under the superintendence of some minister. That minister, whatever department he may have in charge, may be here to-day and gone to-morrow, and that may be so even though he be the First Minister. In that respect it is no difference whether the minister to whose department this deputy of external affairs is attached is the First

Minister or any of his colleagues. This work is analogous to work of the Department of State; and in other countries we have such duties discharged by the Secretary of State. It seemed not improper ; it seemed the best course to attach these duties to the Department of the Secretary of State. You will have then a gentleman appointed to be the permanent Under Secretary of State for External Affairs. As time goes on he will become saturated, I hope, with the atmosphere or the spirit of that department which the hon. gentleman so eloquently described. His usefulness will, of course, increase with time, and if we can secure, as I think we may very possibly be able to secure in the original appointee to that position if this measure becomes law, a gentleman of experience, expert, able in the discharge of just such duties, so much the better, because we shall have a good foundation laid whereupon to build. With such a permanent official appointed, he need not in the beginning at any rate be surrounded by an army of clerks. I should hope that two or three, or at most four or five efficient assistants in the way of clerks assigned to work under him, may be entirely sufficient for the carrying on of the business of this department. The additional expense to the country will simply be the $5,000 which the under secretary will receive together with the remuneration to be paid to any new clerks who may be required for the service of this Department of External Affairs.

It is very possible, I think, that, by assigning to these duties of this department some of the present clerks in the State Department, who, perhaps, could be spared, it will be unnecessary to call for the services of even the few additional clerks that I have referred to. But, once you get a department established of this character, you have that one man, the permanent under-secretary to whom I have referred, who is charged with responsibility for these things—he and his Minister the Secretary of State. Take one of the cases I have mentioned by way of illustration: A despatch comes with regard to which either the permanent under-secretary or the temporary minister in charge feels that he cannot make the answer to council without consulting somebody else. If it is a formal matter, if it is a matter he knows all about, and he feels that he does not need to go to any of his colleagues for purposes of consultation, he prepares his answer to council at once and that is an end of that transaction. But if it is a matter of more difficult character, if, for instance, it concerns the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the policy of that department, and also involves some question of international law,—what then should be done? Either that deputy has a personal conference, if he wants it, or communicates by correspondence, with the department interested, or the minister himself sees his colleague on the subject. The most harmonious relations, I am very glad to state, exist between the members of the government, and we can see each other with the utmost freedom, and with the utmost pleasure, at any time and discuss any matter of the country's business. It is not of necessity that there should be even the formality of the writing of letters; the ministers who are interested in the matter can meet, and in half-an-hour, or, perhaps in five minutes, settle upon the line of answer to be sent,—if not upon the wording, at all events upon the substance, of what is to be done with reference to this despatch. Instructions are given to the deputy head, who, probably with his own pen, will frame an answer, he being in a better position, from superior knowledge of the craftsmanship, to frame a despatch than even the minister himself. And, as a result, you get the best way of handling matters which otherwise are more or less complicated and might occasion difficulty and trouble. I do not apprehend, if this resolution is carried and the Bill to be founded upon it is passed, any continuation of the practical difficulties which I have already, myself, experienced on several occasions, and which in my mind have given rise to a feeling that some step of this character is absolutely necessary. There ought to be some one man at least who would have all the strings in his hands, would know what had passed before and would see to it that what was going out from this government was not inconsistent with what had gone before but was in continuation of the general line of policy which, in regard to dealing with any particular matter that may have come up, had already been adopted by the government.

Mr. SPROULE. What do you propose to do now with the officer who was assigned to that duty last year?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. When we get into committee, I will answer that. Motion agreed to and House went into committee.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Chairman, I have not to find fault with the discussion that has taken place—far from it; I think it is quite apropos. I am very glad of the observations addressed to the House by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). I suppose that my hon. friend from North Toronto will not dispute this—that a Department of External Affairs is a necessity of government I suppose that he will not dispute this also —that, some time or other whether now or later, there must be in this government, as in all other governments, a Department of External Affairs. If my hon. friend agrees

with this—and I do not think he can dispute it—I think he has answered all the criticisms which he has offered to the House. The only question which might arise, in my opinion, is, whether or not the time has come when such a department is necessary. If you tell me that Canada has not yet reached such a point in its development that necessity arises for this department, that is a question that we can debate. But if you tell me that under no circumstances should such a department be created, I say that that is a proposition which you cannot maintain, and, I am sure, on reflection, will not maintain. I look upon it as a matter of necessity that when a government which has reached the condition that Canada has reached, such a department cannot be dispensed with.

Mr. FOSTER. It means that Canada must carry on some external relations?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It means that Canada has to carry on external relations——

Mr. FOSTER. What has she been doing for the last forty years?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not only for the last eleven years but for the last forty years, and even before confederation,—every government must carry on such relations. But I believe that the time has come when there must be a department to carry on these relations, because the business cannot efficiently be done otherwise. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) asks: What about Mr. Mackenzie? Mr. Mackenzie will remain where he was placed last year. He is in the Department of the Privy Council, and his duty is to look after the foreign and imperial correspondence. He will have precisely the same duties to perform as he is performing at the present time.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman tell us briefly what Mr. Mackenzie has been doing?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He looks after the imperial and foreign correspondence. When it is brought to him, he has to enter it in a book, docket it and distribute it. That is the duty of Mr. Mackenzie.

Mr. FOSTER. He is attached now to the Privy Council.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He remains attached to the Privy Council. But the department we have now in mind is not only a clerical one, is not only to perform the clerical work which Mr. Mackenzie has to perform. My hon. friend understands very well what will be the duties of this department: There is to be a permanent official the Under Secretary of State for external affairs, whose duty and business would be to keep posted from day to day on the external history of Canada as it progresses. Despatches come relating, let us say, one to the Justice Department, one to the Marine and Fisheries, one to the Post Office, one to the Customs and one to the Interior. They are distributed to these departments, and there they are lost—that is, so far as the other departments are concerned; each minister has the despatch that has been sent to him but that is all. We want a department in which the history of all these despatches will be kept and followed from day to day.

Mr. FOSTER. Is Mr. Mackenzie not doing that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He is doing that simply as a clerical department.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I wish to say to the Prime Minister that it would help us a great deal in arriving at a decision on this matter if we had statistics of the number of these despatches received daily, or monthly, and the necessity for the department.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is a very fair question. I have not the statistics to-day, I will have them at the next stage of this Bill; I shall be happy to bring down, all the statistics the hon. gentleman has mentioned. Now, my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said a moment ago that when he came to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, being, as he said, a boy, and knowing nothing of the business of the department, he had to rely upon a very able man, Mr. Wm. Smith, and he paid him a very deserved compliment. But I may say to my hon. friend that after the experience which he has acquired in thirty years of public life, and with all the attention he has given to it, were he again to return to-morrow to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, he would still largely have to rely upon his deputy minister. It is not expected of a minister that he should carry in his mind all the details of the office, which have to be gathered by the deputy minister. The time of the minister is too precious, he would not be able to do justice to his department if he were compelled to keep in mind all the details which properly come before the deputy minister. I may say to my hon. friend that he would need such a deputy minister as he had under him before. I may say to him that when I came into office, now twelve years ago, and when despatches began to come in relating to foreign affairs, I had not in the Department of the Privy Council any official who could inform me, or upon whom I could rely; I had to go to another officer, who is fortunately well qualified for that position, I have no hesitation in giving his

name, Mr. Pope, the under secretary—and get from him all the information I needed relating to those foreign affairs, before I could come to a decision and advise my colleagues, or His Excellency the Governor General, in relation thereto. It is therefore indispensable, I think, that at this time we should have what every other government has, a department of external affairs, where everything relating to our foreign relations may be found, and that instead of their being scattered as at present in the various departments, they should be concentrated in one department, where we can get them at a moment's notice, a department in charge of a man who is acquainted, not only with that department, but with the affairs of all the departments in so far as they relate to external affairs.

Mr. HAGGART. What are the statutory powers you are going to give to this new department?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They are found in this section:

The Secretary of State as head of the said department shall have the conduct of all official communications between the government of Canada and the government of any other country in connection with the external affairs of Canada, and shall be charged with such other duties as may be from time to time assigned to the said department by order of the Governor in Council in relation to such external affairs, or to the conduct and management of international or intercolonial negotiations, so far as the same may appertain to the government of Canada.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. These are large powers. Every confidential report will go to that department.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It will be in the discretion of the Governor in Council to say whether any confidential report shall go to the department or not; some may go there and others may not. But the hon. gentleman knows very well that there must be some department to which even confidential despatches may be assigned. The one thing I want to impress upon the committee is the necessity for the government of Canada to have now a department in which the information which is now scattered over all the departments, may be concentrated for the advantage of the ministers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The right hon. gentleman spoke of a committee of external affairs as a necessity of government. The history of this country during the past forty-two years will show that his words could not be taken in their literal acceptation. If the right hon. gentleman meant that some official activity, some departmental work in connection with external affairs, is a necessity of this government, then we would all be inclined to agree with him. Now, I do not find any fault with the object which is aimed at by this legislation, I am not disposed to quarrel with that. The right hon. gentleman said that the object of the creation of this new department was three-fold: First, the allotment of despatches; secondly, the creation of a history of each subject to which reference can be made from time to time; and thirdly, the preparation of a draft despatch in reply to any communication from abroad. Those were the three objects, and I regard them as very desirable and necessary objects. But I have yet to see that it is necessary to create a new department for that purpose. Let me point out to the right hon. gentleman what he is doing. In the United States at the present time there are nine departments. One of these is the Department of the Secretary of State, which deals with all foreign relations; and one would think that if the Department of the Secretary of State in the United States can deal with, and tabulate, and prepare the history of these matters connected with the foreign relations of a population of nearly 100,000,000, the Department of the Secretary of State in Canada could do the same thing for our foreign relations, which are very limited indeed as compared with those of the United States. If in the Commonwealth of Australia, where they have only eight departments, and where the Minister of External Affairs is the Prime Minister of the commonwealth, they can get along without a Secretary of State, it does seem to me a piece of unnecessary machinery in this country to have, not only a Department of Secretary of State, but a new Department of External Affairs as well. In other words, to carry on the machinery of government in this respect for the people of Canada, requires not only the machinery which is sufficient for ninety millions of people in the United States, but also the machinery that carries on the same governmental work for the government of Australia. I was much struck with the history of affairs given by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, but I would not be disposed to draw from his remarks exactly the same conclusion which he did, although he did not very much dispute the argument which was put forward by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). The difficulty in the whole matter has been that you have, not too little, but too much machinery. You have three departments getting in each others way, the Department of the Secretary of State, the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the Department of Justice, in the illustration which was given to us by the Minister of Justice. What you want is not more machinery, but better organization. You have any amount of machinery now. My hon.

friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) referred to the fourteen departments of government He was altogether too modest. There are more than fourteen departments. Can the Secretary of State tell me how many departments of government there are now?

Mr. MURPHY. There are fourteen departments of government.

Mr. SPROULE. Seventeen.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. For example, there is a Department of the Interior and a Department of Indian Affairs.

Mr. MURPHY. Both under one minister.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman is speaking of ministers. I was speaking of departments, and my hon. friend from Grey was referring to departments. I say there are a great many more than fourteen departments. After all, the creation of something that you call a Department of External Affairs will amount to nothing. It is the organization which you must create for the purpose of coping with this work that will count in the end. I am absolutely unconvinced by anything in the argument put forward by the Prime Minister and by the Secretary of State that the mere creation of this department is going to advance you one single step. Take, for instance, the illustration put very cogently by the Minister of Justice this afternoon: What should have been done with the case of the 'Agnes Donoghue?' What, in the name of common sense, had the Department of Marine and Fisheries to do with it? Can any human being conceive why the Department of Marine and Fisheries should have interfered with that? Suppose a British subject went to some other country and undertook to enter into a railway enterprise there, suppose that he obtained a charter for a railway and that the government there confiscated his undertaking in a manner unwarranted by international law and complaint was made to this government; would the complaint go to the Department of Railways and Canals for Canada? You might just as seriously send that to the Department of Railways and Canals as to send this particular complaint to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. It should have gone to the Secretary of State and some minister whether before or after the creation of this department, must, in a case of that kind, invoke the aid of the Department of Justice. The creation of this new Department of External Affairs does not advance the work of government in this respect one jot or iota as far as I can understand.

I do not for one moment lift my voice against the expenditure of $5,000, or a larger sum of money, for doing the very necessary work that ought to be done in connection with our administration, as far as foreign affairs are concerned, but I do protest against the unnecessary multiplication of the departments of the government. What will it amount to? You create this department, that department, and the other department, and then you create this branch, that branch, and the other branch, when, as the returns brought down this very session indicate to this House and the country, you do not even go to the trouble to indicate to the clerks of these departments what their duties are. Return after return has been brought down and laid upon the table of this House indicating that nearly every department of this government has, up to the present time, absolutely failed to comply in any sense with the legislation of this parliament passed in July last. The creation of departments amounts to nothing, and the creation of branches of departments amounts to nothing, but the creation of a live system of organization in any department of the government does count for something and that is after all what the Prime Minister himself must desire in this matter.

There is one other circumstance to which I would like to invite attention, and which to me has seemed important in view of what has been suggested to me this afternoon by hon. gentlemen who have been members of an administration, a privilege which, to the present time, it has not been my fortune to enjoy. In the Commonwealth of Australia, situated, in so far as Great Britain is concerned, very much as we are, the Minister of External Affairs is the Prime Minister; so that all the matters of a confidential character alluded to this afternoon, some of which possibly could not be disclosed even to the Cabinet as a whole, shall come to the Prime Minister as Minister of External Affairs, and he shall use his judgment and discretion as to how far they must be kept confidential even as far as members of his cabinet are concerned. If we are to concede what the Prime Minister has argued for—and I am not disposed to concede it because I am not yet convinced—but if one were disposed to concede the argument of the Prime Minister that a new department is necessary for the mere purpose of organization, then I say that that department should be under the control of the Prime Minister and not under the control of the Secretary of State. Mr. Chairman, that is the way the situation strikes me at the present time. Let me just add in conclusion that I do not see that any of the dangers or difficulties which were pointed out by the Minister of Justice this afternoon would be in the least obviated by the creation of this new department. The minister at the head of the Department of External Affairs might be away, the minister in charge of any one of the departments might be away and still an emergency might arise. You may always expect contingencies of any kind in matters of government. The creation of this department

will not do away with them. I thoroughly concede, of course, what the Minister of Justice argued, that the creation of a history of each of these subjects touching external affairs under the control of a capable officer would be of infinite importance to the ministers who are here in Ottawa and who have to deal with situations of that kind, but I do not see that it is very much forwarded by the mere creation of this department and by calling it a Department of External Affairs.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think that after all the difference between the two sides of the House on this question is not very great. It seems to be very minute indeed. If I understand the criticisms that have been offered by hon. gentlemen opposite, they have admitted frankly the necessity and advisability of having special officers detailed for the work that we have in mind. They say that it would be sufficient to increase the personnel of the department of the Privy Council over which the Prime Minister presides. The Prime Minister may not necessarily be the President of the Council. Sir Charles Tupper, when he came into office, took the portfolio of Secretary of State. When Sir John Macdonald formed his government in 1878 he took the portfolio of the Interior in addition to his duties of Prime Minister. When the present government was formed in 1896 I came to the conclusion that the Prime Minister should be President of the Council. I am still of that opinion. Very shortly after I took office I discussed this point with Sir Charles Tupper and he thought I should have taken the portfolio of Secretary of State. I differed with him; I thought the Prime Minister should be President of the Council. Whenever there is a change of government my hon. friend on the other side of the House may not become President of the Council but he may become Secretary of State, or take another portfolio. It does not matter under which minister the Department of External Affairs may be placed, it is sufficient that it should be under a responsible minister. The fact that there will be some confidential despatches which the Prime Minister may have to keep to himself does not weigh very much with me; in fact, in the course of my experience during the last twelve years, there never came to me a despatch which I thought I could not take to council. On the contrary, upon every occasion that any matter of this kind occurred, I have always thought it preferable to take the whole cabinet into the confidence of the Prime Minister and of His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be on your judgment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Of course. I do not believe there is anything which should be kept from council, although there might be some things that it would possibly be advisable to keep within the Prime Minister and the Governor General and perhaps one or two of the colleagues of the Prime Minister for the time being. But this matter will not be changed when there is a Department of External Affairs. One thing that I would like to impress upon hon. gentlemen opposite is that the present system cannot continue any longer. It is very true that for the forty years that confederation has lasted we have not had such a department, but forty years ago the foreign relations of the government were not the same as they are to-day. Canada has increased very much during that time, and, in my humble judgment, we have come to the point when we must pay much more attention to these matters than we have in the past. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), who has been in the government, thought it should be sufficient if we were to increase the number of clerks and detail three or four of them to give us the information which we want to have. I do not dispute that this is a method which might perhaps work. It may be that it would be sufficient to detail a staff in the Department of the Privy Council or the Secretary of State and assign to them the work we now have in mind. I do not think there can be any discussion as to the necessity of doing this work. It must be done, and it must be organized promptly. But we have thought after consideration that it was better to give to this branch the dignity and importance of a department by itself, as is done in other countries.

Mr. FOSTER. Dignity is very costly.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, I do not think my hon. friend can say that with any truth. We will have a deputy head, perhaps two or three officers and no more. When we come to another stage in the discussion of this Bill, we will place before the House exactly the staff they want to have and for which we will ask the sanction of parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. Could the minister now tell us how many will be required and their salaries?

Mr. MURPHY. It is believed that not more than four will be required in any event and three may be sufficient. It is further believed that gentlemen now in the service may be transferred to this new department at the salaries which they are now receiving.

Mr. SPROULE. I have been looking up the record to see what was said at the time of Mr. Mackenzie's appointment. I find the Prime Minister said that Mr. Mackenzie had been appointed a clerk in the office

of the Privy Council and that his duties would be to classify and keep track of the correspondence which was accumulating very fast from the imperial authorities and colonial and foreign governments. He was to collate it and I thought answer it as well, and I think the Prime Minister spoke of Mr. Mackenzie's familiarity with newspaper work and his educational endowments. Is Mr. Mackenzie to be at the head of the new department?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. McKenzie will remain in the office of the Privy Council and this new department will be under the control of the Secretary of State. It is not contemplated that Mr. Mackenzie will be at the head of the new department.

Mr. SPROULE. If Mr. Mackenzie is to remain in the Privy Council and collate this correspondence, what is the necessity of this department ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the despatches were to be sent directly to the Department of External Affairs, Mr. Mackenzie would perhaps be transferred to that department; but it is thought better that the despatches as they come from the Governor General should be sent to the Privy Council because the ministers then can have a friendly discussion over it. Some of these despatches are not of importance, but others are of great importance and it is thought better that they should come directly to the Privy Council before going to the Exterior Department. Mr. Mackenzie will continue to look after the correspondence as he does to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. If a communication should come from the British Ambassador at Washington it would be received by the Governor General; the Governor General would send it to the Privy Council, the Privy Council would hand it over to Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Mackenzie would send it to the Department of the Exterior and the new department would collate it again, register it and I presume answer it on their own judgment and responsibility, because up to this time the information given us is that the Privy Council would expend no inquiry or intelligence on it, but after the answer would be prepared the Privy Council would decide whether it was an appropriate answer.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is about right. The communication will go to His Excellency and be referred by him to the Privy Council; the Privy Council will send it to the Department of External Affairs with instructions or without instructions and the Department of External Affairs, when they have passed on it and prepared an answer, will send it back to council to be discussed.

Mr. SPROULE. Council will then discuss it, sign it, and send it back through the same channel, I presume. It will make a much slower mode of carrying on business.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Oh, no.

Mr. SPROULE. Referring to the number of departments, we have the Department of Trade and Commerce, the Department of Labour, the Customs Department, and now the Department of the Exterior, the Department of Marine, with the sub-department of Fisheries; the Department of the Interior, the Department of Indian Affairs, the Department of Finance, the Department of Inland Revenue, the Post Office Department, the Department of the Privy Council, the Department of Public Works, the Department of the Secretary of State, the Department of Marine and Fisheries, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Justice and of the Solicitor General, the Department of Railways and Canals, and the Department of Mines. In all we have twenty-one departments and yet this government condemned their predecessors for having eleven departments. I am told the Printing Bureau is now to be a new department.

As to the working of this new department, supposing a communication comes from the British Ambassador referring to the Fisheries Treaty, would that communication be submitted to the Department of Marine and Fisheries before being dealt with by the Department of the Exterior ? Where will that department get the information required to answer it ? Would it be answered before going to the Department of Marine and Fisheries ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That depends upon the circumstances. If a despatch came from Mr. Bryce to the Governor General on a question of the fisheries, it would be sent to the Privy Council, and the Privy Council would send it to the Department of External Affairs.

Mr. FOSTER. What is Mr. Mackenzie doing in the meantime?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He is an officer of the Privy Council, and looks after the work assigned to him.

Mr. FOSTER. What is that special work?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The important correspondence of the Privy Council. The Department of External Affairs may perhaps be able to give an answer in five minutes, or it may have to get information from the Department of Marine or some other department. But when a question has been the subject of communication from day to day or week to week for some time, the Department of External Affairs would probably be able to answer it on the spot without reference to any other department.

Mr. FOSTER. I have listened most attentively to the Prime Minister's explanation and to the explanation given by the Secretary of State. When the Secretary of State was asked how many departments there were, it was really a study to view his countenance. Of course, he is a young minister. When he has been there for a year, he will probably be able to count the number of departments there are in this government; but it will be a business for him just the same. The Secretary of State was very practical when my hon. friend from East Grey asked about the officials already appointed. He answered that the probability was that there would be transfers of three or four from other departments and that there would be really no more new officers outside of the under secretary. That of course went back directly to Mr. Mackenzie. A year ago Mr. Mackenzie was picked out of the fourth estate and appointed to this office, an office which was specially defined, the need of which was great, and a definition of the duties of that office was made by the Prime Minister. The difficulty was that things were not in order, the despatches were not classified and tabulated, and Mr. Mackenzie was put there to bring order out of disorder. Now, we are going to have the organization put in charge of the Secretary of State, and it seems to me that it was the idea of the Secretary of State that Mr. Mackenzie should go to his department and do his organizing and tabulating in that department. The Prime Minister says no, he is to be kept in the office of the Privy Council, and if his duties there are to be to tabulate and keep a history of the documents, are you going to have two tabulations and two histories? That will not make matters more workable, but will make them more cumbersome; in fact, you will have just one more circumlocution office. I want to tell the Prime Minister, and it may be taken for what it is worth, as a minister who had something to do with such matters, that he will find that it is absolutely impracticable to have great questions, affecting intimately one department or another, adjusted without the active co-operation of the minister of the department. Mere matters of form an ordinary clerk can attend to; but our external affairs are now very important affairs. The Minister of Justice fairly made my hair stand on my head when he was depicting the heart-curdling vision—which he brought to the edge of the platform and then refused to raise the curtain upon— of war, bloody war which was on the very verge. What neighbour was it—Japan, China or the United States. Happily the Minister of Justice was here, and, without a single man of the fourth estate knowing anything about it, he settled the whole difficulty. Does this not show the Prime Minister how important our external affairs are? They are so important that they ought not to be in the hands of a second-rate or third-rate minister. I do not make any invidious distinctions. The young man who comes in as a new minister has yet to learn his business. As a rule the Department of the Secretary of State will go to a young man. He has not the drill, the experience, the wisdom necessary for our external affairs, which are important and are going to be more so, and upon their proper adjudication, with temper, delicacy of touch, wisdom and discernment, will depend whether there will be international disagreements or international peace. The best drill that I ever had since I came into public life was the drill I got in the Department of Marine and Fisheries when the Atlantic and Pacific fisheries questions were up. I would have been very sorry to have been deprived of having had that experience and the breadth and growth that it gave me. I was the right person to have that business in charge, because I was the head of that department. When I went there I relied upon my deputy minister, but I did not rely upon him entirely. I made every part of the department, which was a tremendously extended one, a special study, and within two years I knew the history and operation of every part of the department. Sir John Macdonald said: You are the minister of that department, and it is you who must take this matter in charge. I did so, with the assistance of the Governor General and the Minister of Justice, and it was the best drill I ever had, and was an antidote to the sickening mass of detail and party patronage business which every minister in the course of time gets so heartily sick of. You are going to take that from every department, you are going to have a bureau which will do that business. The Minister of Justice said that the officials would get saturated with the business in time; but you cannot sit in the Secretary of State's Department and know what the Minister of Agriculture or what the Minister of Marine knows about his own department. You will never do in that department what will be satisfactory to a responsible live minister unless he has a hand in the pie, and he has a right to have a hand there. You may bring from that bureau all that your new fledged diplomats may pen on paper but the minister whose department is chiefly affected will say: I do not agree with some parts of it, I will have to think it over; and then your merry-go-round starts again. I lay these difficulties before the Prime Minister and the thinking men of the House, so that they may be considered.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Bill (No. 90) to create a Department of External Affairs.—Hon. Charles Murphy—introduced and read the first time.

CIVIL SERVICE BILL.

Mr. FOSTER. When does the Minister of Agriculture propose to go on with the Civil Service Bill? I do not want to hurry him, but we will be getting into other business now and that Bill should be considered.

Mr. FISHER. The delay has been caused by the necessity of making out the schedules which we agreed to attach to the Bill. All the schedules are ready except those of the Senate and the House of Commons, and I cannot proceed with the Bill until the classification of the Senate and House of Commons employees is prepared. I am pressing it forward with all my power.

IMMIGRATION.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of Interior) moved second reading of Bill (No. 17) respecting immigration.

Mr. FOSTER. This requires some explanation.

Mr. OLIVER. This Bill differs in detail rather than in principle from the law passed some three years ago, and the necessity for the changes in detail arises from the changed conditions of immigration. The law now on the statute-book was the first action by parliament on the policy of selected immigration and since then circumstances have arisen which make it necessary to follow a policy of more and more restriction or more and more careful selection. This brings with it the difficulty of enforcing the law as it is, and we find that the law requires amending in order to make it more satisfactory in enforcement when tested by opposition which brings it under review of the courts. It is with the view of carrying out the principles contained in the existing Act and to make it more effective that this Bill has been framed. There is a provision against what is called assisted immigration. It has never been the policy of the government to assist immigration but there were no definite proceedings taken to actually prevent assisted immigration until an order in council was passed a year ago and that order in council is incorporated in the present Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. Do I understand that under this Bill there shall be no assisted immigration either to steamships or to individual agents?

Mr. OLIVER. The Bill is in accordance with the order in council at present existing, which provides for the exclusion from Canada of immigrants assisted by charitable organizations unless the immigrant has been approved by the authorized agent of the Canadian government before sailing.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that does not do away with the assistance to immigration if I understand it correctly, it relates only to the assistance given by a philanthropic or charitable institution.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. You will not accept the immigrants, notwithstanding the assistance given them, unless they are regarded as suitable when examined. But the question I asked is: Do the government intend by this Bill to stop immigration that is assisted, for instance, by paying commission to those working in the United States to bring immigrants to Canada?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know that I understand quite what my hon. friend wants to arrive at.

Mr. SPROULE. Take, for instance, the North Atlantic Trading Co., they got a lot of money that was really assistance to immigration, being paid a certain commission. The steamships also are paid a commission and so are agents operating in the United States. That I would call, in the ordinary acceptation of the term, assisted immigration. What I ask is: Do the government intend to stop this assistance or carry it out as heretofore?

Mr. OLIVER. I think the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) is hardly well advised in using the term 'assisted immigration' in referring to the matter mentioned. I should consider this immigration effort and not assistance to immigration. This Bill embodies the principle which is now contained in an order in council and which has always been the policy of this government in regard to immigration that there should be no assistance to immigrants to enable them to immigrate.

Mr. SPROULE. But, if you give them a reduced passage, would not that be assistance?

Mr. OLIVER. The government has not given anybody a passage of any kind at any price.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). This Bill is a very considerable change from the provisions of the law which hitherto have governed our immigration system, and I have no hesitation in saying that it is a step forward upon the lines which have very often been advocated in this House, and more particularly on this side of the House. As I understand the measure, it does not in any way interfere with the system of favouring immigration which has existed hitherto; it does not disturb in any manner our immigration agencies established in the United States, in the British Isles and on the continent. It in no way changes the system of bonusing immigrants which has hitherto existed, and in

relation to which we are still governed by the order in council which has considerably enlarged the system, extending it to railway navvies and other classes, which, up to the time of passing that order in council, never had been comprised within the bonus system. What the Bill aims at particularly is to provide for a strict examination of immigrants when they land in Canada. It has been found—there is no doubt whatever about it—that our system of examination was utterly deficient. And the object of this legislation is to provide a system that will assure a more careful examination of incoming immigrants. I say that, so far as that goes, this law is a step forward. But the question which suggests itself, I am sure, to every member of this House who has taken any interest in the question of immigration is this: If this is a good law, if it provides a safeguard against a class of immigrants who are not desirable in this country, why has it not been enacted sooner? While giving credit to my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) for this measure, I say it is fit and proper for us to ask why this safeguard was not provided ten or twelve years ago when we began receiving in this country such large quantities of immigration, when from an expenditure of about $100,000 a year or $125,000 a year, which was our limit up to 1896, we went up to an expenditure of $700,000, $800,000, and finally, even more than $1,000,000. As a consequence of a very much more expensive propaganda and the establishment of far more numerous agencies and of a system of bonusing which had never been known before, we have had an immense influx of immigrants. The conditions prescribed by this Bill were known to be necessary at that time. They were urged on this side of the House repeatedly when that wave of immigration began to invade Canada. This measure is taken largely from the American immigration regulations and law. Why did not we adopt it before? That is the serious observation I wish to lay before the minister—let him tell us why we are, so to speak, locking the stable door after the horse is gone? For that is what we are doing. The explanation must certainly be found in the fact that, during a certain number of years which former members of this House will certainly remember, we had given to the tendency of immigration to this country a push forward which was extremely imprudent. Not to go too extensively into affairs of the past, it will be remembered that, through the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company largely, the country paid out, speaking off-hand, but I think pretty closely to the figures—over $450,000 in bonuses and expenses of advertising. It will hardly be denied that in this we were doing an extremely imprudent thing, for we never were able to find out what became of that money and to whom it was paid. I do not wish to go at too great a length into that phase of the question, and to recall a past which most of those who took an interest in the question at that time, I am sure, have still in mind. This proposed legislation, to my mind, shows the usefulness of the campaign, in this House and outside of this House, which was kept up by the opposition for a long time in order to secure the very provisions that we find in this Bill. And it is extremely regretable, I am sure, not only in the interests of our country, but in the interests of the immigrants of the better class who have come here and succeeded, that these enactments were not put into law before the large influx of immigrants into Canada, amounting, I suppose, in the last ten years, to over 800,000 people, had begun.

Let me say a word with regard to one of the dispositions of the Bill, and which is continued, if I may say so, in the principle of the Bill. The whole Bill proceeds upon what is to my mind a bad principle, and I venture to say that before long we will come to the conclusion in this House and in the country that that principle is not well founded. The whole Bill is founded on the principle of the examination of the immigrant after he lands, or is about to land, in Canada. I think that experience has demonstrated, and statistics will show, that this is a wrong principle. We should make sure that the immigrant is a fit and proper person to come to this country before he leaves the port of embarkation. This is what happens in practice: The immigrant will go to the booking agent, we will say, in the British Isles or on the continent. The agent is anxious in the first place to bring this immigrant within the bonus class, and I submit to my hon. friend the minister that with the wide order in council authorizing the payment of bonuses, it is not a very difficult task for an experienced booking agent to get that immigrant into the class which earns him a bonus. No examination whatever as to the physical condition of the immigrant takes place before landing. There is no inquiry whatever as to his moral qualifications to become a citizen of this Dominion. All that takes place is that the booking agent makes sure that he will earn, through this immigrant, his bonus, and sells him a ticket. Everything induces the agent to direct this immigrant to Canada, if possible, not only because of the bonus he receives, but because of the generous commission he gets from the transportation company.

The immigrant arrives in Quebec, we will say. Now members of this House who have followed the proceedings of the Immigration Committee in the past sessions, know what

kind of an examination the immigrant undergoes there. It is exceedingly brief. I think it was Mr. Scott, the superintendent, who told us that the examination is a matter of two or three minutes, or perhaps four minutes. The immigrant passes before a medical examiner at the port of arrival. There are a thousand or two thousand immigrants to be examined, and a train is waiting to carry them on to their destination. He will look at their eyes, at their external appearance, but no proper medical examination takes place. And I ask the House how is it possible in the short space allowed to the examiner, to make sure, even in the most superficial manner, of the qualifications of the immigrant to enter this country. He passes before a second officer and is immediately hastened on board the train, and moves away. Now what happens? He arrives in Montreal or Toronto. The man we will suppose, is undesirable; we will suppose that he is guilty of some offence. He is immediately brought before one of our criminal courts, either for some worse or some petty offence. The magistrate asks him where he comes from, what steamship line brought him across. He is remanded, and through the immigration agent, as I understand, the department of my hon. friend the minister is communicated with. The department sends an officer to make sure of the fact. Deportation in that case is found necessary; the man is at our expense detained in jail, he is afterwards forwarded with a guardian at the expense of the country, as a rule, to the port where he landed, for instance at Quebec. When the steamer is out in the stream ready to go, he is taken on board the vessel and sent home. He arrives in Liverpool. They don't want him there, and will not receive him. He is sent on perhaps to London, and there what is the condition of that man? It may be that he is only in the early stage of criminality, but he is an absolutely lost individual, utterly discouraged, ostracized, and his fate is one, although he may be a criminal, very much to be deplored.

In the case of those who are deported because they are afflicted with disease, which very often happens—we had last year over 800 deported after admission to this country—the case is infinitely more pitiful. The man is returned to the company that has brought him over, and he is sent back. If he is the father of a family who came out here to prospect and found an establishment, he returns to his home in Europe, having expended all the money he had when he came out here to establish a home. He is absolutely discouraged, and becomes a very active agent in doing as much harm as possible to this country, spreading everywhere the idea that this is the very worst country a man could come to. Very often families are separated, and the utmost distress and grief accompany this deportation. Cases have come under my observation where the hardship is very great indeed. I have known of other cases of people deported from Montreal who, after having done a great deal of harm in that city, in a variety of ways which it is not necessary to dilate upon now, have been sent back to their own country. There was a case came under my own personal knowledge of a prostitute who arrived in this country from Europe. There was nothing apparently to prevent her admission to this country. She came to Montreal and established a house there, and after a time was brought before the magistrate, and had to be deported. It is evident that it was impossible at the port of entry to discover the objection that existed in that case, and a great deal of harm resulted. There is no doubt whatever that if inquiries had been made, and if that person had been told on the other side that it was absolutely useless for her to attempt to enter Canada, we would have been spared the expense and the disagreeable consequences which resulted in that case.

I have a few more remarks to make on this subject, but as we have now passed the hour of six o'clock I move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the Prime Minister be good enough to tell us what business will be taken up to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Supply, commencing with the Department of Railways and Canals.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 6.10 p.m.

INDEX

FIRST SESSION—ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT, 1909.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 2 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading ; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist ; *, without remarks or debate ; Accts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned ; Amt., Amendment ; Amts., Amendments ; Amalg., Amalgamation ; Ans., Answer ; Ass., Assurance ; B., Bill ; B.C., British Columbia ; Can., Canada or Canadian ; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway ; Com., Committee ; Co., Company ; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence ; Consd., Consider ; Consdn., Consideration ; Cor., Correspondence ; Deb., Debate ; Dept., Department ; Depts., Departments ° Div., Division ; Dom., Dominion ; Govt., Government ; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General Hse., House ; H. of C., House of Commons ; Incorp., Incorporation ; Ins., Insurance ; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway ; Man., Manitoba ; Mess., Message ; M., Motion ; m., moved ; Neg., Negatived ; N.B., New Brunswick ; N.W.T., North-west Territories ; N.S., Nova Scotia ; O.C., Order in Council ; Ont., Ontario ; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island ; P.O., Post Office ; Par., Paragraph ; Prop., Proposed ; Q., Quebec ; Ques- Question ; Recom., Recommit ; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference ; Rep., Report, Reported ; Reps., Reports ; Res., Resolution ; Ret., Return ; Ry., Railway ; Rys., Railways ; Sel., Select ; Sen., Senate ; Sp., Special ; Stmnt., Statement ; Sup., Supply ; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary ; Wthdn., Withdrawn Wthdrl., Withdrawal ; Y.N., Yeas and Nays ; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

AMES, Mr. H. B., *Montreal, St. Antoine.*

Assets of Canada in detail on December 31, 1908 (M. for ret.*) 172 (i).

Budget, The, 4663 (iii).

Budget Speech, 1898, Statement *re* Finances, (M. for ret.*), 173 (i).

—— Inquiry for Stmnt., 1321 (i).

Canada Eastern Ry., Original Price, Value, Amount expended for Repair (Ques.) 2149, 2579 (ii).

—— Corrected Answer (remarks) 3364 (ii).

Chicoutimi Pier, Specifications *re* Contract with T. Desbiens, &c. (M. for copies*) 2161. (ii).

Commissions to Bank of Montreal *re* debt (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 399 (i).

Deferred Elections, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burrell) Ques. of Order, 2868 (ii).

Dom. Lands, Expenditures charged to Capital Account (M. for ret.*) 173 (i).

Dominion 4 per cent Loan, Amount of Sinking Fund (Ques.) 545 (i).

Dominion Loans, Amount redeemable, &c. (Ques.) 545 (i).

See 'Loans.'

France and Canada Ocean SS. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5223 (iv).

Funded Debt, Redeemable, Total Sinking Fund (Ques.) 342 (i).

Gaspé-Perce Mail Contract, Expiration of (Ques.) 2596 (ii).

'Glimpses of Northeastern Canada,' Number of Copies circulated, Payments *re* &c. (Ques.) 4640 (iii).

AMES, Mr. H. B.—Con.

Govt. Credit, Cash on deposit, &c. (M. for ret.*) 173 (i).

Govt. Temporary Loans, Liabilities between April, 1907, to Dec., 1908 (M. for ret.*) 172 (i).

—— Inquiry for, 4119 (iii).

G. T. P., Branch Lines, Plans *re* Orillia Branch (Ques.) 1077 (i).

—— Contracts for North Bay Sections, Estimated Cost per mile &c. (Ques.) 819 (i).

—— Guarantee *re* Loan, &c., Security (remarks) 3258 (ii).

G. T. P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., on Res., 3578 (ii); on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 4052; on M. for 2°, 5120; in Com., 5190; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 5593 (iii).

G.T.P. Ry., Commissioners' Revised Stmnt. as to Cost (Ques.) 1056 (i).

Harbour Commissioners of Mostreal, Interest, Loans, &c. (M. for cor.*) 1734 (i).

Homestead and Pre-emptions, Total Acreage sold, Moneys received, &c. (Ques.) 482 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6170 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6704 (iv).

I. C. R. and P. E. I. Rys., Earnings and Expenditures for Oct. 1907 and the year 1908 (Ques.) 1415 (i).

I. C. R. and P. E. I. Rys., Items in Public Accounts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 173 (i).

AMES, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*

James Bay and Labrador, Exploratory Party, &c. (Ques.) 4696 (iii).

Liabilities, Contingent or Nominal, on 1st Jan., 1909 (M .for ret.*) 173 (i).

Loans of Jan., 1909, Expenditure *re* &c., (Ques.) 2596 (ii).

Loan of Dec., 1907, &c., Sums available for Public Works, &c. (Ques.) 669 (i).

Loans, Interest on Temporary, for 12 and three-quarter years (Ques.) 4898 (iii).

Loans of Dec., 1907, and Oct., 1908, Information *re* (Ques.) 1075 (i).

See 'Dom. Loans.'

Militia and Defence, Expenditures *re* Capital Account since 1895 (M. for ret.*) 158 (i).

Montcalm Electoral District, Votes polled, Spoiled Ballots, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2597 (ii).

Montreal Bridge and Terminal Co.'s B. 180 (Mr. Ecrement) in Com., 6629 (iv).

Montreal Harbour Dues, Increase of, Interest due Govt., &c. (Ques.) 1416 (i).

National Trans. Ry., Loans *re* Construction, Eastern Division, Rates of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 679 (i).

Natural Resources B. 159 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6382 (iv).

Natural Resources, Conservation Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 6374 (iv).

Pneumatic Tubes, Montreal, Quantity and Value of Purchase, &c. (Ques.) 1068 (i).

Preston, W. T. R., Emplymt. by Govt., Transfer, &c. (Ques.) 3991 (ii).

——— Transfer to Holland (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6657 (iv).

Public Works, Hours of Labour B. 35 (Mr. Verville) on M. to dschg. from Order Paper, 4990 (iii).

Ry. Subsidy, C. 40, Edward VII., Reps. *re* Payment of (M. for copy*) 2161 (ii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 1718 (i).

Revenue Details *re* amount of $699,235.52 in November, 1908 (M. for ret.*) 158 (i).

Rivière du Moulin Pier, Pets. Reps., &c., *re* Contract (M. for copies*) 2161 (ii).

Royal Canadian Accident Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 63) 1°*, 1116 (i); on Senate Amts., 6788 (iv).

Secret Commissions Prevention B. 31 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1131 (i).

S. A. Land Grants to Teachers, &c. (Ques.) 3986 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (wharfs and basins) 788 (i).

Charges of Management, 399 (i).

Civil Govt.—Civil Service Commission (salaries) 386; Railways (consulting engineer) 386; Sec. of State (salaries) 459 (i).

Indians—B.C. (destitute) 1140; (schools) 1141 (i).

AMES, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Labour Dept. (industrial disputes) 655 (i).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and New Zealand) 6651; (contingent fund) 6655; (Gaspé) 6651; (Halifax and Nfld.) 6651; (Magdalen Islands) 6652; (P.E.I. and C.B. and Nfld.) 6652; (Prince Rupert, B.C. and Jedway) 6652; (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 6653; (Victoria, &c., and Skagway) 6654 (v).

Militia (supplies) 6664 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Strathcona) 3224 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Nanaimo) 3224 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Grosse Isle) 3211 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Bridgewater) 1283; (Halifax) 1289; (New Glasgow) 1291 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston R.M.C.) 1512 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additional wing) 1253; (museum) 1275; (peat testing) 1502; (Royal Mint) 1271 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Cookshire) 1293 (i); (detention hospital) 3221 (ii); (Joliette) 1293; (Knowlton) 1301; (Montreal P. O., enlargement) 1316 (i); (Montreal, examining warehouse) 3211 (ii); (Montreal, postal station) 1306; (St. Johns) 1317; (Sherbrooke drill hall) 1317 (i); (Sherbrooke) 3222 (ii); (Three Rivers) 1318 (i).

Public Works—(contingencies) 3672 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—.N. S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2344; (Bay St. Lawrence) 2455; (Blue Rocks) 2455; (Breton Cove) 2456; (Cow Bay) 2466; (Middle River) 2477; (South Lake, Lakevale) 2480 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse a la Barbe) 2513; (Anse l'Ilot) 2513; (Batiscan) 3276; (Bonaventure river) 2559; (Bonaventure) 3277; (Chicoutimi) 2523; (Clarke City) 2527, 2540; (Doucet's Landing) 2545; (Douglastown) 2546; (Father Point) 2548; (Gaspé) 2550; (Lake St. John) 2556; (Laprairie ice piers) 2900; (Magdalen Islands) 2557; (Mistook) 2557; (Nicolet) 3246; (repairs) 2554; (Richelieu river) 2559; (Rimouski) 2557; (St. Alphonse de Bagotville) 2900; (Ste. Anne des Monts) 3288; (St. Francis du Lac) 3285; (Ste. Fulgence) 2906 (ii); (St. Jean des Chaillons) 2906; (St. Maurice) 2900; (St. Michel, Yamaska) 3262; (St. Nicholas) 2908; (Saguenay dredging) 2802, 2887; (Saguenay River) 3284; (Sorel) 3289; (Yamaska) 3291 (ii).

Trade and Commerce (annuities administration) 6660; (Chinese administration) 6655; (commercial agencies) 6657 (iv).

Ways and Means (sugar) in Com., 5101 (iii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J.E., *East Lambton.*

Agriculture Dept., Expenditure *re* Employees (Ques.) 2756 (ii).

Agricultural Fertilizers, B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4447 (iii).

Animals Contagious Diseases Act, Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 754 (i).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

Books entering Canada under British Preferential Tariff, &c. (Ques.) 2586 (ii).
Budget, The, 4910 (iii).
Canada-France S.S. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 4440 (iii).
Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5460 (iii).
Civil Service Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6327 (iv).
Civil Service Salaries, in Com. on Res., 406 (i).
Cochrane Town Site, G. T. P., Interference *re* (Ques.) 2586 (ii).
Cold Storage Plant, Govt. Assistance to (Ques.) 2756 (ii).
Envelopes, Complaints *re* Mutilation of through Mail (Ques.) 349 (i).
Experimental Farms, Location in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1939 (i).
Free Mail Delivery in Cities, Names, Mail routes, &c. (Ques.) 2585 (ii).
French SS. Subsidy: *See* 'Canada,' &c.
Fruit Marks Act, Number of Inspectors, &c. (Ques.) 3477 (ii).
——— Regulations *re* Inspection, on M. (Mr. Burrell) to Com. of Sup., 3376 (ii).
Grand Bend Dock, Approaches (Ques.) 2586 (ii).
G. T. P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5255, 5329 (iii).
G. T. P., Resignation of Mr. Morse, Action of Govt. (Ques.) 345 (i).
Holstein Cattle at Experimental Farm, &c. (Ques.) 2756 (ii).
Mackey's Station Post Office, Complaints *re* Management (Ques.) 545 (i).
Mail and Stage Routes, Total Number of Miles, &c. (Ques.) 481, 813 (i).
Mail Boxes purchased and entered without Duty, Authority *re* (Ques.) 547 (i).
Mail Contracts expiring on April 1, 1909, Renewals, Tenders, &c. (M. for ret.*) 685.
——— Inquiry for Ret., 4801 (iii).
——— Renewals without tender in April, 1909, &c. (Ques.) 477 (i).
Oil, Gas, &c., Borings, Details of Expenditure of $35,000, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 684 (i).
Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5423, 5565 (iii).
Postoffice Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 4249 (iii).
Post Office Act (registered letters) Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 741 (i).
Railway Commission Vacancy, Appmt. of Practical Farmer, on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2638 (ii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

Royal Mint, Coins manufactured, Sale and Purchase of Silver, &c. (M. for ret.*) 354 (i).
Rural Free Mail Delivery, on M. for Sup. 2774 (ii).
Rural Mail Routes, Location, &c. (Ques.) 347 (i).
Number of routes, &c. (Ques.) 6408 (iv).
Purchase of Boxes, Duty, &c. (Ques.) 179 (i).
——— Total Expenditure on Routes (Ques.) 677 (i).
St. Joseph Wharf Expenditure in 1908 (Ques.) 2586 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Adulteration of Food (fraudulent marking) 455 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census, &c.) 696 (i); (live stock industry) 5871; (tobacco) 5881 (i).
Canals—Lachine (cement) 1566 (i).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 643; Civil Service Commission (salaries) 393, 705; Govt. Railways (salaries) 462; Finance (salaries) 384 (i); Mines (salaries) 3675; Post Office (contingencies) 726; (salaries) 721; Sec. of State (salaries) 461 (i).
Excise (methylated spirits) 448; (Stamps, &c.) 439 (i).
Inland Revenue (electric power export) 455 (i).
Post Office (inspectors' salaries) 1052; (rural delivery) 1714 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 1374; (Ottawa, peat testing) 1391 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Au Sable) 3292; Que. (Doucet's Landing) 2546 (ii).
Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 453 (i).
Telephone Rates in Canada, Control of by Govt. on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1788 (i).
Thedford, Arkona and Fort Frank Rural Mail Delivery, Delay in Establishing, &c (Ques.) 476 (i).
Trade Relations with Germany, Improvements, &c. Total Exports, &c. (Ques.) 482 (i).

ARTHURS, Mr. J., *Parry Sound.*

Burks Falls, and Trout Creek Mail Routes, Contractor, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 3193 (ii).
McKenzie, Mr. D., Resignation as Postmaster of Three Brooks, N.S., Apptmt. of a Successor (Ques.) 4640 (iii).
Magnetawan River Improvements, Amount expended, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 476 (i).
Natural Resources Conservation Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 6378 (iv).
Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 4534 (iii).
Public Works Expenditure *re* Byng Inlet, &c. (Ques.) 1178 (i).

ARTHURS, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Quebracho Extract, Quantity imported, Pet. *re* Duty, (Ques.) 1178 (i).

SUPPLY—

Excise—(inspectors salaries, &c.) 436 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 2311 (ii).
Penitentiaries—Dorchester (supplies) 917; Generally (supplies) 894 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 1373 (i); Dredging—Dom. (vessels, repairs) 3338; Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Lake Nipissing) 3308; (Little Current) 2973; (Maganatawan) 2981; (Monetteville) 3308 (ii).

Voters' Lists, Parry Sound, Cost of Revision, &c. (Ques.) 669 (i).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B., (Minister of Justice) *North York.*

Bourke, Mr., Retirement of: *See* 'Miner, Bill.'

B. C. Penitentiary, Escape of Convict Bill Miner, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 350 (i).

Buell, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. before Rw Commission (Ans.) 3252 (ii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr Clarke) in Com., 3005 (ii).

C. P. R., Issue of New Stock, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1342 (i).

Coal Oil Explosions, Investigation *re* Deaths &c. (Ans.) 1057 (i).

Cobalt Lake, Disallowance of Act, on M. (Mr. Clarke) for Cor., 1750 (i).

Commissions, Secret or Illicit Payments Prevention (B. 31) 1° m., 325 (i).
See 'Secret,' &c.

Criminal Code Amt. (B. 148) 1° m., 463 (i); 2° m., 6383, 6391; in Com., 6756; on Senate amts., 7085 (iv).

Criminal Code (flogging) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for 2°, 556; in Com., 567 (i).

Death Penalty Commutations, Number in the last 25 years (Ans.) 670 (i).

Ewart, Mr. J. S., Emplymt. *re* Hague Tribunal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7061 (iv).

——— Emplymt. re Newfoundland Fisheries (Ans.) 5630 (iii).

Exchequer Court Act (registrar) Amt. (B. 98) 1°m., 2127 (iii); in Com., 5340 (iii).

Exchequer Court Act (appeal) Amt. (B. 151) 1°m., 4695 (iii); in Com., 6744 (iv).

External Affairs Dept., on prop. Res. (Mr. Murphy) 1991 (i).

Extradition Act Amt. (B. 149) 1°*, 4634; in Com., 5236 (iii).

Florence Mining Co.'s Appeal *re* Ont. Legislation, on M. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 6935 (iii).

Graft and Secret Commissions: *See* 'Secret.'

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

Judges in Quebec now receiving Pensions, Date of Apptmts. (Ans.) 5634 (iii).

Judges of District and County Courts, Salaries (B. 193) prop. Res., 6122; in Com. on Res., 6769 (iv).
See 'Yukon.'

Kingston Penitentiary, Number of Prisoners, &c. (Ans.) 4226 (iii).

——— Tenders for Coal, &c. (Ans.) 4226 (iii).

——— Tenders *re* Potatoes (Ans.) 4227 (iii).

Lebel, Mr. Achille, Request *re* Pet. of Right, &c. (Ans.) 3253 (ii).

Man. County Court, Apptmt. of Judge (Ans.) 342 (i).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B.C. Penitentiary, Admission of Detectives (Ans.) 1183 (i).

——— Investigation *re*, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1820 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 932 (i), 7046 (iv).

——— Letter *re* visit of Mr. A. D. McIntyre (Ans.) 2595 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Ret., 1192 (i).

——— Moneys received prior to escape (Ans.) 4899 (iii).

N.B. Supreme Court, Vacancies, &c. (remarks) 6687 (iv).

Newmarket Canal, Holland River, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com. of Sup., 3128 (ii).
See 'Supply.'

New Westminster Penitentiary, Warden from 1876 to 1888, &c. (Ans.) 2769 (ii).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 4473 (iii); 5994 (iv).

Prisoners, Paroled or Pardoned, Cost of Ret (Ans.) 673 (i).

Railway Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6213 (iv).

Railway Belt, B.C., Litigation between Dom. and B.C. (Ans.) 3043 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Contract with J. G. Herous *re* Timber, &c. (Ans.) 6405 (iv).

——— Insufficient Number of Guards, &c. (Ans.) 1417 (i).

——— Manufacture of Furniture (Ans.) 673 (i).

Secret Commissions Prevention (B. 31) 1° m., 325; in Com., 1122, 1479 (i); Sen. Amts., 4412 (iii).

Street Car Traffic on Sundays and Dom Legislation (Ans.) 1415 (i).

SUPPLY—

Canal—Trent (Holland River) 1888 (i).
Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 440 (i).
Miscellaneous (Hague Tribunal) 7057 (iv).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Penitentiaries—B.C. (salaries) 7046; Kingston (skis) 7057 (iv).

Usury Act, 1908, Prosecutions, Penalties, &c. (Ans.) 481 (i).

Waterways Treaty, Amendment by U.S. Senate, Ratification of by Govt. (Ans.) 4288 (iii).

Waterways and Boundaries Treaty and Welland Canal Construction (Ans.) 6292 (iv).

Wells, Judge, Absence with and without Leave (Ans.) 4898 (iii).

Yukon Act Amt. (B. 156) 1° m., 4882; in Com., 5235 (iii).

BARKER, Mr. S., *East Hamilton.*

Canadian, Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 1685 (i).

Fisheries in B.C., Depletion of, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 6504 (iv).

G.T.P. Loan Bill 128 (Mr. Fielding) on Amt. (Mr. Ames) to M. for 3°, 5602 (iii).

I.C.R. Branch Lines Extension, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2169 (ii).

Ry. Commission Vacancy, on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) Ques. of Order, 2662 (ii).

Ry. Level Crossing, Accident near Kingston (remarks) 255 (i).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (cement) 1568; St. Lawrence (district office) 1573; Soulanges (slope trimmings) 1571 (i).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen's Office (extra clerks) 3434 (ii).

Labour Dept.—Miscellaneous (opium conference) 3434 (ii).

Legislation—House of Commons (debates) 3437; (promotions) 3436; (voters' lists) 3436 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lime Kiln crossing) 3438 (ii).

Militia (R. M. College) 3423 (ii).

Post Office (rural mails) 3423 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Clarke City) 2541 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Aston, track scale) 3415; (working expenses) 3421; Miscellaneous (Quebec Bridge) 3421 (ii).

Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B 29 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 2141 (ii).

BARNARD, Mr. Geo. H., *Victoria, B.C.*

Address, The, 70 (i).

Banfield Creek Lifeboat, Cost, Wreck, &c. (Ques.) 1730 (i).

Bibbington, Thos., Cancellation of Pilotage Certificate (M. for cor.*) 3991 (ii).

B. C. Wharfs, Inquiry for Ret., 3004 (ii). *See* 'Wharfs.'

Deferred Elections, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burrell), 2874 (ii).

Esquimalt Garrison (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2298 (ii).

BARNARD, Mr. Geo. H.—*Con.*

Esquimalt Naval Fortifications, Expenditure by Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 474 (i).

—— Maintenance by Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 349 (i).

Esquimalt Permanent Corps, Inspection, Total Cost (Ques.) 2764 (ii).

Indian Reserves Reduction, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1734 (i).

Kingston Penitentiary, Revenue from Sales, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1190 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 3255 (ii).

Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 3537 (ii).

Pilotage Rates, Scale of Charges for B.C., &c. (Ques.) 3476 (iv).

Robertson, Thos., Suspension by Pilotage Board (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6855 (iv).

St. Joseph's Hospital for Mariners, B.C., Arrangements *re* (Ques.) 3197 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 5950 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 654 (i).

Civil Service Commission (salaries) 708 (i).

Indians—B.C. (surveys commission) 1145 (i)

Militia (salaries) 2298 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 6673; (life saving records) 6675; (naval militia) 6683 (iv).

Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 909 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Prince Rupert quarantine) 2081; (Victoria immigration) 2081 (ii); Yukon (Commissioner's residence) 1594 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's rapids) 2098; Ont. (Victoria) 2117 (ii).

Public Works—Dredging (generally) 6534 (iv).

Trade Commissioner at Shanghai, Vacancy, Apptmt. (Ques.) 2320 (ii).

Victoria Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2100 (ii).

Victoria Post Office, Pet. from Letter Carriers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1712 (i).

Warships discarded by G. B., Offer to Fisheries Protection Service (Ques.) 2379 (ii).

Wharfs in N. S., N. B. and B. C., Amount expended since 1906 (Ques.) 348 (i).

—— Particulars of Expenditures (M. for ret.*) 1190 (i).

See 'B. C.,' &c.

BARR, Mr. J., *Dufferin.*

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4448 (iii).

Band of 36th Regiment, Payments to (Ques.) 4892 (iii).

See 'Thirty-Sixth,' &c.

Canada-France SS. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 4443 (iii).

BARR, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Canadian Medical Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Roche) in Com., 4842 (iii).
Civil Service Salaries, M. for Com. on Res., 321; in Com. on Res., 409 (i).
Commercial Feeding Stuffs B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5216 (iii).
Criminal Code (flogging) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., Ques of Order, *re* irregular voting, 568 (i).
Customs Seizures for 1904-5-6-7-8, Number, Dates, Sale of, &c. (M. for ret.*) 826 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 2773 (ii).
Experimental Farms, Locations, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1953 (i).
Franking Privilege *re* Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1653 (i).
French SS. Line: *See* 'Canada,' &c.
Gabriel, Capt., Payment *re* Recruiting for 1908 (Ques.) 4893 (iii).
G. T. P. Lake Superior Branch Lines Subsidy B. 30 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 667 (i).
Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr.Conmee) in Com., 4529; 5384; 5568 (iii).
Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 4252 (iii).
Public Health Bureau, Establishment of by Govt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1105 (i).
Ry Act. (level crossing) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 2392 (ii).
Railway Act (telephone crossings) Amt. (B. 32) 1° m., 326; 2° m., 876 (i).
Rural Mail Boxes, Number delivered in Dufferin County (Ques.) 341 (i).
Rural Free Mail Delivery, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 2793 (ii).
Seizures by Inland Revenue, Number for 1904-5-6-7-8, Dates, Amounts realized, &c. (M. for ret.*) 685 (i).
Senate, Abolition of, on proposed resolution, (Mr. Lancaster) 1461 (i).
Stork, W. W., Inspector of Animals, Details *re* Expenditures (Ques.) 6092 (iv).
Superior and Ontario Ry. Co.'s incor. B. 78 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3966 (ii).

SUPPLY—

(i);(cold storage) 3189 (ii); (exhibitions) (i); (cold storage) 3189 (ii); exhibitions) 727 (i); (experimental farms) 5955 (iv); (experimental farm, electric ry.) 3192 (ii); (live stock industry) 5842 (iii); (Year-Book) 702 (i).
Canals—Lachine (cement) 1567; (wharfs and basins) 791 (i).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 643; Customs (contingencies) 591; Post Office (contingencies) 725 (i).
Excise (inspectors, salaries) 436 (i).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 7026; (St. Boniface hospital) 7235 (iv).

BARR, Mr. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Indians—B. C. (destitute) 1140; (schools) 1142 (i).
Indians—Ont. and Quebec (legal expenses) 994; (schools) 978 (i).
Indians—P.E.I. (medical attendance) 1000 (i).
Indians—Saskatchewan (farm implements) 1004 (i).
Penitentiaries—Kingston (supplies) 887 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Victoria immigration) 2083 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (engineers) 1619 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 1361; (Kingston Vet. hospital) 1534; (R. M. College) 1533 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additional wing) 1259, 1270; (museum) 1275 (i); 3219 (ii); (telephones) 1607 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Burlington piers) 2967; (Cobourg) 2968; Que. (Saguenay dredging) 2814 (ii).
Quarantine (generally) 3193 (ii).
Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 453 (i).

Telephone Lines crossing Railways, Applications *re*, Refusals, &c. (Que.) 335 (i).
——— Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 353 (i).
Thirty-sixth Regiment, Payments *re* Rental for Storage of Arms, &c. (Ques.) 4894 (iii). *See* 'Band.'
Towers in Dufferin County, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 341 (i).

BEATTIE, Mr. T., *London.*

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4457 (iii).
Bacon Curing Industry for 1907-8, Number of Hogs condemned, &c. (Ques.) 342 (i).
Hogs killed from Nov., 1907 to Nov., 1908, Condemnation of, &c. (M. for ret.*) 684 (i).
Judge, H. A., Emplymt. as Detective by Govt. (Ques.) 1399 (i).
London and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 102) 1°*, 2318; in Com., 3846; 3983 (ii).
Monarch Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 82) 1°*, m. 1648 (i).
Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G.B., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 3534 (ii).
Silver Currency, coined in Canada for 1905-6-7-8, Profits, &c. (Ques.) 868 (i).
Street Car Traffic on Sundays, Dom. Legislation re (Ques.) 1414 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 5951 (iv); (agricultural grants) 993; Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 893; Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 1387 (i); Harbours and Rivers —Ont. (Rondeau harbour) 2979 (ii).

Zinc Discovery in Albermarle Twp., Bounty *re* (Ques.) 1077 (i).

BEAUPARLANT, Mr. A. M., *St. Hyacinthe.*

Criminal Code (flogging) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for 2°, 563 (i).

Death Penalty, Commutations, Number for the last 25 years (Ques.) 670 (i).

Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G.B., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 3559 (ii).

BELAND, Mr. H. S. *Beauce.*

Natural Resources Conservation Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 6375 (iv).

Pulp and Paper produced in Can., Quantity exported to G.B. and U.S., (Ques.) 3048 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Lake St. Francis) 2554 (ii).

BICKERDIKE, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*

Criminal Code (wife beating, &c.) Amt. (B. 4) 1° m., 92; 2° m., 556; in Com., 567 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6166 (iv).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Act Amt. (B. 3) 1° m., 91 (i).

——— Remarks, 555 (i).

Smith, Thomas L., Patent Relief (B. 71) 1°*, 1318 (i); 3° m., 2578, 2950 (ii).

BLACK, Mr. J. B., *Hants.*

Dominion Atlantic Ry., Examination, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2927 (ii).

——— Interview with Manager (remarks) 3003 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act, Regulations *re* Inspection on M. (Mr. Burrell) to Com. of Sup., 3397 (ii).

I.C.R. Branch Lines Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2205 (ii).

Public Health Bureau, Establishment of by Govt. (prop. res.) 1081 (i).

SUPPLY—

Railways—I.C.R. (original construction) 2927 (ii).

Windsor, N.S., Post Office, Tenders *re* renovating, &c. (Ques.) 4288 (iii).

BLAIN, Mr. R., *Peel.*

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4467 (iii).

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 755 (i).

Canada-France SS. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 4442 (iii).

Cigarette Prohibition Legislation, &c. (Ques.) 246 (i).

Disraeli Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2357 (ii).

Fishery Regulation Treaty, &c. and Action of Ont. Govt. (remarks) 6531 (iv).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4421 (iii).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5270, 5493 (iii).

——— on M. for 3° (remarks) 5555 (iii).

Hog Tariff from U.S. to Canada, Increase of (Ques.) 821 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) on M. to rsm. adjnd. debate (remarks) 4414 (iii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 6702; in Com. on B., 6704 (iv).

I. C. R., Frauds, Suspension of Officials (remarks) 2673 (ii).

Interior Officials, Dismissals, Charges, &c. (Ques.) 2380 (ii).

Mount Pleasant Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3423 (ii).

N.B. Central Ry. Commission's Rep., Ques. of Privilege *re* Vote, 6409 (iv).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 4496, 5300 5308, 5352, 5410, 5559 (iii).

Ottawa Buildings, Payment of Taxes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1609 (i).

Port Credit, Customs Revenue, Superannuation of Collector, &c. (Ques.) 3049 (ii).

Port Credit Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3329 (ii).

Post Offices in Peel County, Number, &c. (Ques.) 3046 (ii).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry Co.'s incorp. B. 62 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 2536 (ii).

Public Works Expenditures, Promises during elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1357 (i).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 2391 (ii); in Com., 6207, 6300 (iv).

Rural Free Mail Delivery, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 2797 (ii).

Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. W. McIntyre) on M. for 2°, 778 (i).

Superior and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 78 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3982 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food (fraudulent marking 456 (i).

Arts, Agricultural, &c. (census, &c.) 696 (i); (experimental farm electric ry.) 3193 (ii); Gold and Silver Marking Act) 809 (i); (live stock industry) 5834 (iii); (swine commission) 6984 (iv); (tobacco) 5881 (iii).

Canals—Lachine (cement) 1566 (i); St. Lawrence (District office) 1574 (i).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 648 (i); (experimental farm) 6982 (iv); Aud. Gen's Office (extra clerks) 3435 (ii); In-

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

terior (salaries) 6247 (iv); Sec. of State (salaries) 459 (i).
Dom. Lands (advertising) 6285 (iv).
Excise (methylated spirits) 449 (i).
Indians—B.C. (destitute) 1139 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and S. Africa) 6651 (iv).
Militia (supplies) 6664 (iv).
Miscellaneous (maps) 3463 (ii); (patent medicines) 458 (i).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 6670 (iv).
Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 892; St. Vincent de Paul (supplies) 915 (i).
Post Office (rural mails) 3423 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (rents) 1618 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 1596 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Partridge Island water service) 3207 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Bridgewater) 1287 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Belleville armoury) 1357; (Glencoe) 1367; (Markham) 1387; (Whitby) 1393, 1539 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 621; (grounds) 1600; (peat testing) 1389; (telephones) 1609 (i), 3232 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Quebec citadel) 3213 (ii); (Sherbrooke drill hall) 1317 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's residence) 1592; (rents, &c.) 1621 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Beaver) 1623; (Cape Bald) 1625; (Moncton) 1628; (St. John tributaries) 1637 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2743; (Sandy Cove) 3236 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Blind River) 3292; (Collingwood) 3294; (Lake Nipissing) 3311; (Spanish River) 3328 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Tignish) 2510 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Batiscan) 3276; (Clarke City) 2540; (Garthby) 2549; (Laprairie) 3287; (Rivière du Loup) 3284; (Ste. Anne des Monts) 3287; (Saguenay dredging) 2803, 2878 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 3349 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Windsor) 3421 (ii).
Railways—N.T.R. (surveys, &c.) 6936 (iv).

Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4160 (iii).

BLONDIN, Mr. P. E., *Champlain.*

Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 223 (i).

St. Maurice and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 176) on M. for 2°, 6083 (iv).

Stone, Broken and Rough for Marine Dept. Tenders, Contracts, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 2593 (ii).

BLONDIN, Mr. P. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Clarke City) 2527; (Saguenay dredging) 2811, 2885 (ii).

Transcontinental Ry., La Tuque Yard, Site (Ques.) 6292 (iv).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W., K.C.M.G., (Minister of Militia and Defence) *Kings, N.S.*

Algoma Rifles, 97th Reg., Removal from Sault Ste. Marie (Ans.) 1411 (i).

Annual Drill, Discontinuance, &c. (Ans.) 343 (i).

Armouries, supplied by Officers, Policy of Govt. (Ans.) 824 (i).

Armouries, Building, &c., on Inquiry for Ret., 2129, 3110, 3937 (ii).

Band of 36th Regiment, Payments to (Ans.) 4893 (iii).

Belleville Drill Hall, Land Site, Officers' Quarters, &c. (Ans.) 674, 818 (i).

Bisley Team, Use of Ross Rifle, &c. (Ans.) 5643 (iii).

Canadian Patriotic Fund (B. 175) 1°*, 5887 (iii); 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 6739 (iv).

Dom. Arsenal, Quebec, Names of Bidders, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 3050 (ii).

Dominion Atlantic Ry., Examination (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2927 (ii).

Eastern Townships Cavalry Brigade, Site for (Ans.) 5644 (iii).

Esquimalt Garrison (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2299 (ii).

Esquimalt Naval Fortifications, Expenditure by Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 475 (i).

Esquimalt Permanent Corps, Inspection, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2765 (ii).

Fort Cumberland Land, Govt. Ownership, Sale, &c. (Ans.) 3481 (ii).

Gabriel, Capt., Payments for recruiting 1908 (Ans.) 4893 (iii).

Garrison Common, Transfer of Property to Exhibition Ass'n., Delays, &c. (Ans.) 182 (i).

Geodetic Survey Bureau, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Cor., 3077 (ii).

Imperial General Staff, Organization, O.Cs., Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Talbot) for Copies, 1420 (i).

Imperial Partnership with G. B. and Her Colonies, on Amt. (Mr. Hughes) 6424 (iv).

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 3866 (ii).

Japanese Immigration, Sir P. Lake's Speech in Toronto (Ans.) 1066 (i).

Kingston Batteries, Tenders *re* Supplies (Ans.) 4225 (iii).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*

Kingston Military Buildings, Tenders, Number of Targets, &c. (Ans.) 546 (i).
See 'R.M.C.'

Lansdowne Drill Shed, Contract *re* Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 5630 (iii).

Lee-Enfield Rifles, Issue of New Barrels, &c. (Ans.) 6088 (iv).

Loggie, W. S. Co., Payments to, by Govt. for 1906-7-8 (Ans.) 480 (i).

Militia, Annual Training, Completion of Plans, &c. (Ans.) 683 (i).

Militia Camps, Eastern Townships, Selection of Site (Ans.) 343 (i).

Militia Estimates (annual statement) 2244 (ii).

——— Items in Estimates (Ans.) 4634 (iii).

Militia at Halifax, Delayed Payments (remarks) 2773 (ii).

Militia, Permanent Corps, Winter Equipment, &c. (Ans.) 2377 (ii).

Military Lands purchased near Kingston, Name of Agent, &c. (Ans.) 547 (i).

N. W. Rebellion, 1885, Grants to R. N. W. M. P. (Ans.) 184 (i).

Ottawa Service Corps, Complaints *re* Padding Pay List (Ans.) 6784 (iv).

Petewawa Camp, Number of Permanent Force, Date of Opening, &c. (Ans.) 5639.

Quebec Camps of Instruction, Date of, Regiments attending, &c. (Ans.) 5641 (ii).

Red River Expedition, Land Grants to Officers, &c. (Ans.) 3991 (ii).

Richmond Rifle Range, Protection *re* Shooting (Ans.) 1723 (i).

Ross Rifle, Authority *re* Adoption by Canadian Govt. (Ans.) 1072 (i).

——— Bayonets, Contracts *re* (Ans.) 344 (i).

——— Bisley Camp, Description of, &c. (Ans) 344 (i).

——— (remarks) 5644 (iii).

——— Claims for Damages *re* Accidents, &c. (remarks) *re* Form Answers, 548 (i).

——— Factory Bayonets, Installment of Machinery, &c. (Ans.) 670 (i).

——— Factory, Number of Employees, Inspections *re* Standards (Ans.) 1411 (i).

——— Number accepted and rejected by Militia Dept. (Ans.) 245 (i).

——— Number accepted and returned, Payments to Co. for 1903, (Ans.) 329 (i).

——— Reps. *re* Merits or Demerits, Cor. &c., on M. (Mr. Worthington) for Ret., 1190 (i).

——— Small Arms Com. Rep., Date of last Contract, &c. (Ans.) 471 (i).

——— Weight, Length, Diameter, &c. (Ans.) 4891 (iii).

Royal Canadian Dragoons, St. John, Contract *re* Supplies (Ans.) 2767 (ii).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*

Royal Military College, Stables, Erection of (Ans.) 1732 (i).

——— Water Supply, Defects, &c. (Ans.) 682 (i).
See 'Kingston.'

St. John, Military Properties, Leases, Rentals, &c. (Ans.) 672 (i).

Sherbrooke Armoury, Completion, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 5643 (iii).

Sherbrooke New Regiment, Construction, Appropriation *re* Band (Ans.) 5643 (iii).

Snider Rifles, Disposition of Old Ones (Ans.) 2383 (ii).

S. A. Bounty Act, Regulations (remarks) 2234 (ii).

S. A. Land Grants to Teachers, &c. (Ans.) 3986 (ii).

Strathcona, Lord, Gift to Dom. *re* drilling of school children (letter read) 3198 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St John and Minas Basin) 6654 (iv).

Militia (annual drill) 2311, 2314, 3422; (contingencies) 2307; (ordnance) 2307; (permanent force) 3422; (properties) 2314 (ii); (priv. sec.'s salary) in conc., 4049 (iii); (R. M. C. commandant) 6660 (iv); (R.M. College) 3423; (salaries) 2244 (ii); (supplies) 6661 (iv); (transport) 3423; (warlike stores) 2317 (ii).

Pensions (Fenian Raid) 812; (N.W. rebellion) 812 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston, R.M.C.) 1512 (i).

Targets, Rifles, Supplies, &c., Extension to Schools, &c. (Ans.) 681 (i).

Thirty-sixth Regiment, Payments *re* Storage of Arms (Ans.) 4894 (iii).

Toronto Barracks, Delay *re* Erection on Humber River Site (Ans.) 183 (i).

Toronto Old Fort Property, Reclamation and Restoration, &c. (Ans.) 3984 (ii).

——— Condition of, &c. (statement) 6415 (iv).

Truro Armoury, Apptmt. of Caretaker (Ans.) 186 (i).

University Drill Corps, Establishment of (Ans.) 683 (i).

Woodstock, N.B. Armoury, Bowling Alley Operations, &c. (Ans.) 5157 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L., *Halifax, N.S.*

Address, The, 23 (i).

All-Red Line, Negotiations *re*, Progress, &c. (Ques.) 148 (i).

——— O.Cs., Cor. *re* (M. for copies*) 158 (i).

American Tariff, Consideration of, &c. (remarks) 5103 (iii).

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 240; on M. for 2°, and in Com., 750 (i).

Asiatic Exclusion from B.C., Tel. *re* Denial, &c., 39 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Asiatic Exclusion from B. C., on Ques. of Priv. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 666 (i).
——— Memorandum from Bishop of British Columbia (read) 1394 (i).
See 'Japanese.'
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 2nd Vol., Inquiry for, 140, 876, 1250 (i).
Bourke, Mr., Retirement: *See* 'Miner, Bill.'
Budget, The, Date of (remarks) 3111 (ii).
B.C. Subsidy, Increase, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 43 (i).
Caledonia and Liverpool Ry. Lines, Construction (M. for cor.*) 1734 (i).
Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3022, 3028 (ii).
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Edwards) on M. for 1°, 5891 (iv).
Canadian Medical Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Roche) in Com., 4843 (iii).
Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. Dubeau) on Senate Amts., 4594 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Aid B. 186 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6739 (iv).
Carleton, Electoral Division, Resignation, &c. (notification) 94 (i).
See 'Comox.'
Cassells, Judge, Investigation *re* Marine, Action of Govt. *re* Report (remarks) 2218, 3003, 3249, 3568 (ii).
See 'Marine Investigation.'
Civil Service Salaries, Classification *re* Schedules, &c., on M. for Sup., 2439 (ii).
——— Inquiry for, 3254 (ii).
Civil Service (increase) Salaries B. 187 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for Com. on Res., 303 (i); in Com. on Res., 411; 962 (i); on M. for 3°, 6829 (iv); on Senate Amts, 7068 (iv).
See 'House of Commons.'
Civil Service Bill, Preparation of Schedules (remarks) 5999 (iv).
Civil Service Commissioners, O. Cs., Deptl. Orders, Regulations, &c. *re* (M. for copies*) 158 (i).
Cobalt Lake Act, Disallowance of, on M. (Mr. Clarke) for Cor., 1760 (i).
Commissions: *See* 'Secret.'
Committees, Reference of Reports, &c. (remarks) 2024 (ii).
Committees, Standing, Change *re* Rules of Hse., on prop. Res. (Mr. Brodeur) 1320 (i).
——— on M. to conc. in 1st Rep. of Com. 2119 (ii).
Comox-Atlin and Carleton, Writs of Election, Issue of (remarks) 94, 327 (i).
Co-operative Societies, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 2327 (ii).
Criminal Code (flogging) Amt B. 4 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 569 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Criminal Code (general amts.) B. 148 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6392, 6766 (iv).
Dartmouth Post Office, Insufficient Accommodation (remarks) 3255 (ii).
Daylight Saving Bill, on M. to place on Govt. Orders (remarks) 3203 (ii).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 1478 (i).
Debt: *See* 'Net.'
Disallowance of Ontario Act, O.C., Inquiry for, 4882 (iii).
Dog-Fish Reductions Plants, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c. (M. for ret.*) 158 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 3254 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 379 (i).
'Duty of the Hour,' Pamphlet, Distribution of ref., to in Address, 25 (i).
8 Hour Day: *See* Labour.'
Estimates, Inquiry for, 140 (i).
Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 151 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6750 (iv).
External Affairs Dept., B. 90 (Mr. Murphy) on prop. Res., 1999 (i); in Com., 4470 (iii).
Fisheries, Deptl. Rep., Inquiry for, 664 (i).
Fisheries, Jurisdiction with Provinces, Negotiations re (remarks) 2018 (ii).
Fisheries Regulations, *re* International Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6970 (iv).
See 'International,' 'Waterways,' &c.
Fisheries Settlement with Provinces, Rep. of Mr. Bastedo (Ques.) 327 (i).
Fisherman's Union of N. S., Cor. with Govt. (M. for copy*) 2161 (ii).
Fishing Bounties, Delay in sending Forms (remarks) 1187 (i).
——— Forms of Application (remarks) 1022 (i).
Florence Mining Co.'s Appeal *re* Ont. Govt. Legislation, on M. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 6938 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 6922 (iv).
Foran, Mr. W., Apptmt. of Successor (remarks) 3363 (ii).
Franco-Canadian Treaty, Announcement *re* Signing (remarks) 140 (i).
——— Approval of Convention by France (Ques.) 148 (i).
——— Delay re Approval by France (Ques.) 166 (i).
——— O. Cs., Cor., between G.B. and France (M. for copies*) 157 (i).
Franking Privilege *re* Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1681 (i).
Franklin Montgomery Gray, Patent Relief B. 132 (Mr. Rankin) in Com., 4884 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Geodetic Survey Bureau, Establishment of, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Cor., 3080 (ii).
Gerrymander, Ref. to in Address, 24 (i).
Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6126 (iv).
Govt. Railways Act (compensation) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 771 (i).
Govt. Tenders, &c., Ques. of Order, Irrelevancy of debate, 280 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Crothers) 572 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) 575 (i).
Gowganda Postal Facilities (remarks) 1325 (i).
G. T. Ry., Major Hill Park, Conveyance of, O.Cs. Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 352 (i).
——— Negotiations *re* (remarks) 13 (i), 6412 (iv).
G.T.P., Amount of Guaranteed Bonds of N.T.R., Western Div., &c. (Ques.) 1398 (i).
G.T.P., Legislation (remarks) 2219 (ii).
G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 3583 (ii); on M. for 2°, 5103; in Com., 5189, 5261, 5309; on M. for 3°, 5537; (amt.) 5544; Neg. (Y. 70; N. 106) 5592 (iii).
G.T.P. Loans, Cor., Reps., &c., Particulars, &c. (remarks) 2771 (ii).
——— Details *re* (remarks) 3111 (ii).
G.T.P., Mileage Construction of N.T. Ry., Cost per Mile, &c. (Ques.) 1184 (i).
——— Number of Miles of Western Div. completed, Amounts paid by Govt. (Ques.) 1398 (i).
——— Prairie and Mountain Sections, Detailed Stmnt. of Expenditure (remarks) 3256 (ii).
——— Pusher Grades, Information *re* (remarks) 4883 (iii).
——— Total Expenditure *re* Construction of N.T.R. (Ques) 1181 (i).
Halifax and Southwestern Ry. Subsidy, Negotiations *re* Construction (Ques.) 1561 (i).
Hecate Strait, Statute, &c., Cor. with U.S Govt. (remarks) 4882 (iii).
——— Further Information, 4990 (iii).
House of Commons Classification, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 6099 (iv).
——— in Com. on Res., 6112 (iv).
Hudson Bay Ry. Surveys, on M. (Mr. Meighen) for Ret., 686 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6169 (iv).
Imperial Defence, Conference *re*, Action of Govt. (remarks) 6942 (iv).
See 'Naval.'
Insurance Act Amt. (B. 97) on M. for 1°, 2125 (ii); in Com. on Res., 6704; in Com., 6816 (iv).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Insurance Legislation, Ref. to in deb. on Address, 31 (i).
I.C.R., on Annual Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) 2701, 2725 (ii).
——— Board of Management, Apptmt. of (remarks) 4803 (iii).
——— Branch Lines, Printing of (remarks) 664 (i).
——— Employees Settlement *re* Conciliation Act (remarks) 6686 (iv).
——— Freight Clerks, Investigation *re* Labour Disputes, Rep. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3258 (ii).
——— I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry. Employees, Number for each month, 1908 (Ques.) 1173 (i).
——— I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry. Employees, Salaries, &c., for 1908 (Ques.) 243 (i).
——— Proposal *re* Sale or Leasing, &c. (Ques.) 164 (i).
See 'Govt. Rys.'
International Fisheries Commission, Names, Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 1073 (i).
See 'Fisheries.'
International Waterways Commission, on M. (Mr. Lancaster) to Com. of Sup., 6644 (iv).
See 'Waterways.'
Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3863 (ii)
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 3852
Japanese Immigration, Ques. of Priv. *re* Telegram to Victoria 'Colonist,' 290 (i).
See 'Asiatic.'
Japanese Treaty with G. B., Date of Effect, Termination, &c. (Ques.) 2152 (ii).
Judges of District and County Courts B. 193 Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6769 (iv).
Kingston Military Buildings, on Ques. of Order, 2497 (ii).
Labour Dept., B. 165 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), on prop. Res., 5350 (iii); in Com., 6717 (iv).
Labour Hours for Working Men, on M. (Mr. Verville) to Com. of Sup., 5939 (iv).
Latchford Dam, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3321 (ii).
Level Crossing Accidents, on Inquiry for, Ret., 1117 (i).
——— Orders of Ry Com. of Privy Council, Inquiry for, 549 (i).
See 'Ry. Act,' &c.
Lobster License, Refusal to W. C. Henley, Cor., &c., Inquiry for, 4803 (iii).
Mail delivered in Towns, &c., Rural Free Delivery, &c. (M. for ret.*) 157 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension (remarks) 2240 (ii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Delay in Printing Evidence, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 632 (i).

—— Inquiry for, 402, 549 (i).

—— Inquiry for Report, 6 (i).

See 'Cassells,' 'Supply—Marine.'

Marine Dept. Number of Employees in Halifax County (Ques.) 667 (i).

—— Remarks, 875 (i).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B. C. Penitentiary, Investigation *re*, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1830 (i).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 940 (i).

Mission River Piers, Advertisement for Tenders, &c. (remarks) 6919 (iv).

Naturalization Act Amt. Bill, (remarks) 971 (i).

Natural Resources of Canada, Conservation of, Apptmt. of Sel. Com. (M.) 355 (i).

Natural Resources Conservation B. 159 (Mr. Fisher) on prop. Res., 6379 (iv); on M. for 1°, 4989 (iii).

Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G. B., on on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 3513 (ii).

See 'Imperial.'

N. B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Report, on M. (Mr. Foster) to lay on Table, 5624 (iii).

—— on Amt. (Mr. Crothers) to Com. of Sup., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 5646; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 5681 (iii).

—— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Calvert) *re* Vote, 6414 (iv).

Net Debt of Canada, Present Amount, Increase, &c. (Ques.) 147 (i).

Newmarket Canal, Holland River, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com. of Sup., 3121, 3173 (ii).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 1043 (i); in Com., 4473 (iii); in Com., 5974 (iv.) on M. for 3°, 6001 (iv).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6315 (iv).

Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Transfer to Holland (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6656 (iv).

—— (remarks) 5999 (iv).

Private Bills, Extension of Hour of considering, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier)—(remarks) 5774 (iii).

Public Accounts Com. Calling of Meetings, &c. (remarks) 663, 1188 (i).

—— 12th Rep., on M. to conc., 6559 (iv).

Pulpwood Papers, Duties, &c., Negotiations with U.S. (remarks) 2384 (ii).

Pusher Grades on I.C.R., &c., Ref. to in Com. on G.T.P. Bill, 5290 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Quebec Bridge, Rebuilding, Estimated Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 165 (i).

Ry. Act (electric power) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1118 (i).

—— (level crossings) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 3°, 523 (i).

—— (level crossings, &c.) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 2399 (ii); in Com., 6201, 6294; on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 6307 (iv).

Ry. Capitalization of Stock, Regulations by Ry. Commissioners (remarks) 1187 (i).

Ry. Level Crossings, Accident near Kingston (remarks) 255 (i).

Railway Level Crossings, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1205 (i).

Railway Subsidies Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 5628 (iii).

Restaurant Committee, on M. to adopt 2nd Rep. of Com., 401 (i).

Revenue for December, Details of 'Miscellaneous' (Ques.) 149 (i).

Rural Mail Delivery, System, &c. (Ques.) 148 (i).

Scotch Farmers, Report of Visit to Canada (remarks) 6060 (iv).

Secret Commissions Prevention B. 31 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1123 (i).

Sessions of Parlt., Length of, &c. (remarks) on Address, 27 (i).

Sissiboo River Bridge, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Jameson) to Com. of Sup., 6843 (iv).

Smith, John Denison, Relief (B. 157) in Com. 6070 (iv).

Speaker, Election of, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4 (i).

Standing Orders Com., on M. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) to conc. in 1st Rep., 2019 (ii).

Strathcona, Lord, Gift to Dom. *re* drilling of school children (remarks) 3201 (ii).

Supply—One-fourth of Estimates (remarks) 3936 (ii).

SUPPLY.

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 695; (census, &c.) 698; (Year-book) 705 (i).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s office (extra clerks 3435 (ii); Customs (contingencies) 607; Indian Affairs (salaries) 971; Post office (salaries) 613; Public Works (salaries) 614 (i).

Civil Service Commission (salaries) 705 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (travelling expenses) 608 (i).

Dom. Lands (surveys) 3464 (ii).

Fisheries (International Fisheries commission) 3443; Miscellaneous (Cushing & Co.'s claims) 3455 (ii).

Indians—Nova Scotia (medical relief) 3462 (ii)

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Indians, Que. (medical relief) 3461 (ii).
Legislation (members indemnity), 7067 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Mexico) 6650; (contingent expenses) 6655; (P.E.I., C.B. and Nfld.) 6654; (St. John, Halifax and Yarmouth) 6654 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries (investigation) 3450 (ii).
Militia (ordnance) 2308 (ii); (supplies) 6661 (iv); (warlike stores) 2317 (ii).
Mines (geological specimens) 7063 (iv).
Miscellaneous (seed grain) 3466 (ii); unprovided items) 3467 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 6670; (patrol boats) 6682; (tidal surveys) 6679; (wrecking plant) 6680 (iv).
Pensions (Mrs. Wilmot) 884 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (R. M. College) 1384, 1512 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. and Que. (Batiscan) 3276; (Bonaventure) 3277; (Montreal river) 2976 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 2931 (ii).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese administration) 6656; (commercial agencies) 6656 (iv).

Tenders: *See* "Govt."
Thessalon and Northern Railway Co's B. 104 (Mr. Smith) in Com., 6064 (iv).
Treaties between U. S. and G. B., O.Cs., Regulations, &c (M. for copies*) 1081 (i).
Trent Canal, Damages in Peterborough County, Inquiry for statement, 5777 (iii).
Wake, John Relief (B. 178) in M. for 2°, 6081 (iv).
Water Carriage of Goods B. 105, on M. for 2°, 6774 (iv).
Water Carriage of Goods Bill, (remarks) 6847 (iv).
Water Powers, Leases on Canals, Records, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2038.
Waterways Treaty, Announcement *re* Acceptance (remarks) 2494 (ii).
—— Acceptance of U.S. Senate Amts. (remarks), 4471 (iii).
—— Date of Signing, Date of Receipts, &c., (Ques.) 1074 (i).
—— Delay in Placing before Canadian Parlt. (remarks) 174 (i).
—— Despatch from Sec. of State for Colonies (remarks) on M. for Sup., 633 (i).
—— Discussion by Mr. Gibbons (remarks) 1563 (i).
—— N. B. Fisheries, Regulations *re* (remarks) 1248 (i).
—— O.Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1087 (i).
—— Publication by Newspapers (remarks) 1187 (i).
—— Inquiry for 7, 158, 292, 402, (i), 2019 *See* 'International.'

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Ways and Means (sugar) in Com., 5100 (iii).
Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 2135 (ii).
Yukon Ordinances (beer tax) on prop. res (Mr. Oliver) 5892 (iv).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C. *Algoma, West.*

Algoma Rifles, 97th Reg., Removal from Saulte Ste. Marie to Sudbury, &c. (Que.) 1411 (i).
Algoma Steel Co., Contracts with N.T.R. *re* Rails, &c. (Ques.) 336 (i).
Caughnawaga Indian Reserve, Grants to Churches (Ques.) 1410 (i).
Caughnawaga—Iroquois Indian Reserve, Returns of Fine for Stealing, &c. (Ques.) 1410 (i)
See 'Jacobs.'
Cobalt Lake Act, Disallowance of, on M. (Mr. Clarke) for Cor., 1744 (i).
Experimental Farms, Location, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1946 (i).
Farm and Garden Produce, Quantity imported into Sault Ste. Marie, &c. (Ques.) 339 (i).
Fish Hatchery, Establishment at Sault Ste. Marie, &c. (Ques.) 337 (i).
Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4424 (iii).
Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 209 (i).
Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3883 (ii).
Jacobs, F. Macdonald, Complaints *re* Caughnawaga Fines and Conviction (M. for cor.*) 1420 (i).
Lighthouse Keepers, Lake Huron, Increases to (Ques.) 336 (i).
Loggie, W. S. Co., Payments to for 1906-7-8 by Govt., Dates, &c. (Ques.) 479, 668 (i).
Marine Inquiry: *See* 'Investigations'
Michipicoten River Wharf, Expenditure, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 338 (i).
National Art Gallery, Expenditure *re* Pictures, &c. (Ques.) 6087 (iv).
Natural Resources, Conservation Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 6372 (iv).
Nipigon River Dredging, Expenditure for 1908 (Ques.) 3653 (ii), 4223 (iii).
—— Estimated Quantity, &c., (Ques.) 5635 (iii).
Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 1026 (i); in Com., 4502, 5570 (iii).
Port Arthur Harbour Dredging, Mission River, &c., Contractors, Inspectors, &c. (Ques.) 5775 (iii).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Railway Mail Clerks, Increase of Salaries (Ques.) 4223 (iii).

Red River Expedition, Land Grants to Officers, &c. (Ques.) 3990 (ii).

St. Joseph's Island Wharfs, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 337 (i).

St. Nicholas Island Indian Reserve, Disposal of by Govt. (Ques.) 1410 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie Channels, Contracts *re* Buoys, Competition, &c. (Ques.) 3482 (ii).

Sea Gull Wharf, Amounts expended, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 338 (i).

Sec. of State, Date of Resignation, Apptmt. of Successor, &c. (Ques.) 185 (i).

Steel Importations, from March 31, 1908, to Jan. 31, 1909 (M. for ret.) 355 (i).

Superior and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 78 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3963 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 1909; (dredging) 1909 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (heating) 1615; Ont. (Glencoe) 1367; (Leamington) 1386; Ottawa (telephones) 1606 (i); 3231; Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Little River) 3234; Que. (Doucet's Landing) 2543 (ii).

Tenby Bay Wharf Warehouse, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 239 (i).

Voters' Lists, Electoral District of Thunder Bay, &c., Cost, &c. (Ques.) 340 (i).

Waterways Treaty, Amendment of U. S. Senate, Ratification by Govt. (Ques.) 4288 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Magrath) to Com. of Sup., 6602 (iv).

——— Conditional Ratification (remarks) 2335 (ii).

——— Ratification of by U.S., &c., on M. for Sup., 1353 (i).

BOYER, Mr. G., *Vaudreuil.*

Carillon Dam Water Power, Lease of, &c. (Ques.) 1557 (i).

Cedar Rapids Manufacturing and Power Co.'s (B. 94) 1°*, 2120; in Com., 3404, 3472, 3605 (ii).

Census and Statistic Bulletins, French Translation, &c. (Ques.) 1404 (i).

Census Vote for 1910, Intention of Govt., &c. (Ques.) 531 (i).

Debates, Official, Cost of Printing (Ques.) 1720 (i).

——— French Translation Staff, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1722 (i).

Deslisle River Fishway, Reps., Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 1733 (i).

Dom. Lands Act, French Translation, &c. (Ques.) 532 (i).

BOYER, Mr. G.—*Con.*

French Translators, Number, Amount of Work (M. for ret.*) 1733 (i).

Quebec Bridge Report, French Translation (Ques.) 1722 (i).

St. Anne de Bellevue Locks, Pet. *re* Dredging (Ques.) 3483 (ii).

St. Justine Mail Delivery, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 3480 (ii).

Soulanges Canal, Number of Employees, Names, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 869 (i).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H., *Selkirk.*

Budget, The, 5044 (iii).

'Canada Posten' Winnipeg, Amounts received from Govt. (M. for ret.*) 3992 (ii).

C.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 3155 (ii).

C.P.R. Gimili Branch Subsidy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2965 (ii).

Colclaugh, F. W., Cor., Pets., &c., re Fishery Operations with Commercial Companies (M. for copies*) 1191 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2674, 3202, 3655 (ii).

Dredge on Lake Winnipeg, Expense *re* moving Str. 'Mikado' from Sandbar, &c. (Ques.) 869 (i).

Elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William, Govt. Operation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 4024 (ii).

Fisheries of Man., Cor. with J. H. Davies, Cor., Pets, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1190 (i).

Fishing Leases on Nelson, &c., Rivers, Great Slave Lake, &c., Cancellation of (Ques.) 340 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 354 (i).

Fish caught in Summer, Incomplete Return (remarks) 2128 (ii).

See 'Whitefish.'

Franking Privilege and Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1662 (i).

Gimli, Hiransa, &c., Light, Placing of (Ques.) 1403 (i).

Govt. Employees, Interference in Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6876 (iv).

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4433 (iii), 5908 (iii).

G.T.P. Winnipeg Terminals, Cor. between Rothwell & Co. and Govt. *re* Purchase from Matthews & Kerns (M. for copies*) 1081 (i).

Halfbreeds living in U. S., Allotment of Scrip, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1735 (i).

Hazel Ridge Post Office, Application *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1710 (i).

Homesteads west of Lake Winnipeg, Rep. *re* Unfitness for Settlement (Ques.) 3251 (i).

Icelander River Dredging, Total Cost (Ques.) 347 (i).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

Lake Winnipeg White Fishing, Extension of Close Season, &c. (Ques.) 340 (i).

Logberg Printing Co., Payments to by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 1191 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2674, 3255, 3938 (ii).

Manitoba Fisheries, Apptmt. of Icelander *re* Commission (remarks) 3255 (ii).

——— Depletion by American Fishermen, on M. for Sup., 6475, 6942 (iv).

Otonabee River Dredging, Amounts paid, Quantity done, &c. (Ques.) 3044 (ii), 4221 (iii).

Political Partizanship: *See* 'Govt. Employees.'

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 4253 (iii).

Red River Settlers, Deputation *re* Land Grants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6278 (iv).

St. Andrew's Lock, Bridge Approaches (Ques.) 2159 (ii).

——— Completion of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3000 (ii).

——— Completion of (remarks) in Com. of (Ques.) 531 (i).

St. Peters Indian Reserve, Instructions of Mr. Vaughan, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 354 (i).

——— Patents *re* Surrender (M. for ret*) 1191 (i).

——— Treaty Cor., Instructions, &c. (M. for copies*) 1421 (i).

——— Surrender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1017, 1139 (i).

——— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 2128 (ii).

Selkirk Post Office, Estimated Cost, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 347, 530 (i).

Snag Boat at Selkirk, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 474 (i).

Steamers on Lake Winnipeg for Indian Dept., Lease, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1403 (i).

Sturgeon Breeding in Lac du Bonnet, Sale of Fish, &c. (Ques.) 531 (i).

SUPPLY—

Indians, B. C. (destitute indians) 1139; Generally (general expenses) 1017; Man. (seeds, &c.) 1005 (i).

Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 893, 907; St. Vincent de Paul (supplies) 914; Stony Mountain (supplies) 918 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 1543; Man. (Winnipeg P.O.) 1550; Ont. (Kingston R.M.C.) 1508; Ottawa (peat testing) 1501 (i).

Public Works—Harbour and Rivers—Man. (Lac du Bonnet) 2116, 2985; Man. (St. Andrews rapids) 2097; Man. (Winnipeg Beach) 2986 (ii).

Railways—N.T.R. (surveys, &c.) 6985 (iv).

Timber Berths, Nos. 1316, &c., Applications, Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 2162 (ii).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

Ward, Fleetwood Howard, Relief (B. 182) 1°*, 5997 (iv).

Whitefish, Sturgeon, Winter and Summer caught, Quantity, Value exported, &c. (M. for ret.*) 826 (i).

See 'Fish.'

Winnipeg Beach Pier, Removal of Obstruction in Manitou Rapids, &c. (Ques.) 335 (i).

Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 2133 (ii).

Winnipeg P. O. and Ry. Station Mail Contract, Tenders, Changes, &c. (Ques.) 869 (i).

BRISTOL, Mr. E., *Center Toronto.*

G. T. P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on Amt. (Mr. Ames) to M. for 3°, 5600 (iii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Res., 6697 (iv).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp., B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5420 (iii).

Railway Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6232 (iv).

BRODER, Mr. A., *Dundas.*

Cold Storage Instalment (remarks) on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2662 (ii).

Experimental Farms, Location, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1949 (i).

Geodetic Survey Bureau, Establishment of, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Cor., 3079 (ii).

I. C. R., on Annual Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) 2741 (ii).

Natural Resources Conservation Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 6367 (iv).

Nation River Drainage, Cor. O. Cs., &c. (M. for ret.) 686 (i).

——— Rep. of Engineer *re* (Ques.) 1178 (i).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp., B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 1050 (i).

Railway Level Crossings, Prevention of Accidents, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1212 (i).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food (fraudulent marking) 456 (i).

Civil Govt—Customs (Board of Customs) 588 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 1598; Man. (Dauphin) 1544 (i).

Telephone Rates in Canada, Control of by Govt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1769 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) *Rouville.*

Address, The, 63 (i).

Aids to Navigation on N. S. Coast, Applications *re*, Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 5640 (iii).

'Anticosti' Str., Amount of Work done, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 671 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Banff Fish Hatchery, Establishment of, Representations *re* (Ans.) 871 (i).

Banfield Creek Lifeboat, Cost, Wreck, &c. (Ans.) 1730 (i).

Cable between Vancouver and Mainland, Application re (Ans.) 1073 (i).

Canada-France SS. Subsidy (B. 146) in Com. on Res., 4437 (iii).
See 'France.'

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Taylor) 5459 (iii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. (B. 131 (1° m., 4124; in Com., 5218 (iii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Edwards) on M. for 1°, 5891 (iv).

Canadian Coasting Trade, Number of British and Canadians (Ans.) 5633 (iii).

Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. Dubeau) on Senate Amts., 4165 (iii).

Cassells, Judge: *See* 'Marine,' &c.

Colclough, F. W., on Inquiry for Ret., 3202, 3656 (ii).

Committees, Special, Ref. to of Reports of Depts., &c. (remarks) 2025 (ii).

Committees, Standing, Prop. Res. (Mr. Brodeur) *re* Rules of the Hse., 1319 (i).

Desjardins, Capt., Emplymt. by Marine Dept., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4696 (iii).

Dixon's Entrance, Prince Rupert, Rep. from Imp. Govt. *re* (Ans.) 2590 (ii).

Dogfish Reduction Plant, on Inquiry for Ret., 3254 (ii).

East Point Lighthouse Keeper, Resignation of L. McDonald, Apptmt. of Successor, &c. (Ans.) 3194 (ii).

Esquimalt Naval Station, Maintenance by Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 349 (i).

Fagin, Thos., Emplymt by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 2154 (ii).

Falconer, Mr. K., Total Payments *re* Marine Bookkeeping, &c. (Ans.) 1730 (i).

Fish Hatchery, Establishment at Sault Ste Marie, &c. (Ans.) 337 (i).

Fish Hatchery at Lake Winnipegosis, Amt. expended, Qualifications of Inspector, &c. (Ans.) 820 (i).

Fish Hatcheries, Number in Canada, &c. (Ans.) 3479 (ii).

Fish Island, Lighthouse Keeper, Appmt. of (Ans.) 6786 (iv).

Fishing Bounty Forms, Application for (remarks) 1022, 1249 (i).

Fishing in Lake Winnipegosis, Pet. *re* Closing in Summer (Ans.) 2381 (ii).

Fishing Leases in N. W., Cancellation of (Ans.) 341 (i).

Fishing Seasons, Leases, &c. (Ans.) 169 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Fishing Seine Licenses, Number on Pacific Coast (Ans.) 3483 (ii).

Fishing Weirs in Passamaquoddy Bay, Investigation *re* Ownership (Ans.) 6088 (iv).

Fisheries in B.C., Depletion of, &c., on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 6504, 6519 (iv).

Fisheries Cruiser for Pacific Coast, Tenders *re*, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 2156 (ii).

Fisheries Development, Apptmt. of Select Com., on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 514 (i).

Fisheries Officers at Port Joli, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 4697 (iii).

Fisheries Regulations *re* International Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6963 (iv).

——— Action of Ont. Govt. (remarks) 6519 (iv).
See 'Waterways.'

Fisheries Report, on Inquiry for, 664 (i).

Fisheries Settlement with Provs., Rep. of Mr. Bastedo (Ans.) 328 (i).

Fishery Commission Regulations, Adoption of (remarks) 6412 (iv).

Fishery Cruisers, Number owned by Govt. (Ans.) 2769 (ii).

Fishery Wardens in Victoria County, N.S., Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 5637 (iii).

Fishery Inspector for Cape Breton Island, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 5632 (iii).

France and Canada SS. Subsidy (B. 146) in Com., 5219 (iii).
See 'Canada, &c.'

Gimli, Hiransa, &c., Placing of Lights (Ans.) 1403 (i).

Glace Bay Range Lightkeeper, Salary, Applications, &c. (Ans.) 5636 (iii).

Government Harbours and Piers Act Amt. (B. 89) 1° m., 1972 (i); in Com., 4414 (iii), 5896, 6123 (iv).

Govt. Ships purchased from G.B., since 1896, Expenditure, &c., *re* Repairs (Ans.) 3196

Honora Dock, Yearly Receipts (Ans.) 7072 (iv).

Ice Breaker for Northumberland Straits, Contractor's Name, Price, &c. (Ans.) 674 (i).

Ice-breaking Steamers, Superannuation of Officers, Crews, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Copies, 1473 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6176 (iv).

Immigration to U.S., Repatriation, &c., on M. (Mr. Paquet) for Cor., 846 (i).

Investigations in Depts., by Mr. Justice Cassels, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3723 (ii).
See 'Marine.'

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Johnston, Capt., Repayments of Money *re* Hestia (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6889 (iv).
Lac du Bonnet, Opening of for Summer Fishing (Ans.) 1728 (i).
Lake Ontario Fishing Industry, Regulations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 381 (i).
Lake Winnipeg White Fishing, Extension of Close Season (Ans.) 340 (i).
LeBlanc, O. J., Dismissal as Fishery Overseer, Complaints, Investigation, &c. (Ans.) 2596 (ii).
Lighthouse Board, Reorganization of (Ans.) 1974 (i).
Lighthouse Keepers, Lake Huron, Increase of Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 337 (i).
Lobster Fisheries, Violation of Act (remarks) 3705 (ii).
Lobster Licenses in P.E.I., Number, Pets., &c. (Ans.) 1076 (i).
Lobster License refused to W. C. Henley, Cor. *re* (remarks) 4803 (iii).
Lobster Packing Licenses granted in N.S. for 1908, Names and Addresses (Ans.) 328 (i).
Lobster Packers and Difficulties with Fishermen, &c. (remarks) 6062 (iv).
Loggie, W. S. Co., Payments to by Govt. for 1906-7-8, Dates, &c. (Ans.) 480 (i).
McPhaiden, Capt. D., Resignation *re* Position (Ans.) 1973 (i).
Marconi Stations between Montreal and Quebec, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 2762 (ii).
Margaree Island Lighthouse, Expenditure *re* Road (Ans.) 6090 (iv).
Marine Agent, Georgetown, P.E.I., Name, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 3194 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 738 (i).
Marine and Fisheries Book-Keeping, Results of change in Methods (Ans.) 1919 (i).
Marine Employees, Number in Halifax County (Ans.) 667 (i).
——— (remarks) *re* Answer, 875 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, Judge Cassel's Rep. (presented) 14 (i).
See 'Investigations,' &c., 'Patronage,' "Ques. of Priv." "Supply-Marine," &c.
Marine and Fisheries, Number of Employees, (Ans.) 1080 (i).
Marine Supplies purchased since Investigation, Names (Ans.) 3473 (ii).
——— Purchase of by Tender (Ans.) 168, 1974 (i).
Meteorological Stations in Ont., Number erected in 1908, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3195 (ii).
——— Situations, &c. (Ans.) 3985 (ii).
"Montcalm," Icebreaker, Number of Crew, &c. (Ans.) 167 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

'Montcalm,' Name of Engineer *re* Investigations, &c. (Ans.) 548 (i).
——— Res. of Chamber of Commerce, Quebec, &c. (Ans.) 328 (i).
Montreal Bridge and Terminal Co.'s B. 180 (Mr. Ecrement) in Com., 6629 (iv).
Montreal as a Free Port, (remarks) 4802 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissionners Act Amt. (B. 154) 1° m., 4798; in Com., 5234 (iii); 6559 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 192 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 6743 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Dismissal of Employees (Ans.) 874 (i).
——— Promises re Wharfage Dues, &c. (Ans.) 874 (i).
Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 3552 (ii).
Navigable Waters Protection (B. 152) 1° m., 4797; in Com., 5225 (iii); 3° m., 6128 (iv).
Niagara Ice Jam, Assistance by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 4703 (iii).
Northwest Fish Company, Leases, &c. (remarks) 6777 (iv).
Oshawa Port, Appointment of Officers by Marine Dept., &c. (Ans.) 3201 (ii).
Patronage List, Abolition of, Comn. to Judge Cassels, (remarks) 876 (i).
Pictou Fishery Overseers, Prosecutions *re* Salmon illegal Fishing (Ans.) 5633 (iii).
Pilotage Rates, Scale of Charges for B. C. (Ans.) 3476 (ii).
Plaster Mines Lighthouse, Dismissal of Hector McRae (Ans.) 6784 (iv).
P. E. I. Winter Communication with the Mainland, on M. (Mr. Warburton) 6466 (iv).
Public Works by Marine Dept., Tenders *re* (Ans.) 2766 (ii).
Ques. of Priv. *re* Quotations from Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (Mr. Taylor) 4041 (iii).
Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 375 (i).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. Bradbury) 2674 (ii).
Robertson, Thos., Suspension by Pilotage Board, B.C. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6861 (iv).
St. Joseph's Hospital, B.C., Arrangements for Sick Mariners (Ans.) 3197 (ii).
St. Lawrence Channel, Amount expended, Continuation of Work (Ans.) 2150 (ii).
Sault Ste Marie Channels, Contracts *re* Buoys, &c. (Ans.) 3482 (ii).
Shanghaiing in Vancouver, Investigation, Rep., &c. (Ans.) 3481 (ii).
Soulanges Island, Change of Name (Ans.) 2757 (ii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Sorel Ship Yards, Repairs of Boats owned by Marine Officials, &c. (Ans.) 4703 (iii).

'Stanley' and 'Minto' Strs., Names and Residences of Officers (Ans.) 675 (i).

——— Officers off duty from 12th to 17th Feb., 1909 (Ans.) 1976 (i).

Statutes, French Translation, &c. (remarks) 2022 (ii).

Stone, Broken and Rough, Tenders, Contracts, &c., from Marine Dept. (Ans.) 2593 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 3702; (McLeod, Mr. O. L.) 3436 (ii); (salaries) 380 (i), 3687 (ii).

Fisheries (bait freezers) 6950 (iv); (biological stations) 3438 (ii), 6953; (breeding establishments) 6946; (commissions) 6957; (contingencies) 6981 (iv); Miscellaneous (Cushing & Co.'s claims) 3450 (ii); (customs licenses) 6958; (dog fish plant) 6950; (fish curing) 6952 (iv); (international commission) 3439, 3688 (ii), 6960; (oyster culture) 6949; (protection cruiser) 6947; (transportation) 6956; (Young, Mr. W. S., compensation) 6982 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, rents, &c.) 6889; (buoy steamer) 6910; (Clarke, Mrs. A. G., compensation) 6981; (construction) 6904; (ice breaking) 6915; (lightkeepers' salaries) 6981 (iv); (Lime kiln crossing) 3438 (ii); (maintenance) 6902; (meteorological service, L. F. Gorman) 6982 (iv); (pilot pensions) 3437 (ii); (property in St. John) 6915; (salaries) 6889; (West coast trail) 6981 (iv).

Marine—Dredging (plant, &c.), 6885 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries (hydrographic surveys) 6916 (iv); (investigation) 3450 (ii); (meteorological service) 6916 (iv).

Marine Hospitals (sick seaman) 3438 (ii); 6946 (iv).

Marine—Public Works (piers on St. Lawrence) 6888; (St. Lawrence ship canal) 6877; (Sorel ship yard) 6885 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 6670 (iv); (ice-breaker for Northumberland Straits) 3437 (ii), 6673 (iv); (life saving rewards) 6675; (naval militia) 6683; (obstructions, removal, &c.) 6679; (patrol boats) 6682; (wrecks, investigations) 6679; (wrecking plant) 6680 (iv).

Railways—Miscellaneous (litigation, &c.) 2055 (ii).

Tadousac and Riviere du Loup Winter Navigation (Ans.) 344 (i).

Telephone Stations between Quebec and Montreal re Navigation (Ans.) 2594 (ii).

Warships discarded by G. B., Offer to Can. for Fisheries Protection (Ans.) 2379 (ii).

Waterways Treaty, International N. B. Fisheries, Par. in St. John 'Globe' (remarks) 1244 (i).

See 'Fisheries.'

Wharfs Bill: *See* 'Govt. Harbours,' &c.

Whitefish Spawn for Lake Winnipegosis, Contract *re* (Ans.) 1403 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Winnipegosis Fish Hatchery, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 1402 (i).

BUREAU Hon. J. (Solicitor General), *Three Rivers and St. Maurice.*

Bourke, Mr., Retirement: *See* 'Miner, Bill.'

Criminal Code Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 6389 (iv)

Extradition Act Amt. B 149 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5243 (iii).

Franking Privilege *re* Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1664 (i).

Immigration to U. S., Repatriation, &c., on M. (Mr. Paquet) for Cor., 853 (i).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B. C. Penitentiary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 925 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1833 (i).

Political Weekly Letter, Franking and Distribution, &c. (Ans.) 1921 (i).

St. Maurice and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 176 (Mr. Blondin) on M. for 2°, 6084 (iv).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Manufacture of Church Pews (remarks) in Com of Sup., 900 (i).

SUPPLY—

Penitentiaries—B.C. (retirements) 924; (Dorchester electric lighting plant) 884 (supplies) 916; Generally (salaries) 886; Kingston (supplies) 886; St. Vincent de Paul (supplies) 914; Stony Mountain (supplies) 918 (i).

BURRELL, Mr. M., *Yale-Cariboo.*

Address, The, 72 (i).

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4449 (ii).

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B 18 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 767 (i).

Bourke, Mr., Retirement: *See* 'Miner, Bill'

Cariboo Mail Service, Payments *re* (Ques.) 1731 (i).

———(remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3424 (ii).

Civil Services Salaries, in Com. on Res., 963 (i).

Comox-Atlin Election, Issue of Writ for 11th Parlt., Date of Nomination, Instructions to Returning Officer, &c. (Ques.) 682 (i).

——— Remarks, 825 (i).

Deferred Elections, Notice of Motion, 2815; (prop. res.) 2818; Amt. neg. (Y. 69; N. 115) 2876 (ii).

Experimental Farms, Locations, &c., on prop Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1932 (i).

Fishery Regulation, &c., on M. (Mr. Taylor) 6528 (iv).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1672 (i).

Fruit Imports to B.C. from U.S., Quantities, Values, &c. (Ques.) 3250 (ii).

BURRELL, Mr. M.—*Con.*

Fruit Marks Act, Regulations *re* Inspection on M. for Sup., 3364 (ii).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 5173; in Com., 5327 (iii).

Greenwood and Grand Forks Post Office Sites, Options *re* (Ques.) 814 (i).

Kelly-Douglas Contracts: *See* 'Supply—Public Works, Yukon,' &c.

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 96) 1°*, 2120 (ii).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B.C. Penitentiary, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1839 (i).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 926 (i).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 4482 (iii).

Quesnel Telegraph Station Supplies, Contracts *re* (Ques.) 1919 (i).

Railway Commission, Vacancy, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer, on prop. Res. (Mr Staples) 2663 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food (fraudulent marking) 456 (i).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 730 (i); (experimental farms) 5949 (iv); (tobacco) 5881 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 655 (i).

Post Office (miscellaneous) 1716 (i); (rural mails) 3424 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Vernon) 2075 (ii); Ont. (Kingston, R.M.C.) 1512 1532; Que. (Joliette) 1298 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C (Okanagan) 6544; (Quesnelle, &c.) 6544 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraphs—B. C. (Kamloops) 3348 (ii).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 3352 (ii).

Telephone Rates in Canada, Control of by Govt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1807 (i).

CALVERT, Mr. W. S., *West Middlesex.*

N.B. Central Ry. Commission, Vote *re*. Ques. of Priv., 6412 (iv).

Toronto, Niagara and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 42) 1°*, 626 (i); in Com., 2063 (ii).

CAMPBELL, Mr. G., *Dauphin.*

Address, The, 132 (i).

Budget, The, 4866 (iii).

—— Ques. of Order, 4956 (iii).

Burrows, T. A., Timber Permit *re* sections in twps. 30 and 31 (Ques.) 2592 (ii).

C.P.R. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 3156 (ii).

File Hill Indian Agency, Resignation of Mr. Godfrey, Charges against Inspector, &c. (Ques.) 3045 (ii).

CAMPBELL, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Fish Hatchery, Lake Winnipegosis, Amount expended, Qualifications of Inspector, &c. (Ques.) 820 (i).

Fishing in Lake Winnipegosis, Pet. *re* Summer closing (Ques.) 2381 (ii).

Irrigation Propositions for Land by Percy Aylwin, &c. (Ques.) 2380 (ii).

Lac du Bonnet, Opening for Summer Fishing (Ques.) 1728 (i).

Lake Manitoba, Rep. *re* Lowering of Waters, Pet. from Settlers, &c. (Ques.) 2593 (ii).

Manitoba Boundaries Question, Notice of Discussion, 3802 (ii).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B. C. Penitentiary, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1882 (i).

Mossy River Dredging, Expenditure of Appropriation, Delays, &c. (Ques.) 816 (i).

Northwest Fish Co., Leases, &c. (remarks) 6776 (iv).

Privilege, Ques. of, Bribing Deptl. Officials, &c., 6777 (iv).

Railway Commission, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer, on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2643 (ii).

Squatters Claims on Dauphin Reserve (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6287 (iv).

—— Burning of Buildings, &c. (Ques.) 3045 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Post Office (contingencies) 725 (i).

Dom. Lands (timber protection) 6288 (iv).

Legislation (members indemnity) 7066 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries (investigation) 3450 (ii).

Militia (salaries) 2298 (ii).

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 3465 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Dauphin) 2997 (ii).

Timber Berth, No. 1122, Original Applications, Tenders, &c. (M. for ret.*) 353 (i).

Whitefish Spawn for Lake Winnipegosis, Contract *re* (Ques.) 1403 (i).

Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 2130 (ii).

Winnipegosis Fish Hatchery, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1402 (i).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B., *Carleton, N.B.*

Canadian, Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 1690 (i).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 141 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6766 (iv).

Extradition Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5241 (iii).

Franking Privilege *re* Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1671 (i).

Franklin Montgomery Gray Patent Relief B. 132 (Mr. Rankin) in Com., 4889 (iii).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 5579 (iii).
Mayes Affidavit, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4359 (iii).
N.B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Report, on Amt. (Mr. Crothers) to Com. of Sup., (remarks) 5657 (iii).
Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5393 (iii). 5975, on M. for 3°, 6004 (iv).
Royal Victoria Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 177), M. to place on order paper for 2°, 6082 (iv).
Secret Commissions Prevention B. 31 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1127 (i).
Smith, John Denison Relief B. 157 (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com., 6071 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John survey) 1642 (i).
Telephone Rates in Canada, Control of by Govt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1794 (M.) to adj. debate, 1810, agreed to (Y. 101; N. 47) 1811 (i).

CASH, Mr. E. L., *Mackenzie.*

Hudson's Bay and Pacific Ry. Co's (B. 43) 1°*, 626 (i); in Com., 2067 (ii).
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co's. (B. 81) 1°*, 1648 (i); in Com., 3844, 3942 (ii); on Senate Amts., 5486 (iii); 6073 (iv).

CHISHOLM, Mr. A. W., *Inverness.*

Budget, The, 5085 (iii).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T., *East Huron.*

Canada-France SS. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 4441 (iii).
C.P.R. Additional Stock, Distribution of, on M. (Mr. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 427 (i).
East Huron Public Works, Expenditure during 20 years (Ques.) 3477 (i).
Foot and Mouth Disease, States quarantined, Prevention, &c. (M. for ret.*) 684 (i).
G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on prop. Res., 4094 (iii).
Immigration Agents, Bonus Commissions, &c. (Ques.) 1407 (i).
Lands in Man., and N.W., Number of Acres undisposed of (Ques.) 2374 (ii).
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3947 (ii).
Peterborough West, Expenditure re Public Works for twenty years (Ques.) 4636 (iii).
Post Office Act (registered letters) Amt. B 19 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 746 (i).
Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 62 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 2533 (ii).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T.—*Con.*

Public Health Bureau, Establishment of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1091 (i).
Public Works in Middlesex, Expenditures for twenty years (Ques.) 4228 (iii).
Public Works in South Wellington, Expenditure for last 20 years (Ques.) 3655 (ii).
Savings Bank Deposits, Increase of Interest (Ques.) 1396 (i).
SUPPLY—
Canals Welland (repairs) 2035 (ii).
Welland County, Expenditure *re* Public Works (Ques.) 3990 (ii).
Wingham Post Office Clock (Ques.) 4637 (iii).

CHISHOLM, Mr. Wm., *Antigonish.*

I.C.R. Branch Lines Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2215 (ii).
Miner, Bill, Escape from B.C. Penitentiary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 930, 949 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2347 (ii).

CLARE, Mr. G. A., *South Waterloo.*

I.C.R. Machinery at Moncton Shops, Purchase of &c. (M. for ret.*) 1191 (i).

CLARKE, Mr. A. H., *South Essex.*

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s (B. 56) 1°*, 868; 2° m., 1147 (i); in Com., 2571, 3004 (ii), 5481 (iii), 5995, 6006, 6028 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Henderson) to refer back to Special Com., 5434 (iii).
——— on Order for Com., 4164 (iii).
——— (M.) to disch. Order, 4472 (iii).
Canadian Medical Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Roche) in Com., 4844 (iii).
Cobalt Lake Act, Disallowance of (M. for cor. &c.) 1735 (i).
Experimental Farms, Locations, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1955 (i).
Florence Mining Co.'s Appeal *re* Ontario Legislation, on M. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 6939 (iv).
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) on Sen. Amts., 6074 (iv).
Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. Molloy) in Com., 5483 (iii).
——— Objections, &c., 5483 (iii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act, Applications *re* Exemptions, Instructions to Carriers, &c. (Ques.) 156 (i).
Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5358 (iii).
Post Office Act (registered letters) Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 743 (i).
Public Accounts Com., (M.) to ref. Pub. Accounts, Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 1479 (i).

CLARKE, Mr. A. H.—*Con.*

Public Accounts Com., 11th, 12th and 14th. Reps. (M.) to conc., 6559 (iv).

Ry. Act (fires) Amt. (B. 7) 1° m., 94; 2° m., 375 (i).

Railway Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6229 (iv).

Standing Orders Com., 1st Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 2019 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Markham) 1388 (i).

Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore Rapid Ry. Co.'s (B. 120) 3802 (ii).

CLARK, Mr. M., *Red Deer.*

Animals Contagious Diseases Act. Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 769 (i).

Budget, The, 4687, 4703 (iii).

Franking Privilege *re* Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1677 (i).

Mayes Affidavit, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4381 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order, 4395 (iii).

Par. in Toronto 'World' *re* Mr. Foster, Ques. of Priv., 3941 (ii).

Railway Commission, Vacancy, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer from N.W., on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2641; (amt.) 2659, agreed to (Y. 94; N. 54) 2669 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c., (live stock industry) 5861 (iii).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 7027 (iv).

CONGDON, Mr. F. T., *Yukon.*

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4469 (iii).

Deferred Elections, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burrell) 2838 (ii).

External Affairs Dept. B. 90 (Mr. Murphy) in Com., 4470 (iii).

Extradition Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 5246 (iii).

Mines and Minerals (M.) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 6919 (iv).

Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 3523 (ii).

Railway Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6221 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, &c.) 6900 (iv); N.W.M.P. (force) 3664 (ii); Yukon Govt. (administration) 6273 (iv).

Yukon Ordinances (beer tax) on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 5893 (iv).

Yukon Ordinances (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7079 (iv).

CONMEE, Mr. J., *Thunder Bay and Rainy River.*

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4465 (iii).

Allegash River, Diversion of Waters, on M. (Mr. Michaud) for Reps., 3086 (ii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Edwards) on M. for 1°, 5891 (iv).

Cobalt Lake Act, Disallowance of, on M. (Mr. Clarke) for Cor., 1746 (i).

Election Act (ry. employees) Amt. (B. 112) 1° m., 3468 (ii).

G. T. P. Lake Superior Branch Subsidy B. 30 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 667, 1025 (i).

G.T.P. Loan, B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 3622 (ii); Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 5544 (iii).

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 3850 (ii)

London and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 102 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3847, 3983 (ii).

Mayes Affidavit, on Reading of Original, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4271 (iii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. (B. 150) 1°m., 4690 (iii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 3° (amt.) 6128 (iv).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 34) 1°*, 465; 2°m., 1026 (i); in Com., 4472, 4485, 5296, 5352, 5360, 5559 (iii), 5958; 3° m., 6000; agreed to (Y. 76; N. 39) 6005 (iv).

——— Ques. of Order, 4522 (iii).

Prudential Trust Co.'s incorp. (B. 91) in Com., 5484 (iii).

Ques. of Privilege, *re* 'Special Trains,' 4290 (iii).

Ry. Act (cattle-guards) Amt. (B. 99) 1°m., 2127 (ii).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 2388 (ii).

Secret Commissions Prevention B. 31 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1131 (i).

Superior and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 78) 1°*, 1479 (i); in Com., 3845, 3963 (ii).

Thessalon and Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. Smith) in Com., 5484, 5574 (iii), 6062 (iv).

Water Powers leased on Canals, Records, &c (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2039 (ii).

Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 2142 (ii).

COWAN, Mr. G. H., *Vancouver City.*

Address, The, 57 (i).

Bank of Vancouver (B. 52) 1°*, 738 (i); in Com., 2147 (ii).

COWAN, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

British Columbia Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 55) 1°*, 868; 2°m, 1147 (i).

Budget, The, 4751; (personal explanation) 4751 (iii).

Central Park, B.C., Mail Delivery, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 2590 (ii).

Civil Service Salaries, on M. for Com. on Res., 306 (i).

Dixon's Entrance, Prince Rupert, Rep. from Imp. Govt. *re* (Ques.) 2590 (ii).

Fishing and Seining Licenses on Pacific Coast, Number granted (M. for ret.*) 3992 (ii).

Fishing Seine Licenses, Number on Pacific Coast, &c. (Ques.) 3482 (ii).

Grain Elevator at Vancouver, Construction of (Ques.) 2590 (ii).

G.T. Ry., Indebtedness to Canada, Payments made, &c. (Ques.) 3046 (ii).

Kitsilano Indian Reserve, Tel. to Mr. McInnes *re* Transfer to City (Ques.) 1973 (i).

Lighthouse Board, Reorganization of (Ques.) 1974 (i).

McPhaiden, Capt. D., Resignation as Shipping Master, Applications *re* Position (Ques.) 1973 (i).

Marine Supplies, System of Purchase, &c. (Ques.) 1974 (i).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B. C. Penitentary, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1844 (i).

Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G.B., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 3554 (ii).

Shanghaiing in Vancouver, Investigation *re* Rep., &c. (Ques.) 3481 (ii).

S. A. Bounty Act, Regulations (remarks) 2225 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 1372 (i); Telegraph Lines Yukon—(Ashcroft-Dawson) 3349, 3350 (ii).

Vancouver Election Poll Clerks, Delay in Payments to (Ques.) 1418 (i).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S., *York, N.B.*

Courtney Bay Dredging Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2111 (ii).

Customs Collector at Bathurst, N.B., Leave of Absence, &c. (Ques.) 5157 (iii).

Customs Collector at Fredericton, Superannuation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 605 (i).

Govt. Railways Act (damages) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 242 (i).

Govt. Tenders, Opening and Receiving, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to Prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 265 (i).

Indian Point Dredging, Tenders *re*, Rock Prices, &c. (Ques.) 1397 (i), 2763 (ii).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*

I. C. R., Wallberg Contract, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3475 (ii).

LeBlanc, O. J., Dismissal as Fishery Overseer, Complaints, Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 2595 (ii).

Mayes Affidavit reading Originals, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4347 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order to Amt. (Mr. Daniel) 4258, 4317 (iii).

——— Ref. to in debate on Govt. Tenders, 265 (i).

Meagher, Mathias, Apptmt. to Customs Staff at Debec, N.B., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3655 (ii).

N.B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Report, on Amt. (Mr. Crothers) to Com. of Sup., 5756, 5777 (iii).

N.B. Supreme Court Vacancies, Apptmts, &c. (remarks) 6686 (iv).

Oromocto Wharf, Total Cost, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 2319 (ii).

Queens and Sunbury Mail Service, Established in Oct., 1908, &c. (Ques.) 2375 (ii).

Queens and Sunbury, Wharfs Construction, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2320 (ii).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 2393 (ii).

St. John River Channel Survey, Rep., Letters, Instructions, &c. (M. for ret.*) 881 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3254 (ii), 5249 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Customs (Board of Customs) 585; (contingencies) 606 (i).

Fisheries (international fisheries commission) 3440; Miscellaneous (Cushing & Co.'s claims) 3453 (ii).

Indians—N.B. (medical relief) 3462 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries (fisheries conference) 3689; (investigation) 3450 (ii).

Penitentiaries—Dorchester (electric lighting) 885; (supplies) 916; Generally (supplies) 887 (i).

Public Works—Buildings —B.C. (Victoria immigration) 2085 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 1598 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Partridge Island water service) 3206 (ii); (St. John, drill hall) 1293 (i); (St. John, hospital fittings) 3210 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Westville) 1292 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additional wing) 1253; (museum) 1275; (Royal Mint) 1272 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (Commissioner's residence) 1593 (i).

Public Works—Dredging—Dom. (vessels, repairs) 3338; Mar. Provs. (plant) 3340 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrews rapids) 2106 (ii).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 2511 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Beaver) 1622; (Buctouche) 1623; (Cape Bald) 1625; (Cummings Cove) 1625 (i); (Dorchester) 3237 (ii); (Dover) 1625; (Harvey Bank) 1626; (Heron island) 1626; (Mill's Point) 1626; (Moncton) 1627; (North Head) 1629; (Quaco) 1629; Richibucto, 1629 (i), 3238 (ii); (St. John surveys) 1641 (i); (St. John tidal waters) 3238 (ii); (St. John tributaries) 1637; (Shippigan harbour) 1645; (Whitehead wharf) 1646 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur) 2093 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Gibson siding) 3418 (ii).

Tenders: *See* 'Govt.'

Waterways Treaty, N.B. Fisheries Regulations *re* (remarks) 1247 (i).

Wharfs in Queens and Sunbury, Tenders called in Oct. 1908, Estimates, &c. (Ques.) 2374 (ii).

Woodstock Armoury Bowling Alley, Operations, &c. (Ques.) 5157 (iii).

CROSBY, Mr. A. B., *Halifax.*

'Anticosti' Str., Amount of Work, Tenders *re*, &c. (Ques.) 671 (i).

Bounty on Steel Shipbuilding, Delegations *re* (Ques.) 6090 (iv).

Cariboo Breakwater, N.S., Amount of Expenditure (Ques.) 2152 (ii).

Civil Service Act (letter carriers) Amt B. 137 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6329 (iv).

Coasting Trade, O.C. *re* Privileges to Foreign Ships (remarks) 6123 (iv).

Cold Storage Establishments in Halifax, Res. from Commercial Committee (remarks) 3567 (ii).

Criminal Code (flogging) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for 2°, 566 (i).

Fenian Veterans, Land Grants to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6281 (iv).

Fishing Bounty, Forms of Application (remarks) 1021 (i).

——— Delay in sending Blank Forms (remarks) 1249 (i).

Fishing Bounties, Payments to in Liverpool County (M. for ret.*) 3992 (ii).

Fisheries Development, Apptmt. of Sel. Com. on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 491 (i).

——— Ques. of Order, 519 (i).

Govt. Employees and Interference at Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6869 (iv).

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5903 (iv).

Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 215 (i).

CROSBY, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 5585 (iii).

Halifax Custom House, Total Cost, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 815 (i).

Halifax Post Office, Contract *re* Reconstruction, &c. (Ques.) 814 (i).

I.C.R., Annual Stmnt. (remarks) 2684 (ii).

——— Freight Clerks, Conciliation Board, Rep. (M. for copy*) 2597 (ii).

——— Investigation *re* Labour Disputes (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3261 (ii).

——— Settlement *re* Arbitration (remarks) 2127, 3568 (ii).

Johnston, Capt., Repayment of moneys from Str. Hestia (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6889 (iv).

Labour Department B. 165 (Sir Wifrid Laurier) in Com., 6735 (iv).

Labour Hours for Workingmen, Restriction, &c., on M. (Mr. Verville) to Com. of Sup., 5945 (iv).

Militia at Halifax, Delay in Payments (remarks) 2672, 2773 (ii).

Political Interference: *See* 'Govt. Employees,' &c.

Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Transfer to Holland (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6656 (iv).

'Scotia,' SS., Subsidy Terms, &c. (Ques.) 4895 (iii).

S. A. Bounty Act, Regulations (remarks) 2227 (ii).

Spry Bay Govt. Wharf, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 4895 (iii).

Supply—Harbours and Rivers, N.B., Ques. of Order, 1635 (i).

SUPPLY

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage for fruits, &c.) 6983; (experimental farms) 5952 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Customs (Board of Customs) 586; (contingencies) 600 (i).

Fisheries (commissions) 6958 (iv); (Cushing & Co.'s claims) 3453 (ii); (customs licenses) 6959; (cruisers) 6947; (transportation) 6956 (iv).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 7032 (iv).

Indians—Generally (inspectors) 1164; (relief) 1167 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, &c.) 6889 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and G.B.) 6650; (Canada and Nfld.) 6651; (contingent fund) 6655; (Halifax and Canso) 6651; (Halifax and Nfld.) 6651; (Halifax and Spry Bay) 6652; (Magdalen Islands) 6652; (P.E.I. and C. B., and Nfld.) 6652 (iv).

Marine—Dredging (plant, &c.) 6886; Public Works (St. Lawrence ship canal) 6877 (iv).

Militia (permanent force) 3422 (ii); (supplies) 6661 (iv); (warlike stores) 2317 (ii).

CROSBY, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Miscellaneous (Canada and W. I. Trade Relations) 6556 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 6671; (icebreaker for Northumberland Straits) 6673; (naval militia) 6683; (obstructions, removal, &c.) 6679; (wrecks investigations) 6679; (wrecking plant) 6680 (iv).
Post Office (rural mails) 3423 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings, B.C. (Victoria immigration) 2086 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Halifax) 1289; (Shelburne) 1292 (i).
Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Kingston, R.M.C.) 1510; (Whitby) 1528 (i).
Public Works—Buildings, Ottawa (additional wing) 1258; (Royal Mint) 1274; (telephones) 1611 (i).
Public Works—Dredging (generally) 6554 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2343; (Cow Bay) 2467; (Peswick) 2474; (Portuguese Cove) 2480; (Sorel) 3291; (Spry Bay) 2474; (Tangier) 2484 (ii).
Quarantine ("Challenger") 5883 (iii).
Railways—G.T.P. (Quebec Bridge) 2053 (ii); I.C.R. (extensions) 6557 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese administration) 6656; (commercial agencies) 6656 (iv).

CROTHERS, Mr. T. W., *West Elgin.*

Civil Service Salaries Increases B. 187 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 6341 (iv).
Govt. Tenders, Opening, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 579 (i).
—— Ques. of Order, 571 (i).
G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5266; on M. for 3°, 5530 (iii).
Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures by Judge Cassels, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3756 (ii).
Letter Carriers at St. Thomas (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3428 (ii).
N.B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Report, *re* Hon. Mr. Pugsley (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 5645; Amt. neg. (Y. 63; N. 90) 5830 (iii).
Port Stanley Pier, Wage of Labourers, Delays in Payment (remarks) 4047 (iii).
Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 4248 (iii).
—— (registered letters) Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 744 (i).
Secret or Illicit Commission Prevention B. 31 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1125, 1482 (i).
S.A. Bounty Act (remarks) 2223 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 646; Customs (contingencies) 591; Inland Revenue (salaries) 429 (i).
Excise (inspectors salaries) 436 (i).
Penitentiaries—Dorchester (supplies) 917; Generally (supplies) 910; St-Vincent de Paul (supplies) 914; Stoney Mountain (supplies) 921 (i).

CROTHERS, Mr. T. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office (rural mails) 3428 (ii).
Printing and Stationery (salaries) 808 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Shelburne) 1292 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Simcoe) 1392; (Whitby) 1524 (i).
Westville Post Office, Contract Price, Inspector, &c. (Ques.) 2755 (ii).
Yukon Ordinances (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7077 (iv).

CURRIE, Mr. J. A., *North Simcoe.*

Adulteration Act Amt. (B. 107) 1° m., 2490
Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4450, 5203 (iii).
Ammonal Explosives Patent Relief B. 93 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 2.79 (ii).
Bonuses and Subsidies overdue, &c. (Ques.) 2763 (ii).
Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 2571 (ii).
Canadian Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 1692, 1865 (i).
Canadian Ships Docking for Repairs, Res. *re* (Ques.) 3053 (ii).
Canadian Ships, Duty *re* Repairs in Foreign Countries (Ques.) 2762 (ii).
Coal conserved for Home Market, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 3108 (ii).
Cobalt Lake Act, Disallowance of, on M. (Mr. Clarke) for Cor., 1740 (i).
Cold Storage Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6742 (iv).
Commercial Feeding Stuffs B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5208 (iii).
Dominion Atlantic Ry., Examination by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2928 (ii).
Dumping Clause, Orders from Treasury Board (remarks) 4412 (iii).
External Affairs Deptl. B. 90 (Mr. Murphy) on prop. Res., 1998 (i); in Com., 4436 (iii).
Fishery Commission Regulations, Adoption of (remarks) 6411 (iv).
Fishery Regulations with U. S. and Action of Ont. Govt. (remarks) 6532 (iv).
Foreign Correspondence, Number of Letters, &c. (Ques.) 3986 (ii).
Fort Malden, Representations *re* Sale, &c. (Ques.) 6087 (iv).
Geodetic Survey Bureau, Establishment of, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Cor., 3071 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Pet. *re* Expenditure (remarks) 6415 (iv).
Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4415 (iii).
Govt. Ships purchased from British Shipbuilders since 1896, Expenditure in Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 3195 (ii).

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*

G. T. P. Prairie Section Contracts, Names of Contractors, &c. (Ques.) 3987 (ii).

Holland River at Newmarket, Rep. *re* Flow of Water (Ques.) 472 (i).
See 'Trent,' &c.

Ice-Breaker for Northumberland Straits, Contract with Messrs. Vickers, Sons & Maxim (M. for cor.*) 3056 (ii).

Imperial Partnership with G. B. and Her Colonies, on Amt. (Mr. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 6446 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6798 (iv).

Lake Transportation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3295 (ii).

Lee-Enfield Rifles, Issue of New Barrels, &c. (Ques.) 6088 (iv).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. (B. 173) 1° m., 5626 (iii).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3954 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 6079 (iv).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 192 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 6744 (iv).

Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 3543 (ii).

Newmarket Canal, Holland River, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com. of Sup., 3133 (ii).
See 'Holland,' &c.

Priv. Ques. of (Mr. Conmee) *re* 'Special Trains,' 4292 (iii).

Public Works by Marine Dept., Tenders *re* (Ques.) 2765 (ii).

Railways and Canals (remarks) on Annual Stmnt., 2691 (ii).

Railway Act (trainmen) Amt. (B. 172) 1° m., 5625 (iii).

Railway Commission, Vacancy, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer, on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2668 (ii).

Ross Rifle, Weight, Length, Diameter, &c. (Ques.) 4891 (iii).

Royal Casualty and Surety Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. H. H. McLean) in Com., 2577, 2718 (ii).

S.A. Veteran Land Grants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6274 (iv).

Superior and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 78 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3976 (ii).

SUPPLY.

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 728 (i); (live stock industry) 5866 (iii).

Canals—Beauharnois (water power) 1911 (i)

Canals—Generally (staff, &c.) 2072 (ii).

Canals—Lachine (wharfs and basins) 790 (i).

Canals—Trent (construction) 2074, 3178 (ii); (Holland River) 1579, 1587 (i); (Newmarket) conc., 4049; (amt.) neg. (Y. 52; N. 80) 4049 (iii).

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 1907; (surveys) 1909 (i).

Civil Govt.—Customs (contingencies) 605 (i); Mines (salaries) 3680 (ii); Post Office (salaries) 613, 722 (i).

Civil Service Commission (salaries) 717 (i).

Fisheries (cruisers) 6947 (iv).

Indians—B.C. (surveys commission) 1159

Indians—Generally (inspectors) 1165 (i).

Indians—Ont. (legal expenses) 996; (surveys) 989 (i).

Interior (St. Mary's and Milk River diversions) 6269 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoy steamer) 6910 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries (fisheries conference) 3688 (ii).

Penitentiaries—Stoney Mountain (supplies) 922 (i).

Printing and Stationery (salaries) 836 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (power) 1617 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Cornwall) 1360; (Glencoe) 1373; (Kingston R.M.C.) 1381, 1509, 1534; (Markham) 1387; (Whitby) 1525 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 620; (peat testing) 1390, 1499 (i).

Public Works—Dredging (generally) 6536 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Okanagan) 6545 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John survey) 1645 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Cow Bay) 2466; (Middle River) 2479; (Yarmouth) 2485 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood) 3294; (Owen Sound) 3316; (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Bonaventure) 3279; (Sorel) 3290 (ii).

Railways—I. C. R. (Moncton, cut-off) 2921 (ii).

Railways—Miscellaneous (McGill school) 2071 (ii).

Railways—Ry. Commission (litigation) 2070 (ii).

Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 452 (i).

Telephones in Canada, Control of Rates, &c. on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1775 (i).

Trent Valley Waterways, Extension to Georgian Bay, &c. (Ques.) 473 (i).
See 'Holland,' 'Supply—Canals,' &c.

Waterways Treaty with U. S., Changes in Draft Treaty *re* Intersection of Islands, on M. for Sup., 1490 (i).

Weights and Measures *re* Vessel Owners and Rys., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3683 (ii).

Western Canadian Life Assurance Co.'s B. 37 (Mr. Knowles) in Com., 2564 (ii).

Wharfs, Govt.: *See* 'Govt. Harbours,' &c.

Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 29) in Com., 2067 (ii).

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*

Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4158 (iii).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W., *St. John City.*

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 752 (i).

Canada-France S.S. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 4441 (iii).

Carter, Edward S., Emplymt. as Sessional Clerk (Ques.) 5094 (iii).

Civil Service Salaries, Classification *re* Schedules, &c., on M. for Sup., 2447 (ii).

Commercial Feeding Stuffs B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5207 (iii).

Courtney Bay, Contracts *re* Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).

Fisheries Development, Apptmt. of Sel. Com. on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 506 (i).

Fishing Weirs in Passamaquoddy Bay, Investigation *re* Ownership, &c. (Ques.) 6088 (iv).

Franking Privilege *re* Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1697 (i).

French SS. Line: *See* 'Canada,' &c.

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6126 (iv).

I. C. R., Branch Lines (remarks) *re* prop. Res., 2162 (ii).

—— Freight Clerks, Investigation *re* Labour Disputes (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3260 (ii).

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).

Lobster Fisheries, Violation of Act, Par. in St. John Standard (remarks) 3705 (ii).

Maritime Dredging Co., Tender *re* St. John Harbour (Ques.) 6787 (iv).

Mayes Affidavit, Reading of (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4253 (iii).

—— Reading of Original, Document (read) 4300; (Amt.) 4311; Amt. neg. (Y. 60, N. 100) 4409 (iii).

—— Ques. of Order, 4313 (iii).

Port Credit Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3330 (ii).

Railway Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6208 (iv).

Returns, Inquiry for, 2129, 2493 (ii).

St. John Dredging, Apptmt. of Supt., &c. (Ques.) 5632 (iii).

St. John Harbour and Courtney Bay Surveys and Borings, Cor. Reps. O. Cs. Advestisements *re* Tenders, &c. (M. for ret.*) 826 (i).

—— Contract with Mayes, John Moore & Co., Cor., (M. for copies*) 826 (i).

St. John Postmaster, Superannuation of, Apptmt. of Successor, &c. (Ques.) 871 (i).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

Sissiboo River Bridge, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Jameson) on Com. of Sup., 6845 (iv).

S. A. Bounty Act, Regulations *re* (remarks) 2222 (ii).

S.A. Land Grants, Number located, Apptmts. of Substitutes, &c. (Ques.) 6404 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 5947 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Civil Service Commission (salaries) 387; Finance (salaries) 384; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 381 (i).

Fisheries (Cushing & Co.'s claims) 351; (international fisheries commission) 3440 (ii).

Indians—N.B. (medical attendance) 999; N.S. (seed grain, &c.) 998; Ont. (legal expenses) 995; (surveys) 991; P.E.I. (medical attendance) 1000 (i).

Labour Dept.—Miscellaneous (Opium Conference) 3434 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, &c.) 6897 (iv).

Militia (ordnance) 2307; (rifle shooting) 2297; (salaries) 2272; (transport) 3423 (ii).

Penitentiaries—Dorchester (electric light plant) 884 (i).

Post Office (letter carriers) 1653, 1697 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Victoria immigration) 2088 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (St. John drill hall) 1293 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additional wing) 1264; (Royal Mint) 1271; (telephones) 1605 (i).

Public Works—Dredging—Dom. (vessels) 3338; Mar. Provs. (plant) 3339 (ii).

Public Works—Dredging—P.E.I. (Georgetown) 1293 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Beaver) 1622; (Buctouche) 1623; (Campbellton) 1625; (Campobello) 1646; (Cape Tormentine) 1626; Kouchibougouac) 1626; (Leonardsville) 1626; (Moncton) 1627; (Point du Chene) 1629 (i); (St. John) 2109 (ii); (St. John harbour) 1645; (St. John River tributaries) 1633; (Seal Cove) 1645; (Shippegan) 1646 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur) 2094 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Bonaventure) 3282; (Ste. Anne des Monts) 3287; (Saguenay) 32 5 (ii).

Railways—Miscellaneous (McGill school) 2071 (ii).

Telephones, Provincial Control of by Ry. Commission (Ques.) 1418 (i).

Telephone Rates in Canada, Control by Govt.; on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1770 (i).

Vessels, Govt. Inspection B. 73 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 1319 (i).

Waterways Treaty, International and N.B. Fisheries, Par. in St. John Globe, 1243 (i).

DELISLE, Mr. M. S., *Portneuf.*

Quebec Judges now receiving Pensions, aDte of Apptmts., &c. (Ques.) 5634 (iii).

DEMERS, Mr. M. J., *St. John and Iberville.*
Immigration to U.S., Repatriation, &c., on M. (Mr. Paquet) for Cor., 864 (i).
Investigations into Dept. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3893 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Richelieu) 2560 (ii).

DEVLIN, Mr. E. B., *Wright.*
Civil Service Salaries, on M. (Mr. Fisher) for Com. on Res., 320 (i).
Experimental Farms, Establishment of, on prop Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1950 (i).
Hull Customs Duties, Amount collected, &c. (Ques.) 1418 (i).
Immigration to U.S., Repatriation, &c., on M. (Mr. Paquet) for Cor., 857 (i).
Investigation into Deptl. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3871 (ii).
Mayes Affidavit, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).
Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 49) 1°*, 738 (i).

DOHERTY, Mr. C. J., *Montreal, St. Anne.*
Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 151 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6744 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6178.
Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) 6816 (iv).
Investigations into Depts. by Mr. Justice Cassels (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 3706; Amt. Neg. (Y. 54; N. 94) 3934 (ii).
Judges of the District and County Court B. 193 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6772 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 154 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6560 (iv).
Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 4248 (iii).
Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 3°, (amt.) 6310 (iv).
Robertson, Thos., Suspension by Pilotage Board, B.C. (remarks) on M. for Sup. 6864 (iv).
Secret or Illicit Commission Prevention B. 31 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1487 (i).
Security Life Insurance Co. of Canada B. 188 (Mr. Proulx) in Com., 6782 (iv).
Statutes, French Translation, &c. (remarks) 2024 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Immigration (agents, &c.) 7029 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal postal station) 1313 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (St. Francis river) 2898; (Yamaska) 2900 (ii).

DONNELLY, Mr. J. J., *South Bruce.*
Central Bank of Canada, Liquidation of (Ques.) 2151 (ii).
Chesley Post Office, Amount of Vote *re* (Ques.) 543 (i).
——— Site, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i).
G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on prop. Res., 4089 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Cornwall) 1359 (i).
Walkerton and Lucknow Ry. Co.'s (B. 53) 1°*, 738 (i).

DUBEAU, Mr. J. A., *Joliette.*
Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s (B. 38) 1°*, 465 (i); on Sen. Amts., 4164, 4593, 5486 (iii).
Experimental Farms, Locations, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1956 (i).
Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization and Ry. Co.'s (B. 126) 1°*, 4041 (ii); in Com., 4836 (iii).

ECREMENT, Mr. A., *Berthier.*
Immigration Agents in France, Number, Reps., Resignation of J. E. Cyr (Ques.) 1414 (i).
Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3771 (ii).
Marconi Stations between Montreal and Quebec, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 2762 (ii).
Montreal Bridge and Terminal Ry. Co.'s (B. 180) 1°*, 5997; in Com., 6628 (iv).
St. Lawrence Channel, Amount expended 1908, Continuation, &c. (Ques.) 2150 (ii).
Telephone Stations between Montreal and Quebec *re* Navigation (Ques.) 2594 (ii).

EDWARDS, Mr. J. W., *Frontenac.*
Agriculture. Expenditures for (Ques.) 1070 (i).
Barriefield Camp, Par. in "Military Gazette," Ques. of Priv., 5622 (iii).
Budget, The, 4760 (iii).
Canada Shipping Act Amt. (B. 179) 1° m., 5889 (iv).
Fish Hatcheries, Number in Canada (Ques.) 3479 (ii).
Hay from U. S., Entries at Kingston, &c. (Ques.) 1177 (i).
Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3927 (ii).
Kingston Batteries, Tenders *re* Groceries, &c., (Ques.) 4225 (iii).
Kingston Military Buildings, Tenders, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 546 (i).
——— Correction of Figures (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2540 (ii).

EDWARDS, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

Kingston R. M. Buildings, Excessive Expenditures (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2495 (ii). *See* " Military," " R. M. C.'s &c.

Kingston Penitentiary, Dep. Warden's Residence, Plans, &c (Ques.) 2589 (ii).

—— Number of Prisoners, Guards, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 4226 (iii).

—— Potatoes purchased, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 4227 (iii).

—— Tenders for Coal, &c. (Ques.) 4227 (iii).

Military Buildings at Kingston, (M.) for Original Tenders, 1922 (i). *See* " Kingston ".

Military Lands purchased near Kingston, Name of Agent, &c. (Ques.) 546 (i).

Pork, Bacon, &c., from U.S., Entries at Kingston, &c. (Ques.) 1177 (i).

Post Office Revenue at Kingston, Brantford, Sherbrooke and Quebec, Salaries of Postmaster, &c. (Ques.) 5633 (iii).

Public Health Bureau, Establishment of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1104 (i).

Railway Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 3°, 523 (i).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 2391 (ii); in Com., 6227 (iv).

Railway Level Crossing Accident near Kingston, (remarks) 251 (i).

Railway Level Crossings, Prevention of Accidents, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1225 (i).

Royal Military College Cottages, Estimated Total Cost (Ques.) 1732 (i), 2319 (ii).

—— Stables, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 1732 (i).

Royal Military College, Total Cost of (Ques.) 1733 (i). *See* 'Kingston,' &c.

Rural Free Mail Delivery, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 2800 (ii).

Sherbrooke Drill Hall, Contract *re* (Ques.) 3478 (ii).

S. A. Veterans' Warrants, Number, Homesteads issued, &c. (Ques.) 2818 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Fisheries (contingencies) 6980 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lightkeepers' salaries) 6981 (iv).

Militia (annual drill) 2312; (ordnance) 2308; (properties) 2314 (ii).

Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 909 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston artillery park) 3223 (ii); (R. M. College) 1507, 1533 (i); conc. (amt.) 4049 (iii); (Whitby) 1532 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Rideau Hall grounds) 1611 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Quebec citadel) 3213; (Sherbrooke) 3223 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Wolfe Island canal) 3302 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P. E. I. (bridges) 2508 (ii).

EDWARDS, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse a l'Ilot) 2514 (ii).

Veterans of 1866, Land Grants to (Ques.) 668 (i).

Veterinary Hospital, Kingston, Dimensions, Tenders *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 2150 (ii).

Wolfe Island Canal, Construction, Contribution *re* Maintenance by Govt. (Ques.) 3043 (ii). *See* 'Supply.'

Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4157 (iii).

ELSON, Mr. P., *East Middlesex.*

Hickory and Ash Handles for Farm Implements, Number imported for 1908 (Ques.) 1239 (i).

Mail Service between Hyde Park Post Office, &c., in Middlesex County, &c. (Ques.) 3251 (ii).

Polling Booths in Ont., Payment *re* Rents, &c. (Ques.) 3251 (ii).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 2400 (ii); in Com., 6224 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock industry) 5873 (iii).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R., *Westmoreland.*

Canadian, Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 1687 (i).

Courtney Bay Dredging Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2114 (ii).

Govt. Railways Act (compensation) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 772 (i).

Harvey-Salisbury Railroad incorp. (B. 35) 2° m., 775 (i).

I.C.R., Applications *re* Running Privileges (Ques.) 351 (i).

—— on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 2737 (ii).

—— Board of Management, Apptmt. of (remarks) 4803 (iii).

—— Branch Lines, Extension of Feeders, &c. (prop. res.) 2162 (ii).

—— Branch Lines Rep., Inquiry for Copy, 664, 1718 (i).

—— printing, &c. (remarks) 875 (i).

—— (M. for copy) 882 (i).

I.C.R., Employees at Moncton, Number, &c. (Ques.) 330 (i).

—— Proposal *re* Leasing, &c. (Ques.) 164 (i)

—— Speed of Special Mail Trains, Instructions *re*, &c. (Ques.) 872 (i).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*

London and Lancashire Plate Glass Co.'s incorp. B. 27 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 2146 (ii).

McAvity-Mayes Dredging Contract, Ques. of Order, Irrelevancy of debate, 276 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 154 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6559 (iv).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 1039 (i).

Railway Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6246 (iv).

Railways and Canals, (remarks) on Annual stmnt., 2700 (ii).

Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep., Inquiry for, 1250 (i).

Ry. Employees Provident Act Amt. B. 164 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6741 (iv).

Salisbury and Harvey Railroad Co.'s incorp. (B. 35) 1°*, 465; in Com., 1363, 1513 (i).

SUPPLY.

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and Minas Basin) 6654 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. Campobello) 1647 (i); N.S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2370 (ii).

Williams, Thos., Employee of I.C.R. at Moncton, Superannuation, &c. (Ques.) 330 (i).

Winnipeg and Northwestern Rv. Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 2139 (ii).

ETHIER, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*

Central Ry. of Canada (B. 166) 1°*, 5623 (iii).

Debates, Official, on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc. in 1st Rep. of Com., 1476 (i).

Franklin Montgomery Gray, Patent Relief B. 132 (Mr. Rankin) in Com., 4887 (iii).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 5154 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6140 (iv).

Immigration to U.S., Repatriation, &c., on M. (Mr. Paquet) for Cor., 861 (i).

Private Bills, Refunding of Fees (M.) 5889 (iv).

——— (M.) to conc. in 8th Rep. of Com., 5997 (iv).

St. Maurice and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 176) 1°*, 5777 (iii).

Salvation Army Council B. 142 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6069 (iv).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S., (Minister of Finance), *Shelburne and Queens, N.S.*

Aerial Navigation, Experiments by Canadians (Ans.) 2383 (ii).

Alberta and Saskatchewan, Annual Allowance, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 2588 (ii).

American Silver, Exportation of (remarks) 6780 (iv).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

American Tariff, Consideration of (remarks) 5103 (iii).

Annuities Act Amt. (B. 109) 1°*, 2670 (ii); 2°m., 6773 (iv).

Annuities Act, Number of Applicants, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 3477 (ii).

Armouries, Returns, Inquiry for, 3937 (ii).

Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Part O (presented) 1393 (i).

Bank Act Amt., Legislation *re* (Ans.) 1732 (i).

Beet Root Sugar, Refineries, Duty *re* Preferential Tariff (Ans.) 3047 (ii).

Bills of Lading Bill, Discussion *re* (remarks) 6918 (iv).

Bonuses and Subsidies overdue, &c. (Ans.) 2763 (ii).

Bounties on Steel Shipbuilding, Delegation *re* (Ans.) 6091 (iv).

Bowden, Annie, Relief, B. 194 (Mr. Sproule) on M. for 1°, 6918 (iv).

Budget, The, 4546 (iii).

——— (announcement) 4220 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order, 5060 (iii).

Budget, The (remarks) 1813 (i), 3111, 3649 (ii).

Budget, Speech of 1898, on Inquiry for Stmnt. 1321 (i).

Business of the Hse., Adjournment for Easter (remarks) re Assent to Bills, 4119 (iii).

——— Motions to be dropped (remarks) 4036 (ii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3033 (ii).

——— on M. to ref. to Standing Orders Com., 3041 (ii).

——— on order for Com., 3411 (ii).

Canada SS. Service with Germany, Negotiations *re* (Ans.) 2589 (ii).

Canada National Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 76 (Mr. A. Haggart) in Com., 2578 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 3410 (ii).

Central Bank of Canada, Liquidation of (Ans.) 2151 (ii).

Chartered Banks, Unpaid Balances for more than five years (Ans.) 2592 (ii).

Civil Service, Inside Employees, Payments to in 1896 (Ans.) 1913 (i).

Civil Service Salaries, Names of those receiving no Increases (Ans.) 1726 (i).

See 'House of Commons.'

Coal conserved for the Home Market, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 3108 (ii).

Coasting Trade, O. C. *re* privileges to Foreign Ships (remarks) 6123 (iv).

Coinage at Canadian Mint, Date of, Circulation, Profit, &c. (Ans.) 1401 (i).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Co-Operative Societies, on Question of Order (Mr. Speaker) 2327 (ii).

Customs Tariff Amt. (B. 162) 1°*, 2°* and 3°*, 5103 (iii).

Deferred Elections, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burrell) 2840 (ii).

Dumping Clause, Orders from Treasury Board (remarks) 4412 (iii).

Easter Adjournment (remarks) 3650 (ii).

Equity Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 6626 (iv).

Estimates, Suppl. (presented) 2597 (ii).

——— (1909) presented, 6092 (iv).

——— (1910) presented, 7065 (iv).

Estimates, Passing of (remarks) 3203 (ii).

Expenditures and Receipts, for 1908-9, N. T. R. Cost, &c. (Ans.) 4289 (iii).

Financial Statement—The Budget, 4546 (iii).

Fishery Regulations and Action of Ont. Govt. (remarks) 6528 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Minimum Tariff on Farm Products (Ans.) 5158 (iii).

——— Present Condition (Ans.) 4896 (iii).

——— Treaty, on Inquiry for, 1977 (i) 3254 (ii).

——— Supplementary, Mess from His Ex. (presented) 2148 (ii).

——— (stmnt.) 7070 (iv).

German and Canadian Treaty, Negotiations *re* (remarks) 4125 (iii).

Govt. Loans (B. 191) Res. prop., 6292; in Com. on Res., 6709; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., 6711 (iv).

Govt. Loans, Amounts and Dates falling due prior to 1913 (Ans.) 3654, 3704 (ii).

——— Expenditure *re* Negotiations (Ans.) 1724 (i).

See 'Loans.'

Govt. Savings Banks, Amount of Deposits in Oct. 1889, 1896, 1897, 1898 (remarks) 1724 (i).

Grain Elevator at Vancouver, Construction of (Ans.) 2590 (ii).

G. T. P. Loan (B. 128) prop. Res., 2670 (ii); on prop Res. (remarks) 4060, 4096; in Com. on Res., 3569; 2° m., 5103; in Com., 5189, 5251, 5323, 5488; on Amt. (Mr. Ames) to M. for 3°, 5597; on Amt. (Mr. Middlebro) 5611 (iii).

G.T.P. Bonds guaranteed by Govt., Available for Prairie Section (Ans.) 2589 (i).

G.T.P., Legislation *re* (remarks) 2219 (ii).

——— Loan Res., Details *re* (remarks) 3111 (ii).

———Loans, on Inquiry for Cor., &c., 2772 (ii).

——— Negotiations *re* Loan prior to Oct., 1903 (Ans.) 4290 (iii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

G.T.P., Prairie and Mountain Sections, Detailed Stmnt. of Expenditures (remarks) 3257 (ii).

See 'Expenditures,' &c

G.T.Ry. Co., Indebtedness to Govt., Interest due &c. (Ans.) 2759, 3046 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Taylor) for Papers, 3056 (ii).

G.T.Ry. Co., Prior Lien on Assets, Opinion of Mr. Shepley (Ans.) 4228 (iii).

Grand Trunk Stock, Outstanding Interest, Liabilities, &c. (Ans.) 3651 (ii).

Great West Permanent Loan Co.'s incorp. B. 40 (Mr. A. Haggart) in Com., 2509 (ii).

Harbour Commissioners of Montreal (B. 192) in Com. on Res., 6743; in Com., 6744 (iv).

See 'Montreal.'

House of Commons Classification, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 6101 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6159 (iv).

Industrial Disputes Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 1°, 3567 (ii).

Insurance Act (B. 97) 1° m., 2121; 2° m., 2564 (ii); in Com. on Res., 6687; in Com., 6704, 6788 (iv).

Insurance Bill, Discussion (remarks) 6290

Insurance Act Amt. Bill, Progress in Senate (remarks) 7069 (v).

Johnston, Capt., Repayment of Moneys *re* Str. 'Hestia' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6892 (iv).

Labour Department B. 165 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 6724 (iv).

Lancashire and London Plate Glass Co.'s incorp. B. 27 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 2147 (ii).

Loans by Govt., Expenses *re* (Ans.) 1922 (i).

Loans, Expenditures *re* (remarks) 4124 (iii).

Loans of Jan., 1909, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2596 (ii).

Loans of 1874, four per cent, Date of first Notice (Ans.) 3654 (ii).

Loans, Temporary, Details of $20,606,333 for Jan. 31, 1909 (Ans.) 1498 (i).

——— Interest for twelve and three quarter years, &c. (Ans.) 4898 (iii).

Loans issued since 1907, on Inquiry for Ret., 4125 (iii).

Loans, Return, on Inquiry for, 1562 (i), 2129, 2674, 3110, 3937 (ii).

See 'Govt.,' 'G.T.P.'

Lobster and Fishing Licenses in P.E.I., Number issued in 1904, Pets., &c. (M. for ret.*) 2160 (ii).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co. (B. 81) Correction, Permission to Clerk of Senate (remarks) 5886 (iii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Mayes Affidavit, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4400 (iii).
See 'N.B. Central Ry.'

Militia at Halifax, Delay in Payments (remarks) 2672 (ii).

Montreal Bridge and Terminal Co.'s (B. 180) on Senate Amts., 6917 (iv).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners (prop. res.) 3197 (ii).
See 'Harbour,' &c.

Montreal Harbour Dues, Interest due Govt., Increases, &c. (Ans.) 1417 (i).

Montreal Woollen Mills, Closing *re* Tariff Laws (Ans.) 2591 (ii).

Muir Memorial Fund, Request for Govt. Aid (Ans.) 5095 (iii).

N.B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Report, O. Cs., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to lay on Table, 5625 (iii).

Nickel Ore, Export Duty *re* (Ans.) 5634 (iii).

Old Age Pensions: *See* 'Annuities,' &c.

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5564 (iii).

Pensions: *See* 'Annuities.'

Proportional Representation, House of Commons, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 2623 (amt.) 2624 (ii).

Prudential Life Ins. Co.: *See* 'Security,' &c.

Pugsley, Mr., and Mayes Affidavit: *See* 'Mayes.'

Quebec Tercentenary, Amount subscribed, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 1721 (i).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 1718 (i).

Royal Canadian Accident Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 63 (Mr. Ames) on Senate Amts. 6788 (iv).

Royal Casualty and Surety Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. H. H. McLean) in Com., 2575, 2717 (ii).

Royal Life Insurance Co.'s B. 177 (Mr. McCraney) on M. for 1°, 5885 (iii).

Savings Bank Deposits, Increase of Interest (Ans.) 1396 (i).

Security Life Insurance Co.'s B. 188 (Mr. Proulx) in Com., 6782 (iv).

Silver Currency coined in Can. for 1905-6-7-8, Profits, Amount of U.S. Silver circulated, &c. (Ans.) 868 (i).

Sissiboo River Bridge, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Jameson) to Com. of Sup., 6844 (iv).

SS. Line to Germany: See 'Canada,' &c.

Submarine Co.'s Patent Relief B. 77 (Mr. Proulx) on order for Com., 4592 (iii).

Supply (B. 117) in Com. on Res., 1°, 2°, 3°*, 4051 (iii).

Supply (B. 195) Prop. Res., 7080, 1° m., 7081 (iv).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Supply, One-Fourth of Estimates (remarks) 3936 (ii).

Supply—Conc., Reading of Items (remarks) 4048 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock industry) 5857 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (extra clerks) 3434; Finance (contingencies) 3436; Gov. Gen.'s Office (contingencies) 3434 (ii).

Dom. Lands (surveys) 3464 (ii).

Immigration, 5832 (iii); (agents, &c.) 7012; (G.B. agents, &c.) 7018 (iv).

Legislation (members indemnity) 7065 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoy steamer) 6912; (construction) 6908 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and G.B.) 3437 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Canada and W. Indies Trade Relations) 6556; (Hague Tribunal) 7062 (iv); (legal expenditure *re* Chinese seizure) 3466 (ii); (Parliamentary Guide) 7064 (iv); (unprovided items) 3466 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Victoria immigration) 2089 (ii); (Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John tributaries) 1638 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (Aston track scale) 3415 (ii).

Tariff Changes *re* Tin (remarks) 4126 (iii).

Temporary Loans: *See* 'Loans.'

Thos. L. Smith, Patent Relief B. 71 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for 3°, 2950 (ii).

Toronto Old Fort, Pets. *re* Transfers (remarks) 4122 (iii).

Vancouver Bank B. 52 (Mr. Cowan) in Com., 2147 (ii).

Water Carriage of Goods between Can. and G.B., Regulations *re* (Ans.) 2764 (ii).

Water Carriage of Goods Bill (remarks) 6846 (iv).

Ways and Means—The Budget (annual statement) 4546 (iii).

Ways and Means (sugar) in Com., 5099 (iii).

Western Canadian Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 37 (Mr. Knowles) in Com., 2564 (ii).

Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4146 (iii).

FISHER, Hon. S. A., (*Minister of Agriculture*) *Brome.*

Agriculture Committee of 1908, Printing and Distribution of Rep. (remarks) 3938 (ii).

Agriculture, Deptl. Employees, Names, Position, Salaries, Increases, &c. (Ans.) 1058 (i).

——— Outside Service at Ottawa, Names, Position, &c. (Ans.) 823 (i).

Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 12 (i).

Agricultural Estimates, Delay in considering (remarks) 4412 (iii).

Agriculture, Expenditure for (Ans.) 1070 (1).

FISHER, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

Agriculture, Expenditure *re* Employees (ii).

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4469 (iii).

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. (B. 18) 1° m., 240; in Com., 750 (i).

Animals, Health of, Inspection, &c., Total Expenditure (Ans.) 821 (i).

Campbellford and Brighton Mail Contract (Ans.) 3479 (ii).

Canning Factories Inspectors, Number, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 822 (i).

Census Vote for 1910, Intention *re* (Ans.) 532 (i).

Civil Service Act, Delays, &c. (remarks) 5895 (iv).

Civil Service Commissioners' Rep., on Inquiry for, 1022 (i).

Civil Service Resolutions, Conc. before Easter (remarks) 3703 (ii).

Civil Service Salaries (B. 187) prop. Res., 160; M. for Com., 292; in Com. on Res., 403, 953, 1135 (i); 1° m., 6330; in Com., 6346; 3° m., 6822; on Amt. (Mr. Foster) 6824; on Senate Amts., 7068 (iv).

Civil Service Salaries Schedules, on Inquiry for 2009 (i); 2336 (iii), 5998 (iv).

——— Classification Schedules, &c., on M. for Sup., 2423 (ii).

——— Senate Schedules, &c. (remarks) 6061 (iv).

See "House of Commons."

Cold Storage Act Amt. (B. 147) 1° m., 4471 (iii); in Com., 6742 (iv).

Cold Storage Establishments at Halifax (remarks) 3567 (ii).

Cold Storage Plants, Govt. Assistance to (Ans.) 2756 (ii).

——— Shipments of Fruit, &c., Amount, &c. (Ans.) 2818 (ii).

Conservation of Resources: *See* "Natural."

Criminal Code Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6757 (iv).

Exhibitions subsidized by Dom. Govt., Amount, Officials, &c. (Ans.) 544 (i).

Experimental Farms Live Stock, Number, Estimated Value, &c. (Ans.) 546 (i).

Experimental Farms, Locations, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1957 (i).

Experimental Farming Stations, Establishment of (Ans.) 823 (i).

"Farm Weeds" Number distributed, &c. (Ans.) 2758 (ii).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1677 (i).

Franklin Montgomery Gray Patent Relief B. 132 (Mr. Rankin) in Com., 4883, 5028 (iii).

FISHER, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

French Translation of Documents in Dept of Agriculture (Ans.) 2762 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act, Number of Inspectors (Ans.) 3477 (ii).

——— Regulations *re* Inspection, on M. (Mr. Burrell) to Com. of Sup., 3380.

Gretna Quarantine Building, Total Cost, Price of Land, &c. (Ans.) 824 (i).

Hogs dressed, Inspection *re* (Ans.) 2758 (ii).

Holstein Cattle at Experimental Farms, &c. (Ans.) 2756 (ii).

House of Commons Classification, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 6096 (iv).

Mail Contracts, Renewals in April, 1909, without Tenders (Ans.) 477 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Purchases, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Taylor) Ques. of Order, 4045 (iii).

Mayes Affidavit, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Daniel) 4315 (iii).

Nappan Experimental Farm, Number of Employees, Rate of Pay, &c. (Ans.) 5640 (iii).

Natural Resources Conservation Commission (B. 159) prop. Res., 5249 (iii), 6363 (iv); 1° m., 4988 (iii); in Com., 6382 (iv).

Plank, Mr. M. W., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 3252 (ii).

Public Health Bureau, Establishment of by Govt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1112 (i).

Railway Commission, Vacancy, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer, on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2635 (ii).

Registered Stock, Regulations *re* Importation from U. S. (Ans.) 2379 (ii).

Rutherford, Dr. J. S., Resignation, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 1720 (i).

Scotch Farmers, Report of Visit to Canada (remarks) 6060 (iv).

Stork, W. W., Inspector of Animals, Details of Expenditure (Ans.) 6092 (iv).

Submarine Co.'s Patent Relief B. 77 (Mr. Proulx) in Com., 4538 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 688; (census, &c.) 696 (i); (cold storage) 3188 (ii); (cold storage for fruits) 6983 (iv); (exhibitions) 727 (i), 5947 (iv); (Experimental Farm, electric ry., 3192; (fruit transportation) 3187 (ii); (fumigating stations) 809; (Gold and Silver Marking Act) 809 (i); (International Institute) 5882; (live stock industry) 5833 (iii); (Patent Record) 3186 (ii); (Public Works Health Act) 810 (i); (swine commission) 6984 (iv); (tobacco, Canadian) 5881 (iii); (Tracadie Lazaretto) 809; (Year-Book) 702, 726 (i), 3187 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 643 (i); (experimental farm) 6982 (iv); Inland Revenue (salaries) 429 (i); Mines (salaries) 3674 (ii).

FISHER, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Service Commission (salaries) 715 (i).
Legislation (members' indemnity) 7068 (iv).
Miscellaneous (conservation commission) 7064 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Victoria immigration) 2089 (ii); Generally (experimental farms) 1598 (i); Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Yarmouth) 2487 (ii).
Quarantine (Challenger, Str.) 5883 (iii); (quarantine) 3193 (ii).

Tuberculosis Congress, International, Delegates to (Ans.) 1186 (i).

Yarmouth Harbour Buoys (remarks) 1115 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E., *North Toronto.*

Address, The, 46 (i).

Agriculture, Deptl. Employees, Name, Position, Salary, Increases, &c. (Ques.) 1058 (i).

——— Outside Service at Ottawa, Names, Position, Increase of Salary, &c. (Ques.) 823 (i).

——— Sums voted (Ques.) 1409 (i).

All Red Route, Information *re* (remarks) 7070 (iv).

American Immigration Agents, Duties *re* (remarks) 2244 (ii).

Armouries built since 1896, Number, Cost, &c. (M. for ret.*) 157 (i).

Bell, Charles F., Conditions of Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2322 (ii).

Budget, The, Reply to Financial Statement, 4585 (iii).

——— Remarks, 1813 (i), 4125 (iii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3030 (ii); 5995, 6026 (iv).

——— on M. to ref. to Com. on Standing Orders, 3042 (ii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5218 (iii).

Canadian Economic Lubricant Co., Payments to since 1906 (Ques.) 176, 188 (i).

Canadian Liverpool and Western Ry Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 2129 (ii).

Cassells, Judge: *See* 'Investigations,' 'Marine.'

Central Railway of N. B., Action of Govt. *re* Rep. of Commission (remarks) 4125 (iii).
See 'N. B. Central.'

Civil Service Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6325 (iv).

Civil Service Bill, Preparation of Schedules (remarks) 2336 (ii); 5998 (iv).

——— (remarks) 2009 (i).

Civil Service Salaries, Increase B. 187 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for Com. on Res., 311; in Com. on Res., 403, 953, 1136 (i); on M. for 2°, 6334; in Com., 6346; on M. for 3°, 6823; (amt.) 6824 (iv).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Civil Service Salaries: Circular Letter *re* Election Campaign (read) 318 (i).

Civil Service Resolutions, Conc. before Easter (remarks) 3702 (ii).

——— Delay, &c. (remarks) *re* Blocking, 5895 (iv).

Civil Service Apptmts. since July, 1908; Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 142 (i).

——— since Sept. 1908 (Ques.) 143 (i).

Civil Service Act, Promotions, Transfers, Apptmts. under (M. for ret.*) 352 (i).

Civil Service Salaries, Classification Schedules, Inconsistencies, &c., on M. for Sup., 2404 (ii).

Civil Service Temporary Clerks, Classification under sec. 7 of C. S. Act, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 354 (i).

Civil Service, Increases from April 1, 1908, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1069 (i).

——— Inside Employees, Total Payments in 1896 (Ques.) 1913 (i).

——— Names of those receiving no Increases (Ques.) 1726 (i).

Civil Service Reorganization, Temporary Clerks, &c. (Ques.) 142 (i).

Civil Service Salaries, O.C. *re* Increases Ret. (remarks) 1395 (i).

——— Defective Ret. (remarks) 1562 (i).

Civil Service, Payments in 1896 and 1909-10 at Ottawa (Ques.) 2148 (ii).
See 'Supply—Civil Govt.'

Civil Service Bill, Schedule of Senate (remarks) 6061 (iv).
See 'House of Commons.'

Civil Service Commissioners' Rep., Inquiry for, 874, 1022 (i); 2241, 3111 (ii); 4047 (iii).

Cobalt Lake Act, Disallowance of, on M. (Mr. Clarke) for Cor., 1736 (i).

Commercial Negotiations *re* Senatorships, Ref. to in debate on Address, 52 (i).

Committees, Special, Ref. to of Deptl. Reps. (remarks) 2026 (ii).

Conservation of our Resources: *See* 'Natural.'

Deferred Elections, on prop. res. (Mr. Burrell) 2857 (ii).

Deptl. Statistical Publications, Inquiry for Ret., 4642 (iii).

Dredging Contracts, Inquiry for O.C., 255 (i).
See 'St. John,' &c.

Dredge, Govt.-owned, employed in N.S. under Contract, Arrangements, &c. (Ques.) 2320 (ii).

Dredges purchased by Public Works Dept., Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 145 (i).

Estimates, Passing of (remarks) 3203 (ii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Ewart, Mr. J. S., Emplymt *re* Hague Tribunal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7059 (iv).

Expenditures and Receipts of Dom. for 1908-9, N.T.R. Cost, &c. (Ques.) 4289 (iii).

External Affairs Dept., on prop. Res. (Mr. Murphy) 1983 (i).

'Falcon' and 'Fearless,' Strs., Purchase of. Capacity, &c. (Ques.) 187 (i).

Fenian Veterans, Land Grants, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6277 (iv).

Fisheries Development, Apptmt. of Sel. Com. on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 511 (i).

Fisheries Regulations *re* International Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6964 *See* 'Waterways.'

Fishing Seasons and Leases, Extensions, &c. (Ques.) 169 (i).

Florence Mining Co.'s Appeal *re* Ont. Govt. Legislation, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 6921 (iv).

Forests, Waterways, &c., on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 6919 (iv).

France and Canada Ocean SS. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5220 (iii).

Franking Privilege *re* Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1673 (i).

—— Names of Ministers (Ques.) 2585 (ii).

French Treaty, Information *re* (remarks) 7070 (iv).

—— Inquiry for, 1977 (i); 2148 (ii).

Govt. Business, on M. to take Mondays. 3938 (ii); 4041 (iii).

Govt. Employees, Interference with Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6871 (iv).

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5898, 6124 (iv).

Govt. Loans or Advances, since Dec., 1908, Purposes for, &c. (Ques.) 163 (i).

Govt. Loans, from July, 1896, Amounts, Conditions, &c. (M. for ret.*) 172 (i).
See 'Loans'

Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 227 (i).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on prop. Res., 4104 (iii); in Com. on Res., 3572 (ii); in Com., 5283, 5323, 5488; on M. for 3°, 5496 (iii).

G.T.P. Bonds, Guaranteed, available for Prairie Section (Ques.) 2589 (ii).

G.T.P., Eastern Div., Expenditure *re* Loans, &c. (Ques.) 4634 (iii).

—— Lands sold along Route, Prices, Names, &c.: (M. for ret.*) 352 (i).

—— (Ques.) 143 (i).

—— Papers, &c., Printing of (remarks) 2950 (ii).
See "Expenditures."

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Harbour and River Works, Piers, &c., Procedure *re* Construction by day labour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2513 (ii).

House of Commons, Additional Wing, Cost *re* Construction, Disposal of Rooms, &c. (Ques.) 140 (i).

—— Expenditure for Deptl. Labour (Ques. 2149 (ii).

House of Commons, Additional Rooms (remarks) *re* answer to Ques., 170 177 (i).

House of Commons Classification, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 6094 (iv).
See "Civil Service."

Imperial Conference, on Production of Cor. (remarks) 7069 (iv).

Imperial Defence (remarks) on M. for 3° of Supply Bill, 7081 (iv).
See "Naval."

Imports and Exports of Merchandise for 1908, &c. (Ques.) 4288 (iii).

"Industry" Dredge, Cor., Reps., &c., *re* Purchase, Removal, Repair, &c. (M. for copies*) 826 (i).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6789 (iv).

Insurance Bill, Progress in Senate (remarks) 7069 (iv).

I.C.R., on Annual Statement (remarks) 2678 (ii).

—— Branch Lines Extension, on prop. Res (Mr. Emmerson) 2197 (ii).

—— Commission, Appointments since its creation, Places, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 172 (i).

—— Employees, Dismissed or suspended for 1908, Names, Dates, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3055 (ii).

—— Inquiry for ret., 4641 (iii).

I.C.R. Employees Strikes Dispute, Rep. of Commission (remarks) 289 (i).

I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Earnings and Working Expenses Monthly, &c. (Ques.) 162 (i).

—— Total Working Expenditure and Receipts, Amount of Capital Expenditure (Ques.) 5641 (iii).

Interior Clerks, Names, Salaries in Outside Service, Increase after June 1st, Resignations, &c. (Ques.) 532 (i).

—— Expenditure *re* Increases (Ques.) 1064 (i).
See "Supply—Civil Govt."

International Waterways Commission: *See* "Waterways".

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures by Judge Cassels, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Supply, 3832 (ii).

—— Ques. of Order *re* "Manipulation of Trust Funds," 3849 (ii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Japanese Treaty, ref. to in debate on Address, 46 (i).

Johnston, Capt., Repayments of Moneys *re* Str. "Hestia" (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 6889 (iv).

Kingston Military Buildings, on Ques. of Order, 2496 (ii).

"Lady Evelyn" Str., Purchase Price, Repairs, &c., (Ques.) 144 (i).

Lake Simcoe and Newmarket Canal, Cor. *re* Construction, &c. (M. for ret.*) 172 (i).

Letter Carrier Systems in Cities, Regulations *re* Apptmts. (Ques.) 5158 (iii).

Loans negotiated from 1st Jan., 1907, O.Cs. Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 685 (i).

——— Inquiry for Rets., 1561 (i); 4125 (iii).

Loan falling due on Nov. 1, 1908, Disposition of (Ques.) 147 (i).

Loans, Temporary, Details of $20,606,333 for Jan., 1909 (Ques.) 1408 (i).
See 'Govt. Loans.'

Major's Hill Park Hotel, Title *re* Land, &c. (Ques.) 147 (i).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3953 (ii).

Marconi Stations, Construction, Maintenance, Amounts paid (Ques.) 177 (i).

Marine Investigation by Judge Cassels, Expenditure, Legal Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 167 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Purchase of by Tender, &c. (Ques.) 168 (i).

——— (remarks) *re* Answer to Question, 3044 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2818 (ii).

Mayes Affidavit, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4390 (iii).

——— Reading of Original, on Ques. of Order to Amt. (Mr. Daniel) 4260 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order, 4362 (iii).

——— Reading of Original Document (remarks) 4299 (iii).

——— Dredging Contract, ref. to in debate on Govt. Tenders, 227 (i).

——— Dredging Contract, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Emmerson) 276 (i).

Militia Expenditures by Public Works Dept. from 1896 to 1909 (Ques.) 2379 (ii).

Mines and Minerals, on M. (Mr. Congdon) to conc. in 3rd Rep., 6919 (iv).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B. C. Penitentiary, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1851 (i).

Minister of Inland Revenue, Information *re* Election (remarks) 13 (i).

'Montcalm' Str., Total Cost of Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 168 (i).

N. T. Ry. Employees, &c., Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 4801 (iii), 6919 (iv).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Natural Resources, Conservation Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 6368 (iv).

Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G.B. (prop. Res.) 3484 (ii).

——— Notice of Motion, 482 (i), 3202 (ii).

Naval Defence of Sea Coast, Interpretation *re* Res. of Hse. (Ques.) 4289 (iii).
See 'Imperial.'

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5226 (iii).

N. B. Central Ry. Commission, Rep., Printing, &c. (remarks) 4236 (iii).

——— Statement *re* (remarks) 4296 (iii).

——— Report (M.) to lay on Table, 5487 (iii).

——— Rep., O.Cs., &c. (M.) to lay on Table, 5624 (iii).

——— Rep., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 5681 (iii).

——— Rep., on Amt. (Mr. Crothers) 5699 (iii).

Newmarket Canal, Holland River, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com. of Sup., 3162 (ii).
See 'Supply—Canals.'

New York Lubricant Co., Payments to (Ques.) 188 (i).

Old Age Annuities Act, Number of Employees, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 141 (i).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 1029 (i); in Com., 5566 (iii).

Patronage List, Abolition of, Comn. to Judge Cassels (remarks) 876 (i).

Penitentiaries and Prison Labour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 904 (i).

Political Partizanship: *See* 'Govt. Employees.'

——— Report, (M.) to lay on Table, 5487 (iii).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 4247 (iii); in Com., 6314 (iv).

Post Office Apptmts., Incorrect Ret. (remarks) 1023 (i).

Preston, W. T. R., Transfer to Holland (remarks) 6000 (iv).

Prisoners Paroled or Pardoned, Cost of Ret., &c. (Ques.) 673 (i).

Privilege, Ques. of *re* 'Special Trains,' Ques. of Order (Mr. Conmee) 4291 (iii).

Protection of Coast Line and Sea-ports, &c., Notice of prop. Res., 482 (i).
See 'Naval.'

Prudential Life Ins. Co.: *See* 'Security.'

Public Works Dept., Salaries, O.C. *re* Increases (Ques.) 1074 (i).

Pugsley, Mr., and Mayes Affidavit: *See* 'Mayes,' 'N.B. Central.'

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Quebec Bridge Co., Payments to Stockholders, &c. (Ques.) 163 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 353 (i).

Quebec Tercentenary, Amounts subscribed, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1721 (i).

Ry. Act (electric power) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1122 (i).

Railway Act (general) Amt. B. 106 (Mr Graham) on M. for 2°, 6194 (iv).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for 1°, 92 (i).

Railway Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Lancaster) on motion for 3°, 522 (i).

Railway, Two-Cent Fares, Refunds by G.T. Ry., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com of Sup., 2912 (ii).

Restaurant Committee, H. of C., Interim Rep. (remarks) 402 (i).

——— on M. to adopt 2nd Rep. 401 (i).

Returns, Inquiry for, 1718 (i), 2128, 2218, 2493, 2674, 3110 (ii).

Royal Canadian Mint, Total Cost, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 116 (i).

——— Amount of Silver, &c. (M. for ret.*) 352 (i).

Rural Free Mail Delivery, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 2802 (ii).

St. John Harbour Contract, Payments to G. S. Mayes *re* Dredging (Ques.) 1181 (i).

———Dredging Contracts, Surveys, &c. (Ques.) 1917 (i).

——— Date of Beginning of Work, Contracts with Companies, &c. (Ques.) 2158 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Manufacture of Church Pews (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 901 (i).

Salvation Army Council Bill 142 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6068 (iv).

Saturday Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5644 (iii).

Secret Commissions Prevention B. 31 (Mr Aylesworth) in Com., 1124 (iv).

Security Life Insurance Co. of Canada B. 188 (Mr. Proulx) in Com., 6783 (iv).

Seed Grain Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 144 (i).

Seed Grain Vote, Distribution, Details of (M. for ret.*) 352 (i).

S.A. Volunteers Land Grants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6277 (iv).

——— Number issued, Sale of by Govt. Employees &c. (Ques.) 143 (i).

Statistical and Special Information Publications, Number issued by Depts., Costs, &c. (M. for ret.*) 157 (i).

Submarine Co.'s Patent Relief B. 77 (Mr. Proulx) on Order for Com., 4592, 4595 (iii).

Superior and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 78 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3983

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Supplies for Marine and Pub. Works Depts., Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 141 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture (cold storage for fruit) 6983 (iv).

Canals—Lachine (cement) 1536 (i).

Canals—Trent (construction) 3178 (ii); (Holland River) 1888 (i).

Canals—Welland (gate-lifter) 2036 (ii); (Port Colborne) 1903 (i); (Port Maitland) 2030; (repairs) 2034 (ii); (widening) 1903

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (experimental farm) 6982 (iv).

Civil Govt.—External Affairs (salaries) 7064 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 971 (i).

Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (electrical branch) 445; (salaries) 431, 444; (travelling expenses) 447; (weights and measures) 447 (i).

Civil Govt.—Interior (outside service) 6284; (salaries) 6248 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 440 (i).

Civil Govt.—Marine (contingencies) 3702; (salaries) 3688 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Mines (salaries) 3673 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Public Works (salaries) 3666 (ii).

Civil Service Commission (printing) 7065 (iv).

Dom. Lands (advertising) 6285; (Hydrographic survey) 6284; (maps, &c.) 6289 (iv).

Excise (inspectors, salaries) 436; (stamps, &c.) 437; (tobacco stamps) 448; (travelling expenses, &c.) 437 (i).

Fisheries (commissions) 6957; (international commission) 6960; (transportation, &c.) 6956; (Young, W. S., compensation) 6982 (iv).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 7012; (agents in G.B.) 7014 (iv); (gen. vote) 5832 (iii).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (blankets, &c.) 976; (medical attendance) 976; (schools) 976 (i).

Inland Revenue (collection of duties) 448 (i).

Interior (astronomical surveys) 6263; (buffalo herds) 6991; (park reservations) 6971; (St. Mary's and Milk River diversions) 6268 (iv).

Legislation (members indemnity) 7066 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, &c.) 6889; (St. John property) 6915; (salaries) 6889 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Mexico) conc., 7074

Marine (biological station) 6953; (dredging plant, &c.) 6885 (iv); (fisheries conference) 3696 (ii); (hydrographic surveys) 6917 (iv).

Marine—Public Works (piers on St. Lawrence) 6888; (St. Lawrence ship canal) 6878; (Sorel ship yard) 6885 (iv).

Metric System (lectures) 454 (i).

Militia (ordnance) 2308; (salaries) 2271, 2306 (ii).

Mines (assay office, B. C.) 7063; (ore tests) 7063 (iv).

Miscellaneous (conservation commission) 7064; (Hague Tribunal) 7057; (Parliamentary Companion) 7064 (iv).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
N. W. M. P. (compensations) 3664; (force) 3656 (ii).
Penitentiaries—Dorchester (electric light plant) 884; Generally (salaries) 886; (supplies) 888 (i).
Post Office (inspectors' salaries) 1650 (i).
Public Works—Buildings, Dom. (rents, &c) 3672 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Partridge Island water service) 3206 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additional wing) 1254 (i); (clerk of works) 3225; (electric lighting) 3226; (elevators) 3228; (grounds) 3225; (H. of C., additions) 3204 (ii); (new bldg.) 1250 (i); (Rideau Hall) 3233 (ii); (Royal Mint) 1272 (i), 3205; (telephones) 3229 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Joliette) 1299 (i); (Quebec citadel) 3213; (Sherbrooke) 3223 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (Dawson) 3224 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 2511 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John tidal waters) 3240 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2338; (Little Current) 3234; (Sandy Cove) 3235; (Scotch Cove) 3234 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Naufrage pond) 2509; (Tignish) 2510 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse a la Barbe) 2512; (Batiscan) 3274; (Bonaventure) 3277; (Cap St. Ignace) 2523; (Chicoutimi) 2523; (Clarke City) 2527; (Laprairie) 3287; (Nicolet) 3246; (Riviere du Loup) 3284; (Ste. Anne des Monts) 3287; (St. Francis du Lac) 3286; (St. Helen's Island) 3245; (St. Michel Yamaska) 3262; (Saguenay dredging) 2802, 2887, 3285 (ii).
Railways—G.T.P. (Brunet, A.) 2042; (inspection) 2048; (Quebec bridge) 2050 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (board of commissioners) 6986 (iv); (bridge strengthening) 2931; (Chatham) 2946; (Drummondville) 2949; (facilities) 2948; (Halifax) 2935; (Moncton cut-off) 2921, 2922; (Moncton shops) 2946; (original construction) 2925; (Riviere du Loup) 2949; (St. Rosalie) 2948; (Sackville) 2935; (Sydney Mines) 2936; (water supply) 2947 (ii).
Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 2055; (litigation, &c.) 2055; (unforeseen items) 2054 (ii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (litigation) 2056; (maintenance) 2044 (ii).
Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 452 (i).
Yukon Govt. (roads, &c.) 6273 (iv).
Conc., Reading of Items (remarks) 4018 (iii).
Thos. L. Smith, Patent Relief, B. 71 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for 3°, 2578 (ii).
Toronto Old Fort, Reclamation of Land from Park, Blackwell Co., Restoration, &c. (Ques.) 3984 (ii).
——— Pets. *re* Transfer, &c. (remarks) 4122 (iii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Toronto, Old Fort, Condition of, &c. (remarks) 6415 (iv).
Transcontinental Ry. Commission, Inquiry for Ret., 6412 (iv).
See 'G.T.P.'
Trent Canal: *See* 'Newmarket.'
Two-cent Rate on Rys.: *See* 'Ry. Two Cent' &c.
Water-powers, Leases of Canals, Records of &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2037 (ii).
Waterways Treaty, N. B. Fisheries, Regulations *re* (remarks) 1245 (i).
Ways and Means (sugar) in Com., 5100 (iii).
Weights and Measures *re* Vessels (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3623 (ii).
Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 2134 (ii).
Wharfs: *See* 'Govt. Harbours.'
Yukon Ordinances (beer tax) on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 5894 (iv).
———in Com. on Res., 7076 (iv).

FOWKE, Mr. F. L., *South Ontario.*
Canada Line SS. Service with Germany. Negotiations *re* (Ques.) 2589 (ii).
Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 4533 (iii).
Oshawa Port, Customs Collector (remarks) 2673 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture (cold storage) 3191 (ii); Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Whitby) 1535 (i)

FRASER, Mr. A. L., *Kings, P.E.I.*
Budget, The, 4980 (iii).
Elmira and Harmony Ry., P.E.I., Contract *re* Construction (Ques.) 1243 (ii), 6787 (iv).
Fish Island Lightkeeper, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 6786 (iv).
Georgetown Marine Agent, Name, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 3194 (ii).
Greenfield, P.E.I., Post Office, Removal of, &c. (Ques.) 5776 (iii).
Harmony-Elmira Branch of P.E.I. Ry., Tenders *re* Construction (Ques). 1243 (i).
See 'Elmira.'
Ice-Breaker for Northumberland Straits, Name of Contractor, Price, &c. (Ques.) 674 (i).
Ice-Breaking Steamers, Reps. *re* Superannuation of Officers and Crews, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Copies, 1472 (i).
Lobsters Licenses in P.E.I., Number issued. Pets, &c. (Ques.) 1076 (i).
Lorne Valley, P.E.I., Tenders *re* Mail Contract, &c. (Ques.) 5776 (iii).
McDonald, Lauchlin, Resignation as Lightkeeper of East Point, P.E.I., Apptmt. of Successor, &c. (Ques.) 3194 (ii).

FRASER, Mr. A. L.—*Con.*

Naufrage Pond Protection Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2461 (ii).

Panmure Island Wharf, Purchase of Right of Way, &c. (Ques.) 6403 (iv).

Pictou and Magdalen Mail Service, Contract, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 3047 (ii).

P.E.I. Winter Communication with the Mainland, on M. (Mr. Warburton) 6465 (iv).

'Stanley' and 'Minto' Strs., Names and Residences of Officers (Ques.) 674 (i).

Sturgeon Pier, P.E.I., Tenders, Contracts *re* raising, &c. (Ques). 1241 (i).

SUPPLY.

Arts: Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 5949 (iv).

Fisheries (bait freezers) 6950; (fish curing) 6952 (iv).

Public Works—Dredging—P. E. I. (Souris) 6554 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E. I. (bridges) 2508, (Graham's Pond) 2507 (Naufrage pond) 2508; (Port Vernon) 2511; (Sturgeon pier) 2510 (ii).

Railways—P. E. I. (Charlottetown) 2959; (Harmony—Elmira branch) 2952; (Montague) 3420; (Souris) 3418 (ii).

GAUVREAU, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*

Cabano Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 122) 1°*, 3802 (ii); in Com., 4839 (iii).

Catholic Church Extension Society Co.'s incorp. (B. 176) 1°*, 6083 (iv).

Label, Mr. Achille, Application for Pet. of Right *re* I. C. R. (Ques.) 3253 (ii).

Railway Mail Clerks, Furois, Dorais and Wathen, Dates of Examinations for Promotion, &c. (Ques.) 3253 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2371 (ii).

Tadousac and Riviere du Loup Winter Navigation (Ques.) 344 (i).

GEOFFRION, Mr. V., *Chambly and Vercheres.*

Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s (B. 38) on Senate Amts. 5485 (iii).

Hart-Otis Car Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 92) 1°*, 2019 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 4799 (iii); in Com., 6567 (iv).

Montreal Terminal Ry. Co.'s (B. 48) 1°*, 738; 2° m., 1147 (i).

St. Maurice and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 176) 2° m., 6083 (iv).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*

Dredges owned by Govt., Number, Construction, Price, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2596 (ii).

Fort Erie and Buffalo Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 69) 1°*, 1318 (i); in Com., 3403 (ii).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M.—*Con.*

Preston, W. T. R., Complaints from Japan, *re* Work, &c. (Ques.) 480 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt—Civil Service Commission (salaries) 393 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (St. Michel, Yamaska) 3268 (ii).

GERVAIS, Mr. H., *Montreal, St. James.*

Criminal Code Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6396 (iv).

Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., (M.) to conc., 1474 (i).

Fisheries Development, Apptmt. of Sel. Com., on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 510 (i).

G. T. P., Montreal Branch, Agreement, Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 816 (i).

——— Commission, Names of Employees, Residence, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 826 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Dismissal of Employees (Ques.) 874 (i).

——— Promises *re* Wharfage Dues, &c. (Ques.) 874 (i).

Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) M. to adj. debate, 1469 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal postal station) 1308 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (St. Helen's Island) 3243 (ii).

GIRARD, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*

Canadian Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 44) 1°*, 626; in Com., 1685, 1719, 1858, 1862 (i); 2058, 2129 (ii).

Chicoutimi Pulp Co., Amount due Govt. *re* Booms, &c. (Ques.) 4222, 4891 (iii).

Chicoutimi Wharf, Expropriation of Land, Prices paid, &c. (Ques.) 4222 (iii).

Colonization and Repatriation Society, Lake St. John, Detailed Statements of Expenditures (M. for ret.*) 3991 (ii).

Immigration to U.S., Repatriation, &c., on M. (Mr. Paquet) for Cor., 865 (i).

Labour Hours for Workingmen, on M. (Mr Verville) to Com. of Sup., 5933 (iv).

Saguenay River Booms, Construction of by Govt. (Ques.) 4222 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (St. Alphonse de Bagotville) 2904; (Saguenay dredging) 2878 (ii).

GLADU, Mr. J. E. O., *Yamaska.*

Budget, The, 4774 (iii).

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3925 (ii).

GOODEVE, Mr. A. S., *Kootenay.*

Address, The, 111 (i).
B.C. Ry. Belt Lands, Settlers' Titles, &c. (Ques.) 1727 (i).
Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5472 (iii).
Commercial Feeding Stuffs B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5216 (iii).
Deferred Elections, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burrell) 2850 (ii).
Experimental Farms, Locations, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1943 (i).
'Farm Weeds' Book, Number distributed, Names, &c. (Ques.) 2757 (ii).
G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5276 (iii).
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 26) 1°*, 290 (i).
Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com. (amt.) 3411, 3605 (ii).
Miner, Bill, Escape from B.C. Penitentiary, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1847 (i).
Olin, Chas., Total Payments *re* Visits to Sweden (Ques.) 871 (i).
—— Rep. (M. for copy*) 881 (i).
S. A. Bounty Act, Regulations (remarks) 2229 (ii).
Submarine Co.'s Patent Relief B. 77 (Mr. Proulx) in Com., 4540 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs (contingencies) 594 (i); Post Office (salaries) 721 (i).
Civil Service Commission (salaries) 710 (i).
Post Office—Miscellaneous (ry. mail clerks) 3432 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (rents) 1617; Ottawa (Royal Mint) 1282 (i).

GORDON, Mr. D. A., *East Kent.*

Fruit Marks Act, Regulations *re* Inspection, on M. (Mr. Burrell) to Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).
Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6815 (iv).
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s (B. 119) 1°*, 3703 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 3187; (fruit transportation) 3187 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 1368 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood) 3297; (Sydenham) 3324 (ii).

GORDON, Mr. Geo., *Nipissing.*

Abitibi and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 66) 1°*, 1318 (i).
Cobalt Lake Act, Disallowance of, on M. (Mr. Clarke) for Cor., 1758 (i).

GORDON, Mr. Geo.—*Con.*

Dokis Indian Reserve, Payment for Berths, Lapses, &c. (Ques.) 542 (i).
Franking Privilege and Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1665, 1706 (i).
G. T. P. Ry., Dismissal of Engineers, Names, &c. (Ques.) 817 (i).
Lake Nipissing and Monetteville Canal, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1559 (i).
Lake Nipissing Floods, Claims of Settlers, &c. (Ques.) 817 (i).
Latchford Dam on Montreal River, Contract *re* (Ques.) 543 (i).
—— Cor. with T. & N. O. Ry. Commission (read) in Com. of Sup., 3320 (ii).
Natural Resources, Conservation Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 6381 (iv).
New Liskeard Wharf, Construction *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2553 (ii).
Nipissing Indian Reserve, Open for Settlement (Ques.) 684 (i).
North Bay Post Office Inspector, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 1558 (i).
Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry Co.'s incorp. B. 62 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 2538 (ii).
Rural Free Mail Delivery, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 2795 (ii).
Sturgeon Falls and Sudbury Public Buildings, Purchase of Land, &c. (Ques.) 817 (i).
SUPPLY—
Indians—Generally (relief) 1168 (i).
Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 894 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Bridgewater) 1285; (Guysborough) 1288; (Shelburne) 1292 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 1362; (R. M. College) 1384 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (telephones) 1609 (i); 3232 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Joliette) 1295 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Lake Nipissing) 3310; (Latchford dam) 3320; (Bonaventure) 3283; (Gaspé) 2553; (Lake St. Francis) 2555 (ii).
Railways—G.T.P. (Quebec Bridge) 2053 (ii).
Water Powers, Leases on Canals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2041 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. Geo. P., (Minister of Railways and Canals), *Brockville.*

Algoma Steel Co., Contracts *re* Rails, &c. (Ans.) 336 (i).
Aylen, Mr. J., Emplymt. by Transcontinental Ry. (Ans.) 5096 (iii).
Belleville Drill Hall, Acquisition of Land, Ownership of Officers Quarters, &c. (Ans.) 818 (i).
Bills of Lading, Jurisdiction by Ry. Commission (Ans.) 1179 (i).
Birdsalls Landing Wharf, Rice Lake, Cost of &c. (Ans.) 825 (i).

GRAHAM, Hon. Geo. P.—*Con.*

Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Ry., Stockholders, Freight and Passenger Rates &c. (Ans.) 3473 (ii).

Buell, Mr., Legal Work on Ry. Commission *re* Express Companies, 3002 (ii).

Campbell, Bush, Emplymt. on Trent Canal (Ans.) 1066 (i).

Canada Eastern Ry., Original Price, Value, Expenditure, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 2149, 2580 (ii).

—— Corrected Answer, 3363 (ii).

Canadian Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 2061 (ii).

Canadian Medical Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Roche) in Com., 4843 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Subsidy (B. 186) 1°*, 6292; in Com., 6739 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 3409 (ii).

Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 38 (Mr. Geoffrion) on Senate Amts., 5486 (iii).

C. P. R., Additional Stock, Distribution, &c., on M. (Mr. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 421, 1326 (i).

—— on M. for Sup. (remarks) 784 (i).

—— Ref. to Courts (remarks) 883 (i).

—— Law Suit (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2920 (ii).

C. P. R. Gimli Branch (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2965 (ii).

C. P. Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 3157 (ii).

See 'G. T. P. B. 25.'

Canadian Railways, Improved Service (remarks) on M. for Sup., 632 (i).

Canadian Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 11 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 986 (i).

Carillon and Grenville Canals, Number of Employees from July to Oct., 1907-8 (Ans.) 1396 (i).

Carillon Dam Water Power, Leace of, &c. (Ans.) 1557 (i).

Cataract Water-power Supply, Leases (explanation) in Com. of Sup., 2036 (ii).

Cattle Guards, Killing of Live Stock, &c. (Ans.) 680 (i).

—— Complaints *re* (Ans.) 1724 (i).

—— Failure of Companies to erect (Ans.) 1409 (i).

Cement Contract to W. G. Hartsanft Cement Co., Quantity, Price, &c. (Ans.) 3985 (ii).

Civil Service Salaries Increases B. 187 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2° (remarks) 6343 (iv).

Coast Line and Seaports Protection, prop. Res. (remarks) 549 (i).

Cochrane Town Site and G. T. P., Interference *re* (Ans.) 2586 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. Geo. P.—*Con.*

Dickie, Alfred, Payments to *re* Damages by Fire (Ans.) 1075 (i).

Dominion Atlantic Ry., Examination by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2927 (ii).

Dredge on Lake Winnipeg, Expense *re* moving 'Mikado' from Sandbar (Ans.) 869 (i).

Election Expenses in North and South Ontario, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2588 (ii).

Elmira and Harmony Branch Ry., P. E. I., Contract *re* Construction (Ans.) 1243 (i), 6787 (iv).

Falconer, Mr. R. S., Emplymt. by Govt., Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 332 (i).

Fenelon Falls Lockmaster, Payments to, Allowances, &c. (Ans.) 1068 (i).

Foret, Land leased to N. & A. Bourbonnais, Conditions, &c. (Ans.) 2591 (ii).

Fort Erie and Buffalo Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 69 (Mr. German) in Com., 3404 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal and Welland Canal Enlargements (stmnt.) in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).

Gillis, Angus, Compensation *re* Injuries on I. C. R. (Ans.) 6089 (iv).

Govt. Railways Act (damages) Amt. (B. 20) 1° m., 241; 2° m., 770; in Com., 771 (i).

G. T. P., Advertisements for Tenders *re* Ties, &c. (Ans.) 6091 (iv).

—— Amount of Guaranteed Bonds of N. T. R., Western Div., &c. (Ans.) 1399 (i).

—— Branch Lines, Plans *re* Orillia Branch (Ans.) 1077 (i).

—— Branch to Montreal, Agreement, Conditions, &c. (Ans.) 816 (i).

—— Contracts for North Bay Section, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 820 (i).

—— Cost per Mile (remarks) 2494 (ii).

—— Dismissal of Engineers, &c. (Ans.) 817 (i).

—— Disputes with N.T.R. *re* Classification, &c. (Ans.) 2322 (ii).

—— Eastern Div., Expenditures *re* Loans (Ans.) 4634 (iii).

—— Employees, Total Number, Nationality, &c. (Ans.) 249 (i); 3042 (ii).

G.T.P. Lake Superior Branch Subsidy B. 30 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 1025; in Com., 1718 (i).

G.T.P. and C.P.R., Ft. William, B. 25 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 1718 (i).

G.T.P. Lake Superior Branch, Number of Miles completed (Ans.) 4287 (iii).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 5110, 5117; in Com., 5291, 5309; on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to M. for 3°, 5617 (iii).

G.T.P., Mileage Construction of N.T. Ry., Average Cost per Mile (Ans.) 1184 (i).

G.T.P. and N.T.R. Classification, Reference *re* (Ans.) 4899 (iii).

GRAHAM, Hon. Geo. P.—*Con.*

G.T.P., N.B. Section, Estimated Cost (remarks) 2384 (ii).

—— Papers, on Inquiry for, 2773 (ii).

—— Prairie Section Contracts, Name of Contractors, &c. (Ans.) 3987 (ii).

—— Ry. Commissioners, Revised Stmnt. as to Cost (Ans.) 1056 (i).

—— Resignation of Mr. Morse, Action of Govt. *re* (Ans.) 345 (i).

—— Tenders, on Inquiry for Ret., 4801 (iii).

—— Total Expenditure to Feb., 1909, of Winnipeg-Moncton Section, &c. (Ans.) 3704 (ii).

—— Unpaid Wages, Claims of Stationmen, &c. (Ans.) 5629 (iii).

—— Western Div., Number of Miles completed, Payments by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 1398 (i).

—— Winnipeg Terminal Site, Negotiations *re* Purchase (Ans.) 1071 (i).

G. T. Ry., Level Crossings, Cost of Protection, &c. (Ans.) 1914 (i).

Guysborough Public Works, Amount of Appropriation Expended (Ans.) 819 (i).

Halifax and Southwestern Ry. Subsidy, Negotiations *re* Construction (Ans.) 1561 (i).

Harmony-Elmira Branch of P.E.I. Ry., Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 1243 (i) 6787 (iv).

Harvey-Salisbury Railroad incorp. B. 35 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 776 (i).

Highways, Removal of Planks, &c. (remarks) 1022 (i).

Holland River Canal, Deputation *re* Construction (Ans.) 2153 (ii).

—— Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1915 (i).

—— Land Valuators, Remuneration, &c (Ans.) 2591 (ii).

—— Rep. *re* Flow of Water (Ans.) 473 (i).

—— Tender for Section 1, &c. (Ans.) 3251 (i).

See 'Trent,' &c.

Hudson Bay Ry., Total Expenditure, Number of Employees (Ans.) 1056 (i).

Hudson Bay Surveys, on M. (Mr. Meighen) for Ret., 685 (i).

Hungry Bay Dike, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 349 (i).

I.C.R., Applications *re* Running Privileges (Ans.) 351 (i).

—— Board of Management, Apptmt. of (remarks) 4803 (iii).

—— Branch Lines, Rep. *re* Conditions, &c. (Ans.) 351 (i).

—— Branch Lines, on M. for Rep. (Mr. Emmerson) 882 (i).

GRAHAM, Hon. Geo. P.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Branch Lines Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2216 (ii).

—— Branch Lines Rep., Printing of (remarks) 875 (i).

—— Branch Lines Report, on Inquiry for, 664, 1718 (i).

—— Classification of Employees, Hours of Labour, &c. (Ans.) 1723 (i).

—— Double Tracking, Survey *re* at Amherst, &c. (Ans.) 529 (i).

—— East Bound Traffic, Percentage, &c. (Ans.) 529 (i).

—— Employees at Moncton, Number, &c. (Ans.) 331 (i).

—— Employees, Classification, Clerks Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 2157 (ii).

—— Frauds, Suspension of Officials (remarks) 2673 (ii).

—— Freight Clerks Betterments, Govtl. Intention (Ans.) 1561 (i).

—— Freight Clerks Disputes, Settlement of (Ans.) 247 (i).

—— Freight Clerks Dispute, Rep. of Commission (remarks) 289 (i).

—— Freight Clerks, Settlement *re* Arbitration (remarks) 2128 (ii), 6686 (iv).

—— Freight Clerks, Investigation *re* Labour Disputes (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3260 (ii).

—— Freight Clerks, Disputes, Letter of Dep. Min. of Rys. *re* Award of Board (Ans.) 4698; Cor., &c. (read) 4698 (iii).

—— Freight Employees, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 3568 (ii).

—— Freight Earnings in Cape Breton, Ticket Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 5632 (iii).

—— Motor Cars, Total Cost of Construction, Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 1720 (i).

I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry. Employees Provident Fund (B. 164) 1° m., 5248 (iii)

I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Earnings and Working Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 162 (i)

—— Earnings and Expenditures for Oct. 1907 and year 1908 (Ans.) 243, 1415 (i).

—— Number of Employees each month for 1908 (Ans.) 1173 (i).

—— Receipts and Working Expenditures, Amount of Capital Expenditure (Ans.) 5641 (iii).

I.C.R., Proposal *re* Leasing or Sale, &c. (Ans.) 164 (i).

—— Printing and Stationery, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2374 (ii).

—— St. Ignace Station, Requests *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 3476 (ii).

—— Special Mail Trains, Instructions *re* Speed (Ans.) 872 (i).

GRAHAM, Hon. Geo. P.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Truro Station, Erection of (Ans.) 824 (i).
——Truro Staff, Number employed, &c. (Ans.) 329 (i).
—— Truro Staff, Number employed for Sept., Oct., Nov. and Dec. (Ans.) 244 (i).
—— Wallberg Contract, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3475 (ii).
See 'Govt. Rys.'
Kingston Penitentiary, Dep. Warden's Residence, Plans, &c. (Ans.) 2589 (ii).
Lachine Canal Repairs, Cement Contracts (explanation) in Com. of Sup., 1564 (i).
Lakefield Wharf, Amount of Expenditure, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 1063 (i).
Lake Nipissing Floods, Claims of Settlers, &c. (Ans.) 817 (i).
Level Crossing Accidents Ret., on Inquiry for (remarks) 1117 (i).
Level Crossings on Rys., Number of Accidents, &c., on Inquiry for Ret., 549, 1321 (i).
See 'Railways,' &c.
Loggie, W. S. Co., Payments to *re* Ry. Contracts (Ans.) 668 (i).
London and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 102 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3847 (ii).
McKenzie, Calvin, Emplymt. on I.C.R., &c. (Ans.) 2152 (ii).
Madoc-Eldorado Branch Ry., G.T. Bonus *re*, &c. (Ans.) 245 (i).
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3845 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 6078 (iv).
Mileage of Ry. Construction, from 1888 to 1908, &c. (remarks) 1076 (i).
Montreal Bridge and Terminal Co.'s B. 180 (Mr. Ecrement) in Com., 6629 (iv).
Mossy River Dredging, Expenditure of Appropriation, Delays, &c. (Ans.) 816 (i).
N.T. Ry (Red River bridge)—(B. 153) 1° m., 4798; in Com., 5235 (iii).
See 'Aylen.'
Nation River Drainage, Cor. O. Cs, &c., on M. (Mr. Broder) for Ret., 687 (i).
Newmarket Canal, Holland River, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com. of Sup., 3114 (ii).
Newmarket Canal to Lake Wilcox, Construction, Surveys, &c. (Ans.) 5157 (iii).
See 'Holland,' &c.
Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 1045 (i); in Com., 5565 (iii), 5970 (iv).
Passengers Ticket Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. J. D. Reid) on M. for 2°, 552 (i).
Payne, J. Lambert, Duties, Salary, Hours of Work, &c. (Ans.) 1727 (i).

GRAHAM, Hon. Geo. P.—*Con.*
Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Contract Price, Extras, &c. (Ans.) 818 (i).
Port Bruce Harbour, Amount of Expenditure (Ans.) 818 (i).
Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 62 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 2531 (ii).
Prudential Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr.) Macdonell) in Com., 5485 (iii).
Quebec Bridge, Progress *re* Rebuilding. Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 165 (i).
—— Payments to Stockholders, &c. (Ans.) 163 (i).
—— Res. *re* Submarine Viaduct, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 2321 (ii).
Railway Act (fires) Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Clarke) on M. for 2°, 378 (i).
Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 106 (prop. res.) 2323; in Com. on Res., 2384 (ii); 2°m., 6186; in Com., 6200, 6293; on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to M. for 3°, 6312; on Senate Amts., 7068 (iv).
Railway Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 3°, 521 (i).
Ry. Act (telephones wires) Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Barr) on M. for 2°, 879 (i).
Railway Act (water powers, &c.) Amt. (B. 21) 1° m., 242; 2° m., 1117, in Com., 1118 (i).
Railway Aid in Alberta, Representations *re* (Ans.) 676 (i).
Railways in Alberta and Sask., Number of Miles in Operation (Ans.) 3049 (ii).
Railways and Canals (annual statement) on M. for Sup., 2675 (ii).
—— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1318 (i).
—— Deptl. Rep., on Inquiry for, 1250 (i).
—— Payments to Mr. J. A. Lussier, &c. (Ans.) 3990 (ii).
Ry. Capitalization of Stock, Regulations by Commission (remarks) 1187 (i).
Railway Commissioners, Pet. *re* Vacancy (Ans.) 529 (i).
Railway Commission Vacancy, Apptmt, of Practical Farmer, on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2665 (ii).
Railway Commissioners' Rep. (presented) 289 (i).
Railway Crossings, Width of Openings, &c. (remarks) 3568 (ii).
Ry. Employees Provident Act Amt. (B. 164) in Com., 6740 (iv).
Ry. Lands Expropriation, Complaints *re* (remarks) 4802 (iii).
Railway Level Crossings, Accident near Kingston (remarks) 252 (i).
Railway Level Crossings, Cor. with Ry. Commissioners (remarks) 291 (i).
—— Legislation *re* (remarks) 1978 (i).

GRAHAM, Hon. Geo. P.—*Con.*

Railway Level Crossings, Prevention of Accidents, on prop., Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1208 (i).

Railways in Saskatchewan, Number of Miles in Operation from 1896 to 1903 (Ans.) 3475 (ii).

Railway Subsidies Act Amt. (B. 174) 1° m., 5628 (iii); in Com., 6741 (iv).

Railways, Two-Cent Fares, Refunds by G. T. Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2917 (ii).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 3111 (ii).

St. Johns Wharf, P.Q., Contract *re* Wharf Extension (Ans.) 2768, 2770 (ii).

St. Pierre River Drainage, Flooding, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) 4234 (iii).

Soulanges Canal, Expenditure *re* Repairs, Suspension of Mr. A. Sauve (Ans.) 1494 (i).

——— Number of Employees, Names, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 869 (i).

Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. W. McIntyre) on M. for 2°, 778 (i).

Steel Cars, Introduction of by I. C. R. (Ans.) 481 (i).

Stellarton Station, I. C. R., Area *re* Concrete Walks, &c. (Ans.) 5631 (iii).

Stony Lake Property, Damages *re* Floods (Ans.) 825 (i).

Stony Lake Wharfs, Number, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1064 (i).

Sturgeon Falls and Sudbury Public Buildings, Purchase of Lands, &c. (Ans.) 817 (i).

Superior and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 78 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3983 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Beauharnois (water power) 1910 (i).

Canals—Carillon and Grenville (Carillon dam) 3421; (macadamizing road) 2029; (St. Anne's lock) 2029; (repairing dam) 2029 (ii).

Canals—Chambly (St. John harbour) 1571; (surveys) 1910 (i).

Canals—Cornwall (repairs) 2029; (washout repairs) 2029 (ii).

Canals—Galops (bridges) 2029 (ii); (collector) 1574 (i).

Canals—Generally (staff and repairs) 2071 (ii).

Canals—Lachine (basin No. 2) 1910 (i); (slope walls) 3420 (ii); (cement testing) 792; (wharfs and basins) 786, 1563 (i).

Canals—Miscellaneous (surveys) 2055 (ii).

Canals—Rideau (bridges) 2030; (improvements) 3420 (ii).

Canals—St. Lawrence (district office) 1572 (i).

Canals—Sault Ste Marie (construction) 1909; (dredging) 1909 (i).

Canals—Soulanges (fireproof building) 1569; (slope trimmings) 1569 (i).

Canals—Trent (construction) 1577 (i), 2074, 3177; (dredging) 2030 (ii); (Holland river) 1578, 1887 (i).

GRAHAM, Hon. Geo. P.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Canals—Welland (bridges) 2036 (ii); (electric plant) 1903 (i); (gate-lifter) 2036; (junction locks) 2036 (ii); (Port Colborne) 1903 (i); (Port Maitland) 2030; (repairs) 2034 (ii); (surveys) 1909; (widening) 1903 (i).

Civil Govt.—Railways (salaries) 462; Sec. of State (salaries) 460 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Wolfe Island) 3313 (ii).

Railways—G. T. P. (Brunet, A.) 2042; (inspection) 2048; (Quebec bridge) 2050 (ii).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 2960 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Aston track scale) 3415 (ii); (board of commissioners) 6986 (iv); (bridge strengthening) 2931; (Campbellton) 2951; (Chatham) 2946; (double tracking) 2753; (Drummondville) 2949; (Eastville) 2951 (ii); (extension) 6557 (iv); (facilities) 2947; (Gibson siding) 3418; (Halifax) 2935; (Loggieville) 2753; (machinery for shops) 2952; (Moncton cut-off) 2921; (Moncton shops) 2946; (original construction) 2925; (Point Tupper) 2951; (Rivière du Loup) 2949; (rolling stock) 2952; (Ste. Rosalie) 2948; (Sackville) 2934; (Sydney Mines) 2936; (Truro) 2754; (water supply) 2947; (Windsor) 3421; (working expenses) 3421 (ii), 6985 (iv).

Railways—Miscellaneous (arbitrations, &c.) 2054; (litigations, &c.) 2055; (Quebec bridge) 3421; (unforeseen items) 2054 (ii).

Railways—N.T.R. (surveys, &c.) 6985 (iv).

Railways—P.E.I. (Charlottetown) 2959; (Harmony—Elmira branch) 2952; (Montague) 3420; (Souris) 3418 (ii).

Railways—Ry. Commission (litigation) 2056; (maintenance) 2044 (ii).

Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 454 (i).

Telegraph and Telephone Tariffs, Regulations by Ry. Board, &c. (Ans.) 2764 (ii).

Telephone Companies, O.C. *re* Control by Ry. Commission (Ans.) 1072 (i).

Telephone Lines crossing Railways, Applications, Refusals, &c. (Ans.) 335 (i).

Telephones, Provincial, Control of by Ry. Commission (Ans.) 1419 (i).

Thessalon and Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. Smyth) in Com., 6063 (iv).

Toronto, Niagara and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 42 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 2065 (ii).

Transcontinental Ry. Commission Officials, Ret. (remarks) 2494 (ii).

——— Rep. (presented) 289 (i).

Transcontinental Ry., La Tuque Yard, Site (remarks) 6292 (iv).

Trent Canal, Damages through Peterborough County (remarks) 5777 (iii).

——— Land Damages, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 4641 (iii).

Waterways Extension to Georgian Bay, &c. (Ans.) 474 (i).

See 'Holland,' 'Supply—Canals.'

GRAHAM, Hon. Geo. P.—*Con.*

Wallberg, Mr., Claims *re* Moneys due him (Ans.) 3989 (ii).
Water Powers leased on Canals, &c., Records &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2038 (ii).
See 'Ry. B. 21,' 'Ont. & Mich.'
Welland Canal Employees, Number for Sept. and Oct. (Ans.) 470 (i).
——— Number of Employees, Total Salaries, Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 815 (i).
——— Total Cost, Tonnage, &c. (Ans.) 2155 (ii).
See 'Georgian.'
Western Canadian Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 37 (Mr. W. McIntyre) on M. for 2°, 779 (i)
Williams, Thos., I.C.R. at Moncton, Superannuation, &c. (Ans.) 331 (i).
Wire Fencing purchased during 1908, Tenders, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 245 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 1321 (i).
Vautelet, H. A., Emplymt. by Govt., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 1412 (i).

GUTHRIE, Mr. H., *South Wellington.*

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 766 (i).
Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5473 (iii); in Com., 6012 (iv).
Committee, Standing Orders, on M. to conc. in 1st Rep. of Com., 2120 (ii).
Govt. Tenders, Opening and Receiving Prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) (amt.) 199 (i); Amt. agreed to (Y. 118; N. 76) 580 (i).
Niagara-Welland Power Co.'s (B. 33) 1°*, 465 (i); in Com., 2571 (ii).
Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5960 (iv).
Private Bills, Payments of Fees, 14th Rep. of Com. (M.) 4986 (iii).
Railways and Canals, Tel., &c., 14th Rep. of Com. (M.) 4986 (iii).
Ridout, John Grant Relief (B. 121) 1°*, 3802. (ii).
S. A. Bounty Act, Regulations *re* (remarks) 2223 (ii).
Smith John Denison Relief (B. 157) 1°*, 4988 (iii).
Winnipeg Bank (B. 158) 1°*, 4988 (iii).
Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B 29 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 2132 (ii).

HAGGART, Mr. A., *Winnipeg.*

Canada National Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 76) in Com., 2578 (ii).
Cedar Rapids Mfg. & Power Co.'s B. 94 (Mr. Boyer) in Com., 3405 (ii).
Coal and Timber Lands owned or leased by Private Individuals, Corporations, Revenue collected, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1420 (i).

HAGGART, Mr. A.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Winnipeg Terminal Site, Negotiations *re* Purchase (Ques.) 1070 (i).
Great West Permanent Loan Co.'s incorp. (B. 40) 1°*, 626 (i); in Com., 2569 (ii).
Imperial Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 76) 1°*, 1479 (i).
Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6805 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt., Customs (Board of Customs) 584 (i).
Indians—Ont. (legal expenses) 994; Ont. and Que. (schools) 978 (i).
Indians—Sask. (farm implements) 1004 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 1548; (Winnipeg P. O.) 1550 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont (Burlington piers) 2967 (ii).

HAGGART, Hon. John, *South Lanark.*

Annuities Act, Number of Applicants, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 3477 (ii).
C.P.R. Additional Stock, Distribution of, on M. (Mr. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 424, 1326 (i).
——— Ref. to Court (remarks) 883 (i).
Civil Service Salaries, on M. for Com. on Res., 299; in Com. on Res., 409 (i).
Cobalt Lake Act, Disallowance of, on M. (Mr. Clarke) for Cor., 1748 (i).
External Affairs Dept., on prop. Res. (Mr. Murphy) 1999 (i).
Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4415 (iii).
Govt. Railways Act (compensation) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 775 (i).
Govt. Tenders, Opening and Receiving, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 200 (i).
G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 3579 (ii); on M. for 2°, 5141; in Com., 5256, 5495 (iii).
G.T.P. Lake Superior Branch Subsidy B. 30 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 1024 (i).
G.T.P., Original Quantities, &c. (remarks) 2772 (ii).
House of Commons Classification, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 6116 (iv).
Insurance Act B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 6693 (iv).
I.C.R. Branch Lines, Extension, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2196 (ii)
I.C.R. (reply) to Annual Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) 2709, 2720 (ii).
Mayes' Affidavit, Reading of Original, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4223 (iii).
Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 1036 (i).

HAGGART, Hon. John—*Con.*

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6323 (iv).

Ry. Act (electric power) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1118 (i).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 2330 (ii); in Com., 6216 (iv).

Railway Commission Vacancy, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2637 (ii).

Railway Level Crossings, Prevention of Accidents, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1229 (i).

St. Pierre River Drainage, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) 4235 (iii).

Supply, Conc., Reading of Items (remarks) 4048 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Chambly (St. Johns' harbour) 1571 (i).

Canals—Galops (bridges) 2029 (ii).

Canals—Lachine (cement) 794, 1567; (concrete wall) 1569; (wharfs and basin) 1565 (i).

Canals—St. Lawrence (district office) 1573 (i).

Canals—Soulanges (slope trimming) 1569 (i).

Canals—Trent (dredging) 2030 (ii).

Canals—Welland (Port Maitland) 2031; (repairs) 2034 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 644 (i).

Printing and Stationery (salaries) 805 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Partridge Island water service) 3208 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Belleville armoury) 1356 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additional wing) 1255; (Royal Mint) 1273 (i).

Public Works—Harbour and Rivers—Que. (Ste. Anne des Monts) 3287; (St. Michel, Yamaska) 3269 (ii).

Railways—G.T.P. (Brunet, A.) 2042; (inspection) 2048; (Quebec Bridge) 2050 (ii).

Railways—I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 2931; (Moncton cut-off) 2921 (ii).

Waterways Treaty, Despatch from Col. Sec. of State (remarks) on M. for Sup., 642 (i).

Waterways Commission Treaty, on M. (Mr. Magrath) to Com. of Sup., 6607 (iv).

Welland Canal, Lease to Cataract Power Co. &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2036 (ii).

HARRIS, Mr. Lloyd, *Brantford.*

Budget, The, 4653 (iii).

I.C.R., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 2750 (ii).

Patterson, Mildred Gwendolyn Relief (B. 143) 1°*, 4411 (iii).

HARTY, Mr. Wm., *Kingston.*

SUPPLY.

Canals—Generally (staff, &c.) 2072 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Wolfe Island canal) 3304 (ii)

HENDERSON, Mr. D., *Halton.*

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4454 (iii).

Budget, The, 4814 (iii).

Canada-France SS. Subsidy B. 148 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 4438 (iii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) on Order for Com., 3411 (ii).

——— on M. to dschg. Order (remarks) 4472 (iii).

——— on M. to place on Order Paper, 5093 (iii).

——— on M. for Com., (M.) to ref. back to Special Com., 5129, neg., 5444 (iii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 6006 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 3410 (ii).

Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. Dubeau) on Senate Amts., 4594 (iii).

Coal conserved for the Home Market, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 3109 (ii).

Experimental Farms, Locations, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1955 (i).

Fishery Regulations, Action of Ontario Govt. &c., on M. (Mr. Taylor) 6528 (iv).

Fisheries Regulations *re* International Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6977 (iv).

Franking Privilege *re* Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1655, 1696 (i).

French Treaty (remarks) 7071 (iv).

See 'Canada and France.'

Govt. Loans B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6711 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6183 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 2125 (ii).

Labour Department B. 165 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 6725 (iv).

Labour Hours for Working Men, on M. (Mr. Verville) to Com. of Sup., 5945 (iv).

Lake Ontario Fishing Industry, Regulations, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 381 (i).

Loans: *See* 'Government.'

London and Lancashire Plate Glass Co.'s Bill (remarks) 4445 (iii).

London and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 102 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3846 (ii).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3946 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 6076 (iv).

N.B. Central Ry. Commission's Report, on M. (Mr. Foster) to lay on Table, 5488 (iii).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5560 (iii).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Post Office Act (registered letters) Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 241; in Com., 746 (i).
Private Bills, Extension of Hour for considering, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5774 (iii).
Ry. Employees Provident Act Amt. B. 164 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6741 (iv).
Rural Free Mail Delivery, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 2798 (ii).
S. A. Bounty Act, Regulations *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2221 (ii).
Submarine Co.'s Patent Relief B. 77 (Mr. Proulx) in Com., 4542 (iii).
Superior and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 78 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3965 (ii).
Supply Bill, Amendments by Senate (remarks) 4120 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census, &c.) 699 (i); (live stock industry) 5849 (iii); (swine commission) 6985 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s (salaries) 383 (i).
Civil Govt.—Charges of Management, 399 (i).
Civil Govt.—Civil Service Commission (salaries) 387 (i).
Civil Govt.—Customs (Board of Customs) 581 (i).
Civil Govt.—Finance (salaries) 384 (i).
Civil Govt.—High Commissioner (contingencies) 386; (salaries) 385 (i).
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 381 (i).
Immigration (agents) 7025 (iv).
Indians—Ont. (legal expenses) 993 (i).
Legislation (members indemnity) 7066 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries (fisheries conference) 3694 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Bridgewater) 1286; (Glace Bay) 1288; (Shelburne) 1292 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 1369; (Whitby) 1518 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (furniture) 1605; (heating) 1601; (Major's Hill) 1601 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont (bridges, repairs) 2968; (Burlington piers) 2966 (ii).
Toronto, Niagara and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 42 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 2065 (ii).
Ventilation and Fire Escapes of New Wing (remarks) 6781 (iv).
Ways and Means (sugar) in Com., 5099 (iii).
Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4201 (iii).

HERRON, Mr. J., *Macleod.*

Alberta and Saskatchewan Annual Allowance, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 2588 (ii).
C. P. Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. McIntyre) in Com., 3161 (ii).
Canadian Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 11 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 986 (i).

HERRON, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Coal Royalty, Total Amount paid to March 31st, 1908 (Ques.) 2588 (ii).
Coal Strikes in the West, Settlement of (remarks) 5352 (iii).
Elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, Govt. Operation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 4035 (ii).
'Free Press,' Man., Payments to, Inquiry for Ret., 1978 (i).
Grazing Leases, Total Acres, Annual Rental, &c. (Ques.) 3703 (ii).
Homesteads, Volunteer Substitutes *re* Duties (Ques.) 1078 (i).
Hudson Bay and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 43) in Com., 2067 (ii).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6181 (iv).
Immigration Inspectors, Names, Addresses, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1406 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 2160 (ii).
Immigration of Undesirables into Canada, Payments *re* (Ques.) 1406 (i).
Land Grants to Early Settlers in Man., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6274 (iv).
Peigan Indian Agency, Surrender of Land (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).
Pincher Creek Post Office, Complaints *re* Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1711 (i).
Railway Commission, Vacancy, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer, on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2667 (ii).
S. A. Bounty Act, Regulations (remarks) 2224 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Excise (methylated spirits) 451 (i).
Interior (boundaries) 6266 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Lethbridge) 1551 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Victoria, immigration) 2084 (ii).
Public Works—Dom. (cattle quarantine stations) 1620 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Whitby) 1522 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alberta (Old Man River) 3336 (ii).
Timber Lands, Alberta, Revenue due and payable, &c. (Ques.) 3193 (ii).
Winnipeg 'Free Press,' Total Amounts paid by Govt., 1906-9 (M. for ret.*) 354 (i).

HODGINS, Mr. G. F., *Pontiac.*

Arnprior and Pontiac Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 87) 1°*, 1970 (i).
Cobalt Range Ry. Co.'s (B. 86) 1°*, 1813 (i).
SUPPLY—
Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 895 (i).

HUGHES, Mr. S., *Victoria and Haliburton.*
Aerial Navigation, Experiments by Canadians (remarks) 2383 (ii).
American Immigration Agents, Duties *re*, &c. (remarks) 2243 (ii).
American Silver, Exportation of (remarks) 6780 (iv).
Beet Root Sugar Refineries, Duty *re* Preferential Tariff (Ques.) 3047 (ii).
Canada-France SS. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 4442 (iii).
Canned Meats, Contract called for by G. B. (Ques.) 1238 (i).
Fenelon Falls Lockmaster, Payments to, Allowances, Duties (Ques.) 1067 (i).
France and Canada SS. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4442, 5223 (iii).
Govt. Employees, Interference at Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6874 (iv).
Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4418 (iii).
G. T. P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 3577 (ii); in Com., 5294 (iii); on prop. Res. (remarks) 4099 (iii).
——— on M. for 3° (remarks) 5522 (iii).
G. B. and Her Colonies: *See* 'Imperial Partnership.'
Homestead and Pre-emptions, in Man., &c., Number of Acres, &c. (Ques.) 1180 (i).
Hudson Bay Lands, Number of Acres homesteaded or pre-empted (M. for ret.*) 1421 (i).
Imperial Partnership of G.B. and her Colonies (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6417 (iv).
I.C.R. Branch Lines, Rep. of Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Emmerson) for Copy, 882
——— (remarks) *re* prop. Res., 2162 (ii).
Kingston Military Buildings, Excessive Expenditure (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2506 (ii).
Mayes Affidavit, Ques. of Order, 4262; on Ques. of Order, 4263 (iii).
——— on Reading Original (remarks) 4298 (iii).
——— Ques. of Order, 4326 (iii).
Militia Annual Training, Completion of Plans, &c. (Ques.) 682 (i).
Militia, Permanent Corps, &c., Winter Equipment, &c. (Ques.) 2376 (ii).
Mine Owners and Miners, Percentage of British Origin (remarks) 4121 (iii).
Miner, Bill, Escape from B.C. Penitentiary, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1845 (i).
Miniature Rifles, Targets, Supplies, &c., Extending to Colleges, &c. (Ques.) 681 (i).
Newmarket Canal, Holland River, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com. of Sup., 3143, 3172 (ii).
See 'Supply—Canals.'

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*
N.W.M. Police, Land Scrip, Refusal of Grants (Ques.) 1066 (i).
Oshawa Customs Collector, Name, &c., Acquisition by Govt. (Ques.) 2372 (ii).
——— incorrect answer (remarks) 2672 (ii).
——— Revenue, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 1972 (i).
Oshawa Harbour, Apptmt. of Officials by Govt., Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 3046 (ii).
Oshawa Harbour Purchase, Negotiations, &c. (Ques.) 1918 (i).
Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 4238 (iii).
Post Office Act (registered letters) Amt B. 19 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 743 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Conmee) *re* 'Special Trains,' on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 4292 (iii).
Ry. Act (electric power) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1118 (i).
Railways and Canals (remarks) on Annual Stmnt., 2683 (ii).
Ross Rifle, Use of at Bisley (remarks) 5644 (iii)
Royal Military College Water Supply, Defects, &c. (Ques.) 682 (i).
Rural Free Mail Delivery, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 2795 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Manufacture of Church Pews (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 901 (i).
Sanitary School of Technology, Govt. Aid *re* (remarks) 6061 (iv).
S.A. Bounty Act, Regulations *re* (remarks) 2226 (ii).
S.A. Veterans Land Grants, Conditions of Entry, &c. (Ques.) 1179 (i).
Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. W. McIntyre) on M. for 2°, 778 (i).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 727 (i).
Canals—Generally (staff, &c.) 2072 (ii).
Canals—Lachine (wharf and basins) 789 (i).
Canals—Trent (construction) 2074, 3177 (ii); (Holland River) 1902 (i).
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 1904 (i).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 651; Post Office (salaries) 722; Railways (salaries) 463 (i).
Civil Service Commission (salaries) 720 (i).
Immigration (agents) 7014; (G. B. agents) 7020; (St. Boniface hospital) 7034 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 6889 (iv).
Marine—Public Works (St. Lawrence ship canal) 6877 (iv).
Militia (salaries) 2293 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Banff roads and bridges) 1171; (Banff water works) 1172 (i).
Penitentiaries—Dorchester (supplies) 918; Generally (supplies) 897 (i).
Pensions (N.W. rebellion) 812; (Mrs. Wilmot) 884 (i).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Printing and Stationery (salaries) 806 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Chilliwack) 2091; (Prince Rupert quarantine) 2082; (Vancouver) 2082; (Victoria immigration) 2083 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 1596 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston Vet. hospital) 1534 (i); (Port Arthur) 2092 (ii); (R.M. College) 1533; (Whitby) 1526 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additional wing) 1269; (Major's Hill) 1603; (Royal Mint) 1271 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Quebec citadel) 3212 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (Dawson) 3225 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrews rapids) 2106 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 2511 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Cow Bay) 2471; (generally) 2118; (Middle River) 2478; (Sandy Cove) 2475; (South Lake, Lakevale) 2483; (Wallace bridge) 2484 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Tiffin) 2116; (Victoria) 2117 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Saguenay dredging) 2807 (ii).
Railways—G.T.P. (Quebec bridge) 2052; Miscellaneous (McGill school) 2071 (ii).

University Drill Corps, Establishment of, &c. (Ques.) 683 (i).

Ventilation and Fire Escapes of New H. of C. Wing (remarks) 6781 (iv).

Western Canadian Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 37 (Mr. W. McIntyre) on M. for 2°, 779 (i).

Whitby Harbour, Acquisition by Govt., Negotiations *re* (Ques.) 2372 (ii).

Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4160 (iii).

JAMESON, Mr. C., *Digby.*

Aids to Navigation on N.S. Coast, Applications *re* Personal Inspections, &c. (Ques.) 5640 (iii).

Budget, The, 4717 (iii).

Fairy Lake Indian Reserve, N.S., Conditions of Lease, Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 2816 (ii).

Fisheries Development, Apptmt. of Sel. Com., on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 486 (i).

Fisheries Officers at Port Joly, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 4697 (iii).

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6124 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6184 (iv).

Little River Wharf, Amount expended, Estimated Cost. (Ans.) 476 (i).

JAMESON, Mr. C.—*Con.*

Sandy Cove Breakwater, Amounts owing for Labour, &c., Names, &c. (Ques.) 1728 (i).

—— Payments to Contractors (Ques.) 1419 (i).

Sissiboo River Bridge, Construction, &c., on M. for Sup., 6834 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 728 (i).
Civil Govt.—High Commission (contingencies) 386 (i).
Fisheries (commissions) 6957; (customs licenses) 6958; (fish breeding establishments) 6946; (international commission) 6961; (oyster culture) 6949; (protection cruiser) 6947; (transportation) 6956 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction) 6909 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries (hospitals) 6946; (hydrographic surveys) 6916 (iv).
Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 3438 (ii).
Marine—Public Works—(piers on St. Lawrence) 6888 (iv).
Pensions (Fenian raid) 812 (i).
Post Office (ry. mail clerks) 3433 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Georgetown) 1293 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Joliette) 1300; (Montreal postal station) 1316; (Quebec) 1317 (i).
Public Works—Dredging (generally) 6534; (Mar. Provs.) 6553 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis Ice Piers) 2360; (Arisaig) 3233; (Baileys Brook) 3234; (Cheverie) 2456; (Church Point) 2457; (Clark's Harbour) 2462; (Digby) 2474; (Little River) 3234; (Minasville) 2479; (Sandy Cove) 2475, 3236; (South Lake, Lakevale) 3235; (Upper Prospect) 3235; (Yarmouth) 2484 (ii).
Railways—I. C. R. (extensions) 6557 (iv).

Westport Landing Pier (remarks) in Com of Sup., 2457 (ii).

—— Amount expended, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 475 (i).

Weymouth P. O., Change of Name, &c. (M for cor.*) 3055 (ii).

Weymouth River Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2360 (ii).

Wood and Wood Pulp, Negotiations *re* Tariff Increase (Ques.) 1241 (i).

Yarmouth Harbour Buoys, Displacement of (remarks) on M. to adjn., 1114 (i).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E., *Moosejaw.*

Deferred Elections, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burrell) 2867 (ii).

Joliette and Lake Manuan Ry. Co.'s B. 126 (Mr. Dubeau) in Com., 4836 (iii).

Kootenay and Alberta Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 133) 1°*, 4286 (iii).

Prairie Fires, Relief *re* (remarks) 6411 (iv).

S. A. Bounty Act, Regulations *re* (remarks) 2227 (ii).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock industry) 5873 (iii).

Western Canadian Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 37) 1c*, 465 (i); in Com., 2564 (ii).

KYTE, Mr. G. W., *Richmond, N.S.*

Fisheries Development, Apptmt. of Sel. Com. on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 497 (i).

I. C. R. Branch Lines, Extension, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2188 (ii).

Investigations in Deptl. Expenditures by Justice Cassels, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3746 (ii).

LACHANCE, Mr. A., *Quebec Centre.*

Desjardins, Capt., Emplymt. by Marine Dept., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4696 (iii).

Hoffman, Mr., Emplymt. by Marine Dept., &c. (Ques.) 4696 (iii).

Royal Guardians incorp. (B. 95) 1c*, 2120 (ii).

LAKE, Mr. R. S., *Qu'Appelle.*

Budget, The, 5079 (iii).

C. P. Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 3153 (ii).

Coal and Timber Lands, Approx. Area, Names of Owners, Amount of Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 1185 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 1978 (i).

Deferred Elections, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burrell) 2845 (ii).

Elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William, Govt. Operation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 4011 (ii).

Ewart, J. S., Emplymt. *re* Newfoundland Fisheries (Ques.) 5629 (iii).

Foley, T. P., Emplymt. in Interior Dept. (Ques.) 2320 (ii).

Govt. Employees, Interference at Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6867 (iv).

Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 224 (i).

G. T. P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5330 (iii).

Humboldt Election Officials, Payments to (Ques.) 1731 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6171 (iv).

Land Grants to Early Settlers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6276 (iv).

Qu'Appelle Electoral District, Voters' Lists, &c. (M. for copies*) 1191 (i).

Railway Commission, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer, on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2659 (ii).

——— Ques. of Order, 2663 (ii).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*

Railways, Number of Miles in Operation in Saskatchewan from 1896 to 1908 (Ques.) 3475 (ii).

S. A. Veteran Land Grants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6273 (iv).

Strachan, A. A., Land Patent, Homestead Duties, Cor. (M. for copy*) 3992 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 5952 (iv); (live stock industry) 5834 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 6247 (iv).

Dom. Lands (surveys, plans, &c.) 6273 (iv).

Indians—Generally (grist and saw mills) 1016; (inspectors) 1167; Man., &c. (live stock) 1005; Sask. (farm implements) 1002 (i).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 6994 (iv).

Northwest Mounted Police (force) 1660 (ii).

Post Office (letter carriers) 1698 (i).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 2960 (ii).

LALOR, Mr. F. R., *Haldimand.*

American Immigration Agents, Duties to Canadians on Border (remarks) 2242 (ii).

Civil Service Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6325 (iv).

Civil Service Salaries on M. (Mr. Fisher) for Com. on Res., 298 (i).

Fruit Marks Act, Regulations *re* Inspection, on M. (Mr. Burrell) to Com. of Sup., 3390 (ii).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5252 (iii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6797 (iv).

Nails, Quantity imported, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 2156 (ii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5231 (iii).

Newmarket Canal, Holland River, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com. of Sup., 3141 (ii).

Piers, &c., constructed by Day Labour, Procedure by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2519 (ii).

Railway Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6210 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock industry) 5880 (iii).

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 1905 (i); (Port Maitland) 2032 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Customs (contingencies) 593 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Whitby) 1520 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton cut-off) 2924 (ii).

Timber Limit Regulations, Suspension, &c. (Ques.) 342 (i).

Welland Canal, Number of Employees, Total Salaries, Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 815

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln and Niagara.*

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) on M. for (Mr. Henderson) to ref. back to Special Com., 5437; on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5447; in Com., 5481 (iii), 6039 (iv).
Canadian Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 1869
Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. 91 (Mr. Geoffrion) on Senate Amts., 5486 (iii).
Cobalt Lake Act, Disallowance of, on M. (Mr. Clarke) for Cor., 1758 (i).
Criminal Code (flogging) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com. (amt.) 568 (i).
Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 151 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 4695 (iii).
Extradition Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5236 (iii).
G.T.P., B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 5185; in Com., 5272 (iii).
House of Commons Classification, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 6099 (iv).
Immigration Bonuses to Societies, Names, Amounts (Ques.) 1406 (i).
International Waterways Commission, on M for Sup., 6630 (iv).
Level Ry. Crossings: *See* 'Ry. Bills.'
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3951 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 6078 (iv).
Mayes-McAvity, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4277 (iii).
Miner, Bill, Escape from B.C. Penitentiary, on M. (J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1877 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 154 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6575 (iv).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5228 (iii).
Niagara Ice Jam, Action of Govt. *re* Assistance (remarks) 4703 (iii).
N.B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Report, on Amt. (Mr. Crothers) 5689 (iii).
Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 1049 (i); in Com., 5304, 5369 (iii), 5967 (iv).
Passengers Ticket Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Reid) on M. for 2°, 554 (i).
Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 4249 (iii).
Preston, Mr. W. T. R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6657 (iv).
Prudential Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 5484 (iii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 6195; in Com., 6293; on M. for 3° (amt.) 6302; Neg. (Y. 70; N. 100) 6310 (iv).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*

Railway Act (fires) Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 376 (i).
Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for 1°, 92 (i).
Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. (B. 6) 1° m., 93; 2 °m., 374; 3 °m., 521 (i).
Railway Act (water-powers) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 242 (i).
Railway Level Crossings, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1218 (i).
Salisbury and Harvey Railroad Co.'s incorp. B. 35 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1363 (i).
Salvation Army Council B. 142 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6069 (iv).
Senate, Abolition of (prop. res.) 1421 (i).
Smith, John Denison, Relief B. 157 (Mr. A K. Maclean) in Com., 6072 (iv).
Superior and Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 78 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3985 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Beauharnois (water-power) 1912 (i); Generally (staff, &c.) 2073 (ii).
Civil Govt.—Mines (salaries) 3677 (ii).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 7001 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries (fisheries conference) 3688 (ii).
Militia (R.M.C. commandant) 6660; (supplies) 6668 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (patrol boats) 6682 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston. R.M.C.) 1507 (i).
Railways—G.T.P. (Quebec Bridge) 2051 (ii).
Railway—Miscellaneous (arbitration) 2054; (McGill school) 2071 (ii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (litigation) 2056, 2070; (maintenance) 2046 (ii).
Thessalon and Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. Smyth) in Com., 6064 (iv).
Weights and Measures, Discussion *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3685 (ii).
Welland Canal Employees, Number in Sept. and Oct., &c. (Ques.) 470 (i).
Yukon Act (judges) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5236 (iii).

LANCTOT, Mr. A,, *Richelieu.*

Investigation into Deptl. Expenditures by Judge Cassels, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3896 (ii).

LAPOINTE, Mr. E., *Kamouraska.*

Experimental Farming Stations, Establishment of (Ques.) 823 (i).
Experimental Farms, Location in Eastern Quebec, &c. (prop. res.) 1925 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G., (Prime Minister), *Quebec East.*

Address, The (M.) 12 (i).
Address, The, 33 (i).
—— (M.) to present, 139 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
All-Red Line, Negotiations *re* (Ans.) 148 (i).
——— on Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7070 (iv).
American Immigration Agents, Duties *re* Travellers (remarks) 2243 (ii).
Ash Wednesday Adjournment (M.) 1320 (i).
Asiatic Exclusion from B.C., Telegram from Mr. Borden (read) in deb. on Address, 39 (i).
See 'Japanese,' 'Privilege.'
Bank of Montreal, Commissions *re* Debts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 399-400 (i).
Brazilian Electro Steel and Smelting Co.'s B. 10 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 1024 (i).
B.C. Increased Subsidy, Ref. to in debate on Address, 41 (i).
Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 3023 (ii), 5480 (iii), 5995, 6025 (iv).
——— on M. to place on Order Paper, 5094 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5446 (iii).
Canned Meats, Contracts called for by G.B. (Ans.) 1238 (i).
Carleton and Comox-Atlin, Issue of Writ (remarks) 327, 401 (i).
Carter, Edward S., Emplymt. as Sessional Clerk (Ans.) 5095 (iii).
Cassels, Judge, Rep. *re* Marine Investigation, Discussion (remarks) 2219, 3003, 3249 (ii).
See 'Marine,' 'Investigations,' &c.
Central Ry. of N.B., Rep. of Commission *re* (remarks) 4125 (iii).
See 'N.B. Central.'
Cigarettes Legislation, &c. (Ans.) 246 (i).
Civil Service Act, Delay, &c. (remarks) 5895 (iv).
Civil Service Classification, Papers laid on Table, 325 (i).
* *See* 'House of Commons.'
Civil Service Commissioners, on Inquiry for Rep., 874, 1023 (i), 2241, 3111 (ii), 4047 (iii).
Civil Service Salaries Increase B. 187 (Mr. Fisher) Salaries on M. for Com. on Res., 307; in Com. on Res., 1138 (i); on M. for 2°, 6838 (iv).
Coast Line and Seaports Protection, on Notice of prop. Res. (remarks) 549 (i).
See 'Imperial Defence,' &c.
Committees, Sel. Standing (M.) to prepare List, 12 (i).
——— Rep. (presented) 325 (i).
——— (M.) to add Name, 664 (i).
Committees, Standing, Prop. Res. (Mr. Brodeur) Remarks, 1320 (i).
——— Change of Names (M.) 2217 (ii).
Comox-Atlin and Carleton By-elections, Discrepancy in Answers (remarks) 826, 874

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Comox-Atlin, &c., Writs of Election (remarks) 327, 401 (i).
Conservation of our Resources: *See* 'Natural.'
Criminal Code (flogging) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for 2°, 562 (i).
Daylight Saving Bill, on M. to place on Govt. Orders, 3203 (ii).
——— on M. (Lewis) to ref. to special Com., 3468 (ii).
Debt of Canada, Jan. 31st, 1909, Increase from 1908 (Ans.) 1079 (i).
Deptl. Payments *re* Marine Supplies (remarks) 2322 (ii).
Disallowance of Ont. Act, O.C. re (remarks) 4883 (iii).
Easter Adjournment (M.) 3705 (ii).
External Affairs Dept., on prop. Res. (Mr. Murphy) 1980 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Legislation *re* Bounty (Ans.) 3478 (ii).
Fishing Bounty Claims, Delay in sending Forms (remarks) 1187 (i).
Fisheries Convention with U.S., Reference to Hague Tribunal (remarks) 1395 (i).
Fisheries Jurisdictions and Provinces, Negotiations *re* (remarks) 2018 (ii).
Florence Mining Co.'s Appeal *re* Ontario Govt. Legislation, on Ques. of Order, 6921 (iv).
Forest, Waterways, &c., on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 6919 (iv).
France and Canada Ocean SS. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) prop. Res., 2017 (ii); in Com., 5223 (iii).
Franco-Canadian Treaty, Announcement *re* Signing (remarks) 140 (i).
——— Approval of Convention by France (Ans.) 149, 166 (i).
French Language on Govt. Works, Govtl. Intention *re* (Ans.) 249 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal, Pet. *re* Expenditure (remarks) 6415 (iv).
Govt. Business, on M. to take in Mondays (Remarks) 3938 (ii), 4041 (iii).
——— (M.) to take in Wednesdays, 2017 (ii).
——— Saturday Sittings (M.) 5644 (iii).
See 'Morning,' &c.
Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4419 (iii).
G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5310; on M. for 3°, 5513 (iii).
G.T.P., Alleged Over-classification, Action taken by Govt. (Ans.) 178 (i).
——— Statmnt. of Mr. Wainwright *re* Inception (Ans.) 1561 (i).
G.T.R., Hotel Site, Negotiations *re* (remarks) 13 (i), 6412 (iv).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Grey, Earl, Extension of Time as Governor General (announcement) 5351 (iii).
Hecate Strait Status, Cor. with U.S. Govt. (remarks) 4882, 4990 (iii).
Hog Tariff from U.S. to Canada, Increase of (Ans.) 821 (i).
Homestead Pre-emptions, &c. (remarks) 1181 (i).
House of Commons Classification (M.) to conc., 6093 (iv).
See 'Civil Service,' &c.
Imperial Conference, Cor. laid on Table, 7069 (iv).
Imperial Defence, Action of Govt. *re* (remarks) 6942 (iv).
Imperial Defence, on M. for 3° of Supply Bill, 7082 (iv).
See 'Naval.'
Imperial Partnership with G. B. and Her Colonies, on Amt. (Mr. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 6446 (iv).
Industrial Disputes Act, Discussion *re* (remarks) 4641 (iii).
Insurance Act Amt. (remarks) 1022 (i).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 160 (i).
International Fisheries Commission, Names of Commissioners (Ans.) 1073 (i).
International Waterways Treaty with U.S., Change in Draft Treaty *re* Intersection of Islands (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1493 (i).
—— (explanation) 1562 (i).
—— Acceptance of U. S. Senate Amts. (remarks) 4472 (iii).
—— Conditional Ratification (remarks) 2336 (ii).
—— Date of Signing, Date of Receipt, &c. (Ans.) 1074 (i).
—— Delay in placing before Can. Parlt. (remarks) 175 (i).
—— Despatch from Colonial Sec. Earl of Crewe (read) 550 (ii).
—— Despatch from Colonial Sec. of State (remarks) on M. for Sup., 639 (i).
—— Discussion by Mr. Gibbons (remarks) 1563 (i).
—— Presentation of (remarks) 2494 (ii).
—— Publication of Newspapers (remarks) 1188 (i).
—— Ratification of by U. S., on M. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 1355 (i).
International Waterways Commission, on M. (Mr. Lancaster) to Com. of Sup., 6637 (iv).
—— N. B. Fisheries, Regulations *re* (remarks) 1245 (i).
—— Treaty, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7, 159, 292, 402 (i), 2019 (ii).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3848 (ii).
—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 3849 (ii).
See 'Cassels.'
Japanese Treaty with G. B., Date of Effect, Termination, &c. (Ans.) 2152 (ii).
King, Mr. Mackenzie, Total Amount paid *re* Visit to China (Ans.) 6407 (iv).
Labour Dept. (B. 165) in Com. on Res., 5350 (amt.) 5350 (iii); 2° m., 6712; in Com., 6717 (iv).
Labour Dept., Appmt. of a Minister (Ans.) 186 (i).
Lindsay Block, Negotiations *re* Purchase, &c. (Ans.) 681 (i).
Loans of Dec. 1907 and Oct. 1908, Information *re* (Ans.) 1075 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Mexico) conc., 7074 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Memorial (remarks) 2239 (ii).
—— Legislation *re* (Ans.) 530 (i), 3480 (ii).
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3962 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 6073 (iv).
Marconi Stations, Construction, Maintenance, &c., Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 177 (i).
Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Purchases of, Names of Individuals (Ans.) 3044 (ii).
See 'Deptl.' &c.
Marine Investigation, Prosecutions *re* (Ans.) 153 (i).
—— Total Expenditure (Ans.) 167 (i).
—— on Inquiry for Rep., 7 (i).
See 'Cassels.'
Mayes Affidavits, Reading of Original, on Ques. of Order to Amt. (Mr. Daniel) 4262 (iii).
—— on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4386 (iii).
—— Dredging Contract, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Emmerson) 277 (i).
Miner, Bill, Escape from B. C. Penitentiary, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1848 (i).
Minister of Inland Revenue, Information *re* (remarks) 14 (i).
'Montcalm,' Str., Total Cost of Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 168 (i).
Morning Sittings (M.) 5159 (iii).
See 'Govt. Business.'
Natural Resources of Can., Conservation of, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Sel. Com., 371 (i).
—— on Order for rsmnd. debate (remarks) 688 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Natural Resources of Canada, Special Com. (M.) 1556 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 6367 (iv).
Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 3504; (amt.) 3512; Amt. to Amt., 3564 (ii).
——— Interpretation of Res. in Hse. (Ans.) 4289 (iii).
See 'Imperial,' &c.
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. Brodeur) on Amt. (Mr. Conmee) to M. for 3°, 6129 (iv).
N. B. Central Ry. Commission's Report, on M. (Mr. Foster) to lay on Table, 5488 (iii).
——— (objections) 5624 (iii).
N. B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Report, and Hon. Mr. Pugsley, on Amt. (Mr. Crothers) to Com. of Sup., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 5646 (iii).
——— Rep., Printing, &c. (Ans.) 4236 (iii).
——— Statement *re* (remarks) 4296 (iii).
Newmarket Canal, Holland River, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com. of Sup., 3169 (ii).
N. W. Mounted Police Barracks, Transfer of Grounds to Ry. Corporation, &c. (Ans.) 819 (i).
N. W. M. P. Land Scrip, Refusal of Grants, &c. (Ans.) 1066 (i).
N. W. Rebellion, 1885, Grants to N. W. M. P., &c. (Ans.) 184 (i).
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°* *pro forma*, 9 (i).
Old Age Annuities Act, Number of Employees, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 142 (i).
Ontario and Manitoba Boundaries, Decision *re* (Ans.) 1075 (i).
Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 1042 (i); in Com., 4535, 5304, 5364, 5567, 5964 (iii); on M. for 3°, 6003 (iv).
Oriental Immigration into B. C., Inaccuracy of Answer (remarks) 1249 (i).
——— Res. of Provl. Govt. *re* Royal Commission, Corrected Answer, 1976 (i).
See 'Asiatic.'
Penitentiaries and Prison Labour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 903 (i).
Post Office Savings Banks Deposits, Rates of Interest (Ans.) 1067 (i).
Potatoes sold in Bags, Statute *re* Measurements (Ans.) 352 (i).
Preston, W. T. R., Complaints from Japan *re* Work, &c. (Ans.) 187, 480 (i).
——— Transfer to Holland (remarks) 5999 (iv)
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6656 (iv).
Private Bills, Amendments to Rules of House (M.) to conc., 6120 (iv).
——— Apptmt. of Special Com. *re* Revising of Rules (M.) 5351 (iii).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Private Bills, Extension of Hour, &c. (M.) 5774 (iii).
——— Payment of Fees, on M. (Mr. Guthrie) 4987 (iii).
Private Bills, Refund of Fees, on M. (Mr. Ethier) to conc. in 8th Rep., 5889, 5997 (iv).
Privilege, Ques. of, Asiatic Exclusion, Tel. of Mr. R. L. Borden, 664 (i).
Provincial Rights: *See* 'Ont. & Mich. B. 34.'
Prudential Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 5485 (iii).
Public Accounts Com., Delay in Organizing (remarks) 663 (i).
——— Meetings, &c. (remarks) 1189 (i).
Public Works, Hours of Labour B. 35 (Mr. Verville) on M. to dschg. from Order Paper, 4990 (iii).
Pugsley, Mr., and Mayes Affidavit: *See* 'N. B. Central.'
Pulp and Paper Duties, Negotiations with U. S. (remarks) 2384 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Report, French Translation, &c. (Ans.) 1722 (i).
Ry. Act (commissioners, &c.) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6296; on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 6307 (iv).
Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 374; on M. for 3°, 527 (i).
Royal Guardians incorp. B. 95 (Mr. Rivet) on M. to consider, 7072 (iv).
Salvation Army Council B. 142 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6069 (iv).
Sanitary School of Technology, Govt. Aid to (remarks) 6061 (iv).
'Scotia,' SS., Subsidy Terms, &c. (Ans.) 4895 (iii).
Sec. of State, Date of Resignation, Apptmt. of Successor (Ans.) 185 (i).
Speaker, Election of (M.) 2 (i).
Speaker, Dept., Apptmt. of (M.) 140 (i).
Specie Reserve, Date of last Inspection (Ans.) 869 (i).
Speech from Throne: *See* 'Address.'
Strathcona, Lord, Gift to Dom. *re* Training of School Children (M.) of Thanks (remarks) 3200 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Charges of Management, 399 (i).
Civil Govt.—Aud. General (salaries) 383; Civil Service Commission (salaries) 387; Finance (salaries) 384; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (salaries) 398; High Commissioner (contingencies) 386; High Commissioner (salaries) 385; Privy Council (salaries) 398; Railways (consulting engineer) 386; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 385 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and G.B.) 6650; (Canada and Mexico) 6650; (Canada and Nfld.) 6651; (Canada and New Zealand) 6651; (Canada and

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

S. Africa) 6651; (contingent fund) 6655; (Gaspe) 6651; (Halifax and Canso) 6651; (Halifax and Nfld.) 6651; (Halifax and Spry Bay) 6652; (Magdalen Islands) 6652; (P.E.I. and C.B. and Nfld.) 6652; (Prince Rupert, B.C. and Jedway) 6652; (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 6653; (St. John, Halifax and Yarmouth) 6654; (St. John and Minas Basin) 6654; (Victoria, &c., and Skagway) 6655 (iv).

N.W.M.P. (compensations) 3665; (maintenance of force) 3656 (ii).

Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 891 (i).

Pensions (Mrs. Wilmot) 883 (i).

Trade and Commerce (annuities administration) 6660; (Chinese administration) 6655; (commercial agencies) 6656 (iv).

Telegram *re* Exclusion of Asiatics from B.C. (read) in debate on Address, 39 (i).

Telephone Rates in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr Lennox) 1811 (i).

Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 3001 (ii).

——— Part II., Rep. (presented) 3936 (ii).

Trade Commissioner at Shanghai, Vacancy. Apptmt. (Ans.) 2320 (ii).

Tuck, ex-Chief Justice, Rep. *re* Offer of a Knighthood (Ans.) 154 (i).

Veterans of 1866, Land Grants to (Ans.) 668 (i).

Water Carriage of Goods (remarks) *re* placing on Govt. Orders, 6186 (iv).

Wood and Wood Pulp, Negotiations *re* Tariff Increase (Ans.) 1241 (i).

Yukon Ordinances (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7076 (iv).

——— (beer tax) on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 5894 (iv).

LAVERGNE, Mr. L., *Drummond and Arthabaska.*

Quebec and Oriental Ry. Co.'s (B. 138) 1°*, 4286 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Batiscan) 3274 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R. (Postmaster General) *Gaspe.*

Address, The, 80 (i).

Agricultural Industry, Number of Farmers, &c. (Ans.) 151 (i).

Alien Labour Act, Proposed Amts. (Ans.) 167 (i).

Black Lake Postmaster, Complaints, Investigation, &c. (Ans.) 4896 (iii).

Brighton and Campbellford Mail Route, Increase in Contract Price (remarks) 3355 (ii).

Brophy's Post Office, Name of Postmaster, Changes *re* (Ans.) 1186 (i).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—Con.

Burks Falls and Trout Lake Mail Routes, Contractors, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3196 (ii).

Canadian Economic Lubricant Co., Payments to (Ans.) 188 (i).

Cariboo Mail Service, Payments *re* (Ans.) 1731 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3426 (ii).

Carson, Mr. Geo., Emplymt. by P. O. Dept., Absences, &c. (Ans.) 4697 (iii).

Cassell's Report: *See* 'Investigations.'

Central Park, B.C., Mail Delivery, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 2590 (ii).

Chilliwack Post Office Site, Plans, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 1414 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 137) 1°*, 4253 (iii); in Com., 6324 (iv).

See 'Post Office,' &c.

Civil Service Salaries, in Com. on Res., 963 (i).

Coal Strikes in the West, Settlement of (remarks) 4120, 5352 (iii).

Co-operative Societies, on M. for Sup. (remarks) 2331 (ii).

Dartmouth Post Office, Insufficient Accommodation (remarks) 3256 (ii).

Deferred Elections, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burrell) 2843 (ii).

Dorland and U. E. Loyalists Mail Route, Carrier, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 334 (i).

Envelopes, Complaints *re* Mutilation of through Mails (Ans.) 349 (i).

Etobicoke Postmaster, Apptmt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 671 (i).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 151 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6754 (iv).

Experimental Farms and Agricultural Stations, Establishment of since Jan., 1908 (Ans.) 157 (i).

———Locations, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1969 (i).

'Falcon' and 'Fearless' Strs., Purchase and Capacity, &c. (Ans.) 187 (i).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1653 (i).

Franking Privilege *re* Campaign Literature, Names of Ministers (Ans.) 2585 (ii).

Free Mail Delivery in Cities, Names, Stage Routes, &c. (Ans.) 2585 (ii).

Gaspé-Perce Mail Contract, &c. (Ans.) 2596 (ii).

Glace Bay Mails, Contract *re* Collection (Ans.) 5775 (iii).

Glace Bay Post Office Inspector, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 5636 (iii).

Govt. Employees, Interference with Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6872 (iv).

Gowganda Postal Facilities (remarks) 1395, 1704 (i).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

G.T.P., Siberian Labourers (Ans.) 4898 (iii).
——— Answer to former Question (remarks) 4989 (iii).
Greenfield, P.E.I., Post Office, Removal of, &c., (Ans.) 5776 (iii).
Immigration to U.S., Repatriation, &c., on M. (Mr. Pauqte) for Cor., 837 (i).
Imperial Partnership with G.B. and Her Colonies, on Amt. (Mr. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).
Industrial Disputes Act, Statistics *re* Number of Strikes (Ans.) 155 (i).
Insurance Act Amt. Bill, Progress in Senate (remarks) 7069 (iv).
I.C.R. Employees Strikes Dispute, Rep. of Commission (remarks) 290 (i).
Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3917 (ii).
King, Mr. Mackenzie: *See* 'Supply—Labour,' &c.
Labour Department B. 165 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 6726 (iv).
Labour Hours for Working Men, 8-hour day, &c., on M. (Mr. Verville) to Com. of Sup., 5938 (iv).
'Lady Evelyn' Str., Purchase Price, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 144 (i).
Letter Carriers in Cities, Appmts. (Ans.) 5158 (iii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Lévis Postmastership, Apptmt. of Successor to Mr. A. Lafrancois (Ans.) 4636 (iii).
Londonderry, &c., Mail Contracts, Name, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 825 (i).
Lorne Valley, P.E.I., Tenders *re* Mail Contract (Ans.) 5776 (iii).
Mackey's Station Post Office, Complaints *re* Management (Ans.) 545 (i).
Macleod Post Office, Complaints *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1711 (i).
McKenzie, Mr. D., Resignation as Postmaster of Three Brooks, Apptmt. of a Successor (Ans.) 4640 (iii).
Mail Boxes purchased and entered free of Duty, &c. (Ans.) 548 (i).
Mail Service in Hyde Park Post Office, in Middlesex country, &c. (Ans.) 3251 (ii).
Mail and Stage Routes, Number of Miles, &c (Ans.) 481, 814 (i).
Malagash, N.S., Mail Contract, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 5639 (iii).
Manufacturing Industries, Number of Employees (Ans.) 152 (i).
Meat and Canned Foods Act, Applications *re* Exemptions, Instructions, &c. (Ans.) 156 (i)

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

New York Lubricant Co., Payments to (Ans.) 188 (i).
North Bay Post Office Inspector, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 1558 (i).
N.S. Mail Services, Number, &c. (Ans.) 1731 (i).
Owen Sound Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i).
Piers, Wharfs, Construction by Day Labour, Procedure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2515 (ii).
Pictou to Magdalen Island Mail Contract. Tenders *re* (Ans.) 3047 (ii).
Political Partizanship: *See* 'Govt. Employees.'
Postmaster General's Rep. (presented) 12 (i).
Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. (B. 136) prop. Res., 3802 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4236 (iii); in Com., 6313 (iv).
See 'Civil Service.'
Post Office Act (registered letters) Amt. (B. 19) 1° m., 241; in Com., 738 (i).
Post Office Apptmts., Incorrect Returns (remarks) 1023 (i).
Post Office Deposits and Interest Credits in Pass Books (Ans.) 4896 (iii).
Post Offices and Dom. Govt. Savings Banks, Distinction *re* (Ans.) 4897 (iii).
Post Office Orders and Postal Notes, Total Number issued payable in G.B. (Ans.) 1242 (i).
Post Office Payments to Mail Carriers, &c. *re* Newmarket and Aurora (Ans.) 1560 (i).
Post Offices in Peel County, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3046 (ii).
Post Office Revenues at Kingston, Brantford, Sherbrooke and Quebec, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 5633 (iii).
Queens and Sunbury, Mail Service established in Oct. 1908 (Ans.) 2375 (ii).
Railway Mail Cars, Unsuitability, &c. (Ans.) 3653 (ii).
Ry. Mail Clerks, Furois, Dorais and Wathen, Date of Examination, &c. (Ans.) 3253 (ii).
Railway Mail Clerks, Increase of Salaries (Ans.) 4223 (iii).
——— Number killed or injured, &c. (Ans.) 3476 (ii).
Railway Mail Service Increases, &c. (Ans.) 336 (i).
Roblin and Forest Mills Mail Route, Carrier, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 334 (i).
Rural Mail Boxes, Number delivered in Dufferin County (Ans.) 341 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 2784 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Rural Mail Delivery, Establishment of in Grey County (Ans.) 672 (i).

——— in East Northumberland, &c. (Ans.) 3480 (ii).

——— Location of Routes, Non Delivery, &c. (Ans.) 347 (i).

——— Number of Routes, &c. (Ans.) 6409 (iv).

——— in Prince Edward County, Contract *re* (Ans.) 1077 (i).

——— Purchase of Boxes, Duty, &c. (Ans.) 179 (i).

——— System, &c. (Ans.) 148 (i).

——— Total Expenditure on Routes (Ans.) 677 (i).)

See 'Supply.'

St. John Postmaster, Superannuation, Appointment of Successor, &c. (Ans.) 871 (i).

St. Justine Station Mail Delivery, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 3480 (ii).

Ste. Philomène Mail Contract, Yearly Cost &c. (Ans.) 2770 (ii).

St. Polycarpe Post Office, Complaints *re* Officials, Change of Site, &c. (Ans.) 4894 (iii).

Sillsville and The Pines Mail Route, Carrier, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 333 (i).

Souris Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. J. Dolmage, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 1916 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6851 (iv).

See 'Govt. Employees.'

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 652; (salaries) 651; Post Office (contingencies) 725; (salaries) 613, 720 (i).

Labour Dept. (industrial disputes) 655 (i); (printing, &c.) 3433; Miscellaneous (opium conference) 3433 (ii).

Post Office (country postmasters) 1700; (inspectors' salaries) 1649 (i), 3431 (ii); (letter carriers) 1697; (mail carriers) 1653; (miscellaneous) 1716 (i); (miscellaneous stamps) 3432 (ii); (rural delivery) 1714 (i), 3423 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Doucet's Landing) 2544; (Douglastown) 2547; (Father Point) 2548; (Gaspé) 2550; (Rimouski) 2558 (ii).

Sydney Free Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1708 (i).

Thedford, Arkona and Fort Frank Rural Mail Delivery, Delays, &c. (Ans.) 477 (i).

Tercentenary Postage Stamps, Total Amount *re* Sale (Ans.) 3654 (ii).

Winnipeg P.O. and Ry. Station Mail Contract, Tenders, Changes, &c. (Ans.) 870 (i).

LENNOX, Mr. H., *South Simcoe.*

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) 4452 (iii).

Agricultural Industry, Number of Farmers, &c. (Ques.) 151 (i).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Alien Labour Act, Proposed Amts. (Ques.) 166 (i).

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 760 (i).

Associated Press Despatches, Amount contributed, Supervision, &c. (Ques.) 331 (i).

Aylen, Mr. J., Emplymt. by Transcontinental Ry. (Ques.) 5096 (iii).

Bills of Lading Bill, Disussion re (remarks) 6918 (iv).

Bonaventure Public Works, Amount expended prior to 1900, &c. (M. for ret.*) 173, 353 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 1320 (i), 2218, 3004 (ii).

Canada-France SS. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 4437 (iii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3004 (ii), 5480 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. Henderson)* to ref. back to Special Com., 5437; (amt.) 5444; neg. (Y. 52; N. 103) 5478 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order, 5460 (iii).

Canadian, Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 1719, 1868 (i), 2062 (ii).

Civil Service Salaries, on M. for Com. on Res., 300 (i).

See 'House of Commons.'

Criminal Code Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6393, 6756 (iv).

Disraeli Wharf, Number of Vessels calling, &c. (Ques.) 2761, 2816 (ii).

Dredging Contract of McAvity and Mayes, Recovery of Amounts, &c. (Ques.) 166 (i).

See 'Mayes.'

Dry Docks, Construction under Subsidies Act, Negotiations *re* (Ques.) 478 (i).

——— Annual Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 246 (i).

Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co.'s Bill (remarks) on M. for Com. on Private Bills, 1362 (i).

Equity Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp B. 161 Aylesworth) in Com., 6626 (iv).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 151 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6749 (iv).

External Affairs Dept. B. 90 (Mr. Murphy) in Com., 4470 (iii).

Extradition Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5239 (iii).

Falconer, Mr. K., Total Payments to *re* Marine Bookkeeping, &c. (Ques.) 1729 (i).

Florence Mining Co.'s Appeal *re* Ontario Govt. Legislation (M.) to Com. of Sup., 6920 (iv).

Franklin Montgomery Gray Patent Relief B. 132 (Mr. Rankin) in Com., 4883, 5028 (iii).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4427 (iii).

Govt. Loans B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 6710 (iv).

Govt. Railways Act (compensation) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 774 (i).

G. T. P. Ry., Alleged Over-classification, Action by Govt. *re* (Ques.) 178 (i).

——— Disputes with N. T. R. *re* Classification, &c. (Ques.) 2321 (ii).

G. T. P., Lake Superior Branch Lines Subsidy B. 30 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 666 1025; in Com., 1365 (i).

G. T. P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 5118; in Com., 5192, 5291, 5317 (iii).

——— on M. for 3° (remarks) 5527 (iii).

G. T. P. Ry. Co., and National Transcontinental Ry., Classification, &c. (M. for cor.*) 3055 (ii).

——— Reference *re* (Ques.) 4899 (iii).

G. T. P., Eastern Div., Itemized Schedules of Engineer's Estimates (M. for ret.*) 1923 (i).

——— Quantities of Work executed, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1923 (i).

——— inquiry for ret., 2773 (ii), 4801, 4990 (iii), 6060 (iv).

——— Mr. Wainwright's Stmnt. *re* Inception (Ques.) 1560 (i).

G. T. Ry. Level Crossings, Cost of Protection, &c. (Ques.) 1913 (i).

Harvey-Salisbury Railroad incorp. B. 35 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 2°, 775 (i).

Holland River Canal, Land Valuators, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 2591 (ii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 3055 (ii).

——— at Newmarket, Tenders for Section 1, &c. (Ques.) 3253 (ii).

See 'Newmarket.'

House of Commons Classification, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 6098 (iv).

Immigrants, British to Canada, direct from Native Country, Number, &c. (Ques.) 1919 (i).

Immigrants, British Subjects prevented entering Can., &c. (Ques.) 478 (i).

Immigrants prevented from landing in Can., Nationality, &c. (Ques.) 478 (i).

Immigration Regulations, O.C., Application of, &c. (Ques.) 250 (i).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6705 (iv).

Johnston, Capt., Repayment of Moneys from Str. 'Hestia' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6890 (iv).

Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com., 3472 (ii).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Level Crossing Accident Ret., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (remarks) 1116 (i).

——— Number of Accidents, Inquiry for Ret., 548 (i).

See 'Rys.,' &c.

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) on Sen. Amts., 6075 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries Book-Keeping, Result of Change in Method (Ques.) 1919 (i).

See 'Falconer.'

Mayes Affidavit, Reading of, on Ques. of Order to Amt. (Mr. Daniel) 4263 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order, 4315 (iii).

Mayes Dredging Contract at St. John, Conditions, Recovery of Amount, &c. (Ques.) 1174 (i).

——— Recovery of Moneys (Ques.) 153 (i).

Manufacturing Industries, Number of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 152 (i).

Marine Investigation, Prosecutions *re* Judge Cassel's Rep. (Ques.) 152 (i).

Montreal Bridge and Terminal Co.'s B. 180 (Mr. Ecrement) in Com., 6629 (iv).

Montreal Woollen Mills, Closing *re* Tariff Laws (Ques.) 2591 (ii).

Natural Resources Conservation Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 6366 (iv).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5228 (iii).

N. B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Rep., on Amt. (Mr. Crothers) to Com. of Sup., (remarks) 5686 (iii).

Newmarket Canal, Holland River, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com. of Sup., 3130 (ii).

See 'Supply—Canals.'

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 4472, 4521, 5296, 5366, 5559 (iii), 5958; on M. for 3°, 6000 (iv).

Post Office Act (registered letters) Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 741 (i).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Co.'s incorp. B. 62 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 2530 (ii).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Conmee) *re* 'Special Trains,' 4292 (iii).

Prudential Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 5185 (iii).

Quebec Bridge, Res. *re* Sub-Marine Viaduct, Construction of (Ques.) 2321 (ii).

Railway Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 3°, 524 (i).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 2383 (ii); on M. for 2°, 6187; in Com., 6200 (iv).

——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 6123 (iv).

Railway Act (water-powers) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 242 (i).

Railway Level Crossings, Cor. with Ry. Commission (remarks) 291 (i).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Railway Level Crossings, Legislation *re* (remarks) 1977 (i).

—— Number of Accidents, Time, Cause, &c. (M. for ret.*) 158 (i).

Railway Crossings, Methods adopted by Ry. Board, *re* Protection, Expenditures, &c. (M. for ret.*) 827 (i).

—— Preventions *re* Accidents (prop. res.) 1192 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 1320 (i), 6412 (iv).

Roof Garden, New Wing, H. of C. (remarks) 7074 (iv).

Royal Canadian Accident Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 63 (Mr. Ames) on Senate Amts., 6788 (iv).

Royal Casualty and Surety Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. H. H. McLean) in Com., 2575, 2717 (ii).

Royal Life Insurance Co.'s B. 177 (Mr. Sutherland) on M. for 1°, 5885 (iii); on M. for 2°, 6082 (iv).

Salvation Army Council B. 142 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6068 (iv).

Secret Commissions Prevention B. 31 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1134 (i).

Souris Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6854 (iv).

S.A. Bounty Act, Regulation *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2219 (ii).

Submarine Co.'s Patent Relief B. 77 (Mr. Proulx) in Com., 4541 (iii).

Superior and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 78 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3845 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Lachine (wharfs and basins) 1564 (i).

Canals—Trent (construction) 2074 (ii); (Holland River) 1897 (i).

Canals—Welland (repairs) 2034 (ii).

Fisheries (Cushing & Co.'s claims) 3451; (International Fisheries Commission) 3446 (ii).

House of Commons (salaries) 6775 (iv).

Indians—Man. (St. Peters, removal) 3462 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, &c.) 6890 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries (investigation) 3450 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 6671; (patrol boats) 6682 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (rents, &c.) 2075 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 1598 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (electric lighting) 1600; (elevators) 1599; (Major's Hill) 1602; (Rideau Hall) 1604 (i); (telephones) 3230 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's residence) 1592 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N S. (generally) 2118; (Yarmouth) 2486 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Tiffin) 2116; (Victoria) 2117 (ii).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse a la Barbe) 2512; (St. (Poupore, W. J., claims) 3361 (ii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (monuments) 6543 (iv).

Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Poupore, W. J., claims) 3361 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton cut-off) 2925 (ii).

Railways—N.T.R. (surveys, &c.) 6986 (iv).

Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 6657 (iv).

Telephones in Can., Control of Rates, &c. (prop. res.) 1761 (i).

Telegraph and Telephone Tariffs, Regulations from Ry. Board, &c. (Ques.) 2764 (ii).

Telephone and Telegraph Special Com., of 1905, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 153 (i).

Toronto, Niagara and Western Ry. Co.'s B 42 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 2063 (ii).

Transcontinental Ry., Inquiry for Ret., 6060 (iv).

See 'G.T.P.'

Tuck, Ex-Chief Justice, Rep. *re* Offer of a Knighthood (Ques.) 154 (i).

Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 2132, 2136 (ii).

Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, 4126 (iii).

Woollen Mills, Number, Quantity of Can. Wool used, &c. (Ques.) 150 (i).

Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada for 1907, Duty, &c. (Ques.) 149 (i).

Vancouver Bank B. 52 (Mr. Cowan) in Com., 2147 (ii).

LEWIS, Mr. E. N., *West Huron.*

Address, The, 128 (i).

Assaults and Offences (B. 88) 1°m., 1971 (i).

Civil Service Salaries, in Com. on Res., 410 (i).

Criminal Code (motors) Amt. (B. 60) 1°m., 952 (i).

Criminal Code (wife beaters) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for 1°, 93; on M. for 2°, 561 (i).

Daylight Saving (B. 108) 1° m., 2491; 2° m., 3468; (M.) for Special Com., 3468 (ii).

—— Request to place on Govt. Orders, 3203 (ii).

Guelph and Goderich Ry. Co.'s (B. 47) 1°*, 738 (i).

Load Line on Ships (B. 45) 1° m., 663 (i).

Ry. Act (sanitary conditions) Amt. (B. 111) 1° m., 3362 (ii).

Vessels, Govt. Inspection (B. 73) 1° m., 1319 (i).

Weapons, Offensive (B. 83) 1° m., 1716 (i).

Wireless Telegraphy on Ships (B. 74) 1° m., 1393 (i).

LOGGIE, Mr. W. S., *Northumberland, N.B*

Budget, The, 4974 (iii).
Experimental Farms, Location, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1945 (i).
Fisheries Development, Apptmt. of Sel. Com., on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 505 (i).
Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5909 (iv).
Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 282 (i).
G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 5588 (iii).
I. C. R., Branch Lines Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2214 (ii).
——— on Annual Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) 2746 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Railways—I. C. R. (Sackville) 2935 (ii).

LORTIE, Mr. J. A., *Soulanges.*

Foret, Land, Lease to N. & A. Bourbonnais, Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 2591 (ii).
St. Polycarpe Post Office, Complaints *re* Officials, Change of Site, &c. (Ques.) 4894 (iii).
Soulanges Canal, Amount expended for Repairs, Suspension of A. Sauve, &c. (Ques.) 1404 (i).
Soulanges County Wharfs, Repairs, Valuations, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3055 (ii).
Soulanges Island, Change of Name (Ques.) 2757 (ii).
Wharfs at St. Zotique, Amounts of Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 1400 (i).

LOW, Mr. T. A., *South Renfrew.*

Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M (Mr. Lennox) 4218 (iii).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M., *Pictou.*

Budget, The, 4991 (iii).
——— Remarks, 4746 (iii).
Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5460 (iii).
Canadian, Liverpool and Western Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 1867 (i).
C. P. R., Issue of New Stock, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1324 (i).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6401 (iv).
'Duty of the Hour' Pamphlet, Distribution of in Pictou (remarks) 26 (i).
Franklin Montgomery Gray Patent Relief B. 132 (Mr. Rankin) in Com., 4885 (iii).
G. T. P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 5556, 5575 (iii).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6153 (iv).
Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6802, 6812 (iv).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*

Johnston, Capt., Repayment of Moneys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6893 (iv).
Miner, Bill, Escape from B. C. Penitentiary, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1855 (i).
Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5971 (iv).
P. E. I. Winter Communication with the Mainland, on M. (Mr. Warburton) 6462 (iv).
Prudential Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 5484 (iii).
Railway Act (fires) Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 377 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2341; (Cow Bay) 2469 (ii).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C., *South Toronto.*

American Barlock Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 123) 1°*, 4041 (iii).
American Fishing Vessels, Seizures, Courts of Trial Procedure, &c. (Ques.) 172 (i).
Ammonal Explosives (1908) Patent Relief (B. 93) 1°*, 2120; 2° m., 2579 (ii).
Bank Act Amt., Legislation *re* (Ques.) 1732 (i).
Canadian Red Cross Society's incorp. (B. 160) 1°*, 4988 (iii).
Coinage at Canadian Mint, Date of, Circulation, Profit, &c. (Ques.) 1401 (i).
Dom. Elections Act (deposits) Amt. (B. 16) 1° m., 160 (i).
Dredging Contracts in Ont. and Que. for 1907-8, Renewals, &c. (Ques.) 3049 (ii).
Electric Power exported at Niagara Falls, Names of Licensees, Taxation, &c. (Ques.) 345 (i).
Equity Fire Insurance Co. of Canada, incorp. (B. 161) 1°*, 4988 (iii); in Com., 6625 (iv).
France and Canada Commercial Treaty, Present Condition (Ques.) 4896 (iii).
Franklin Montgomery Gray Patent Relief B. 132 (Mr. Rankin) in Com., 5028 (iii).
Garrison Common, Transfer of Property to Exhibition Association, Delays, &c. (Ques.) 182 (i).
Govt. Deposits in Banks, Discrimination *re* &c. (Ques.) 245 (i).
Immigrant Agents in Canada, Locating Settlers, Names, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2160 (ii).
Immigrants, Arrival for present year, Names, Addresses of Agents, in Canada, &c. (Ques.) 1404 (i).
Industrial Disputes Act Amt. (B. 113) 1° m., 3565 (ii).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Industrial Disputes, Discussion *re* (remarks) 4641 (iii).

——— Statistics *re* Strike, &c. (Ques.) 154 (i).

Insurance Commission, Omission of Evidence of British Actuaries, &c. (Ques.) 243 (i).

I.C.R. Station Freight Clerks Disputes, Settlement of (Ques.) 246 (i).

London and Lancashire Plate Glass Indemnity Co. of Canada (B. 27) 1°*, 290 (i); in Com., 2146 (ii).

Manitoba and Ontario Boundaries, Decision *re* (Ques.) 1074 (i).

Muir Memorial Fund, Request for Aid (Ques.) 5095 (iii).

N.W. Rebellion, 1885 Veterans, Grant to N. W. M. P. (Ques.) 184 (i).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5355, 5396 (iii), 5965 (iv).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 4239, 4246 (iii); in Com., 6313 (iv).

Post Office Deposits and Interest Credits in Pass Books (Ques.) 4896 (iii).

Post Office Orders and Postal Notes, Total Number issued, payable in G.B. (Ques.) 1242 (i).

Potatoes sold in Bags, Measurements *re* (Ques.) 351 (i).

Prudential Trust Co., Limited incorp. (B. 91) 1°*, 2019 (ii); in Com., 5484 (iii).

Salvation Army Council B. 142 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6069 (iv).

Statutes for 1908, Delay in Publishing, &c. (Ques.) 183 (i).

Superior and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 78 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3966 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Post Office (letter carriers) 1698 (i).

Pubic Works—Buidings—Ont. (Toronto barracks) 1505; (Toronto drill hall) 1504; (Toronto observatory) 1505 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Royal Mint) 3205 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Toronto) 3317 (ii).

Thessalon and Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. Smyth) in Com., Ques. of Order, 5575 (iii).

Toronto Barracks, Delay *re* Erection on Humber River Site (Ques.) 183 (i).

See 'Garrison.'

Toronto Harbour Works, Delay *re* Payments to Men (Ques.) 544 (i).

Toronto, New Post Office, Delay in Construction (Ques.) 336 (i).

Ry. Act (level crossings, &c.) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 2388 (ii); in Com., 6211, 6297 (iv).

Railway Mail Service, Increases, &c. (Ques.) 336 (i).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Waterways and Boundaries Treaty and Welland Canal Enlargement (Ques.) 6292 (iv).

Waterways Treaty Commission, on M. (Mr. Magrath) to Com. of Sup., 6614 (iv).

MACLEAN, Mr. A. K., *Lunenburg.*

Canadian, Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 2062 (ii).

Committees, Special, Ref. to of Deptl. Reps. (remarks) 2028 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6761 (iv).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 151 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6746 (iv).

Fisheries Convention, Reference to The Hague (remarks) 1395 (i).

Fisheries Development, Apptmt. of Sel. Com., on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 493 (i).

Geodetic Survey Bureau, Establishment of (M. for cor.) 3056 (ii).

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4422 (iii).

Govt. Tenders, Opening and Receiving, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 576 (i).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Crothers) 574 (i).

House of Commons Elevators, Repairing and Running (remarks) 2337 (ii).

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3808 (ii).

Johnston, Capt., Repayment of Moneys from Str. 'Hestia' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6890 (iv).

Natural Resources of Can., Conservation of, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Sel. Com., 369 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 723 (i)

Fisheries (commissions) 6958; (customs licenses) 6960 (iv); (international fisheries commission) 3449; Miscellaneous (Cushing & Co.'s claims) 3460 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, &c.) 6890; (lightkeepers salaries) 6981 (iv).

Marine—Dredging (plant, &c.) 6886 (iv).

Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 890 (i).

Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Bridgewater) 1284; Ont. (Whitby) 1540; Ottawa (peat testing) 1502 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2346; (generally) 2118 (ii).

Telephone Companies, O.C. *re* Control by Ry. Commission (Ques.) 1072 (i).

Telephone Rates in Canada, Control of by Govt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1772 (i).

MACLEAN, Mr. A. K.—*Con.*

Toronto, Niagara and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 42 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 2064 (ii).

Waterways Treaty, N.B. Fisheries, Regulations *re* (remarks) 1245 (i).

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F., *South York, Ont.*

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 753 (i).

C.P.Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 3039, 3155 (ii).

C.P.R., Additional Stock, Distribution, &c., on M. for Sup., 416 (i).

——— O.C. *re* (M. for copy*) 685 (i).

——— O.Cs., &c. (read) 780 (i).

——— Ref. to Courts, &c. (remarks) 882 (i).

——— Remarks, on M. for Sup., 1321 (i).

Canadian Railways, Improved Service, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 626 (i).

Dominion Atlantic Ry., Examination by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2928 (ii).

Fisheries Development, Appmnt. of Select Com., on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 491 (i).

G.T.P. Lake Superior Branch Lines Ry. Co.'s B. 30 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 1366 (i).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr Fielding) in Com. on Res., 3612 (ii); in Com.., 5277, 5326 (iii).

Gowganda Mail Facilities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1703 (i).

Harvey-Salisbury Railroad incorp. B. 35 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 2°, 777 (i).

House of Commons Classification, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 6103 (iv).

Post Office Act (registered letters) Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 740 (i).

Ry. Act (hours of labour) Amt. B. 72 (Mr. R. Smith) on M. for 1°, 1318 (i).

Railways Two-Cent Fare, Refund of Money by G. T. Ry., Letter *re* (read) 2911 (ii).

Smith, John Denison Relief B. 157 (Mr. Maclean) in Com., 6071 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Sec. of State (salaries) 461 (i).
Excise (methylated spirits) 450 (i).
Inland Revenue (electric power export) 455 (i).
Labour Dept. (industrial disputes) 658 (i).
Metric System (lectures) 454 (i).
Post Office (letter carriers) 1703 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Montreal river) 2975 (ii).

Thessalon and Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. Smyth) in Com., 6065 (iv).

McALLISTER, Mr. D. H., *Kings and Albert, N.B.*

Franking Privilege *re* Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1713 (i).

Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 280 (i).

McALLISTER, Mr. D. H.—*Con.*

I.C.R. Branch Lines Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2208 (ii).

Public Health Bureau, Establishment of by Govt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1101 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (St. John surveys) 1642 (i).

Wells, Judge, Apptmt. in Westmoreland County, Absence with and without Leave, &c. (Ques.) 4897 (iii).

McCALL, Mr. A., *Norfolk.*

G.T.P. Loans B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 5168 (iii).

St. Williams Landing Pier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3332 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Bridgewater) 1284 (i).

Welland Canal, Total Cost, Tonnage, &c. (Ques.) 2154 (ii).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S., *Calgary.*

Banff Fish Hatchery, Establishment of, Representations *re*, &c. (Ques.) 871 (i).

Calgary Electoral District, Dep. Returning Officers, Scrutineers, &c. (M. for ret.*) 685 (i).

——— Voters' Lists, Copy (M. for copy*) 685 (i).

Coal Strike in the West, Settlement by Dept. of Labour (remarks) 5351 (iii).

Irrigation, Investigation *re* Water Supply (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv).

Natural Resources Commission B. 159 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6381 (iv).

Natural Resources, Lands, &c., Details of Moneys received, &c. (M. for ret.*) 685 (i).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Payments to since Cancellation of Contract (Ques.) 1071 (i).

North Saskatchewan River Surveys, Average Cost per Mile (Ques.) 870 (i).

'Opportunities in Canada,' Name of Publisher (Ques.) 2158 (ii).

——— Number of Copies distributed, &c. (Ques.) 676 (i).

Railway Aid in Alberta, Representations *re* (Ques.) 676 (i).

Railways in Alberta and Sask., Number of Miles in Operation (Ques.) 3049 (ii).

R. N. W. Mounted Police Barrack Grounds, Transfer to Ry. Corporation, &c. (Ques.) 819 (i).

Rural Mail Delivery, Alberta (M. for cor*) 3056 (ii).

School Lands, Alberta, Total Area, Fund, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 7072 (iv).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Dom. Lands—(timber protection) 6286 (iv).

Villa Lots in Section 14, Twp. 21, Applications *re* Transfer, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 685 (i).

McCOIG, Mr. A. B., *West Kent.*

Experimental Farms, Locations, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1952 (i).

Hogs, Dressed, Inspection of, &c. (Ques.) 2758 (ii).

McCOLL, Mr. J. B., *West Northumberland, O.*

SUPPLY—

Penitentiaries—Stony Mountain (supplies) 920 (i).

McCRANEY, Mr. G. E., *Saskatoon.*

Canadian Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 11) 1°*, 159 (i).

Commerce Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 189) 1°*, 6403 (iv).

Committee, Standing Orders, 1st Rep. (presented) 2119 (ii).

Fidelity Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 190) 1°*, 6403 (iv).

Prudential Life Insurance Co.'s Change of Name (B. 188) 1°*, 6403 (iv).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Land Grant, Location, &c. (Ques.) 468 (i).

Royal Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 177) 1° m., 5885 (iii).

Wake, John Relief (B. 178) 1°*, 5886 (iii); 2° m., 6081 (iv).

Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 29) 1°*, 290 (i); in Com., 2130 (ii).

Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4207 (iii).

McGIVERIN, Mr. H. B., *Ottawa.*

Civil Service Salaries, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Com. on Res., 319 (i).

——— Classification Schedules, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2451 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Civil Service Commission (salaries) 396 (i).

McINTYRE, Mr. W., *Strathcona.*

Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 23) 1°*, 290 (i).

Alsek and Yukon Ry. Co.'s (B. 67) 1°*, 1318 (i).

Athabaska Ry. Co.'s (B. 68) 1°*, 1318 (i).

Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 79) 1°*, 1648 (i).

C.P. Ry. Co.'s (B. 79) in Com., 3039, 3151 (ii).

C.P.R. Issue of New Stock, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1350 (i).

McINTYRE, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co.'s (B. 24) 1°*, 290 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. for Com. on Private Bills, 1362 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6167 (iv).

Moravian Church Board of Elders incorp. (B. 167) 1°*, 5623 (iii).

Railway Crossings, Width of Opening, &c. &c. (remarks) 3568 (ii).

St. Mary's Ry. Co., Change of Name (B. 46) 1°*, 738 (i).

Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 36) 1°*, 465; 2° m., 778 (i).

Western Canadian Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 37) 2° m., 778 (i).

Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4156 (iii).

McKENZIE, Mr. D. D., *Cape Breton, North.*

Budget, The, 5021 (iii).

——— Remarks, 4745 (iii).

Canada-France SS. Subsidy B. 46 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 4444 (iii).

Coal, Conserving for the Home Market (prop. Res.) 3087 (ii).

Expropriation of Ry. Lands, &c., Complaints *re* (remarks) 4802 (iii).

Fisheries Development, Apptmt. of Sel. Com. on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 500 (i).

Mayes Affidavit, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4275 (iii).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B. C. Penitentiary, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1877 (i).

'Northumberland' Dredge, Men on Voters' Lists (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2403 (ii).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 1047 (i).

Payne, J. Lambert, Duties, Salary, Office Hours, &c. (Ques.) 1726 (i).

Railway Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6212 (iv).

Secret Commissions Prevention B. 31 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1134 (i).

Superior and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B 78 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3974 (ii).

SUPPLY

Ocean and River Service (wrecking plant) 6681 (iv).

Public Works—Harbour and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2362 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (facilities) 2948; (Sydney Mines) 2938 (ii).

McLEAN, Mr. H. H., *Sunbury and Queens.*

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5911 (iv).

McLEAN, Mr. H. H.—*Con.*

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6808 (iv).

Royal Casualty and Surety Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 51) 1°*, 738 (i); in Com., 2575 (ii).

SUPPLY

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John tributaries) 1635 (i).

McLEAN, Mr. M. Y., *South Huron.*

Budget, The, 4901 (iii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 6011 (iv).

McMILLAN, Mr. J. A., *Glengarry.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (telephones) 1607 (i).

MADDIN, Mr. J. W., *Cape Breton South.*

Boat Harbour, Skinner's Cove, Yearly Expenditure, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 2817 (ii).

Brophy's Post Office, Name of Postmaster, Changes *re* (Ques.) 1186 (i).

Budget, The, 4936 (iii).

Cape Breton South, Election Returning Officer, Payments *re* Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 5636 (iii).

Cassell's Report: *See* 'Investigations.'

Cedar Rapids Mfg. & Power Co.'s B. 94 (Mr. Boyer) in Com., 3406 (ii).

Criminal Code (flogging) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for 2°, 534 (i).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6400, 6758 (iv).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 151 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6750 (iv).

Fisheries Development, Apptmt. of Sel. Com., on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 503 (i).

Fishery Inspector at Cape Breton, Apptmt. of Successor to A. C. Bertram (Ques.) 5631 (iii).

Fishery Wardens in Victoria County, N.S., Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 5637 (iii).

Flint Island Fog Alarm, Contract *re*, &c. (Ques.) 5636 (iii).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i).

Glace Bay Mails, Contract *re* Collection, &c. (Ques.) 5635, 5775 (iii).

Glace Bay Range Lightkeeper, Applicants, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 5636 (iii).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 3636 (ii).

I.C.R. Earnings for Freight Shipments, Ticket Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 5632 (iii).

MADDIN, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

Inverness Harbour, Items of Expenditure of 1908-9, Vote, &c. (Ques.) 6404 (iv).

Investigations in Depts. by Mr. Justice Cassels, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3736 (ii).

Labour Hours for Working Men, Restriction, &c., on M. (Mr. Verville) to Com. of Sup., 5939 (iv).

Lobster Packers, Investigation *re* Difficulties with Fishermen (remarks) 6062 (ii).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B. C. Penitentiary, on M. (J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1873 (i).

Plaster Mines Lighthouse, Dismissal of Hector McRae, &c. (Ques.) 6784 (iv).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6323 (iv).

Ry. Employees Provident Act Amt. B. 164 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6741 (iv).

Secret or Illicit Commissions Prevention B. 31 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1484 (i).

'Stanley' Str., &c., Total Expenditure from 1894 to 1908 (M. for ret.*) 1922 (i).

SUPPLY.

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, &c.) 6898; (buoy steamer) 6914; (maintenance) 6902 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries (meteorological service) 6915 (iv).

Penitentiaries—St. Vincent de Paul (supplies) 915 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Glace Bay 1288; (New Glasgow) 1290; (Westville) 1292 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2344; (Baddeck) 2453; (Cow Bay) 2463 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Meaford) 2984 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Sydney Mines) 2936 (ii).

Sydney, Free Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1706 (i).

Tatamagouche River Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2365 (ii).

'Zaidee' and 'Gladiator' Govt. Strs., Privileges *re* Towing, &c., (Ques.) 5631 (iii).

MAGRATH, Mr. C. A., *Medicine Hat.*

Aylwin, F. P., Grant of Land *re* Irrigation Purposes, Cor. Reps., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1190 (i).

Blood Indian Reserve, Sale of Land (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1006 (i).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3025 (ii).

Canadian Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 11 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 987 (i).

Experimental Farms, Location, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1943 (i).

Geodetic Survey Bureau, Establishment, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Cor., 3075 (ii).

MAGRATH, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*

Hand Hills, Alberta Post Office, Application *re* (M. for copy*) 2162 (ii).

Niagara River Falls, Amount of Overflow (Ques.) 1074 (i).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 1037 (i); in Com., 5380 (iii).

Railway Charters, Lapsed Powers, Date of Charters, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1190 (i).

SUPPLY.

Civil Govt.—Customs (contingencies) 599 (i).

Indians—Generally (schools) 1015; Man, &c. (live stock) 1006 (i).

N. W. M. P. (force) 3664 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Lethbridge) 1551 (i).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 2964 (ii).

Waterways Commission, Treaty *re* Milk River and St. Mary's River: on M. for Sup., 6583 (iv).

Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 2145 (ii).

MARSHALL, Mr. D., *East Elgin.*

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4455 (iii).

Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 170) 1°*, 5623 (iii).

Canning Factories Inspectors, Numbers, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 822 (i).

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5901 (iv).

Port Bruce Harbour, Amount of Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 818 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3331 (ii).

Port Stanley Pier, Latest Date of Payments to Men (Ques.) 342 (i).

Postmasters Salaries in East Elgin (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3429 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 5952 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Customs (contingencies) 602 (i).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 7026 (iv).

Post Office (rural mails) 3429 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (engineers, &c.) 1619; (power) 1617 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Whitby) 1530 (i).

Public Works—Dredging (generally) 6535 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Burlington piers) 2967; (McGregor's Creek) 2975; (Port Stanley) 2977 (ii).

Railways—Ry. Commission (litigation) 2069; (maintenance) 2045 (ii).

MARTIN, Mr. M., *Montreal, St. Mary's.*

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (cement) 803 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal postal station) 1303 (i).

MARTIN, Mr. W. M., *Regina.*

Elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William Govt. Operation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 4026; (amt.) 4034 (ii).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 3629 (ii).

Railway Commission, Vacancy, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer from N. W., on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2656; (amt.) 2659; Agreed to (Y. 94; N. 54) 2669 (ii).

S.A. Bounty Act, Regulations *re* (remarks) 2228 (ii).

MEIGHEN, Mr. A., *Portage la Prairie.*

Assiniboine River Works, Cost per yard for Sept. and Oct. (Ques.) 1239 (i).

——— Pets., &c. *re* Straightening of, &c. (Ques.) 472 (i).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3004 (ii); on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5455 (iii).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 3° (amt.) 5616 (iii).

Hudson Bay Ry. Surveys, (M. for ret.) 685 (i).

Hudson Bay Ry., Total Expenditure, Number of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 1055 (i).

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures by Judge Cassels, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3798, 3803 (ii).

Makaroff Postmaster, Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1702 (i).

Mayes Affidavit and Mr. Pugsley, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B. C. Penitentiary Admission of Detectives, &c. (Ques.) 1182 (i).

N.B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Report, on Amt. (Mr. Crothers) 5699 (iii).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5389 (iii).

Ry. Commission Vacancy, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer, on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2652 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Customs (board of customs) 586; (contingencies) 590 (i).

Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 837; Stony Mountain (supplies) 919 (i).

Post Office (country postmasters) 1700; (Ry. clerks) 1700 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 1596; (lighting) 1616 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 1544; (Winnipeg P.O.) 1551 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 1369(i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (telephones) 1609 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Joliette) 1294 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's residence) 1595 (i).

MICHAUD, Mr. P., *Victoria, N.B.*

Allegash River, Diversion of Waters, Reps. &c. (M. for copy) 3082 (ii).

Cabano Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 122 (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com., 4839 (ii).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s (B 171) 1°*, 5623 (iii).

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S., *North Grey.*

Animals Contagious Diseases Act B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 751 (i).

Fenian Raid Veterans, Legislation *re* Bounty (Ques.) 3478 (ii).

Franking Privilege *re* Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1669 (i).

Govt. Employees, Interference at Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6868 (iv).

Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 213 (i).

G. T. P., Lake Superior Branch, Number of Miles completed, Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 4286 (iii).

G. T. P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on prop. Res., 4075; in Com., 5265, 5322, 5494; on M. for 3° (amt) 5604 (iii).

G. T. P., Negotiations *re* Proposed Loan, prior to Oct. 1908 (Ques.) 4290 (iii).

G. T. Stock, Outstanding, Rate of Interest, Total Liabilities, &c. (Ques.) 3651 (ii).

Mileage of Ry. Construction, from 1888 to 1908, Authorized by Charters (Ques.) 1076 (i).

Militia Expenditures, Items in Estimates, &c. (Ques.) 4634 (iii).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B. C. Penitentiary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 948 (i).

Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G. B., on prop Res. (Mr. Foster) 3528 (ii).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 4481, 5376 (iii), 5971 (iv).

Owen Sound Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i).

Owen Sound Post Office, Original and Present Cost, Change of Plans, &c. (Ques.) 247 (i).

Rural Mail Delivery, Establishment of in Grey County (Ques.) 671 (i).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (wharfs and basins) 791; Soulanges (slope trimmings) 1570 (i).

Dom. Lands (surveys) 3463 (ii).

Fisheries (International Fisheries commission) 3446 (ii).

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 3465 (ii).

Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 896 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (heating) 1613 (i).

Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Halifax) 1289 (i).

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (furniture) 1605; (heating, &c.) 1601; (Rideau Hall heating) 1611; (Royal Mint) 1280 (i).

Public Works—Dredging—Ont. (Wingfield) 3347 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Meaford) 2983, 3313; (Owen Sound) 3315 (ii).

Western Canadian Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 37 (Mr. W. McIntyre) on M. for 2°, 778 (i).

MILLER, Mr. H. H., *South Grey.*

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 125) 1°*, 4041 (iii).

Budget, The, 4845 (iii).

Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 284 (i).

——— rsmd. adjnd. debate, 571 (i).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s (B. 140) 1°*, 4411 (iii).

Hudson Bay and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 124) 1°*, 4041 (iii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 6695; in Com., 6800 (iv).

Insurance Bill, Addresses, Reps., &c., made to Committee of 1907-8 (M.) to lay on Table, 2489 (ii).

——— (M.) to ref. to Special Com. Banking and Commerce, 2490 (ii).

Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com., 3414 (ii).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5568 (iii).

Prudential Trust Co.'s incorp B. 91 (Mr Macdonell) in Com., 5484 (iii).

Railway Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 3°, 6306 (iv).

Royal Casualty and Surety Co.'s Bill (Mr. McLean) in Com., 2718 (ii).

Salvation Army Council (B. 142) in Com., 6068 (iv).

Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 1448 (i).

Smith, John Denison Relief B. 157 (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com., 6073 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Generally (staff, &c.) 2073 (ii).

Excise (methylated spirits) 449 (i).

Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies), 894, 908 (i).

Water Carriage of Goods Bill (remarks) *re* discussion, 6774 (iv).

——— B. 105, 2° m., 6774; in Com., 6774 (iv).

Wood Alcohol, Quantity purchased, Price, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1396 (i).

MOLLOY, Mr. J. P., *Provencher.*

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 768 (i).

Big Grass Marsh Swamp Lands, Transfer of, &c. (M. for cor.*) 3056 (ii).

Budget, The, 5059 (iii).

Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.'s (B. 141) 1°*, 4411; in Com., 5483 (iii).

Railway Commission, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer, on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2647 (ii).

MONK, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*

Boivin, Ernest, Emplymt. by Govt., Cheque to A. Desbiens (Ques.) 2759 (ii).

Bonin, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3990 (ii).

Canada and France Ocean SS. B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5219 (iii).

Canadian Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 1861 (ii), 2062 (ii).

Capital Supply Co., and Govt. Patronage, Names of Promotors, &c. (Ques.) 683 (i).

Co-Operative Societies (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2323 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 48 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 6383 (iv).

Deferred Elections, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burrell) 2841 (ii).

Experimental Farms, Locations, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1967 (i).

Fagin, Thos., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 2154 (ii)

Germany and Canadian Treaty, Negotiations *re* (remarks) 4125 (iii).

Godin, Dr., Payments to *re* Land Damages (Ques.) 3990 (ii).

Govt. Business, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 2017 (ii).

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6124 (iv).

Govt. Tenders, Opening and Receiving, on prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 196 (i).

G. T. P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 5147; in Com., 5191 (iii).

Hopper Scows, Construction of (Ques.) 1185 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 2010 (i), 5217 (iii); in Com., 6155 (iv).

——— on M. to resume adjnd. debate (remarks) 4413 (iii).

Immigration Deportations, Amounts expended, &c. (Ques.) 1975 (i).

Immigration to U. S. and Repatriation, &c., on M. (Mr. Paquet) for Cor., 840 (i).

Imperial Defence Conference (remarks) on M. for 3° of Supply Bill, 7084 (iv).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Insurance Bill, Discussion *re* (remarks) 6290 (iv).

Land Grants to early Settlers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6275 (iv).

Levis Postmastership, Apptmt. of Successor to Mr. A. Lafrancois (Ques.) 4636 (iii).

Lindsay Block, Ottawa, Negotiations *re* Purchase (Ques.) 681 (i).

Lussier, J. A., Payment to by Ry. Dept. (Ques.) 3990 (ii).

——— Returning Officer at St. Johns-Iberville, Payments to (Ques.) 2766 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Inquiry for Evidence, 662 (i).

Martel, Hormidas, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3990 (ii).

Montreal Free Port, Recommendation of Royal Commission (remarks) 4802 (iii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 4799; in Com., 5234 (iii).

Natural Resources Conservation Commission on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 6363 (iv).

Navigable Waters Protection Act. Amt. B. 152 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5226 (iii).

Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Contract Price, Extras, &c. (Ques.) 818 (i).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 4245 (iii); in Com., 6314 (iv).

Proportional Representation in House of Commons, &c. (prop. res.) 2598 (ii).

Railway Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6297; on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to M. for 3°, 6313 (iv).

Railway Level Crossings, Prevention of Accidents, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1227 (i).

Red River Settlers, Land Grants, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6279 (iv).

'Richelieu,' Dredge, Removal of Captain, &c. (Ques.) 1185 (i).

Richelieu River Improvements Office (Ques.) 1185 (i).

Royal Canadian Dragoons at St. Johns, P.Q., Contracts *re* Supplies (Ques.) 2767 (ii).

Royal Casualty and Surety Co.'s Bill (Mr. McLean) in Com., 2720 (ii).

Rutherford, Dr. J. S., Resignation, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 1720 (i).

St. Johns Harbour, P.Q., Contract for Wharf Extension, &c. (Ques.) 2768, 2770 (ii).

——— Improvements in Richelieu River, Estimates, &c. (Ques.) 2817 (ii).

St. Johns Military Buildings, Lease, Rentals, &c. (Ques.) 672 (i).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

St. Maurice and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. Geoffrion) on M. for 2°, 6083 (iv).

Ste. Philomene Mail Contract, Annual Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2770 (ii).

St. Pierre River Drainage, Floods, &c. (M.) to adjn. Hse., 4229 (iii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Contract with J. G. Heroux *re* Timber, Inspection *re* (Ques.) 6404 (iv).

——— Manufacture of Church Pews (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 900 (i).

——— Manufacture of Furniture, &c. (Ques.) 673 (i).

Salvation Army Council B. 142 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6068 (iv).

Smith, John Denison, Relief B. 157 (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com., 6071 (iv).

Statutes, French Translation, Designation of Titles (remarks) 2023 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 691; (exhibitions) 727; (Year Book) 701 (i).

Canals—Lachine (wharfs and basins) 790 (i).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 6247 (iv); Labour Dept., (Labour Gazette) 654; Post Office (salaries) 724 (i).

Civil Service Commission (salaries) 705 (i).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 7003; (G. B. agents) 7019 (iv).

Interior (astronomical surveys) 6264 (iv).

Labour Dept. (industrial disputes) 655 (i).

Militia (salaries) 2278 (ii).

Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 900 St. Vincent de Paul (furniture making) 900 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal postal station) 1303 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2347 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (docks, &c.) 2896; (Saguenay dredging) 2887 (ii).

Tariff Changes *re* Tin, &c. (remarks) 4126 (iii).

Transportation Problem (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2888 (ii).

MURPHY, Hon. C. (Secretary of State), *Russell.*

Agriculture Dept., Outside Service, Amounts voted (Ans.) 1409 (i).

Aud. Gen.'s Rep., on Inquiry for, 1250 (i).

Debates, Official, Cost of Printing, &c. (Ans.) 1720 (i).

——— French Translation, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1722 (i).

Dom. Elections, Payments to Officials, &c. (Ans.) 1067 (i).

Cape Breton South, Payments *re* Elections, Expenses to Ret. Officers (Ans.) 5636 (iii).

MURPHY, Hon. C.—*Con.*

Capital Supply Co. and Govt. Patronage, Names of Promoters (Ans.) 684 (i).

Census and Statistics Bulletins, Translation of (Ans.) 1404 (i).

Civil Service Apptmts. since July, 1908, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 142 (i).

Civil Service Apptmts. since Sept., 1908 (Ans.) 143 (i).

Civil Service, Names and Positions of those receiving no Increases (Ans.) 1558 (i).

——— Payments in 1896 and 1909-10 at Ottawa (Ans.) 2149 (ii).

——— Re-organization, Temporary Clerks, &c. (Ans.) 142 (i).

———Salaries, in Com. on Res., 1135 (i).

——— Salaries Ret. (remarks) 1395 (i).

Comox-Atlin Elections, Issue of Writ for 11th Parlt., Instructions to Returning Officer, &c. (Ans.) 682 (i).

External Affairs Deptl. (B. 90) prop. Res., 1813, 1978; 1°* of of B., 2008 (i); in Com., 4436, 4470 (iii).

Foran, Mr. Wm., Apptmt. of Successor (remarks) 3363 (ii).

Foreign Correspondence, Number of Letters, &c. (Ans.) 3987 (ii).

'Free Press,' Man., Payments to, on Inquiry for Ret., 1978 (i).

Humboldt Election Officials, Payments to (Ans.) 1731 (i).

Logberg Printing Co., Suppl. Ret. (presented) 4041 (iii).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 2674 (ii).

Lussier, J. A., Returning Officer at St. Johns-Iberville &c. (Ans.) 2767 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Delay in Printing, &c. (remarks) 633 (i).

Marine Investigation, Evidence, &c., on Inquiry for, 402, 549 (i).

Naturalization Act Amt. (B. 5) 1° m., 93; 2° m., 378 (i).

Oriental Immigration into B. C., Res. *re* Royal Commission (Ans.) 1242 (i).

Polling Booths in Ont., Payments *re* Rents (Ans.) 3251 (ii).

Secretary of State, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 14 (i).

Statutes for 1908, Delay in Publishing, &c. (Ans.) 184 (i).

SUPPLY.

Civil Govt.—External Affairs (salaries) 7064 (iv); Sec. of State (contingencies) 461; (salaries) 458 (i).

Civil Service Commission (printing) 7065 (iv); (salaries) 705 (i).

Printing and Stationery (salaries) 804 (i).

Timber Limit Regulations, Suspension, &c. (Ans.) 343 (i).

MURPHY, Hon. C.—*Con.*

Towers in Dufferin County, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 341 (i).

Vancouver Election Officials, Delay in Payments to (Ans.) 1418 (i).

Voters' Lists, Parry Sound, Cost of Revision (Ans.) 669 (i).

—— Thunder Bay, &c., Cost of (Ans.) 340 (i).

NANTEL, Mr. W. B., *Terrebonne.*

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 765 (i).

Budget, The, 4780 (iii).

Canadian, Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 1693, 1859 (i), 2062, 2129 (ii).

Criminal Code (flogging) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for 2°, 566 (i).

G. T. P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 5152, 5159 (iii).

Immigration to U. S. and Repatriation, &c., on M. (Mr. Paquet) for Cor., 852 (i).

Judges Salaries, Error in Statutes of 1905 (remarks) 6474 (iv).

Railway Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6296 (iv).

Ry. Act (farm crossings) Amt. (B. 54) 1° m, 813 (i).

Railway Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 3°, 526 (i).

SUPPLY.

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 647 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Cap. St. Ignace) 2522 (ii).

NEELY, Mr. D. B., *Humboldt.*

Budget, The, 4951 (iii).

C.P.Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 3151, 3161 (ii)

Elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, Govt. Operation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 4017 (ii).

Insulting Language towards members, Ques. of Priv., 3942 (ii).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3844, 3942 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 6073 (iv).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 62) 1°*, 1116 (i); in Com., 2530, 2537 (ii).

Railway Commission, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer, on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2649 (ii).

NESBITT, Mr. E. W., *North Oxford.*

Budget, The, 4804 (iii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., on Ques. of Order (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3020 (ii); on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5477 (iii); in Com., 6048 (iv).

NESBITT. Mr. E. W.—*Con.*

Equity Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 6128 (iv).

Govt. Tenders, Opening and Receiving, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 225 (i).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6806 (iv).

McQucid, Laura, Relief (B. 181) 1°*, 5997 (iv).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3958 (ii).

Mayes Affidavit, Ques. of Order, 4279, 4375 (iii).

Railway Commission Apptmt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) Ques. of Order, 2639 (ii).

Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 1437 (i).

Water Carriage of Goods (B. 105) 1°*, 2670 (ii).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B., *East Hastings.*

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3026 (ii).

Civil Service Salaries, Classification *re* Schedules, &c., on M. for Sup., 2449 (ii).

Criminal Code (flogging) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for 2°, 561 (i).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 3579, 3614 (ii); on M. for 2°, 5120; in Com., 5269 (iii).

Madoc-Eldorado Branch Ry., G.T.R. Bonus *re*, &c. (Ques.) 245 (i).

Mayes Affidavit, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4369 (iii).

—— Reading of Original, on Ques. of Order *re* Amt. (Mr. Daniel) 4269 (iii).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B. C. Penitentiary, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup, 1842 (i)

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 1040 (i).

Ry. Act (contracts) Amt. (B. 39) 1° m., 465 (i).

Railway Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6202 (iv).

Ross Rifles, Number accepted and rejected by Militia Dept. (Ques.) 245 (i) .

—— Total Payments *re* (Ques.) 329 (i).

Ross Rifle Factory, Number of Employees, Inspection *re* Standards, &c. (Ques.) 1411 (i).

Vautelet, H. A., Emplymt. as Architect, Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 1412 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. FRANK (Minister of the Interior) *Edmonton.*

Aylesworth, Geo. Anson, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 249 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. Frank—*Con.*

Bell, Charles F., Conditions *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 2323 (ii).

Berube, Rev. E. P., Emplymt. by Immigration Dept. (Ans.) 3986 (ii).

Birtle Agency, Purchase of Live Stock (stmnt.) in Com. of Sup., 1168 (i).

Birtle Hospital, Attendance of Dr. Wright (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease, &c. (Ans.) 6785 (iv).

—— Sale of Land (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1008 (i).

Brandon City, Exchange of Lands, &c. (Ans.) 2322 (ii).

Brewster, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. *re* Immigration (Ans.) 3483 (ii).

B. C. Railway Belt Lands, Settlers, Titles, &c. (Ans.) 1727 (i).

Burrows, T. A., Timber Permit in Twp. 30 and 31, &c. (Ans.) 2592 (ii).

Catholic Immigration, Instructions to Agents (remarks) 2672 (ii).

Caughnawaga Indian Reserve, Grants for Church Purposes (Ans.) 1410 (i).

Caughnawaga-Iroquois Indians' Reserve, Return of Fines for Stealings, &c. (Ans.) 1410 (i).

Coal and Timber Lands, Approx. Area, Owners Names, &c. (Ans.) 1185 (i).

Coal Royalties, Total Amount payable in 1908 (Ans.) 2588 (ii).

Dokis Indian Reserve, Payments for Berths, Lapses, &c. (Ans.) 542 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 8) 1° m., 94; in Com., 379 (i); on Senate Amts., 2911 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act, French Translation, &c. (Ans.) 532 (i).

Fairy Lake Indian Reserve, N. S., Lease, Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 2816 (ii).

File Hill Indian Agency, Resignation of Mr. Godfrey, Charges against Inspector, &c. (Ans.) 3045 (ii).

Fishery Licenses issued to Wikwinikong Indians, Representations *re* (Ans.) 6407 (iv).

Foley, T. P., Emplymt. in Interior Dept. (Ans.) 2321 (ii).

Fort Malden, Representations *re* Sale, &c. (Ans.) 6087 (iv).

Geodetic Survey Bureau, Establishment of, on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) for Cor., 3068 (ii).

Georgian Bay Islands, Sale of Advertisements, &c. (Ans.) 3991 (ii).

'Glimpses of Northwestern Canada,' Copies circulated, Payments *re*, &c. (Ans.) 4641 (iii).

G. T. P., Lands sold for Stations, &c. (Ans.) 143 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. Frank—*Con.*

G.T.P., Terminal Town Sites Ret. (remarks) 2494 (ii).

Grazing Leases Total Area, Annual Rental, &c. (Ans.) 3703 (ii).

Griffith, Mr. Wm., Apptmt. as Immigration Agent, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 1415 (i).

Hickman, W. A., Emplymt. by Govt., Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 3054 (ii).

Higgs, Deportation by Immigration Dept. (Ans.) 147 (i).

Homesteads and Pre-emptions, Total Acreage sold, Moneys received, &c. (Ans.) 482 (i).

Homesteads and Pre-emptions in Man., &c. Number of Acres, &c. (Ans.) 1180 (i).

Homesteads west of Lake Winnipeg, Rep. *re* unfitness for Settlement (Ans.) 3252 (ii).

Immigration Act Amt. (B. 17) 1°*, 240 (i); 2° m., 2009 (i); on M. for resmng. adjd. debate, 4413; 2°, 5218 (iii); in Com., 6129 (iv).

Immigration Agents, Apptmts. in France since 1908, Names, &c. (Ans.) 678 (i).

Immigration Agents in France, Number, Reps. Resignation of J. E. Cyr (Ans.) 1414 (i).

Immigration Agents, Bonus Commissions, &c. (Ans.) 1407 (i).

—— Names, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1405 (i).

Immigration Agents resident in Canada (Ans.) 3989 (ii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, Restrictions, &c. (Ans.) 3705 (ii).

Immigration Bonuses to Societies, Names, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 1406 (i).

Immigration Bounties for 1907-8, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 678 (i).

Immigrants, British, prevented from landing in Canada, &c. (Ans.) 478 (i).

Immigration Deportations, Amounts expended, &c. (Ans.) 1975 (i).

Immigrants Destitute in Toronto (remarks) 2335 (ii).

Immigrants from G. B. to Canada direct (Ans.) 1919 (i).

Immigrants for 1907-8 from U. S., G. B., France and Belgium, Amount of Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 679 (i).

Immigration Inspectors, Names, Addresses, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1406 (i).

Immigrants, Number arriving in Canada for present year, Names and Addresses of Canadian Agents, &c. (Ans.) 1404 (i).

Immigrants prevented landing in Canada, Nationality, &c. (Ans.) 479 (i).

Immigration Printing and Advertising, Amount exended in 1908-9 (Ans.) 2381 (ii).

Immigration Regulations, O.C. *re*, Application of (Ans.) 250 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. Frank—*Con.*

Immigrants rejected and deported, Number, &c. (Ans.) 677 (i).

Immigration of Undersirables into Canada, Payments *re* (Ans.) 1406 (i).

Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 14 (i).

Indians Timber Lands, Sale of, List read in Com. of Sup., 1165 (i).

Interior Deptl. Clerks, Increases *re* Salaries, List of Names, &c. (Ans.) 532 (i).

——— Outside Service, Expenditure *re* Increases (Ans.) 1065 (i).

Interior, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1021 (i).

——— on inquiry for, 876 (i).

——— Officials Dismissals, Charges, &c. (Ans.) 2382 (ii).

Irrigation, Investigation *re* Water Supply (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6283 (iv).

Irrigation Proposition for Lands by Percy Aylwin (Ans.) 2380 (ii).

Judge, H. A., Emplymt. by Govt. as Detective, &c. (Ans.) 1400 (i).

Kitsilano Indian Reserve, Transfer to City, &c. (Ans.) 1973 (i).

'La Region du Lac Saint Jean, Guides des Colons,' Distribution in Quebec (Ans.) 678 (i).

Lake St. John Ry. Colonization Subsidy Grant, &c. (Ans.) 678 (i).

Land Grants to early Settlers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6276 (iv).

Lands in Man. and N. W. undisposed of by Govt. (Ans.) 2374 (ii).

Land Patents for Sections 16, 20 and 22, &c., Payments of Taxes, &c. (Ans.) 4901 (iii).

Latitude and Longitude of Canadian Cities, &c. (Ans.) 2378 (ii).

Milk River, Mackie Lease, &c. (Ans.) 6405 (iv).

Miller, Mr. N. B., Immigration Agent, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7000 (iv).

Nipissing Indian Reserve, Open for Settlement (Ans.) 684 (i).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Payments to since cancellation of Contract (Ans.) 1072 (i).

North Saskatchewan River Surveys, Average Cost per Mile (Ans.) 870 (i).

Olin, Chas., Total Payments *re* visit to Sweden (Ans.) 871 (i).

'Opportunities in Canada,' Name of Publisher (Ans.) 2158 (ii).

——— Number of Copies distributed (Ans.) 676 (i).

Orientals in B. C., Number, &c. (Ans.) 1920 (i).

Prairie Fires, Relief *re* (remarks) 6411 (iv).

OLIVER, Hon. Frank—*Con.*

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Land Grant, Location, &c. (Ans.) 469 (i).

Railway Subsidies Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 5629 (iii).

Rama Indian Trust Funds, Amount held by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 544 (i).

Rama Twp., Expenditure on Roads and Bridges (Ans.) 677 (i).

Rand, Dr. F. A., Payments *re* Indians (stmnt.) in Com. of Sup., 1168 (i).

Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Compensation to Squatters, &c. (Ans.) 531 (i).

Rutherford Islands, Dispute *re* Ownership, &c. (Ans.) 6408 (iv).

St. Nicholas Indian Island, Disposal of by Govt. (Ans.) 1410 (i).

St. Peters Indian Reserve, Surrender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1019, 1139 (i).

School Lands, Alberta, Total Area, Funds, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 7072 (iv).

Seed Grain Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 144 (i).

Seed Oats purchased for Albert and Sask., Complaints *re* (Ans.) 1420 (i).

Seed Wheat, Purchase for Sask. and Alberta, Price, Grade, Loss, &c. (Ans.) 1419 (i).

S. A. Veteran Land Grants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6273 (iv).

——— Homestead issued, &c. (Ans.) 2818 (ii).

——— Scrip, Sale of to Govt. Employees (Ans.) 143 (i).

S. A. Land Grants, Number located, Appointments of Substitutes, &c. (Ans.) 6404 (iv).

——— Conditions of Entry, &c. (Ans.) 1179 (i).

——— Regulations re (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2221 (ii).

——— Regulations as to Residence, &c (Ans.) 541 (i).

Spanish River Indians, License for cutting Timber (stmnt.) in Com. of Sup., 1170 (i).

Squatters on Dauphin Lands, Burning of Buildings, &c. (Ans.) 3045 (ii).

Squatters Claims *re* Dauphin Reserve (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6287 (iv.)

Steamers on Lake Winnipeg for Indian Dept., Lease, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1403 (i).

Sturgeon Breeding in Lac du Bonnet, Sale of Fish, &c. (Ans.) 531 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 971 (i); Interior (salaries) 6247 (iv).

Dom. Lands (advertising) 6285; (hydrographic survey) 6284; (maps, &c.) 6289 (iv); (surveys) 3463 (ii), 6273; (timber protection) 6286 (iv).

OLIVER, Hon. Frank—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Immigration (agents, &c.) 7000; (deportations) 7021; (G.B. agents) 7015; (St. Boniface hospital) 7035 (iv).

Indians—B.C. (cleansing orchards) 1160; (destitute) 1139; (schools) 1142; (surveys commission) 1144 (i).

Indians—Generally (destitute, &c.) 1010; (general expenses) 1016; (grist and saw mills) 1016; (inspectors travelling expenses) 1161; (relief) 1167; (schools) 1015; (surveys) 1016; (timber inspectors) 1161; (triennial clothing) 1015 (i).

Indians—Man., &c. (annuities) 1002; (live stock) 1005 (i); (St. Peters, removal) 3462 (ii); (seeds, &c.) 1004 (i).

Indians—N.B. (medical attendance) 999 (i), 3462 (ii).

Indians—N.S. (medical attendance) 998 (i), 3462 (ii); (seed grain) 998 (i).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (agricultural grants) 993; (annuities) 998; (blankets) 976; (legal expenses) 993; (medical attendance) 976; (surveys) 989; (schools) 976, 989 (i).

Indians—P.E.I. (Lennox wharf) 1000; (medical attendance) 1000 (i).

Indians—Que. (medical relief) 3461 (ii).

Indians—Sask. (farm implements) 1002 (i).

Indians—Yukon (schools) 1160 (i).

Interior (astronomical surveys) 6263; (buffalo herds) 6991; Miscellaneous (park reservations) 6991 ; (St. Mary's and Milk River diversions) 6269 (iv).

Miscellaneous (Banff, roads and bridges) 1171; (Banff, water works) 1171; (litigation) 1172 (i); (maps) 3466; (seed grain) 3464 (ii).

N.W. Ter. Govt. (salaries) 1171 (i).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 2962 (ii).

Yukon Govt. (administration salaries) 6272; (roads, &c.) 6273 (iv).

Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Purchase by Govt. Sales, &c. (Ans.) 477 (i).

Timber Lands, Alberta. Amount due and Payable (Ans.) 3194 (ii).

Turtle Mountain Squatters, Removal, Compensation, &c. (Ans.) 1417 (i).

Vaughan, Mr., Surveys, Incomplete Return (remarks) 2128 (ii).

Volunteer Substitutes for Homestead Duties (Ans.) 1078 (i).

Watson, R. J., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2158 (ii).

Yukon Ordinances (prop. res.) in Com., 7075 (iv).

——— Beer Tax (prop. res.) 5892 (iv).

Zinc in Albermarle County, Govt. Bonus *re* (Ans.) 1078 (i).

OSLER, Mr. E. B., *Toronto, West.*

Newmarket Canal, Holland River, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com. of Sup., 3146 (ii).

Post Office Act (registered letters) Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 746 (i).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (cement testing) 791 (i).

OSLER, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt.—Customs (Board of Customs) 589 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Amherst) 1283; Ont. (Toronto barracks) 1506; Ont. (Whitby) 1529; Ottawa (new bldg.) 1251; (Royal Mint) 1281 (i).

OWEN, Mr. C. L., *East Northumberland, Ont.*

Campbellford and Brighton Mail Contract, &c. (Ques.) 3479 (ii).

——— (remarks) 3655 (ii).

Govt. Policy *re* Govt. Buildings (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2507 (ii).

G.T.P., Cost of N. B. Section, Estimated Cost, &c. (remarks) 2383 (ii).

——— Cost per Mile (remarks) 2494 (ii).

Ry. Act (electric power) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1121 (i).

Rural Mail in East Northumberland, &c. (Ques.) 3480 (ii).

SUPPLY.

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock industry) 5879 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Brighton) 3314 (ii).

Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4153 (iii).

PAPINEAU, Mr. L. J., *Beauharnois.*

SUPPLY.

Canals—Beauharnois (water power) 1911 (i).

PAQUET, Mr. E., *L'Islet.*

Agriculture Dept., French Translation of Documents (Ques.) 2762 (ii).

Berube, Rev. E. P., Emplymt. by Immigration Dept. (Ques.) 3986 (ii).

Exhibitions, Subsidized by Dom. Govt., Amounts, Officials, &c. (Ques.) 544 (i).

Experimental Farms, Locations, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1940 (i).

——— Establishment of since Jan. 1908, &c. (Ques.) 156 (i).

French Language on Govt. Works, Signatures *re*, Govtl. Intention (Ques.) 249 (i).

——— Telephone Cos., &c., Cor. with Govt. (M. for copies*) 1421 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6129 (iv).

Immigration Agents, Apptmts. in France since 1908, Names, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 678 (i).

Immigration Agents resident in Canada (Ques.) 3989 (ii).

Immigration Bounties for 1907-8, Amounts, &c. (Ques.) 678 (i).

Immigrants for 1907-8, Number from U. S., G. B., France and Belgium, Amount of Expenditure (Ques.) 678 (i).

PAQUET, Mr. E.—*Con.*

Immigrants rejected and deported, Number, &c. (Ques.) 677 (i).

Immigration to U. S. and Repatriation, Cor. with Dept. of Interior and Colonization Societies (M. for copy) 827 (i).

Labour Dept., Apptmt. of Minister, &c. (Ques.) 186 (i).

Lake St. John Ry., Colonization Subsidy Grant, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 678 (i).

'La Region du Lac Saint Jean, Guides des Colons,' Distribution of Pamphlet (Ques.) 678 (i).

Latitude and Longitude of Canadian Cities, Record of (Ques.) 2378 (ii).

Lévis Graving Dock, Insufficient Capacity, &c. (Ques.) 186 (i).

'Montcalm' Icebreaker, Number of Crew, Daily Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 167 (i).

——— Name of Engineer, *re* Investigations (Ques.) 548 (i).

——— Res. of Chamber of Commerce, Quebec, &c. (Ques.) 328 (i).

Sessional Messengers appointed or dismissed since 1880 (M. for ret.*) 521 (i).

Statutes, French Translation, Designation of Titles (remarks) 2020 (ii).

SUPPLY.

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 688; (year-book) 703 (i).

PARDEE, Mr. F. F., *West Lambton.*

Brazilian Electro-Steel and Smelting Co. Limited (B. 10) 1°*, 159; in Com., 1023 (i).

Canada Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 56)—(M.) to place on Order Paper, 5093 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 75) 1°*, 1479 (i); in Com., 3409 (ii).

Cedar Rapids Mfg. & Power Co.'s B. 94 (Mr. Boyer) in Com., 3406 (ii).

Collingwood Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 12) 1°*, 159 (i).

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5901 (iv).

Govt. Railways Act (compensation) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 773 (i).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 3599 (ii).

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s (B. 13) 1°*, 160 (i).

Huron and Ontario Ry Co.'s (B. 14) 1°*, 160 (i).

Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com., 3414 (ii).

Mexican Land and Irrigation Co.'s (B. 15) 1°*, 160 (i).

National Accident and Guarantee Co. of Canada (B. 103) 1°*, 2318 (ii).

Railway Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6209 (iv).

PARDEE, Mr. F. F.—*Con.*

Railway Level Crossings, Prevention of Accidents, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1231 (i).

PARENT, Mr. G., *Montmorency.*

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3879 (ii).

PATERSON, Hon. Wm., (Minister of Customs), *Brant.*

Associated Press Despatches, Amount collected, Supervision, &c. (Ans.) 332 (i).

Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Vols I. and II. (presented) 12 (i).

——— Vol. II (presented) 1474 (i).

Bacon Curing Industry, Number of Hogs condemned, &c. (Ans.) 342 (i).

Books entering Canada under British Preferential Tariff, &c. (Ans.) 2587 (ii).

Budget, The (remarks) 4598, 4915 (iii).

Canadian Imports, Percentage entering Can. in 1908 (Ans.) 1728 (i).

Canadian Ships docking for Repairs, Res. *re* (Ans.) 3053 (ii).

Chinaware, Customs Duty, &c. (Ans.) 4636 (iii).

Civil Service Salaries, in Com. on Res., 964 (i).

Coasting Trade, O.C. *re* Change of Date (Ans.) 3052 (ii).

Costello Thos., Rep. of Woollen Industry, &c. (Ans.) 1176 (i).

Customs Collector at Bathurst, Leave of Absence (Ans.) 5157 (iii).

Customs Seizures, on Inquiry for Ret., 2773 (ii).

Debt, Net, Present Amount, Increase, &c. (Ans.) 148, 342 (i).

Dominion Loans, Amount Redeemable, &c. (Ans.) 545 (i).

Dominion 4 per cent Loan, Amount of Sinking Fund (Ans.) 545 (i).

See 'Loans', 'Govt. Loans.'

Electric Power exported at Niagara Falls, Names of Licensees, Taxes imposed, &c. (Ans.) 346 (i).

Estimates for 1909-1910 (presented) 327 (i).

Fish caught in Summer, Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 2128 (ii).

Foot and Mouth Disease, Present Condition, Embargo, &c. (Ans.) 334 (i).

Fruit Imports into B.C. from U.S., Quantities, Values, &c. (Ans.) 3250 (ii).

Funded Debt, Redeemable, Sinking Fund, &c. (Ans.) 342 (i).

Govt. Deposits in Banks, Discrimination *re* (Ans.) 246 (i).

Govt. Loans or Advances since Dec. 1908, Purposes, &c. (Ans.) 163 (i).

PATERSON, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
G.T.P. Total Expenditure *re* Construction of N.T.R. (Ans.) 1182 (i).
Hay, &c., from U. S., Entries at Kingston (Ans.) 1177 (i).
Hickory and Ash Handles, Number imported for 1908 (Ans.) 1210 (i).
Hull Customs Collections, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 1418 (i).
Imports and Exports for 1908 (Ans.) 4288 (iii).
Insurance Commission, Omission of British Actuaries' Evidence (Ans.) 243 (i).
Labour Department B. 165 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 6719 (iv).
Loans of Dec., 1907, Sums available for Works (Ans.) 669 (i).
Loan falling Due on 1st Nov. 1908, Disposal of (Ans.) 147 (i).
See 'Dom. Lands.'
Mail Boxes purchased and entered into Canada free of Duty, &c. (Ans.) 547 (i).
Market Garden Produce, Total Imports from 1901-8, Duty collected, &c. (Ans.) 5096 (iii).
Meagher, Mathias, Apptmt. to Customs Staff at Debec, N.B., Salary (Ans.) 3655 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex., Estimates (presented) 327 (i).
Nails, Quantity imported, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 2156 (ii).
National Trans. Ry., Loans *re* Construction of Eastern Div., Rates of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 679 (i).
Oshawa Harbour, Apptmts. by Gov., Payments, &c. (Ans.) 3046 (ii).
Oshawa Customs Collector, Name, &c. (Ans.) 1973 (i), 2373 (ii).
——— Remarks, 2373 (ii).
Passover Bread, Higher Duties, Request *re* (Ans.) 3986 (ii).
Pork, Bacon, &c., Entries at Kingston, &c. (Ans.) 1177 (i).
Port Credit, Customs Revenue, Superannuation of Collector (Ans.) 3049 (ii).
Preston, W. T. R., Emplymt. by Govt., Transfer, &c. (Ans.) 3991 (ii).
Pulp and Paper produced in Canada, Quantity exported, &c. (Ans.) 3048 (ii).
Quebracho Extract, Quantity imported, Pet. *re* Duty, &c. (Ans.) 1179 (i).
Revenue for December, Details of 'Miscellaneous' (Ans.) 149 (i).
Rifles, Swiss and Foreign imported into Canada, Regulations *re* (Ans.) 2382 (ii).
Royal Canadian Mint, Total Cost, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 147 (i).
——— Number of Coins manufactured, Purchase of Silver, &c. (Ans.) 244 (i).

PATERSON, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Sault Ste. Marie Farm and Garden Imports, Value, &c. (Ans.) 339 (i).
Savings Deposit and Loans, 3 per cents, Amounts, &c. (Ans.) 680 (i).
Securities of Corporations, Amount deposited with Govt., &c. (Ans.) 247 (i).
Shipping Drawbacks, Amounts paid from 1898 to 1908 (Ans.) 167 (i).
Ships repaired in Foreign Countries, Duty *re* (Ans.) 2763 (ii).
Steel Importations from March 31st, 1908, to Jan. 31st, 1909, on M. (Mr. Boyce) 355 (i).
Supply (M.) for Com., 140 (i).
SUPPLY—
Adulteration of Food (fraudulent marking) 455 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock industry) 5865 (iii).
Civil Govt.—Civil Service Commission (salaries) 390, 705 (i).
Civil Govt.—Customs (Board of Customs) 581; (contingencies) 590 (i).
Civil Govt.—Finance (salaries) 384 (i).
Civil Govt.—Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (salaries) 399 (i).
Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (electrical branch) 445 ; (salaries) 428, 444; (travelling expenses) 447; (weights and measures) 447 (i).
Civil Govt.—Public Works (contingencies) 3672 (ii).
Customs—(preventive service) 611; (printing and stationery) 609; (travelling expenses) 608 (i).
Excise (inspectors, &c., salaries) 436; (methylated spirits) 448; (tobacco stamps) 437, 447 (i).
Inland Revenue (customs collections) 448; (electric power exports) 455 (i).
Metric System (lectures) 454 (i).
Miscellaneous (patent medicines) 458 (i).
Pensions (N.W. rebellion) 812 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Lachute) 1302 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2368 (ii).
Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 452; (intercolonial Bureau) 455 (i).
Telephone and Telegraph Special Com. of 1905, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 153 (i).
Trade and Commerce, Part I., (presented) 176 (i).
Trade Relations with Germany, Total Exports, &c. (Ans.) 482 (i).
Ways and Means, (M.) for Com., 140 (i).
Wood Alcohol, Quantity purchased, Price, &c. (Ans.) 1397 (i).
Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4145 (iii).
Woollen Mills, Number, Canadian Wool used, &c. (Ans.) 150 (i).
Wool, Raw, Imported into Canada for 1907, Duty, &c. (Ans.) 150 (i).
Yukon Ordinances (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7080 (iv).

PATERSON, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*

'Zaidee' and 'Gladiator' Govt. Strs., Privileges *re* Towing, c. (Ans.) 5631 (iii).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H., *Argenteuil.*

Animals, Health of, Inspection, &c., Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 821 (i).

Budget, The, 4642 (iii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 2572 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Aid B. 186 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6740 (iv).

Carillon and Grenville Canals, Number of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 1396 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 1734 (i).

Cedar Rapids Manufacturing Co.'s B. 94 (Mr. Boyer) in Com., 3404, 3472 (ii).

Civil Service: *See* 'House of Commons.'

Franking Privilege and Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1657 (i).

Govt. Employees, Interference at Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6877 (iv).

Govt. Loans B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 6710 (iv).

Govt. Loans, Amounts and Date prior to 1913, Due, &c. (Ques.) 3654 (ii).

——— Loans of 1874, 4 per cent, Date of first Notice (Ques.) 3654 (ii).

——— Loans falling due prior to 1913 (Ques.) 3704 (ii).

Govt. Piers and Harbours Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4429 (iii).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on prop. Res., 4091; in Com., 5237, 5331; on M. for 3°, 5614 (amt.) 5616 (iii).

G.T.P. Ry., Total Expenditure to Feb., 1909 *re* Building and Equipment from Winnipeg to Moncton, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3704 (ii).

G.T.R. Co., Prior Lien on Assets, Opinion of Law Officers of Crown (Ques.) 4228 (iii).

House of Commons Classification, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 6117 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 6699; in Com., 6705 (iv).

Insurance Bill, Inquiry *re* Legislation, 971, 1022 (i).

Labour Department B. 165 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 6729 (iv).

Lachute Mills Post Office, Cor. *re* (M. for copies*) 158 (i).

Loans: *See* 'Govt. Loans.'

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 1038 (i); in Com., 5306 (iii).

Ottawa Assurance Co.'s (B. 139) 1°*, 4286 (iii).

Ottawa Buildings leased by Govt., Rental, Superficial Area, Taxes, &c. (Ques.) 1556 (i).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

Passover Bread, Higher Rate of Duty, Request *re* (Ques.) 3986 (ii).

Political Partizanship: *See* 'Govt. Employees.'

Royal Casualty and Surety Co.'s Bill (Mr. McLean) in Com., 2717 (ii).

Specie Reserve, Date of Last Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 869 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 646; Indian Affairs (salaries) 973 (i).

Indians—Man. (St. Peters, removal) 3432 (ii).

Miscellaneous (unprovided items) 3466 (ii).

Post Office (miscellaneous, stamps) 3432 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (lavatories) 1392; (peat testing) 1389; (steel fittings) 1391 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Lachute) 1301 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (Campbellton) 2951; P. E. I. (Harmony-Elmira) 2958; (Souris) 3419 (ii).

Tercentenary Postage Stamps, Total Amount *re* Sale (Ques.) 3654 (ii).

Thos. L. Smith, Patent Relief B. 71 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for 3°, 2950 (ii).

Timber Inspector, Salary, 973 (i).

Tuberculosis Congress, International, Delegates *re* (Ques.) 1186 (i).

Water Carriage of Goods Bill, Discussion *re* (remarks) 6846 (iv).

——— Remarks *re* placing on Govt. Orders, 6186 (iv).

PICKUP, Mr. S. W., *Annapolis.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers——N.S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2342 (ii).

PORTER, Mr. E. GUSS, *West Hastings.*

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 756 (i).

Belleville and Corbyville Collectors of Inland Revenue, Retirements, Apptmts, &c. Ques. 4893 (iii).

Belleville Drill Hall, Land Site, Officers' Quarters, &c. (Ques.) 673, 817 (i).
See 'Hastings.'

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) on M. (Mr. Henderson) to ref. back to Special Com., 5440 (iii).

Civil Service Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6327 (iv).

Extradition Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5242 (iii).

Govt. Piers and Harbours Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4428 (iii).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5254 (iii).

PORTER, Mr. E. Guss—*Con.*

Hastings Rifle Battalion, Quarters in Belleville Drill Hall (Ques.) 1076 (i).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5227 (iii).

Post Office Act (registered letters) Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 743 (i).

Ry. Act (electric power) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1120 (i).

Railway Mail Clerks killed or injured, Number (Ques.) 3476 (ii).

Railways Two-Cent Fare, Refund by G. T. Ry. Co. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2920 (ii).

Rural Mail Delivery in Prince Edward County, Establishment of (Ques.) 1077 (i).

Secret or Illicit Commissions Prevention B. 31 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1124, 1482 (i).

SUPPLY.

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Public Works Health Act) 811 (i).

Canals—Trent (construction) 1577; (Holland River) 1580 (i).

Interior (astronomical surveys) 6266 (iv).

Pensions (Fenian raid) 813 (i).

Public Works — Buildings—Ottawa (telephones) 1608 (i).

Yukon Govt. (administration salaries) 6272 (iv).

Trent Canal Fish Slides (remarks) 2672 (ii).

PRICE, Mr. Wm., *West Quebec.*

Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. Dubeau) on Senate Amts., 4594 (iii).

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3877 (ii).

Johnston, Capt., Repayment of Moneys from Str. 'Hestia' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6889 (iv).

SUPPLY.

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, rents, &c.) 6880; (salaries) 6889 (iv).

Marine—Dredging (plant) 6886 (iv).

Marine—Public Works (piers on St. Lawrence) 6888; (St. Lawrence ship canal) 6877; (Sorel yard property) 6885 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Victoria immigration) 2085 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (rents) 2453 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston, R. M. C.) 1383, 1511 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (generally) 2118; (South Lake, Lakevale) 2483 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Lake St. Francis) 2554; (Lévis) 2094; (repairs) 2554; (St. Anne des Monts) 2906; (St. Charles) 2095; (Saguenay dredging) 2809; (Sorel) 2909 (ii).

PROULX, Mr. E., *Prescott.*

Security Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 188) in Com., 6781 (iv).

Submarine Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 77) 1°*, 1479 (i); in Com., 4538 (iii).

PROWSE, Mr. L. E., *Queens, P.E.I.*

SUPPLY.

Railways—P.E.I. (Charlottetown) 2960 (ii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm. (Minister of Public Works) *St. John City and County.*

Allegash River, Diversion of Waters, on M. (Mr. Michaud) for Cor., 3084 (ii).

Assiniboine River, Straightening of (Ans.) 472 (i).

——— Cost per yard for Sept. and Oct. (Ans.) 1239 (i).

Belleville Drill Hall, Officers Quarters *re* (Ans.) 1076 (i).

Boat Harbour, Pictou Co., N.S., Total Expenditure, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 2817 (ii).

Boat Harbour, Skinner's Cove, Yearly Expenditure, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 2817 (ii).

Boivin, Ernest, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2759 (ii).

Bonaventure Public Works, Expenditure prior to 1900 on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Ret., 174 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 1320 (i), 2218, 3004 (ii).

Canadian Economic Lubricant Co., Payments to since 1906 (Ans.) 177 (i).

Cariboo Breakwater, N.S., Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2153 (ii).

Cassels' Report: *See* 'Investigations.'

Cedar Rapids Mfg. & Power Co.'s B. 94 (Mr. Boyer) in Com., 3404 (amt.) 3409; in Com., 3472; (amt.) 3605 (ii).

Charlottetown Post Office, Sidewalk Construction, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 4228 (iii).

Chesley Post Office, Amount of Vote, &c. (Ans.) 543 (i).

——— Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1360 (i).

Chicoutimi Pulp Co., Sale of Booms (Ans.) 4222, 4891 (iii).

Chicoutimi Wharf, Expropriation of Land, &c. (Ans.) 4222 (iii).

Chilliwack Public Building, Negotiations *re* Site (Ans.) 1073 (i).

Civil Service Salaries, Classification *re* Schedules, &c., on M. for Sup., 2443 (ii).

——— Increases since April, 1908, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1069 (i).

See 'Public Works,' 'Supply,' &c.

Cobourg Harbour Expenditure, Amount of Expenditure for 1908 (Ans.) 3988 (ii).

Courtney Bay, Contracts *re* Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).

See 'St. John,' &c.

Disraeli Wharf, Number of Vessels calling, &c. (Ans.) 2816 (ii).

Dredging Contracts in Ont. and Quebec, for 1907-1908, Renewals, &c. (Ans.) 3050 (ii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Dredging Contract, Recovery of Moneys from McAvity and Mayes, &c. (Ans.) 166 (i).
See 'Mayes,' &c.
Dredges, purchased by Public Works Dept., Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 146 (i).
Dry Docks, Construction under Subsidies Act, Negotiations *re* (Ans.) 478 (i).
Dry Docks Subsidies Act, Annual Expenditure (Ans.) 246 (i).
East Huron Public Works, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 3477 (ii).
Eatonville Wharf, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 4638 (iii).
Estimates, Passing of (remarks) 3204 (ii).
Flint Island Fog Alarm, Contract *re*, Wages, &c. (Ans.) 5637 (iii).
Fraser River, Flooding at Delta, Rep. of Mr. Coste, &c. (Ans.) 2587 (ii).
Georgian Bay Ship Canal Rep. (presented) 14 (i).
Girard, Mr. L. P., Emplymt. on Saguenay Dredging Works (stmnt.) in Com. of Sup., 2811 (ii).
Govt. owned Dredge working in N.S., Arrangements *re* Contract (Ans.) 2320 (ii).
Govt. Tenders, Opening and Receiving, on prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 192, 232, 256 (i).
——— O.C. laid on Table, 171 (i).
See 'Investigations,' &c.
Grand Bend Dock, Approaches, &c. (Ans.) 2586 (ii).
G.T.R. Hotel on Major's Hill Park, Title *re* Land, &c. (Ans.) 147 (i).
Greenwood and Grand Forks Post Office Sites, Options *re* (Ans.) 814 (i).
Grenville-Hawkesbury Bridge, Aid to (Ans.) 1558 (i).
Halifax Customs House, Total Cost, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 815 (i).
Halifax Post Office, Contract for Reconstruction, &c. (Ans.) 814 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, Piers, &c., Procedure *re* Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2513 (ii).
Harding, Mr.: *See* 'Investigations,' &c.
Hopper Scows, Construction of (Ans.) 1185
Honora Dock, Manitoulin, Construction, Dimensions, Exependiture, &c. (Ans.) 6408 (iv).
House of Commons, Allotment of New Rooms Instructions *re* (Ans.) 141, 466 (i).
——— Explanations *re* Answer, 170, 177 (i).
House of Commons Classification, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 6098 (iv).
House of Commons Elevators, 2338 (ii).
——— New Wing, Amount expended for Deptl. Labour (Ans.) 2149 (ii).
See 'Roof Garden.'

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Icelander River Dredging, Cost of (Ans.) 347 (i).
Indian Point Dredging, Tenders *re*, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 1397 (i), 2763 (ii).
Inverness Harbour Improvements, Purchase of Land, &c. (Ans.) 4637 (ii).
——— Items of Expenditure *re* Vote of 1908-1909 (Ans.) 6404 (iv).
Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures by Judge Cassels, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3899 (ii).
Jesus River Dredging, Amount expropriated, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1069 (i).
Kingston Military Buildings, Correction of Figures (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2539 (ii).
——— Excessive Expenditure (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2501 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order, 2498 (ii).
——— Tenders, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 546 (i).
See 'R. M. C.' &c.,
Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com., 3606 (ii).
Lacas, Emile, Absence from Dept. for 1906-7-8, Pay, &c. (Ans.) 4635 (iii).
Lakefield Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3332 (ii).
Lake Manitoba, Rep. *re* Lowering of Water, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 2593 (ii).
Lake Nipissing and Monetteville Canal, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1559 (i).
Lake Simcoe Waters, on Inquiry for Ret., 2773 (ii).
Latchford Dam on Montreal River, Contract *re* (Ans.) 543 (i).
——— Cor. with T. N. & O. Ry. Commission (remarks) 3320 (ii).
Levis Graving Dock, Insufficient Capacity, &c. (Ans.) 186 (i).
Lismore Wharf, Construction of, Unpaid Accounts, &c. (Ans.) 1079 (i).
Little Current, Dredging Depth, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 7073 (iv).
Little River Wharf, Amount expended, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 476 (i).
Loggie, W. S. Co., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 480 (i).
London and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3846 (ii).
Magnetawan River Improvements, Amount expended, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 476 (i).
Manitoulin Island, Telephone or Telegraph System, Representations *re* (Ans.) 6407 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries Public Works Depts., Purchase of Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 141 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*

Maritime Dredging Co., Tender *re* St. John Harbour (Ans.) 6787 (iv).

Markham Post Office, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6406 (iv).

Mayes Affidavit, Reading of Original, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4255, 4313; on Ques. of Order, 4257 (iii).

——— (explanation) 4297 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Daniel) 4315 (iii).

Mayes-McAvity Dredging Contract (remarks) in debate on Govt. Tenders, &c., 205, 232, 256 (i).

——— Conditions, Recovery of Amount, &c. (Ans.) 1174 (i).

See 'Investigation,' 'St. John.'

Michipicoten River Wharf, Expenditure, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 338 (i).

Military Buildings, on M. (Mr. Edwards) for Original Tenders, 1922 (i).

Militia Expenditures by Public Works Dept. from 1896 to 1909 (Ans.) 2380 (ii).

Mission River Piers, Advertisement for Tenders (remarks) 6920 (iv).

Napanee River Dredging, Surveys, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 333 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2094 (ii).

National Art Gallery, Purchase of Pictures, &c. (Ans.) 6087 (iv).

Nation River Drainage, Rep. of Engineer *re* (Ans.) 1178 (i)

N.B. Central Ry. Commissioners Report, on Amt. (Mr. Crothers) to Com. of Sup., 5683 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order, 5658, 5680 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 5647 (iii).

——— Ques. of Priv., &c., 6058 (iv).

——— Rep., Printing, &c. (remarks) 4236 (iii).

New Liskeard Wharf, Construction of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2553 (ii).

Newspaper Advertising: *See* 'Whitby.'

New Westminster Dry Dock, Application *re* Govt. Aid (Ans.) 3048 (ii).

Niagara Falls, Amount of Overflow (Ans.) 1074 (i).

Nipigon River Dredging, Appropriations voted in 1908, Payments *re* (Ans.) 3653 (ii). 4223 (iii).

——— Estimated Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 5635 (iii).

'Northumberland,' Dredge, Number of Crew, Names, Emplymt., &c. (Ans.) 2815 (ii).

——— Names on Voters' Lists, on M. for Sup., 2403 (ii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5970 (iv).

Oromocto Wharf, Total Cost, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 2319 (ii).

Oshawa Harbour, Acquisition by Govt. (Ans.) 1919 (i), 2373 (ii).

——— Expenditures, &c. (Ans.) 3046 (ii).

Otonabee River Dredging, Name of Contractor, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3044 (ii).

——— Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 4221 (iii).

Ottawa Buildings leased by Govt., Rentals, Superficial Area, Taxes, &c. (Ans.) 1558 (i).

——— Payment of Taxes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1610 (i).

Owen Sound Post Office, Original and present Cost, Plans, &c. (Ans.) 248 (i).

Panmure Island Wharf, Purchase of Right-of-way, &c. (Ans.) 6403 (iv).

Peat Fuel Testings, Memorandum of Dr. Haanel read in Com. of Sup., 1493 (i).

Peterborough West, Expenditure *re* Public Works (Ans.) 4637 (iii).

Pneumatic Tubes, Montreal, Quantity and Value of Purchase (Ans.) 1068 (i)

Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Repairs to (Ans.) 1557 (i).

Port Arthur Harbour and Mission River Dredging, Contractors, Inspectors, &c. (Ans.) 5775 (iii).

Port Credit Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3329 (ii).

Port Hood Breakwater, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 4892 (iii).

Port Stanley Pier, Latest Date of Payments to Men (Ans.) 342 (i).

——— (remarks) 4048 (iii).

Public Works, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 464 (i).

——— Deptl. Salaries, O.C. *re* Increases (Ans.) 1074 (i).

——— Expenditure re Byng Inlet, &c. (Ans.) 1178 (i).

Public Works in Middlesex, Expenditure for twenty years (Ans.) 4228 (iii).

Public Works Expenditures, Promises during Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1357 (i).

——— Expenditure for South Wellington, last 20 years (Ans.) 3655 (ii).

Public Works Supplies, Notice to Agents *re* Purchases, laid on Table, 3650 (ii).

Queens and Sunbury Wharfs Construction, Estimated Cost (Ans.) 2320 (ii).

Quesnel Telegraph Station Supplies, Contract *re* (Ans.) 1919 (i).

Restaurant Com., 2nd Rep. of Com. (M.) 290, 401 (i).

——— Interim Com. (remarks) 402 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*

Returns, on Inquiry for, 2493, 2674, 3110 (ii).

'Richelieu,' Dredge, Removal of Captain (Ans.) 1185 (i).

Richelieu River, Improvement Office (Ans.) 1186 (i).

Root Garden, New Wing, H. of C. (remarks) 7074 (iv).

R. M. C. Cottages, Cost, Specifications, &c. (Ans.) 1733 (i), 2319 (ii).

Royal Military College Stables, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1732, 1733 (i).

See 'Kingston,' 'Veterinary,' &c.

Royal Mint, Fencing, O. C. *re* (read) in Com. of Sup.), 1356 (i).

St. Andrew's Lock, Bridge Approaches (Ans.) 2159 (ii).

—— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3000 (ii).

St. Andrews Rapids Locks, Construction, Number of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 531 (i).

St. Anne de Bellevue Locks, Pet. *re* Dredging (Ans.) 3483 (ii).

St. John, N.B., Dredging, Apptmt. of Supt., &c. (Ans.) 5632 (iii).

—— Date of Beginning of Work, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 2158 (ii).

—— Payments to G. S. Mayes (Ans.) 1181 (i).

—— Surveys, &c. (Ans.) 1918 (i).

—— on Inquiry for Ret., 3255 (ii).

See 'Courtney.'

St. Johns, P.Q., Richelieu River Improvements, Estimates, &c. (Ans.) 2817 (ii).

St. Joseph's Island Wharfs, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 337 (i), 2586 (ii).

St. Lawrence Channel, Amount expended, Continuation of Work (Ans.) 2151 (ii).

St. Williams Landing Pier (remarks) in Com of Sup., 3332 (ii).

Saguenay River Boom, Construction of by Govt. (Ans.) 4222 (iii).

Sandy Cove Breakwater, Amounts owing, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1419, 1728 (i).

Sea Bull Wharf, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 338 (i).

Selkirk Post Office, Estimated Cost, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 348, 530 (i).

Shell River Bridge, Original Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 529 (i).

Sherbroke Drill Hall, Contract *re*, &c. (Ans.) 3478 (ii).

Simcoe and Couchiching Lakes, Expenditure *re* Lowering Waters (Ans.) 543 (i).

Snag Boat at Selkirk, Total Cost (Ans.) 474 (i).

S. A. Patriotic Fund, Names of Beneficiaries (Ans.) 2157 (ii).

Spry Bay Govt. Wharf, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 4895 (iii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*

Sturgeon Pier, Tenders, Contract *re* Raising (Ans.) 1241 (i).

Superior and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 78) in Com., 3964 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (concrete walls) 1569 (i).

Civil Govt.—Civil Service Commission (salaries) 394; Public Works (contingencies) 3672 (ii); (salaries) 613 (i), 3665 (ii).

Fisheries (international fisheries commission) 3442; Miscellaneous (Cushing & Co.'s claims) 3451 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Lethbridge) 1551 (i), (Strathcona) 3224 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Chilliwack) 2090; (Nanaimo) 3224; (Prince Rupert quarantine) 2081; (Vancouver) 2082; (Vernon) 2075; (Victoria immigration) 2082 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (cattle quarantine stations) 1620; (engineers, &c.) 1619; (heating) 1613 (i), 3233 (ii); (lighting) 1616; (power) 1617; (rents) 1617 (i), 2075, 2452, 3673 (ii); (water) 1619 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 1596; (experimental farms) 1598 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 1543; (Winnipeg P.O.) 1549 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Grosse Isle) 3211; (Partridge Island, water service) 3206 (ii); (St. John drill hall) 1293 (i); (St. John hospital fitting) 3210 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Amherst) 1282; (Bridgewater) 1283; (Glace Bay) 1287; (Guysborough) 1288; (Halifax) 1288; (New Glasgow) 1290; (Pictou) 1291; (Shelburne) 1291; (Westville) 1292 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Belleville armoury) 1356; (Cornwall) 1359; (Glencoe) 1361, 1366 (i); (Kingston artillery park) 3223 (ii); (Kingston R. M. C.) 1381, 1507, 1532 (i); (Kingston R.M.C.) in conc., 4049 (iii); (Kingston vet. hospital) 1534; (Leamington) 1386; (Markham) 1386; (Simcoe) 1392; (Toronto, barracks) 1505; (Toronto, drill hall) 1504; (Toronto, observatory) 1505; (Whitby) 1393, 1519, (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additional wing) 1253; (astronomical observatory) 617 (i), (clerk of works) 3225 (ii); (electric lighting) 1600 (i), 3226 (ii); (elevators) 1600 (i), 3228 (ii); (fittings) 1391; (furniture) 1605; (grounds) 1600 (i), 3225 (ii); (heating, &c.) 1601 (i); (House of Commons alterations) 3204 (ii); lavatories) 1392; (Major's Hill) 1601; (museum) 1275 (i), 3215 (ii); (new bldg.) 1250; (peat fuel testings) 1389, 1494; (Rideau Hall) 1604 (i), 3233 (ii); (Rideau Hall grounds) 1611; (Rideau Hall, heating) 1612; (Royal Mint) 1271 (i), 3205 (ii); (telephones) 1605 (i), 3229 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Georgetown) 1292 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Cookshire) 1293 (i); (detention hospital) 3221 (ii); (Joliette) 1294; (Knowlton) 1301; (Lachute) 1301 (i); (Montreal, examining

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

warehouse) 3211 (ii); (Montreal P.O., enlargement) 1317; (Montreal, postal station) 1503 (i); Quebec citadel) 3211 (ii); (Quebec) 1317; (St. Johns) 1317; (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 1317 (i), 3222 (ii); (Three Rivers) 1318 (i).

Public Works — Buildings—Sask. (Prince Albert) 1555 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's residence) 1592 (i); (Dawson) 3224 (ii); (rents, &c.) 1620 (i).

Public Works—Dredging—Dom. (generally) 6534 (iv); (vessels, repairs) 3338 (ii).

Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. 6553 (iv); (plant) 3339 (ii).

Public Works—Dredging—Ont. (Wingfield) 3347 (ii).

Public Works—Dredging—P. E. I. (Souris) 6555 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alta (Old Man River) 3337 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Okanagan) 6544; (Quesnelle) 6544 (iv); (Victoria) 2102; (Lac du Bonnet) 2985; (Lake Dauphin) 2997; (Portage la Prairie) 3001, 3333; (repairs, &c.) 2985; (Roblin bridge) 2996; (St. Andrews rapids) 2097; (Winnipeg Beach) 2986 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Beaver Harbour) 1622; (Buctouche 1623; (Campbellton) 1625; (Campobello) 1646; (Cape Bald) 1625; (Cape Tormentine) 1625; (Cummings Cove) 1625 (i); (Dorchester) 3237 (ii); (Dover) 1625; (Harvey bank) 1626; (Heron island) 1626; (Kouchibougouac) 1626; (Lameque) 1626; (Leonardsville) 1626; (Mill's Point) 1626; (Moncton) 1627; (North Head) 1629; (Pink Rock) 1629; (Pointe du Chene) 1629; (Quaco) 1629; (Richibucto) 1629 (i), 3237 (ii); (Richibucto) conc., 4049 (iii); (St. Andrews) 1645 (i); (St. John) 2109 (ii); (St. John harbour) 1645; (St. John surveys) 1641 (i); (St. John, tidal waters) 3238 (ii); (St. John, tributaries) 1633; (Seal Cove) 1645; (Shippegan) 1645; (Whitehead wharf) 1646 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2338; (Arisaig) 3233; (Avonport pier) 2453; (Baddeck) 2453; (Bailey's Brook) 3234; (Bay St. Lawrence) 2455; (Big Bras d'Or) 2455; (Blue Rocks) 2455; (Breton Cove) 2456; (bridges) 2474; (Cheverie) 2456; (Church Point) 2457; (Clark's harbour) 2462; (Cow Bay) 2463; (Digby) 2473; (Glace Bay) 3234; (Grand Etang) 3234; (Little Narrows) 2477; (Little River) 3234; (Middle River) 2477; (Minasville) 2479; (Port Hastings) 2479 (ii); (Port Hood) 6543 (iv); (Portuguese Cove) 2480, 3234 (ii); (repairs, &c.) 6543 (iv); (Sandy Cove) 2475, 3235; (Scotch Cove) 3234; (South Lake, Lakevale) 2480, 3235; (Spry Bay) 2474; (Tangier) 2484; (Upper Prospect) 3235; (Wallace bridge) 2484; (Yarmouth) 2484 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Blanche River) 2966; (Blind River) 3292; (bridges, repairs) 2968; (Brighton) 3314; (Burlington channel) 2966; (Cobourg) 2967; (Collingwood) 3294; (Goderich piers) 2968; (Gravenhurst) 2981; (Lake Nipissing) 3308; (Latchford dam) 3320; (Little Current) 2973, 3302; (McGregor's Creek) 2975; (Magnetawan) 2982; (Meaford) 2984, 3313; (Montreal river) 2975 (ii); (Newcastle) 6544 (iv); (Owen Sound) 3315; (Petewawa) 3308; (Port Arthur, &c.) 2092; (Port Stanley) 2977; (Richard's Landing) 2978; (Rondeau) 2979; (St. Lawrence channel, Kingston) 2979; (Sault Ste. Marie) 2980, 3317; (Silver Centre) 3317; (Southhampton) 2980, 3317; (Spanish River, 3324; (Sydenham) 3324; (Tiffin) 2115; (Toronto) 2980, 3317; (Victoria) 2117; (Wolfe Island canal) 3304 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (bridges) 2507; (creosoted timber) 2511; (Graham's Pond) 2507; (Naufrage pond) 2512, 2508; (Sturgeon pier) 2510; (Tignish) 2510; (Vernon) 2511 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse à l'Ilot) 2513; (Anse à la Barbe) 2512; (Batiscan) 3274; (Bonaventure) 2559; (Bonaventure River) 3277; (Cap St. Ignace) 2522; (Chicoutimi) 2523; (Clarke City) 2526, 2540, 2887; (Doucet's Landing) 2543; (Douglastown) 2546; (Garthby) 2549; (Gaspé) 2550; (general repairs) 3243; (Lake St. Francis) 2554; (Lake St. John) 2556; (Laprairie ice piers) 2899 (ii); (Laprairie) 3287; (Lévis) 2094; (Magdalen Islands) 2557; (Mistook) 2557; (Nicolet) 3246; (repairs, &c.) 2554; (Richelieu) 2559; (Rimouski) 2558; (Rivière du Loup) 3284; (St. Alphonse de Bagotville) 2902; (Ste. Anne des Monts) 2906, 3287; (St. Charles river) 2095; (St. Francis du Lac) 3285; (St. Francis river) 2898; (St. Fulgence) 2906; (St. Jean des Chaillons) 2906; (St. Maurice) 2900; (St. Michel d'Yamaska) 3247, 3262; (St. Nicholas) 2908; (Saguenay) 3284; (Saguenay dredging) 2802, 2878; (Sorel) 2909, 3289; (Yamaska) 2900, 3291 (ii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Julien, Wm. compensation) 3349 (ii); (monuments) 6543 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—B.C. (Kamloops) 3348 (ii).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Yukon (Ashcroft) 3349; (Ashcroft Dawson) 3349 (ii).

Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Poupore, W. J., claims) 3361 (ii).

Sussex St. Govtl. Buildings, Architect's Plans, &c., Ownership, &c. (Ans.) 4638 (iii).

Tatamagouche Bay Wharf, Expenditure for Oct. and Nov., &c. (Ans.) 185 (i).

Tenby Bay Wharf, Warehouse, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 340 (i).

Thessalon and Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. Smyth) in Com., 6064 (iv).

Toronto Harbour Works, Delay *re* Payments to Men, &c. (Ans.) 544 (i).

Toronto, New Post Office, Delay in Construction (Ans.) 336 (i).

Transportation Problem (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2891 (ii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*

Uxbridge Post Office, Option on Sites, &c. (Ans.) 181, 1731 (i), 6091 (iv).

Tenders: See 'Govt.,' &c.

Veterinary Hospital at Kingston, Dimensions, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 2150 (ii).

Victoria Harbour, B.C. Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Eup., 2105 (ii).

Wallace Bridge Wharf, Contracts *re* Construction (Ans.) 1916 (i).

Welland, Expenditure *re* Public Works (Ans.) 3990 (ii).

Westport Landing Pier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2458 (ii).

—— Amount expended, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 476 (i).

Westville Post Office, Area of Concrete Walks (Ans.) 6086 (iv)

—— Contract Price, Inspectors, &c. (Ans.) 2755 (ii).

Weymouth River Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2362 (ii).

Wharfs, B.C., on Inquiry for Ret., 3004 (ii).

Wharfs on Inland Waters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3331 (ii).

Wharfs between Longue-Pointe and Pointe-aux-Trembles (Ans.) 1069 (i).

Wharfs in N.S., N.B., and B.C., Amount expended since 1906 (Ans.) 348 (i).

Wharfs in Queens and Sunbury, Tenders called for in Oct., Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans). 2375 (ii).

Wharfs at St. Zotique, Amounts expended (Ans.) 1401 (i).

Whitby Harbour, Acquisition by Govt. Negotiations *re* (Ans.) 2372 (ii).

Whitby, &c., Public Buildings, Advertisements *re*, List of Papers (read) in Com. of Sup., 1514 (i).

Windsor, N.S., Post Office, Tenders *re* renovating (Ans.) 4289 (iii).

Wingham Post Office Clock, &c. (Ans.) 4637 (iii).

Winnipeg Beach Pier, Removal of Obstructions in Manitou Rapids (Ans.) 335 (i).

Wolfe Island Canal, Maintenance by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 3043 (ii).

RANKIN, Mr. J. P., *North Perth.*

Franklin Montgomery Gray, Patent Relief (B. 132) 1°*, 4221; in Com., 4883, 5028 (iii).

REID, Mr. J. D., *Grenville.*

Agricultural Fertiliers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) on M. for 1°, 2910 (ii).

Belleville Drill Hall (remarks) *re* Answer to Question, 674 (i).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) on M. (Mr. Henderson) to ref. back to Special Com., 5442 (iii).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

C.P.R. Stock Issue (remarks) on M. for Sup., 786 (i).

Civil Service Salaries, in Com. on Res., 407 (i).

Commercial Feed Stuffs B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) on M. for 1°, 3937 (ii); in Com., 5211 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 4633 (iii).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1655 (i).

Govt. Employees, Interference at Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6870 (iv).

Govt. Railways Act (compensation) B. 20 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 780 (i).

Govt. Tenders, Opening and Receiving (prop. Res.) 188 (i).

—— Notice of, 170.

House of Commons Elevator, Repairing and Running (remarks) 2337 (ii).

Montreal Terminal Ry. Co.'s B. 48 (Mr. Geoffrion) on M. for 2°, 1147 (i).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 4494, 4530 (iii).

Passenger Ticket Act Amt. (B. 2) 1°*, 91; 2° m., 550 (i).

Preston, W. T. R., Protest from Japan *re* Statements, &c. (Ques.) 186 (i)

—— Transfer to Holland (remarks) in Com of Sup., 6657 (iv).

Railway Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6200; in Com., 6293 (iv).

Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. W. McIntyre) on M. for 2°, 778 (i).

Submarine Co.'s Patent Relief B. 77 (Mr. Proulx) in Com., 4538 (iii).

Superior and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 78 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3968 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food, (fraudulent marking) 456 (i).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 689; (census, &c.) 696; (exhibitions) 729 (i); (live stock industry) 5834 (iii), (Patent Record) 696; (Public Works Health Act) 810 (i).

Canals—Beauharnois (water-power), 1910 (i).

Canals—Chambly (St. John's harbour) 1571; (surveys) 1910 (i).

Canals—Lachine (basin No. 2) 1910; (cement) 1567; (wharfs and basins) 786;

Canals—St. Lawrence (district office) 1572; (Galops collector) 1574 (i).

Canals—Soulanges (slope trimmings) 1569 (i).

Canals—Trent (Holland River) 1578 (i).

Canal—Welland (electric plant) 1903; (Port Colborne) 1903 (i).

Civil Govt.—Customs (board of customs) 585; (contingencies) 602 (i).

Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (salaries) 445 (i).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 613, 720 (i).
Civil Govt.—Public Works (salaries) 3671
Civil Govt.—Railways and Canals (salaries) 461 (i).
Civil Govt.—Sec. of State (contingencies) 461; (salaries) 459 (i).
Civil Service Commission (salaries) 392, 705 (i).
Customs—Miscellaneous (printing and stationery) 609; Outside Service (salaries 608 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoy steamer) 6910 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (contingent fund) 6655 (iv).
Marine—Public Works—(St. Lawrence ship canal) 6878 (iv).
Militia (gratuities) 2313 (ii); (supplies) 6662 (iv); (warlike stores) 2317 (ii).
Miscellaneous (patent medicines) 458 (i).
Northwest Mounted Police (force) 3660 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 6670; (ice-breaker, Northumberland Straits) 6673; (life saving rewards) 6675; (patrol boats) 6682; (wrecking plant) 6681; (wrecks investigations) 6679 (iv).
Penitentiaries—(supplies) 899; St. Vincent de Paul (supplies) 915 (i).
Printing and Stationery (salaries) 804 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (heating) 1614; (rents) 1618 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Whitby) 1521 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 618 (i); (museum) 3215 (ii); (new bldgs.) 1252; (telephones) 1605 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (detention hospital) 3221; (Quebec citadel) 3213 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon, (rents, &c.) 1620 (i).
Public Works—Dredging—Dom. (vessels) 3338 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Portage la Prairie) 3333 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Yarmouth) 2485 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Spanish River) 3329; (Toronto) 3320; (Wolfe Island) 3305 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Clarke City) 2528, 2541; (Nicolet) 3246; (Saguenay dredging) 2810; (St. Helen's Island) 3245; (St. Michel d'Yamaska) 3247 (ii).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese administration) 6655; (commercial agencies) 6657 (iv).
Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 452; (Intercolonial Bureau) 455 (i).

Tompkins Hannah Ella, Relief (B. 135) 1°*, 4411 (iii).

RHODES, Mr. E. N., *Cumberland.*

Boat Harbour, Pictou Co., N.S., Total Expenditure, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 2318 (ii).
Eatonville Wharf, Expenditures *re* (Ques.) 4638 (iii).

RHODES, Mr. E. N.—*Con.*

Falconer, Mr. R. S., Emplymt. by Govt., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 332 (i).
Fort Cumberland Land, Govt. Ownership, Sale, &c. (Ques.) 3481 (ii).
Guysborough County Public Works, Expenditure of Votes, &c. (Ques.) 819 (i).
Indians, Medical Attendance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1169 (i).
Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6797 (iv).
I. C. R., Claims for Damages by persons in N. S., Settlement, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3054 (ii).
——— Claims for Damages, Settlement of between June and Dec. 1908 (Ques.) 2157 (ii)
——— Double Tracking, Survey *re* at Amherst, &c. (Ques.) 529 (i).
Lismore Wharf, Construction, Unpaid Accounts, &c. (Ques.) 1079 (i).
McKenzie, Calvin, Employt. on I.C.R., Pay, &c. (Ques.) 2152 (ii).
Malagash, N.S., Mail Contract, Expiry of, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 5639 (iii).
'Minto' and 'Stanley' Strs., Officers off duty on 12th to 17th Feb. 1909, &c. (Ques.) 1975 (i).
Nappan Experimental Farm, Names of Employees, Rate of Pay, &c. (Ques.) 5640 (iii).
'Northumberland' Dredge, Men on Voters' Lists (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2403 (ii).
——— Number of Crew, Names, Emplymt., &c. (Ques.) 2815 (ii).
Pictou County Fishery Overseers, Prosecutions in Salmon Illegal Fishing (Ques.) 5632 (iii).

SUPPLY.

Civil Govt.—Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 652 (i).
Indians—N.S. (medical attendance) 998 (i).
Labour Dept. (industrial disputes) 658 (i).
Penitentiaries—Dorchester (electric lighting) 884 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John) 2115 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Baddeck) 2454; (Big Bras d'Or) 2455; (Breton Cove) 2456; (bridges) 2474; (Cumberland) 2118; (Joggins Mines) 2477; (Little Narrows) 2477; (Portuguese Cove) 2480; (Wallace bridge) 2484 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (double tracking) 2753; (Loggieville) 2753 (ii).

Wallace Bridge Wharf, Contracts *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1916 (i).

RIVET, Mr. L. A. A., *Hochelaga.*

Canadian Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 1867 (i).
Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures by Judge Cassels, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3791 (ii).

RIVET, Mr. L. A. A.—*Con.*

Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 154 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6574 (iv).

Montreal Municipal Rights, Par. in 'La Presse' (remarks) 1648 (i).

Royal Guardians (B. 95) M. to consider, 7071 (iv).

Washington R. McCloy, Patent Relief (B 169) 1°*, 5623 (iii).

ROBB, Mr. J. A., *Huntingdon.*

Bills of Lading, Jurisdiction by Ry. Commission (Ques.) 1179 (i).

Foot and Mouth Disease, Present Condition Embargo, &c. (Ques.) 334 (i).

Govt. Employees, Interference at Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6870 (iv).

Hungry Bay Dyke, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 349 (i).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6811 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Militia (salaries) 2305 (ii).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*

Birtle Hospital, Attendance of Dr. Wright *re* Indians (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).

Canadian Medical Association incorp. (B. 134) 1°*, 4221; in Com., 4840 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 3479 (ii).

——— Memorial *re* (read) 2235 (ii).

———Settlement re Delimitation, &c. (Ques.) 530 (i).

Man. Judicial District, Apptmt. of Judge (Ques.) 341 (i).

Makaroff Postmaster, Salary, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1703 (i).

Manitoba Post Office Transfers since Nov. 1908, Names of former Postmasters, &c. (Ques.) 1414 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 1922 (i).

Pope Post Office, Pet. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1713 (i).

Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Compensation to Squatters, &c. (Ques.) 530 (i).

Shell River Bridge, Original Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 529 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census, &c.) 697 (i).

Civil Govt.—Finance (salaries) 385 (i).

Indians—Generally (destitute, &c.) 1010; (general expenses) 1016; (schools) 1015 (i).

Indians—Man. (annuities) 1002; (live stock) 1005; (seed grain) 1004; (surveys) 1015 (i).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (schools) 979 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 3422 (ii).

Miscellaneous (litigation) 1172 (i); (seed grain) 3465 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 1546; (Winnipeg P.O.) 1549 (i).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Prince Albert) 1555 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Portage la Prairie) 3001; (repairs) 2985; (Roblin bridge) 2995; (St. Andrews rapids) 2108 (ii).

Telephone Rates in Canada, Control of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1761 (i).

ROSS, Mr. J. A., *Rimouski.*

La Compagnie du chemin de fer International de Rimouski incorp. (B. 50) 1°*, 738 (i).

ROY, Mr. C., *Montmagny.*

Can. Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 6020 (iv).

Cap St. Ignace, I.C.R. Tank, Cor. *re* Construction (M. for copies*) 3992 (ii).

Immigration to U.S., Repatriation, &c., on M. (Mr. Paquet) for Cor., 859 (i).

I.C.R., St. Ignace Station, Requests *re* Construction (Ques.) 3476 (ii).

——— Construction, &c. (M. for pets.*) 3992 (ii).

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, by Judge Cassels, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3890 (ii).

Laberge, Alphonse, Lease with Govt. (M. for copies) 3992 (ii).

ROY, Mr. E., *Dorchester.*

Canadian Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 2860 (ii).

Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 222 (i).

Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 3547 (ii)

RUSSELL, Mr. J., *East Toronto.*

Immigrants, Destitute, Par. in Toronto 'Telegram' (remarks) 2335 (ii).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 4240 (iii); in Com., 6316 (iv).

RUTAN, Mr. W. W., *Prince Albert.*

C.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 3039; (amt.) 3040, 3151 (ii).

Deferred Elections, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burrell) 2848 (ii).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3950 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 6079 (iv).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L., *Souris.*

American Immigration Agents, Duties, &c. (remarks) 2243 (ii).

Budget, The (remarks) 4968 (iii).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L.—*Con.*

Civil Service Salaries, in Com. on Res., 410 (i).

Coal Oil Explosions, Evidence, Reps. *re* Explosions in Man. (M. for copies*) 1421 (i).

——— Investigation as to Deaths, &c. (Ques.) 1056 (i).

Elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, Govt. Operation (prop. res.) 3993 (ii).

Govt. Railways Act (compensation) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 775 (i).

Highways, Removal of Planks, Instructions from Ry. Commissioners (remarks) 1722 (i).

King, Mr. Mackenzie, Total Amount paid to *re* Absence in China, &c. (Ques.) 6406 (iv).

Labour Department B. 165 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 6737 (iv).

Railway Act (fires) Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Clarke) on M. for 2°, 377 (i).

Railway Commission Vacancy, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2630 (ii).

Rural Free Mail Delivery, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 2801 (ii).

Souris Postmaster, Dismissal of, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6847 (iv).

——— Investigation *re* (Ques.) 1915 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 727 (i).

Civil Service Commission (salaries) 390, 708 (i).

Immigration (deportations) 7022 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Amherst) 1282; (Bridgewater) 1285; (Shelburne) 1291 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (museum) 1278; (Royal Mint) 1274 (i).

Turtle Mountain Squatters, Removal, Compensation, &c. (Ques.) 1417 (i).

Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 29 Mr. McCraney) in Com., 2134 (ii).

SCHELL, Mr. M. S., *South Oxford.*

Fruit Marks Act, Regulations *re* Inspection, on M. (Mr. Burrell) to Com. of Sup., 3393 (ii).

Ry. Commission Vacancy, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer, on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2661 (ii).

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 41) 1°*, 626 (i).

Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4211 (iii).

SEALEY, Mr. W. O., *Wentworth.*

Canadian Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 1694 (i).

Fruit Marks Act, Regulations *re* Inspection, on M. (Mr. Burrell) to Com. of Sup., 3402 (ii).

SEALEY, Mr. W. O.—*Con.*

Geodetic Survey Bureau Establishment, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Cor., 3070 (ii).

Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 278 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 3190 (ii); (Year Book) 705 (i).

Civil Govt.—Mines (salaries) 3681 (ii).

Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4171 (iii).

SEGUIN, Mr. P. A., *L'Assomption.*

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3931 (ii).

Patent Medicines Act, Apptmt. of Analysts, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 3476 (ii).

SEXSMITH, Mr. J. A., *East Peterborough.*

Adulteration Act Amt. (B. 100) 1° m., 2217 (ii).

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4448 (iii).

Birdsall, Landing Wharf, Rice Lake, Cost of, Contract *re* (Ques.) 825 (i).

Commercial Feeding Stuffs B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5208 (iii).

Lakefield Wharf, Amount of Expenditure, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 1063 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3332 (ii).

Otonabee River Floods, Payments to Property Owners re Damages (M. for ret.*) 1190 (i).

Railway Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6228 (iv).

Stellarton Station, I. C. R., Area of Concrete Walks, &c. (Ques.) 5630 (iii).

Stony Lake Property, Damage *re* Floods (Ques.) 825 (i).

Stony Lake Property Owners, Payments *re* Damages by Floods (M. for ret.*) 1190 (i).

——— Wharfs, Number, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1064 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 3190 (ii); (experimental farm) 5950 (iv); (experimental farm, electric ry.) 3193 (ii); (International Institute) 5883; (live stock industry) 5878 (iii).

Canals—Trent (construction) 3183 (ii).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 7032 (iv).

Post Office (rural mails) 3424 (ii).

Trent Valley Canal Land Damages, Amounts paid *re*, &c. (Ques.) 4641 (iii).

Watson, R. J., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2158 (ii)

Westville Post Office, Area of Concrete Walks &c. (Ques.) 6085 (iv).

SHARPE, Mr. S., *North Ontario.*

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4458, 5203 (iii).

Armouries supplied by Officers, Policy of Govt., &c. (Ques.) 824 (i).

Bank Act (unclaimed balances) Amt. (B. 155) 1° m., 4801 (iii).

Buell, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. before Ry. Commission (Ques.) 3252 (ii).

——— (remarks) 3002 (ii).

Buildings, Public, erected. Names of Villages, Cost of Maintenance, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3055 (ii).

Campbell, Bush., Emplymt. on Trent Canal (Ques.) 1066 (i).

Canada-France SS. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 4442 (iii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 2573 (ii), 6053 (iv).

——— in Com., 3018; Ques. of Order, 3019 (ii).

——— on M. to ref. back to Com., on Standing Orders, 3041 (ii).

——— on Order for Com. (M.) to ref. back to Com. on Banking, &c., 4164 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. Henderson) to ref. back to Com., 5443 (iii).

Canadian Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 2058 (ii).

Cattle Guards at Ry. Crossings, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 1724 (i).

Cattle Guards at Ry. Crossings, Complaints to erect, &c. (Ques.) 680, 1409 (i).

Cement Contract to W. G. Hartsanft Cement Co., Quantity, Price, &c. (Ques.) 3985 (ii).

Chartered Banks, Unpaid Balances for five years, &c. (Ques.) 2592 (ii).
See 'Bank Act.'

Civil Service Act, Apntmt. of Officials in 1908, Names, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 827 (i).

Commercial Feeding Stuffs B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5207 (iii).

Foot and Mouth Disease, Precautionary Measures *re* Prevention, Apptmt. of Officials, &c. (M. for ret.*) 521 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Minimum Tariff on Farm Products (Ques.) 5158 (iii).

Govt. Loans, Expenditure *re* Commissions, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2161 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 1724 (i).

Govt. Savings Banks, Deposits for Oct. 1889, 1896-7-8, Number of Officials, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1924 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1723 (i).

G.T.P., Tenders for Ties *re* N.T. Ry., Advertisements for Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 6091 (iv)

SHARPE, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Holland River Canal, Deputation *re* Construction, Rep. of Engineers, &c. (Ques.) 2153 (ii).

Indians, Medical Relief (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1169 (i).

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures by Judge Cassels, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3774 (ii).

Lakes Simcoe and Couchiching, Lowering of Waters, Expenditures, &c. (M. for ret.*) 685 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2773 (ii).
See 'Simcoe.'

Loans by Govt., Expenses *re* (Ques.) 1921 (i).

Loan Returns, Expenditures, &c. (remarks) 4124 (iii).
See 'Govt. Loans.'

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Supplies, Purchases since Investigation (Ques.) 472 (ii).

Marine Supplies, Amounts paid *re* by Departments of Govt. to Companies, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2597 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 3044 (ii).

Newmarket Canal, Holland River, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com. of Sup., 3121 (ii).

North and South Ontario Election Expenses, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 2587 (ii).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5383 (iii), 5968 (iv).

Plank, Mr. M. W., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3252 (ii).

Post Office and Dom. Govt. Savings Banks, Distinction *re* (Ques.) 4897 (iii).

Post Office Savings Banks, Rate of Interest on Deposits, &c. (Ques.) 1067 (i).

Rama Indians, Trust Funds, Amount held by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 543 (i).

——— Expenditures on Roads and Bridges (Ques.) 677 (i).

Savings Deposits and Loans, 3 per cent, &c., Amounts, &c. (Ques.) 679 (i).

Simcoe and Couchiching Lakes, Expenditure *re* Lowering Waters (Ques.) 543 (i).
See 'Lakes.'

S. A. Bounty Act, Regulations *re* (remarks) 2234 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 700; (exhibitions) 733 (i).

Canals—Lachine (cement) 801 (i).

Canals—Trent (construction) 1577 (i); 2074, 3179 (ii); (Holland River) 1578, 1587, 1887 (i).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 647 (i).

Civil Govt.—Civil Service Commission (salaries) 706 (i).

Civil Govt.—Customs (Board of Customs) 587; (contingencies) 593 (i).

SHARPE, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 721 (i).
Civil Govt.—Public Works (salaries) 616 (i).
Indians—Generally (inspectors) 1162; Ont. (legal expenses) 996 (i).
Labour Dept. (industrial disputes) 655 (i).
Miscellaneous (litigation) 1172 (i).
Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 892 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (New Glasgow) 1291; (Westville) 1292 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Cornwall) 1359; (Glencoe) 1361, 1366; (Kingston Vet. Hospital) 1534; (Whitby) 1522 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 618; (Royal Mint) 1280 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Joliette) 1294 (i)
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Lake Nipissing) 3309; (Sault Ste. Marie) 3317; (Silver Centre) 3317; (Sydenham) 3324 (ii).
Railways— G. T. P. (Quebec Bridge) 2052 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton cut-off) 2925 (ii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (litigation) 2057, 2068 (ii).

Uxbridge Post Office, Options *re* Sites, &c. (Ques.) 181, 1731 (i), 6091 (iv).

Wallberg's Claims *re* moneys due him, Fiat &c. (Ques.) 3989 (ii).

SHARPE, Mr. W. H., *Lisgar.*

Budget, The, 4794 (iii).
——— Ques. of Order, 4958 (iii).
——— Remarks, 5062 (iii).
English Oats, Number of Bushels, Purchase Prices paid (M. for ret.*) 1734 (i).
Fisheries in Pembina River, Regulations or Agreements with U.S., Cor., O.Cs., &c. (M. for copies*) 548 (i).
Gretna Quarantine Buildings, Total Cost, Price of Land, &c. (Ques.) 824 (i).
Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 62 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 2535 (ii).
Seed Oats purchased for Alberta and Sask., Complaints *re* (Ques.) 1420 (i).
Seed Wheat, Number of Bushels purchased, Price paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1734 (i).
——— (Ques.) 1419 (i).
South African Land Grants, Changes *re* Regulations as to residence, &c. (Ques.) 541 (i).
Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Surrender of Land (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).

SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 5956 (iv).
Civil Service Commission (salaries) 710 (i).
Penitentiaries—Stony Mountain (supplies) 923 (i).

SHARPE, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg P. O.) 1550 (i).
Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 2965 (ii).

SIFTON, Hon. C., *Brandon.*

Corporations' Securities, Total Amounts deposited with Govt. (Ques.) 247 (i).
Forests, Waterways and Water-Powers, 3rd rep. (M.) to conc., 6919 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry., Number of Employees, Nationality, &c. (Ques.) 249 (i), 3042 (ii).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H., *Guysborough.*

Agriculture and Colonization Com., Documents printed and distributed, Number of (M. for ret.*) 1191 (i).
Canadian Imports, Percentage entering Can. in 1908, &c. (Ques.) 1728 (i).
Fisheries Development, Apptmt. of Sel. Com. (prop. res.) 483 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6172 (iv).
I.C.R., Branch Lines, Extension, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2193 (ii).
——— East Bound Traffic, Percentage, &c. (Ques.) 528 (i).
Lobster Packing Licenses granted in N.S. for 1908, Name and Address, &c. (Ques.) 328 (i).
N.S. Weekly Mail Service, Number of (Ques.) 1731 (i).
Shipping Drawbacks, Amounts paid from 1898 to 1908 (Ques.) 167 (i).

SMITH, Mr. A. W., *North Middlesex.*

Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4153, 4194 (iii).

SMITH, Mr. R., *Nanaimo.*

Address, The, 94 (i).
——— Ques. of Order, 134 (i).
Budget, The, 4727 (iii).
Burrard, Westminster Boundary Ry. and Nav. Co.'s (B. 61) 1°*, 1116 (i).
Cooperative Societies, on M. for Sup., 2333 (ii).
Deferred Elections, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burrell) to M. for Sup., 2855 (ii).
Deptl. Payments to Companies *re* Marine and Other Supplies (Ques.) 2322 (ii).
Fishery Cruisers, Number owned by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 2769 (ii).
Fisheries Cruiser for Pacific Coast, Tenders, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 2155 (ii).
New Westminster Penitentiary, Warden from 1876 to 1888, Escape of Prisoners, &c. (Ques.) 2769 (ii).
New Westminster Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1710 (i).

SMITH, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Orientals in B. C. on Jan. 1, 1909, Number naturalized, &c. (Ques.) 1920 (i).

Ry. Act (hours of labour) Amt. (B. 72) 1°m., 1318 (i).

Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s (B. 58) 1°*, 868 (i).

Victoria and Barkley Sound Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 59) 1°*, 868 (i); on Senate Amts., 4445 (iii).

SMYTH, Mr. Wm. R., *East Algoma.*

Fishery Licenses issued to Wikwinikong Indians, Representations *re* (Ques.) 6107 (iv)

Franking Privilege, Abuse of by Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i).

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4128 (iii).

Honora Dock, Manitoulin, Construction, Dimensions, Expenditures, &c. (Ques.) 6408 (iv).

——Yearly Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 7072 (iv).

Howell, H. M., Payments to, Itemized Statement (M. for copy*) 3992 (ii).

Little Current Dredging, Depth, Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 7072 (iv).

Manitoulin Island Telephone or Telegraph System, Representations *re* (Ques.) 6407 (iv).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 4531 (iii).

Rutherford Bay, Ownership of Islands, Settlement of, &c. (Ques.) 6408 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Indians—Ont. and Que. (schools) 985; (surveys) 990 (i).

Penitentiaries—Kingston (supplies) 887 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Blind River) 3293; (Little Current) 2973; (Montreal river) 2975; (Richard's Landing) 2978; (Spanish River) 3325 (ii).

Thessalon and Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 104) 1°*, 2318 (ii); in Com., 5483, 5574 (iii), 6062 (iv).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Hon. Charles Marcil) *Bonaventure.*

Address, The, Order, Ques. of (ruling) 134 (i).

Belleville Drill Hall (remarks) *re* answer to Question, 674 (i).

Bills, Assent to by Dep. Gov. (Mess. from Senate) 4119 (iii).

—— Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 4122 (iii).

Bills, Procedure in absence of Promoters (remarks) 4145 (iii).

Budget, The, Members remarks checked, 4874 (iii).

—— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Cowan) Ques. of Order, 4756 (iii).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Budget, The, Ques. of Order (Mr. Campbell) 4957 (iii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) on M. to ref. back to Com. on Banking and Commerce, 3941 (ii).

—— on M. (Mr. S. Sharpe) to ref. back to Banking Com., 4164 (iii).

—— on M. (Mr. Henderson) to refer back to Special Com., 5429 (iii).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 5458 (iii).

Carleton County Electoral Div., Certificate of Election (notification) 1553 (i).

—— Issue of Warrant (notification) 159 (i).

Comox-Atlin, Member Elect., Certificate of (notification) 1234 (i).

—— Resignation of Mr. W. Sloan (notification) 14 (i).

Co-Operative Societies, Members remarks checked, 2326 (ii).

Deferred Elections, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Ames) 2868 (ii).

Disraeli Wharf, Irregularity of Question, 2761 (ii).

Florence Mining Co.'s Appeal *re* Ont. Govt. Legislation, Ques. of Order, 6921 (iv).

Govt. Tenders, &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. R. L. Borden) 280 (i).

—— Ques. of Order (Mr. Staples) 285 (i).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Crothers) ruling, 573 (i).

G. T. P., Sub-contracts on B. C. Section, Violation of Labour Contracts, Members remarks checked, 3940 (ii).

House of Commons Classification, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 6109 (iv).

—— Classification (presented) 2493 (ii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., Irrelevancy of debate, 6168 (iv).

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, &c. on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 3849; (ruling) 3855 (ii).

Kingston Military Buildings Expenditure, Ques. of Order, 2496 (ii).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Hughes) 2506

Library of Parlt., Joint Rep. (presented) 12 (i).

Manitoba Fisheries, Depletion of, Members Remarks checked, 6944 (iv).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) on Senate Amts., 6080 (iv).

Manitoba Post Office Transfer Questions (remarks) 1414 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Supplies, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Brodeur) Ques. of Order, 4044 (iii).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

McAvity-Mayes Dredging Contract, Stmnt. of Minister must be accepted (ruling) 273 (i).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Emmerson)—(ruling) 276 (i).

Mayes Dredging Contract, Correction in Answer (amt.) 1175 (i).

——— Remarks, 153 (i).

Mayes Affidavit, Reading of, Ques. of Order, 4254, 4259; (ruling) 4259, 4297 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Daniel) 4315 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 'imputing motives,' (ruling) 4408 (iii).

Members, New, Notification of, Comox-Atlin, 1234 (i).

Mess from Senate, 4119 (iii).

Mess. from His Ex., Estimates (read) 2597 (ii), 6092, 7065 (iv).

Mess. from His Ex., Opening (read) 7 (i).

——— (prorogation) 7086 (iv).

Mines and Minerals, on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep., 6919 (iv).

Miner, Bill, on Ques. of Order (Mr. J. D. Taylor) —(ruling) 1823-4 (i).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. Brodeur) on Amt. (Mr. Conmee) to M. for 3°, 6129 (iv).

N. B. Central Ry. Commission's Report, on M. (Mr. Foster) to lay on Table (ruling) 5488, 5624 (iii).

N. B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Report *re* Hon. Mr. Pugsley, on Amt. (Mr. Crothers) to Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order, 5646 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 5659, 5680 (iii).

Newmarket Canal, Irrelevancy of Debate (remarks) 3141 (ii).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s Bill, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Sproule) 1116 (i).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Campbell), Members remarks checked, 6779 (iv).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Conmee) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 4291 (iii).

Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen's Sec. (read) 7074 (iv).

Railway Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) to M. for 3°, (ruling) 6306 (iv).

Ry. Act (sanitary conditions) Amt. B. 111 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 3363 (ii).

Ry. Commission, Ques. of Order, 2662 (ii).

Railway Commission Vacancy, Ques. of Order, on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2629 (ii).

Restaurant Com., Mess. from Senate, 378 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Customs—Members remarks checked, 585 (i).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

House of Commons (debates) 3437; (promotions) 3436 (ii); (salaries) 6775 (iv); (voters' lists) 3436 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Bonaventure) 3278 (ii).

Speaker, Election of (remarks) 6 (i).

Speech from Throne (read) 9 (i).

Yukon Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 2120 (ii).

SPEAKER, Mr. Deputy (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) *South Perth.*

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., Members remarks checked, 4455 (iii).

Budget, The, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fielding) 5060 (iii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., on Ques. of Order (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3019; (ruling) 3020 (ii).

Canadian Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 2062 (ii).

C. P. Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. McIntyre) on Amt. (Mr. Rutan) 3041 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ont. Ry. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 3410 (ii).

Cedar Rapids Mfg. & Power Co.'s B. 94 (Mr. Boyer) on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) 3409 (ii).

Civil Service Salaries, Members remarks checked, 407 (i).

Criminal Code (flogging) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., Irregular Voting (ruling) 568 (i).

Fisheries Development, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Crosby) 519 (i).

Franking Privilege *re* Political Literature, Member remarks checked, 1667 (i).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1683 (i).

Govt. Policy *re* Public Buildings, Ques. of Order, 2507 (ii).

Govt. Tenders, Opening, &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Crothers) 572 (i).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) on Amt. (Mr. Neely) 3949 (ii).

Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. Molloy) on objections (Mr. Clarke) to Com., 5483 (iii).

Miner, Bill, on Ques. of Order (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 950 (i).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., Amt. (read) 5231 (iii).

N. B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Report, on Amt. (Mr. Crothers) to Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order, 5764 (iii).

SPEAKER, Mr. Deputy—*Con.*

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B| 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., (ruling) *re* Quoting from Newspapers, 4484 (iii).

——— in Com., Members checked, 5356, 5571 (iii).

——— in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Middlebro) 5972 (iv).

St. Mary's and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 70) 1°*, 1318 (i).

SUPPLY.

Arts, &c. (live stock industry), Ques. of Order, 5855 (iii).

Ocean and River Service, Ques. of Order, 6680 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Man., Ques. of Order (ruling) 1545 (i).

Public Works—Man.: Member's remarks checked, 2999 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. Members remarks checked, 1524 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont., on Ques. of Order (ruling) 1537 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers,—N.B., on Ques. of Order (ruling) 1635.

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Sandy Cove) 2475 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R., Members' remarks checked, 2926 (ii).

Weights and Measures, Discussion *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3687 (ii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4446 (iii).

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 750; in Com., 756 (i).

Bills of Lading Bill, Discussion *re* (remarks) 6918 (iv).

Bowden, Annie Relief (B. 194) 1° m., 6917 (iv).

Brazilian Electro Steel and Smelting Co.'s B. 10 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 1023 (i).

Canada-France SS. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 4437 (iii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3036 (ii), 5482 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. S. Sharpe) to ref. back to Banking Com., 4164 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. Henderson) to ref. back to Special Com., 5435 (iii).

Canadian Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 1688 (i).

Canadian Medical Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Roche) in Com., 4840 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 3410 (ii).

Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. Dubeau) on Senate Amts., 4164, 4593 (iii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

C.P.R. Additional Stock, Distribution of, on M. (Mr. Macleau) to Com. of Sup., 426 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 785 (i).

Canadian Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 11 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 987 (i).

Cassels Report: *See* 'Investigations.'

Catholic Immigration, Instructions to Agents, Par. in Mail and Empire, 2672 (ii).

Cedar Rapids Mfg. & Power Co.'s B. 94 (Mr. Boyer) in Com., 3407 (ii).

Civil Service Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6325 (iv).

Civil Service Salaries Increase B. 187 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for Com. on Res., 322; in Com. on Res., 415, 955, 963 (i); in Com., 6347; on M. for 3°, 6830 (iv).

Cold Storage Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6742 (iv).

Cold Storage for Fruit, Amount shipped to G.B. for 1907-8 (M. for ret.*) 3056 (ii).

——— Amount, System, &c. (Ques.) 2817 (ii).

Cold Storage (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6833 (iv).

Commercial Feeding Stuffs B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5204 (iii).

Commissions: *See* 'Secret,' &c.

Committees, Special, Ref. to of Deptl. Reps. (remarks) 2026 (ii).

Criminal Code (flogging) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 569 (i).

Debates, Official 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 1476 (i).

Dominion Lands Act Amt. (B. 64) 1° m., 1234 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt., Memorandum *re* Ques. of Priv., 3002 (ii).

External Affairs Dept., on prop. Res. (Mr. Murphy) 1988 (i).

Florence Mining Co.'s Appeal *re* Ont. Govt Legislation, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 6923 (iv).

Fort Erie and Buffalo Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 69 (Mr. German) in Com., 3403 (ii).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1670 (i).

French SS. Line: *See* 'Can.-France.'

Fruit Marks Act, Regulations *re* Inspection, on M. (Mr. Burrell) to Com. of Sup., 3400 (ii).

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4414 (iii), 5897 (iv).

Govt. Loans B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 6710 (iv).

Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr Reid) 204 (i).

G. T. P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on prop. Res., 4099; on M. for 2°, 5138; in Com., 5260 (iii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Great West Permanent Loan Co.'s incorp. B. 40 (Mr. A. Haggart) in Com., 2569 (ii).

Harvey-Salisbury Railroad Co.'s incorp. B. 35 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 2°, 777 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 2009 (i).

Imperial Defence; *See* 'Naval.'

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 6693; in Com., 6705, 6802 (iv).

Investigations into Depts. by Mr. Justice Cassels, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3729 (ii).

King, Mr. Mackenzie, Result of his Mission, &c. (remarks) 4121 (iii).

Kingston Military Buildings, Ques. of Order, 2507 (ii).

Labour Department B. 165 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 6729 (iv).

Lafferty, Dr., Expenses *re* Tuberculosis Convention (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).

Loans: *See* 'Govt. Loans.'

London and Northwestern Ry Co.'s incorp. B. 102 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3984 (ii).

Mail Cars, Recommendation of Ry. Commission *re* Changes (Ques.) 3652 (ii).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3954 (ii).

Mayes Affidavit, on Ques. of Order to Amt. (Mr. Daniel) 4258 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order *re* Reading original document, 4297 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order 'imputing motives,' 4401, 4408 (iii)).

McAvity-Mayes Dredging Contract, ref. to in debate on Govt. Tenders, 205 (i).

Mileage of Ry. Construction (remarks) *re* Question, 1076 (i).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B. C. Penitentiary, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1841 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 192 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6744 (iv).

Natural Resources Conservation Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 6371 (iv).

——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Sel. Com., 370 (i).

Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 3555 (ii).

Newmarket Canal, Holland River, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com. of Sup., 3149 (ii).

Niagara-Welland Power Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 2571 (ii).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 1030 (i); in Com., 4479, 5303, 5406 (iii).

——— (M.) that Com. rise, 4532 (iii).

——— Ques. of Priv. *re* Speaking, 1115 (i).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Ottawa Buildings, Taxes by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1610 (i).

Ottawa Service Corps, Complaints *re* Padding Pay Lists (Ques.) 6784 (iv).

Penitentiaries and Prison Labour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 906 (i).

Piers, Wharves, &c., constructed by day labour, Procedure by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2519 (ii).

See 'Govt. Harbours,' &c.

Post Office Act (registered letters) Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 738 (i).

Private Bills, Refunding of Fees, on M. (Mr. Ethier) 5889 (iv).

Public Health Bureau, Establishment of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1109 (i).

Railway Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6208 (iv).

Ry. Act (electric power) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1119 (i).

Railways, Two-cent Fares, Refunds by G. T. Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2917 (ii).

Salisbury-Harvey Ry. Co.'s B. 35 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1513 (i).

Secret Commissions Prevention B. 31 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1122 (i).

Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 1445 (i).

Souris Postmaster, Dismissal of, &c. (remarks) on Com. of Sup., 6853 (iv).

Steel Cars, Introduction of on I. C. R., &c. (Ques.) 481 (i).

S. A. Bounty Act, Regulations (remarks) 2226 (ii).

Submarine Co.'s Patent Relief B. 77 (Mr. Proulx) in Com., 4539 (iii).

Superior and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 78 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3963 (ii).

SUPPLY.

Arts, Agriculture, &c., (cold storage for fruit) 6983 (iv); (Gold and Silver Marking Act) 809; (Public Works Health Act) 810 (i); (swine commission) 6984 (iv); (Tracadie Lazaretto) 810 (i).

Canals—Lachine (cement) 797; (wharfs and basins) 786 (i).

Canals—Welland (Port Maitland) 2033 (ii).

Canals—Soulanges (slope trimmings) 1570 (i).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (experimental farm) 6982 (iv); (salaries) 643 (i).

Civil Govt. (charges of management) 399 (i).

Civil Govt.—Civil Service Commission (salaries) 391 (i).

Civil Govt.—Customs (Board of Customs) 602 (i).

Civil Govt.—Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (salaries) 398 (i).

Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (salaries) 428 (i).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 440 (i).
Civil Govt.—Public Works (salaries) 3665 (ii).
Customs—Miscellaneous (printing and stationery) 609 (i).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 7011 (iv).
Indians—B. C. (cleansing orchards) 1160; (destitute) 1139; (schools) 1142; (surveys commission) 1151 (i).
Indians—Generally (grist and saw mills) 1016; (inspectors) 1162; (oil boring) 1170; (triennial clothing) 1014 (i).
Indians—Ont. (legal expenses) 994; (surveys) 989 (i).
Indians—Ont. and Que. (schools) 983, 989 (i).
Indians—P. E. I. (Lennox wharf) 1001 (i).
Indians—Sask. (farm implements) 1002 (i).
Indians—Yukon (schools) 1160 (i).
Interior—Miscellaneous (buffalo herds) 6994 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoy steamer) 6912; (construction) 6904; (ice breaking in Thunder Bay) 6915.
Marine and Fisheries (fisheries conference) 3689 (ii).
Marine—Public Works (St. Lawrence ship canal) 6877 (iv).
Militia (salaries) 2278 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Banff, roads and bridges) 1171; (Banff, water works) 1171 (i).
Northwest Mounted Police (force) 3660 (ii).
Northwest Ter. Govt. (salaries) 1171 (i).
Penitentiaries (supplies) 916 (i).
Post Office (country postmasters) 1703 (i).
Printing and Stationery (salaries) 807 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (engineers, &c.) 1619; (heating) 1614; (lighting) 1616 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, P. O.) 1549 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Bridgewater) 1284; (Halifax) 1289 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (furniture) 1605; (museum) 1277; (Rideau Hall, grounds) 1611; (Rideau Hall, heating) 1612; (telephones) 1606 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (rents, &c.) 1620 (i).
Public Works—Dom. (cattle quarantine stations) 1620 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 2511 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Beaver) 1622; (Buctouche) 1624; (Moncton) 1628 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2343 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood) 3298 (ii).
Railways—G.T.P. (inspection) 2049 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Aston track scale) 3418 (ii); (board of commissioners) 6989 (iv); (Windsor) 3421 (ii).
Railways—N.T.R. (surveys, &c.) 6985 (iv)
Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance) 2047 (ii).

Telephones in Canada, Control of Rates, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1770 (i).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Tenders: *See* 'Govt. Tenders,' 'Investigations.'
Water Carriage of Goods, Regulations *re* (Ques.) 2764 (ii).
Water Powers leased on Canals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2039 (ii).
Weights and Measures, Discussion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3684 (ii).
Welland Canal Water Power, Lease to Cataract Power Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2036 (ii).
Western Canadian Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 37 (Mr. Knowles) in Com., 2564 (ii).
Wharfs: *See* 'Govt. Harbours,' &c.
Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4185 (iii).
Yukon Ordinances (beer tax) on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 5893 (iv).
Yukon Ordinances (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7075 (iv).

STANFIELD, Mr. J., *Colchester.*

Canadian Coasting Trade, Number of British or Canadian, &c. (Ques.) 5633 (iii).
Coasting Trade, O.C. *re* Change of Date, &c. (Ques.) 3051 (ii).
Dickie, Alfred, Payments to *re* Damages by Fire (Ques.) 1075 (i).
Dom. Arsenal, Quebec, Names of Bidders, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3050 (ii).
I.C.R., Classification of Employees, Hours of Labour, &c. (Ques.) 1723 (i), 2156 (ii).
—— Freight Clerks, Betterments, Govtl. Intention (Ques.) 1561 (i).
—— Motor Cars, Cost of Construction, Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 1719 (i).
—— Truro Staff, Number of Employees for Sept., Oct., Nov. and Dec., 1908 (Ans.) 244 (i).
—— number employed, &c. (Ques.) 328 (i).
—— Station at Truro, Erection of (Ques.) 824 (i).
—— Stationery and Printing, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2374 (ii).
Londonderry Station to Great Village, Mail Contract, Name, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 824 (i).
Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 2393 (ii).
Shad Fisheries, Rep. of Prof. Prince, Inquiry for Ret., 3254 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (rents) 2453 (ii); (water) 1619 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Westville) 1292 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Joliette) 1296 (i).

STANFIELD, Mr. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (bridges) 2474; (Brule) 2460; (Economy) 2460 (ii); (Tatamagouche) 1621 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (Truro) 2754 (ii).

Tatamagouche Bay Wharf Expenditure for Oct. and Nov., &c. (Ques.) 185 (i).

Truro Armoury, Apptmt. of Caretaker, &c. (Ques.) 186 (i).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D., *Macdonald*

Assiniboine River Improvements, Cor., Vouchers, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1191 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 3254 (ii).

Brandon City, Exchange of Lands, Issue of Patent, &c. (Ques.) 2322 (ii).

Budget, The (remarks) 5063 (iii).

C.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. McIntyre) in Com., 3160 (ii).

Election Act (ry. employees) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 1°, 3472 (ii).

Experimental Farms, Live Stock, &c. (M for ret.*) 1420 (i).
——— (Ques.) 546 (i).

Experimental Farms, Locations, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1959 (i).

Govt. Tenders, Ques. of Order, 285 (i).

Patents for Lands of Sections 16, 20 and 22, &c., Payment of Taxes, &c. (Ques.) 4900 (iii).

Ry. Commissioners Board, Pet. *re* Vacancy, &c. (Ques.) 529 (i).
——— Apptmt. of Practical Farmer from N.W. (prop. res.) 2625 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order, 2648 (ii).

Rural Free Mail Delivery, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 2802 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census, &c.) 696; (Gold and Silver Marking Act) 809 (i); (live stock industry) 5837 (iii); (Public Works Health Act) 810 (i).
Excise (methylated spirits) 449 (i).
Penitentiaries Generally (supplies) 899; St. Vincent de Paul (Supplies) 914 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 1543; (Winnipeg P.O.) 1549 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 618 (i)
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Portage la Prairie) 3332 (ii).

Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Purchase by Govt., Sales, &c. (Ques.) 477 (i).

Telephone Rates in Canada, Control of by Govt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1784 (i).

Thompson Municipality Patent, Grant, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6280 (iv).

Usury Act, 1908, Prosecutions, Penalties, &c., (Ques.) 481 (i).

STEWART, Mr. T. J., *West Hamilton.*

Budget, The, 5089 (iii).

Criminal Code (concealed weapons) Amt. (B. 101) 1° m., 2217 (ii).

Foresters Insurance Business, Complaints *re* (remarks) 6510 (iv).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6321 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food (fraudulent marking) 456 (i).
Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (salaries) 429 (i).

STRATTON, Mr. J. R., *West Peterborough.*

I.C.R. (remarks) on Annual Stmnt., 2700 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Trent (construction) 3178 (ii).

SUTHERLAND, Hon. R. F., *North Essex.*

Budget, The, 4616 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6764 (iv).

Florence Mining Co.'s Appeal *re* Ont. Govt. Legislation, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 6922 (iv).

House of Commons Classification, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 6106 (iv).

Mayes Affidavit, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4276 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Emmerson) 277 (i).

Salvation Army Governing Council incorp. (B. 142) 1°*, 4411 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Dredging (generally) 6539 (iv).

TALBOT, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4469 (iii).

Anglo Canadian and Continental Bank (B. 118) 1°*, 3703 (ii).

Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. Dubeau) on Senate Amts., 4594 (iii).

Experimental Farms, Locations, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1941 (i).

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6127 (iv).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 3622 (ii); on M. for 2°, 5153; on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to M. for 3°, 5618 (iii).

House of Commons Classification, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 6111 (iv).

Immigration to U.S., Repatriation, &c., on M. (Mr. Paquet) for Cor., 855 (i).

Imperial General Staff, Prop. Organization, O.Cs. Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 1420 (i).

TALBOT, Mr. O. E.—*Con.*

Japanese Immigration, Sir P. Lake's Speech at Toronto (Ques.) 1065 (i).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3962 (ii).

Mayes-McAvity Affidavit, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) Ques. of Order, 4280 (iii).

Proportional Representation, Ques. of Order, 2599 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Militia (salaries) 2282 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Saguenay dredging) 2814 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. Geo., *Leeds.*

Agricultural Estimates, Delay in Considering (remarks) 4412 (iii).

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4448 (iii).

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 751 (i).

Australian Trade with Canada, Subsidy, &c., on M. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 6473 (iv).

Aylesworth, Geo. Anson, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 248 (i).

Black Lake Postmaster, Complaints, Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 4896 (iii).

British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 85) 1°*, 1813 (i).

Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Ry. Names of Stockholders, Passenger Rates, Freight, &c. (Ques.) 3473 (ii).

Budget, The, (remarks) 3649 (ii).

Canada-France SS. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res. 4443 (iii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 5481; on M. (Mr. Henderson) to ref. back to special Com., 5443; Ques. of Order, 5458 (iii).

Canadian Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 11 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 987 (i).

Carson, Mr. Geo., Emplymt. by P. O. Dept., Absence, &c. (Ques.) 4697 (iii).

Charlottetown Post Office, Sidewalk Construction, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 4228 (iii).

Coal conserved for the Home Market, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 3109 (ii).

Coal Strikes in the West, Settlement of (remarks) 4120 (iii).

Commercial Feeding Stuffs B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5208 (iii).

Debates, Official, on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc. in 1st Rep. of Som., 1478 (i).

Debt of Canada, Jan. 31, 1909, Increase from 1908 (Ques.) 1079 (i).

Easter Adjournment (remarks) 3649 (ii).

External Affairs Dept. B. 90 (Mr. Murphy) in Com., 4436 (iii).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1657 (i).

TAYLOR, Mr. Geo.—*Con.*

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4423, 4430 (iii), 5907 (iv).

Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening, on prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 284 (i).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 3609 (ii); on M. for 2°, 5123; in Com., 5250 (iii).

G.T. Ry., Indebtedness to Canada (M. for O.Cs.*) 3056 (ii).

——— Interest Due, &c. (Ques.) 2759 (ii).

Griffith, Mr. Wm., Apptmt. as Immigration Agent, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 1415 (i).

Higgs, Deportation by Immigration Dept. (Ques.) 147 (i).

House of Commons, Additional Rooms, Allotment, &c. (Ques.) 177, 466 (i).

House of Commons Elevators, Repairing and Running (remarks) 2337 (ii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6182 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. Bill, Progress in Senate, 7069 (iv).

I.C.R. Freight Clerks Disputes, Letter of Dep. Min. of Rys. *re* Award of Board (Ques.) 4697 (iii).

Inverness Harbour, C.B. Improvement, Purchase of land, &c. (Ques.) 4637 (iii).

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, by Judge Cassels, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3910 (ii).

Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s (B. 80) 1°*, 1648 (i); in Com., 3411, 3605 (ii).

Lacas, Emile, Absence from Dept. for 1906-7-8, Pay, &c. (Ques.) 4635 (iii).

Lansdowne Drill Shed, Tenders, Contract *re* Repairs (Ques.) 5630 (iii).

Margaree Island Lighthouse, Expenditure *re* Road (Ques.) 6090 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries Purchases, &c., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Brodeur) 4044 (iii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 154 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5235 (iii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5234 (iii).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5570 (iii).

Parliament Hill Grounds, Condition of (remarks) 6473 (iv).

Port Hood Breakwater, Expenditures *re* (Ques.) 4892 (iii).

Priv., Ques. of (Mr. Conmee) *re* 'Special Trains,' 4295 (iii).

Public Accounts Com., on M. to ref. Pub. Accounts, &c. to Com., 1479 (i).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 2394 (ii).

Sessional Allowance Deduction (remarks) 4119 (iii).

TAYLOR, Mr. Geo.—*Con.*

Sorel Ship Yards, Repairs of Boats owned by Marine Officials, &c. (Ques.) 4702 (iii).

Submarine Co.'s Patent Relief B. 77 (Mr. Proulx) in Com., 4539 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock industry) 5833 (iii); (Year-book) 704, 726 (i).

Canals—Galops (collector) 1574 (i).

Canals—Lachine (cement) 1566; (cement testing) 794 (i).

Canals—Trent (Holland River) 1591 (i).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 649 (i).

Civil Govt.—Aud. General (salaries) 383 (i).

Civil Govt (charges of management) 399 (i).

Civil Govt.—Customs (board of customs) 582; (contingencies) 590 (i).

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 383 (i).

Civil Govt.—Public Works (salaries) 613 (i).

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 720 (i).

Civil Govt—Trade and Commerce (salaries) 385 (i).

Civil Service Commission (salaries) 387, 714 (i).

Customs—Miscellaneous (printing and stationery) 609; (revenue cruisers) 611 (i).

Fisheries (dog fish plant) 6950; (international commission) 6968; (transportation) 6956 (iv).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 7002 (iv).

Indians—B.C. (destitute) 1141; (schools) 1143 (i).

Indians—Generally (legal expenses) 996 (i).

Indians—N. S. (seed grain) 998 (i).

Indians—Ont. (annuities) 998 (i).

Indians—P. E. I. (Lennox wharf) 1000 (i); (medical attendance) 1000 (i).

Marine and Fisheries (biological stations) 6954 (iv); (fisheries conference) 3691 (ii).

Militia (salaries) 2302 (ii).

Mines (geological specimens) 7063 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 3437 (ii).

Penitentiaries—Kingston (skis) 7056 (iv); (supplies) 886 (i).

Penitentiaries—St. Vincent de Paul (supplies) 914 (i).

Penitentiaries—Stony Mountain (supplies) 919 (i).

Post Office (miscellaneous) 1716 (i).

Printing and Stationery (salaries) 805 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armmouries) 1596 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 1548 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Cornwall) 1360; (R. M. College) 1383; (Whitby) 1542 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additional wing) 1256; (astronomical observatory) 617; (grounds) 1601 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. Johns) 1317 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's residence) 1592 (i).

Public Works—Dredging (generally) 6539 (iv); Mar. Provs. (plant) 3346 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. Geo.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Dauphin) 2997; (Portage la Prairie) 3333 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Blanche river) 2966; (bridges, repairs) 2972; (Burlington piers) 2967; (Collingwood) 3294; (Goderich) 2968; (Gravenhurst) 2981; (Kingston channel) 2979; (Lake Nipissing) 3309; (Little Current) 2974; (McGregor's Creek) 2974; (Magnetawan) 2983; (Meaford) 2984; (Richard's Landing) 2978; (Sault Ste. Marie) 2980; (Southampton) 3317; (Spanish River) 3328; (Toronto) 2980; (Wolfe Island canal) 3304 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Batiscan) 3276; (Bonaventure) 2559, 3282; (Cap St. Ignace) 2523; (Lake St. Francis) 2555; (Laprairie ice piers) 2899; (Saguenay dredging) 2805; (St. Alphonse de Bagotville) 2902; (St. Francis river) 2898; (St. Francis du Lac) 3286; (St. Jean des Chaillons) 2908; (St. Nicholas) 2909 (ii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (monuments) 6543 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 3349 (ii).

Quarantine ('Challenger') 5884 (iii).

Railways—I. C. R. (working expenses) 3421 (ii).

Railways—P.E. I. (Charlottetown) 2960; (Harmony-Elmira) 2957 (ii).

Wharfs: *See* 'Govt. Harbours,' &c.

Wire Fencing. Advertisements for Tenders, &c. (M. for ret.*) 354 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 1321 (i).

Wire Fencing purchased in 1908, Tenders, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 245 (i).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D., *New Westminster*

Address, The, 120 (i).

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 762 (i).

Bourke, Mr., Retirement of: *See* 'Miner, Bill.'

B.C. Penitentiary, Escape of Convict Bill Miner, Rep. *re* Investigation (Ques.) 350 (i)

B. C. Timber Lands, Leases granted since 1896, Names, Addresses, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1923 (i)

Budget, The, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fielding) 5060 (iii).

Cable between Vancouver and Mainland, Application *re* (Ques.) 1073 (i).

Chilliwack Post Office Site, Plans, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 1414 (i).

Chilliwack Public Building, Negotiations *re* Purchase of Property (Ques.) 1073 (i).

Fisheries in B. C., Depletion by American Fishermen, on M. for Sup., 6500 (iv).

Fisheries Regulations *re* International Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6967 (iv).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

Franking Privilege and Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1663 (i).

——— Ques. of Order, 1683 (i).

Fraser River, Flooding at Delta, Rep. of Mr. Coste, &c. (Ques.) 2587 (ii).

Gillis, Angus, Claims *re* Compensation for Injuries on I. C. R. (Ques.) 6089 (iv).

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5905 (iv).

G. T. P., Siberian Labourers (Ques.) 4898 (iii).

——— Information *re* Answer to Question, 4989 (iii).

G. T. P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5328 (iii)

G. T. P., Sub-contractors on B. C. Section, Importation of Labour, &c. (remarks) 3939 (ii).

——— Unpaid Wages, Claims of Stationmen, &c., Payments *re* (Ques.) 5629 (iii).

Hickman, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Govt., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 3054 (ii).

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3921 (ii).

Labour Hours for Working Men, Restriction, &c., on M. (Mr .Verville) to Com. of Sup., 5944 (iv).

Mail Contracts, Fair Wage Clause (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3430 (ii).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B.C. Penitentiary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 925 (i), 7035 (iv).

——— Ques. of Order, 950 (i).

——— Cor. Reps., &c. (M. for ret.) 1192 (i).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B.C. Penitentiary, Investigation *re*, on M. for Sup., 1813 (i).

——— Ques. of Order, 1821 (i).

——— Letter *re* Visit of Alex. D. McIntyre, &c. (Ques.) 2595 (ii).

——— Moneys received previous to escape from Penitentiary (Ques.) 4898 (iii).

See 'B.C.,' &c.

New Westminster Dry Dock, Application for Govt. Aid (Ques.) 3048 (ii).

New Westminster Post Office, Free Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1709 (i).

Nickel Ore, Export Duty *re* (Ques.) 5634 (iii).

Oriental Immigration into B.C., Res. *re* Royal Commission (Ques.) 1242 (i).

——— Inaccurate Answer, 1248 (i).

Piers, Wharfs, &c., constructed by Day Labour, Procedure *re* (remarks) in Com of Sup., 2521 (ii)

Political Weekly Letter, Franking and Distribution by Govt. (Ques.) 1920 (i).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

Postal Law Violation, Number of Prosecutions, Penalties, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1924 (i).

Railway Belt, B.C., Litigation between Dom. and B.C. (Ques.) 3043 (ii).

Registered Stock, Arrangements *re* Importation from U.S., Regulations *re* (Ques.) 2379 (ii).

Richmond Rifle Range, Protection *re* Shooting (Ques.) 1723 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 729 (i); (experimental farm) 5940 (iv); (live stock industry) 5875 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 724 (i).

Fisheries (biological stations) 3438; (international fisheries commission) 3459 (ii); 6967 (iv).

Indians—B.C. (surveys commission) 1144 (i).

Militia (ordnance) 2310 (ii).

Penitentiaries (B.C.) 7035 (iv); (retirements) 924 (i).

Post Office (rural mails) 3430 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Chilliwack) 2090; (Victoria immigration) 2086; (Williams Head) 2090 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 1598 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 623; (Mount's Hill) 1601 (i).

Public Works—Dredging (generally) 6540 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Okanagan) 6549 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrews rapids) 2108 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. Andrews) 1645; (St. John tributaries) 1639; (Welchpool Campobello) 1646 (i).

Public Works—Harbour and Rivers—N.S. (Cow Bay) 2471; (generally) 2118 (ii).

Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 57) 1°*, 898 (i).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. Wm. (Minister of Inland Revenue) *Comox-Atlin.*

Agricultural Fertilizers (B. 110) 1°m, 2910 (ii); in Com., 4446, 5202 (iii).

Belleville and Corbyville, Retirements and Apptmts. (Ans.) 4894 (iii).

Commercial Feeding Stuffs (B. 127) 1°m, 3936 (ii); in Com., 5204 (iii); on Senate Amts., 6743 (iv).

Deferred Elections, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burrell) 2846 (ii).

Inland Revenue Seizures, on Inquiry for, 2773 (ii).

James Bay and Labrador, Exploratory Party (Ans.) 4697 (iii).

Kelly, Douglas Co.: *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works,' &c.

Patent Medicines Act, Apptmts. of Analysts, &c. (Ans.) 3476 (ii).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. Wm.—*Con*

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Mines (salaries) 3673 (ii).
Mines (assay office, B.C.) 7063; (geological specimens) 7063: (ore tests) 7063 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 3355 (ii).

Weights and Measures *re* Vessels, Owners and Rvs. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3683 (ii).

THOBURN, Mr. W., *North Lanark.*

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 6703 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 734 (i).
Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 912; Dorchester (supplies) 917; St. Vincent de Paul (supplies) 916; Stony Mountain (supplies) 923 (i).
Public Works—Dredging (generally) 6540 6554 (iv).

Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4140 (iii).

THORNTON, Mr. C. J., *Durham.*

Cobourg Harbour Expenditure for 1908, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 3988 (ii).

Meteorological Station at Port Hope, Situation, &c. (Ques.) 3985 (ii).

Meteorological Stations in Ont., Number erected in 1908, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 3195 (ii).

Rural Free Mail Delivery, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 2782 (ii).

SUPPLY

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Newcastle) 6543 (iv).

TOBIN, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2356 (ii).

TODD, Mr. W. F., *Charlotte.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 15 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (peat testing) 1391 (i).

TOLMIE, Mr. J., *North Bruce.*

Parsons, Frank, Relief (B. 130) 1°*, 4286 (iii).

TURCOTTE, Mr. G. A., *Nicolet.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 20 (i).

Canadian Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 1859 (i).

Experimental Farms, Location, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1947 (i).

TURCOTTE, Mr. G. A.—*Con.*

Labour Hours for Working Men, Restriction, on M. (Mr. Verville) to Com. of Sup., 5925 (iv).

Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 3540 (ii).

Submarine Co.'s Patent Relief B. 77 (Mr. Proulx) in Com., 4543 (iii).

TURCOTTE, Mr. J. P., *Quebec County.*

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3932 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (docks, &c.) 2896 (ii).

Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4214 (iii).

TURGEON, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6127 (iv).

I.C.R. Branch Lines Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2209 (ii).

N.B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Report, on Amt. (Mr. Crothers) to Com. of Sup., 5825 (iii).

Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 1442 (i).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G., *Assiniboia.*

American Silver, Exportation of (remarks) 6780 (iv).

Athabaska Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 84) 1°*, 1813 (i).

Australian Trade Direct for Eastern Canada, on M. for Sup., 6469 (iv).

Blackhall, Victor Eccles Relief (B. 115) 1°*, 3651 (ii).

Brandon Transfer Ry. Co.'s (B. 9) 1°*, 159 (i).

British Colonial Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 114) 1°*, 3651 (ii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3005 (ii), 5481 (iii), 6047 (iv).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5448 (iii).

C.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com. (amt.) 3041 ; in Com., 3155 (ii).

C.P.R. and G.T.P. Joint Section at Fort William Co.'s (B. 25) 1°*, 290; in Com., 1718 (i).

C.P.R., New Stock, Closing of Law Suit (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2920 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1334 (i).

Civil Service, Names and Positions of those receiving no Increases (Ques.) 1558 (i).

Civil Service Salaries, Increase B. 187 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 406 (i); in Com. 6346 (iv).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G.—*Con.*

Coltman, Anne Louisa Relief (B. 116) 1°*, 3651 (ii).
Cowan, John Christopher, Relief (B. 184) 1°*, 5997 (iv).
Franking Privilege *re* Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).
Grenville-Hawkesbury Provl. Bridge, Bonus *re* (Ques.) 1558 (i).
G.T.P. Lake Superior Branch Subsidy (B. 30) 1°*, 290; 2° m., 666, 1024, 1364 (i).
G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 3644 (ii).
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3951 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 6075 (iv).
Markham Post Office, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 6406 (iv).
Mexican Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 168) 1°*, 5623 (iii).
Railway Act (construction) Amt. (B. 65) 1° m., 1236 (i).
Railway Act (fires) Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Clarke) on M. for 2°, 377 (i).
Superior and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 78 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3971 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Civil Service Commission (salaries) 395 (i).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 7006 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (original construction) 2926 (ii).
Toronto, Niagara and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 42 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 2064 (ii).
Union Station, G.T.P. &c. at Portage la Prairie (B. 28) 1°*, 290 (i).
Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B 29 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 2139 (ii).

VERVILLE, Mr. A., *Maisonneuve.*

Budget, The, 4757 (iii).
Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, Restrictions, &c. (Ques.) 3704 (ii).
Labour Hours for Working Men, Restrictions, &c., on M. for Sup., 5913 (iv).
Public Works, Hours of Labour (B. 22) 1°*, 240 (i).
Public Works, Hours of Labour (B. 35) M. to dischg. from Order Paper, 4990 (iii).

WALLACE, Mr. T. G., *Centre York, Ont.*

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease, &c. (Ques.) 6784 (iv).
Budget, The, 4970 (iii).
——Remarks, 4855 (iii).
Chinaware, Customs Duty, &c. (Ques.) 4636 (iii).
Etobicoke Postmaster, Apptmt. of, Salary, &c. (Ques.), 671 (i).

WALLACE, Mr. T. G.—*Con.*

Holland (Newmarket) Canal, Expenditure *re* Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1915 (i).
Lowndes, Charles Bowerbank, Relief (B. 144) 1°*, 4411 (iii).
Market Garden Produce, Total Imports 1901-1908, Duty collected (Ques.) 5036 (iii).
Milk River, Mackie Lease, Particulars *re* (Ques.) 6405 (iv).
Moore, Isaac Relief (B. 145) 1°*, 4411 (iii).
Newmarket Canal, Holland River, (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 112; Amt. Neg. (Y. 71; N. 112) 3176 (ii).
Newmarket Canal to Lake Wilcox, Construction, Surveys, &c. (Ques.) 5157 (iii).
Post Office Payments in Newmarket and Aurora, to Mail Carriers, &c. (Ques.) 1560 (i).
Somerville, Thos., Payments to by Post Office Dept. (Ques.) 1559 (i).
S.A. Patriotic Fund, Names of Beneficiaries (Ques.) 2157 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Trent (Holland River) 1590, 1886 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Markham) 1386 (i).

WARBURTON, Mr. A. B., *Queens, P.E.I.*

Budget, The, 4923 (iii).
Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 218 (i).
Ice-breaking Steamers, Superannuation of Officers, Reps. (M. for copies) 1469 (i).
Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 3534 (ii).
P.E.I. Winter Communication with the Mainland, (M. for ret.) 6448 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Civil Service Commission (salaries) 710 (i).
Railways—P.E.I. (Harmony-Elmira) 2956 (ii).

WHITE, Mr. G. V., *North Renfrew.*

Graham Post Office, Pet. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1713 (i).
Natural Resources Conservation Commission B. 159 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6382 (iv).
Petewawa Camp, Number of Permanent Force, Date of Opening, &c. (Ques.) 5639 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 1908 (i).
Militia (ordnance) 2309; (properties) 2316 (ii).
Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 896 (i).
Post Office (ry. clerks) 1699 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (furniture) 1605 (i); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Petewawa) 3307 (ii).

WHITE, Mr. W. H., *Victoria, Alberta.*

Campbell, Aaron Wm. Morley Relief (B. 183) 1°*, 5997 (iv).

Deferred Elections, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burrell) 2866 (ii).

WILSON, Mr. C. A., *Laval*

Budget, The, 4792 (iii).

Cobalt Lake Act, Disallowance of, on M. (Mr. Clarke) for Cor., 1740 (i).

Jesus River Dredging, Amount of Expropriation, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 1069 (i).

Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Repairs to, &c. (Ques.) 1557 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Insufficient Number of Guards, &c. (Ques.) 1417 (i).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (wharfs and basins) 791 (i).

Civil Govt.—Civil Service Commission (salaries) 398 (i).

Wharfs between Longue Pointe and Pointe-aux-Trembles, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 1068 (i).

WILSON, Mr. U., *Lennox and Addington.*

Agriculture Committee's Rep. of 1908, Printing and Distribution (remarks) 3938 (ii).

Dorland and U. E. Loyalist Mail Route, Mail Carrier, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 334 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6181 (iv).

Immigration Agents, Names, Addresses, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1405 (i).

Immigration, Printing and Advertising, Amount expended for 1908-9 (Ques.) 2381 (ii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 2597 (ii).

Interior, Deptl. Rep., Inquiry for, 876 (i).

Miller, Mr. N. B., Immigration Agent, Fraudulent Returns (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6994 (iv).

Napanee River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2093 (ii).

——— Surveys, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 333 (i).

Roblin and Forest Mills Mail Route, Carrier, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 333 (i).

Sillsville and The Pines Mail Route, Carrier, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 333 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 3189; (fruit transportation) 3187 (ii); (Year Book) 703 (i), 3186 (ii).

Immigration (agents' salaries) 6994; (deportations) 7021 (iv).

Penitentiaries—Dorchester (supplies) 917; Generally (supplies) 910 (i).

WILSON, Mr. U.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Port Arthur) 2093 (ii); (Toronto drill hall) 1504 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Quebec citadel) 3211 (ii).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N., *Sherbrooke.*

Annual Drill, Discontinuance of, &c. (Ques.) 343 (i).

Bisley Team, Use of Ross Rifle (Ques.) 5642 (iii).

Brewster, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt., *re* Immigration (Ques.) 3483 (ii).

Costello, Thos., Rep. *re* Woollen Industry, &c. (Ques.) 1176 (i).

Eastern Townships Cavalry Brigade, Site for &c. (Ques.) 5644 (iii).

Militia Camps in Eastern Townships, Selection of Site, &c. (Ques.) 343 (i).

Navy of Canada or G.B., Contributions *re* (M. for cor.*) 1191 (i).

Quebec Camps of Instruction, Date of Regiments attending, &c. (Ques.) 5641 (iii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 3258 (ii).

Rifles, Swiss and Foreign imported, Regulations *re* (Ques.) 2381 (ii).

Ross Rifle, Authority *re* Adoption by Can. Govt. (Ques.) 1072 (i).

——— Bayonet Contracts, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 344 (i).

——— Bisley Competitions, Description of (Ques.) 343 (i).

——— Factory Bayonets, Instalment of Machinery, &c. (Ques.) 670 (i).

——— Mark I and Mark II, used by Canada at Bisley, Description, &c. (M. for ret.*) 684 (i).

——— Rep. of Small Arms Com., Date of last Contract (Ques.) 471 (i).

——— Reps. *re* Merit or Demerit, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.) 1189 (i).

Sherbrooke Armoury, Completion of, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 5643 (iii).

Sherbrooke New Regiment, Construction, Appropriations *re* Band (Ques.) 5643 (iii).

S.A. Bounty Act, Regulations *re* (remarks) 2232 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Service Commission (salaries) 714 (i)

Militia (ordnance) 2308; (salaries) 2289 (ii).

WRIGHT, Mr. WM., *Muskoka.*

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4451 (iii).

Budget, The, 5007 (iii).

Canada-France SS. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 4438 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6393 (iv).

WRIGHT, Mr. Wm.—*Con.*

Dom. Elections, Payments to Officials, &c. (Ques.) 1067 (i).

Georgian Islands, Sale of, Advertisements *re* (Ques.) 3991 (ii).

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4417, 4431 (iii).

G.T.P. Loan, B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com on Res., 3631 (ii).

——— on M. for 3° (remarks) 5550 (iii).

Natural Resources Conservation B. 159 (Mr. Fisher) on prop. Res., 6377; in Com., 6383 (iv).

Newmarket Canal, Holland River, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com., of Sup., 3126 (ii).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 2392 (ii); in Com., 6224 (iv).

Submarine Co.'s Patent Relief B. 77 (Mr. Proulx) in Com., 4540 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census, &c.) 700 (i); (experimental farm electric ry.) 3192; (Patent Record) 3186 (ii).

Canals—Grenville (macadamizing road) 2029; (St. Anne's locks) 2029 (ii).

Canals—Trent (Holland River) 1578, 1895 (i); (construction) 3177 (ii).

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 1908 (i); (Port Maitland) 2031 (ii)

Civil Govt.—Customs (board of customs) 586 (i).

Fisheries (commissions) 6957; (dog fish plant) 6950; (protection cruiser) 6947 (iv).

WRIGHT, Mr. Wm.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Immigration (deportations) 7021; (St. Boniface hospital) 7035 (iv).

Indians—B. C. (surveys commission) 1152 (i).

Indians—Generally (inspectors travelling expenses) 1161; (timber inspectors) 1161 (i).

Interior (St. Mary's and Milk River diversions) 6270 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries (hospitals) 6946 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Bridgewater) 1286 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Markham) 1386; (Whitby) 1393 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 620; (Major's Hill) 1601 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Gravenhurst) 2980; (Montreal River) 2977; (Tiffin) 2115; (Toronto) 2980; (Victoria) 2117 (ii).

Railways—I. C. R. (Sackville) 2935 (ii).

Railways—Miscellaneous (unforeseen items) 2054 (ii).

Sussex Street Govtl. Buildings, Architects Plans, Ownership, &c. (Ques.) 4638 (iii).

Welland Canal, Lease to Cataract Power Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2037 (ii).

Wharfs on Inland Waters (remarks) in Com of Sup., 3331 (ii).

Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 2140 (ii).

Yukon Ordnances (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7076 (iv).

INDEX—SUBJECTS

Abitibi and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 66.'

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12; Moved (Mr. Todd) 15; Seconded (Mr. Turcotte) 20 (i).

Debate:—(Mr. R. L. Borden 23; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 33; (Mr. Foster) 46; (Mr. Cowan) 57; (Mr. Brodeur) 63; (Mr. Barnard) 70; (Mr. Burrell) 72; (Mr. Lemieux) 80; (Mr. R. Smith) 94; (Mr. Goodeve) 111; (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 120; (Mr. Lewis) 128; (Mr. Campbell) 132 (i)

——— Ques. of Order (Mr. R. Smith) 134; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 134 (i).

Adulteration Act: *See* 'B. No. 107.'

Adulteration of Food, Fraudulent Marking: in Com. of Sup., 455 (i).

Aerial Navigation, Experiments by Canadians, Govt. Aid to: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2383 (ii).

Agricultural Fertilizers: *See* 'B. No. 110.'

AGRICULTURE.

Agriculture, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 12 (i).

——— Deptl. Employees, Name, Position, Salary, Increases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1058 (i).

———Expenditure *re* Employees: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2756 (ii).

——— Expenditure *re* Farms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1070 (i).

——— French Translation of Documents: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2762 (ii).

——— Outside Service at Ottawa, Names, Position, Increases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 823, 1409 (i).

——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 673, 688, 809 (i).

Agricultural Estimates, Delay in Considering: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4412 (iii).

Agricultural Industry, Number of Farmers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 151 (i).

Animals, Health of, Inspection, &c., Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 821 (i).

Bacon Curing Industry for 1907-8, Number of Hogs condemned, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 342 (i).

Cold Storage, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6833 (iv).

See main heading.

Dairy and Fruit Industries, Cold Storage, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3187 (ii).

Experimental Farms: in Com. of Sup., 5947 (iv).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*

Experimental Farms or Stations, Establishment of since Jan., 1908, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 156 (i).

Experimental Farms, Live Stock, Number, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 546 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Staples) 1420 (i).

Experimental Farms, Locations in Eastern Canada, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1925 (i).

'Farm Weeds,' Number distributed, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Goodeve) 2757 (ii).

Foot and Mouth Disease, States quarantined, Prevention, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. T. Chisholm) 684 (i).

Fruit Imports into B.C. from U.S., Values, Quantity, &c.: (Mr. Burrell) 3250 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act, Number of Inspectors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3477 (ii).

Hogs killed from Nov., 1907, to Nov., 1908, Condemnation of, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Beattie) 684 (i).

Hogs, Dressed, Inspection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCoig) 2758 (ii).

Holstein Cattle at Experimental Farm, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2756 (ii).

Live Stock Industry: in Com. of Sup., 5833 (ii).

Nappan Experimental Farm, Names of Employees, Rate of Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 5640 (iii).

Potatoes sold in Bags, Statue *re* Measurements: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 351 (i).

Registered Stock, Arrangements *re* Importation from U. S., Regulations *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2379 (ii).

Stork, W. W., Inspector of Animals, Details *re* Travelling Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 6092 (iv).

Tobacco, Canadian, Encouragement of: in Com. of Sup., 5881 (iii).

Aids to Navigation, Light System, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6904 (iv).

Aids to Navigation on N. S. Coast, Applications *re* Personal Inspections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 5640 (iii).

Alberta Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 23.'

Alberta and Saskatchewan Annual Allowance, Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 2588 (ii).

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 125.'
Algoma Rifles, 97th Reg., Removal from Sault Ste. Marie to Sudbury: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1411 (i).
Algoma Steel Co., N. T. R. Contracts *re* Rails, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 336 (i).
Alien Labour Act, Proposed Amts.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 166 (i).
Allegash River, Diversion of Waters, Reps., &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Michaud) 3082 (ii).
All-Red Line, Negotiations *re*, Progress, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 148 (i).
——— Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 158 (i).
——— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7070 (iv).
Alsek and Yukon Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 67.'
American Bar-Lock Co.: *See* 'B. No. 123.'
American Fishing Vessels; Seizures, Courts of Trial Procedure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 172 (i).
American Immigration Agents, Interference with Canadians: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) 2242 (ii).
American Silver, Exportation of: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 6780 (iv).
American Tariff, Consideration of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5103 (iii).
Amherst Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1282 (i).
Ammonal Explosives (1908) Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 93.'
Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank: *See* 'B. No. 118.'
Animals Contagious Diseases Act : *See* 'B. No. 18.
Animals, Health of, Inspection, &c., Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 821 (i).
Annapolis Ice Piers, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 2338 (ii).
Annual Drill: in Com. of Sup., 2311, 3422 (ii).
Annual Drill, Discontinuance of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 343 (i).
Annuities Act, Number of Applicants, Amount &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. Haggart) 3477 (ii).
Annuities and Administration Treaty of Indians: in Com. of Sup., 998 (i).
Annuities for Old Age, Administration, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6660 (iv).
See 'Old Age,' 'Pensions,' &c.
Anse a la Barbe Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2512 (ii).
Anse a l'Ilot: in Com. of Sup., 2513 (ii).
'Anticosti' Str., Amount of Work, Tenders *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 671 (i).
Archives: in Com. of Sup., 688 (i).
Arisaig Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3233 (ii).
Armouries built since 1896, Number, Cost, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 157 (i).
——— Incomplete, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2128, 3937 (ii).
Armouries, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 1596 (i).
Armouries supplied by Officers, Policy of Govt.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 824 (i).
Arnprior and Pontiac Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No 87.'
Ashcroft-Dawson Telegraph Lines, Supplies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3349 (ii)
Ash Wednesday Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1320 (i).
Asiatic Exclusion in B.C., Tel. of Mr. Borden: Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in debate on Address, 39 (i).
——— Denial (Mr. R. L. Borden) 39 (i).
——— Telegram to Victoria Colonist: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 290 (i).
——— Memorandum from Bishop of Columbia: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1394 (i).
——— Telegraphic Rep. of Toronto 'News'; Ques. of Priv. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 664 (i).
Assaults against the Person: *See* 'B. No. 88.'
Assay Office, Vancouver, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7063 (iv).
Assets of Canada in Detail for Dec. 31st, 1908: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 172 (i).
Assiniboine River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3332 (ii).
——— Cor., Vouchers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Staples) 1191 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Staples) 3254 (ii).
Assiniboine River, Pets., &c., *re* Straightening of: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 472 (i).
Assiniboine River Works, Cost per yard for Sept. and Oct.: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 1239 (i).
Associated Press Despatches, Amount contributed, Supervision, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 331 (i).
Aston Junction Track Scale: in Com. of Sup., 3415 (ii).
Astronomical Observatory, Boundaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6263 (iv).
Astronomical Observatory, Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6263 (iv).
Athabasca Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 68'
Athabaska Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 84.'
Aud. Gen.'s Office, Extra Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 3434 (ii).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Vols. 1 and 3: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 12 (i).
——— Part O.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 1393 (i).
——— Vol. II.: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 1474
Aud. Gen.'s Rep. Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 140, 876, 1250 (i).
(i).

Australian Trade Direct with Canada, &c.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Turriff) 6469 (iv)
Automobile Accidents: *See* 'B. No. 60.'
Avonport Piers, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2453 (ii).
Aylen, Mr. J., Emplymt. by Transcontinental Ry.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5096 (ii).
Aylesworth, Geo. Anson, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 248 (i).
Aylwin, F. P.; Grant of Land *re* Irrigation Purposes, Cor. Reps., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Magrath) 1190 (i).
Bacon Curing Industry for 1907-8, Number of Hogs condemned, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 342 (i).
Baddeck Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2453 (ii).
Bailey's Brook Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).
Bait Freezers, Cold Storage, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iv).
Band of 36th Regiment, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 4892 (iii).
See 'Militia.'
Banff Fish Hatchery, Establishment of, Representations *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 871 (i).
Banff Roads and Bridges: in Com. of Sup. 1171 (i).
Banff Water Works, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1171 (i).
Banfield Creek Life Boat, Cost, Wreck, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 1730 (i).
Bank Act Amt., Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1732 (i).
Bank Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 155.'
Bar-Lock Patent: *See* 'B. No. 123.'
Batiscan Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup., 3274 (ii).
Bay St. Lawrence Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 2455 (ii).
Beauharnois Water Power Leases: in Com. of Sup., 1910 (i).
Beaver Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1622 (i).
Beet Sugar Refineries, Duty *re* Preferential Tariff: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3047 (ii).
Bell, Charles F., Conditions of Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2322 (ii).
Belleville Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1356 (i).
Belleville and Corbyville, Collectors of Inland Revenue, Retirements, Apptmts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 4893 (iii).
Belleville Drill Hall, Land Site, Officers' Quarters: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 673, 817 (i).
——— Quarters for Officers of 40th Hastings Rifles: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1076 (i).
Bérubé, Rev. E. P., Emplymt. by Immigration Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 3986 (ii).
Bibbington, Thos., Concellation of Pilotage Certificate: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Barnard) 3991 (ii).
Big Bras d'Or Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2455 (ii).
Big Grass Marsh Swamp Lands, Transfer of, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Molloy) 3056 (ii).
Bills of Lading, Discussion *re* Bill: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6918 (iv).
——— Jurisdiction by Ry. Commission: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 1179 (i).
Bills, Procedure *re* in absence of Promotors: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 4445 (iii).
Bills, Royal Assent, 4122 (iii), 7086 (iv).

BILLS:

Bill (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).
1°*, 9 (i).

Bill (No. 2) To amend the Passenger Tickets Act.—(Mr. Reid, Grenville).
1°*, 91; 2°m., 550 (i).

Bill (No. 3) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Bickerdike).
1°, 91; on Order for 2°, 555 (i).

Bill (No. 4) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Bickerdike).
1°, 92; 2°m., 556; in Com., 567 (i).

Bill (No. 5) To amend the Naturalization Act.—(Mr. Murphy).
1°, 93; dschgd., 378 (i).

Bill (No. 6) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 93; 2°, 374; in Com., 375; 3°m., 521; 3°*, 876 (i).

Bill (No. 7) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).
1°, 94; 2°, 375 (i).

Bill (No. 8) To amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°, 94; 2° and in Com., 379; 3°*, 402 (i); Sen. Amts., 2911 (ii).

Bill (No. 9) Respecting the Brandon Transfer Railway Company.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°*, 159; 2°*, 327; in Com., and 3°*, 989 (i).

Bill (No. 10) Respecting the Brazilian Electro Steel and Smelting Company, Limited.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 159; 2°*, 327; in Com., 1023; 3°*, 1024 (i).

Bill (No. 11) To incorporate the Canadian Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 159; 2°*, 327; in Com., 986; 3°*, 988 (i).

Bill (No. 12) Respecting the Collingwood Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 159; 2°*, 327; in Com., and 3°*, 989 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 13) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 160; 2°*, 327; in Com., and 3°*, 1364 (i).

Bill (No. 14) Respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 160; 2°*, 327; in Com., and 3°*, 989 (i).

Bill (No. 15) Respecting the Mexican Land and Irrigation Company, Limited.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 160; 2°, 1024 (i).

Bill (No. 16) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 160 (i).

Bill (No. 17) Respecting Immigration.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°*, 240; 2°m., 2009 (i), 4413, 5217 (iii); in Com., 6129 (iv).

Bill (No. 18) To amend the Animals Contagious Diseases Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
1°, 240; 2°m., 749; in Com., 750; 3°, 770 (i).

Bill (No. 19) To amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).
1°, 241; 2° and in Com., 738; 3°*, 882 (i).

Bill (No. 20) To amend the Government Railways Act.—(Mr. Graham).
1°, 241; 2°, 770; in Com., 779; 3°*, 780 (i).

Bill (No. 21) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Graham).
1°, 242; 2° and in Com., 1117; 3°*, 1122 (i).

Bill (No. 22) Respecting the Hours of Labour on Public Works.—(Mr. Verville).
1°*, 240 (i).

Bill (No. 23) Respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).
1°, 290; 2°*, 437; in Com., and 3°*, 1696 (i).

Bill (No. 24) Respecting the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).
1°, 290; 2°*, 438; in Com., and 3°, 1363 (i).

Bill (No. 25) Respecting the Joint Section of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, at Fort William, Ontario.—(Mr. Turiff).
1°*, 290; 2°*, 438; in Com., 1718; 3°*, 1718 (i).

Bill (No. 26) Respecting the Kootenay Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Goodeve).
1°*, 290; 2°*, 438; in Com., and 3°*, 1364 (i).

Bill (No. 27) To incorporate the London and Lancashire Plate Glass and Indemnity Company of Canada.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 290; 2°*, 438 (i); in Com., 2146; 3°*, 2147 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 28) Respecting the Union Station and other joint facilities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Midland Railway of Manitoba, at Portage la Prairie.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°*, 290; 2°*, 438; in Com., and 3°*, 1696 (i).

Bill (No. 29) Respecting the Winnipeg and Northwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. McCraney).
1°*, 290; 2°*, 438 (i); in Com., 2067, 2130; 3°*, 2146 (ii).

Bill (No. 30) Respecting the Subsidy from the Ontario Government to Lake Superior Branch of G. T. Pacific Railway.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°*, 290; 2° m., 66, 1364 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3415 (ii).

Bill (No. 31) To prevent the payment or acceptance of illicit or secret commissions, and other like practices.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
1°, 325; 2° and in Com., 1122; in Com., 1479; 3°*, 1490 (i); Sen. Amt., 4412 (iii).

Bill (No. 32) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Barr).
1°, 326; 2°, 876 (i).

Bill (No. 33) Respecting the Niagara-Welland Power Company.—(Mr. Guthrie).
1°*, 465; 2°*, 779 (i), in Com., 2571; 3°*, 2571 (ii).

Bill (No. 34) To incorporate the Ontario and Michigan Power Company.—(Mr. Conmee).
1°*, 465; 2°, 1026 (i); in Com., 4472, 4593, 5296, 5352, 5559 (iii), 5958, 6000; 3° m., 6001 (iv).

Bill (No. 35) To incorporate the Salisbury and Harvey Railroad Company.—(Mr. Emmerson).
1°*, 465; 2°, 775; in Com., 1363, 1513; 3°, 1513 (i).

Bill (No. 36) Respecting the Southern Central Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).
1°*, 465; 2°, 778 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2067 (ii).

Bill (No. 37) To incorporate the Western Canadian Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Knowles).
1°*, 465; 2°, 778 (i); in Com., 2564; 3°*, 2569 (ii).

Bill (No. 38) Respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Dubeau).
1°*, 465; 2°*, 779; in Com., and 3°*, 1696 (i); Sen. Amts., 4164, 4593, 5486 (iii).

Bill (No. 39) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Northrup).
1°, 465 (i).

Bill (No. 40) To incorporate the Great West Permanent Loan Company.—(Mr. Haggart, Winnipeg).
1°*, 626; 2°*, 1366 (i); in Com., 2569; in Com., and 3°*, 2578 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 41) Respecting the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Schell).
1°*, 626; 2°*, 988; in Com., and 3°*, 1696 (i).

Bill (No. 42) Respecting the Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert).
1°*, 626; 2°*, 988 (i); in Com., 2063; 3°*, 2037 (ii).

Bill (No. 43) Respecting the Hudson Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Cash).
1°*, 626; 2°*, 988 (i); in Com., 2067; 3°*, 2067 (ii).

Bill (No. 44) To incorporate the Canadian Liverpool and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Girard).
1°*, 626; 2°*, 988; in Com., 1685, 1719, 1858 (i), 2058, 2129; 3°*, 2129 (ii).

Bill (No. 45) Respecting Load Lines on Ships.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 663 (i).

Bill (No. 46) Respecting the Crawford Bay and St. Mary's Railway Company, and to change its name to 'British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba Railway Company.'—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).
1°*, 738; 2°*, 988; in Com., and 3°*, 1719 (i).

Bill (No. 47) Respecting the Guelph and Goderich Railway Company.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°*, 738; 2°*, 988 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2067 (ii).

Bill (No. 48) Respecting the Montreal Terminal Railway Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion).
1°*, 738; 2° m., 1147; 2°*, 1366 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2951 (ii).

Bill (No. 49) Respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Devlin).
1°*, 738; 2°*, 988 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2539 (ii).

Bill (No. 50) To incorporate La Compagnie du Chemin de fer International de Rimouski.—(Mr. Ross).
1°*, 738; 2°*, 1366 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2539 (ii).

Bill (No. 51) To incorporate the Royal Casualty and Surety Company of Canada.—(Mr. McLean, Sunbury and Queens).
1°*, 738; 2°*, 988 (i); in Com., 2575, 2717; 3°*, 2720 (ii).

Bill (No. 52) Respecting the Bank of Vancouver.—(Mr. Cowan).
1°*, 738; 2°*, 989 (i); in Com., 2147; 3°*, 2148 (ii).

Bill (No. 53) Respecting the Walkerton and Lucknow Railway Company.—(Mr. Donnelly).
1°*, 738; 2°*, 989 (i); in Com., 2147; 3°*, 2068 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 54) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Nantel).
1°, 813 (i).

Bill (No. 55) To incorporate the British Columbia Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Cowan).
1°*, 868; 2° m., 1147; 2°*, 1366 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2578 (ii).

Bill (No. 56) Respecting the Canada Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).
1°*, 868; on Order for 2°, 1147; 2°*, 1366 (i); in Com., 2571, 3004, 3041, 3411 (ii), 4164, 4472, 5093, 5429, 5480 (iii), 5995, 6006; 3°*, 6058 (iv).

Bill (No. 57) Respecting the Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor, New Westminster).
1°*, 868; 2°*, 1055 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2148 (ii).

Bill (No. 58) Respecting the Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).
1°*, 868; 2°*, 1055 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2148 (ii); Sen. Amt., 4445 (iii).

Bill (No. 59) To incorporate the Victoria and Barkley Sound Railway Company—(Mr. R. Smith).
1°*, 868; 2°*, 1366 (i); in Com and 3°*, 2539 (ii).

Bill (No. 60) To amend the Criminal Code respecting injuries to Persons due to Motor Vehicles.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 952 (i).

Bill (No. 61) Respecting the Burrard Westminster Boundary Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).
1°*, 1116; 2°*, 1366 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2539 (ii).

Bill (No. 62) To incorporate the Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Neely).
1°*, 1116; 2°*, 1366 (i); in Com., 2530; in Com., and 3°*, 2578 (ii).

Bill (No. 63) To incorporate the Royal Canadian Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. Ames).
1°*, 1116; 2°*, 1366 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2720 (ii); Sen. Amts., 6788 (iv).

Bill (No. 64) To amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. Sproule).
1°, 1234 (i).

Bill (No. 65) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°, 1236 (i).

Bill (No. 66) Respecting the Abitibi and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Gordon, Nipissing).
1°*, 1318; 2°*, 1513 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2951 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 67) Respecting the Alsek and Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).
1°*, 1318; 2°*, 1513 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2951 (ii).

Bill (No. 68) Respecting the Athabasca Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).
1°*, 1318; 2°*, 1513 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2951 (ii).

Bill (No. 69) To incorporate the Fort Erie and Buffalo Bridge Company.—(Mr. German).
1°*, 1318 (i); 2°*, 2579; in Com., 3403; 3°*, 3404 (ii).

Bill (No. 70) Respecting the St. Mary's and Western Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Perth).
1°*, 1318; 2°*, 1513 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2951 (ii).

Bill (No. 71) Respecting a Patent of Thomas L. Smith.—(Mr. Bickerdike).
1°*, 1318; 2°*, 1513 (i); in Com., 2578; 3° m., 2578, 2950 (ii).

Bill (No. 72) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).
1°, 1318 (i).

Bill (No. 73) To provide for the Government Inspection of Vessels.—(Mr. Lewis.)
1°, 1319 (i).

Bill (No. 74) Respecting Wireless Telegraphy on Ships.—(Mr. Lewis.)
1°, 1393 (i).

Bill (No. 75) Respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.)
1°*, 1479 (i); 2°*, 2148; in Com., 3409; 3°*, 3984 (ii).

Bill (No. 76) To incorporate the Canadian National Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Haggart, Winnipeg.)
1°*, 1479; 2°*, 1719 (i); in Com., 2578; 3°, 2578 (ii).

Bill (No. 77) Respecting a Patent of the Submarine Company.—(Mr. Proulx.)
1°*, 1479 (i); 2°*, 2148 (ii); in Com., 4538; 3° m., 4544, 4592; 3°*, 4836 (iii).

Bill (No. 78) To incorporate the Superior and Western Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Conmee.)
1°*, 1479 (i); 2°*, 2257; in Com., 3845, 3963; 3°*, 3983 (ii).

Bill (No. 79) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona.)
1°*, 1648 (i); 2°*, 2148; in Com., 3039, 3151; 3°*, 3162 (ii).

Bill (No. 80) Respecting the Kootenay and Arrowhead Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor, Leeds.)
1°*, 1648 (i); 2°*, 2148; in Com., 3411, 3472, 3605; 3°*, 3606 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 81) Respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cash.)
1°*, 1648 (i); 2°*, 2148; in Com., 3844, 3942; 3°*, 3963 (ii); Sen. Amt., 5486 (iii), 6073 (iv).

Bill (No. 82) Respecting the Monarch Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Beattie.)
1°*, 1648 (i); 2°*, 2148 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

Bill (No. 83) To amend the Criminal Code respecting offensive Weapons and Capital Offences.—(Mr. Lewis.)
1°, 1716 (i).

Bill (No. 84) Respecting the Athabaska Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Turriff.)
1°*, 1813 (i); 2°*, 2148; in Com., and 3°*, 3984 (ii).

Bill (No. 85) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor, Leeds.)
1°*, 1813 (i); 2°*, 2148; in Com., and 3°*, 3984 (ii).

Bill (No. 86) Respecting the Cobalt Range Railway Company.—(Mr. Hodgins).
1°*, 1813 (i); 2°*, 2148; in Com. and 3°* 3847 (ii).

Bill (No. 87) To incorporate the Arnprior & Pontiac Railway Company.—(Mr. Hodgins.)
1°*, 1970 (i); 2°*, 2148 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4839 (iii).

Bill (No. 88) Respecting Assaults and Offences against the Person.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 1971 (i).

Bill (No. 89) To amend the Government Harbour and Piers Act.—(Mr. Brodeur).
1°*, 1972 (i); 2° and in Com., 4414 (iii), 5896, 6123; 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 90) To create a Department of External Affairs.—(Mr. Murphy).
Res. prop., 1813; M. for Com. on Res., 1978; in Com. on Res., 1996; 1°* of B. 2008 (i); 2° and in Com., 4436, 4470; 3°*, 4471 (iii).

Bill (No. 91) To incorporate the Prudential Trust Company, Limited.—(Mr. Macdonell.)
1°*, 2019; 2°*, 2579 (ii): in Com., 5484 (iii); 3°*, 6098 (iv).

Bill (No. 92) Respecting Patents of the Hart-Otis Car Company, Limited.—(Mr. Geoffrion.)
1°*, 2019; 2°*, 2267 (ii).

Bill (No. 93) Respecting Patents of Ammonal Explosives (1908), Limited.—(Mr. Macdonell.)
1°*, 2120; 2° m., 2579, 2720 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 94) Respecting the Cedar Rapids Manufacturing and Power Company.—(Mr. Boyer.)

1°*, 2120; 2°*, 2579; in Com., 3404, 3472, 3605; 3°*, 3605 (ii).

Bill (No. 95) To incorporate the Royal Guardians.—(Mr. Lachance.)

1°*, 2120; 2°*, 2579 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

Bill (No. 96) Respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Burrell).

1°*, 2120; 2°*, 2579; in Com., and 3°*, 3847 (ii).

Bill (No. 97) Respecting Insurance.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°, 2121; 2°, 2564 (ii); Res. prop., 6687; in Com., 6704, 6788; 3°*, 6822 (iv).

Bill (No. 98) To amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 2127 (ii); 2° and in Com., 5349; 3°*, 5350 (iii).

Bill (No. 99) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Conmee).

1°, 2127 (ii).

Bill (No. 100) To amend the Adulteration Act.—(Mr. Sexsmith).

1°, 2217 (ii).

Bill (No. 101) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Stewart).

1°, 2217 (ii).

Bill (No. 102) To incorporate the London and Northwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. Beattie).

1°*, 2318; 2°*, 2579; in Com., 3846, 3983; 3°*, 3984 (ii).

Bill (No. 103) Respecting the National Accident and Guarantee Company of Canada.—(Mr. Pardee).

1°*, 2318; 2°*, 2579 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 104) Respecting the Thessalon and Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Smyth).

1°*, 2318; 2°*, 2579 (ii); in Com., 5483, 5574 (iii), 6062; 3°*, 6068 (iv).

Bill (No. 105, from the Senate) Relating to the Water Carriage of Goods.—(Mr. Miller).

1°*, 2670 (ii); 2°, 6774; in Com., 6774 (iv).

Bill (No. 106) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 2323; in Com. on Res., 2384; 1°* of B., 2402 (ii); 2°, 6186; in Com., 6200, 6293; 3° m., 6302; 3°*, 6313; Sen. Amt., 7068 (iv).

Bill (No. 107) To amend the Adulteration Act.—(Mr. Currie, Simcoe).

1°, 2490 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 108) Respecting the Saving of Daylight.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 2491; 2°, 3468 (ii).

Bill (No. 109, from the Senate) To amend the Government Annuities Act, 1908.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°*, 2670 (ii); 2°, 6773; in Com., and 3°*, 6774 (iv).

Bill (No. 110) Respecting Agricultural Fertilizers.—(Mr. Templeman).

1°, 2910 (ii); 2° and in Com., 4445, 5202; 3°*, 5217 (iii).

Bill (No. 111) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 3362 (ii).

Bill (No. 112) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Conmee).

1°, 3468 (ii).

Bill (No. 113) To amend the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°, 3565 (ii).

Bill (No. 114, from the Senate) To incorporate the British Colonial Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Turriff).

1°*, 3651; 2°*, 3847 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

Bill (No. 115, from the Senate) For the relief of Victor Eccles Blackhall.—(Mr. Sutherland).

1°*, 3651; 2°*, 3847 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

Bill (No. 116, from the Senate) For the relief of Annie Louise Coltman.—(Mr. Turriff).

1°*, 3651; 2°*, 3847 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

Bill (No. 117) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial years ending respectively March 31, 1909, and March 31, 1910.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. of Ways and Means, 4051; 1°, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 4051 (iii).

Bill (No. 118, from the Senate) Respecting the Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank.—(Mr. Gervais).

1°*, 3703; 2°*, 3848 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

Bill (No. 119, from the Senate) Respecting the Quinze and Blanche River Railway Company.—(Mr. McGiverin).

1°*, 3703; 2°*, 3848 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4839 (iii).

Bill (No. 120, from the Senate) Respecting the Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore Rapid Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).

1°*, 3802; 2°*, 3984 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4839 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 121, from the Senate) For the relief of John Grant Ridout.—(Mr. Guthrie).
1°*, 3802; 2°*, 3984 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4839 (iii).

Bill (No. 122) To incorporate the Cabano Railway Company.—(Mr. Gauvreau).
1°*, 3802 (ii); 2°*, 4067; in Com., 4839; 3°*, 4840 (iii).

Bill (No. 123, from the Senate) Respecting certain Letter Patent of the American Bar-Lock Company.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 4041; 2°*, 4165; in Com., and 3°*, 5429 (iii).

Bill (No. 124, from the Senate) Respecting the Ontario, Hudson Bay and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Schell).
1°*, 4041; 2°*, 4165; in Com., and 3°*, 5487 (iii).

Bill (No. 125, from the Senate) Respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company (Mr. Schell).
1°*, 4041; 2°*, 4165; in Com., and 3°*, 5487 (iii).

Bill (No. 126, from the Senate) Respecting the Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. Dubeau).
1°*, 4041; 2°*, 4165; in Com., 4836; 3°*, 4839 (iii).

Bill (No. 127) Respecting Commercial Feeding Stuffs.—(Mr. Templeman).
1°, 3936 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 5204; 3°, 5213 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6743 (iv).

Bill (No. 128) To authorize a Loan to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 2670; M. for Com. on Res., 3569, 3606 (ii), 4052; 1°* of B., 4118; 2° m., 5103, 5159; in Com., 5250, 5309, 5488; 3° m., 5496, 5575; 3°*, 5621 (iii).

Bill (No. 129, from the Senate) For the relief of Evelyn Martha Keller.—(Mr. Pardee).
2°*, 4445; in Com., and 3°*, 4839 (iii).

Bill (No. 130, from the Senate) For the relief of Frank Parsons.—(Mr. Tolmie).
1°*, 4286; 2°*, 4445; in Com., and 3°*, 4839 (iii).

Bill (No. 131) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Brodeur).
1°, 4124; 2° and in Com., 5218; 3°*, 5218 (iii).

Bill (No. 132, from the Senate) Respecting certain Letters Patent of Franklin Montgomery Gray.—(Mr. Rankin).
1°*, 4221; 2°*, 4445; in Com., 4883, 5028; 3°*, 5028 (iii).

Bill (No. 133. from the Senate) To incorporate the Kootenay and Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. Knowles).
1°*, 4286; 2°*, 4445; in Com., and 3°*, 4839 (iii)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 134, from the Senate) To incorporate the Canadian Medical Association.—(Mr. Roche).
1°*, 4221; 2°*, 4445; in Com., 4840; 3°*, 4891 (iii).

Bill (No. 135, from the Senate) For the relief of Hannah Ella Tomkins.—(Mr. Reid, Grenville).
1°*, 4411; 2°*, 4891 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6068 (iv).

Bill (No. 136) To amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).
Res. prop., 3802 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4237; 1°* of B., 4253 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6313; 3°*, 6324 (iv).

Bill (No. 137) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).
Res. prop., 3802 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4237; 1°* of B., 4253 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6324; 3°*, 6330 (iv).

Bill (No. 138, from the Senate) Respecting the Quebec Oriental Railway Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion).
1°*, 4286; 2°*, 4445; in Com., and 3°*, 5487 (iii).

Bill (No. 139, from the Senate) Respecting the Ottawa Fire Insurance Company, and to change its name to Ottawa Assurance Company.—(Mr. Perley).
1°*, 4286; 2°*, 4445; in Com., and 3°*, 4594 (iii).

Bill (No. 140, from the Senate) Respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—(Mr. Miller).
1°*, 4411; 2°*, 4545; in Com., and 3°*, 5487 (iii).

Bill (No. 141, from the Senate) Respecting the Manitoba Radial Railway Company.—(Mr. Harris).
1°*, 4411; 2°*, 4545; in Com., 5483; 3°*,5483 (iii).

Bill (No. 142, from the Senate) To incorporate the Governing Council of the Salvation Army in Canada.—(Mr. Miller).
1°*, 4411; 2°*, 4545 (iii); in Com., 6068; 3°*, 6070 (iv).

Bill (No. 143, from the Senate) For the relief of Mildred Gwendolyn Platt Patterson.—(Mr. Harris).
1°*, 4411; 2°*, 4545; in Com., and 3°*, 4891 (iii).

Bill (No. 144, from the Senate) For the relief of Charles Bowerbank Lowndes.—(Mr. Wallace).
1°*, 4411; 2°*, 4545; in Com., and 3°*, 4891 (iii).

Bill (No. 145) from the Senate), For the relief of Isaac Moore.—(Mr. Wallace).
1°*, 4411; 2°*, 4545; in Com., and 3°*, 4891 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 146) To amend the Act relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies.—Mr. Brodeur).

Res. prop., 2017 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4436; 1°* of B., 4445; 2° and in Com., 5219; 3°*, 5249 (iii).

Bill (No. 147) To amend the Cold Storage Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°, 4471 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6742; 3°, 6742 (iv).

Bill (No. 148) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 4631 (iii); 2° m., 6383; in Com., 6391, 6756; 3°*, 6769; Sen. Amt., 7084 (iv).

Bill (No. 149) To amend the Extradition Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°*, 4634; 2° and in Com., 5236; 3°*, 5249 (iii).

Bill (No. 150) To amend the Navigable Waters' Protection Act.—(Mr. Conmee).

1°, 4690 (iii).

Bill (No. 151) To amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 4695 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6744; 3°*, 6756 (iv).

Bill (No. 152) To amend the Navigable Waters' Protection Act.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°, 4797; 2° and in Com., 5225 (iii); 3°, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 153) Respecting the National Transcontinental Railway.—(Mr. Graham).

1°, 4798; 2° and in Com., 5235; 3°*, 5235 (iii).

Bill (No. 154) Respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°, 4798; 2° m., 5234 (iii); in Com., 6559; 3°*, 6583 (iv).

Bill (No. 155) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).

1°, 4801 (iii).

Bill (No. 156) To amend the Yukon Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 4882; 2° and in Com., 5235; 3°*, 5236 (iii).

Bill (No. 157, from the Senate) For the relief of John Denison Smith.—(Mr. McLean, Lunenburg).

1°*, 4988; 2°*, 5487 (iii); in Com., 6070; 3°*, 6073 (iv).

Bill (No. 158, from the Senate) Respecting the Bank of Winnipeg.—(Mr. Molloy).

1°*, 4988; 2°*, 5487 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 159) To establish a Commission for the Conservation of Natural Resources.—(Mr. Fisher).

Res. prop., 5249 (iii); in Com. on Res., 6362; 1°, 4988; in Com., 6381; 3°*, 6383 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 160, from the Senate) to incorporate the Canadian Red Cross Society.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°, 4988; 2°*, 5487 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6068 (iv).

Bill (No. 161, from the Senate) To incorporate the Equity Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°, 4988; 2°*, 5487 (iii); in Com., 6625; 3°*, 6628 (iv).

Bill (No. 162) To amend the Customs' Tariff (Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 4584; in Com. on Ways and Means, 5099; 1° of B., 5103; 2° and in Com., 5103; 3°*, 5103 (iii).

Bill (No. 163, from the Senate), To incorporate the Prairie Provinces Trust Company.—(Mr. Sutherland).

1°*, 5248 (iii); 2°*, 6082; in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 164) To amend the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Act.—(Mr. Graham).

1°, 5248 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6740; 3°*, 6741 (iv).

Bill (No. 165) To establish the Department of Labour as a separate Department of the Government of Canada.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

In Com. on Res., 5350, 1°* of B., 5350 (iii); 2° m., 6712; in Com., 6717; 3°, 6738 (iv).

Bill (No. 166, from the Senate), Respecting the Central Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Ethier).

1°*, 5623 (iii); 2°*, 6082; in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 167, from the Senate) To incorporate the Board of Elders of the Canadian District of the Moravian Church in America.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).

1°*, 5623 (iii); 2°*, 6082; in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 168, from the Senate) Respecting Mexican Transportation Company, Limited, and to change its name to Mexican Northwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. Sutherland).

1°*, 5623 (iii); 2°*, 6082; in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 169, from the Senate) Respecting the Patents of Washington R. McCloy.—(Mr. Rivet.)

1°*, 5623 (iii); 2°*, 6082; in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 170 from the Senate, Respecting the Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. Marshall.)

1°*, 5623 (iii); 2°*, 6247; in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 171, from the Senate) Respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. Michaud.)
1°*, 5623 (iii); 2°*, 6082; in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 172) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Currie, Simcoe.)
1°, 5625 (iii).

Bill (No. 173) To amend the Manitoba Grain Act.—(Mr. Currie, Simcoe.)
1°, 5626 (iii).

Bill (No. 174) To correct a Clerical error in Chapter 63 of the Statutes of 1908, respecting Railway Subsidies.—(Mr. Graham.)
1°, 5628 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6741; 3°*, 6742 (iv).

Bill (No. 175, from the Senate), Further to amend Chapter 92 of the Statutes of 1901, respecting the Canadian Patriotic Fund Association.—(Sir Frederick Borden).
1°*, 5887 (iii); 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 6739 (iv).

Bill (No. 176, from the Senate) To incorporate the St. Maurice and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion.)
1°*, 5777 (iii); 2°, 6083; in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 177, from the Senate) Respecting the Royal Victoria Life Insurance Company, and to change its name to the Royal Victoria Life Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Sutherland).
1°, 5885 (iii); 2°*, 6082; in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 178, from the Senate) For the relief of John Wake.—(Mr. McCraney.)
1°*, 5886 (iii); 2°, 6081; in Com., and 3°*. 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 179) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Edwards.)
1°*, 5889 (iv).

Bill (No. 180, from the Senate) Respecting the Montreal Bridge and Terminal Company.—(Mr. Ecrement.)
1°*, 5997; 2°*, 6082; in Com., 6628; 3°*, 6630; Amts., 6917 (iv).

Bill (No. 181, from the Senate) For the relief of Laura McQuoid.—(Mr. Nesbitt.)
1°*, 5997; 2°*, 6082; in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 182, from the Senate) For the relief of Fleetwood Howard Ward.—(Mr Lewis).
1°*. 5997; 2°*, 6083; in Com., and 3°*. 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 183. from the Senate) For the relief of Aaron William Morley Campbell.—(Mr. White, Alberta.)
1°*, 5997; 2°*, 6083; in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill No. 184, from the Senate) For the relief of John Christopher Cowan.—(Mr. Turriff.)
1°*, 5997; 2°*, 6083; in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 185, from the Senate) To incorporate the Catholic Church Extension Society of Canada.—(Mr. Parent.)
1°*, 6083; 2°*, 6247; in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 186) Respecting certain Aid for the extension of the Canadian Northern Railway.—(Mr. Graham.)
1°*, 6292; 2°, and in Com., 6739; 3°*, 6740 (iv).

Bill (No. 187) To authorize certain increases of Salaries to Members of the Civil Service. Inside Service.—(Mr. Fisher).
Res. prop., 160, 292; in Com. on Res., 324, 403, 953, 1135 (i); 1°*, 6330; 2 m., 6330; in Com., 6346; 3° m., 6822; Sen. Amts., 7068 (iv).

Bill (No. 188, from the Senate) Respecting the Prudential Life Insurance Company of Canada, and to change its name to the Security Life Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Proulx).
1°*, 6402; 2°*, 6625; in Com., 6781; 3°*, 6784 (iv).

Bill (No. 189, from the Senate) To incorporate the Commerce Insurance Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion).
1°*, 6403; 2°*, 6625; in Com., and 3°*, 6788 (iv).

Bill (No. 190, from the Senate) Respecting the Fidelity Life Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. McCraney).
1°*, 6403; 2°*, 6625; in Com., and 3°*, 6788 (iv).

Bill (No. 191) To authorize the raising, by way of loan, of certain sums of money for the public service.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 6292; in Com. on Res., 6708; 1°* of B., 6711; 2° and in Com., 6711; 3°*, 6822 (iv).

Bill (No. 192) To provide for further advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Brodeur).
Res. prop., 3197 (ii); in Com. on Res., 6743; 1°* of B., 6744; 2° and in Com., 6744; 3°*, 6744 (iv).

Bill (No. 193) To amend the Judges' Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
Res. prop., 6122; in Com. on Res., 6769; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 6773 (iv).

Bill (No. 194, from the Senate) For the relief of Annie Bowden.—(Mr. Wallace).
1°, 6917; 2° and in Com., 6918; 3°*, 6985 (iv).

Bill (No. 195) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of Canada for the year ending 31st March, 1909, and the year ending 31st March, 1910.—(Mr. Fielding).
In Com. of Ways and Means, 7080; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., 7081; 3°*, 7084 (iv).

Biological Stations and Investigations: in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iv).
Biological Stations, Marine: in Com. of Sup., 3438 (ii).
Birdsall Landing Wharf, Rice Lake, Cost of Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 825 (i).
Birtle Agency, Purchase of Live Stock: Statement (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 1168 (i).
Birtle Hospital, Attendance of Dr. Wright *re* Indians: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).
Bisley Team, Use of Ross Rifle: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5642 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 5644 (iii).
Blackhall, Victor Eccles, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 115.'
Black Lake Postmaster, Complaints, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4896
Blanche River, Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 2966 (ii).
Blankets for Indians: in Com. of Sup., 976 (i). *See* 'Indians.'
Blind River Wharf in Com. of Sup., 3292 (ii).
Blood Indian Reserve, Lease *re*: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 6784 (iv).
——— Sale of Land: Remarks (Mr. Margrath) in Com. of Sup., 1006 (i).
Blue Rocks Harbour Improvements: in Com of Sup., 2455 (ii).
Boat Harbour, Pictou Co., N.S., Total Expenditure, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 2318 (ii).
Boat Harbour, Skinner's Cove, Yearly Expenditure, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2817 (ii).
Boivin, Ernest, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2759 (ii).
Bonaventure Public Works, Amount expended prior to 1900, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 173, 353 (i).
——— Inquiry (Mr. Lennox) for Ret., 1320 (i), 2218, 3004 (ii).
Bonaventure River Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2559, 3277 (ii).
Bonin, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3980 (ii).
Bonuses and Subsidies overdue, &c.: Ques. (Mr J. A. Currie) 2763 (ii).
Books entering Canada under British Preference Tariff, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2586 (ii).
Bounty on Steel Shipbuilding, Delegation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 6090 (iv).
Bourke, Retirement of: *See* 'Miner, Bill.'
Bowden, Annie, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 194.'
Brandon City, Exchange of Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 2322 (ii).
Brandon Transfer Co.: *See* 'B. No. 9.'
Brazilian Electro Steel and Smelting Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 10.'
Breton Cove Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2456 (ii).
Brewster, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt., *re* Immigration: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3483 (ii).
Bridgewater Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1283 (i).
Brighton and Campbellford Mail Route, Increase in Contract Price: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 3479, 3655 (ii).
Brighton Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Owen) in Com. of Sup., 3314 (ii).
British Canadian Accident Insurance Co : *See* 'B. No. 63.'
British Colonial Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 114.'
B. C. Life Assurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 55.'
B. C. Penitentiary, Retirements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 924 (i).
——— Escape of Convict Bill Miner, Rep. *re* Investigation: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 350 (i).
See 'Miner,' &c.
B. C. Ry. Belt Lands, Settlers Titles, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Goodeve) 1727 (i).
B. C. Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 85.'
B.C. Subsidy in B.C., Promises *re*: Ref to in debate on Address (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 41 (i)
B. C. Timber Lands; Leases granted since 1896, Names, Addresses, &c.: M. for ret.* (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1924 (i).
B. C. Wharfs: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Barnard) 3004 (ii).
See 'Public Works.'
Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 170.'
Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Ry., Names of Stockholders, Passenger Rates, &c.: (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3473 (ii).
Brophy's Post Office, Name of Postmaster, Changes *re*: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 1186 (i).
Brule Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 2460 (ii).
Buctouche Channel: in Com. of Sup., 1623 (i).
Budget Speech: Annoucement (Mr. Fielding) 4220 (iii).
Budget, The,—Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 4546 ; Reply (Mr. Foster) 4585, 4595 ; (Mr. Sutherland) 4616; (Mr. Perley) 4642 ; (Mr. Harris) 4653; (Mr. Ames) 4663; (Mr. M. Clark) 4687, 4703; (Mr. Jameson) 4717; (Mr. Ralph Smith) 4727; (Mr. Cowan) 4751; (Mr. Verville) 4757; (Mr. Edwards) 4760; (Mr. Gladu) 4774; (Mr. Nantel) 4780; (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 4792; (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 4794; (Mr. Nesbitt) 4804; (Mr. Henderson) 4814; (Mr. Miller) 4845; (Mr. Wallace) 4855; (Mr. Campbell) 4866; (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 4901; (Mr. Armstrong) 4910; (Mr. Paterson, remarks) 4915; (Mr. Warburton) 4923; (Mr. Maddin)

Budget, The.—*Con.*
4936; (Mr. Neely) 4951; (Speaker, Mr.) Ques. of Order (ruling) 4957; (Mr. Schaffner) 4968; (Mr. Wallace) 4970; (Mr. Loggie) 4974; (Mr. Fraser) 4980; (Mr. Macdonald) 4991; (Mr. Wright) 5007; (Mr. McKenzie) 5021; (Mr. Bradbury) 5044; (Mr. Molloy) 5059; (Mr. Fielding) Ques. of Order, 5060; (Mr. Staples) 5063; (Mr. Lake) 5079; (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 5085; (Mr. T. J. Stewart) 5089 (iii).

Budget Speech, 1898, Statement *re* Finances; M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 173 (i).

——— Inquiry for Statement (Mr. Ames) 1321 (i).

Budget, The: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1813 (i), 4125 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3649 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3111 (ii).

Buell, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. before Ry. Commission: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3252 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3002 (ii).

Buffalo Herds in N. W. Parks: in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iv).

Buildings, Public; erected in Villages, &c., Names, Cost of Maintenance, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3055 (ii).
See 'Pub. Works.'

Burks Falls and Trout Creek Mail Routes, Contract, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 3196 (ii).

Burlington Channel Piers Construction: in Com. of Sup., 2966 (ii).

Burrard, Westminster Boundary Ry. and Nav. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 61.'

Burrows, T. A., Permit *re* Sections in Twps. 30 and 31: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 2592 (ii).

Business of the House, Adjournment for Easter: Remarks re Assent to Bills (Mr. Fielding) 4119 (iii).
See 'Govt Business.'

By Elections, Comox-Atlin and Carleton, Discrepancy in Answers: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 825 (i).
See 'Carleton,' &c.

Cabano Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 122.'

Cable between Vancouver and Mainland, Application *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1073 (i).

Caledonia and Liverpool Ry. Lines, Construction, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1734 (i).

Calgary Electoral District, Dep. Returning Officers, Scrutineers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McCarthy) 685 (i).

——— Voters Lists, Copy, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. McCarthy) 685 (i).

Campbell, Aaron William Morley, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 183.'

Campbell, Bush, Emplymt. on Trent Canal: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1066 (i).

Campbellford and Brighton Mail Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 3479, 3655 (ii).

Campbellton Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1625 (i).

Campbellton Improvements, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2951 (ii).

Canada Eastern Railway, Original Price, Expenditure *re* Repairs, Valve, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2149, 2579 (ii).

——— Corrected Answer (Mr. Graham) 3363 (ii).

Canada and G.B. SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 3437 (ii), 6650 (iv).

Can. Life Assurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 56.'

Canada Line SS. Service with Germany, Negotiations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowke) 2589 (ii).

Canada and Mexico SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 6650; Conc., 7074 (iv).

Canada and Newfoundland SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv).

Canada and New Zealand: in Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv).

'Canada Posten,' Winnipeg, Amounts received from Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bradbury) 3992 (ii).

Canada and South Africa SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv).

Canada and W. Indies Trade Relations, Commission *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6556 (iv).

Canadian Coasting Trade, Number of British and Canadians, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5633 (iii).

Canadian Economic Lubricant Co., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 176, 188 (i).

Canadian Imports, Percentage entering Can. in 1908 via Can. Ports: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1728 (i).

Canadian Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 44.'

Can. Medical Association: *See* 'B. No. 134.'

Can. National Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 76.'

Can. Northern Ry., Aid to: *See* 'B. No. 186.'

Can. Northern Ont. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 75.'

Can Northern Quebec Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 38.'

C. P. R., Extensions of: *See* 'B. No. 79.'

C. P. R. and G. T. P. at Ft. William: *See* 'B. No. 25.'

C. P. R., Additional Stock, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 416 (i).

——— Increase, O. Cs. *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. F. Maclean, 685 (i).

——— Ref. to Courts, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W F. Maclean) 882 (i).

——— O. Cs., &c.: Read (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 780 (i).

C. P. R., New Stock, O. Cs.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1321 (i).

C. P. R., New Stock, Closing of Law Suit: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) on M. for Sup., 2920 (ii).

——— Gimli Branch Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 2965 (ii).

Can. Patriotic Fund Association: *See* 'B. No. 175.'

Canadian Railways, Improved Service, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 626 (i).

Can. Red Cross Society: *See* 'B. No. 160.'

Can. Shipping Act: *See* 'B. No. 131 and 179.'

Canadian Ships, Docking for Repairs, Res. *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 3053 (ii).

Canadian Ships repaired in Foreign Countries, Duties *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 2762 (ii).

Canadian Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 11.'

CANALS :

Beauharnois Water Power Leases: in Com. of Sup., 1910 (i).

Canal Staff and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2071 (ii).

Carillon Canal, Macadamizing Road: in Com. of Sup., 2029 (ii).

Carillon Dam, Repairs to Gap: in Com. of Sup., 3420 (ii).

——— Water Power, Lease of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 1557 (i).

Carillon and Grenville Canals, Number of Employees from July to Oct., 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1396 (i).

——— Number of Employees, Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Perley) 1734 (i).

——— Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2029 (ii).

Cement Testing, Lachine Canal: in Com. of Sup., 791 (i).

Chambly Canal, St. Johns' Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 1571 (i).

——— Surveys, Boundaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1910 (i).

Cornwall Canal, Repairs to North Bank: in Com. of Sup., 2029 (ii).

——— Repairs to Washout in Banks: in Com. of Sup., 2029 (ii).

Galops Canal, Bridges : in Com. of Sup., 2029 (ii).

——— Toll Collector: in Com. of Sup., 1574 (i).

Georgian Bay Canal, Pet. *re* Expenditure: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 6415 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal and Welland Canal Enlargements: Statement (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).

Lachine Canal, Basin No. 2: in Com. of Sup., 1910 (i).

——— Cement Contracts: Explanation (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 1564 (i).

CANALS—*Con.*

Lachine Canal, Concrete Walls: in Com. of Sup., 1569 (i).

——— Slope Trimmings: in Com. of Sup., 1569 (i).

——— Slope Walls: in Com. of Sup., 3420 (ii).

——— Wharfs and Basins: in Com. of Sup., 786, 1563 (i).

Lake Nipissing and Monetteville Canal, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1559 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 3420 (ii).

——— Jones' Falls Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 2030 (ii).

St. Anne's Lock, Renewing Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 2029 (ii).

St. Lawrence Canals: in Com. of Sup., 1572 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie Construction: in Com. of Sup., 1909 (i).

Soulanges Canal, Amount expended for Repairs, Suspension of Mr. A. Sauve: Ques. (Mr. Lortie) 1404 (i).

——— Fire Proof Building: in Com. of Sup., 1569 (i).

——— Number of Employees, Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 869 (i).

——— Slope Trimmings: in Com. of Sup., 1569 (i).

Trent Canal: in Com. of Sup., 1886 (i).

——— Campbell, Bush, Emplymt.: Ques. Mr. S. Sharpe) 1066 (i).

——— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 1577 (i), 2074 (ii).

——— Damages in Peterborough County: Inquiry for Stmnt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5777 (iii).

——— Fenelon Falls Lockmaster, Payments to, Allowances, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1067 (i).

——— Fish Slides: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 2672 (ii).

——— Holland River, Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com. of Sup., 3112; Neg. (Y. 71; N. 112), 3176 (ii).

——— Holland River Canal, Deputation *re* Construction, Rep. Expenditures, &c: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2153 (ii).

——— Holland River Canal, Land Valuations, Remuneration *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2591 (ii).

——— Holland River Canal, Newmarket: in Com. of Sup., 1578, 1587, 1886 (i).

——— Holland River at Newmarket, Rep. *re* Flow of Water: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 472 (i).

——— Holland River Canal, Newmarket, Tenders for section 1, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3253 (ii).

CANALS—*Con.*
Trent Canal, Holland River Canal, Expenditure *re* Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 1915 (i).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2030 (ii).
Lake Simcoe and Newmarket Canal, Cor. *re* Construction, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 172 (i).
——— Land Damages, Amounts paid *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 4641 (iii).
——— Land Values, Expropriations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3177 (ii).
Newmarket Canal to Lake Wilcox, Construction, Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 5157 (iii).
Welland Canal, Electric Power Plant: in Com. of Sup., 1903 (i).
——— Employees, Number for Sept. and Oct.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 470 (i).
——— Feeder Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 2036 (ii).
——— Number of Employees, Total Salaries, Revenue, &c: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 815 (i).
——— Port Maitland Piers: in Com. of Sup., 2030 (ii).
——— Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2034 (ii).
——— Steel Gate Lifter: in Com. of Sup., 2036 (ii).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 1909 (i).
——— Total Cost, Tonnage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCall) 2154 (ii).
——— Widening: in Com. of Sup., 1903 (i).
Water Power Leases on Canadian Canals: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2037 (ii).
Canned Meats, Contract called for by G. B.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1238 (i).
Canning Factories, Numbers, Salaries: Ques. Cape Breton South, Election Payments to (Mr. Marshall) 822 (i).
Cape Bald Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1625 (i).
Cape Breton South, Election Payments to Returning Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 5636 (iii).
Cape Tormentine Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1625 (i).
Capital Supply Co., and Govt. Patronage, Names of Promoters, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 683 (i).
Cap St. Ignace Station, Construction, Pets., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. C. Roy) 3992 (ii).
——— Tank, Construction, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. C. Roy) 3992 (ii).
Cap St. Ignace Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2522 (ii).
See 'I.C.R.'
Cariboo Breakwater or Causeway, Yearly Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 2152 (ii).
Cariboo Mail Service, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 1731 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Burrell) in Com. of Sup., 3424 (ii).
Carillon and Grenville Canal, Number of Employees, Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Perley) 1734 (i).
——— Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2029 (ii).
Carillon Canal Dam, Repairs to Gap: in Com. of Sup., 3420 (ii).
——— Water Power, Lease of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 1557 (i).
Carillon Canal, Macadamizing Road: in Com. of Sup., 2029 (ii).
Carleton and Comox-Atlin, Issue of Writ: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 401 (i).
Carleton Electoral Division, Resignation of Member: Notification (Mr. R. L. Borden) 94 (i).
——— Issue of Writ: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 159 (i).
——— Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1556 (i).
Carson, Mr. Geo., Emplymt. by Govt., Absences of: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4697 (iii).
Carter, Mr. Edward S., Emplymt. as Sessional Clerk: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5094 (iii).
Cassels, Judge, Investigation *re* Marine, Action of Govt. *re* Report: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2218, 3003, 3249, 3568 (ii).
See 'Depts. of Govt.' 'Govt. Tenders,' 'Patronage.'
Cataract Water Power Supply, Leases on Welland Canal: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2036 (ii).
Catholic Church Extension Society of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 185.'
Catholic Immigration, Par. in 'Mail and Empire' *re* Limitations: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 2672 (ii).
Cattle Guards at Ry. Crossings, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1724 (i).
Cattle Guards, Killing of Live Stock, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 680 (i).
Cattle Guards on Rys., Failure of Rys. to erect, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1409 (i).
Cattle Quarantine Station Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1620 (i).
Caughnawaga Indian Reserve, Grants to Churches: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1410 (i).
——— Return of Fines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1410 (i).
Cedar Rapids Manufacturing and Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 94.'
Cement, Contract to W. G. Hartsanft Cement Co., Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3985 (ii).
Cement Testing, Lachine Canal: in Com. of Sup., 791 (i).
Census and Statistics Bulletins, French Translation: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 1404 (i).

Census, Statistics, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 696 (i).
Census Vote for 1910, Intention *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 531 (i).
Central Bank of Canada, Liquidation, &c. Ques. (Mr. Donnelly) 2151 (ii).
Central Park, B.C., Mail Delivery, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 2590 (ii).
Central Ry. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 166.'
Central Ry. of N.B., Rep. of Commission *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4125 (iii).
See 'N. B. Central,' &c.
Chambly Canal, St. Johns Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 1571 (i).
——— Surveys, Boundaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1910 (i).
See 'Canals.'
Charlottetown, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2959 (ii).
Charlottetown Post Office, Sidewalk Construction, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4228 (iii).
Chartered Banks, Unpaid Balances for five years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2592 (ii).
Charters of Rys., Mileage, Construction: *See* 'B. No. 65.'
Chatham, Diversion of Line, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).
Chesley Post Office, Amount of Vote *re*: Ques. (Mr. Donnelly) 543 (i).
Chesley Post Office Site: Remarks (Mr. Donnelly) in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i).
Cheverie Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2456 (ii).
Chicoutimi Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2523 (ii).
Chicoutimi Pier, Contract of T. Desbiens, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 2161 (ii).
Chicoutimi Pulp Co., Amount due by Govt. *re* Booms: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4222 (iii).
——— Sale of Booms: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4891 (iii).
Chicoutimi Wharf, Expropriation of Land, Prices paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr .Girard) 4222 (iii).
Chilliwack Post Office Site, Plans, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1414 (i).
Chilliwack Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 2090 (ii).
——— Negotiations *re* Purchase of Property: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1073 (i).
Chinaware, Customs Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 4636 (iii).
Chinese Immigration Act, Administration, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6655 (iv).
Chinese Seizures in Nova Scotia, Legal Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 3466 (ii).
Church Point Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2457 (ii).

Cigarette Prohibition, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 246 (i).
Civil Service Salaries: *See* 'B. Nos. 137, 187.'
Civil Service Res., Conc. before Easter Adjournment: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3702 (ii).
Civil Service Act, Apptmt. of Officials in 1908, Names, Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 827 (i).
——— Delay *re* Schedule, Blocking, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5895 (iv).
Civil Service Act, Promotions, Transfers, Apptmts. under: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 352 (i).
Civil Service, Apptmts. since July, 1908, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 142 (i).
——— since Sept., 1908: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 143 (i).
Civil Service Commissioners, O. Cs. Deptl. Orders, Regulations, &c. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 158 (i).
——— Printing: in Com. of Sup., 7065 (iv).
——— Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 874, 1022 (i), 2241 (ii).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 705 (i).
Civil Service Bill, Preparation of Schedules: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5998 (iv).
——— Classification : Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 325 (i).
——— Classification *re* Schedules, &c.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Foster) 2404 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3254 (ii).
Civil Service Examiners Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 4047 (iii).
Civil Service Increases since April, 1908, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1069 (i).
——— O.C. *re* Increase: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1395 (i).
——— Defective Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1562 (i).
Civil Service, Inside Employees, Total Payments to in 1896: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1913 (i).
Civil Service Salaries, Names of those receiving no Increases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1726 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Turriff) 1558 (i).
Civil Service, Payments in 1896 and 1908-10: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2148 (ii).
——— Reoranization, Temporary Clerks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 142 (i).
——— Schedules: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2336 (ii).
——— Schedules of Senate: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6061 (iv).
Civil Service Temporary Clerks, Classification under sec. 7, of C.S. Act, Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 354 (i).
Clarke City, Seven Islands Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2526, 2540, 2887

Clark's Harbour Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 2462 (ii).
Clarke, Mrs. A. G., Compensation *re* death of her son: in Com. of Sup., 6981 (iv).
Coal Conserving for the Home Market: Prop. Res. (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) 3087 (ii).
Coal Oil Explosions, Investigation as to Deaths, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1056 (i).
——— Evidence, Rep., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Schaffner) 1421 (i).
Coal Royalties, Total Amount paid to March 31, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 2588 (ii).
Coal Strikes in the West, Settlement of: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4120 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. McCarthy) 5351 (iii).
Coal and Timber Lands, Owned or Leased by Private Individuals, Corporations, &c. Revenue collected, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Haggart) 1420 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1185 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lake) 1978 (i).
Coasting Trade, O. C. *re* Change of Date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3051 (ii).
——— O. C. *re* Privileges to Foreign Ships: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 6123 (iv).
Coast Line and Seaports Protection: Prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) Remarks, 549 (i).
See 'Naval Defence,' 'Imperial Defence.'
Cobalt Lake Act, Disallowance of by Dom. Govt. Cor., &c.: M. for Papers (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 1735 (i).
Cobalt Range Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 86.'
Cobourg Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2967 (ii).
Cobourg Harbour Expenditure for 1908, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 3988 (ii).
Cochrane Town Site, G.T.P., Interference *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2586 (ii).
Coinage at Canadian Mint, Date of, Circulation, Profit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1401 (i).
Colclaugh, F. W., Cor., Pets., &c., *re* Fishery Operations with Commercial Companies: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bradbury) 1191 (i).
——— Return: Inquiry for (Mr. Bradbury) 2674, 3655 (ii).
Cold Storage Act: *See* 'B. No. 147.'
Cold Storage for Apples: Remarks (Mr. D. A. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 3187 (ii).
Cold Storage in Halifax, Res. of Commercial Committee *re* Establishment: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 3567 (ii).
Cold Storage Plant, Govt. Assistance to: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2756 (ii).
Cold Storage Shipments of Fruit, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2817.
——— Amount shipped to G.B. for 1907-8: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 3056 (ii).
Cold Storage for Fruit, Experiments, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6983 (iv).
Cold Storage, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6833 (iv).
Collingwood Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3294 (ii).
——— Payments to Mr. Battle: in Com. of Sup., 3294 (ii).
Collingwood Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 12.'
Colonization and Repatriation Society, Lake St. John, Detailed Statements, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Girard) 3991 (ii).
Coltman, Annie Louise, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 116.'
Commerce Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 189.'
Commercial Feeding Stuffs: *See* 'B. No. 127.'
Commissions, Illicit or Secret: *See* 'B. No. 31.'
Committees, Sel. Standing: M. to Prepare List (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12 (i).
——— Rep. presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 325 (i).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to add Names, 664 (i).
——— Change of Names: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2217 (ii).
Committees Standing, Change of Rules *re* Prop. Res. (Mr. Brodeur) 1319 (i).
Committees, Reference of Reports to, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2024 (ii).
Comox-Atlin Electoral District, Resignation of Mr. W. Sloan: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 14 (i).
Comox-Atlin and Carleton, Writs for Election, Issue of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 327 (i).
Comox-Atlin Election, Issue of Writ for 11th Parlt., Date of Nomination, Instructions to Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 682 (i).
——— Correction *re*: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 874 (i).
——— Certificate of Election (Mr. Speaker) 1234 (i).
Concealed Weapons: *See* 'B. Nos. 83 and 101.'
Conservation of Natural Resources: *See* 'B. No. 159.'
See 'Natural Resources,' &c.
Conservation Commission: in Com. of Sup., 7064 (iv).
Contagious Diseases Act: *See* 'B. No. 18.'
Cookshire Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 1293 (i).
Co-operative Societies: Remarks (Mr. Monk) on M. for Sup., 2323 (ii).
Cornwall Canal, Repairs to Washout in Banks: in Com. of Sup., 2029 (ii).
See 'Canals.'
Cornwall Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i).
Corporation Securities, Total Amount deposited with Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Sifton) 247 (i).

Costello, Thos., Rep. *re* Woollen Industry, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1176 (i).
Country Postmasters' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1700 (i).
Courtenay Bay, Dredging Contracts: in Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).
See 'St. John.'
Cowan, John Christopher, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 184.'
Cow Bay Run and Osbornes: in Com. of Sup., 2473 (i).
Cow Bay, Port Morien Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2463 (ii).
Crawford Bay and St. Mary's Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 46.'
Creosoted Timber Purchases in Mar. Provs: in Com. of Sup., 2511 (ii).
Cribbin's Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2473 (ii).
Criminal Code: *See* 'B. Nos. 4, 60, 83, 88, 101 and 148.
Criminal Code (general amts.): *See* 'B. No. 148.'
Crossings of Rys.: See 'B. Nos. 3, 6, 106.
Cummings Cove, Deer Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1625 (i).
Cushing & Co., Claims *re* Seizures of Schooner 'Evolution': in Com. of Sup., 3450 (i).
Customs Tariff: *See* 'B. No. 162.'
CUSTOMS—
Beet Sugar Refineries, Duty *re* Preferential Tariff: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3047 (ii).
Books entering Canada under British Preference Tariff, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2586 (ii).
Canadian Imports, Percentage entering Can. in 1908 via Can. Ports: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1728 (i).
Canadian Ships repaired in Foreign Countries, Duties *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 2762 (ii).
Chinaware, Customs Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 4636 (iii).
Chinese Seizures in Nova Scotia, Legal Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 3466 (ii).
Customs, Board, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 581 (i).
——— Collection, Inland Rev.: in Com. of Sup., 448 (i).
——— Collector at Bathurst, N. B., Leave of Absence: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 5157 (iii).
——— Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 590 (i).
——— Inspectors' Travelling Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 608 (i).
——— Printing and Stationery: in Com. of Sup., 609 (i).
——— Revenue Cruisers: in Com. of Sup., 611 (i).
CUSTOMS—*Con.*
Customs Seizures for 1904-5-6-7-8, Number Dates, Sale of, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barr) 826 (i).
Farm and Garden Produce, Quantity imported into Sault Ste Marie, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 339 (i).
Hay from U. S., Entries at Kingston, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1177 (i).
Hickory and Ash Handles for Farm Implements, Number imported for 1908: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 1239 (i).
Hull Customs Duties, Amount collected: Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 1418 (i).
Imports and Exports of Merchandise for 1908, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4288 (iii).
Market Garden Produce, Total Imports from 1901-8, Duty collected: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 5096 (iii).
Meagher, Mathias, Apptmt. to Customs Staff at Debec, N. B., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 3655 (ii).
Nails, Quantity imported, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 2156 (ii).
Oshawa Customs Collector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1972 (i), 2372 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 2672 (ii).
Passover Bread, Higher Rate of Duty, Request *re*: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3986 (ii).
Pork, Bacon, &c., from U. S., Entries at Kingston, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1176 (i).
Port Credit Customs Revenue, Superannuation of Collector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3049 (ii).
Quebracho Extract, Quantity imported, Pet. *re* Duty: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 1178 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Farm and Garden Imports, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 339 (i).
Steel Importations from 31st March, 1908 to Jan. 31st, 1909: M. for Ret. (Mr. Boyce) 355 (i).
Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes: M. (Mr. Lennox) 4126 (iii).
Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada for 1907, Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 149 (i).
Dairy and Fruit Industries, Cold Storage, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3187 (ii).
Dartmouth Post Office, Insufficient Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3255 (ii).
Dauphin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1543 (i).
Daylight Saving Act: *See* 'B. No. 108.'
Daylight Savings Bill, Request to place on Govt. Orders (Mr. Lewis) 3203 (ii).
Death Penalty Commutations, Number for the last 25 years: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 670 (i).

Debates, Official: in Com. of Sup., 3437 (ii).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 1474 (i).
Debates, Official, Cost of Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 1720 (i).
—— French Translation Staff, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 1722 (i).
Debt of Canada, Jan. 31, 1909, Increase from 1908: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1079 (i).
See 'Finance.'
Deferred Elections, Amt. (Mr. Burrell) to Com. of Sup., 2818; Neg. (Y. 69; N. 115) 2876 (ii).
—— Notice of Motion (Mr. Burrell) 2815; Prop. Res., 2818 (ii).
Delisle River Fishway, Reps. Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Boyer) for Copies, 1733 (i).
Departments of Govt., Investigation by Mr. Justice Cassels: Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3706; Neg. (Y. 54; N. 94) 3954 (ii).
—— Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) *re* 'trust funds,' 3849 (ii).
Debate (Mr. Brodeur) 3706; (Mr. Sproule) 3729; (Mr. Maddin) 3736; (Mr. Kyte) 3746; (Mr. Crothers) 3756; (Mr. Ecrement) 3771; (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3774; (Mr. Rivet) 3791; (Mr. Meighen) 3798, 3803; (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3808; (Mr. Foster) 3832; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3848; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) *re* 'Manipulation of Trust Funds,' 3849; (Mr. Speaker) 3849; Ruling, 3855; (Mr. Conmee) 3850; (Mr. R. L. Borden) on Ques. of Order, 3852; (Mr. R. L. Borden) on Amt., 3863; (Sir Frederick Borden) 3866; (Mr. Devlin) 3871; (Mr. Price) 3877; (Mr. Parent) 3879; (Mr. Boyce) 3883; (Mr. C. Roy) 3890; (Mr. Jos. Demers) 3893; (Mr. Lanctot) 3896; (Mr. Pugsley) 3899; (Mr. Daniel) 3907; (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3910; (Mr. Lemieux) 3917; (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3921; (Mr. Gladu) 3925; (Mr. Edwards) 3927; (Mr. Séguin) 3931; (Mr. J. P. Turcotte) 3932 (ii).
See 'Cassels,' &c.
Deptl. Payments to Companies *re* Marine and other Supplies: Ques. (Mr. Ralph Smith) 2322 (ii).
Deptl. Statistical Publications: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4642 (iii).
Desjardins, Capt., Employmt. by Marine Dept., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 4696 (iii).
Destitute Indians: in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).
Dickie, Alfred, Payments to *re* Damages by Fire: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1075 (i).
Digby Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2473 (ii).
Disraeli Wharf, Number of Vessels calling at: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2761, 2816 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2350 (ii).
Divorce: *See* 'B. Nos. 115, 121, 129, 130, 135, 143, 144, 145, 157, 178, 181, 182, 183, 184 and 194.'
Dixon's Entrance, Prince Rupert, Rep. from Imp. Govt., *re*: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 2590 (ii).
Dog-Fish Reduction Plants, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 158 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3254 (ii).
—— Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iv).
Dokis Indian Reserve, Payment for Berths, &c. Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 542 (i).
Dom. Arsenal, Quebec, Names of Bidders, Tenders, *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3050 (ii).
Dominion Atlantic Ry., Examination by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Black) in Com. of Sup., 2927 (ii).
—— Interview with Manager: Remarks (Mr. Black) 3003 (ii).
Dominion Buildings, Heating: in Com. of Sup., 1613 (i).
—— Lighting: in Com. of Sup., 1616 (i).
—— Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1617 (i), 2075, 2452 (ii).
See 'Public Works.'
Dom. Buildings, Stamp Cancelling Machines, Power, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1617 (i).
Dom. Public Buildings, Engineers Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1619 (i).
—— Water Powers: in Com. of Sup., 1619 (i).
Dom. Elections Act: *See* 'B. Nos. 16, 112.'
Dom. Elections, Payments to Ret. Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wright) 1067 (i).
Dom. Lands Act: *See* 'B. Nos. 8, 64.'
Dom. Lands Act, Memorandum *re*: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Sproule) 3002 (ii).
—— French Translation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 532 (i).
Dom. Lands Advertising, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6285 (iv).
Dom. Lands, Expenditures charged to Capital Account: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 173 (i).
Dom. Lands Maps: in Com. of Sup., 6289 (iv).
Dom. Lands, Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3463 (iii), 6273 (iv).
Dominion Loans, Amount Redeemable, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 545 (i).
Dominion 4 per cent Loan, Amount of Sinking Fund: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 545 (i).
See 'Govt. Loans,' &c.
Dorchester Penitentiary, Electric Lighting Plant: in Com. of Sup., 884 (i).
—— Supplies: in Com. of Sup., 916 (i).
Dorchester Wharf Addition: in Com. of Sup., 3237 (ii).
Dorland and U. E. Loyalist Mail Route, Mail Carrier, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 334 (i).
Doucet's Landing Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2543 (ii).

Douglastown Pier Addition: in Com. of Sup., 2546 (ii).
Dover Wharfs on Petitcodiac River: in Com. of Sup., 1625 (i).
Dredge, Govt.-owned employed in N.S. under Contracts, Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2320 (ii).
Dredges owned by Govt., Number, Construction, Price, &c.: M. (Mr. German) for Ret.* 2596 (ii).
Dredge on Lake Winnipeg, Expense *re* moving Str. 'Mikado' from Sand Bar, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 869 (i).
Dredges purchased by Public Works Dept., Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 145 (i).
Dredging Contract of McAvity-Mayes, Recovery of mounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 166 (i). *See* 'Mayes,' &c.
Dredging Contracts in Ontario and Quebec for 1907-8, Renewals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3049 (ii).
Dredging Contracts: Inquiry for O.C. (Mr. Foster) 255 (i).
Dredging, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 6534 (iv).
Dredging Mar. Provs. Generally: in Com. of Sup., 6553 (iv).
——— Plants, Contracts, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3339 (ii).
Dredging Plant for St. Lawrence River: in Com. of Sup., 6885 (iv).
Dredging Vessels, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3338 (ii).
Drummondville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2949 (ii).
Dry Docks, Construction under Subsidies Act, Negotiations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 478(i).
Dry Docks, Montreal and Quebec: Remarks (Mr. Turcotte) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).
Dry Dock Subsidies Act, Annual Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 246 (i).
Dumping Clause, Orders from Treasury Board *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 4412 (iii).
'Duty of the Hour' Pamphlet, Distribution of, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 25 (i).
Easter Adjournment: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3649 (ii).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3705 (ii).
Eastern Townships Cavalry Brigade, Site of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5644 (iii).
East Huron Public Works, Expenditure during 20 years: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 3477 (ii).
East Point Lighthouse keepers, Resignation of L. McDonald, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3194 (ii).
Eastville Subway Crossing: in Com. of Sup., 2951 (ii).
Eatonville Wharf, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 4638 (iii).
Economy Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 2460 (ii).
Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 24.'
Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co.'s Bill: Remarks (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 1362 (i).
Election Expenses in North and South Ontario, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2587 (ii).
Electrical Engineers' Branch, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 445 (i).
Electric Light Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 452 (i).
Electric Power exported at Niagara Falls. Names of Licensees, Taxation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 345 (i).
Electric Power Export: in Com. of Sup., 455 (i).
Elevators, &c., Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3228 (ii).
See 'House of Commons.'
Elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William, Govt. Operation: Prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3993 (ii).
Debate (Mr. Lake) 4011; (Mr. Neely) 4017; (Mr. Bradbury) 4024; (Mr. W. M. Martin) 4034; (Mr. Herron) 4035 (ii).
Elmira Branch and Harmony Ry., P.E.I., Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 1243 (i), 6787 (iv).
English Oats. Number of Bushels purchased, Prices paid: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 1734 (i).
Envelopes, Complaints *re* Mutilation through Mails: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 349 (i).
Equity Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 161.'
Esquimalt Garrison: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 2298 (ii).
Esquimalt Naval Fortifications, Expenditure by Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 474 (i).
——— Maintenance by Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 349 (i).
Esquimalt Permanent Corps, Inspection, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2764 (ii).
Estimates (1909-10): Presented (Mr. Paterson) 327 (i).
——— (1908-9): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 2597 (ii).
Estimates, Passing of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3203 (ii).
——— Suppl. (1909): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6092 (iv).
——— Suppl. (1910): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7065 (iv).
Estimates, Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 140 (i).

Etobicoke Postmaster. Apptmt. of, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 671 (i).
Ewart, Mr. J. S., Emplymt. by Govt. *re* Hague Tribunal: Remarks (Mr .Foster) in Com. of Sup., 7059 (iv).
——— Emplymt. *re* Newfoundland Fisheries : Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5629 (iii).
Exchequer Court Act (appeal) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 151.'
Exchequer Court Act (registrar) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 98.'
Excise Inspectors' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
Excise Travelling Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 437 (i).
Exhibitions: in Com. of Sup., 727 (i).
Exhibitions subsidized by Dom. Govt., Amounts, Officials, &c: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 544 (i).
Expenditures and Receipts of Dom. for 1908-9, N.T.R., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4288 (iii).
Experimental Farms : in Com. of Sup., 5947 (iv).
——— Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1598 (i).
Experimental Farms, Live Stock, Number of Cattle, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Staples) 1420 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Staples) 546 (i).
Experimental Farms, Locations in Eastern Canada, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1925 (i).
Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Electric Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 3192 (ii).
——— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6982 (iv).
Experimental Farms or Stations, Establishment of since Jan., 1908, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 156 (i).
Experimental Farming Stations, Establishment of : Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 823 (i).
Expropriation of Ry. Lands, Complaints *re* Remarks (Mr. Mackenzie) 4802 (iii).
External Affairs, Dept. of: *See* 'B. No. 90.'
External Affairs, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7064 (iv).
Extradition Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 149.'
Fagin, Thos., Employee of Marine Dept., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2154 (ii).
Fairy Lake Indian Reserve, N. S., Conditions of Lease, Revenue, &c., Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2816 (ii).
'Falcon' and 'Fearless' Strs., Purchase of, Capacity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 187 (i).
Falconer, Mr. K., Total Payments to *re* Marine Bookkeeping: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1729 (i).
Falconer, Mr. R. S., Emplymt. by Govt., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 332 (i).
Farm Crossings over Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 54.'
Farm and Garden Produce, Quantity imported into Sault Ste Marie, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 339 (i).
Farm Implements and Tools, Indians: in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).
'Farm Weeds,' Pamphlet, Number distributed, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Goodeve) 2757 (ii).
Father Point Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2548 (ii).
Feeding Stuffs: *See* 'B. No. 127.'
Fenelon Falls Lockmaster, Payments to, Allowances, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1067 (i).
Fenian Raid Pensions: in Com. of Sup., 812 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Legislation *re* Bounty: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 3478 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6277 (iv).
Fertilizers re Agriculture: *See* 'B. No. 110.'
Fidelity Life Insurance Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 190.'
File Indian Agency, Resignation of Mr. Godfrey, Charges against Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 3045 (ii).
Financial Statement—The Budget (Mr. Fielding) 4546; Reply (Mr. Foster) 4585 (ii). *See* 'Budget.'
FINANCE—
American Silver, Exportation of: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 6780 (iv).
Assets of Canada in Detail for Dec. 31, 1908: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 172 (i).
Bank Act Amt., Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1732 (i).
Bank of Montreal, Commissions *re* Debt: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 399 (i).
Central Bank of Canada, Liquidation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Donnelly) 2151 (ii).
Chartered Banks, Unpaid Balances for five years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sharpe) 2592 (ii).
Coinage at Canadian Mint, Date of, Circulation, Profit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1401 (i).
Corporation Securities, Total Amount deposited with Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Sifton) 247 (i).
Debt of Canada, Jan. 31, 1909, Increase from 1908: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1079 (i).
Finance, Deptl. Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 3436 (ii).
Funded Debt, Redeemable, Total Sinking Fund: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 342 (i).
Govt. Credit, Cash on Deposit, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 173 (i).
Govt. Deposits in Banks, Discrimination *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 245 (i).
Govt. Loans, Amount Redeemable, &c., Ques. (Mr. Ames) 545 (i).

FINANCE—*Con.*

Govt. Loans, Amount and Dates falling due prior to 1913; Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3654 (ii).

—— Loans or Advances since Dec., 1908, Purposes for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 163 (i).

—— Loans, Expenditure *re* Negotiations: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1724, 1921 (i).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2161 (ii).

—— 4 per cent Loan, Amount of Sinking Fund: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 545 (i).

—— Loan of 1874, 4 per cent, Date of First Notice: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3654 (ii).

—— Loans from July, 1896, Amounts, Conditions, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 172 (i).

—— Loans negotiated from 1st Jan., 1907, O.Cs., Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 685 (i).

—— Loan of Dec., 1907, &c., Sums available for Public Works, &c. Ques. (Mr. Ames) 669 (i).

—— Loan falling Due on Nov. 1, 1908, Disposition of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 147 (i).

—— Loans of Dec., 1907, and Oct., 1908, Information *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1075 (i).

—— Loans of Jan., 1909, Expenditure *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2596 (ii).

—— Loans falling due prior to 1913: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3704 (ii).

—— Temporary Loans, Details of $20,606,-333 for Jan., 1909: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1408 (i).

—— Temporary Loans, Interest for 12 and a quarter years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4898 (iii).

—— Temporary Loans, Liabilities between April, 1907 and Dec., 1908: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 172 (i).

Govt. Savings Banks, Amounts of Deposits on Oct., 1889, 1896, 1897, 1898: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1723 (i).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1924 (i).

Liabilities, Contingent or Nominal on 1st Jan., 1909: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 173 (i).

National Trans. Ry., Loans *re* Construction, Eastern Div., Rates of Interest: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 679 (i).

Net Debt of Canada, Present Amount, Increase of: Ques.: (Mr. R. L. Borden) 147 (i).

Revenue Details *re* Amount of $699,235.52 in December, 1908: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 158 (i).

Savings Bank Deposits, Increase of Interest: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 1396 (i).

FINANCE—*Con.*

Savings Deposits and Loans, 3 per cent, &c., Amounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 679 (i).

Silver Currency coined in Canada for 1905-6-7-8, Profits, U. S. Silver circulated in Can., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 868 (i).

Specie Reserve, Date of Last Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 869 (i).

Usury Act, 1908, Prosecutions, Penalties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 481 (i).

Fires caused by Locomotives: *See* 'B. No. 7.'

Fish Island Lightkeeper, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 6786 (iv).

FISHERIES—

American Fishing Vessels, Seizures, Courts of Trial, Procedure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 172 (i).

Bait Freezers, Cold Storage, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iv).

Banff Hatchery, Establishment of, Representations *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 871 (i).

B.C.: *See* 'Manitoba.'

Bounties, Delay in sending Forms: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1187 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 1249 (i).

—— Bounties, Payments to in Liverpool County: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crosby) 3992 (ii).

Colclaugh, F. W., Cor., Pets., &c., *re* Fishery Operations with Commercial Companies: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bradbury) 1191 (i).

Commissions: in Com. of Sup., 6957 (iv).

Commission, International: in Com. of Sup., 6960 (iv).

—— Names, Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1073 (i).

—— Regulations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Sup., 6963 (iv).

—— Regulations, Adoption of: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 6411 (iv).

Conference, Prof. Prince's Salary, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3688 (ii).

Convention, Ref. to the Hague Tribunal: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1395 (i).

Cruisers: in Com. of Sup., 6947 (iv).

—— Number owned by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 2769 (ii).

—— for Pacific Coast, Tenders accepted, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 2155 (ii).

Customs Officers, Payments *re* Licenses: in Com. of Sup., 6958 (iv).

Deslisle River Fishway, Reps., Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Boyer) for Copies, 1733 (i).

Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iv).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 158 (i).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

Ewart, J. S., Emplymt. *re* Newfoundland Fisheries: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5629 (iii).

Fish-Breeding Establishments, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6946 (iv).

Fish-Curing Establishments, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6952 (iv).

Fisheries Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 6980 (iv).

Fisheries Convention, Ref. to the Hague Tribunal: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1395 (i).

Fisheries Development and Protection, Apptmt. of Sel. Com.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 483 (i).

Fisheries Jurisdiction with Provs., Negotiations *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2018 (ii).

Fisheries of Man., Cor. with J. H. Davis, Cor., Pets., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bradbury) 1190 (i).

Fisheries in Pembina River, Regulations, &c., with U.S., Cor., O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 548 (i).

Fisheries Regulations with U.S., Action of Ontario Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Brodeur) 6519 (iv).

Fishermen's Union of N.S., Documents, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2161 (ii).

Fishing in Lake Winnipegosis, Pet. *re* Summer Closing: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 2381 (ii).

Fish Transportation, Conservation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6955 (iv).

Hatcheries, Number in Canada: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 3479 (ii).

Hatchery, Establishment at Sault Ste. Marie, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 337 (i).

Hatchery, Lake Winnipegosis, Amount expendel, Qualifications of Inspector: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 820 (i).

Inspectors for Cape Breton Island, Apptmt. of Successor to A.C. Bertram: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 5631 (iii).

Lac du Bonnet, Opening for Summer Fishing: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 1728 (i).

Lake Ontario Fishing Industry, Regulations, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 381 (i).

Lake Winnipeg, White Fishing, Extension of Close Season, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 340 (i).

Leases on Nelson River, &c., Cancellation of: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 340 (i).

Leases in Northwest, Cancellation of: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bradbury) 354 (i).

LeBlanc, O. J., Dismissal as Fishery Overseer, Complaints, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2595 (ii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

Licenses issued to Wikwinikong Indians, Representations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Smyth) 6407 (iv).

Lobster Licenses in P.E.I., Number issued, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 1076 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Fraser) 2160 (ii).

Lobster Fisheries, Violation of Act, Par. in St. John Standard: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 3705 (ii).

Lobster Packing Licenses granted in N.S. for 1908, Names and Addresses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 328 (i).

Manitoba Fisheries, Apptmt. of Icelander *re* Commission: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 3255 (ii).

——— Depletion of by American Fishermen: on M. for Sup., (Mr. Bradbury) 6942, 6475 (iv).

——— Depletion in B.C. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 6500 (iv).

Northwest Fish Company's Leases, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 6776 (iv).

Officers at Port Joli, N.S., Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4697 (iii).

Pictou County Fishery Overseers, Prosecutions of Salmon Illegal Fishing: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 5632 (iii).

Seasons and Leases, Extensions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 169 (i).

Seine Licenses, Number on Pacific Coast: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 3482 (ii).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Cowan) 3992 (ii).

Settlement with Provs., Rep. of Mr. Bastedo: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 327 (i).

Shad Fisheries, N.S., Rep. of Prof. Prince Inquiry for (Mr. Stanfield) 3254 (ii).

Sturgeon Breeding in Lac du Bonnet, Sale of Fish, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 531 (i).

Wardens in Victoria County N.S., Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 5637 (iii).

Warships discarded by G. B., Offer to Fisheries Protection Service: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2379 (ii).

Weirs in Passamaquoddy Bay, Investigations *re* Ownership: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 6088 (iv).

Whitefish Spawn for Lake Winnipegosis, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 1403.

Whitefish, Sturgeon, Winter and Summer, Quantity caught, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bradbury) 826 (i).

Winnipegosis Hatchery, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 1402 (i).

Young, W. S., Payment *re* Collection of Whitefish Eggs: in Com. of Sup., 6982 (iv).

Flint Island Fog Alarm, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 5636 (iii).

Florence Mining Co.'s Appeal *re* Ontario Legislation: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Lennox) 6920; Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 6921 (iv).

Foley, T. P., Emplymt. in Interior Dept.: Ques (Mr. Lake) 2320 (ii).
Foot and Mouth Disease, Precautionary Measures *re* Prevention, Apptmt. of Officials, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sharpe) 521 (i).
——— Present Conditions, Embargo, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 334 (i).
——— States quarantined, Prevention, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. T. Chisholm) 684 (i).
Foran, Mr. Wm., Apptmt. of Successor: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3363 (ii).
Foreign Correspondence, Number of Letters, &c.; Ques. (Mr. Currie) 3986 (ii).
Forests, Waters, &c.: 3rd Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Sifton) to conc., 6919 (iv).
Foret, Land Lease of N. A. Bourbonnais, Conditions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lortie) 2591 (ii).
Fort Cumberland Land, Govt. Ownership, Sales, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 3481 (ii).
Fort Erie and Buffalo Bridge Co.: *See* 'B. No. 69.'
Fort Malden, Representations *re* Sale of: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 6087 (iv).
France and Canada Commercial Treaty, Present Condition: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4896 (iii).
——— Announcement *re* Signing: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden), 140 (i).
——— Approval of Convention by France: (Mr. R. L. Borden) 148 (i).
——— Delay *re* Approval by France: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 166 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3254 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 1977 (i), 7070 (iv).
Franco-Canadian Treaty, Minimum Tariff on Farm Products: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5158 (iii).
——— O. Cs., Cor. between G. B. and France: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 157 (i).
——— Supplementary Rep., Mess from His Ex- Presented (Mr. Fielding) 2148 (ii).
Franking Privilege, Abuse of by Member: Remarks (Mr. Smyth) in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i).
Franking Privilege *re* Campaign Literature, Names of Minister, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2585 (ii).
Franking Privilege *re* Political Literature: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1653 (i).
Fraser River, Flooding at Delta, Rep. of Mr. Coste, &c.: (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2587 (ii).
Free Mail Delivery in Cities, Names, Mail Routes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2585 (ii).
'Free Press,' Man.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Herron) 1978 (i).
See 'Winnipeg.'
French Language on Govt. Works, Govtl. Intention *re*: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 249 (i).
French Language used by Ry. Cos., Telephone Cos., &s.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Paquet) 1421 (i).
French SS. Subsidy: *See* 'B. No. 146.'
French Translators, Number, Amount of Work &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyer) 1733 (i).
Fruit, Cold Storage: *See* 'B. No. 147.'
Fruit Imports into B. C. from U. S., Values, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 3250 (ii).
Fruit Marks Act, Number of Inspectors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3477 (ii).
——— Regulations *re* Inspection: M. (Mr. Burrell) on M. for Sup., 3364 (ii).
Fumigating Stations: in Com. of Sup., 809 (i).
Funded Debt, Redeemable, Total Sinking Fund: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 342 (i).
See 'Debt,' &c.
Gabriel, Capt., Payment *re* Recruiting for 1908: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 4893 (iii).
Galops Canals, Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 2029 (ii).
——— Toll Collector: in Com. of Sup., 1574 (i).
Garrison Common, Transfer of Property to Exhibition Association, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 182 (i).
See 'Toronto.'
Garthby Wharf, Lake Aylmer: in Com. of Sup., 2549 (ii).
Gaspé Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2550 (ii).
Gaspé and Gulf of St. Lawrence Schooner Service: in Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv).
Gaspé-Percé Mail Contract, Expiration of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2596 (ii).
Geodetic Survey Bureau, Establishment of: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3056 (ii).
Geological Specimens, Purchase of: in Com. of Sup., 7063 (iv).
Georgetown Marine Agent, Name, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3194 (ii).
Georgetown Public Building, P.E.I.: in Com., of Sup., 1292 (i).
Georgian Bay Ship Canal, Rep.: Presented (Mr. Pugsley) 14 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal and Welland Canal Enlargements: Statement (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal, Pet. *re* Expenditure: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 6415 (iv).
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale of, Advertisements *re*: Ques. (Mr. Wright) 3991 (i).
Germany and Canadian Treaty Negotiations: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 4125 (iii).
Gerrymander, &c., Ref. to in Debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 24 (i).
Gibson Siding I.C.R., Passenger Cars: in Com. of Sup., 3418 (ii).
Gillis Angus, Claims *re* Compensation for Injuries on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 6089 (iv).

Gimli, Hiransa, &c.: Placing of Lights, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1403 (i).
Girard, Mr. L. P., Emplymt on Saguenay Dredging Works: Stmnt. in Com. of Sup., (Mr. Pugsley) 2811 (ii).
Glace Bay Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).
Glace Bay Mails, Contract for collecting: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 5775 (iii).
Glace Bay Post Office, Inspector, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 5635 (iii).
Glace Bay Public Bulding: in Com. of Sup., 1287 (i).
Glace Bay Range Lightkeeper, Applicants, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 5636 (iii).
Glencoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1361, 1366 (i).
'Glimpses of Northeastern Canada,' Copies circulated, Payments *re* &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4640 (iii).
Goderich Harbour, Repairs to Piers: in Com. of Sup., 2968 (ii).
Godin, Dr., Payments to *re* Land Damages: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3990 (ii).
Gold and Silver Marking Act: in Com. of Sup., 809 (i).
Gorman, L. F., Remuneration *re* Meteorological Service: in Com. of Sup., 6982 (iv).
Govt. Annuities Act: *See* 'B. No. 109.'
Govt. Business: M. to take in Mondays (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4041 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3938 (ii).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 2017 (ii).
Govt. Credit, Cash on Deposit, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 173 (i).
Govt. Deposits in Banks, Discrimination *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 245 (i).
Govt. Employees, Interference in Elections: Remarks (Mr. Lake) on M. for Sup., 6867 (iv).
Gov. Gen's Office, Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 3434 (ii).
Govt. Harbours and Piers: *See* 'B. No. 89.'
Govt. Liabilities Return: Inquiry for: Remarks (Mr. Ames) 4119 (iii).
Govt. Loans, Expenditure *re* Negotiations: Purposes for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 163 (i).
Govt. Loans, Amounts and Dates falling due prior to 1913: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3654, 3704 (ii).
Govt. Loans Expenditure *re* Negotiations: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1724 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2161 (ii).
Govt. Loans from July 1896, Amounts, Conditions, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 172 (i).
Govt. Loans: *See* 'Loans,' &c.
Govt. Policy *re* Buildings: Remarks (Mr. Owen) on M. for Sup., 2507 (ii).
Govt. Rys. Act: *See* 'B. No. 20.'
Govt. Railways: *See* 'I.C.R.' &c.
Govt. Savings, Amounts of Deposits on Oct., 1889, 1896, 1897, 1898, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1723 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1924 (i).
Govt. Ships purchased from G. B. since 1896, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 3195 (ii).
Government Steamers, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6670 (iv).
Govt. Temporary Loans, Liabilities between April, 1907, to Dec., 1908: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 172 (i).
Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening: Prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 188; Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) 199 (i).
——— Notice of Prop. Res. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 170 (i).
Govt. Tenders, Opening, &c., resmg. adjnd. debate (Mr. Miller) 571 (i).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Crothers) 571, Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 573 (i).
——— Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) Agreed to (Y. 118; N. 76) 580 (i).
See 'Depts.' &c.
Govt. Tenders, O. C. *re* Opening, &c.: Laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 171 (i).
Gowganda Postal Facilities: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1395 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 1703 (i).
Graham's Pond, P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 2507 (ii).
Graham Post Office, Pet. *re*: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) in Com. of Sup., 1713 (i).
Grain Elevator at Vancouver, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 2590 (ii).
Grain Weights, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 173.'
Grand Bend Dock, Approaches, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2586 (ii).
Grand Etang Channel, Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).
G. T. P. Branch Lines Co.: *See* 'B. No. 140.'
G. T. P. and C. P. R. at Ft. William: *See* 'B. No. 25.'
G. T. P., Lake Superior Branch Subsidy: *See* 'B. No. 30.'
G. T. P. Ry., Loan to: *See* 'B. No. 128.'
G. T. P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) Prop. Res. 2670, 3569 (ii), 4109; 1°*, 4118 (iii); (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3583; (Mr. Hughes) 3577; (Mr. Ames) 3578; (Mr. J. Haggart) 3579; (Mr. Northrup) 3579, 3614; (Mr. Pardee) 3599; (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3609; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 3612; (Mr. Talbot) 3622; (Mr. W. M. Martin) 3629; (Mr. Maddin) 3636; (Mr. Turriff) 3644 (ii); (Mr. Ames) 4052; (Mr. Middlebro) 4075; (Mr. Donnelly) 4089; (Mr. Perley) 4091; (Mr. T. Chisholm)

G. T. P. Loan Bill—*Con.*
4094; (Mr. Foster) 4104; (Mr. Sproule) 4113 (iii).
Debate on 2° (Mr. Fielding) 5103; in Com., 5189; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5103; (Mr. Graham) 5117; (Mr. Lennox) 5118; (Mr. Ames) 5190; (Mr. Northrup) 5120; (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 5123; (Mr. Sproule) 5138; (Mr. J. Haggart) 5141; (Mr. Monk) 5147; (Mr. Nantel) 5152, 5159; (Mr. Talbot) 5153; (Mr. Ethier) 5154; (Mr. McCall) 5168; (Mr. Burrell) 5173; (Mr. Lancaster) 5185; (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 5250; (Mr. Fielding) 5251; (Mr. Lalor) 5252; (Mr. Porter) 5254; (Mr. Armstrong) 5255; (Mr. J. Haggart) 5256; (Mr. Sproule) 5260; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5261, 5309; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5265, 5277, 5326; (Mr. Middlebro) 5265, 5322; (Mr. Crothers) 5266; (Mr. Perley) 5267, 5331; (Mr. Northrup) 5269; (Mr. Blain) 5270; (Mr. Lancaster) 5272; (Mr. Goodeve) 5276; (Mr. Foster) 5283, 5323; (Mr. Lennox) 5291, 5317; (Mr. Graham) 5291, 5309; (Mr. Hughes) 5294; (Mr. Burrell) 5327; (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 5328; (Mr. Armstrong) 5329; (Mr. Lake) 5330; (Mr. Fielding) 5323; (Mr. Perley) 5331; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5337; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5345; (Mr. Foster) 5488, 5496, (Mr. Fielding) 5489; (Mr. Blain) 5493; (Mr. J. Haggart) 5495 (iii).
Debate on 3° (Mr. Foster) 5496; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5513; (Mr. Crothers) 5530; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5537; (amt.) 5544, neg. (Y. 70; N. 106) 5592; (Mr. Conmee) 5546; (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5556, 5575; (Mr. Carvell) 5579; (Mr. Crosby) 5585; (Mr. Loggie) 5588; (Mr. Ames) 5593, (amt.) 5597; (Mr. Fielding) 5597; (Mr. Barker) 5602; (Mr. Middlebro) Amt., 5604; (Mr. Fielding) 5611; (Mr. Perley) Amt., 5614; (Mr. Meighen) Amt., 5616 (iii).
G. T. P. and Midland Ry. of Manitoba: *See* 'B. No. 28.'
G. T. P. Ry.: *See* 'National Transcontinental Ry.
G. T. R. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 13.'
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—
Alleged Over-classification, Action by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 178 (i).
Amount of Guaranteed Bonds of N. T. R. Western Div.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1398 (i).
Bonds guaranteed by Govt., Available for Prairie Section: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2589 (ii).
Branch Lines, Plans *re* Orillia Branch: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1077 (i).
Brunet, A., Emplymt. of: in Com. of Sup., 2042 (ii).
Cochrane Town Site, Interference *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2586 (ii).
Commissioners, Revised Stmt. as to Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1056 (i).
Construction Commission, Names of Employees, Residences, Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Gervais) 826 (i).
Contracts for North Bay Sections, Estimated Cost per Mile: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 819 (i).
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Cost per Mile: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 2494 (ii).
Cost of N. B. Section: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 2383 (ii).
Dismissal of Engineers, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 817 (i).
Disputes with N. T. R. *re* Classifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2321 (ii).
Eastern Div., Expenditures *re* Loans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4634 (iii).
Employees, Total Number, Nationality, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sifton) 249 (i), 3042 (ii).
G. T. P. Ry. Co., and Transcontinental Ry., Classification, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 3055 (ii).
G. T. P. and N. T. R. Classification, Reference *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4899 (iii).
Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 2048 (ii).
Lake Superior Branch, Number of Miles completed, Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 4286 (iii).
Lands sold along Route, Price, Names, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 352 (i).
Lands sold for Stations, Town Sites, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 143 (i).
Legislation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2219 (ii).
Loans, Cor., Reps., &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2771, 3111 (ii).
——— Security: Remarks (Mr. Ames) 3258 (ii).
Mileage Construction of N. T. Ry., Average Cost per Mile: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1184 (i).
Miles of Western Division completed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1398 (i).
Montreal Branch, Agreement, Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gervais) 816 (i).
N. T. Ry., Eastern Div., Quantity of Work executed, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 1923 (i).
See 'Transcontinental.'
Negotiations *re* Proposed Loan prior to Oct., 1908: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 4290 (iii).
Number of Miles of Western Division completed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1398 (i).
Prairie Section Contracts, Names of Contractors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 3987 (ii).
Prairie Section and Mountain Section, Detailed Stmnt. of Expenditure: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3256 (ii).
Pusher Grades, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4883 (iii).
Resignation of Mr. Morse, Action of Govt. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 344 (i).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Siberian Labourers: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 4898 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 4989 (iii).
Sub-contractors on B. C. Section, Importation of Labour, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D Taylor) 3939 (ii).
Tenders, Advertisements *re* Ties: Ques (Mr. S. Sharpe) 6091 (iv).
Tenders: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 4801 (iii).
Terminal Town Sites Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 2194 (ii).
Total Expenditure to Feb., 1909, *re* Building and Equipment of Winnipeg-Moncton Section: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3704 (ii).
Total Expenditure *re* Construction of N. T. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1181 (i).
Unpaid Wages, Claims of Stationmen, &c., Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 5629 (iii).
Wainwright, Mr., Statement *re* Inception: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1560 (i).
Winnipeg Terminal Site, Negotiations *re* Purchase: Ques. (Mr. A. Haggart) 1070
——— Purchase by Rothwell & Co. from Kern & Matthews, Cor., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Bradbury) 1081 (i).
G. T. Ry., Indebtedness to Canada, Payments made, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 3046 (ii).
——— Indebtedness to Canada: M. for O. Cs. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3056 (ii).
——— Prior Lien on G. T. P. Assets, Opinion of Law Officers of Crown: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 4228 (iii).
——— Stock Outstanding, Total Liabilities, &c: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 3651 (ii).
Gravenhurst Wharf Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 2980 (ii).
Gray, Franklin Montgomery, Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 132.'
Grazing Leases, Total Area, Annual Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 3703 (ii).
G. B. and Her Colonies: *See* 'Imperial Partnership.'
Great West Permanent Loan Co.: *See* 'B. No. 40.'
Greenfield, P.E.I., Post Office, Removal of: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 5776 (iii).
Greenwood and Grand Forks, Post Office Sites, Options *re*: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 814 (i).
Grenville-Hawkesbury, Provl. Bridge, Govt. Aid to: Ques. (Mr. Turriff) 1558 (i).
Gretna Quarantine Building, Total Cost, Price of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. H. Sharpe) 824 (i).
Grey, Earl, Extension of Time as Governor General: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5351 (iii).
Griffith, Mr. W., Apptmnt. as Immigration Agent, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1415 (i).
Grist and Sawmills for Indians: in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).
Grosse Isle, Disinfecting Apparatus: in Com. of Sup., 3210 (ii).
Guelph and Goderich Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 47.'
Guysborough County Public Works, Expenditure of Votes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 819 (i).
Guysborough Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1288 (i).
Hague Tribunal, Apptmts., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7057 (iv).
See 'Ewart,' &c.
Half-Breeds living in U.S., Allotment of Scrip, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bradbury) 1735 (i).
Halifax and Canso SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv).
Halifax Customs House, Total Cost, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 815 (i).
Halifax Dom. Buildings, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1288 (i).
Halifax Increased Accommodation, I C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 2935 (ii).
Halifax Militia, Delay in Overdue Pay: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 2672 (ii).
Halifax and Newfoundland SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv).
Halifax Post Office, Contract *re* Reconstruction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 814 (i).
Halifax and Southwestern Ry. Subsidy, Negotiations *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Graham) 1561 (i).
Halifax and Spry Bay SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 6652 (iv).
Hand Hills, Alberta, Post Office, Applications, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Magrath) 2162 (ii).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 2985 (ii).
——— N.S., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1621 (i), 2118, 2474 (ii).
Harbour, Rivers and Bridges, General Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3302 (ii).
——— Ont., General Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2968 (ii).
——— P. E. I., General Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2507 (ii).
See 'Public Works.'
Harbours and River Works, Piers, &c., Govt. Procedure *re* Construction by Day Labour: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2513 (ii).
Harmony-Elmira Branch of P. E. I. Ry., Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 1243 (i), 6787 (iv).
Hart-Otis Car Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 92.'
Harvey Bank Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1626 (i).

Hay from U. S., Entries at Kingston, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1177 (i).

Hazel Ridge Post Office, Application *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 1710 (i).

Heating, &c., Dom. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3233 (ii).

Hecate Straits, Status, &c., Cor. with U. S. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4882. 4990 (iii).

Heron Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1626 (i).

Hickman, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Govt., Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3054 (ii).

Hickory and Ash Handles for Farm Implements, Number imported for 1908: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 1239 (i).

Higgs, Deportation of by Immigration Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 147 (i).

Highways, Removal of Planks, Instructions from Ry. Commissioners: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 1022 (i).

Hoffman, Mr., Emplymt. by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 4696 (iii).

Hogs killed from Nov., 1907, to Nov., 1908, Condemnation of, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Beattie) 684 (i).

Hogs Dressed, Inspection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCoig) 2758 (ii).

Hog Tariff from U.S. to Canada, Increase of: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 821 (i).

Holland River Canal, Newmarket: in Com. of Sup., 1578, 1587, 1886 (i).

Holland (Newmarket) River Canal, Expenditure *re* Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 1915 (i).

——— Deputation *re* Construction, Rep., Expenditures, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2153 (ii).

——— Land Valuators, Remuneration *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 3055 (ii).

——— Land Valuations, Remuneration *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2591 (ii)

——— Rep. *re* Flow of Water: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 472 (i).

——— Tenders for Section 1, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3253 (ii).

See 'Newmarket,' 'Canals,' &c.

Holstein Cattle at Experimental Farm, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2756 (ii).

Homestead and Pre-emptions in Man., &c., Number of Acres, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1180 (i).

Homestead and Pre-emptions, Total Acreage sold, Moneys received, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 482 (i)

Homesteads for Volunteers, Duties performed by Substitutes: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1078 (i).

See 'S. A.,' &c.

Homesteads West of Lake Winnipeg, Rep. *re* Unfitness for Settlement: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 3251 (ii).

Honora Dock, Manitoulin, Construction, Dimensions, &c., Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr Smyth) 6408 (iv)

——— Yearly Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smyth) 7072 (iv).

Hopper Scows, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1185 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS:

Additional Wing to Building, Cost of Construction, Disposal of Rooms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 140 (i).

Additional Rooms, Allotments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 177, 466 (i).

——— Remarks *re* Answer to Question (Mr Foster) 170 (i).

Additional Wing: in Com. of Sup., 1253 (i).

Alterations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3204, (ii).

Carter, Mr. Edward S., Emplymt. as Sessional Clerk: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5094 (iii).

Debates, Official: in Com. of Sup., 3437 (ii).

——— Cost of Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 1720 (i).

——— French Translation Staff, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 1722 (i).

Elevators, Repairs, Running, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 2337 (ii).

Franking Privilege, Abuse of by Member: Remarks (Mr. Smyth) in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i).

French Translators, Number, Amount of Work, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyer) 1733 (i).

House of Commons, New Wing, Payments to Deptl. Staff: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2149 (ii)

——— Promotions, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3436 (ii), 6775 (iv).

——— Staff Classification: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 2493 (ii).

——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 6094 (iv).

Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 160 (i).

Members Indemnity *re* Absences: in Com. of Sup., 7065 (iv).

Morning Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5159 (iii).

Representation: *See* 'Proportional.'

Restaurant Committee. 2nd Rep. of Joint Com.: M. (Mr. Pugsley) to adopt 290, 401 (i).

——— Interim Rep.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 402 (i).

——— Mess. from Senate (Mr. Speaker) 378 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

Roof Garden, New Wing, H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 7074 (iv).

Saturday Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5644 (iii).

Sessional Allowances: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 4119 (iii).

Sessional Messengers appointed or dismissed since 1880: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 521 (i).

Statutes, French Translation, Designation of Titles: Remarks (Mr. Paquet) on M. for Sup., 2020 (ii).

Ventilation and Fire Escapes of New H. of C. Wing: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 6781 (iv).

Howell, H. M., Payments to, Itemized Statement: M. for Copy* (Mr. Smyth) 3992 (ii).

Hudson Bay and Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 43.'

Hudson Bay Lands, Number of Acres Homesteaded, Pre-empted, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Hughes) 1421 (i).

Hudson Bay Ry. Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 2960 (ii).

——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Meighen) 685 (i).

Hudson Bay Ry., Total Expenditure, Number of Employees: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 1055 (i).

Hull Customs Duties, Amount collected: Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 1418 (i).

Humboldt Election Officials, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1731 (i).

Hungry Bay Dike, Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 349 (i).

Huron and Ontario Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 14.'

Hydrographic Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 6284, 6916 (iv).

Ice-Breaker for Northumberland Straits, Contract with Messrs. Vickers, Sons & Maxim: M. for Cor.* (Mr. J. A. Currie) 3056 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 674 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 3437 (ii), 6673 (iv).

Ice-Breaking Steamers, Superannuation of Officers and Crews: M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. Warburton) 1469 (i).

Icelander River Dredging, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 347 (i).

Immigration Act: *See* 'B. No. 17.'

IMMIGRATION—

Agents, Apptmts. in France since 1908, Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 678 (i).

——— Bonus Commissions: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 1407 (i).

Agents in Can. locating Immigrants, Names, Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 2160 (ii).

Agents in France, Number, Reps., Resignation of J. E. Cyr: Ques. (Mr. Ecrément) 1414 (i).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

Agents in G. B., &c., Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 7014 (iv).

Agents, Names, Addresses, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1405 (i).

——— Resident in Canada: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 3989 (ii).

——— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6994 (iv).

American Agents, Interference with Canadians: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) 2242 (ii).

Asiatic Exclusion in B.C., Tel. of Mr. Borden: Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in debate on Address, 39 (i).

——— Denial (Mr. R. L. Borden) 39 (i).

——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 290 (i).

——— Rep. of Toronto 'News': Ques. of Priv. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 664 (i).

——— Forged Telegram, Memorandum from Bishop of Columbia: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1394 (i).

Berube, Rev. E. P., Emplymt. by Immigration Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 3986 (ii).

——— Bonuses, Abolition of, Restrictions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 3704 (ii).

Bonuses to Societies, Names, Amounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 1406 (i).

——— Bounties for 1907-8, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 678 (i).

Brewster, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. *re* Immigration: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3483(ii).

Catholic Immigration, Par. in 'Mail and Empire' *re* Limitations: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 2672 (ii).

Deportations: in Com. of Sup., 7021 (iv).

——— Amount of Expenditure *re*: Ques. Monk) 1975 (i).

Destitute Immigrants, in Toronto: Par. in 'Toronto Telegram' (Mr. Russell) 2335 (ii).

Griffith, Mr. W., Apptmt. as Immigration Agent, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1415 (i).

Higgs, Deportation of by Immigration Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 147 (i)

Immigrants, Arrivals for present year, Names, Addresses of Agents in Canada: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1404 (i)

Immigrants, British Subjects, prevented entering Canada, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 478 (i).

Immigrants from G. B. to Canada direct Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1919 (i).

Immigrants prevented from landing in Canada, Nationality, &c.: Ques. (Mr Lennox) 478 (i).

Immigrants rejected and deported, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 677 (i).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

Immigrants for 1907-8, Number from U.S., G.B. and France and Belgium, Amount of Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 678 (i).

Immigration of Uudesirables into Canada, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1406 (i)

Immigration to U.S., and Repatriation, Cor. with Dept. of Interior and Colonization Societies: M. for Copy (Mr. Paquet) 827 (i).

Immigration Supply, Absence of Ministers: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5832 (iii).

Inspectors, Names, Addresses, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1406 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Herron) 2160 (ii).

Japanese Immigration, Sir P. Lake's Speech at Toronto: Ques. (Mr. Talbot) 1065 (i).

Miller, Mr. N. B., Immigration Agent, Fraudulent Returns: Cor. read (Mr. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 6994 (iv).

Orientals in B. C. on Jan. 1, 1909, Number naturalized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1920 (i).

Oriental Immigration into B.C., Res. *re* Royal Commission: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1242 (i).

——— Inaccurate Answer: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1248 (i).

——— Corrected Answer (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1976 (i)

Printing and Advertising, Amount expended for 1908-9: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 2381 (ii).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 2597 (ii).

Quebec Detention Hospital in Savard Park: in Com. of Sup., 3221 (ii).

Regulations, O.Cs., Application of, &c: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 250 (i).

St. Boniface Immigration Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 7035 (iv).

Imperial Defence, Conference *re*: Action of Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6942 (iv).

——— Cor. laid on Table: (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7069 (iv)

Imperial Defence: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on M. for 3° of Supply Bill, 7081 (iv).

See 'Naval.'

Imperial General Staff, Prop. Organization, O.Cs., Cor.: M. for Copies (Mr. Talbot) 1420 (i).

Imperial Partnership with G.B. and Her Colonies: Amt. (Mr. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 6417 (iv).

Imports and Exports of Merchandise for 1908, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4288 (iii).

Indian Point Dredging, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1397 (i); 2763 (ii).

INDIANS—

Agency Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).

INDIANS—*Con.*

Agricultural Grants to Indians: in Com. of Sup., 993 (i).

Annuities and Administration Treaty for Indians: in Com. of Sup., 998 (i).

Annuities: Man. in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).

Birtle Agency, Purchase of Live Stock: Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 1168 (i).

Blankets for Indians: in Com. of Sup. 976 (i).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease *re*: Ques. (Mr. Wallace)6784 (iv).

B. C., Cleansing Orchards: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).

——— Relief of Destitutes: in Com. of Sup., 1139 (i).

——— Schools: in Com. of Sup., 1141 (i).

——— Surveys Commission: in Com. of Sup., 1144 (i).

Caughnawaga Indian Reserve, Grants to Churches: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1410 (i).

Caughnawaga-Iroquois Indian Reserve, Returns of Fines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1410 (i).

Destitute Indians: in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).

Dokis Indian Reserve, Payment for Berths, Lapses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 542 (i).

Fairy Lake Indian Reserve, N.S., Conditions of Lease, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2816 (ii).

Farm Implements and Tools, Indians: in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).

File Indian Agency, Resignation of Mr. Godfrey, Charges against Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 3045 (ii).

General Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).

Grist and Sawmills for Indians: in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).

Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 14 (i).

——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 971 (i).

Inspectors of Timber: in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).

Jacobs, F. Macdonald, Complaints *re* Fines collected from Caughnawaga Indians: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boyce) 1420 (i).

Kitsilano Indian Reserve, Tel. to Mr. McInnis *re* Transfer to City of Vancouver: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 1973 (i).

Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 993 (i).

Lennox Wharf for Indians, P.E.I.: in Som. of Sup., 1000 (i).

Litigation Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 1172 (i).

Live Stock for Indians, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 1005 (i).

Man. Annuities: in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).

Man. Seed Grain, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).

INDIANS—*Con.*
Medical Attendance: Remarks (Mr. Rhodes) in Com. of Sup., 1169 (i).
Medical Relief, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 3462 (ii).
—— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 998 (i), 3462 (ii).
—— Ont. and Que.: in Com. of Sup., 976 (i).
—— P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i).
—— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 3461 (ii).
Nipissing Indian Reserve, Open for Settlement: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 684 (i).
Oil Borings: in Com. of Sup., 1170 (i).
Rama Indians Trust Fund, Amount held by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 543 (i).
Rand, Dr. F. A., Payments *re* Indians: Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 1168 (i).
Reserves, Reduction, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Barnard) 1734 (i).
St. Nicholas Indian Island, Disposal of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1410 (i).
St. Peters Reserve, Patents *re* Surrender: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bradbury) 1191 (i).
—— Instructions of Mr. Vaughan, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bradbury) 354 (i).
—— Instructions, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bradbury) 1421 (i).
—— Removal to Fisher's Lake: in Com. of Sup., 3462 (ii).
Schools: in Com. of Sup., 976, 1015 (i).
Seed Grain, Relief, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 998 (i).
Seed Grain, &c., Man.: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
Steamers on Lake Winnipeg for Indian Dept., Lease. Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1403 (i).
Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 989 (i).
Surveys Commission, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 1144 (i).
Surveys, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).
Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Purchase by Govt., Sales, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 477 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).
Indian Timber Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).
Timber Lands, Sale of: List read in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Oliver) 1165 (i).
Triennial Clothing: in Com .of Sup., 1014 (i).
Yukon. Schools: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).
Industrial Disputes: *See* 'B. No. 113.'
Industrial Disputes Act, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 4641 (iii).
—— Statistics *re* Strike, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 154 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act: in Com. of Sup., 655 (i).
Inspection of Ships: *See* 'B. No. 73.'
Insurance Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 97.'
Insurance Bill, Addresses, Reps., &c., made to Com. of 1907-8: M. (Mr. Miller) to lay on Table, 2489 (ii).
—— M. to ref. to Special Com. on Banking and Commerce, 2490 (ii).
Insurance Bill, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6290 (iv).
—— Inquiry *re* Legislation (Mr. Perley) 971, 1022 (i).
—— Progress in Senate: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7069 (iv).
Insurance Commission, Omission of Evidence of British Actuaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 243 (i).
Intercolonial Bureau of Weights and Measures: in Com. of Sup., 455 (i).
Intercolonial Railway: *See* 'B. No. 20.'
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys. Provident Fund: *See* 'B. No. 164.'
See 'Govt. Rys.' &c.
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—
Annual Statement, on M. for Sup. (Mr. Graham) 2675; Reply (Mr. J. Haggart) 2709 (ii).
Apptmts. by Commission since its creation, Places, Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 172 (i).
Aston Junction Track Scale: in Com. of Sup., 3415 (ii).
Board of Management, Apptmt. of: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 4803 (iii).
—— Rules, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6986 (iv).
Branch Lines, Acquisition of by Govt.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2162 (ii).
—— Rep. *re* Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 351 (i).
—— M. for Copy (Mr. Emmerson) 882 (i).
—— Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Emmerson) 664, 875, 1718 (i).
Bridge Strengthening: in Com. of Sup., 2931 (ii).
Campbellton Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2951 (ii).
Cap St. Ignace Station, Requests *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. Roy) 3476 (ii).
—— Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Roy) 3992 (ii).
—— Tank, Construction, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Roy) 3992 (ii).
Chatham, Diversion of Line: in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).
Claims for Damages, Settlement of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 2157 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Rhodes) 3054 (ii).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Classification of Employees, Hours of Labour, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1723 (i), 2156 (ii).

Double Tracking: in Com. of Sup., 2753 (ii).

——— Survey *re* at Amherst, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 529 (i).

Drummondville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2949 (ii).

Earnings from Freight Shipments, Ticket Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 5632 (iii).

Employees, Dismissed or Suspended for 1908, Names, Dates, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 3055 (ii).

Employees at Moncton, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 330 (i).

Employees, Settlement *re* Conciliation Act: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6686 (iv).

Employees Strikes Disputes, Rep. of Commissioners: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 289 (i).

Extensions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6557 (iv).

Facilities and Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 2947 (ii).

Frauds, Suspension of Officials: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 2673 (ii).

Freight Clerks, Betterments, Govtl. Intentions: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1561 (i).

——— Dismissal of: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 3568 (ii).

——— Conciliation Board Rep.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Crosby) 2597 (ii).

——— Settlement by Arbitration: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 2127 (ii).

Freight Clerks, Settlement of Labour Dispute: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Sup., 3258 (ii).

——— Letter from Dep. Min. of Rys. *re* Award: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4697; Cor. &c. read (Mr. Graham) 4698 (iii).

——— Settlement of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 246 (i).

Gibson Siding for Passenger Cars: in Com. of Sup., 3418 (ii).

Gillis, Angus, Claims *re* Compensation for Injuries: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 6089 (iv).

Halifax, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 2935 (ii).

I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Earnings and Working Expenses, Monthly: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 162 (i).

——— Earnings and Expenditures for Oct., 1907 and the year 1908: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1415 (i).

——— Total Working Expenditures and Receipts, Amount of Capital Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5641 (iii).

I.C.R. and P.E.I. Employees, Number for each month, 1908: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1173 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

I.C.R., &c., Employees, Permanent and Temporary, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 243 (i).

I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Items in Public Accounts, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 173 (i).

Leasing, Proposal *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 164 (i).

Lebel, Mr. Achille, Application for Pet. of Right *re* I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 3253 (ii).

Loggieville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2753 (ii).

Machinery for Shops: in Com. of Sup., 2952 (ii).

——— Purchase of, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clare) 1191 (i).

Moncton Cut-off: in Com. of Sup., 2921 (ii).

Moncton Locomotive and Car Shops: in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).

Motor Cars, Cost of Construction, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1719 (i).

Officials: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4641 (iii).

Original Construction: in Com. of Sup., 2925 (ii).

Percentage of East Bound Traffic: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 528 (i).

P.E.I. Ry.: *See* main heading.

Rolling Stock: in Com. of Sup., 2952 (ii).

Running Privileges, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 351 (i).

Ste. Rosalie Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2948 (ii).

Sackville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2934 (ii).

Speed of Special Mail Trains, Instructions *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 872 (i).

Stationery and Printing, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2374 (ii).

Steel Cars, Introduction of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 481 (i).

Stellarton Station, Area of Concrete Walks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 5630 (iii).

Sydney Mines, Diversion of Line: in Com. of Sup., 2936 (ii).

Truro, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 2754 (ii).

——— Staff, Number employed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 244, 328 (i).

——— Station, Erection of: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 824 (i).

Wallberg Contract, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 3475 (ii).

Water Supply: in Com. of Sup., 2947 (ii).

Williams, Thos., Emplymt. at Moncton, Superannuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 330 (i).

Windsor Branch, Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 3421 (ii).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Wire Fencing: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 1321 (i).

Working Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 3421 (ii), 6985 (iv).

INTERIOR—

Aylesworth, Geo. Anson, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 248 (i).

Brandon City, Exchange of Lands, &c.: Ques (Mr. Staples) 2322 (ii).

B.C. Ry. Belt Lands, Settlers' Titles, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Goodeve) 1727 (i).

B.C. Timber Lands; Leases granted since 1896, Names, Addresses, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1924 (i).

Foley, T. P., Emplymt. in Interior Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2320 (ii).

Homestead and Pre-emptions, Total Acreage sold, Moneys received, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 482 (i).

Hudson Bay Lands, Number of Acres Homesteaded, Pre-empted, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Hughes) 1421 (i).

Interior Clerks, Outside and Temporary, Increases, Resignations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 532, 1064 (i).

Interior Deptl. Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. U. Wilson) 876 (i).

——— Presented (Mr. Oliver) 1021 (i).

Interior, Deptl. Salaries, Promotions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6247 (iv).

——— Salaries for Outside Service: in Com. of Sup., 6284 (iv).

Interior Officials, Dismissals Charges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2380 (ii).

Lands in Man. and N.W., Undisposed of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2374 (ii).

School Lands, Alberta, Total Area, Fund, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 7072 (iv).

Turtle Mountain Squatters, Removal, Compensation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1417 (i).

Internal Economy Commission: Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 160 (i).

International Fisheries Commission: in Com. of Sup., 3439 (ii).

——— Names, Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr R. L. Borden) 1073 (i).

International Institute, Aid to: in Com. of Sup., 5882 (iii).

International Waterways Commission: on M for Sup. (Mr. Lancaster) 6630 (iv).
See 'Waterways.'

International Waterways Treaty, Despatch from Col. Sec. Earl of Crewe: Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 550 (i).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2019 (ii).

Inverness Harbour, C.B., Improvement, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4637 (iii).

Inverness Harbour, Item of Expenditure of 1908-9 Vote, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 6404 (iv).

Investigations, &c.: *See* 'Departments of Govt.'

Irrigation, Investigation *re* Water Supply: Remarks (Mr. McCarthy) in Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv).

Irrigation Propositions for Land by Percy Aylwin, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 2380 (ii).

Jacobs, F. Macdonald, Complaints *re* Fines collected from Caughnawaga Indians: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boyce) 1420 (i).
See 'Indians.'

James Bay and Labrador Exploratory Party: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4696 (iii).

Japanese Immigration, Sir P. Lake's Speech at Toronto: Ques. (Mr. Talbot) 1065 (i).

Japanese Treaty with G. B., Date of Effect, Notice of Termination: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2152 (ii).

Japanese Treaty, Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 46 (i).
See 'Asiatic.'

Jesus River Dredging, Amount of Expropriation, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1069 (i).

Joggins Mines Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2477 (ii).

Johnston, Capt., Repayment of Moneys *re* Str. '*Hestia*': Remarks (Mr. Price) in Com. of Sup., 6889 (iv).

Joliette Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1293 (i)

Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 126.'

Judges Act (Ont. and Alta.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 193.'

Judges Salaries, Correction of Error in Statutes of 1905: Remarks (Mr. Nantel) 6474 (iv).

Judge, H. A., Emplymt. as Detective by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 1399 (i).

Justice, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 440 (i).

Kamloops and Okanagan Telegraphs: in Com. of Sup., 3348 (ii).

Keller, Evelyn Martha, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 129.'

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co. *See* 'B. No. 96.'

King, Mr. Mackenzie, Total Amount paid *re* Opium Commission: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 6406 (iv).

——— Result of his Mission, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 4121 (iii).
See 'Opium.'

Kingston Artillery Park, Gun Shed: in Com of Sup., 3223 (ii).
Kingston Batteries, Tenders *re* Groceries: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 4225 (iii).
Kingston Military Buildings, Correction of Figures (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 2539 (ii).
—— Excessive Expenditures: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) on M. for Sup., 2495 (ii).
—— Military College Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1507 (i); M. in Conc. to reduce Vote (Mr. Pugsley) 4049 (iii).
Kingston Military Buildings, Tenders, Expenditure, &c. (Mr. Edwards) 546 (i).
Kingston Penitentiary, Dep. Warden's Residence, Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 2589 (ii).
—— Manufacture of Skis: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iv).
—— Number of Prisoners, Guards, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 4226 (iii).
—— Revenue from Sales, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barnard) 1190 (i).
—— Receipts: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Barnard) 3255 (ii).
—— Supplies: in Com. of Sup., 886 (i).
—— Tenders *re* Coal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 4226 (iii).
—— Tenders *re* Potatoes: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 4227 (iii).
Kingston Veterinary Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 1534 (i).
—— Dimensions, Tenders for Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 2149 (ii).
See 'Royal Military College.'
Kitsilano Indian Reserve, Tel. to McInnes *re* Transfer to City of Vancouver: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 1973 (i).
Knowlton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1301 (i).
Kootenay and Alberta Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 133.'
Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 80.'
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 26.'
Kouchibougouac Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1626 (i).
Laberge, Alphonse, Lease with Govt.: M. for Copy* (Mr. C. Roy) 3992 (ii).
Labour, Dept. of: *See* 'B. No. 165.'
Labour Dept., Appointment of Minister, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 186 (i).
Labour Dept., Opium Conference: in Com., of Sup., 3433 (ii).
Labour Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 651 (i).
Labour Gazette: in Com. of Sup., 652 (i).
Labour Hours for Working Men, Restriction, &c.: (Mr. Verville) to Com. of Sup., 5913 (iv).

Labour Hours: *See* 'B. No. 22.'
Lacas, Emile, Absence from Dept. of Public Works, for 1906-7-8, Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4635 (iii).
Lac du Bonnet, Opening for Summer Fishing: (Mr. Campbell) 1728 (i).
Lac du Bonnet Bridge: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 2116, 2985 (ii).
See 'Sturgeon.'
Lachine Canal, Basin No. 2.: in Com. of Sup., 1910 (i).
—— Cement Contracts: Explanation (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 1564 (i).
—— Concrete Walls: in Com. of Sup., 1569 (i).
—— Slope Trimmings: in Com. of Sup., 1569 (i), 3420 (ii).
—— Wharfs and Basins: in Com. of Sup., 786, 1563 (i).
Lachute Mills Post Office, Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Perley) 158 (i).
Lachute Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1301 (i).
La Compagnie du Chemin de fer International de Rimouski: *See* 'B. No. 50.'
'Lady Evelyn' Str., Purchase Price, Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 144 (i).
Lafferty, Dr., Expenses *re* Tuberculosis Convention: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).
Laffin, R. L., Increase of Salary, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Maddin) in Com. of Sup., 6915 (iv).
Lake Dauphin, Mossy River Obstruction: in Com. of Sup., 2997 (ii).
Lakefield Wharf, Amount of Expenditure, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 1063 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Sexsmith) in Com. of Sup., 3332 (ii).
Lake Manitoba, Rep. *re* Lowering of Waters, Pet. from Settlers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 2593 (ii).
Lake Nipissing Floods, Claims of Settlers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 817 (i).
—— Improvement of Narrows to Monnetteville: in Com. of Sup., 3308 (ii).
Lake Nipissing and Monetville Canal, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1559 (i).
Lake St. Francis (Beauce) Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 2554 (ii).
Lake St. John Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 2556 (ii).
Lake St. John Ry., Colonization Subsidy Grant &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 678 (i).
Lakes Simcoe and Couchiching, Lowering of Waters, Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 685 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2773 (ii).

Lake Simcoe and Newmarket Canal, Cor. *re* Construction, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 172 (i).

Lake Transportation : Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) in Com. of Sup., 3295 (ii).

Lake Winnipeg White Fish, Extension of close Season, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 340 (i).

Lameque Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1626 (i).

Land Grants to Early Settlers: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 6274 (iv).

Lands in Man. and N. W., Undisposed of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2374 (ii).

Land Patents of Section 16, 20 and 22, Payments of Taxes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 4900 (iii).

Lansdowne Drill Shed, Tenders, Contract *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 5630 (iii).

Laprairie Ice Piers: in Com. of Sup., 2899 (ii).

'La Region du Lac Saint Jean, Guides des Colons,' Distribution in Quebec, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 678 (i).

Latchford Dam, Cor. with T. N. & O. Ry. Commission *re* Sale of Lots: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 3320 (ii).

Latchford Dam on Montreal River, Contract *re*, &c.: Ques, (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 543 (i).

Latitude and Longitude in Canadian Cities, Record of: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2378 (ii).

Leamington Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1386 (i).

Lebel, Mr. Achille, Application for Pet. of Right *re* I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 3253 (ii).

LeBlanc, O. J., Dismissal as Fishery Overseer, Complaints, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2595 (ii).

Lee-Enfield Rifle, Issue of New Barrels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 6088 (iv).

Lennox Wharf for Indians, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i).

Leonardsville, Deer Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1626 (i).

Lethbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1551 (i).

Letter Carriers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1653, 1697, 1712 (i).

Letter Carriers' Salaries: *See* 'B. No. 136.'

Letter Carriers Salaries at St. Thomas: Remarks (Mr. Crothers) in Com. of Sup., 3428 (ii).

Letter Carriers' System in Cities, Regulations *re* Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5158 (iii).

Level Crossings of Railways: *See* 'B. Nos. 3, 6, 106.'

Level Crossing Accident Ret., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 1116 (i)

Level Crossings on Rys., Number of Accidents: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 548, 1320 (i).
See 'Rys.'

Level Crossings, Orders of Ry. Com. of Privy Council: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 549 (i).

Levis Graving Dock, Insufficient Capacity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 186 (i).

Levis Harbour Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2094 (ii).

Levis Postmastership, Apptmt. of Successor to Mr. A Lefrançois: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4636 (iii).

Liabilities, Contingent or Nominal on 1st Jan., 1909: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 173 (i).

Library of Parlt., Joint Rep.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 12 (i).

Life--Saving Rewards, Boats, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6675 (iv).

Lighthouse Agencies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6889 (iv).

Lighthouse Board, Re-organization of: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 1974 (i).

Lighthouse Buoy Steamer, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6910 (iv).

Lighthouses, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6904 (iv).

Lightkeepers, Lake Huron, Increases to: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 336 (i).

Lightkeepers' Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6889, 6981 (iv)

Lighthouses, Maintenance, Repairs, Supplies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6902 (iv).
See 'Marine.'

Lighting, &c., Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3226 (ii).

Lindsay Block, Ottawa, Negotiations *re* Purchase: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 681 (i).

Lismore Wharf, Construction, Unpaid Accounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1079 (i).

Litigation Expenses *re* Railways and Canals: in Com. of Sup., 2055 (ii).

Little Current Dredging, Depth, Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smyth) 7072 (iv).

——— Improvement of Northern Channel: in Com. of Sup., 2973, 3302 (ii).

Little Narrows Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2477 (ii).

Little River Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).

——— Amount expended, Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 476 (i).

Live Stock for Indians, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 1005 (i).

Live Stock Industry: in Com. of Sup., 5833 (iii).

Load Lines on Ships: *See* 'B. No. 45.'

Loans, Government: *See* 'B. Nos. 128, 186 and 191.'
Loan falling Due on Nov. 1, 1908, Disposition of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 147 (i).
Loans by Govt., Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1921 (i).
Loan Returns, Inquiry for (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4124 (iii).
Loan of 1874, 4 per cent, Date of First Notice: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3654 (ii).
Loan of Dec., 1907, &c., Sums available for Public Works, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 669 (i).
Loans of Dec., 1907, and Oct., 1908, Information *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1075 (i).
Loans of Jan., 1909, Expenditure *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2596 (ii).
Loans negotiated from 1st Jan., 1907, O.Cs., Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 685 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4125 (iii).
Loans: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 1561 (i), 2674, 3937 (ii).
Loans, Temporary, Interest for 12 and a quarter years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4898 (iii).
——— Details of $20,606,333 for Jan., 1909: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1408 (i).
See 'Govt. Temporary Loans,' &c.
Lobster Fisheries, Violation of Act, Par. in St. John 'Standard': Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 3705 (ii).
Lobster or Fishing Licenses issued in P.E.I. since Jan., 1904, Pets., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Fraser) 2160 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 1076 (i).
Lobster Licenses, Refusal to W. C. Henley, Cor., &c.: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4803 (iii).
Lobster Packing Licenses granted in N. S. for 1908, Names and Addresses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 328 (i).
Logberg Printing Co., Payments to by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bradbury) 1191 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bradbury) 2674, 3255, 3938 (ii).
——— Suppl. Ret.: Presented (Mr. Murphy) 4041 (iii).
Loggie, W. S. Co., Payments for 1906-7-8 by Govt., Dates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 479 (i).
——— Payments to *re* Ry. Contracts: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 668 (i).
Loggieville Improvements, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2753 (ii).
London and Lancashire Plate Glass and Indemnity Co.: *See* 'B. No. 77'.
London and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 102.'
Londonderry Station to Great Village Mail Contract, Name, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 824 (i).
Lorne Valley, P.E.I., Tenders *re* Mail Contract: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 5776 (iii).
Lorneville Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1626 (i).
Lowndes, Charles Bowerbank, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 144.'
Lussier, J. A., Payments to by Ry. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3990 (ii).
——— Returning Officer at St. Johns-Iberville, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2767 (ii).
Mackey's Station Post Office, Complaints *re* Management: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 545 (i).
Macleod Post Office, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 1711 (i).
McAvity-Mayes Dredging Contract: *See* 'Govt. Tenders.'
——— Recovery of Moneys, &c.: Ques. (Mr Lennox) 153 (i).
See 'Mayes.'
McCloy, Washington R., Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 169.'
McDonald, Lachlin, Resignation as Lightkeeper for East Point, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3194 (ii).
McGregor's Creek Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 2974 (ii).
McKenzie, Calvin, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 2152 (ii).
McKenzie, Mr. D., Resignation as Postmaster of Three Brooks, Apptmt. of a Successor: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 4640 (iii).
McLeod, Oswald L., Salary: in Com. of Sup., 3436 (ii).
McPhaiden, Capt. D., Resignation as Shipping Master, Application *re* Position: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 1973 (i).
McQuoid, Laura, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 181.'
Machinery for I.C.R. Shops: in Com. of Sup, 2952 (ii).
Madoc-Eldorado Branch Ry., G.T. Bonus, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 245 (i).
See 'Bills 39 and 106.'
Magdalen Islands and Mainland SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 6652 (iv).
Magnetawan River Improvements, Amount expended, Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 476 (i).
Magnetawan Wharf, Parry Sound: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 2981 (ii).
Mail Boxes purchased and entered into Canada free of Duty: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 547 (i).
Mail Clerks, Number killed or injured in past two years: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 3476 (ii)
See 'Post Office,' Railways,' &c.
Mail Contracts expiring on 1st April, 1909 Renewals, Tenders, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr Armstrong) 685 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 4801 (iii).

Mail Contracts, Fair Wage Clause: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 3430 ii).
——— Renewals in April, 1909, without Tenders: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 477 (i).
Mail delivered in Towns, &c., Rural Free Delivery, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 157 (i).
Mail Service from Hyde Park Post Office, &c., Middlesex County: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 3251 (ii).
Mail and Stage Routes, Total Number of Miles, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 481, 818 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: in Com 6650 (iv)
Major's Hill Park Hotel, Title *re* Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 147 (i).
See 'G. T. R.' &c.
Major's Hill Park: in Com. of Sup., 1601 (i).
Makaroff Postmaster's Salary: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 1702 (i).
Malagash, N.S., Mail Contract, Expiry of, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 5639 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Memorial *re*: Read (Mr. Roche) 2235 (ii).
——— Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 3479 (ii).
——— Notice of Discussion (Mr. Campbell) 3802 (ii).
——— Settlement *re* Delimitation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 530 (i).
Manitoba County Court Judge, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 341 (i).
Manitoba Fisheries, Apptmt. of Icelander *re* Commission: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 3255 (ii).
Manitoba Fisheries, Depletion of by American Fishermen: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Bradbury) 6475, 6942 (iv).
——— Depletion in B.C. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 6500 (iv).
Man. Grain Act: *See* 'B. No. 173.'
Man. and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 81.'
Manitoba Post Office, Transfers since Nov. 1908, Names of former Postmasters, Ques. (Mr. Roche) 1414 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Roche) 1922 (i).
Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 141.'
Manitoulin Island Telephone or Telegraph System, Representations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Smyth) 6407 (iv).
Manufacturing Industries, Number of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 152 (i).
Maps of Dom. and N. W. Ters., Engraving, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3466 (ii).
Marconi Stations, Construction, Maintenance, Amounts Paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 177 (i).
Marconi Stations between Montreal and Quebec, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement) 2762 (ii).
Margaree Island Lighthouse, Expenditure *re* Roads to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6090 (iv).

MARINE:
Aids to Navigation, Light System, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6904 (iv).
Aids to Navigation on N. S. Coast, Applications *re* Personal Inspections, &c. Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 5640 (iii).
'Anticosti' Str., Amount of Work, Tenders, *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 671 (i).
Banfield Creek Life Boat, Cost, Wreck, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 1730 (i).
Bibbington, Thos., Cancellation of Pilotage Certificate: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Barnard) 3991 (ii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6855 (iv).
Cassels, Judge, Investigation *re* Marine Dept., Action of Govt. *re* Report: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2218, 3249, 3568 (ii).
See 'Marine.'
Desjardins, Capt., Emplymt. by Marine Dept. Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 4696 (ii).
East Point Lighthouse Keeper, Resignation of L. McDonald, &c., Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3194 (ii).
Fagin, Thos., Employee of Marine Dept., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2154 (ii).
Falconer, Mr. K., Total Payments to *re* Marine Bookkeeping: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1729 (i).
'Falcon' and 'Fearless' Strs., Purchase of, Capacity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 187 (i).
Fish Island Lightkeeper, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 6786 (iv).
Flint Island Fog Alarm, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 5636 (iii).
Georgetown Marine Agent, Name, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3194 (ii).
Gimli, Hiransa, &c., Placing of Lights, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1403 (i).
Glace Bay Range Lightkeeper, Applicants, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 5636 (iii).
Gorman, L. F., Remuneration *re* Meteorological Service: in Com. of Sup., 6982 (iv).
Government Steamers, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6670 (iv).
Hoffman, Mr., Emplymt. by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 4696 (iii).
Hydrographic Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 6284 (iv).
Ice-Breaker for Northumberland Straits: in Com. of Sup., 3437 (ii), 6673 (iv).
——— Contract with Messrs Vickers, Sons & Maxim: M. for Cor.* (Mr. J. A. Currie) 3956 (ii).
——— Name of Contractor, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 674 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*

Ice-Breaking Steamers, Superannuation of Officers and Crews: M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. Warburton) 1469 (i).

Life-Saving Rewards, Boats, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6675 (iv).

Lighthouse Agencies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6889 (iv).

Lighthouse Board, Re-organization of: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 1974 (i).

Lighthouse Buoy Steamer, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6910 (iv).

Lighthouses, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6904 (iv).

Lighthouse Keepers, Lake Huron, Increases to: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 336 (i).

Lighthouses, Maintenance, Repairs, Supplies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6902 (iv).

Lightkeepers Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6889, 6981 (iv).

McDonald, Lachlin, Resignation as Lightkeeper for East Point, P. E. I.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3194 (ii).

McPhaiden, Capt. D., Resignation as Shipping Master, Application *re* Portion: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 1973 (i).

Marconi Stations, Construction, Maintenance, Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 177 (i).

Marconi Stations between Montreal and Quebec, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ecrément) 2762 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Book-Keeping, Result of Change: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1919 (i).

Marine and Fisheries, Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 3702 (ii).

——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 738 (i).

——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 380 (i).

Marine Dept., Halifax County, Number of Employes: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 667 (i).

——— Incorrect Answer: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 875 (i).

——— Answer (Mr. Brodeur) 1080 (i).

Marine Hospitals: in Com. of Sup., 6946 (iv).

——— Care of Sick Seamen: in Com. of Sup., 3438 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation: in Com. of Sup., 3450 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Inquiry for Evidence: (Mr. R. L. Borden) 402, 549 (i).

——— Inquiry for Evidence (Mr. Monk) 662 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Sup., 632 (i).

——— Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*

Marine Investigation, Rep.: Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 14 (i).

Marine Investigation by Judge Cassels, Legal Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 167 (i).

——— Prosecutions *re* Judge Cassels Rep.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 152 (i)

Marine and other Supplies, Deptl. Payments to Companies *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ralph Smith) 2322 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Purchase of, Names of Individuals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3044, 3472 (ii).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2597 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Purchase by Tender, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 168 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2818 (ii).

——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Brodeur) 4041 (iii).

——— System of Purchase: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 1974 (i).

'Minto' and 'Stanley' Strs., Officers off Duty from 12th to 17th Feb., 1909: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1975 (i).

'Montcalm' Icebreaker, Number of Crew, Daily Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 167 (i).

——— Res. of Chamber of Commerce, Quebec, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 328 (i).

——— Total Cost of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 168 (i).

Montreal Harbour Dues, Increase of, Interest due Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1416 (i).

Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 6670 (iv).

Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iv).

Pilotage Rates, Scale of Charges for B.C.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 3476 (ii).

Pilots, Pension to F. X. Lamarre: in Com. of Sup., 3437 (ii).

Plaster Mines Lighthouse, Dismissal of Hector McRae, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 6784 (iv).

Police Patrol Boats in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 6682 (iv).

Robertson, Thos., Suspension by Pilotage Board, B.C.: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) on M. for Sup., 6855 (iv).

St. John Lighthouse, Purchase of Land, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6915 (iv).

St. Joseph's Hospital, Victoria, B.C., Arrangements for Sick Mariners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 3197 (ii).

St. Lawrence Ship Canal: in Com. of Sup., 6877 (iv).

St. Lawrence Channel, Expenditure *re* Dredging, Continuation of Work, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement) 2150 (ii)

MARINE—*Con.*

Sault Ste. Marie Channels, Contracts *re* Buoys, Competition, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3482 (ii).

'Stanley' and 'Minto' Strs., Names and Residences of Officers: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 674 (i).

Supplies for Marine and Public Works Depts., Purchase by Tender, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 141 (i).

Tadousac and Rivière du Loup Winter Navigation: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 344 (i).

Telephone Stations between Montreal and Quebec *re* Navigation: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement 2594 (ii).

Thunder Bay, Ice Breaking Steamer: in Com. of Sup., 6915 (iv).

West Coast Trail on Vancouver Island: in Com. of Sup., 6981 (iv).

Wrecks, Investigations: in Com. of Sup., 6679 (iv).

Wrecking Plant Subsidy, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6680 (iv).

Maritime Dredging Co., Tenders *re* St. John Harbour: Ques. (Mr. Daniels) 6787 (iv).

Market Garden Produce, Total Imports from 1901-8, Duty collected: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 5096 (iii).

Markham Post Office, Total Cost *re*: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 6406 (iv).

Markham Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1386 (i).

Martel, Hormidas, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3990 (ii).

Mayes Affidavit *re* Mr. Pugsley, Original Document, &c., Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4253; Affidavit (read) 4300; (amt.) 4311 (iii).

Debate:—Order, Ques. of (Mr. Speaker) 4254; (Mr. Pugsley) on Ques. of Order, 4255; (Mr. Foster) on Ques. of Order, 4260; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Ques. of Order, 4262; (Mr. Hughes) on Ques. of Order, 4263; (Mr. Lennox) on Ques. of Order, 4263; (Mr. Conmee) Ques. of Order, 4268; (Mr. Northrup) on Ques. of Order, 4269; (Mr. Devlin) on Ques. of Order, 4272; (Mr. Sproule) 4273; (Mr. Crocket) 4273; (Mr. R. F. Sutherland) on Ques. of Order, 4276; (Mr. Lancaster) on Ques. of Order, 4277; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt., 4281; (Mr. J. Haggart) on Ques. of Order, 4283; (Mr. Pugsley) 4313; (Mr. Daniel) Ques. of Order, 4319; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4297, 4324; (Mr. Crocket) on Amt., 4347; (Mr. Carvell) 4359; (Mr. Northrup) 4369; (Mr. M. Clark) 4381; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4386; (Mr. Foster) 4390; (Mr. Fielding) 4400; Amt. neg. (Y. 60; N. 100) 4409 (iii).

——— on Ques of Order *re* Reading Original Document, 4297; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4297; Ques. of Order (Mr. Daniel) 4313; Amt. neg. (Y. 60; N. 100) 4409 (iii).

Mayes Dredging Contract at St. John Harbour, Condition, Recovery of Amount of: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1174 (i).

Meaford Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3313 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) in Com. of Sup., 2983 (ii).

Meagher, Mathias, Apptmt. to Customs Staff at Debec, N.B., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr Crocket) 3655 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act, Application *re* Exemptions, Instructions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 156 (i).

Medical Association: *See* 'B. No. 134.'

Members Indemnity *re* Absences: in Com. of Sup., 7065 (iv).

Members introduced, 1234, 1813 (i).

Mess. from Senate, *re* Assent to Bills (Mr. Speaker) 4119 (iii).

——— Estimates, 1909-10: Read (Mr. Speaker) 327 (i).

——— Suppl. Estimates: Read (Mr. Speaker) 2597 (ii).

——— Suppl. Estimates, 1910: Read (Mr. Speaker) 7065 (iv).

Meteorological Service: in Com. of Sup., 6915 (iv).

Meteorological Stations in Ont. erected in 1908: Ques. (Mr .Thornton) 3195 (ii).

Meteorological Station at Port Hope, Situation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 3985 (ii).

Methylated Spirits, Excise: in Com. of Sup., 448 (i).

Metric System: in Com. of Sup., 454 (i).

Mexican Land and Irrigration Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 15.'

Mexico Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 168.'

Mexican Transportation Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 168.'

Michipicoten Wharf. Expenditures, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 338 (i).

Middle River Shear Dam: in Com. of Sup., 2477 (ii).

Mileage of Ry. Construction from 1888 to 1908. Authorized by Charters: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1076 (i).

MILITIA:

Algoma Rifles, 97th Reg., Removal from Sault Ste. Marie to Sudbury: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1411 (i).

Annual Drill: in Com. of Sup., 2311, 3422 (i).

——— Completion of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 682 (i).

——— Discontinuance of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 343 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*

Armouries built since 1896 Number, Cost, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 157 (i).
——— Incomplete Ret., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2128 (ii).
Armouries Generally: in Com. of Sup., 1596 (i).
Armouries supplied by Officers, Policy of Govt.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 824 (i).
Arsenal, Quebec, Names of Bidders, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3050 (ii).
Belleville Drill Hall, Land Site, Officers' Quarters: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 673, 817 (i).
Belleville Drill Hall, Quarters for Officers of 40th Hasting Rifles: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1076 (i).
Bisley Team, Use of Ross Rifle: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5642 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 5644 (iii).
Camp in Eastern Townships, Selection of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 343 (i).
Camps of Instruction, Quebec, Date of, Regiments attending, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5641 (iii).
Capital Account, Expenditure *re* since 1895: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 158 (i).
Eastern Townships Cavalry Brigade, Site of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5644 (iii).
Esquimalt Garrison: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 2298 (ii).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Maintenance, &c., by Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 349, 474 (i).
Esquimalt Permanent Corps, Inspection, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2764 (ii).
Gabriel, Capt., Payment *re* Recruiting for 1908: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 4893 (iii).
Garrison Common, Transfer of Property to Exhibition Ass'on, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 182 (i).
Gratuities: in Com. of Sup., 2313 (ii).
Halifax Militia, Delay in Overdue Pay: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 2672, 2773 (ii).
Imperial General Staff, Prop. Organization, O.Cs., Cor.: M. for Copies (Mr. Talbot) 1420 (i).
Kingston Artillery Park, Gun shed: in Com. of Sup., 3223 (ii).
Kingston Batteries, Tenders *re* Groceries: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 4225 (iii).
Kingston Land purchased, Name of Agent, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 546 (i).
Kingston Military Buildings: M. for Original Tenders (Mr. Edwards) 1922 (i).
Kingston R.M.C. Buildings, Excessive Expenditures: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) on M. for Sup., 2495 (ii).
——— Correction of Figures (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 2539 (ii).

MILITIA—*Con.*

Kingston R.M.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3423 (ii).
——— Commandant: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 6660 (iv).
——— Water Supply, Defects, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 682 (i).
Lee-Enfield Rifle, Issue of New Barrels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 6088 (iv).
Militia, Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 2307 (ii).
Militia Estimates: Annual Statement (Sir Frederick Borden) 2244 (ii).
Militia Expenditures, Details of Estimate Items: Ques. (Mr. Middleboro) 4634 (iii).
Militia and Defence, Expenditure *re* Capital Account since 1895: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 158 (i).
Militia Expenditures by Public Works Dept. from 1896 to 1909: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2379 (ii)
Militia Salary of Priv. Sec.: Conc., 4049 (iii).
Militia Supplies, Contracts, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6661 (iv).
Military Properties: in Com. of Sup., 2314 (ii).
Miniature Rifles, Supplies, &c., Extending to Colleges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 681
Mulloy, Pte., Pension *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 2313 (ii).
Ordnance and Arms: in Com. of Sup., 2307 (ii)
Permanent Force: in Com. of Sup., 3422 (ii).
——— Winter Equipment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2376 (ii).
Petewawa Camp, Number of Permanent Force, Date of Opening, &c.: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 5639 (iii).
Properties: in Com. of Sup., 2314 (ii).
Quebec Citadel, Refurnishing, &c., for Tercentenary: in Com. of Sup., 3211 (ii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Amount subscribed, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1721 (i).
Richmond Rifle Range, Protection *re* Target Shooting: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1722 (i).
Rifles, Swiss and Foreign Regulations *re* Importation into Canada: Ques. (Mr Worthington) 2381 (i).
Ross Rifle, Authority *re* Adoption by Can. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1072 (i).
——— Bayonet Contracts, Cost of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 344 (i).
——— Bisley Competitions, Description of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 343 (i).
——— Claims for Damages *re* Accidents, &c.: Remarks *re* former Answer (Sir Frederick Borden) 548 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*

Ross Rifle Factory, Bayonets, Installments of Machinery, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 670 (i).

—— Number of Employees, Inspection *re* Standards: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 1411 (i).

Ross Rifles, Mark I., and Mark II, used by Canada at Bisley, Description, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 684 (i).

—— Number accepted and rejected by Militia Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 245, 329, (i).

—— Reps. *re* Merits and Demerits, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 1189 (i).

—— Rep. of Small Arms Com., Date of last Contract: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 471 (i).

—— Weight, Length, Diameter, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 4891 (iii).

Royal Canadian Dragoons, Contract *re* Supplies: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2767 (ii).

St. Johns Military Buildings, Lease, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 672 (i).

Sherbrooke New Regiment, Construction, Appropriations *re* Band: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5643 (iii).

Snider Rifles, Disposition of Old Ones: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2381 (ii).

Supplies, Contracts, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6661 (iv).

Thirty-Sixth Regiment, Payments for Storage of Arms: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 4894 (iii).

—— Band, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 4892 (iii).

Transport: in Com. of Sup., 3423 (ii).

Truro Armoury, Apptmt. of Caretaker, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 186 (i).

University Drill Corps, Establishment of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 683 (i).

Warlike Stores: in Com. of Sup., 2317 (ii).

Woodstock Armoury, Bowling Alley Operations: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 5157 (iii).

Milk River, Mackie Lease, Particulars re: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 6405 (iv).

See 'Waterways,' &c.

Miller, Mr. N. B., Immigration Agent, Fraudulent Returns: Cor. read (Mr. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 6994 (iv).

Mill's Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1626 (i).

Minasville Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2479 (ii).

Minerals, Investigations *re* Tests: in Com. of Sup., 7062 (iv).

Mines, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 3673 (ii).

Mines and Minerals, 3rd Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Congdon) to conc., 6919 (iv).

Mine Owners and Miners, Percentage of British Origin: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 4121 (iii).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B. C. Penitentiary: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 925 (i).

—— Admission of Detectives, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 1182 (i).

—— Cor., Reps., &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1192 (i).

—— Cor., &c.: Read (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 7035 (iv).

—— Letter *re* Visit of Mr. A. D. McIntyre: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2595 (ii).

—— Moneys received in Penitentiary previous to escape: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 4898 (iii).

—— Remarks on M. for Sup., 1813 (i).

Miniature Rifles, Supplies, &c., Extending to Colleges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 681 (i).

Minister of Inland Revenue, Information *re* Election: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13 (i).

'Minto' and 'Stanley' Strs., Officers off Duty on 12th to 17th Feb., 1909: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1975 (i).

Mint, Royal, O.C. *re* Fence: Read (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 1356 (i).

Mission River Piers, Advertisement for Tenders: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6919 (iv).

Mistook Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2557 (ii).

Monarch Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 82.'

Moncton Cut-off Line, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2921 (ii).

Moncton Locomotive and Car Shops: in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).

Moncton Wharf, Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 1627 (i).

Montague Branch, P.E.I. Ry., Land Claims: in Com. of Sup., 3420 (ii).

Montcalm Electoral District, Votes polled, spoiled Ballots, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 2597 (ii).

'Montcalm' Ice-breaker, Number of Crew, Daily Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 167 (i).

—— Name of Engineer *re* Investigations: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 548 (i).

—— Res. of Chamber of Commerce, Quebec, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 328 (i).

—— Total Cost of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 168 (i).

Montreal Bridge and Terminal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 180.'

Montreal Eastern Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 1303 (i).

Montreal Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 3211 (ii).

Montreal as a Free Port, Recommendation of Royal Commission: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 4802 (iii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners: *See* 'B. No. 154.'

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Dismissal of Employees: Ques. (Mr. Gervais) 874 (i).
—— Interest, Loans, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Ames) 1734 (i).
—— Promise *re* Wharfage Dues, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gervais) 874 (i).
Montreal Harbour Dues, Increase of, Interest due Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1416 (i).
Montreal Harbour Improvements, Claims of W. J. Poupore: in Com. of Sup., 3361 (ii).
Montreal Municipal Rights: Par. in 'La Presse' (Mr. Rivet) 1648 (i).
Montreal River, Improvements at Latchford: in Com. of Sup., 2975 (ii).
Montreal Terminal Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 48.'
Montreal Woollen Mills, Closing *re* Tariff Laws: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2591 (ii).
Monuments, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6543 (iv).
Moore, Isaac, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 145.'
Moravian Church in Canada: *See* 'B. No. 167.'
Morning Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5159 (iii).
Mossy River Dredging, Expenditure of Appropriation, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 816 (i).
Motor Vehicles Accidents: *See* 'B. No. 60.'
Mount Pleasant Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 3423 (ii).
Muir Memorial Fund, Request for Govt. Aid: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5095 (iii).
Mulloy, Pension *re*, Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 2313 (ii).
Museum, Victoria Memorial: in Com. of Sup., 1275 (i).
Nails, Quantity imported, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 2156 (ii).
Nanaimo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3224 (ii).
Napanee River Dredging, Surveys, Cost, &c.: (Mr. U. Wilson) 333 (i).
Nappan Experimental Farm, Names of Employees, Rate of Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 5640 (iii).
National Accident and Guarantee Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 103.'
National Art Gallery, Expenditures *re* Pictures: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 6087 (iv).
National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'B. No. 153.'
N. T. Ry., Employees, &c., Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4801 (iii), 6919 (iv).
—— Eastern Div., Tenders *re* Construction: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 4990 (iii).
—— Loans *re* Construction, Eastern Div., Rates of Interest: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 679 (i).
—— Surveys, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6985 (iv).
See 'G.T.P.,' 'Transcontinental.'
Nation River Drainage, Cor., O.Cs., &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Broder) 686 (i).
Nation River Drainage, Rep. of Engineer *re*: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 1178 (i).
Naturalization Act: *See* 'B. No. 5.'
Naturalization Act Amt. Bill: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 971 (i).
Natural Resources of Canada, Conservation of, Apptmt. of Sel. Com.: M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 355 (i).
Natural Resources Com., on Order for rsmd. debate: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 688 (i).
—— Special Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1556 (i).
Natural Resources, Lands, &c., Details of Money received, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McCarthy) 685 (i).
Natural Resources: *See* 'Conservation of,' &c.
Naufrage Pond: in Com. of Sup., 2508, 2512 (ii).
—— Protection Works: Remarks (Mr. Fraser) in Com. of Sup., 2461 (ii).
Naval Defence of Canada: Notice of Motion (Mr. Foster) 3203 (ii).
—— Aid to G. B.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 3484 (ii).
See 'Imperial,' &c.
Naval Defence of Sea Coast, Interpretation of Res. in House: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4289 (iii).
Naval Militia and Training Cruiser: in Com. of Sup., 6683 (iv).
Navigable Waters Protection Act: *See* 'B. Nos. 150 and 152.'
Navy of Canada or G. B., Contributions to: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Worthington) 1191 (i).
Net Debt of Canada, Present Amount, Increase of,: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 147 (i).
N. B. Central Ry. Commissioners Rep. and Hon. Mr. Pugsley: Amt. (Mr. Crothers) to Com. of Sup., 5645; Neg. (Y. 63; N. 90) 5830 (iii).
—— Question of Order (Mr. Speaker) 5646; Questions of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 5658, 5680; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 5659, 5690; (Mr. Crocket) 5756, 5777; (Mr. Turgeon) 5825 (iii).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 6058 (iv).
N. B. Central Commission, &c., Vote *re*: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Blain) 6409 (iv).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Calvert) 6412 (iv).
N. B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Report, O. Cs., &c. M. (Mr. Foster) to lay on Table. 5624 (iii).
—— Rep., Printing: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4236 (iii).
—— Statement *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4296 (iii).
N. B. Supreme Court Vacancies, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) 6686 (iv).
Newcastle Harbour Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Thornton) in Com. of Sup., 6543 (iv).

New Glasgow Public Building Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 1290 (i).
New Liskeard Wharf, Construction *re*: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 2553 (ii).
Newmarket Canal, Holland River, Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com. of Sup., 3112; Neg. (Y. 71; N. 112) 3176 (ii).
Newmarket Canal, to Lake Wilcox, Construction, Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 5157 (iii).
See 'Holland.'
New Westminster Dry Dock, Application for Govt. Aid: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3048 (ii).
New Westminster Penitentiary, Warden from 1876 to 1888, Escapes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 2769 (ii).
New Westminster Post Office, Free Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1709 (i).
New York Lubricant Co., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 188 (i).
Niagara-Welland Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 33.'
Niagara Ice Jam, Assistance of Dom. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) 4703 (iii).
Niagara River Falls, Amount of Overflow: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 1074 (i).
Nickel Ore, Export Duty *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 5634 (iii).
Nicolet Harbour, Repairs to Jetty: in Com. of Sup., 3246 (ii).
Nipigon River Dredging, Appropriation voted in 1908, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3653 (ii), 4223 (iii).
——— Estimated Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5635 (iii).
Nipissing Indian Reserve, Open for Settlement: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 684 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Payments to since Cancellation of Contract, &c: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1071 (i).
North Bay Post Office, Inspector, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1558 (i).
North Head, Grand Manan Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1629 (i).
North Saskatchewan River Surveys, Average Cost per Mile: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 870 (i).
'Northumberland Dredge,' Men on Voters' Lists: Remarks (Mr. Rhodes) 2403 (ii).
——— Number of Crew, Names, Emplymt. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 2815 (ii).
Northwest Fish Company's Leases, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 6776 (iv).
N.W. Mounted Police Force, Compensations: in Com. of Sup., 3664 (ii).
——— Land Scrip, Refusal of Grants: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1066 (i).
N.W.M.P., Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3656 (ii).
——— Yukon: in Com. of Sup., 3659 (ii).
N.W. Rebellion, 1885, Grants to N.W.M.P., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 184 (i).
N.W. Ter. Govt. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1171 (i).
N.S. Weekly Mail Service, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1731 (i).
Oaths of Office. *See* 'B. No. 1.'
Oats: *See* 'English,' 'Seed.'
Obstructions in Navigable Rivers, Removal, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6679 (iv).
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 6670 (iv).
Oil Gas, &c., Borings, Details of Expenditure of $35,000, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 684 (i).
Okanagan River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6544 (iv).
Old Age Annuities, Number of Employees, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 141 (i).
Old Age Pensions: *See* 'B. No. 109.'
Old Man River Improvements: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 3336 (ii).
Olin, Chas., Total Payments *re* Visits to Sweden: Ques. (Mr. Goodeve) 871 (i).
——— M. for Copy* (Mr. Goodeve) 881 (i).
Ontario Act, Disallowance of, O.C., *re*: (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4882 (iii).
Ontario, Hudson Bay and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
Ontario and Man. Boundaries, Decision *re* Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1074 (i).
Ontario and Michigan Power Co. *See* 'B. No. 34.'
Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s Bill: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Sproule) 1115 (i).
Opening of Parliament., Mess from His Ex.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 7 (i).
Opium Conference, Mr. King's Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 3433 (ii).
'Opportunities in Canada,' Names of Publisher: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 2158 (ii).
——— Number of Copies distributed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 676 (i).
Ordnance and Arms: in Com. of Sup., 2307 (ii).
Oriental Immigration into B.C., Res. *re* Royal Com.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1242 (i).
——— Inaccurate Answer: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1248 (i).
——— Corrected Answer (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1976 (i).
See 'Asiatic.'

Orientals in B.C. on Jan. 1, 1909, Number naturalized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1920 (i).
Oromocto Wharf, Total Cost, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2319 (ii).
Oshawa Collector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1972 (i), 2372, 3046 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 2672 (ii).
Oshawa Harbour, Negotiations *re* Acquisition by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1918 (i), 2372 (ii).
Otonabee River Dredging, Amounts paid, Quantity done, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 3044 (ii), 4221 (iii).
Otonabee River Floods, Payments to Property Owners *re* Damages: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sexsmith) 1190 (i).
Ottawa Assurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 139.'
Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 617, 1389, 1494 (i).
Ottawa Buildings, Electric Lighting: in Com. of Sup., 1600 (i).
——— Elevators: in Com. of Sup., 1599 (i).
——— Grounds, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3225 (ii).
——— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1601 (i).
——— Heating, Salaries to Engineers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3226 (ii).
——— Lavatories, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1392 (i).
Ottawa Buildings, leased by Govt., Rentals, Superficial Area, Taxes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1556 (i).
Ottawa Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 139.'
Ottawa Buildings, Museum: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 3215 (ii).
——— New Deptl. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1250 (i).
——— Staff Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 3225 (ii).
——— Steel Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1391 (i).
——— Taxes paid by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 1609 (i).
——— Telephones: in Com. of Sup., 1605 (i).
Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 49.'
Ottawa Public Grounds: in Com. of Sup., 1600 (i).
Ottawa Service Corps, Complaints *re* Padding Pay Lists, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 6784 (iv).
Owen Sound Harbour Dredging and Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 3315 (ii).
Owen Sound Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i).
Owen Sound Post Office, Original and Present Cost, Change of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 247 (i).
Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iv).
Panmure Island Wharf, Purchase of Right-of-Way, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 6403 (iv).
Park Reservations: in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iv).
Parliamentary Guide: in Com. of Sup., 7064 (iv).
Parliament Hill Grounds, Condition of: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6473 (iv).
Parsons, Frank, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 130.'
Passenger Tickets: *See* 'B. No. 2.'
Passover Bread, Higher Rate of Duty, Request *re*: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3886 (ii).
Patent Bills: *See* Bills Nos. 71, 77, 92, 93, 123, 132 and 169.
Patent Medicines Act, Apptmt. of Analysts, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3476 (ii).
Patent Medicines: in Com. of Sup., 458 (i).
'Patent Record,' in Com. of Sup., 696 (i), 3186 (ii).
Patriotic Fund: *See* 'B. No. 175.'
Patronage List, Abolition of, Com. to Judge Cassels: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 876 (i).
Patterson, Mildred Gwendolyn Platt, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 143.'
Payne, J. Lambert, Duties, Salary, Hours of Work, &c.: (Mr. McKenzie) 1726 (i).
Peat Fuel Testing Building: in Com. of Sup., 1389 (i).
——— Memorandum of Dr. Haanel: Read in Com. of Sup., 1494 (i).
Peigan Indian Agency, Surrender of Land: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).
Pembroke Ry. Crossing, Cost of Protection by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2159 (ii).
Penitentiaries: in Com. of Sup., 884 (i), 7035 (iv).
——— Generally, Supplies: in Com. of Sup., 887 (i).
Penitentiaries and Prison Labour: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. of Sup., 903 (i).
Pensions: *See* 'B. No. 109.'
Pensions, Mrs. Wilmot, N.W.M.P.: in Com. of Sup., 883 (i).
Pensions, N.W. Rebellion: in Com. of Sup., 812 (i).
Peswick Wharf: in Com .of Sup., 2474 (ii).
Peterborough West, Expenditure *re* Public Works for twenty Years: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 4636 (iii).
Petewawa Camp, Number of Permanent Force, Date of Opening, &c.: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 5639 (iii).
Petewawa Dock: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) in Com. of Sup., 3307 (ii).
Pictou County Fishery Overseers, Prosecutions in Salmon illegal Fishing: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 5632 (iii).
Pictou and Magdalen Island Mail Services, Contract, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser)

Pictou Public Buildings, Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1291 (i).
Piers on Lake St. Peter, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6887 (iv).
Pilots, Pension to F. X. Lamarre: in Com. of Sup., 3437 (ii).
Pilotage Rates, Scale of Charges for B. C.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 3476 (ii).
Pincher Creek Post Office, Complaints re Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 1711 (i).
Pink Rock Wharf, Shepody Bay: in Com. of Sup., 1629 (i).
Plank, Mr. M. W., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3252 (ii).
Plaster Mines Lighthouse, Dismissal of Hector McRae, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 6784 (iv).
Pneumatic Tubes, Montreal, Quantity and Value of Purchase, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1068 (i).
Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Contract Price, Extras, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 818 (i).
—— Repairs to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1557 (i).
Pointe du Chene Breakwater Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 1629 (i).
Pointe Tupper Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2951 (ii).
Police Patrol Boats in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 6682 (iv).
Political Partizanship: *See* 'Govt. Employees.'
Political Weekly Letter, Franking and Distribution by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1922 (i).
Polling Booths in Ont., Payments for Rents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 3251 (ii).
Pope Post Office, Pet. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 1713 (i).
Pork, Bacon, &c., from U.S., Entries at Kingston, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1176 (i).
Portage la Prairie Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3001, 3332 (ii).
Port Arthur and Fort William Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2091 (ii).
Port Arthur Harbour and Mission River Dredging, Contractors, Inspectors, &c. Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5775 (iii).
Port Bruce Harbour, Amount of Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 818 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 3331 (ii).
Port Colborne Elevators, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1903 (i).
Port Credit Customs Revenue, Superannuation of Collector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3049 (ii).
Port Credit Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 3329 (ii).
Port Hastings Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2479 (ii).
Port Hood Breakwater, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4892 (iii).
Port Hood Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6543 (iv).
Port Stanley Groynes: in Com. of Sup., 2977 (ii).
Port Stanley Pier, Delay in Paying Labourers Wages: Remarks (Mr. Crothers) 4047 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 342 (i).
Portuguese Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2479, 3234 (ii).
Postal Law Violations, Number of Prosecutions, Penalties, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1924 (i).
Post Office Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 19 and 136.'
POST OFFICE:
Black Lake Postmaster, Complaints, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4896 (iii).
Brophy's Post Office, Name of Postmaster, Changes *re*: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 1186 (i).
Burks Falls and Trout Creek Mail Routes, Contractor, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 3196 (ii).
Campbellford and Brighton Mail Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 3479 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Owen) 3655 (ii).
Cariboo Mail Service, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 1731 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Burrell) in Com. of Sup., 3124 (ii).
Central Park, B.C., Mail Delivery, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 2590 (ii).
Country Postmasters' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1700 (i).
Dorland and U. E. Loyalist Mail Route, Mail Carrier, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 334 (i).
East Elgin Postmasters Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 3429 (ii).
Envelopes, Complaints *re* Mutilation through Mails: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 349 (i).
Etobicoke Postmaster, Apptmt. of Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 671 (i).
Franking Privilege *re* Campaign Literature, Names of Ministers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2585 (ii).
—— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1653 (i).
Free Mail Delivery in Cities, Names, Mail Routes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2585 (ii).
Gaspé-Perce Mail Contract, Expiration of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2596 (ii).
Glace Bay Mails, Contract for collecting: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 5775 (iii).
Glace Bay Post Office, Inspector, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 5635 (iii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Gowganda Mail Facilities: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1395 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 1703 (i).

Graham Post Office, Pet. *re*: Remarks (Mr G. V. White) in Com. of Sup., 1713 (i).

Greenfield, P.E.I., Post Office, Removal of: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 5776 (iii).

Hand Hills, Alberta Post Office, Applications, Reps., &c., *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Magrath) 2162 (ii).

Hazel Ridge Post Office, Application *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 1710 (i).

Lachute Mills Post Office, Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Perley) 158 (i).

Letter Carriers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1653, 1697 (i).

——— Salaries at St. Thomas: Remarks (Mr. Crothers) in Com. of Sup., 3428 (ii).

——— System in Cities, Regulations *re* Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5158 (iii).

Lévis Postmastership, Apptmt. of Successor to Mr. A. Lafanccis: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4636 (iii).

Londonderry Station to Great Village Mail Contract, Name, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 824 (i).

Lorne Valley, P.E.I., Tenders *re* Mail Contract: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 5776 (iii).

Mackey's Station Post Office, Complaints *re* Management: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 545 (i).

Macleod Post Office, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 1711 (i).

McKenzie, Mr. D., Resignation as Postmaster of Three Brooks, Apptmt. of a Successor: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 4640 (iii).

Mail Boxes purchased and entered into Canada free of Duty: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 547 (i).

Mail Carriers, Post Office Payments in Newmarket and Aurora to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 1560 (i).

Mail Contracts, Fair Wage Clause: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 3430 (ii).

Mail Contracts, Renewals in April, 1909, without Tenders: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 477 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 685 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 4801 (iii).

Mail delivered in Towns, &c., Rural Free Mail Delivery, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 157 (i).

Mail Service from Hyde Park Post Office, &c., Middlesex County: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 3251 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Mail and Stage Routes, Total Number of Miles, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 481, 813 (i).

Makaroff Postmaster's Salary: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 1702 (i).

Malagash, N.S., Mail Contract, Expiry of, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 5639 (iii).

Manitoba Post Office, Transfers since Nov. 1908, Names of former Postmasters, Ques. (Mr. Roche) 1414 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Roche) 1922 (i).

Montreal Eastern Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 1303 (i).

Mount Pleasant Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 3423 (ii).

New Westminster Post Office, Free Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1709 (i).

North Bay Post Office Inspector, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1558 (i).

N. S. Weekly Mail Service, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1731 (i).

Owen Sound Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i).

Pictou and Magdalen Island Mail Services, Contract, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3047 (ii).

Pincher Creek Post Office, Complaints *re* Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 1711 (i).

Political Weekly Letter, Franking and Distribution by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1922 (i).

Pope Post Office, Pet., *re*: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 1713 (i).

Postal Law Violations, Number of Prosecutions, Penalties, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1924 (i).

Postmaster General's Rep.: Presented (Mr. Lemieux) 12 (i).

Postmasters' Salaries in East Elgin: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 3429 (ii).

Post Office Apptmts., Incorrect Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1023 (i).

Post Office Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 725 (i).

Post Office Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 613, 720 (i).

Post Office Deposits and Interest Credits in Pass Books: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4896 (iii).

See 'Savings'

Post Office Inspectors, Travelling Expenses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3431 (ii).

Post Office Inspectors' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1649 (i).

Post Office Miscellaneous Items: in Com. of Sup., 1716 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Post Office Orders and Postal Notes, Total Number issued, Payable in G. B.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1242 (i).

Post Offices in Peel County, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3046 (ii).

Post Office Revenue at Kingston, Brantford, Sherbrooke and Quebec, Salaries of Postmasters, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 5633 (iii).

Quebec Post Office, Elevators, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1317 (i).

Queens and Sunbury Mail Service, Established in Oct., 1908: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2375 (ii).

Railway Mail Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 1699 (i), 3432 (ii).

——— Increases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 336 (i).

——— Increase of Salaries: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4223 (iii).

Railway Mail Clerks, Furois, Dorais and Wathen, Dates of Examination for Promotions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 3253 (ii).

Railway Mail Clerks, Number killed or Injured in past two years: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 3476 (ii).

Roblin and Forest Mills Mail Route, Carrier, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 333 (i).

Rural Mail: in Com. of Sup., 1714 (i), 3423 (ii).

Rural Mail Delivery: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Armstrong) 2774 (ii).

——— East Northumberland, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 3480 (ii).

——— Establishment of in Grey County: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 671 (i).

——— Location of Routes, Non-Delivery, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 347 (i).

——— Number of Routes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6408 (iv).

——— Prince Edward County, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1077 (i).

——— Purchase of Boxes, Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 179 (i).

——— System, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 148 (i).

——— Total Expenditure on Routes: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 179 (i).

Rural Mail Boxes, Number delivered in Dufferin County: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 341 (i).

St. John Postmaster, Superannuation of, Apptmt. of Successor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 871 (i).

St. Justine Mail Delivery, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3480 (ii).

Ste. Philomene Mail Contract, Annual Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2770 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

St. Polycarpe Post Office, Complaints *re* Officials, Change of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lortie) 4894 (iii).

Savings Banks Deposits, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1067 (i), 4897.

Sillsville and the Pines Mail Route, Carrier, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 333 (i).

Somerville, Thos., Payments to by P.O. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 1559 (i).

Souris Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. J. Dolmage, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1915 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) on M. for Sup., 6847 (iv).

Sydney Free Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Maddin) in Com. of Sup., 1706 (i).

Tercentenary Postage Stamps, Total Amount *re* Sale: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3654 (ii).

Thedford, Arkona and Fort Frank Rural Mail Delivery, Delays in Establishing: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 476 (i).

Victoria Post Office, Pet. from Letter Carriers: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 1712 (i).

Wingham Post Office Clock, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 4637 (iii).

Winnipeg P.O. and Ry. Station Mail Contract, Tenders, Changes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 869 (i).

Potatoes sold in Bags, Statute *re* Measurements: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 351 (i).

Prairie Fires, Govt. Relief: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) 6411 (iv).

Prairie Provinces Trust Co.: *See* 'B. No. 163.'

Preston, W. T. R., Complaints from Japan *re* Work, &c.: Ques. (Mr. German) 480 (i).

——— Emplymt. by Govt., Transfer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3991 (ii).

——— Protest from Japan *re* Statements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Reid) 186 (i).

——— Transfer to Holland: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5999, 6656 (iv).

Preventive Service, Customs: in Com. of Sup., 611 (i).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 62.'

Prince Albert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1555 (i).

P.E.I., Cape Breton and Newfoundland SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 6652 (iv).

P.E.I. Winter Communication with Mainland, on M. for Sup. (Mr. Warburton) 6448 (iv).

P.E.I. Ry., Harmony-Elmira Branch: in Com. of Sup., 2952 (ii).

See 'Railways.'

Prince Rupert, B.C. and Jedway, Queen Charlotte Island SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 6652 (iv).
Prince Rupert Quarantine Station: in Com. of Sup., 2081 (ii).
Printing and Stationery, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 804 (i).
Prisoners paroled or pardoned, Cost of Ret., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 673 (i).
Private Bills, Apptmt. of Com. to revise Rules: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5351 (iii).
—— Extension of Hour for considering: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5774 (iii).
—— Payment of Fees, 14th Rep. of Com. M. (Mr. Guthrie) 4986 (iii).
Private Bills, Refund of Fees: M. (Mr. Ethier) to conc., in 8th Rep. of Com., 5889, 5997 (iv).
—— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to amend Rules of Hse *re*, 6120 (iv).
Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Bribing Deptl. Offiials, &c. (Mr. Campbell) 6777 (iv).
Privilege, Ques, of (Mr. Conmee) *re* 'Special Trains,' &c., 4290 (iii).
—— Order, Ques. of (Mr. Foster) 4291 (iii). *See* 'Question,' &c.
Proportional Representation in House of Commons: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 2598; Amt. (Mr. Fielding) 2624; Agreed to, 2625 (ii).
Prorogation: Mess. from His. Ex., 7086 (iv).
Protection of Coast Line and Seaports, &c.: Notice of Prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 482 (i). *See* 'Naval.'
Provincial Rights: *See* 'B. No. 34.'
Prudential Life Ins. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Prudential Trust Co. Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 91.'
Public Accounts Com., Calling of Meetings: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 663, 1188 (i).
—— M. to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Public Accounts, &c., to Com. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 1479 (i)
Public Accounts Com., 12th and 14th Reps.: M. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) to conc., 6559 (iv).
Public Health Bureau, Establishment of by Govt.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1081 (i).
Public Works, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Pugsley) 464 (i).
Public Works, Hours of Labour: *See* 'B. No. 22.'
Public Works, Hours of Labour B. 35 (Mr. Verville): M. to dsch. from Order Paper, 4990 (iii).
PUBLIC WORKS:
Amherst Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1282 (i).
Annapolis Ice Piers, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 2338 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Anse a la Barbe Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2512 (ii).
Anse à l'Ilot: in Com. of Sup., 2513 (ii).
Arisaig Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3233 (ii).
Assiniboine River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3332 (ii).
—— Cost per yard for Sept. and Oct.: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 1239 (i).
Avonport Piers Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2453 (ii).
Baddeck Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2453 (ii).
Bailey's Brook Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).
Batiscan Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup., 3274 (ii).
Bay St. Lawrence Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 2455 (ii).
Beaver Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1622 (i).
Belleville Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1356 (i).
Big Bras d'Or Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2455 (ii).
Blanche River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2966 (ii).
Blind River Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3292 (ii).
Blue Rocks Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2455 (ii).
Boat Harbour, Pictou Co., N.S., Total Expenditure, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 2318 (ii).
Boat Harbour, Skinner's Cove, Yearly Expenditure, Completion, &c.: (Mr. Maddin) 2817 (ii).
Bonaventure Public Works, Amount expended prior to 1900, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 173, 353 (i).
—— Inquiry (Mr. Lennox) for Ret. 1320 (i).
Bonaventure River, Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2559, 3277 (ii).
Breton Cove Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup. 2456 (ii).
Bridgewater Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1283 (i).
Brule Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup. 2460 (ii).
Buctouche Channel: in Com. of Sup., 1623 (i).
Burlington Channel Piers Construction: in Com. of Sup., 2966 (ii).
Campbellton Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1625 (i).
Cape Bald Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1625 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Cape Tormentine Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1625 (i).

Cap St. Ignace Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2522 (ii).

Cariboo Breakwater or Causeway, Yearly Expenditure, &c.: (Mr. Crosby) 2152 (ii).

Charlottetown Post Office, Sidewalk Construction, Tenders, *re*: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4228 (ii).

Chesley Post Office, Amount of Vote *re*: Ques. (Mr. Donnelly) 543 (i).

Cheverie Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2456 (ii).

Chicoutimi Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2523 (ii).

Chicoutimi Pier, Contract of T. Desbiens, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 2161 (ii).

Chicoutimi Wharf, Expropriation of Land, Prices paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4222 (iii).

Chilliwack Post Office Site, Plans, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1414 (i).

Chilliwack Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 2090 (ii).

Church Point Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2457 (ii).

Clarke City, Seven Islands Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2526, 2540, 2887 (ii).

Clark's Harbour Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 2462 (ii).

Cobourg Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2967 (ii).

Cobourg Harbour, Expenditure for 1908, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 3988 (ii).

Collingwood Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup. 3294 (ii).

——— Payments to Mr. Battle: in Com. of Sup., 3294 (ii).

Cookshire Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 1293 (i).

Cornwall Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i).

Courtenay Bay Dredging Contracts: in Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).

Cow Bay, Port Morien Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2463 (ii).

Cow Bay Run and Osbornes: in Com. of Sup., 2473 (ii).

Cribbin's Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2473 (ii).

Cummings Cove, Deer Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1625 (i).

Dauphin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1543 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Digby Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2473 (ii).

Disraeli Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2350 (ii).

Dorchester Wharf Addition: in Com. of Sup., 3237 (ii).

Doucet's Landing, Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2543 (ii).

Douglastown Pier Addition: in Com. of Sup., 2546 (ii).

Dover Wharfs on Petitcodiac River: in Com. of Sup., 1625 (i).

Dredge, Govt.-owned, employed in N. S. under Contracts, Arangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2320 (ii).

Dredges owned by Govt., Number, Construction, Price, &c.: M. (Mr. Garman) for Ret.*, 2596 (ii).

Dredges purchased by Public Works Dept., Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 145 (i).

Dredging, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 6534 (iv).

——— Mar. Provs., Generally: in Com. of Sup., 6553 (iv).

——— Mar. Provs., Plants, Contracts, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3339 (ii).

Dredging Plant for St. Lawrence River: in Com. of Sup., 6885 (iv).

Dredging Vessels, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3338 (ii).

East Huron Public Works Expenditure during 20 years: Ques. (Mr. Chisholm) 3477 (ii).

Eastville Subway Crossing: in Com. of Sup., 2951 (ii).

Eatonville Wharf, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 4638 (iii).

Economy Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 2460 (ii).

Father Point Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2548 (ii).

Fraser River, Flooding at Delta, Rep. of Mr. Coste, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2587 (ii).

Garthby Wharf, Lake Aylmer: in Com. of Sup., 2549 (ii).

Gaspe Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2550 (ii).

Georgetown Public Building, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1292 (i).

Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).

——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1287 (i).

Glencoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1361, 1366 (i).

Goderich Harbour, Repairs to Piers: in Com. of Sup., 2968 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Graham's Pond, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 2507 (ii).

Grand Bend Dock, Approaches, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2586 (ii).

Grand Etang, Channel Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).

Gravenhurst Wharf Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 2980 (ii).

Greenwood and Grand Forks Post Office Sites, Options *re*: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 814 (i).

Gretna Quarantine Building, Total Cost, Price of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. H. Sharpe) 824 (i).

Guysborough Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1288 (i).

Guysborough County Public Works, Expenditure of Votes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 819 (i).

Halifax, Customs House, Total Cost, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 815 (i).

——— Dom. Buildings, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1288 (i).

——— Post Office, Contract *re* Reconstruction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 814 (i).

Harbours and Rivers and Bridges, Generally, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 2985 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1621 (i), 2118, 2474 (ii).

——— Ont., General Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2968 (ii).

——— P.E.I., General Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2507 (ii).

——— Quebec, General Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3243 (ii).

Harbours and River Works, Piers, &c., Govt. Procedure *re* Construction by Day Labour: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2513 (ii).

Harvey Bank Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1626 (i).

Heron Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1626 (i).

Honora Dock, Manitoulin, Construction, Dimensions, &c., Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Smyth) 6408 (iv).

House of Commons, New Wing, Payments to Deptl. Staff: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2149 (ii).

Icelander River Dredging, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 347 (i).

Indian Point Dredging, Tenders *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2763 (ii).

——— Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1397 (i).

Inverness Harbour, C.B., Improvement, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4637 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Jesus River Dredging, Amount of Expropriation, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1069 (i).

Joggins Mines Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2477 (ii).

Joliette Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1293 (i).

Kingston Royal Military College Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1507 (i).

——— M. in Conc. to reduce Vote (Mr. Pugsley) 4049 (iii).

——— Cottages, Estimated Cost, Specifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 2319 (ii).

——— College Stables, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1732 (i).

——— Military Buildings: M. for Original Tenders (Mr. Edwards) 1922 (i).

Kingston Veterinary Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 1534 (i).

——— Tenders for Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 2149 (ii).

Kouchibougouac Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1626 (i).

Lac du Bonnet Bridge: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 2116 (ii).

Lachute Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1301 (i).

Lake Dauphin, Mossy River Obstructions: in Com. of Sup., 2997 (ii).

Lakefield Wharf, Amount of Expenditure, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 1063 (i).

Lake Nipissing Floods, Claims of Settlers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 817 (i).

Lake Nipissing, Improvement of Narrows to Monetville: in Com. of Sup., 3308 (ii).

Lake St. Francis (Beauce) Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 2554 (ii).

Lake St. John Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 2556 (ii).

Lameque Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1626 (i).

Lansdowne Drill Shed, Tenders, Contract *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 5630 (iii).

Laprairie Ice Piers: in Com. of Sup., 2899 (ii).

Leamington Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1386 (i).

Leonardsville, Deer Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1626 (i).

Lethbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1551 (i).

Lévis Harbour, Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2094 (ii).

Lismore Wharf, Construction, Unpaid Accounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1079 (i).

Little Current, Improvement of Northern Channel: in Com. of Sup., 2973, 3302 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Little Current Dredging, Depth, Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smyth) 7072 (iv).

Little Narrows Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2477 (ii).

Little River, Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).

——— Amount expended, Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 476 (i).

Lorneville Breakwater Wharf: in Com of Sup., 1626 (i).

McGregor's Creek Bank Protection: in Com of Sup., 2974 (ii).

Maganatawan River Improvements, Amount expended, Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 476 (i).

Maritime Dredging Co., Tenders *re* St. John Harbour: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 6787 (iv).

Markham Post Office, Total Cost *re*: Ques (Mr. Wallace) 6406 (iv).

Markham Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1386 (i).

Meaford Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3313 (ii).

Michipicoten Wharf, Expenditures, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 338 (i).

Middle River Shear Dam: in Com. of Sup., 2477 (ii).

Mill's Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1626 (i).

Minasville Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2479 (ii).

Mission River Piers, Advertisement for Tenders: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6919 (iv).

Mistook Wharf Repairs: in Com of Sup., 2557 (ii).

Moncton Wharf, Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 1627 (i).

Montreal River, Improvements at Latchford: in Com. of Sup., 2975 (ii).

Mossy River Dredging, Expenditure of Appropriation, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 816 (i).

Nanaimo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3224 (ii).

Napanee River Dredging, Surveys, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 333 (i).

Naufrage Pond: in Com. of Sup., 2508, 2512 (ii).

——— Protection Works: Remarks (Mr. Fraser) in Com. of Sup., 2461 (ii).

New Glasgow Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1290 (i).

New Liskeard Wharf, Construction *re*: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 2553 (ii).

Nicolet Harbour, Repairs to Jetty: in Com. of Sup., 3246 (ii).

Nipigon River Dredging, Expenditure for 1908: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3653 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Nipigon River Dredging, Estimated Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5635 (iii).

North Head, Grand Manan Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1629 (i).

Okanagan River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6544 (iv).

Oromocto Wharf, Total Cost, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2319 (ii).

Oshawa Harbour, Negotiations *re* Acquisition by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1918 (i), 2372 (ii).

Otonabee River Dredging, Name of Contractor, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr Bradbury) 3044 (ii).

——— Amounts paid, Quantity done, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 4221 (iii).

Owen Sound Harbour Dredging and Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 3315 (ii).

Owen Sound Post Office, Original and Present Cost, Change of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 247 (i).

Panmure Island Wharf, Purchase of Right-of-way, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 6403 (iv).

Peswick Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2474 (ii).

Peterborough West, Expenditure *re* Public Works for twenty years: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 4636 (iii).

Petewawa Dock: Remarks (Mr. Gerald White) in Com. of Sup., 3307 (ii).

Pictou Public Buildings, Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1291 (i).

Piers on Lake St. Peter, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6887 (iv).

Pink Rock Wharf, Shepody Bay: in Com. of Sup., 1629 (i).

Pointe du Chene Breakwater Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 1629 (i).

Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Contract Price, Extras, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 818 (i).

——— Repairs to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1557 (i).

Point Tupper Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2951 (ii).

Port Arthur and Fort William Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2091 (ii).

Port Arthur Harbour and Mission River Dredging, Contractors, Inspectors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5775 (iii).

Port Bruce Harbour, Amount of Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 818 (i).

Port Hastings Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2479 (ii).

Port Hood Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6543 (iv).

——— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4892 (iii).

Port Stanley Groynes: in Com. of Sup., 2977 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Port Stanley Pier, Delay in Paying Labourers Wages: Remarks (Mr. Crothers) 4047 (iii).

—— Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 342 (i).

Portuguese Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2479, 3234 (ii).

Prince Albert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1555 (i).

Public Works Dept., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 613 (i), 3665 (ii).

—— Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 3672 (ii).

—— Deptl. Salaries, O. C. *re* Increases: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1074 (i).

—— Supplies, Notice to Agents *re* Purchases: Letter laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 3650 (ii).

—— Works by Marine Dept., Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 2765 (ii).

Public Works, Expenditure *re* Byng Inlet, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 1178 (i).

Public Works Expenditures, Promises during Elections: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1357 (i).

Public Works Health Act: in Com. of Sup., 810 (i).

Public Works in Middlesex, Expenditure for twenty years: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 4228 (iii).

Public Works in South Wellington, Expenditure for last 20 years: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 3655 (ii).

Quaco Harbour Pier: in Com. of Sup., 1629 (i).

Quebec Harbour, Levis: in Com. of Sup., 2091 (ii).

Queens and Sunbury Wharfs, Construction, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2320 (ii).

Quesnel Telegraph Station Supplies, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 1919 (i).

Richard's Landing, St. Joseph's Island Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2978 (ii).

Richelieu River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2559 (ii).

—— Improvements Office: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1185 (i).

Richibucto Cape, Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1629 (i).

Richibucto Harbour, Claims of John Jardine: in Com. of Sup., 3237 (ii).

Richibucto Harbour Breakwater: Conc., 4049 (iii).

Rimouski Wharf Sheathing West Side: in Com. of Sup., 2557 (ii).

Riviere du Loup Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 3284 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Rivière du Moulin Pier, Pets., Reps. *re* Construction: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 2161 (ii).

Rondeau Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2979 (ii).

Royal Military College Cottages, Estimated total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1732 (i). *See* 'Kingston.'

St. Alphonse de Bagotville Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2900 (ii).

St. Alphonse Wharf, Removal of Rocks: in Com. of Sup., 2901 (ii).

St. Andrew's Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1645 (i).

Ste. Anne des Monts, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2906, 3287 (ii).

St. Charles River, Estuary Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2095 (ii).

St. Francis du Lac, Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3285 (ii).

St. Francis River: in Com. of Sup., 2898 (ii).

St. Fulgence Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2906 (ii).

St. Jacques River, Ice Piers: in Com. of Sup., 3287 (ii).

St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2906 (ii).

St. John Drill Hall, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1293 (i).

St. John Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1645 (i), 2109 (ii).

—— Dredging, Apptmt. of Supt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5632 (iii).

—— Dredging, Contracts, Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1917 (i), 2158 (ii).

St. John River, Construction of Tidal Waters Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 1633 (i), 3238 (ii).

—— Contribution of Local Govt.: in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).

St. Johns, P.Q., Contract for Wharf Extension: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2770 (ii).

—— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1317 (i).

—— Richelieu River Improvements, Estimates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2817 (ii).

—— Wharf, Expenditure, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2768 (ii).

St. Joseph's Island Wharfs, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 337 (i).

St. Joseph Wharf, Expenditure in 1908: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2586 (ii).

St. Lawrence River Channel at Kingston, Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 2979 (ii).

St. Maurice River: Grande Piles Channel: in Com. of Sup., 2900 (ii).

St. Michel, Yamaska, Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3247, 3262 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

St. Nicholas Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2908 (ii).

Saguenay River Booms, Construction of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4222 (ii).

Saguenay River, Dredging and Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2802, 2878 (ii).

Saguenay River Wharf: in Com. of Sup, 3284 (ii).

Sandy Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup, 3235 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 2475 (ii).

Sandy Cove Breakwater Construction, Payments to Contractors: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1419 (i).

——— Amounts owing for Labour &c., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1728 (i)

Sault Ste. Marie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2980 (ii).

——— Dredging Approaches: in Com. of Sup., 3316 (ii).

Scotch Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).

Sea Gull Wharf, Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 338 (i).

Seal Cove, Grand Manan Island Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 1645 (i).

Selkirk Post Office, Estimated Cost, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 347, 530 (i).

——— Completion of, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5643 (iii).

Shelburne Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1291 (i).

Shell River Bridge, Original Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 529 (i).

Sherbrooke Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1317 (i).

——— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 3478 (ii).

Shippegan Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1645 (i).

Silver Centre Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3317 (ii).

Simcoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1392 (i).

Snag Boat at Selkirk, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 474 (i).

Sorel Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2909, 3289 (ii).

Sorel Ship Yard, Purchase of Property: in Com. of Sup., 6885 (iv).

Souris Dredging, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 6554 (iv).

Southampton Dock Extension: in Com. of 3317 (ii).

——— Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2980 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

South Lake, Lakevale Channel, Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 2480, 3235 (ii).

Spanish River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3324 (ii).

Spry Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2474 (ii).

——— Expenditures *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 4895 (iii).

Stony Lake Wharfs Number, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 1064 (i).

Strathcona Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3224 (ii).

Sturgeon Falls and Sudbury Public Buildings, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 817 (i).

Sturgeon's Pier, Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 2510 (ii).

——— Tenders, Contracts, &c., for raising: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 1241 (i).

Sydenham River, Clearing East Branch: in Com. of Sup. 3324 (ii).

Tangier Harbour Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2484 (ii).

Tatamagouche Bay Wharf, Expenditure for Oct. and Nov., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 185 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 1621 (i).

Tatamagouche River Bridge: Remarks (Mr. Maddin) in Com. of Sup., 2365 (ii).

Tenby Bay Wharf, Warehouse Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 339 (i).

Three Rivers Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1318 (i).

Tiffin Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).

Tignish Pier Extension: in Com. of Sup. 2510 (ii).

Toronto Harbour Improvements; in Com. of Sup., 3317 (ii).

——— Delay *re* Payments to Men: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 544 (i).

——— Western Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 2980 (ii).

Upper Prospect Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3235 (ii).

Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2082 (ii).

Vernon, B.C., Public Building; in Com. of Sup., 2075 (ii).

Vernon River Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 2511 (ii).

Victoria Harbour Improvements, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 2117 (ii).

Victoria Immigration Buildings, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 2082 (ii).

Wallace Bridge Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2484 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Wallace Bridge Wharf, Contract *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1916 (i).
Welchpool, Campobello Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1646 (i).
Welland County, Expenditures *re* Public Works: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 3990 (ii).
Westport Landing Pier: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 2457 (ii).
——— Amount expended, Estimated Cost, &c: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 475 (i).
Westville Post Office, Contract Price, Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 2755 (ii).
Westville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1292 (i).
Wharfs in N. S., N. B. and B. C., Amount expended since 1906, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 348 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barnard) 1190 (i).
Wharfs in Queens and Sunbury, Tenders called for in Oct. 1908, Estimated Cost, &c.: (Mr. Crocket) 2374 (ii).
Wharfs at St. Zotique, Amounts of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lortie) 1400 (i).
See 'Public Works,' &c. ,
Whitby Harbour, Negotiations *re* Acquisition by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2372 (ii).
Whitby Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1393 (i).
——— Advertisements for Tenders: Read in Com. of Sup., 1514 (i).
Whitehead, Grand Manan Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1646 (i).
Windsor, N.S., Post Office, Tenders *re* Renovating, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Black) 4288 (iii).
Winnipeg Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 1549 (i).
Yamaska Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2900 (ii).
Yamaska River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 3291 (ii).
Yarmouth Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2484 (ii).
Pulp, Paper, &c., Negotiations with U. S., *re* Duty: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2384 (ii).
Pulp and Paper produced in Canada, Quantity exported to G. B. and U. S.: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 3048 (ii).
Quaco Harbour Pier: in Com. of Sup., 1629 (i).
Qu'Appelle Electoral District, Voters' Lists, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 1191 (i).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Land Grant, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 468 (i).
Quarantine, General Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 3193 (ii).
——— Partridge Island Water Service: in Com. of Sup., 3206 (ii).
Quarantine, Steamers 'Challenger,' &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5883 (iii).
Quebec and Blanc Sablon SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 6653 (iv).
Quebec Bridge Co., Payments to Stockholders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 163 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 353 (i).
Quebec Bridge Rebuilding, Estimated Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 165 (i).
——— Plans, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2050, 3421 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Report, French Translation: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 1722 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Res. *re* Sub-Marine Viaduct, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2321 (ii).
Quebec Camps of Instruction, Date of, Regiments attending, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5641 (iii).
Quebec Citadel, Refurnishing, &c., for Tercentenary: in Com. of Sup., 3211 (ii).
Quebec Detention Hospital in Savard Park: in Com. of Sup., 3221 (ii).
Quebec Harbour, Lévis: in Com. of Sup., 2094 (ii).
Quebec Harbours and Rivers, General Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3243 (ii).
Quebec Judges, now receiving Pensions, Date of Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 5634 (iii).
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 171.'
Quebec Oriental Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 138.'
Quebec Post Office, Elevators, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1317 (i).
Quebec Tercentenary, Amount subscribed, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1721 (i).
Quebracho Extract, Quantity imported, Pet. *re* Duty: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 1178 (i).
Queens and Sunbury Mail Service, Established in Oct., 1908: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2375 (ii).
Queens and Sunbury Wharfs, Construction, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2320 (ii).
Quesnelle and Fort George Improvements: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) in Com. of Sup., 6544 (iv).
Quesnel Telegraph Station Supplies, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 1919 (i).
Ques. of Privilege, Insulting Members: Par. in Toronto 'World' (Mr. M. Clarke) 3941 (ii).
See 'Privilege.'
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 119.'
Ry. Act Amt.: *See* 'Bills 2, 3, 6, 21, 32, 39, 54, 65, 72, 99, 106, 111 and 172.'
Railway Aid in Alberta, Representations *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 676 (i).

Ry. Charters and Mileage Construction: *See* 'B. No. 65.'
Ry. Commission's Powers: *See* 'B. No. 39.'
Ry. Subsidies, 1908, Clerical Error: *See* 'B. No. 174.'
Ry. Trainmen on Locomotives: *See* 'B. No. 172.'
Railway Act (level crossings) Amt. B. No. 3 (Mr. Bickerdike): Remarks *re* M. for 2°, 555

RAILWAYS:
Alberta and Saskatchewan, Number of Miles in Operation: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 3049 (ii).
——— Aid in Alberta, Representations *re* Ques. (Mr .McCarthy) 676 (i).
Algoma Steel Co., N.T.R. Contracts *re* Rails, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 336 (i).
Arbitrations and Awards: in Com. of Sup., 2054 (ii).
Aylen, Mr. J., Emplymt. by Transcontinental Ry. Co.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5096 (iii).
B.C. Railway Belt, Litigation between Dom. and B.C.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3043 (ii).
Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Ry., Names of Stockholders, Passenger Rates, Freight Rates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3473 (ii).
Buell, Mr., Legal Work before Ry. Commission *re* Express Companies: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3002 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3252 (ii).
Caledonia and Liverpool Ry. Lines, Construction, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1734 (i).
Canada Eastern Railway, Original Price, Expenditure *re* Repairs. Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2149, 2579 (ii).
——— Cost of: Corrected Answer (Mr. Graham) 3363 (ii).
C.P.R. Additional Stock, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 416 (i).
——— O.Cs. *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 685 (i).
——— O.Cc., &c.: Read (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 780 (i).
——— O.Cs.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1321 (i).
——— Ref. to Courts, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 882 (i).
C.P.R., Closing of Law Suit: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) on M. for Sup., 2920 (ii).
——— Gimli Branch Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 2965 (ii).
Canadian Railways, Improved Service, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 626 (i).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*
Capitalization of Stock, Regulations by Ry. Commissioners: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1187 (i).
Cattle Guards at Ry. Crossings, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1409, 1724 (i).
Central Ry. of N. B., Rep. of Commission *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4125 (iii).
See 'N.B. Central,' &c.
Charters, Lapsed Powers, Date of Charters, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Magrath) 1190 (i).
Crossing, Accident near Kingston: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) 251 (i).
Crossings of Rys., Methods adopted by Ry. Board *re* Protection, Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 827 (i).
Crossings, Number of Accidents, Time, Cause, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 158 (1).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 548, 1320 (i).
Crossings, Cor. with Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 291 (i).
——— Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 1977 (i).
——— Preventions *re* Accidents: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1192 (i).
——— Width of Opening, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. McIntyre) 3568 (ii).
Dominion Atlantic Ry., Examination by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Black) in Com. of Sup., 2927 (ii).
——— Interview with Manager: Remarks (Mr. Black) 3003 (ii).
Expropriation of Ry. Lands, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) 4802 (iii).
French Language used by Ry. Cos., Telephone Cos., &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Paquet) 1421 (i).
G. T. Ry., Indebtedness to Canada: M. for O.Cs. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3056 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 2759 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 3046 (ii).
G.T. Ry., Level Crossings, Cost of Protection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1913 (i).
G.T. Ry., Madoc-Eldorado Branch Ry., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 245 (i).
G. T. Ry., Major's Hill Park, Conveyance by Govt., O.Cs., Reps., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 352 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13 (i).
G. T. Stock, Outstanding, Rate of Interest, Total Liabilities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 3651 (ii).
Grant to McGill College: in Com. of Sup., 2071 (ii).
Halifax and Southwestern Ry. Subsidy, Negotiations *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Graham) 1561 (i).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Harmony-Elmira Branch of P. E. I. Ry., Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 1243 (i).

Highways, Removal of Planks, Instructions from Ry. Commissioners: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 1022 (i).

Hudson Bay Ry. Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 2960 (ii).

——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Meighen) 685 (i).

Hudson Bay Ry., Total Expenditure, Number of Employees: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 1055 (i).

Lake St. John Ry., Colonization Subsidy Grant, Amounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 678 (i).

Level Crossing Accident Ret., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 1116 (i).

Level Crossings, Orders of Ry. Com. of Privy Council: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 549 (i).
See 'Crossings.'

Lussier, J. A., Payments to by Ry. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3990 (ii).

Mail Cars, Recommendation of Ry. Commissioners *re* Changes: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 3652 (ii).

Mail Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 1699 (i), 3432 (ii).

Mail Clerks, Furois, Dorais and Wathen, Dates of Examination for Promotions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 3253 (ii).

Mail Clerks, Increase of Salaries: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4223 (iii).

Mail Service, Increases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 336 (i).

Mileage of Ry. Construction from 1888 to 1908, Authorized by Charters: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1076 (i).

N. B. Central Ry. Commission, Rep., Printing: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4236 (iii).

——— Statement *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4296 (iii).

N. B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Report, O.Cs., &c.: M. (Mr. Foster) to lay on Table, 5634 (iii).

N. B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Rep. and Hon. Mr. Pugsley; Amt. (Mr. Crothers) to Com. of Sup., 5645; Neg. (Y. 63; N. 90) 5830 (iii).

——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 6058 (iv).

Payne, J. Lambert, Duties, Salary, Hours of Work, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McKenzie) 1726 (i).

Pembroke Ry. Crossing, Cost of Protection by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2159 (ii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

P.E.I. Ry., Charlottetown, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 2959 (ii).

——— Elmira and Harmony Branch Ry., Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 6787 (iv).

——— Harmony-Elmira Branch: in Com. of Sup., 2952 (ii).

——— Montague Branch, Land Claims: in Com. of Sup., 3420 (ii).

——— Souris Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 3418 (ii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Land Grant, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCraney 468 (i).

Railways and Canals Dept., Consulting Engineer: in Com. of Sup., 386 (i).

——— Deptl. Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. Emmerson) 1250 (i).

——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 1318 (i).

——— Litigation Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 2055 (ii).

——— Miscellaneous Works: in Com. of Sup., 2054 (ii).

——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 461 (i).

——— Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2055 (ii).

Railway Commissioners, Report: Presented (Mr. Graham) 289 (i).

——— Board, Pet. *re* Vacancy: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 529 (i).

——— Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 2056, 2068 (ii).

——— Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).

——— Vacancy, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer from N.W.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2625; Amt. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2659; Agreed to (Y. 94; N. 54) 2668 (ii).

Ry. Subsidy c. 40, Edward VII., Reps., &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Ames) 2161 (ii).

Railways, Telegraphs, &c., Com., 14th Rep. *re* Private Bills Payments, M. (Mr. Guthrie) to conc., 4986 (iii).

Saskatchewan, Number of Miles in Operation from 1896 to 1908: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3475 (ii).

Telegraph and Telephone Tariffs, Regulations by Ry. Board: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2764 (ii).

Telephone Companies, O.C. *re* Control by Ry. Commission: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1072 (i).

——— Provincial Control by Ry. Commission: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1418 (i).

Telephone Lines crossing Rys., Applications, Refusals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 335 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barr) 353 (i).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*
Two-Cent Fares, Refund by G. T. Ry., Letter Read (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 2911 (ii).
Rama Indians Trust Fund, Amount held by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 543 (i).
Rama Township, Expenditures on Roads and Bridges: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 677 (i).
Rand, Dr. F. A., Payments *re* Indians: Stmnt (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 1168 (i).
Red Cross Society: *See* 'B. No. 160.'
Red River Expedition, Land Grants to Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3990 (ii).
Red River Settlers, Deputation *re* Land Grants: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 6278 (iv).
Registered Letters: *See* 'B. No. 19.'
Registered Stock, Arrangements *re* Importation from U. S., Regulations *re* : Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2379 (ii).
Regulations and Treaty *re* Fisheries, Prof. Jordan's Communication, &c.: to Ont. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Sup., 6963 (iv).
Representation in House of Commons: *See* 'Proportional.'
Restaurant Com., 2nd Rep.: M. (Mr. Pugsley) 290 (i).
——— Interim Rep.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 402 (i).
See 'House of Commons.'
Returns: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 1718 (i), 2218, 2493, 2674, 3110, 3202 (ii).
Returns, Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 6412 (iv).
Revenue Details *re* Amount of $699,235.52 in December, 1908: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 158 (i).
Revenue for December, Details of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure': Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 149 (i).
Richard's Landing, St. Joseph's Island Pier : in Com. of Sup., 2978 (ii).
'Richelieu' Dredge, Removal of Captain, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1185 (i).
Richelieu River Improvements, Office: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1185 (i).
Richelieu River Improvements: in Com. of Sup. 2559 (ii).
Richibucto Cape Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1629 (i).
Richibucto Harbour, Breakwater: Conc., 4049 (iii).
——— Claims of John Jardine: in Com. of Sup., 3237 (ii).
Richmond Rifle Range, Protection *re* Target Shooting: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1722 (i).
Rideau Canal Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3420 (ii).
——— Jones' Falls Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 2030 (ii).
Rideau Hall, Fuel Allowance: in Com. of Sup., 1611 (i).
——— Grounds, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1611 (i), 3232-3 (ii).
Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Compensation to Squatters, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 530 (i).
Ridout, John Grant, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 121.'
Rifles, Swiss and Foreign, Regulations *re* Importation into Canada: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2381 (ii).
Rimouski Wharf, Sheathing West Side: in Com. of Sup., 2557 (ii).
Riviere du Loup, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 3284 (ii).
——— Machine Shops, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2949 (ii).
Riviere du Moulin Pier, Pets., Reps. *re* Construction: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 2161
River St. John Wharfs, Contribution of Local Govt.: in Com. of Sup. 1638 (i).
See 'St. John,' &c.
Robertson, Thos., Suspension by Pilotage Board, B.C.: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) on M. for Sup., 6855 (iv).
Roblin Bridge: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2995 (ii).
Roblin and Forest Mills Mail Route, Carrier, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 333 (i).
Rondeau Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2979 (ii).
Roof Garden, New Wing, H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 7074 (iv).
Ross Rifle, Authority *re* Adoption by Can. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1072 (i).
——— Bayonet Contracts, Cost of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 344 (i).
——— Bayonets at Factory, Installments of Machinery, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 670 (i).
——— Bisley Competitions, Description of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 343 (i).
——— Claims for Damages *re* Accidents, &c.: Remarks *re* former Answer (Sir Frederick Borden) 548 (i).
Ross Rifle Factory, Number of Employees, Inspection *re* Standards: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 1411 (i).
Ross Rifles, Mark I., and Mark II., used by Canada at Bisley, Description, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 684 (i).
——— Number accepted and rejected by Militia Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 245, 329 (i).
——— Reps. *re* Merits and Demerits, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 1189 (i).
——— Rep. of Small Arms Com., Date of last Contract: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 471 (i).

Ross Rifle, Weight, Length, Diameter, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 4891 (iii).
Royal Canadian Accident Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 63.'
Royal Canadian Dragoons, Contract *re* Supplies: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2767 (ii).
Royal Casualty and Surety Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 51.'
Royal Guardians: *See* 'B. No. 95.'
Royal Military College: in Com. of Sup., 3423 (ii).
Royal Military College, Kingston, Additional Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1381 (i).
—— Commandant: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 6660 (iv).
—— Estimated Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1732 (i), 2319 (ii).
Royal Military College Stables, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1732, 1733 (i).
Royal Military College, Water Supply, Defects, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 682 (i).
Royal Mint, Coins manufactured. Sale and Purchase of Silver, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 244, 354 (i).
—— Guard House, Gates, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3205 (ii).
—— Refining Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 1271 (i).
—— Total Cost, Expenditure, Amount of Silver, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 352 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 146 (i).
R.N.W.M. Police Barracks Grounds, Transfer to Ry. Corporations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 819 (i).
See 'N.W.M.P.'
Royal Victoria Life Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 177.'
Rural Free Mail Delivery: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Armstrong) 2774 (ii).
—— Number of Routes, &c.: Ques (Mr. (Armstrong) 6408 (iv).
Rural Mail Boxes, Number delivered in Dufferin County: Ques. (Mr .Barr) 341 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery: in Com. of Sup., 1714 (i), 3423 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery, Alberta: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McCarthy) 3056 (ii).
Rural Mails in East Northumberland, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 3480 (ii).
—— Establishment of in Grey County: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 671 (i).
—— Prince Edward County, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1077 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery, Location of Routes, Nondelivery, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 347 (i).
—— Purchase of Boxes, Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 179 (i).
—— System, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 148 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery, Total Expenditure on Routes: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 677 (i).
Rutherford Bay Island, Dispute *re* Ownership, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smyth) 6408 (iv).
Rutherford, Dr. J. S., Resignation, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1720 (i).
St. Alphonse de Bagotville Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2900 (ii).
St. Alphonse Wharf, Removal of Rocks: in Com. of Sup., 2901 (ii).
St. Andrew's Bridge Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3000 (ii).
—— Contract re Approaches: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 2159 (ii).
St. Andrew's Lock Construction, Number of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 531 (i).
St. Andrew's Rapids Locks, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2097 (ii).
St. Andrew's Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1645 (i).
Ste Anne de Bellevue Locks, Pets. *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3483 (ii).
Ste. Anne Des Monts Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2906, 3287 (ii).
St. Anne's Lock, Renewing Bridges: in Com of Sup., 2029 (ii).
St. Boniface Immigration Hospital: in Com of Sup., 7035 (iv).
St. Charles River, Estuary Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2095 (ii).
St. Francis du Lac Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3285 (ii).
St. Francis River: in Com. of Sup., 2898 (ii).
St. Fulgence Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2906 (ii).
St. Helen's Island Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. of Sup., 3243 (ii).
St. Jacques River, Ice Piers: in Com. of Sup., 3287 (ii).
St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2906 (ii).
St. John Drill Hall, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1293 (i).
St. John Harbour and Courtney Bay, Surveys and Borings, Cor., Reps., Advertisements *re* Tenders, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Daniel) 826 (i).
St. John Dredging, Apptmt. of Supt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5632 (iii).
St. John Harbour, Dredging Contract, Payments to Mayes *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1181 (i).
—— Contracts, Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1917 (i).
—— Contract for Wharf Extension: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2770 (ii).
—— Date of beginning, Contracts, &c.: Ques (Mr. Foster) 2158 (ii).

St. John Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1645 (i), 2109 (ii).

——Surveys, Election Promises: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 1642 (i). *See* 'Mayes,' &c.

St. John Hospital, Fitting of Martello Building: in Com. of Sup., 3210 (ii).

St. John Lighthouse, Purchase of Land, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6915 (iv).

St. John and Minas Basin SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 6634 (iv).

St. John Postmaster, Superannuation of, Apptmt. of Successor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 871 (i).

St. John River, Channel Survey, Rep., Letters, Instruction, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr Crocket) 881 (i).

—— Construction of Tidal Waters Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 3238 (ii).

—— Survey between Fredericton and Woodstock: in Com. of Sup., 1641 (i).

——Surveys: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Crocket) 3254 (ii), 5249 (iii).

—— Tributaries, Wharf construction in Tidal Waters: in Com. of Sup., 1653 (i).

St. Johns Military Buildings, Lease, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 672 (i).

—— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1317 (i).

St. Johns, Richelieu River Improvements, Estimates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2817 (ii).

St. Johns Wharf, Expenditure, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2768 (ii).

St. Joseph's Hospital, Victoria, B.C., Arrangements for Sick Mariners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 3197 (ii).

St. Joseph's Island Wharfs, Expenditures *re* Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 337 (i).

St Joseph Wharf, Expenditure in 1908: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2586 (ii).

St. Justine Mail Delivery, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3480 (ii).

St. Lawrence Canals: in Com. of Sup., 1572 (i).

St. Lawrence Channel, Expenditure *re* Dredging, Continuation of Work, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement) 2150 (ii).

—— Channel at Kingston, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2979 (ii).

St. Lawrence Ship Canal: in Com. of Sup., 6877 (iv).

St. Mary's and Milk River Diversions by U.S.: in Com. of Sup., 6288 (iv). *See* 'Waterways.'

St. Mary's and Western Ontario Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 70.'

St. Maurice and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No 176.'

St. Maurice River, Grande Piles Channel: in Com. of Sup., 2900 (ii).

St. Michel, Yamaska Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3247, 3262 (ii).

St. Nicholas Indian Island, Disposal of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1410 (i).

St. Nicholas Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2908 (ii).

St. Peters Indian Reserve, Instructions of Mr. Vaughan, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bradbury) 354 (i).

—— Patents *re* Surrender: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bradbury) 1191 (i).

—— Removal to Fisher's Lake: in Com. of Sup., 3462 (ii).

—— Surrender, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 1017, 1139 (i).

St. Peters Indian Treaty, Cor., Instructions, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bradbury) 1421 (i).

Ste. Philomene Mail Contract, Annual Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2770 (ii).

St. Pierre River Drainage, Floods, &c.: M. (Mr. Monk) to adjn., 4229 (iii).

St. Polycarpe Post Office, Complaints *re* Officials, Change of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lortie) 4894 (iii).

Ste. Rosalie Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2948 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Contract with J. G. Herous *re* Timber, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6404 (iv).

—— Furniture Making: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 900 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 673 (i).

—— Insufficient Number of Guards, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1417 (i).

St. Williams Landing Pier: Remarks (Mr. McCall) in Com. of Sup., 3332 (ii).

Sackville Improvements, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2934 (ii).

Saguenay River Booms, Construction of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4222 (iii).

Saguenay River Dredging and Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2802, 2878 (ii).

Saguenay River Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3284 (ii).

Salaries of Civil Servants. *See* 'B. Nos. 137, 138 and 187.'

Salaries of Letter Carriers. *See* 'B. No. 136.'

Salisbury and Harvey Railroad Co. *See* 'B. No. 35.'

Salvation Army Council. *See* 'B No. 142.'

Sandy Cove Breakwater, Amounts owing for Labour, &c., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1728 (i).

Sandy Cove Breakwater, Payments to Contractors: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1419 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 2475, 3235 (ii).
Sanitary Conditions on Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 111.'
Saturday Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5644 (iii).
Sault Ste. Marie Channels, Contracts *re* Buoys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3482 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie, Construction : in Com. of Sup., 1909 (i).
——— Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 1909 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Farm and Garden Imports, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 339 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2980 (ii).
——— Dredging Approaches: in Com. of Sup., 3316 (ii).
Savings Bank Deposits, Increase of Interest: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 1396 (i).
Savings Deposits and Loans, 3 per cent, &c., Amounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 679 (i). *See* 'Loans.'
School Lands, Alberta, Total Area, Fund, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 7072 (iv).
Scotch Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).
Scotch Farmers, Report *re* Visit to Canada : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6060 (iv).
'Scotia' SS., Subsidy Terms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 4895 (iii).
Sea Gull Wharf, Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 338 (i).
Seal Cove, Grand Manan Island Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 1645 (i).
Secretary of State, Date of Resignation, Apptmt. of Successor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 185 (i).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Murphy) 14 (i).
Sec. of State, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 458 (i).
Security Life Insurance Co., of Canada : *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Seed Grain, Distribution to Settlers: in Com. of Sup., 3464 (ii).
——— Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 144 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 352 (i).
Seed Grain, Relief, &c.: Indians: in Com. of Sup., 998 (i).
Seed Oats purchased for Alberta, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 1420 (i).
Seed Wheat, Number of Bushels purchased, Price paid, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 1734 (i).
Seed Wheat, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 1419 (i).
Seizures by Inland Revenue, Number for 1904-5-6-7-8, Dates, Amounts, realized, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barr) 685 (i).
Selkirk Post Office, Estimated Cost, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 347, 530 (i).
Senate, Abolition of : Prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 1421 (i).
Senatorships, Commercial Negotiations *re*: ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 52 (i).
Sergeant-at-Arms, Classification *re* C. S. Bill: *See* 'House of Commons, Staff,' &c.
Sessional Allowances, Deductions *re* Assent to Bills: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 4119 (iii).
Sessional Messengers appointed or dismissed since 1880: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 521 (i).
Sessions of Parlt., Length of, Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 27 (i).
Shad Fisheries, N.S., Rep. of Prof. Prince: Inquiry for (Mr. Stanfield) 3254 (ii).
'Shanghaiing' in Vancouver, Investigation *re*, Rep. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 3481 (ii).
Shelburne Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1291 (i).
Shell River Bridge, Original Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 529 (i).
Sherbrooke Armoury, Completion of, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5643 (iii).
——— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 3478 (ii).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1317 (i), 3222 (ii).
Sherbrooke New Regiment, Construction, Appropriations *re* Band: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5643 (iii).
Shippegan Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1645 (i).
Shipping Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 131 and 179.'
Ships Inspection: *See* 'B. No. 73.'
Ships' Water Lines: *See* 'B. No. 45.'
Shipping Drawbacks, Amounts paid from 1898 to 1908: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 167 (i).
Sillsville and The Pines Mail Route, Carrier, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 333 (i).
Silver Centre Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3317 (ii).
Silver Currency coined in Canada for 1905-6-7-8, Profits, U.S. Silver circulated in Can., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 868 (i).
Simcoe and Couchiching Lakes, Expenditure *re* Lowering Waters: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 543 (i).
Simcoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1392 (i).
Sissiboo River Bridge, Construction, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) on M. for Sup., 6834 (iv).
Smith, John Denison, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 157.'

Smith, Thomas L., Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 71.'
Snag Boat at Selkirk, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 474 (i).
Snider Rifles, Disposition of Old Ones: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2381 (ii).
Somerville, Thos., Payments to by P.O. Dept.: (Mr. Wallace) 1559 (i).
Sorel Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2909, 3289 (ii).
Sorel Ship Yard, Purchase of Property: in Com. of Sup., 6885 (iv).
——— Repairs of Boats owned by Marine Officials: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4702 (iii).
Soulanges Canal, Amount expended for Repairs, Suspension of Mr. A. Sauve: Ques. (Mr. Lortie) 1404 (i).
——— Fire Proof Building: in Com. of Sup., 1569 (i).
——— Number of Employees, Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 869 (i).
——— Slope Trimmings: in Com. of Sup., 1569 (i).
Soulanges County Wharfs, Repairs, Valuations &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lortie) 3055 (ii).
Soulanges Island, Change of Name: Ques. (Mr. Lortie) 2757 (ii).
Souris, Man., Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. J. Dolmage, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1915 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) on M. for Sup. 6847 (iv).
Souris Dredging, P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 6554 (iv).
Souris Wharf Extension, P. E. I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 3418 (ii).
S. A. Bounty Act, Regulations *re* : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) on M. for Sup., 2219 (ii).
South African Land Grants, Changes *re* Regulations as to Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 541 (i).
——— Conditions of Entry, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1179 (i).
——— Number located, Apptmts. of Substitute, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 6404 (iv).
——— Land Scrip, Sale of to Govt. Employees: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 143 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 6273 (iv).
——— Land Grant to Teachers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3986 (ii).
——— Homesteads issued, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 2818 (ii).
S. A. Patriotic Fund, Names of Beneficiaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 2157 (ii).
Southampton Dock, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2980 (ii).
——— Dock Extension: in Com. of Sup., 3317 (ii).
Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
South Lake, Lakevale opening Channel: in Com. of Sup., 2480 (ii).
——— Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 3235 (ii).
Spanish River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3324 (ii).
Speaker, Election of, 2 (i).
Speaker, Dep., Apptmt. of: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 140 (i).
Specie Reserve, Date of Last Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 869 (i).
Speech from Throne: Read (Mr. Speaker) 9 (i).
Spry Bay Govt. Wharf, Expenditures *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 4895 (iii).
Spry Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2474 (ii).
Squatters Claims on Dauphin Reserve: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 6287 (iv).
——— Burning of Buildings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 3045 (ii).
Stamps, Special, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3432 (ii).
Standing Orders Com., 1st Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) to conc., 2019 (ii).
'Stanley' and 'Minto' Strs., Names and Residences of Officers: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 674 (i).
——— Total Expenditure from 1894 to 1908: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Maddin) 1922 (i).
Statistical and Special Information Publications, Number issued by Depts., Cost, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 157 (i).
Statutes, French Translation, Designation of Titles: Remarks (Mr. Paquet) on M. for Sup. 2020 (ii).
Statutes for 1908, Delay in Publishing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 183 (i).
Steamers on Lake Winnipeg for Indian Dept. Lease, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1403 (i).
Steamship Subsidies: *See* 'B. No. 146.'
SS. Subventions, Contingent Fund: in Com. of Sup., 6655 (iv).
Steel Cars, Introduction of on I.C.R., &c.: (Mr. Sproule) 481 (i).
Steel Importations from 31st March, 1908, to Jan. 31, 1909: M. for Ret. (Mr. Boyce) 355 (i).
Stellarton Station, I.C.R., Area of Concrete Walks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 5630 (iii).
Stone, Broken and Rough for Marine Dept., Tenders, Contracts, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 2593 (ii).
Stony Lake Property, Damage *re* Floods: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 825 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sexsmith) 1190 (i)
Stony Lake Wharfs, Number, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 1064 (i).
Stony Mountain, Penitentiary Supplies: in Com. of Sup., 918 (i).

Stork, W. W., Inspector of Animals, Details *re* Travelling Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 6092 (iv).

Strachan, A. A., Land Patent, Homestead Duties, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lake) 3992 (ii).

Strathcona, Lord, Gift to Dom. *re* Drilling of School Children: Letter read (Sir Frederick Borden) 3198; M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) of Thanks, 3200; Seconded (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3201 (ii).

Strathcona Public Building: in Com. of Sup.. 3224 (ii).

Street Car Traffic on Sundays, Dom. Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 1414 (ii).

Sturgeon Breeding in Lac du Bonnet, Sale of Fish, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 531 (i). *See* 'Lac du Bonnet.'

Sturgeon Falls and Sudbury Public Buildings, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo Gordon) 817 (i).

Sturgeon's Pier, Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 2510 (ii).

Sturgeon Pier, P.E.I., Tenders, Contracts, &c., for raising: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 1241 (i).

Submarine Co.'s Patent: *See* 'B. No. 77.'

Sugar: *See* 'Ways and Means.'

Superior and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 78.'

Supplies for Marine and Public Works Depts., Purchase by Tender, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 141 (i).

Supply Bills: *See* 'Bills 117 and 195.'

Supply: M. for Com. (Mr. Paterson) 140 (i).

Supply, Conc. Reading of Items: Remarks (Mr. John Haggart) 4048 (iii).

——— One-fourth Estimates voted: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 3936 (ii)

SUPPLY:

Committee:

Adulteration of Food:

General vote, 455 (i).

Administration of Justice: *See* 'Justice.'

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:

Archives, 688 (i).
Census and Statistics, 696 (i).
Cold Storage for Fruit, 6983 (iv).
Dairying Industry, &c., 3187 (ii).
Electric Ry. to Ottawa Farm, 3192 (ii)
Exhibitions, 727 (i).
Experimental Farms, 5947 (iv).
Fumigation Stations, 809 (i).
Hog Commission, 6984 (iv).
Gold and Silver Marking Act, 809 (i)
International Institute, 5882 (ii).
Live Stock Industry, 5833 (iii).
Patent Record, 696 (i), 3186 (ii).
Seed Control Act, 5880 (ii).
Tobacco Industry, 5881 (iii).
Year Book, 701, 726 (i), 3186 (ii)

Charges of Management:

General Vote, 399 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Committee—*Con.*

Civil Government:

Agriculture, 643 (i), 6982 (iv).
Auditor General's Office, 383 (i), 3434 (ii).
Civil Service Commission, 386, 705 (i). 7065 (iv).
Customs, 590 (i).
External Affairs, 7064 (iv).
Finance, 384 (i), 3436 (ii)
Gen. Consulting Engineer, 386 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 398 (i), 3434 (ii)
High Commissioner's Office, 385 (i).
Indian Affairs, 971 (i).
Inland Revenue, 428, 444 (i)
Interior, 6247 (iv).
Justice, 440 (i).
Labour, 651 (i)
Marine and Fisheries, 386 (i), 3436, 3687 (ii).
Militia and Defence, 2244, 2306 (ii)
Mines, 3673 (ii).
Post Office, 613, 720 (i).
Printing Bureau, 804 (i).
Privy Council Office, 380 (i).
Public Works, 613 (i), 3665 (ii).
Railways and Canals, 461 (i).
Secretary of State, 458 (i).
Trade and Commerce, 385 (i).

Customs:

Miscellaneous, 609 (i).
Preventive Service, 611 (i)
Salaries, Contingencies, &c., 581, 591 (i).

Dominion Lands:

Contingencies, &c., 6285 (iv).
Hydrographic Surveys, 6284 (iv).
Salaries, 6284 (iv).
Surveys, &c., 3463 (ii), 6273 (iv).
Timber Protection, 6283 (iv).

Excise:

Methylated Spirits, 448 (i)
Salaries, &c., 436 (i).
Stamps, 437, 447 (i).
Travelling Expenses, &c., 433, 447 (i)
Weights and Measures:
Electric Power Export, 455 (i).
General Vote, 447 (i).
Metric System, 454 (i).
Salaries *re* Light Inspection, 452 (i).

Fisheries:

Biological Stations, 3438 (ii), 6953 (iv).
Cold Storage for Bait, &c., 6959 (iv).
Dog Fish, 6950 (iv).
Educational Establishments, 6952 (iv).
Fish-breeding Establishments, 6943 (iv).
Fishery Commissions, 6957 (iv).
Fresh Fish, Conservation, &c., 6955 (iv).
International Fisheries Commission, 3439 (ii), 6960 (iv).
Oyster Culture, 6949 (iv).
Protection Service, 6947 (iv).
Provincial Rights, &c., 6958 (iv).
U. S. Vessels Licenses, 6958 (iv).
W. S. Young, 6932 (iv).

Geological Survey:

Assay Office, Vancouver, 7063 (iv).
Mines Branch, 7062 (iv).
Victoria Memorial Museum, Specimens 7063 (i)

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Govt. of Northwest Territories:
Generally, 1171 (i).
Govt. of Yukon Territory:
Maintenance of Roads, 6273 (iv).
Salaries, &c., 6272 (iv).
Immigration :
Agents' Salaries, &c., 6994 (iv).
Contingencies, &c., 7014 (iv).
Hospitals, 7034 (iv).
Indians :
British Columbia, 1139-1160 (i).
Generally, 1161-1167 (i).
Man. and N.W.T., &c., 1002, 1016 (i), 3462 (ii).
Maritime Provs., 976, 989 (i).
New Brunswick, 999 (i), 3462 (ii).
Nova Scotia, 998 (i), 3462 (ii).
Ont. and Que., 976, 989 (i), 3461 (ii).
Prince Edward Island, 1000 (i).
Yukon, 1160 (i).
Legislation :
Debates, 3437 (ii).
General Vote, 6775 (iv).
Increases in Salaries, 3437 (ii).
Permanent Messenger, 3436 (ii).
Senate, 7065 (iv).
Voters' Lists, 3436 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Agencies, Rents, &c., 6889 (iv).
Aids to Navigation, 6904 (iv).
Ice-breaking, 6915 (iv).
Lime Kiln Crossing, 3437 (ii).
Maintenance and Repairs, 6902 (iv).
Payment to Mrs. A. G. Clarke, 6981 (iv).
Pension to Pilot, 3437 (ii).
Purchase of Land at St. John, N.B., 6915 (iv).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 6889, 6981 (iv).
Vancouver Island, West Trail, 6981 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions:
Chinese Immigration Act, 6655 (iv).
Commercial Agencies, 6656 (iv).
General Vote, 3437 (ii), 6650-6654 (iv).
Old Age Pensions Act, 6660 (iv).
Marine Hospitals:
Care of Sick Seamen, 3438 (ii), 6946 (iv).
Militia:
Annual Drill, 2311, 3422 (ii).
Contingencies, 2313 (ii).
Gratuities, 2313 (ii).
Military Properties, 2314 (ii).
Ordnance, &c., 2307 (ii).
Pay and Allowances, 2316, 3422 (ii), 6660 (iv).
Royal Military College, 3423 (ii).
Transport, 3423 (ii).
Warlike Stores, 2317 (ii).
Miscellaneous:
Arrest of Chinese at Sydney, 3466 (ii).
Banff Park, 1171 (i).
Can. and West Indies, Trade Relations, 6556 (iv).
Conservation Commission, 7064 (iv).
Hague Tribunal, 7057 (iv).
Industrial Disputes Act, 655 (i).
Injuries to N.W.M.P., 3664 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Miscellaneous—*Con.*
Labour Dept., 652 (i), 3433 (ii).
Litigated Matters, 1172 (i).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, 3449 (ii).
Opium Conference, 3433 (ii).
Park Reservations, 6391 (iv).
Patent Medicines, 458 (i).
Parliamentary Companion, 7064 (iv).
Printing Maps, 3466 (ii), 6289 (iv).
Seed Grain, 3464 (ii).
Seizure of Schooner 'Evolution,' 3450 (ii).
Mounted Police:
General Vote, 3656 (ii).
Ocean and River Service :
Ice-breaker, 3437 (ii), 6673 (iv).
Life Saving, 6675 (iv).
Maintenance and Repairs, 6669 (iv).
Naval Militia, 6683 (iv).
Patrolling Northern Waters, 6682 (iv).
Removal of Obstructions, 6679 (iv).
Tidal Service, 6679 (iv).
Wreck Investigations, 6679 (iv).
Wrecking Plant, 6680 (iv).
Penitentiaries:
B.C., 924 (i), 7035 (iv).
Dorchester, 916 (i).
General Vote, 884 (i).
Kingston, 886 (i).
Manitoba, 918 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul, 914 (i).
Pensions, 812, 883 (i).
Post Office:
Mail Service, 1714 (i), 3423 (ii).
Miscellaneous, 1715 (i), 3431 (ii).
Salaries and Allowances, &c., 1649, 1696 (i); 3204 (ii).
Public Works—Capital :
Buildings:
Astronomical Observatory, 617 (i).
New Buildings, 1250 (i).
Parlt. Buildings, Additions, &c., 1253 (i), 3204 (ii).
Royal Mint, 1271 (i), 3205 (ii).
Victoria Memorial Museum, 1275 (i).
Harbours and Rivers :
Lévis, Deep Water Wharf, 2094 (ii).
Port Arthur, &c., Improvements, 2091 (ii).
Quebec Harbour, 2095 (ii).
Red River Improvements, 2097 (ii)
St. John Harbour, 2109 (ii).
Tiffin Harbour, 2115 (ii).
Victoria Harbour, 2117 (ii).
Public Works—Income :
Buildings:
British Columbia, 2075—2090, 3224 (ii).
Generally, 1598 (i).
Manitoba, 1543—1550 (i), 3332 (ii)
New Brunswick, 1293 (i), 3206—3210, 3237 (ii).
Nova Scotia, 1282-1292 (i).
Ontario, 1356-1361, 1366-1393, 1493-1543 (i), 3223, 3233-35, 3292-3325 (ii).
Prince Edward Island, 1292 (i).
Quebec, 1293-1318 (i), 3210-3222, 3243-3249, 3262-3291 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Rents, Repairs, &c., 1599-1620 (i), 2452, 3225-3233 (ii).
Saskatchewan, Alberta and Northwest Territories, 1551-1555 (i), 3224 (ii).
Yukon Territory, 1592, 1620 (i), 3224 (ii)
Dredging:
General Vote, 6534, 6553 (iv).
Mar. Provs., 3339 (ii).
Ont. and Que., 3347 (ii).
Repairs, 3338 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers:
British Columbia, 6544 (iv).
Manitoba, 2985-3001 (ii).
Maritime Provinces, 2511 (ii).
New Brunswick, 1622-1646 (i).
Nova Scotia, 1621 (i), 2338-2371, 2453-2484 (ii), 6543 (iv).
Ontario, 2966-2980 (ii), 6543 (iv).
Prince Edward Island, 2597-2512 (ii).
Quebec, 2512-2529, 2540-2564, 2802-2814, 2878-2909 (ii).
Marine Dept.:
Dredging Plant, 6885 (iv).
Permanent Piers, Lake St. Peter, 6887 (iv).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 6877 (iv).
Sorel Property, 6885 (iv).
Miscellaneous:
Compensation to Wm. Julien, 3349 (ii).
Generally, 6543 (iv).
Slides and Booms:
General Vote, 6542 (iv).
Telegraph Lines:
B.C., 3348 (ii).
Yukon, 3348, 3349 (ii).
Transportation Facilities:
Montreal Harbour, 3361 (ii).
Quarantine:
Further Amount, 3193 (ii).
Steamers, 5883 (iii).
Tracadie, &c., 809 (i).
Railways and Canals:
Canals:
Beauharnois, 1910 (i).
Carillon and Grenville, 2029, 3420 (ii).
Chambly, 1571 (i).
Cornwall, 2029 (ii).
Galops, 2029 (ii).
Generally, 2071 (ii).
Lachine, 786, 1563 (i), 1910, 3420 (ii).
Quebec Canals,, 1910 (i).
Rideau, 2030, 3420 (ii).
St. Anne's Lock, 2029 (ii).
St. Lawrence Canals, Office, 1572 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie, 1909 (i).
Soulanges, 1569 (i).
Trent, 1577, 1886 (i), 2030, 2074, 3177 (ii).
Welland, 1903 (i), 2030-2041 (ii).
Miscellaneous:
A. Brunet, Remuneration, 2042 (ii).
Arbitrations and Awards, 2054 (ii).
Costs of Litigation, 2055 (ii).
G.T.P. Ry. Inspection, 2048 (ii).
McGill College, Contribution, 2071 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Miscellaneous—*Con*
Miscellaneous Works, 2054 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Plans, 2050, 3421 (ii).
Railway Commission, 2044, 2056, 2068 (ii).
Surveys and Inspections, 2055 (ii).
Railways:
Intercolonial Railway, 2753, 2921-2949, 2951, 3415-3418 (ii), 6557, 6985 (iv).
National Transcontinental Railway, 6985 (iv).
Prince Edward Island Railway, 2952-2959, 3418 (ii).
Scientific Institutions:
General Vote, 6263 (iv).
Hydrographic Surveys, 6916 (iv).
New Steamer, 6917 (iv).
Meteorological Service, 6915, 6982 (iv).
Water Rights on International Rivers, 6268 (iv).
Unprovided Items:
General Vote, 3466 (ii).
Supply, Concurrence, 4048 (iii), 7074 (iv).
Surveys by Mr. Vaughan: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bradbury) 2128 (ii).
Sussex Street Govtl. Buildings, Architects Plans, Ownership of: Ques. (Mr. Wright) 4638 (iii).
Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Purchase by Govt., Sales, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 477 (i).
——— Surrender of Land: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).
Sydenham River, Clearing East Branch: in Com. of Sup., 3324 (ii).
Sydney Free Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Maddin) in Com. of Sup., 1706 (i).
Sydney Mines Diversion Line: in Com. of Sup., 2336 (ii).
Tadousac and Rivière du Loup, Winter Navigation: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 344 (i).
Tangier Harbour, Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2484 (ii).
Tariff, The: *See* 'B. No. 162.'
Tariff Changes *re* Tin: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 4126 (iii).
Tariff, Protection, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., on Live Stock Industry, 5833 (iii).
Tatamagouche Bay, Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 1621 (i).
Tatamagouche Bay Wharf, Expenditure for Oct. and Nov., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 185 (i).
Tatamagouche River Bridge: Remarks (Mr. Maddin) in Com. of Sup., 2365 (ii).
Telegraph Lines, &c., across Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 22.'
Telegraph Lines, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3348 (ii).
Telegraph Operators' Hours: *See* 'B. No. 72.'

Telegraph and Telephone Tariffs, Regulations by Ry. Board: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2764 (ii).
Telephone Companies, O.C. *re* Control by Ry. Commission: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1072 (i).
Telephone Lines crossing Rys., Applications, Refusals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 335 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barr) 353 (i).
Telephones, Ottawa Buildings: in Com of Sup., 3229 (ii).
Telephones, &c., Provincial Control by Ry. Commission: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1418 (i).
Telephone Rates in Canada, Legislation *re*: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1761 (i), Amt. (Mr. Carvell) agreed to (Y. 101; N. 47) 1811 (i).
Telephone Stations between Montreal and Quebec *re* Navigation: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement) 2594 (ii).
Telephone and Telegraph Special Com. of 1905, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 153 (i).
Tenby Bay Wharf, Warehouse Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 339 (i).
Tercentenary Postage Stamps, Total Amount *re* Sale: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3654 (ii).
Thedford, Arkona and Fort Frank Rural Mail Delivery, Delays in Establishing: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 476 (i).
Thessalon and Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 104.'
Thirty-Sixth Regiment, Payments for Storage of Arms: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 4894 (iii).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Thompson Municipality Land Patent, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 6280 (iv).
Three Rivers Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1318 (i).
Thunder Bay, Ice Breaking Steamer: in Com. of Sup., 6915 (iv).
Tidal Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6679 (iv).
Tiffin Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup. 2115 (ii).
Tignish Pier Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2510 (ii).
Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 41.'
Timber Berth No. 1122, Original Applications, Tenders, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Campbell) 353 (i).
—— Nos. 1216, &c., Applications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bradbury) 2162 (ii).
Timber Inspectors' Travelling Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).
Timber Lands in Alberta, Revenue due, Payable, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 3193 (ii).
Timber Limit Regulations, Suspension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 342 (i).
Timber Protection, Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 6286 (iv).
Tobacco, Canadian, Encouragement of: in Com. of Sup., 5881 (iii).
Tobacco Stamps: in Com. of Sup., 437, 447 (i).
Tomkins, Hannah Ella, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 135.'
Toronto Barracks, Delay *re* Erection on Humber River Site: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 183
Toronto Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1504 (i)
Toronto, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3317 (ii).
—— Western Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 2980 (ii).
Toronto Harbour Works, Delay *re* Payment to Men: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 544 (i).
Toronto Meteorological Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 1505 (i).
Toronto Military Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 1505 (i).
See 'Garrison.'
Toronto, New Post Office, Delay in Constructing: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 336 (i).
Toronto, Niagara and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 42.'
Toronto Old Fort, Condition of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6415 (iv).
—— Pets. *re* Transfer, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4122 (iii).
—— Reclamation of Land from Park Blackwell Co., Restoration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3984 (ii).
Towers in Dufferin County, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 341 (i).
Tracadie Lazaretto: in Com. of Sup., 809 (i).
Trade and Commerce: in Com. of Sup., 6655 (iv).
Trade and Commerce, Part I: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 176 (i).
—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3001, 3236 (ii).
Trade Commissioners and Commercial Agencies: in Com. of Sup., 6656 (iv).
Trade Commissioner at Shanghai, Vacancy, Apptmt., &c: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2320 (ii).
Trade Relations with Germany, Improvement *re*, Total Exports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 482 (i).
Transcontinental Ry. Commission, Official Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Graham) 2494 (ii).
—— Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 289 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 6000 (iv).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 6412 (iv).
See 'G.T.P.'
Transportation Problem: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 2888 (ii).
Treaties between U.S. and G.B., of April 11, 1908, O.C. Regulations, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1081 (i).
See 'Waterways,' 'Germany,' &c.

Trent Canal: in Com. of Sup., 1886 (i).
——— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 1577 (i), 2074 (ii).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2030 (ii).
Trent Canal, Damages in Peterborough County Inquiry for Stmnt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5777 (iii).
——— Fish Slides: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 2672 (ii).
——— Land Damages, Amounts paid *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 4641 (iii).
——— Land Values, &c., Expropriations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3177 (ii).
Trent Canal, Newmarket: Amt. (Mr. J. A. Currie) Neg. (Y. 52; N. 80) 4049 (iii).
Trent Valley Waterways, Extension to Georgian Bay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Currie) 473 (i).
See 'Holland River,' &c.
Triennial Clothing, Indians: in Com. of Sup., 1014 (i).
Truro Armoury, Apptmt. of Caretaker, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 186 (i).
Truro I. C. R., Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 2754 (ii).
See 'I. C. R.'
Tuberculosis, International Congress, Delegates to: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1186 (i).
Tuck, ex-Chief Justice, Rep. *re* Offer of a Knighthood: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 154 (i).
Turtle Mountain Squatters, Removal, Compensation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1417 (i).
Unclaimed Balances in Banks: *See* 'B. No. 155.'
University Drill Corps, Establishment of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 683 (i).
Unprovided Items: in Com. of Sup., 3466 (ii).
Upper Prospect Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3235 (ii).
Usury Act, 1908, Prosecutions, Penalties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 481 (i).
Uxbridge Post Office, Options *re* Sites, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 181, 1731 (i), 6091 (iv).
Vancouver Bank: *See* 'B. No. 52.'
Vancouver Election Officials, Delay in Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 1418 (i).
Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 57.'
Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2082 (ii).
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 58.'
Vautelet, H. A., Emplymt. as Architect, Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 1412 (i).
Ventilation and Fire Escapes of New H. of C. Wing: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 6781 (iv).
Vernon River Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 2511 (ii).
Vernon, B.C., Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2075 (ii).
Veterans of 1866, Land Grants to: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 668 (i).
Victoria and Barkley Sound Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 59.'
Victoria Harbour Improvements, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 2117 (ii).
Victoria Immigration Buildings, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 2082 (ii).
Victoria Post Office, Pet. from Letter Carriers: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 1712 (i).
Victoria, Vancouver and Skagway SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 6654 (iv).
Villa Lots in Section 14, Twp. 21, Applications *re* Transfer, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. McCarthy) 685 (i).
Voters' Lists, Electoral District of Thunder Bay, Cost of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 340 (i).
——— Parry Sound, Cost of Revision, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 669 (i).
Voters' Lists, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3436 (ii).
Wake, John, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 178.'
Walkerton and Lucknow Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 53.'
Wallace Bridge Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2484 (ii).
——— Contracts *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1916 (i).
Wallberg, Mr., Claims *re* Moneys due him: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3989 (ii).
——— Contract of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 3475 (ii).
Ward, Fleetwood Howard, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 182.'
Warlike Stores: in Com. of Sup., 2317 (ii).
Warships discarded by G. B., Offer to Fisheries Protection Service: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2379 (ii).
Water Carriage of Goods: *See* 'B. No. 105.'
Water Carriage of Goods between Can. and G.B., Regulations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2764 (ii).
Water Carriage of Goods, Discussion *re* Bill: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 6846 (iv).
Water Lines of Ships: *See* 'B. No. 45.'
Water Powers: *See* 'B. No. 21.'
Water Power, Leases on Canadian Canals: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2037 (ii).
Waterways Treaty, Acceptance of U.S. Senate Amts.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4471 (iii).
——— Amendment of U.S. Senate, Ratification by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4288 (iii).
Waterways Treaty with U.S.: Changes in Draft Treaty *re* Intersection of Islands: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) on M. for Sup., 1490 (i).
——— Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1562 (i).

Waterways Treaty, Conditional Ratification: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 2335 (ii).
—— Date of Signing and Receipt: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1074 (i).
—— Delay in placing before Can. Parlt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 174 (i).
—— Despatch from Sec. of State for Colonies: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Sup., 633 (i).
—— Discussion by Mr. Gibbons: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1563 (i).
—— Further Information: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 292 (i).
—— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7, 158, 292, 402 (i).
—— International and N.B. Fisheries, Par. in St. John 'Globe.': Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 1243 (i).
—— O.Cs. Cor. Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1081 (i).
—— Presentation of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2494 (ii).
—— Publication by Newspapers: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1187 (i).
—— Ratification by U.S. Senate: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Boyce) 1353 (i).
—— U. S. Rider *re* St. Mary's River and Milk River: M. (Mr. Magrath) to Com. of Sup., 6583 (iv).
Waterways and Boundaries Treaty, and Welland Canal Enlargement: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 6292 (iv).
Watson, R. Jr, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 2158 (ii).
Ways and Means: M. for Com. (Mr. Paterson) 140 (i).
—— The Budget (Mr. Fielding) 4546 (iii). *See* 'Budget.'
Ways and Means, Sugar: in Com. on Tariff, 5099 (iii).
Weapons, Carrying of: *See* 'B. Nos. 83 and 101.'
Weights and Measures, Discussion of Estimates: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) in Com. of Sup., 3683 (ii).
—— Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 447 (i).
Welchpool, Campobello Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1646 (i).
Welland Canal, Electric Power Plant: in Com. of Sup., 1903 (i).
—— Employees, Number for Sept. and Oct.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 470 (i).
—— Feeder Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 2036 (ii).
—— Number of Employees, Total Salaries, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 815 (i).
—— Port Maitland Piers: in Com. of Sup., 2030 (ii).
—— Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2034 (ii).
Welland Canal, Steel Gate Lifter: in Com. of Sup., 2036 (ii).
—— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 1909 (i).
—— Total Cost, Tonnage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCall) 2154 (ii).
—— Widening: in Com. of Sup., 1903 (i).
Welland County, Expenditures re Public Works: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 3990 (ii).
Wells, Judge, Apptmt. in Westmoreland County, Absence with and without Leave, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McAllister) 4897 (iii).
Western Canadian Life Assurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 37.'
West Coast Trail on Vancouver Island: in Com. of Sup., 6981 (iv).
Westport Landing Pier: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 2457 (ii).
Westport Wharf, Amount expended, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 475 (i).
Westville Post Office, Area of Concrete Walks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 6085 (iv).
—— Contract Price, Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 2755 (ii).
Westville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1292 (i).
Weymouth Bridge: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 2360 (ii).
Weymouth P.O., Change of Name, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Jameson) 3055 (ii).
Wharfs and Piers Act: *See* 'B. No. 89.'
Wharfs between Longue Pointe and Pointe-aux-Trembles, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1068 (i).
Wharfs in Inland Rivers: Remarks (Mr. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 3331 (ii).
Wharfs in N.S., N.B. and B.C., Amount expended since 1906: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 348 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barnard) 1190 (i).
Wharfs in Queens and Sunbury, Tenders called for in Oct., 1908, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2374 (ii).
Wharfs at St. Zotique, Amounts of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lortie) 1400 (i).
Wheat: *See* 'Seed.'
Whitby Harbour, Negotiations *re* Acquisition by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2372 (ii).
Whitby Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1393 (i).
—— Advertisements for Tenders: Read in Com. of Sup., 1514 (i).
Whitefish Spawn for Lake Winnipegosis, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 1403 (i).
Whitefish, Sturgeon, Winter and Summer caught, Quantity, Value exported, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bradbury) 826 (i).
Whitehead, Grand Manan Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1646 (i).

Williams Head Quarantine Station: in Com. of Sup., 2090 (ii).
Williams, Thos., Emplymt. on I.C.R. at Moncton, Superannuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 330 (i).
Windsor Branch, I.C.R. Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 3421 (ii).
Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore Rapid Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 120.'
Windsor, N.S., Post Office, Tenders *re* Renovating, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Black) 4288 (iii).
Wingfield Basin Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) in Com. of Sup., 3347 (ii).
Wingham Post Office Clock, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 4637 (iii).
Winnipeg, Bank of: *See* 'B. No. 158.'
Winnipeg Beach Pier, Removal of Obstruction in Manitou Rapids, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 335 (i).
Winnipeg Beach Protection: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 2986 (ii).
Winnipeg 'Free Press.' Total Amount paid by Govt., 1906-9: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Herron) 354 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Herron) 1978 (i).
Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No.. 29.'
Winnipeg P.O. and Ry. Station Mail Contract, Tenders, Changes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 869 (i).
Winnipeg Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 1549 (i).
Winnipegosis Fish Hatchery, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 1402 (i).
Wire Fencing, Advertisements for Tenders, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 354 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 245 (i).
Wire Fencing, I.C.R.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 1321 (i).
Wireless Telegraphy on Ships: *See* 'B. No. 74.'
Wolfe Island Canal, Bridge, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 3302 (ii).
——— Construction, Contribution *re* Maintenance: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 3043 (ii).
Wood Alcohol, Quantity purchased, Price, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Miller) 1396 (i).
Wood and Wood Pulp, Negotiations *re* Tariff Increase: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1241 (i).
Woodstock Armoury, Bowling Alley Operations: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 5157 (iii).
Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes: M. (Mr. Lennox) 4126 (iii).
Woollen Mills, Number, Quantity of Canadian Wool used, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 150 (i).
Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada for 1907, Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 149 (i).
Wrecks, Investigations: in Com. of Sup., 6679 (iv).
Wrecking Plant Subsidy, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6680 (iv).
Yamaska Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2900 (ii).
Yamaska River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 3291 (ii).
Yarmouth Harbour Buoys, Displacement of: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) on M. to adjn., 1114 (i).
Yarmouth Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2484 (ii).
Year-Book: in Com. of Sup., 701 (i), 3186 (ii).
Young, W. S., Payment *re* Collection of Whitefish Eggs: in Com. of Sup., 6982 (iv).
Yukon Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 156.'
Yukon Buildings, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup, 1620 (i).
Yukon, Commissioner's Residence, Dawson: in Com. of Sup., 1592 (i), 3224 (ii).
——— Buildings, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1620 (i).
——— Commissioner's Residence: in Com. of Sup., 1592 (i), 3224 (ii).
——— Northwest Mounted Police: in Com. of Sup., 3659 (ii).
Yukon Govt., Administration of: in Com. of Sup., 6272 (iv).
Yukon Ordinances: Prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 7075 (iv).
——— Beer Tax (prop. res.) 5892 (iv).
——— Roads, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6273 (iv).
——— Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 3348 (ii).
'Zaidee' and 'Gladiator,' Govt. Strs., Privileges *re* Towing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paterson) 5331 (iii).
Zinc Mines, Discovery in Albermarle Twp., Govt. Bounty to: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 1077 (i).