OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FOURTH SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT

---

4 EDWARD VII., 1904

VOL. LXVIII

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE FIRST DAY OF AUGUST TO THE TENTH DAY OF AUGUST, INCLUSIVE

OTTAWA
PRINTED BY S. E. DAWSON, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1904

ERRATA

VOL. V.

Col. 8315, 12th line from bottom for :—'two millions' read 'two hundred millions,'

House of Commons Debates

FOURTH SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT

VOL. V.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE FIRST DAY OF AUGUST TO THE TENTH DAY OF AUGUST, INCLUSIVE. CONTAINING GENERAL INDEX FOR THE FIVE VOLUMES.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, August 1, 1904.

The SPEAKER took the chair at Eleven o'clock.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. L. N. CHAMPAGNE presented the third report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the official report of the Debates of the House during the present session, as follows :

Your committee recommend that in addition to the regular index to the official report of the debates of the present session an analytical index covering the several volumes thereof be prepared and issued in a separate volume and a sufficient number of copies of the said index be printed and bound for distribution to those entitled to receive bound copies of the official report of the debates.

That Mr. Daniel McGillicuddy be appointed to prepare the index in question to the English Revised edition and Mr. Marc Sauvalle to the French edition, said work to be performed apart from that of the present staff, and that on the final completion of the above work the foregoing be paid for their services the sum of $750 each.

All of which is respectfully submitted,

(Sgd) L. N. CHAMPAGNE,
Chairman.

TREADGOLD CONCESSION—REPORT OF COMMISSION.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) laid on the table of the House the report of Mr. Justice Britton on the Treadgold concession, with the exhibits filed at the inquiry and the evidence.

Mr. SPROULE. Will this report be printed for the use of the House?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think the better course is to leave it to the Committee on Printing as usual, as we are so near the end of the session.

Mr. SPROULE. If that is done it may not be printed at all, because the Printing Committee may not be got together.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The committee will surely have more than one sitting before the end of the session.

SOULANGES CANAL—CLAIM OF MESSRS. O'BRIEN.

Mr. F. D. MONK. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the government, in case further estimates are to be brought down, to the very equitable claim of the firm of Messrs. O'Brien in connection with the construction of the Soulanges canal

about 1892. Their contract was cancelled. They had $18,000 worth of plant there, they had a deposit as security for the carrying out of the contract and there was a large drawback at the time the contract was cancelled. I do no want to take up the time of the House, but their claim is certainly an equitable one, entitled to the consideration of the government, and I think it will be due to them to give the claim an equitable settlement.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not understand what my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) means by an equitable settlement. Does he advise the payment of the claim?

Mr. MONK. I think they are entitled to a certain sum of money and they should get it.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON. (Minister of Railways and Canals). The claim of Messrs. O'Brien is receiving consideration, and as far as I have looked into the matter it certainly presents very strong merits. The matter is now being considered and perhaps a decision will be reached at an early stage.

SOUTH WATERLOO VOTERS' LISTS.

Mr. G. A. CLARE. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) a question regarding the voters' list of South Waterloo. To make my statement clear I may say that the right hon. Prime Minister, in reply to my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) a few days ago gave a list of voters' lists which had been printed, and amongst those were the lists for South Waterloo. Two or three days after I wrote to the King's Printer, asking if I could get the lists for South Waterloo, and he replied that :

> The lists are not ready for distribution, but as soon as they are printed copies will be sent to you.

There must be some misunderstanding, because if they are printed I should be able to get them.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is a misunderstanding, because my information comes from exactly the source from which the information of my hon. friend (Mr. Clare) comes ; that is from the King's Printer. I will inquire again about it.

QUESTIONS.

PAINTING BRIDGE AT DUNNVILLE.

Mr. LANCASTER asked :

1. What sum of money has been paid during the years 1903 and 1904 for painting the bridge over the Grand river at Dunnville ?
2. To whom was such money paid, and at what dates ?

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

1. There was nothing paid in the year 1903 for painting the bridge over the Grand river at Dunnville, but the sum of $182.75 was paid in the year 1904, the work having been commenced in the fall of 1903 and finished in April, 1904.
2. The money was paid to Messrs. Congdon & Marshall, of Dunnville. On the 24th of May, 1904.

TOBACCO CULTURE.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Is there a government experimental station for the culture of tobacco at St. Jacques de l'Achigan, in the county of Montcalm ?
2. Who is in charge of this experimental station ?
3. What was the cost of said experimental station in the years 1902 and 1903, respectively ?
4. Has the government received reports from said experimental station for the year 1902 and the year 1903 ?
5. What experiments have been made by the government at said station during the past two years ?
6. Is said experimental station in existence at present ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. Not at present. During the years 1899, 1900 and 1901, by direction of the government, experimental and demonstrative work in culture and handling of tobacco was carried on by Mr. Louis V. Labelle, on his property at St. Jacques de l'Achigan,

in the county of Montcalm. Mr. Labelle becoming an officer of the Inland Revenue Department, ceased this work and it has not been taken up again.

This answer covers the remaining questions.

INTERPRETATION OF 'CORPS.'

Mr. E. D. SMITH—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

1. Does the word 'corps' in section 2, subsection (b) of the New Militia Act have the same meaning as in the old Militia Act ?

2. If an officer of the Canadian militia considers himself wronged in a military matter by his superior officer, what is his course to secure redress ?

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

1. This is a matter of interpretation, but clause 22 of the Militia Bill interprets 'corps' to mean the following :

(a.) 'Corps' means a military body appearing in the list of establishments as a separate unit.

I think this is the meaning under the present law.

2. The mode of redress is fixed by the Army Act, par. 42.

ADULTERATED JAMS.

Mr. E. D. SMITH asked :

1. What are the penalties under the existing law to which those selling or manufacturing adulterated jams or jellies are subject ?

2. Bulletin No. 96 of the Inland Revenue Department having stated that an analysis of 74 jams or jellies, selected indiscriminately over the Dominion, showed the following result :

	Genuine.	Doubtful.	Adulterated.	Total.
A. Raspberry jam..	2	1	16	19
B. Straberry jam ..	1	1	17	19
C. Plum jam..	3	1	8	12
D. Peach jam	0	2	5	7
E. Miscellaneous. ..	0	0	2	2
F. Jellies..	8	0	7	15
	14	5	15	74

What action has the minister taken in regard to the parties selling or manufacturing these adulterated jams or jellies ? Or if none has been taken, what action does he intend to take ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Inland Revenue) :

1. For selling, if adulteration is not injurious to health, a penalty of from $5 to $100 and costs. For manufacturing, a penalty not exceeding $200 and costs or three months' imprisonment.

2. Instructions have been issued requiring the payment of the cost of collection and analysis of sample and if this be not paid legal proceedings will be instituted for collection of full penalties.

I.C.R.—PENSIONS.

Mr. GOURLEY asked :

1. In what stage is the pension scheme promised by the Minister of Railways to the employees of the Intercolonial Railway last year and the present year ?

2. Has such scheme been submitted to the government for approval ?

3. Will an Act be introduced this session to give effect to said system ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). A pension scheme, prepared by a joint committee of the management and employees of the Intercolonial Railway was presented during the present session of parliament to the Minister of Railways, and he gave the matter consideration and study, with the result that a Bill was drawn up, and the data as to the employees of the road, furnished by the Railway Department, as respects both the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railway, was submitted to an actuary for computation as to results. The work of the actuary and his assistants took up about two months of time. The final report of the actuary was only received by the Minister of Railways about a week ago. The Bill and report of the actuary have been submitted to the government for consideration ; but owing to the extreme lateness of the session it has been deemed impracticable to undertake to

have the proposals laid before parliament this year. A Bill will be introduced at the next session of parliament, providing that pensions may be paid to officials and employees of the permanent staff of the government railways who have rendered long and faithful services, and who attain to such an age as will necessitate their relief, and for those who become permanently incapacitated or disabled, and generally for the purpose of promoting efficiency in the railway service.

TRURO STATION.

Mr. GOURLEY asked :

1. Will a new station be built at Truro this summer ?
2. If not, will provision be made in the estimates next year for that purpose ?

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

1. No.
2. The whole question relating to additional accommodation at Truro will be considered by the Minister of Railways before the next session of parliament.

TRURO ESPLANADE.

Mr. GOURLEY asked :

Will the esplanade at the Intercolonial Railway depot at Truro be graded this summer ?

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

The question of an esplanade at the railway depot at Truro will be considered after the session closes.

ROUND-HOUSE AT TRURO.

Mr. GOURLEY asked :

1. Has the site of the round-house at Truro been settled upon ?
2. At what date was it acquired ?
3. Where is the location ?
4. From whom was the land bought ?
5. What was the price paid ?

Mr. EMMERSON.

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

The question of the site of the round-house at Truro has been settled in the mind of the Minister of Railways, but official action has not yet been taken.

This answers the 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th paragraphs.

BOUNTIES ON STEEL.

Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved that the House go into committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution :

That it is expedient to amend chapter 68 of the statutes of 1903, respecting bounties on certain articles manufactured from steel, and to provide as follows :—

1. Resolved, that section 1 of the said Act be amended by adding the words 'or used,' after the word 'use' in subsection (a), and after the word 'sold' in subsections (b) and (c).

2. Resolved, that the foregoing provisions shall be held to have come into force on the 24th of October, 1903.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 152) respecting an arbitration between His Majesty and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Fitzpatrick.

DOMINION ELECTIONS' ACT, 1900—AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 148) to amend the Dominion Elections' Act of 1900—Mr. Fitzpatrick—was read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Chairman, the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) is not in the House this morning, but will be here this evening. He wishes to speak on this Bill and I would be glad to have it stand.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am quite agreeable. I may state now that it is my inten-

tion to ask that the reference in the Bill to Algoma be eliminated. That is to say there will be no exceptional treatment as to Algoma and therefore the Bill will be applicable simply to certain counties in British Columbia and the province of Quebec.

Progress reported.

POST OFFICE ACT—AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 153) to further amend the Post Office Act—Sir William Mulock—was read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. This section abolishes the office of chief inspector for the Dominion.

Mr. CLARKE. Who is to discharge the duties formerly discharged by that officer ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There has been no chief inspector acting for some years.

Mr. SPROULE. Are you going to appoint a new one to take the place of the former one ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. This does not mean an additional appointment. I have not had any chief inspector since the death of Mr. Sweatman. That office is being abolished.

Mr. SPROULE. Then it is not intended that the chief superintendent shall do the work ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The chief superintendent has to do only with the city post offices.

Section agreed to.

On section 3,

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. At the present time, besides chief inspectors and post office inspectors, we have assistant post office inspectors, who frequently conduct examinations and inquiries ; so does the chief city superintendent. It is proposed to give to the assistant post office inspector as well as to the chief city superintendent the same powers that were given to inspectors, namely, to hold inquiries and to examine persons on oath or affirmation.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—appointment of superintendent,

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is proposed to have a superintendent in each post office where the revenue reaches $500,000. The only post offices which at present will come under that designation are those of Toronto and Montreal. The post office revenue of Toronto is approaching, if it has not already reached, $1,000,000. Montreal is a good second.

Mr. CLARKE. How many offices are there in which the revenue is over $400,000 ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not think there are any besides Toronto and Montreal. The revenue of Winnipeg this year will be nearly $250,000. At present this clause is applicable only to two offices.

Mr. CLARKE. The intention, then, is to appoint a superintendent in the Toronto post office and one in Montreal post office at a salary of $1,800 a year ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes ; it will be a promotion.

Mr. CLARKE. Who at present does the work which the superintendent is to do ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The work is done by the various officers.

Mr. HAGGART. Should not his duties be defined ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not think it is necessary to define them. There is nothing in the law defining the duties of any of the officials. The duties are assigned to them by their superior officers.

Mr. CLARKE. Will this officer have precedence over the deputy postmaster ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No ; he will be subordinate to the assistant postmaster.

Mr. KEMP. Will he be under the instructions of the postmaster and the assistant postmaster ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. This officer will be as much under the orders of the postmaster as any other officer in the post office. The postmaster is left to organize his staff, getting the most use he can out of them. There is no exception made in the case of the superintendent. So far as I have anything to do with the superintendent, I shall deem it my duty to promote to this office the man best qualified to discharge what would ordinarily be understood to be the duties of such an officer. He will be an intermediate officer, between a first-class clerk and the assistant postmaster.

Mr. MACLEAN. This officer will probably meet the case I have in view. I have seen the Toronto post office practically administered by a very young but very competent man, doing first-class work, and getting about $600 a year. I believe that has happened in several of the post offices of this country. If this clause will permit a man of that kind to receive a reward in keeping with the services he discharges, I think it will be a good move.

Section agreed to.

On section 6,

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Under the Act of 1902, it is made optional with letter

carriers to come in under the new scheme therein provided, or to remain under the old law. The time in which to exercise that option expired within two months after the passage of that Bill. Some of the letter-carriers desired after it was too late to exercise that option, and last year parliament passed an Act extending the time. That time has expired, and now a considerable number of letter-carriers have signified their desire to avail themselves of the provisions of the law and come in under the Act of 1902. This is giving .them three months further time.

Mr. CLARKE. What will be the position of these men who were in the service prior to 1897 if they come in under this Act? Under this Act the sum that stands to their credit in the superannuation account will be passed over to another account, and they will get that sum with interest at five per cent on leaving the service; but when they leave or are discharged there is no superannuation beyond the amount at their credit. What advantage is it to these men to come under this Act? Their position at present is such that when they retire they receive superannuation, which continues as long as they live, but under my hon. friend's Act they will not. Is that right?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is wrong. The Act is in the following words:

> Such election shall not affect his rights or position under the Civil Service Superannuation Act or Retirement Act of 1898.

Mr. CLARKE. Will they still continue paying into the superannuation fund the same percentage of their wages that they do now, and will they receive the same superannuation after they have been retired?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The language of the statute is quite plain: 'Such election shall not affect their rights or position under the Civil Service Superannuation Act or retirement Act of 1898.'

Mr. CLARKE. I do not quite understand. Under the civil service law which existed when they entered the post office as letter-carriers, they contributed so much per month to the superannuation fund, and after their services were dispensed with they got so much per annum during the balance of their lives. Will the fact that they take advantage of the present Act deprive them of their superannuation when they leave the service?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is not for me to say what the law means. I have read the hon. gentleman the statute, and I will pass the Act over to him. It is to be found in the statutes of 1902.

Mr. PUTTEE. Has any kind of pressure been exercised on the men to get them to come in under this Act?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Not the slightest. The department is not interested one way or the other. Some carriers have petitioned for this privilege and the department has simply acceded to their request. If some letter-carriers had not had themselves prejudiced, they would long since have availed themselves of the advantages of this Act. Under the old law the salary of a letter-carrier was $600, but under the present Act he can attain $725 a year, and in addition have some other advantages.

Mr. PUTTEE. Under the old law a letter-carrier was entitled, in case of sickness, to his pay, and under the new Act he is not.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. He is not entitled to it under the old law.

Mr. PUTTEE. Under the Civil Service Act he was.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No.

Mr. PUTTEE. As a matter of fact he does get it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. He may or may not.

Mr. PUTTEE. They are fearful that their sick-pay is going to be stopped, and I do not know whether that would be looked upon as pressure to induce them to come under the new Act. Is the rumour right that sick-pay will be stopped?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There is not the slightest pressure whatever. Some persons have been telling some letter-carriers that this Act is not to their advantage. If they choose to follow that advice, they are perfectly at liberty to do so. The department is not in the slightest degree concerned. As for sick-pay, it is entirely an error to suppose that under the law, civil servants are entitled to pay when absent from duty, be the cause what it may, except when enjoying their holidays. If there is one class who, it is very desirable, should respond to the duty call, it is the letter-carriers, and there must be proper pressure put on them to secure their reporting for duty in the morning. To allow them to imagine themselves indisposed and absent themselves, when they could perform their duty, is against the public interest. Many a man, able to do his work, may imagine himself unfit if he thinks his pay is not going to stop. It is entirely a mistaken idea to suppose that either the letter-carriers or anybody else receive their pay when not doing their work. The carriers, when at their maximum, are paid $2.25 a day and may obtain a bonus of $20 a year, totally $725 a year. In addition they are allowed two weeks holidays and are given their uniforms winter and summer. It is first-class pay for men in that walk of life, and it is enticing to the service a very large number of people who are supposed

to be in much better positions. I do not regard the letter-carrier as being a skilled workman, for we find many men coming into the service who are not skilled workmen, and a good many coming in who have trades and crafts and who think that the condition of the letter-carriers is better than theirs. There is not the slightest desire in the department to have any one transferred from one class to the other, but there is a difference between $600 and $725 and any intelligent man can see the advantage.

Mr. HEYD. There is a misapprehension in the minds of the letter-carriers of the old school that, in the event of their being sick for an indefinite period, they have acquired the right to be paid. They have obtained the impression that they are legally entitled to be paid while laid up. It will clear the atmosphere a good deal to let them know that they have no such legal right, and that if any of them have occasionally enjoyed their pay while ill that was simply a matter of courtesy and not of law.

Mr. CLARKE. With regard to the matter of which the hon. gentleman speaks, a petition was sent to the Postmaster General on the 10th of March last by the letter-carriers of the Dominion who are under the provisions of Bill (No. 106) in which they refer to this very question of sick-pay. They say :

> We, the undersigned letter-carriers of the Dominion of Canada, all of whom are under Bill (No. 106) beg to state that we appreciate your efforts to better the condition of the post office employees generally. Nevertheless, we think that the change has not benefited us to the extent to which your honour had intended that it should, and we would request that you give the following brief epitome of our claims your favourable consideration :
>
> 1st. We feel that loss of pay in sickness or accident is a condition not imposed on any other branch of the service, and that if you take into consideration the unfavourable conditions under which we have to perform our duties, these disabilities will be removed by you in our case.
>
> 2nd. That reduction in grade is a condition that we would ask to be eliminated from the Bill, and some fixed form of penalty inserted specifying the acts for which imposed and how the same may be regained by those unfortunate enough to fall from the path of duty.

These are the two paragraphs in this petition referring to the sick pay. The hon. Postmaster General says that these men receive $2.25 a day. That is the maximum pay, I believe, of class 'E.'

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. And they may receive a bonus of $20 besides.

Mr. CLARKE. So they receive $2.25 with a bonus of $20 in addition—that is the maximum. But it is optional with the officers of the department to lower these men from grade 'E' to grade 'D' or 'C' or 'B;' and of course, the pay is reduced with the grade. Only those in the highest class receive $2.25 a day, and they are not paid during the period of sickness.

Mr. HEYD. Wherein do they differ in that respect from the old condition ?

Mr. CLARKE. As I understand it, the difference is this—that if a man contracted sickness in the discharge of his duty and was able to send a medical certificate, his pay went on during the period of sickness. Of course, if the sickness were caused by misconduct on the part of the man himself he could not obtain the medical certificate and so was not entitled to sick-pay. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) will see that in this memorial complaint is made of the withholding of sick-pay from men who are under the operation of the Bill (No. 106) which has been passed since 1896. Now, with regard to the position of the men who were in the service——

Mr. HEYD. Let us finish that other point first. As I understand it, although they occasionally got sick-pay they had no legal right to it—it was a matter of favour.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not know that.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. They had no legal right to it.

Mr. CLARKE. But they received sick-pay.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Some did and some did not.

Mr. CLARKE. In the case of the men who were able to show by a medical certificate that the sickness was not caused by misconduct or indiscretion on their own part, they received sick-pay. But it makes no difference what may be the cause of sickness, they now receive no sick-pay ; they receive $2.25, if they are in the highest grade for each day on duty. Now, with regard to the men appointed prior to 1896, they do not think that it would be to their advantage to come under the provisions of the hon. minister's Bill—at least many of them do not. They memorialized the department in March last. Of course these men are officials who are under the provisions of the Act of 1882. Their petition says :

> We, the letter carriers of Toronto post office working under the provisions of the Civil Service Act of 1882-3, respectfully ask your consideration of our petition for an increase of salary for the reasons hereinafter set forth :
>
> We do not question your desire to better the condition of the letter-carriers by the legislation enacted at the past two sessions of parliament, but regret to say that owing to our length of service in the department we are unable to take advantage of it, and think it would be unreasonable to expect us to accept its provisions, which detract materially from any financial benefits set forth therein.
>
> We feel it incumbent upon us to urge upon your honour as a defence against the unfair, artificial and unstable arguments of outside

comparisons and market value of labour that our work has a value in itself which the outside market cannot determine.

That is the point of this petition.

Mr. HEYD. But the sick-pay is the principal one.

Mr. CLARKE. I presume that they understand that, in their own interest, they should not take advantage of the provisions of the hon. gentleman's Act of 1902. They think it would be unreasonable to accept its provisions, because the acceptance would detract materially from any financial benefits accruing to them therefrom. Their pay is $650, I believe——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is $600.

Mr. CLARKE. Less whatever small sum is deducted on account of the superanuation fund—say $10, $15 or $20 per annum. When they become incapacitated or retire from service they receive superannuation for the remainder of their lives.

Mr. COCHRANE. How much ?

Mr. CLARKE. If a man served for thirty years, as I understand it his superannuation would be $360.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If he had served thirty-five years he would be entitled to 70 per cent of his salary or $420 a year.

Mr. CLARKE. Now, that is secured to him as a result of his compliance with the conditions on which he entered the service. He commenced at a very low salary—$25 or $30 a month—and it took him seven or eight years to reach the maximum.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Nearly nine years.

Mr. CLARKE. Then, that makes his position all the stronger. It would take him nine years to work up from the minimum salary to the maximum of $600 a year. But, as he understood it, a part of the contract was that, in consideration of his beginning at a low wage and working up, he would establish and make good his right to superannuation when the department did not require his services any longer. The contention of the men who came in under that law is that if they take advantage of the Act of the hon. gentleman they lose their superannuation, and the sum to be paid them would be only the total of their payments into the superannuation fund, with interest added. They would continue to pay a certain sum annually into the fund ; and when they retire, what they receive is whatever is at their credit in the superannuation fund—it may be $200, $300 or $400. But they absolutely deprive themselves of the right to superannuation. Now, that is the difference between the two schemes, as I understand it from the men.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Of course, that is entirely erroneous.

Mr. CLARKE. Then. the hon. gentleman (Sir William Mulock) will please explain how it is.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I have read the statute twice ; I will send it to him.

Mr. CLARKE. I will read it, because I do not wish to misunderstand the law. This is the Act of 1902 :

Such election shall not affect his rights or position under the Civil Service Superannuation Act or the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1898.

Does that mean that the carriers will still continue to pay in annually as they did up to the passage of the Act of 1897, and that when they retire from the service they will receive an annual allowance, if they have served 35 years, of seventy per cent of their wages ? Is that the explanation ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not wish the hon. gentleman's remarks to go abroad unchallenged. The hon. gentleman is quite aware that when the retirement Act was passed an option was given to all persons who were then on the superannuation list, either to continue under the old superannuation list or to come in under the Retirement Act ; and if a letter-carrier was entitled to superannuation under the old Act and did not desire to be transferred to the provisions of the new law, he remained entitled to all the benefits of the old law. A letter-carrier who was entitled to superannuation then is entitled to superannuation to-day ; and if to-day a letter-carrier chooses to change his mode of payment, and instead of being paid by the year to be paid on another basis, he is still entitled to his rights under the Superannuation Act.

Mr. CLARKE. Of 1882-83 ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Whatever the date of the Superannuation Act is. Whether the hon. gentleman is arguing, or supporting the contention of others, or whatever view he is advancing, it would be a great pity if if letter-carriers were misled, and by the suggestion that they are losing the benefit of the Superannuation Act, were to fail to avail themselves of the great pecuniary advantages that the Act of 1902 conferred upon them. A number of them have been badly advised, prejudiced, and have failed to avail themselves of the opportunity of having a salary of $725 a year, which is waiting for them if they choose to accept it. A number, more wise, have availed themselves of it. It would be incorrect to state that all the old letter-carriers had refused to accept the new law; a considerable number of them have. I gave some figures when I was asked that question some time ago. I do not remember the number now, but the number that have already accepted the new Act and those

who are now anxious and waiting to accept it, will represent considerably more than a majority of the letter-carriers. They have been misled or frightened, and have not therefore profited as they might have done by the Act. That does not affect their legal right in the case of sick-pay, for they have no such legal right. My hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Heyd) stated that nothing in the law entitled letter-carriers or any other members of the civil service to pay when absent, for whatever cause, unless they are employed under the statute ; and if there is any class that the public expect to be on hand for the performance of their duty it is the letter-carriers. When one makes default it is too late in the morning to appoint a substitute to perform that morning's work. The state of affairs in some parts of the Dominion made it necessary to withdraw any excuse to letter-carriers not to be prompt and punctual in attendance at their duties. If any man comes under this Bill and works faithfully, he is well paid for it—as well paid as any class of workmen in Canada. If. however, they do not wish to avail themselves of this measure, it is entirely their own affair and their own loss.

Mr. MONK. I would take this opportunity of asking the minister if it is a rule in the post office at Montreal and the substations, that when letter-carriers who are ill and who produce satisfactory proof to the postmaster, by a medical certificate or otherwise, that they are ill, they are deprived of their pay ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The rule is, in the first instance, to withhold pay from any one who is absent from duty except during his holidays ; the cause of his absence is investigated in the first instance by the officers of the post office in question. They make their report accordingly, furnishing such evidence as bears upon the case, which is transmitted to the Deputy Postmaster General, and he thereupon pronounces upon the case, and decides whether, under all the circumstances, the employee should or should not be granted sick leave.

Mr. HEYD. Is that a matter of law ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No.

Mr. MONK. That strikes me as imposing upon the minor employees of the department because letter-carriers are minor employees—a very long and difficult procedure in order to obtain pay for periods of illness. I think, in a large place like Montreal where the postmaster is a trustworthy man, he ought to have power to exercise a certain discretion. Now, either the Postmaster General is rather harsh to the minor employees of his department, the letter-carriers in particular——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not think so.

Mr. MONK—or else he is a much maligned man, because in Montreal the letter-carriers are dissatisfied, and those employed in the inside post office are dissatisfied, and it seems to me there is a consensus of dissatisfaction to-day, showing that there must be some grievance. I have already offered the Postmaster General to investigate it with him if he will come down——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I found the hon. gentleman's statement was entirely without foundation.

Mr. MONK—but the hon. gentleman has never accepted my offer.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I investigated what he said, and found it absolutely baseless.

Mr. MONK. I am still waiting for him to come to Montreal. When I brought up the question some time ago, of these men being obliged to work overtime without extra pay——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is absolutely untrue.

Mr. MONK—my hon. friend at that time caused to be placed in the post office at Montreal, as I am informed, in a conspicuous place, a notice that nobody should work overtime—that is the information I have—when I brought up the question of overtime-work a notice was given that nobody should be called upon to work overtime. Well, I think nobody should be called upon to work overtime. I think that notice was quite proper. But I think circumstances may arise——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is not the tenor of the notice.

Mr. MONK—that is the tenor, according to the information given to me——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My hon. friend is misinformed.

Mr. MONK—that no person should work overtime. I think there are circumstances where letter-carriers and minor employees, sorters, may be called upon to work overtime. That is done in every country. In the United States the postmaster who makes them work overtime without making them an allowance as extra pay is liable to dismissal. That is a rule which my hon. friend, if he has at heart the interest of the men, should make one of the regulations of his department. Let me give him one instance, that is the case of Mr. Henry Goodrick, who resides at Mount Royal Vale, and was employed as a letter-carrier by the Post Office Department for six years.

There never was a complaint against him, there never was a reprimand. He had walks, as they call them, in Montreal and vicinity and nobody had any complaint to make against him. He resigned and I called for a return of all the papers connected

with his resignation. They have been brought down and I have that return here. I do not wish to take up the time of my hon. friend to any great extent, but I wish to point to the case of Henry Goodrick as an example. Goodrick had been three years letter-carrier in Westmount. Westmount is an important municipality near Montreal and a sub-station. There never has been any complaint against him of any kind. In Westmount there is a very large mail. At the time I got the information I am now referring to, there were only five letter-carriers. There is a considerable population, there is considerable mail and it has been positively asserted to me that the number of five letter-carriers is quite insufficient to distribute the mail within the time assigned for these letter-carriers. They have delivered the mails time and again, as I am informed, up to ten o'clock at night by lamplight and as an instance of the overcrowding of the mails in that locality, and of the insufficiency of the delivery staff, I may say that mails arriving at Westmount on the 27th December were detained in part and delivered only on the 3rd of February following. On the 12th February of this year Goodrick was removed from Westmount where he had been for three years during which time his conduct had been perfect, and during which time he had been living in the neighbouring municipality of Mount Royal Vale. He was removed to Point St. Charles without any reason being assigned to him therefor. There appears to be no reason in this letter that I have before me. Goldrick was ill. I refer to papers Nos. 33, 34, 27, 29, 30, 31 and 32. From these documents produced I find that he furnished a satisfactory certificate given by a licensed practitioner, Dr. Day, as to the cause of his absence which was the serious illness with which he was afflicted and which appears to have been caused in part by over work. That certificate was placed in the hands of the postmaster, but his salary was not given to him for the time during which he was absent. What better proof could the postmaster have of the cause of the absence of this man than the certificate of a respectable doctor of the locality showing the grave nature of the illness with which he was afflicted. About a month after Goodrick had been removed from Westmount to Point St. Charles, an inquiry was held into the cause of dissatisfaction that might exist against him. He had asked for an investigation, he had inquired as to the cause of his removal which under the circumstances appeared to him to be more or less of a disgrace. In the month of April Mr. Beausoleil, the postmaster of Montreal, instituted an inquiry. He made an investigation, to which Goodrick was not a party and of which he was not notified, into the report unfavourable to him which had been made by the postmistress of Westmount.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not want to interrupt my hon. friend but I want to ask him whether he thinks this is the proper occasion to discuss a question of this kind, because it is quite impossible for me to take it up now. I have none of my officers here. We are now discussing a Bill to amend the Post Office Act, and if the hon. gentleman wants to discuss a matter involving departmental action the proper time would be when we are considering the estimates, and when I would have my officers here to inform me of the facts. He is now undertaking to make an ex parte statement, an extreme one, and one which is incapable of explanation at the present time. Surely his own sense of propriety will tell him whether this is a proper occasion or not. It can be productive of no good on this occasion..

Mr. MONK. The question of the pay of the officers of the department and the particular question of allowing pay to those who are ill is a question under which the discussion of Goodrick's case comes up.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think it is quite out of order.

Mr. MONK. There are several sections of this Bill bringing up the question of the pay of superior officers and my contention is that sufficient consideration is not given to the minor officers of the department. It is possible that my hon. friend the Postmaster General may not have the officers of the department here to assist him but I have only a few words more to say in reference to Mr. Goodrick's case, and my hon. friend can have the statement which I have made and explain it when the opportunity seems suitable to him. This ex parte investigation by the postmaster was conducted a month after the removal of Goodrick from the walk upon which he had been engaged, and although he was an old employee of the department and although this investigation was one to which he must be a party he received no notice whatever of it. Under these circumstances I think there is proof in this very return that whilst my hon. friend the Postmaster General is anxious to secure proper treatment for the superior officers of his department those in minor positions are not given sufficient attention. Of course, as the hon. Postmaster General said, there is no special knowledge required by a letter-carrier, but it is a position of trust of responsibility and of hard work, and if a man has been in that position for six, seven or ten years he is entitled to as much consideration as any other men of the civil service. In conclusion I find from this return that ample proof was given of the illness from which this man suffered. He was removed without cause being indicated to him from Westmount to Point St. Charles and an investigation ex parte was started

against him a month later, the result of which investigation was communicated to the department. I contend that he was entitled to an investigation and to the opportunity of answering the charges made against him by the postmistress of Westmount and by some other letter-carrier who had made a report unfavourable to him. He asked for an investigation. He received none. My hon. friend can take communication of the return brought down and of the remarks which I have made already in respect to Mr. Goodrick's case, and I am sure he will find that Goodrick, although he has tendered his resignation since he has found that he cannot obtain justice from his immediate superior and from the department, is entitled to an investigation even now and my hon. friend should grant the investigation that has been applied for.

Mr. KEMP. The hon. Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) referred to the wage paid to letter-carriers as being $2.25 a day. I understand that under the Act there are three or four different grades. A few days ago I met a letter-carrier on the street in Toronto, a man whom I have known for a number of years. He has been in the employ of the Post Office Department as a letter-carrier for at least ten years, and I think he said fifteen years—I am not sure. He has been engaged in that capacity for ten years at any rate. He said that he was getting $1.60 a day. I know him to be a very good man, a worthy man in every sense. He cited an instance of another man who was appointed only five years ago and who was getting $2.25 a day. Would the Postmaster General say who does the grading ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If the hon. gentleman will give me the particulars with the names of two officers, I will give him full information and I am sure he will find there is a satisfactory explanation.

Mr. KEMP. Who does the grading of letter-carriers ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. They are graded by Act of parliament.

Mr. KEMP. Yes, but I was under the impression that it could be done outside an Act of parliament, that is not right.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. A letter-carrier when appointed enters in grade 'A.' The statute provides when he may be transferred to grade 'B' and to another grade, and in every case a man is transferred unless he has done something to disqualify himself for promotion. Of course the postmasters in each city are anxious to recommend men for promotion and the promotions stimulate officers to perform better services. If a letter-carrier does not get promotion, it is his own fault.

Mr. KEMP. It is in the hands of the postmaster ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand from the Postmaster General that if a letter-carrier elects to come under the provision of this new Act, chapter 28 of the Statutes of 1902, he does not lose the superannuation to which he was entitled under the Act of 1882-3 if he entered under that Act ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I have tried to make it as clear as possible, by reading the statute. When an Act says that nothing in that Act shall affect the status of an officer under some other law, how can the new law operate in conflict with what it expressly provides ?

Mr. CLARKE. That is true, I must admit that ; but I laboured under the impression that if the letter-carriers accepted the provisions of the hon. gentleman's Act, they barred themselves from the advantages of the Superannuation Act of 1882-3. I think a great many of the letter-carriers also were under that impression.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. When the Bill of 1902 was under discussion, my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) whom I see in his place, put this question to me, and I read the section dealing with it. That hon. member acquiesced in the sufficiency of the words for he made no answer after I read them.

Mr. HAGGART. If the letter-carrier accepts the provisions of the new Act does he not abandon all rights which he had under the old Act?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand he abandons none of them. The law of 1902 provides for five grades. These men may be graded down again.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes, so may any officer.

Mr. CLARKE. Suppose that an officer has been graded down, and that he has been paying into the superannuation fund the required percentage of the salary paid in a higher grade than the one to which he is reduced ; and suppose that he has been reduced from grade 'E' to 'C.' In grade 'E' he would receive $2.25 per day, but in grade 'C' $1.75 per day. When such a man comes to be superannuated, under what grade would he receive his superannuation allowance ? He may have been paying under the higher grade into the superannuation fund for years, but at the time of his superannuation he may be in the lower grade.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is quite competent for the Governor General in Council to lower the status of any civil servant.

A man may be in the first class of the civil service but may be lowered to a lower grade and if his salary was reduced with his grading his superannuation would be computed in proportion. The Superannuation Act provides that superannuation shall be based upon the average salary for the last three years of the officer's tenure in office. It is so rare a thing to lower an officer in status that the clause may perhaps serve as a little warning, but I do not think it will ever have any other effect. The whole tendency in the public service is to be lenient and therefore I hardly think it is a practical question.

On section 7,

Mr. CLARKE. What is the effect of this?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The section that is referred to here, provides for classes who are exempt from passing the promotion examination. This adds to that section the words 'sorters and stampers' so that they also will be exempt from passing promotion examinations.

Mr. CLARKE. The effect will be to do away with the necessity of passing the civil service examination.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Where an officer is doing work of this kind he undergoes a certain examination by the higher officials in the office to see whether he is familiar with the work of the department.

Mr. HAGGART. Does this allow a sorter or stamper to be promoted to a third-class clerkship?

SIR WILLIAM MULOCK. It is not dealing with that feature at present. A stamper or sorter or any one in the service who wants a promotion will have to undergo an examination provided by the civil service Act. It is the view of the department that when it comes to men who are doing post-office work inside, the examination should not be a civil service examination but an examination by the officers of the department on the work they are going to do. We have a provision in the Act for examining these officers when they are being promoted, for examining them departmentally.

Mr. HAGGART. Virtually what I said is correct; you do not need an examination unless you are promoting the man to a clerkship. The object of it is to allow a sorter or stamper to be made a third-class clerk without any other than a technical examination in the office as to his duties.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Of course he has had to pass some examination in order to enter the service.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that this section practically annuls the provision of the Civil Service Act; and if it should apply to this branch, you would think that it might apply with equal propriety to almost every other branch.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not know about other branches, but I know that in the Post Office Department what we chiefly require is men who understand the technical work of the post office. When a man has been appointed stamper and assorter, he has commenced his career, and before being transferred to a higher class, he should be examined departmentally. That is the object of this clause.

On section 8—chief post office superintendent's salary,

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The present law fixes the salary at $3,000 a year on appointment, no more and no less. The appointee is therefore appointed to the maximum at once. By this provision the maximum is raised from $3,000 to $3,500, the minimum being $3,000, with an annual increase of $100 till the maximum is attained.

Section agreed to.

On section 10—transportation expenses of letter-carriers.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the necessity of this legislation?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The object is rather apparent. Street railway companies enjoy a monopoly, and in some instances are very exacting; and this is a method by which we can perhaps secure the performance of the service satisfactorily, and without having to submit to exactions.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the amount you have to pay now to street railways for transporting letter-carriers? Does it average $50 a year?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I could not say.

Mr. HAGGART. Where are you entitled to free transportation?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. In Winnipeg only.

Mr. CLARKE. How will that work out practically? Will the hon. gentleman cite a case where this clause would become operative?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. In every city except Winnipeg where we have a letter-carrier delivery system.

Mr. CLARKE. Take the case of Toronto. I suppose the company there charge the government a bulk sum for the right to send its letter-carriers on the cars to their various routes. Will it be optional to the letter-carrier to say whether he will avail himself of the $50 or not?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No. The interest of the service will determine it.

Section agreed to.

On section 11,

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. At present the salaries are determined by section 'b' of the schedule, but that is only intended to apply to city post offices, on what is commonly known as the civil service basis. There are now growing up a good many places called cities which are not on the civil service basis. Therefore it is left to the Governor in Council to determine whether such post offices shall or shall not be on a civil service basis. If so section 'b' applies. It does not make any change in the present conditions. I propose to add the following section :

It shall not be lawful to transmit by mail any books, magazines, periodicals, circulars, newspapers or other publications which contain advertisements representing marvellous, extravagant, or grossly improbable cures, or creative or healing powers by means of medicines, appliances or devices referred to in such advertisements.

Mr. HAGGART. That would give you power to stop any newspaper in Canada.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there any appeal from the decision of the department ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. What does the hon. gentleman suggest ?

Mr. CLARKE. I am not able to suggest anything. This is very drastic power to give any one.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not see that the parliament of Canada is called on to act as censor over what the people shall read. It is just another little bit of that repressive legislation to which I object. Let the people read what they have a mind to. The minister will run foul of the newspapers. The medical men may have put up a combine with him, he will find the newspapers on his back and rightly so.

Mr. MACLEAN. Will the Postmaster General tell us if a similar law is in force in the United States, and if he has seen any report as to the result of its working ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not know the experience of any law on the subject.

Mr. MACLEAN. There is a law in the States.

Sir WILLAM MULOCK. They are beginning to apply it now. My hon. friend from West Toronto inquired whether there would be any appeal. An appeal from whom ?

Mr. CLARKE. I suppose it would be the duty of some one to determine whether periodicals, circulars, magazines and newspapers contain advertisements of grossly improbable cures and so forth. In such a case will not the newspaper have some right to appeal ?

Sir WILLAM MULOCK. The Post Office Act vests the power entirely in the Postmaster General. It would not do for an officer in the first place to exercise his discretion. Any one in the responsible position of minister, before he exercises such an authority, would have to lay down general rules. There would have to be some regulations given a newspaper or periodical and careful consideration of what is and what is not proper advertising. To-day there is a crying evil. People who are in extremely ill health, who have lost all faith in the regular practitioners, will grasp at straws and become victims of swindlers who advertise these fraudulent devices for restoring health. Some papers to-day are running an advertisement that is positively shocking.

Mr. MACLEAN. Such as electric belts.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That may be shocking too. We see advertisements of people professing to have supernatural powers. The hon. gentleman from North Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) may think that the public are not all gullible, but considering the enormous extent of these advertisements and the fortunes made by the people who are carrying out these schemes, and considering that there is no effective way of reaching these frauds under the law of the land, we cannot too soon direct our attention to save the unwary from becoming the victims of such wicked devices.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. But the Postmaster General will note that the supernatural gentleman to whom he refers is not touched by this amendment. It says 'by means of medicines, appliances or devices.' I take it that that means human devices—not supernatural. Surely he is not going to legislate beyond the bounds of the Dominion of Canada ? If he will read his amendment he will see the ridiculousness of the whole thing.

Mr. MACLEAN. And how does the hon. gentleman (Sir William Mulock) propose to deal with the political quacks who infest this country ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We must leave them to their constituents.

Mr. SPROULE. How would this amendment meet such a case as this ?—I was yesterday looking over a paper and saw an account of a marvellous cure effected through attendance at a certain shrine. Any medical man would ridicule the idea of cures being effected in the way described. There would be no way to account for it except on the assumption of a miracle having been performed. The question is would this apply to such cases and would the newspaper giving this account of alleged cures be excluded from the mails ?

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. I think that the object which the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) has in view is a very

good one. There is too much trash disseminated amongst the people. But the question arises in my mind, who shall be the judge as to what is trash and what is not? It seems to me that the Postmaster General will have a difficult task before him to say what shall and what shall not be published. Of course, if he admits my advertisement to the papers some of the Tories will say that he is not acting fairly, and the Grits will say the same. We should have somebody who is not a politician to decide these matters. If the hon. gentleman is going to carry out this system, some censor should be appointed to say what matter should be disseminated amongst the people and what should not. I am satisfied the papers contain a good deal of trash and that the people read the trash in preference to reading the truth, but the difficulty will be to decide what is the truth. I am strongly in favour of keeping quack medicine advertisements, out of the papers, if possible, for they do the people no good.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I believe the hon. Postmaster General will find that anybody publishing an improper or obscene advertisement can be reached and punished under the criminal code. And as to this paternalistic scheme of his to guard the people in case some one should take some quack medicine that the doctor would not prescribe, I must say I cannot favour it. Let the people buy what they want. Why, what would Senator Fulford say to this kind of thing? He will not thank the Postmaster General for interfering with his advertisements of pink pills or with the newspapers that print those advertisements. The mere fact that he makes money out of them is no reason against them. Half these fellows who advertise patent medicines put out medicines that they believe may do some good. There is a little cayenne pepper in the liniments or a little ipecac in the medicines. Why, if the people want to use these things let them do so—they are like regular old wives' medicines, if they do not do any good, they will not do much harm. You will never make the people wise or cautious by legislation. The people learn that by experience. The hay-fork men came around the country but it did not take the farmers long to get on to them; and the lightening-rod men and all the others—the farmers soon learn. The farmers are not such fools as the Postmaster General seems to think they are. Why, they even get on to the politicians. The Postmaster General himself is known all over the country by the farmers. He used to come around and sing his little song about 'bigger patches on our pants.' But the farmer is not as gullible as the Postmaster General evidently thinks he is and he will take care of himself.

Sir WILIAM MULOCK. It seems to have taken the farmers of North Victoria a long time to learn wisdom.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. They are among the very best. The Postmaster General came in there with his political quack medicines, but the boys were on to him in a minute and they stood right by the old family physician.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill as amended reported.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. MACLEAN. I think the Postmaster General should not press the third reading at this time. This is a very important amendment that he has introduced, and without any notice given I believe. Certainly, the press of the country and others who are interested should have an opportunity to present any views that they have to present on the subject within the next twenty-four or forty-eight hours.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think that is a reasonable request.

Motion for third reading withdrawn.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at Three o'clock.

GENERAL INSPECTION ACT—AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 124) to amend the General Inspection Act—Sir Richard Cartwright—read the second time and House in committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister give us an explanation of the weaknesses of the former legislation?

Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT (Minister of Trade and Commerce). This section defines the word 'dealer' as meaning the person or firm manufacturing or importing, or having in his or its possession for sale, or exposing or offering for sale, any binder twine. Questions have been raised as to whether parties who have purchased binder twine from other parties and exposed it for sale should be held responsible for shortage. This Act involves the necessity of all parties who expose binder twine for sale taking the consequences of shortage.

Mr. BLAIN. If a dealer purchases binder twine from a manufacturer and a farmer purchases it from the dealer and it is found to be short, the farmer can proceed against the dealer rather than the manufacturer—is that it?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes. The dealer is held responsible for selling short twine; of course, he will have his remedy against the manufacturer.

Mr. CLANCY. While I sympathize with the desire that those purchasing twine shall

get just what they pay for, both as to length and quality, is it not going a long way to make an innocent dealer, who has no means of knowing whether the twine is what it is represented to be, responsible for any shortage ? If that is done, it seems to me no man will dare to undertake to deal in twine, because he may sell it in perfect good faith. The answer is that he has recourse against the manufacturer. But that is rather an awkward position. I am heartily in favour of any measure that will protect the consumer ; but I think the Minister of Trade and Commerce will himself conclude that to make every dealer in the country responsible for a thing that it is impossible for him to know, because he has no guilty knowledge of the Act, is going a very long way. I do not know whether the right hon. gentleman is able to point to legislation of a similar kind elsewhere ; if he can, it would be useful to the committee.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid that unless you make it pretty stringent, you give no protection at all to the farmer. My hon. friend will notice that the dealer has a remedy straight against the manufacturer who had sold him any binder twine which was short. I do not think that any hardship will result from compelling the dealer to be responsible in the first instance, and he will be able to protect himself if he receives short measure from any manufacturer. I am afraid that to exempt the dealer would be merely offering a premium to the fraud we are desirous of restraining. My hon. friend will observe that a considerable amount of twine has been offered to the farmers which was short. I can assure him that I have received a great many communications from farmers and others, all commending the object of the government in this matter in giving them full measure in the matter of twine. I do not think any practical harm will result from it.

Mr. CLANCY. There is much in what the right hon. gentleman says. But it would be very pertinent here to inquire what the inspector of binder twine is doing, if he makes his visits as he should to the establishments where twine is being manufactured, and where it is imported. It seems to me that if he is doing his duty there would be really no occasion for any widespread complaint. I may just mention here—it is a very difficult thing to say—that binder twine that is known to be short has been reported and the attention of the inspector has been called to it, as I am informed—I give this for what it is worth, I do not vouch for the accuracy of my information, because I have no personal knowledge of it. But I am informed that in one case at least, where it was brought to his notice, the inspector never proceeded against the parties who had manufacturered twine contrary to the law. Now, if there are complaints that have brought forth letters to the hon. gentleman, it would seem to emphasize that statement as having some element of truth in it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman will give me the particulars, I will make inquiries into them.

Mr. CLANCY. I will give them to the hon. gentleman privately.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the date of the Inspection Act relating to binder twine ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think 1901.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I notice that the second clause of this Bill says :

> Upon or attached to every ball of binder twine sold or offered for sale in Canada there shall be a label with the name of the dealer and the number of feet of twine per pound in the ball marked or stamped thereon.

I think that is a very wise provision. At the present time the law only refers to the manufacturer, but if I sell somebody binder twine without the tag bearing the name of the manufacturer and the number of feet to the pound attached to the ball of twine I cannot be prosecuted. The provision of the first clause of this Bill is that the responsibility shall also apply to dealers. Those who deal in binder twine must see, when they buy from the manufacturers, that these provisions are complied with, that the name of the manufacturer and the number of feet to the pound are stamped upon a tag attached to each ball of twine. If the dealer does that when he buys the twine from the manufacturer he has nothing to fear.

Mr. CLANCY. It goes farther than that. Suppose that the law has been entirely complied with in the direction the hon. gentleman indicates and it is found that notwithstanding that the twine is short of the length marked upon the tag the dealer is then liable without recourse.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Then he has recourse against the manufacturer for selling him wrongly marked twine. It is the dealer's duty in the first place to see that the law is complied with. When he buys the twine he must see that the number of feet to the pound is stamped properly upon it and if a dealer sells that twine wrongly marked or stamped he is guilty of fraud.

Mr. GILMOUR. It is rather the manufacturer's duty to see that the twine is marked according to law and that it contains the number of feet stamped upon the tag. Have the inspectors not time to go around and inspect all the factories and see that the provisions of the law in regard to the length of the twine are complied with ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think the manufacturer is certainly liable, and there is a penalty declared against him if he wrongly marks binder twine, but in case there is collusion

between a dealer and a manufacturer and the dealer gets a lot of binder twine that is wrongly marked, he should be held responsible. Suppose a manufacturer is outside the country, and you cannot follow him, and suppose a dealer is imposing on the farmers by selling them binder twine which is not up to the standard, you must hold the dealer responsible, and he must see when he buys his twine that it complies with the law.

Mr. CLARKE. Can the dealer follow the manufacturer outside of the country if the twine is improperly marked ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. He need not buy his twine from that manufacturer. That is his remedy.

Mr. GILMOUR. It is necessary to protect the dealer as well as the farmer. If the dealer buys from an outside manufacturer, before the binder twine is allowed to come into the country, care should be taken to see that it complies with the law. If the twine is manufactured in this country it should be inspected before it leaves the factory. Many dealers would not be able to tell how many feet there were to the pound in a ball of twine, and would not, therefore, know whether it complied with the law or not. It is unfair to the dealer to place such a responsibility upon him unless you provide for an inspection such as I have suggested.

Mr. HEYD. There is nothing harsh in the provisions of this section. The same principle applies to the grocery trade. If a grocer sells a pound of adulterated pepper to an innocent purchaser he is liable. He has his recourse against the wholesale dealer, but primarily he is responsible. It is an easy thing for the dealer in binder twine to protect himself by simply purchasing from reputable manufacturing establishments. There are no manufacturers of a reputable character engaged in the trade putting up improperly marked binder twine, and all the dealer has to do is to see when he makes his contract that he makes it with a respectable firm. If you are going to do the farmer any good you have to reach the man who is selling twine, because he is better able to protect himself from the charge of selling improperly marked twine than the farmer is to protect himself from imposition. There is no hardship in this case, and the law, to be effective, must be enforced against the dealer.

Mr. STEPHENS. If when the binder twine is imported into the country it could be examined and passed by a competent person before it goes into the hands of the dealer, it would be better and more simple. It is a difficult thing to know whether binder twine is running the length that is marked on the tag or not, and it puts the dealer to considerable trouble to find out, whereas, if a man who was well up in the business could examine the twine as it entered the country, and pass it before it entered into the hands of the dealer, it would be much more simple and much more effective.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is done at the manufactory as far as is practicable.

Mr. STEPHENS. I have reference to imported twine more than to twine made in the country.

Mr. HAGGART. Suppose a dealer buys twine believing it to be all right, the fact that it was found afterwards to be not all right would be only prima facie evidence against him in the court. I take it that he would be able to explain to the court if the purchase was made in good faith by him. The fact that it was found not to comply with the law would not be sufficient to convict him. Surely the dealer would have the right to explain it. Does the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce say that the very fact of the dealer having in his possession twine which might be properly marked, but which was not of the proper length, and who sells it to another party although he bought it in good faith, would be liable to conviction under the Act ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think so.

Mr. HAGGART. The ordinary interpretation of the statute would indicate that the fact would only be prima facie evidence as to the guilt of the party, and that he would be at liberty to explain afterwards.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it will render the Act almost null and void unless you compel the dealer to be responsible for giving the article that he professes to give and that he gets money for. The dealer receives a certain sum of money for selling a certain number of feet of binder twine, and if he does not sell that number of feet of binder twine he will do so at his own peril, and he ought to be convicted.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the law make it obligatory that every ball of binder twine shall have a stamp with the name of the manufacturer upon it ?

Mr. HEYD. On to-day's order paper there is a question which shows that fifty-five samples of jam out of seventy-four have been adulterated, and if I understood the reply given to that question, it was that the men selling that jam were to be prosecuted. Why should a man who sells adulterated jam innocently be prosecuted any more than the man who sells binder twine which does not comply with the law ?

Mr. CLANCY. Because in one case there are no inspectors, while in the other there are inspectors.

Mr. HEYD. This trade is inspected. Any man who is engaged in the grocery trade is supposed to sell pure goods, and the only recourse he has is to fall back upon the man

from whom he purchased his goods. The same is true of those engaged in the sale of binder twine.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think there is no difficulty in carrying out this provision. To give an example of how this matter works out, I may say that not long ago I bought a quantity of lace which was made in Germany. Each one of these packages of lace was supposed to contain twelve yards. When we sold the lace we found that there were not twelve yards in each package. The purchasers came on us for redress, and we had to refund the money. We at once wrote to the firm in Montreal from whom we had purchased these goods and they made it good to us. The same thing will apply to the sale of binder twine. If we sell binder twine it is right that we should be liable just the same as if we sell any other kind of goods.

On section 121,

Upon or attached to every ball of binder twine sold or offered for sale in Canada there shall be a label with the name of the dealer and the number of feet of twine per pound in the ball marked or stamped thereon.

Mr. BLAIN. The law at present is that the manufacturer of binder twine must put upon each ball of twine a tag showing the number of feet per pound contained in the ball. Are we to understand that under this section 121 the ball of twine is to have a similar tag attached to it ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) will read that in connection with section 120 he will see that the word 'dealer' included the parties manufacturing. The parties manufacturing are covered by the express definition given.

On section 122,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The first and second subsections of this subsection considerably reduce the penalties formerly imposed.

On section 123,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to call the attention of the committee to an amendment which I shall move :

Except that binder twine manufactured in Canada for export need not be labelled with the name of the dealer but there shall be attached to every ball so manufactured a label with the number of feet to be found in the ball, marked or stamped thereon, in the same manner as when for sale in Canada, and the onus of proof that such twine was manufactured for export shall rest upon the manufacturer, dealer, carrier or other person in whose possession the twine is found.

2. Every manufacturer or dealer who falsely represents any binder twine found in his possession as manufactured for export or who shall sell or offer for sale for consumption in Canada any such twine shall be liable to a penalty of $1,000.

The object you can see is not to interfere with Canadian trade which is springing up with the United States, but at the same time I do not want them to send across the line and then return to us twine in regard to which all the conditions of the law have not been fulfilled.

Mr. BLAIN. Is that date in section 3, '1902,' correct ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That was the date fixed in the original statute. I do not think there is much risk of twine remaining on hand from that time but I have left it in to avoid any danger of unjust dealing with these people.

Mr. CLANCY. I must say that it is very gratifying to find the Minister of Trade and Commerce now legislating to promote trade between Canada and the United States. There is a combine in the United States that has raised the price of twine high enough there and in Canada to enable them to import fibre into Canada manufacture it here and pay the duty on the twine going into the United States. That is the price our farmers are paying for twine to-day by reason of the hon. gentlemen destroying every binder twine factory in Canada by giving free binder twine.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think my hon. friend is misinformed there.

Mr. CLANCY. Not at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think so.

Mr. CLANCY. There is a duty if I am not mistaken of 20 per cent on binder twine going from Canada into the United States, yet our manufacturers in Canada instead of selling to our own people are finding a market in the United States. The price is high enough there to enable them to sell it, and yet our price is the same as the American price.

Mr. STEPHENS. I think the hon. gentleman is in error. The twine that goes from Canada into the United States is a class of twine that goes there free of duty.

Mr. BLAIN. What class ?

Mr. STEPHENS. I think it is a class of twine that runs less than 600 feet to the pound.

Mr. HEYD. It is a twine in which there is no manilla.

Mr. STEPHENS. It is made from sisal or New Zealand hemp.

Mr. CLANCY. It is all kinds that we make here.

Mr. STEPHENS. The twine that goes into the United States is of a kind that enters that country free of duty ?

Mr. CLANCY. What information has the hon. gentleman that it goes into the United States free of duty ?

Mr. STEPHENS. I looked up the Act some years ago, if I remember that is the class.

Mr. BLAIN. Did I understand the hon. member for Brant to say that all the binder twine manufactured in Canada in which there is no manilla can enter the United States free of duty ?

Mr. HEYD. That is my impression.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the hon. gentleman state that as a fact ?

Mr. HEYD. I think so.

Mr. BLAIN. You do not know.

Mr. HEYD. It is easy to find out ; we can get the United States tariff.

Mr. BLAIN. I thought that if the hon. gentleman was informing the committee possibly he would know himself.

Mr. HENDERSON. The binder twine question is one that deserves the very greatest consideration. It is a well known fact, admitted by the Minister of Trade and Commerce to-day, that Canada makes more twine than can be sold in Canada. For years twine made in Canada has been to the United States, notwithstanding the fact that there is an open market for it in Canada. On the other hand, we import immense quantities of twine from the United States. We consume in all about 28,000,000 pounds of twine, of which about one-half is American and the other half Canadian. So far as we can gather, there is a hugh combination in the manufacture and sale of twine, in which the American manufacturers predominate. They seem willing to give the Canadian manufacturers one-half of the Canadian market provided the American manufacturers fix the price ; and that is the reason we are to-day paying the enormous price we are for twine. I apprehend that the Peterborough manufacturer for whose purpose this clause has been introduced, to enable him to get rid of his twine in the United States, is not allowed to say at what price he will sell his twine in Canada. It must be sold at the price fixed by the American combine. The dealer in twine in an ordinary country village does not fix the price of his twine. The price is dictated to him by the American trust, even if he buys from a Canadian dealer. I do not feel like making it any easier for these people to carry on their operations. The farmers are fleeced every year by being compelled to pay three, four or five cents a pound more for their twine than they ought to pay. The whole thing is the result of the change that took place on the 1st of January, 1898, when twine was put upon the free list. Had we maintained a good round duty on twine, sufficient to protect the market of this country for the Canadian manufacturer, we should have had all our twine made in Canada and sold to the farmers of this country on fair terms and at fair prices, and this American combination would not have had the power to interfere with us as they have been doing during the past two or three years. Our government, while exercising this paternal care over the binder twine industry, insisting that the measurements shall be right and that the name of the manufacturer shall be put on the tag, should institute an inquiry into the whole matter, and find out why it is being sold at three, four or five cents more than it is worth, and why the American manufacturer is allowed to fix the price of every pound of twine sold in this country.

Mr. WRIGHT. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question ? Do I understand him to say that the retailer has the price fixed by the manufacturer ?

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. No. I am in the trade, and I know.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman's price is fixed for him, and if he does not sell it at that price, he gets no more twine.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. As a matter of fact, that is not true. I sell twine also.

Mr. HENDERSON. All right ; the hon. gentlemen can do it this year, but wait until next year. I admit that they can sell it this year. When they buy twine, they can sell it at what price they choose ; but let them wait until next year and see whether they will sell any twine then or not. This is something the government should investigate. There is no reason why, when we consume 28,000,000 pounds of twine in Canada, our manufacturers should come to parliament and get legislation to enable them to ship their surplus to the United States to find a market when there is a large market in Canada for all they make.

Mr. CLARKE. What percentage of the twine used in Canada is made in Canada ?

Mr. HENDERSON. Fifty per cent in round numbers. Our manufacturers seem to be allowed to sell only that much, and if they do not agree to that, the American manufacturers are sufficiently strong to crush them out of the market. If our manufacturers did not submit to these tyrannical measures, there would not be a pound of twine manufactured in Canada in three years. So the government have something more to do than simply to fix the length of a pound of twine and to require the name of the manufacturer to be put on the

tag. They must go a great deal further and get at the bottom of the whole matter, and see that our manufacturers are protected, and not forced to sell their twine outside of Canada for the reason that they are not permitted to sell it in Canada. I approve of the Bill so far as it goes, protecting the farmer against short lengths and short weight. Any legislation which we can put on the statute-book to protect the farmer it is our duty to pass ; but we must protect him not only in regard to the length, but in regard to the price of the twine. There is no doubt that during the years gone by the price to the farmers was increased as much as three cents a pound by short lengths. A farmer paying for what was represented as 600 feet and getting only 480 feet was simply paying three cents a pound more than he ought to have paid. We are trying to remedy that ; but we must go further and break up this huge trust that enables the American manufacturer to fix the price of twine in Canada.

Mr. STEPHENS. I am astonished to hear the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) say that the dealer's price is fixed for him by the manufacturer.

Mr. HENDERSON. I did not say by the manufacturer. I say it is fixed by the American trust.

Mr. STEPHENS. It is not. I have been in the binder twine business since it has been established in Canada, and I have never yet had any dealer or manufacturer say to me at what price I should sell the twine, or even ask at what price I was selling it. I have handled as much as 100 tons in a year. I have never known a year in which I could not buy twine freely except the year 1896, when the government of the day went into a combine with the Canadian Cordage Company of Montreal and tied up all the factories except one or two, and then they would not give you a price on twine but would sell it and put the price on afterwards.

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask what twine sold at that year ?

Mr. STEPHENS. It was very low and would have been considerably lower if the government had not tied up all the twine they made and allowed the Consumers' Cordage Company to sell at their own prices. True the twine was cheap, but the reason was the hemp was very cheap. That was before the Cuban war and the hemp was sold in New York for less than four cents a pound. The labour market was also very cheap. That was during the hard time of the national policy, which made labour cheap.

Mr. HEYD. I want to explain this binder twine duty business and put the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) right. That hon. gentleman evidently did not know what he was talking about. I said that only binder twine containing manilla was subject to a duty. Let me read from the Customs Tariff of the United States :

> 491. Binding twine : All binding twine manufactured from New Zealand hemp istle or Tampico fiber, sisal grass, or sunn, or a mixture of any two or more of them, of single ply and measuring not exceeding six hundred feet to the pound ; provided, that articles mentioned in this paragraph if imported from a country which lays an import duty on like articles imported from the United States, shall be subject to a duty of one-half of one cent per pound.

That shows that there is no duty on binder twine except that which contains manilla.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is the kind we make.

Mr. T. I. THOMSON. I think that the binder twine question presents a much more serious aspect than that shown by the hon. member for Halton. If there is an American combine for the purpose of fixing the price of binder twine in Canada and extorting larger figures from our farmers than are necessary, the government of Canada is not altogether blameless. The Conservatives established a plant at the Kingston penitentiary some years ago, so that we might make a certain quantity of twine and put it on the market to regulate the price. And it was put on the market at a reasonable advance on cost to prevent combinations from charging the farmers extortionate prices. The Ontario government did likewise. They put a plant at the Central prison for that purpose. But during all the years the present administration has been in office, the manufacturers have been extorting exaggerated prices from the farmers, and the twine manufactured in the Kingston penitentiary and the Central prison at Toronto cannot be bought a cent cheaper than the American trust charge for twine ; yet these gentlemen, while they charge the farmers just as much as the American combine charges him, will sell to their friends, the jobbers, for one-half what they charge the farmers. They sell to the farmers mixed manilla twine at nine and a half to ten cents a pound, while they sell to their friends hundreds of tons at four and five cents a pound. The government have the key of the position. Had they placed their twine on the market at reasonable prices, no combine could charge more. There must be some self-interest, some conspiracy in order that the farmers may be charged more than reasonable profit on the twine manufactured by the government.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Really I cannot allow such ridiculous statements to go unchallenged. I cannot understand how any sane man can seriously get up and make such a statement as the hon. gentleman has

just given utterance to. We are told that we regulate the price of binder twine, of which some 28,000,000 pounds are used in Canada, and we do this despite the fact that the whole product of the Kingston penitentiary is some 400 tons. How, with such an infinitesimal production we can control the price is to me inexplicable. The hon. gentleman further said that we sold the binder twine to our friends at three and four cents a pound less than to the general public. What authority has he for that statement ?

Mr. T. I. THOMSON. The Auditor General's Report. I will lay it before you in a moment.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I should like to see it. We put up for sale our output each spring. We send our circulars around the country telling our farmers that each one of them on application may have a certain quantity at cost price with one cent added. We have issued this circular the last three years. Those who take an intelligent interest in what is going on know that.

Mr. SPROULE. You sell the twine at ten and a half cents a pound, but it is only 600 feet to the pound. The ordinary twine is 650 feet to the pound. When you take into consideration the length and add the freight, the price is about the same as you can buy it at in any village in the country.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That only shows that binder twine is sold at a reasonable price, because our twine is sold at actual cost plus one cent, and we pay fifty cents a day for our labour and buy the raw material at the lowest cash price.

Mr. SPROULE. How is it that last year or the year before, at the end of the season the balance was sold out to Mr. Connolly for about 5 cents a pound, whereas the farmers had to pay 10 cents ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There has not been a pound of twine sold to Connolly since 1896. In 1896 Mr. Connolly, through a man named Galliher, succeeded in buying up the whole output of the year, and as a result not a single pound of binder twine was put by the government on the market that year.

Mr. SPROULE. I may be mistaken in the name, but I know the twine was sold and the excuse given for selling it at so low a price was that it would deteriorate if held over. But our farmers have had twine lying from year to year in their barns and it did not deteriorate. I have frequently put the question to them, and they have invariably said that keeping it over for a year made no difference. But that was the excuse given to us for selling this large quantity of twine at so much less than the price at which it was sold to the farmer.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is confusing two things, and I think he will agree with me, when I explain the matter, that is the case. Two or three years ago—I have forgotten exactly when it was—a resolution was passed in this House ordering the Department of Justice not to dispose of the binder twine except in small lots to farmers and to sell it at a certain small advance above cost. During the season the binder twine was offered for sale to the farmers, but they took only a small proportion of it, something like one-quarter of it. So we had something like three-quarters left over at the end of the season, and that was sold by public auction. That is why the twine realized this small figure. And what was the result ? At the next session of parliament it was decided that, instead of proceeding that way the Department of Justice should have a free hand like other manufacturers, to sell the twine, preference being given to the farmers.

Mr. SPROULE. It was because preference was not given to the farmers that it had to be sold by public auction.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. When I say that it was sold by public auction, I do not mean that an auctioneer stood up and sold it on the market, but that tenders were called for.

Mr. SPROULE. We tried to bring it out that these advertisements were not put in the papers to say that the twine was for sale to any person who would pay the highest price for it, but circulars were sent out to individuals who were in the habit of handling twine, and they put in their tenders. So far as our inquiry led to real information, we were inclined to believe that there was an understanding among these parties as to who was to get the twine and what price was to be given for it. Just as, on a former occasion, when the twine made in the Kingston Penitentiary was sold to H. N. Bate & Sons, and the Hobbs Hardware Company of London, the same individuals controlled the Central Prison output and so controlled the price of binder twine for Canada.

Mr. HEYD. It is no wonder that the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. T. I. Thomson) left the House when the facts were given. But I see that he has now returned. If the hon. gentleman will turn to 43—M of the Auditor General's Report he will find an account of the sales of binder twine and the prices received :

32,945½ pounds pure manilla (600 feet) at 10¼ and 10½ cents.

8,590 pounds pure manilla (650 feet) 11½ cents and 11¼ cents.

34,586 pounds sisal at 9½ cents, 9¼ cents and 9 cents.

51,091 mixed manilla (monarch) at 10½ cents and 10¼ cents.

38,714½ pounds Kingston special at 9½ cents and 9¼ cents.

84,724 pounds extra standard at 10½ cents and 10¼ cents.

It does not look as if they sacrified very much if they sold the binder twine at those figures.

Mr. SPROULE. What year was that ?

Mr. HEYD. That is in the Auditor General's Report of last year.

Mr. T. I. THOMSON. I am very glad that the hon. gentleman for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) has given me the opportunity to put this properly before the House. I turn to the sessional papers for 1902-3, volume XXXVII, No. 1, and I find there the statement of sales presented by the Auditor General :

Maple leaf (pure manilla), 17,325 pounds at 10 cents.
Mixed manilla (Monarch)—
6,783 pounds at 10½ cents.
12,960 pounds at 10¼ cents.
12,905 pounds at 10 cents.
220,000 pounds at 5 1-10 cents.
Sisal—
1,358 pounds at 9½ cents.
8,000 pounds at 9¼ cents.
15,905 pounds at 9 cents.
200,065 pounds at 6⅛ cents.
60,025 pounds at 4⅜ cents.

Now, I think that is pretty conclusive proof that the American trust controls the price of binder twine in Canada, and that this has been the case since the duty was removed. And if the trust has charged the people more than is legitimate, what excuse is there for the government ? the Minister of Justice states, they are selling this twine at a small advance on cost. But I ask what justification is there for selling the great bulk of it for half the price to jobbers at which it is sold to the farmers ? He has not explained that, and I will give him an opportunity to do so.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The whole thing was explained while the hon. gentleman (Mr. T. I. Thomson) was out of the chamber a few minutes ago.

Mr. T. I. THOMSON. I have quoted from the Auditor General's Report in the sessional papers of 1903, showing the sales made in the previous years. This is not for 1896.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall this be adopted ?

Mr. T. I. THOMSON. I think the Minister of Justice should give some explanation. This is a very serious charge.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, not at all serious.

Mr. T. I. THOMSON. The combination were charging more for the twine than is legitimate and the government were charging as much as the combination. Of course there was no object in the farmer buying from the government. Yet, when the government could not sell their twine owing to the high price asked by the government, they sold it to their friends at low prices, and the farmer had to pay the combination price when he purchased from their friends.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not know that it is proper, at this stage of the session, to expect a transaction to be explained twice over because it suits the convenience of an hon. gentleman to step out into the lobby while the explanation is being given. I explained that in this House a resolution was passed directing that the binder twine should be sold to the farmers exclusively. As a result a large part of it remained on our hands at the end of the season. We decided to dispose of this by tender, and the tenders were called for and the twine sold. The question was investigated the next year while my estimates were before the Committee of Supply. I discussed the whole matter and the resolution was cancelled and instructions given that the Department of Justice should be left free to dispose of the binder twine in the ordinary way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved to insert after the words 'for sale' in subsection 2, the words ' in Canada ;' also to change the word ' confiscated ' to the word ' seized.'

Amendments agreed to.

Bill as amended, reported, read the third time and passed.

INSPECTION OF GRAIN.

House in committee on Bill (No. 113) respecting the inspection of grain.—Sir Richard Cartwright.

On section 2,

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand that the chairman of the committee has gone carefully over the Bill since it was reprinted, and says he has found it correct with the amendments made by the committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, I have gone carefully over the Bill. There are just a few verbal amendments to make the Bill readable, but no material change. The Bill was carefully considered ; the committee spent eleven days over it, and I think it is pretty nearly perfect.

On section 4,

Mr. CAMPBELL. There is one change here, adding after the words 'in his division' the words ' or divisions.'

Mr. HENDERSON. That is in view of having one chief inspector for the whole.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

On section 52,

The inspection fees upon grain within the several districts shall be paid by the inspec-

tors into, and shall form part of, the Consolodated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is proposed to strike out clause 52 and to substitute clause 87 in its place. The object is to enable the government to collect the inspection in weighing fees. The clause we propose to add is the same as clause 87 of the Bill and when we come to clause 87 it is proposed to strike that out altogether. I therefore beg to move in amendment that section 52 be struck out and that the following section be substituted in lieu thereof :

The inspection fees upon grain inspected within the division shall be treated as advanced charges, to be paid by the carrier or warehouseman in whose possession the grain is at the time of its inspection, and shall be paid through the chief inspector into, and shall form part of, the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, and accounts thereof shall be kept by the chief inspector in such manner and in such detail as is from time to time determined by the minister.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This puts section 87 in place of section 52.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 69,

Mr. T. I. THOMSON. I would call the attention of the committee to a complaint that comes from my own constituency that the government have appointed a weigher of grain but that there is no provision made for paying him. What provision is there for paying a man who may be appointed to weigh grain ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certain fees are allowed per car.

Mr. T. I. THOMSON. How is he going to collect them ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We will have to make regulations to that effect. We can do that under the authority of this Act when it is passed.

Mr. T. I. THOMSON. Then it is the intention of the government to do so ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To make certain fees for all the grain that is weighed out.

On section 74, inspection east of Winnipeg.

Mr. HENDERSON. The question upon which there was most division in the subcommittee who examined this whole Bill very carefully from beginning to end was this question of mixing grain or permitting grain to be mixed in the western country, or after it had once gone into an elevator. While agreeing with my colleagues on the committee in nearly everything in connection with the Bill I reserved to myself the right to take exception to the matter to which I now refer and in order to bring before the committee without waste of time my views upon this point I shall move the following amendment :

That the following words be added to section 74 :—

And all grain placed in any elevator at Winnipeg shall be inspected into such elevator by the government inspector and be inspected out on the same grade as inspected in.

I understand that the complaint of eastern millers is that the grain that goes into, say the northern elevator at Winnipeg, is not inspected out on the same grade as that on which it goes in, that several grades of grain may be mixed together and the result is that the car which is inspected out is of a quality inferior to the high standard of grain which western millers such as the Ogilvies are able to buy on the western market, and that our eastern millers are handicapped because they cannot get that high class western grain used by the western millers with whom the eastern men have to compete in the sale of flour. I do not use the word 'elevator' as meaning a public elevator. I mean any elevator into which grain is put, and if grain is put into an elevator at Winnipeg I say it should be inspected in, and then when it comes out it should be inspected out as the same grade as it was inspected in so that the man who buys on that inspection will be able to get grain of the same class as goes into the elevator. I believe this amendment which I move is in harmony with the wishes of eastern men, and as it affects them materially, I think it is deserving of the careful consideration of this committee. I admit that my colleagues did not agree with me on this matter, but I felt that I was compelled, owing to the manner in which it was brought to my attention, more especially by a miller in my own county who is a large shipper of flour, to submit this change to the committee for their consideration.

Mr. CAMPBELL. As the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) has said this point was about the only one on which the the committee differed at all. I may say that these elevators in Winnipeg to which he refers are private elevators. The evidence which was submitted to us by Mr. Horn the chief grain inspector from the western division and also letters from the Ogilvie Milling Company which gets a large amount of grain from this elevator, indicate that the grain from this elevator was as good as what was selected from other elevators. The practice has been that dealers in Winnipeg will have perhaps 50 or 60 elevators all along the line. They are buying this grain constantly and the committee took this view that the men who bought the grain could do just what they liked with it. and could put it all into one bin if they choose, that it was nobody's business, but when they brought it to Winnipeg and asked

the official inspector to inspect that grain and put his stamp upon it, there should then be no tampering or mixing. We have carefully provided for that, but if you go further and inspect all the grain into elevators in Winnipeg, including private elevators it will entail a great deal more work and will necessitate the employment of more officials. But I do not think it will overcome the difficulty referred to by the hon. member for Halton, (Mr. Henderson) because there are elevators still farther back, at Brandon, at Emerson, and at other points where they are receiving this grain from the small elevators along the line. Whenever the small elevators get filled up they ship the grain into a large elevator. Then in many cases they take in grain at certain seasons of the year when it is damp and out of condition. That grain is dried in the elevator and it would be quite impossible to inspect it in. However, when this grain is being shipped out it is officially inspected and it must be kept clear without any mixing after that. I do not think that we can safely amend the clause, in fact, Mr. Horn, the chief inspector whose testimony was very clear and distinct on that point, thought it was quite unnecessary to do that. I would prefer that the committee should let the Bill stand as it is for a year, and then if it is found, as it probably will be, that as the great Northwest fills up there will have to be other divisions further west and that inspections will be necessary at Brandon and Prince Albert just as at Winnipeg to-day, then we can adopt whatever amendment is necessary. But in the present state of the grain trade there I do not think it would be desirable or in the interests of the trade to inspect this grain in as well as out, and that was the view taken by the committee.

Amendment (Mr. Henderson) negatived.

On section 75,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In section 75, after the word 'or' in the 23rd line I would move to insert the word 'at' so that it would read:

Any grain inspected at Winnipeg or other western point may be reinspected at Fort William or at other terminal elevators, &c.

In the 28th line I would move; that the words 'Canadian Pacific Railway Company' be struck out and the words 'any railway company' be substituted.

Mr. BOYD. Before the Bill is reported, I wish to call attention to a matter which I brought before the House last year, that is the posting on the blackboards of the stations at Fort William of the price of wheat in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories. I do not know whether it should come here or under the Grain Act.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That comes under the Grain Act.

Mr. BOYD. I want to be sure, because I want to test the House on the question. I proposed it last year, but was not able to get it in.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That was discussed when the members for Winnipeg were not here.

Mr. BOYD. I know how the Winnipeg men feel about it. They do not want it. All I wanted to see was whether I could bring the matter up here.

Mr. HENDERSON. When the hon. member spoke to me about his amendment, my impression was that it should come as an amendment to the Grain Act. However, if there is a possibility of introducing it here without in any way destroying this Act, that might be done.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It belongs more properly to the Grain Act.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

THE MILITIA ACT.

On the order,

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 5) respecting the Militia of Canada—Sir Frederick W. Borden.

Mr. HAGGART. I ask the hon. minister to let this Bill stand till this evening. The leader of the opposition is not here, and he wants to be here when it comes up. Colonel Tisdale also is going to move an amendment. I thought there was an understanding with the Minister of Militia that the Bill would come up to-morrow.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The understanding was that we would complete the work in Committee of the Whole, and report the Bill for a third reading to-morrow, when certain resolutions of which notice has been given me by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) may be moved. This is simply to put through certain clauses which were suggested the last time the House was in committee on the Bill.

Mr. HAGGART. The only reason I make the request is that the leader of the opposition left me a memorandum requesting that the Militia Bill, if the government are willing, be held over until he is present.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There was one clause which the minister or the leader of the opposition were to draft, on which they were agreed. I do not know what stage that has reached. I suggest that the Minister of Militia hold the Bill open until the leader of the opposition is here to-night.

House went into committee on the Bill.

On section 69,

The Governor in Council may place the militia, or any part thereof, on active service anywhere in Canada, and also beyond Canada, for the defence thereof, at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of emergency.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. When this clause was passing through committee, it was suggested that there should be a provision for calling parliament within a certain number of days after the militia were called out, in the event of an emergency. I have copied the English law almost verbatim, which I think applies to this case, and I propose a section to be called 69a :

Whenever the Governor in Council places the militia or any part thereof on active service anywhere in Canada or beyond Canada for the defence thereof, if parliament be then separated by such adjournment or prorogation as will not expire within ten days, a proclamation shall be issued for a meeting of parliament within fifteen days, and parliament shall accordingly meet and sit on the day appointed by such proclamation and shall continue to sit and act in like manner as if it had stood adjourned or prorogued to the same day.

Mr. HAGGART. Was not that clause passed in committee before ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, it was suggested that some such clause should be adopted, and I promised to have one drafted. This is the one which the Minister of Justice has handed me, and it is copied from the English law.

Mr. MACLEAN. Is it the intention of the government to confine the calling out of the militia for the defence of Canada ? I am quite sure we are making a mistake in doing this. We are part and parcel of the British empire, and the defence of the empire is an emergency which might call for the turning out of the Canadian militia and sending them abroad. We have a political alliance to-day with the empire. We have, I believe, a defensive alliance. In this Bill we have the oath set forth : 'I do sincerely promise and swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to His Majesty.' This proposed amendment used the very same language as the clause to which I object, namely :

When the Governor in Council places the militia or any part thereof on active service in Canada or beyond Canada for the defence thereof——

And so on. I object to the limitation, to the use of the militia of Canada only for the defence of Canada. Either we are of the empire, or we are not. If we are of the empire, as I say we are, the militia of Canada and the resources of Canada ought to be at the service of the empire, always provided that the people of Canada, through their parliament, are consenting parties. There ought to be provision in this Act under which the Governor in Council, assuming the responsibility of the Act, may order the forces of this country outside of this country not only for the defence of Canada but for the defence of the empire. We to-day have a political alliance with the empire. We also have, I believe, a defensive alliance. To-day, our country is defended by the army and navy of the mother country. And, surely, while that state of affairs is continued we should not declare in our legislation that the forces of Canada are only for the defence of Canada. Not only have we a political and defensive alliance with the empire, but I hope we shall have a closer commercial alliance between Canada and the mother country before long. That is the great question that is before the empire to-day,—the political binding of the empire together, the defensive binding of the empire together and the commercial binding of the empire together. If that is the work that the people of the empire have in hand, let not this country, at this important stage of this great discussion, put it on record that the militia force of Canada is to go outside of Canada only for the defence of Canada. Let us put it fairly. Let all the world know that the imperial idea in the mother land has all the daughter states and colonies at her back in an emergency. To enact such a clause as here proposed is, in effect, to declare that the power and resources of Canada, which is the greatest of the daughter states, are not to be used for the defence of the empire. In England to-day there is a movement which means a great deal to Canada—a closer commercial union between the mother country and colonies. That movement is growing. The government in England is more or less committed to it. Mr. Chamberlain's committee reported the other day in favour of the extension of the principle of trade preference. Let us not prejudice that position by saying to all the world that whatever military forces we have are only for the defence of Canada. The prayer read in this House every day by Mr. Speaker, is, concerning the King, 'strengthen him to overcome and vanquish all his enemies.' That prayer, I believe, comes from the heart of the people of Canada. Let us not cause the statutes of Canada to give the lie to the prayer that we deliver here every day. I am a Canadian and nothing but a Canadian ; I am a nationalist and nothing but a nationalist. But I believe that the future of Canada is bound up with the maintenance of the imperial tie, and requires that we be prepared on all occasions to stand by the empire. That being the case, do not put it in our legislation that the fighting force of the country is purely for the defence of Canada. Why limit it ? Leave out these words, and I will have no objection to the clause. But to put in these words is to place us in a false position and to make people think that in some way Canadians are not pre-

pared to defend the empire. We are prepared to defend the empire, but, all the time, we wish to retain complete independence over ourselves as to what we shall do. We do not wish to be dragged into a war, but we want to be free to elect to go if such is our wish. But, under this clause, the Governor in Council will be limited and will not know what to do. They will say : Our powers are limited : We cannot send the forces of Canada outside of Canada except for the defence of Canada. If we are not ready to assume our responsibilities for the empire let us go about it in the proper way and arrange for separation.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Oh, oh !

Mr. MACLEAN. That is your intention.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Whose intention ?

Mr. MACLEAN. It is the intention of whoever framed this Bill.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) must be fair. There can be no intention of anything like that. Does he not know that only volunteers can be sent out of this country ?

Mr. MACLEAN. I know what it says in this Bill.

Mr. TALBOT. What did the old Act say?

Mr. MACLEAN. It left the Governor in Council free. We had the matter before the House some days ago, and it was shown that the Governor in Council had power to send the Canadian forces outside of Canada without being limited by these words 'for the defence of Canada.'

Mr. TALBOT. No, the Governor in Council could not send them before.

Mr. MACLEAN. Then let us put it in this Bill.

Mr. HEYD. Nonsense. Would the hon. gentleman give the government power to send out militia to South Africa ?

Mr. MACLEAN. Certainly. If the Governor in Council will assume the responsibility of doing it, then call parliament and let parliament ratify the Act if it thinks proper. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) is a Liberal, and yet he proposes to limit the freedom of the parliament of Canada and of the Governor in Council.

Mr. HEYD. I would certainly limit them so that they cannot send out people to South Africa.

Mr. MACLEAN. Why ?

Mr. HEYD. Because they have no right to do it.

Mr. MACLEAN. Let me tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) why there should be no limitation. The mother country, with her soldiers and her sailors has defended Canada from all attack, no matter from what side it threatened. She has spent her blood and treasure on this continent to maintain the integrity of Canada. Why should we restrict our government so that we cannot assist the mother country as she has assisted us ? Why should not the people of Canada be at the service of the empire ?

Mr. HEYD. Can the government of Great Britain send her own militia to South Africa ?

Mr. MACLEAN. The militia is the only army we have. Now the hon. gentleman is pettifogging. The only army we have is this active militia, it is the forces of Canada, the only forces we have to defend this country. Now, I say when the empire is defending us in every quarter of the globe, why should not the services of the forces of Canada be at the service of the empire ? The motherland has stood by us, as I said before, has fought all our battles, is defending us to-day, is defending the Canadian flag on every sea on the face of the globe. That being the case, why should we be limited as to what we should do in the matter ? Let us be free. Let the Governor in Council assume responsibility. Let them call parliament, but let them have freedom to come to the defence of the empire in an emergency. War is an emergency, war has not ceased, it is springing up every day ; and that being the case, we must be prepared not only to defend our own country but to defend the empire. And what has that empire done for the people of Canada ? It has guaranteed to us that those institutions which we are proud of, and which we are trying to maintain on this continent——

Mr. TALBOT. What about our territory that she gave away ?

Mr. MACLEAN. Granted that she did. The hon. gentleman comes from the province of Quebec, and the rights of the province of Quebec to-day are guaranteed by the empire and surely the hon. gentleman and all the other citizens of this country ought to stand by the empire, and be prepared to defend the empire that guarantees to us the form of government that we now enjoy. Now, if that is the case, why should we not be British, and outspoken in favour of British connection ? Why should we go through this Act and combat out every reference to the empire ? The soldiers in the militia swear loyalty to the King ; we pray here that the King may overcome all his enemies ; and surely if we are to have an empire, why not be prepared to defend it ? Why not let the Governor in Council have full authority to do what they think proper in the circumstances—always provided that parliament is called, and always provided that Canada has complete control over her forces, complete independence of action, and that in no way can we be overridden by

any outside authority. The people of this country are prepared to trust the government; the government always has the confidence of the people, and that being the case the action of the Governor in Council should not be limited in the disposition of these forces. The forces are for the defence of the country, they are for the defence of the empire, and it is of supreme moment that they may be used in an emergency. The life of the nation is supreme, the life of the empire is supreme, and there ought to be no qualifying clause in regard to the action of the authority, whatever it is, in whom the supreme power is vested. That being the case, let us withdraw these words. If the government persist in adopting that clause as it is phrased now, I will move to strike out the words 'for the defence thereof.'

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). It seems to me we are making much ado about nothing. The old law was very vague and indefinite; there was nothing in it that would apply one way or the other as to whether the troops could be moved out of Canada or not. I make this statement after having carefully considered the matter at the time of the South African war. Here is the position that is taken now, that we give to the Governor in Council authority to employ the troops of Canada either within or without Canada for the defence of Canada. Then we make provision that parliament should be summoned fifteen days after a declaration of war, and that the troops may be called out, so that parliament shall decide then what use is to be made of the troops, whether within or without Canada, and what we are to do with them. But I say now, speaking as a member of parliament, that I would long hesitate to give to any government no matter how good, power of attorney authorizing them to use the troops of Canada at any time at their own sweet will, whether within or without Canada, when parliament might be summoned within fifteen days thereafter. Why not leave that in the hands of parliament? The British empire is not going to pieces in fifteen days. If parliament has to be summoned within fifteen days, why not let parliament deal with it?

Mr. MACLEAN. Let parliament say whether the troops are to be used outside for the defence of Canada or for the defence of the empire.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think my hon. friend does not understand the result of his amendment. What he wants to do is to give to the Governor in Council, without authority, without the sanction of parliament, authority to order the troops anywhere within the British empire. I cannot agree to that.

Mr. MACLEAN. I wish to have the law so that whenever the Governor in Council sees fit they may order the militia of Canada on active service anywhere in Canada or beyond Canada, without the limitation proposed in the amendment.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is provided for.

Mr. MACLEAN. Let the Governor in Council be free to send the troops abroad or anywhere.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Canada must decide that, not the Governor in Council.

Mr. MACLEAN. They have as much right to decide that here as they have in England.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not at all.

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes, we are of the empire, and we have to take our responsibilities in connection with it. The defence of the empire is just as important as the defence of Canada. That is the way I take it.

Mr. FITZPARTICK. And we take it that way, and we are prepared to assume our share of the responsibility for it.

Mr. SPROULE. On the occasion of that unfortunate trouble in South Africa, the troops received consent to go to South Africa without parliament being called together.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They volunteered.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, but when objection was taken, what was the answer given by the First Minister in regard to the action of the government allowing that to be done? The answer was that the sentiment in favour of imperial defence was so strong that had the government not consented to it, there might have been a rebellion. But owing to the loyal sentiment of the Canadian people the government took the action it did. Now, that was done without any injury to the country, without any impropriety, and the loyal sentiment of Canada was so pronounced and evident that no government could withstand it in a critical moment like that. My hon friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) desires to go no further in this particular case. The Minister of Militia and Defence says he has modelled this clause after the Imperial Act. But he forgets that the Imperial Act includes the whole empire, applies to the whole empire, and when these troops are called out, will go to any part of that empire.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Will my hon. friend allow me to say now what I intended to say later on? The militia of Great Britain cannot be sent beyond the boundaries of Great Britain.

Mr. GOURLEY. That has no application here. The minister says what is absolutely opposed to common sense.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The militia could not be sent to this country.

Mr. GOURLEY. That is a quibble.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you mean that the militia could not be sent out of the United Kingdom ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It could not.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, I was mistaken, because I thought it could be.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought at any time it could be sent to any part of the world long before there were any signs of war, and that the government could at any time open proceeding with those great ironclads in any part of the world, though parliament might not be in session, in defence of the country. And is it to be said that an integral part of the British empire, which is defended by the empire on the high seas as well the United Kingdom itself, shall be unwilling or unable to bring our forces into co-operation with the empire and defend it in any part of the world ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We are not.

Mr. SPROULE. If what the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence contended be correct, we are because I claim that even without the consent of parliament the British fleet may be ordered to any part of the world when there is the slightest sign of danger.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is right.

Mr. SPROULE. And it goes to the scene of the trouble at a moment's notice if necessary to open the batteries of its ironclads against the enemy.

Mr. GOURLEY. And the regular army.

Mr. SPROULE. And the regular army may also be sent. That is protection in the highest sense of the word. That is the authority which the imperial government have and that it is derived from the English Act which we are copying. But we are confining it to a limited area, whereas England has the whole empire as her field of operations. For that reason I say that we would be doing less than our duty if we did not hold ourselves in readiness at any time to go to the defence of the empire, and if our government, taking the responsibility upon their shoulders, were not prepared to do as they did in the South African affair and send our forces out to protect the empire and defend our flag. What is the use of our connection with the mother country if it is not that ? We receive her protection the world over. Our commerce, our trade our people are under her care and we feel that we are safe because of the protection which we enjoy from the British fleet and the British army. Are we to be such poltroons that we are not prepared to throw in our quota to help to defend the empire in any part of the world wherever the need may be ? We are doing less than our duty as an integral part of the British empire and less than what the loyal sentiment of Canada demands if we restrict our Act in such a way that we cannot do our duty in that respect and if we fail in our duty we will be held strictly to account by the loyal people of Canada.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing that would tend so much to the peace of the world as to have it known that the British empire and colonies stood ready at any moment to defend themselves. I am satisfied that if the powers of Europe knew that not only Canada, but Australia, South Africa, and all the British colonies were bound together, not by a rope of sand, but by a strong and firm determination to defend every part of the empire they would hesitate long before they would make war against the British empire. Therefore, I think this clause should be framed in such a way that we could at any time as occasion demanded, say that our men should go to the defence of the empire. I hope a provision will be inserted in the Bill under which we will be able at any time, without calling parliament together in case our safety is placed in jeopardy, in case a nation makes war against us to send our militia to the defence. We do not know how soon such an occasion may arise. Suppose a foreign fleet were to come up the St. Lawrence, and we do not know how soon that may happen because Great Britain is continually in trouble, would we Canadians sit quietly here waiting until parliament met ? On the contrary would we not go against the enemy determined to defend our shores ? I think so and I think we should be able to send our troops outside of Canada if need be. I think we should have the power to send them wherever it was necessary to defend the British empire.

Mr. SEYMOUR GOURLEY (Colchester). Mr. Chairman, I am not in the habit of using very strong language in this House. At the same time, I believe it would be almost justified to-day. I do not know whether it is the intention of the draughtsman or not, I cannot enter into his mind and therefore I cannot charge against the draughtsman the intention of entering a wedge between Canada and the British empire, but I am allowed from what the draughtsman has done to draw my own conclusion and the conclusion I draw from reading the clause as changed and from reading the old Act is that there was a distinct intention to make a clear-cut change in regard to the power of this government over the militia. That is clear. Every man and especially every militiaman that

you talk with on the street will tell you at once, after the former debate we had here, that the clear intention of the change was to drive a wedge between this country and the empire. Whether that is true or not I will not say, but I do say that in the public opinion of this country there has been created a doubt as to the fealty and loyalty of Canada to the empire. That is an unfortunate thing at this time but what did we see in London the other day? In the unfortunate speech made by the Solicitor General, with whom I am friendly and in reference to whom I do not wish to say a word in his absence, he emphasized the fact that there was in Canada a separatist party. I do not myself endorse that proposition, but I am arguing as to the effect of this upon the world and I am pointing out what public opinion is in Canada since the Solicitor General made that speech. I am not frightened at separation. No power on earth can separate any portion of Canada from this empire. Any man who has any wish in his heart or any dream that Canada will ever be torn from the empire must remember that the streets will flow with British blood before he gets his wish. and any man who entertains that idea will most surely be disillusioned. No power under Heaven can separate this country from the British empire. But, there are worse things than that and that is to create the public opinion that Canada has really not any interest in the empire and is not prepared to go to the defence of the empire in time of need. If those gentlemen who recently charged that there is a separatist party in this country would act decently there would be no need of such a public opinion existing in the world. All those men who are so alarmed when the charge is made that there is a separatist party in this country need do is to turn around and make the speech I am making to-day, to stand by the empire and to stand up for anything that will strengthen Canada and destroy the notion that there is the least vestige of public opinion in this country in favour of separation from the empire. I want to deal for the moment with the speech of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden). Coming from Nova Scotia he should have common sense, he should have the power of mental discrimination, and he should have the power when he reads a section of the Bill to know what it means. When he tells me that there is no change in the two sections it is impossible for me to believe that the hon. gentleman has read the section which is before us. It would be impossible for me to believe that any man could have made the statement that there is no clear and wide difference between these two sections if he had read them. But the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has made a more extraordinary and misleading statement still. I do not know he intended it because it strikes me that he does not thoroughly understand this Bill. When in answer to the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) he stated that the volunteers in England could not be sent abroad he must have intended in giving that answer and in drawing that parallel to mislead the House. There is no similarity whatever between the two cases. In England the standing army defends the shores of the mother country and defends the empire all over the world and in case of an emergency the English government can send every one of these soldiers of the empire away from England for service in any part of the world and in doing so leave the country absolutely defenceless. All the navy may at any day be sent abroad. Therefore England has made provision that she can call out her militia to defend her shores while the army is abroad fighting the battles of the empire. You agree to send our militia abroad to fight our battles and I will agree that the volunteers required for the defence of the country after that shall not be sent out of the country. That will be a parallel. The militia is our standing army and we want it to be placed on the same footing as the standing army in England so that the Governor in Council can send it to any part of the world to defend this empire. Then in reference to the naval militia which is being established, I want power given to the Governor in Council to send it to any part of the world. It would be extraordinary if that were not provided. I say that when the Minister of Militia undertook to persuade this House that there was no comparison and no argument in citing the case of the volunteers of England not being sent abroad he was utterly and absolutely misleading and the Minister of Militia will never be able to make any one believe that that is an argument for this change. The Minister of Justice said that he had great doubt about the construction of this old section. I do not wish to say anything unkind of any one, but I think that his attitude with reference to the construction of this section arose not out of his mind, but out of the circumstance that he represents a city in the province of Quebec. At the time of the South African war it was well known that the province of Quebec unfortunately—and that is the only thing I do not like about the province—unfortunately at the time it was believed that every man in the province of Quebec was opposed to sending a soldier to help the empire in that part of the empire, and that gentleman representing a constituency down there may well have imbibed that opinion, and the opinion he gave on that occasion was more or less influenced, as all our opinions are, by our local surroundings. I can only accept his opinion as being the result of his surroundings because it is impossible to believe that

this plain language means anything else than what appears on its face.

Her Majesty may call out the militia or any part thereof, either within or without Canada, at any time that it appears advisable to do so by reason of war, invasion, insurrection or danger of any of them.

If there could be any doubt, then as the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) says, let us clear it up, let the Minister of Justice point out the difficulty he had in advising the Crown on that occasion that they could send the militia by Order in Council to any part of the empire. Let the minister tell us what words are lacking in the wording of the section which I think is as broad and ample as is required, and then let us amend the section, and make it clear for all time that there is no doubt as to the government's power to take such action. The Minister of Justice went on to say : Oh, but you can call parliament ; the Governor in Council has power to call out the militia for the defence of Canada but if we want it sent abroad let parliament be called. That is not an answer to the situation. What we want on the statute-book is a clear expression to the whole world that we stand for the empire. Then let parliament be called. Parliament is called in England although there the government have the fullest power to send the army and navy to defend the empire in any part of the world. Yet parliament is called to control it, to revise the action of the government. We want the same thing here. We want the government to have the fullest power to send troops at a moment's notice to any part of the world. If parliament is called it could meet in fifteen days, in which time not much could have been done. The enrolment could not be half completed in fifteen days and no harm could have been done. But we want the proclamation on the statute-book, express and clear, that the people of Canada have placed their standing army, that is, our militia at the service of the British empire, at any moment or at any time. If the minister does not do that, he will awaken a sentiment in this country against the militia. I am for the militia ; I have helped the minister to get his estimates through this House, but if this kind of humbug is to prevail, if the feeling is to go abroad in Canada that the militia is being used as a tool not to save the empire but to break it up, we had better repeal this Act and throw it to the winds. Let me tell the minister that is the feeling that is growing. I had reason to talk to numbers of militiamen, and every one of them has alluded to this clause and put upon it only one interpretation, that it is intended to separate Canada from the empire eventually and this is one of the steps. If it is not, and hon. gentlemen realize the feeling that exists, why not resort to the old section or let him suggest whatever words he desires to have added to that section, and then the next time difficulty arises if he should be Minister of Justice he could have no doubt as to the power of the government to call out the militia and to send them to any part of the empire.

From a military standpoint, if the hon. Minister of Militia intends to use the militia for the defence of Canada, he must see that it is necessary to send them abroad for a blow may be struck at India which will destroy Canada, or that blow may be struck in South Africa or in the farthest islands of the sea without a shot being fired in Canada. The Minister of Militia must understand that. It is a matter of plain deduction that this empire may be broken in the farthest islands of the sea and that the government of Canada must have power to send the militia to defend the empire in whatever quarter it may be attacked.

Let the minister make it quite clear that we can send the militia to any part of the world.

Mr. MACLEAN. All I ask is that these limitations be removed. The government have only to strike out these words 'for the defence thereof.' The characteristic of the world to-day is the struggle for mastery in trade, industry and manufactures. There are great men in Europe, statesmen and crowned heads, who are constantly planning trade and industry which the British empire, for the removal of that supremacy in trade and industry which the British empire has to-day. These men are constantly planning in some way to destroy that British supremacy or any portion of it. In treating a question of this kind these men will go by what they find and when they take up the Canadian statutes and see that the statement that the militia force of Canada is only for the defence of Canada and that it cannot be sent out of the country for the defence of Canada, it will encourage them in their design. We do not want to let that impression go abroad ; do not let any enemy of the empire be able to use the Canadian statute-book to say : The army of Canada is only for the defence of Canada. Let these men know not only by our statute-book but by our actions, that the people of Canada are behind the empire every time. We have our parliamentary freedom and that being the case, we should not put on record a limitation on our actions.

It is true that our forces are called the active militia. It is an active militia in the sense that it is the citizens' army. It is the citizens' army and the only army we have, except for the permanent force which is provided for in this Act. If that permanent force is anything it is a regular army, and even this, a regular army of only 3,000 men, is governed by this Act so that it cannot be sent abroad for the defence of the empire. There is no reason then to change the law from what it was. This amendment certain-

ly appears to be a limitation of the previous law. Let us have this provision for the summoning of parliament, let us insist on having the absolute control of our own purse and our own men, but if the people and the government wish in an emergency—and in an emergency everything turns on immediate action—let us be free if the government care to assume the responsibility of sending the forces of Canada outside of Canada, whether for the defence of Canada or of the empire outside of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. After this Bill passes could the volunteers go to any part of the British empire ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Just the same as before.

Mr. SPROULE. What portion of the Bill gives them the right ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The section you are considering.

Mr. GOURLEY. Citizens of the United States could enlist in the same way to defend the British empire.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will answer my hon. friend. The troops we sent to South Africa were not sent under the militia law at all. They were sent under a special arrangement; they went as volunteers. The same thing could be done at any time. It certainly would not be done under the militia law, either as it was or as we propose to make it, because there is no essential difference. Notwithstanding the fact that my hon. friend from Colchester questions my possession of common sense, I still believe that the Act as we propose it is essentially the same in that respect as it was before, the object being to make clear the actual intention. Now, I do not propose to be drawn into the heroics that have been indulged in by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) and my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Gourley) except perhaps to make this one observation. I do not think there is any necessity for the people of Canada to advertise their loyalty to the British empire by putting it on the statute-book in any special form. The people of the British empire, and the people of the world at large, so far as they are interested in Canada, know full well what the loyalty of Canada is and what it means ; and it is appreciated in the proper quarter. It suits our hon. friends opposite on certain occasions to shout about their loyalty. It has suited them sometimes in the past, and I regret to say that they are engaged in the same enterprise now, if not in this House, outside of it, of endeavouring to cast some doubt upon the loyalty of the people who sit on this side of the House. I do not think it is necessary to go into that subject. I think the experience of the last few years has proved that there is no difference between the political parties in Canada as to their loyalty to Canada or their loyalty to the British empire. The very fundamental idea of a militia force always has been, and is now, home defence. In every portion of the British empire, without any exception, the same principle is laid down which is found in the Bill before the House—that the militia of that particular part of the British empire, including the British islands themselves, shall be limited in their service to the particular part of the empire in which they live. I have taken the trouble to examine the old militia laws of the different provinces which made up the Dominion of Canada, and in every one of those provinces we find the same limitation. It has always existed. Under these circumstances it is absurd to talk about service abroad.

Mr. GOURLEY. Why ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Because we are not fitted for service abroad without a special provision to that end ; and when the time comes, should it unfortunately come again, then parliament, under the provisions of the Bill we are proposing, will be immediately convened. In that respect this Bill is much more in the interest of service abroad, if we choose to give it ; because parliament will be immediately convened, and such steps will be taken as may be thought necessary and desirable by parliament towards the defence of the empire, should Canada desire to engage in that defence beyond the borders of Canada. The whole point is that a militia force is a force for home defence. The militia law of Great Britain expressly provides the limitation that the militia shall not serve beyond the United Kingdom. So it seems to me that our Bill meets the requirements which are met by similar legislation in every other part of the British empire. In addition to the authority we had in the past, we are now arranging that parliament shall automatically meet within fifteen days after any emergency that may arise, when parliament can take such steps, with the guidance of the government of the day, or independent of the government of the day, as it sees fit, for the support of the empire in any part of the world.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister has evidently declined to accept the amendment of the hon. member for East York, that the words 'for the defence thereof' be omitted. The old Act was quite different from this Bill. It read :

> Her Majesty may call out the militia, or any part thereof, for active service, either within or without Canada, at any time when it appears advisable so to do, by reason of war, invasion, or insurrection, or danger of any of them.

The new law simply reads : 'The Governor in Council'—not His Majesty, you will observe :

The Governor in Council may place the militia, or any part thereof, on active service anywhere in Canada, and also beyond Canada, for the defence thereof.

If the minister objects to the other words, I have an amendment which I purpose offering to the Bill. It is as follows :

The Governor in Council shall, subject to the conditions of the imperial service, accept the services of Canadian militiamen who volunteer to serve the empire on active service, in any part of the world, and shall have authority to equip and place them at the disposal of the imperial authorities, whether parliament be called, or in session or not, and shall incur the necessary expenses towards that end.

In regard to the service of the militia in the old country, I might just read from the Army Act, section 81 :

In 1859 a power was given to the sovereign to accept voluntary offers by the militia to serve in the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man ; this was extended by the Act of 1875 to serve in Malta and Gibraltar ; and as so extended was re-enacted in 1882.

I do not want any grins contradicting my statement.

Mr. FIELDING. There is nothing in the Act to prevent grins.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (reading) :

A further extension to any part of the world was made in 1898. At the same time the Crown was authorized to employ militiamen volunteering to serve, whether an order embodying the militia was in force at the time or not.

So that we find that the services of a militia corps in the United Kingdom may be utilized in any part of the world under the English law, that is, if they volunteer. And we find that certain individual militiamen, under the law, may be taken to any part of the British empire.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Under the British law the militia of the United Kingdom cannot be ordered for foreign service.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have said that also. I have said that volunteer offers may be taken.

Mr. GOURLEY. Does the minister say here that if a militia regiment of Canada volunteers to go abroad, he could, under this law, provide the money and send them to the front?

Mr. FIELDING. No, nor could he under the English law either.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is the point I want to make clear. Of course no power in Canada can prevent Canadian boys from enlisting in the imperial service. We owe allegiance to the imperial rather than to the Canadian service. If it should ever come to the test whether the people of Canada are to obey the mandate of the Governor in Council on the one hand or His Majesty in Council on the other, there would be no doubt or mistake as to which order will prevail. It will be the imperial order which the people of Canada will obey. We are Britons first, so far as the defence of the empire is concerned. That must be clearly understood, and if the Canadian government should undertake to issue a mandate preventing any volunteer in Canada from serving the British empire, the rebel would be the one standing by the Canadian government and not the one standing by the empire. So we find the English Act permitting the use of the militia of that country in any part of the British empire where they may choose to serve. We want the same thing in the Dominion. We want it provided that when a militiaman in the Dominion volunteers to serve the empire in time of war, it shall be the duty of the Canadian government to accept that service and to see that he is fitted out and sent on to take part in the imperial war. We do not want any hesitation such as was shown when the South African war broke out. We want no quibbling as to whether parliament or the Governor in Council has the right to order out the troops. We want it clearly understood that when Canadian boys volunteer their service to the empire for the defence of the empire in any part of the world, it shall not only be the right, but the duty of the Canadian government to take these men, fit them out and send them wherever Britain may require their services.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Permit me to draw the attention of the House to the fact that it is rather to be regretted that the hon. member for Kings, N.B., (Mr. Fowler) is not here at present, as I think he would benefit very largely by the lecture on loyalty to which we have just been treated. When this discussion was up, the hon. member for King's said (see page 6374 of 'Hansard') :

Mr. FOWLER. I do not quite understand the effect of the word 'emergency' here. In view of the powers given the government under section 77 ; powers by the way which I very strongly object to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What do you object to ?

Mr. FOWLER. I object to the word 'emergency' here because of the wide powers given the government in section 77 where the Governor in Council has power to send the militia out of Canada.

Mr. GOURLEY. He contradicted that afterwards.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Pardon me, my hon. friend's memory is not accurate. Then the discussion went on :

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. But only for the defence of Canada.

Mr. FOWLER. You can call almost anything the defence of Canada—you could call sending

the militia to any part of the British empire doing it for the defence of Canada. The Governor General in Council should not have power to do that ; that power should remain in the hands of parliament alone.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We have had that power for a long time.

Mr. FOWLER. That makes no difference, we are now discussing this Bill which makes changes in many directions and the existing law can be changed as well in this respect. I do not believe in this centralization of power in the Governor General in Council. It would seem that every Act passed in this parliament now inclines to give more power to the government of the day. Parliament has no right to divest itself of its inherent powers ; we are here as the repesentatives of the people and we should hold this power in our own hands,—

and a lot more to the same effect.

Mr. GOURLEY. If he said that, he ought to be ashamed of himself.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The hon. member for King's did not want the Governor in Council to have the power to send troops beyond Canada even for the defence of Canada. That was his position. What is ours ? It is that we are prepared to give the Governor in Council a blank power of attorney extending over fifteen days. The Governor in Council may send the militia of Canada out of Canada at any time, when deemed necessary for the defence of Canada. If, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, it should be necessary, because of a war going on in India, to send our militia out there for the defence of Canada, they may, in the exercise of their discretion, do it, because they are the sole judges of what is necessary to be done in defence of Canada. But we do not think it advisable that that power should be absolutely and unrestrictedly in the hands of the Governor in Council. We think it advisable that the period during which they may exercise that power should be restricted and that parliament should be called together and be consulted at the earliest opportunity. Parliament must be summoned in fifteen days and then the whole matter will be in the hands of the people's representatives. So far as we are concerned, it may be suggested that this is treason, and that we are separatists. But these are mere idle words which are being used for a purpose, and my hon. friends may as well understand that that purpose will not be served by all their vapouring, and that no sensible people attach the slightest consequences to their silly threats. Our loyalty does not consist exclusively of words and hot air. In the unpatriotic task in which my hon. friends are engaged, of endeavouring to create the impression here and abroad that the Liberal party, which represents the majority of the people, are a gang of separatists, they are simply holding themselves up to ridicule and no good purpose can be served by such methods. In any event, the position we take is that the Governor in Council must be controlled by parliament and parliament alone can decide, after the Governor in Council has taken the first step, the extent to which our troops may be moved out of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. If there is such a sentiment, what gave rise to it?

Mr. FIELDING. The statements of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. SPROULE. It could not be the action of the opposition, but must be the action of the government.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The words of the opposition.

Mr. SPROULE. Take the whole of the Militia Bill. It first does away with the General Officer Commanding, which is one of the ties connecting us with the imperial powers.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It does not do away with him.

Mr. SPROULE. It practically does away with it when we get the right to do away with it, and especially when we see the organs of the hon. gentlemen opposite declaring that the last General Officer Commanding has gone away and that the sending out of a general officer commanding from Great Britain will never be repeated. Are we not, then, justified in concluding that the trend of events under this government seems to be in that direction ? What interpretation do we put on the fact of the name of His Majesty being cut out so often from this Bill ? Does not that seem to weaken the tie ? A great many of the common people have so interpreted it, whether rightly or wrongly. But whose action gave rise to this belief? Was it the action of the opposition ? It could not be ; it was the action of the government. The Minister of Militia says that there is no necessity to advertise our loyalty by statute. But is it not better, by statute or in some other way, to let the world know where we stand and the power we possess as a portion of the British empire, rather than keep these things in the dark and make belief that we are not prepared to defend the empire ? It is merely putting it in the statutes that the world may read it and know that our position in the British empire is settled. We are supposed to be loyal people and we have a flag, the glorious Union Jack. But should the day come when that flag is hauled down at Gibraltar, or on the Red sea, or in any part of the world, what will be our position? The battle deciding the fate of the empire, and so deciding the fate of Canada might be in a distant country, and defeat for the empire would be as much a defeat for us as though the disaster took place upon Canadian soil. Is it to be said that we who have in our hands the power to go to the

defence of the empire are not to do it in an emergency ? I say that we do less than our duty if we are not prepared to do that. The Minister of Militia said that home defence is the destiny and duty of a militia. I differ with the hon. gentleman entirely on that point. I say that our militia in the wider sense of the term, means the defence of the empire to which we belong. If it does not mean that to hon. gentlemen opposite, at least the Canadian people believe that it does mean that or ought to mean that. That is what the loyal sentiment of this country stands for. And, if the law is not in accordance with the sentiment, let us amend the law and make it to read with the loyal sentiments of Canada.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Would the hon. gentleman allow me a moment to point out that not a single man of the militia of the United Kingdom can be ordered for service to this country, nor can a man of the militia of Australia or any part of the British empire.

Mr. SPROULE. But the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) forgets that the defence of the empire is largely in the hands of the navy and that the regular army of Great Britain takes part in that work of defence throughout the world. But we have no regular army. In time of danger we can only call the militia the only defence we have. It represents to us both the army and the navy, or, if it does not, then, it is not what we desire that it should be. We have no navy and no standing army, and our militia must represent both until our organization is changed, and for that reason we should not amend this Act in such a direction as to curtail our power. I am not much of a militiaman, and am not familiar with military life, but bringing my common sense to bear on this Act, I have reached the conclusion that, by these amendments, our powers are circumscribed. This Act does not enlarge, but narrows our powers, taking away the rights we had and making those rights less than we recognized them to be in the past, and confining them within the limits of Canada. Suppose, as one hon. gentleman has said, there were an attack upon Newfoundland, which is almost a part of Canada. Suppose that through some complication of the French shore difficulty, the French fleet should be found off Newfoundland some morning. Should we be obliged to sit here idle, because we have no power to assist in the defence of that part of the empire until parliament was called together? Would that be doing our duty to the empire? Yet, that is something that might happen any day. I say that the impression upon the popular mind—rightly or wrongly—is that the trend of these amendments is in the direction of limiting the powers more and more, circumscribing them by the bounds of Canada and not extending them to the bounds of the empire. Yet, were the British flag to be hauled down in any part of the world, how long would it remain over us in Canada. Not twenty-four hours. That being the case, it is incumbent upon us to be ready to do our part in the defence of the empire wherever that defence may be necessary, because in defending the empire we are defending ourselves.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. minister told us that when he was in England there were four points agreed upon by the imperial defence committee and himself. May I ask, with respect to the general officer commanding and the establishment of a council as referred to in sections 7 and 30 of the Bill, is there any correspondence between the hon. gentleman and the imperial authorities ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The business before the committee is the further consideration of section 77 and the amendment thereto.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is the same as was agreed on.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, by both the leader of the House and the leader of the opposition.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The leader of the opposition wishes me to read it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This is a new clause.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (reading) :

Whenever the Governor in Council places the militia or any part thereof, on active service anywhere in Canada or beyond Canada, for the defence thereof, if parliament be then separated by adjournment or prorogation as will not expire within ten days, a proclamation shall be issued for the meeting of parliament within fifteen days, and parliament shall accordingly meet and sit upon the day appointed by such proclamation, and shall continue to sit and to act in like manner as if it had stood adjourned or prorogued for the same day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does this follow the provision of the English statute in that respect ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, word for word.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why is it necessary to change the words of the former statute in view of the summoning of parliament ? Why is it desirable ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There was no provision in the former statute for call-

ing out the troops at all. This is an entirely new clause.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But you have altered the terms of the section from what they were before as to calling out the militia. Why do you require to do that if you have parliament summoned within fifteen days? Is not that a sufficient safeguard so far as concerns the use to which the militia might be put? It seems to me to be the greatest possible safeguard, and a proper safeguard, because in parliament you have the voice of the country acting upon the government and directing them in what the will of the country is.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have explained that there was no object except to make quite clear what the intention of the Act was. I think there never was any doubt as to the meaning of the Act, although the words, perhaps, were not so clear as they ought to be. 'For the defence thereof,' those words have been introduced so that it might be quite clear that the calling out of the militia to serve outside the country could not be done except for the purpose of the defence of Canada. I said this afternoon that the only object of the militia corps in, so far as I knew, in any country, at any rate in the British empire, is for home defence. The United Kingdom itself has passed a law providing that the militia shall not serve without the territory of the United Kingdom. The same idea is contained in all the militia laws of all parts of the empire and it did not seem to me that there would be any doubt upon that point. A good deal has been said this afternoon about this being a retrograde step. I do not understand that this law in its spirit differs in any way from the old law.

Mr. GOURLEY. Why not leave the old Act?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am sure my hon. friend would not pretend to say that under the law as it is to-day the government could send a corps of the militia upon foreign service.

Mr. GOURLEY. I have not the slightest doubt of it; you could send them anywhere.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am quite prepared to come to close quarters on that question and I am quite prepared to say that in so far as the militia are concerned I do not believe it is in the interests of the militia that a provision of that kind should be made.

Mr. GOURLEY. Why, every man in Canada wants to go.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not think the hon. gentleman himself would seriously contemplate a proposition by which the government would have authority to order the militia to serve a thousand miles away from Canada.

Mr. GOURLEY. Why not? What are we here for?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is for the hon. gentleman to explain that. I do not think that any thoughtful man looking at the condition of things in this young country——

Mr. GOURLEY. Explain yourself. Tell me what you mean.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN—would seriously propose to enact a statute which would place in the hands of any government the power of ordering out the militia to serve in distant parts of the world.

Mr. BARKER. That is the old Act.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is not the old Act. I have taken the trouble to go to the statute of old Canada and of the various provinces in this Dominion and there I have found that not one of them contains a provision by which the militia can be sent outside of the province itself. That being the case it seems to me that we may just as well understand where we are and I accept, fully, absolutely and entirely, myself, the responsibility for the proposition which is contained in this clause.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know that there is anything very extraordinary about that. It is usually supposed that when an hon. gentleman introduces a Bill into this House he accepts the responsibility for it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The hon. gentleman need not sneer at my statement. If he had been here this afternoon he would have heard all sorts of charges and insinuations against hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I cannot help what took place this afternoon. All I repeat is that when an hon. gentleman introduces a Bill into this House he is supposed to take full responsibility for it and there is nothing that seems extraordinary about that. I was not aware that the militia of the United Kingdom were confined in the way the hon. gentleman suggests. In a report of the recent army council it is put in this way: that the militia may be ordered for certain service out of the United Kingdom, but not the volunteers. Whether that is a correct statement of the law I do not know—

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN—but I can refer the hon. gentleman to the report in a few minutes. If my memory is not altogether at fault without having the document be-

fore me, that is what the report contains. But that is not precisely the point we are dealing with. Everything that the hon. gentleman said might be conceded and still no good reason shown for making this change in the law. The law which he proposes to change is this :

Her Majesty may call out the militia, or any part thereof, for active service either within or without Canada, at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of war.

What is the practical effect of it ? The practical effect of it is that it leaves the whole matter absolutely in the judgment of the executive of this country. There can be no doubt about that. There is no tribunal in Canada except the people of Canada which can call in question the judgment of the executive of Canada in taking action under that statute. After all it is entirely a question for the executive, for the government of Canada as controlled by parliament under the statute which the hon. gentleman proposes. I challenge any successful contradiction of that statement. Nobody in Canada except parliament and the people of Canada can call in question that action of the executive. Therefore, to all intents and purposes, the hon. gentleman is leaving the law as it was before except that he is adding certain words which he sees fit to insert in this statute advertising as it were that Canada is taking a little step away from the rest of the empire. That is what I do not like about it. It is the same in effect as it was before, precisely the same, but on the face of it it is not the same as it was before. It will not be considered as it was before by those who are looking on in foreign countries. That is the objection I have to it. If you leave the statute as it was, it will have precisely the same effect in operation as the statute which the hon. gentleman proposes. If the government of this country makes up its mind that the defence of Canada requires troops to be sent abroad, no tribunal in Canada can call that action in question except parliament and the people acting upon parliament. Therefore it is simply a matter for the judgment of the executive, but you have here this change in form which seems to me not advisable. I, myself, when this Bill was at a previous stage, suggested that we should follow the English provision as to the calling of parliament within fifteen days. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia spoke to me about it at the time. Ten days is the time fixed in Great Britain, twenty days was spoken of and eventually I told him that as far as my judgment was concerned I thought that fifteen days would be a fair time in this country considering our means of communication. I am absolutely in favour of that provision because I think parliament, here as in the mother country, should be called when a serious question of that kind confronts parliament and the people. It seems to me that if you have that you have every possible safeguard that you desire and I do not see any object in inserting certain words which would alter the effect in one way but which are liable to be misunderstood. That is the objection I have ; here are certain words which are liable to be misunderstood, and particularly liable to be misunderstood in other countries ; then why should we gratuitously and without really effecting any change in the law insert them ? I am willing to be convinced in this matter, I want to be absolutely reasonable about it, but does not that view of the matter commend itself to the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence ? Is he prepared to seriously controvert what I have said as to the effect of this change ? I think not. Is he seriously prepared to controvert the view that the calling of parliament in fifteen days must always operate as an effective safeguard ? If not, what is the good of changing the law in such a way as to make it liable to be misunderstood ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Mr. Chairman, I must say that I cannot see how there can be any misunderstanding. I cannot see why anybody in the world, the imperial authorities, for instance, will misunderstand the commonwealth of Australia or any one of the colonies, in which precisely the same restriction or even a more stringent restriction exists. Who is to call it in question ? I can tell the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) that as a matter of fact this proposed Bill has been before the imperial authorities for a whole year. It was before the imperial authorities on the occasion on which I had the honour to attend a meeting of the Defence Committee. It was discussed clause by clause and exception was taken to every clause to which objection could be taken, and I assert that the imperial authorities absolutely approved of this cluase and I am here to make that statement.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to ask the minister to be good enough to tell us who sit on this side of the House what objection he would have to clause 69 if it were altered in the way proposed by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean). It would then read :

The Governor in Council may place the militia or any part thereof on active service anywhere in Canada, and also beyond Canada, at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of emergency.

Coupling with that clause the amendment proposed (leaving out the words 'for the defence of Canada), whereby within fifteen days after the government so call out the militia, parliament must meet to consider what the cabinet have done. What possible

objection can there be ? Does the hon. gentleman suppose that there is a militiaman in Canada who would not take the risk of being called out in some great emergency for active service knowing that within fifteen days the parliament of Canada had to meet to rectify an error if error there should be on the part of the government ? Where is the militiaman from one end of this Dominion to the other who would not take the risk of being ordered out of Canada in such an emergency ? The hon. gentleman has said that gentlemen on this side of the House are desirous of advertising their loyalty.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman from Montmagny—I think it is—says 'hear, hear.' I have noticed several times that he has taken the opportunity of intervening with a sarcastic hear, hear, in this debate. I repeat that there is not from end to end of this Dominion, in any of the provinces, I do not care in what province, any militiaman who will object to the risk of being ordered out by the government of Canada for active service, knowing that parliament must be called within fifteen days to pass upon that order. Any militiaman who would object is not worthy of being a member of the militia of Canada. He is not worthy of the name of Canadian, because we all know that such an order would never be made by any government of Canada except in extreme emergency. Take the case mentioned by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). Suppose that some foreign nation attacked Newfoundland. Are we to remain sitting in our chairs doing nothing, not even making necessary preparations that the fifteen days would allow us, because the hon. gentlemen have put upon the statutes a provision that the militia must only act for the defence of Canada ? The hon. Minister of Militia laughs. He puts such words in the statute that they cannot even make the order to call out the active militia except for the defence of Canada. What would the taking of Newfoundland by some foreign nation mean to Canada ? In fifteen days, as is suggested by my friend beside me (Mr. Gourley), Newfoundland might become the possession of a foreign nation. What would that mean to Canada ? Does the hon. gentleman suppose that if such an emergency should arise any militiaman from east to west of this land, would object to turning out in the defence of the empire though not in the defence of Canada ? Defending Newfoundland would not be defending Canada.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It might.

Mr. BARKER. It might, but in the opinion of the government of the day it might not. We know well enough that in 1899 when the fate of the whole British empire, including the fate of Canada, was at stake the First Minister thought Canada was not interested. The Minister of Militia will not deny that that is the case. I assert that to be a statement made by the First Minister of Canada ; in the time of the South African war when the very fate of Great Britain and of every colony of Great Britain was at stake, the First Minister allowed himself to be interviewed and his interview was published in the Toronto 'Globe' of, I think, October 4th, 1899, and he stated in that interview that the government of Canada had no power under the Militia Act to intervene ; they could not send a soldier, they could not pay a dollar. Why, Sir, what a disgrace it would have been to this Dominion had we not intervened ! Canada would never have recovered from that disgrace. But, Sir, within ten days after that the government found the means of doing what the Militia Act, according to their contention, did not enable them to do. The old Act, the Act which is in force at this minute, was not clear, it was subject to some doubt, the Minister of Justice tells us. But what does the Minister of Militia want to do ? Does he want, in removing all doubt, to make the change in the interests of the British empire ? No, not a bit of it. The hon. gentleman wants to change in the opposite direction and to make it absolutely clear that we cannot and shall not interfere in such a case. That is what these gentlemen are doing and that, Sir, is what we object to. Now we say that the people of every part of this Dominion are willing in such a great emergency as war to leave to the ministry of the day, whether that ministry be Liberal or Conservative, the power of calling out the militia. They are willing to do that with the constitutional safeguard which the hon. gentlemen propose that within fifteen days after the order is pronounced, parliament shall be called together to say yes or no, to the decision that the active militia shall be sent beyond our borders. Who is going to object to that ? Who can object to it ? I think if he were to tell that to the militia of Canada they would say that they would like to have another Minister of Militia. They would tell him he is not the kind of minister they want in the interests of this Dominion. I say that having regard to the law as it stands, to the fact that the Minister of Militia tells us that the law he now proposes does not materially alter the law as it stands, the old law confers no greater power on the government than the law he proposes, and therefore he would do well in the interest of Canada to leave it as it is. Why does he want to make the change ? He wants to accentuate the question that was raised in 1899, as to the power of Canada to interfere on behalf of the British empire, even if the empire's very life was at stake. The hon. gentleman wants to put it beyond doubt that he cannot interfere. He is seek-

ing not to enable us to interfere, but absolutely to prevent us from interfering, no matter how dire the need might be. If there were any danger to be apprehended from leaving the law as it is, one could understand it; but the hon. gentleman has not attempted to show that there is a danger. When was any question ever raised under the law except in regard to the South African war? And yet at that time what did the people of Canada say? Why, the government were actually kicked into sending assistance to the empire in South Africa. That is the fact, hon. gentlemen know it, and this government want to put themselves in the position that they cannot get another kick of the same kind.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. At the time of the Egyptian war the Conservative government would not send a man.

Mr. BARKER. The Postmaster General does not attempt to answer what I have just said. His reply is the reply of the little blackguard in the street who puts his finger to his nose and says: You-re another. Is it not time to have that sort of thing stopped in this country? Suppose the Conservative party did fifty times what the hon. gentleman and his colleagues sought to do in 1899, is that any excuse?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It shows how insincere the hon. gentleman's remarks are.

Mr. BARKER. I am very much obliged to the hon. gentleman. I can only say that I stand here to justifiy myself. The hon. gentleman was in parliament on both occasions. He had the opportunity in 1899 of knowing how wrongfully, according to his opinion, his opponents had previously acted, and instead of taking warning by their errors, he simply followed a bad example. I do not propose to do that, and if the Conservative party had done tenfold wrong——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman would endorse it.

Mr. BARKER. I say I am prepared to do right now, and as far as I can, I will try to compel the hon. gentleman to do right. Now, I say, that the old law has worked no harm. Hon. gentlemen opposite admit that in 1899——

Mr. BOURASSA. I rise to a point of order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but for a long time I have felt that this whole discussion was out of order. Clause 77 of the Bill has already been adopted by the committee over two weeks ago. The motion proposed by the Minister of Militia is a new clause, and we have no right to discuss a clause which has already been adopted.

Mr. BARKER. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that there is an amendment before you.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Sir Frederick Borden moves to amend the Bill by inserting a new clause entitled 77a after clause 77, and that is the question before the committee at the present time.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does that not include the words 'for the defence of Canada,' to which the hon. member for Hamilton is taking exception?

Mr. BOURASSA. I respectfully submit that the question of the defence of Canada in clause 77 has been settled by this committee. Of course, I know that there are other means of bringing up the question again.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to suggest that when an amendment is proposed, that amendment may have a bearing on other clauses which have been passed and may have to be reconsidered; and all that is necessary to put a member in order is to move the reconsideration of the other clause.

Mr. BARKER. The same words are introduced into the two clauses. If you omit them from this, you will probably have to go back and omit them from the other. Therefore one cannot very well discuss the amendment without discussing the two clauses together. The whole question must be discussed as one question. If the words 'for the defence thereof' are not in this amendment, the whole law must be changed. I object to these words as absolutely unnecessary according. to the statement of the Minister of Militia himself. He is conveying not only to the empire at large, but to every other people, that Canada has laid down distinctly in its statutes that it will never use its militia except for the defence of Canada.

That is what I object to in the words proposed by the Minister of Militia. If we are to say openly to the world that we will never do anything with our militia, under any circumstances whatever, except for the mere defence of our country, why do we belong to the British empire? Are we to receive support from the British navy? Are we to live under he British flag? Are we to refer to this statute to the British empire or the King of Great Britain, and while referring to the King of Great Britain, and over again—much as we have done to eliminate him from the statute—are we to say, that under no circumstances whatever, shall we intervene in a British war except for our own selfish purposes? No matter if the British empire were to be dissolved and crushed, we will remain still, we will never move, the government of Canada shall have no power even to call out for fifteen days the active militia, provided the emergency that has arisen is not one directly affecting our own Dominion. Surely every Canadian who

claims to be a British subject must see the impropriety of inserting such words in this statute. I observe again the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne) laughing when I used the words 'British subject.'

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I ask the hon. gentleman to recall that statement entirely. I think my loyalty is quite equal to his.

Mr. BARKER. I said not a word about your loyalty.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. You said that I was sneering when you used the term 'British subject.' I am as proud as any one here of being a British subject, and whilst I have the opportunity, I would like to remind the hon. gentleman that if he is to-day a British subject, he owes that privilege to us French Canadians. If the British flag is floating in Canada to-day and if you can keep your two hands to-day upon it—to use a favourite motto of your dear friend who has just left our shores—you owe that to the French Canadians who saved it in 1776 and 1812, and hon. gentlemen opposite, with their tin swords, paper cocked hats and rocking horses are not likely to be the saviours of their country or more necessary to the defence of Canada than we are.

Mr. BARKER. I do not propose to enter into any discussion with the hon. gentleman as regards who saved Canada. I am only speaking for myself as a British subject, and as I would speak if the hon. gentleman had never existed or any person of his race. I am quite as willing as any one to admit French Canadian loyalty, but for my part I deny that my existence as a British subject is due to the hon. gentleman or any of his.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. He did not say that. He said that Canada to-day was indebted to the loyalty of French Canadians in 1776 and 1812 for the preservation of the flag over the eastern part of this Dominion and practically over this country, and I say so too.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman can let the hon. member speak for himself.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I can speak for him and for myself as well.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman did not get up to speak for himself but for the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne). I deny what the hon. member for Montmagny has said so far I am concerned.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Then you have not read your history aright.

Mr. BARKER. I have read as much history as you have. I am quite willing to admit what French Canadians have done in the past. We are all proud of what they have done in the past, but it is also proper that we should not forget what the men in Ontario have done in the past. They have fought and bled for their country just as well as their neighbours, but they do not perhaps boast unnecessarily of it, and I do not think the hon. gentleman need boast too much, either. We are glad to admit and always shall, what the men of Quebec did. We will never deny it. But that does not prevent us to-day from objecting to anything being put in a statute of this Dominion that will at all detract from what may be thought by the world at large of the loyalty of Canadians to the British empire. The moment we put in a statute only unnecessary words such as are proposed by the Minister of Militia, we will leave the world at large to believe that we are departing from that loyalty to the British empire which we all feel so sincerely. I do not want to occupy longer the time of the House, but I say this, that if there were any necessity shown for these words, I would not object to them. I am not disposed to put the government of the day above parliament. I say that the government of the day must be subject to parliament, but when it comes to a question of this nature—and it is only a matter of fifteen days that is in controversy—I say it is ridiculous to stipulate that the Dominion of Canada, the people of Canada, cannot, in some great emergency which alone could call upon the government to send its troops out of this Dominion, allow their government free action during fifteen days to organize the militia of Canada and then call parliament together to pass upon their action. Why, Sir, what do fifteen days or thirty days mean in the calling out of the militia? Before the fifteen days were over the men would hardly be assembled at their headquarters. It would take fifteen days to gather them together at their various barracks and drill-sheds, and it is to be supposed that we must not allow the government of the day to call them out, when within fifteen days after the order goes forth to call them out, the government must call parliament together. Does anybody suppose that there can be any possible danger to the liberties of the people or any danger to the militia of Canada being sent against their will out of the country? Is there any danger that parliament cannot prevent it? Before a man of them could be sent out of this Dominion, parliament would meet and put an end to it, if the government happened to be wrong. But the government do not want to leave it in their own power even to do such a thing, no matter how great the necessity may be. They are not willing that even they or their political opponents should have the power. They want to put it in black and white on the statutes that they cannot do it. Surely we may well protest against that. Surely we may look upon it as offensive to our fellow British subjects

throughout the world that we should proclaim upon our statute-book that we would not do such a thing in the defence of the empire. We are not saying that the government should have unrestricted power to send them out, but that they should have it subject to the reasonable safeguard that exists in the old law as it stood, which would give all the protection needed and avoid conveying to the world the offensive idea that we are not prepared to do our duty to the empire at large.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not wish to impute motives to anybody in the House, but it does seem to me difficult to understand what possible good such a speech as that just delivered by the hon. gentleman can possibly serve. I am afraid that he is not so much exercised as to what the rest of the world may think about this particular section of the statute as he is anxious by hook or by crook to say something or do something that will prejudice a certain portion of the people against this government. The hon. gentleman has asked, with an affectation of much anxiety, what the world will think, and what the rest of the British empire will think of Canada—though I have told him over and over again that upon the statute-book of every colony of the British empire is to be found precisely the same provision as he is now criticising. And, Sir, upon the statute-book of the mother country herself, the hon. gentleman will find this :

Section 12, part 3. Any part of the militia shall be liable to serve in any part of the United Kingdom but no part of the militia shall be carried or ordered to go out of the United Kingdom.

Why, the hon gentleman out-Herods Herod. He is more loyal than the King. But let him look at the statute-book of that colony which, I believe, according to its population and means sent more men and spent more money than any other part of the British empire in the South African war—I refer to New Zealand—and in the Militia Act of that colony he will find the following :

The Governor may, by a proclamation in the 'Gazette,' direct the commander of the forces, to draw out with all convenient speed all of the defence forces therein for actual service, and to lead the said forces into any part of the district or colony which may seem best and to which such forces can be lawfully taken.

And the same thing is true of the law of Australia :

Members of the defence force who are members of the military forces shall not be required, unless they voluntarily agree to do so, to served beyond the limits of the Commonwealth and those of any territory under the authority of the Commonwealth.

Now, Mr. Chairman, coming back for a moment to the present law, the hon. gentleman says that we are doing something against the best interests of Canada, something that will prejudice Canada in the eyes of our sister colonies and of the mother country. Let me ask him to look at the present law and say, if he can, that under that law—taking not a single clause, but the law as it stands on the statute-book—the government of Canada can order out the militia to serve in South Africa or any other part of the world. He will not say so.

Mr. BARKER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to answer his question ? I do not say we can. But I ask, that being the case, why alter the law ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN—To make it absolutely clear, to make it as clear as it is upon the statute-book of the United Kingdom or upon the statute-book of other colonies. Why, what is the very title of this law ? It is a law relating to the militia and defence. What is the very essence of militia ? As I have said before, the underlying first principle of a militia organization—as any man who is familiar with the history of militia organization or military law knows—the prime object and the sole object of a militia is to defend the homes of the people. But the hon. gentleman went out of his way to find excuse for some quite unnecessary sneers at the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) with reference to the action which was taken in the time of the South African war. Well, I would recommend that hon. gentleman to read the debate which took place the other day in the imperial parliament, and especially to read what Mr. Arnold-Foster had to say as to the Prime Minister of Canada. He will find, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Arnold-Foster, the Secretary of State for War in the imperial government, said that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Prime Minister of Canada, had rendered most distinguished service during the troubles in South Africa. It is a little too late—yes, and it is in exceedingly bad taste—for the hon. gentleman, at this time of day, to sneer at the Prime Minister of this country. In that connection, let me point to the fact that this country came to the assistance of the mother country in South Africa. And how ? Under the existing militia law which the hon. gentleman is so afraid to have touched ? Not at all, but by the voluntary offer of services from the people of this country. Does the hon. gentleman wish this country to embark upon the dangerous proceeding of preparing to take part in foreign wars ? Is that the policy of the hon. gentleman ? I think we have enough to do to attend to our own affairs. And, in my humble opinion we shall best serve the empire by making ourselves solid at home and preparing to defend our own soil. But the hon. gentleman says that we shall appear in bad form before other portions of the British empire.

Does he know that, in addition to the fact that the great commonwealth of Australia has precisely the same provisions upon its statute-book that we are putting upon ours that great commonwealth has persistently and determinedly refused to invest a single dollar of its money in a navy to go beyond the seas immediately surrounding Australia ? Yet the hon. gentleman presumes to sneer at this government, and presumes to say that the slight alteration that is being made in this statute is something that is going to reflect upon the character of Canada. Well, Sir, in conclusion, let me tell him, repeating what I said this afternoon, that the loyalty of Canada and the power of Canada to aid the mother country are too well known to make it necessary to place any declaration upon the statute-book. The statute we have here and this provision of it is, as I have said, entirely in accord with the spirit of the militia force—it is that and nothing more. And the attempt of the hon. gentleman and others to prejudice the people of this country against this government, on this ground is unworthy of the hon. gentleman and of this parliament.

Mr. BARKER. I want to say one word in allusion to a remark of the Minister of Militia. He says I sneered at the First Minister. I alluded to the opinion expressed by the First Minister in 1899, when he said that the old Act, the one that is now in force, prevented the government sending the active militia out of Canada for any purpose not Canadian. I said that the Minister of Justice expressed the same opinion. I referred to these opinions when I asked the Minister of Militia, as I did ask, under these circumstances, what was the need of altering the law.

Mr. TALBOT. I ask the hon. gentleman what he meant when he said that the government, including the Prime Minister, had been kicked into doing what they did do.

Mr. BARKER. That is so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As the Minister of Militia has read a statute apparently in conflict with something I referred to, I would like to read from a report of a royal commission on the militia and volunteers, which has been recently made public in Great Britain. This report was made under a Royal Warrant bearing date 23rd April, 1903. The second paragraph of the first division of the report is as follows :—

> The function of the volunteer force has always been held to be the support of the regular forces in the protection of the United Kingdom against 'actual or apprehended invasion,' while that of the militia has been two-fold ; this force having had the same duties as the volunteer force in the event for which the volunteers would be called out for active service, and further, having at all times come forward, and frequently been used, as a supplement to the regular army during war for garrison duties both at home and abroad and even for field service abroad.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Purely as volunteers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I don't know about that. I suppose there must be some statute or some authority vested in the government which would enable that to be done.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, there is.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And it was in that view I suggested that the militia of the United Kingdom might be sent abroad under the authority of the government or of parliament, because I had distinctly in my mind this paragraph which I had read not long before. It would appear therefore that there must be some statutory provision in the legislation of the United Kingdom beyond that to which the hon. gentleman has referred ; otherwise the report of the commission, headed by the Duke of Norfolk, could hardly have been couched in the terms I have just read. They are very significant, because it says the volunteers are purely for the protection of the United Kingdom against actual or apprehended invasion.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Those words in the report 'having at all times come forward and frequently been used' would suggest that they themselves had volunteered.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, they could not be sent beyond the limits of the country, it seems to me, without some statutory provision, without some vote of parliament at least. Certainly, it is perfectly plain that their use has not been confined to the defence of the United Kingdom. They have, as distinctly stated in this report, been used for garrison duty both at home and abroad.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. On their volunteering to do so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know whether they cease to become militia on becoming volunteers. The report may be ambiguous on that point ; it certainly does not say so, because it distinguishes them from the militia all through ; and with regard to the use to which the militia has been put, it is still distinctly spoken of as distinct from the volunteers.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. What is the meaning of those words 'on coming forward' ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That would seem to suggest volunteering.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On the other hand, you would hardly suppose they would be regarded as militia if they ceased to have the status of a militia and became volunteers, or an integral part of the regular army. Of course there is nothing to prevent the men of the militia from entering the regular army.

As pointed out in this report, the regular army in Great Britain is recruited from the ranks of the militia more largely than from any other source. That is one objection which is pointed out in this report to the actual conditions as they exist in Great Britain at the present time ; the ranks of the militia are continually depleted by the best men leaving the militia and becoming recruits in the regular army. However my suggestion to the Minister of Militia was simply this, that no good purpose, it seemed to me, could be obtained by altering the law from what it was before. You will still have a government responsible for acting one way or the other, for sending troops out of Canada or refraining from doing so. The only tribunal to which an appeal can be made is parliament, and if parliament is to be summoned within fifteen days, where after all is the great advantage in altering the wording of the statute ?

Mr. FIELDING. The explanation of the report which the hon. gentleman has read will be found in the English statute in which, after first distinctly stating that the militia shall not be ordered abroad, it goes on to provide that where men volunteer they may within a limited area be used in service abroad, but the limitation refers particularly to the Jersey Islands, the Channel Islands, Guernsey, the Isle of Man, and they may go as far as Malta and Gibraltar ; but only to that extent, and then only when they volunteer.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman is right up to a certain year, and since that year he is entirely wrong. I will read a summary of the law which says :

> In 1859 a power was given to the sovereign to accept voluntary offers by the militia to serve in the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man ; this was extended by the Act of 1875 to service in Malta and Gibraltar ; and as so extended was re-enacted in 1882. A further extension to any part of the world was made in 1898. At the same time the Crown was authorized to employ militiamen volunteering to serve, whether an order embodying the militia was in force at the time or not.

Every man in South Africa saw some of those volunteers in the militia uniform of the regular army ; and they have served in other parts of the world since 1898.

Mr. FIELDING. The law to which I referred and which was placed in my hand by some friend, was passed in 1882. My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) corrects me to the extent of saying that under a later amendment volunteers may go to any part of the world. But it is only when they volunteer; and the main fact still remains that the militia of Great Britain cannot be ordered beyond the confines of the United Kingdom. That, I am advised, is the law.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would judge from the statutes, which I have not examined carefully, that they cannot go without their own consent. Still they go as an embodied part of the militia.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There is nothing in the law to prevent them if they choose to volunteer. The government has no power in Great Britain, I understand, to order the militia of Great Britain to serve outside the United Kingdom. What the law may permit a man to do if he desires to do it of his own motion, is entirely a different matter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman appreciates what I was trying to convey to the Minister of Finance. I was merely suggesting that they go as a body of militia with their consent.

Mr. GALLIHER. Volunteer militia, I think they are called.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If I do not make myself clear to the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) I am unfortunate. The militia are embodied in a regiment, a particular number of men are embodied in a regiment of militia. That regiment of militia cannot be ordered beyond the confines of the United Kingdom, but if the men, or a large number of men, are willing to go, then that regiment can go as a regiment of militia.

Mr. GALLIHER. As volunteers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, they do not go under the English law as volunteers ; they go as a regiment.

Mr. FIELDING. I would almost think that was correct. But still the main point remains ; if the whole regiment were to volunteer and go as a body they would still be a body of militia and the Act contemplates that that can be done, but it is subject to the main provision of the statute that the militia shall not be carried or ordered out of the United Kingdom.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, the subject before us is of no little importance to the country and of no little importance to the future well-being of Canada. It is to be regretted that there have come up in the debate in regard to this measure some expressions that would seem to reflect or cast a doubt on the loyalty of a part of the people of this country, but I believe that when I look over the faces of the members of this House who are reflecting the opinions of the people of the whole of Canada there is no disloyalty in Canada. I believe I can speak for this House, and speaking for this House speak for the country when I say that Canada stands for the integrity of the empire not only in sentiment, not only in vapouring, speech not only in discussion in parliament, but for the integrity of the empire embodied in the legislation placed on the statute-book. Therefore, I say it is of no little importance that the world

should know, that Great Britain should know that we are taking no retrograde step in this regard and that we are content with the statute as the statute formerly was upon this question. I have been met and others may perhaps have been met with this reflection while visiting in the old land : 'You speak and boast of your loyalty and you pride yourself upon being a part of the British empire. What are you doing for the British empire ? Your loyalty is very cheap. It is costing you nothing for the maintenance of your independent status or for the support of the army or the navy'— I would like to be able to point to the fact that we are not taking any retrograde step in this regard not only as regards the speeches made on the stump, at social gatherings, or elsewhere, but I would like to be able to point to the statute-book and say : We are doing something and we are willing to do something to maintain the integrity of the empire. The Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) has repeated that the only underlying principle upon which the existence of the militia is based is the defence of the country. The same might be said in regard to every armed force. No armies are organized now for aggression or conquest. They are ostensibly for the protection of the country and of the trade of the country in which they are formed. It may be that their warfare may be waged a long way from home as we may have to protect the interests of Canada a long way from Canada, but if we would regard ourselves as a part of the empire we would be able to bear our share of the burden and responsibility of the empire and in so doing we would be doing something to show that in this regard we are not taking any retrograde step. We ought to be willing to give Great Britain the support of our statute legislation so that they may see that there is no doubt upon the question, and if doubt or ambiguity exists, let it be eliminated by expressing in unmistakable language that we are not taking any backward step, that we are holding as firm to those principles that we have professed in past years to-day as ever we have done and that we are ready and willing as ever to assist the empire. I believe that in doing so we are simply expressing the sentiments of our country. I do not think that there is any part of Canada, that there is any political party in it, that there is any province in which there is any sentiment of disloyalty. We are proud of the empire to which we belong and I believe that there are thousands of Canadians who would be willing to wipe away the reproach which is cast upon us to-day by the question ; What are you doing and what are you willing to do for the maintenance of the empire ? We are all intensely interested in this question and we ought to be willing to make good our professions. If we take a little step in advance of other parts of the empire what does it matter ? It is only our right, it is only our duty. We have no standing army, we have no navy, we are contributing very little in that regard. but if we are able to say: 'We have a militia in Canada, an armed force, and we are not only willing to stand up in defence of our borders at home but for the defence of the empire, wherever we are called upon,' we would have the backing of the whole of the Dominion of Canada in doing so.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hon. gentlemen opposite are losing the real point that I raised this afternoon. The hon. Minister of Militia and Defence says that the militia of Great Britain cannot be ordered without the United Kingdom. He to-day is taking power to move the militia of Canada out of this country and in moving them out to say when they go forth that they must go forth only for the defence of Canada. He has limited the movement of the force of Canada by putting it on the statute-book that if they go without the country they can go out in order to assist in the defence of Canada. That is an unfair position to put the people of Canada in. They want to be free and this parliament ought to be free, if the power is given to move the militia out of Canada, to send them out for any purpose, the defence of the empire or the defence of Canada. I think there is no good reason why a limitation of this kind should be made. I agree with my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Richardson). These are growing times, the empire is growing and if Canada can lead the empire, can lead Australia, New Zealand and other colonies, and if we say we are ready not only to maintain our own defence but to send our forces without Canada to assist in defending the empire we are only going along the line of progress. I agree also with what has been said about the loyalty of Canadians. We have no doubt as to the loyalty of Canadians. I would be very willing to see my hon. friend from Labelle Minister of Militia in this country. I would just as soon see the chief command of the forces of Canada in the hands of a French Canadin as in those of a British Canadian. I have every confidence in him and I am sufficient of a Canadian to say that I want to see the supreme command in Canada in the hands of a Canadian. I will never be ashamed of it. I say that we have men in this country competent to command our militia. There is not a citizen of this country not capable of being Minister of Militia and that being the case do not put a restrictive meaning on the position that we in Canada are prepared to take. Let it be known to all the world that not only are we prepared to defend our own country, but send our troops outside of Canada not

only for the defence of Canada, but for the defence of the empire and of her trade at any time.

Mr. GALLIHER. I think a matter of this kind should be discussed dispassionately on both sides. I do not consider that fireworks or declamations are necessary to the production of a convincing argument. The proposition before us is as to whether we shall place in the hands of the government the power to say not only that the militia of Canada shall be sent out of Canada in defence of Canada, but also that it may be sent to any part of the world in defence of the British Empire. I think the latter is too great a power to place in the hands of the government. If it is necessary surely the parliament of Canada, representing the people, should be the first body to determine whether or not the militia should be sent abroad to fight the wars of the mother country.

Let us be as patriotic as we desire, yet we know as reading men, we know as thinking men that these things have occurred in the past and may occur in the future, that the mother country may be the aggressor, and may enter upon a war for the purpose of aggrandisement or the acquisition of territory. Those days are not dead in the world. It is yet possible that Great Britain or any other nation may go to war for this purpose. Suppose that such a war should be declared by Great Britain, a war for the purpose of aggrandisement. Are we going to say that any government shall have power to say to the militia of Canada : 'You shall go forth to aid in that war,' even although we may believe it to be an unjust or unreasonable war ? I say that power should be in the hands of the representatives of the people. The amendment of that section will still leave it in the hands of the people's representatives to decide whether or not our militia should go forth to take part in a war whether that war is or is not a war in which we as a part of the British empire are interested. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Richardson) has made the statement that he is frequently met with the question : Why do you not contribute something towards keeping up the British army or navy, contribute something towards the defence of the empire ; you are doing nothing. Let me tell the hon. member that when the people of Canada are elevating the standard of the militia here, or when they will, as I hope they will in the near future, provide a certain coast protection by way of a navy, I say that we are contributing towards the defence of the empire. We are contributing just as materially and I claim we are contributing more materially towards the defence of the empire, when we elevate the standing of our own army than we would be by paying in dollars and cents so much into the British treasury which might be expended elsewhere than in Canada. That I say is to my mind a sufficient answer to any person who makes the accusation that we are not contributing anything towards imperial defence. I do not think that any one in this House, I doubt if there is a citizen in all Canada who entertains the slightest doubt in his mind of the fact that when the time comes, if it should come, that Great Britain while engaged in a just war in a just cause needs the assistance of Canada she will only have to ask for it ; aye, she will not even have to ask for it, the sons of Canada will be ready to offer their services as they did in the South African war.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why not put it in the statute ?

Mr. GALLIHER. Reference has been made to certain portions of this country as being indifferent to defence. I do not think that is a fair statement. I would call attention to the fact that of the very first quota of men that ever went from Canada to engage in the service of the imperial government some twenty years ago,—I refer to the expedition to the Soudan—three-fourths were French Canadians. I knew this personally, I know the class of men who were in that party. I will state that no abler, more energetic, more loyal or more faithful body of men ever left the shores of Canada than the contingent that sailed from Canada in 1884. I speak from personal experience, I speak because I know whereof I speak, I speak because I myself worked and slept side by side with these men, and I cannot permit any reflection to be cast by any hon. member of this House upon them.

Mr. LANCASTER. Who said anything against them ?

Mr. GALLIHER. It was read this afternoon.

Mr. LANCASTER. Not a word.

Mr. GALLIHER. I know whereof I speak, I heard it. I say that no statement of that kind should be made. Of course if it is done for political purposes—I will not say it is, for I suppose it would not be parliamentary for me to say it is—but if it is for political purposes, it may be one way of playing the game. Perhaps it is justified, but at all events it is unfair. The hon. member for Colchester differed with the hon. Minister of Justice and the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence as to the interpretation of the section of the old Act with regard to the meaning of the phrase 'either within or without Canada.' It appeared to be in his mind if I understood him correctly that under the Act as it stands now, the government could send soldiers to any part of the empire. There may be many others not only lawyers but laymen who may hold

the same opinion as the hon. member. If there are such men is it not well that we should amend the section so that there can be no doubt upon that subject, so that whereas the government can order out the militia for the defence of Canada yet when it comes to deciding the question of sending the militia outside of Canada to take part in a war between Great Britain and a foreign power, parliament should have the right to decide as to whether those troops should be ordered out or not? Lawyers do not always agree.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is the hon. member a lawyer?

Mr. GALLIHER. Well, I play at it sometimes. I do not agree with the conclusion reached by the hon. member for Colchester, because I take it we are legislating on matters pertaining to Canada and to Canada only, and I think reading this section and keeping in mind the fact that this legislation has regard to our own country, that these are the statutes of Canada, not statutes affecting Great Britain in any way, the meaning of the words 'within or without Canada' would be and could only be that something directly affecting Canada not indirectly affecting it, was involved. He may be correct and I may be wrong: I am simply stating that there is that difference of opinion between us, and with that difference of opinion existing between us, it seems to me that the government are acting wisely in placing that beyond question, by carrying this amendment. I do not think because we make this amendment that any feeling should arise that we are striking a blow at the loyalty of the people of Canada towards the British empire. I think if we do, we must think in our minds that there is a sinister motive in doing this. If I correctly apprehend the feeling of the people of Canada towards the mother country, neither this government nor any other government in Canada could have a sinister motive, which I take it was almost imputed by some members who spoke on the other side of the House.

If I gauge correctly the feeling of the people of Canada towards the mother country, it is absurd to charge this or any other government with any such sinister motives such as were almost imputed to this government by some hon. members who spoke on the opposite side. I cannot imagine that any government could make this change with any such motives in view. It is certainly drawing a very strained conclusion to charge any government, considering the relations that now exist between Canada and the mother country, with wanting to alter our status in any way so as to weaken those relations. Were I on the opposition side I should be sorry to think such a thing possible, and being a supporter of the government and also a British subject, and proud of the fact, I would be doubly sorry to imagine that any such motive could actuate the present administration.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The hon. member for Yale (Mr. Galliher) has imputed to me sentiments to which I certainly gave no expression. I did not say anything to advocate that we should contribute to the support of the British navy or army. What I said was that I met with the reproach on the other side of the Atlantic that we held our loyalty very cheap and that it cost us nothing. I would like to be able to point to the statutes of Canada and say: here is our legislation, this is what we are doing and are prepared to do by our militia. There is no use disguising the fact, we may boast as we like about being a great country and a great nation, we are a small nation, but live in the hopes of becoming a great one some day. But we are great to-day in this, that we are in close unity with the empire and therefore every tendency which has the slightest appearance of weakening that union should be avoided as much as possible. On the contrary it would be better for Canada to strengthen her own position and strengthen the empire by giving moral support to Great Britain in every cause she adopts. We should not go back but take a step forward, and if necessary legislate ahead of what the other colonies have done in that regard. We want no standing army, but there is no reason why we should not to a certain extent give a larger sphere to the militia of this country than is given in the old country or the other provinces. It would be to the benefit of Canada to do this. Of that there can be no doubt. It is to be deplored that we would do anything which would have a semblance of weakening the ties which we believe do exist between Canada and the empire. Let us feel more and more that we are an integral part of the empire; and being proud of our citizenship, we should be willing to do our share in defence of it.

Mr. GALLIHER. I wish to set myself right with my hon. friend. I did not intend to impute anything to him that he did not say. I merely referred to him for the purpose of saying that when such statements were made to him, as he said were, the answer to them was—and I think it a sufficient answer—that the best way in which we could contribute to the defence of the empire was by improving in Canada our own forces and our own resources. I did not intend to say anything further.

Mr. FIELDING. After a somewhat protracted debate, it seems pretty clear that our differences are merely in form and words and not in substance. In the early part of the discussion it was assumed that some material change was proposed in the clause; but as the debate proceeded it was made clear that such was not the case. My

hon. friend the leader of the opposition suggested that if we would permit the law to remain exactly as it is, its effect would be precisely the same as it would be under the amendment proposed. I believe my hon. friend is right and that the difference is only in form and in words ; and that being the case, it is a pity we should any longer protract the debate. I would ask my hon. colleague the Minister of Militia to go on with the other clauses, reserving this, and see if some other form cannot be adopted which will carry out equally well what we all desire.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think that that is a very good suggestion. For my part I am convinced that it is after all a question of what determination the executive will come to. If they come to any particular determination, they can be only checked by parliament no matter which form of words you adopt. As the Minister of Militia himself has said, I think in an earlier part of this discussion, the most effective way to defend Canada might be to strike somewhere outside of Canada, and the government can always take that view, for which of course there would be responsibility to parliament. For that reason, I thought there was no need to make any change in the words of the old law, because after all the change proposed is only in the words and not in the practical effect of the section. I think therefore the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) is a good one. Might I be permitted also to bring to the attention of the Minister of Militia, because he seems to rely upon the English practice in this regard, the section he placed in my hands just now, to be found in the manual of military law issued by the War Office in 1899. On page 812 there is a provision that the militia, if they see fit, may volunteer for service out of Great Britain and His Majesty may accept their services. Would it be out of place—I am putting this forward as a mere suggestion—for us to adopt some legislation here to provide that our militia may, if they see fit, volunteer for service out of Canada and the Governor in Council may, if he sees fit, accept their services ? I would qualify that by the same provision with regard to parliament which we have already adopted. If we are to follow the English system in the one case, does not the minister think it would be proper to follow it in the other? There would be more reason to follow that course in this country. In Great Britain they have a standing army and we have not. Our whole defence is in the militia. And if there be reason for this in the United Kingdom, is there not more reason in this country ?

Mr. FIELDING. The suggestion is worthy of consideration. There is just this difference possibly that when the English militia volunteer and go abroad, they would of course be subject to the English militia Act which is made in harmony with the British Army Act. It would be inconvenient, if we sent our militia from Canada for service abroad, to attempt to operate them under the Canadian military law. It would be perhaps necessary that they should come under the operation of the British army regulations rather than the Canadian Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is a mere matter of detail. The suggestion is one I offer for consideration and I cannot say that I am absolutely wedded to it. I was led to make the suggestion by having placed before me this particular provision, which restricts the sending of militia out of the United Kingdom.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I was about to say that I think there would be considerable difficulty in carrying out such a provision. Under existing conditions, our militia, if sent on service abroad, would have to be under the British army. No other service abroad would be recognized. We found no difficulty whatever, during the time of the South African war, in organizing about eight thousand men in Canada for service in South Africa, by making a special contract with them and enlisting them at once for service abroad in the imperial army. There can be no difficulty in the future. It has always been open to the young men of Canada to serve abroad, and we can at any time repeat exactly the method that was adopted in 1899 and 1900.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Probably the minister is quite right as to that. Possibly the only difference would be that you could send the militia in units or regiments, as they are now organized, and perhaps that is not a very important thing. But one difficulty the hon. gentleman speaks of does not seem to exist. Our militia, when called out for active service within Canada or out of Canada are subject to the King's regulations. Therefore, if you called them out and sent them abroad, they would be subject to the same discipline and control as soldiers in the British army.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In proposing that the Canadian parliament should be called within a reasonable time as the English parliament is called within ten days, I thought that was all the safeguard that was required. I have already expressed my views of these word, ' for the defence thereof.' I think they are aggravating, and I believe they were put in, not with that intention possibly, but at the instance of certain gentlemen who had made it their boast at the time the troops went to South Africa that it would never occur again. Our friend from British Columbia said that a certain portion of the community had been classed

as disloyal. I did not class any as disloyal. What I do say is that the severance of the link is going on, not only on the part of my hon. friend from Labelle, but on the part of men who boast the good English names, and I regret to see it. I proposed an amendment this afternoon, but in view of the statement of my leader, I will withdraw it on the understanding that something will be substituted in lieu of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. My hon. friends must not be too ready to say hear, hear, to everything that tends to dismember the empire. We want them to understand that there are gentlemen in this House and in the country who have views on this subject that they are not afraid to express. On the understanding that this section is held over and will come up again, possibly till to-morrow morning, I will withdraw my amendment at the present time.

Mr. GOURLEY. In view of the suggestion of the Minister of Finance, I want to call the attention of the Minister of Militia to the wording of his amendment. In the event of the empire being at war, this amendment will not enable you to call parliament, because under it you are only to call parliament in case the militia are called out for active service.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The government always has power to call parliament.

Mr. GOURLEY. But the amendment is being inserted to justify you in calling it in a certain exigency; but you cannot call parliament until the militia are called out for active service, and you need not call them out in case of a war not immediately affecting Canada. Therefore this amendment is perfectly illusive. The government would say, we will not call parliament because we have not called out the militia for active service, and we do not think we will. This amendment will never do. What you want is power to call parliament within ten days whenever the empire is at war. I am the most peaceful man in the world; but I want to see this country prepared, when the necessity arises, to take a strong part. I only want the interests of the empire conserved. I have no quarrel with the French people. I rather admire them. If men like Champlain and Cartier were in this country to-day, they would be leaders in expressing this sentiment.

Mr. TALBOT. Leave the French alone; they will take care of themselves.

Mr. GOURLEY. The French people in Quebec, I believe, are thoroughly loyal and straight. If there is any thing wrong with them, it is simply that some of their leaders want to make votes. I want this amendment changed so that when there is war in the empire, a proclamation will call this parliament to decide whether we shall send troops to that war or not.

Mr. BOURASSA. It seems to me that the government have some disposition to rely on the instructions of the hon. member for North Victoria, the hon. member for Colchester and the hon. member for East York, in framing their policy, instead of relying on the support of their friends. As they seem anxious to have Conservative ideas on the subject, I am going to quote them a Tory authority in support of their position. The very strange assertion has been made that the position taken by the Minister of Militia in the wording of this clause is a new one, that this introduces a new spirit into the organization of the Canadian militia. But I wish to remind the House that in the Militia Act of 1855 the restriction was very stronger than it is now. Section 61 of that Act provided:

> The Commander in Chief may call out the militia or any part thereof, whenever it is in his opinion advisable so to do, by reason of war, invasion, or insurrection, or imminent danger of any of them.

And section 75 was as follows:

> The militia so called out may be marched to any part of the province, or to any place without the province but coterminous therewith, where the enemy is, and from which an attack on this province is apprehended.

So, under the law of 1855, not only could not the militia of Canada be sent abroad to defend the empire, but if the empire had been at war with Mexico it would have been impossible for the Commander in Chief to send troops to defend Canada against an attack from Mexico. Under the working of the new clause, there is ample room to send the militia anywhere for the defence of Canada. According to that clause the Minister of Militia, no doubt, could send troops to the shores of Newfoundland for the protection of Canada, or in case we should be threatened with attack from Mexico, the minister could send troops, if necessary, even to meet the Mexicans in their own territory. But the restriction in the present has very properly been made, according to the spirit of all our militia laws with the idea that the militia is organized for the defence of Canada. It may be very disloyal for us to assert that principle, but I must say that I have not been very deeply touched by the display of loyalty given by the hon. gentlemen from North Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) and from Colchester (Mr. Gourley). Of course these hon. gentlemen are not like hon. members on this side. They have to make up by their ultra-loyal protestations now for sentiments to which they have previously given utterance. I do not know of any hon. gentleman on this side—and I would like the government to remember that before they take the advice of such gentlemen as the hon. mem-

ber for Colchester in regard to proposed legislation—who has said a man required to be an idiot before he could be elected to the British House of Commons. None of us have gone to the point of saying, when it suited our political purposes—our narrow party purposes—that because the British minister thought proper, by his own authority, to call back a subordinate who is under his orders, that he is a coward. We respect ourselves as Canadians, and we respect the British as they should be respected. We know where we stand. We do not make our loyalty to serve our party purposes, ready to put it aside when there is any party advantage to be gained thereby. I do not know that any member of our party belongs to a powerful organization—a so-called religious or social organization—which, according to its Grand Master is essentially a political organization. The predecessor of the present Grand Master used to lecture us in this House, the French Canadians especially, but English speaking members also, upon their loyalty. Yet he once advised a certain element in the United Kingdom to go into rebellion under arms against the authority of the Queen because the laws sanctioned by the Queen did not suit his particular political views.

I thought this amendment was prepared by the government of Canada. I thought the government of Canada knew that it could rely upon the faithful support of its followers upon this occasion. I fail to understand why the government should now stop the passage of this section in order that the extraordinary lights of the opposition—the legal, military and loyalty lights, such as the hon. member of Colchester and the hon. member for North Victoria—might be called to the aid of the government in order that we may have a proper law. I do not know whether I am expressing the sentiments of the Liberal party, but I must say that I do not understand that we have been sent here to be led by the hon. member for Victoria and the member for Colchester. We have been sent here to stand by the government and the Liberal party as long as they stand by Liberal principles and as long as they have faith in the support of their followers. But I may say to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and to the government, that if we have reached the point where they must get their inspiration and direction from what I may call the narrowest section of the Tory party, then, I think there will be much difference in the sentiment of the Liberals when the next election comes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am delighted that we have at last unmasked the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). He has shown himself in his true light——

Mr. BOURASSA. Exactly. What I have always been—a Liberal.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He has been masquerading up and down this country, and it is an open secret that the boast has been made that these objectionable words had been put into this clause at the instigation of the hon member for Labelle, and that this is the condition upon which he allowed the Bill to be brought before the House.

Mr. BOURASSA. I deny that absolutely. I read the clause for the first time in the draft Bill. I never saw the Minister of Militia about it. I had several conversations over other clauses of the Bill, but not over this one. The hon. member (Mr. Sam. Hughes) must take those words back.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I wish to endorse absolutely what has been said by my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa). I never consulted him, and he never made a suggestion to me with reference to this clause.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The statement has been current that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) was behind the scenes in this matter. Did the hon. minister draw that clause himself ? No, he did not.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) is obliged to accept the statement of the hon. member for Labelle.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Let me inform the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) that I have not disputed the word of the hon. member for Labelle.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman is bound to accept the statement made by the hon. gentleman for Labelle.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have nothing to do with his statement. I make the statement that the report is current.

Mr. BRODEUR. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) must accept the statement.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I will not accept the statement; it has nothing to do with what I said. I say the report is current in this country. Why, it has been published in the papers throughout the length and breadth of Canada.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) must know the rule—that when a statement is made in reference to another hon. gentleman and that hon. gentleman denies it, that denial must be accepted by the hon. gentleman. Whether he believes it to be true or not is another question—but he must accept it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will state to the committee that he accepts——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am not disputing the statement of the hon. member for Labelle, I have nothing to do with it. I make the statement that I have seen this report in the public press.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) denies it that ends it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No, when the hon. member denies the statement that does not end it. The hon. member speaking must accept the statement.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I will accept the statement the hon. gentleman has made, but he did not touch the question I was dealing with. He says that he never consulted the Minister of Militia on this subject. I did not say he did. I will not retract what I did not say.

Mr. BOURASSA. I tell the hon. gentleman not only that I did not speak to the Minister of Militia on the subject, but that I had no communication with him at all and the first I knew of the clause was when I read it in the draft Bill.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) to say that he did not communicate with the Minister of Militia on this subject or anybody else ? I accept that statement. But he has gone up and down this country boasting that Canadian soldiers shall not serve the empire, and it has been stated only a moment ago by the hon. gentlemen themselves that they did not intend that Canadian militiamen shall serve the empire, that they are only to be a force for the defence of Canada, in other words, that Canadians will never again take part in imperial wars. Let me tell the hon. gentlemen that whenever Britain needs assistance, Canadian troops will give it ; and if the hon. gentlemen opposite happen to be in power and decline to send them again, as they did decline to send them the last time, mark my words, they will send them or they will get out of power ; they will send them as they sent them the last time, at the point of the bayonet of public opinion. We are told that the record of sending those troops has not yet been made public, and the statements that have already been made public by the Prime Minister and his colleagues on that occasion can be quoted to prove that this government sitting opposite never, directly or indirectly, intended that one man or one rifle should leave Canada for the defence of the empire. I want to tell the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) and the hon. gentlemen opposite, that whether they are willing or not, though they do put in the statute book that this militia shall only be used for the defence of Canada and shall not go abroad—I want to tell them that there is no power in the government and no power in this country to prevent the loyal men of Canada from standing in defence of the empire.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. They are all loyal.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No, they are not loyal, they are lip loyal when it suits their convenience here to be so ; but when it suits their convenience elsewhere, in whispers around the clubs——

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Who are disloyal ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not know that the hon. gentleman has a commission to stand up and ask me questions. I shall tell him when it suits my convenience.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I want to know if the hon. gentleman could give me an answer, and I see he cannot.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes, I can give a very satisfactory answer. I can say that the agitation which the press of the hon. gentlemen opposite is conducting in the city of Halifax, in the city of Quebec, and in the city of Montreal, is along the identical lines of the agitation which led up to the revolution of 1837. I hold in my hand a history written by a good Liberal, a man who lived and died a Liberal, John McMullin, of Brockville, every one knows of him. I will not read it here, but I refer my hon. friend from Labelle to the pages of that history ; and he will find there—I daresay he has taken his inspiration from something of that kind—he will find that the same plan of campaign was carried on before 1837 that we see going on around us to-day. They may just as well understand it, if the agitation is to sever one after another the links between the colonies and the empire, they may just as well understand that the people of Canada will have to be reckoned with, and that they cannot succeed in their operations. If these words do not mean anything, I care not what the law on the statute-book may be, whether parliament is called or not, the sentiment of this country will be as strong as it was in the Transvaal war, and will again drive any government, even though it be in the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite, to take action to allow young Canadians; 'to permit'—I believe that is the term used—to permit young Canadians to go and fight for the empire.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 68 has not been passed. It will read section 59 in the reprinted Bill.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I move the adoption of clause 59 in the reprinted Bill. But before that is put I would like to read what I propose as a new clause, 59a.

His Majesty shall be liable to make compensation for the death of any person, or for any injury to the person or to property arising from the use of any such rifle range, or of any

rifle range under the control of the Department of Militia and Defence for target practice, carried on in accordance with the regulations of the Governor in Council in that behalf; provided that there shall be no claim to compensation where death or injury to the person is due to negligence on the part of the person killed or injured, or where such person at the time death or injury was sustained, was present as a spectator of the shooting or for the purpose of taking part in the shooting, or in some official or other capacity in connection therewith; or in case of injury to property, where such injury is due to negligence on the part of the owner of the property.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On looking at the amendment I see it is provided that—

There shall be no claim to compensation where death or injury to the person is due to negligence on the part of the person killed or injured, or where such person at the time death or injury was sustained was present as a spectator of the shooting.

Would not that take away from the Crown liability for a spectator who was injured through the negligence of some person authorized to use the rifle range?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Voluntarily, yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In that case you leave a civil action to the party in respect to the injury against the person who is guilty of the negligence?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Exactly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then follows another branch:

Or in some official or other capacity in connection therewith.

Is not that possibly going a little too far? I am not sure but that the Crown should be liable in a case of that kind. Perhaps the principle may be quite right, but it would exclude the Crown from liability for compensation in the case of the death of a person engaged in an official or other capacity in connection with the rifle range.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is right, but if by negligence an accident happens or if a man voluntarily exposes himself to this risk he has no claim.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, you are following the principle of law, until the law was amended by statute, of a workman knowingly entering upon a dangerous task and who would not be entitled to any compensation by reason of the danger.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Under the present statute as we have it the proprietor of adjoining property is to be compensated for damage resulting to his property by reason of the existence of the rifle range in this vicinity, but if he is working on his property and an accident arises he receives no compensation. This is to make the person of the proprietor of the adjoining property as sacred as the immovable property itself.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Two thousand yards beyond the rifle range is controlled by the government. In case a person were on the property in rear of the rifle range controlled by the government and were injured, would he be compensated? He must not be off the property controlled by the range in order to be entitled to compensation?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is right.

Mr. BRODEUR. An accident occurred some years ago in which a man working on his farm was killed and he could not get any compensation from the courts. This is to cover a case of that kind.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He was not killed; he was only wounded.

Mr. BRODEUR. He was only wounded. The courts decided that under the statute there was no compensation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is only one suggestion I would like to make to the hon. Minister of Justice. I do not know whether it would be necessary or desirable to save the rights of any person injured against all persons other than the Crown. You may have circumstances under which the Crown would not be liable; for example if the shooting is not carried on under the regulations of the Governor in Council. That is a condition precedent to liability under the Crown. The injury might occur where the shooting was not so carried on and there might be an argument made that the statute is exhaustive and that it comprehends all claims for injury in respect to a rifle range. I do not know that it could be so construed, but it might perhaps be guarded against.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. You might let the amendment go through and we may consider it before the third reading, and if there is any point in it we will remedy it by a further amendment.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is one further section which I propose to insert as section 61a. It will come after section 61 of the reprinted Bill. It is as follows:

61a. Any person, not being at the time an officer or member of the militia, or a member of a rifle association or club formed or recognized under regulations, who, without the consent of the person in charge of such rifle range, or of some person authorized in that behalf by regulations, uses for target practice a rifle range which has been inspected and approved, shall incur a penalty not exceeding twenty-five dollars.

Section agreed to.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There is one amendment to which the hon. minister drew attention clause 72 of the reprint.

The Army Act for the time being in force in the United Kingdom and the King's regulations, &c.

In this case I might point out that there is no ambiguity whatever in the law as now amended. The question was asked of the minister the other night and I do not think he need have any hesitation in believing that the principle of the English law is that when a man joins the militia force he loses none of the rights of citizenship, and except when in uniform or on duty the English militiaman, the volunteer officer and man, the yeomanry officer and man, each and all of them, are absolutely independent of the King's regulations and the Army Act, but the officer and man of the regular army and militia officer are subject to the King's regulations and the Army Act in England throughout the year.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. What page is that ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The pages are 522, 523 and 219, section 88. Briefly stated, the situation is this. Those who are subject to military law throughout the year in England, that is who are subject to the King's regulations and the Army Act are officers and men of the regular service and officers of the militia. The reason that the officers of the Imperial militia were brought under the operation of the Army Act some years ago was that more than three fourths of the officers of the militia are also officers of the regular service, men who are on the retired list or half-pay or officers who had attained the rank of lieutenant or captain and then retired to their home towns taking commissions in the militia. Then too the adjutant of every militia regiment in the old country is an officer on the staff of the regular service. But the militiamen and non-commissioned of the militia force are not at any period under the operation of the King's regulations and Army Act except when on duty, using that term in a general sense, nor are the officers and men of the volunteer force, nor are the officers and men of the yeomanry except when on duty. The exceptions then to the operation of the King's regulations and the Army Act are officers and men of the yeomanry, officers and men of the volunteers, and men of the militia. My leader prepared an amending clause which was accepted by the minister which had reference to the control over a man not in uniform who is on duty. It was intended to remove the ambiguity of the present law in regard to such a man. I think the case it was intended to meet was that a man might for instance go down to watch his corps drill, refuse to put on his uniform and stand in front of the corps and try to create dissension. I think it was to try to meet such a case that the present clause was put in the Bill years ago. I want to go further than this. The Bill at the present time makes it absolutely clear that the commanding officer has no authority over his men when they are not on duty, and I was sorry to see that three officers, two of whom have commanded and one of whom still commands a regiment in Toronto seem to be impressed with the idea, as I have frequently pointed out in this House, that they had some unseen or hidden control over these men when off duty. The first principle of the militia system is that it is a free system, it is a system for the defence of the country, and a system for free men, and once a man in the militia is off duty he is independent of his colonel and can treat that colonel in any way he chooses, subject of course to the restrictions of the Civil Law. I am proud to say that the men of the militia force generally show that respect to their officers which is due them, and that it is absolutely unnecessary to apply any law in this respect. Discipline is training, not repression. The minister knows from his long experience in militia affairs—and I am bringing this up in all kindness—and any one who has had experience with the permanent corps knows, that again and again the men of a force can give very excellent suggestions for the benefit and improvement of that force. At the present time it is as much as the life of one of these fellows is worth to run foul of a senior. I am not speaking of the minister, and I am sure he understands that I am not making any special reference. Suppose for instance that a lieutenant should undertake to make some suggestions to a captain who was disposed to tyrannize over him. He would be subjected to what in the army is called the devil's clutches. That is the term used in the army for bringing a man under the tyrannizing clauses in the Army Act for no offence whatever. I will give an instance. During the South African war after the battle of Colenzo, a major in comand of a militia corps in England made the statement that the British officers had not their individuality sufficiently developed. He enunciated that idea one evening at a meeting of a committee of ladies and gentlemen formed in the city to take up subcription for the 'Absent-Minded Beggar Fund. He had nothing whatever to do with the meeting but he simply in conversation made this remark. This gentleman was brought under what is called the devil's clutches. He was retired from his command although he was one of the best officers in the service. He never had an opportunity of being heard and only that he happened to be a prominent officer who was able to fight the matter and to have it brought up publicly he would have been dismissed with ignominy from his corps which he had raised to a very high state of efficiency. I

do not see any harm in this amendment, but in this case the remark happened to be made to an officer who had power and who wished to tyrannize over this major. I wish to submit an amendment and I would be pleased if the minister would change it in any way to meet the requirements. I believe that under the new system in England to which the leader of the opposition has referred, officers and men are encouraged to take hold of these matters, and that a magazine is to be published whose columns will be open to those who wish to contribute articles and that those who contribute articles are to be paid for them whether or not their views agree with the views of the government, if their articles are worthy of consideration. That is the principle I want. I want to have the officers of the permanent force to whom of course this particular refers, relieved as far as possible from the tyrannous clauses of the King's regulations and the Army Act, or what is termed in the imperial service, the devil's clutches. The amendment I would propose is as follows :

Nothing in this Act shall at any time prevent any officer or man of the militia except when on parade or on duty from temperately expressing his views on questions affecting the welfare of the militia force, and communicating suggestions, criticisms and statements thereon to the public of Canada.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I quite agree in the statement that has been made that the object the hon. member has in view in making the suggestion is purely to promote the welfare of the force. I quite accept that statement but I want to point out to him what perhaps he knows better than I do, that this question of discipine is a very delicate one, and a very vital one, and I am very much afraid that such a section as this incorporated into that Militia Bill would be misunderstood and misconstrued, and if, even in one case, it were misinterpreted and advantage taken of it by an officer or man who wished to act in an objectionable manner, a great deal of harm might be done to the force. At the same time, if my hon. friend would look at clause 72, he will agree, and I understand he does agree, that so far as the main part of the clause is concerned, it is quite satisfactory and that there will be no question in the future, if there ever was in the past, as to when the Army Act shall operate so far.

I understand, however, that he objects to that part of subsection 2 which excludes the whole of the permanent force and the members of the permanent staff of the militia from the operation of the Act. Well, possibly there may be some point in what my hon. friend says as to the too great severity of the Army Act. If abuses exist in that direction, we can perhaps modify them to some extent by regulations, or we can modify the Act in the future. So far as I know, no one connected with the permanent force or with the staff is asking for any change. On the whole, the old law has worked satisfactorily, and I am very much afraid it would be introducing a dangerous element to pass this section at the present time. I would therefore ask my hon. friend, having brought his views before the House, to agree to let the matter stand, at any rate until we have the experience of another year under the new Bill. I shall be very glad to consider this matter, and in making up our regulations, to endeavour as far as possible to meet the points he has suggested.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister has not shown any specific case in which difficulty could arise. I am not proposing to interfere with discipline. If a man becomes intoxicated or disorderly, he can be dealt with ; but I want men to be free to speak and make suggestions for the good of the force. It has only been within the last two weeks that an officer sent me a private and confidential and registered letter, in which he said, for Heaven's sake do not let anybody know that I have written to you ; and yet he only wished to make a suggestion in regard to the pay of officers and staff sergeants in camp. He had the notion of some city colonels that he was subject to the King's regulations the year round. I am satisfied that very many excellent suggestions could be made by men in the permanent force ; but they are afraid to go to the minister himself. I have said to some of them, why don't you bring that before the minister or the general ? They would shrug their shoulders and say, we have not any authority. It is to meet that class of cases that I make this proposal. I have been thirty-seven years connected with the force, and I have never had to place a man under arrest in my life. I am not at all impressed with the idea that discipline means restriction. On the contrary, it means education, training, self-control, not control by others. Discipline is the exact reverse of oppression and tyranny. I would commend this matter to the minister in the hope that he will give it his very best consideration.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I shall be very glad to do that. I would like to say one word further. I think there is a great deal of force in what the hon. gentleman has said, and I think it is possible in the regulations to provide in some way that intelligent men who take an active interest in the welfare of the force should be asked, perhaps once a year, to express their opinion in regard to any subject relating to the force on which they wish to speak. I think that might be useful.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I may say that among the best suggestions which I received last year in regard to pensions were some which came to me from a non-commissioned

officer. I dare not let his name be known, although there was nothing wrong in what he wrote to me; but it was contrary to the regulations for him to write. The minister adopted a good many of his suggestions in his Bill. Why not adopt the policy which the British government is pursuing, and have some centre to which these men could send their expressions of opinion?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is a very good idea.

On section 84,

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is proposed to substitute the 'may' for 'shall' in this section.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the object?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Do not criticise me too closely. But if the hon. gentleman reads the clause he will see that 'may' is a good substitute. In this case, I think, 'may' will be read as 'shall.'

On section 110,

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is proposed to amend this by adding, after the word 'penalty' the words 'If an officer, to twenty-five dollars and if a man to ten dollars for each offence.' This distinguishes between an officer and a man.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. But they are punishable by the Army Act. It opens 'every man of the militia' and 'man' is specifically defined at the beginning. The hon. minister had better say, 'every officer or man' at the beginning.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) will look at the interpretation clause he will find that it includes warrant officer and non-commissioned officer as well as private.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes, but neither of these is an officer.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This must be for militia authorities to decide, but would not the hon. gentleman distinguish between an officer, a non-commissioned officer and a private?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. 'Every man of the militia who disobeys any lawful order of his superior officer, or is guilty of insolent or disorderly behaviour towards such officer, shall incur a penalty,' if an officer, of so much, and if a man, of so much. I think it should be clear this could only apply when they are on duty, or in uniform.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It only does apply then.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. But the 'lawful order' covers the order part of it. Now look at the second clause, 'Every man of the militia who disobeys any lawful order.' That is all right because it is not a lawful order unless he is on duty. But the next part 'or is guilty or any insolent or disorderly behavious towards such officer shall incur a penalty of $10 for each offence.' Why not put in the words 'such officer or man while on duty'?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Because section 72 controls that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is the King's Regulations and the Army Act, in section 72. This is a civil court offence under the Canadian law.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. But 72 fixes the time when the man is under the control of his superior officer.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. But 110 is an old Army Act, this is a statute of Canada, and it brings the man up for punishment. I suggest that it read 'or is guilty of any insolent or disorderly behaviour towards such officer or man when on duty.' What harm can it do.

Mr. TALBOT. Does the hon. gentleman not admit that the second part applies to the first?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am asking the hon. Minister of Justice—he is a lawyer and I am not—what the interpretation of that might be. Would the hon. minister look at it and see?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The first part is all right. If it is a lawful order and if he is guilty of any insolent or disorderly behaviour to his superior officer he would be liable to a penalty, but the question would come up that the officer would not be an officer unless he was on duty. He would be merely a citizen.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. How would it do to make it read this way:

Every man of the militia who, when on service, disobeys any lawful order, &c.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not mean the first part. The word 'lawful' covers that.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That means surely that it is a lawful order?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I want to make it clear. It is the same old wording in the original Act, but it is under the Army Act and refers to a condition of things in which, with the permanent force in England, the men are always on duty.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. How would it do to make it read this way?

Every man of the militia who disobeys any lawful order of his superior officer, or who, when on service, is guilty of any insolence or disorderly behaviour towards such officer, shall incur a penalty, &c.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That will cover it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think that is all right. I move :

That the words ' who when on service ' be inserted after the word ' or ' in the second line.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has raised the point: Would it be a lawful order if he was not on service ? I do not think it would be.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought it was the contention of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence the other day that any order of his superior officer, whether he was in uniform or not, would be a lawful order.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In the case of Cole vs. Cook that point was decided.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is right.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The title is to be changed back to what it was in the old Act :

An Act respecting the Militia and Defence of Canada.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That can be changed on the third reading.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Let us finish it up to-night.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. We will drop all the amendments and I think it will be satisfactory to us if the hon. minister will accept as section 69 the following :

The Governor in Council may place the militia, or any part thereof, on active service anywhere in Canada and also beyond Canada for the defence of the empire.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, that will not do.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What clause has replaced this in the original Bill ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Clause 79 when the Bill was introduced.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know that there is any great object in keeping it in committee, if it is desired to get it through to-night, and if there can be further discussion on the third reading.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps you might reconcile the conflict of view on it by making it ' for defence ' instead of the words ' for the defence thereof.'

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It would be the same thing in effect.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In effect I think it is the same thing now.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. So do I, absolutely the same thing.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Because after all the responsibility is thrown upon the government in power.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. A mere play upon words.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The only reason I have for objecting to the language is perhaps a sentimental one.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. You might let the section go through in its present form, and if on the third reading there is any suggestion we can deal with it then.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am agreeing to this in the belief that every one is here who wanted it to stand.

Mr. SPROULE. If there was permission given to amend it on the third reading it would be all right.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There cannot be any undertaking given to amend it on the third reading.

Mr. SPROULE. We have this disadvantage that on the third reading we are out of committee and you only speak on it once.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is one of the advantages.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. After all I do not see, when you already have a provision fixing the terms upon which you can call out the militia why you require to repeat these terms in the amendment.

Whenever the Governor in Council places the militia of Canada or any part thereof on active service anywhere in Canada or beyond Canada for the defence thereof.

That is already covered. Why not have it.

Whenever the Governor in Council places the militia of Canada, or any part thereof, on active service.

You have already limited the calling out of the militia and this is a mere repetition.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is right.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It would meet my sentimental objection. Then it would read:

Whenever the Governor in Council places the militia of Canada, or any part thereof, on active service, the parliament of Canada shall then, &c.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I shall read the section as it was and as it is.

69. The Governor in Council may place the militia, or any part thereof, on active service anywhere in Canada and also beyond Canada, for the defence thereof, at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of emergency.

Then the amendment as first proposed was as follows :

Whenever the Governor in Council places the militia, or any part thereof, on. active service anywhere in Canada or beyond Canada for the defence thereof, parliament, if parliament be then separated by such adjournment,——

and so on. Now the proposition is that the words

Anywhere in Canada or beyond Canada for the defence thereof,

be struck out.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I would suggest that you put in the word 'so,'—'whenever so called out.'

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I took about a day to draw that clause and I would like to have as little emendation as possible.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (reading):

Whenever the Governor in Council so places the militia, or any part thereof.

Mr. SPROULE. You will make it as bad as ever.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is intended to meet the preceding state of affairs.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is the minister going to accept my suggestion.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Let us get through with one suggestion at a time; they are coming in so fast now, that we will not have time to deal with them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think the word 'so' is necessary.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Very well, probably it does not.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is the minister going to accept the amendment to have the word 'thereof' changed to 'empire.'

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Do not start another row.

Bill as amended reported.

Amendments read the first and second times, and agreed to.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Bill (No. 157) respecting the payment of certain railway subsidies.—Mr. Emmerson—was read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would like to amend section 1 by a slight verbal change. I would move to add the words 'difference between the' before the word 'amount' on the 25th line and to strike out words 'over and above' on the same line.

On section 2—'cost' defined—

Mr. SPROULE. This would put it in the power of the minister on the chief engineer's recommendation to increase the subsidy considerably.

Mr. EMMERSON. This gives power to fix the subsidy beforehand on data furnished by the chief engineer. This change is favoured by the Auditor General and by the department, as it will avoid a great many difficulties, and it will be very much easier to reach a conclusion beforehand. In all cases this course need not necessarily be followed. It will only be when a company applies.

Mr. SPROULE. They will always apply.

Mr. EMMERSON. Some may not. I can well understand a company in certain circumstances not desiring to be limited to a certain amount, hoping to get the full $6,400. The amount in this instance is dependent upon the chief engineer's report, which would naturally be on the safe side.

Mr. SPROULE. While it might be more convenient to the Auditor General and the department in some respects, because it would give them less trouble in going over the accounts, still it leaves in the hands of the Minister of Railways power to make the subsidy what he likes between $3,200 and $6,400 a mile, with the aid of the engineer, who is always available, and who can no doubt be got to make a certificate to suit the minister's purpose.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman does not know the engineer.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The position is this. Under the law every subsidized railway is entitled to $3,200 a mile. If the cost of construction exceeds $15,000 a mile, it is entitled to an additional subsidy of one-half the cost exceeding $15,000 a mile, but not to exceed in any case $6,400 a mile. Assuming the road costs $18,000 per mile, that would entitle the contractor to $3,200 per mile and an additional $1,500. When the government enter into a subsidy contract, as provided by this section, the company will not get the whole of the subsidy until the whole of the road is completed. They will get the ordinary subsidy of $3,200 per mile and only 70 per cent of the extra subsidy, the 30 per cent being retained by the government. If the road costs the sum estimated by the chief engineer or an additional amount, the company then get the 30 per cent. Otherwise they forfeit the 30 per cent. The government make themselves absolutely sure, and I do not understand what benefit or advantage there is to the contractor in this measure.

Mr. SPROULE. There is this, that he has during his progress estimates so much more money from month to month.

Mr. CLANCY. Is there not also this advantage? Suppose the road cost $14,000 a mile, under the present law the contractor would get $3,200 and no more. But if the engineers' estimate was $18,000 per mile, he would be in pocket 70 per cent on the extra $1,500.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is that possibility. If the engineer estimated the cost,

say $18,000 a mile, the contractor would get $3,200 a mile and 70 per cent of the extra $1,500. If on completion it was ascertained that the average cost was under $15,000 a mile, he would be in that 70 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. That is if the estimates were unreliable.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is that danger, which possibly should be removed by providing that if the subsidies paid were afterwards discovered not to be earned, the money should be recovered. Suppose the engineer estimated the cost at $18,000 and it afterwards turned out that the cost did not exceed $15,000 per mile.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Could he err that far ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is possible. Does the contractor get his $3,200 per mile before the completion of the work ?

Mr. FIELDING. As it progresses.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He gets $3,200 per mile as the work progresses and then he gets 70 per cent of $1,500 per mile additional, assuming the road to cost $18,000 per mile. When you retain from him 30 per cent, do you retain it on the $3,200 as well as on the $1,500 ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, he is entitled to the $3,200 absolutely.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would it not be well to amend the statute so that the government would retain 30 per cent of the whole until they had the final statement of the chief engineer as to the cost ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It seems to me that in the interests of the department this is a very desirable measure, because you fix the amount and there is something determined. It is not left to what I may term the haggling that results thereafter. I can very well understand that it is not merely in the interest of the contractor that you should fix a definite sum, but it is certainly in the interest of the country. The monied interest, the banks, are interested, and the fact that you have a subsidy determined in the first instance is based upon the theory that inquiry has been made by the chief engineer into the conditions and surroundings of the proposed road.

Mr. CLANCY. I am afraid the hon. minister is taking some of the risks the bank would take under the present law.

Mr. EMMERSON. By no means. For the department, through its engineer must have a thorough survey—the quantities and all the data—to enable them to fix the amount. I recognize that it is advantageous to the department and to all concerned, but I think it is more to the advantage of the department really than it is to the others, because you can have the amount fixed beyond all question. It does not depend upon circumstances which may afterwards arise.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I must confess I do appreciate very much the argument of the hon. gentleman. How he can say that it is in the interest of the department and the country to pay an additional subsidy of $1,500 per mile passes my comprehension. We are basing our arguments upon the case of a road estimated to cost $18,000, but which turns out to have cost $15,000 per mile. In one case the company is entitled to $3,200 of a subsidy, but in the other case it would be entitled to $4,700. Why pay the additional amount ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Suppose it cost more than $18,000 a mile ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then, you go on and pay a subsidy accordingly.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No. The bonus is fixed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the hon. gentleman is right——

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It all turns on the estimate of the engineer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I should think it would be the fairest way to let the matter be controlled in the end by the actual cost of the road.

Mr. FIELDING. The advantage gained is, to some extent, the purpose of the Bill—certainty. It will be an advantage to the railway man. If we aid a railway it is because we believe it will benefit the country, and we want, within reasonable limits, to help the contractor. Of course he is certain of his $3,200 a mile, but he desires also, within reasonable limits, to know what surplus subsidy he is entitled to. If he goes to the bank and says: This railway is going to cost a sum which will entitle me to $6,400 a mile, and I want you to finance accordingly, the bank may say: It may be that you will be entitled to that subsidy, but what guarantee have we of that ? We have the guarantee of the $3,200, and you ask us to advance large sums on the theory that this road is to be a costly one, but we have no guarantee. So, the contractor says to the government: Make an estimate of the cost and put me in such a position that I can tell the bank how much I am to get. That is a legitimate request. The engineer who is called upon to make his estimate will be aware that his estimate will be subject to comparison and examination when the road is finished, and that if it proves to be seriously wrong, he will be discredited. His natural tendency therefore, will be, in the first instance, to make a careful, safe, conservative estimate, for his own reputation—unless we assume that he is a man who wants to be dishonest. But, going on the fair assumption that he is a man who wants to do his duty, his tendency

will be to make a careful, safe, conservative estimate. Taking that, you then allow a margin by paying only 70 per cent of the estimated surplus subsidy. You have two checks which give a reasonable assurance that there will be no abuse. Abuse can follow from only one of two assumptions—either that the engineer is incompetent in making his estimate and that his errors more than counterbalance the margin of safety, and the other—which we need not assume—that he is dishonest and wishes to deceive the government. I think it will be found in practice that the engineer, for his own reputation, will make a moderate and careful estimate, and I think that no cases will be found where the actual cost will be less than the engineer's estimate.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the experience of the roads generally subsidized as to earning this $6,400 of a bonus? I imagine there are only a few cases.

Mr. FIELDING. Perhaps the minister has the figures on that point. When I was in the department my attention was called to the fact that there were several. They did not all get that amount by any means, but there have been several that have got it.

Mr. EMMERSON. There have been cases where parliament has fixed the bonus at $6,400.

Mr. FIELDING. They would not come in under this Act.

Mr. CLANCY. If I understand the Bill, the effect will be that all roads costing less than $15,000 a mile will get an additional subsidy.

Mr. FIELDING. No, not an additional subsidy.

Mr. CLANCY. They get 70 per cent or 50 per cent of the additional cost and to that extent, it does mean an additional subsidy to the road.

Mr. FIELDING. It does not mean an additional subsidy to what they would otherwise receive. If they do not receive it now, they would receive it at the end of the undertaking. But, if the road cost the sum fixed they would have no assurance in the meantime that they would receive it. They would have to speculate on the engineer's ultimate report. The effect is to reach a conclusion, with a margin for safety, at an earlier stage and to give the company the assurance at once.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The government is taking the risk of the correctness of the estimates instead of the person who is to advance the money.

Mr. FIELDING. Except, that the contractor takes the risk of the road costing more.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The contractor takes a certain risk, because it may turn out that the road cost more than the estimate made by the chief engineer.

Mr. EMMERSON. He forfeits his right to the additional amount.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I appreciate that. I do not know whether or not there would be anything in the experience of the government to indicate that possibly the contractor might in that case come along with a claim.

Mr. FIELDING. It does not take much ground for that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It might possibly work out that, whenever the cost had been overestimated the government would recover nothing, and when under estimated the contractor would put in a claim and say that, though he had no legal claim, yet, in all fairness he ought to be paid.

Mr. EMMERSON. The word 'may' is there.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I must say that I have not yet known of a contractor who was afraid of the word 'may' or of any other. There is this to be observed also—that the surveys, plans, and profiles, I suppose, will not be made by the chief engineer, but will be furnished by the contractor.

Mr. FIELDING. He will not do it personally, but he will have to send his engineers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The language is:

> Upon the report of the chief engineer of government railways, and his certificate that he has made careful examination of the surveys, plans and profiles of the whole line so contracted for.

I do not know what is intended; but would there not be some little risk in taking the surveys, plans and profiles submitted by those who are to build the road? And does it not mean that?

Mr. FIELDING. It is capable of meaning that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It does not call for examination, except of the surveys, plans and profiles made by those who are to build the road. There is certainly a looseness in the statute in that regard. I think the statute would be satisfied by the examination of those surveys, plans and profiles. Possibly the government might consider whether there should not be some additional safeguard in that respect.

Mr. BARKER. I would suggest to the Minister of Railways that seventy per cent on half the estimated cost over $15,000 is rather risky; the government might find it had paid a larger subsidy than it intended to pay. It seems to me a more reasonable proposition would be to allow fifty per cent absolutely and hold twenty per cent for final

settlement. You would then run no risks. Take fifty per cent instead of seventy as a positive advance that the bank could count upon, and leave the other twenty per cent in suspense.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman said the other twenty, it would be the other fifty, would it not ?

Mr. BARKER. I understand you propose to give them seventy per cent absolutely.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Seventy per cent on the excess.

Mr. BARKER. Do you ever pay the balance of the half of the excess?

Mr. FIELDING. Not if he accepts the seventy per cent.

Mr. BARKER. The seventy per cent if accepted by him is taken as a settlement ? The danger is that you may have an overestimate which will cause you to pay him too much. For example, you would pay him too much if the estimate was $19,500 a mile and it actually costs $17,500. I suggest that instead of allowing seventy per cent on half the excess you agree to pay him fifty per cent, you are safe in doing that ; and if in the final settlement he is entitled to more, pay him the other twenty per cent as a final adjustment. Give him a right to collect the other twenty per cent.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is substituting fifty for seventy.

Mr. BARKER. Pay him finally exactly the sum of money as if under this proposal you gave him seventy per cent.

Mr. EMMERSON. Why would not sixty and forty per cent be right.

Mr. BARKER. I think seventy is too high.

Mr. EMMERSON. Put in sixty and forty, and retain forty per cent for safety.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Some documents were placed on the table with regard to the report of Mr. Justice Britton along with the Order in Council, cancelling the concession. Some suggestion was made this morning that these documents should be printed, but that was not acquiesced in. Then the Minister of Justice was to give some information or a report as to the diversion of traffic from the Intercolonial. The minister will not forget that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I will give my hon. friend a copy of the letters I have received ; that is all the information I have. In addition to that, I have a statement of claim that I will hand to my hon. friend in the morning. I may say that the measure of damages and the mode of estimating the damages are not here. That will depend on correspondence.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken up to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. We will take up in the morning the resolution respecting the Canada Eastern, and perhaps other resolutions on the Order Paper ; and later in the day, supply will be moved. The Postmaster General will move the third reading of his Bill, and after three o'clock, the Militia Bill.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And my Election Bill. I stated to-day in the absence of the leader of the opposition, that I intended to drop the reference to Algoma so far as Ontario is concerned, and confine the Bill merely to British Columbia and the province of Quebec.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.15 a.m.—Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, August 2, 1904.

AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS. I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Smith, Vancouver :

That the second report of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, which reads as follows, be adopted :—

1. That 20,000 copies of the evidence of Dr. William Saunders, taken by this committee in the current session of parliament, be printed in pamphlet form, forthwith, in the usual numerical proportions of English and French, as advance sheets of the committee's final report, for distribution as follows :—16,900 copies to the members of parliament ; 3,000 copies to be allotted to the Department of Agriculture for distribution ; and 100 copies for the use of the committee .

2. That 20,000 copies of the evidence of each member of the official staff at the Central Experimental Farm who testified before this committee in the current session of parliament, be printed forthwith, in pamphlet form, in the usual relative numbers in English and French, as advance sheets of the committee's final report, and distributed as follows :—19,400 of each to members of parliament ; that 500 copies of his own evidence be allotted to each member of the said official staff ; and 100 copies of each to the use of the committee.

3. That 50,000 copies of the evidence of Professor J. C. MacLennan on the metric system be printed forthwith, in pamphlet form, in the usual relative numbers of English and

French, to be distributed as follows :—46,400 copies to members of parliament ; 3,000 to the Department of Inland Revenue for distribution ; 400 to the use of the witness, Professor MacLennan ; and 200 to the use of the committee.

4. That 20,000 copies of the evidence of Mr. A. P. Stevenson, Nelson, Manitoba, be printed forthwith, in pamphlet form, in the usual relative numbers in English and French, as advance sheets of the committee's final report, and distributed as follows :—19,800 to members of parliament ; 100 copies to the witness ; and 100 copies to the use of the committee.

5. That 50,000 copies each of the Grain and Grain Inspection Acts be printed in pamphlet form, under one cover, in the usual relative numbers of English and French, and allotted to the members of parliament—less 200 copies for use of the committee—for distribution amongst the grain-growing agriculturists of Canada.

6. That 1,000 copies of the evidence upon immigration and settlement, taken before the committee in the current session of parliament, be printed in the usual relative numbers of English and French, in pamphlet form, for distribution by the Bureau of Immigration.

7. The committee recommend that each and all of the aforesaid enumerated evidence form a part of their final report.

I may say that it was the unanimous recommendation of the committee that this report should be presented to the House and adopted.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE. This report will cause a very heavy outlay of money, and I suggested in the committee that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Douglas) should get some estimate of the expenditure to which we are committing the country. The report comes at the tail end of the session, and there will be no opportunity of distributing these documents until next year. Is it wise to expend so much money for the printing of a great deal of matter which cannot reach the people until next year, if at all ? Has the Minister of Finance any idea of the cost ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Though my attention was not specially drawn to the matter, when I observed the report on the Order paper I asked the Clerk of the House to obtain an estimate, and I am advised that the cost will be between $4,000 and $5,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you mean the whole of it ?

Mr. FIELDING. The whole of the printing which is included in the report. I thought at first the order seemed to be a large and generous one, but the Agricultural Committee was unanimous in its conclusion, and as the matter is one of very deep interest to the farming community any disposition which at first I had to object has been removed. I am not disposed to raise any objection.

Mr. DOUGLAS.

Mr. SPROULE. Does that cover the cost of printing, paper and everything ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Judging by an estimate which I had submitted to me some years ago for similar work, I thought it would cost a great deal more.

Mr. FIELDING. At my request the Clerk of the House communicated with Dr. Dawson, the King's Printer, who has made a memo. of the details, which shows the cost will be some $4,489.

Mr. SPROULE. That is much less than I thought.

Motion agreed to.

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Bill (No. 145) to amend the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, 1903.—Hon. Sydney Fisher.

TOBACCO LICENSES—CANCELLATION.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Inland Revenue) moved :

That the House do to-morrow go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :—

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Inland Revenue Act, in providing that :

(2.) Any license authorized by this Act may be cancelled in any case where a person who, being a manufacturer of any class of goods subject to a duty of excise, either directly or indirectly—

(a.) makes a sale of any such goods to a person who sells or intends to sell goods of that class in connection with his own business, subject to the condition that the purchaser shall not sell or deal in goods of a like kind produced by, or obtained or to be obtained, from any other manufacturer or dealer ; or

(b.) makes such sale upon terms that would in their application deprive the purchaser of any profit upon the sale of such goods, if they should so sell or deal ; or

(c.) consigns any such goods to another person for sale upon commission, upon such terms that the consignee can profit by such sale only if he does not sell or deal in goods of a like kind, manufactured by, or obtained, or to be obtained, from any other manufacturer or dealer.

Motion agreed to.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT, 1900—AMENDMENT.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 148) to amend the Dominion Elections Act of 1900.—Mr. Fitzpatrick.

On section 1—proclamation by returning offcer.

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). I beg leave to move that the words 'the east riding of Algoma, in the province

of Ontario,' be struck out. There will then be no reference at all to Ontario.

Mr. MONK. I understand that in the counties of Gaspé and Chicoutimi and Saguenay elections are not to be held on the same day as in other counties.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is no change with respect to Quebec at all. We leave the law as it is, that is, it is optional with the returning officer to have the election on the same day or to defer it.

Mr. MONK. Our provincial elections are held on the same day all over the province. I am not quite sure as to Chicoutimi and Saguenay ; but in the county of Gaspé provision is made for communication by telegraph between the Magdalen islands and the mainland. The means of communication are better than they were formerly, and if it is possible under the provincial law to hold the elections on the same day, it seems to me that it is equally possible under the federal law.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The conditions are not at all the same. The electoral district of Gaspé under the provincial law does not include the Magdalen islands. They are a separate district, as are also the counties of Chicoutimi and Saguenay. There are four counties instead of two. Any one who knows the geographical conditions in the province of Quebec knows that in winter time it is absolutely impossible to hold the elections in Chicoutimi and Saguenay on the same day as in the other districts. It is impossible within the eight days after the nomination to deliver the ballot boxes and papers from Tadousac to the straits of Belle Isle, a distance of 600 miles.

Mr. MONK. I do not think my hon. friend is right as to the extent of the territory. I understand that between the Magdalen islands and the mainland there is provision in the provincial law that the proclamation may be sent by telegraph.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. With regard to the districts in British Columbia, I understand that the general elections of 1896 in Yale and Cariboo were held at the same time as in other parts of the Dominion. Does the Minister of Justice know whether that is the case or not ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My information is to the effect that in summer it is quite possible to hold the elections in those localities at the same time as in others, but that in winter it is a physical impossibility. It must be borne in mind that this is all discretionary with the returning officer. If the conveniences are such as to enable him to hold the election on the same day as in other districts, there is no reason why he should not do it ; but if the elections take place in winter, we ought not, by any Act of ours to deprive any important portion of the community of the right to vote.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What does my hon. friend think is the difficulty in the way of holding the elections ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The ballot boxes are in the possession of the returning officer on nomination day, and he has to distribute them and the ballot papers in the eight days between nomination day and the day of voting.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems to me that the observations of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice are hardly pertinent. The only difficulty I can see is about the posting up of the proclamation. I do not think the polling box comes into it at all.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Why ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Because section 29 says :

> In the electoral districts of Algoma, in the province of Ontario, of Gaspé and Chicoutimi and Saguenay, in the province of Quebec, and of Burrard and Yale and Cariboo, in the province of British Columbia, the returning officers shall fix the day for the nomination of candidates, and also the day and places for holding the polls ; the nomination in the said electoral districts shall take place not less than eight days after the proclamation hereinbefore required has been posted up,—neither the last day of posting it up nor the day of nomination being reckoned ; and the day for holding the polls shall be at as early a date thereafter as possible, but not less than than seven days after nomination, and at a general election it shall, if possible, be the same day as that fixed by the Governor General for the other electoral districts, but not sooner.

Is not the whole difficulty with the distribution of the proclamation ? You go on apparently the same as in other constituencies, with some discretion, I admit, allowed the returning officer. If an election in Yale and Cariboo was held in 1896 at the same time as in other parts of the Dominion, surely we may conclude that the same thing can be done again. The very argument which the Minister of Justice used in answer to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is a strong argument in favour of my contention now. Importance is attached by the minister to the fact that in the provincial election one of these counties is divided. Well, Yale and Cariboo are divided into two districts. If that is an important circumstance in connection with Gaspé or Chicoutimi or Saguenay, it is equally important in British Columbia. In other words, if you could hold in November, 1896, a general election for the whole of this enormous riding at the same time as in the other constituencies, is there any possible reason, when that huge constituency is divided into two, why you could not hold elections in the two subdivided ridings on the same day as in the rest of Canada, more

especially as to-day the means of communication are considerably better than they were eight years ago ? The memorandum I have before me says that since that date further transportation facilities, such as the Crow's Nest Pass Railway and steamboat communication, have been introduced.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Just to set the leader of the opposition right, let me tell him that the constituency to-day is quite different from what it was in 1896, even although it has been divided. In 1896 it did not take in these outlying points. Many mining camps have sprung up throughout the district, many miles beyond the limits of Yale and Cariboo, since the election of 1896. In 1900 the elections were not held on the same day, but the constituency has been divided. I am well conversant with the riding, and I know that if the elections are held at any time when the weather is unfavourable, it will be impossible to get the ballot boxes into a number of the districts on time. Possibly the most central point will be Kamloops. It will be impossible to get the ballot box into the Chilicoten country and the Stuart lake country if the weather is at all unfavourable. Drive from Kamloops to Barkerville, and even under the most favourable conditions, it would take a week to reach there from nomination day until polling day. Then again in the eastern portion of the country and north of the Revelstoke country, it would be physically impossible to do the work in Yale and Cariboo in seven or eight days. I have driven through the country and know it fairly well, and the fact is this, that if you have very good weather you might get through in time, but with unfavourable weather that would be impossible.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, you may have weather in any part of the country which may prevent a number of people from voting. That applies to every constituency in Canada. I dare say there have been hundreds of voters prevented by the weather all over Canada from depositing their ballots, but you cannot alter the law to meet every individual case ; and what I am suggesting is that Yale and Cariboo, divided as it is and enjoying better means of communication, is just as capable of having an election held on the same day as many other constituencies in Canada. I do not see how it possibly can be otherwise. It is divided in two and you have better means of communication. When you give all possible importance to the fact that fresh settlements have sprung up, can you possibly say that the conditions are not in these as good at present as they were for the whole riding in 1896 ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. No better. The same communication exists to-day as existed forty years ago in the different parts of the country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. These are the means they had in 1896 ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. But the settlements did not then go nearly so far back.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They generally have means of communication where there are settlements. If there were means of communication forty years old, that indicates that there have been settlements there for forty years.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I said that the communication now is no better than it was forty years ago. It is just as good as in 1896, but the settlements go further. There is no better means of communication than horses to-day and pack trains.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There are places forty years old in that riding to which there has been the same communication as forty years ago, by means of roads. I suppose the new settlements have good means of communication now ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. They have pack trails.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is a means of communication to which the hon. gentleman has already referred. These are used a good deal in the western country for the conveyance of freight. What is the great difficulty in getting a ballot box from some central point to every outlying place in the district in three or four days ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. It cannot be done.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You have seven days.

Mr. MACPHERSON. You cannot do it in seven days.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The condition of things amply justifies legislation. And my present information is that there has been no change in the conditions which would justify any departure from the law as we have it.

Mr. ALCORN. Referring to all the constituencies in which it is proposed to postpone the election, it has always appeared to me that the objection with regard to posting proclamations before the nomination and notices afterwards, and the distribution of ballot boxes, is one that has very little merit. It is a mere matter of placing that work in the hands of a sufficient number of men. It is true that, as a matter of practice, the returning officer for the sake of earning the extra mileage connected with the posting up of these documents does the work personally or with the assistance of one deputy. If he employed three or four, or half a dozen men, surely, in any of these constituencies, the work could be done in eight days. Therefore, I do not see that there is any force in the objection as to these outlying districts. I fancy that, if the plan were adopted of em-

ploying a large number of men, if the returning officer did not insist in earning all the mileage himself, the difficulty would disappear.

Mr. GALLIHER. I have said on a previous occasion practically all that I have to say on this subject. I only now repeat that my desire is that all the people in the constituency which I now represent and which has been divided and which will hereafter return two members, will in the next election, however remote they may be from railway travel have an opportunity to vote. As representative of that district I do not propose to take the risk, by being compelled to have the elections seven days after the nomination, of having some person deprived of the opportunity to vote. Without going into the matter further, this is my reason and my only reason for the course I have advocated.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 3—nomination and polling days in certain districts,

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before this is carried, I would ask the Minister of Justice whether he has come to any conclusion about two Bills introduced by the hon member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) one with regard to the Northwest Territories Representation Act and the other with regard to the Yukon Territory Representation Act. That hon. gentleman pointed out that grave abuses existed under the law as it is at present, and proposed what seem to me very moderate and reasonable amendments. And there was an arrangement, if I remember rightly that there should be an opportunity of discussing them.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think the arrangement was that we should allow these Bills to stand over in the expectation that something might be done in the way of legislation proposed by the government. The Bill was prepared, but, by the time I was ready to introduce it, the session had so far advanced that I thought it better to drop it for this session.

Mr. ALCORN. With regard to section 29 and the amendments proposed by the Minister of Justice, it seems to me extremely desirable—and I believe that no one will gainsay the desirability—that elections throughout Canada should be held on the same day. And it appears to me that, under existing circumstances, there is no practical difficulty in the way of attaining that object. The work to be done by the returning officer we are more or less familiar with. His duties are set forth in the statute, the principal being the posting up of the proclamation before the nomination and posting up in the same places afterwards his notice of the holding of the poll. His other duties are clerical and occupy practically no time. We are all aware that, although the statute speaks of a large number of particulars with which he has to acquaint himself for the purpose of issuing his proclamation, yet in practice, the returning officer merely obtains a copy of the last proclamation, provincial or Dominion, and from that he can in a short time possess himself of all the knowledge necessary to issue the proclamation. As I observed, if, instead of posting up these proclamations and notices himself, he will employ a sufficient number of men he can have the documents posted within the prescribed time. For the purpose of obviating any difficulty of that kind in the excepted ridings, I have drawn up an amendment to section 29 which I will take the liberty of moving. I think this amendment ought to commend itself to the Minister of Justice and to the House, for it seems to me it obviates any difficulty which can reasonably be assigned to holding the elections throughout Canada on the same day. The statute as it stands provides that the Governor in Council fixes the day of nomination in all the constituencies except those named in that section, and also the date of polling. By section 29, the returning officers fix the date of nomination and polling in the excepted ridings. I propose to do away with that by providing that both these dates shall be fixed by the Governor General, but that the time between the holding of the nomination and the polling shall be enlarged in the case of the excepted ridings. The usual practice, I understand, is to allow thirty days between the issuing of the writs of election and the polling day. I propose practically to cut that time in two and allow half of it before the nomination and the other half after it. Thus, instead of allowing seven or eight days—it is seven in reality—as now, for the returning officer to do his work after nomination, I would allow fourteen days on each side of that date. I move that clause 3 be struck out and the following substituted :

In the electoral districts of Gaspé, and Chicoutimi and Saguenay, in the province of Quebec ; and of Comox-Atlin, Kootenay and Yale-Cariboo, in the province of British Columbia ; the day for the nomination of candidates so to be fixed by the Governor General and named in the writ of election, shall not be less than fourteen clear days next before the day also so fixed and named for holding the polls, and the day for holding the polls shall be the same day throughout Canada.

Amendment (Mr. Alcorn) negatived.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not gather exactly what the view of the government is with regard to these amendments. As I said before, they seem to be very moderate. For example, in the Northwest Territories this provision with regard to the enumerator names a time within which the electors may conveniently find him. He is to be

present at a certain place for two consecutive hours in every day of eight days preceding the election for the purpose of enabling them to apply for certificates. The certificates referred to are certificates of the authority referred to act as agent. The difficulty that has arisen is that these have been used, as I am informed, for the purpose of enabling personation to be carried on. It is merely desired that those safeguards that seem to me reasonable shall be adopted in order that personation shall not be carried on, and that the persons representing both candidates shall have an equal opportunity of applying for these certificates.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Perhaps if my hon. friend will renew his question to-morrow morning at eleven o'clock, in the interval I will endeavour to look over the Bill and see what can be done.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps in the meantime the hon. gentleman will look over both Bills, Nos. 117 and 118.

Mr. MONK. In regard to the province of Quebec, the Minister of Justice said there were four counties out of which he constitutes two counties for federal purposes. Is he quite sure of that ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. MONK. As I read the last election law of Quebec, Gaspé and the Magdalen Islands form two separate constituencies, but Chicoutimi and Saguenay are one constituency. It has been suggested to me from the district of Quebec, by people who are more competent than I am and perhaps as competent as my hon. friend and as conversant with the geography of that interesting district, that it is not at all impossible to have the elections at the same time in those two large constituencies if authority were given by statute to the returning officer to make his proclamation and to obtain the results of the election by telegraph.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. How would he send his ballot boxes ?

Mr. MONK. He can do that before. The objection pointed out to me was made on behalf of the Magdalen Islands, and my hon. friend will understand it. We have communication with the north shore of the St. Lawrence, and in the Magdalen Islands we have communication by telegraph. But the peculiarity of the Magdalen Islands is that it is impossible to cross over to them between the 15th of December and the 20th of May, and provision has to be made for such a contingency. The consequence is, for instance, that if we had an election this fall, as some people insinuate we may have, the Magdalen Islands in the county of Gaspé would not be represented in the next session of this parliament until after the 20th of May.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It may not.

Mr. MONK. It might not be, as my hon. friend says, and possibly it might be. But what was represented to me by my friends in the district of Quebec was that such a regrettable want of representation might be obviated by giving the returning officer power in those districts to act by means of telegraphic communication.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That suggestion must have come from Quebec, and not elsewhere.

Mr. MONK. The representation I am making on behalf of these people is a serious one. There is no doubt that an amendment could easily be made giving him that power. There would be then no possible contingency in which the county of Gaspé would not have its duly elected representative, even between the period from the 15th of December and the 20th of May. I am not prepared with an amendment, but my hon. friend I think could easily prepare one which would enable us to have the elections in the province of Quebec all over at the same time.

Mr. CHARLES MARCIL. I undertook a few moments ago to give some explanations in regard to the county of Gaspé, where I had the honour of being a candidate some eight years ago. The county of Gaspé in the summer time is much easier of access than it is in winter. In summer we have navigation on both shores, we have navigation also to the Magdalen Islands ; but in the winter time this disappears entirely ; and we have no railways. The first parish in the county of Gaspé is forty miles from the nearest railroad station, and the mainland is 320 miles long. There used to be in the old Election Act a provision as regards the Magdalen Islands that if the election was held in the winter time the proclamation could be cabled over to the islands and the deputy returning officer on the island was authorized to prepare with a pen the proclamation necessary to bring on that election and the ballots as well. The first difficulty that would exist between the nomination and the voting would be this, that as soon as the candidates are nominated the returning officer must go to Quebec or send to Quebec to have the ballots printed as there is no French printing office nearer than Quebec.

There may be a local printing office in Rimouski and perhaps another at Rivière du Loup but generally the ballots are printed at Quebec. Before the ballots are returned to Perce there is generally a lapse of three or four days. Then the returning officer must cover the whole area of 320 miles which lies between Cap Chat and Newport. I had the pleasure of covering that district on snowshoes or rowing in an open boat in March of 1897. It took me eight

weeks day after day to cover the county of Gaspé from end to end, and then I had the satisfaction of being beaten by six votes. My opponent at the time was the Prime Minister of the province and he had fixed one clear month between nomination and voting. Voting used to come one or two weeks after the nomination but in that year there was apparently a premonition that something would happen to the party in power—as it did happen—and instead of putting the voting later than the general voting, the voting was placed on the same day but the nomination was fixed one month earlier. There is no human possibility of holding an election in Gaspé between November and May unless you give the returning officer at least two weeks in which to send to Quebec to have his ballots printed and to distribute the ballots, and I am sure if you refer the matter to the returning officer himself he will place one month between nomination and voting. As far as the islands are concerned, I believe the old provision exists that you can wire over the proclamation.

Mr. MONK. I find there is already a provision in the Elections Act of 1900 section 151, that information of the result of the voting may be made by telegraphic communication between Chicoutimi and Saguenay and Gaspé, and that after obtaining such information by telegraph the returning officer may make his proclamation. As he is allowed to make his proclamation by telegraph I do not see that there is very much difficulty. Of course the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) knows more about the district than I do, although I still maintain that I know as much as the Minister of Justice, but as regards the time that must elapse between nomination and voting my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) is mistaken, because according to the last Quebec electoral law, the law of 1903, as I read section 7, the voting must take place eight days after nomination. There remains the questions of printing of the ballots.

Mr. C. MARCIL. The whole year around or only in the summer time ?

Mr. MONK. The whole year except in the Magdalen Islands. No election can take place in the Magdalen Islands between December 15 and May 20 but if telegraphic communication can be legalized by statute of course that can be obviated.

There remains the important questions of the printing of the ballots which of course can be easily overcome if there is a printing press in the Magdalen Islands. As that locality is progressive there may be one before long, and in the provincial statutes it is provided that the elections shall take place as indicated under section 97 if possible. Those two words could be introduced into the Federal Act with the amendment I have suggested, and as soon as the difficulty of printing the ballots could be obviated then the elections could be held all over at the same time.

Mr. C. MARCIL. The best way to deal with Gaspé is to leave the matter open and let the returning officer be the judge. Circumstances vary with the season. In the summer you can cover the whole district easily, but from November until May it is difficult. The maritime road on the south shore is sometimes closed in winter and it is impossible to cover the distance in four days from Cap Chat to Cap Gaspé ; you must send to Quebec to get the ballots printed. It is not the distribution of the boxes, as this might be done days before. You have to wire the names of the candidates to Quebec, and have the ballots printed, brought to Gaspé and then have them taken to the different subdivisions by horse or sled or dog train, on the south shore. It is impossible to cover that great area in eight days.

Mr. MONK. The means of communication are increasing every day and with such a very able representative as my hon. friend the district should be able to secure good communication. I am afraid my hon. friend conceived a gloomy impression of the peninsula in 1897.

Mr. C. MARCIL. I must admit that the communications in the summer time are improved, but I am sorry the Solicitor General is not present. He would point out that we have now a splendid steamship service on the south side, which we had not in 1897 and we also have a service on the Bay de Chaleurs side. Then we have 100 miles of railway in Bonaventure county and that is being extended, but all these while they are good in the summer, but we have only the railway in the winter.

Mr. ALCORN. I am very glad indeed to hear the hon. member for Bonaventure state that fourteen days was sufficient time to allow between nomination and polling.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Bill as amended reported.

FISHERIES ACT—AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 74) to amend the Dominion Fisheries Act (Mr. Prefontaine) was read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

1. The 'Fisheries Act,' chapter 95 of the Revised Statutes, is amended by inserting the following section immediately after section 6:—

'6*a*. No one shall, at any time, engage in the manufacture from whales of oil or other commercial product, and no vessel or boat shall be employed in the whale fishery, except under license from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, under a penalty not exceeding five hundred dollars and not less than three hundred dollars.

"2. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries may issue licenses under this section, for a period in each case not exceeding nine years, under the following conditions:—

'(*a*.) No license shall issue until the site of the factory has been approved by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and no site shall be approved within fifty miles of any other whale factory, or in such proximity to any inhabited place or places as, in the opinion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, may cause any danger or detriment to the public health;

'(*b*.) No license shall be issued until the applicant therefor has given assurances to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, of a satisfactory nature, that he (the applicant) is in a position to convert any whale captured into commercial products within twenty-four hours of the landing of such whale, and that he is also in a position to conduct his whale factory and business in such a manner that no noxious or deleterious matter will be introduced into any public waters, bays, creeks, rivers or harbours.

'3. The holder of any such license shall not operate more than one whaling steamer in connection with the whale factory under license.

'4. The license shall become void and forfeited unless the factory named therein is erected, equipped and working within two years from the date of the issue of the license.

'5. The fee charged on each such license shall be eight hundred dollars for the first year, one thousand dollars for the second year, and twelve hundred dollars for the third and each ensuing year, and the fee on all subsequent licenses for the same factory shall be twelve hundred dollars; such fee shall be payable to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, first on the issue of the license, and on the first day of July in each year thereafter: Provided that the Governor in Council, after the first two years, may exact, in lieu of such fee, a sum equal to two per cent of the gross earnings of each factory, which shall be payable as aforesaid.

'6. Every license, upon cause shown, after one month's notice in writing to the licensee, shall be liable to forfeiture for any infraction of this section, or any regulation under it, or for failure to fulfil and carry out the assurances required under paragraph (*b*) of subsection 2 of this section; and in the case of forfeiture, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries may, without any suit or other proceedings at law, and without compensation, cancel the license.

'7. The Governor in Council may, from time to time, make such regulations as to him seem necessary for carrying out and enforcing any of the provisions of this section, and for controlling and regulating the manufactures carried on in the licensed factories, and the disposal of all refuse therefrom.

'8. Boats known as 'tow-boats' shall not be used by any one in the prosecution of the whaling industry, and no vessel other than the vessel from which the whales have been captured or killed, shall, by any method or contrivance, bring or tow into port any whale for manufacture or other purpose; but nothing in this section shall prevent any one, other than the holder of a license, or his employees, from towing any dead whale to land, and having it manufactured or otherwise disposing of it in accordance with the provisions of this section.

Mr. ALCORN.

'9. No one shall pursue, capture, shoot or kill any whale within the distance of one-half nautical mile of any vessel or boat not at anchor or engaged in any kind of fishing, or within one nautical mile of any vessel or boat at anchor or engaged in any kind of fishing.

'10. No one shall have in his possession, or use in the catching or killing of whales, any contrivance which does not include a harpoon, with a whaling line attached thereto, fixed or fastened to the boat or vessel from which the whale is captured or killed.

'11. Every one who violates any provision of this section, or of the regulations made hereunder, for which violation no penalty is herein specially provided, shall be liable to a fine exceeding two hundred dollars, and not less than fifty dollars.

'12. All machinery and apparatus, and all vessels and boats, and their tackle, apparel and furniture, used in violation of this section, or of any regulation made hereunder, shall be confiscated to His Majesty.—Mr. Préfontaine.

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Up to the present we have had no regulations with regard to our whale fishery, which has of late years become an important industry on the Atlantic coast and which we hope will also become important on the Pacific coast. In the United States there are no laws regulating the whale fishery, but there are laws in Newfoundland which have proven very satisfactory, and which have helped a good deal to develop the industry in that colony. We have copied the Newfoundland law almost word for word. In Scotland there are laws bearing on the subject and these were amended at the last session of the British parliament, also in the direction of the Newfoundland laws. By this Bill we intend to regulate the whale fishery so that it may be carried on under such supervision as will prevent it from being a menace and nuisance to other fishing industries. The locations will be secured from private individuals, or from the Crown, or from the provincial authorities, but it is provided that no vessel will be licensed to fish within fifty miles of another location. It is also provided that the license shall issue for the one whaling boat so that four or five tugs cannot be employed on the same location, which might tend to create a monopoly of the industry and cause a nuisance by the carcasses of the animals not being properly disposed of after the oil and other valuable parts are secured.

Mr. HAGGART. Does this apply to Hudson bay ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. To all Canadian waters.

Mr. HAGGART. You claim Hudson bay exclusively under the jurisdiction of the Dominion as Canadian waters ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is some question between us and the government of

Newfoundland on that point. We have received from Quebec twenty-two applications; from Nova Scotia, seventeen; from New Brunswick, one; from British Columbia, eleven. We have received no applications for whaling privileges in Hudson bay.

Mr. GOURLEY. Of course any controversy there is as to the jurisdiction over Hudson bay is between the government of Canada and the government of Newfoundland. There is no question at all as to British jurisdiction.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. None at all. There are some parts of Hudson bay about which there is correspondence at the present time with the Newfoundland government, but as regards Hudson bay proper, there is no doubt at all that it is under Canadian jurisdiction.

Mr. GOURLEY. Quite so.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The following amendment has been suggested, after the words 'nine years' in the section:

Provided always that the licensee shall be entitled to have the said license renewed from time to time for periods of nine years, upon giving six month's notice thereof in writing previous to the determination of each period.

Those engaging in the industry may have to spend $50,000 and more, so that if they were exposed to have their licenses taken away without cause after nine years, it would be a bar to their engaging in the industry.

Mr. CLANCY. I see that $1,200 is the maximum license fee and although the industry might be found to be very profitable, you do not provide for charging a higher fee on the renewing of the license.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is a provision in subsection 5:

Provided that the Governor in Council, after the first two years, may exact, in lieu of such fee, a sum equal to 2 per cent of the gross earnings of each factory.

This will amount to a very much larger sum than $1,200.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. HAGGART. How are these licenses to be awarded—by priority of application upon the conditions being performed by the applicant?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Priority is always taken into consideration.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the minister understand the effect of the other amendment? Is the renewal of the license forever, in periods of nine years, upon the performance of the conditions? The renewal should be optional with the government, and the government should be able to change the regulations and conditions.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We might change the word 'shall' to 'may.'

Mr. GOURLEY. I think the Act should go further. If a man invests a large amount of capital in the industry, it should not be discretionary with the government to renew the license or not.

Mr. MORRISON. It seems to me that the hon. member for Colchester has struck the exact point which the minister intended in the first amendment; that is, when a licensee invests all the way from $60,000 to $100,000, it is only fair that he should have some claim to a renewal of his license after a period of nine years. Under the remarks of the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), that claim would be taken away, and the government might arbitrarily refuse to renew the license, and the man's whole investment might be swept away.

Mr. GOURLEY. I agree with the hon. gentleman. I think the party who has invested his money should have a choice.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I would like the committee to remark also that by the provision of section 5 the government is well protected because there it is provided that the Governor in Council after the first two years may exact, in lieu of such fee, a sum equal to two per cent of the gross earnings of each factory, which shall be payable as aforesaid. If the industry proves very important and increasing, we can apply section 5.

Mr. GOURLEY. I think you will really deter people from going into the industry if you only give them nine years.

Mr. HAGGART. Under the clause as the minister proposes, it is a lease in perpetuity, renewable every nine years, upon the party performing the conditions. The remedy which the minister says he has under clause 5 is no remedy against the individual at all. The remedy must apply to all the parties who will fish under these regulations. It must be a general regulation.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. If these words were out, you would put this industry entirely in the hands of the Governor in Council without taking into consideration at all what has been the investment, and that might deter capitalists from investing at all in the industry.

Mr. CLANCY. I suppose the assumption is that the Governor in Council will exercise its power. Or does the hon. gentleman propose to give up that power and give a lease in perpetuity? The committee will assume that at the end of each period the government may take such action as will be just to those engaged in the industry and in the interests of the country. To give a lease in perpetuity would be to give up absolutely that power which ought to reside in the hands of the executive.

Mr. PREFONTAINE moved the following amendment :—

Provided always that the Governor in Council may from time to time renew such license for periods of nine years upon giving six months' notice thereof in writing.

Mr. HAGGART. That makes the Governor in Council give the notice.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The intention is that the licensee shall give it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Better let that stand and we will make it right at another stage.

On section 2,

Subsection 7 of section 14 of the said Act is repealed, and the following is substituted therefor: —

7. No one shall use a bag-net, trap-net,, pound-net or fish-weir of any kind for capturing fish, without a special license from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries ; and no such license shall extend to the capturing of salmon by such means : Provided that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries may grant licenses for the capture of salmon in specified waters in the province of British Columbia by the use of trap-nets.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Chapter 95, 49 Victoria (Consolidated Statutes) section 14, subsection 7, says :

No one shall use any bag-net, trap-net or fish pound, except under a special license granted for capturing deep-sea fish other than salmon.

This question has been debated a great deal amongst the people of British Columbia.

Mr. KAULBACH. Is that confined strictly to British Columbia waters ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes. We are seeking to amend this section to provide for the installation of trap-nets legally under the Fisheries Act, in order to be in a position to compete with the Americans who have been using the same kind of apparatus to catch the salmon for the last seven or eight years, to the great detriment of those interested in the canneries and fisheries of British Columbia as has been strongly urged by their representatives. These trap-nets are already in existence in the northern part of British Columbia under permission granted, I think, ten or twelve years ago. The same question came up at that time, and, from the information I have gathered, the fishermen in British Columbia are divided as to the use of trap-nets, one section wishing to have them allowed and the other section opposing their use. While this question was pending, the then Minister of Fisheries, being under the impression that the question would be settled so as to allow trap-nets, allowed parties to construct and use trap-nets. And, when the law was introduced, this party threatened to make a claim against the government of Canada for a very large amount. Under the circumstances, it was thought proper to allow this man to run these nets till the lumber used in the construction of them should be destroyed by time. But the party is still fishing with these trap-nets. It is stated that this does not interfere with the fishermen of the Fraser River. It is a very important question in British Columbia, and there is a good deal of divergence of opinion as regards the use of these trap-nets, but the majority of the people seem now to be in favour of the use of these nets. that is why this legislation is being introduced.

Mr. HAGGART. What has been the effect of the fishing there ? Are the fish diminishing ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It cannot be said that they are diminishing. It takes about four years for a salmon to grow into condition to be used in the canneries. The extraordinary fact has been observed that it is only once in four years that the fishing is really good. This year, it is expected, it will be less than in any other of this quadrennial period. Next year, being the fourth year, it is expected that the fish will come in large quantities. Different suggestions have been made of improvements being adopted to increase the number of the fish, and I think we have about arrived at the point where we shall be able to act jointly with the provincial authorities and be able to adopt means which will put this great industry of British Columbia on a proper footing, not only for one year in four, but for every year.

Mr. HAGGART. How long does this license last ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is renewed every year. I should explain that these trap-nets are very costly. There are different arguments in favour of them, but the best is that if, say 20,000 salmon are caught in trap-nets and the owner of the nets is not able to either sell them or pack them within a certain time, they can be set free without injury, to be caught by somebody else, whilst, with the other apparatus, every salmon that is caught must be canned or else it is lost.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). Is there not danger, in using trap-nets, of reducing the catch of salmon, so that ultimately the salmon fishery will be destroyed ? We in Nova Scotia set trap-nets for herring, mackerel, cod-fish, haddock and so on, but if a salmon happens to get into the net it must be set free again. If the fisherman is greedy enough to sell that salmon, his license will be taken away from him. Under these circumstances, only a few can be taken. What I fear is that the wholesale way of catching salmon in British Columbia will greatly injure or destroy the fisheries.

Mr. MORRISON. I regret very much indeed the policy adopted by the Minister of

Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Prefontaine) concerning the salmon fishery in British Columbia. With all due deference to him and his predecessors, my opinion is—and it is backed by statistics and the results of scientific research—that the catching of salmon in trap-nets is utterly indefensible. I am sure that the minister has not in his department any evidence that would reasonably justify the course which he is adopting in this instance. The commissioner of fisheries, in my opinion, is responsible for this grave step on the part of the government. I do not wish to shift the responsibility from the shoulders of the minister, but I know that the practical working out of these matters in the department hinges very largely on the advice of the commissioner of fisheries. Now, the commissioner, in my opinion, knows practically nothing about the requirements of the fisheries in British Columbia. That he knows very little is evidenced by his reports and his advice as to the habits of the salmon in British Columbia. He knows very little indeed,—taking the same means of arriving at a conclusion as to what he does know—he knows very little indeed as to the views of the fishermen as a whole in the province of British Columbia with respect to this important industry. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who has never been in British Columbia in his capacity as a minister, has stated that the majority of the people in British Columbia engaged in the fishing industry are in favour of this method of fishing. That is not the fact. The minister has evidently been so advised by the commissioner who has on several occasions gone to the province, and, in my opinion has bungled the thing in every instance, advising the minister wrongly, and, in consequence of the advice of the commissioner of fisheries, and perhaps other officials, the government have taken this erroneous step. So far as the fishermen in the province of British Columbia are concerned, I venture to say there is not a man of them who is not opposed to trap-net fishing. The people who want to install these traps and who have succeeded to a limited extent in getting them installed, are the capitalists in Montreal and Toronto, Mr. Porteous of Montreal, Mr. Cronyn and Mr. Aemilius Irving of Toronto, who are controlling the British Columbia Packing Association, men who are engaged in salmon fishing in British Columbia, but who know nothing about it personally, except to the extent of making dividends and profits out of it, and exploiting this important industry to its ultimate ruin.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Bloated capitalists.

Mr. MORRISON. No, I am not going to talk about bloated capitalists at all. I think we ought to encourage capital, and if there is one province in the Dominion of Canada which requires capital more than another, it is British Columbia. But there is such a thing as getting capital at too great a cost, and in this case that is so. I do not wish to detain the House further in expressing my strong objection to this clause, and I move that all the words after 'means' in the 49th line be struck out of subsection 2.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister will agree to that.

Mr. MORRISON. I urge that there is not sufficient evidence before the minister to justify him in making such an important amendment to the fishery laws as this clause involves. What I have been urging for a long time upon the minister is that he should visit the province himself and investigate matters before he adopts this legislation.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister says he wants to make the present law so that it can be enforced.

Mr. MORRISON. No, he has granted licenses to several people to fish by this trap method. I cannot understand by what authority he has done so. There is Mr. Todd of Victoria, for instance, who got a trap license, and he is to-day fishing salmon with a trap-net.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I would like to state that the reason why the practice of trap fishing was initiated by the minister was due to the fact that for many years fishing by traps has been very extensively carried on on the sound. If there is anything in the argument at all, it is that the waters are likely to be depleted by the practice of trap fishing. As a matter of fact traps are extensively used on the American side of the Sound at the present time. The great object in adopting the practice of fishing by traps on the west coast of Vancouver Island is to meet the practice of fishing by traps that is carried on on the American side at the present time. That is the object. Of course my hon. friend from Westminster (Mr. Morrison) very properly considers that this will interfere with the fishing industry, and in time will very materially affect the interests of Westminster. But the fact remains that at the present time an extensive method of trap fishing has been adopted and is in operation in the United States; and if it is true that a depletion will take place by that method, it will equally take place if practiced by American fishermen. The only remedy, and it is a complete one, is to operate this method on both sides of the line, and if the result follows as has been stated, then parties on the other side will have just as much interest as we have in coming together to consider some other method of catching fish.

Mr. SPROULE. After the fish are already caught.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. The fish are being caught by the Americans now, and whatever injury is being done, it is done to their advantage. If it is a good thing for them to catch fish by traps, it will not be a bad thing for us to catch fish by traps. If a remedy is sought to this destructive method of fishing, I think it will be brought about more quickly by adopting the same system.

At one o'clock, committee took recess.

Committee resumed at Three o'clock.

Progress reported.

THE MILITIA ACT.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 5) to amend the Militia Act.

Hon. DAVID TISDALE. Before the motion is adopted I wish to move the amendment of which I have given notice. I may say that were it not for the importance of this measure and especially of the very drastic alterations introduced into the Bill by the minister, I would not detain the House at this time with any lengthened remarks. In order to bring the matter clearly before the House, and to permit of its being discussed without going beyond the record I shall read the amendment which I am about to propose which sets forth not only the alterations I propose but also the clauses in the Bill which I wish to strike out or amend. The motion reads as follows :—

That the said Bill be not read a third time, but that it be referred back to the committee of the whole House with instructions to the committee to strike out section 7 of the said Act, which reads as follows : —

7. The Governor in Council may appoint a militia council to advise the minister on all matters relating to the militia, which are referred to the council by the minister. The composition, procedure and powers of the council shall be as prescribed.

And also to strike out section 30 of the said Act, which reads as follows :—

Section 30. There may be appointed an officer who shall hold rank not below that of a colonel in the militia or in His Majesty's regular army, who may be, subject to the regulations and under the direction of the minister, charged with the military command of the militia, and such officer shall have the rank of major-general in the militia, and shall be paid at such rate, not exceeding $6,000 per annum, as is prescribed; and substitute therefor the following :—

30. There shall be appointed an officer who holds the rank of colonel or rank superior thereto, in His Majesty's regular army, who shall be charged, under the orders of His Majesty, with the military command and discipline of the militia, and who, while he holds such appointment, shall have the rank of major-general in the militia, and shall be paid a salary at the rate of $4,000 per annum, and any addition thereto in lieu of allowances, such sum, not exceeding $2,000 per annum, as is determined by the Governor in Council.

And also to strike out section 31 of the said Act, which reads as follows :—

31. There may be appointed an officer who shall hold rank not below that of colonel in the militia or in His Majesty's regular army, who may be, subject to the regulations and under the direction of the minister, charged with the military inspection of the militia, and such officer shall be paid at such rate, not exceeding $6,000 per annum, as is prescribed.

And also to strike out section 32 of the said Act, which reads as follows :—

32. The duties and authority of each of the officers respectively referred to in the two next preceding sections shall be defined by the Governor in Council.

And substitute therefor the following :—

32. The Governor in Council shall from time to time make such orders as are necessary respecting the duties to be performed by the officer commanding the militia, by the adjutant general, by the quartermaster general and by the officers of the militia generally.

Also to strike out section 36 of the said Act, which reads as follows :—

36. The Governor in Council may establish a general staff, headquarters staff, and district staff, and may appoint a chief of the general staff and such officers to the respective staffs as are deemed necessary, and shall define their duties and authority; and substitute therefor the following :—

36. His Majesty may appoint staff officers of the militia with such rank as from time to time is found requisite or necessary for the efficiency of the militia service, and such staff officers shall have such rank and authority in the militia as are held relatively in His Majesty's service, and their duties shall be such as are, from time to time, prescribed, with power to the committee to make such other alterations, if any, as shall be necessary to bring the Act in accord with the above changes.

I shall now briefly explain the nature of the amendments, and their application to these sections.

Section 7 which deals with formation of a militia council is a new section. I am asking to repeal that absolutely.

Section 30 is a new section, which differs from the corresponding section in the existing law in two respects. The new section provides that it shall be optional with the government whether such an officer is appointed or not, and secondly it provides that the officer shall act not only subject to the regulations, but 'under the direction of the minister.' Now these are both significant changes, and I shall remark on their nature and application later.

Section 31 provides for the appointment of an inspecting officer to the militia. As my motion will, if accepted, restore the General Officer Commanding as under the existing law, I move to strike that out, believing that the general officer will be able to perform the inspection as well as his other duties as he has done in the past. Thus we will save the expenditure of $6,000 a year,

although we might prevent some hon. gentleman who is looking for a new position with a large salary at the country's expense from attaining his desire.

Section 32 which I ask to repeal, and for which I propose to substitute another clause, involves a very material change also. The present law vests in the Governor in Council power to make such 'orders as are necessary with respect to duties to be performed by the General Officer Commanding.' This new clause authorizes the Governor in Council to define the duties and authority of the General Officer Commanding. Under the present Militia Act the Orders in Council which are authorized to be made are only 'respecting the duties to be performed by the General Officer Commanding.' A most important difference and in my opinion is one of the greatest safeguards if properly carried out, against, the introduction of political influence into the the militia. The present law hands over to the General Officer Commanding the command and discipline of the militia. It authorizes the Governor in Council to make orders as to the performance of his power. The high court of parliament have passed upon that, and the Governor in Council cannot override the action of parliament for an Act of parliament is above an Order in Council.

There has been very general discussion on the law and regulations governing our militia system, and in view of the lateness of the session I shall not enter into a further discussion, but shall refer those who wish to understand the subject to the records of the House. When the Minister of Militia first introduced this Bill, he told us that he would defer the consideration of it until he could consult the home authorities. Well, he did consult the home authorities, but since that consultation and since the introduction of this Bill this year very drastic changes have been made in it affecting the organization of our military system; changes far more important than those which the minister thought it well to consult the war officer about last year when he first introduced the Bill, and yet the hon. gentleman presses these charges this year after admitting yesterday that he had not consulted the Imperial authorities about them. Now as to the introduction of politics into the Canadian militia, it is admitted by the best authorities in the colonies as well as in Great Britain, that a cardinal principle in the perfection of a military organization is the exclusion of politics in every shape and form. Let me state here that I never knew or heard of the slightest attempt to introduce politics in any manner whatever into the administration of the Militia Department during the long years of the Conservative regime. In order that this statement of mine may be endorsed, I quote from the 'Military Gazette'; the following extracts from speeches delivered on September 19th, 1899, at a banquet tendered by the Montreal Garrison at the Windsor Hotel to Sir Percy Girouard.

In reply to the toast of our guest, Sir Percy said:—

'Canada has as good a fighting machine as could be found in the world, but he would emphasize the fact that it should be free from political trammels. (Cheers.) The militia have perfect faith in their commanding officers, district officers commanding, and, above all, their general, who should rule with a perfectly free hand, which means and reads, success.

Hon. Dr. Borden said:

I have only been Minister of Militia for three years, and the militia forces of this country have been in existence for twenty-five years, but I think it is only due to the gentlemen who have preceded me that I should say that I do not believe that they have abused their positions in order to introduce politics. 'I say,' proceeded the Hon. Dr. Borden, 'that every battalion in the Dominion of Canada has been untrammelled in the selection of its officers. No man can say to you that the lieutenant-colonel of any battalion has been dictated to by the government at Ottawa. Will any one tell me that there has been gross abuses of this kind in Canada? I don't believe it. Of course, in the first instance, when the Canadian provinces, in 1868, felt the necessity for having a military force, and Sir George Cartier took the matter in hand, it was necessary to choose persons to take command who were not in the regular army. It was the best force that was available, and from that time the people have given their money and their time for the privilege of serving the flag of the country. That being the case, what was more natural than that the head of the department of the government should have had something to do with selection of the men who have been in command of the battalions. No doubt, that has been done, but it has not been done for the last twenty years, and there has been promotion from the lower grade to the higher grade officers in the regular course. There has been no gross abuse on the part of the 'civil head' in any branch of the service. I make this statement in justice to those who have been at the head of the department in the past—not for myself, for I have only had my present position for three years.'

I quote this in order to show the contrast between the administration of the militia under the Conservative regime, and the present unfortunate state of affairs.

The Minister of Militia claims that for the old system he has substituted his new plan of a military council, based on the British Army Council recently adopted in England, but I think I will be able to show that such is not the case. I think it would be fairer to the minister and less subject to dispute if I read a short extract from his speech in Committee of the Whole. He said:

In view of the course which has been pursued by the War Office, I have thought it advisable to provide, in the Bill now before parliament, the machinery by which the government of this country may follow the example of the imperial government. Under the

new system, there will be a Militia Council corresponding to what is in England called the Army Council. That council will be composed of the Minister of Militia, as chairman of the council, with four military men and two additional civilians.

The Militia Council, as I say, will be composed of seven members, as is the Army Council—four military, three civil. The Minister for the time being will be the chairman; the principal military officer will be known as the Chief of the General Staff. Then there will be the Adjutant General, the Quartermaster-General and the Master-General of Ordnance. The two additional civilians would be the Deputy Minister and, probably, the Chief Accountant of the department.

Under the system there will be no General Officer Commanding. There is no Commander in Chief in England to-day and there will be no General Officer Commanding here. There would be a first military officer known as the Chief of the General Staff, the most important military officer in the country as he is to-day the most important military officer in England, except some of the generals commanding in chief in some of the large districts.

Now, the first thing I will do will be to explain briefly the new reconstruction scheme in England. It is composed of: first, the Defence Committee; and secondly, the Army Council. In regard to that, and as an indication of the importance and duties of these committees, I will read from the 'Reconstruction Committee' report with which the hon. gentleman compares his scheme. The report says, at page 9, of section 15 of part 1:

> Speaking broadly, the distribution of duties must be as follows:—
>
> A. Secretary of State.
>
> B. 1st Military Member.—Military policy in all its branches. War staff duties, intelligence, mobilization, plans of operations, training, military history, higher education, war regulations.
>
> C. 2nd Military Member.—Recruiting, pay, discipline, rewards, peace regulations.
>
> D. 3rd Military Member.—Supply, clothing, remounts, transport.
>
> E. 4th Military Member.—Armaments and fortifications.
>
> F. Civil Member.—The parliamentary Under-Secretary of State. Civil business other than finance.
>
> G. Civil Member.—The Financial Secretary. Finance, audit, accounting, estimates.

The naming of these different members and the reading of the importance and extent of their duties shows enough for the purposes of my argument. I read from part 1, page 14, part of section 5:

> The Army Council is to administer and not to command the army. Executive command being vested in generals outside the War Office, who will be responsible for the training and efficiency of all troops within their districts, an independent Inspection Department must be provided for the information and the protection of the Council.

The next is the Inspection Department. The Inspector General has under him the following inspectors: Cavalry; Horse and Field Artillery; Garrison Artillery. Engineers; Mounted Infantry. Next comes the Decentralization Committee, and under this England is divided into five territorial divisions, which are subdivided into a great many more districts. Each of these divisions is commanded, not by a Commander in Chief, but by a General Officer Commanding in Chief. The next department is that of Military Finance. The next is that of the Chief of the General Staff, which is a department itself. The next department is the Department for the Promotion and Selection of Officers. The Inspector General is the president and the General Officers Commanding in Chief are members. Each of the above departments has a separate council and organization. In addition, there are the following three great departments: Adjutant General's Department; Quartermaster General's Department; and Department of Master General or Ordnance. Each has several branches under it, assisted by one or more councils or committees. What do these great councils have charge of? About 500,000 regular soldiers, largely on a war footing, some small portion in reserve, and an expenditure of $175,000,000; and I am credibly informed that to-day there is a committee sitting in the old country under the Duke of Norfolk, to provide a scheme for their volunteers in addition. Now, what is our existing system? It is founded on the idea of two branches, one civil and the other military, each having restricted authority, with some joint or dual authority. They act separately in many things. Each in many cases has to approve of what the other does. In many cases they act independently of each other. The general is to have charge of the military branch and the minister is to have charge of the civil branch. He is to have the command, the discipline, the education, nomination, promotion and selection for appointment of officers; the preparation and maintenance of plans of defence, and the regulation and mobilization of the militia. He is to advise the Minister of Militia on all military questions. He is to have the control and supervision of the military branch. The minister, on the other hand, is the head of the civil branch. He has the financing and the initiation of all matters that lead to the expenditure of money.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Is my hon. friend stating the present condition of things in Canada as he understands it?

Mr. TISDALE. Yes.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The minister, then, is the head of the civil branch only?

Mr. TISDALE. Only, except in this way. If you will look at the Act and the regulations, you will see that the discipline of the militia is in the charge of the General Officer Commanding and that the power of

the Governor General in Council is one of regulating or supervising. There are two branches the duties of which run necessarily more or less together, the military and the civil ; but the command and discipline of militia, the nomination of officers and matters of that description exclusively belong to the general, subject to the approval of the minister. He must have the minister's approval ; and if the minister refuses, then the responsibility is on him and he will have to reckon with parliament. But the idea underlying the present system is that you should have two capable, honest men at the head of the militia who will have above all things the interests of the service at heart. And if that fundamental principle fails, no legislation can be perfect. The minister should have the initiation of all matters involving the expenditure of money. He will have charge of the financial aspect of all questions of supply, works and buildings, arms, ordnance, &c., and especially the control of the civil branch and supplies, the Governor in Council being authorized to make orders respecting the duties of each and as to certain of their subordinates. The military branch being in short under the general and the civil branch under the minister. The military branch to command, train, educate and organize the militia for war. The civil branch to clothe, arm, feed, transport and look after the business end in general. An experienced general officer to train, command, organize and discipline. The minister to look after the business and expenditure of the department. After all what is the object the law should aim at ? It is to attain the greatest efficiency combined with the greatest simplicity and the least expense. Just consider the subject matter of our present system. You have 2,000 men at the most on a war footing, to be largely used in detachments or as schools of training for the militia. And you have 45,000 men, who are expected to appear under arms once a year and train from twelve to sixteen days.

Now, let me quote the minister in the Committee of the Whole against the existing system :—

> Without troubling this committee by going into details, I think I may say, without fear of contradiction, that it is quite obvious that the system which has been in existence in this country ever since confederation has not worked well. I am not going to animadvert upon or criticise any officers who have been sent out here to assist us in administering the militia of this country. I do not propose to do that, but I think that every one will agree that the system has not worked well, and I am prepared to blame the system much more than the individuals who have attempted to work it. I believe it is an impossible system. I believe it is absolutely and entirely impossible to get on with the system which we have attempted to work in this country since confederation.

Strong words ! Statements merely. In reply I will content myself with giving past experience of the existing system :

Established in England in 1793. Kept in force there without change until 1870. Change when made then was more on account of the magnitude to which the army had grown and the increase of expenditure than anything else. The English system lately again changed under the reconstruction report.

In neither case was there any change in the principle of having a general officer charged with the responsible command and discipline of the army in the sense we understand it here.

Since confederation the existing system has been in force, 37 years—25 under Conservative sway, five under old Liberal rule (old school), Alexander Mackenzie ; under present minister eight years. In the 30 years only with one general officer commanding was there any serious friction. This minister in eight years has disposed of four: Generals Gascoigne, Hutton, O'Grady-Haley, and lastly, Dundonald. Boasted of the efficiency lately of the militia when Dundonald came and of the great improvement of the militia in the last three years. For the expense expended upon them our militia will compare favourably with any militia in the world. The existing system has been in force on the same principle as to the military branch as I have mentioned in England and Canada continuously 111 years. Constitutional authorities show it was not only introduced to prevent abuses, but will be successful. if fairly administered. Today Scotland is under a general officer commanding in the sense we understand it in perfect parallel in principle with our present scheme. What is good enough for Scotland should be good enough for us in a military sense.

Before going further into this question, let me point out one or two specific matters. While the minister says there shall be no more a General Officer Commanding in Canada, yet he retains the option to appoint one. Under the present system there must be an officer in command of our forces who holds the rank of not less than colonel in His Majesty's regular army. In discussing this question the other day the hon. minister was misleading. He made the charge that under the present Act our Canadian militia were being discriminated against. Sir, there is no question of discrimination, but simply a question of qualification. It is true that before a Canadian could be appointed General Officer Commanding under the present law, he would have to obtain the rank of colonel in His Majesty's regular army, but that after all is simply a question of qualification. No man thinks more of the rights of Canadians than I do or of the militia,

but I say that this is no discrimination against Canadians, nor do I believe that our Canadian militia look upon it as such. Canadians are not conceited as a rule—although you will find some glaring exceptions—and I do not think you will find any Canadian pretending that an officer in the Canadian militia could possibly have the same opportunities of training to become a General Officer Commanding as are enjoyed by an officer in the British regular army. I hope that the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) will not disagree with me on this point. That hon. gentleman is a colonel of a militia regiment and a very good officer, much appreciated by his own battalion and by the men of mine as well, and I am sure he will not say that he has had had as good opportunities of gaining the knowledge and experience which we look for in our General Officer Commanding than would a man have, whether from Canada or elsewhere, who holds a commission in His Majesty's regular army and has risen in the ranks through his own efficiency. And you must not forget that nowadays promotion can no longer be obtained by purchase in the British army, but must be gained by sheer force of merit. I am in favour of exacting a still higher qualification than that of colonel for the man who is to take charge of our forces. I think that he ought to have a rank above that of colonel. I think he ought to have the rank of a brigadier or general of a higher rank. And if the pay be not sufficient, I am prepared to take the responsibility of voting for an increase. When we increased the pay a few years ago, and very properly increased it, under my hon. friend's administration, we did so on the understanding that if possible we would get an officer from the old country of higher rank than that of colonel. Let me say further that the militia of Canada do not want this change. What they want at their head is a man possessing the best qualifications; and if the men and officers of our militia were not in fear of being disciplined for exercising the right of speech, you would have ninety-nine out of a hundred of them protesting against this change in this Bill. What we require at the head of our forces is a man who has had experience of war itself, and we can always find plenty of such, and very desirable ones, in the old country if we take the proper steps. Our force is good enough to have the best man that money can obtain. We are not afraid of rivals in this Canadian country. We are prepared to stand on our merits.

I propose here to briefly contrast the ministers new scheme or system with the new English scheme and point out some of the important matters in that connection.

I have briefly explained both these schemes. Sir, let us briefly examine as to their similarity. The English scheme is for a great regular army of 100,000 men—always under arms and maintained whether on a peace or war footing. The cost being the vast sum of $175,000,000 per year. Efficiency and readiness being the first object at whatever cost.

Under seven great committees, each with different members, each with defined duties, some mixed but largely separate, and permanent organizations. In addition the three great departmental organizations of the adjutant general, quartermaster general and master of ordnances, any one of which latter three has more and larger duties and many times greater expenditure than the whole Militia Department of Canada. Each of them with sub branches and assisted by one or more committees. This 'plain plebian Canadian,' as he ostentatiously called himself the other night (though he has a Sir to his name), with a chief of staff, adjutant general, quartermaster general, master general of ordnance, deputy minister, and chief accountant, all to be nominated by himself and all to be under his control and direction, claims to have formed and constituted a system and organization for the management and control of our militia, on all fours with the great imperial one which I have briefly described.

Another misleading statement is that made by the hon. gentleman that there is no commander in chief in England. Technically he is within the truth, no doubt. There is no one in England known by that particular name. But in every one of these divisions there is a commander in chief as much as there ever was. The hon. gentleman (Sir Frederick Borden) may laugh, but a laugh is not proof. And I regret to see the hon. gentleman indulge in such levity. I am talking for the minority in this House. I have not a majority behind me to declare my words to be right, whether they be right or not. I speak here under a high sense of duty. Nothing else could have caused me to claim the attention of hon. members at this stage of the session. But this is a life-or-death question with us, this question of defence. Each one of these five heads of divisions in England is equal to almost any commander in chief he could get. The principle is the same. And, I want to tell the hon. minister further that every one of them is vested with all the powers, in a military sense, that, I claim, the General Officer Commanding has and ought to have whether he is a militiaman or whether he is qualified by being in the regular army. And I will bring proof of that presently. I know that the hon. minister has either not looked into this matter far enough to understand it, or that he must be trying to mislead us. Now, for the proof. This is from the report I have alluded to and upon which my hon. friend claims to have founded his scheme——

Page 10, section 10—

We strongly hold that the training and preparation of His Majesty's forces for war should

be the first and, as far as possible, the undivided duty of general officers commanding-in-chief.

Page 12, section 27, part 2, as stated in paragraph 10 the primary duties of the generals commanding-in-chief——

'Generals' not 'general.'

—will be the training and preparation of the regular and auxiliary forces for war. The discipline of all officers serving in the command, including the power of convening and confirming the sentences of general courts martial, will be vested in them. They will also deal with the promotions, transfers and retirements of regular officers up to the rank of major of the units territorialized in the district under their supervision.

Page 15, section 18, part 1. A selection board should be created composed of general officers commanding-in-chief, who should make a recommendation to the Secretary of State and the army council for all promotions and appointments of officers above the rank of captain, with the exception of officers of the general staff who should, as in Germany be centrally advised and administered.

Further to emphasize my statement in regard to retaining this power in England, I may say that, since the appointment of the commander in chief in 1793, they have never lessened the authority or control of the commander in chief so far as concerns the military branch in any material degree below that of our General Officer Commanding. If you go fully into the change made in 1870 and the reasons for it, you will find that it was to meet the conditions growing out of the magnitude of the army and the expenditures which its great size made necessary, but it did not weaken, as the hon. gentleman would have us believe, the power of the military authority in regard to the military branch for the purposes I am discussing and claiming. While the hon. gentleman can find the statement that the Secretary of State was to be put over the general, I defy him to show that the regulations were of the character he contends. The fact is that the regulations like this army council business were such that if the duties of each were properly performed if there was no interference by one part of the establishment with another, the whole was entirely under the command of the military branch, as we have it under our system.

Now, let me point to a very glaring dissimilarity between the ministers new scheme and the English scheme to which he says his is similar. Take the head and front of the great scheme, the defence committee itself. This committee does not attempt the selection of any one of its permanent members except the secretary. Let me read :

9. The permanent nucleus of the defence committee should consist of :

I. A permanent secretary who should be appointed for five years renewable at pleasure.

II. Under this, officials two naval officers selected by the admiralty, two military officers chosen by the War Office and two Indian officers nominated by the Viceroy, with, if possible, one or more representatives of the colonies. These officers should not be of high rank and the duration of their appointment should be limited to two years.

This indicates the proper appreciation of such matters that is shown by those in charge of them in England. They do not desire to grasp power individually. It is one of the glories of their government, and one of the bulwarks of their national safety, that this spirit exists in England. Our minister, this 'plain plebeian Canadian,' not only proposes to nominate all the members of his militia council, but to have them under his control as well as any General Officer Commanding, or other commander if one is appointed. And more than that—what do you think ? He limits their power to the giving of 'advice.' And, even at that, he may seem to fear that they may be too familiar, because he limits them to such matters as he may ask their advice about. The section says :

The Governor in Council may appoint a militia council to advise the ministers in regard to all matters relating to the militia——

It would be somewhat sensible if it stopped there, but it goes on——

—which may be referred to the council by the minister.

While I have shown that the minister committed himself in his speech absolutely to the militia council scheme, with the chief of the general staff for his principal military adviser, he had so little confidence in that scheme that he provided an alternative scheme with a General Officer Commanding to command the militia. He had so little confidence in his militia council scheme that he provided an alternative scheme, with a General Officer Commanding as commander of the militia, showing a want of confidence, on his own part, in the scheme of his own making, before he had even tried the first. Why, we heard him declare the other day that there was to be no commander-in-chief. Yet so fearful is he of this militia council scheme with these officers of the department nominated by him and under his control, that he puts an alternative in his Bill, which amounts, as I have said, to a vote of want of confidence in it, carried by himself before he has tried it—declaring with one breath that his scheme was similar to the English scheme, and at the same time providing that there might be a General Officer Commanding after all. Imagine a minister abolishing a system which has worked so well as our present scheme, and introducing in its place one of which he has so little knowledge that he dares not confine himself to it, and provides in the same Bill for an alternative if the other does not work. It would be laughable if it were not

so serious. Does he imagine the people of this country are going to put up with this sort of experimental legislation ?

On the money question alone, it is very serious. What are the facts ? I notice that a number of newspapers have been commenting on the largeness of our expenditure upon militia, and they put it at $2,000,000 a year. These gentlemen are much mistaken, it is almost double that. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. A. T. Thompson) boasted the other day that the minister had spent $10,000,000 in the last three years on the militia, and jeered at the Tories because they had spent so little when they were in power. And what did the Minister of Militia say last year when he was asking us for $3,750,000, which we ungrudgingly gave him after he outlined the magnificent scheme of defence, which we now know was prepared by the late General Officer, he said he could not expect to ask for less for five years. When I questioned him, he finally admitted that he was doubtful whether he could ever lessen it. This year he is asking for $4,105,447.10 ; and it is whispered in the air that there are $3,000,000 yet to come down in the way of supplementaries. Now, I agree with him that if this scheme is carried out in proper shape and by competent hands, it is a great scheme ; and there will be a great responsibility on him if it is a failure. We never had a General Officer Commanding here equal to the late one—my hon. friend knows that. No one has ever attempted to master the whole system of defence and lay out a scheme such as he did. We know he was competent, we know he was submissive, and if I had time I would refer to the report. He allowed his report to be pigeon-holed, he allowed his report to be cut and carved by the Minister of Militia, and then sent it, modified at the minister's request, back to the minister, and the minister, without his knowledge or consent, cut out pages and paragraphs of it and then published it. Is not that a patient sort of gentleman to have to deal with ? There is one thing plain. Whether the minister adheres to his own plan or tries the plan of the General Officer Commanding, he has taken mighty good care, to use his own language of last year in the House, to say that he will be 'boss' of the situation. The Bill provides that the General Officer Commanding, if one is appointed, as well as the chief of the general staff, must act under the direction of the minister, no question of limit. What is the use of having a competent man in charge of the Militia Department ? My hon. friend knows that there is no necessity of a Minister of Militia having any military rank or knowledge of military matters. I am forced to the conclusion from recent events that the best qualification he can have is to be ignorant of military matters. Get a competent military man, give him fair-play, give him a fair supply to meet the schemes he evolved, and there will be less trouble. Shut out the politicians, and there will not be any trouble.

Is it not intolerable we should have forced through the House a double-barrelled alternative scheme to be experimented upon to the tune of $4,000,000 ? He declares that it is similar to the great English scheme. Surely the authors of the English scheme will be proud of such a child. No wonder he did not dare submit it to the home authorities before bringing it before parliament. The 'boss' of the militia council, the 'boss' of the chief of staff, the 'boss' of the General Officer Commanding, if he tries to run both functions at the same time—anything is possible with the minister holding these powers, except our present 'impossible' scheme, as he calls it, which has worked so well in England and here for 111 years, and which, according to my contention, is still working in England, and has worked well ever since they put a strong hand on the King and compelled him to make his appointments by merit and keep the politicians from unduly influencing the military, so that the army of England might become what it is and has been for ages past. They asked it in the early days. Well, he is to be our military expert whether we like it or not. I am trying to fancy the manœuvering of troops under the General Officer Commanding, under the direction of the Minister of Militia. It will be a refreshing exhibition of military movements. Let him catch the General Officer Commanding or chief of staff even speaking of a report, annual or 'special,' until they have the minister's sanction, and then after he has received and mutilated it to his heart's content he will probably suppress or declare it private. I say it is monstrous to give such authority to a man with no military qualification, compelling the General Officer Commanding, or any self-respecting chief of the military staff, in command of the organization and training of our militia, to come under the direction of the minister. He has not the qualification of a first lieutenant, I mean the military qualification, I am speaking in no other sense. I venture to say he could not pass the examination to-day for that appointment, and yet the Minister of Militia is to be the military expert. Imagine the hon. gentleman in this House applying this violent expression to the late General Officer Commanding.

A more highly concentrated exhibition of egotism and self-assertion cannot, I believe, be found in the English language.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Hear, hear.

Mr. TISDALE. Sir, the colossal magnitude of the hon. gentleman's belief in his own capacity and opinion is beyond my comprehension. But will not the boys behind him be glad ? He is the master.

He is the dictator, but I warn them to look out; he may become the tyrant. Dictators often become tyrants. I know one gentleman who will be happy, the Minister of Agriculture, who I hope is present. Surely on the general staff or the headquarter's staff or the district staff or some other staff, the hon. Minister of Militia will find an opportunity to appoint him to some position. Surely his warlike attitude on the Dundonald debate deserves consideration. Staff position means cocked hat and feathers. By all means let it be a large hat, to suit the head, many feathers, small saddle, big spurs and a great sword.

The correspondents of the press gallery have been commenting on the hon. Minister of Agriculture rather familiarly lately I fear. When he dons this 'war paint' they better beware of such 'quibs,' as the following which appeared during the Dundonald debate. I have more but this must suffice.

It was worth a trip to Ottawa to hear little Syd. say: 'it is ME.' The bad grammar aside, the House roared at the cocky little man.

He has exhibited lately a principle which I admire; he has shown gratitude for the free hand he was allowed with the 13th Light Scottish Dragoons. I have heard that he appreciates the present position of the Minister of Militia sufficiently to be aware of the probability of that minister's great difficulty in getting a self-respecting chief of staff or general officer commanding under these present powers. It is reported he has published a want ad. in the papers. I am certain it is in the papers, but I am not prepared to state that he is responsible for its publication. However, it is very applicable and I shall read it.

Wanted.—A tame G.O.C. Warranted safe for children and fools to play with. Trained to recognize his 'superiors' by the constitutional label, and to be subject to the regulations. Will not let Tories pet him. Apply to the Minister of Militia at Ottawa—or, better still, to the Department of Agriculture. No telephone messages answered.

This really sets forth the situation and I hope that he will secure such an officer.

In conclusion I wish for a moment to refer to the extraordinary position of the minister in not communicating with the British War Office or the home authorities in reference to the late changes in this Bill. It will be within the memory of hon. gentlemen that two or three years ago at the colonial conference in London the imperial authorities evinced a keen interest in the formation of a scheme of defence which would include the colonies. It will be remembered that while the government did not agree to contribute anything directly they took it upon themselves to establish a strong militia defence scheme in Canada. When my hon. friend brought in his Bill the changes proposed in it were of a minor character compared with the Bill as it now stands. This year at the commencement of the session he introduced practically the same Bill, but he held it up in committee for some time, and now he has brought it back again with the very drastic changes I have mentioned. By the new Bill he departs entirely from any system of defence which we have had in Canada since confederation. It involves a whole change of system, and not only an absolute change of system but an absolute separation in every detail of our system from the imperial army or any imperial defence system. I say that I am startled and astonished that he saw fit not to communicate with the imperial authorities before making these changes. What does it mean, and is he fair to us? It is a very serious thing.

If as the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) wishes, we are merely to have a militia force in this country to aid the civil power in police matters, then I agree with him that we are spending too much money on our militia. But, if on the other hand, we want to have a national force, then we should pay great heed to the magnificent scheme of defence of the late General Officer Commanding under which we would have 45,000 trained men with a possibility of increasing the establishment to 100,000, and with trained officers, and non-commissioned officers who could supply a second line of defence of another 100,000, making in all 200,000. Not only the Canadian militia, but the British army and navy are to be considered in our defence scheme, and it is unfair and unjust to the British army and dangerous to ourselves that our Canadian military force should not be in a position to render them effective assistance. I believe in the responsibility of government, but at the same time I believe in common sense. We have the army and navy of Great Britain at our back, and I say it is not treating the imperial authorities fairly, in view of what they have done for us, that this government, in proposing to change the whole system of our defence, has not thought it worth while to communicate with them. That is a mistake and it is against the best interests of Canada. I have shown beyond all question that the new scheme proposed by the Minister of Militia has no resemblance to the British army scheme, in form or in substance. Under this new scheme of his, the Minister of Militia will be absolute dictator not only in his department, but in the militia of Canada; he can do everything with the solitary exception of ordering out the militia for active service. It is beyond all question that no better scheme could be devised to invite political interference in the militia. We have the whole Department of Militia with one man dominating even the mi-

litary commander, who should have control of the military part if there is any intention of making our militia system a success. The clothing of the Minister of Militia with such powers can only result in the introduction of politics. The scheme of the Minister of Militia is alternating, experimental and uncertain. I am against investing any man or any political party with such powers in connection with our militia. No political party should ever be entrusted, nor should any political party ever ask to be entrusted with such powers over the militia of Canada. I protest against them as arbitrary, unreasonable, subversive and destructive of the best interests of the militia. I protest against the scheme as bearing on its face an unpleasant suggestion of separation from our brotherhood in the imperial army. I therefore, beg to move the motion of which I have given notice.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. (Minister of Militia). At this late stage of the session, and in view of the fact that I have discussed on several occasions precisely the subjects which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tisdale) has brought to the attention of the House, I shall endeavour to make my statement on this amendment in the fewest possible words. I trust that my hon. friend will not, because of the brevity of my remarks, think that I wish to show him any disrespect, or that I do not fully appreciate his earnestness. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tisdale) has been in the habit of appearing before us in a more or less pathetic mood, and we are accustomed to see him exhibit himself rather as a man of sorrows, but to-day he has come before us in an entirely new role. To-day he is humorous, delivering to us a little bit of wit—my hon. friend beside me says they should be labelled so that we might know they were witticisms—but at all events the hon. gentleman has given us little bits of wit which smell very strongly of the mid-night oil, and bear evidence of the expenditure of a very great deal of time upon them, which I think the House will agree with me in believing was time not very well occupied. My hon. friend objects to my proposals. He first complains that there is no evidence that I have submitted these proposals to the imperial authorities, and he intimates that there has been bad faith. He tells us that a certain Bill was introduced last year and re-introduced this year after having been discussed with the imperial authorities, but that later on it was changed without consultation with the war office. Well what happened? After the Bill was introduced this year, or about the time it was introduced, the Esher Committee appointed by the Prime Minister of England to report upon the organization of the war office, presented its report, and about the month of March last, the war office took this report up and the imperial government adopted it.

What opportunity had I to introduce these amendments in my original Bill? I had none. At the earliest possible moment, immediately after the first consideration of the Bill, I gave notice of them, and on three different occasions since then this Bill and these proposals have been under discussion. But, forsooth, I have not submitted the amendments to the imperial authorities. I have not submitted them formally, because I am perfectly aware that the imperial authorities will be delighted to know that we have adopted the new policy which they have adopted. We have been in the habit, in all matters of administration in the militia of this country, to follow closely the lead of the imperial war office—why? Because if a great war ever occurred, in which Canada was engaged or interested, we would be working side by side with the authorities in the war office. Therefore, as a matter of convenience, the policy has always been followed in this country, and we propose always to follow it, of adopting from time to time the schemes which are adopted by the war office. I may say that I have had correspondence of a private character with the Under Secretary of State for War, Sir Edward Ward, and I have authority to say—I am sure he would not object to my saying it—that he is in entire sympathy with us in the proposals we are making. Let that be the answer to the charge of disrespect to the imperial authorities. No greater compliment could be paid to the imperial authorities than the course we have pursued. No stronger indication of our sincere desire to remain in the closest possible touch with the war office could possibly be shown than the course which we have pursued.

The hon. gentleman has undertaken to move an amendment which, as he himself has stated, substantially means that we should continue in the condition of things which now exists, that we should not change, that we should not follow the war office in its change. I will not follow the hon. gentleman in his discussion of what he considers the great advantages of the present system.

The hon. gentleman has laid down the proposition that in this country at present the Militia Department is under dual control. The hon. gentleman by that statement has shown that he has failed absolutely to grasp the conditions. The Militia Department is not and cannot be under dual control. There can be only one head to the Militia Department under any system that can be adopted in this country which is under responsible government. The minister who receives the warrant from the people to occupy the position of Minister of Militia must be the head of the Militia Department, and he alone can be its head.

The hon. gentleman has animadverted upon certain words which are introduced into the Act now before the House. Well, it seems necessary and proper that the fact as it exists should be put in the statutes, and so the words 'under the direction of the Minister' are inserted. The hon. gentleman has referred to the condition of things in England. He has referred to the Statute of 1870, and has attempted to show that the condition of things in England is a condition of dual control. Let me read to the hon. gentleman an extract from an Order in Council passed in the War Office under the Act of 1870 :

As it is expedient to define the duties of the Field Marshal Comamnding the Forces under the Letter of Service issued by Her Majesty's direction, by the Secretary of State for War, on the 15th of July, 1856, I have the honour to request that, subject to the approval of the Secretary of State for War and to his responsibility for the administration of the Royal Authority and Prerogative in respect of the army—the said officer shall——

—do certain duties.

That language is unmistakable : 'subject to the approval of the Secretary of State for War and to his responsibility for the administration of the royal authority and prerogative in respect of the army.' Why, Mr. Speaker, it seems necessary every week, and almost every day in the week, to repeat and reiterate in this House to the hon. gentleman and some of his friends the fact, which is well known to everybody acquainted with the principles of responsible government, that the minister at the head of a department is responsible to parliament and the country, and that every man in that department is subject to the control of the minister.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Let us just understand what the hon. minister means. I understand that under the system in Great Britain at the present time—take, for example, the selection of officers—the Secretary of State, as a member of the Army Council, acts solely upon the recommendation of one of the military members of the council. That is the case, is it not ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No. If my hon. friend will look at the report of the war office——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will read the report, and let us see whether it bears out what the hon. gentleman says. I read from page 11 :

The selection of the military subordinates in each branch shall be made by the Secretary of State upon the sole recommendation of the responsible member of the council.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It passes to the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of State makes the recommendation. Therefore, as I have said, the Secretary of State is in control and is solely responsible.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I said that he acted solely upon the recommendation of the military officer charged. I understood the hon. gentleman to dissent from that. What difference is there between that and the system we have been pursuing in this country ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Let me ask a question. How does that in any way disprove the statement I have just made, that the minister has control of the department ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, he has control, but he acts upon the advice of an expert upon matters in regard to which the advice of an expert is essential.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That may be ; but the statement I made was that the minister is responsible and that the minister controls. Responsibility and control go side by side and hand in hand. Now, the hon. gentleman has wandered very widely afield. He has talked about political interference, in which I will not follow him, except to say that if he and his friends were disposed to be as fair as I was in the speech which he quoted as having been made by me in Montreal, a great many of the groundless charges which have been made against my administration would not be made. I have always endeavoured to be fair, and I would recommend my hon. friends opposite to emulate to some extent the course which I have pursued in that respect. If I saw fit, I could find many cases of hardship in which heads of the department in former times were guilty. I do not think it is in the public interest that we should come to parliament to ventilate these cases. It is far better that we should join together in the endeavour to work out a system which will be an improvement on the present one. I think, Mr. Speaker, that I need not make any further references to this matter. I have a list I could use which would disprove very fully the charge made against me of having abused my position in connection with appointments either in the permanent force, the headquarters staff or the militia generally. I shall content myself with just one statement. I challenge anybody, in this House or out of it, to show a single instance in which I have abused my position in order to do injury to any officer or benefit any friend by making a political appointment against the rules and regulations of the militia.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the minister be good enough to tell me what his understanding is of the manner of appointing and promoting officers of the auxiliary forces under the new scheme in Great Britain ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I read the report very carefully, but am not prepared to say what the details may be which will be adopted by the militia council to be

appointed. I am dealing with the reorganization of the headquarters of the department, and I shall leave to those skilled men the task of advising whoever may be the minister with reference to the regulations which should be formulated.

To come back to the question of the departure from our present system and the adoption of the English system, I am satisfied that the present system is unworkable. It has been found unworkable in England, and I think the experience, not only of myself, but of previous ministers in this country, abundantly prove that it is not workable here. If the system of utilizing commander-in-chief is not workable in England, it is much more likely to prove unworkable in this country. The imperial government, after trying in vain for about half a century, to make the system effective, has come to the conclusion that it is absolutely unworkable. I think I may perhaps on this point read the conclusions reached by the Esher Committee in this regard.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The conclusion is arrived at upon the ground of the desirability of decentralization.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (reading):

It was recognized both by the Hartington Commission and by the members of the War Commission who signed the minority report, that the high office of Commander in Chief, as hitherto defined, is inconsistent with the principle of the administration of the army by the Secretary of State and a board or council. Attempts to combine the administrative and executive functions of the army have led to confusion, to reduplication of work, to expense, to dual control, to divided responsibility, and ultimately to the conditions revealed in the evidence taken before the Royal Commission on the South African War.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the hon. gentleman not see that is put upon the ground that its jurisdiction is too expensive? Therefore, it is divided up into eight in the hope that in that way the office of commander-in-chief can be filled in a manner beneficial to the army and the country:

In order to secure effective control, the commander should be in constant touch with the units of his command. Owing to the wide extent of the King's dominion, this necessary condition cannot be fulfilled by a commander in chief.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Here is the quotation I was looking for. It is on page 8, section 8:

8. The relations of the Secretary of State to the military heads of the War Office are not such as to enable him to discharge his duties to the best advantage. The centralization of a vast number of incongruous functions in the Commander in Chief results in the neglect of work of primary importance. The War Office, as was pointed out by the 'Hartington Commission,' has no thinking department, and the branches concerned with preparations for a campaign, and with the collection of necessary information, are weak, and not sufficiently in touch with the Secretary of State. At the same time, the duties and the responsibilities of the military heads are ill-defined, and their relations to each other and to the Secretary of State are not such as effective administration demands. No distinction between policy and routine work exists, and the military heads, absorbed in work with which they have nothing to do, have no time for the proper consideration of questions of real importance, or for exercising foresight and initiative. Leaving out of consideration numerous minor flaws in the machine, the above conditions alone fully suffice to account for evils ramifying through the whole structure of the army, and rendering it inefficient for war. No scheme of reconstruction can be worthy of the acceptance of His Majesty's government unless it provides substantial and permanent guarantees against the continuance of these conditions.

9. The Hartington Commission stated that 'the complete responsibility to parliament and the country, of the Secretary of State for the discipline as well as for the administration of the army must now be accepted as definitely established.' At the same time, it was premised that, in practice, 'the responsibility of the Secretary of State appears to be still, in some respects, less real than that of the First Lord' of the Admiralty. It is now clear from the evidence given before the War Commission that real power has been divorced from responsibility, with results injurious to the military advisers of the Secretary of State, and fatal to his authority with his colleagues in the cabinet.

And I may say that in the speech which Mr. Arnold-Foster recently delivered, in bringing down the war budget, he makes the following statement:

It is absolutely necessary to make a change in the organization, composition, and distribution of the army.

The late war, and the commission on the war, which has recently reported, have made it abundantly clear that the army in its present form is not suited to the requirements of the country, or adapted for war.

All branches of the army are raised on a system which exaggerates the difficulties that must always attend purely voluntary enlistment, and, both in the regular and auxiliary forces, there exist endless sources of friction which lead to wasteful effort, to bad work and, in some cases, to discontent and misunderstanding.

Then he goes on to say:

His duty is to provide a remedy for the evils that exist. Not a partial, but a complete remedy; not a remedy for one, but for all the evils complained of; not a remedy for want of organization only, but a remedy for over-expenditure as well.

Can such a remedy be found? The answer is, 'Yes.' It can be found if both parties are prepared to consider the question of the army outside the arena of party discussion, and if successive administrations are prepared to agree upon a scheme of reform, and to carry it out consistently and progressively. On no other terms can the army be reformed and its cost diminished.

Now, Mr. Speaker, returning to what I was saying with regard to the experience in Canada I am sure that it must be abundantly clear, from the experience of Canada from the day of confederation down to the present moment that the system which my hon. friend has praised so highly is not a system that is workable in this country. You find general officer after general officer making the attempt and failing; and I do not so much blame the general officers as I blame the system.

Let me refer to some of the advantages which, I think, will follow the adoption of the new system. The hon. gentleman says that my proposals are not even similar to those of the war office. I have not claimed that they were identical: If the hon. gentleman will examine the statement which I made in this House and from which he made quotations, he will find that I do not pretend to say that they are identical. But I do say that I think the idea of appointing a council was a good one, and, that, so far as under the altered conditions, it can be adopted in this country, so far I think it would be of advantage to the Militia Department. And that far, and that far only, I propose to go. It is more or less a tentative scheme. The hon. gentleman has called it an experiment. Possibly he may not have been so very far astray in that. But the experiment being made by the imperial authorities perhaps, is not so much an experiment as here, because they have had in the admiralty department of Great Britain a similar system for about a century. Well, Sir, we must make experiments sometimes, and I believe that we are justified in this case, in view of all that I have read and in view of my own personal experience and of that of every Minister of Militia in this country, in making a trial of this new system. It is true that we have called it an advisory board. We have appointed a board to advise the minister. My hon. friend says that I have restricted the subjects dealt with by the board. It is true that they are only to advise upon the questions submitted by the minister, but it is equally true that the Governor in Council is given the power under this Act to provide all regulations which shall control the action of the board and which shall control the powers of the members of the board. What are the advantages of this system? Let me emphasize those advantages by referring to the disadvantages of the present system. One of the chief disadvantages of the present system is perhaps, that under it each new officer who comes to this country seems to feel it to be his duty to condemn everything that has been done by his predecessor and to mark out an entirely new line for himself. So that, under the system that we have had there has been absolutely no continuity of purpose. Under the system which I propose the militia council will be composed of seven men. The minister will be the chairman. The four leading military authorities of the country will be members, as also will the deputy minister and the chief accountant of the department. In this council, composed of these seven men, with the Minister of Militia in the chair, all matters pertaining to the welfare of the militia will be under discussion, and there we shall have face to face the men who are responsible for the well being of the militia. Under the present system the minister knows—or is permitted to know—not very much about what is going on in the department. I will not detain the House by giving examples, but examples have been given here, and I can assure the House that one of the things which the General Officer Commanding thinks he has a right to do is to keep absolute and close control of everything appertaining to the military branch and only to allow the minister to know that which it pleases him to allow the minister to know. Now, clearly that is not in the interest of the country. Clearly it is to the interest of the country that the minister should know what every one of the various officers in the headquarters of the Militia Department know. And this new scheme will give that opportunity. There the minister will sit with his advisers about him face to face, so that he can put important questions before that council and have the advantage of hearing the different arguments with reference to them. More than that, there will be a record kept of what takes place at that council and, so, when a conclusion is reached that conclusion will be made a matter of record, not only for the benefit of the minister for the time being, but for the benefit of future ministers. Thus, if, at a future time some suggestion is made of an amendment or alteration, the record will be taken up and the reasons which induced the minister to come to the conclusion will be there exposed to view. Surely this will be an enormous advantage over the condition of things, to-day, there is no co-operation among the different heads of the department, absolutely—I was going to say absolutely none, but certainly I am justified in saying that there is very little. Under this system, every branch will be brought before the council and will be discussed there, so that each member of the council will be more or less under the necessity of becoming acquainted with the work pertaining to every branch of the headquarters staff.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If I may be allowed to interrupt, I would say that I think that very desirable; but what I do not understand is why that could not be done now without amending the law.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) had been in my place for the last eight years with an im-

perial General Officer Commanding in the same department, he would know. I assure him, in all frankness and sincerity and honesty that, under the present system, it is absolutely impossible. It cannot be done —it never can be done with a General Officer Commanding in the same building. But my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) has told us that there are still commanders in chief in England, and his relation of the case was somewhat pathetic. While we had supposed that Mr. Arnold Forster had succeeded—I will not say in getting rid of—but in dispensing with the commander-in-chief at the war office, my hon. friend says that, on the contrary he has five of them. And I felt inclined to sympathize with Mr. Arnold Forster.

But what is the fact? My hon. friend has missed the point altogether. There will be commanding officers to command the militia in every district of the Dominion, and under this system greater power will be given to these commanding officers than they possess now, necessarily so. To-day, as the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) has said more than once in this House, a district officer commanding is little better than a first-class clerk; he has very little power, almost no power. Under the new system which will be worked out on the lines of the British system later on, much greater power will be given him, and a certain amount of decentralization will take place which will enable these district officers commanding to get the experience which they so much need in the command and control of their respective districts. Those are the officers to whom my hon. friend refers in England as being the commanders-in-chief, they are the commanders of the different districts.

But my hon. friend has said that I am inconsistent; he says that I am still keeping on the statute-book the power to appoint a General Officer Commanding, and so I am. Whoever heard of an army without a general officer commanding, and without a commander in chief? In time of peace the administration can be carried on more advantageously, I believe, by a chief of the general staff and a military council; but in an emergency it is absolutely necessary, it seems to me, that the government should have the power of appointing a man to the supreme command of the militia. Under the law there is a provision as to what should be done in time of war. In time of war when imperial troops are co-operating with our troops, the King would appoint an imperial officer; in time of peace, in an emergency, in a riot, if it were necessary to call out a large number of troops from the different districts, it would be necessary to have a commanding officer. Anything occurring in any one district could be dealt with by the district officer commanding; but in case of riot or threatened invasion it would be absolutely necessary for the government of Canada to have power to appoint a general officer commanding, and that is the reason why that provision is left upon the statute-book. Now I do not know, Mr. Speaker, that I need detain the House longer. I do not think it necessary to go over the argument which has been repeated five or six times in this House as to why the command of the militia of this country should be thrown open to a Canadian. I have repeated my views upon that point many and many a time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Under existing conditions it is open to a Canadian officer, is it not?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is not open to a Canadian officer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is open to a Canadian if he has the requisite training.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. To an officer of the Canadian militia, I should have said, to be more explicit, and that is what the hon. member for South Norfolk meant in his argument. He contended that it was no reflection upon officers of the Canadian militia to continue to exclude them from any hope of gaining the command. I must say, without wishing to repeat the arguments that I have stated several times here, that I think it is the very greatest reflection upon officers of the Canadian militia. Whether an officer of the Canadian militia will be appointed, I do not know. But we have many distinguished officers in the Canadian militia, and if we never undertake the work of command, Mr. Speaker, how shall we get experience in command? Are we to go on for ever as at present in point only where they will be able to take command? I think not. To use a simile which I used once before in this House, we would feel it was casting a very great reflection upon the judiciary of this country if, for instance, we were voluntarily to place upon our statute-book a law saying that the chief justice of the Dominion of Canada must be an imperial lawyer, or jurist. Nobody would think of saying that it would not be an outrage, and a most severe reflection upon everybody engaged in the legal profession in this country. Well, I want to know if it is not just as much of a reflection upon the men who have spent their time and risked their lives, who have given up the whole of their time to qualify and fit themselves to be officers of the Canadian militia, to deny to them the opportunity, after having become qualified, of reaching the highest position in the gift of this country, namely, the head of the Canadian militia? So far as I am concerned, I am absolutely against any restriction of that kind. Now I think there is nothing further that I need dwell upon. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the House will not accede to the motion of my hon. friend.

Mr. KEMP. Before the hon. gentleman takes his seat, I would like to ask him a question. Under this Act, will members of the militia force be subject to military law or discipline, when not on duty; in other words, can a man join the militia force and still retain full freedom of speech and action when not on duty, the same as he enjoyed previous to becoming a member of the force ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will read the clause which governs that matter, clause 72 of the Act :

The Army Act for the time being in force in the United Kingdom, the King's regulations, and all other laws applicable to His Majesty's troops in Canada and not inconsistent with this Act or the regulations made thereunder, shall have force and effect as if they had been enacted by the parliament of Canada for the government of the militia, and every officer and man of the militia shall be subject thereto from the time of being called out for active service, and also during the period of annual drill or training under the provisions of this Act, and also at any other time while upon military duty or in the uniform of his corps upon or within any rifle range or any armoury, or other place where arms, guns, ammunition or other military stores are kept, or any drill shed or other building or place used for militia purposes, or during any drill or parade of his corps at which he is present in the ranks, when going to or from the place of drill or parade, and also whether in uniform or not at any drill or parade of his corps at which he is present as a spectator.

That refers to the active militia. Subsection 2 refers to the permanent force :

Officers and men of the permanent force and members of the permanent staff of the militia shall at all times be subject to military law.

Mr. KEMP. Then do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that when a man is off duty he does not have the same freedom of speech that he had before he joined the militia force ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have read the statute, and my hon. friend will have to draw his own conclusion.

Mr. KEMP. Will the hon. gentleman give us an interpretation of the meaning of the statute in fewer words ? Has he any objection to do that ?

Mr. H. A. WARD. I am in entire sympathy with the amendment moved by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale). I was rather surprised to hear the Minister of Militia say that the time of that hon. gentleman had not been well expended in getting up the matter which he brought before the House to-day. I think my hon. friend will admit that there is always room for two opinions on important questions of this kind.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Hear, hear.

Mr. WARD. I do not think any hon. gentleman expending time in working up his own particular opinion on this or any other important matter brought before this House is wasting his time in any sense of the word. I was amazed to hear the Minister of Militia state that under the old order of things he had control in the same manner as under this Bill. Shortly afterwards the minister stated that he really had very little control on account of there being a general officer commanding in his department, that matters in connection with the department had been withheld from him by different general officers commanding in succession. I do not know that this ever occurred when the party on this side were in power, and I would point out to the House that during the 18 years when the Conservatives were in power and different Ministers of Militia were in control of that department, only four general officers commanding were required to assist the ministers of militia. I think that only one of these general officers commanding went home before his term had expired.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think that four went home before their time expired, General McDougall, General Luard, General Middleton and General Herbert.

Mr. WARD. My hon. friend then will probably explain how it occurred that there were only four general officers commanding in eighteen years, as stated in the Militia List.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I was not there, I do not know.

Mr. WARD. My hon. friend during his short period of eight years, has also had four.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. These are growing times you know.

Mr. WARD. Undoubtedly, in regard to dismissing officers. The minister stated that a general officer commanding from England was quite as objectionable as a chief justice of the Canadian courts coming from the mother country. I cannot see the force of that comparison because I can imagine that a lawyer practising in this country is quite capable of fitting himself for any position on the bench. But we must consider that a general officer commanding requires to have had a great deal of service in the field if he is to qualify as general officer commanding the Canadian militia. It has always been so considered, and I think it is rather an unfortunate thing that this change is being made. I do not mean to say that Canadians should not take such positions because as the leader of the opposition has stated, the fact of making it necessary that an English officer should be appointed does not preclude Canadians from taking that position. Ever since the Royal Military College was established, and I ven-

ture to say even before that, there have been Canadians going into the English army and many of them I have no doubt are now fitted to take the position of the general officer commanding, so there is nothing in that argument that I can see. I regret very much that this position of general officer commanding is to be done away with. It is not so stated in the Bill, but there is no doubt from the expressions which have fallen from the minister that this is the intention of the Bill. It seems to me that in doing away with the requirement that the general officer commanding shall be one of His Majesty's generals or colonels the minister is weakening the ties—and there are very few of them left—the open ties that bind us to the mother country. I am sure that we all regret it on that and on other accounts as well. The minister has stated that in establishing the council to assist him he has been following the lead of the imperial House of Commons. It seems to me that we are advancing too rapidly in establishing a council here. We might well have waited until we saw the effect of the council in the mother country. It is only an experiment there, and it seems to me that we might very well have put off establishing a council here until we saw how it worked in the mother country. The minister has also stated that it was found to be utterly unworkable in England to have the commander in chief working with the civil portion of the war office. It seems to me that England had gone on for a great many years before it was found out that this system was unworkable. Commanders in Chief have existed there for a great many years, as have also general officers commanding in Canada, and I think that on that account alone the minister's statement in this respect has not very much foundation in fact. I regret the establishment of this council because although the minister states that he had actual and free control of his department under the old order of things it seems to me that this new order of things is simply emphasizing that control and placing the control of the militia forces entirely in the hands of the minister. I think it cannot but have that effect, and no matter what administration is in power for the time being that is a dangerous power to give to any minister of the Crown. The general officer commanding as we all know had certain branches in the Militia Department to manage, of course under the direction of the minister, and those portions of the department which he managed, he managed I venture to say until this administration came into power, absolutely without political control. I would like to see that order of things still continue, and I am sorry that it does not exist at the present time. If I were not paired, I would vote for the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Tisdale) with great pleasure.

Mr. WARD.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of Militia has spoken of following the lead of the war office of Great Britain. It might be a very desirable thing to follow the lead of the war office in Great Britain so far as conditions are the same, but you cannot always follow the lead of the war office in Great Britain because they have a standing army there and we do not want a standing army in this country. We can hardly call our small permanent force a standing army and therefore when you come to compare our system with the English system, you must look not at the standing army of Great Britain, but at the disposition of the auxiliary forces. If you take the empire as a whole, you have a standing army which is largely recruited in Great Britain and you have auxiliary forces in Great Britain and in different outlying portions of the empire, which in the event of difficulty in any part of the empire can be used in connection with the standing army. I would not like to say that I would follow the lead of the war office in every respect. Suppose, for example the war office should adopt the recommendations of the recent committee of which the Duke of Norfolk is chairman; the concluding paragraph recommends that for effective defence of the United Kinkdom, universal conscription in Great Britain is desirable, if not necessary. I do not think that in this country we should be prepared to follow that lead of the war office in a matter of that kind. I would not go quite so far as the Minister of Militia in saying we must follow the lead of the war office in every respect.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I meant as to the organization of the War Office itself; we have always followed that as closely as we could, mutatis mutandis.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Everybody will admit that we can get very valuable suggestions from Great Britain, but we must adapt them to the conditions which prevail in this country, and we must consider them in view of the fact that we have only an auxiliary force, a militia force, a force designed for the defence of the country, but a force which can work in harmony and in co-operation with the regular army in event of danger.

I cannot quite understand why the Minister of Militia desires to eliminate from the statute-book the words that now declare that the General Officer Commanding—if there is to be a General Officer Commanding—shall be charged with the military command and discipline of the militia. There has been a very important change made in that respect, and I venture to think that when we compare our auxiliary force with the auxiliary force of the mother country, we will find that no such change as is here proposed has been brought about in Great Britain. I say that after having read the

report of Lord Esher's Committee pretty carefully. Our present law says :

There shall be appointed an officer who holds the rank of colonel or rank superior thereto in His Majesty's regular army, who shall be charged, under the orders of His Majesty with the military command and discipline of the militia, and who while he holds such appointment shall have the rank of major-general in the militia.

The words in our present law make it abundantly clear that the minister is solely responsible to parliament, and that it is only in respect to the military command and discipline of the militia that the General Officer Commanding is specially charged. It seems to me that the situation is further amply safeguarded at present by the fact that in respect to recommendations for appointments, and in respect to matters of expenditure, the General Officer Commanding can only recommend and the minister himself must in the end decide. That is absolutely the law of Canada at present, and it offers all possible safeguards to the absolute authority of the civil power in respect to such matters. That position has been asserted over and over again, not only by the present Minister of Militia, but by former Ministers of Militia, and it is not necessary for me to elaborate it. I believe that the military command and discipline of the militia might very well continue vested in a general officer commanding, who is at present charged with it. He may not control the expenditure ; he may not even make appointments further than to recommend, but the military command and the discipline of the militia are matters that should be vested in a general officer commanding, rather than in a minister who may hold his position for three or four years, who may not be a military man in the first instance, and who may be succeeded by some one who has no more military experience than he. There must be some object in changing the existing law to the following proposal in the new Bill :

There may be appointed an officer who shall hold rank not below that of colonel in the militia or in His Majesty's regular army, who may, subject to the regulations and under the direction of the minister, be charged with the military command of the militia.

What is the object in leaving out the word 'discipline,' and why should we change a statute which amply guarded the civil power ? The minister has made something of a point in stating that the change makes a colonel in the Canadian militia eligible for the position of commander-in-chief. I look upon that question from the standpoint of qualification. If we have opportunities in Canada by which a gentleman holding the position of colonel in the militia can acquire the necessary training and experience to enable him to act effectively as commander-in-chief, then by all means let us make the change. When this subject came up for discussion early in the session I said to the Minister of Militia that if he would convince me that the Canadian militia affords the means of qualifying a man for such a position, then I would at once assent to the proposal. I do not at present feel convinced that service in the Canadian militia affords opportunities of that kind. For example, let us take the case of Sir Percy Girouard, a very eminent officer, who is, I think, a colonel in the British army. If Sir Percy Girouard had his sole military experience as a colonel in the Canadian militia, I would doubt very much his qualifications to command our militia in time of war ; but with the experience which he, a Canadian, has acquired in the British army, he may be, and no doubt would be, eminently qualified for that purpose. There is an object lesson at once. It is not any discrimination against Canadians ; it is simply a question as to training. Any Canadian is to-day in a position to acquire that necessary training in the regular army. If he can acquire it in the Canadian militia, well and good: let us have him, and let us give him the first choice, but until we are absolutely sure he can get that training and experience in the Canadian militia, let us not be in a hurry to change the qualifications for that office which have existed in the past.

Let me also point out to the Minister of Militia that he has not in this Bill followed the course which is pointed out by the report of Lord Esher's Committee. The minister desires that everything shall be under his command and direction. That is the object of the new legislation. Let us see how these matters are dealt with under the scheme of Lord Esher's Committee, which the minister says he has followed. We are not to look to the regular army ; we are to look at the disposition made with regard to the auxiliary force, and if the minister will consult part III., page 7 of the Esher report, he will see :

We have recommended that the training of the auxiliary force should be supervised by the general officers commanding-in-chief, who should also deal with the promotion, transfer, and retirement of officers. Inspection of the auxiliary force should be carried on by these general officers, or by officers deputed by them. Administrative questions affecting the auxiliary force should be dealt with by the major-generals commanding the eight districts.

So far as the auxiliary forces of Great Britain are concerned, matters are left, by the proposal of this committee, very much more under the military branch than they are left under the military branch in Canada to-day. In Great Britain the General Officers Commanding are to deal with the promotion, transfer and retirement of officers, while here the General Officer Commanding only recommends and the minister appoints. So far as I can understand it, the Minister of Militia is altering the law in exactly the opposite direction to that recommended by

Lord Esher's Committee in respect to the auxiliary forces.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is not the report of the Esher Committee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is. It is the report of the War Office reconstruction committee of 1904, of which Lord Esher was chairman.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is the one.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems to me that the Minister of Militia has given his attention too much to the recommendations of that committee so far as they are concerned with the regular army of some 500,000 men, but according to this report the auxiliary force of Great Britain, numbering 30,000 men, is to be dealt with by a very small portion of the machinery provided for in the report of this committee.

In attempting to create this council in Canada, are we not simply taking the name and taking none of the substance? The council in Great Britain is an absolutely different thing from that which the minister proposes here. So far as the object of the minister is concerned, of having a consultation between those who represent the military part of the department and those who represent the civil part, I sympathize with him, but it seems to me that he may accomplish that without any statute, and so far as the constitution of his council is concerned, it is as different as night is from day from that which is proposed by Lord Esher's Committee. What have you there? You have the Secretary of State through whom the council speaks to parliament. The Secretary of State speaks to parliament upon the recommendation of the other members of the council. There is first a military member who is charged with military policy in all its branches; there is another military member, who deals with recruiting, pay and discipline; the third deals with clothing, remounts and transport; the fourth deals with armaments and fortifications; there is a civil member who deals with civil business other than finance: and, lastly, there is a civil member, the financial secretary, who deals entirely with the question of finance. These members are all coordinate in the council, but they can only speak to parliament through the Secretary of State; and in speaking to parliament he is guided solely by the recommendation of the member who has charge of the particular department which is referred to. The council proposed by the minister is not along that line at all. While the object is all right, it does not seem to me that we should establish a council in Canada simply because they have established one in Great Britain, which is absolutely different in its constitution, which has to deal not only with the auxiliary forces in Great Britain, but also with a standing army of some 500,000 men.

I do not know that there is anything further that I need say, except this. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat suggests that if the council in the united kingdom is to some extent an experiment, it might at least be well for us to pause a little and see what the result of that experiment will be, rather than to rush in and appoint a council; that it is unadvisable to follow the recommendations of this committee of Lord Esher's in some respects, and not to follow them in other respects, and insist on starting an experiment ourselves because an experiment has been begun in the United Kingdom. It may be that the report of this committee if acted upon, will result in great good. That remains to be seen. But it does not necessarily follow, even if that should be granted, that the experiment which the Minister of Militia now proposes to make is one that will result in any very great good.

With regard to friction between the head of the department and the General Officer Commanding, I do not propose to deal with that at present, except to say that it will not do for any one of us to imagine that because friction exists the other party is always absolutely and entirely at fault. There may be a little fault on both sides. I suppose that where differences occur in this world there is very often fault on both sides; and perhaps the difficulties that have occurred have not been so much the result of the system as the result of lack of tact on one side or the other, or on both sides, in trying to carry that system out. At all events, it does not seem to me that any crisis has occurred in this country to make it necessary to depart from that which has worked fairly well in the past, and which might do fairly good work in the future. I do not propose to detain the House further than to say that it does seem to me, in view of what I have heard both from my hon. friend from South Norfolk and from the Minister of Militia, that we are not wise in departing hastily from that which has served us well up to the present time.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, we have listened with a good deal of interest to the minister's explanation, and also to the addresses on this side of the House. I think the address delivered by the hon. leader of the opposition has convinced the minister that after all it would be advisable for him to hold over the clause in the Bill relating to the council, until he can adapt it more closely to the British law, or at all events until he sees how that law will be worked out. The chief advantage claimed for the council is that it will afford an opportunity for these gentlemen to meet together and discuss various questions that arise from

time to time. One of the chief arguments advanced for gettng rid of an imperial General Officer Commanding is that he controls the Militia Department. Well, Sir, if the facts were inquired into, I think it would be found that the General Officer Commanding, at all events the last one, has not been treated with the courtesy due to a gentleman occupying that position. From the various papers which the Minister of Militia has from time to time laid before the House this year in regard to the department, we find that the large number of letters and orders which have passed between the Minister of Militia and the General Officer Commanding have passed through the deputy minister. I am free to say that that is an entirely improper course. I have no hesitation in saying that communications passing between the minister and the General Officer Commanding should be direct, and not through the deputy minister. If the minister wanted to have this council, why should he not summon these gentlemen to his presence at any time—the General Officer Commanding, the quartermaster-general, the deputy minister, the adjutant-general and the director-general of ordnance? These are all capable men, they are all at his disposal at the present time, and there is nothing to prevent him summoning them to his presence at any time, and having an informal and unofficial chat with them. I understood from the minister that when the Bill passed the committee stage and came up for its third reading, the details of this council would be submitted to the House, and the duties, powers and restrictions of each member of it would be determined.

The minister says he is going to bring down the regulations at some subsequent time. I purposed at the time asking, in case the council were determined upon, that the minister should make the chief staff officer of that council an imperial officer with high imperial training, and I thought that in the statute the duties of these officers should be determined. That is very important, and had the minister done that it would have removed any opposition which might have developed against the proposition in certain quarters. However there is another argument which is used from time to time as a plea for getting rid of the necessity of having an imperial officer as General Officer Commanding. One may just as well look things squarely in the face. There is no man who has the monopoly of the right to express his own opinions, and I am satisfied that if in this and other countries certain matters in controversy had been temperately discussed before they came to a final issue, a great deal of mischief and evil would have been avoided. The policy of drift is a policy fatal to the interests of any people or individual. Had the British government faced the South African issue long years ago in a kind, firm and effective manner, we would not have had the later troubles to deal with. If these Russian and Japan troubles had been faced years ago, there would have been no necessity for these two nations to have gone to war. If in the United States the difficulties between the north and south had been boldly faced at the proper time, that disastrous civil war would have been avoided. The same remark applies to troubles we have had within our own country. One of the links which joins this country with the empire is the appointment of an imperial officer to the command of our militia. There are only a few links left. We have the Governor General, we have the right of appeal to the Privy Council, and we had the General Officer Commanding, and that is about all. We are getting rid of the General Officer Commanding and in this measure there are certain changes, which while they may not affect the practical operation of the law, certainly jar upon our national sentiment as Britons. We have for instance the omission of the name of His Majesty almost entirely; though it may be argued that the omission does not really make any practical change, still it touches the sentiment of the people and we know that sentiment plays a strong role in national affairs. Then we have these hon. gentlemen claiming our right to make our own treaties, and we are promised a Bill for the establishment of a Canadian navy, and we have the provisions in this Bill restricting the sending of our militia outside of Canada; and taking all these things together, they lead to the conclusion that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is ultimate independence of Great Britain by evolution if not by revolution. The way to put a stop to that process of disintegration is to educate the people. I have faith in the people. I believe that if the advantages which accrue to Canada through its being part of the great British empire were fully made known in every part of the Dominion, there is not a man who values the best interests of this country who would not rally to the support of that principle. For that reason I shall be delighted if my hon. friends opposite will discuss this matter temperately here in the House so that both sides may be fairly presented to the people. If that line be pursued, I have sfficient faith in the people to believe that no appeal to race of fanaticism will prevent their standing firm by the old flag which has brought freedom, liberty and justice to all classes in the Dominion. We frequently hear the question of imperialism raised and are asked, are you going to keep a British officer in command who wants to build a line of forts along the border and build up imperialism and go in for all sorts of nonsensical extravagance? And these gentlemen will point us to the United States as an instance of what a country should do in relation to military matters. Sir, I cannot employ the time

of the House better than give it a little record of the history of the United States—just a brief summary of the wars during the last hundred years, since 1793. Would you believe it, Sir, that democratic republic has spent, not millions, but billions more of money in war, military and naval expenditures, than has the whole British empire. I know that is a statement which will at first sight seem astounding, but the facts are easily ascertained. Here is a statement of the various American wars :

United States Wars.	Men.
Revolution, 1775-83..	395,330
N.W. Indian, 1790-95..	8,983
French naval, 1798-1800..	4,593
Tripoli naval, 1801-1805....	3,330
First Creek Indian, 1813-1814..	13,781
1812, Great Britain, 1812-1815..	576,622
First Seminole, Nov., 1817, Oct., 1818..	7,911
Black Hawk, Apl., 1831, Sept., 1832..	6,465
Cherokee 1836-1837..	9,494
Second Creek, May., '36, Sept., '37....	13,418
Florida, Dec., '35, Aug., '43..	41,122
Aroostook, '38-'39..	1,500
Mexican, Apl., '46, July, '48..	112,230
Apache, Navajo, Utah, 1849-1855..	2,561
Second Seminole, 1856-1858..	3,687
Civil, Jan. 9, 1861-June 23, '65..	2,778,303
Spanish, 1898..	298,913

So that if those who point out that if we would cast in our lot with the United States or become independent, we would have very little military expenditure, will look at the facts, they will find them startling. I have here a list of the wars of Britain in the same period. From 1793 to 1815, when Britain fought the whole world, her actual expenditure amounted to $4,155,000,000, and still Britain's war expenditures are not much more than one-half the expenditure, of the United States during the last hundred years. Canada has taken part in the wars of 1812 and 1837. and in the Fenian Raids, of 1866 and 1870 ; the Red River Rebellion of 1870, the Northwest Rebellion of 1885, and in the South African war.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. And the Canadian voyageurs on the Nile expedition.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am very proud of the Canadians who went on that expedition, but I did not include that, because they were not under arms. They did excellent work, but they went, not as soldiers, but as voyageurs.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. But they helped in the campaign.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. However, I shall be glad to include the Nile voyageurs. But add that item also, and you find that all the money that has been spent on the militia and in the wars of the Dominion of Canada is less than $70,000,000, counting from the first settlement of the country to the present time. Now, since 1791 and up to 1882, the United States spent in war no less than $8,839,527,573. I refer, for the figures to the American statistics, and I have the works here for reference. This sum included pensions up to 1866. Since 1866, the pensions paid have amounted to $3,037,826,080. On the army and navy from 1883 to 1903, the expenditure of the United States has been about $2,000,000,000. That does not include the incidental expenses connected with the Cuban and Philippine wars. On this account I am satisfied you could add at least $300,000,000 to this sum. Then there is an extra amount of $3,000,000,000, the indirect expenses of the great American civil war as estimated by the best statistical authorities. Take these items together and we find that from 1793 up to the present time the United States has spent no less than $16,877,353,653. This is against something over $70,000,000 in a hundred odd years for Canada. The cost of war to Great Britain has been $13,000,000,000. Now, the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) asked what was the average per head. The population of the United States is fifteen times that of Canada. The war expenses of the United States have been $281 for every $1 spent on war or the militia by Canada. In other words, the United States have spent $20 per head in war since their establishment as a nation. But let us take the annual cost of the United States army and navy for the last year, and we find these are the figures. These figures do not include anything for the state militia or national guards.

ANNUAL COST OF UNITED STATES ARMY AND NAVY.

	Total.	Per head.
Army..	$115,734,049	$1 30
Navy....	78,856,363	1 00
Pensions	141,752,870	1 75
Total..	$336,342,282	$4 05

Note.—For this year the United States estimates are much higher, being $96,000,000.

Last year, Canada spent thirty-seven cents per head—or, say forty cents per head—for militia and defence generally. As against this forty cents per head for Canada, Great Britain spends $6 per head, including the cost of the navy and the army for the whole empire ; and the United States spends $4.05 per head, as I have shown. Now, Canada's export and import trade amounted to $467,064,685 last year ; Great Britain's trade to $4,388,150,265 ; the United States trade, imports and exports was $2,445,889,552. The revenue from the United States last year was $560,396,674 or $7 per head, of which they spent for war last year, $4.05 per head. The revenue of Canada last year was, say $15 per head——

Mr. TALBOT. Nine dollars.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Surely, the revenue was more than $45,000,000. I think my estimate was right, but let us say $12 per head—let us be safe and say $10 per head.

And, as against that we spent thirty-seven cents per head for the defence of the country.

Mr. TALBOT. That is at least an indication of our common sense.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. We will come to that in a moment. Now the shipping of the world is compared as follows :—

SHIPPING OF COUNTRIES COMPARED.

	Tons.
Great Britain	14,431,672
United States	3,337,156
Germany	3,138,568
Canada	2,000,000
France	1,519,922
Italy	1,159,082
Norway	1,632,757

Canada includes her coasting and inland shipping.

This is a comparison of the leading shipping nations of the world. And, for the defence of our shipping and of our empire country, Canada contributes the magnificent sum of thirty-seven cents per head. Now, a comparison of the expenditure of certain countries of the world of similar population to Canada will have an enlightening effect. And I would like you to note, Mr. Speaker which are the stable and which the unstable governments of this world. Colombia, which is included in the table I shall give, is the nation that, a little while ago sat idly by and saw the great Panama canal wrested from her and the independent state of Panama carved out of her territory. There are no other countries in the world, except Costa Rica and Corea, that stand on a par in expenditure on militia and defence. No other countries but these are so low in the scale for the preparation for defence as Canada.

Countries.	Cost per Head.			
	Population.	Army.	Navy.	Total.
				$ cts.
Argentine	4,794	1·88	1·15	3 03
Australia	4,740	·90	·10	1 00
Belgium	6,799	1·65		
Chili	3,050	1·54	1·35	2 89
Colombia	5,000	·40		
Denmark	2,464	1·12	2·80	3 92
Greece	2,433	1·46	·60	2 06
Netherlands	5,263	1·80	1·30	3 10
Norway	2,339	1·64	·80	2 44
Portugal	5,428	1·18	·80	1 98
Roumania	5,912	1·27	·15	1 42
Sweden	5,175	1·94	·65	2 59
Switzerland	3,315	1·71	.....	1 71
Canada	5,371	·37	.....	37

The population is given in thousands.

In the case of Switzerland, which is paying $1.71 per head, I may mention that the rate is lower in recent years than in former years, because a great deal of the former expenditure was for the purchase of rifles and material. They now have these on hand as an investment, and all they have to do is to keep the supply good. Canada, as it will be seen, spends the magnificent sum of 37 cents per head for her militia. Now, Sir, a newspaper of Toronto, the 'Telegram,' said very properly the other day, in speaking of a recent speech delivered by the Postmaster General in that city, wherein he made a reference to 'the life-giving ploughshare' and condemning militarism, had this to say :

> Agriculture would see its products rot on the fields of Canada if Britain shared Sir William Mulock's one-sided love for the 'life-giving ploughshare.' The agricultural preserving battleship enables the farmers of Canada to get the products of the 'life-giving ploughshare' to the markets of the world. Every country needs ploughshares, but unless the despotism of a military nation is to rule the earth, the free nations must shelter the 'life-giving ploughshare' behind the rifles of an army and the battleships of a navy.

Sir, you will search the record of all the countries of the world in vain, and except Corea and one or two of the semi-savage communities in Central and South America, you cannot find a nation so low down in the scale of military expenditure, and occupying so humiliating a position, as Canada does to-day in throwing almost the entire burden of her defence upon the British taxpayers. Take the United States as a fair example, and if Canada were to become independent, if she should cut adrift from Great Britain, she must be prepared for many years to come to assume an enormous burden of at least $4 per head of her people, to provide for self-defence, because then we should have to depend upon our own resources exclusively.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have been asked during recess by a number of gentlemen on both sides of the House to state the authorities I have consulted in making up my statement. I may say I have consulted the Financial Reform Association's 'Almanac of England,' one of the finest publications for statistical purposes, which takes a very radical view of all matters of this kind. I consulted also the 'Statistician and Economist,' an up-to-date publication from the United States. For data referring farther back, I consulted an old official publication issued for many years until 1889, the 'American Almanac', which was published by the Librarian of Congress and was thoroughly

accurate. Among other modern authorities I have consulted the New York 'Tribune' almanac, the United States government reports, the Trade and Commerce Reports of Canada and the 'British Statistical Returns.' My figures I think will be found fairly accurate. I have left off the odd units.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. May I ask my hon. friend a question before he commences his speech? On what does he base his estimate of an annual expenditure of 37 cents per head in Canada? Does he include the capital expenditure for military purposes for this year?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No the figures I took were for 1903. I used the figures as published in the report of the Minister of Trade and Commerce for that year. If the hon. member takes the figures of the Department of Trade and Commerce for that year and divide them by the population he will find that I am within the mark.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. Including the capital expenditure?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am taking the figures published there.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. I do not think it covers that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. At the outside, I think the largest expenditure claimed is 46 or 47 cents for this year.

However, the point I want to make in connection with it is this. I have already given the tonnage of the Canadian shipping. I now purpose submitting a brief statement of nations having merchant shipping in every instance inferior in tonnage to the Canadian shipping and I will show the expense to which each of these countries is subjected for the sustaining of its navy for the defence of its shipping.

Country.	Mercantile tonnage.	Cost of navy.
Argentine Republic	95,000	$ 5,516,000
Austria Hungary	556,000	7,558,000
Brazil	158,000	13,408,000
Chili	113,000	4,003,000
Denmark	538,000	6,875,000
France	1 519,000	61,359,000
Italy	1,159,000	25,400,000
Mexico	18,000	2,285,000
Netherlands	612,000	6,675,000
Norway	1,632,000	1,615,000
Portugal	106,000	4,187,000
Spain	784,000	7,188,000
Sweden	690,000	3,203,000
Canada	2,000,000	.....

Canada, with about 2,000,000 tons of shipping if we include our inland shipping, with her enormous shipping ranking fourth or fifth of the nations of the world, pays not one dollar. These are figures which I am sure will rather surprise the House and which will rather make those who talk very glibly around the country about severing the last ties that bind us to the empire and setting up our own flag as an independent nation, hesitate before they launch the great project of cutting the last tie that holds us to Britain and setting up our own establishment.

Canada's trade as compared with that of Great Britain last year stood in the proportion of about one to ten, her shipping about one to seven and her population about one to eight. Great Britain pays an enormous sum for the maintenance of her navy, I think $150,000,000. Canada profits by the protection afforded her throughout the world by that navy, yet she contributes not one dollar to its support. As has been aptly stated, Britain's fleet guards Canada's trade, Britain's army protects us throughout the length and breadth of the world. We profit by the fact that Britain has guaranteed our loans in the past and so saved the people of our country in straight dollars and cents large sums of interest money. Britain has given Canada vast military properties, forts and other public properties of the empire which Canada now holds. Britain conducts Canada's consular services and to it all we contribute one half the cost of maintenance of a little garrison at Esquimalt, and that is the sum total of Canada's contribution to the great imperial concern. Yet hon. gentlemen will hesitate as to whether we should allow ourselves to be considered as part and parcel of the great empire. Let us take another aspect of the case. Various plans have been proposed by the hon. gentlemen opposite for the defence of Canada. The Minister of the Interior in a very able speech delivered in this city, with much of which I heartily agree, said that it was his ambition to see a military rifle in the hands of every man in Canada with ammunition for practice and ranges where this practice might be carried out. This was the statement of the Minister of the Interior, one of the most progressive young members of parliament, one of the most progressive men in many respects in Canada, the Napoleon of the government. I find the Prime Minister himself—I do not know whether it was in a moment of weakness—on a very recent occasion when it was at all events congenial to take this line, stated that he wished to see volunteer companies, not rifle companies merely but volunteer companies in every village, town, city and community in Canada. I find too, that the member for Labelle, speaking in this House has also endorsed similar views to those held by the Prime Minister. These are the views held by these gentlemen. Now, Sir, on the other hand, I find the Toronto 'Globe' with another line of defence.

The 'Globe' has announced its defence policy. For land defence we will depend upon the kindness of our good neighbour, Uncle Sam. For maritime defence we already shelter behind the skirts of Great Britain. This

is definite, and, of course, carries with it a high spirit and a self-respect eminently suited to young Canada.

This is from the Toronto 'News' whose editor is the chronicler of the Prime Minister. Now we will figure out the system of these hon. gentlemen opposite. The Minister of Militia himself has furnished the House this year with an estimate between $2,000,000 and $3,000,000, and yet as was announced only a year ago by the able young lieutenant, the member for Haldimand (Mr. A. T. Thompson) with all this expenditure on the militia we only have the shadow of the skeleton of a skeleton.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. For the whole militia ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not know the exact words the hon. gentleman used.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. Might I ask the hon. gentleman to honour me so greatly as to read my speech. I can only deny what he said as I have already done in this House on several occasions.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I understand the hon. gentleman referred only to the rural corps.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. My remarks referred only to the rural infantry, because owing to the extra pay for the horses, the cavalry and artillery came out at full strength.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I will take the hon. gentleman's statement, I do not want to misrepresent him. But he referred to the fighting arm of the force.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. One of the fighting arms.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Artillery is all right, cavalry is all right, but look at the records of any modern war and you will find that it is the man behind the gun, the man with the rifle, that does the execution. Nine out of ten killed and wounded in the present war, the records show, were killed and wounded by rifle bullets so that after all it is the rifle we have to depend on and the hon. gentleman admits that the infantry, the rural infantry, was the shadow of the skeleton of a skeleton.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. Will the hon. gentleman quote me a little further, and state what I said this session as to the government having provided the remedy which I suggested ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Notwithstanding that the hon. gentleman has taken it back this year, still it stands on 'Hansard' in cold type.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON. I spoke the truth both times.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In Canada there are 1,500,000 men capable of bearing arms, but let us say there are a million men available and if a rifle were given to each according to the suggestion of the Prime Minister, the Minister of the Interior, and the member for Labelle, (Mr. Bourassa), then there would be an immediate expenditure of $25,000,000 for rifles ; for ranges there would be an immediate expenditure of $50,000,000 because the rifles would be no good without the ranges, and for fifteen rounds of amunition per man yearly there would be 50 cents a man, amounting to $500,000 a year or $5,000,000 running over a period of ten years. For the inspection and organization of these regiments and rifle corps the least sum that could be put down for a period of ten years would be $8,000,000, and I estimate this for ten years because none of these rifles will last longer than that period. Therefore for rifles we have $25,000,000 for ranges $50,000,000 ; for ammunition $5,000,000 for inspection and organization $8,000,000 which gives us a total of $88,000,000 during the first ten years for this rifle service alone. We would spend $88,000,000 in ten years or $8,800,000 a year for teaching the young idea how to shoot according to the policy of the Prime Minister and his colleagues. The subsidized press of the government charged the late General Officer Commanding with advocating the expenditure of $10,000,000 or $12,000,000 in three or four years, although that charge has never been proven, but here we have the Napoleon of Finance, the Minister of the Interior, the Prime Minister, and the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) advocating a policy which would require $8,800,000 a year and remember that in this calculation is not included the expenditure for a navy nor for artillery nor heavy ordnance, nor saddlery, nor medical supplies, nor rations, nor horses, nor cost of organization, nor annual pay for the men. Following the custom of the present government in other matters there would be of course a large number of highly salaried officers looking after this organization and I have not included a dollar of pay for them. As to a navy, if we make comparison with other countries having an infinitely smaller shipping tonnage, fewer harbours, a shorter coast line, and less important interests in all parts of the world than Canada has, I am well within the mark in saying that our navy would cost us at least $8,000,000 a year if the policy of the men who would cut adrift from Britain were carried out. Then in addition we would require for equipment for the army $3,000,000 ; for artillery $5,000,000 ; and that would not suffice to fortify one harbour on the Atlantic coast, and one on the Pacific coast. There would be pay for officials and expenditure of various kinds which would amount at least to $10,000,000 a year, so that without one dollar for equip-

ment and the various other things I have mentioned, we would have $34,800,000 every year, which this country must assume, and comparing it with the expenditure of other countries similarly situated, I venture to say it would be nearly half as much more rather than one dollar less. There is another aspect of the case. We have heard of lectures being delivered all over the country to the effect that Canada must cut adrift from Britain. I remember an able lecture delivered by my good friend Mr. Ewart, of Winnipeg, in which he pointed out a few disabilities under which we labour, and amongst others the right to appeal to the privy Council, and the denial of the privilege of making our own treaties, and the fact that we had an important officer commanding our forces. Nobody has ever heard of these things in the country, except in connection with the agitation gotten up by a very few demagogues. Let us compare the stability of government under the old British flag with that of other countries, and I will not go back further than one hundred years. The British constitution has not been changed for a hundred years, but what about France. I have always admired France and her people, because I understood the good qualities of the French.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes, I am free to say that I am always glad to pay a tribute to the people of France. I chance to have a little interest in that people through ties of blood and relationship, and therefore I have no prejudices against them, paying little attention to the demagogic elements which display themselves at times among certain ones in Canada, and regarding their virtues rather than their little weaknesses. Since 1792 France has been in turn a kingdom, a republic, a directorate, a consulate, an empire, kingdom, a republic, an empire and a republic again. Within a hundred years she has had a dozen different constitutions; she has been deluged with blood, her country has been devasted by war and her people have had to bear the enormous cost of all the dreadful struggles which in that time have agitated that beautiful country. The boundaries of France greatly changed in the same period. Alsace and Lorraine have been won and lost; the northern boundary has varied; the Franche Comté has been added; she has added Savoy and Nice. At one time a part of Germany, the Netherlands, Holland and Belgium, were included in her territory, and afterwards were lost to her. She has also held part of Italy. Turn to Germany, and you find that South German Confederation, and the old Confederation of the Rhine were broken up, and various forms of government were established throughout the length and breadth of the country, largely owing to the operations of France. Prussia, Pomerania, Brandenburg, part of Poland, part of Denmark, part Sweden, the free cities Bavaria, Wurtemburg, Baden, Elsass and Lothringen—these have all at various times within that period had constitutions of their own; but they are all now within the great north German confederation. Their constitutions have changed. They too have been devastated with war and all its accompaniments. Italy within the same time has had included within its domains the following independent nations, such as Canada would be if she cut adrift from Britain: Sardinia, Piedmont, the Ligurian republic, the Cisalpine republic, Venice, Lombardy, Tuscany, the States of the Church, Naples, the Two Sicilies, and the little Kingdom of Italy. These were gradually absorbed one after the other; and finally in 1870 when the war broke out between France and Germany, the capital which had been transferred from Turin to Florence; was changed to Rome. The nations making up the kingdom of Italy have had a dozen constitutions during the century, and have been subject to all the disabilities that similar nations laboured under. Within a hundred or one hundred and ten years, the Netherlands and Belgium have changed. From the old Austrian Netherlands and the old province of Holland, they became part of France. then they were independent as the 'United Netherlands' for thirty years; and finally they became separated as Belgium and Holland. During that time their constitutions have changed, and they have suffered the horrors of war. I could go through the whole of the European states, and could point out how similar conditions have prevailed all over the continent.

Turning to the United States we find that she has been constantly enlarging her territory. In 1803 she obtained Louisiana from France by purchase. In 1819 she obtained Florida from Spain by purchase. In 1836 Texas, with the connivance of the United States, obtained its independence from Mexico, and in 1845 Texas was annexed to the United States the western part being purchased later. In 1846 the Oregon treaty established the boundary from the 42nd parallel and in the Rockies to the 49th parallel; and in 1853 her territory was enlarged on the border of Mexico by the Gila —Gasden purchase; and in 1898 Porto Rico, and the Philippines were added, with Cuba independent. We find that the United States has preserved her constitution during that time, although her borders have greatly changed.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. How about Canada?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Canada is part of Britain, and in that time Canada has formed her confederation, a young nation, and is pursuing the co-operative line.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Development.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes, the line of development. We are pursuing the co-operative plan, and we want to pursue it still further in connection with the mother country.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question? Have we not had changes in our boundaries?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. May be, I am not very well up in 'geography,' but I do not see where Canada has won or lost any territory—or at least, where Britain has lost any. Canada does not own any territory. Britain owns this country. It was British dollars and blood, not Canadian dollars and blood, that bought and won this country, and I fail to see that since then it has won or lost any territory. People in Canada have a perfect right to hold independence views if they choose, and some may wish to see Canada annexed to the United States ; but I am convinced that the great heart of Canada is in favour of a still closer union with the motherland, by which we shall become full partners in the concern, taking our fair share of its burdens ; not content to spend simply 40 to 50 cents per head per year on the militia but not a cent on its naval defence, when every other country with a shipping not half of what Canada has, spends millions on its navy. If we were full partners in the concern, we would have all the advantages that belong to a co-operative society in business. We would have that prominence which has characterized Great Britain through the centuries, when the map of the world and the history of the world shows that all other nations have been the victims of chaos and disintegration.

In conclusion, I may point to this fact, that with such a union there would be an object lesson that would guarantee the peace and prosperity of the world, as that could be accomplished by no other union. In various countries we have heard of massacres of human beings within the year. In the Soudan, in the ten years preceding the British occupation of that country, upwards of 3,000,000 people were butchered in cold blood. Since Britain has taken possession of the land, the country has prospered, the expenditure has been far more than met by the revenue, and Canada as well as Britain has become interested in the trade of that country. The United States has brought the Philippines under the sway of civilization and modern government. Great Britain, united with her colonies, and standing shoulder to shoulder with United States, which I would like to see, could dictate terms to the people of any country who would tyrannize over their fellow men.

Take the case of Turkey, upwards of 40,000 people have been butchered in Turkey within twelve months, yet Europe stands idly by unable to interfere on account of the jangling and quarrelling of European nations among themselves. But if Britain and her colonies were united and standing shoulder to shoulder with the United States, they could dictate to the Sultan of Turkey or to the government of any country that persecution must cease within the borders of that country, and that would undoubtedly at once put an end to it. Many years ago when amid the old Alpine mountains persecution was rampant, a message was sent by Cromwell—and the power of England was then not nearly so great as it is to-day —that if the persecution did not immediately cease, English cannon would be heard and English soldiers would be seen, not in the Swiss mountains and Alpine hills, but in the streets of Rome and under the walls of that city, and on the receipt of that message persecution at once ceased. In like manner, if the civilized powers of the world, if Britain and her colonies alone, standing shoulder to shoulder with the United States, would take concerted action, that would bring about a condition of affairs which would make for the peace and prosperity of the world and put an end to these expensive wars.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER put the motion.

Mr. TALBOT. I draw the attention of the chair to the fact that there is no seconder to the motion.

Mr. INGRAM. There is a seconder and as good a man as the one who raised the point.

Amendment (Mr. Tisdale) negatived on division.

Mr. HANCE J. LOGAN. I have an amendment to move, and before doing so I shall make one or two explanatory remarks. In so doing, I shall not follow the example set by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes), but will take up as short a time as possible in explaining the object I have in view. I propose to move that sections 79, 80 and 81 be struck out and another section substituted. These sections provide for the calling out of the militia of Canada in the case of a riot or disturbance. Under them the militia can be called out at any time by three justices of the peace sending a requisition to the district officer commanding. Such a request compels that officer to send the militia to the locality where the disturbance either occurs or is expected to occur. I do not think that such power should be given to three men who are not responsible to any one. Both in the United States and Canada, the militia have been called out when there was no particular need for their services. There is, for instance, great difference of opinion as to whether the militia was really needed at Valleyfield. It was certainly called out against the protest of the civil authorities. There

is also some question as to whether the militia should have been called out a few weeks ago at Sydney. I have no personal knowledge of the matter, except that I know that question has been raised. We should endeavour to prevent its being so easy for men to be called out to shoot their fellowmen in order perhaps to carry out the behests of some corporate or private concern. I believe in the militia being called out when absolutely necessary, but I do not believe that we should leave it in the power of three justices of the peace, who are responsible to no one, to cause the militia of Canada to be called out in time of disturbance or of anticipated disturbance. In the amendment I propose moving, it is provided that where a disturbance is anticipated or a riot or disturbance has occurred, the first person to be approached must be the head of the municipality, for the municipality after all has to pay the Bill, if the militia is called out. In other words, if a disturbance should occur, the first person who shall have power to ask for the militia to be called out shall be the mayor or warden or other head or acting head of the municipality. In case the mayor or the warden declines or is unable to act, then an appeal can be made to the county or district court judge having jurisdiction in such place, or if there be none, to any judge of the Superior Court who has jurisdiction there. In other words, I want to provide that the first person who shall be called upon to bring out the militia shall be the one who is immediately responsible to the people. The people have to pay the piper, and should the warden or the mayor decline, possibly through influences that are not exactly proper, then an appeal may be taken to the judiciary of the country. I beg therefore to move the following amendment:

That Bill No. 5, intituled an Act respecting the Militia of Canada be not now read the third time, but be referred back to the committee of the whole with instructions to the committee to strike out clauses 79, 80 and 81, and substitute therefor the following:—

79. The district officer commanding in any locality, if he is present in the locality and able to act, or if he is not so present, or from sickness or other causes is unable to act, the senior officer of the active militia in any locality, shall call out the same or such portion thereof as he considers necessary for the purpose of preventing or suppressing any such actual or anticipated riot or disturbance, when thereunto required in writing by such civil authorities hereinafter mentioned; provided always that so far as the permanent force is available, in the opinion of the officer upon whom the requisition is made, a sufficient number of that force is to be employed upon this duty before recourse is had to other militia corps.

79a. The civil authorities by whom such requisition may be made are—

(a.) If the place where the riot or disturbance occurs or is anticipated is municipally organized, the mayor, or warden or other head or acting head of the municipality, unless he has declined or is unable to act, and in that case the county or district court judge, or one of the county or district court judges, having jurisdiction in such place, or if there is no such county or district court judge, any judge of a Superior Court who has jurisdiction there.

(b.) If the place where such riot or disturbance occurs or is anticipated is not municipally organized, the county or district court judge, or one of the county or district court judges, having jurisdiction in such place, or if there is no such county or district court judge, then to any judge of a Superior Court having jurisdiction there.

2. Wherever under subsection 1 of this section a judge is designated as the civil authority by whom a requisition may be made, and there is no such judge, or the judge, or all the judges, who might have acted are absent, or unable to act, the requisition may be made by any five justices of the peace having jurisdiction at the place where such riot or disturbance occurs or is anticipated.

3. Where the requisition is made by a judge any statements of fact contained therein shall be final and binding upon all parties in any way concerned.

4. Where the requisition is made by justices of the peace any statement of fact therein shall not be open to dispute by the officer upon whom the requisition is made.

80. In every such requisition it shall be stated that a riot, or disturbance has occurred or is anticipated, and that the service of the active militia is required in aid of the civil power.

81. The requisition may be in the following form, or to the like effect, and the form may be varied to suit the facts of the case:—

County of

To wit:

Whereas, it has been made to appear to our satisfaction that a riot or disturbance of the peace, beyond the powers of the civil authorities to suppress (or to prevent, or to deal with,) and requiring the aid of the active militia to that end, has occurred and is in progress (or is anticipated as likely to occur) at (or in)....., a place municipally organized (or not municipally or ganized).

And whereas (here state any other facts upon which the authority of the person or persons making the requisition depends, as, for example, that a mayor, &c., has declined, or is unable to act, or that any judge or all the judges who might have acted are absent or unable to act or that there is no judge with authority to act).

These are therefore to require you to call out the active militia present in..... or such portion thereof as you consider necessary for the purpose of suppressing (or preventing, or dealing with) such riot or disturbance.

Dated at....., this.....day of ....., 19.....

(Here follow the signature or signatures of the civil authorities making the requisition followed by words or letters showing the capacity in which they act.

You will notice that under section 79a it is provided that in unorganized districts, where there is no judge, and where there is no

mayor or warden, five justices of the peace may call out the militia, but in all other parts of Canada, incorporated towns and municipalities, the militia can only be called out by a request, first of the head of the municipality or, in case he declines or is unable to act, by an appeal to the judiciary existing in that part of the Dominion. There is one point in section 79a to which I desire to call the attention of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), as I think he has before him a copy of this amendment. On mature consideration, I think it may be better to change this amendment somewhat. I think we might add to the mayor or warden two justices of the peace—but to provide that the mayor or warden must consent——

Mr. GOURLEY. Why not two councillors?

Mr. LOGAN. That has been suggested, but I am afraid it would not be practical in a large city like Toronto or Montreal. When immediate action is needed, as in these cases, you can always get hold of the mayor, and there are always magistrates in the district available. Under the amendment, as I at first proposed it, power is given to one man—the mayor. It might be that he would not be the proper kind of man—he might be excitable or be under wrong influences. It might hardly be wise to place it in the power of one man to bring out the militia possibly to attack his fellow-countrymen. So I think I will change this proposed amendment of mine in committee, so as to insert, after the words 'mayor or warden,' the the words 'and two justices of the peace.' Under our present law the requisition for calling out the militia must be signed by three magistrates, one of whom it is provided shall be the mayor or the warden. But it provides, further on, that if the mayor or the warden refuses, the other magistrates can proceed in spite of his refusal, or even his protest. Under the amendment, as I shall submit it to the committee, the mayor cannot call out the militia alone, but must be accompanied in the requisition by two magistrates, but he can prevent the militia being called out even if the two magistrates desire it. If he objects, there must be an appeal to the county court judge, or, in some parts of the Dominion, to the superior court judge.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Before my hon. friend (Mr. Logan) takes his seat, I would ask him to point out specifically the words of the Bill that are changed by his proposed amendment.

Mr. LOGAN. I will first read the old section.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman means the section of this Bill ?

Mr. LOGAN. There has been no change, as I understand it.

Mr. TISDALE. Yes, I think there has been. I have had some experience. The senior officer present is ordered out—a captain can be ordered out in preference to a colonel.

Mr. LOGAN. That is not the point I was referring to. The question is, not to whom the requisition is directed, but what civil authorities have the power to call out the militia. If I mistake not, the old and the new law are the same on that point.

Mr. GOURLEY. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It substitutes 'shall' for 'may'—it is 'shall' in the new Bill and 'may' in the present law.

Mr. LOGAN. I do not see much difference. Because if it is 'shall' in the new Bill, yet if he refuses to act it does not make any difference, except that the fact is reported to the district officer commanding. In the old Bill the mayor 'may' be one of those to call out the militia, but under the new Bill he 'shall' be one, but still, as I say, it does not make any difference, because when the report is made to the district officer commanding, that seems to end it, and the militia are still called out by the three justices of the peace. These three authorities could call out the militia under the old Bill; by the amendment which I am placing before the House the mayor of an incorporated town or the warden of a county or district are substituted for the three justices of the peace and the chairman or custos of the board of sessions. It provides further that in the case of the warden or mayor declining to call out the militia or is unable to do so, there is then an appeal to the county court judge in some parts of the Dominion and to the superior court in other parts.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. An appeal—does the hon. gentleman mean a technical appeal ?

Mr. LOGAN. I would not call it exactly an appeal. But supposing a strike were under way——

Mr. GOURLEY—Application would be the right word.

Mr. LOGAN. An application would be an appeal, because a man who thought his property was in danger in an uncorporated town would go to the mayor and ask him to call out the militia ; if the mayor refused, in that sense he could appeal to the judge of the county court.

Mr. GOURLEY. I hope the Minister of Militia will see his way to accept the substance of this motion. I have not had time to consider the language, but that is immaterial. Now my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) said there was very little difference between the section in the new Act and the section in the old, and I concur in that. While the old Act names the officer commanding in the district, the new Act still enlarges the number of militia officers from which that choice can be made. But none of the militia officers can act ex-

cept upon requisition of three justices of the peace. Now that is the point I want to make so far as Nova Scotia is concerned. When this Act was originally passed there was an entirely different state of affairs in the maritime provinces. In 1868, when the old Militia Act was passed we had no municipal authority in Nova Scotia, we had the court of sessions with a custos at the head of that body. Now this Act to-day repeats the anomaly of referring to the custos. That is an anomaly that should not appear in the Act, for so far as the maritime provinces are concerned, there is no custos at all, and there is no part of the country then to which that refers. It is an utterly obsolete phrase. The point I wish to make to the minister is this, that at the time the custos was referred to he was the governing authority of the municipality, he was the head of the body that had to pay the bills, and it was very proper then that the Act should vest that authority in the person who was responsible as the head of the county for paying the expenses of calling out the militia. Now that there are new conditions existing I want the new Act to correspond with those conditions. At the present time there is no custos responsible to the people of the county, and no court of sessions, but in their stead we have erected a municipality, so that to-day in every town or municipality the authority belonging to and exercised by the old quarter sessions or custos is now exercised absolutely by these new bodies. Therefore as the law placed that authority in the custos a few years ago—because he was the representative man and he was the head of the body that had to pay the bills—it should now be placed directly in the hands of those who have to pay the bills. For surely if a town is to be charged with a large expenditure of money it should have something to say, and have some responsibility in connection with incurring the debt. Now I have not been able to read the motion and only understand it from having heard it read; but the genius of the motion is one that should be incorporated in the new Bill. I must say, however, that I think, as my hon. friend has taken up the idea, he should perhaps have carried it to a more logical conclusion, that is, he should have vested the authority, in towns, in the mayor and say three councillors. This story of not being able to get the councillors together—why, every town council or the majority of them, can be called together in half an hour in every incorporated town in Nova Scotia. These riots do not occur in a moment; they are the subject of discussion for weeks and weeks, and then they culminate. There would never be a sudden disturbance in which you could not get the municipal body together. Supposing a riot was threatened in a town over which a municipal council has authority. All the counties are supplied with telephones. I could inform everybody in Colchester in an hour by using the telephone in an emergency. Therefore, I think there is no advantage in this provision, as you could reach them almost as quickly as you could reach any three magistrates in the county. While I concur to a large extent in the motion, I think where there are regularly organized municipalities, the authority should be vested in the mayor and, say, three councillors, or perhaps the council should be called together and this should be decided at a special meeting of council called, say, on twenty-four hours' notice. In the case of a county council forty-eight hours' notice might be required, and in them the authority should be vested. This idea of putting a great power like that into the hands of three irresponsible magistrates is not right. The magistrate to-day in the province of Nova Scotia is utterly irresponsible to the public. He is simply a quasi criminal judge exercising summary jurisdiction not responsible to any one on earth; and to put this enormous power into the hands of three magistrates is a mistake. Very often these magistrates are men in the employ of the very companies who desire them to exercise this very authority. In the case of the recent strike at Sydney I am told that all the authorities were in the employ of the company, and now the town of Sydney will be visited with an enormous expenditure because the militia were called out. If the council of the town of Sydney had been consulted, a body of representative men, elected by their fellow-citizens, lawyers and business men, who would know exactly the responsibility they were assuming in this matter, the militia would not have been called out. But they are passed over, and three magistrates, utterly irresponsible characters in the employ of the company, set about ordering out the militia, putting the whole cost, perhaps $50,000, upon their fellow-citizens. It is a wonder they are not mobbed. I think the hon. member for Cumberland has moved exactly in the right direction. The only thing is that we want the section drafted with care. I am not prepared to accept any exact wording as given without consideration, but the essence of his amendment should be accepted by the Minister of Militia, as far as the maritime provinces are concerned, because the whole circumstances have changed since the original law was adopted. The other is a splendid idea. We have county court judges all over Nova Scotia and Supreme Court judges. If there is any question of any place not having a county council or a city council, then let application be made to one of the judges. A judge could be applied to anywhere in Nova Scotia within five hours, and a judge would be a fair-minded, judicial man, who would require an affidavit of some responsible person setting out the facts and would exercise a proper discretion, such as you could expect from the three magis-

trates. We must remember that the militia officer has no discretion at all. When the requisition comes to him he has to act; and, therefore, we should be careful to place the responsibility of requisitioning him to call out the militia in the hands of the most responsible people in the community. That is, perhaps, the most serious power the people can exercise, and it should not be put in the hands of three irresponsible persons. The Minister of Militia must know how irresponsible many of the magistrates who hold commissions in Nova Scotia are. You can get three of them at any moment to sign a death warrant. I mean that while many of them are respectable men, you could pick up three of them who would call out the militia without proper justification. A company could go around and pick up the most worthless magistrates in the community and get them to call out the militia. The cost of so calling them out would be charged against the civil authority of the town who would not have a word of appeal in reference to the calling out. I sincerely hope the Minister of Militia will see that the principle of this amendment is accepted, and that the wording is properly arranged.

Mr. ARCH. CAMPBELL. I desire, as a member of the House, to enter my protest against this proceeding. This Bill was introduced in the early days of the session. It was fully discussed and amended in committee, it was then reprinted and we have spent day after day over this Bill this session, when that time should have been occupied with more important business. Now, in the closing days of the session, on the third reading an important amendment is moved without any notice having been given. I do not know whether the amendment is good or not, but I say it is a wrong thing to thus take a leap in the dark and to accept a long and important amendment. I, for one, will protest against the passage of such an amendment to-night.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the session is too far advanced to make a wise change such as this. I believe the amendment should be accepted; I believe it is a necessary and wise substitute for section 79 of the Bill in its present form. When we were in committee I made a proposition very similar to the one now in your hands. I pointed out the weakness of section 79. It is provided there that the militia may be called out on the requisition of two justices of the peace and the mayor, and if the mayor refuses, his refusal is simply noted and the proceeding goes on. I pointed out that the mayor is the only man who represents the people who have got to pay, and if he refuses, it should take some superior power to override him. I believe that if this amendment is accepted it will work out very beneficially. It will place the responsibility upon the mayor and the warden. When in time of emergencey, as often happens, people who are excited, or people who have some end to serve, come and ask for the calling out of the militia, the mayor would feel the responsibility of his position, and would proceed to exercise the power which he has as head of the municipality, and to swear in special constables to keep the peace. I claim that that plan is far preferable to having magistrates rush out the militia.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I wish to say that the amendment which my hon. friend (Mr. Logan) has moved was not shown to me until a very short time ago, and I have been so much engaged in the debate this afternoon that I have not had an opportunity of examining it. However, as my hon. friend from Colchester and other members who have spoken upon the subject have said that there are merits in the amendment—and I quite agree in that view—and as I feel that the question is really one of the most important features of the whole Bill, I think that, even at this late date, it is desirable that due consideration should be given to my hon. friend's proposal. I sympathize very much with my hon. friend from York (Mr. Campbell) in his desire to get on with the Bill. I dare say that I feel more strongly than he does on that subject, but nevertheless it is never too late to do the right thing, and if we have been here all this session and have failed to seize on the vital point that is necessary to make this part of the law what it ought to be, surely it is our duty to pause now and do whatever we have failed to do heretofore. I would therefore feel disposed to make this suggestion, that if it can be understood that the exact words of the amendment shall not be considered to be binding, but that the House can go into committee with the understanding that in committee a form of words may be agreed upon which shall include the principle which my hon. friend wishes, we might go into committee.

Mr. TISDALE. For a long period this power has been vested in the magistrates, but if the men now appointed to that office by the governments of the different provinces, deserve the character which has been given them in this House, it is time we should take the power out of the hands of the magistrates. Magistrates are now vested with great power over personal liberty, and it is intolerable to hear that such men are appointed to the office as hon. gentlemen have told us of to-night. If proper magistrates were appointed, I would oppose this amendment, but in view of the generally expressed opinion that such magistrates are not appointed, they should not be entrusted with power under this Bill.

Mr. GOURLEY. There are many good magistrates appointed in Nova Scotia, but there are some who are appointed for political reasons only, and probably those who wanted to have the militia called out would

appeal to magistrates who are not the best of their class.

Mr. TALBOT. I have only a word to say. We know that to-day half of the strikes that are organized in Canada are incited by American labour organizations, and in view of that fact we should do nothing in this parliament which would make it impossible or difficult to have the militia called out in aid of the civil power to safeguard life or property. I do not care what means you take to do it, but there should be ample authority in this Bill to have the militia called out when it is necessary.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When we were debating this section as far back as the 22nd of March last, I drew attention to the desirability of giving to the municipal body, which would have to pay the expense, a greater voice in the calling out of the militia in such cases. The Minister of Militia made no reply to that, but on the same day I asked the Minister of Justice whether he did not concur in that view. He very fairly stated that while he realized the importance of it, we must take into consideration the possible disinclination of municipal authorities to call out the militia in view of the fact that they would have to pay the expense. It seems to me that the motion of my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) is in the right direction, but its terms must be very carefully considered. The hon. gentleman desires to bring in the judicial authority in case the municipal authorities do not see fit to act where action is necessary; but the manner in which that should be done will have to be carefully weighed. Is the judge going to act ex parte without notice to the rest of the community? The difficulty is that if you do give notice to the rest of the community, in the meantime your riot is going on. If I were called upon to construe the amendment, I would not without great consideration be able to interpret what it means. My hon. friend spoke of it as an appeal, but obviously it is not an appeal. Is it the idea of my hon. friend, that the judge should act as a judicial officer upon evidence?

Mr. LOGAN. My meaning is that the first application for the aid of the militia must be made to the mayor, and if the mayor declines or fails to call out the militia, then the parties who are aggrieved can go to the judge of the county court and apply to him in the same way as they would apply to the mayor in the first instance.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is not a question of being aggrieved. The idea in the first instance was, that three magistrates who are appointed to preserve the peace should as conservators of the peace call out the militia to aid the civil power if the civil power needed aid. It never was intended, and it should not be intended that any particular person who is aggrieved should have power to ask for the calling out of the militia. It is the public peace that had to be considered in the first place, but of course private rights are involved in that, because private property might be destroyed. My hon. friend (Mr. Logan) says that you are simply to tell the judge that it is desirable to call out the militia, and that you need not present evidence.

Mr. LOGAN. You would have to convince the judge. He would not call out the militia without being convinced of the necessity for doing so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When you speak about convincing, you must mean the presentation of evidence.

Mr. LOGAN. There would not be time in the midst of a riot to give evidence.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is what I think, and that is why I do not see how you could go to a judge as a judicial officer. The judge having jurisdiction in the district may live fifty miles away from the scene of the riot, and if you do not go to him as a judicial officer and produce evidence, how can he know of the circumstances of the riot? The justice of the peace is supposed to see the riot before him, or to know, from his personal knowledge of the locality, that it is imminent. But a judge who lives fifty or sixty miles away will know only what some one may tell him or what he may read in the newspapers. I am not pointing this out for the purpose of defeating the object of my hon. friend from Cumberland, because I have already expressed my view in favour of that object; but I am pointing out that it is not an easy thing to deal with. We want to guard against the militia being made use of for purposes inconsistent with the original intention of the statute. We want to give the municipality a proper voice, but we do not want the militia to be called out for the purpose of coercing anybody of men in the interest of any person. We want the militia to be called out when there is a breach of the peace or a threatened breach of the peace, because we require the peace to be kept in this country. We want to safeguard all these considerations; but it may not be so easy to state our object in plain language. I will support the motion to refer the Bill back to the Committee of the Whole, and if that is done, we may find a way out of the difficulty suggested, and put the statute on a better basis than it has at present; because I thoroughly agree with that part of the remarks of my hon. friend from Cumberland in which he said that the statute in its present condition is not very satisfactory.

Amendment agreed to, and House went into committee.

Mr. LOGAN moved that sections 79, 80 and 81 of the Bill be reconsidered.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. TISDALE. As I understand the amendment, it proposes, first, to give the municipal authorities entire jurisdiction in the matter, and, secondly, if they decline or fail to act, to give the jurisdiction to a judge.

Mr. LOGAN. That is right, so far as organized municipalities are concerned. There is a special section referring to unorganized districts.

Mr. TISDALE. If you give the jurisdiction to the municipality, there are two things that ought to be observed. According to my view, we ought not to relegate it to the representatives of the municipality alone, because they are elected officials, municipal politicians, and they might be more influenced by considerations of expense than by the necessity of the circumstances. We must remember, or else there is no justification for this legislation, that life and property are above expense ; and therefore we should consider not only those who are liable for the expense, but somebody in whom the legislature has confidence, and who would have a voice in regard to the larger principle of the protection of life and property.

Then as regards the judge, I think the suggestion an excellent one, judging by Ontario, that the county judges should be given the power. I assume that the protection of life and property is above the consideration of expense. We ought to have always some one at hand to whom we could apply to have the militia ordered out, some one who is disinterested in the sense of being neither a politician nor interested in the expense, and I do not know of any one who could fill the bill better than a judge.

Mr. LOGAN. If the mayor would refuse to call out the militia because he did not wish to take the responsibility, then the parties can apply to a judge.

Mr. TISDALE. But in some of the districts, which are very large, would it be fair to put all the responsibility upon the judge ? He might be some weak man who would hesitate to act. Why should he not have some assistance in arriving at a conclusion ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The intention of the statute is to enable a militia corps to be called out in case of a riot or disturbance, and the question arises who shall call it out. Under the present law it is provided that the chairman of the quarter sessions or three magistrates, one of whom may be the mayor or warden, can requisition the district officer commanding, and that officer is obliged to obey their requests. When this question was up for consideration it was argued that as the municipality would be burdened with the expense, it was but right that it should have something to say in connection with the requisition. It is to meet that difficulty that the amendment is proposed. I understand the amendment to provide that instead of the chairman of quarter sessions, whose duties have now disappeared, the mayor or warden may requisition for the troops, and in case they refuse then a judge of the county court or district court may act, or in default of either a judge of the Superior Court. These judges would perform the duties that are now vested in the three magistrates. It is further provided that in the event of the mayor or warden refusing to act and of there being no judge available, then five justices of the peace may requisition the district officer commanding. But the trouble would be to get the five justices of the peace.

Mr. EMMERSON. Why not make the sheriff the officer to determine ? He is charged with the custody of the peace in a municipality, and it seems to me he would be a very proper officer to act.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If there are no other suggestions, I would move that the committee rise and resume consideration of the amendment to-morrow.

Progress reported.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 74) to amend the Fisheries Act—Mr. Prefontaine—read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. MORRISON. With the permission of the committee I beg to withdraw the amendment I moved.

Motion agreed to and amendment withdrawn.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I would like to withdraw the clause. I move that clause 2 be struck out.

Mr. INGRAM. Does this mean that the proposition to use traps in British Columbia is not to be carried out?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This means that the section is to be dropped and the law to remain as it was.

Mr. INGRAM. Are not traps now permitted to be used in British Columbia?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There are traps there as I stated before dinner. They have been used in British Columbia for the last ten or twelve years, and they will continue to be used just the same.

Mr. EARLE. Are any other traps to be allowed except those for which permission was given some years ago ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, there are others used at present, I understand.

Mr. EARLE. Under license ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. EARLE. Are other licenses to be granted, or does this do away with the granting of trap licenses in British Columbia ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The law remains as it is.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the law ?

Mr. INGRAM. Where are the traps located that are now allowed ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In the northern waters of British Columbia.

Mr. INGRAM. That is a very satisfactory answer. We would like to know where they are, at any rate within a hundred miles.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That was explained fully before dinner, and also why they were tolerated.

Mr. EARLE. Under what law or rule are they permitted to fish with traps in British Columbia to-day?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. As I understand it, the law that we have had on the statute-books since 1886 has been construed, down to the present time, as authorizing the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to issue licenses for trap-nets.

Mr. INGRAM. During certain seasons.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, without restriction. Going on that assumption licenses have been issued and I suppose it is intended to issue them in the future as in the past.

Mr. EARLE. But is the law such that any one applying for a trap-net license would be able to obtain it ? Is it dependent on the will of the minister ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, the power is with the minister.

Mr. INGRAM. We have here a peculiar state of affairs. What was the object of the minister putting this section in the Bill? The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) condemned the clause the minister proposed and the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Ralph Smith) supported the minister. I understand that the other members from British Columbia strongly supported the minister in the legislation he offered to the House. Now, what has brought about these changes ? Has the minister changed his views ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No.

Mr. INGRAM. Or backed down ?

Mr. EARLE.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I never back down. This clause was introduced in the Bill under the impression that it was necessary, and to regularize the position. On more fully considering the case it was found that the clause was unnecessary and I decided to drop it.

Mr. INGRAM. Then, the minister in effect says that the advice given by his chief officials is wrong, and the hon. member for New Westminster is right. So, the minister is obliged to withdraw the legislation his officials have advised him to adopt.

Mr. EARLE. As I understand the minister, some time ago when speaking to me on the subject, it was open, to any one who would comply with the regulations to obtain a license for trap fishing. I would like to hear from the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Ralph Smith) and the hon. junior member for Victoria (Mr. Riley) who were on the commission that investigated this question, and, as I understood, recommended that authority should be given for trap fishing such as was intended by this Order in Council. Now, it comes down to this, that we are in the position that we have been in for the last few years. I would like to understand from the members of the committee who are here what their views are with regard to the recommendation they made.

Mr. GOURLEY. The section in the Consolidated Statutes reads :

> No one shall use a bag-net, trap-net or fish pound, except under special license, granted for the capture of deep-sea fish other than salmon.

That was sought to be repealed by the section that is now dropped. It appears that the minister can grant licenses to use trap-nets other than for salmon fishing. But, I understand that the proposition was for salmon.

Mr. INGRAM. I take it that the minister is in favour of the Americans catching the larger portion of the salmon that comes up the Fraser river, seeing that he is not willing to let Canadians fish with the appliances that the Americans use.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. These are the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Ingram's) conclusions.

Mr. INGRAM. These are the arguments advanced to-day, and the hon. minister has backed down.

Mr. EARLE. I would like to know in what position those parties are who have gone to the expense of erecting traps. They tell me that they have spent something over $20,000 and their license enables them to fish for one year only. So. they will be at the will of the minister, whether they shall be able to use trap-nets in future or not. If that is the case, it is a serious matter.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Those who took the licenses knew the law under which they took them.

Mr. EARLE. The law, as I was given to understand it, since the Order in Council has been passed is interpreted by the minister in an entirely different way from what it was.

Mr. HAGGART. I think the hon. minister from Victoria (Mr. Earle) did not pay attention to what the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) said. As I understand that hon. gentleman, he told us plainly that these trap licenses were issued under an assumption of authority by the minister. And I think there can be no doubt about it. The law is as clear as possible. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has no power whatever to issue the licenses to catch salmon in trap-nets. He wanted authority to issue such licenses, but he now withdraws that clause and leaves the law as it was. If I understand the English language it seems as plain as possible that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, under the old Act, has no power to issue licenses for trap-net fishing.

Mr. EARLE. In regard to the law, of course I am not able to speak authoritatively. But last year when an amendment to the Fisheries Act was introduced, the power to grant trap fishing licenses was included. Then, in obedience to some representations, or for some other reason, that provision was withdrawn; and the minister, when questioned by myself, said there was power already in existence giving him authority to issue licenses to fish by traps. Now I maintain that if there is power to grant licenses to fish by traps, why not provide that any one complying with the fishery regulations shall be able to obtain a license to fish in that manner?

Section agreed to.

Mr. INGRAM. I would ask the minister whether he intends to allow these fishermen to continue their trap fishing for salmon?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. If the law does not give him the right, what authority has the minister to allow them to do so?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That construction of the statute has been acted on since 1886, and I do not suppose great harm will follow if that construction is continued to be acted upon.

Mr. INGRAM. Then I understand that is not the true construction of the law.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I did not say anything about that.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask the minister in what position these trap-fishermen are at the present moment.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They are in a very fine position.

Mr. INGRAM. What about the gentlemen who are applying to fish with trap-nets?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They are also.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems to me there are some matters about this that might be considered a little. It is quite an unusual situation to have the Minister of Marine and Fisheries suggesting a particular amendment to the law, and then withdrawing it without any information whatever. It is not a matter to be passed over without some reason being given. If the Minister of Justice thinks that the law as it stands at present does not justify the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in doing that which he proposes to do, we have this situation before us, that the minister proposes deliberately to violate the law as understood by the Department of Justice. Well, does the hon. gentleman take that position? It is not a very usual position for a member of the government to take, it is not a position that is to be passed by with a mere jibe or smile. I think the minister should take it a little more seriously, and give us some information as to why this Bill is carried in its present form. Moreover, if these licenses are to be granted simply according to the caprice of the minister, is that a very desirable condition of affairs? I understood that was stated to be the case, in answer to the hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Earle). Does the minister regard that as good administration? He may, but I think there are some hon. gentlemen, even on the other side, who would not so regard it. A great many probably would not regard it as a very proper mode of administering public affairs. I think the minister ought to give us some explanation of this.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. When I withdrew the amendment I gave an explanation as clearly as possible, and there is no necessity for the hon. gentleman reading me a lecture on what is the duty of the minister of Marine and Fisheries, or a member of the cabinet. I understand perfectly well my position. I withdraw the clause because I thought it was unnecessary. I think that is perfectly plain language, and means that the law as it exists is sufficient.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was not the minister advised that the law was not sufficient before he introduced that measure?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I was advised—not by the Minister of Justice—by some of my officials that it might be better to have this clause inserted. But after considering the whole question I have come to the conclusion that there was no need for it. That was my opinion at first, and I have come

back to the opinion that this clause is unnecessary.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the hon. gentleman think it was wise to act on the advice of his officers, contrary to his own opinion, without first obtaining the opinion of the Department of Justice? Has he obtained any such opinion?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In view of the doubt that obviously has existed in his department, why does he not obtain an opinion from the Department of Justice?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I had never any doubt about it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the minister had no doubt, he took a most unusual course in proposing an amendment that has already taken up the time of this House for a considerable period——

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I did not lose much time when I discovered the amendment was unnecessary.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN—in proposing that amendment as to the uselessness of which he had no doubt. That is the minister's position. He knew that the amendment was not necessary, knew absolutely, never had any doubt about it; yet he has put this country to the expense of having it printed, and the House to the inconvenience of considering it for some time, when he had no doubt on the subject at all. Well, it is not wonderful that our sessions are prolonged when ministers of the Crown will act in this way.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Lecturing an opponent is very easy. But there is this fact. I have declared before this House that I introduced this clause on the advice of some of my officials, although I was perfectly satisfied there was no necessity for it. You see this every day, Bills introduced to test the opinion of the House. In this case it was a small clause introduced to test the opinion of the House. Where is the harm in that, or what is the use in losing an hour or two hours in cross-examining me about what I thought at the beginning, what I thought at the middle, what I thought at the end, and what I think at the present moment. I think this is a loss of time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am inclined to agree that it is hardly worth while to consider what the minister did think at any of these periods, because it does not seem to have any particular value.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It had this value that the clause was withdrawn.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And because it changed so very often.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No it did not.

Mr. EARLE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The Bill has now been disposed of, and the hon. member cannot discuss it.

Mr. CLARKE. Why not?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. He can discuss the propriety of rising.

Mr. EARLE. I would like to enter my protest as strongly as I can against the course the minister has pursued in regard to trap licenses. If the course he has pursued and is pursuing is continued, it will be most unjust to the canners and fishermen of British Columbia. The commission reported upon the desirability of granting trap licenses.

Mr. MORRISON. No, if the hon. gentleman will permit me, he is entirely in error in saying that. I happened to be a member of the commission and it reported nothing of the kind.

Mr. EARLE. You did not report against it?

Mr. MORRISON. They reported against the desirability of admitting trap licenses.

Mr. EARLE. That was a year ago, but not against granting them in the future, and I understand that the commission this year, consisting of the hon. members for Vancouver and Victoria were in favour of granting such licenses, and considered it was only fair they should be granted.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Do I understand the hon. member to say that the commission was appointed last year?

Mr. EARLE. Last year.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. No there was no commission last year. The commission was appointed in 1901 and the commission did not report in favour of trap fishing.

Mr. EARLE. I read the report, and I think it will bear out what I say that although you did not report in favour of granting trap-licenses that year the inference was that at a future date trap-licenses should be granted.

Mr. MORRISON. No; quite the contrary.

Mr. EARLE. Aside from that, it was decided to issue trap-licenses this year and trap-licenses have been issued. If so, why confine it to one or two people. Why not issue them if the applicants comply with certain regulations which the department may issue? That is the complaint I have to make.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. If the hon. member has read the regulations issued by the department he will see that every man complying with the regulations issued by the government can have a trap-license.

Mr. EARLE. The minister does not say so.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I am not talking about what the minister says. If the hon. gentleman will read the official regulations as published by the government he will see that what I have said is correct. I have a copy of these regulations. The hon. gentleman has seen this and he must see that any British subject complying with the regulations may apply to the minister and get a trap-license.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood the hon. gentleman to favour the clause which the minister has just withdrawn.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Of course when the minister tells us that the Act as it was is as effective as it would be in the amended form, why should we make any change? It does not matter so long as the license is legal.

Mr. INGRAM. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he was not aware of the minister's opinion until this evening?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I thought that the minister considered this necessary or he would not have introduced it. I consider that when the minister has explained that in his opinion the old Act is effective, that is as satisfactory to me as if he had passed his amendment.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the hon. gentleman think that under the present law traps can be established at the point advocated this afternoon?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I certainly think so. I believe that the licenses and regulations issued by the government are effectual.

Mr. EARLE. I must have misunderstood the minister because I understood him to say that if any licenses be granted they are only granted by the minister, that there are no regulations enabling anybody to put up traps and be certain they will be able to obtain a license.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. If the hon. member will permit me, he has a copy of the regulations in his possession, and they will tell him plainly that the regulations passed by the Order in Council permit any British subject applying for a license for trap fishing and complying with these regulations to have that permission.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. member for Westminster has a right to complain. If the minister's contention is right and if the contention of the hon. member for Vancouver is right then the hon. member for Westminster is not doing his duty if he does not object to it, because that was the ground of his objection to-day.

Bill as amended reported.

Amendments read the first and second time.

Mr. PREFONTAINE moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have had my attention called to subsection 14 of section 7 of the statute which has been referred to. It is as follows:

> No one shall use a bag-net, trap-net, or fish-pound, except under a special license granted for capturing deep-sea fish other than salmon.

Is the Minister of Marine of opinion that under that subsection he has power to grant a license to capture salmon?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Section 16 modifies it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Speaking hurriedly I would not think that section 19 which is a section of a general character giving authority to issue leases and licenses would interfere with the plain intent of subsection 14 of section 7 which seems to me to contain a direct prohibition against issuing licenses for the use of these implements in the capture of salmon. That would be my view, speaking very hurriedly of course and without much consideration. I would still recommend that the Minister of Marine should get the considered opinion of the Minister of Justice on this point.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time.

PURCHASE OF THE CANADA EASTERN RAILWAY.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolutions:

1. That it is expedient—

(a.) To authorize the Governor in Council to purchase from the Alexander Gibson Railway and Manufacturing Company, and to authorize the said company to sell and convey to His Majesty, the whole of the railway and undertaking formerly belonging to the Canada Eastern Railway Company, but now vested in the Alexander Gibson Railway and Manufacturing Company, the same having been sold, transferred and assigned to that company, pursuant to and by virtue of chapter 59 of the statutes of 1898, including the main and branch lines of the said railways and all buildings, fixtures and appurtenances appertaining thereto, together with all the rights, franchises powers privileges and property held or exercisable in respect thereof or in connection therewith; and that upon such purchase being effected the said railways and its branch lines shall become and form part of the government railways system and be operated as such.

(b.) That it be made a condition of such purchase that the said railway and undertaking shall be conveyed to His Majesty free and clear from all charges liens and encumbranches affecting the same under and by virtue or in respect of any mortgages, bonds, debentures, preference stocks or other securities or otherwise howsoever.

(c.) That authority be given for the payment for the said railway and undertaking

and other property as aforesaid out of any unappropriated moneys forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, the sum of $800,000.

2. That whereas the Fredericton and Saint Mary's Railway Bridge Company has made default in payment of the advances of money paid to it by the Governor in Council under the statutes of 1887, chapter 26, and of interest thereon which said advances and interest were made a first charge and lien and were duly secured by a mortgage on all the property, real and personal, of the Bridge Company, and by reason of such defaults all the property real and personal, and all the rights franchises, easements and privileges of the said Bridge Company became by virtue of the said last-mentioned Act and mortgage forfeited to the Crown, it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council, by his officers or agents, to enter and take possession of the said property, rights, franchises, easements and privileges on behalf of His Majesty and operate the same or any portion thereof as part of the government railway system.—Mr. Emmerson.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). In presenting these resolutions I shall endeavour to be as concise as possible. I invite the attention of the committee to the railway in question and to the conditions which prevail in connection with it. The Canada Eastern Railway connects the waters of Miramichi Bay at Loggieville with the River St. John and Fredericton. The whole distance of the line including the branches is 136½ miles. The main line of the railway is 125 miles. There is a branch known as the Nelson branch, and another known as the Blackville-Indiantown branch, in length 9½ miles. The first portion of the railroad built was known as the Chatham branch, which connected the town of Chatham on the Miramichi river with the Intercolonial Railway at Chatham Junction. That was built in 1875 and was subsidized by the Dominion government to the extent of $24,439.84 worth of old rails. There was no subsidy granted by the provincial government to that portion of the road.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the amount of the subsidy ?

Mr. EMMERSON. When that road was built it was the policy of the Federal government to aid the construction of railways by granting so many tons of rails per mile, and in this case the value of the rails granted was $24,439.84. That company was known as the Chatham Branch Company, and it was operated from 1875 to 1884 by a company, the principal member of which was Mr. Alexander Gibson, of Marysville, N.B., a gentleman widely known in his own province and indeed throughout the Dominion. Mr. Gibson organized a company known as the Northern and Western Railway Company, to build a line of railway from the Intercolonial Railway at Chatham Junction to the river St. John at Fredericton, a distance of 108 miles. They built that road, and they also built a branch line from Blackville to Indiantown connecting at Indiantown with the branch of the Intercolonial Railway known as the Indiantown branch, which runs from Indiantown to Derby Junction on the line of the Intercolonial Railway. This Blackville-Indiantown branch was built in 1886 and the distance is 8½ miles. The distance from Chatham Junction to Gibson on the banks of the river St. John is 108 miles and that line was built in 1884 and 1885. For a certain period, while the Chatham Branch made connection at Chatham Junction with the Intercolonial Railway and also with the Northern and Western, these railways were run as separate coporations and separate railways. In 1890 or thereabouts, the Chatham Branch Railway Company amalgamated with the Northern and Western, and Mr. Gibson who was interested in the Northern and Western united his interests with Mr. Snowball and his Chatham corporation, and they formed what was known as the Canada Eastern Railway Company. Then the whole line, including the Chatham branch, the Blackville-Indiantown branch, and the line from Chatham Junction to Gibson and across the Fredericton bridge to Fredericton, became known as the Canada Eastern. These forces were united for a number of years when, through some disagreement as to the management, Mr. Snowball retired from the corporation and sold out his interest in the Chatham branch, 9½ miles long, for $200,000. In 1894 the Nelson branch, or Nelson loop as it was called, was built, and it was 5¾ miles in length. In the same year, 1894, the line was extended from the town of Chatham to the terminus at Loggieville, which is a fishing town in which large fishing and canning interests are established. That made the total length of the line 136½ miles and there are connected with that line sidings to the extent of 8¼ miles. The assistance given by the several governments to the construction of these several roads was as follows : The Dominion government gave in cash subsidy to these several lines $350,400 in all ; they also gave old rails to the value of $24,439.84, making a total subsidy contributed by the Dominion government of $374,839.84. The provincial government subsidized the line from Chatham Junction to Gibson to the extent of $400,000 as a total subsidy. It was then known as the Northern and Western. It therefore follows that what is known as the Canada Eastern Railway, the railway which it is proposed to purchase and make part of the Intercolonial Railway, was subsidized by the federal and provincial governments to the extent of $774,839.84.

In 1875, when it was proposed to construct the Chatham branch, the municipality of Northumberland voted a bonus of $20,000 for that branch ; but for some reason or

other, which I know not, the bonus was never paid, and was never collected from the municipality. The section of this line between Blackville and Chatham Junction, a distance of about twenty miles, was never subsidized by the Dominion. The Blackville Junction branch to Indiantown, a distance of eight and a half miles, got a subsidy from the Dominion only, and not from the province. That is to say, the Dominion subsidized from Gibson, on the bank of the St. John river, to Blackville, and thence on to Indiantown, but did not subsidize the Northern and Western line from Blackville to Chatham Junction where it made connection with the Intercolonial Railway. As I have stated, the Canada Eastern Company, becoming possessed of all these lines, operated them, and operated them very successfully. It operated the line in connection with the Fredericton bridge. I am sure that all the members of this committee are familiar with that bridge. It was a bridge constructed over the St. John river connecting the city of Fredericton with the town of Gibson. It was built by the Fredericton Bridge Company. The government of Canada made a loan to that company of $350,000, with interest at 4 per cent, and a mortgage was taken on the bridge. The Fredericton Bridge Company entered into a contract with the Canada Eastern Railway Company, whereby the latter secured running rights over the bridge, and connected their terminus at Gibson with the city of Fredericton by constructing an additional mile or thereabouts of railway.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was it built as a railway bridge ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. It did not get a subsidy ; it only got a loan ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It also got a subsidy later on from the Dominion government of $30,000. I think the Canadian Pacific Railway also secured running rights over the bridge, and operated it in connection with what is known as the Gibson line, from Fredericton or Gibson to Woodstock on the northern side of the St. John river.

Mr. HAGGART. Who owns the bridge ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Fredericton Bridge Company, and the government has a mortgage against it. There has been no interest paid on that indebtedness from the time the loan was made down to the present, so far as I am aware.

Mr. SPROULE. When was the loan made ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The bridge was a steel bridge, built in 1888, and it connects by rail the Canadian Pacific Railway at the city of Fredericton with the Canada Eastern Railway at Gibson across the St. John river. I may state for the information of the committee that the bridge consists of six spans of 242 feet in length, or 1,452 feet in all ; two spans of 165 feet, or 330 feet in all ; and one swing span of 245 feet ; making the bridge over 2,000 feet in length. The loan was made in 1888, and before the bridge was completed the subsidy of $30,000 was granted.

Mr. KEMP. What amount is now due in interest compound yearly or half-yearly ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not made the calculation. Hon. members will find, in the return brought down, a copy of the mortgage to the government of Canada given by the Fredericton and St. Mary's Railway Bridge Company.

Mr. GOURLEY. Are they practically the same people in interest as the railway company ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Not identically so. The total cost of the bridge is said not to have exceeded the amount of the loan and the subsidy, although I am not in a position to state that to the House as a fact, because I have not taken pains to find out particularly whether the bridge company did actually contribute something to the cost of the bridge or not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the income from the bridge not been more than sufficient to keep it up, or why is the interest altogether in arrear ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is claimed that the income from the bridge has not been more than sufficient, if indeed sufficient, to keep the bridge in thorough repair.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the income ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not the return, and have not received from the company any return yet.

Mr. KEMP. Who had the right to fix the income ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The bridge company, subject to the Governor in Council, as regards the tolls.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. In what condition is the bridge ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is in a very good condition. One of the spans was injured some few years ago by a very severe ice pressure and that has been repaired, and in other respects the bridge is in a very sound condition. The business of the road, during the first few years, when these several roads were operated separately, was not very great. Indeed, for the first year or two after the amalgamation of the several railways under the corporate name of the Canada Eastern, the earning power of the road was not very satisfactory. But in 1894, in consequence of the growing importance of the towns which that railway serves and of the attention

which was paid by the management to the business interests of that section, the road seemed to make very considerable progress. The gross earnings of the road and the expenditures and net earnings were as follows :

Year.	Gross Earnings.	Expenses.	Net Earnings.
1894.....	$ 96,000	$ 65,000	$ 31,000
1895.....	108,000	68,000	40,000
1896.....	122,000	77,000	45,000
1897.....	127,000	83,000	44,000
1898.....	127,000	86,000	41,000
1899.....	127,000	91,000	36,000
1900.....	137,000	99,000	38,000

These expenses included the expenditure generally, comprising the betterments. There had been established some pulp industries, one particularly at Chatham, a cotton mill also was established at Marysville, and several large saw-mills were built along the line of the Canada Eastern, all of which very materially swelled the earning power of the road. A difficulty arose, however, in connection with the traffic, and it became a question as to whether that traffic, say from Marysville, should seek an outlet to the market by way of the Canada Eastern to Chatham junction and thence to Montreal and the Ontario market, or whether it should cross the river and take the Canadian Pacific Railway. In the latter case, the earnings for the Canada Eastern would not amount to very much at all ; but as the traffic went by way of the Canada Eastern and sought connection with the Intercolonial, the earning power of the road increased.

Mr. KEMP. The hon. gentleman did not give us the earnings after 1900.

Mr. EMMERSON. No ; I propose to give you the earnings after that. A great proportion of the traffic then went by way of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the results were as follows :

Year.	Gross Earnings.	Expenses.	Net Earnings.
1901.....	$133,400	$121,000	$ 12,400
1902.....	116,000	125,000	*9,000
1903.....	116,000	113,000	3,000

* Deficit.

I may say with respect to this that the company, having constructed the road, operated it quite successfully up to a certain period, and it is a question for our consideration as to the causes which brought about the changed result. The road had been built with wooden bridges, the culverts had been wooden, and the earnings of the road had not been, to any very material extent at least, expended in the maintenance of the standard and character of the road. The result was that gradually down to 1901 the condition of the bridges became such that it was necessary for the company to spend practically all its earnings on the betterment of the road and the improving of its character. In 1902 this was done. In 1902 the company not only expended all its earnings, but $9,000 in addition, in improving the railway. I invite the attention of the committee at this point to the report of the engineers of the Intercolonial, who made a very thorough examination and report on the condition of this road. It will be observed from their report—and I need not weary the committee with the details—that they have stated very distinctly the bridges that were rebuilt and reconstructed and the betterments that were made all along the line during the past three or four years.

Mr. HAGGART. What was the amount expended each year for the last three or four years on betterments of the road ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not the actual amount.

Mr. HAGGART. It is in the returns. I have it here.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a return—however, I shall come to that as I proceed, it arises in the order of my remarks. I have spoken of the rent of the road, the country it traverses and the business that has been done. It is material for us to know what amount of money has been invested in the road. I would invite the attention of hon. members to a report made by Mr. Schreiber, and also to a report of the engineers, giving a statement of the cost of the road. According to Mr. Schreiber the road and the rolling stock cost $2,098,412, or an average of $15,429.50 per mile. This is the cost of the road from the returns made by the company and their presentation of the case. In Mr. Schreiber's report of May 9th, 1904, he gives us the cost of the road and then the cash cost per mile. The total cash cost he puts down at $1,768,000 or an average of about $13,000 per mile.

Mr. GOURLEY. The road could never have been built for that.

Mr. EMMERSON. He draws a distinction in his report between the cost of the road and the cash cost.

Mr. GOURLEY. The road between Truro and Windsor, one of the nicest countries in the world, cost $30,000 per mile. I have that direct.

Mr. EMMERSON. The Canada Eastern in their return state the cost of this road

at upwards of $15,000 per mile, while Mr. Schreiber gives the cash cost at $1,768,000 or $13,000 per mile. In that way he gives what is known as the present value of the road to be $1,221,220.

Mr. GOURLEY. Does this include the rolling stock or not ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, that includes rolling stock.

Mr. KEMP. Has the hon. minister any estimate of the cost based upon the earning power of the road for the last five or six years ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Reference is made to that in Mr. Schreiber's report. I have not that report before me. He does not figure out what it would be.

Mr. HAGGART. What does he value it at on its earning power ?

Mr. EMMERSON. He does not put it in dollars and cents. He calls attention to the fact that the earning power of the road, taking into consideration the last two years, would not justify placing a high value upon it. I propose to deal with the matter from that standpoint. We must take into consideration conditions and circumstances, and we must bear in mind the history of the road. We must remember that this railway, like a great many branch lines in the maritime provinces, was constructed through an excellent country, but by people who did not anticipate that, after the road was built, there must necessarily be efforts made to keep up the standard of the road to retain traffic or to manage the road from the standpoint of creating business. The result has been that the road got into such a position that it was necessary to take every dollar that was earned—and more if they could get it—to maintain the character of the road after it had been allowed to run down, in a measure, and after the earnings had been used, perhaps, not for maintaining the road, they were obliged to take all these earnings at a later date and attempt to recover the ground that was lost.

Mr. KEMP. What kind of business were they obliged to refuse to carry on the ground of the condition of the road?

Mr. EMMERSON. They were not obliged to refuse traffic. But the passenger traffic on that line has certainly not been, for the past few years what it should have been. If people intended to go from Moncton to Chatham and to the north shore, they would go by Canadian Pacific Railway to St. John and around to the Intercolonial Railway, in preference to going by this road. The train service has been such, except for a few years, as would not induce travel. That section of the country is a splendid section, and, if the line were properly maintained, the tourist travel alone would be an excellent and paying feature. The railway, by reason of its condition, has not had even the freight traffic which other conditions would have secured.

I may say that if you take the business aspect of this railway, constructed as it was, maintained as it has been, running through a country excellent in every respect, rich in various resources, with the possibilities there are for a large increase in these directions—if you take that aspect of the railway you will realize that from a business standpoint it possesses potentialities that have never been realized, but which might be realized under different conditions. Now the nature of the traffic, the lumbering interests there, the mining interests, the connections that will be made with the coal fields, the pulp industries about being re-established, the fishing industry which is a growing one—in all these lines there is a business aspect which should not be overlooked in considering this proposition. Now Mr. Schreiber, in a report which he made to Mr. Blair, speaking of the volume of business, says :

> I am informed the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are in negotiation with the Canada Eastern Railway Company for the purchase of their road between Chatham and Fredericton. If such be the case, I suggest it would be greatly in the interest of the Intercolonial Railway traffic to head off any such arrangement, for, rest assured, that if it gets into the hands of such a powerful rival competitor as the Canadian Pacific Railway is, great inroads will most certainly be made into the business of the Intercolonial, more especially that which is now drawn from the Miramichi and Bathurst districts, and points north thereof, but so long as the Canada Eastern remains an independent institution, the Intercolonial can pretty well control the traffic along its own lines. I am not, as you are well aware, an advocate of government operation of railways, nevertheless, I do hold to the opinion that so long as it is the policy of the government to own and work railways, just so long should every effort be put forth to maintain the traffic of their roads, yes, indeed, in every legitimate way. If the ideas I have expressed meet your views, I may perhaps be permitted to suggest that rather than allow the Canada Eastern to pass into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it would be a good move for the government to acquire the road, if it could be had at a reasonable figure. This road is said to be in a good running condition and the earnings according to the railway statistics exceed operating expenses, and have steadily increased from year to year, which is satisfactory, as it goes to show that there is an advancement in the development of the country, inasmuch as the earnings of the road now are derived from local business.

Then he proceeds to give a statement with reference to that :

> It will thus be observed that in 1887-88 the gross earnings per mile of railway were $389.50, which increased in 1896-97 to $929.22, an increase of over twenty-five per cent.

Mr. HAGGART. Would you mind laying that report on the table ?

Mr. EMMERSON. You have it there, it is among the papers brought down. It is dated December 13, 1897. Mr. Mackenzie's report for that same year makes reference to the business of that road, and I would refer hon. members to the statements contained both in Mr. Schreiber's report and in Mr. Mackenzie's report as to the volume of business. Now in the resolution under the consideration of the committee, it is asserted that it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to secure this road, that is the effect of it, and to run it as a part of the Intercolonial system. It might be desirable for me to point out why the Intercolonial should want it, why this road should become a part of the Intercolonial system. It must be obvious to all that the geographical conditions surrounding that railway make it desirable that that road should become part of the Intercolonial system. When we bear in mind that the Intercolonial has a sphere of influence of its own, that is to say, that it runs down through the northern section of New Brunswick and controls the traffic of that whole section, running from Moncton to Rivière du Loup, it will be recognized that it would be necessary to maintain its control over that section at least. We recognize the fact that the railway is much longer than the Canadian Pacific Railway running through the maritime provinces ; we recognize the fact that the Intercolonial has to skirt that great stretch of country around the southern shore of the St. Lawrence river, and that it makes a bend until it strikes the waters of the Baie des Chaleurs and thence on down to Moncton. Now it controls to-day the traffic of those northern sections of New Brunswick, the Baie des Chaleurs, the Gaspé, the Miramichi, the Richibucto, all those waters and all those towns, and the traffic arising therefrom is under the control and within the zone of the influence of the Intercolonial. But the Intercolonial to-day has no connection with the heart of the province of New Brunswick; it does not reach that great, rich and flourishing section of the province, the St. John valley. It is true that the Canada Eastern has been able to make a very satisfactory rate, and if that were to continue it would not be so important, from that standpoint, to make this Canada Eastern a portion of the Intercolonial system ; but if it were to become the property of a rival corporation, the Intercolonial would be entirely shut off from the centre of the province. Acquire the Canada Eastern and you give the Intercolonial Railway not only the control of its present sphere of influence but you enable it to enter into the heart of New Brunswick and you put it in competition at Fredericton with other lines. It can get its portion of the traffic, it can reach the flourishing settlements along the shores of the St. John river, and more than that, you place it in a position whereby you are enabled to connect the government system with the coal fields of New Brunswick, because a railway is now being constructed from the heart of the New Brunswick coal fields, that is the Newcastle and Grand Lake coal fields as these are called, to connect them with the Canada Eastern at Gibson.

Mr. KEMP. What other system of railways wanted to purchase it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Negotiations were in progress with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. KEMP. Has the hon. gentleman any definite knowledge with regard to that.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, you will find a statement of that in the return.

Mr. KEMP. A statement by the officers of that railway ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, not by the officers of that road. The officers of the Canadian Pacific Railway were in negotiation for its purchase and they had an option on the road for $800,000.

Mr. KEMPT. And they turned it down ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Subsequently there were negotiations with respect to this sale but a difference arose as regards the amount which the Canadian Pacific Railway were willing to pay. I need not detain the committee by referring to the importance of the Chatham and Fredericton sections. The industries at Chatham and at Fredericton are very important, and the traffic from them would be very considerable indeed. Last year alone there was an exchange of traffic at Chatham Junction of upwards of $125,000. Take the Canada Eastern away from its present owners and put it under the control of another corporation making connections with the American and western markets by means of the Canadian Pacific Railway and you cut off the earning power of the Intercolonial Railway very materially. If you refer to the report of Mr. Tiffin, or of Mr. Mackenzie, or of Messrs. Mackenzie & Burpee, you will see that the loss from freight and express business would be of very considerable importance. Under present conditions the Intercolonial Railway is enabled to get to the city of Fredericton by means of the Canada Eastern. Make that railway a part of the Canadian Pacific Railway system and the Intercolonial Railway is entirely cut off from Fredericton and the heart of the province. But more than that, you will have an invasion of the Intercolonial Railway territory by the Canadian Pacific Railway which would have a very material influence upon the earnings of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. GOURLEY. Do you pay them anything for carrying the mails ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Just the same as we pay other roads. The Baie des Chaleurs trade and the Miramichi trade is under the control of the Intercolonial Railway. That is a very considerable trade. Let us look at the matter of pulp wood alone. Gentlemen representing the capitalists who are now reconstructing that Miramichi sulphide mill were here the other day with respect to freight arrangements over the Intercolonial Railway, and it was found that in and around their mill alone the daily tonnage to be handled would be ten cars of pulp wood, and three of coal inwards, and four cars of pulp wood outwards, making a total of 17 cars to be handled daily on which the railway would receive the freight earnings. The Intercolonial Railway can now control that traffic to the American market, and if they purchase the Canada Eastern they can control it either by way of the Canada Eastern or by way of Chaudière. But if you permit the Canadian Pacific Railway to acquire these rights, they would invade that territory. They would be competitors with the Intercolonial Railway and by reason of the greater distance to the American market they would practically cut off entirely a great deal of the American trade which originates along the line of the Intercolonial Railway to-day in and around Chatham, Newcastle, Bathurst and other points on the north shore. As the Canada Eastern exists to-day it is a very great feeder to the Intercolonial Railway. As I stated a moment ago, $125,000 represented the interchange of trade with the Canada Eastern at Chatham Junction. It is an important feeder and must become more so.

Mr. HAGGART. The whole traffic of the road is only $116,000 for passengers and freight. How could they bring $125,000 ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is only with respect to the $125,000 interchange at Chatham Junction according to the report of Mr. Tiffin, and of Mr. Mackenzie, the Intercolonial engineer, who make this report as to the interchange of traffic.

Mr. HAGGART. Surely the minister must be mistaken in some way. The whole earnings of the road are only $116,000, passengers and freight, and how could there be an interchange of $125,000 ?

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend will refer to the report ?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not care anything about the report. I have your report in which it is stated the whole traffic from passengers and freight is about $116,000 per year.

Mr. EMMERSON. In Mr. Mackenzie's report I might read this letter. It is dated March 21, 1904, in which it is stated :

> The inward business between the Canada Eastern and the Intercolonial Railway amounts to about $125,000.

That simply means the interchange of traffic at Chatham Junction which goes by way of the Intercolonial Railway to western points, and which does not represent either gross or net, the earnings of the Canada Eastern, but which represents the interchange of trade at that point coming from Chatham Junction.

Mr. KEMP. Coming and going ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Coming and going.

Mr. KEMP. Does that not represent charges that are earned by other roads which may haul that freight 500 miles or 1,000 miles ? Does not that include the earnings of the other roads, only a portion of which goes to the Canada Eastern ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That may be, but that does not effect the question. I am not putting that down as earning power, or as representing the gross business of the Intercolonial Railway ; but what it does mean is that the Intercolonial Railway, by reason of its connection with the Canada Eastern, is enabled to have this traffic over its line as far as it goes. A portion of it may go beyond Chaudière junction and Lévis to American points, or it may go to the eastern townships, but wherever it goes, if the Canadian Pacific Railway had connections there and could invade that territory and had control of that line from Chatham junction to the town of Chatham and to Loggieville, then it would be all lost to the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. BARKER. Does the minister say that his officers have told him that that $125,000 traffic could be taken away by any other line ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Certainly it could.

Mr. BARKER. The greater portion of it must be for points on the Intercolonial Railway that the Canadian Pacific Railway could not reach.

Mr. EMMERSON. There may be a proportion, but this represents the shipment from this point, and it is composed very largely of fish and pulp——

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman tells us what the total traffic is. His officers could tell him exactly what the interchange is for points that the Canadian Pacific Railway could reach, but the minister is giving the whole traffic.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend mistakes the point I am seeking to make. It is not as to what proportion belongs to the Intercolonial Railway, or what is retained by the Intercolonial Railway to-day ; but it is with respect to the control of the traffic within that territory. The traffic originating at Loggieville and Chatham finds its market at American points.

Mr. BARKER. Does the minister mean to say that the traffic originating at Loggieville or Chatham amounts to $125,000 a year interchange ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is what I said at that point—Chatham junction.

Mr. HAGGART. You will find it is the total value of the products exchanged there.

Mr. EMMERSON. It says that the interchange of inward business between the Canada Eastern Railway and the Intercolonial Railway amounts to about $125,000 a year, which, if the Canada Eastern Railway were made a competing line, would be lost to the Intercolonial Railway, and that traffic, instead of going up over the Intercolonial Railway, would go by way of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Fredericton, and thence on to Boston and other American points by way of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Boston and Maine Central. A portion of that goes to-day over that line, but if the Canada Eastern were to be secured by the Canadian Pacific Railway, no portion of that traffic would go by way of the Intercolonial Railway up to Quebec to connect with the Central, the Grand Trunk Railway or any other railway there. That is the point I am seeking to make, and that is the point the officers made in their report in respect to that.

Mr. BARKER. What is the total interchange of traffic at the junction point, whether it is divertible to other lines or not ? The $125,000 includes everything ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have stated to my hon. friend that some of it goes by way of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. BARKER. And could not go any other way ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It could go another way.

Mr. BARKER. There must be a very considerable traffic to points on the Intercolonal Railway that cannot be reached by any other line.

Mr. EMMERSON. For the twelve months ending the 29th of January, 1904, there were shipped from Chatham 169 car-loads to Canadian points via Fredericton ; that is, by way of Fredericton and the Canadian Pacific Railway to Canadian points ; there were 47 car-loads to Canadian points via Chatham junction, and 11 car-loads to United States points via Chatham junction.

Mr. KEMP. Surely the Intercolonial Railway would get very little earnings out of that traffic at the present time ?

Mr. EMMERSON. But the Canadian Pacific Railway gets it, and if the Intercolonial Railway had control of that section of the line from Chatham to Chatham Junction instead of allowing that to go around by the Canadian Pacific Railway, they could take it from Chatham junction.

Mr. KEMP. But they take it now and lose money at the end of the year.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend is anxious to take even the little express business and send it around by way of the Canadian Pacific Railway ; but I am actuated by a higher and, I trust, a holier motive ; I want to secure this business for the Intercolonial Railway ; I want to see that traffic come by the Intercolonial Railway to the Chaudière and make connection there for American points. It can be done to the advantage of the shipper ; it can be done to the advantage of the Intercolonial Railway ; and it will not be contributing to American lines as is now the case, because when it strikes Vanceboro, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, it runs over the Boston and Maine system to Boston and other points.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is a little more definite statement as to this in Mr. Tiffin's report, at page 58, of the documents brought down.

Mr. EMMERSON. I asked hon. gentlemen to refer to that. For the twelve months ending January 29th, 1904, there were 141 car-loads shipped to New England and western points via Fredericton. You see, by reason of the arrangement which has existed, the Intercolonial Railway loses all that. There is no reason why all that Loggieville and Chatham traffic should not be enjoyed by the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. That traffic is now enjoyed by the Canada Eastern ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Very largely ; it goes by the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. But the Canada Eastern carries it from points on their own line to the Intercolonial Railway ?

Mr. EMMERSON. And to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The point is that the Intercolonial Railway can take that traffic originating along the line of the Canada Eastern at Chatham junction, and have the benefit of the haul over the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal in the case of western bound freight.

Mr. BARKER. Where was that traffic from Loggieville destined to ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Some of it to the Canadian Pacific. I gave the exact number of carloads.

Mr. BARKER. You have told us that is gross. It may have been going to a point where you would not receive it on the Intercolonial Railway at all.

Mr. EMMERSON. The greater proportion of it came down over the Intercolonial Railway—45,000 as against 31,000 by the Canadian Pacific Railway ; but it takes its

origin in Canadian cities, very largely in Montreal.

Now, aside from the general traffic of the road, there is the Canadian express business, which, from the following statement, will be seen to be increasing quite rapidly :

	Gross earnings.	Net earnings.
1895	$ 1,545.42	$ 695.43
1896	1,671.29	752.08
1902	2,371.42	1,067.14
1903	2,822.30	1,270.01

It will be seen that these figures have doubled since 1895; and if the business were taken from the Canada Eastern, there would be still greater loss to the Intercolonial Railway, as the proportion of receipts accruing to the Intercolonial from this business must be greater than the proportion accruing to the Canada Eastern, on account of the much longer haul over the Intercolonial. This express business is growing. The receipts of the Intercolonial from it amount annually to about $100,000 net. It is run on the co-operative principle, and that is about the proportion accruing to the Intercolonial. If we did not take over the Canada Eastern and it were to become a part of another system, the Intercolonial would not have the benefit of that express traffic, because there would be no way of getting into Fredericton or reaching the intervening points between Chatham Junction and Fredericton, or, for that matter getting into Chatham. If this were a matter for the consideration of a railway corporation, sound business principles would actuate it to endeavour not only to secure this road, but to prevent it being secured by another company, because that would shut them out from the volume of business which is principally to be shared by them ; and if a railway corporation would do this in consideration of sound business principles, why should not the government do it in this instance ?

Mr. BARKER. Will the hon. gentleman explain what effect the Grand Trunk Pacific will have upon this line ? It cuts this line in two, and, according to the views of the hon. gentleman, it will give a shorter and more direct route. Is that going to improve the traffic ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is going to have an entirely different source of supply. I am glad my hon. friend mentioned the Grand Trunk Pacific, because it cannot find its way to Moncton without crossing this railway, and it will be of very great advantage to that road as a part of the Intercolonial to have a connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific at that point. My hon. friend may think that by making that interjection, he is overturning the argument which I am endeavouring to make as to the advantage the Intercolonial will have in being connected with the Canada Eastern. The Intercolonial gets its supply from an entirely different source from that which will feed the Grand Trunk Pacific, and they will in no way clash or interfere with each other ; but it would be to the advantage of the Intercolonial to have the Canada Eastern, particularly during the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the development of that country and its coal fields. All this would be of very material advantage to the Intercolonial and to the country tapped by these roads at that point.

Now, it cannot be said that the price is too high. I do not for a moment anticipate that hon. gentlemen opposite will raise any very serious objection to the resolution now in your hands ; but if they did, somebody might say that the road was not worth the price which we are paying for it. It seems to me that if there ever was a good bargain, this is the one. For instance, we are not paying double the value of the rails and the ties on the road.

Mr. KEMP. The value must be on the earning power of the road.

Mr. EMMERSON. Not necessarily so at all, and not fairly so. If that were so, there would be no railway subsidies granted in this country at all. Many railroads are built with the view of developing the country, and we give them subsidies because they are not supposed to be very successful transportation companies. In the development of a new country, there must necessarily be a loss in operating a line of railway in a new section, and the experience of this railway is not different in that respect from the experience of other roads. Therefore you cannot properly base the valuation of a road on its earning power ; it would be unjust and unfair, and has never been recognized in Acts of parliament or in the conduct of public affairs in this country. Just take the rails of that 136 or 40 miles, and you would have at the price of old rails to-day being realized by the Intercolonial upwards of $300,000 worth. And then you take the ties and you have nearly a half a million dollars worth.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. What is the weight of the rails ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Fifty-six and fifty-eight pounds, but mostly sixty, according to the report of the engineer.

Mr. KEMP. What amount will it require to bring the road up to the standard of the Intercolonial, both as regards the roadbed and the rolling stock ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not an engineer's estimate of that, but it would not require very much money to make the road a first-class standard, though possibly not up to that of the Intercolonial. It would not necessarily require to be up to the standard of the Intercolonial, because it is not a trunk line and never will be. Without getting a report from an engineer, I have been over

the road and am satisfied that $1,000 per mile will make it a splendid, up-to-date road, and in my opinion this road in the course of the next year or so, will be worth $1,000,000, especially considering the situation of the government as regards the Fredericton bridge. Here is the Fredericton bridge owned by the government, which has been there for years, and out of which the government have never realized anything. But by operating it in connection with this road, it will be of advantage to that section of country and the business interests of the whole Dominion, because it is important, not merely to that section but to Montreal and Toronto and other industrial centres of the Dominion, that the business advantages shall be increased at Fredericton and all other points, because at these places the manufacturers of Ontario and Quebec find a very profitable market. On the other hand it will certainly be of advantage to Fredericton and the adjacent points to be put in connection with the markets of the west by railway competition.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Are there any large villages or small towns between Fredericton and Chatham ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, quite a number. There are Marysville, Boiestown, Loggieville, Blackville, Millerton, Indiantown and other points all along the line. There are some very large saw-mills at some of these points and a great many other industries.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Can the hon. minister give the total population in the towns and villages along that road ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I should think there would be a population of about 30,000.

Mr. GOURLEY. Is it fairly settled all along ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, and it is very largely a lumbering country, and a very excellent agricultural country at different points. Mr. Tiffin, in a report which he made in 1902, thus speaks of the traffic :

> I find that for the year ending October 31, 1901, the total freight traffic carried amounted to 114,406 tons, on which their earning amounted to $88,958.18 ; passenger traffic for the same period amounted to $32,839.42 ; mails, $3,994.24 ; miscellaneous receipts, including express, $2,092.34 ; making a total revenue of $127,884.22.

He continues :

> There are several good towns on the line, having fair populations and good business prospects. The most important of these is Fredericton, the capital of the province. Then comes Marysville with its large cottonmills, sawmills, &c. Chatham has a population of about 5,000, at which point are located a number of sawmills and two pulp mills, the largest of which is unfortunately closed down through financial difficulties.

By reason of this closing down the earning power of the Canada Eastern during the past three years has been very materially affected, but I am glad to say that the strongest possible hopes are held out that this industry is to be re-established on a larger basis with very strong capitalists behind it. Mr. Tiffin goes on to say :

> Loggieville, the headquarters of Loggie Brothers, at which place there is quite a large fish industry ; Blackville with a population of about 1,000 ; Boiestown, which is the distributing centre for a large amount of produce that goes into the various lumber camps ; Doaktown, with a population of about 1,000 ; and the rest of the places on the line are all small villages, but all more or less fairly good traffic points.
>
> On business interchanged with the Canadian Pacific Railway at Fredericton for the year ending October 31st, 1901 (and which is included in the total figures given above) the Canada Eastern's earnings amounted to on local business—that is business from Canada Eastern Railway points to points reached by the Canadian Pacific Railway or their connections—$15,719.54 ; while the Canada Eastern's proportion on their business—that is business handed to them by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and which consists principally of flour and produce from western Ontario—amounted to but $473.33, so that the Ontario business handled via Fredericton is very small indeed.
>
> I may say that the business for the year ending October 31st, 1901, is not as good as for the preceding years, owing to the closing down of the Maritime Sulphite Fibre Company's mill at Chatham, which was a big loss to the Canada Eastern.

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman is going to read over the rest of these notes, I propose that we adjourn, as it is nearly twelve o'clock. I perceive that he is not half through.

Mr. EMMERSON. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. I am nearly through.

Mr. HAGGART. I hope so.

Mr. EMMERSON. I can sympathize with the hon. gentlaman. I am just as anxious as he to get through. I am simply calling the attention of the committee to these several reports and am only desirous of giving information.

Mr. HAGGART. The information has been very meagre so far.

Mr. EMMERSON. No doubt my hon. friend would say that if he had tons of it. But the information is there, and I invite the attention of the committee to it. There can be no very serious objection to this resolution. It is one fraught with a great deal of benefit to the section of country traversed by this line of railway. The idea of this purchase is not new to hon. members. A paper somewhat celebrated in the political history of this country, a certain confidential document which was read by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), contained a passage setting forth the desira-

bility of securing the Canada Eastern as part of the government system. Hon. Mr. Blair the author of that paper is taken as an authority on these matters by hon. gentlemen opposite, and he gives very strong reasons why it is in the interest of the country as well as of the Intercolonial that the Canada Eastern should be a part of the government system.

Mr. KEMP. What did he say?

Mr. BARKER. Read the paper.

Mr. EMMERSON. Hon. gentlemen opposite have possession of that paper.

Mr. LENNOX. My recollection is that it was the Canada Atlantic and not the Canada Eastern.

Mr. EMMERSON. It made reference to the Canada Eastern as well. Now, we pay for the road less than $6,000 a mile.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) a question, if he would allow me. Has he calculated how much he will have to spend in addition to the purchase money, to provide rails heavy enough to carry his locomotives? I take it that he will have to increase the weight of his rail as he is doing on other portions of the line, and that the cost will be $500,000 less the value of the old rails—a net increase in cost of about $300,000. Then, perhaps he will tell us how much he will have to spend in increasing the strength of the bridges. Probably he will have to spend a million in addition to the purchase price.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) is disturbing himself unnecessarily. It is not proposed to make this a trunk line, but simply to run it as a feeder to the Intercolonial. In Cape Breton, for instance, and on other parts of the system, we are not increasing the weight of rails, nor are we putting on these large locomotives. I do not apprehend that it will be necessary in our day at least, to put on heavy engines on this line. Probably my young-looking friend—I will not say my fresh looking friend—will have passed away before that is necessary. I can see that it is a matter of dispute as to which one I refer to.

Mr. GOURLEY. I think it must be me.

Mr. EMMERSON. Both the hon. gentlemen (Mr. Gourley) and the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) are young looking. My hon. friend will probably not live to see the day when it will be necessary to put heavy engines on this road. This road should be purchased as a feeder for the Intercolonial and also to protect the present traffic of the Intercolonial. For $6,000 a mile you are getting an excellent road-bed and a good line of railway, laid with 56 pound to 60 pound rails. And you are getting a line of railway 72 per cent of tangent, and with curves and gradients that are certainly not excessive.

Mr. HAGGART. Don't you call 80 feet an excessive gradient?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is true there are one or two grades that are heavier than might be desired, but in the main they are not heavy. And there are no very severe curves.

Mr. HAGGART. The curvature is all right.

Mr. GOURLEY. As long as you get onto the curves you are all right.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Are there any iron bridges?

Mr. EMMERSON. There may be one, but in the main the bridges are of wood. And the reason for the expenditure on the road during the past two or three years being so heavy is, as hon. gentlemen will see if they refer to the report, that so many bridges have been rebuilt and renewed. Now I do not think that there will be any serious objection—I trust there will not—on the ground that this is an addition to the capital account of the Intercolonial. I know that that is a matter with reference to which some of my hon. friends opposite are very sensitive. Of course there have been those who were uncharitable enough to say that this was simply sectional.

Mr. HAGGART. Is this purchase to be charged to the capital account of the Intercolonial?

Mr. EMMERSON. Why should it not be?

Mr. HAGGART. But is it?

Mr. EMMERSON. I should suppose it would be. This road becomes a part of the government system of railways, and, as such, will represent the amount of money put into it. It is true we have about $70,000,000 invested in the Intercolonial. That is not for the benefit of that section merely. And, if you add to that capital expenditure by the purchase of the Canada Eastern, it will not be for the benefit of that section of the country merely. It may be said that there is a heavy deficit on the Intercolonial this year. Admitted. Are you to condemn the expenditure on the Intercolonial for that reason? You might as well condemn the $90,000,000 spent on the canals. We spend, this very year over $800,000 on account of income, in connection with the canal system. No one complains of that, because the canals are necessary in the interests of commerce and navigation. They afford one of our means of transportation. The Intercolonial is another means. It is an investment by the Dominion in aid of the trade

of the country and to unite the separated provinces more closely together. There is no complaint because of the expenditure on the canals ; there should be no complaint with respect to the Intercolonial. Each of these agencies is doing its work for the benefit of Canada. And I believe that the purchase of the Canada Eastern Railway and making it part of the Intercolonial and opening the heart of the province of New Brunswick will be an advantage to the Intercolonial and to the people living there. But I believe also that it will redound to the honour and credit of Canada and to the advantage of the whole people, and I believe also that it will redound to the profit of the Dominion and very materially improve the earning power of the government system of railways.

Mr. HAGGART. I will endeavour, in the short remarks I intend to make, to keep as closely as possible to the commercial aspect of this undertaking. What is it ? It is the purchase of 136 miles of road in the province of New Brunswick, towards the construction of which the New Brunswick government, according to the statement of the hon. gentleman, gave a bonus of $400,000, the Dominion government, of $374,800, and a municipality contributed $20,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. They did not pay it.

Mr. HAGGART. I am taking the report of the minister himself, in which he says the amount was paid.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, that is a statement of the subsidies that were given, but I wish to state to my hon. friend that that amount was not paid.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know whether it was or not, but I am taking his return for it, and it says that it was paid. You will find in the railway statistics of municipal aid, $20,000. So here are $774,000 paid by the province of New Brunswick and by the Dominion government to this road. Let us look at the financial position. There are 136 miles of railroad, that earned a total of $116,000 a year, or last year the net surplus was in the neighbourhood of $2,600. The hon. member accounts for the small amount of earnings over the expenditure by the large expenditure upon the road for the last three years, bringing it up to its present magnificent standard. What is the amount expended for the last three years in repairs and everything else ? In the neighbourhood of $42,000 a year, or less than is expended by almost any railroad in Canada for repairs and maintenance for a similar length. The hon. gentleman says that his deputy estimated the value of the road at $1,200,000. He says that the parties who own the road have expended on it $1,500,000.

Mr. EMMERSON.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, the parties claim they have expended $2,098,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Anyway, there is $800,000 of government money expended on that road, and there is a net revenue of $2,400. The hon. gentleman says it is a feeder to the Intercolonial. What possible feeder can it be to the Intercolonial ? There is a little fish carried from Chatham on the south shore of the Miramichi river to the junction of the Intercolonial ; there is a little freight collected from Fredericton and Chatham Junction, and forwarded on the Intercolonial ; but as I stated, the total freight and traffic only amounts to $116,000. How would the collection of that amount of freight benefit the Intercolonial, if every particle of freight that is now carried only benefits it to the extent of $125,000, as the report says ? It is true that the fish that is carried from Chatham to the junction of the Intercolonial may contribute a small amount to the Canada Eastern, and the long haul by the Intercolonial may give a larger amount. I see by the report the hon. gentleman lays on the table, signed E. Tiffin, traffic manager, a statement of what the tariff is, or is expected to be, from Canada Eastern Railway points :

> Still another thing to be considered is the fact that if the Canada Eastern Railway were to pass into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it would to a large extent shut us off from enjoying any traffic either to or from Canada Eastern Railway points. For the year ending 30th June, 1901, we handed to them 35,760 tons, on which our earnings were $58,877 ; and we received from them 12,886 tons upon which our earnings were $26,874.

That is the total amount of earnings that the Intercolonial Railway received from the Canada Eastern Railway from outward bound or inward bound freight. Fancy the rivalry between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the government of Canada as to who should assume possession of that road of 136 miles, with an earning power of $2,400 per year. Let me tell the hon. gentleman, what every railroad man knows, that a railroad that does not earn $850 per mile per annum cannot possibly pay running expenses and management. No railroad commences to be on a paying basis until it earns between $1,700 and $1,800 per mile per year. The traffic on that road is increasing, we are told ; in 1895 it was so much, and at present it has reached the enormous sum of $116,000 per year. Just fancy that for a road of 136 miles. Imagine the difficulty that the poor fellows who own that road have to undergo to keep it running, to keep up the rails and ties, station houses and everything else on 136 miles, besides paying expenses of the men employed upon it out of $116,000 a year. Yet this is the magnificent bargain the people of Canada are going to get for $800,000, a

benefit that accrues not only to the people of the maritime provinces but to the people of Ontario especially ; they are especially to be benefited by the acquisition of that road down in that section of the country. If that was the end of it, we would not have so much to complain of. Here are $800,000 taken at the beginning, but what will come afterwards ? You will find in the acquisition of that road what you found after the acquisition of the road connecting the Intercolonial with Montreal, that instead of its being a benefit to the Intercolonial it is a drag upon it. A large sum will have to be expended to bring it up to the standard that the road should be in, and the expenditure must be greatly in excess of receipts. It is then not only an expenditure of $800,000, but you have to keep up the bridges, you have to keep the road in a good state of repair, and keep it running afterwards. I say it would be better that this $800,000 were pitched into the sea, or made a present of to the provinces down there and let them keep the road, than that we should enter into any such bargain as this. 'Oh, but we don't begrudge the people of the western portion of this Dominion the expenditure that has been made upon the canals !' The expenditure at the present day amounts to about $90,000,000. That is solely for the benefit of this section of the country and particularly for the Northwest provinces. Let me draw the distinction between that expenditure about which the hon. gentleman talks. The Dominion has made an expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway or $70,000,000. We pay the interest upon that ; that is part of the national debt. Besides that this year we made an expenditure owing to loss in working the road, an actual expenditure, between it and the Prince Edward Island Railway, of $2,750,000. Where is there any such loss on the canals ? You only pay your proportion of the interest. We pay the same on $70,000,000 on the Intercolonial Railway. We have a larger portion in this section of the country and the expenditure of $90,000,000 on the canals is not at all to be compared with the expenditure of $70,000,000 on the Intercolonial Railway. Taking it even from that point of view the comparison is absurd.

Mr. EMMERSON. Is not the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway for Ontario as well ?

Mr. HAGGART. Partially and only partially for Ontario. The great benefit of the building of the Intercolonial Railway is not the carrying of through traffic from Ontario to points in the maritime provinces but the handling of local traffic within the maritime provinces themselves. To a certain extent every part of the Dominion benefits from the operation of every railway. It is a mutual benefit. Has the minister persuaded any member in this House that the expenditure of $800,000 for the acquisition of this road will be a benefit to the Intercolonial Railway in any respect whatever ? Does not the Intercolonial Railway now benefit by the interchange of traffic with the Canada Eastern ? The express business on the Intercolonial Railway amounts to a net profit of $100,000 a year and he fears he would lose the express traffic on this section of the road. How would you lose it ? You would have the right to send express parcels over the Canada Eastern or if it was acquired by the Canadian Pacific Railway you would have the right to send on that road as on any other road in Canada and no matter who had possession of that road they would be compelled to carry express parcels on fair terms from Halifax to Fredericton. Could you not establish an office to collect the express at Fredericton ? There is no use debating the question. You are paying $800,000 for an undertaking which is managed in the most economical manner by the parties now in possession and which realizes $2,400 a year. If this becomes part of the Intercolonial Railway the result of its operations will be the same as on the rest of the Intercolonial Railway as it is managed to-day and we will have a far larger deficit than we have at present. What possible advantage is a branch of that kind to the Intercolonial Railway ? What possibilities or potentialities are there in it ? I should be glad to see the country between Fredericton and Chatham ten times as fertile and productive as it is. The minister talks of possible development in pulp wood and manufactures along the road. If there was a factory every ten miles of the road would the probabilities be any greater for the future than under the present conditions ? My protest against this on behalf of the people of my section of the country is that while we are willing to make any expenditure that is for a public utility which would be a benefit to the people of the maritime provinces we object to expenditures which are utterly useless and which will be a load upon the people of the country not only now but to the end of time, especially if the road is managed as it is at the present moment.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I also wish to protest against the purchase of this road. If the government are going to extend the system of government owned railways and to increase the area served by the Intercolonial Railway, they will do well to do it in a section of the country where there might be some traffic, but instead of that in this case we see they have selected one of the most unprofitable roads in the country. Its gross earnings on a length of 136 miles were only $116,000. There is not enough return to justify the expenditure of a single dollar upon capital account upon the road. I judge by the minister's remarks that the

road must be in an extremely dilapidated condition. He acknowledges that passengers have been obliged to go by St. John and around in that way to get to Chatham rather than travel over the road. What sort of service, what sort of cars, and rails must there be. He acknowledges that there are only fifty-six pound rails. We all know that no road that claims to be in any respect a first-class road, has rails of that weight. If the government purchase this road, we will immediately find the Minister of Railways coming to parliament to ask a large grant to rerail the road, and we will have to pay $300,000 to substitute eighty pound rails for the sixty pound rails. In all probability too the ties will have to be renewed and the present wooden bridges will have to be replaced with iron bridges. We will have an expenditure not only of the $774,000 of bonuses we have paid and the $800,000 we are paying for the road we will have to spend a large amount for the purpose I have mentioned. The minister says that the Canadian Pacific Railway had an option on the road for $800,000 but they did not regard it as worth that much. The minister steps in and proposes to pay that price for the road although the Canadian Pacific Railway were not willing to pay it. It was stated that some years ago the traffic was $20,000 or $30,000 a year more than it is now. That shows simply that the country was a timber country, that the timber has been stripped off and the road has become less profitable so this is a good time to unload it upon the government.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am sure my hon. friend does not wish to make a misstatement. There has been no statement that the earnings were $20,000 or $30,000 more a few years ago than they are to-day. They have not been reduced but the net earnings have been.

Mr. HAGGART. The total earnings have been reduced. The statement of the minister was that that total earnings a few years ago were in the neighbourhood of $136,000 and now they are $116,000.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. This railway is now owned by a private individual who runs it to try to make money out of it, and no doubt he charges as high rates as it will bear, but immediately the government gets possession down will come the rates, and the revenue will probably be thirty per cent less than at the present time. The truth is that this line will be an everlasting burden upon the people of this country. If its purchase would be beneficial to the people along the road, or to the people of any part of this Dominion, I would not hesitate to approve of its purchase by the government, even though it should be a loss ; but its purchase benefits no one except the private individual who has it to sell. I do not think it is the mission of this parliament to tax the people to benefit a private individual.

The express service on this railway amounts to the magnificent gross sum of $2,400 a year and the minister is greatly afraid that if the Canadian Pacific Railway took hold of the road, the Intercolonial Railway would lose its share in this huge annual earning of $2,400. The fact is that the Intercolonial Railway will get the greater portion of that no matter who owns the road, because that express matter must be mainly destined to points on the Intercolonial Railway or from points on the Intercolonial. It is the same way in regard to the freight. The minister stated that the interchange of traffic amounted to $125,000 a year, but three-fourths of that is destined to points on the Intercolonial Railway or from points on the Intercolonial, and cannot be taken by any other railway. The payment of $800,000 for the purchase of this railway is only the beginning of it, because we will have an annual deficit on this road for all time to come, and the people of Canada will assume that burden to benefit a private individual. The Minister of Railways stated that in wishing to have the Dominion Express Company on the whole line of the Intercolonial Railway, I was in favour of a loss on the Intercolonial Railway. The minister has no justification for making that statement. I believe that if the Dominion Express is on the Intercolonial Railway system there will be a very large gain on account of the competition that will arise, and in addition to that the people living on that line will have an enormously better express service than they have now. It will benefit the fishermen of the lower provinces who can send their fish to the west ; it will benefit the fruit growers of the west who can send their fruit to the east, and the consumers will be benefited by the lower prices of fruit brought about by competition. I believe that the Dominion Express Company have guaranteed that there shall be no loss of revenue whatever.

Mr. EMMERSON. Have they done so ?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I believe so; I am sure of it.

Mr. EMMERSON. It has not been done to my knowledge and I think I should know about it.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. If the minister will look into the matter he will find it has escaped his attention. I do not believe we are justified in buying this railway at any price. Even if it were cheap, we don't want it. It is just like certain ladies who buy goods at the bargain counters which they have no need for ; the minister thinks the road cheap therefore he buys it, no matter what the consequence to the taxpayer. The road will serve no good purpose and I enter my earnest protest against its purchase.

Mr. KEMP. We are asked to pay $800,000 for this railway, and the question is whether it is worth it or not. To my mind it is not worth it. I am not disposed to dispute

that this railway would act as a feeder to the Intercolonial Railway, but I do believe it is not worth the money the government propose to pay for it, and I believe the government is making a very bad bargain for the country. Transactions of this kind are usually based on the earning power of the property purchased ; but the minister could show no basis of that kind, and he seemed to think that the hope for the success of this railway was in the future. That is not a businesslike way of approaching the matter at all. I repeat that this is an unfortunate bargain for the country. We may assume that the road has been run with the utmost economy, and that it will be impossible for the government to operate it as economically as it has been operated by the private owners. Last year this railway only earned $2,674, the year before there was a deficit of $9,000, and the year before that, the net earnings were only $12,400. There is no doubt it will be a losing concern under the management of the government. This railway is a white elephant on the hands of its present owners and the government has no valid excuse for paying this exorbitant sum of money for it. I enter my protest against the whole transaction.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not a fact that this railway was offered for $400,000 by the banks that held the securities ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I don't know anything about that.

Mr. FIELDING. I heard no such figure as that mentioned, but I did hear it stated that offers had been made at a lesser sum than it is now proposed to pay. I made personal inquiry into that, and I am in a position to state that it is not correct.

Mr. SPROULE. I heard the statement made that it was offered for a little less or a little more than $400,000.

Mr. FIELDING. I may say to my hon. friend that I have communicated with the bank referred to, and I have the distinct statement of the bank that it is not correct.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is this road taken over in pursuance of any general policy pointing to the acquisition of similar roads in the maritime provinces, or is it a special case resting upon the special merits of this particular project ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This matter is dealt with solely on its merits, without regard to other railways.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is not in pursuance of any policy of acquiring branch lines in the maritime provinces ?

Mr. EMMERSON. One very good reason is that it is necessary to protect the territory of the Intercolonial from invasion by a rival corporation, and to secure to the Intercolonial an entrance into the heart of the province of New Brunswick. If that Canada Eastern road were in possession of the Canadian Pacific Railway, for instance, it would enable the Canadian Pacific to go into the territory which has been peculiarly the territory of the Intercolonial and to compete with it for its best paying traffic. That is the main reason why I advocate the purchase of the road.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What would be the net profit to the Intercolonial of the traffic capable of being diverted ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not an estimate ; but it would affect the traffic of the whole Intercolonial—the traffic reaching into Quebec and Montreal and the province of Ontario—and would take from the control of the Intercolonial that which it has to-day. There would be a direct loss, and in addition to that a far greater indirect loss.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is of no value to the committee to say that it affects the whole traffic of the Intercolonial, because we all know that it cannot do anything of the kind. Mr. Tiffin's report, which covers the entire interchange of traffic between the Intercolonial and this road, gives $57,000 of freight in one direction and $27,000 in another direction; and if we assume that the whole of that traffic will be diverted, which we should not assume for one moment, it would be a loss of $84,000, on which I do not know what the net profit would be. It is useless to say that it affects the entire traffic of the Intercolonial Railway, which amounts to a great many millions of dollars. I understand the minister to say that this road was not taken over in pursuance of any general policy. If it is on the particular merits of the enterprise, I think I can point out other roads in New Brunswick which would be as desirable, which would afford quite as remunerative a traffic, and which would possess all the strategic elements this road possesses. I thought possibly the minister might announce to us that the government had decided upon a policy with regard to all roads similarly situated in the maritime provinces. I do not know any reason why there should be a distinction between this road and a great many others that might be referred to. It seems to me that it should not be undertaken except in pursuance of some general policy. The Intercolonial Railway is joined by a great many roads in my own province, for example, the Midland, the Dominion Atlantic, the road running through Inverness county, and there may be others that do not occur to me at this moment. In New Brunswick there are also a great number of small branch lines which join the Intercolonial, and some of which would I believe be more efficiently operated by the government than they are by the companies which own them at present ; and possibly they might possess some strategic value which the minister thinks is pos-

sessed by this road. It would have been more satisfactory to me to have known from the minister whether or not there is a general policy of that kind, because, otherwise, I do not quite appreciate the reasons which have induced the government to enter into this enterprise. I am sure the minister himself would have been the first to concede that there are many other roads in the maritime provinces which would come within every possible reason which he has suggested to the committee as justification for the government taking over this road. Have there been applications to the government from companies owning other lines in the maritime provinces to take them over ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There were petitions circulated with respect to the line running from St. Stephen to St. John via St. George. That is the only line as to which there was any application that I can recall.

Mr. DANIEL. Is that the line said to be owned by Russell Sage ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is the line known as the Shore Line road.

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

Mr. EMMERSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 163)) authorizing the government of Canada to purchase the Canada Eastern Railway and to take possession of the Fredericton and St. Mary's Railway bridge.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. FIELDING moved the ajournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. I understand it is the intention to move that the House go into Committee of Supply early to-morrow so as to give my hon. friend from Pictou opportunity to move an amendment. But in advance we might agree to put the Militia Bill through its final stage.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.35 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, August 3, 1904.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. L. N. CHAMPAGNE moved :

That the third report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the official report of the Debates of this House during the present session be adopted.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I understand that the report of the committee is for the appointment of two additional members to the staff, for the purpose of making a new index. This, I think, is unnecessary, and is going to involve a great expense to the country. I voted against it in the committee, and I vote against it here. I object to the adoption of the report.

Mr. CHAMPAGNE. In answer to the hon. gentleman and for the information of the House, I will give a few words of explanation in support of the motion now before you. The report recommends :

That in addition to the regular index to the Official Report of the Debates of the present session, an analytical index covering the several volumes thereof be prepared and issued in a separate volume and a sufficient number of copies of the said index be printed and bound for distribution to those entitled to receive bound copies of the Official Report of the Debates.

This is the first portion of the report. The second portion is to this effect :

That Mr. Daniel McGillicuddy be appointed to prepare the index in question to the English Revised Edition, and Mr. Marc Sauvalle to the French Edition, said work to be performed apart from that of the present staff, and that on the final completion of the above work, the foregoing be paid for their services the sum of $750 each.

The first portion of the report has been considered for some time by those who have taken an interest in the efficiency of the Report of the Debates of this House, and who desire an index to 'Hansard' as complete and as perfect as can be secured. To attain that object an analytical index has been suggested. During the present session and during previous sessions the matter has been discussed before the committee, and recently a sub-committee was formed to consider the subject. The report of that sub-committee is in substance what is now submitted to the House. Most of the hon. members of the House have had an opportunity of judging for themselves of the importance and the advantage of the improvement now suggested by reading the sample sheet which has been sent to them since the report of the committee was laid on the table the other day. This is an analytical index of the debates of the House during one of the sittings of the present session, both in English and French. It contains in condensed form the substance of every speech delivered on a certain subject, and the names of the members who addressed the House. At the end of each session a separate volume called the analytical index of ' Hansard ' will be published and distributed to those entitled to receive the

'Hansard.' This book will, I am sure, be of considerable value, and a great improvement on the present system. Let me quote from the sample sheet, which has been ordered to be prepared by the Debates Committee, and you will see the difference between the present index and the one which we are now suggesting. One subject, a very important subject, was discussed before this House a few weeks ago; it was the alien labour question. The hon. leader of the opposition made a speech on that question, and it is indexed as follows:

Borden, R. L. (Halifax).

Promise of general alien law given under pressure from Opposition—3498. In the case of the Crow's Nest Pass the exclusion of alien labour was specially applied to that branch of C.P.R.—3500.

The following are samples of the indexing of other speeches on the same subject:

Bourassa, H. (Labelle).

The exclusion law should not apply indiscriminately—3457. If foreigners are to be excluded let it be understood that only Canadian engineers shall be employed—3459.

Clarke, E. F. (West Toronto).

American law respecting the employment of foreigners on subsidized or public works quoted: New York State—3482. Illinois, Idaho, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, California—3484. Crow's Nest Pass could not be compared with Transcontinental—3485. The efforts of Mr. Taylor, M. P., to obtain labour legislation praised—3485.

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Chas. (Quebec County).

Government is anxious to protect labourers on subsidized works—3496. All complaints will be investigated—3497. Organized labour will be protected within the limits of what is right—3498.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the present index is well made, and it is not the intention to do away with it. An important improvement was introduced this year by which a partial index is issued from time to time as the session progresses. This, I think, has been found very convenient, but it contains a mere reference to the subjects discussed and to the names of the members taking part in the debates, without giving any idea of the nature or substance of the speeches delivered. We now propose, as I have said, to publish an analytical index in a separate volume at the end of each session, giving the substance of every speech delivered on every subject in the House. As to the gentlemen to whom we propose to give this work, Messrs. McGillicuddy and Sauvalle, they are undoubtedly well qualified. They are both distinguished journalists, and most competent to undertake this work, and the remuneration suggested is far from being excessive. The work is to be tried for the present session, and this trial experiment will not bind the House for future sessions in case it should be found unsatisfactory. It was suggested in the committee to have an analytical index made for every session since the publication of 'Hansard'; but, as I have stated, we expect merely to have the work done for the present session as a trial.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

WHARF AT ST. MATHIAS, QUE.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. What is the estimated cost of the wharf at St. Mathias, county of Rouville?
2. What amount has been expended on the said wharf to date?
3. What was the amount of the contract for its construction?
4. What is the cost of the shed on the said wharf?
5. What were the wages fixed in said contract of construction in regard to the different classes of workmen?

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works):

1. $3,500.
2. $4,727.55.
3. Work was done by day labour.
4. It is impossible to give the exact cost of the shed; the wharf having been built by day labour, it would be difficult to separate the labour chargeable to the shed from that chargeable to the wharf.
5. There was no contract, the work was done by day labour.

I.C.R.—TUNNEL AT RIVIERE DU LOUP.

Mr. GAUVREAU asked:

1. Is the Honourable the Minister of Railways aware that the town council of Fraserville passed a resolution, which has been sent to the Department of Railways, asking, as a matter of public safety, that a tunnel be constructed at the Rivière du Loup station, on the Intercolonial Railway?
2. If so, has the engineer of the department paid a visit to the locality?
3. Has any report been made regarding the cost of the work to be done?
4. If so, what is the amount?
5. Does the Department of Railways intend to meet the desires of the public, as expressed in the resolution by the town council of Fraserville?

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

1. The minister is aware that a resolution from the town council of Fraserville on this subject was received in 1896.
2. Yes, many times.
3. Yes.
4. $52,657.
5. It has reached no decision on the question at present.

GOVERNMENT STEAMER 'QUADRA.'

Mr. EARLE asked :

1. Have any complaints been received at the Department of Marine and Fisheries respecting alleged ill-treatment of the crew of the Dominion government steamer 'Quadra' ?

2. If so, what is the nature of these complaints ?

3. Are the members of the crew of the 'Quadra' paid their wages regularly ?

4. What is the arrangement regarding pay for the men ?

5. If, when the 'Quadra' is absent on a cruise at the time the monthly pay falls due, has any arrangement been made whereby the families of the men can draw their pay ?

6. Who selects the supplies for the 'Quadra' ?

7. From whom are supplies for the 'Quadra' purchased in British Columbia ?

8. Is the government aware that members of the crew assert that the food is of inferior quality, and is often insufficient in quantity ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The department has received no complaints. All that we know about this question is what we have learned from the reports of the papers. I intend, when I go to British Columbia, to investigate, myself, the condition of affairs.

ANIMAL CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) moved that the House go into Committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution :—

That it is expedient to provide that the Animal Contagious Diseases Act of 1903 be amended as follows :—

That paragraph (e) of section 2 of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act of 1903, chapter 11 of the Statutes of 1903, be amended by adding after the word 'farcy' in the third line of the said paragraph the words 'maladie du coit'.

That subsections 2 and 3 of section 12 be stricken out, and the following substituted therefor :—

'The compensation, if any, shall be two-thirds of the value of the slaughtered animal before the same became affected with infectious or contagious disease, or came in contact with, or in dangerous proximity to animals so affected ; provided that when it is clearly shown that an animal has been slaughtered on insufficient grounds, and that the slaughter was not in accordance with, or justifiable under this Act, the owner shall be entitled to compensation at the full value of the animal so slaughtered.'

That subsection 4 of the said section 12 be amended by adding at the end thereof the following :—

'But shall not exceed, in the case of grade animals, $150 for each horse ; $60 for each head of cattle ; or $150 for each pig or sheep ; and in the case of pure-bred animals, $300 for each horse ; $150 for each head of cattle ; or $50 for each pig or sheep.'

He said : I beg to say that this resolution has been communicated to His Excellency the Governor General and that he has approved of the same.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the House go into committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolutions :—

1. In these resolutions, unless the context otherwise requires, the expression 'cost' means the actual, necessary and reasonable cost, and shall include the amount expended upon any bridge, up to and not exceeding $25,000, forming part of the line of railway subsidized not otherwise receiving any bonus, but shall not include the cost of terminals and right of way of the railway in any city or incorporated town ; and such actual, necessary and reasonable cost shall be determined by the Governor in Council, upon the recommendation of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and upon the report of the Chief Engineer of Government Railways, certifying that he has made or caused to be made an inspection of the line of railway for which payment of subsidy is asked, and careful inquiry into the cost thereof, and that in his opinion the amount upon which the subsidy is claimed is reasonable, and does not exceed the true, actual and proper cost of the construction of such railway ?

2. The Governor in Council may grant a subsidy of $3,200 per mile towards the construction of each of the undermentioned lines of railway (not exceeding in any case the number of miles hereinafter respectively stated), which shall not cost more on the average than $15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, and towards the construction of each of the said lines of railway not exceeding the mileage hereinafter stated, which shall cost more on the average than $15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, a further subsidy beyond the sum of $3,200 per mile of 50 per cent on so much of the average cost of the mileage subsidized as is in excess of $15,000 per mile, such subsidy not exceeding in the whole the sum of $6,400 per mile :—

1. To the Bracebridge and Trading Lake Railway Company, for a railway from Bracebridge, in Muskoka, to a point at or near Baysville, Ontario, in lieu of the subsidy granted by item 7 of section 2 of chapter 8 of 1900, not exceeding 15 miles.

2. To the Bruce Mines and Algoma Railway Company, for the following lines of railway :—

(a.) For that portion of its line of railway from Bruce Mines Junction southerly to the town of Bruce Mines, on Lake Huron, a distance not exceeding three miles ;

(b.) For the 6 miles of railway constructed from Gordon Lake station, being the end of its line as subsidized by chapter 7 of 1901, northward to Rock Lake, a distance of 6 miles ;

(c.) For 12 miles from Rock Lake northward, a distance not exceeding 12 miles.

The subsidies to the said lines being granted in lieu of the subsidy granted by item 38 of section 2 of chapter 57 of 1903, not exceeding 21 miles.

3. To the Nipigon Railway Company, for the following lines of railway :—

(a.) From a point at or near Nipigon station on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Nipigon Lake, not exceeding 30 miles ;

(b.) From a point on Nipigon Bay of Lake Superior to a point on the west of Lake Helen on the line of the said Nipigon Railway, not exceeding 3½ miles ;

(c.) From a point on the line of the Nipigon Railway at or near the crossing of the Fraser River, to a point on Lake Jesse by way of Cameron's Falls, not exceeding 1½ miles ;

(d.) From a point on the north shore of Lake Nipigon northerly, not exceeding 45 miles.

The subsidies to the said lines being granted in lieu of the subsidy granted by item 33 of section 2 of chapter 57 of 1903, not exceeding 80 miles.

4. For the construction of a branch line of railway beginning at the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's main line at St. Philippe d'Argenteuil Station, or at a point between there and Grenville, thence in a northerly direction, in lieu of the subsidy granted by item 49 of section 2 of chapter 57 of 1903, not exceeding 3 miles.

5. To the Chateauguay and Northern Railway Company, for a railway from a point in Hochelaga ward, Montreal, to a point on the Great Northern Railway in or near the Town of Joliette, passing through the Town of L'Assomption, Quebec, together with a spur line into the said town, in lieu of the subsidy granted by item 32 of section 2 of chapter 8 of 1900, not exceeding 42 miles.

6. To the Great Northern Railway Company of Canada, to enable it to extend its railway from Arundel to a point in the municipality of the united townships of Preston and Hartwell, Province of Quebec, in lieu of the subsidy granted to the Montford and Gatineau Colonization Railway by item 6 of section 2 of chapter 57 of 1903, not exceeding 30 miles.

7. To the Chateauguay and Northern Railway Company, for a branch line from a point on its main line to or near Charlemagne, thence northerly and westerly to a point on the Montford and Gatineau Railway at or near Morin Flats, in lieu of the subsidy granted to the Montford and Gatineau Colonization Railway by item 41 of section 2 of chapter 57 of 1903, not exceeding 22 miles.

8. To the Ottawa River Railway Company, for a line of railway from a point at or near Ste. Agathe des Monts Station towards the Township of Howard in the County of Argenteuil, passing near Lakes St. Joseph and Ste. Marie, in a southerly direction, in lieu of the subsidy granted to the Montreal Northern Railway Company by item 58 of section 2 of chapter 57 of 1903, not exceeding 15 miles.

9. To the Ottawa River Railway Company, for a line of railway between a point in the Parish of St. Andrews, in the County of Argenteuil, and a point in the Parish of St. Lawrence, in the County of Jacques Cartier, passing through the Parishes of St. Placide, St. Eustache and St. Martin, in lieu of the subsidy granted by item 10 of section 2 of chapter 57 of 1903, not exceeding 38 miles.

10. For a line of railway from Lardo towards Upper Arrow Lake, British Columbia, in lieu of the subsidy granted by item 28 of section 2 of chapter 7 of 1901, not exceeding 30 miles.

11. To the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company, either for a line of railway from a point at or near Spence's Bridge on the Canadian Pacific Railway to Nicola Lake, or for a line of railway from a point at or near the Village of Coutlee, southerly towards Princeton and Headley, in lieu of the subsidy granted by item 26 of section 2 of chapter 57 of 1903, not exceeding 45 miles.

12. To the Western Alberta Railway Company, from a point on the United States boundary, west of range 27, north-westerly towards Anthracite, in the District of Alberta, in lieu of the subsidy granted by item 40 of section 2 of chapter 7, 1899, not exceeding 50 miles.

3. The Governor in Council may grant the subsidy hereinafter mentioned towards the construction of the bridge also hereinafter mentioned, that is to say :—

1. To the Chateauguay and Northern Railway Company, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by item 33 of section 2 of chapter 8 of 1900, for a single-track standard railway bridge, with two roadways 10 feet wide, for free vehicular traffic, the same as upon a public highway, from Bout de L'Ile to Charlemagne at the junction of the Ottawa and St. Lawrence Rivers, a sum not exceeding $51,000.

4. The subsidies hereby authorized towards the construction of any railway or bridge shall be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, and may, unless otherwise expressly provided in this Act, at the option of the Governor in Council, on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, be paid as follows :—

(a.) Upon the completion of the work subsidized ; or

(b.) By instalments, on the completion of each ten-mile section of the railway, in the proportion which the cost of such completed section bears to that of the whole work undertaken; or

(c.) Upon the progress estimates on the certificate of the Chief Engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals, that in his opinion having regard to the whole work undertaken and the aid granted, the progress made justifies the payment of a sum not less than $30,000 ; or

(d.) With respect to (b) and (c) part one way, part the other

5. The subsidies hereinbefore authorized to be granted to companies named shall, if granted by the Governor in Council, be granted to such companies respectively ; the other subsidies may be granted to such companies as establish to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council their ability to construct and complete the said railways and bridge respectively ; all the lines and the bridge for the construction of which subsidies are granted, unless they are already commenced, shall be commenced within two years from the first day of August, 1904, and completed within a reasonable time, not to exceed four years from the said first day of August to be fixed by the Governor in Council and shall also be constructed according to descriptions, conditions and specifications approved by the Governor in Council on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and specified in each case in a contract between the company and the said Minister, which contract the Minister, with the approval of the Governor in Council, is hereby empowered to make. The location also of such subsidized lines and bridge shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.

6. The granting of such subsidies, and the receipt thereof by the respective companies, shall be subject to the condition that the Governor in Council may at all times provide and secure to other companies such running powers, traffic arrangements and other rights, as will afford to all railways connecting with the railways and bridge so subsidized, reasonable and proper

facilities in exercising such running powers, fair and reasonable traffic arrangements with connecting companies, and equal mileage rates between all such connecting railways ; and the Governor in Council shall have absolute control, at all times, over the rates and tolls to be levied and taken by any of the companies, or upon any of the railways and the bridge hereby subsidized.

7. Every company receiving a subsidy hereunder, its successors and assigns, and any person or company controlling or operating the railway or portion of railway subsidized hereunder shall each year furnish to the government of Canada transportation for men, supplies, materials and mails over the portion of the line in respect of which it has received each subsidy, and whenever required, shall furnish mail cars properly equipped for such mail service ; and such transportation and service shall be performed at such rates as are agreed upon between the Minister of the Department of the Government for which such service is being performed, and the company performing it, and, in case of disagreement then at such rates as are approved by the Governor in Council ; and in or towards payment for such charges the Government of Canada shall be credited by the company with a sum equal to 3 per cent per annum on the amount of the subsidy received by the company hereunder.

8. As respects all railways and the bridge for which subsidies are hereby granted, the company at any time owning or operating any of the railways, shall, when required, produce and exhibit to the Minister of Railways and Canals, or any person appointed by him, all books, accounts and vouchers, showing the cost of constructing the railway or bridge, the cost of operating it, and the earnings thereof.

9. The Governor in Council may make it a condition of the grant of the subsidies herein provided, or any heretofore authorized by any Act of Parliament, as to which a contract has not yet been entered into with the company for the construction of the railway, that the company shall lay its road with new steel rails, made in Canada, if they are procurable in Canada of suitable quality, upon terms as favourable as other rails can be obtained, of which the Minister of Railways and Canals shall be the judge.

10. Whenever a contract has been duly entered into with a company for the construction of any line of railway hereby subsidized, the Minister of Railways and Canals, at the request of the company, and upon the report of the chief engineer of government railways, and his certificate that he has made careful examination of the surveys, plans and profiles of the whole line so contracted for, and has duly considered the physical characteristics of the country to be traversed and the means of transport available for construction, naming the probable and reasonable cost of such construction, may, with the authorization of the Governor in Council, enter into a supplementary agreement, fixing definitely the maximum amount of the subsidy to be paid, based upon the said certificate of the chief engineer, and providing that the company shall be entitled to be paid, as the minimum, the ordinary subsidy of $3,200 per mile, together with the 60 per cent of the difference between the amount so fixed and the said $3,200 per mile, if any ; and the balance, 40 per cent, shall be paid only on completion of the whole work subsidized, and in so far as the actual cost, as finally determined by the chief engineer, entitles the company thereto ; Provided always :

(a.) That the estimated cost, so certified, is not less on the average than $1,800 per mile for the whole mileage subsidized ;

(b.) That no payment shall be made except upon a certificate of the chief engineer that work done is up to the standard specified in the company's contract ;

(c.) That in no case shall the subsidy exceed the sum of $6,400 per mile.

He said : I beg to state that these resolutions have been communicated to His Excellency the Governor General and that he has approved of the same.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, I think there is a general desire on both sides of the House that prorogation should take place at an early date. If possible we will try to have His Excellency prorogue parliament on Saturday of this week, but it cannot be done unless the Order Paper is considerably curtailed. Therefore, I beg to move that the following orders be dropped :—

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS.

An Act to amend the Civil Service Act.

An Act respecting the Naval Militia of Canada.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS.

Bill (No. 98) respecting the Harbour of Port Arthur, in the province of Ontario.

Bill (No. 125) for the inspection and sale of seeds.

Bill (No. 151) respecting the incorporation of Seed-growers' Associations.

Bill (No. 99) respecting the Harbour of Fort William, in the province of Ontario.

I may say that the Naval Militia Bill is ready, and that there is an item in the estimates providing for the necessary steps to be taken, if it is found possible, but it may not be possible to have the ships ready for this winter while the fishermen are at leisure. It will be impossible to have these ready this winter and the intention is to propose this measure again early in the coming session.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE. May I ask the right hon. Prime Minister if it is the intention of the government to expedite the passage of Bill (No. 135) respecting Labour Union Labels ? I think an assurance was given that the Bill would be taken up by the government and passed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are numerous public Bills which are not amongst government orders on the paper, the passage of which the government have been asked to favour, but at this late period of the session I think it would not be possible to

pass these Bills, and I think this one must share the fate of the others. I regret that the Bill has not passed, but I think it will come up early next session.

Mr. NAT. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, before you put the motion, I would like to draw the attention of the right hon. leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to the late date at which this session has been called, as well as the session preceding this one. I do not wish to take up the time of the House reading the speeches of the right hon. gentleman on this question when he so sarcastically ridiculed the government of the day for bringing the House together at a much earlier date than he called this session or last session, in fact, on the average much earlier than he has called the House together since he has been in power. As I said before, when I took occasion to speak on this mattter, the majority of the representatives in this House are from agricultural districts; the majority of the men occupying seats in this House are engaged in the active industries of the country, and every man occupying a position in this House comes here at a great disadvantage at the date at which parliament has been called together during the last two years. Out of some seventeen months since March, 1903, we have been kept here about thirteen months. For hon. members who live in Ontario and Quebec it matters very little. It would be quite immaterial to a number of them if the session lasted the whole year, because many of them can go away from here on Friday morning and come back on Monday or Tuesday, thus having an opportunity of attending to their business. But for men coming from distant portions of this country it is an outrage—no question about it—for they are brought here in the spring, say in March, when they should be going home. They are kept here during the season of opening of business—the opening of every business. The man who comes here from a distanat constituency loses his whole spring, and, losing the spring, he loses his whole year. The leader of the government smiles at this, yet he, in his time, severely criticised others who did what he is doing to-day. If I wished to take from my desk and read his speeches—he does not want me to or I would do it—I could show how he wished that the gods who rule over us could come down and tell us why they do these things. We might pray that the gods who rule over us to-day would come down and tell us why this inconsistency. Here we are, at the end of five months, with some of the most important legislation of the session to be rushed through, forced through, at the last moment in order that we may close the session. We have some $12,000,000 or $15,000,000 yet to be voted, and this is to be put through in a day or two. And many important measures are to be dropped from the order paper. But, when a larger number of members come from the western portion of the country, as will soon be the case, they will demand an earlier calling of the House together. I claim that parliament should be summoned to meet in November. A great deal of the legislation could then be introduced, so that we might know what work is to be done. We could adjourn over Christmas, and then meet after the holidays and get through with the business. If the business of this House were put before us in proper time more attention could be given to it, and more of it would be put through and in better shape. If we come here in the spring and are kept here during the summer, men are bound to try to get away from this chamber as much as they can, and so business is not attended to as it shou'd be. The government is not doing its duty to the people; it is certainly not doing its duty to the representatives of the people, who have to come here at very great sacrifices from long distances. And the government will have to reckon with the people from the western portion of this country in the very near future. I would like to hear from the leader of the government what excuse he has to offer for keeping us here, because he is mainly to blame for it——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BOYD. Hon. gentlemen opposite may laugh. But they know well the cause of our being kept here so late in the season. They know how late important and debatable legislation has been introduced this session. And they know the legislation that was introduced last session at a very late hour. They know what enormous expenditure we have been called upon to vote. Last session it ran up to no less than $250,000,000. This year it is about $80,000,000, which is about double what the leader of this House used to gaze upon with horror when the people, as his friends said, were being bled white. It took three and a half or four months to vote the $37,000,000 or so required in those days. And the voting of money is about all that we are really called here for. If the government could get the money, I fancy they would not care if we never got together. Now, we are faced with estimates of about $80,000,000, and hon. gentlemen opposite find fault if we spend four and a half months over the business of the session. And they will come down with estimates of $15,000,000 within three or four days of the close of the session and ask the representatives of the people to push the votes through. And then they will laugh because of the length of the session, and attribute delay to this side of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOYD. These hon. gentlemen may laugh, but they will find that when they undertake to discuss this matter with the electors of the country those electors will not be inclined to find fault with the length of time taken up in discussing the expenditures proposed by this government. Why, Mr. Speaker, instead of spending only four or four and a half months, six months could be profitably occupied in discussing the measures that have been brought before this House this session, including the Supply Bill, covering the enormous amount of money called for by this government. There are few members in the House who have taken up less of the time of the House than I have.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOYD. Not but that sometimes I would have liked to take more part in the discussion, and sometimes felt that I ought to do so. But I was anxious that business should be expedited. But, anxious as I am to avoid a moment's delay and even at this late hour, I enter my solemn protest against the lateness of the date at which this parliament has been called together, and against the delay in bringing down a great deal of the important legislation which has been placed before us.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I am sure the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) has brought up a very important question. He speaks for the west. But I think it is equally important for us in the east that the sessions of parliament should be called in good time. I see no reason why we should not adopt a similar method to that followed in the United States—calling the session in the autumn and carying on the business through the winter. Our legislation is not of a character making it impossible to control the time of the meeting of our parliament. Most of the members of this House are engaged in some business, and their acceptance of membership in this House as a rule entails great sacrifices upon them. It seems to me that the ministry should change the time of our sitting. Even the fiscal year might be changed, if necessary, from the 30th June to the 30th April, or even to the 31st of December of the previous year, in order to facilitate the business of this House. It would be an enormous convenience to a people like those of Canada who are practically all workers and whose time is valuable. I have never heard any good reason why we should not adopt some such method.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) has asked me to give what excuse I can for keeping him here so late. I do not think I am altogether blamable for that. I may be held responsible for the time when he was called to the session of parliament, but, as to the reason why he is kept here so long, if he will look around him he will see more than one whom he should blame for that. I have not forgotten the speeches I used to make. And I am still of opinion that there was, and is, an unwritten law that parliament should be called together early in the year. But, as head of the government, I have not found it practically possible always to comply with this law. I have no excuse to offer except the one I offered last year. Last year we deliberately postponed the sitting until a great measure which we wished to submit to parliament was ready, I think that, under the circumstances, that was a sufficient excuse. With regard to the suggestions made that parliament should meet in November instead of in January, that is a question upon which the government is ready to receive information, and to learn what are the views of the members of the House. But, taking it all in all, I think it would be inconvenient to bring members together early in November, only to separate for the Christmas holidays, and then force them to come back again. The best method of all, in my humble judgment, would be to call parliament for the despatch of business in the early days of January and, so far as I am responsible for the action of parliament, I will try to live up to that law.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am inclined to agree with the Prime Minister that he is not alone to blame for the lateness of the session or for the delay we have suffered since. I am disposed to admit that other members of the government are just as much to blame as he is.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose that was what the right hon. gentleman meant. It is very desirable that we should get together earlier in the year than we have done. What the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) and the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith) have said on that point is absolutely correct. There is a certain leisure time during the year, and for practically all classes of business that time is the winter months. It is more convenient to the great majority of the members of this House to meet at that season than at any other. We waste that time practically, then we come here just as the busy season begins. I have heard some suggestion that the delay is very often due to the inability to make up the public accounts and get business ready. If that be the case, would it not be better to make the fiscal year end on the 1st of April or May or March instead of 1st of July, so that we might be sure of beginning business every session early in January at the very latest. I would not be disposed to think unfavourably of the suggestion of the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) that we might

get through part of the work in November or December and settle down to the real work of the session early in January, but if that is inconvenient, we ought to be able to begin not later than the second week in January. And if it were necessary to change the fiscal year for that purpose, I would heartily support a proposal to that end.

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General) moved third reading of Bill (No. 153) to further amend the Post Office Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is a very unusual provision in this Bill, one of which I had no notice, and which was moved in committee when I happened to be out of town. It relates to certain powers to be assumed by the Postmaster General with regard to advertisements of a certain character in newspapers or periodicals. There was very little consideration given it. Would the hon. gentleman have any objection to our going into committee again and giving it further discussion ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think it is an important addition to the law and deserves full consideration. It would be better perhaps to let the clause stand for the present, and next session we shall be in a better position to decide on its merits.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I appreciate very much the suggestion of the hon. gentleman. I have received a great many representations with regard to it, and no great evil could result by our deferring action until another session. Of course, I do not wish to be understood as being opposed to the spirit of the amendment, but I am of the opinion that we might let it stand over for consideration during recess, and we would then be in a better position to devise a provision which would secure what we all desire.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I quite understand that the suggestion of my hon. friend does not indicate any opposition to the general object aimed at, but that it may be better to learn during recess the views of the country and take the matter up again next session. In accord, therefore, with the wishes of my hon. friend, I move that the order for the third reading be discharged and the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole with instructions to amend by striking out the clause referred to.

Motion agreed to.

House again went into committee on the Bill.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK moved to strike out the following clause :—

It shall be lawful to transmit by mail any books, magazines, periodicals, circulars, newspapers or other publications which contain advertisements representing marvellous, extravagant, or grossly improbable cures, or creative or healing powers by means of medicines, appliances or devices referred to in such advertisements,

Motion agreed to, Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

THE MILITIA ACT.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 5) respecting the Militia of Canada.—Sir Frederick Borden.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). I have looked over the amendment suggested yesterday by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), and I think it might be adopted with one or two verbal changes. The provision of the Bill is that the civil authorities by whom requisition is to be made are, first, the mayor of the town or of the municipality within the limits of which a riot has occurred or is anticipated; second, in case of the refusal of the mayor or warden, then by a judge of the county court or of a district judge; in default of a county court judge, that is to say, in those provinces where there are no district or county court judges, then it would be a judge of the superior court; and in default of these persons, that is to say, of the warden, the county court judge, or a superior court judge, then a stipendiary magistrate or police magistrate, and two persons having the jurisdiction of justice of the peace. In order to adopt this amendment we will have to withdraw sections 79, 80 and 81. I therefore move that they be struck out and the following clauses be substituted therefor : 79 is practically the same as printed in the Bill now.

79a. The civil authorities by whom such requisition may be made are :

(a) If the place where such riot or disturbance occurs or is anticipated is municipally organized, the mayor or warden, or other head or acting head of the municipality, unless he has declined or is unable to act, and in that case the county or district court judge, or one of the county or district court judges, having jurisdiction in such place, or if there is no such county or district court judge, any judge of a superior court who has jurisdiction there ;

(b) If the place where such riot or disturbance occurs or is anticipated is not municipally organized, the county or district court judge, or one of the county or district court judges, having jurisdiction in such place, or if there is no such county or district court judge, then any judge of a superior court who has jurisdiction there.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the phrase 'mayor or warden of the municipality' used ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. A municipality would include a town or other corporation.

Instead of the words 'having jurisdiction,' I would substitute the words, 'who has jurisdiction.'

2. Wherever under section 1 of this section a judge is designated as the civil authority by whom a requisition may be made, and there is no such judge, or the judge, or all the judges, who might have acted are absent, or are unable to act, the requisition may be made by any judge or magistrate having jurisdiction at the place where such riot or disturbance occurs or is anticipated, and who may do alone whatever is authorized by the Criminal Code, 1902, to be done by any two or more justices of the peace.

3. Where the requisition is made by a judge, any statement of fact contained therein shall be final and binding upon all parties in any way concerned.

4. Where the requisition is made by justices of the peace, any statement of fact therein contained shall not be open to dispute by the officer upon whom the requisition is made.

Mr. CLARKE. Does this mean that if the mayor of a municipality or the head of a municipality declines to act, refuses to act because possibly he does not see any occasion for calling out the militia or for requisitioning the district officer, then the militia may be called out on the order of a judge, notwithstanding the fact that the municipal authorities declined to act?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. With the greatest possible respect, I think that is a very grave departure from the present rule.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It would be a great improvement on the present rule.

Mr. CLARKE. I doubt that, with the greatest respect for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What is the present rule?

Mr. CLARKE. The present rule, I think, is that two justices of the peace, or three justices one of them the mayor, shall requisition.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. 'May' is the word.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Formerly it was 'may,' it is now 'shall.'

Mr. CLARKE. If the mayor and his associates in the council see no good reason why the militia should be called out, I do not think the militia should be called out; that is my judgment, unless——

Mr. LOGAN. Under the present law, even though the mayor may refuse or may protest against calling out the militia, the militia can be called out by any three magistrates.

Mr. CLARKE. I think if the militia are called out against the wishes of the municipality, that the military authorities should pay the expenses. The practice has been in Ontario, so far as I am aware, that where there is a board of police commissioners, one of whom is the mayor, the requisition shall be signed by the board of police commissioners. It is a high-handed proceeding, unless a riot is imminent, where the municipal authorities do not think it necessary, that any other authority should have power to call out the militia. In this connection I may say that I think the time has come, if we have a military force, that that force should be used, wherever practicable or possible, instead of the militia; and if a law is to be enacted that the municipality shall pay the expense of calling out the militia, that the law should be enforced. I do not think this is proper legislation. I do not think it should rest with a judge, I do not think he should be the sole arbiter to determine whether the militia shall be called out in cases such as are contemplated under this Act.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. For years and years the statute-book has contained an enactment to the effect that in case the mayor refuses to act any three magistrates may call out the militia. We have had no word of protest against that law, and now because we are trying to improve it in the direction of protecting the municipalities, giving them additional protection, my hon. friend objects.

Mr. CLARKE. Probably all the wisdom is not contained under the hon. gentleman's hat, and I do not think he has the right to say that because he is trying to improve the law, I object to its improvement. I do not object to the improvement of the law, but I challenge the accuracy of the statement that the proposed amendment is an improvement. I say that so far as the municipality of which I have the honour to be one of the representatives is concerned, the board of police commissioners, consisting of two justices of the peace and the mayor, have always been willing, where they felt it was necessary in order to preserve public order and safety, to call out the militia. I think it is a retrograde rather than a forward movement, to give the power to a judge in case the municipal authorities refuse to act. In my judgment, it is a retrograde movement to give the authority to a judge to call out the militia, and to place the expense of maintenance on the municipal athorities.

Mr. GOURLEY. If the municipal authority has acted wisely in refusing to call out the militia, the judge will refuse to call it out.

Mr. LOGAN. Under the present law the municipal authorities can protest as much as they please, and yet the militia can be called out by three perhaps irresponsible magistrates. The only difference now is that we propose that the first requisition shall be made by the mayor representing

the people who pay the bills. He shall first make the request, but if he refuses——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The mayor does not make any request to the judge. If he makes a request it is to the proper military officer and it brings the law into operation.

Mr. LOGAN. If he does not they will not be called out.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Whenever he makes a request that the militia shall be called out they come out. I am trying to understand my hon. friend, and I presume what he means is that the mayor shall have the first opportunity of deciding. This statute and the former statute do not contemplate the same procedure. This statute speaks about some persons declining to act. What is the scheme? Does some one go and make application for the calling out of the militia, some irresponsible person? I do not exactly understand the scheme of the statute.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Any three justices of the peace may now of their own motion call upon the commanding officer to call out the militia without any regard to the municipal authorities.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend obviously does not understand what I am talking about; of course, that may be my fault. The present Bill contains this expression:

> When thereunto required in writing by the chairman or custos of the quarter sessions of the peace, or by any three justices of the peace, of whom the warden, mayor or other head or acting head of the municipality or county in which such riot or disturbance occurs or is anticipated as aforesaid, shall be one, unless he has declined or is unable to act.

My hon. friend from Cumberland has followed the same language. Who is to make the application?

Mr. CLARKE. Anybody who likes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know about that. I want to know what the real meaning of the statute will be.

Mr. FIELDING. Who makes it now?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know.

Mr. FIELDING. There is no change.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Any citizen or any one who wants to bring the matter to the notice of the magistrates.

Mr. FIELDING. The magistrate may do it of his own motion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think that was the idea of the original statute. I think the idea of the original statute was that these justices of the peace, as conservators of the peace, could act of their own motion.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Could the minister tell me the clause in the original Act?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Section 34, of subsection 2.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The words are:

> When thereunto required in writing by the chairman or custos of the quarter sessions of the peace, or by any three justices of the peace of whom the warden, mayor or other head of the municipality or county in which such riot, disturbance or other emergency occurs or is anticipated as aforesaid, may be one.

That is exactly what I was coming to. I would think that that section to which the minister has just referred me did not contemplate an application by any person at all. It contemplated that these men, as conservators of the peace, these three justices of the peace, of whom the mayor might be one, could act of their own motion. We depart from that idea by the clause which the Minister of Militia inserted in his Bill, and we are following out that same novel idea here in speaking of an application by some person. If you are going into applications——

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is no application.

Mr. LOGAN. There is no application—it is the same language.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is no reference to any application in the Bill, but when I spoke of that I understood the Minister of Justice to say that any person could go and make an application.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course.

Mr. FIELDING. Just as at present.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Quite so. But there is no expression in subsection 2 of the section of the present law to which I have referred, which speaks of their declining to act. When you speak of a man declining to act, that involves the idea of an application to some person.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If at the present time a riot is in progress to the knowledge of a person who, for instance, is interested in a factory where a disturbance may occur, he goes to the justices of the peace, calls the fact to their attention, and thereupon the justices act. He applies to the magistrates exactly as I could go to call their attention to a murder in the street. It is just a breach of the peace.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I appreciate what the minister has said. The justice in that case is not acting on the application of any person, but he may have had some information brought to his attention. He goes and investigates the matter himself and acts upon his own motion, and not at the instance or upon the application of any person. But when you change that and use an expression such as that found in the Bill as introduced by the Minister of Militia, and in this amendment, speaking of a person having declined to act, it

does seem to me, with all deference to the view of the Minister of Justice, that that involves the idea of an application.

Mr. LOGAN. You have the reference to the mayor declining to act in the present law. The old section says :

Unless he has declined or is unable to act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think my hon. friend is mistaken.

Mr. LOGAN. I mean in the new Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have just said that the minister introduced that for the first time in the present Bill. I think we ought to be a little careful in working out that idea. I admit what the Minister of Justice has suggested, that you get into difficulty the moment you begin to provide procedure and to deal with procedure, but if you provide a certain remedy in case the warden of a municipality has declined to act, I do not see how he could decline unless an application had first been made. If the warden has declined to act, and you go from him to a judge sixty or one hundred miles away, must you not have something on which to base the application to that judge ? Surely you must have an application and something on which to go to the judge to prove, for example, that the warden has declined to act, and I should think that you must be able to show some good reason to the judge for acting if the warden has declined to act. It is practically an appeal from the warden to the judge, but are you going to trust to the judge, without any evidence, to overrule the warden and to do that which the warden says he does not think it necessary to do, although the warden is on the spot, cognizant of all the circumstances, and the judge is 60 or 70 or 100 miles away, I must confess that seems to present a good deal of difficulty.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will my hon. friend suggest some remedy for it ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not say that I can at the moment; but I might also say that we have not had a great deal of time to consider how to remedy it. I am not criticising my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, but I think it right to point out these difficulties in the measure as proposed by the hon. member for Cumberland, and as approved now by the Minister of Justice. Does not the Minister of Justice see that there is some little force in them ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I see that if you lay down the rule of procedure to be followed you will end in interminable difficulties. That is my experience. When you have had a law on the statute-book for many years authorizing a magistrate to act, you can very well trust a judge to exercise the same discretion which you allow a magistrate to exercise now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I can see that. A judge is a justice of the peace, and if he is on the spot and has the situation before him, he can act as well as any other justice of the peace. The point I make is this, that when you give to a judge what is practically an appellate power to overrule the warden of the municipality, who has said, that it is not necessary to call the militia out, you ought to provide some safeguard as to the evidence which shall be placed before him before he shall undertake that very important duty. It is all very well for the minister to say you get into difficulties when you undertake to provide procedure. I answer that when you make procedure necessary and do not provide it, you get into still worse difficulties.

Mr. ROSAMOND. Might there not be a case in which the mayor or the warden would be intimidated from acting or sympathized with the rioters, and therefore failed to act ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We are trying to provide for that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And I say that in providing for that, if you are going to make the legislation effective, you ought to establish some form of evidence or some way of making the application to the judge, and you ought to provide that some responsible person shall make that application.

Mr. HAGGART. I would suggest that, if you give either the judge or the other parties power in the first instance, that would do away with the difficulty.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The question is whether we are going to leave the matter exclusively with the warden or the mayor.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the word 'magistrate' used in a technical sense ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, it is used in the sense in which it is used in section 541 of the Criminal Code.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That would eventually bring it down to a police magistrate or other official having the authority of two justices of the peace ; so that you do eventually come down to an authority which is perhaps not more responsible than the authority provided in the law at present.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It practically comes back to that.

Mr. FIELDING. Apart from one point, which I think my hon. friend will find has been dealt with, I do not think it is necessary to establish any procedure in providing for the action of the judge. He would, subject to that one point, have to act on the same class of knowledge or information on which the justices of the peace would act under the provisions of the present Act ; that is to say, he would have to obtain his know-

ledge, either from immediate contact with the difficulty, or from representations made to him. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition, in reply to that, says that you are creating practically an appellate court, and therefore you need a procedure. We have thought of that, for this reason, that it would be quite possible that a dispute might arise. Inasmuch as jurisdiction would only come to the judge after the refusal of the mayor or warden to act, it might be necessary to establish some method of absolute proof of that refusal. If you did not do so, you might get into difficulty afterwards, in case the judge were not possessed of proper jurisdiction. To get over that difficulty, we have introduced a provision that whether the judge acts on personal knowledge or information, his action shall not be challenged. The presumption is that the judge, when called on, has satisfied himself that the mayor or warden has refused to act. He can get that knowledg in any way that is reasonable; but after he acts on the assumption that the mayor or warden has refused to deal with the difficulty, then his action cannot be challenged. I think my hon. friend will see that that meets the chief ground on which his criticism might be based. Apart from the question of possible jurisdiction that might arise, it seems to me that there is no special reason for providing procedure as to what the county judge shall do. He must obtain his knowledge and take his action in precisely the same way as the justice of the peace does now. As to the general theory and purpose of this amendment, I think it will meet the reasonable wishes of hon. gentlemen on both sides. There is a difficulty in the present law which the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) puts strongly, that is, that this is a matter involving taxation. The municipality may be subject to a heavy tax imposed upon it through the act of two or three magistrates, who, it is said, without being offensive to any individual, are not responsible persons. The calling upon three magistrates seems to be the outcome of old traditions, before our municipal institutions were as well organized as they are at present; and in amending the law, we should adapt it to the modern conditions of popular government. Therefore the first application is made to the mayor or warden, who represents the public opinion of the community, and who specially represents the tax-paying power of the community.

In nineteen cases out of twenty we may safely assume that the mayor or the warden will stand for law and order and take the necessary step to call out the militia. But there may be a twentieth case where, under local conditions, the municipal authorities will decline or be afraid to act. It is quite conceivable that a municipal magistrate, the mayor or the warden, may be terrorized by the mob. What are we to do in such a case? Are we to say that there shall then be no power under heaven to preserve law and order? We do not want to take that view. We take the view that there should be some power, in such a case, to step in and say law and order shall be maintained. Under this amendment, should the mayor or warden not act, an appeal may be made to a judge, and a judge is, in the proper sense of the word, a responsible officer. I think we may safely give to our judges power which we would not give to ordinary local magistrates.

Mr. PUTTEE. We must remember that at present if the mayor of a municipality objects or refuses to act, that refusal is automatically set aside. As I understand the amendment, it provides that in case he refuses, the petition can still be carried over his head to a judge and the judge can reverse his decision. So far as that goes, it is certainly along the right line, but I am not sure whether I read the amendment rightly. It seems to me that it leaves the power exclusively in the hands of the mayor to call out the militia and does not require three people as the present law does. At present it takes three justices of the peace, one of whom may be the mayor. Would it not be preferable to still leave the power in the hands of three people than give it exclusively to any one man even though he be the mayor. Under this amendment the mayor may act on his own motion, so that you are giving power to one man of his own motion to call out the militia. I think we had better leave it to the three men, still giving an appeal to the judge if the mayor refuses to act.

Mr. LOGAN. Last night I suggested the very thing the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) has just mentioned, and as the government has taken this matter over and the Minister of Justice has drafted an amendment, I would suggest that there be added the words 'two justices of the peace' before the word 'mayor.' No doubt there is something in the point made by the hon. member for Winnipeg that you are putting very large powers in the hands of one man. According to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, in nineteen cases out of twenty the warden or mayor will do his duty, but in the twentieth case he might be influenced to call out the militia when there is no need for it. If you add the words 'two justices of the peace,' that puts a sort of anchor to windward of the mayor before he can call out the troops, but if the mayor refuses to act, then an appeal can be had to a judge.

Mr. HAGGART. A mayor in lower Canada is the head of the municipality. We have no such definition in Toronto. The head of the municipality is the reeve.

Mr. LOGAN. The mayor would be taken as the head of the town or village municipality.

Mr. MORIN. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice what is to be done where there is only one justice of the peace? The amendment says there must be two.

Mr. LOGAN. There are very few places in Canada, where there is likely to be labour trouble, where there are not more than two magistrates. In our part of the country we have a great number.

Mr. MORIN. In my locality we have only one.

Mr. MONK. I quite apreciate the desire of my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) to improve the law. He no doubt has had the experience which I have had on several occasions. He no doubt has found great difficulty in getting the law in motion in a moment of disorder such as this provision contemplates. What I would like to point out is the way the proposed law will work out in practice. I venture to say that in nineteen cases out of twenty, a judge will be called upon to act. The chief magistrate of the city, the representative of popular opinion, will decline to act. He will say this is a matter for judicial adjudication, and there is the judge to whom you can apply, and you had better lay the matter before him. The judge will refuse to act except according to some kind of procedure which is not indicated. He will require an application. No police magistrate in Montreal would act in a matter of that importance without having an applicant. There at once you will meet very great difficulty. The chief magistrate, the mayor and justices of the peace, must act spontaneously.

Mr. FIELDING. A judge can if he will.

Mr. MONK. He can, but he will not. He is exercising an appellate jurisdiction, and he would require an applicant and absolute proof that the authority, who is temporarily charged with this important proceeding, has declined to act. It will be difficult to get the proof that the mayor has declined to act and still more difficult to get an applicant. And, moreover, let the committee consider this, that, if the judge, as is often the case in our province and probably everywhere else, is somewhat far removed from the scene of the commotion, he will require proof, he will make his proceeding a proceeding of record in order to be able to justify himself completely. This will entail great delay. So, although I quite appreciate the idea that, in the case—which sometimes presents itself—of the chief magistrate of the city being reluctant to act, there is to be recourse, still, I think, the remedy suggested by my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) will not simplify, but will complicate matters. Then, of course, there is the principle urged by my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Clarke) that all the taxpayers of the municipality are responsible for what action is taken, and I view with considerable fear the tendency of this amendment to vest in the judge power to initiate proceedings which may involve considerable cost to taxpayers. I would, therefore, hold that the initiative should rest where the responsibility rests.

Mr. LOGAN. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) says that in nineteen cases out of twenty the mayor will fail to do his duty.

Mr. MONK. If this law is amended as suggested by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) it will be natural for the mayor refuse to act. He will say: You have a judge who is better able to appreciate these matters; go to him; I have a peculiar responsibility to the ratepayers and I would rather not act. I understand the motive of my hon. friend from Cumberland, and I know that it is difficult to set the law in motion from my own personal experience in matters of this kind. But I think the government had better take this matter into consideration. I think the present law, though it does not always work satisfactorily, had better remain until the government has found some better remedy than that suggested, which, I believe, can be found.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I did not catch my hon. friend's (Mr. Monk's) meaning. I understood him to say that he wishes the matter to remain entirely in the hands of the mayor and the municipalities.

Mr. MONK. I say that it is better to leave the law as it is until some better remedy is found than that suggested in this amendment, which I think will not work, for the reasons I have indicated.

Mr. CLARKE. The modus followed in Ontario in cases where it is feared that a riot may occur or where there is actual rioting is this: If the authorities who are responsible for the maintenance of law and order are satisfied that the police force that they have at their command is not sufficient to enable them to keep down disorder, they requisition the militia officer commanding the district for the troops which he may think necessary to assist them. But I contend that the proposed amendment will put too much power in the hands of one authority who does not know anything about the resources of the municipality and its power to put down riots, ignoring the persons best qualified to judge of these matters, the board of police commissioners, one of whom is the mayor and all of whom are justices of the peace. In case the mayor declines it is better to leave the matter in the hands of the police commissioners than to pass it

over to the county judge. I enter my protest against any power being given to the judge to act upon his own initiative to call out the militia, and throw the expense upon the municiaplity. We have an efficient police force in every city in Ontario, and that police force in every case is under the control of a board of police commissioners. It is not reasonable that this authority, with its knowledge of the resources of the municipality and the force it can bring to bear to quell disturbance, should be set aside and that a judge should be given the sole power to call out the militia, involving the community in turmoil and the municipality in expense.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) is mistaken when he says that the board of police commissioners now have power. Under the law the power is not given to them.

Mr. CLARKE. They have the power, because one of the members of the board of police commissioners is the mayor and the other two are justices of the peace.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, but any other three justices of the peace have equal power to call out the militia. My hon. friend's (Mr. Clarke's) argument is based upon the assumption that the police commissoners now control in this matter, and we want to change it. But the law is not as he states it.

Mr. CLARKE. I have never known a case yet where the board of police commissioners were ignored and irresponsible justices of the peace called upon to requisition the militia authorities to call out the troops. Why, it would be absurd to do so. These justices of the peace may be taxpayers also, but it would be ridiculous for them to overlook the authority whose duty it is to maintain law and order.

Mr. PUTTEE. But it is possible, and I believe that it has been done.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Puttee) favour handing over this power to a judge instead of to the municipal authorities in the first place ?

Mr. PUTTEE. No, but I think that if the head of the municipality refuses to act his refusal should count for something. At present, it counts for nothing. We want some better safeguard.

Mr. CLARKE. We have, under the present law, the safeguard that the militia can be called out only upon the requisition of two justices of the peace and the mayor, or three justices of the peace. I have knowledge of the facts for over a quarter of a centuary as far as Ontario is concerned, and I am confident that I am right when I say that the machinery of the law has never been set in motion except by the police commissioners. And I say that it would be a retrograde movement to take the initiative of calling out the militia from the board of police commissioners. If the police commissioners refuse, then, other justices of the peace may act ; but until the commissioners refuse to act, I do not think that any judge of the province of Ontario, however eminent, should be given the initiative, because he cannot have the intimate knowledge of the resources of the municipality and its power to quell riots that the police commissioners possess.

Mr. FIELDING. It seems to me that before we undertake to change the law we should make sure what the law is. We are not discussing the practice in Toronto, but the law as it is before us.

Mr. CLARKE. The police commissioners proceed legally.

Mr. FIELDING. I agree that it is legal for the police commissioners, if justices of the peace, to call out the militia, but it would be equally legal for any three justices of the peace to do so.

Mr. CLARKE. I admit that.

Mr. FIELDING. It has always seemed to me dangerous to leave power in the hands of three irresponsible justices of the peace to call out the militia and impose large taxes upon the community.

Mr. CLARKE. Perhaps the hon. minister will permit me. If the government would amend the law so as to provide that in the cities of this province where we have boards of police commissioners the request to call out the militia must go to the police commissioners first, and that only when they fail shall resort be had to some superior court judge or two judges—then, I could understand the proposal.

Mr. FIELDING. There is no such proposal before us. We have to deal with the law as it stands, and not with the practice in Toronto.

Mr. CLARKE. It is the practice in other cities as well.

Mr. FIELDING. But my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) bases his whole argument upon the assumption that the board of police commissioners are now the body to be considered and that this amendment will brush them aside. That is absolutely fallacious.

Mr. CLARKE. What will this amendment do ?

Mr. FIELDING. First, let us consider the existing law. My hon. friend contended that the board of police commissioners now have that power, and that the amendment will brush that aside. His contention is entirely

erroneous. The board of police commissioners are not recognized by the existing laws.

Mr. CLARKE. I say that the board of police commissioners who are responsible for the maintenance of law and order in a municipality, and are at the head of the police force, consists of justices of the peace.

Mr. FIELDING. I say there are scores of justices of the peace who are not police commissioners, and any three of these justices of the peace can call out the militia in any part of the country, and thereby impose a charge and heavy taxation upon the whole municipality. That is the present law, and I do not think it has worked very badly. Perhaps it is open to some objection. It is contended that down in Sydney recently the militia were called out by persons who did not represent the wishes of the municipality—I offer no opinion of my own on that point. Then if the present law—not the Toronto practice—if the present law, which allows any three justices of the peace to call out the militia, is satisfactory, we do not need to amend it; but if it is open to an objection which may arise out of the old-time habit of quarter sessions and justices of the peace governing the country before the days of popular and responsible government, then we should try to modernize it, and in trying to modernize it, the question arises, shall we leave the matter entirely in the hands of the municipal authorities, or shall we under exceptional circumstances provide some other authority, and if another authority, who better than the county judge?

Mr. CLARKE. If the hon. gentleman admits that the law has worked fairly well, there ought to be some reason given why this amendment should be persisted in. I have pointed out that while the contention of the hon. gentleman is quite true that three justices of the peace may be the persons to call out the militia, the practice has been, not only in Toronto but in every other city of Ontario where there is a regularly constituted board of police commissioners, to apply to them, because they are all justices of the peace, and the mayor is one of them. The amendment proposes to place the power in the hands of the mayor in the first place, and if he fails then to give it over to the county court judge. I think it would be far better, in the interest of popular government, to leave the power of calling out the militia to the police commissioners as at present, and not pass it over to the county judge.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend comes back to his old error. He says it would be better to leave it to the police commissioners. If it is left to the police commissioners, then it is left to any three justices of the peace.

Mr. CLARKE. That is quite true. But I say that in practice the experience has been that these three justices of the peace are persons who have in their hands the administration of the police force, and who know what the resources of the municipality are, and who would not put the municipality to the expense of calling out the militia unless they were satisfied that they have not a municipal police force sufficient to deal with any riot that may be feared. That is the point I wish to make. It would be better to leave the power with these authorities who have been acting rather than take it out of their hands and pass it over to a judge. If the persons who have made the requisition will undertake to bear the expense, or if the government itself, in the maintenance of law and order, will bear the expense of calling out the militia, that is another matter.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We cannot base legislation for the whole Dominion exclusively on what has been the practice in Toronto. So far as this legislation is concerned, he will find in Ontario outside of Toronto, places where there would not be police commissioners, and in the province of Quebec, and I think in all the other provinces, any three magistrates can act without reference to the municipal authorities at all.

Mr. CLARKE. Many statutes are passed in this House which recognize local conditions and make exemption in favour of those conditions; and no person has more skill and is better able to prepare legislation of that kind than my hon. friend the Minister of Justice. Now, if it is better to leave the calling out of the militia with justices of the peace, which practice now exists in Ontario, and if the spirit of the law can be put into force by justices of the peace who are police commissioners in the various cities, why not make the exemption?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Would you use the words 'police commissioners?'

Mr. CLARKE. I mean the justices of the peace who are police commissioners.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Is it not possible under the present Act for that application to come from three justices of the peace in Ontario?

Mr. CLARKE. Yes.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. It is evident that the object of the hon. member for Cumberland is to place the authority for calling out the militia in the hands of representatives of the city before that call is finally made. At the present time, if the manager of a factory or any person with capital had any trouble with his workingmen, it would be possible, under the present Act, to apply to justices of the peace altogether outside the police commissioners.

Mr. DANIEL. I have no desire to hang on to the present Act, if anything can be suggested which will improve it. At the same time, I think it is important that, as

the municipality will have to pay the expenses of calling out the militia, that power should be left largely in the hands of the representatives of the people in each municipality. At the present time, so far as I am aware, the Act calls for at least the signature of the mayor or the warden. As a matter of fact, and in actual practice, the position of mayor is one that is not fully defined in the statutes. But he acts in a measure, as one may say, for the King in all those cases where there are no statutes defining his action. He represents in his own person law and order; for which he is responsible, and he is looked upon by the people in the municipality for such action as may be necessary in cases of riot or mob violence. I endorse the argument of the Minister of Finance, I entirely agree that if the law is to be changed it should be changed in such a way as that the persons who are responsible to the people should bear the responsibility of calling out the militia. The argument is right, but his conclusion, it appears to me, is entirely wrong, because he concluded that the best authority to be charged with this power, in the sense of responsibility was the judge of the county court. But as I understand it, he is not responsible at all in that way. The point I wish to make is that the power of calling out the militia should be placed entirely in the hands of those who are the elected representatives of the people, and if the mayor or warden does not act, then I would place it in the hands of the provincial government through the Attorney General, or somebody who is responsible to the people. I certainly think it would be much better to do that than to place this power in the hands of a judge, more especially since I have heard the remarks of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden), and other legal gentleman whose speeches have convinced me that any judge would require to take certain legal procedure before calling out the militia.

Mr. FIELDING. Would not the Attorney General likewise ?

Mr. DANIEL. The Attorney General, I think, is responsible to the people, and he will have his eyes and ears open, and will know what is going on. I certainly think that if a change is made so as to place the power in the hands of any one outside the municipal representatives, it should be placed in the hands of some one who is responsible to the people, and has to be elected by the people. I take it that it would be better to place the authority in the hands of the provincial government through the Attorney General than to place it in the hands of a judge of county or other court. I think it is a matter that perhaps the government might take a little more into their consideration and see if they cannot prepare an amendment which would better meet the wishes of the House. I think the arguments that have been advanced against the reference to a judge are very strong indeed.

Mr. ALCORN. May I draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to the use of the term 'Mayor or warden' as designating the officers who are to act in the case of a disturbance. I think this term is entirely inapplicable to the province of Ontario. We have mayors of cities and towns and reeves of local municipalities. The warden is simply the head of the county council which is composed of a number of local municipalities. The warden may be resident in another municipality a long distance away from the seat of the disturbance and so would have no personal knowledge of the local conditions. I would suggest that the word 'reeve' be substituted for the word 'warden.'

Mr. PUTTEE. I would like to point out to my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) that his difficulties are not nearly so great as he seems to imagine they are. If you put back the two justices of the peace with the amendment which has been proposed——

Mr. CLARKE. Has that amendment been accepted?

Mr. PUTTEE——that would meet the objection of the hon. member for West Toronto. If they have a police commission, they will follow precisely the same course as they have done before. The amendment would simply give the alternative of a further application to a judge in case the mayor or warden refused to act.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith) asked what the law is. I will read the law :

> The senior officer of the active militia present at any locality shall call out the same or such portion thereof as he considers necessary for the purpose of preventing or suppressing any such actual or anticipated riot or disturbance, or for the purpose of meeting and dealing with any such emergency as aforesaid, when thereunto required in writing by the chairman or custos of the quarter sessions of the peace——

I have not had the privilege of meeting that gentleman ; I do not know who he is.

Mr. FIELDING. I know him.

Mr. CLARKE—reading——

> —or by any three justices of the peace of whom the warden, mayor, or other head of the municipality or county in which such riot, disturbance or other emergency occurs or is anticipated as aforesaid, may be one ; and he shall obey such instructions as are lawfully given to him by any justice of the peace in regard to the suppression of any such actual riot or disturbance, or in regard to the anticipation of such riot, disturbance or other emergency, or to the suppression of the same,

or to the aid to be given to the civil power in case of any such riot, disturbance or other emergency.

That is the present law. Three justices of the peace are required to support such a requisition, of whom the mayor or warden may be one, recognizing, of course, the consideration that ought to be shown to the local municipality in a matter of such vital importance to it. The amendment we are discussing proposes that if the mayor or warden refuses to call out the militia, a judge shall be appealed to. I think that is certainly not legislation that should be passed until we first of all exhaust the power of appeal to the local authority which is familiar with the capacity of the municipality to control in case of a riot. In each of the cities of Ontario we have an efficient police force. That force is governed by a board of police commissioners all of whom are justices of the peace and one of whom is the mayor of the city. It would be far better to leave the law as it is rather than to take this power out of the hands of the police commissioners and place it in the hands of a judge.

Mr. LOGAN. Under the present law even should the mayor refuse to act you could call out the militia.

Mr. CLARKE. Justices of the peace are not going to act when there are police commissioners, who are also justices, who have control of the municipal police force and who are responsible for the preservation of order.

Mr. LOGAN. The militia has been called out by justices of the peace when it should not have been called out, and under the present act it is a question whether the justice of the peace for Carleton county could not call out the militia in Toronto. If, in the past, mistakes have been made, we should endeavour to prevent those mistakes in future.

Mr. CLARKE. We have had a good deal of experience with regard to the calling out of the militia. We think that safeguards should be put in the Act to prevent the militia force from being called out needlessly, but we think that there might be a temporary augmentation of the police force to meet such an emergency. But, what I desire again to say is that we should not, when we have justices of the peace acting as police commissioners, one of whom is the mayor, suspend the authority of the board and give the power to a judge of the county or of the Superior Court to call out the militia and have the municipality pay for it.

Mr. LOGAN. If the hon. Minister of Justice will accept the amendment I suggest, I think the difficulty can be overcome. My suggestion is that you add the words 'two justices of the peace' before the word 'mayor.' That will meet the objection of my hon. friend because it will make it compulsory on the mayor to sign the requisition, whereas under the old law he can sign it or not as he sees fit.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is the law as it is proposed by the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence.

Mr. LOGAN. No, the law proposed by the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence says that even if the mayor refuses to sign, the justices of the peace can give the necessary authority. My sugestion is that we have the requisition made by two justices of the peace and the mayor but that the mayor must sign the requisition.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That could be accomplished by a very much simpler process than the hon. gentleman proposes. It can be accomplished by striking out three or four words in the clause introduced by the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence.

Mr. FIELDING. That clause provides for no reference to the judge.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What does the government think of the suggestion of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel)? I have not given very much consideration to it but it strikes me as rather practical; that if we should go to the judge the attorney general should make the application.

Mr. FIELDING. No, that the Attorney General should be substituted for the judge.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The way it struck me was that if you go to the Attorney General first it will——

Mr. FIELDING. Would not time be against that?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No more than going to the judge.

Mr. LOGAN. Take the Sydney case for instance.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not at all wedded to the idea. I am only trying to grope my way to see if we cannot arrive at some satisfactory settlement of the difficulty. Dealing with districts that are municipally organized would it not be right to provide that in all these cases you must have two justices of the peace and a warden? I would not say anything about the necessity of a refusal by the warden before you go to the judge because as my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has pointed out the requisition is conclusive as to the facts. But, there is the alternative of applying to the judge at the instance of the attorney general of the province although perhaps that is too cumbersome.

Mr. FIELDING. There is another difficulty in the matter. The hon. member

for St. John (Mr. Daniel) presses the doctrine of popular government a little farther than I am prepared to do, though I thought I was a pretty good Liberal in that respect. His idea is that the municipal authority must have the largest share in the matter and that if we depart from that at all he would appeal to the Attorney General of the Province, because the Attorney General represents public opinion. Let me remind my hon. friend that under British institutions in matters of the preservaton of law and order and the administration of justice, it is not deemed wise to have too close a contact with public opinion. The British idea is that it is sometimes well to interpose something between public opinion and the machinery for the preservation of law and order and the administration of justice. Under the present law you have three irresponsible magistrates, if you call them irresponsible as the hon. member for St. John does, and to give the responsibility to the judges certainly gives a high class of responsibility. I may say the idea of entrusting the whole thing to the municipal authorities whether to the mayor or others and leaving it entirely to them, while in most cases it would work well might cause difficulty. In the great majority of cases the municipal authority would act. But circumstances might arise in which a mayor or warden would fail to act. It is to meet that case that you want some other authority and I do not think you can have any better authority than a judge.

Mr. CLARKE. My hon. friend must remember that the majority of these are life appointments.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman is still speaking of his police commissioners.

Mr. CLARKE. I am drawing attention to the fact that these are municipal authorities. Two of them out of three are life appointments who control that particular department of municipal government, the police force, and now it is proposed to take away the power they have exercised.

Mr. FIELDING. We do not take it away, because they have not got it.

Mr. CLARKE. They have in practice.

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. CLARKE. If the mayor refuses what will be the effect? Suppose that there is a strike in a factory, and the proprietor goes to the mayor and asks for the calling out of the militia. Then if the mayor refuses he goes to the judge, and the militia will be ordered out although it may be quite unnecessary.

Mr. FIELDING. Suppose the magistrate may be in the employ of the man or the company desiring to have the militia called out, as may easily occur in the case of large companies ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I suggest—although I have not given it full consideration, but we must try to make some progress if we are ever going to get through—that the hon. member for Cumberland substitute for 79 a and b the following :—

(a.) If the place where the riot or disturbance occurs or is anticipated is municipally organized, two justices of the peace, the mayor, or warden or other head or acting head of the municipality, or the county or district court judge, or one of the county or district court judges, having jurisdiction in such place, or if there is no such county or district court judge, any judge of a Superior Court who has jurisdiction there.

I do not think there is so much objection against placing jurisdiction in the judge, and I think perhaps something of that kind might be inserted.

Mr. LOGAN. I do not accept that. It gives an alternative so that they can go either to the municipal authorities or to the judge, and they would be sure to go to the judge. I only want the judge to be available as the last resort.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend does not fully grasp the meaning of his amendment. The amendment would read :

The mayor or warden or other head or acting head of the municipality unless he had declined to act and in that case the county or district court judge,

And so on. The Minister of Finance has pointed out that if the judge says the municipal authority has declined, then it must be conclusively held that he has declined.

Mr. LOGAN. You would hardly expect the judge to say he had declined unless it was the case.

Mr. FIELDING. It would still leave the application to the mayor and require him to refuse.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the judge in his requisition declares that the warden has declined, that statement under the hon. gentleman's amendment is conclusive. Of course this is a mere alternative which I am suggesting on account of the view expressed by the Minister of Finance. I am not wedded to the idea.

Mr. FIELDING. We are all trying to find out how to do it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would strike out subsection 2 altogether, and substitute this which comes from subsection 3 :

All statements of fact contained in any such requisition shall be finally binding upon all parties in any way concerned.

I do not say I am wedded to this view at all. I am merely trying to assist.

Mr. LOGAN. I desire to move that the words 'two justices of the peace' be inserted before the words 'the mayor.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman has not considered the effect of that because

the result of that will be to make the justices necessary parties to the application before the judge. Under the reading of the section as it is at present, that is the effect of it although I do not suppose my hon. friend intends that. If my hon. friend looks at the section for a moment he will see this. The section will require to be remodelled, as the proposed amendment makes the justices necessary parties to the requisition of the judge. If he goes to amend the section in that blind way that is the result.

Mr. LOGAN. The leader of the opposition need not imagine that I am trying to amend the section blindly. I was advised by one of the best draughtsmen we have that you could amend it by inserting the words 'two justices of the peace' and leaving the balance of the section as it is at present. It will then read :

If the place where the riot or disturbance occurs or is anticipated is municipally organized two justices of the peace, the mayor, or warden or other head or acting head of the municipality unless he has declined or is unable to act, and in that case the county or district court judge, or one of the county or district court judges, having jurisdiction in such place, or if there is no such county or district court judge, any judge of a Superior Court who has jurisdiction there.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I shall put the amendment of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If we agree upon the amendment of the leader of the opposition it will not be necessary.

Mr. LOGAN. I do not think the leader of the opposition really presses his amendment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, I have not moved it.

Mr. LOGAN. I will withdraw the amendment if it is going to expedite this matter and leave it as it is.

Mr. PUTTEE. That is worse than ever. If the two justices of the peace are left out, we are making the law worse than at present. We are giving all the power to one man and I do not care who that man is, it is not even as safe as the custom that has been followed. The hon. member for Cumberland last night asked that there should be three men, with the power to go to a fourth man in the event of their refusing, but now he asks to go to one man. The amendment in no way meets the case.

Mr. LOGAN. Half a loaf is better than no bread. I am trying to get the best I can. How would it do to say :

Two justices of the peace and the mayor or warden or other head or acting head of the municipality, unless they decline or are unable to act.

Mr. OSLER. One of them might act and the other two decline.

Mr. CLARKE. It strikes me this clause has been drafted to meet a particular case, and it might be well to give it a little consideration.

Mr. FIELDING. What case ?

Mr. LOGAN. There is no case.

At One o'clock, committee took recess.

Committee resumed at Three oclock.

Amendment to amendment agreed to.

Mr. LOGAN. I desire to move that subsection 'a' be struck out, and that the following be inserted in lieu thereof :

If the place where such riot or disturbance occurs or is anticipated is municipally organized, the mayor or warden or other head or acting head of the municipality, together with two justices of the peace, or, in the event of such mayor or warden or other head or acting head refusing or being unable to act, the county or district court judge, or one of the county or district court judges, having jurisdiction in such place, acting alone, or, if there be no such judge, then any judge of a Superior Court who has jurisdiction there.

As the clause in your hands does not include two justices of the peace, I think it was agreed this morning that this should be inserted to meet the objection of the hon. member for West Toronto. There was some question about the wording of the section, as to whether the magistrates were disconnected with the judge. In this we provide that the judge may act alone.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not know how that amendment is going to work ; but I do not propose to offer any opposition to it at this stage.

Amendment agreed to, and Bill reported.

Mr. FITZPATRICK moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few remarks in regard to some of the minor details of this Bill which I presume can be regulated by Order in Council. First, with regard to the clause providing that the pay of the militia shall be 50 cents a day as a minimum, rising for good conduct to $1 a day. Hitherto militiamen have received 50 cents a day from the government, and in many counties, including my own, they have been paid in addition 25 cents a day by the county council ; so that they have received 75 cents a day. As the county councils suppose that the pay of the militia is now to be 75 cents a day or thereabouts, they have taken no action. In my own county, and I suppose in a good many others, the council has thought it unnecessary to add the 25 cents a day. Therefore, unless the minister provides that the pay shall be at least 75 cents a day, it is quite possible that the men may get less than they did before. It seems to me that the minister should make it plain that the minimum will be 75 cents a day. I think any volunteer who is not

guilty of misconduct should get at least $1 a day. Then, my attention has been called by a militiaman to the fact that when men are called out to quell a riot or a disturbance, they are not paid promptly. I think that immediately after they are sent home, or before they are sent home, they should be paid as promptly as they are when on duty at their annual drill. There is a clause in the Act providing that a militiaman on leaving the country shall surrender his arms and accoutrements to the proper authorities. I think a similar provision should apply to a militiaman who leaves his military district. There is a grievance in the fact that a medical officer who is with a dismounted unit at the annual drill is not allowed to have a horse, though in time of active service or in war a horse is absolutely necessary to him. Therefore the complaint is made that he is not able to appear at the annual drill as he would appear if he were called to battle. In times past he had a horse; then it was taken away; and afterwards, owing to the many complaints that were made of the injustice to him, it was returned; but now we have gone back to the former condition, and he is not allowed to have a horse on parade. Another matter to which I wish to draw special attention is the question to whom a militia officer who feels aggrieved is to apply for the redress of his grievance. I placed this question on the order paper a day or two ago, and received the reply that that came under section 42 of the Queen's regulations. That section reads:

> If an officer thinks himself wronged by his commanding officer, and on due application made to him does not receive the redress to which he may consider himself entitled, he may complain to the Commander in Chief in order to obtain justice, who is hereby required to examine into such complaint, and through a Secretary of State make his report to Her Majesty in order to receive the directions of Her Majesty thereon.

There seems to be some difference of opinion with regard to the application of this section. In my own county there has been a case in which great injustice appears to have been done. The case is one of long standing, one that occurred some four or five years ago. Many militia officers know it well. It is that of Captain Colonel Von Wagner. That gentleman was in command of the Fourth Field Battery of Hamilton a great number of years. In 1889 that battery was a portion of the second artillery brigade. Colonel Von Wagner was retired, but instead of being placed upon the reserve of officers, as an officer retired for honourable service during many years, he was practically dismissed. That Fourth Field Battery was not a separate corps but a portion of the second artillery brigade. The commanding officer of that second artillery brigade was a man who could have been retired, if he had served the proper length of time, according to the law regarding the tenure of command. Colonel Von Wagner was retired. He claims that there was an injustice and that he has a grievance and a very great grievance indeed. He took command of the Fourth Field Battery of the city of Hamilton when it was almost in a conditon of disbandment and brought to bear on it great executive and military ability. This gentleman, with whom I am personally acquainted and for whose ability I can vouch, who was in every way fitted to command a battery, who was well acquainted with that district, the Niagara district, who was descended from the United Empire Loyalists, the best stock who brought this battery up to a high state of perfection, in the country,—this man, whose long and valuable service ought to have been regarded with favour by the government—was dismissed. What did he do? He did exactly as this 42nd section of the Queen's regulations prescribes. He made application to the Commandership in Chief, General Hutton, and got no reply. He wrote a second time and got no reply. Failing to get any satisfaction from the commanding officer, he did exactly as the Queen's regulations prescribe. According to these regulations, the minster should have examined into his complaint, but Colonel Von Wagner has not up to the present known of any examination, and if an examination had taken place surely he would have known something about it. In a civil case at any rate, the complainant is always called into court. Surely that cannot be called an examination unless the complaint is heard and knows of the examination. But Colonel Von Wagner has certainly never heard of any investigation up to the present, and nearly five years have pased away. So that this section which refers to the Queen's regulations, is somewhat deficient apparently, if we are to judge by the example of Colonel Von Wagner, now on the retired list, but who ought to be on the reserve list.

Mr. CLARKE. I intimated to the Minister of Militia last night that I would draw his attention to a communication I had received asking why the cavalry regiments which have been established recently contain five squadrons while the old established cavalry regiments contain only four? Why have these old efficient corps not been increased to five squadrons? I understood the minister to say that he would obtain the information and answer the question, and this is the only opportunity given me to renew the question.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I wish my hon. friend would not delay the passage of the third reading, and to-morrow if he renews the question I will see that it is answered.

Bill read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—REVIEW OF THE FINANCIAL SITUATION.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to move an amendment which I shall read at the close of my remarks. The opportunity given by the end of the session to review the conduct of the administration, particularly in reference to financial matters, is one that it would not be well to allow to pass without taking advantage of it. In connection with this matter, it is impossible not to recall the attitude maintained during many years by the gentlemen now constituting the government, at the time when they were in opposition. At that time their attitude was entirely in favour of economy, of reduced expenditures and of lessening the burden of taxation. It may seem a somewhat hackneyed narration to refer to this matter, but there are good reasons why it is the duty of public men to keep the record of the gentlemen now in power in sight. It seems to me there is nothing more important to good government in a country which enjoys representative institutions than to carefully weigh the conduct of public men. It seems to me important that public men should avoid making any promises to the public which they do not intend to carry out, and that the people on the other hand should exact from public men in office a fulfilment of the promises made by them when in opposition. During a great many years, when the late Conservative adminstration was administering the affairs of Canada, the present occupants of the treasury benches, then in opposition, declared that the public outlay was too lavish, that the burden of taxation was too heavy. And in view of this attitude at that time, it is well for us to contrast the policy which these gentlemen then definitely announced with their performance in office. I need not go to the trouble of repeating all the different statements made by these gentlemen. It suffices to say that practically the whole of the opposition of that day, led by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, took the ground that the administration of this country was costing too much. That right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) laid down the proposition that about $2,000,000 should be saved out of the expenditure made in 1893-4. In view of these facts, in view of the record of these facts, in view of the record of these hon. gentlemen, I propose to put on 'Hansard' a statement showing how this government has proceeded to lighten the burden of taxation and make good their promises of economy and reduced expenditure and taxation. First of all, as regards the taxation of the people, beginning with 1890, I shall give the taxation collected for a series of years. That is taxation proper, the two sources of taxation being the customs and excise.

TOTAL RECEIPTS—TAXES—CONSERVATIVE.

1890	$ 31,587,072
1891	30,314,151
1892	28,446,157
1893	29,321,367
1894	27,579,203
1895	25,446,199
1896	27,759,285
Total	$200,453,434
Average	$ 28,636,205

It is noticeable, in this connection, that the tendency under this administration was towards reduction of taxes, because in 1896, the taxes were less than in 1890 by $2,554,866.

Now, coming to the period of the present government we find that the taxes under their regime were as follows:

TOTAL RECEIPTS—TAXES—LIBERAL.

1897	$ 28,648,626
1898	29,576,456
1899	34,958,069
1900	38,242,223
1901	38,743,550
1902	43,389,112
1903	49,015,506
Total	$262,573,542
Average	$ 37,510,506
Liberal excess	$ 62,120,118
Average Liberal excess	8,874,301

Now, instead of showing any reduction, we find that the amount for 1897 was exceeded by the amount for 1903 by no less than $20,366,880, and by that of 1904 by no less than $24,697,994, an enormous increase, being nearly equal to the amount of all the taxes collected by the Conservatives in the year 1894. We have not the public accounts for the year 1904, still, we can gather the main facts from the speech of the Minister of Finance and the returns that have been brought down in the 'Gazette.' We find that for 1904 the taxes collected amounted to $53,346,620.06. So, if we take the last seven years of the present administration that is, from 1898 to 1904 inclusive, and contrast them with the last seven years of the Conservative administration which I have already given to the House we find that the taxes collected from the people by this government amounted to $287,271,536, an average of $41,038,791 per year.

It is not necessary, at this time to delay the House by drawing all the comparisons which may be drawn between these figures. I place them upon the pages of 'Hansard' so that members can compare them at their leisure. It is enough to say that the taxation under this government, which promised economy and reduced taxation, is

practically double what it was under the Conservatives. To that matter I will refer a little later. Let me now turn to the expenditure. The following figures show the expenditure for the years mentioned. This is the total expenditure, and not that on consolidated revenue account alone :

TOTAL EXPENDITURE—CONSERVATIVE.	
1890	$ 41,770,333
1891	40,793,208
1892	42,272,136
1893	40,853,723
1894	43,008,234
1895	42,872,338
1896	44,096,384
Total	$295,666,361
Average	$ 42,236,052
TOTAL EXPENDITURE—LIBERAL.	
1897	$ 42,972,756
1898	45,334,281
1899	54,542,635
1900	52,717,467
1901	57,982,866
1902	63,970,800
1903	61,746,572
Total	$379,267,377
Average	$ 54,181,054

The excess of expenditure under this government over that under the Conservatives for the seven years is $83,601,016, or an average of $11,943,002. Now the Minister of Finance in his budget speech estimated that the total expenditure for 1904 would be $66,000,000. Adding that to the expenditure of the six preceding years in order to contrast these with the last seven years of the Conservative administration, we find that the total expenditure from 1898 to 1904 inclusive amounted to $412,294,621, an average of $58,899,232. This was in excess of the average of the last seven years of the Conservative administration by no less than $16,663,180 per year.

Now, it is not hard to account for these expenditures when we come to look at some of the items. It is impossible to go over the whole outlay of the country, so I have selected a few items of expenditure that we may make a contrast in order to learn how it is that this country, which is increasing in population at a comparatively moderate rate—only about one per cent per year—shows such an enormous proportion of increased expenditure :

INCREASE OF EXPENDITURE.

—	1896.	1903.	Increase.	Per cent.
	$	$	$	
Administration of Justice	758,270	959,948	201,678	·266
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics	210,878	436,402	225,524	1·07
Census, 1891	549,992	1,149,879	599,587	1·09
Civil Government	1,396,628	1,554,792	158,164	·11
Fisheries	427,251	527,829	100,578	·235
Immigration	120,199	642,914	522,715	435·
Quarantine	95,247	263,331	168,084	177·
Lights and Coast Survey	466,058	964,144	498,086	107·
Miscellaneous	172,363	528,231	355,868	207·
Ocean and River Service	181,452	417,137	235,685	130·
Public Works	1,299,769	4,065,553	2,765,784	213·
" Collection, Revenue	159,460	562,404	402,944	253·
Railways and Canals. Collection, Revenue	3,826,226	7,221,705	3,395,479	91·3

The House will see that under the head of miscellaneous the increase of expenditure has been 207 per cent. I may remark that this is a very suggestive heading, under which many questionable expenditures might be covered up ; many expenditures which could not find a place in any proper light or consideration in former days, could be gathered together, and the enormous increase under this head is suggestive of many things. In public works there has been an increase of 213 per cent. That is one of the departments of the government in which I think the administration has shown itself an adept, because it has succeeded in making this expenditure in such a manner as to help maintain itself in power ; because we find, if we look through the estimates to-day, that in respect of one matter which was constantly condemned by leading men of the Liberal party in opposition, that is, the erection of public buildings in various towns of Canada, we find that in that branch of the public service the present administration has shown itself exceedingly skilful. We find in the estimates of this year that instead of the few public works which used to be erected by the Conservative government, and which evoked a great deal of keen criticism by the then opposition, there are no less than forty public buildings in var-

ious small places in Canada provided for in these estimates. The hon. gentlemen opposite have evidently learned the lesson of constructing these public buildings in the most likely places to secure votes ; in that respect they have entirely eclipsed their teachers, if at any time the Conservative party might be considered their teachers in that respect. So we find under the head of public works, as might be expected, an increase of 213 per cent in the outlay of the country.

Now, it is true that during the eight years that hon. gentleman opposite have been in power there has been an increase in the population of the country, and to that extent they might plead justification for an increased expenditure. But the increase in the population during that period has only been about 8 per cent, or at the rate of one cent per annum. Therefore they might justify an increase of 8 per cent in the expenditure by a concurrent increase in the population ; but they cannot by any such argument justify an increase of 215 per cent. Under the heading of public works and collection of revenue, the outlay has been increased 253 per cent. In railways and canals, collection of revenue, the increase is 91·3 per cent. That, of course, is not so important, because these services have to be maintained, and in some cases the works are not money-making institutions, and we might reasonably expect that though there might be no increase of revenue, there would be a large increase of expenditure. But in respect to all the other items I have read, controllable items of expenditure, and reflected in the figures placed upon the public accounts, in respect of all these branches, the outlay has increased, not in proportion to the increase of population, but enormously beyond the increase of population. In so far as all these matters are concerned that I have now recited, and in regard to which the administration promised to reduce the taxation and to reduce the expenditure, they have illustrated in the most startling manner an administration of a totally different character. When they urged upon the people the advantages of low taxation and low expenditure, their intention was probably at that time, so far as we can determine by what we saw of their conduct, to pursue an entirely different course when they reached office, and they have done so ; they have practically almost doubled the taxation, and we may roughly say that they have almost doubled the expenditure of Canada. It will be remembered that the opposition at that time laid down the rule that Canada could be governed for a sum of about $36,000,000 per year. But this last year, instead of reaching that point and giving Canada an administration costing $36,000,000, they have given us an administration costing $66,000,000, or very nearly double the amount.

Then there is another way of bringing the matter home to the understanding of the people, and that is by comparing the taxation and expenditure per head :

Taxation and expenditure per head since 1895 have been as follows :

Year.	Taxation per head.	Expenditure per head.
	$	$
1892-95	5·59	8·41
1896	5·46	8·14
1897	5·57	8·28
1898	5·69	8·63
1899	6·65	9·72
1900	7·19	9·95
1901	7·19	10·76
1902	7·95	11·72
1903	8·87	11·17
1904	9·44	11·74

Now, that was not the course followed by the Conservatives, although they were so keenly criticised. The Conservatives had really in view a reduction of the taxation and expenditure, because the average of the total expenditure from 1892 to 1896 was $400,000 less than during the period between 1887 and 1891. The tendency of that administration was towards economy ; on the other hand, the tendency of the Liberal party in power has been in the very opposite direction. They have not only increased the taxation and expenditure, but they have done so consistently—being consistent in that matter alone—they have increased it regularly in every year in which they have been in power, almost without exception. In 1903, it is true, they made a small reduction ; probably they expected at that time to go to the country, and wished to procure the merit before the taxpayers of making a small reduction. But the fact of the matter is, that while the premier confidently stated, and the statement was repeated by his lieutenants in the House, that if they ever got into power they would reduce the total expenditure by two or three millions, the fact is that not only did they not reduce the expenditure by two or three millions, but they have practically doubled it during the eight years they have been in power.

I suppose that, like another prophet crying in the wilderness, I might lift up my voice in protest for a very long time before it would have the slightest effect upon hon. gentlemen opposite. They seem to be rather confident that the country prefers high taxation and high expenditure, if we can judge from the course they are following. However, the hon. gentleman who is most particularly responsible for this policy, while the whole administration is responsible for it, is my hon. friend from my own pro-

vince, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). I suppose he must feel that he is held responsible by the people of Canada to a large extent, not only for the surpluses every year, but for the annual bill of costs which he renders; so that, I suppose, he must realize that at least in the province of Nova Scotia, as any where else, a great deal of interest is taken in this matter. I am going to turn back to a period in Nova Scotia history when the hon. gentleman and I had some dealings with each other, and remind him of the attitude taken in 1885 by the party led by that hon. gentleman on this very matter of expenditure. In 1885 a very important motion was made in the legislature of Nova Scotia based entirely upon the question of the taxation of the country. Mr. Fraser, the member for Guysborough, who was a very active supporter of the hon. gentleman, made the statement there that Nova Scotia was being overtaxed, that the province was actually being taxed to the amount of $3,093,466 per year, and that Nova Scotia was not receiving in return from the Dominion government an expenditure equal to the amount which she was contributing to the funds of the country. I did not agree with the figures that were presented in reference to the expenditure being made by the Dominion and with which Nova Scotia was chargeable, nor do I agree with them now, but basing their argument entirely on the fact that the taxation then amounted to under $3,000,000, these hon. gentlemen went on to argue that Nova Scotia and Nova Scotians were in such a condition that they required to receive some relief, and that the imposition of taxation to which they were subjected at that time was one that justified them in seeking some relief somewhere, and of endeavouring to escape from that difficulty. Now, I am going to call to the attention of my hon. friend what the people of Nova Scotia, as represented in the local legislature, thought of the situation then, thought of this taxation, and the course they thought fit to pursue, and I am going to contrast that with the situation in which these Nova Scotians find themselves to-day as being under the control of a taxing master, then the hon. member for Halifax and premier of Nova Scotia, and now Finance Minister of Canada. Mr. Fraser argued that the taxes paid by Nova Scotia at that time were about $3,000,000. The population of Nova Scotia at that time was 442,572 persons, and multiplying that by the average rate of taxation, $6.60 per head, we find that the taxes paid by Nova Scotians amounted to $2,920,975, or a little under the amount estimated by the member for Guysborough at that time. But in 1903, the last year for which we can get the figures exactly, the taxes paid to the Dominion by these same Nova Scotians were not $2,920,975, but $4,264,856. No doubt the population has increased to a certain extent, but the people are actually paying more taxes. The population of Nova Scotia between 1885 and 1903 has increased 4·1 per cent, but the taxes have increased by nearly 27 per cent, so that the increase of taxes is entirely out of all proportion to the increase of population. Now, in order to show the people of this country, and the people of my own province of Nova Scotia, how this matter was regarded in 1885, I am going to read the resolutions that were moved in that year and in the year following by the hon. member for Guysborough, who had charge of this matter, and by the hon. gentleman who was at that time the leader of the government (Mr. Fielding), and I am sure I will not be troubled to appeal to the hon. Minister of Finance to give to this matter his most earnest consideration. It surely will not be hard to persuade him that this matter is of the greatest political consequence in the province of Nova Scotia, and there can be no doubt at all that the government will necessarily be held to account. At page 100 of the 'Hansard' of the Nova Scotia legislature, session 1884-5, it will be found that Mr. Fraser moved as follows:

Whereas the financial and commercial condition of the province of Nova Scotia is in a very unsatisfactory state;

And whereas, it is evident that the terms of the British North America Act, combined with the Canadian tariff and fiscal laws, are the principal causes contributing to this unsatisfactory state of the finances and trade of the province;

And whereas, there is no prospect that, while the province remains upon the present terms of union a member of the Canadian federation, any improvement in the foregoing respects is at all possible;

And whereas, it seems evident that the interests of the people of the several maritime provinces now incorporated with Canada are in most respects identical;

Therefore resolved, that this branch of the legislature of Nova Scotia is of the opinion, and does hereby declare its belief that the interests of the people of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island would be advanced by withdrawing from Canadian federation and uniting under one government;

And further resolved, that, if the government of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island and the people thereof will be found unwilling to withdraw from the Canadian federation for the purpose of forming a union of the maritime provinces, then this assembly deems it absolutely necessary that Nova Scotia in order that its railways, and its other public works and services, may be extended and maintained as the requirements of the people need them; its industries properly protected; its commerce invigorated and expanded; and its financial interests placed upon a sound basis, such as was the case previous to confederation, should withdraw from the union with Canada and return to the status of a province of Great Britain, with full control over all fiscal laws and tariff regulations, within the province, such as prevailed previous to 1867.

And further resolved, that the government of Nova Scotia shall, after the prorogation of the legislature, take preliminary action for

the purpose of facilitating the wishes of the assembly by entering into negotiations with the respective governments of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, in order that the legislature of Nova Scotia may be fully advised during its next session, and be thereby enabled to place this vital and important question before the people at the approaching elections, for decision at the polls.

The whole basis of that resolution, aiming at the subversion of the Dominion constitution, and the removal of the maritime provinces from confederation under the leadership of the hon. Minister of Finance and his friends at that time in power, was the fact that at that time the people of Nova Scotia were paying $6.60 per head in taxation. That was looked upon as an oppressive condition, and one that demanded an immediate remedy. In amendment to that the hon. gentleman who is now Finance Minister of Canada moved :

That all the words after 'whereas' to the end of the question be left out, and that the following words be inserted instead thereof :

Previous to the union of the provinces the province of Nova Scotia was in a most healthy financial condition.

And whereas, strong objections were taken at the time of the union to the financial terms thereof relating to the province of Nova Scotia, as being wholly inadequate to meet the requirements of the various services left under the management of the provincial parliament.

And whereas, after seventeen years under the union successive governments have found that the objections which were urged against the terms of union at first apply with greater force now than in the first year of the union, and the feeling of discontent with regard to the financial arrangement is now more general and more deeply fixed than ever before.

And whereas, these facts have been brought to the notice of His Excellency the Governor General and the federal ministry by an address unanimously passed by the legislative council and the house of assembly, and also by the representations of a delegation from the provincial government, without satisfactory results up to this time.

Therefore resolved, that if the government and parliament of Canada fail to make provision during the present session of said parliament to place the province of Nova Scotia in a better financial position in the union, this House affirms that it will be necessary to consider the advisability of taking steps to secure a severance of the political connection between the province and the Dominion of Canada.

That was the end of that matter for that year but in the following session no change having occurred in the position of the country, the taxation not having been lowered, and the dissatisfaction with that taxation being about the same, Mr. Fielding as reported at page 384 of the debates of the Nova Scotia league for 1886, gave the following notice of motion :

That he would move on a future day the following resolution :—

That, previous to the union of the province of Nova Scotia was in a most healthy condition ;

That, by the terms of the union the chief sources of the revenue were transferred to the federal government ;

That strong objections were taken at the time of the union to the financial terms relating to the province of Nova Scotia as wholly inadequate to meet the requirements of the various services left under the management of the provincial legislature ;

That, an appeal was made to the imperial government for repeal of the union as far as it related to this province ;

That, when they refused to assent to such repeal until a further trial of the union was had, the imperial government, in the Colonial Secretary's despatch of the 10th of June, 1868, to Lord Monk, requested that the government and parliament of Canada would modify any arrangement respecting taxation, or respecting the regulations of trade and fisheries, which might prejudice the interests of Nova Scotia ;

That, on the 6th day of October, 1868, the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, in a letter to the Hon. Joseph Howe referring to the above despatch, stated as follows :—

'The Canadian government are not only ready, but anxious to enter upon a full and frank discussion of these points, and are prepared, in case the pressure of taxation should be shown to be unequal or unjust to Nova Scotia, to relieve that pressure by every means in their power. They are also ready to discuss any financial or commercial questions that may be raised by the Nova Scotia government or yourself and representatives of Nova Scotia in the parliament of the Dominion.'

And he further said : 'You may remember that I suggested to the committee that Mr. Annand, the Finance Minister of the province, or any other gentleman selected for the purpose, should visit Ottawa and sit down with the Finance Minister here for the purpose of ascertaining whether any inequality or injustice exists, the extent of such inequality and the best remedy, and I now reiterate the assurance I then gave, that the government here will consider the question not in a rigid but in the most liberal spirit, with a desire to do even more than justice for the sake of securing the co-operation of the people of Nova Scotia in working out a new constitution. We will enter upon the inquiry whenever it will suit your convenience, and the government engage to press upon parliament, with all the influence they possess, the legislation required to carry out any financial readjustment that may be agreed to.'

That, the Dominion government and parliament have never carried out the request or desire of the imperial government and the promise of Sir John A. Macdonald as above quoted ;

That, after nineteen years under the union, successive governments have found that the objections which were urged against the terms of the union at first apply with still greater force now than in the past years of the union, and the feelings of discontent with regard to the financial arrangement is now believed by this House to be more general and more deeply fixed than ever before ;

That, Nova Scotia previous to the union had

the lowest tariff and was, notwithstanding, in the best financial condition of any of the provinces entering the union ;

That, the commercial as well as the financial condition of Nova Scotia is in an unsatisfactory and depressed condition ;

That, it seems evident that the terms of the 'British North America Act,' combined with the high tariff and fiscal laws of the Dominion are largely the cause of this unsatisfactory state of the finances and trade of Nova Scotia ;

That, there is at present no prospect that, while the province remains, upon the existing terms of union, a member of the Canadian federation, any satisfactory improvement in the foregoing respects is at all probable ;

That, previous to 1867 negotiations were in progress for a union of the maritime provinces, but were interrupted by the negotiations for the larger union ;

That, it now appears, as it did then, that the interests of the people of the several maritime provinces now incorporated with Canada are in most respects identical ;

That, the members of the branches of the legislature of Nova Scotia are of opinion, and do hereby declare their belief, that the financial and commercial interests of the people of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island would be advanced by these provinces withdrawing from the Canadian federation and uniting under one government ;

That, if it be found impossible after negotiations for that purpose, to secure the co-operation of the respective governments of the sister provinces in withdrawing from the confederation and entering instead into a maritime union, then this legislature deems it absolutely necessary that Nova Scotia, in order that its railways and other public works and services may be extended and maintained as the requirements of the people need them, its industry properly fostered, its commerce invigorated and expanded and its financial interests placed upon a sound basis such as was the case previous to confederation, should ask permission from the imperial parliament to withdraw from the union with Canada and return to the state of a province of Great Britain, with full control over all fiscal laws and tariff regulations within the province, such as prevailed previous to confederation ;

That, this House thus declares its opinion and belief in order that candidates for the suffrages of the people at the approaching elections may be enabled to place this vital and important question of separation from Canada before them for decision at the polls.

Now since that state paper was prepared by my hon. friend there has not been any lightening of the burden of Nova Scotia so far as taxation is concerned. At the very time that this discussion was being carried on the Dominion government was using its whole power and risking its existence in order to introduce that national policy which has been such an immense advantage to the province of Nova Scotia. They had at that time introduced the system of bounties on iron under which the great industries at Sydney have grown up. They had placed a tax upon the importation of coal so that the production of coal in our province has grown from a comparatively insignificant amount to large proportions the market for it having been extended to Quebec, and almost to Ontario. About that time the Dominion government was extending railways through Cape Breton and was then and ever after willing to contribute by subsidies to the construction of railways in Nova Scotia, so that there was really no ground at that time for the statement that the Dominion government was not doing what was fair for the province of Nova Scotia. The whole basis of this argument, as raised first by the member for Guysboro and as afterwards taken up by the Minister of Finance, was that Nova Scotia was being overtaxed, and was being taxed out of proportion to other portions of Canada, that the people of that province, being large purchasers of imported goods, large consumers of taxable articles, were paying more than their proportion of the whole taxes, and the agitation carried on very successfully for a term of years in that province was only put a stop to by this very resolution which I have read to the House. It was put a stop to by this resolution because as soon as that was put to the people and voted on, the absolute insincerity of the advocates of repeal was made so manifest that no man has ever dared to whisper repeal there since. Practically the whole ground of dissatisfaction was the large taxation imposed on the people by the Dominion government. They reminded their hearers of the low tariff previous to confederation, the 10 per cent tariff, and asked the people to contrast that with the 30 and 35 per cent tariff. Now what is the state of affairs ? Whereas in 1883, the year to which I have referred, the taxation per head in Nova Scotia as elsewhere in Canada was $6.60 and the amount of taxes collected by the Dominion government $2,929,000, in 1896 the last year of Conservative administration, the taxation per head had fallen to $5.46, and the people of Nova Scotia paid in that year $2,485,348, as against $2,929,000 in 1883, so that under that enlightened administrationn of the Conservative party the ground of discontent, if it could ever have existed at all, was being removed and the burdens of the people were being lightened. What has been the experience since the gentleman who led the agitation has assumed power and become the tax master, the great publican, the great tax collector of this country ? In 1903 the taxation per head had risen to $8.87 from $5,46 in 1896, and the taxation paid by us oppressed blue-noses, had risen to $4,086,710 and in 1904 under a Nova Scotia task master, as I might well say, whose little finger is thicker than the waist of the Conservative administration, who, if they punished the people with whips is now punishing them with scorpions. The contribution of Nova Scotia, which was $2,485,348 in 1896, has grown in the past

year to $4,366,915, which has gone to swell the surplus of my hon. friend. Now, I do not think I should appeal in vain if I appealed to my hon. friend to give up his portfolio in this government, and return to Nova Scotia and assist in leading the people of that province out of this condition, which, contrasted with that which prevailed in 1885, might truly be called intolerable. I am reciting these facts for the purpose of showing how enormous, how pole-wide is the difference between the promise of the Liberal part in opposition and the performance of the Liberal party in power. If it be a great and commendable thing in this year of grace 1904 that the revenue of this country has practically doubled and that the surplus of which the Finance Minister boasts has risen to the amount of $16,000,000, how can it be a good thing that the people of Nova Scotia have contributed to this result nearly four and a half millions of dollars, if the condition of affairs in 1885, when they contributed about $3,000,000, was such as to justify them in endeavouring to break up this Dominion? If the condition of things in 1883 was an intolerable grievance, justifying the armed resistance of the citizens of Nova Scotia to this Dominion, how can it be a plea upon which the hon. gentleman is going in the course of a few months to claim credit from the people of that province, that he can show that this enormously increased taxation has been taken out of their pockets? Could there be a more extraordinary spectacle than that which my hon. friend will present in placing himself at the lead of the people of Nova Scotia as their champion and banner-bearer to vaunt the administration which has increased their taxation by 50 per cent, and asking their credit for having a surplus so far ahead of those of Conservative administrations?

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). He will get it, too.

Mr. BELL. I do not think he will. However, prophecy is cheap. I have recited a few of the heads of the expenditure to show how the expenditure has increased. Now I am going to point to one or two items which will account for the enormous increase in the taxes of the people of my province items in which the people of my province are specially interested, in respect of which they contribute their full share of the taxation, and in respect of which they are justified, with every hope of success, in asking the Finance Minister for relief from their burdens; because he voiced their indignation and their sorrow in the past, and he ought to be prepared to listen to their petitions with a very favourable ear now.

My hon. friends opposite, when engaged in political discussion, spend a great deal of their time in dwelling upon two subjects, or one subject and its corollary: that is, the good times and the surplus. Now, how is the surplus got, and why did the Conservative administration not have a large surplus? Well, I think it was because, in the days when the Conservatives were in power, they took reasonable and sensible views of finance. They shaped their tariff policy so as to collect from the people a sufficient sum of money to pay the bills of the country, and as soon as they found that the receipts were in excess of the requirements of the country, they proceeded to lighten the burdens of the people; whereas this administration, which came into power in 1896, when the general improvement in business was becoming manifest, imposed new taxes, and they have maintained them in full force and effect in all the years since, when, owing to increased business and high prices, the imports of the country have greatly increased in value, and the revenue has proportionately increased. During all that period, instead of doing anything to alleviate the burdens of the taxpayers, the Finance Minister has kept the screw on in its full force, and has taken from the people a large sum of money for which he claims credit, instead of coming to them with apologies for the exacting manner in which he has treated them.

Let us take the article of tobacco, which is in this country an article of universal consumption. There are no people who use more tobacco than the shore fishermen of Nova Scotia, who are constituents of my hon. friend. The quantity of tobacco they consume is something enormous. The people along the whole shore line of the fishing counties of Nova Scotia certainly do pay more than their fair share of the tobacco taxes of this country; and the burdens of these people have been very much increased by this administration. Not because the money was needed to carry on the affairs of the country, but in order that the Finance Minister might stand up here year after year and boast of a surplus. In the four years from 1892 to 1895, the Conservative administration collected the following amounts on tobacco:

Excise—	
Tobacco	$ 9,660,843
Cigars	2,673,919
Customs—	
Tobacco and snuff	197,406
Cigars and cigarettes	918,572
Total	$13,450,740

Now, let us contrast the results in those four years with the four years from 1900 to 1903, the last four years recorded in the accounts, under the administration of the present government:

Excise—	
Tobacco	$13,878,665
Cigars	3,558,851
Customs—	
Tobacco and snuff	555,787
Cigars and cigarettes	1,539,170
Total	$19,532,473

This shows an increase in the four years years of $6,081,733. That much of the surplus is accounted for by the increased taxes in four years on the article of tobacco alone. Now, if we allow that there has been an increase in the population, and that $1,000,000 of this increase might be fairly accounted for by the increased number of persons using tobacco and cigars, these figures show that in four years this government have taken $5,000,000 out of the people of this country, or $1,250,000 a year, more than the Conservatives,—and a very large proportion of it, out of the men who live along the shore front of the province of Nova Scotia. So that it is not very hard to account for some part of their surplus. Tobacco, these hon. gentlemen may say, is an article the use of which ought to be controlled and kept in check ; but if they mean to do away with the consumption of tobacco, they will have to increase the duties a great deal more. They have not done that. They have not raised the tax to a point which will reduce consumption, but have judiciously kept it at a point which will produce the highest quantity of revenue. So that they are making use of an article, which is an article of universal consumption, as a means of raising an enormous revenue all of which goes to swell their boasted surplus.

There is another article, which is practically of universal consumption, and which is certainly not an article the use of which should be condemned by any one. That is sugar. When Mr. George E. Foster was Finance Minister and had an abundant revenue, he took the duty off sugar. He alloved the householder to buy his sugar at a reduced rate. He left the money in the people's pockets and was content to do without a surplus. He was content to leave the surplus with the people. Let us take the four years of Conservative administration and see how they handled the sugar business as compared with the administration of these gentlemen. From 1892 to 1903, the revenues derived from the duties on sugar were as follows :

1892	$190,300
1893	148,130
1894	150,955
1895	302,302
Total	$791,687

In four years of Conservative regime. Contrast that with the revenue which hon. gentlemen opposite have derived from sugar :

1900	$2,381,875
1901	2,541,191
1902	2,823,956
1903	2,714,318
Total	$10,461,340

So that the present government in four years took from the people in the shape of sugar duties $10,461,340, whereas in the corresponding four years of the late Conservative administration they only collected $791,687. In four years this administration now in office, which does not like increased taxation, which does not care to bleed the taxpayers white, which aims at relieving the burden of the hard working man, which wants to add to the comfort of our toiling citizens, which wants to enable our working people to enjoy some little luxury—this administration so full of promises has taken in the four years out of the pockets of the people $9,669,653 in the shape of sugar duties. It is not at all wonderful that these gentlemen should have a surplus, but it will be most amazingly wonderful if the people who are paying the piper will be foolish enough to be grateful for it. In these two items alone, and there are many others which represent smaller figures and could be utilized for the purpose of relieving the burdens of taxation—in these two items alone of tobacco and sugar the present government have taken in four years $15,751,386 or nearly $4,000,000 a year taken from the people unnecessarily. Their own blue-books convict them of the fact that they took that money unnecessarily. It is there in the form of a surplus. It is there in order that they may boast of it and adorn that threadbare garment of worn out policies with which they are clothed with a fringe called a surplus. I need scarcely say that this particular expenditure bears heavily on the province of Nova Scotia. Of these very items of sugar and tobacco, the people of Nova Scotia consume more in proportion to their number than the people of any other part of Canada. Unquestionably the amount of tobacco consumed by the fishermen is entirely out of proportion to that consumed by the average citizen, and a large part of this bleeding of the people is absolutely not required for the use of the country but is simply done in order to enable these gentlemen to boast of a surplus. A large part of that surplus is taken unnecessarily from the pockets of men who earn their livelihood in the most dangerous and trying avocation followed by any of the citizens of this country—men who go out to the sea to gather its harvest in the stormy waters that beat upon our Nova Scotia coast. And these men who are compelled to submit to the greatest hardships in the pursuit of their livelihood are thus being bled in order that the administration at Ottawa may boast of a surplus. We could not want more conclusive proof that this administration, instead of studying our finances from the point of view of a conservator of the interests of the people, look upon the whole thing from the standpoint of the publican and their chief aim is to exact from the people every dollar they can possibly get. What are the prospects for the future? Are

things going to be any better ? Not at all. Not until the people have an opportunity to speak will there be a change for the better. The estimates of last year and the current year show that these gentlemen have not repented of their sins. Instead they have hardened their hearts, and instead of making the task of making the cost of living any easier for the people they are going to make it harder. 'Excelsior' is their motto. Higher and higher let us climb the heights of taxation. Let us go forward and onward, and while the estimates voted last year, including those voted this session for the use of the last fiscal year, amounted to $70,000,000, they are not satisfied with that amount but are still increasing it. And that is done by these people who proclaimed that this country could be governed for $36,000,000, and that the men who did not do it for that sum were self-confessed incompetents. Yet these gentlemen are not satisfied with their expenditure of $70,000,000. They believe that another turn of the screw can be made successfully and they are going to spend $77,000,000 in the course of 1905. I shall read to the House the figures of the estimates. These figures are not mine, but have been supplied by hon. gentlemen opposite. In 1903-4 the expenditure was as follows :—

ESTIMATES.

Main—Consolidated Fund..	$56,789,514 61
Main—Capital..	11,602,387 95
Supplementary—Consol. Fund.. ..	1,568,975 41
In session, 1904-05—Capital.... ..	296,663 89
Further Suppl.—Consolidated	10,000 00
Further Suppl.—Consolidated	21,000 00
	$70,288,541 86

For the year 1904-5, the estimates voted or to be voted are as follows :

ESTIMATES, 1904-5.

Main—	
Consolidated Fund	$55,017,238 84
Capital..	7,918,100 00
Supplementary—	
Consolidated Fund	7,065,266 31
Session, 1904-05—	
Capital..	4,774,004 41
Probable addition..	3,000,000 00
	$77,774,609 56

Here we have the startling sum of practically $78,000,000, and that for a people who were represented in 1896 as staggering under an expenditure of $38,000,000. Our estimates to-day show an expenditure of more than double the amount that provoked the fury, the indignation, the sorrow, the tears almost, of these hon. gentlemen when in opposition. In ten years they have shown their sincerity, they have justified the confidence that the Liberals of the country reposed in them, by doubling an expenditure which they pronounced cruel and unnecessary and an indication of incompetence on the part of the men who were undertaking to govern the country. No hon. gentlemen have ever done more to show that they look with the most supreme contempt upon their utterances of previous years. And, no doubt they look with the same contempt upon the idiotic constituencies that could be humbugged by such promises as theirs. For what respect can they have for the voters who listened to their talk almost ten years ago and to whom they go with the record of their performances to-day and who cannot but see that they have outheroded Herod, that they have more than doubled an expenditure that they pronounced cruel, barbarous and a mark of incompetent administration. They will put their tongue in their cheek and wink at one another as they did before. What must they think of the people of Canada to whom they submit their performances of 1904 in contrast with their promises of 1894 ? These hon. gentlemen must go before the people of Canada, a land of common schools where every man knows something about arithmetic. Why, to these people who believed their promises when in opposition, the results that they have brought about will seem worse than a storm or an earthquake—they are nothing less than a cataclysm. If the taxation of former times was such a grievous injury to the people this doubling of it will seem to the people like a convulsion of nature wiping out of existence themselves and their property. It classes itself among the great misfortunes to which men and countries may be subjected. It is not an ordinary increase, not an increase in proportion to the population of the country, but abnormal, phenomenal, unheard of. I do not envy the hon. gentleman who went to the people of Canada and talked of the sins of the Conservatives with their expenditures of $38,000,000 in 1894 going back to the same people with an expenditure of practically $78,000,000 in 1904-5.

Mr. PATERSON. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) speaking of the expenditure or estimates ?

Mr. BELL. Estimates. But let us take the hon. gentleman on that point. Last year parliament voted $68,300,000. and the government spent $66,000,000.—That is their expenditure fell $2,300,000 short of the estimates. For this year, the estimates are $77,774,609.56. Allowing for a proportionate difference between expenditure and estimates, the expenditure for this year would be not less than $75,000,000. I must remind my hon. friend also that I have compared estimates throughout and that when the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) denounced the expenditures under the Conservative administration, he

also criticised the estimates and not expenditure, dealing with the matter on the same basis on which I deal with it now. Now, to show exactly what the government can do, let me point out what has been voted this session.

Total votes for the year 1904-5	$77,774,609 56
Voted this session for the year 1903-4	1,896,639 30
Total	$79,671,248 86

So, we have here practically $80,000,000 voted this session.

Mr. PATERSON. Part of that was last year's estimates.

Mr. BELL. Yes, but it is all voted this year. I think I made the matter perfectly plain.

Now, I believe this country is going to get relief. Not from the gentlemen in power, because their faces are set steadfastly towards taxes and higher expenditure. Even my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) with all his painful recollection of the impoverished condition of the people of Nova Scotia in 1896, with an intolerable expenditure of $6.60 per head, will not change his course. But the people will secure relief as soon as they are given the opportunity. For, here is a record that cannot be presented to a population brought up in the common school, acquainted with the ordinary rules of arithmetic, without making certain the condemnation of those who have made that record. These figures will appeal with the most eloquent tongue to the electors when they are called upon to decide in whose hands they shall place the control of their business affairs. Will they choose an extravagant, reckless party absolutely forgetful of their promises and pledges, ignoring everything they ever said in the way of promise, and showing no desire to relieve the people of their burden of taxation ?—a party who have not realized to the slightest degree the strain upon the taxpayers ? Or will they turn with gratitude to the party whose record in power was one of declining expenditures and reduced taxation, of sympathy with the people and desire to show that they were capable administrators by managing the country's affairs upon as small a sum as possible, while furnishing all the public works and services necessary to secure for our country its proper place among the commonwealths of the world ?

Now I need scarcely say that there are many other subjects with which I would like to deal for a short time, but I must bring my remarks to a close, for I find I have already spoken longer than I intended. Last year we called the attention of the House to the fact that, adding all the expenditures together, the estimates, the railway subsidies, the Grand Trunk Pacific—and I do not suppose we had them all—practically the government of the day had voted away money, or pledged the credit of Canada in the course of one session, to the extent of $256,000,000, or a sum equal to all the debts that have been accumulated by all the men of British race who, under the British government, have occupied any part of this Dominion or of the provinces out of which it was built up ; I say that all the debts of all the provinces and of the Dominion put into one sum would just about equal the amount of money which this administration last session voted away, or to which it pledged the credit of this country. Now this session they have done nearly as much. They have re-imposed the burden of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and have increased it ; instead of calling it now $150,000,000, we may, in view of the higher estimate of the cost as given by the Finance Minister, in view of the knowledge that we are going to guarantee a larger part of the bonds, and a larger portion of the interest, and for a longer period of years, we may fairly enough call it to-day $175,000,000 as the burden that must be taken up by the people before that project is carried to completion. Then we have 471 miles of railway to which bonuses of $3,200 per mile are to be paid this session ; adding 10 per cent of that to those which will exceed in cost $15,000 per mile, we have a sum of $1,657,920. Then there is the bridge near the Premier's old college at L'Assomption, $51,000 ; in all, $1,708,000 voted away this year in the railway subsidies. Then there are in the estimates over $79,000,000 ; there is the sum of the bounties which this government has given with the greatest liberality. They give bounties to nearly everything ; iron, steel, silver, lead, binder twine, oil, all that at the expense of the taxpayers ; there will be a million and a half dollars paid by the people of this country in bounties. Then there are the enormous rebates. I have a table here showing the rebates which I will give in order to show the extent to which this government are assisting various industries, and I do not know but that we on this side might regard it as a merit in hon. gentlemen opposite who were so eloquent in opposition in their desire to cut off every kind of assistance to any industry which was given at the expense of the rest of the country ; and we find that these gentlemen have travelled very far in the direction that was followed by the Conservatives. I subjoin the following table, giving the details of the bounties and rebates :

BOUNTY—BARS—STEEL INGOTS—IRON PIG.

—	Pig Iron.	Steel Ingots.	Bars puddled.
	$	$	$
1898	165,654	54,412	7,706
1899	187,954	74,644	17,511
1900	238,296	64,360	10,121
1901	351,259	100,058	16,703
1902	693,109	84,610	17,710
1903	670,340	721,924	9,541
	2,306,612	1,100,008	79,292
Grand total, 1898-1903			3,485,912
1904—Add Bounty, Iron and Steel			922,104
1903—Lead Bounties			4,380
			4,412,396

DUTIES RETURNED AND DRAWBACKS.

—	1901.	1902.	1903.	Total.
	$	$	$	$
Duties returned	228,875	203,399	243,081	675,355
Drawback	138,948	327,650	152,336	618,934
Grand total				1,294,289

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I beg to sum up the foregoing arguments in the following motion :—

That all the words after the word 'that' in the main motion be left out and the following substituted therefor :

While the total taxes collected for the year ending 30th of June, 1897, were $28,626.11, viz.:

Customs $19,478,247.19
Excise 9,170,378.92

(Public Accounts, 1903, page 54).

Or $5.57 per head of population, notwithstanding the pledges of the Liberal party in opposition to reduce taxation, the total taxes collected for the year ending June 30th, 1903, were $49,015,505.90, viz..

Customs $37,001,726.90
Excise 12,013,779.00

or $8.87 per head of population.

And further it appears from the statement of the Finance Department that the total taxation for the year ending 30th June, 1904, is $53,346,620.06, viz.:

Customs $40,449,608.57
Excise 12,647,011.49

and when full returns are received may reach a total of $53,800,000, or $9.57 per head of population.

That the government maintains the expenditure of the country at a figure out of proportion to the increase of population so that the total expenditure for the year ending June 30, 1904, as stated in the Budget Speech by the Minister of Finance, has reached the vast sum of $66,000,000, viz.:

Consolidated account $54,500,000
Capital account.. 11,500,000

exceeding the total expenditure for the year ending June 30, 1897, by $23,027,244.

That the total estimates for the year ending June 30, 1904, are $77,774,609.56, and that of these estimates nearly $15,000,000 have been submitted on or after July 25th, when a careful consideration of the items is no longer possible.

This House regrets that notwithstanding the pledges of the Liberal party in opposition to reduce taxation and expenditure, the government is maintaining a policy of high and steady increasing taxation and expenditure, and is thus setting an example of wasteful and extravagant management of a character which must work serious injury to the people and interests of Canada.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, I believe it was Abraham Lincoln who was credited with the well known observation that you may fool all of the people some of the time, that you may fool some of the people all the time, but that you cannot fool all the people all the time. It occurs to me that that which Mr Lincoln regarded as impossible is what my hon. friends opposite undertake in these annual motions with respect to the public expenditures. Year after year we go through this proceeding, which, so far as hon. gentlemen are concerned, I might almost describe, without using the word in an offensive sense, as farcical. Each succeeding year, at the same period near the end of the session, some hon. gentleman on the other side of the House undertakes to present a dreadful picture of the financial condition of this country. He rolls up all the possible votes he can find, he searches the estimates, the statutes, the railway subsidies and everything of this kind, he rolls them up into one tremendous whole, he puts them up before the public eye, and he says : See these vast expenditures that the country is being committed to, see how extravagant and reckless the government of this country is, see how the finances of the country are going to the dogs ! The hon. gentleman who formerly led the opposition, and who is now no longer a member of this House, Sir Charles Tupper, began this policy in the year 1896, before this government were well settled in their seats, by presenting a picture of the dreadful prospect in store for this country at the hands of a Liberal administration, a picture of reckless financing, of ruin to the public credit and of destruction to the financial reputation of the country. Each year towards the close of the session some hon. gentleman on the other side of the House repeats something like the same story, adding these extraordinary statements as to the expenditures that are about to be made, and calling upon the country to witness that this Dominion of Canada is in a dreadful position in regard to its finances, or will be at the time at which the current year shall end. But as each year rolls around, as the end of the year is reached, as stock is taken and as the accounts are closed, these

hon. gentlemen are brought face to face with the very gratifying fact that the finances of Canada have been flourishing to a greater degree than at any previous period in our history. And then, as the session rolls on, and we reach the last week, again we have the same old story repeated, the same magnified account of the position which the government are in, and the same dire predictions of all that is going to happen to the Dominion finances under the administration of a Liberal government. I would remind my hon. friends opposite of the old fable of the boy who cried 'wolf, wolf.' He cried 'wolf, wolf' when there was no wolf, but when the wolf did come we know what happened. If, perchance, as years roll on, this government should at any time become reckless and extravagant, and if hon. gentlemen opposite should wish to give the alarm to the country, they will be reminded that they cried 'wolf, wolf,' in times of prosperity, and they will be told that they are not to be trusted when it comes to the criticism of the public finances. I said that there was something farcical—I use the word in no discourteous sense—in the course of my hon. friends opposite, and when I said that I had in my mind the contrast between the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite as manifested in solemn resolution and speech, and the policy which they have manifested by their course throughout the session. Have these hon. gentlemen opposite, who are now the advocates of economy, made one proposition for the reduction of taxation? Have they made one proposition for the reduction of expenditure? If you searched with a microscope the records of this session you might find some place where they asked to strike out a dollar and a half, but I do not think you could find any considerable amount which they have asked to be struck out. I cannot at the moment recall any motion in which they have proposed to strike out of the estimates during the present session any sum of money. If they have made some motion of that kind, I venture to say the amount involved was very small.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was the hon. gentleman here the other night when a motion was made to strike out $60,000?

Mr. FIELDING. Did the hon. gentleman divide the committee on the question of striking that out of the estimates?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, then I am willing to be corrected to the extent of $60,000. Then let it be known throughout the length and breadth of the land that out of this enormously large appropriation, which hon. gentlemen place anywhere at from $200,000,000 to $250,000,000 per annum they did, on one occasion, move to strike out $60,000 I want them to receive credit for that, and I trust that none of our friends will hereafter make that statement, but will recognize the fact that to the extent of ninety-nine per cent of these estimates they are allowed to go without challenge, and that only about one per cent, a very fragmentary amount as compared with the whole, is challenged. For every case in which my hon. friends opposite can show that they proposed to reduce a single dollar of the expenditure, we will show proposals to increase the expenditure of the country by $10 coming from the other side of the House. We have found again and again, on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, demands for increased expenditures. I need not go into the minor branches, but we are constantly reminded in the criticism of the estimates that in some part of the public service there is need of a larger expenditure. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) did me the courtesy of handing me yesterday afternoon a copy of his motion. He handed it to me during a friendly conversation we had in the corridor. I came into the House five minutes after I had obtained this motion of my hon. friend, and I heard one of the chief lieutenants of the opposition standing in his place opposite me denouncing the government for not spending more money on the militia of the country. I heard him with scorn and indignation say that we were only spending thirty-seven cents per head of the population on the militia of the country, and that there were only two other countries that were spending so little—Corea and Costa Rica. My hon. friend from Pictou, when dealing with this resolution, had conveniently forgotten that the echoes of the voice of my hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) had hardly left the room, wherein he demanded that we should expend larger sums on the militia. These hon. gentlemen, on a general vote, condemn our expenditures, but again and again their voices are loudest in demanding that we shall increase our expenditure. I see my genial friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) sitting opposite me. He is going to vote for this resolution declaring that we are spending too much money, but my hon. friend accompanied a deputation the other day to this government to demand a new expenditure upon a great public work which is estimated to cost $100,000,000.

An hon. MEMBER. He will not vote for this motion.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend may vote for it, because he is a good party man, but I know what his opinion would be. Hon. gentlemen opposite, though it may be to a lesser degree and in respect to smaller sums, are constantly demanding that this government shall make further appropriations. Again and again these demands have been made. I remember a year ago, when making a similar speech, I had occasion to remind one of my hon. friends opposite that his chief grievance was that we would not spend

a great deal of money in sending out an expedition to search for the North Pole, and we were condemned for not doing it. All along the line there have been demands for increased expenditure, and hon. gentlemen opposite are not able, except in the one case to which the hon. member for Leeds has referred, to challenge the propriety of any of these expenditures.

Mr. TAYLOR. What about the Grand Trunk Pacific ?

Mr. FIELDING. The Grand Trunk Pacific ? Why the hon. gentlemen have outheroded Herod there. After denouncing the Grand Trunk Pacific, they propose another scheme for a few days which would have enormously added to the debt of this country. I do them the justice to say that after a very short time they became ashamed of it and it is never mentioned now.

> Oh, no, they never mention it,
> It's name is never heard.

As a substitute for it we had our hon. friends recently declaring that they would build the whole of this Grand Trunk Pacific as a government work. As a government work it would probably cost a great deal of money and my hon. friends can hardly make a reputation for economy by declaring that they want to build the Grand Trunk Pacific as a government work. My hon. friend (Mr. Bell) who has moved this motion has constantly spoken about the enormous increase of the expenditure. He says that from year to year the expenditure is increasing. Well it would not be a remarkable condition in a country like Canada if the expenditure did always increase. But as a matter of fact my hon. friend is not correct. In the last blue-books which have been placed on the table of this House with regard to the public expenditure we find that in 1902, our gross expenditure of all classes aggregated 63,970,799, and in 1903 our gross expenditure of all classes aggregated $61,746,591. Thus according to the public accounts of the last year that have been laid before the House there was in that year not an increase of expenditure but a decrease in expenditure to the extent of $2,224,000. My hon. friend referred last year to these enormous estimates and he proposed to treat them all as something coming on us immediately ; and he made them out—I was going to say about two millions, but he has gone a little better to-day in his figures and says $250,000,000. That was the tremendous bill of fare he offered, the dreadful alarm he sounded a year ago, before the intelligent people of this country. What must be their astonishment when they find that the year has ended and although the accounts are not finally made up to the last cent, I have been able to announce that instead of spending the enormous sum of $250,000,000 or anything like it, the actual expenditure for the year was $66,000,000. My hon. friend tried to scare the life out of the people last year with his dreadful story of a probable expenditure of $250,000,000. My hon. friend may say that he never said it was all going to be spent in one year, but he was not very particular to explain that, and I think that many who heard him or read that speech would conclude it was proposed to spend $200,000,000 or $250,000,000 in one year. These expenditures to which my hon. friend refers covered a number of years. Take for example the expenditure for railway subsidies. Some of these appropriations are not expended at all. In many cases the companies are not able to do the work promptly and there is delay. Occasionally they have not been able to do the work at all, and the appropriations have lapsed. But in the meantime they are placed on the statute-books. My hon. friends make the most of them as a large and alarming expenditure. Now it is worth while bearing in mind that the large revenue which we are constantly enjoying is not received entirely from taxes. My hon. friend of course, is aware that we receive besides what are called taxes, that is the customs and excise duties, very considerable sums from other sources, and it is an interesting fact that the proportion of our revenue which we are taking from the people to-day by way of taxes is smaller than it was a few years ago. In 1890 the taxes collected were 79·21 per cent of the revenue. In 1896 the taxes were 75·81 of the revenue. In 1903, the last year for which we have exact figures, the taxes were 74·22 per cent of the revenue, which goes to show that our large expenditures are leading to large returns in other branches which are not to be regarded as taxation. That which we receive from the post office and railways and public works is not in the ordinary sense of the word, taxation, but payments for services rendered, and these figures show that we are getting a larger percentage of our revenue from these other sources than our predecessors obtained. Then it is not for a moment to be presumed that increased amount of taxation means an increased burden on the people or an evidence that the country is suffering any serious disadvantage. An increase in the rate of taxation would be a burden to the people, but the fatal error of the figures of my hon. friend is that he deals only with the amount of the taxation of the country. If the people were poor, as in 1895-6, if they were not able to buy the goods which they desire, the amount of taxation that would be paid would be much lower than it is now. But the enlarged taxation to which he refers, that is the enlargement of the volume of taxation or the amount of revenue collected, is one of the evidences of the growth and progress and prosperity of this country. Up to a certain point a man is obliged to pay taxes. A man must up to the point of

a reasonable living expense, pay the taxes on the things he consumes, but when you pass that point, which I suppose is not the same with different people, one man's needs not being the same as another's, the man becomes his own assessor, he taxes himself pretty much as he wishes. He then elects out his greater prosperity to buy many things which he otherwise would not buy. He indulges in greater comforts, in luxuries, and he does this with the knowledge that he must contribute to the revenue of the country. Now since he is his own assessor, the increased taxes he pays, instead of being evidence of his enduring a burden, is one of the evidences of his greater prosperity and his better position as a citizen of this Dominion. My hon. friend said that under the late government the tendency was towards a reduction of taxation, by which, as he explained, he meant that the rate of taxation per head was falling under the late government and as he described it that was a very happy position. The country according to his view would be most happy when the rate of taxation collected per head was lowest. In 1899, the rate of taxation as he computes it, per head of population, that is the revenue collected from customs, was $5.11. In 1895, it had fallen to $3.50 per head. According to the argument of my hon. friend that should have been a happy and prosperous year for Canada in 1895, because the taxation of the people for customs fell from $5.01 in 1889 to $3.50 in 1895. That was the happy year for Canada if my hon. friend's theory is correct. In 1896 the figures were a shade higher, $3.90. In 1904, the revenue collected from customs, as far as we can compute at present, is about $7.50 per head. My hon. friend treats that increase of taxation of $3.50 per head in 1895 to $7.50 per head in 1904 as a great evil of the country. Which year would Canada most gladly have, the year 1895 with a taxation collected of $3.50 per head, or the year 1904 with a taxation of $7.58 per head?

My hon. friend must see that his whole argument is fallacious to the last degree. The condition of prosperity which he describes would be a condition of adversity, a condition of distress. Will any reasonable man say that the condition of Canada in 1895, when the people paid only $3.50 per head, was as good for all purposes—as good for the present, as good for the people, as good for the future making of this country—as the year 1904, when we confess that we collected $7.58 per head? That is the argument that runs all through my hon. friend's speech. He claims that the increased amount paid by the people is an evidence of burden. I deny that, and I say that the increased taxation which the people have paid is one of the evidences of their prosperity; and, far from regretting it, we should rejoice that the people have not fallen back into the dark days of 1895, when they were only able to pay $3.50 per head.

There is another view of the matter which I should like to present. My hon. friend points out that the taxation per head collected by the late government was less than that which we have collected. We frankly admit that that is so, and we have given some reasons for it. But there is another reason that might be given. If we had pursued the same policy as the late government in a very important matter, we might have got along with less money. The late government collected less money per head, but plunged the country into a heavy debt. They added enormously to the public debt of the country, and left that as a burden on posterity. We have not done that. To the best of our knowledge and belief, we have not added one dollar to the public debt of Canada. The figures given in the Budget speech are not final; but, so far as we can judge at present, we believe it will be found at the close of the year, when the accounts are made up, and the record of our eight years is completed, that substantially there has been no addition to the public debt—that if there is any, it will be a mere trifle. Is it fair to compare the record of a government which out of its revenues carries on enormous public works and pays its way, with the record of a government which took less taxes from the people, but put a burden upon them which will last as long as grass grows and water runs? If the Conservative government had paid their way, they would have increased the taxation enormously. I do not say they should have imposed enough taxes to pay their way; perhaps they were wise in not doing it. But they must not make it a virtue that they do not increase the taxation when what they did was to add largely to the public debt of the country.

This government, they say, has spent money lavishly. We admit that we have spent liberally. On railway subsidies, on public works, on civil government, in every department of a great and growing country there has been and necessarily must be some increase. It would be a rare thing if you could carry on the government of a country in these days of progress without some increase of expenditure in the various departments. We have spent money on railways, on canals, on great public works; we have paid the cost of sending the boys to South Africa; we have paid every ordinary expenditure, every special expenditure, every capital expenditure, bounties, railway subsidies—everything that could be gathered into the net—and paid it all out of these taxes which my hon. friend talks about; and we come out at the end of the eight years with the record that whereas in 1896 the net public debt of the country stood at $50.61 per head, if our anticipations of last year's operations prove to be correct, as we

know they substantially will, we shall stand with a debt of $46.31 per head. So I have shown that the increased taxation to which my hon. friend refers is simply the increased volume of money which, as my hon. friend the Minister of Customs said on one occasion, is generously offered by a grateful public, which steps up to the custom house and asks the Minister of Customs to be good enough to receive this money and apply it to the public affairs of this Dominion.

But, Sir, the total volume of the taxation is of no value for the purpose of comparison in the manner in which it has been used by my hon. friend, because, as I have endeavoured to show, far from being an evil, it is one of the evidences of our prosperity. But we may with great propriety consider what the rate of taxation has been, and there we are able to meet my hon. friend. With the exception of one or two items, which are chiefly, if not wholly articles of luxury, we have reduced the taxation all along the line. The hon. gentleman may search all the items of our tariff with his microscope, and he will find that the items in which there has been any increase of duty are very few, and chiefly articles of luxury, while there has been a large reduction in the rates of duty on articles generally. Sometimes hon. gentlemen have charged us with not reducing the rates of duty, and we had to go over the tariff item by item and show the large reductions we had made. But let us take the total. In 1896, when this government came into office, the customs duties collected on dutiable goods amounted to an average of 29·942 per cent, whereas in 1903, the last year for which the figures are complete, the customs duties on dutiable goods amounted to an average of 27·064 per cent, a reduction of nearly 3 per cent.

Mr. CLANCY. That includes the preference ?

Mr. FIELDING. The rates of duty actually paid by the people, no matter where the goods came from. Taking the total imports the average rate of duty paid in the year 1896 was 19·109 per cent, and the average rate in 1903 was 16·468 per cent, or a reduction of about 2½ per cent ; and yet my hon. friend would convey the impression that this government has increased the taxation of the country. The rates of taxation have not been increased ; they have been reduced ; but the people, owing to their greater prosperity, have been able to buy much more largely than before, and as a consequence they have cheerfully paid more money into the general treasury, even at the lower rates.

My hon. friend said that the late government feeling that they had more money than they needed, had reduced the duty on sugar. The late government never had more money than they needed. If they had, they would have applied it to paying the current expenditure instead of adding $6,500,000 per annum to the debt of the country. My hon. friend said the late government had made sugar free. There never was free sugar under the late government.

Mr. BELL. I never said they made sugar free. In fact, I gave the figures of the duties they collected on sugar in those years. I said they had reduced the duty on sugar.

Mr. FIELDING. I think my hon. friend said that they had taken the duties off sugar. My hon. friend probably said a little more than he meant, because as a matter of fact they did not take the duty off sugar. They took the duty off raw sugar, and left the duty on refined sugar, which is the sugar the people use. That duty was reduced, but it is a mistake to say that the late government took the duty off sugar, or that the duty is higher to-day than it was under the late government. This government has made a change in the sugar duties, and it has made that change for two purposes. One purpose was to change the scale so that instead of a flat rate on all classes of refined, irrespective of quality, the duty should vary and operate the same as an ad valorem duty. Therefore we adopted what is called the polariscopic test, whereby the rate of duty varies according to the strength of the sugar, and that is regarded as the most scientific method of levying the tax. Then we made a change for the purpose of granting a preference to the British West Indies, and for a time there was an increase in the duties levied on sugar. But I am advised by the customs officials—although the figures are not in a condition to use in any volume —that while in 1896 the duty on refined sugar was $1.14 per hundred pounds, the returns of last year will show that the people are only paying $1.11½ per hundred pounds. So that we have actually reduced the duty on sugar and not increased it. To prevent any misunderstanding, let me say that I am now speaking of the duty on refined sugar. But raw sugar is not used by our people. There was a time, even in my memory, when the brown sugar of the West Indies was largely used by the people, but that time passed away to a large extent even before the present government came into power ; and with a better condition of the people, with the people getting higher wages than before, they do not use the West India sugar in its raw condition, and even the poorer classes consume very largely the products of our Canadian refineries. Therefore, so far as the consumer is concerned, we need not bother about the duty on raw sugar. The refiner has to look after that. And on the refined sugar the duty now is $1.11½ per hundred pounds as compared with $1.14 per hundred pounds in 1896.

My hon. friend had something to say about tobacco. He wanted to know what my constituents were going to say about the increased duty on that article. Well, my

constituents have spoken on that subject. There was no question more discussed in the the last election campaign than the duty on tobacco. We had to acknowledge there was an increase, but we went to the people and explained that there are things more important than the duty on tobacco, and that although there was an increase in that duty, the increase was imposed in part for the purpose of guarding against any loss in revenue, arising from the changes we were making in the tariff, and also for the purpose of encouraging an important industry in Canada. And I am glad to say that Canadian tobacco is being more largely used by our people and they are beginning to appreciate it more than they did before. I was able to show to the people of that section, as I would to any other section of intelligent people, that the duty on tobacco was only one item, and that if they would look over the whole list they would see that the policy of the government actually decreased the taxation of the people. And should I have occasion to go down and discuss the question with the people of my constituency, and should I happen to be asked why we put an increased duty on tobacco, I could very well reply: You can well afford to pay an increased duty on tobacco because of the many things this government have done for the people, and no better evidence can be found of what this government have done than in Nova Scotia and in my own constituency. I might say to them that whereas from year to year in the time of the late government, they sought in vain the conveniences of railway communication which were to be found in most parts of the Dominion, whereas in those days these two counties on the sea shore had no railways, all that is changed. We can go now to a part of that country by railway and the day is close at hand when the two counties will have a railway running through them. And if there is no more serious charge against the government than the increased duty on tobacco, I will be able to show in that as well as other parts of the Dominion, by the general record of our administration, that the condition of the people has been improved, that higher wages are paid the labouring classes, that progress is made on every side, and all this will more than counterbalance that increase of duty. But my hon. friends opposite have saved us the trouble of meeting that charge. Only a few days ago they brought forward and voted for a resolution asking that the duty on tobacco be increased. After these hon. gentlemen had gone down into the fishing sections and denounced the government for its policy on the tobacco question, after they had denounced it for increasing the duty, we had the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) coming forward with a motion declaring that the protection we are giving Canadian tobacco is not large enough and that the duty on foreign tobacco should be increased.

Mr. F. D. MONK. This is the second time my hon. friend has misrepresented me. I advocated last year an expenditure for the sending of an expedition to the North Pole and at the same time I advocated reducing the grant of $1,000,000 for importing useless immigrants into this country, spreading disease and making competition to our working men. In the second place, I advocated a change of the duties upon tobacco. I advocated an increase of the custom duties and a reduction of the excise duties, which would simply change the nature of the burden and develop a patriotic industry. But developing a patriotic industry is something my hon. friend does not understand.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know that my hon. friend is the embodiment of patriotism, or that he is so regarded by the hon. gentlemen with whom he associates. We need not, however, get into a discussion on that point. I am content to take his statement that he was advocating an increase of the customs duties on tobacco.

Mr. MONK. And a reduction of excise.

Mr. FIELDING. It is not the excise on Canadian tobacco that my hon. friends opposite have been denouncing in the maritime province, but the increased duty on foreign tobacco. And my hon. friend advocated an increase in that customs duty.

Mr. MONK. And a reduction of the excise.

Mr. FIELDING. Exactly. But we are not discussing the excise. The excise duty is not discussed among our fishermen. When the hon. gentleman's friends go down by the sea and denounce the government on this tobacco question, what they complain of is the increase in the customs duty. It does not always help us to be able to show that we are building up a Canadian industry and that there is a better quality of Canadian tobacco now being produced. These hon. gentlemen opposite will not give us credit for that, but complain of our increase of the customs duties. We advise our people to use the Canadian tobacco and I am glad to say they are using it largely, but many of them do not like it. The complaint of our opponent has been that we have increased the duty on the foreign article.

Mr. MONK. I want the excise to be diminished, so that the Canadian article will be cheaper.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not objecting to any encouragement given the Canadian tobacco industry. That industry has received more encouragement under this government than it ever did from hon. gentlemen opposite, and the Canadian tobacco industry

is developing in a way it never did before. While it was depending on hon. gentlemen opposite it made but small progress.

These hon. gentlemen complain of taxation, but is not their whole policy to increase the burdens of the country? Is not that their policy when they advocate increased protection? Is there anybody so foolish as to deny that increased protection means increased taxation? It may mean increased taxation and increased revenue, or it may mean increased taxation, not for the benefit of the revenue, but for the benefit of the manufacturers. But in either case it means increased taxation. How these hon. gentlemen can call us to account for increased taxation under the circumstances, is something I cannot understand.

In dealing with the expenditure my hon. friend spoke of the increased cost of the census. Well, that has been fully discussed already, and I do not think it would be wise to occupy much time with it. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) who has charge of that department, has entered very fully into that question, and has shown how the census which has recently been taken differs in character from the census of the previous period. He has shown that the volume of information is much larger and that there was necessarily an increase of expenditure. That has been fully explained, and I will not dwell upon it. My hon. friend referred to expenditures on public works. But I would remind him that, while he denounced these expenditures generally, it is seldom indeed that he or his friends can be found to challenge any particular item of expenditure and move to strike it out.

Now, what are the other branches in which there has been an increase? For, of course we admit that there has been a great increase. But many of these increases are only in appearance. Some of them are only cross-entries and so mere matters of book-keeping, while some bring back revenues vastly in excess of the increase of expenditure. For instance, we increased the payment for sinking fund by $565,000 in 1903 as compared with 1896. But that is money which simply passes from one pocket to the other. It comes from the ordinary revenue and goes into investment. On Railways and Canals chargeable to collection, the increase in 1903, as compared with 1896, was $3,395,000. That swells the total expenditure on which hon. gentlemen dwell so strongly. But they forget to say there has been an increase of revenue on this account of $3,334,000, so that the actual increase on that account is not very great. We have expended on quarantine, as my hon. friend said, more than our predecessors. But I am satisfied that the government would not be condemned for that by members of the House who understand the matter. Why, we have heard some hon. members in this House complain because we have not shown greater diligence, because we have not made a larger organization to prevent the bringing in of diseased immigrants and other persons. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has this moment said that he advocated a reduction on the expenditure of immigration. I shall have a word to say about that in a moment. But, if immigrants and other persons are to come into our country, there must be proper arrangements for the protection of the public health by means of quarantine. I do not think that any one who understands the question will complain of the government on that score. We have expended a large sum on the Yukon; no such sum was expended by the late government. This expenditure of ours in the Yukon is added to the other expenditures to swell the total, but these hon. gentlemen who dwell upon that increased expenditure always forget to tell us that for every dollar we have spent on the Yukon practically we have got a dollar back. In fact to a recent date we have made money upon the Yukon. I do not recollect what is shown by the more recent statements, but, I believe that, except for some expenditures on capital account, the Yukon has returned every dollar that has been spent upon it. So, while hon. gentlemen try to make this expenditure a means of alarming the country, we have made it the means of opening up and developing a territory that was unknown to them when they were in power. We have expended more on fisheries. As between 1896 and 1903, there has been an increase of about $100,000. Are we to be condemned for that? Have we not heard hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House, during this very session, express the opinion that larger expenditures should be made upon fisheries, that experiments and investigations should be carried on in order to enable us to develop and utilize the fisheries of British Columbia and the maritime provinces? Where is the member of this House who will vote to reduce the expenditure devoted to the development of the fishing industry of this country? We have increased the expenditure on customs by $332,696 in 1903 as compared with 1896. But that increased expenditure represents the cost of collecting an increased revenue amounting to no less than $17,168,447. Does anybody expect that we are to collect a revenue of $37,000,000 in customs in 1903 for the same amount that was expended in collecting a revenue of $19,000,000 in 1896? We have increased to a small extent the expenditure on excise. The expenditure in 1903 was $8,114 more than that of 1896. But the receipts during that time have increased to the extent of $4,087,773. Does anybody mean to say that you are going to collect $12,000,000 in 1903, as against $7,900,000 in 1896, and yet add nothing to the expenses of collection? We

have increased the expenditure on post offices between 1896 and 1903 by $440,167. But the receipts of that department, in the meantime, have increased to the extent of $1,430,000. We have increased the expenditure on militia, as between 1896 and 1903, to the extent of $826,295. These sums are all given in the grand total which my hon. friend rolls up with a view to alarming the country. Yet, only yesterday, as I have said, we had the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) complaining, not that we expend too much on the militia, but that we expend only 37 cents per head when we ought to be spending at least eight or ten times that amount. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has referred to the expenditure on immigration. If there is anything that this government should be proud of it is the policy of the Minister of the Interior with regard to immigration and the results of that policy in bringing immigrants into this country. I am glad that my hon. friend made allusion to that. It is true that in 1896 they expended on immigration $130,000, and that in 1903 we spent $642,913, an increase under this administration of more than half a million dollars. But, for the little that hon. gentlement opposite spent in 1896 they had nothing to show, except that certain immigrants came into the country and travelled through our country to the United States. To-day we can point with pride to a record of 100,000 people coming into the Northwest every year, adding vastly to the wealth of the territories and to the wealth of the whole Dominion. When my hon. friend speaks of the expenditure on immigration as something to be condemned, I tell him it is something that every member of this government and every supporter of this government means to speak of from this day on with the utmost pride. We have increased the allowance for the government of the Northwest Territories. In 1896, the sums which the late government provided for the carrying on of the government of the Northwest Territories amounted to $330,702. We plead guilty to having appropriated for that service last year $802,466, an increase of $471,000. We are arraigned by this resolution for having expended that money. We are told that these expenditures are lavish and extravagant. But it is useless to talk about these expenditures in bulk ; it is only by going over them item by item as I have done that you can discuss them intelligently. And, when we go to the people of the Northwest Territories, and tell them that, having due regard to the increasing population of that country, recognizing the great needs of that country for development, and voicing the determination of the people and parliament of Canada to deal liberally and generously with the new territory, we do not intend to apologize in the face of the hon. gentleman's motion, for an increase of nearly half a million in the grants to the Northwest Territories.

My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) did me the honour to allude to some discussion which took place in the Nova Scotia legislature some years ago. He represented that I had alleged that Nova Scotia was not then getting her fair share of Dominion taxation. Well, without entering into the question as at that time, I think it can be fairly said that Nova Scotia to-day is receiving a fair share of the taxation that is collected.

Mr. HAGGART. Hear, hear.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) endorses that. I am glad I have his endorsation, and I want to have his words taken down in 'Hansard. I am going to find them valuable.

Mr. HAGGART. So am I.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman says, 'so am I.' The object is plain. While my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) will seek to convey the impression to the people of Nova Scotia that they are being burdened with taxation without receiving a fair share of the revenue, my hon. friend from South Lanark and others will go into Ontario to try and show that Nova Scotia is getting too much. All these things are foolish. I did not say that one province is getting too much or that it is getting too little. This government is willing to consider the needs and claims of all the provinces. In one department one province gets more, and in another department another province gets more. But if you examine the matter fairly you will find it is about even, and that each and every part of the Dominion is receiving recognition in accordance with its needs.

My hon. friend and I threshed out these questions in Nova Scotia many years ago. I do not know whether he or I have the more painful recollection of it. He thinks I have a painful recollection. I do not know that either of us should be pained ; but I am satisfied that if pain there is on the part of either one of us, my hon. friend will share as much of it as I do. At all events, we threshed these questions out year after year, we took the verdict of the people of Nova Scotia upon them, and that verdict never failed to be in accordance with the policy which I endeavoured to pursue. My hon. friend has referred to the finances of the province. I tell him that at that time the government of which he was for a short time a member, left the financial affairs of that province in a condition which was viewed with considerable anxiety and distrust. But under the administration of the Liberal government the condition of the province was improved, order was brought out of chaos, the finances were advanced, new projects were started, projects which the hon. gentleman's friends fought to the utmost, but projects which have been the

means of restoring that province as to its financial affairs until to-day it is one of the most prosperous provinces of the Dominion of Canada. Let me say that the Nova Scotia Liberals having brought their own province into a better financial position, have been glad to have an opportunity, as my friends from that province will say, to come to Ottawa and assist their friends in the other provinces in bringing the Dominion out of the slough of despond in which it had been placed by the government of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Last year I reminded my hon. friend, as I must do again, that he fails to realize the great change that has been brought about in this country. The Canada of to-day is not the Canada of 1896. The Canada of 1896 would hardly be recognized by people who look upon the new Canada that has grown up under a Liberal administration. Why, in 1896, in every part of this Dominion, there was a condition—shall I say of depression? That is too strong a word. There was a condition of discouragement, the people were not satisfied with their condition under the advantages which hon. gentlemen alleged they gave them as a consequence of their policy. It must be said that the condition of Canada in 1896 under the Conservative party was not a satisfactory one. Some progress indeed had been made; you cannot prevent a country like this from making some progress, but it was very small. Just take a few items, they are not new, they have been given before, but they are never old. The Canada that he speaks of, the Canada of 1896, which he used for a comparison, had a total trade of $239,000,000; the new Canada which has grown up under the Liberal administration has a total trade of $470,000,000. The Canada of that date had deposits in the savings banks and chartered banks of $183,000,000; the new Canada of to-day has deposits of $423,000,000. We might go through all the items of trade and commerce. I have dealt with them before, but I ask my hon. friend, in making these comparisons, to remember that the Canada of 1896 is a vastly different country from the Canada of to-day. This government have recognized the changing conditions; and I have no doubt that the legislation which we have introduced has in some degree—in how large a degree may be a matter of debate—but it has in some considerable degree been one of the instrumentalities by which this greater progress has been made. My hon. friend must remember that in making these comparisons he shuts his eyes to the old condition as compared with the new. He must remember that under a Liberal administration Canada has made enormous progress, and if we have expended these moneys we have expended them to the advantage and development of the country; we have expended them also for reasons that will commend themselves to sound financiers. If hon. gentlemen opposite spent little money, they spent more than they had and ran into debt; the lesser sum that they spent was extravagance; the more that we spend is economy, because we have lived within our means.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). I assure you and the government, Mr. Speaker, that I am not going to occupy the time of this House at this period of the session at any length, all being desirous as we are that the work of the session may be brought to a close. But there are some things that should be said, and I shall say them as briefly as possible, adverting to some of the statements made by the Finance Minister who has just taken his seat. The Finance Minister told the old story that is said to have been originated by Abraham Lincoln, about fooling all the people part of the time, or all the time. I thought the story was a very apt one coming from the hon. gentleman, and I came to the conclusion that while the Finance Minister, with his figures, has been fooling the people of this country for a part of the time during the last eight years, he must now come to the conclusion that he is not going to be able to fool all the people all the time. He warns us against crying wolf, wolf, when, as he says, there was no wolf. Well, to my mind the people of this country are alive to the fact that the wolf is already upon us.

The hon. gentleman brought out the old worn out argument that we on this side of the House were not sincere in our protestations against the enormously increased expenditure of which we have heard so much this afternoon. He told us that whilst these many millions had been voted, practically we had not challenged a single item in all these estimates. Had he been in the House, as my hon. friend from Leeds remarked, he would have heard a lengthy discussion and would have witnessed a division on one very important item which we thought was altogether an improper item in the expenditure of this government. But allow me, Mr. Speaker, to remind the Finance Minister of something that he knows just as Well as I do. It is not the practice of an opposition to divide the House on expenditures in the estimates; it was not the practice when the Liberals were in opposition for eighteen years prior to 1896. Out of the $603,000,000 of estimates voted during those eighteen years, the opposition of those days contested only $437,074. Our duty as an opposition is sufficiently discharged when we criticise these estimates, when we point out to the country that these items are not required, that these expenditures are either improper or extravagant. It is not our duty to divide the House from time to time, or to take a vote, knowing that the government would call in their supporters and vote us down on every occasion. But we have sufficiently discharged our duty when we have drawn forcible attention to the

fact that these expenditures are improper expenditures. I am aware of the fact that there are yet about $15,000,000 of estimates to be voted. How are we, in the course of one or two days, going to be able even to criticise those estimates, apart from dividing the House on every one that we may consider an improper expenditure? It is out of the question, and we do not propose to do it. In fact we will be utterly unable even to offer a criticism, and will be compelled by force of circumstances to allow them to go through, and leave the country to judge of the character of those estimates and the manner in which the government treats the opposition of the day by keeping back these large expenditures until they have fixed the closing hours of the session, thus precluding the possibility of our examining them.

Now, let me place on record the history of the Liberal party in regard to voting on estimates. In 1879 a vote of $70,000 for civil government was moved against by the present right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). In 1880 and in 1881 not one dollar was moved against. The whole thing was accepted by the opposition of that day. In 1882 the payment of $8,000 damages to the steamer 'U. E. Upper' was opposed by the late Mr. Mills, who moved that the item be struck out. The years 1883, 1884, 1885, 1886, 1887 and 1888 all passed by, and not a single dollar was contested by the opposition of that time by their votes. Then, in 1889, a motion was made by the present right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce to reduce an item for the Manitoba penitentiary by $10,526. In 1889 there was another vote involving the enormous sum of $500, moved by Mr., now Senator McMullen, in regard to the East Pictou river. Then there was a motion to reduce the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway by $200,000 moved by Sir Louis Davies. Then again there was a motion moved by the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce to reduce an item for the Department of the Interior by $95,748, and there was another motion by Mr. Somerville to reduce the item of immigration by $50,000. You see how considerate the opposition in those days were in regard to peopling the Northwest Territories. The sum of $95,000 was refused to the Minister of the Interior of that day. The small sum that we asked for in those days to encourage immigration was contested by the opposition, who said that it must be reduced to $50,000. We were compelled to accept from the House in those days a sum of not more than $120,000 or $150,000 for immigration purposes, and yet these hon. gentlemen contested that. They said it was too much. They would not permit us to have even this small sum of money for the purpose of promoting immigration, and then they tell us that we failed to bring people into the country, when they were opposing the policy of the Conservative party, who were endeavouring to people that country. We find that in 1889 also a motion was made to strike out $2,300 in connection with the salary of Mr. C. C. Chipman. That motion was made by Mr. McMullen. During 1890, 1891, 1892, 1893, 1894 and 1895 the souls of these economists rested in peace, and they did not move to strike out a single item. Yet, at this late day, the hon. Minister of Finance comes down and tells this House and the people that we, as an opposition, have failed in our duty because we have not moved to strike out every item that was improper. If we did that we would be sitting here until Christmas. We might sit here for fifteen months, and we would not succeed in getting through with all the improprieties that this government is endeavouring to foist on the country at the present time. I think this is a very sufficient answer to the very wise criticism of the hon. Minister of Finance.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 159) respecting the Pacific Bank of Canada.—Mr. Galliher.

SUPPLY—REVIEW OF FINANCIAL SITUATION.

Mr. HENDERSON. I was about to deal with the statement made by the Minister of Finance, which I confess rather staggered me, that the ability of the people to pay increased taxation was an evidence of prosperity, in other words that increased taxation was an evidence of increased prosperity. I confess that this is a new doctrine to me, and in order to see how much more prosperous the people were under this system of increased taxation I have looked up a statement of the amount of money loaned by the loan societies in the Dominion of Canada on mortgage at a time when this taxation was not so great and also at the present time when it has nearly doubled. I find that under the system of higher protection and lower taxation there were loaned by the loan societies in the Dominion of Canada on mortgage security $115,734,852, but under a regime of higher taxation there is loaned to-day, or was in 1902, the latest year of which we have a return, $118,118,553, or an increase of upwards of $2,500,000. I would like to know from the Minister of Finance if he considers that an evidence of increased prosperity. The people of this country have been taught to believe that mortgages were a dangerous thing and should be employed only as a

matter of last resort but here we have under this so-called increased prosperity an increase of millions of money loaned by the loan societies on mortgage security throughout the Dominion of Canada. I may say here that even under this increased prosperity—and I think this statement will be borne out by practically every hon. gentleman in this House—money for ordinary business purposes cannot be obtained to-day as readily as it could seven or eight years ago. I will undertake to say that the lumbermen, the business man, the man who wants to improve his farm, the man who wants money for ordinary purposes has more difficulty today in securing money than he had in those days.

Mr. HEYD. Why ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I will tell the hon. gentleman why. Because the government has been pursuing an improper system.

Mr. HEYD. Well I declare.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Minister of Finance boasted about the bank deposits. Our bank deposits are very large, and the policy of the government last year was to increase the number of banks. That was a policy which I then opposed and I am still opposed to it. Last year I opposed the incorporation of new banks for the reason that I found on investigating the matter, that every new bank became a channel for sending money out of this country, for shoving the money out of this country into the United States for investment. I made the statement then, and I presume it will stand good to-day, that we had at that time, 12 months ago, $26,000,000, more money invested in stocks and bonds or other American securities than all the paid-up capital of the banks in Canada. That is the reason of the difficulty of getting this money. Under a policy that forces the banks to send money out of the country, money becomes more stringent and more difficult for the ordinary business man to secure ; consequently it is enhanced in cost, to the business man, to the lumberman and to the man who wants to get money for the ordinary purposes of every day life. The Minister of Finance told us that the Conservative party had added largely to the debt of the country. We do not deny it, we never denied it, we were a progressive party and were bound to make progress. Canada was a smaller country thirty years ago than it is to-day. It was in its infancy, comparatively, as a Dominion and we were unable to secure money to carry on public works unless the money was borrowed. We spent about $65,000,000 in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Is there an hon. member of this House to-day who will say that was a mistake ? I do not think you will find one even among the party who opposed its construction. I have read the statement of the Hon. George W. Ross in this House. He declared that it was a wise and proper thing to expend that money. Speaking some few years ago the Hon. George W. Ross said :

> No one to-day would say that the building of that railway was a mistake. Canada to-day would be weaker in the councils of the empire ; would scarcely be a federated Dominion as it is were it not for the Pacific Railway.

I need not argue that question ; that expenditure is justified by every man in public life to-day. We had to spend a very considerable sum in the building of the Intercolonial Railway, in the deepening of the St. Lawrence canals, in the deepening of the Welland canal, in the construction of the Sault canal, and in other large public works that remain to-day a lasting monument that the Conservative party ruled in this country for eighteen years. What have the Liberal party to show for the large amount of money they have expended? What monuments will they leave behind them when they go out of power next year to show they ever occupied the treasury benches of this country ? They will have several monuments. The hon. Minister of Agriculture will leave a monument of $500,000 additional cost for the taking of the census of 1901 over the cost of taking the census of 1891. I had a little curiosity one day to find out just what value we were getting for that increased expenditure. I was told there was a larger number of schedules, and consequently it cost more. I looked up the first volume of the census, the only one yet issued, and I discovered in looking into the social condition of the people, this important information, a portion of the information which cost us $500,000 more than the information contained in the census of 1891. In my county I found that there were six Mormons, one Pagan and no Protestants. If that is the kind of information that cost half a million dollars I hope the Minister of Agriculture will revise his first edition of the census. I was under the impression we had a good many Protestants there, because I find that on the 12th of July they make a good showing but the Minister of Agriculture wanted to create a different impression. I belive it was a libel on my county.

Now, Sir, there are a few more monuments. The Minister of Finance charged us with not criticising them. Away up in the Yukon, on the Eldorado, a miner sank a shaft 222 feet deep, and, instead of striking better gravel, he struck a subterranean lake, causing an overflow. He telegraphed down to the Minister of the Interior asking what he would do about it. The Minister of the Interior telegraphed back to him to plug the hole. They let a contract for $6,000 to plug this hole of three feet by four feet. After spending the $6,000, they found that the hole was not plugged. They threw bags of pease

and beans into it ; where they went we do not know—I suppose to the bottom of the lake ; but the $6,000 would not plug the hole. So they had to spend more money. They spent $50,000 to plug the hole, and then they sent word down to the minister that the hole was not yet plugged. But the contractor said he would lease the water running out of the hole and pay the government 10 per cent of the profits. They are plugging holes all over the country, in Ontario as well as in the maritime provinces. Wherever votes can be made they are plugging holes. These are the kind of monuments the Liberal party are going to leave behind them. We had an instance the other day down at the Bay of Seven Islands, where $60,000 was wanted to plug a hole in a hurry before the elections came on : and at Grande Vallée they spent about $65,000 to improve the property of a private individual enabling him to make a good sale. These are the monuments the Liberal party will leave behind them when they go out of power—not a Pacific Railway or an Intercolonial Railway, or a Sault canal. The monuments of the Liberal party will not be lasting monuments.

Hon gentlemen say they have reduced taxation. The minister of Finance told us some years ago that they never intended to reduce taxation, and I believed then that he was making an honest statement of what the policy of the government was. Here are his words :

> It was of the utmost importance that we should maintain a strong financial position and in view of the uncertainties as to the amount of revenue that might be produced by this lower rate of taxation it became necessary that we should take some steps to make good any possible loss that might result. It was thought that it might fairly be met by providing for the raising of some additional taxation in order to balance, or make good, the loss occasioned by the reduction of duties . . . . It was necessary to have an increased revenue in certain directions when we were to lose revenue in other directions.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the date of that?

Mr. HENDERSON. I think about the year 1900. We remember that the Finance Minister in 1897 did reduce the duties on certain articles—for instance, on scythes, sickles, flails, reaping hooks, and that sort of thing ; but at the same time, to maintain a firm financial standing, he increased the duties on rice and other articles necessary to the farmers. He said to a good lady, I reduce the duty on your silk dress, but I must increase it on your fur cape. In that way he maintained a good financial standing—he took the duty off one thing and put it on another ; but he was always very careful to put a great deal more on than he took off, so that the balance would be on the right side.

With regard to the question of taxation, allow me to make a statement. I think it well, after what the Finance Minister has said, that a statement of this kind should go on record. I have carefully calculated what the average rate of duty was on goods dutiable and free in the year 1898, the first year under the tariff of the Liberal party. I find that the average was 18·61. In this I want to be fair to the Minister of Finance. I include in this the duty collected on all goods imported for home consumption. I exclude corn, which was practically not imported for home consumption ; but I include the increased duty on tobacco, which, though practically an excise duty, was taxation all the same. It is immaterial, so far as taxation is concerned, whether an item is excise or customs duty. You might admit tobacco into the country free, and put it into a warehouse ; but when it is ex-warehoused, if you collect excise duty on it, that is taxation all the same. Then, the government has added bounties, which are another form of taxation, and we must include these if we are to get a correct idea of the taxation on the country. I need not go through the years 1899, 1900, 1901 or 1902 ; but I come at once to the year 1903, in which I find that the average rate of taxation was 17·20 per cent. I go back for six years prior to the time the Liberal party came into power, and I make the calculation exactly on the same basis. I want to ascertain whether the people are paying less or more taxes now pro rata than they did then. The average rate of taxation in 1892 was 17·58 per cent, in 1893 17·45 per cent, in 1894 17·24 per cent, in 1895, 17·05 per cent and in 1896, 18·42 per cent ; making the average for the six years 17·55 per cent. If we compare the six years prior to the tariff now in existence with the first six years of the present tariff we find this result ; in the Conservative period, 17·55 per cent. I know of no fairer calculation to get at the rate of duty than what I have given. I maintain, therefore, that the average rate of taxation on goods dutiable and free has not been reduced, but is higher than it was prior to the advent of the Liberal party to power.

Now, the hon. minister seems to confound taxation with protection. I regard taxation as one thing and protection as another. The trouble in the present tariff is that we have too little protection and too much taxation. It is the taxation the people complain of not the protection. We want more protection and less taxation ; and I hope that when the Minister of Finance is modifying his tariff, he will modify it along that line. I am glad that he has learned something in the last few years. To-morrow we may have an opportunity of discussing a measure to grant increased protection to a very important industry of this country, the woollen industry. Although the protection has been increased, I make bold to say that it will result in a reduction of taxation. That

is the line along which we want the Finance Minister to modify his tariff, so as to help the people of this country to make money—not to help the treasury to raise $80,000,000 instead of $40,000,00. It is not the treasury we want to help all together; it is the people we want to help. We want to assist the people to make money. If we do not do that, how can we expect them to pay taxation? I say I am glad the minister is going to put through a resolution in a day or two that will assist the woollen industry along the line of better protection, and I venture to say that it will result in lower taxation to the people of this country.

Now, the hon. Minister of Finance told us that the government has reduced the protection on sugar. As I view it, the taxation on sugar to-day is considerably higher than it was when the Liberals came into power. They found raw sugar with a duty of half a cent a pound, but to-day the average is 64½ cents per hundred pounds instead of fifty cents per hundred pounds. To my mind 14½ cents per hundred pounds is an important increase in the duty on raw sugar. Converted into ad valorem, the duty on raw sugar in 1896 of fifty cents per hundred pounds was equal to twenty-three per cent, and the duty in 1903 of 64½ cents per hundred pounds is equal to thirty-eight per cent, being an increase in the ad valorem of fifteen per cent on raw sugar alone. My idea is that when you increase the duty on raw sugar, you increase the price of refined sugar. When Mr. Foster in 1891 took the duty off raw sugar, which, if my memory serves me right was 1½ cent a pound, the price of refined sugar immediately dropped all over the country. That duty was put on for revenue purposes. The policy of the present government is tariff for taxation, but the policy of the Conservative government was to take the duty off an article of that kind the moment it was not required for revenue purposes. Sir Leonard Tilley took the duty off tea and coffee when we did not require it and Mr. Foster took the duty off raw sugar. The result was the people got cheaper tea and coffee and sugar. Between the years 1891 and 1895, by a single stroke of his pen, in a period of depression, Mr. Foster gave back to the people nearly $19,000,000 which he might have collected, and which, if he had collected it, would have saved him from those deficits we hear so much about. But Mr. Foster was a statesman, he knew the requirements of his country, and he knew that the duty of a statesman is not to take taxes out of the pockets of the people when not called for. He understood his duty to be to assist the people in earning a livelihood and to give them as cheap as possible those things which are not produced in this country. We are told that the late government never had any more money than they needed. I am not very sure about that being an improper policy. What right has any government to have more money than they need? What right has the Finance Minister to have $16,500,000 more than the needs of the country require? That is bad financing.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am glad to know that I have one sympathizer on the other side.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Protection run mad.

Mr. HENDERSON. Let us see what the newspapers supporting these hon. gentlemen said in 1900. Here is what the Montreal 'Witness' said:—

> Mr. Fielding says that we had last year a surplus of $4,837,749, and that this year there promises to be one of $7,500,000, and probably a greater one still to follow next year. Now, all this money is taken out of the pockets of the people by taxation and a surplus of revenue over expenditure for government purposes surely means so much money taken unnecessarily from the pockets of the people.

But I have other authority equally explicit. Let us see what the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) said away back in 1883. Surely he has not forgotten it. He then said:—

> When the government find they have beyond a doubt a surplus, when they can calculate with certainty on having one, it is their bounden duty to reduce taxation.

But we see hon. gentlemen opposite doing the very reverse. We find them increasing taxation on tobacco, sugar and other things, and we look to our hon. friend to stand out boldly by the declaration he made in 1883. But the Minister of Customs said more than that. He said this:—

> It is no part of the duty of a finance minister to extract more money out of the pockets of the public than is absolutely required to carry on public affairs.

I appeal to the hon. minister to tell his colleague the Minister of Finance that he is exceeding his duty and that he has no business taking money out of the pockets of the people when he does not require it. But my hon. friend the Minister of Customs said something more still. In 1883 he made this further statement, and this is the most condemnatory of them all:—

> What would be said of a chancellor of the exchequer in England if he could not estimate the requirements of the public services nearer than $82,000,000? He would be ridiculed as being unable to grasp the financial condition of the country.

I am sure that $16,500,000 is not greater, compared with the entire revenue of Canada, than $82,000,000 would be compared with the entire revenue of Great Britain. Therefore the Minister of Finance stands condemned by his colleague. Therefore, ac-

cording to his colleague, he should be ridiculed as being unable to grasp the financial condition of the country. I am glad the Minister of Justice gave me his hearty response and approval of my sentiments. It was not the policy of the Conservative party to take from the pockets of the people more money than was required. On the contrary, they reduced the taxation on the necessaries of life whenever they found the money was not required, and that is the policy which this government should pursue.

Then the Minister of Finance talks of our having asked to have the protection on tobacco increased, because we voted for a resolution the other day submitted by our friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). The hon. minister said that while we were complaining about the increased duty, we were actually asking for further protection. Well suppose we were, does that necessarily mean that we are asking for an increased duty? Is it not possible to help the tobacco industry without increasing the duty? Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell me that the seventeen business men who form the government are actually unable to help the tobacco industry in any way except by increasing the duty?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON. If the hon. gentleman went out of the House on a wet day, would he hurry over to the Minister of Finance and ask him to put an increased duty on hats in order to protect himself from the rain? Would he not more likely go to a store and buy an umbrella?

Mr. FIELDING. Or borrow one.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think that would be more likely. A few days ago we had a long discussion on the suppression of the dog-fish and the preservation or protection of the fish industry along the maritime coast. Would anybody ask to have an increased duty on fish in order to protect that industry? Sir, there are more ways of protecting the tobacco industry than by increasing the duty, and surely these seventeen hon. gentlemen who form the government can find some other means than by raising high taxation. In order to make plain the point I desire to make and to show that we are not inconsistent at all, let me read the resolution moved by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). It is in these words:—

> The government has not given the tobacco industry of Canada the protection and encouragement it is entitled to.

Is there anything there about increasing the duty on tobacco? I do not think that the Minister of Finance or anybody else can find it. But the government are called upon, under that resolution, to further protect the tobacco industry of this country. And what does my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier want? He wants the government to take the necessary means to destroy that tobacco trust which is eating the vitals out of the industry.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is what we want.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am glad to know that the Minister of Justice is seized with a proper conception of the situation.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Hear, hear. Pretty good from you in view of the cabal that is going on.

Mr. HENDERSON. Another statement of the Minister of Finance was that an additional allowance had been made to the Northwest Territories this year, and the hon. gentleman taunted us on this side with being opposed to increased expenditure and with practically denying to the people of the Northwest an increased allowance to carry on their government. I say that that was a very unfair conclusion. Why, the population of the Northwest Territories during the last six or seven years. I presume, has doubled. Why should they not get a larger allowance? If they pay more taxes into the treasury, should they not get more out? That is not an expenditure that we complain of, that is an expenditure that we approve of. The expenditures that we complain of are those made for plugging a hole, or for building a wharf at Grande Vallée and another at Seven Islands, and all these places where the money is spent, not for the benefit of the public, but for the benefit of private individuals. We approve of the increased allowance for the Northwest; but we approve of more—we believe that these people are ready for self-government, for home rule, if you like to call it so; we believe that they should be no longer wards of this government, but that they should legislate for themselves. And I hope that even yet, before the guns fire for prorogation, the Finance Minister will introduce and have passed a measure that will give these people what they all demand. I believe that it is a universal demand there that the Territories should have provincial autonomy. And I see no reason why they should be kept back, and a few hundred thousand doled out this year and a few hundred thousand more next year, treating those people as children or as wards. That is not the way to make a people out of these western settlers. You must let them know that they are men fit to govern themselves, and give them a constitution that will enable them to control their own affairs. If that is done, I believe you will find a happier state of affairs in that western country.

The Minister of Finance referred to the trade of the country to show how prosperity had expanded during the last seven or eight

years. We all glory in the fact that we have had a prosperous seven years. I hope that the forebodings of the Minister of Finance, when he told us that we were on the crest of the wave, are yet far from realization. I hope that the hon. gentleman himself takes a different view of our future, and believes that we are to have fair sailing for years to come. We all desire it. There are no blue ruin men on this side; we do not preach that doctrine. We will help the government, so long as they are in power—and we believe that, thank goodness, it will not be very long—to give the country the best administration that they can give. And when they go out and we come in, I trust they will take a leaf out of our book, and, instead of decrying the country and its prospects, will render us what assistance they can. But I wish to draw attention to one thing which, I think, deserves passing notice. I believe that the prosperity and development of this country speak for themselves. But I have before me an extract from a speech made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) on the 10th of December last in Toronto. There are figures in that speech designed to show the percentage of increase in trade for a number of the leading countries of the world. Amongst them are Canada, Japan, Cape Colony, the United States, Italy, Germany, Belgium, Argentine, Switzerland, Great Britain and France. The figures show that the greatest percentage of increase in trade stands to the credit of Canada. We would be glad to know that that is the fact. The same matter is contained in 'Political Pointers, No. 4,' which is to be sent all over the country to educate the Liberals as to the prosperity of Canada. I do not know where this pamphlet was prepared, but it bears the ear-marks, to my mind, of the Department of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. 'Political Pointers,' 1, 2 and 3, I believe, were prepared in another department. These figures for the several countries I have named appear to make a comparison of the trade for 1895 with that for 1902. But, would you believe it, Mr. Speaker—I can scarcely ask you to believe it until you have verified it, as I have done by an examination of the Trade and Navigation Returns—instead of giving the figures for Canada for 1902, the Minister of Trade and Commerce gives the figures for 1903. And it is by this means that the minister shows a higher percentage of growth for Canada than for any other country. The percentage of increase to the credit of Japan is 97·20. And if you take the figures for Canada for 1902, you will find that we are outdistanced in the percentage of increase of trade by those seagirt isles in the Pacific now engaged in fighting the Russian bear. I do not say this as a reflection upon Canada, I should have been glad indeed if Canada had been able to make the best showing in this comparison of figures. But Canada is big enough and her increase in prosperity is solid enough to make it unnecessary for us to use figures that we are not warranted in using. The hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) asks me to give the difference between the figures for 1902 and for 1903. The trade of Canada for 1903 was $439,212,202 and for 1902 $392,499,953. This latter is the figure that should have been given in comparing the trade with that of 1895, which was $200,204,242. The increase between 1895 and 1902 was $192,295,711, or 96½ per cent, as against Japan's increase of 97·20 per cent. Why, we find that even Chili showed a better increase between 1896 and 1900. In saying this, I do not depreciate Canada, but, as I say, what I believe is that Canada's prosperity can stand upon its merits; it is not necessary to make an unfair use of figures to demonstrate it. We boast of our prosperity, a prosperity that is world-wide, I am glad to say.

Joseph Chamberlain, speaking one time of the prosperity of Canada, said it was the result of the energy of its own inhabitants. Lord Strathcona and Mr. Balfour, at one time speaking on the same subject in England, said it was the result of elementary and higher education. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), whom we are sorry to see is not in his place in this House, but to whose words we have often listened in this chamber, made the statement that Canada's prosperity was due to causes beyond the control of any government. But, Sir, I believe that if legislation has anything to do with the prosperity of this country, we can trace it back further than the advent to power of the present government. I would like to know—this question has often been asked in this House and I do not think it has ever been satisfactorily answered—what legislative Act has been placed upon the statute-books of this country by the present government to enhance the prosperity of Canada? Nobody answers. They used to tell us it was the preferential tariff. But, Sir, the preferential tariff is being attacked to-day, the Minister of Finance is cutting and carving the preferential tariff because it has produced ruin to one of the most important industries of this country.

Mr. CLANCY. And he has threatened to withdraw it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I had missed that. While I would not express my opinion on that question on a moment's notice, I have my own opinion as to what would be best in the interests of this country. But what I mean to say is that whilst the present government can not point to one single administrative Act they have placed upon the statute-book that has brought about our prosperity, we can go back to 1878 when Sir John A. Macdonald, the great chieftain who led the party who now sit on this side of the House, laid the foundation of Canada's prosperity when he adopted the

national policy of this country. And to-day that is the basis on which the present government is coming back to build on, they are discarding their preferential tariff and coming back to build again on the old foundation so well and truly laid by the old chieftain twenty-five years ago. Mr. Speaker, I claim your pardon and that of the House for the length of time I have occupied ; I do not expect that I shall, during the present session, except on one occasion, occupy much of your time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Just one word before the vote is taken. I did not hear the whole of the remarks of the hon. the Minister of Finance, but they seemed directed towards taunting the opposition with not having moved to strike out a large number of items from the estimates brought down by the government during the past seven or eight years. That has been very conclusively answered by my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson). He pointed out that items aggregating less than half a million dollars were moved against by the Liberal party when in opposition from 1878 to 1896, although the estimates during that period amounted to about $603,000,000. Therefore the Minister of Finance was rebuking, not so much the opposition of the present day, as my hon. friend the Minister of Customs whom I see opposite, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce who is not in his place, and other members of the Liberal party who fought the battles of the Liberal party. During that time less than one thirteen hundredth part of the items brought down were moved against. We have a much better record than that, as I fancy the 'Hansard' would show if it were examined. Therefore the taunt of the Minister of Finance is not so much directed against this side of the House as against his own political friends, who I think must have been somewhat displeased with his allusion.

I did not however rise for the purpose of dealing with that, but with one observation of the Minister of Finance which I thought somewhat inconsistent with the arguments I have heard him make on that side of the House. He said that we on this side of the House have advocated, and do advocate, increased protection ; and he said that increased protection meant necessarily higher taxation. He withdrew from that literal statement afterwards, because he said that the higher taxation might result from increased prices of goods which were manufactured in this country instead of being imported from abroad. I desire to take direct issue with the hon. gentleman on that point. I say that higher protection does not necessarily result and is not likely to result in increased taxation. I say that for these reasons. In the first place, it would obviously tend to decrease the amount of revenue by shutting out foreign goods which were brought into this country, and by substituting for them goods manufactured in this country, thereby giving employment to our own people.

Mr. FIELDING. At a higher price.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have challenged the hon. gentleman across the floor of this House over and over again, and I have challenged his friends on the public platform of this country, to point to one single article manufactured in Canada, in regard to which there is a reasonable competition, which is not sold at a fair price in this country, a price which can be fairly compared with the price paid for the same article in a foreign country ; and until that challenge is answered it is not worth while for the hon. gentleman to take the position which he does. Does he not know that he is repudiating his own leader when he says that ? Because, within the last two years, his own leader, in deprecating any attempt to raise our tariff to such a standard as that adopted in the United States, pointed out that in the United States they were cutting each other's throats, as he expressed it, by competition, and bringing their prices down to such a standard as would not enable the industries long to continue. That is the view which his leader takes of the result of increased protection in the United States. Yet my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, who I believe has put out the same view on some occasions at least, ventures to tell us now that higher protection will necessarily result in higher prices in this country. I say it will not necessarily do anything of the kind, but the very competition which results from increased protection will bring about fair prices and reasonable prices in Canada. I venture to think that there are manufacturers in Canada to-day, and I think that my hon. friend the Minister of Customs knows it, who are rather anxious that in certain lines at least there shall be no greater protection at present until certain competitors are squeezed out, and then they will ask the government for higher protection in order to make more profit.

Mr. HEYD. Exactly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Exactly, and yet my hon. friend the Minister of Finance says that higher protection must necessarily result—necessarily, mark you—in higher prices.

Mr. HEYD. Is'nt that what you say ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Not for a moment. I say that if you give these men protection now which would prevent them from being squeezed out, the competition which will thus be created will prevent higher prices ; and if hon. gentlemen in this House cannot see that, all I have to say is that I do not

think they have bestowed much thought on that subject.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance takes credit to himself for having doled out a certain further amount to the Northwest Territories. Last year I moved a resolution declaring it desirable immediately to grant a provincial status to those territories, and the Minister of Finance or the Prime Minister, I forget which, expressed the opinion, or at least applauded the opinion, that provincial autonomy should not be granted to those territories for a good many years to come. The Northwest Territories of Canada contain, at the present time, I believe, from 400,000 to 500,000 people; and by the end of this year, if the Minister of Finance is correct in his statement, they will contain not less than 500,000 people. If you had passed a statute at this very session for the purpose of conferring provincial rights upon that great country it is beyond doubt that before all the details could be settled and the necessary arrangements made, that country would have a population of 600,000 people, and yet this session has passed by and the government has not said one word or indicated in any way its intention to grant provincial institutions at any early period to these territories. But my hon. friend the Minister of Finance is good enough to tell the House that between $200,000 or $300,000 additional are given to these territories in the way of additional revenue. I say that is not the way to deal with these territories. At the present time they have a population five times at least larger than the population of the province of Prince Edward Island. They have a population larger than the population of British Columbia by one hundred per cent and a population larger than the population of the province of Manitoba. They have as large a population as the province of New Brunswick and yet for some reason that has never been satisfactorily explained to the people of this country and especially to the people of the Northwest Territories they are treated by the government as my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) has stated as wards of this government and they are supposed to be satisfied with an additional dole handed out to them from time to time. I do not think there is any cause to congratulate the government on the attitude they have taken towards the Northwest Territories. I am very glad indeed to support an increased grant to them which will enable them to deal with the many public works which are absolute necessities in that country, much more necessities than they are to the people of the east, and which are particularly necessary to that country at the present time when so large an immigration is going in and when it is desirable not to disappoint in any way the men who are going in and making settlements and to whom the means of communication with different parts of the country and especially the means of communication with railways are absolutely essential if they are to succeed in the business in which they are engaged.

I also rose to object especially to the practice which the government adopted last year and which they have again adopted this year of placing before the members of this House $10,000,000, or $12,000,000, or $15,000,000 of estimates to be voted with no criticism at all in the last two or three days of the session. I do not think that course is worthy of the government. This parliament began its present session on the 10th day of March and surely, if this government have any business instincts at all and they claim to be a business government, they could have had all these estimates down by the middle of May. If they could not have had them down by the middle of May surely they could have had them down by the first of June and if they had been presented at that time it would have been reasonably possible for hon. members to give them that consideration and criticism which is only their due; instead of that, we have in the closing hours of the session estimates amounting to $12,000,000 or $15,000,000 thrown at the members of this House, with no expectation that they can or will do their duty by them, but in the expectation that in the closing hours of the session when members are anxious to get away to their homes, from which they have been kept for so many months, they will pass them through with hardly a word of protest. For my part I desire to enter my protest against this course. If any reason had been shown for it, if my hon. friend the Minister of Finance had said one word on the subject or if any of the other members of the government could have said one word in support of it, I would have been ready to listen to what they had to say in behalf of a system of that kind, but in the absence of any explanation I say the course of the government is wrong, that it is not in accordance with the spirit of the constitution and that it makes absolutely a farce of parliamentary government in this country. I do not propose to detain the House further, I rose almost entirely for the purpose of protesting as I have just protested against that mode of transacting public business in this country.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Bell.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Kidd,
Armstrong,	Lancaster,
Avery,	LaRivière,
Barker,	Lefurgey,
Bell,	Lennox,
Blain,	Léonard,
Borden (Halifax),	MacLaren (Perth),
Boyd,	McGowan,
Brock,	Monk,
Bruce,	Morin,

Carscallen,
Clancy,
Clare,
Clarke,
Cochrane,
Culbert,
Daniel,
Donnelly,
Earle,
Gilmour,
Hackett,
Henderson,
Ingram,
Johnston (Cardwell),
Osler,
Porter,
Pringle,
Richardson,
Robinson (Elgin),
Seagram,
Sherritt,
Smith (Wentworth),
Sproule,
Thomson (Grey),
Tolton,
Vrooman,
Wilmot,
Wilson.—48.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Archambault,
Bazinet,
Beith,
Béland,
Bickerdike,
Blanchet,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Bourassa,
Bourbonnais,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Bruneau,
Campbell,
Carbonneau,
Champagne,
Christie,
Copp,
Costigan,
Cowan,
Davis,
Delisle,
Demers (Levis),
Demers (St. John),
Desjardins,
Douglas,
Erb,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Fisher,
Fitzpatrick,
Fortier,
Gallery,
Galliher,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Gervais,
Gibson,
Girard,
Gould,
Grant,
Guthrie,
Harwood,
Hazzard,
Heyd,
Holmes,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),
Hyman,
Johnston (Lambton),
Kendall,
Lapointe,
Laurier (Sir Wilrid),
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Lavergne (Drum. & Artha.),
LeBlanc,
Logan,
Loy,
Macdonald,
Mackie,
MacKinnon,
Maclaren (Huntingdon),
Macpherson,
McEwen,
McGugan,
McIsaac,
McLennan,
Malouin,
Marcil (Bagot),
Mignault,
Mulock (Sir William),
Oliver,
Paterson,
Power,
Reid (Restigouche),
Riley,
Rivet,
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Rimouski),
Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Ross (Yukon),
Rousseau,
Russell,
Scott,
Stephens,
Sutherland (Essex),
Thompson (Haldm'd & Monck),
Tolmie,
Tucker,
Turcot,
Turgeon,
Wright.—90.

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Calvert,	Taylor,
Harty,	Reid (Grenville),
Wallace,	Tisdale,
Cartwright (Sir R.),	Tupper,
Lovell,	Kendry,
Law,	Casgrain,
Marcil (Bonaventure),	Roddick,
Parmelee,	Pope,
German,	Halliday,
Lang,	Bennett,
Lemieux,	Birkett,
McCool,	Rosamond
Meigs,	Tarte
Préfontaine,	Maclean
Sinclair,	Northrup,
Stewart,	Robinson (Northumberland),
Dyment,	McCormick,
McColl,	Ward,
Emmerson,	Fowler,
Sutherland (Oxford),	Haggart,
Wade,	Kaulbach,
Tobin,	Kemp,
Angers,	Ball,
Bureau,	Ganong,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Hughes (Victoria),
Lavergne (Montmagny),	Lavell,
Lewis,	Goufley,
Matheson,	Hale,
Morrison,	Calvin
Sifton,	Roche (Marquette),
Smith (Vancouver),	Broder.

Amendment negatived.

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

Civil Government—Railways and Canals—to provide for the salary of J. Proulx appointed at $900 to a junior second-class clerkship, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary, $900.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). This is a matter which was overlooked. This officer passed the examination but was over age.

Intercolonial Railway—portable plant for boring and cutting rails, $14,000.

Mr. HAGGART. This seems a large amount for a boring and cutting plant.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is a portable plant which is required, and will economize in laying the steel rails. We have not had one on the Intercolonial and it is necessary to have one. It is similar to what they use on the Grand Trunk.

Intercolonial Railway—extension to Sydney Mines, $25,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is to provide for an extension to the Intercolonial Railway to Sydney mines. Owing to the establishment of a large steel industry by the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company at Sydney Mines the town has grown considerably and it is very desirable that a regular train service should be provided to connect Sydney Mines with the Intercolonial Railway. The estimated cost is $25,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the distance ?

Mr. EMMERSON. A little over two and a half miles.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the amount for land and what for the cost of construction ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No final survey has yet been made and I have not the details. Two or three routes have been suggested and it is not yet determined which one shall be used. The land is not expected to cost more than $7,000 or $8,000.

Mr. HAGGART. $62,000 is a large sum of money for the construction of two and a half miles of road.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is to provide for stations and siding accommodation at both ends. A good deal of siding accommodation is required, especially at the Sydney Mines end.

Intercolonial Railway—to increase accommodation at Amherst, $16,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is for double-tracking the line at Amherst for 3,500 feet, for enlarging the yard and providing additional sidings. Amherst is a very important centre, there are large lumber yards there and it is the site of the car works. The total cost of these necessary repairs is $30,000. We provided in the main estimates for 1904-5, $15,000, leaving a balance for the present year of $16,000.

Intercolonial Railway—diversion of the line at St. Léonard junction, $20,500.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is a diversion that is necessary at St. Léonard junction. It will be about a mile and a quarter in length. There is a very sharp curve here and the curve and bad grade on the approach to the bridge will be eliminated. At present there is a bridge at that point over the Nicolet river and that bridge must be reconstructed in the very near future, and provision is made for it in the estimates. It would be very inadvisable to have the bridge built on the present site and we will necessarily have to go up the river a short distance. In doing that it seems advisable to straighten the road, and to avoid a bad double curve. This is a reverse curve. Then we reduce the grade from 1.3 to .5 per cent; that is a difference of .8 per cent.

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps this would be the proper time for the minister to tell us what amount, since the purchase of that line of road, has been expended upon it on capital account. When it was purchased, we had the assurance from the minister that it was in an excellent state of repair and would require no expenditure.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think the statement that the road was in an excellent state of repair was quite correct; but this is an improvement in the way of curvature and grading. Of course, that would not be involved in the statement as to the excellence of its condition. That was recognized and explained at the time.

Mr. HAGGART. I am very sorry to say that it was not explained at the time. We did not know the curvature of the different parts of the road; but we had the promise of the minister at the time that a separate account would be kept for that particular part of the road, and we want to know what the expenditure on capital account has been since its acquisition.

Mr. EMMERSON. There has not been a separate account kept of the capital expenditure for that road. It would be necessary for me to add up the several amounts year by year.

Mr. HAGGART. Surely that is a question which the minister expected to answer. We purchased a road which was said to be in first-class order. It was denied at the time it was up to the standard of the Intercolonial, and the promise was made that a separate account would be kept of the capital expenditure.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not the information here. To ascertain the amount would be a matter of calculation. I can get the hon. gentleman the information if he desires it, but I cannot give it to-night.

Mr. HAGGART. Surely I am entitled to that information. There may be a vote of $1,000,000 for steel rails, and we do not know whether they are laid on the Drummond County Railway or not.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is no special capital account kept with respect to the Drummond County Railway; but in the estimates each year the details as to the different sections are given, and it would be simply a matter of going over the estimates and adding up the different amounts.

Mr. HAGGART. The estimates will not furnish the information at all. When a vote is taken for $1,000,000 for steel rails, how can you know, by going over the estimates, that a part of that was or was not spent on the Drummond County Railway ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Because the particulars show the expenditure of the different parts of it.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman must see that because a minister tells us that he intends to spend money in a particular way, it does not follow that he will spend it in that way.

Mr. EMMERSON. It must necessarily go there.

Mr. HAGGART. Then I understand from the minister, notwithstanding the promise which was given to this House, that there is no separate account kept of the capital expenditure on that portion of the road ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Nothing more than is contained in the Auditor General's Report as to the expenditures at the different points on the Intercolonial. There is no special capital account for what is known as the Drummond County Railway.

Mr. BARKER. Will the hon. gentleman tell us whether there was any capital expenditure on the Drummond County Railway last year ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, there was.

Mr. BARKER. How much ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not the statement.

Mr. BARKER. After what the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) says, I think we are entitled to ask that the hon. gentleman shall tell us before the item passes.

Mr. EMMERSON. The only way I could get it would be by referring to the Auditor General's Report of last year.

Mr. BARKER. I should think that the minister would have felt himself responsible to the House for the expenditure, and after the statement which has been made by my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) regarding what was said when the road was acquired, we surely are entitled to know how much was spent on that road on capital account last year. It is not for us to say where the hon. gentleman can get his information. We simply ask him for what he should be able to give us.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think I made myself clear that there is no separate capital account kept of the Drummond section.

Mr. BARKER. I thought the hon. gentleman said we could find it out in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. EMMERSON. I stated that we could refer to the Auditor General's Report and pick out the items of capital expenditure.

Mr. BARKER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will pity our ignorance and tell us the facts. The railway was bought by the government on the assurance that no capital expenditure would be required. The hon. gentleman tells us that he has been making capital expenditure ; and when we ask how much he laughs and says he does not know.

Mr. EMMERSON. I could not tell you, because there is no separate capital account kept for the Drummond section of the Intercolonial.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose there is no separate account kept of the receipts and expenditure ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. HAGGART. And there is no way of finding out what the receipts and expenditure are on the Drummond Railway ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Drummond section of the Intercolonial is no more separately identified than the St. John or Moncton section, or the section from St. John to Point du Chene. They are all portions of the Intercolonial, and are not kept separately.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose you could furnish them in a little time ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I could not tell how much money was earned on the Drummond section and how much on the other section.

Intercolonial Railway—diversion of line at Mitchell, $25,100.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is a diversion of one and a half mile. When it is complete the line will be shortened. A very sharp curve will be got rid of and a better approach obtained.

Mr. HAGGART. Where is that Mitchell station ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is the first station to the east of the Nicolet river. It is on the Drummond road, 86 miles from Lévis.

Mr. HAGGART. Will this complete the diversion, or is there a vote in the main estimates ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This will complete.

Mr. HAGGART. Both St. Léonard junction and Mitchell ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Is this contract work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This will be done by contract. There is to be a bridge built, and so on.

Intercolonial Railway—to reduce curve at Birch Cove, $84,500.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is a very bad 'S' curve on the line between Bedford and Halifax.

Mr. HAGGART. Will this finish it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Is there any amount in the main estimates ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, this is the total.

Mr. BARKER. Is this part of the line you double-tracked ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It will be part of the line that will be double-tracked. We propose calling for tenders at once.

Mr. BARKER. Do you propose to have that alteration in the track done separately from the double-tracking ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The new roadbed across the cove in Bedford basin will be double width. The man who gets the contract will make it double width to enable the double-tracking to be done, and it will be done immediately.

Mr. HAGGART. How much for land damages ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Nothing. It is practically filling in the waters of the basin.

Mr. DANIEL. What will be the length of the radius of the curve ?

Mr. EMMERSON. About 1,140 feet.

Double-tracking parts of the Intercolonial, $150,000.

Mr. BARKER. When this work was referred to in connection with the main estimates, I told the minister I would ask him to produce all the papers about the work going on.

Mr. EMMERSON. There were two separate contracts, one to Reid and Archibald and the other to Reid McManus. On the Richmond section, that is, from Richmond to Rockingham, about two and a half miles, the grading is done under contract at schedule prices by Reid and Archibald, and there was work and material supplied by the railway and an amount for land claims. I will lay on the table the papers with respect to that.

Mr. BARKER. Were tenders called for?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, in both instances.

Mr. BARKER. One was a schedule price?

Mr. EMMERSON. The first was. The last, that to Reid McManus, was a bulk sum.

Mr. BARKER. Why was the change made in the system ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is simply a grading under contract at a bulk sum. The prices were asked in that way and the lowest tenderer was Reid McManus at $68,500.

Mr. BARKER. How many tenders were received ?

Mr. EMMERSON. If I remember correctly, five. There was one at $70,000, one at about $75,000 and another at about $95,000.

Mr. BARKER. Was that the bulk sum contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. How much were the tenderers required to deposit with their tenders ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Ten per cent, I think —that is the usual figure. This applies to contracts up to $250,000. Above that not so large a percentage is called for.

Mr. BARKER. That percentage was on the amount of the tender ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. That applied to all the tenders ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. Was any information given to those who were tendering as to the quantities and the nature of the soil ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The specifications, as my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) will see, were pretty full. The parties were required to go and see the location themselves.

Mr. BARKER. You gave simply the profile and cross section ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. Had not the department any information as to the nature of the ground ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, the engineer had made his survey and prepared his specification.

Mr. BARKER. Was any information given to any of the tenderers as to the nature of the ground ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, they were to go and examine it for themselves. They were given the profile and the plans and specifications, and were invited with that information and the information they could get themselves by visiting the ground to make their tenders.

Mr. BARKER. What I ask is, did the department give the tenderers the benefit of the information the department had as to the nature of the ground ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Only as it is shown in the specification.

Mr. BARKER. You gave them no information as to what knowledge the department had concerning the nature of the ground?

Mr. EMMERSON. That knowledge was imparted to them by the specification and the plans.

Mr. BARKER. We will see what is in the specifications. But what I ask is did the department give to any tenderer any information in the possession of the department as to the nature of the soil apart from what is in the specification ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, not to any one tenderer—no information that was not given to the others in the specification and the plans.

Mr. BARKER. I ask, did you give any information to any or all of them as to the information in possession of the department concerning the nature of the soil ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Only the information contained in the specification.

Mr. BARKER. But I ask was any information given beyond that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No information was given beyond that. I think I speak plain English. The only information we gave

them is contained in the specifications and the plans.

Mr. BARKER. No other ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No other—I have already told the hon. gentleman. I hope he does not want me to swear to it.

Mr. BARKER. I am quite ready to take the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Emmerson's) word but the difficulty is to get an answer.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have answered it a good many times.

Mr. BARKER. I asked whether outside the specification, did the department give to the people tendering the information they had in their possession as to the nature of the ground.

Mr. EMMERSON. And I have repeated about ten times that the only information we gave is contained in the specifications and the plans.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. minister answered that a moment ago, after I had asked about half a dozen times.

Mr. HAGGART. How much is to be double tracked, and what amount will be required to finish the work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Under contract now, there is two and a half miles by Reid and Archibald. From Bedford bridge to Windsor junction, is under contract to Reid McManus, a distance of just a shade under five miles. We propose also to go from Rockingham to Birch Cove, a distance of three-quarters of a mile. Then we propose to go from Birch Cove to Bedford, three and three quarter miles ; then we propose to go from Richmond twelve miles. The estimated cost is $303,257.75.

Mr. HAGGART. Is that for that twelve miles or for the whole work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. For the whole, and that includes the cost of a bridge at Bedford.

Mr. HAGGART. How much for the bridge ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It will cost about $45,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it an iron bridge?

Mr. EMMERSON. Steel and stone. Then, we propose to do two miles between Stellarton and New Glasgow. That is found to be necessary on account of the coal trade at that point. The estimated cost of the work from Stellarton to New Glasgow would be about $46,000. Now we are asking for $150,000 additional, which includes everything.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the total distance that you intend to double track ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Twelve miles is the total distance from Richmond to Windsor Junction, and adding the two miles at New Glasgow, would make fourteen miles.

Mr. HAGGART. Surely there is more than that doing altogether. You say it would be $336,000, of which the bridge costs about $40,000, leaving $290,000 for double tracking, which would be over $25,000 a mile.

Mr. EMMERSON. The estimated cost of the work that has been done has not been exceeded. It was done by contract, after tender. They have kept within the estimates, and it has been proven that the estimates were correct, and I therefore assume that the estimates with respect to the balance are pretty nearly accurate. Of course you must take into consideration the new bridge at Bedford, that is $45,000. The cost of the two miles at Stellarton and New Glasgow is estimated at $46,000.

Mr. HAGGART. That is about $23,000 a mile. The other part that you are double tracking would be about $25,000 would it not ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It varies. On the Reid and Archibald contract it would be less than $20,000 a mile ; on the Reid McManus contract it would be about $22,000. Then from Rockingham to Birch Cove will be $23,700.

Intercolonial Railway—rolling stock (revote, $519,000), $1,000,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is to acquire for the Intercolonial some twenty-two new locomotives, some new sleepers and first-class dining cars, postal cars and baggage cars, also some ballast cars and new parlour cars.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the necessity for the new locomotives ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We need them very badly. The estimated cost of one class of locomotives is $24,000 each. Twelve of them will cost at least that much, and the others will cost in the vicinity of $22,000. We are getting them from Kingston by tender, after competition.

Mr. BARKER. How many sleeping cars is the hon. gentleman going to get, and at what price ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We expect to get ten first class sleepers at $20,850.

Mr. BARKER. How many will that make, with what you have already ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We require ten new ones. We had to get four on a rush order in connection with the new ' Ocean Limited' which is put on between Halifax and Montreal.

Mr. HAGGART. How is that train paying ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It has only been on during the month of July, but it is well patronized, and is spoken of in the highest terms. Sir Sandford Fleming told me the other day that he had travelled from Halifax to Montreal in the 'Ocean Limited,' and he said that so far as his observation and experience went, there was not a train on this continent that excelled it.

Mr. DANIEL. Has that any connection with St. John ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, there is a train connects with it at Moncton for St. John.

Mr. DANIEL. What sort of cars are used on the St. John branch ? I have been told they are not of the same quality as are used on the line between Halifax and Sydney.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is not so. The same class of cars that are used elsewhere on the main line are used on the line between St. John and Moncton, the same class of sleepers and the same kind of first-class cars. There is a special train that we put on to accommodate tourists for the island of Cape Breton, which is called the Boston train. We have been short of cars, and there has been some complaint with respect to some of the cars we had to use on that train. There has been a good deal of complaint about the want of parlour cars. American tourists are accustomed to the luxury of parlour cars, and when they reach St. John they find we have not these cars and they go on to Point du Chene in a very ordinary car. We think that should not be, and we are making provision for these up-to-date and modern cars.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The minister said, when I asked him, that he had established a parlor car service from Point du Chene to Moncton.

Mr. EMMERSON. I never made any such statement. I said I hoped to make arrangements for a parlour car service for the Boston train, and I had in mind this very vote.

Mr. HAGGART. I want the details of all you intend to purchase. In regard to the Halifax train, when does it start from Montreal, and does the Canadian Pacific Railway train start at the same time ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The 'Ocean Limited' leaves Montreal at 7.30 every night except Saturdays ; I think the Canadian Pacific Railway train leaves about eight o'clock. We run to Halifax from Montreal in twenty-four hours. In the morning the Montreal limited leaves at 8.45 o'clock.

Mr. HAGGART. What time does the Canadian Pacific Railway leave ?

Mr. EMMERSON. 8.10 p.m.

Mr. HAGGART. Then you have a good service between Halifax and Montreal ?

Mr. EMMERSON. A first class up to date service. We think it is the best on the continent and the best is none too good.

Mr. HAGGART. What does it cost per mile to run that train ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I could not answer that question offhand. It is a good paying train and it is carrying a large amount of traffic.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the distance from Halifax to Montreal ?

Mr. EMMERSON. 800 miles.

Mr. HAGGART. It will cost about 60 cents a mile to run that train. It will cost to run the train both ways in the neighbourhood of $800 a day or about $250,000 a year, and this is for the purpose of running a train that starts almost at the same time from Montreal and Halifax as the Canadian Pacific Railway train.

Mr. LEFURGEY. In regard to the accommodation provided for passengers coming in on the Boston train to Point du Chêne do the cars on the Boston train run direct ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They do.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Those who are coming by the parlour car have to change to the day coach at what place ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This train comes through at night and it has no parlour car, It leaves Boston at night, gets to St. John next morning and goes on to Point du Chêne. Of course, sleepers are on the train, but I think they are put off at Vanceboro as they belong to the Boston and Maine system. Then the train runs on to St. John and then to Point du Chêne.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The Boston train going by way of Vanceboro to Halifax has no parlour car.

Mr. EMMERSON. The Boston train does not go to Halifax ; it goes to Point du Chêne, it has no parlour car.

Mr. LEFURGEY. There is no parlour car provided by the Intercolonial Railway from St. John ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Is that not a peculiar state of affairs ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We have not the cars. I am asking votes for them and my hon. friends are objecting to them.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I do not think they have been objecting to them very much. I do not think there has been much objection but I would like to have the matter remedied. What accommodation is provided for passengers coming down on this mag-

nificent 'Ocean Limited' when they are bound for Point du Chêne?

Mr. EMMERSON. Sleepers.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What accommodation provided at Point du Chêne? No sleepers are provided on the Point du Chêne train.

Mr. EMMERSON. They have to change cars at Painsec Junction and they take the ordinary train from Painsec Junction to Point du Chêne a distance of 11 miles.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The ordinary every day coaches that have been provided for the accommodation of tourists and travellers going by that line to Point du Chêne are the most wretched coaches on the Intercolonial Railway and I would again call the attention of the hon. minister to this fact as I did some weeks ago.

Mr. EMMERSON. What cars is the hon. gentleman referring to?

Mr. LEFURGEY. I am referring to the cars that you transfer to at Painsec Junction in going to Point du Chêne.

Mr. EMMERSON. Does my hon. friend say that the cars attached to the Point du Chêne train are the most wretched cars that my hon. friend has ever seen?

Mr. LEFURGEY. I say that they are amongst the most wretched cars on the Intercolonial Railway. I read a resolution from the Board of Trade at the time when I spoke on this matter before, and I have now a resolution from the Charlottetown Board of Trade dated July 11. Possibly the hon. minister has received that and has been interviewed by the Charlottetown members and others. I shall read the resolution so that he will have an opportunity of knowing what it contains.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have the resolution.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I shall put it on 'Hansard' anyway.

Whereas the attention of the Charlottetown Board of Trade has been frequently called to the unsatisfactory railway passenger service between Stellarton and Pictou, and whereas, upon investigation it has been ascertained that the said service is entirely inadequate to the requirements, for the following seasons, namely:—

That the passenger coaches in use are old and dilapidated and of a type long since discarded on the main line of the Intercolonial; that the changing of cars at Stellarton causes great inconvenience to the travelling public; that, although the distance between Stellarton and Pictou is only 13·7 miles, nearly one hour is occupied in making the run; that there is an unnecessary delay at the Pictou station before the cars are sent to the steamer; and whereas the said unsatisfactory condition is detrimental to travel and mitigates against the interests of the province of Prince Edward Island as a whole, and the city of Charlottetown in particular; therefore resolved, that the Charlottetown Board of Trade protests against the present unsatisfactory state of the railway passenger service between Stellarton and Pictou, and respectfully requests that the Minister of Railways take steps to remedy the same at an early date, by putting modern first-class coaches on the through trains from Halifax and Sydney for the accommodation of passengers destined for Prince Edward Island, and that on arrival at Stellarton the said cars be sent forward to connect with the steamer for Prince Edward Island without delay.

I consider that this is a very moderately worded resolution, because I have travelled over that line as have also the Charlottetown members and they can testify that the inconvenience to passengers and the delay in the train service is certainly intolerable. It says further:

Further resolved, that the Charlottetown Board of Trade does most heartily indorse the resolution passed by the Charlottetown Development and Tourist Association, having reference to the inadequate state of the railway passenger service between St. John, New Brunswick, and Point du Chêne, and requests that the Minister of Railways take immediate steps to remedy the grievance complained of by arranging to run a drawing room car in connection with the through train from Boston each day during its continuance, and that a copy of these resolutions be sent to the Hon. Mr. Emmerson, Minister of Railways, the Hon. Mr. Fielding, Minister of Finance, and to all the Prince Edward Island representatives in parliament.

I trust that I have not been too late in presenting this resolution and that the hon. minister will not get up and tell me that the petition has been presented by all the other members except the hon. member for East Prince as he did on another occasion. I wish to correct a misstatement made by the minister to the effect that I was perfectly satisfied with the minister's answer with regard to the shortage of cars for musselmud and wood during the last winter on the Prince Edward Island Railway. I want to say that I meant to convey no such impression to the minister.

Mr. EMMERSON. That you were perfectly satisfied? You made that statement.

Mr. LEFURGEY. No I did not. I said that as the season had so far advanced nothing that could be done would be of any avail with the people because the musselmud and wood season was over. I assumed that the minister had done all that could possibly be done for this season, that the damage had been done, as far as the musselmud and wood men were concerned, and that all the minister could do was to investigate the causes of the shortage of cars and possibly remedy it on a future occasion.

Mr. HAGGART. We have not yet obtained information about all the cars.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have given the information about the locomotives. We expect to get the following new cars:

No.	Class of car.	Estimated cost Each.
20	1st class day coaches	$15,000
4	2nd class sleepers	11,000
2	dining cars	16,000
4	postal cars	6,000
10	baggage cars	5,000
130	ballast cars	900
4	parlour cars	20,000

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. gentleman say that he is going to pay $20,000 each for parlour cars ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We have estimated that.

Mr. BARKER. Do you really think you are going to pay that ? It would buy a sleeping car or a private car for a minister.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the total ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That would make $1,375,000 worth of cars. We cannot expect to get them all under this vote and we are asking for a million.

Mr. BARKER. I presume it is not intended to buy more cars than are mentioned ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. BARKER. Although the price may be high you will only buy the cars enumerated ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is only an estimate furnished to me as to the probable cost.

Mr. HAGGART. Is this amount for rolling stock to be charged to capital, Intercolonial ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is capital account, Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. HAGGART. You have no plan by which you will need any more than that in the future ?

Mr. EMMERSON. What other cars we have asked for replacing cars, we have to pay out of income. This is additional equipment necessary for the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose the increased business on the road necessitates it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The argument of my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island shows the necessity of this. The class of travel is such that they are very fastidious people. They will not go on the other cars. The new train is simply recognizing this demand.

Mr. BARKER. What are you going to do with the old cars ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We have to use these in connection with what we would call accommodation trains ?

Mr. BARKER. It is not so much because the travellers are so fastidious as that you want extra cars ?

Mr. EMMERSON.

Mr. EMMERSON. A certain class are not ; our own people are not so fastidious.

Mr. GOURLEY. Yes, they are. We cannot be expected to travel in the same cars as the people up here do, we want better ones.

Mr. EMMERSON. These people demand more luxurious coaches, and we have to cater to that traffic.

Intercolonial Railway—steel rails and fastenings, revote, $495,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is simply a revote ; with this vote we expect to put down the heavy rail on about 270 miles.

Mr. HAGGART. What weight rails ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Eighty pound rails.

Mr. BARKER. Where does the minister intend placing these ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We intend placing them to complete the laying of heavy rails between the following points :

Between—	Distance Miles.
Mulgrave and Stellarton	½ (about.)
Painsec Junction and Moncton	¾ "
Halifax and Stellarton	4 (nearly)
Moncton and Newcastle	51¼
Newcastle and Campbellton	107
Campbellton and Ste. Flavie	22
Ste. Flavie and Rivière du Loup	80
Lévis to Chaudière Junction	6

That will cover the 270 miles.

Mr. BARKER. How long have the rails been on those 270 miles—the rails that are there now ?

Mr. EMMERSON. About 14 years.

Mr. BARKER. Is the hon. gentleman not going to charge any portion of the cost to maintenance when he is taking up an old 14-year old rail and replacing it with a new one, or is he going to charge it all to capital ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not thought that any portion of this will be charged to income.

Mr. BARKER. Although these rails have had 14 years' service ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not so sure that they have had 14 years' service.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman told us so.

Mr. HAGGART. How are you to do the 270 odd miles with $495,000 ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It would cost about $1,000,000 for the rails, and we give credit for the old rails to the amount of a little over $500,000.

Mr. HAGGART. How much will it take, then, to complete the Intercolonial ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That will complete the Intercolonial with 80-pound rails, except about 400 miles. This would include the Cape Breton Railway, the short line from Oxford Junction to Pictou, and the portion between Moncton and St. John.

Mr. BARKER. If the hon. gentleman were managing an important railway and were replacing rails that had 14 years' wear, would he not have to charge that wear and tear to ordinary income ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not prepared to give my hon. friend an answer.

Mr. BARKER. Will the hon. gentleman ask his manager, who is beside him, what an ordinary railway company would do under those circumstances ? Ask him whether it would not charge to income the making good of those 14 years of service. If he had done that last year, would not that have made a very serious difference to his disadvantage in the showing of the operation of the line ?

Intercolonial Railway—increased accommodation and facilities along the line, $68,500.

Mr. HAGGART. Will you please explain where you intend to expend this ?

Mr. BARKER. Before the hon. gentleman begins that explanation, I will call his attention to the fact that he has already taken $65,000 for the same purpose in the main estimates, and he will have to take the two together and explain them as one.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is a different vote. Of this, $47,000 is a revote, and the remainder will be used as follows : Mitchell, a dwelling for the agent, $2,300 ; Villeroy junction, a station, $3,000 ; Laurier, a cellar and freight shed, $1,000 ; St. Charles junction, $500 ; St. Pierre, $125 ; Montmagny, an addition to the station, $2,000 ; L'Islet, further accommodation, $1,500 ; Ste. Louise, a dwelling for the agent and to enlarge the station, $3,000 ; Point Rouge, a small shelter, $150 ; Ste. Anne, a station building, $1,500 ; St. André, additional freight accommodation, because of a large industry that has been established there, $1,000 ; St. Alexis, to provide a water supply, $500 ; and contingencies.

Intercolonial Railway—increased accommodation at Truro, $100,000.

Mr. HAGGART. What are you going to do at Truro ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The engine house there now is a disgrace and we require a new one. We want also a coal handling plant and some additional land for the engine house.

Mr. HAGGART. What will that cost ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There are four different sites and I do not wish to state my idea of the cost ?

Mr. GOURLEY. The people there are very anxious to have a new engine house, and I have had several letters asking me where that round house will be built.

Mr. EMMERSON. It would not do to make it known until the land is secured.

Mr. GOURLEY. As your friends have secured option on so many lots, it will make it difficult for you to select.

Mr. EMMERSON. All the more reason why I should not tell now.

Mr. GOURLEY. I think that this sum is entirely inadequate. We want at Truro a station that will cost at least $150,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think my hon. friend from Colchester should get some water for his neighbour beside him.

Mr. GOURLEY. No, Mr. Haggart is doing exactly right. Truro is the shiretown in my riding and the most beautiful town in Canada. But we are really ashamed of our station. People on coming to that station carry away a bad impression of that beautiful town. All the gentlemen from Ontario who have visited Truro, say that while they have very presentable towns in their province, there is nothing like Truro in all Canada. There is a splendid Liberal party in that county and they will not be pleased with this government unless a new station is provided at once. I am going to make it an argument against the government that I have been pressing on them the necessity of this improvement, and I have been doing so on behalf of the Liberals, and that I have met with but indifferent success. I will go down and tell them that while this government pretend to be their friend, when they have an opportunity of showing their friendship they will not do it. There is another and a greater grievance still, under which we suffer. The railway authorities own two or three acres of land all around the station which forms an esplanade and which the town is not allowed to touch. If we had that esplanade, we would make it an ornament to the city. In Truro we have a splendid system of surface drainage, by means of which the streets become dry in an incredibly short time after a rainfall. We were not permitted to touch this esplanade with our surface drainage, and the result is that in rainy weather, this esplanade, which is lower than the average part of the town, becomes converted into an enormous bog around the station, and people arriving on the cars, seeing this wretched marsh, go away with a most unfavourable impression. We had a little struggle with the late government, but we did not get them properly awake before they were out of office, so that we did not get much satisfaction.

Mr. FIELDING. Nobody was awake in those days. Everybody was dead.

Mr. GOURLEY. The late government was so philanthropic that they went around

the country doing everything without being asked, and they would have done for us what we wanted if their attention had been called to it. But unlike the people of Quebec and Ontario, who look to the government for everything, we were doing things in Colchester ourselves and consequently did not press the late government to account. I want the minister to put in the estimates a sum of $10,000 to level up that esplanade. At present it is one and a half foot lower than the rest of the town. It is a disgrace to the Railway Department and a menace to the health of the people.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have deep sympathy for the requirements of Truro. It appears that for a great many years, while the friends of the hon. member for Colchester were in power, the people of Truro were entirely neglected. I have recognized their impoverished condition and the neglect shown them, and have ventured to put in the estimates the sum of $100,000 as a start. I hope in the future we may be able to do even all that Truro expects. My hon. friend cannot very well go back and make any point against the government because of the fact that the government is giving them $100,000 when his own friends gave them nothing. He ought to argue in favour of the government which has recognized the needs of the people in that locality, whereas the late government did not.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman seems to be very anxious to get his estimates through, and yet on every little item he makes a political speech. We have heard those remarks about what the late government did or did not do ad nauseam, and if the hon. gentleman will apply them to one item, and not repeat them at every item, he will get his estimates through much more quickly. Let us be as concise and precise as possible, for we are all anxious to get the business through, but if the hon. gentleman will insist on obstructing as he has been doing, I am afraid that we may not be able to get away for two or three weeks. What are the proposed improvements and what is the amount you intend spending ?

Mr. EMMERSON. For additional land, water supply, drainage, ballasting, new engine-house—which will cost, apart from land, something over $95,000, and will have a heating plant, a power plant and a coal handling plant—additional tracks, further freight shed accommodation and a car shop, which is very much needed. If we met all the requirements at Truro, it would take $266,000. This year we are asking a vote of $100,000, which is probably all we can expend during the current fiscal year.

Intercolonial Railway—to increase accommodation at Halifax, $250,000.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount that we have spent on capital account at Halifax ?

Mr. GOURLEY.

Mr. BARKER. The minister has had a vote of $135,000 in the main estimates in addition to this $250,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. Up to the end of June, 1903, the amount expended was $2,152,-661.23.

Mr. HAGGART. With these other votes, say two and a half millions.

Intercolonial Railway—increased accommodation at Amqui (revote $2,550) $5,550.

Mr. BARKER. There is another double item. In the main estimates we have an item for increased accommodation at Amqui of $7,000, of which $2,000 is a revote. And here we have another item for the same service with a different amount as a revote. Why could not the hon. minister give us all the facts with regard to such a work as this in the first instance ? Why could he not get from his officers a statement of what he required for the whole year and give it us at once ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is because of a change of site. The original estimate was based on the idea of having a station on a certain site, but on account of the need for additional tracks, and because the people are urging to have their convenience studied, a change was necessary involving an additional expenditure. The station and dwelling alone at Amqui will cost, according to the contract price, $5,500.

Mr. BARKER. This comes a little too often. I think we have a right to complain of the way the hon. ministers officials—they are here, and I say it for that reason—bring their estimates before the minister. Again and again we have this happen, that in the main estimates an item is asked for and, a week or two afterwards, in the supplementary estimates there is another vote for the same service. I think the minister should see to it that he gets the proper information when he is making his estimates, so that we may not be put to the trouble, expense and loss of time of discussing items twice over when, with proper care and attention, the matter can be dealt with at once.

Intercolonial Railway—increased accommodation at Antigonish, $14,000.

Mr. HAGGART. How much is required at Antigonish, and what is it for ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is the total. It is to provide a new station. We shall use the present station as a freight shed. Antigonish is a rapidly growing place and the centre of a very flourishing country.

Mr. HAGGART. It is a wonder that the road does not flourish equally with the country.

Mr. EMMERSON. This portion of it does.

Intercolonial Railway—towards improving ferry service at Strait of Canso (revote) $23,400.

Mr. BARKER. Here is another instance of the same thing. We have had this all discussed on the main estimates, and we have the same thing up again here and further money wanted, and only a few weeks between them.

Intercolonial Railway—siding at St. Romuald, $1,500.

Mr. MORIN. Will the minister kindly tell us why this siding is to be built ?

Mr. EMMERSON. To make a crossing siding, so as to facilitate the running of the trains. We want to put in 600 feet there and make a long siding, so that fast passenger trains and others can cross at that point.

Intercolonial Railway—New Glasgow—increased accommodation at (revote $3,900) $30,000.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount for that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is $30,000.

Mr. HAGGART. What is it for ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is proposed to enlarge the yard and provide additional freight sheds. The cost will depend on whether additional land is purchased or not.

Intercolonial Railway—to increase water supply (revote) $3,500.

Mr. HAGGART. Is this along the line ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, along the line.

Intercolonial Railway—additional sidings and spur lines, $23,700.

Mr. HAGGART. Where are these ?

Mr. BARKER. The hon. minister has already taken $118,000 for that purpose.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is to cover a spur line from Fort Lawrence, near Amherst, to the new government wharf—that is one item. It is estimated that this will cost $15,000. It will not be necessary to do the whole work this year, but we are asking for $5,000 on that account. Then we propose to build a spur line at Trois Pistoles—that is, to provide and lay the rails and ties. This will cost $10,400. Another is near Rivière Ouelle station, where we purpose doing the same thing, at a cost of about $8,300.

Mr. HAGGART. To whose places are these spur lines ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The one at Rivière Ouelle is for the benefit of the Intercolonial, in order to get traffic. There is a large mill there.

Mr. HAGGART. Whose mill ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Rivière Ouelle Pulp Company's.

Mr. HAGGART. How much is that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. $8,300.

Mr. HAGGART. Are you in the habit of building spur lines to industries along the Intercolonial without a contribution ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We are simply putting down the rails and ties, they do the grading.

Mr. HAGGART. You don't charge it against their freight ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, we get the freight. They guarantee so many cars each year.

Mr. BARKER. What is the distance ?

Mr. EMMERSON. One is about two miles, and the other two and a half miles. The other goes to the Trois Pistoles Lumber Company.

Mr. BARKER. I suppose the hon. gentleman is going to use some of these old rails that are standing in stores account at about $14 a ton. At that rate he won't have to spend $8,000 on that siding, if he is only putting down rails and ties.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is all we propose to put down.

Mr. HAGGART. On this last item, I wish to draw the minister's attention to the enormous sum that he has taken for capital account on the Intercolonial this year. There are $2,563,000 in the supplementary estimates, and $1,651,500 in the main estimates, and $800,000 for the acquisition of the Canada Eastern. In other words, he is expending $5,000,000 on the Intercolonial Railway on capital.

Prince Edward Island Railway—to increase accommodation at Georgetown, $33,500.

Mr. EMMERSON. Georgetown is the winter port for Prince Edward Island. It is proposed to enlarge the wharf by extending it fifty feet and increasing the width twenty feet ; also to enlarge the warehouse by an extension of forty feet and increasing the width. It will be necessary to do some dredging to give twenty feet of water at low tide.

Prince Edward Island Railway—survey from Souris to Elmira, $1,500.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I would suggest to the minister to add the words ' or Harmony ' after Souris.

Mr. EMMERSON. In the interest of harmony I will accept the suggestion.

Mr. HAGGART. You cannot do it without a message from His Excellency.

Mr. EMMERSON. You cannot change the amount, but you can change the wording.

Mr. HAGGART. Suppose the vote was for a certain expenditure in Toronto ; you

could not change that for an expenditure in Montreal or Halifax.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. The circumstances are quite different. This is for an extension of the main line to Elmira, and Souris is a short distance from Harmony. It is merely a question of where it would be better to join the main line.

Amendment agreed to.

Prince Edward Island Railway—branch line to Vernon River bridge, $50,000.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the amount required for that altogether ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It won't exceed $75,000.

Mr. HACKETT. Is this part of the main line between Southport and Murray Harbour ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is a branch connecting Murray Harbour branch at or near Lake Verde station, with a branch railway about four miles long.

Mr. HACKETT. Is not the Vernon river branch on the main line between Southport and Murray Harbour ?

Mr. MACKINNON. I can explain that to the hon. gentleman. Vernon Harbour is on the main line and is the name of a settlement ; Vernon River Bridge is the name of the village. The spur goes over the main line to the village, three or four miles.

Prince Edward Island Railway—new station at Alberton (revote $985) $2,500.

Mr. HACKETT. Of what material has the minister decided to build this new station ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Of stone.

Mr. HACKETT. Could the minister arrange to have this building placed in a position that would avoid the Y nuisance ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That question has already been settled. We discussed that matter when the main estimates were under consideration.

Mr. HACKETT. I think the hon. gentleman said it was impossible to do away with the Y.

Mr. EMMERSON. I said it would cost somewhere in the neighbourood of $20,000 to avoid that Y. I also reminded the hon. gentleman that if the people in Ottawa could submit to the use of a Y, I thought the people of Alberton should be reasonable enough to accept the conclusion which we urged, that it was impossible to make the branch so as to avoid the Y, the cost being so great.

Mr. HACKETT. The hon. gentleman has had surveyors and engineers there, and they decided that it will cost $20,000 to avoid the Y ? It appears to me that when you are erecting a building of stone that will last for years, it is only right that you should avoid this Y nuisance.

Prince Edward Island Railway—to increase accommodation at Charlottetown, $25,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is for a new station.

Mr. HAGGART. How much will it cost ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The whole of the improvements at Charlottetown will cost about $109,000.

Mr. HACKETT. I would like to ask if the government have secured a site for this new station in Charlottetown and where the station is to be built ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That has not been determined.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the estimated cost of the site without mentioning where it is ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There are two or three places in view and I find that the moment you mention the amount it has an upward tendency as to the cost. If you can put one site against the other you can generally come to a better understanding and purchase the land cheaper. My hon. friend will realize that.

Mr. HAGGART. We will not ask the amount that you are paying for it. You are asking for $110,000 for increased accommodation at Charlottetown. How much of that is to be expended on the building ?

Mr. EMMERSON. $55,000. It is a new station with a covered platform. My hon. friend must remember that this is the office building of the Prince Edward Island Railway, the headquarters.

Mr. HAGGART. Then there is $55,000 that the hon. minister is taking for the land ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, there are a lot of additional sidings and yards.

Mr. HAGGART. We did not hear of those.

Mr. EMMERSON. Then there is wharf accommodation and dredging.

Prince Edward Island Railway—survey from main line to West Shore, $1,500.

Mr. HACKETT. Where will this survey be made ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Somewhere in the vicinity of O'Leary or from whatever is the most feasible point.

Mr. HACKETT. And to the west shore either to West Point or West Cape ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Somewhere in that direction. We are going to survey that loca-

tion and determine as to what would be the best route and the best point to reach, and the best to start from.

Mr. HACKETT. Will the survey go on immediately ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Prince Edward Island Railway—to improve water service ($20,800 revote), $26,800.

Mr. HAGGART. That is a large sum for improving the water service. What is the total amount required ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We are putting overhead tanks along the line of the Prince Edward Railway.

Mr. HAGGART. How many ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Eight.

Prince Edward Island Railway—Charlottetown, extension of railway track along water front, $5,000.

Mr. HAGGART. What is that for.

Mr. EMMERSON. The Department of Marine and Fisheries have purchased a wharf and a large amount of goods is shipped from that point in the winter time. Boats late in the fall and early in the spring stop there and we therefore require to extend the Intercolonial Railway siding to the wharf.

Prince Edward Island Railway—branch line from Cardigan to Montague Bridge, $100,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. The total estimated cost is $195,000. We are asking for $100,000 this year.

Mr. HACKETT. What is the distance between Cardigan and Montague ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Six and a half miles.

Mr. HACKETT. Have surveys been made ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, there has been a survey made.

Prince Edward Island Railway—Summerside, improvements at, $10,000.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would like to know something about these improvements at Summerside.

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot give the details. We are asking for a vote of $10,000.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Is that for a new station ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I received from the Board of Trade of Summerside resolutions asking for improvements at that point and pointing out the great inconvenience resulting to traffic and to business chiefly in connection with the handling of freight. I have not had an opportunity to look into the matter ; but after conferring with the general manager I determined that we should ask for this vote of $10,000 and then take into consideration the necessities afterwards by personally going there and looking into the question.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I have no desire at all to in any way oppose this vote of $10,000. In fact for the improvements that are needed there the amount is not half enough, but I understood that the Board of Trade asked for an extension of the railway to the Queen's wharf with shipping facilities there. This may be for that purpose or it may be for a new station. When I last spoke in regard to the facilities required, on the Prince Edward Island Railway I called the attention of the hon. minister to the fact that we required a new station at Summerside. I pointed out that the station was in a most dangerous place being at the intersection of the street and railway wharf where the passengers to and from the steamer pass and several very serious accidents have occurred. I would like to know whether the hon. minister contemplates remedying this evil by this vote of $10,000. It would seem strange that a vote of $10,000 would be placed in the estimates and the minister not know what it is to be used for.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will not put it in if my hon. friend does not wish it.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The hon. minister knows that I said at the outset that I had no objection to the vote at all.

Mr. EMMERSON. Well then let it go. I fairly stated to the committee that I did not know and could not tell what was to be done with it but that I was going there and would personally inquire into the conditions and that after having studied them we would endeavour to remedy any evils that may exist. I cannot say any more.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I do not wish to block the vote in any way at all. But it seems to me that the hon. minister, when he puts $10,000 into the estimates, should have some idea as to the purpose for which it is going to be used. The same condition prevails in Charlottetown. A large vote has been put into the estimates, but I do not think the hon. minister can tell us where the station is going to be placed. I understand that at Charlottetown they are getting options on the ground opposite the old station and judging from the prices that the people want for a good part of the ground the site will cost very nearly as much as if the station were opposite George street which would be a very much more convenient location for the people and where the majority of the people desire the station to be.

Mr. EMMERSON. We are not discussing that at the present time.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I am pointing out that there seems to be a great deal of doubt in the minister's mind as to what the money voted in all the items for the Prince Edward Island Railway is to be used for. I see that

he also has an item of $5,000 for the extension of the track along the water front at Charlottetown. Five thousand dollars would come nowhere near paying for the extension of the track along the water front in Charlottetown.

Mr. EMMERSON. It will extend the track to the Charlottetown wharf.

Mr. LEFURGEY. That would be pretty nearly as far as the site of the new station house. I do not wish to block the estimates at all. I am very glad to see that many of the things I have been advocating ever since I took my seat in parliament are now being taken up and that the government is at least making an attempt to carry out the promises the Liberal-Conservatives made in 1896 in regard to the giving of these branch lines to the people. I know that on this side of the House the feeling is that the utmost justice should be done to the people of Prince Edward Island in the matter of railway facilities and branch lines. I am surprised however, that the hon. minister has not been urged by his followers and has not put in the estimates upon this occasion a certain amount for a survey from North Wiltshire to Crapaud. For a number of years petitions for this branch line have been sent to the department. It would serve an important section of the country and is very much needed.

P.E.I. Ry.—York station for freight shed, $500.

Mr. HAGGART. Allow me to congratulate the Finance Minister upon the splendid results he has secured for the maritime provinces in the shape of capital expenditures. When speaking a short time ago, he said that Nova Scotia and the maritime provinces were looked after now, that they had not been in the past prior to 1896. We have in the main and supplementary estimates, an expenditure for the maritime provinces of $6,000,000. That added to the expenditure on capital account and the deficit on the Intercolonial Railway for last year makes an amount for these two years of $8,700,000 and some odd. That is looking after the interests of Nova Scotia. The hon. minister may go down there and state to the electors in the different portions of the country my interruptions of 'hear, hear.' I will take every opportunity, especially if I should be down in the maritime provinces, to point out the mismanagement, and the enormous expenditure on capital account on that railway which has been running for thirty or forty years, and which under proper management should not require the expenditure of one cent on capital or income account by the people of this country although giving as favourable rates, and as good accommodation as is required in that country. We have voted this year for these two roads $6,000,000 on capital account following a deficit of $2,700,000 odd last year.

Mr. FIELDING. I wish to thank my hon. friend for his kindly observation regarding the attention this government is paying the maritime provinces. I did not expect it from him. Still as he has been good enough to put it on record we will accept it. I may say that the observations I made this afternoon were made by way of a reply to an hon. gentleman who was painting a very sorrowful picture of the dreadful burdens under which the people of the maritime provinces were said to be suffering by way of taxation, and I simply desired to say that I thought the maritime provinces, not specially but in common with the other portions of the Dominion, were receiving their fair share of public expenditure, neither more nor less. I may say to my hon. friend that he need not lie awake at nights making calculations as to the proportions of interest on expenditure on the Intercolonial. We on our side in the maritime provinces are more generous. We vote millions to the canals and make them free, and no man on this side lies awake at night to figure out the interest which his province pays on the cost of the canals. The canals are in the general interest of the Dominion and we in the maritime provinces appreciate that fact.

Mr. HAGGART. We with the rest of the Dominion pay the interest on the amount expended on the canals. We not only pay the interest on the $70,000,000 expended on railways in the maritime provinces, but we are now asked to supplement it with $6,000,000 this year on capital account, a loss to the people of this country of $2,700,000 odd.

Mr. EMMERSON. Do you pay it all ?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, we pay it all. We pay the deficit of $2,700,000 odd on the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway. That is the people of the Dominion pay it.

Mr. EMMERSON. I thought you meant Ontario.

Mr. HAGGART. The people of the Dominion pay that interest on the $70,000,000 expended on these roads.

Mr. EMMERSON. Who pays the interest on the $90,000,000 spent on the canals?

Mr. HAGGART. The people of the Dominion pay that interest. The people of Ontario and Quebec pay four-sixths, I believe, of that interest, and four-sixths of the interest on the Intercolonial Railway. But we do not object to any expenditure for a useful purpose in the maritime provinces. What I state is that besides paying interest on the Intercolonial Railway and on our canals, we are paying off a deficit and we are asked to spend on capital account on that railway this year $6,000,000.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I cannot agree with all the remarks of the last speaker, (Mr.

(Haggart) because I think Ontario gets a good deal of benefit from the Intercolonial Railway and that possibly one half of the deficit may be fairly charged to Ontario business, because the Intercolonial Railway while serving the upper provinces for the transportation of their manufactured goods down into the maritime provinces charges them nearly 50 per cent less for from one to 50 miles and 88 per cent less from one to 1,000 miles, than the large competing lines, the Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk Railway. If this additional amount was saddled upon the goods coming down or if 50 per cent of it was saddled on these goods, the deficit on the Intercolonial Railway would be to a considerable extent lessened. I wish to again refer to the pension fund which very nearly concerns the employees of the Prince Edward Island Railway, and also the employees of the whole government system. I once before read a resolution from a meeting of the head men among the workmen on the Intercolonial Railway and the minister told me on that occasion that the right hon. the leader of the House was going to bring in a pension Bill this session and was doing everything he could to facilitate the matter so as to have it put through at once. Now I understand this matter has been entirely dropped.

Mr. EMMERSON. It has not been entirely dropped, but like some other legislation it could not be gone on with.

Mr. LEFURGEY. We are at least not going to have it this session, and the scheme that the minister has been working at so faithfully for some time is kept over until the very last hours of the session when it had to be shuffled off the order paper. If the minister had been very solicitous for the welfare of the employees of that system the Bill might have been through the initial stages long before this.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Does the hon. member for South Lanark consider the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway, ill-advised, unnecessary and undesirable ?

Mr. HAGGART. What expenditure does the hon. gentleman mean ? If he asks me in reference to the $6,000,000 that is required for capital expenditure this year, I say that not one item of it except the $800,000 for the acquisition of the Canada Eastern should be charged to capital account. Bridges, sidings, repairs to stations, and everything else is charged to capital account. There is no justification for it. Look at the different railways ; take the Canada Southern, on which the whole track has been relaid with new rails, wooden bridges have been replaced by steel bridges, and not one cent of this expenditure is charged to capital account. What justification has the hon. gentleman for this expenditure ? We believe that the railroad, if properly managed, should yield, not an income to the country, because we do not expect that, but sufficient to pay the expenses of management and the ordinary expenditure on the road. Instead of that, from 1896 to 1904 there has been an expenditure of $24,000,000 on capital account, and this year we are asked to expend $6,000,000. Does the hon. gentleman justify it ? Does he think it is right or reasonable ? Does he think it is justice to the people of the Dominion at large that the whole surplus of the country from 1896 to the present day should be expended on capital account on the Intercolonial Railway ? Have the people of the other provinces no rights at all in regard to the distribution of the surplus which has been taken out of the pockets of the people generally ? Under good management you would have the rates for freight and passengers the same as they are now, and you would have no deficit on the railway. What we complain of is the enormous expenditures which are charged to capital account, a great many of which are of no necessity.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. The expenditure on the railway in Prince Edward Island is for new work. The hon. gentleman objected to that.

Lachine Canal—bridge over canal on line of Atwater avenue, $40,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Why are we obliged to put a bridge there ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Because we put the canal there.

Mr. HAGGART. Was there a street there when the canal was built ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am informed that there was a street there. The traffic has become so great that an additional bridge is required.

Mr. GALLERY. I would like to ask the minister what kind of a bridge it will be—a swing bridge or a draw bridge ?

Mr. EMMERSON. A swing bridge.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. gentleman give us a statement in regard to the bridge—if the work is to be let by contract, and when it will be completed ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It will be let by contract. We have not asked for the tenders yet. It will not be completed before next spring.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the $40,000 finish it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, the bridge will cost about $80,000. We shall have the superstructure put on as early as possible next year.

Mr. BLAIN. How much will you require for the superstructure ?

Mr. EMMERSON. About $40,000.

Mr. FOWLER. I cannot quite understand the necessity for this bridge. This canal has been built for some time, and there has been no bridge at this particular point. The hon. gentleman says there was a street there when the canal was built.

Mr. RIVET. I can give some information to the hon. gentleman. This bridge is going to be built on the line of Atwater avenue, which is about the largest thoroughfare connecting the southern part of Montreal with the upper part. When the canal was built, that portion of the city of Montreal was not in existence, but since then the city has extended in that direction, and now there is a heavy traffic there. A petition has been signed by the manufacturers asking for this bridge, the want of which has been felt for many years, and the need for which is more urgent to-day on account of the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway has a yard there and heavy traffic is carried on in that part of the city. Very large interests require that bridge, and outside the interests of the manufacturers it is very much needed by the people.

Mr. FOWLER. While the hon. gentleman has given good reasons for the building of that bridge, he has not given any reason why it should be built by this Dominion. At the time of the opening of the canal there was neither people nor traffic in that section, according to the hon. gentleman, but since the opening of the canal that section has become populated and a heavy traffic has grown up. While that is an excellent reason for the building of the bridge, it is no reason why the department should build it.

Mr. RIVET. At the time the canal was built there was a road there, but of course the population was not very large. Since then on each side of the road the population has developed and large factories have been built. Besides the road is the boundary line between the towns of St. Henri and St. Cunégonde.

Mr. HAGGART. Does that hon. gentleman say that there there was a road across the canal where the canal crosses there ?

Mr. RIVET. No.

Mr. HAGGART. Because there was a canal there before 1800, but there was no road across it. The hon. gentleman should not give us as a justification of this vote the statement that there was a road across the canal before the canal was built, but he ought to state plainly that he is taking this vote for the purpose of accommodating the people.

Mr. EMMERSON. I understood there was a road there.

Mr. HAGGART. Your information could not have been correct.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister expressly stated there was a road there, and I was satisfied he was mis-informed. Surely the city of Montreal is large enough to build its own bridges without calling on the Dominion to build them.

Mr. GALLERY. Last winter there was a road built right over the canal. That was during the time the other new bridge was being constructed. I may state also that this street is about the widest and one of the oldest in the city of Montreal. When the canal was built the population of Montreal was about 50,000 and to-day, taking in these two municipalities, its population is about 350,000. If the government has built all the bridges across the Lachine canal, why not this bridge ?

Mr. HAGGART. That is the best argument I have heard yet. The government built the others, which they had no right to build, and why should they not build this one ?

Mr. GALLERY. During your time—

Mr. HAGGART. Oh, you will get lots of precedents.

Mr. GALLERY. I think it is necessary this bridge should be built, not only for that part of the city but in the interests of transportation.

Mr. FOWLER. I quite agree that the bridge should be built, but it has not been shown why it should be built by the Dominion government.

Mr. GALLERY. Who would build it ?

Mr. FOWLER. The richest city in Canada ought to build its own bridges.

Mr. GALLERY. Would the hon. gentleman point out what bridge there is in the city of Montreal over the Lachine canal, to the building of which the city paid anything ? Why should we subscribe to build a bridge across the Lachine canal, when hon. gentlemen opposite built those bridges for nothing ?

Mr. FOWLER. No number of wrongs put together can make a right. Every bridge must stand on its own bottom.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it the policy of the government to build bridges over canals ? Is it their policy to build bridges over streets that may have been recently opened up in any particular town or city, which happen to be locations for canals ?

Mr. GERVAIS. There is an answer to the contention of the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Fowler). Where Atwater Avenue is now, there was a public road even before 1700, when Mr. Dollier de Casson, the superior of the Montreal Seminary, entered into a contract with Mr. de Catalogne for the building of a canal between Lachine and Montreal. This proposed canal was even

to be constructed for the benefit of the whole of Nouvelle France. In law the Dominion is bound to build that new bridge for this reason, Lower Canada has been instrumental in constituting a servitude upon the island of Montreal, and this servitude, which was established by the building of the Lachine canal, was created for the benefit of the whole of Canada, and now Canada is bound not to make our burden of that servitude any heavier. That is why I said that Canada is in law and equity bound to build that new bridge ; it having been made a necessity by the very act of the government of the day in building the Lachine canal. We need now in the interests of Montreal a new bridge. It is the action of Canada which has caused the necessity for this bridge and Canada should have to pay for it.

Mr. FOWLER. The same argument would apply to every canal in Canada. But surely the minister will not say that it is the policy of his department to build bridges over the canals wherever municipalities may see fit to lay out a road. The canal is already there, and in this case there was no previous road. If the plea of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gervais) is good, all a municipality need do is to lay out a road to the canal, then come to the department and have a bridge built. He will see how far he has to go to be logical.

Mr. GERVAIS. That is not the present case.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not think the minister will agree with my hon. friend.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the minister answer my question ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The policy adopted by the department, so far as I know, is not to recognize the demand of the municipality to have bridges built wherever the municipalities think they should be put. But there is a great deal in the contention of my hon. friend (Mr. Gervais) that there is a legal liability ; but I think it must be governed by reason, and not merely at the whim of the municipality. It would be very much on the principle of a railway crossing. Of course, there cannot be a bridge for every roadway. But at this point, it seems to me, there is very great reason why there should be a bridge, and very excellent reasons shown why it should be built by the government. The canal is operated by the government, and is there for the benefit of all Canada, as my hon. friend (Mr. Gervais) says. There have been built up in that section some very large manufacturing establishments, and this bridge will offer a shorter haul for the products of those manufactories between Côte St. Paul and St. Gabriel ward and the west end of Ste. Anne's ward and Atwater street railway station. It will offer a shorter means of travel to employees in the west end of the city, many of whom, to avoid a long and circuitous route, are now compelled to walk along the railway tracks. This item appears because of a petition sent to the department by twenty-five or thirty large manufacturing establishments in that end of the city. And it seems to me it is in accordance with what the department has done in the past. If there is any justification for what has been done in the past, there is strong justification for this.

Mr. HAGGART. The argument of the hon. member for Montreal, St. James division (Mr. Gervais), who, I believe, is a lawyer, is one of the most curious arguments I ever heard in this House. The argument of the hon. member for St. James division is right where the government make the canal crossing an existing highway, the servitude, to use a French term, devolves upon the government to provide facilities equal to those that existed before the canal was put there. But in this case there was no road, and so there is no servitude. There is no claim at all where no road existed previously.

Mr. INGRAM. I do not find fault with the representations as to the importance of this bridge and the necessity for it. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement for that. But this is a peculiar idea that he advocates, and, if it is adopted, the application of it cannot be restricted to Montreal. We are told that this bridge will cost $80,000, and that the Dominion is asked to pay for the whole work. If there was no roadway there originally, then the government might take a lenient view of the matter as to assisting the people. But when the city of Montreal asks for a bridge over the canal, the least they can do is to contribute. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) did not suggest that, but proposes that the government shall pay the entire cost. Apply that all over Canada, and you will see the difficulty in which you will land. A canal in this case would be in the same position as a railroad. For instance, in Toronto the people wanted to pass over the tracks, which they find are too numerous to be crossed constantly on the level, and they asked the railways to construct a bridge. Did the railways agree to do it ? No. But they said : We will contribute towards the bridge over our tracks if the city also will pay a portion. So it ought to be with the canal. I do not see why we should adopt a different plan in this case. I am not objecting because this is in the city of Montreal.

Trent Canal—construction, $300,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Where is this money to be expended ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is to connect Balsam lake with Lake Simcoe. We have already had voted in the estimates for 1904-5

a sum of $100,000. We are to spend this vote on hydraulic lift-lock No. 2, $250,000 ; section 2, Balsam lake division, $40,000 ; and engineering, $10,000.

Trent Canal—survey of routes, $11,000.

Mr. GRANT. Will this be spent in surveying the route between Lake Simcoe and Georgian Bay ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is to survey at both ends of the Trent water-way.

Mr. HAGGART. Where is that to be expended ? I do not know about forming any channel.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is to be expended in forming a twelve foot channel from the end of Amelia street in the town of Cornwall to the old lock 17. The work will be done by contract.

Welland Canal—to deepen portions of summit level between Port Colborne and Thorold, $50,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. The estimate is about $150,000 to be expended the present year. The whole thing is to cost $450,000. This is to make fourteen foot navigation at level. The depth will be nineteen feet at the normal level of Lake Erie, and fifteen feet at low water. The surface of Lake Erie seems to be gradually lowering.

Mr. HAGGART. Would not the guard lock at the entrance take you up to the level ? Is there a lift on the guard lock ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Elevator at Port Colborne, $400,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is to commence an elevator at Port Colborne with a capacity of 2,000,000 bushels, which is estimated to cost $1,250,000. We are also deepening the harbour to twenty-two feet, it will afford a twenty-two foot navigation into the Grand Trunk elevator. The whole harbour improvements are estimated to cost $1,600,000, not including the elevator.

Mr. HAGGART. I believe a portion of the work is being done by the Public Works Department.

Mr. EMMERSON. The breakwater is done by the Public Works.

Mr. HAGGART. Could you tell us the total cost of the breakwater and deepening ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, that would be in another department.

Mr. BLAIN. Is this elevator to be constructed on a foundation that was put in by the Public Works Department ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, the Public Works have done nothing there. We have put in the foundation.

Mr. BLAIN. When will this elevator be completed ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Plans are being prepared now and an engineer is at Port Colborne to make an examination for the foundation. We hope to be ready to ask for tenders for the whole work in a short time. We expect to have it completed a year from next fall.

Mr. FOWLER. The canals are free now. Is it the intention that this elevator shall be free ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know, that is a matter over which this department would not have control.

Mr. FOWLER. It is a matter of some little importance to the taxpayer.

Mr. EMMERSON. The question has not yet been determined.

Mr. FOWLER. Do I understand that to mean that it has not been considered ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It occurred to me that the elevators might be free even if the canals were not. But I would naturally expect that the public who use these elevators should pay for them. It is a question of policy as to whether a private corporation should have the right to build an elevator, or whether it would be better for the government to do it. The policy adopted is that the government shall do it, there being so many different shippers whose interests might clash. Therefore, the government would charge the ordinary elevator dues. That would be my idea.

Mr. FOWLER. I should think that if one company built an elevator and their charge was excessive, some other company would build one.

Mr. EMMERSON. That question was taken into consideration.

Mr. FIELDING. The government tried for several years to interest companies in the matter, but the companies seemed to be unwilling to accept the conditions which the government thought necessary to impose with regard to the supervision of rates ; and if the enterprise was to go ahead the government came to the conclusion that they would have to take hold of it. But there were negotiations with the companies, and they were not willing to agree to reasonable conditions.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman might say whether the elevator is to be free ?

Mr. FIELDING. The question has never been formally submitted for decision. I never contemplated that the elevators should be free. I think the public should pay the ordinary elevator charges, just as if it had been put up by a private company.

Mr. FOWLER. What style of an elevator is this to be ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The plan has not been prepared yet, but it is to be a modern style elevator.

Mr. FOWLER. Will it be tubular or not ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It will be of the most modern sort.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you had any correspondence with any forwarding companies stating that when a sufficient depth of water is provided at Port Colborne they intend to utilize this harbour ? I understand that there was some correspondence with a Glasgow or other Scotch firm that were going to put on a line of freight boats.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have heard that the completion of the works there and the erection of an elevator will bring traffic that does not now go that way ; but I have not been familiar enough with the conditions prevailing there to know as to that.

Galops rapids—to complete channel (revote) $28,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. You want that to stand ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. EMMERSON. Stands.

Lachine Canal—to widen road at Lower basin, $49,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Will this complete it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is to widen the road at the lower basin. This roadway between the basin and the roadways is so narrow that it is impossible to carry on the business.

Mr. HAGGART. That is in front of the sugar refinery ?

Mr. GALLERY. No, No. 1 basin is in front of the sugar refinery. It is necessary to have this road widened.

Lachine Canal—to complete paving of Mill street (revote) $3,500.

Mr. HAGGART. Where is Mill street ?

Mr. GALLERY. I think my hon. friend knows where Mill street is. We have already voted $75,000 for the paving of the street.

Mr. HAGGART. Is this work nearly finished ?

Mr. GALLERY. I think this will finish it.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not quite understand why we are doing this paving.

Mr. EMMERSON. The property is owned by the government.

Beauharnois Canal—rebuilding weir at Valleyfield, $15,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Are you using the Beauharnois canal now ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Rideau Canal—to rebuild dam at Poonamalie lock station, $10,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is the Poonamalie dam. Pass the other item and let that stand.

Mr. EMMERSON. Stands. We will now go back to item 9.

Extension of Rideau Canal, $50,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What extension is that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is the extension of the canal and building of locks to get to the mineral district. There is a great body of mineral which is inaccessible to railways and it is reported that by cutting through the canal and building two locks it will give about 17 miles of waterway into the lakes.

Mr. HAGGART. What lakes ?

Mr. EMMERSON. From Desert lake to Devil lake.

Mr. TAYLOR. It not only does that but it furnishes a supply of water which is not now available for the navigation of the Rideau canal.

Railway Commission—to provide for the maintenance and operation of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, $60,000.

Mr. HAGGART. What will the Railway Commission cost altogether, private car and all ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It will cost somewhere in the vicinity of $60,000 a year.

Mr. HAGGART. Wages and all.

Mr. EMMERSON. They will require a traffic expert and traffic clerks.

Mr. HAGGART. What does the traffic expert get ?

Mr. EMMERSON. $3,500.

Mr. HAGGART. Who is he ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Hardwell, formerly assistant freight agent of the Intercolonial Railway stationed at Montreal.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the $60,000 cover the private car ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That was paid out of last year. This will cover any expenses connected with the use of the private car.

Mr. HAGGART. What are the other salaries ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is the chief engineer, $4,800, Mr. Geo. A. Mountain. Then there are two engineers, Mr. Simmons and Mr. Tessier who receive about $2,000 each. These two appointments have not been made but these two gentlemen have been recommended. They are still in the department. The other items are : Traffic expert and traffic clerks, $7,000 ; registrar and accountant, $1,800 ; law clerk, $2,500 ; filing and correspondence clerks, $2,500 ;

chief engineer and assistants, $9,000 ; chief inspector of accidents, $2,500 ; assistant inspectors of accidents, $400 ; stenographers and typewriters, $5,000 ; caretaker of the offices, $500 ; usher of their court and two messengers, $1,500; cook and porter on car, $1,360; official reporting for the board $3,000; travelling expenses for the staff, engineers, and inspectors, $7,000 ; printing and stationery, $5,000 ; advertising, publication of tariffs, publication of orders of the board, $2,000 ; general contingencies, $5,000 ; total, $59,660.

Mr. HACKETT. Besides that there are the commissioners' salaries and the rent of the building.

Mr. EMMERSON. These items of course are simply the recommendation of the board. They have been acted upon only with regard to two or three of the recommendations.

Mr. HACKETT. It will cost more than the Supreme Court ? I hope the government will not be a party to such an enormous expenditure as that, a useless expenditure.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is an expensive luxury.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would not go so far as to say that it is a useless expenditure, I think that it is a good expenditure and that the work they are doing has proved to be of advantage to the country. However that is neither here nor there. I think it was stated by the Minister of Railways of that day, when the Railway Bill was going through parliament, that he anticipated the expenses would be $100,000 a year.

Mr. BLAIN. Have the Railway Commission the absolute power to purchase and engage and expend money as they see fit ?

Mr. FIELDING. I would not understand that.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand there is some considerable conflict between the members of the government and the Railway Commission over this matter.

Mr. FIELDING. I would not say there was any conflict. All bodies like to get all the money for public purposes they can and it is the business of a hard headed Finance Minister sometimes to prevent them getting all they would like.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. minister has been pretty liberal.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend only knows what we grant, he does not know what we cut down.

Mr. HAGGART. Fancy a law clerk and three engineers. It is perfectly absurd. It is an enormity I think almost as great as the capital expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway.

Welland Canal—repairs, $35,000.

Mr. HAGGART. What are the repairs ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The repairs are in locks 12, 15 and 16 of the new canal. It is proposed to take out the present wooden floors and replace them with concrete, the walls and floors being badly undermined. The regulating weirs also require considerable repairs to their foundations.

Chambly Canal—additional lockmen, $3,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This will provide for two additional lockmen at each of the six locks from St. Johns. The staff at combined locks 7, 8 and 9 need not be increased. The additional cost for the ensuing years will be $3,780 instead of $3,000, the additional men being employed during seven months. Complaints came in from the shipping. There were some accidents, and it was necesary to increase the force at these particular locks.

Mr. FOWLER. Has there been an increase in the traffic on this canal ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not think there has been any very great increase in the traffic.

Mr. FOWLER. As a matter of fact, has not the traffic been less ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think not. I think the traffic has been increased over last year.

Mr. HAGGART. It has fallen off considerably from what it was formerly.

Mr. BRODEUR. The traffic, instead of decreasing, has largely increased in recent years. In fact all the pulp wood exported to the United States is passing through that canal. The pulp wood exported from Three Rivers district passes through it and of late years the traffic has certainly increased.

Mr. INGRAM. I find by the Auditor General's Report that the receipts have decreased $828.35 which does not show that the trade is increasing.

Mr. FOWLER. For eleven years you have worked this canal with a reduced staff and now, without any increase in the volume of business you are putting on twelve additional men. I suppose that is another indication of the approaching election.

Mr. EMMERSON. Complaints were made by the shipping interests to the department that the locks were not sufficiently manned and two or three accidents have occurred. In one of them a workman lost his life.

Mr. INGRAM. I suppose the correspondence is in the department in connection with these complaints ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. The whole of the trips through the Chambly canal during the year is 3,323, and the total tonnage 296,709. There is no more passing through that canal than through the Rideau.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. I do not know what the statistics are, but I know the place and I know also the Rideau canal. If any of these gentlemen would go to the port of St. John, they would see a great difference between the trade on the Rideau canal and that passing through the Chambly canal. The Chambly canal is always filled with boats. Perhaps some of the boats do not carry goods both ways, which would make a difference in the tonnage, but the personnel employed on the locks have the same trouble and I am sure that this year the number of boats has increased. The shipping interests are complaining that the service is insufficient at night. I have received many complaints myself. They complain that one man is insufficient at night and ask the government to return to the old system previous to 1893.

Superannuation—extra allowance to Mr. Wallace, expostmaster at Victoria, B.C., $240.

Mr. INGRAM. How does this come ?

Mr. FIELDING. That is an old allowance that has been there for years. I think he was postmaster before confederation.

Mr. INGRAM. And did not get the allowance he was properly entitled to.

Mr. FIELDING. It has been voted year after year, and I do not think I ever heard a question asked about it before.

Militia and Defence—chargeable to income—clothing, $100,000.

Mr. SPROULE. That is an increase. I think that had better be allowed to stand.

Mr. FIELDING. Stand.

Grants to rifle and other associations, $45,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Is there any list of the clubs who receive these grants ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, I have the list. While I am on my feet, I desire to say, with regard to the item for military clothing, that there is another item in the supplementary estimates, and perhaps this one that has just been allowed to stand could be passed with the understanding that anything that hon. gentlemen wish to discuss can be discussed on the other item. And I would have the same understanding with my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) with regard to this vote for rifle associations. I will get the information he desires.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). Carried.

Dominion arsenal, $150,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice an item in the newspapers to the effect that there is going to be another arsenal established at headquarters at Ottawa and also probably one in the West.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I can tell my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) about that in a word. Nothing has been absolutely decided upon. But there is an English firm largely engaged in business of this kind which is disposed to establish at or near Ottawa a cartridge factory and also a powder factory. The department is not disposed to agree to any contract for the manufacture of cartridges unless the same company will undertake also to manufacture explosives, and there seems to be a strong probability that the company will be ready to undertake both. The capacity of the cartridge factory would be about 20,000,000 rounds per annum, and the company would expect the government to undertake to purchase a certain minimum quantity—of course nothing like 20,000,000, perhaps 5,000,000 or 10,000,000 rounds per year, and to take a certain number of tons of explosives that would be required for our own cartridge factory at Quebec, and any other explosives that might be required. There would be a contract made with this company to take a minimum quantity. The capacity of the company to manufacture would be considerably above, probably about double the quantity that the government would agree to purchase.

Mr. SPROULE. Then I understand it is the settled policy of the government to establish a factory ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Salary of superintendent of insurance, $4,000.

Mr. FIELDING. The business is all the time increasing. The expenses are paid by the insurance offices; it is not a charge on the treasury.

Expenses in connection with the Canada Temperance Act, $500.

Mr. FIELDING. If there should be an election at any time under the Canada Temperance Act, we would want a little money to pay the cost.

Unforeseen expenses, expenditure thereof to be under Order in Council, $30,000.

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase of $10,000.

Mr. FIELDING. The amount has stood at $20,000 for a long time. My hon. friend will see that with the general growth of business it is a very small sum to have at the disposal of the government. I think the expenditure last year was much less ; but at any moment some unexpected thing might turn up, and it would be prudent to have a vote of that character ready.

Some resolutions reported.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) delivered two messages from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the messages as follows :

MINTO.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons further supplementary estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the fiscal year 1903-4, and, in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, 25th July, 1904.

MINTO.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons further supplementary estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1905, and, in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, 25th July, 1904.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the messages of His Excellency, together with the estimates, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What business will be taken up to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. We will take up the resolution of my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue respecting tobacco, then we will take up the resolution of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture regarding the contagious diseases of animals, and probably the resolution respecting the bounty on petroleum. When we deal with these three, if we find that we have any further time we will be at liberty to take any of the orders that are standing on the order paper at this stage of the session.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would it not be wise to allow the proposed legislation of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue to stand over ? I have a letter to-night stating that a deputation from Kingston wish to come down and interview the minister, and I thought I could wire them upon the morning before the day on which the Bill is coming up.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think we might take up the resolution to-morrow and we will not dispose of the Bill until the day after to-morrow. I will be very pleased to hear what the deputation have to say.

Mr. TAYLOR. It would be a waste of time to take any proceedings until you hear the deputation.

Mr. BRODEUR. We have had some representations on the subject, and I am bound to say that I do not think it would be possible to delay further consideration of this resolution. We will take it up to-morrow, and take the Bill afterwards.

Mr. TAYLOR. As we will have another session in a few months, I think you had better allow it to stand. It will raise a whole day's discussion, and it will prevent prorogation until some day next week if we go on.

Mr. BRODEUR. The question will raise some discussion, but if we are going to prorogue on Saturday even next week, we must take the resolution as soon as possible.

Mr. FIELDING. We had better go on to-morrow, and we will see how the thing develops.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.20 a.m., Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, August 4, 1904.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

COL. OTTER—FENIAN RAID.

Mr. E. D. SMITH asked :

1. What were the orders issued or instructions given by the Militia Department, or by the G. O. C., to Colonel W. D. Otter for services during the Fenian Raid of 1870 ?
2. On what dates was he on active service ?
3. Where did he serve ?
4. What extra pay did he receive ?
5. What troops served under him ?
6. Were there any clasps or medals issued, or are there any records of services rendered in the Militia List, the application for which was not the same as Militia Form A17 ?

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

1. No record at headquarters.
2. October, 1869, to May, 1870.
3. At Toronto.
4. No record at headquarters.
5. No record at headquarters.
6. None, so far as Fenian Raid or Red River are concerned.

STR. 'ALERT'—ST. LAWRENCE CANAL.

Mr. J. D. REID—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. How many men are employed to run the steamer 'Alert' on the St. Lawrence Canals ?

2. What is the total amount of wages per month, including board of the crew, paid to run the said steamer ?

3. What is the total cost in wages, fuel, &c., to run the said steamer ?

4. What is the total value of the furniture purchasd by Superintendent Stewart for said steamer since he took charge of same, and on whose authority did he make said purchase?

5. How many persons, outside of the crew, were on board on the trip up the Bay of Quinté on said steamer ; and who authorized the said trip ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Five men.

2. $270 per month.

3. For the month of July the cost was $351.

4. $60. It was purchased by Superintendent Stewart without special authority.

5. Four persons outside of the crew. The trip was made in the ordinary course of official duties. No special authority was necessary, as the Murray canal is under the charge of Superintendent Stewart.

TRURO ARMOURY.

Mr. GOURLEY asked :

1. Does the government intend to build an armoury at Truro this year or in the near future ?

2. What is the policy of the government with reference to building armouries in Nova Scotia?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). The matter is under consideration. There is a large lump sum in the estimates for the construction of armouries, out of which armouries may be built at many points.

Mr. GOURLEY. I would point out to the hon. minister that we have a very fine rifle club in Truro, that our militia are active and are entitled to some recognition.

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) moved that the House go into committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution :

That it is expedient to provide that the Customs Act be amended as follows :—

1. That the following provisions be added to section 2 of the said Act :—

(s.). The expression 'duty' or 'duties' includes 'special duty' and 'special duties'.

2. That section 7 of the said Act shall be amended by striking out the following words :— 'and the additional sum, if any, payable under the next following section of this Act.'

3. That section 8 of the said Act, as amended by section 4 of Chapter 14 of the Statutes of 1888, be repealed.

4. That the following subsection be added to section 62 of the said Act, as amended by section 5 of Chapter 14 of the Statutes of 1889 :— 'Provided, however, in respect of goods shipped to Canada on consignment, but which have been sold by the exporter to persons in Canada prior to their importation into Canada, that the duties shall not be assessed in any case upon an amount less than the invoice value to the Canadian purchaser ; exclusive of all charges therein, after shipment from the place whence exported directly to Canada.

'When articles of the same material, or of a similar kind but of a different quality, are found in the same package, charged or invoiced at an average price, it shall be the duty of the appraisers to adopt the value of the best article contained in such package as the average value of the whole ; and duty shall be levied thereon accordingly.

'(2.) The Board of Customs may review the decision of any appraiser or collector of customs as to the principal markets of the country, or as to the fair market value of goods for duty purposes. The decision of the board of customs in regard to such principal markets, and value of goods for duty purposes in any case or class of cases, shall, when approved by the Minister of Customs, be final and conclusive, except as otherwise provided in the Customs Act.'

SATURDAY SESSION.

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

That when this House adjourns on Friday next, it stand adjourned to the following day, Saturday, at 11 a.m.; and that the order of proceedings will be the same as the order for Friday.

Motion agreed to.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT, 1901— AMENDMENT.

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved third reading of Bill (No. 148) to amend the Dominion Elections Act.

Mr. GEO. O. ALCORN. I beg to present the motion I made in committee the other day with regard to section 3 of this Bill, which affects section 29 of the Elections Act. Hon. gentlemen are probably familiar with the matter at issue. Under the Elections Act, as it now stands, the Governor General fixes the days of nomination and election, and names them in the writs, except as regards certain constituencies, two in Quebec and, under the amendment made by this Bill, three in British Columbia. As regards the excepted constituencies, the returning officer fixes both the day of nomination and the day of election, the alleged reason for this being that in those constituencies, owing to their large area and sparse population, it is impossible for the returning officer to do the work assigned to him preparatory to the polling within the delay prescribed in the other constituencies. That work consists mainly of posting his proclamation, which is begun as soon as possible after the receipt of the writs, and the posting notices of the holding of the poll after nomination. It is said that the time allowed under the ordinary rule in other constituencies would not be sufficient in these excepted constituencies. As regards the other duties of the returning officer. I am

satisfied there would be no difficulty whatever in his performing the whole of them within the time fixed by the Bill as it now stands. It is also said that the distribution of the ballot boxes would occupy a little more time than the ordinary rule allows. I understand that the rule ordinarily followed by successive governments is to allow a period of about thirty days between the issue of the writs of election and the polling day. But for the purpose of avoiding any difficulty which the returning officer might experience with respect to the work he has to do in the excepted ridings, I propose that that period of thirty days be divided into two equal periods and to allow fourteen days before and fourteen days after nomination day. In the excepted ridings, instead of postponing the holding of the poll to a date subsequent to that on which the poll is held in other constituencies, I would advance the date of nomination by a week, and allow fourteen days after the issue of the writ for nomination in the excepted constituencies and fourteen days between nomination day and polling day.

I think it is perfectly obvious that this amendment will overcome any difficulty which can reasonably be alleged to exist in the way of the returning officer performing the several duties assigned to him with regard to the posting of the proclamation and notices and the distribution of the ballot boxes. The difficulty assigned as the reason for postponing the elections in Chicoutimi and Saguenay and other districts is that there is not sufficient time to do this work. At confederation, that difficulty might possibly have furnished reasonable grounds for postponing the election, but it has long since disappeared. Allowing fourteen days between nomination and polling is certainly all that is necessary to enable us to have all the elections on one day. Successive governments have left this provision in the election law because it was supposed that advantage might be derived through holding what were in effect a number of by-elections after the general election. I think it is time that that should be swept away and that all the elections be held at the same time.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). I fear that, if we are to accept as accurate the statements made with respect to the local conditions in these constituencies by those who are familiar with them, and which conditions seemed to justify the laws which we have had on the statute-book for many years past, this amendment will not help us to a sufficient extent. I cannot see any good reason why we should depart from the law which we have had so long and which, I think, is still necessary under the circumstances of these excepted constituencies.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have not heard any argument that would convince me that there should be any exception with regard to the two constituencies in British Columbia which I have named, and especially with regard to one of them as to which I have had statements from independent men who are worthy of belief. These men assure me that there is no reason why the election should not be held in the new riding of Kootenay on the same day as the other elections in Canada. While disposed to admit that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) is desirous of doing what is right, I believe he is being misled by his political friends in British Columbia and that this election is to be postponed simply for considerations of party expediency and not from any necessity arising out of the circumstances.

Amendment (Mr. Alcorn) negatived on division.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the motion for the third reading of the Bill is put, I desire again to mention the two Bills introduced by my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) of which I spoke on a previous occasion.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have a memorandum with regard to these Bills. But, unfortunately, it has been left at my office. If my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) will agree, we can read this Bill a third time now, and, at three o'clock, I will be prepared to make a statement with regard to the Bills to which he refers.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

BOUNTIES ON STEEL.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolutions :

That it is expedient to amend Chapter 68 of the Statutes of 1903, respecting bounties on certain articles manufactured from steel, and to provide as follows :—

1. That section 1 of the said Act be amended by adding the words 'or used,' after the word 'use' in subsection (a), and after the word 'sold' in subsections '(b)' and '(c)'.

2. That the foregoing provisions shall be held to have come into force on the 24th of October, 1903.—Sir Richard Cartwright.

Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT (Minister of Trade and Commerce). The object of this resolution is simply to enable parties who not only manufacture wire, but use it in processes of further manufacture in their own factories to enjoy the bounty. That was, I think, the clear intention of the Act, but the question was raised in the Auditor General's office as to whether it could be so interpreted. If parties used wire produced by others, there was no question as to their right to the bounty, but if they produced it in their own factories and used it, objection was taken.

Resolutions read the second time and agreed to.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 165) to amend chapter 68 of the statutes of 1903 respecting the bounties on steel and iron.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first and second time, and House in committee thereon.

Mr. WILSON. I would like the right hon. gentleman to explain what this means, because I do not feel well disposed towards the bounties.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This legislation is introduced to meet an objection taken by the Auditor General. Although there is no question whatever that parties making this steel and selling it to others should receive the bounty, there is a question whether, if they manufacture the iron into wire in their own factories, they are entitled to get the bounty. I think the section is clearly in their favour, but it is to remove any doubt that these words are inserted.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

THE TOBACCO INDUSTRY.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Inland Revenue) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Inland Revenue Act, in providing that :

(2.) Any license authorized by this Act may be cancelled in any case where a person who, being a manufacturer of any class of goods subject to a duty of excise, either directly or indirectly—

(a.) makes a sale of any such goods to a person who sells or intends to sell goods of that class in connection with his own business, subject to the condition that the purchaser shall not sell or deal in goods of a like kind produced by or obtained or to be obtained, from any other manufacturer or dealer ; or

(b.) makes such sale upon terms that would in their application deprive the purchaser of any profit upon the sale of such goods, if he should sell or deal in goods of a like kind, produced by, or obtained, or to be obtained, from any other manufacturer or dealer ; or

(c.) consigns any such goods to another person for sale upon commission, upon such terms that the consignee can profit by such sale only if he does not sell or deal in goods of a like kind manufactured by or obtained or to be obtained from any other manufacturer or dealer.

He said : This legislation has been asked for by almost all the tobacco growers of this country. We have received petitions from tobacco growers in the west as well as from those in the east, asking for legislation of this kind, and from almost all the independent Canadian tobacco manufacturers. This Bill is the outcome of the report of the investigation made by Judge MacTavish in 1902 and 1903, which report has been laid before the House. Complaints have been made to the government that the Empire Tobacco Company and the American Tobacco Company were making exclusive contracts which tended to create a monopoly in this country, and which tended also to a certain extent to destroy all independent manufacturers. The government thought it their duty to investigate the matter, to find out whether these allegations were true, and whether it would be advisable to introduce legislation. That report is well known to members of this House, it was laid on the table last year and again this year. I see, Mr. Speaker, that during the last few days the Empire Tobacco Company and the American Tobacco Company have favoured the members of this House with a memo. upon the resolutions which I have the honour to introduce now ; in which they complain of this legislation as being arbitrary and absolutely opposed to the principle of fair competition. Now, Sir, on account of the memo. having been sent to the members of this House, I propose to give in a few words the history of this American Tobacco Company and this Empire Tobacco Company, and to show what are their aims and objects in opposing this legislation. The American Tobacco Company is not an unknown company in the United States. We find that in 1890 that company was incorporated under the laws of New Jersey as an amalgamation of several tobacco companies, especially of cigarette companies, and a trust with a capital of $25,000,000 was then formed. Since 1890 this little trust of $25,000,000 has increased its capital, according to a report which I hold in my hand, till it has now a capital of $301,576,000 ; so that this company which started with $25,000,000 in 1900 now has a capital, increased by water and otherwise, of over $300,000,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As the hon. gentleman refers to water, I should say he ought to use the word diluted.

Mr. BRODEUR. The right hon. gentleman is right. Almost immediately after the formation of this cigarette trust in the United States, they invaded this country and bought up two or three manufactories of cigarettes. In 1895, the same year in which they bought these independent concerns, they got letters patent from the government, and I find by those letters patent that amongst the persons who asked for them were J. B. Duke, George Arents and Wm. Henry Butler, of New York. Almost at the same time the American Tobacco Company of the United States asked to be listed on the New York Stock Exchange, and there we see, amongst the names of the directors of that American trust, the names of Mr. James B. Duke, George Arents and Wm. Henry Butler ; that is to say, we find the

same men who got letters patent in Canada were directors and proprietors to a certain extent, of the American trust. We find also, by the report of the secretary and treasurer of the company made in 1895, that the American Company were not able in that year to declare a dividend, on account of the increased volume of business and the acquisition during the year of new plant, the company required more working capital than before. So, they did not declare a dividend in 1895 in order that they might buy some new plant. We find in an interview which was published in the New York 'Tribune' in December, 1895, the following statement made by the secretary of the company :

The company last summer paid $1,000,000 for the cigarette business in Canada.

So I say that this American Trust which has been incorporated here under the name of the American Tobacco Company, is controlling the cigarette business of this country and we have evidence that 84 per cent of the cigarette business of Canada is now under the control of the American Trust. They have almost succeeded in killing the cigarette business of independent manufacturers and they have substituted for the former conditions their own modes of doing business. We see also in the report of Judge MacTavish, that in 1898, the United States plug tobacco business was amalgamated and placed under the control of the American Trust. We see also that after having obtained incorporation in the United States, they came to this country, bought out the Empire Tobacco Company and some other companies which are now under their control. Judge McTavish says that the Empire Tobacco Company are now virtually controlled by the same management as that which control the American Tobacco Company. In addition to that last year, or the year before, the American Tobacco Company virtually amalgamated most of the cigar factories in the United States. We must not forget that they are now controlling the United States cigarette business, and that immediately after consummating that arrangement, in 1895 or a little before 1895, they came up to this country and secured control of the cigarette business of Canada. We must also remember that some time after they succeeded in amalgamating the plug tobacco business of the United States, they came up to this country and did the same thing. They had last year or the year before amalgamated the cigar business and we must expect—in fact, I do not know whether it is not now going on in this country—that before many months have passed, they will try to take control of the market of the cigar manufacturers of Canada. Therefore, all the tobacco raised or produced in this country will be entirely under the control of the American Trust.

Mr. BRODEUR.

Now, what are their methods of doing business ? Their methods of doing business in this country are the same as those which exist in the United States. I may perhaps remark here en passant some of the features of those famous contracts of the American Tobacco Company. I commend these contracts to the business men of this House, because I think they will find that under such a contract there is no chance for any other concern to live. Take the contract made in 1895 by the American Tobacco Company and which is still in force ; the selling price is fixed by the company. The purchasers are designated by the company, the freight from the factory to the stores is paid by the company, the property in the goods remains also in the company, but if it happens that the store of the wholesale trader in which these goods have been stored is destroyed by fire the loss has to be sustained by the merchant. Bad debts which the merchant incurs are to be made good by him and the cost of storing and selling the goods is also to be borne by the consignee. Here are several important conditions of this contract, and if the merchant fulfils all these seven conditions, he gets the large profit of two per cent for the sale of these goods. But, there is another clause in this contract which provides that if the merchant will deal exclusively in the products of the American Tobacco Company, he will receive six per cent. But, that is not all. In spite of all these stringent conditions of the contract it is provided also that the company shall be the sole judge whether the merchant shall be entitled to such a percentage or not ; that is to say that they impose upon the wholesale traders the most stringent conditions and they say further that they will pay him only if they want to pay him. But, there is more than that. We find in the exclusive contract of the American Tobacco Company that the merchant will be entitled to this percentage on one condition, and this condition is that he shall not deal in any other Canadian tobacco. They do not care about foreign tobacco. They permit the wholesale traders to sell foreign tobacco, but they prohibit them from selling any other Canadian tobacco in competition with their own. They discriminate against our product and permit the wholesale trader to deal in foreign products ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the hon. gentleman the exact language of that clause ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, the exact language is this :

4th. If you handle no manufactured tobacco made from Canadian leaf or made from a combination of Canadian and foreign leaf except in the brands made by us, and, if you, in all respects, fully comply with the terms and conditions of this agreement, we will pay you a rebate of five cents per pound.

They prohibit the wholesale traders from selling any other Canadian tobacco except

their own, but they do not prevent them from selling any tobacco made from foreign leaf. They discriminate against the Canadian tobacco in this way because they permit the wholesale traders to sell foreign leaf tobacco while they do not permit them to sell any other Canadian leaf except their own. So, I think this makes it very plain that they are discriminating against our own product. Now, I say that this method of doing business in Canada is the same as that which has been adopted by the American Trust in the United States, and we want to know whether an American Trust from the United States can have the privilege of coming into this country and destroying our own industries by such business methods.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is not this the same combination or trust which went to Great Britain and undertook to control the whole tobacco trade ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And was there not a trust formed in Great Britain for the purpose of fighting it ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Can the hon. gentleman tell me whether that is still existing, or whether the two have combined, and what the conditions are under which the business is carried on in the mother country, because that would be a great assistance to us in determining what restrictions should be employed in this country ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have no special information as to the result of that fight in Great Britain between the independent men and the American trust, but my impression is that they have come to some agreement, I am not very positive as to that. I am under the impression, as the leader of the opposition is, that the American trust bought an interest in the British firms and tried to form a combine, but I do not know whether they have succeeded or not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They did go over there and there was a battle royal between the two trusts. The tobacco manufacturers of Great Britain formed a combine with fifteen million pounds, or twenty-five million pounds sterling and a great deal of money was expended in the contest. I understand that finally the arrangement was made by which the British trust would handle in Great Britain the tobacco of the American trust, and the American trust would handle on this side of the Atlantic—not only in the United States, but in Canada—the tobacco manufactured by the British combine. For example, if you take Wills' tobacco which formerly came to us direct from England, it is now sent into Canada through the American trust. What I want to know particularly is, whether or not in the mother country, there is any coercion—if you may use that word—practised by the British trust which was formerly for the purpose of fighting the American trust.

Mr. MONK. The result of the conflict in Great Britain was that they combined. The British manufacturers kept the British territory and the American territory was left to the American trust, and some arrangement was made as regards the colony.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have no special information as to the result of the efforts of the American trust to control the British market, but I have no doubt that my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) is correct. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice has now handed me a book which tells of the result of the tobacco in England. I quote the following :

> Mr. Thomas F. Ryan who conducted the negotiations for this large consolidation in England announced at this time that the Consolidated Tobacco Company (The American Trust) will now pursue its business in the American field including not only the United States but Cuba, Port Rico, the Hawaiian Islands, and the Philippines. The Imperial Company (that was the firm in England) will carry on the business in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland including Scotland and Wales. In the new British American Tobacco Company, limited, the Imperial Company has one third of its stock, and the Consolidated Tobacco Company two thirds. The British American Tobacco Company (that is the new combine on the other side, I think) will carry on the entire business in all foreign countries including India, Canada and Australia.

I am sorry to say that this official of the company had declared that Canada is a foreign country.

Mr. GOURLEY. That is got up by a Yankee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. These are the words of an American writer.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And the words of a Canadian statute ; the Patent Act.

Mr. BRODEUR. It was alleged some time ago by a member of the delegation which came before the government to support those exclusive contracts, that those contracts have been forced upon the trust by the wholesale grocers of the province of Ontario. I must say that those contracts have not been imposed by the grocers upon the American trust as has been alleged. When the delegate, Mr. Bristol, made that assertion I asked him the date of these contracts, but he could not give me the information. He informed me, however, by telegram the day before yesterday that these contracts were made for the first time at the request of the grocers in the month of August, 1898. Mr. Bristol was misinformed as to that, because I see in Hallé, on trusts,

page 25, a reference to the origin of the combines in the United States, which says:

> In some cases finally the coercion is upheld by a system of premiums. The one party pledges itself to buy only from the other or to sell exclusively to it; in compensation it receives special rebates. The American Tobacco Company has for a long while granted such rebates to the cigarette dealers.

Mr. Bristol was therefore misinformed, because these contracts were in existence long before 1898. This book was written in 1895, and we find that the American Tobaco Company were then using these exclusive tobacco contracts. I may say also that in Moody, he speaks of this agreement as being an agreement which has been in existence for years in the dealings of the American Tobacco Company, under the name of 'secret factory agreement.' We have therefore the American Tobacco Trust firmly established in Canada. They have imported into this country their exclusive contract system, and their business methods which they have practised for years in the United States. They propose in two ways to destroy our national industries. In the first place, they buy out a number of existing manufactories. They have bought five such in the province of Quebec: One in Granby, one in Montreal, two in Quebec city and one in Joliette, and of these five factories, three are now closed and only two are in operation. After having purchased and closed those factories they are trying to kill the other manufacturers and having these exclusive contracts, they are using them for that purpose. The trust began this process by advertising very largely their brands of cigars and cigarettes. They are spending large sums in advertising and as I have shown, they have $300,000,000 at their disposal so that they can afford to spend large sums of money. The leader of the opposition will find from the book in his hands, that in England, in order to kill the English tobacco manufacturers they went so far as to make a contract with the retail dealers by which they offered them $1,000,000, that is to say, all their profits during four years if they handled that tobacco exclusively. That is the way they have been doing in England and that is the way they are doing in this country. These are some of the reasons for the legislation which I am now introducing. I say first that no restraint of trade should be allowed in this country. Let us have a free country in all respects, let us be free of any foreign corporation, and let us act as we should act, as Canadians, and purely as Canadians, for the Canadian interest. I say further that no monopolies should exist in this country. Here is a monopoly which is controlling the market in the United States; we should not permit that monopoly to exist in this country. I say that no American trust should control our manufactory, and in saying that I believe I voice the utterances of every man of this House. We want independence in this respect, and no American trust should be allowed to control our manufactures.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I desire to understand the hon. minister's position. Would he regard this as just as great an evil to the people of the country if the capital were all subscribed in Canada and the same methods pursued? Would it not still be an evil? I admit the danger from the United States because they have larger amounts of capital, but if the same methods were pursued and all the capital were Canadian it would be an evil all the same.

Mr. BRODEUR. We would be in the face of a similar danger, but here we have industries now existing, manufactures that have been established for some years in this country. The trust are destroying those manufactures, and the question facing us is whether we should allow their destruction or come to their rescue. I say that these contracts should not be allowed because they discriminate against our own products as I have shown a minute ago. I may be asked: Why not introduce a general law or amend the Criminal Code? That brings me to the discussion of the effect of the anti-trust legislation introduced into the United States. That began in 1887 by the Interstate Commerce Law. Later in 1890 they introduced the Sherman Anti-Trust law, and the government established the Department of Labour and Commerce. In many of the states of the American Union legislation has been introduced for the purpose of preventing the establishment of these trusts but in all cases they have simply declared that the trusts were illegal and should not be allowed and then they provided for a penalty. What is the result? Numberless Bills were filed with the different state legislatures during the next few years. They aimed at forbidding combines for the purpose of raising the prices, &c. They provided for fines of $5,000 to $10,000 and imprisonment for from five to ten years for breaches of the law. Despite of all these rigid provisions of the law, the trusts are just as powerful as they ever were in the United States, and if we simply take the power here to deal with the American trust which is existing in this country by making them liable to a fine of $500 or $1,000, will result in their fighting the matter before the courts for three or four years and in the meantime the national industries will be destroyed. I say that this is not the most effective remedy and after studying the question carefully I have come to the conclusion that the only way of dealing with this American tobacco trust is in the way I am now suggesting. Mr. Speaker you will see by the report of Judge MacTavish that they have in the state of Massachusetts a law of this kind. Judge MacTavish de-

clared in his report that this law would not be sufficient and would not meet the case. Then I am asked : what should we do ? I claim that the only way of dealing with these people is to deal with them as they are trying to deal with others, to give them the same remedy as they are giving to others. That is the reason why I think that the best way would be to provide for the cancellation of their licenses provided they do not cancel those exclusive contracts which they have in existence to-day. We are not going to kill them, I am simply asking this parliament to declare that these people will have to cancel these exclusive contracts, will have to open the channels of trade which they have closed now, and will give the trade the opportunity of dealing with the wholesale traders as the trust now does. It has been alleged that the trade was siding with the American Tobacco Company. I say now, the trade is not siding with the American tobacco trust, the trade is opposed to the trust and the trade is willing that these exclusive contracts should be cancelled as soon as possible. I have in my hands a resolution passed at a special meeting of the Wholesale Grocers' Association of Montreal, and I am led to believe that all the members of that association have signed these exclusive contracts. In this resolution which was passed on July 19, just a few days ago, they said :

> Resolved, that no one be authorized to go to Ottawa on behalf of the Montreal Wholesale Grocers' Association to support the case of the American Tobacco Company.

Here are men who have signed the contracts because otherwise they could not do any business in tobacco, and in spite of that they say. We are not going to support the demand made by the American trust. It might be alleged, it has been alleged in the document which has been distributed amongst the members of this House that the power which we are asking is an arbitrary power. I say no, I say that this power is much less arbitrary than that given in the statute which has existed in this province for years. In 1893 under the regime of the Conservative party a law was introduced in amendment to the Inland Revenue Act declaring that :

> The Minister of Inland Revenue may, where for any reason he deems it in the public interest to do so, refuse to issue any license authorized by this Act.

That is to say that for any reason that the minister deems it expedient he may refuse any license. Is this not a more arbitrary power than the one I am asking ? What I am asking is simply this, that when a license has been granted, either the Minister of Inland Revenue or the Governor in Council, as the House may determine, may cancel the license if such and such a thing exists. In the law passed by hon. gentlemen opposite it is declared that the Minister of Inland Revenue had the right to refuse any license for any reason. I am not asking as much as that but am simply asking that I should be empowered to cancel the license when such and such a contract exists. The minister has almost the same powers to cancel a license when the licensee is unable to render an account or does not pay his dues or penalties. These are very extraordinary powers, but I am not aware of any one instance in which they have been exercised to the detriment of trade.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman consider that this trust is in restraint of trade ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It must be, and Judge MacTavish in his report says that though the contract is legal, it is certainly in restraint of trade.

Mr. SPROULE. Should they not be prosecuted for a penalty under the Criminal Code ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am afraid the result would be that they would drag the case through three or four courts and it would take two or three years before any result could be had. I think the remedy I propose is much more effective. We are face to face with a very serious situation.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not wish to be understood as not being in favour of this. I am not opposing it but simply wish to ascertain what is the best remedy.

Mr. BRODEUR. We are face to face with a very serious danger. These people are taking control of the cigarette business. They have formed a trust for the plug tobacco business. And last year or the year before they formed a trust for the cigar business. And before two or three years our 204 cigar factories, which are giving employment to many people, may be destroyed by this American trust. Is it not our duty to do something to relieve that industry and prevent it from falling into the hands of a foreign corporation. What in such cases will be the result ? There will then be only one buyer, the American trust, and that will pay the farmers whatever price it likes. What will be the result to the merchants ? Take a merchant who today is doing a profitable business, when the trust will be absolute master of the situation, it will come to those wholesale dealers and dictate terms to them. The wholesale men will be at their mercy. It has been alleged that we are interfering to a certain extent with private contracts. Well, if you take the anti-combine clause of 1897 in the Customs Act, is that not an interference with private contracts ? Take the anti-dumping clause now before parliament, is that not an interference with private contracts ? This legislation is asked for the purpose of destroying a private contract made between the exporters and importers

and parliament would be remiss in its duty if they would not pass the legislation I am now introducing. It is perhaps not perfect, it might be better or stronger, but I think it will meet the evil and hope it will receive the support of this House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The question with which the hon. gentleman proposes to deal is one that is very much larger than appears on the surface of these resolutions. It concerns the effect of enormous aggregations of capital which may be used for the purpose of crushing out persons carrying on smaller enterprises with moderate capital. I do not see that the evil would be very different whether the capital employed be Canadian or American, except in one respect. The profits on capital belonging to the United States will go over to that country, but if the capital be raised in Canada, they will be distributed in this country. So far, however, as the individual dealer is concerned, who is crushed out of existence it makes not the slightest difference to him whether the capital employed to crush him comes from the United States or this country. Let me point out in that connection some of the clauses to which the hon. gentleman has referred in these resolutions. For example, in a memorandum, he was good enough to send over to me, there is a clause of this kind :—

7. If you do not discriminate against our cigarettes in favour of those of other manufacture, and if you do not sell, or dispose of, any of our cigarettes at less than the list price, and if, in all respects, you comply with the terms of this agreement, we will pay you a commission of two per cent (2 per cent) on the amount realized by you from the sale of the cigarettes which we may consign to you.

8. If, however, you handle cigarettes of our manufacture, exclusively, and do not sell or distribute, or in any way aid in the sale or disposition of, cigarettes of other manufacture, and if you, in all respects, fully comply with the terms and conditions of this agreement, we will pay you an additional commission of six per cent (6 per cent) on the amount realized by you from the sale of cigarettes which we may consign to you.

Another one of considerable importance is this. In another circular sent out by another branch of this company there is this clause :

4. If you handle no manufactured tobacco made from Canadian leaf, or made from a combination of Canadian and foreign leaf, excepting the brands made by us, and, if you, in all respects, fully comply with the terms and conditions of this agreement, we will pay you a rebate of five cents per pound.

All those clauses would be equally serviceable to a great trust formed in this country and composed exclusively of Canadian capital, and in that case the small dealer and tobacco grower would be crushed by a great corporation just as much as he is at present. Therefore it is not solely a question of keeping out the American trust and of dealing with that trust. But we must all recognize that inasmuch as there are these enormous aggregations of capital chiefly in the United States, we are confronted with the danger that small branches are likely to be formed from time to time, and therefore the danger which confronts us is one which, in the first instance, will come very largely from the United States. But there is a big question behind it all, and that is the control of these trusts generally. It has been said that the trusts are due to the protective system, but I have taken occasion to observe more than once that these trusts find ample scope in the mother country where almost perfect free trade conditions prevail. And in 'Truth about the Trusts,' by Mr. John Moody, of New York, I read in pages 89 to 90. This will show what has been done in Great Britain. The Ogden Company was one branch of the American Company formed for the purpose of obtaining the control of the tobacco trade in Great Britain .—

The Ogden Company telegraphed 7,000 retailers that it would give its entire profit of $1,000,000 a year in cash for the next four years to its customers if they would purchase its goods.

That was the American Company ; why was the offer made ? The book goes on to explain :

This offer was made to counteract an offer of the Imperial Company,——

That was the British Company.

—sent out a few days before wherein the latter agreed to give large bonuses to those customers who would undertake not to sell American goods for a term of years. A large London retail house at this time issued a notice stating that inasmuch as the Imperial Tobacco Company was now really competing with the retailers, it would not sell the Imperial Company's goods in the future.

However, we are not so much concerned with that, as we have not—at least I have not at present—any information as to the methods which this British trust is employing.

Mr. FIELDING. Is it not the fact that the trusts alluded to are uncommon in Great Britain and very common in the United States ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would not be inclined to go so far as that. I do not think the situation can be fairly described in that way, and, even so, we must recollect that modern methods in the employment of large aggregations of capital, have been largely developed by the enterprise of the people of the United States. We know that they have a higher appreciation than most nations of business conditions and of the way to render available for their exclusive use and benefit these conditions. And, even

if it were true, as my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) suggests, that these trusts are more common in the United States—and I believe they are more common there—still that might not be absolutely ascribed to the fact that protection prevails in the United States and free trade prevails in Great Britain. Now, these trusts have been known in the United States for a very considerable time, and the United States has legislated against them ; but, barring two or three somewhat barren victories, I do not think that the legislation of the United States, up to the present time, has been very effective. I think we will probably all agree to that. There is the beef trust in the United States, which, as I understand it, has wiped out of existence hundreds of retail dealers. There is the Standard Oil Company of the United States, which has crushed out hundreds of small companies and hundreds of individual dealers. And of one of these great trusts in the United States it was said that, not only was it able to crush out all those who were opposed to it but, as part of its business enterprise it undertook to control legislatures where it found that control necessary, and, at one time, the legislatures of no less than four great states of the union were under the control of this trust,—that is, these legislatures represented not the will of the people but the will of this great monopoly, and were subservient to its interests with regard to any legislation affecting the monopoly's interests. This is, therefore, a very great subject and one, as I have said before, that we will have to deal with comprehensively some day. We will have to deal with the whole subject of trusts, for I believe—if I may credit what has been told me—that it is not alone the American Tobacco Trust whose influence has been felt in this country but other trusts, especially United States trusts, have made their influence felt in this Dominion. The Dominion Iron and Steel Trust, as I pointel out, I believe, at the commencement of the session, dictated to persons in Canada using steel for the manufacture of nails where they should buy their material, and threatened them that, if they continued to buy their material in Germany, as they had been doing, the trust would come into Canada, establish manufactories and crush them out. This trust even saw fit to render Bills to these Canadian manufacturers charging them, if I remember well, $2 per ton for all material they had purchased in Germany during the previous year. So, it is not the influence of this tobacco trust alone that is felt in Canada, but the influence of other great aggregations of capital in the United States as well. These aggregations of capital are created simply for the reason that capitalists in the United States have seen the advantage which result from combination and from crushing out small rivals.

Mr. BRODEUR. Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) to say that the American Steel Trust is established somewhere in Canada ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, I say that they threatened to establish themselves here. They said to the Canadian manufacturers : You are buying your material in Germany; you should buy it from us, and we propose to compel you to buy from us : If you continue to buy in Germany, this is the alternative we present to you ; either you shall pay us $2 a ton for all material you buy in Germany, or we will come into Canada and establish factories, sending material into Canada, if necessary, below cost, and we will crush you out : We will see to it that you are crushed out unless you comply with our conditions. I assert this because I have the statement from half a dozen different sources from men who have been confronted with that threat by the great steel corporation of the United States of America. So, if is not alone with the American Tobacco Trust that we have to deal. All of us can see, I think, that it is a pretty difficult subject to handle. You may be disposed to say that there should be no restrictions on any man who has goods to sell, as to the conditions under which he shall sell them, and there should be no restriction upon any man who desires to buy as to the terms at which he shall buy. That is a good general proposition. But when we have to deal with the conflicts of modern commerce and the use to which great aggregations of capital can be put, I think, we may all conclude that this general proposition cannot be affirmed alone and in its entirety, because that which is good, and which advances commerce in the ordinary way, may be so used by means of great aggregations of capital as to amount to tyranny—the crushing out of individual enterprise and the eventual creation of a monopoly. The subject is not a new one. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue of course knows that in Great Britain, years ago—and I remember that the same was true of my own province of Nova Scotia—there was legislation against what was called forestalling and regrating, the raising of prices by buying up all the goods that came into a particular market and holding them until the needs of the consumers compelled them to yield to the demands of those who thus held the monopoly of goods. Statutes of that kind were very common in England two or three hundred years ago, and they were common in my own province a hundred years ago. They have been abandoned of late years, but we are coming back to the condition which at one time made the passing of these laws necessary.

Now, I come down to the particular measure which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) has placed before the House. The criticism I would be inclined to make upon it, in the first place, is that he is introducing

it at a very late day of the session. This is a very large subject and one that had better have been brought before the House when there was a fair opportunity for discussing it. It seems to me a rather dangerous undertaking to bring down a motion of this kind when we cannot really expect that it will receive the attention and discussion which a question of such great moment should receive. If these resolutions had been introduced earlier in the session, it seems to me, possibly some comprehensive scheme of legislation might have been worked out and we might have placed on the statute book a law which would deal not only with the conditions which arise through the operations of this company, but with the conditions which arise through the operations of other trusts which have their home in the United States of America. I feel that this legislation is too much of a piecemeal character and that more comprehensive legislation might have been passed had the subject been brought forward earlier in the session.

While I say this, I want my hon. friend who has introduced the measure, in a very careful, a very moderate and well-reasoned speech, to understand that I am in sympathy with the project of curbing these trusts generally, but I do not know that I would fully sympathize with the project of dealing with them by the exact method which he has provided in this case. What is the method? The method is that the government of Canada are to exercise their power of licensing for the purpose of preventing these undesirable trade restrictions from being carried out. That is, as I understand the scope of the measure. With regard to that I have to say, in the first place, that it does not touch any company at all, or any large aggregation of capital which does not require to take out a license. It leaves them absolutely free, as it leaves the American Steel Company, to threaten and coerce Canadian manufacturers, and other trusts are at liberty to carry on their operations in this country as fully and as freely as they do in the United States. I think it desirable that we should have legislation of a somewhat more comprehensive character. Then if you are to deal with the matter of refusing a license or of cancelling a license, is this not rather a dangerous power to put into the hands of the government, and is there any need of doing it in that way?

Mr. BRODEUR. That power already exists in the law, so far as granting the license is concerned.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, it exists in the law at the present time, but it is not in the law for the purpose of dealing with a great question of this kind. The Governor in Council has absolute power to declare that some corporation has violated this provision. The company has an appeal. These companies, let it be remembered, possess great aggregations of capital, and is it desirable to put the government in that relation to a company which may have a capital of three or four hundred million dollars? Now, I am making no personal allusion to the present administration, or to any member of the present administration. My language is just as applicable to an administration formed from this side of the House, it is absolutely impersonal. But when a question as to withdrawing or cancelling a license of that kind to a corporation possessing three or four hundred millions of capital, comes up perhaps on the eve of a general election, is that a desirable state of affairs to establish in this country? I think there might be some food for reflection in that view of the matter. Why can you not provide in these resolutions that any license granted to a company of that kind shall become ipso facto void if that company carries on business in that way? Can you not empower the Attorney General of Canada to go to court, if necessary, when there is an appeal from that court, so that there may be no undue delay, and have it declared that the company has violated the provisions of this section, and that its license has become void, and that it shall never again be renewed? Would not that be a better form of legislation than that which the hon. gentleman proposes? I admit I have not given this question the consideration that it deserves, but it would strike me, in the first place, that what I have suggested is well worthy of consideration by the government. I do not know that I need detain the House any further at this stage: we will have ample opportunity to consider the matter in committee; but I thought it desirable now to place my views before the House in this way.

Mr. F. D. MONK. I quite agree with the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) that it is very regrettable that we should at this late stage of the session be confronted with a question of this magnitude, which is agitating at the present moment the minds, I might almost say, of every legislator throughout the world, the question of the control of trusts. I do not think the government is entirely to blame for that, I am willing to assume a part of the blame myself; because it was only after I had informed the Prime Minister and the Minister of Inland Revenue that I intended to bring up this question that the next day my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue very innocently but with great celerity, gave notice of this resolution.

Mr. TAYLOR. He stole your thunder.

Mr. MONK. It is a lesson to me, and the more so as the organ of the Minister of Inland Revenue has been ceaselessly

blaming me since because I arrived too tardily upon the scene. Be that as it may, let me say at once that I am very much in favour of this measure, whatever may be the objections which present themselves to the mind of anybody conversant with the application of such a law as my hon. friend proposes to introduce. We are face to face with a trust, and there is more than one trust in this country. We have the Standard Oil trust at present at work in Canada. My hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue asked if the great steel trust of the United States was acting in Canada. I do not think there is any doubt about that, it is to my knowledge that it controls at the present time the steel nail trade of Canada in an indirect manner, and possibly other lines of the steel industry. I do not hesitate to say that unless we have some kind of legislation, the field will be open to many more American trusts before long. The story of the tobacco trust and its operations throughout the world has been told by many. The question was asked as to what it did in England. Some years ago the American trust determined to take possession of the English market, and purchased I think in Liverpool rather a modest establishment, that of the Messrs. Ogden, and for a certain time sold tobacco throughout England at less than cost. But in England the American trust had to meet much more formidable competition than we could possibly find in Canada, and a combination of the large English tobacco dealers was formed with a capital of £15,000,000. They waged war against the American tobacco trust in England, and carried the war into Africa, that is into the United States, and before long the American trust had to sue for terms of peace, and an agreement was arrived at, the details of which I need not give to the House. Now, my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue has gone into the details carefully to prove the existence of this monopoly into Canada. I could add to what he has said, because I have studied this question with some care; but it is sufficient to point out the conclusions to which Judge MacTavish arrived at the time he carried out his commission. These are the conclusions:

1. The contract system complained of by the petitioners does in fact exist and is in general use in the cigarette and tobacco trade in Canada.

2. That the provisions of the contracts in question are not illegal, either under the common law or under any statutory law heretofore enacted by the parliament of Canada.

3. That the manufacturers of cigarettes and of Canadian tobacco other than the American and Empire Tobacco Companies, are at a very great disadvantage in the distribution of their goods and in the prosecution of their business generally by reason of such contract system.

The methods pursued in Canada by the American tobacco trust were much the same as those pursued by all trusts, comprising a variety of operations which, taken separately, were not illegal, and were not easy to reach, but which, taken altogether, clearly created a monopoly, as to which there is no room for doubt. The tobacco trust desire to obtain entire control of the tobacco trade of Canada, and that is the point where it interests the growers, because, although there are several thriving manufactories in Lower Canada, and I believe also in Upper Canada, the growers are interested in this way: the one object of this trust, and it is all-powerful on account of its immense command of money, is to obtain control of the manufacture of and the trade in tobacco, and the tobacco grower will have the price of his tobacco fixed in the United States by Mr. Duke and his companions of the American trust, and when it is in the power of the American trust to fix the price of our leaf, they will certainly not fix a price which will be beneficial to the Canadian tobacco grower. They will have put aside all competitors, they will be alone in the field, and they will fix the lowest price possible, a price which will affect all the Canadian tobacco growers. But, as Judge MacTavish points out, they have not yet reached that point, because that entire control has not yet been obtained, but the tobacco growers seeing what is coming, have interested themselves in this question rightfully, just as much as the tobacco manufacturers have, who at the present moment, one by one, are coming under the terrible inroads of this hydra, the tobacco trust. It has been set forth in memoranda produced to the members of this House that the American trust have carefully, cautiously and by their industry, push and energy, built up a trade. That is not exactly correct. They arrived here, and at first gave their attention to the cigarette trade. They bought this trade out. They bought out an important manufactory, the only one existing in Canada. Every one knows what great importance is to be attached to the purchase of a brand of tobacco. It is a fortune in itself. Any one who read Sir William McDonald's testimony before the MacTavish Commission will see what great importance is to be attached to the possesson of known brands. The trust have unlimited means. They can afford to lose money for years, they can afford to have recourse to methods of business that no ordinary manufacturer could possibly have recourse to. They purchased these brands, they purchased the manufactories, and they adopted the contract which has been designated as the consignment contract, the terms of which contract were much more moderate and less exclusive than you find those of the contract of to-day to be. Since the adoption of that contract they have progressed. They have now a contract which is absolutely exclusive. It is absolutely impossible, under this contract, for those who deal with the American Company to advantageously sell any goods other

than those controlled by the trust. Then they have invaded the field of American leaf. They purchased a factory in Montreal, they purchased a factory at Joliette, they closed up the factory in Montreal, they closed up the factory at Joliette, and they acquired an important factory in Quebec. They have now a factory at Granby, and in these factories they manufacture Canadian and combination tobacco. I have already explained to the House that combination tobacco is tobacco made from a mixture of American and foreign leaf. They have not yet invaded the field of foreign leaf, but, as the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue stated, that is in their programme. It is coming, and before long they will invade and get possession of the only field that is left open to-day.

As I understand it, the passing of this law and putting it into execution would involve the cancelling of five licenses in the province of Quebec—a license for the manufacture of cigarettes from foreign leaf in Montreal, two licenses for the manufacture of combination and cut tobacco at Granby, and two licenses for the manufacture of combination and Canadian tobacco at Quebec. All the smaller factories are gradually falling out of existence. They have not been purchased, and the trade is made so difficult for them that it is impossible to carry on the trade as they did before. These gentlemen are urging that they are in the field of competition simply, and that the smaller dealers can carry on their trade. It has been established before the commission that this is impossible. It cannot be done without loss. These are the facts that surround us. It has been said on behalf of these people that they have only made an exclusive contract with about 500 dealers, and that there are throughout the Dominion probably 25,000 dealers ; but anybody acquainted with the conditions will tell us that these 500 dealers, the large jobbers, control the whole trade, and that in order to be able to do business with the 24,500 others, they make this arrangement with the jobbers. Those knowing the condition of affairs know that while this exclusive contract is made with only a few of these dealers, it is made with the principal dealers. It has been said that this law confers upon the minister very arbitrary and very drastic powers. That, I think, is true. I think it is regrettable since the government has been in possession of all the facts connected with this case for two years, that it has not endeavoured by one law to deal with the problem as it presents itself throughout the country, and with all trusts at the same time. Last year my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) introduced a general amendment to the Criminal Code, which, I think, we should have tried. In some way or other that law was dropped, although I urged the government to give it a trial. I think a general law would have been far more advisable, but at the present moment we have to deal with one of these trusts, and there is nothing truer than what has been said, that almost every description of law has been tried ineffectually. I think the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue mentioned forty-five laws that have been tried in the United States. There is no doubt that, if not all, most of these laws have proved practically ineffectual against the destructive inroads of the trust. I am not prepared to say that the method proposed of dealing with this particular trust is not the most effectual. At any rate, we should give it a trial. We will have a chance, if it should prove defective, to amend it before six months have elapsed. Why should we not give it a trial and check at once the most disastrous effects of the operation of this trust upon this most important industry ? I think it is a pity that the exercise of this power has not by my hon. friend been conferred upon a judge. My hon. friend states that already the Inland Revenue Act gives him power to refuse a license. This is a greater power, because it interferes with vested rights, and it is going to be exercised, as my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has said, against a very powerful corporation.

Mr. BRODEUR. Is not the renewal of the license an interference with vested rights also ?

Mr. MONK. I do not see how it is. Perhaps my hon. friend will point out how it is.

Mr. BRODEUR. Suppose a factory has been established for several years under license, would it not be an interference with its rights if a license was refused this year?

Mr. MONK. Yes ; but the hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that as a matter of practice the license is renewed as a matter of course, unless there is some very strong reason against it.

Mr. SPROULE. You could say the same as to liquor licenses.

Mr. MONK. You are dealing with a more complex problem here. In section 39 of the Inland Revenue Act, even the collector has the right under certain conditions to cancel the license, but here is a special problem and there are great vested rights to be considered. Perhaps this power should be conferred on a judge. It is now conferred upon a minister busy with a great many political questions, and it may happen that the next incumbent of the office of the Minister of Inland Revenue will not have given this question the same study as my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur). I think it is a dangerous power to give a minister, and I regret that the exercise of that power is made permissive. This parliament should declare whether this kind of thing is wrong or right, and if parliament finds it wrong I do not think the minister should have the discretion. I think, that in the subsection

of this resolution the word 'shall' should be used instead of the word 'may.' It should be imperative on the minister to cancel the license if the evil exists. I have also a fear that this law may be evaded. The licenses may be changed and this license cancelled and taken over by another corporation having the same objects in view. Any one who reads the story of these trusts must be amazed at the ingenuity which the promoters have recourse to in all countries in order to evade the multiplicity of laws directed against them. What would happen if the manufacturers who have a license should make no contracts at all, but would hand their goods over to some great emporium who would carry out the programme of the trust ? I am also fearful that in the provinces, the question may be raised that we have no right to interfere with contracts that are exclusively under the jurisdiction of the provinces. Last year the remedy proposed by the Minister of Justice brought these contracts under the criminal law. I do not agree with the Minister of Inland Revenue that that law is not effective ; because under it we could have imposed fines on the violators, in such a way that the carrying on of their trade would become impossible.

Mr. GOURLEY. Both remedies are open to us now.

Mr. MONK. I think so. In the province of Quebec under the law of last year every contract made by the tobacco trust would be ipso facto illegal, as being in violation of the criminal law and immoral.

Mr. BRODEUR. If the provincial legislature passed an Act that such contracts should be valid, and at the same time the parliament of Canada should by criminal legislation declare they were illegal, which of the two would prevail ? I think the local legislatures have absolutely the same power as we have in that respect.

Mr. MONK. I am not prepared to speak on that question off-hand, but I think the sense of the decision of the Privy Council is that if by a criminal enactment we bring any matter which is under the control of the provincial legislature, within the purview of this legislature, then we have supreme control.

Mr. BRODEUR. In what case is that decided ?

Mr. MONK. I cannot state from memory, but will get the authority.

Mr. GOURLEY. In the Lord's Day Act, they practically held that.

Mr. MONK. Long ago they laid down that doctrine. We are empowered to legislate in all criminal matters and also for the peace, order and good government of Canada. Although a matter prima facie might appear to be under the control of the provincial legislature by section 93 of the British North America Act, yet our action in bringing it into the domain of the criminal law gives us exclusive jurisdiction. My reason for giving cordial adhesion to this attempt of the Minister of Inland Revenue to suppress this great evil is, that the moment this Act is passed, the government may take steps to suppress it. The onus for the next six months will be on the government to do what it has promised to do for several years past. When innumerable deputations of those aggrieved claimed redress from the government, they were told to prove their statements and a remedy would be supplied. A commission was instituted, and that commission amply justified the statement of facts made by the complainants, and if we were to prorogue without taking some steps to suppress this evil I believe the blame will be upon us. This is a laudable attempt in the right direction, it places the responsibility upon the government, and, after all, within six months parliament will resume again and we will be in a position to go more fully into this question. In the meantime there is not a moment to be lost and I think some step ought to be taken to prevent the destruction of this most important industry.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Inland Revenue, who introduced this resolution, made a lengthy statement, in which he dealt altogether with the question of tobacco. When we come to look at the resolution, we find that it goes much beyond the manufacture of tobacco. It says :

> Any license authorized by this Act may be cancelled in any case where a person who, being a manufacturer of any class of goods subject to a duty of excise, either directly or indirectly——

Now, what classes of goods are manufactured in this country subject to excise ? It is not tobacco only, although manufacturers of tobacco have to take out licenses, but every manufacturer of beer, lager, whisky, vinegar and other articles that come under the excise law. Any practical business man knows that nine-tenths of the business of this country is done just on the line laid down by this resolution, and if the resolution went far enough it would apply to every manufacturer in the country, my hon. friend who sits beside me (Mr. Rosamond) for instance, or the Massey-Harris Company, or the Frost & Wood Company. How do they sell their goods ? They simply appoint an agent in every town or locality and sell to him exclusively, provided he does not handle any one else's goods. It is the same way with the brewers and liquor manufacturers of this country. I

know that liquor manufacturers come to our town and say: You handle my goods exclusively and I will sell to no other dealer in town. That arrangement is made and the percentage of profit is arranged according to the amount of goods sold. My hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) referred to profits of 2 per cent and 6 per cent. That is a small margin, it is no inducement to merchants to do business on a 6 per cent basis. Nine-tenths of the business of the manufacturers is done in this way. It is the same way with the merchants. There is hardly a wholesale merchant in the country who will sell to two retail merchants in a town; they will sell to one provided he handles their goods only and his account is an exclusive account. This is putting power in the hands of the minister to go to every brewer and say: I have information that you are selling exclusively to one man, and unless you put up your license is cancelled. I bring this matter to the attention of the minister and I am sure that once it is brought to his attention he will either amend or withdraw the resolution. If it is intended to refer to tobacco only why not word it:

Any person paying excise on tobacco, cigars, cigarettes, &c.

Why should it apply to manufacturers of everything that pays excise? That is the power the minister takes. I understood that a large deputation of retail merchants the other day waited on the minister and the report got out that these gentlemen were paid their expenses by the Tobacco Company. I have received this telegram:

Geo. Taylor, M.P., Ottawa.

I wish to state most emphatically that the American Tobacco Company did not pay my expenses to Ottawa last week.

(Sgd.) MICHAEL McFARLANE.

Mr. McFarlane is one of the largest retail men in my town. He is no political friend of mine and I did not know what they were for until I received this telegram, but I understand he is one of the retail merchants who were here in opposition to this Bill. I am satisfied from the numbers of retail men here that the Bill does not meet with favour in the trade. I know as a business man that the greater portion of the goods manufactured in this country are sold exclusively through agents and to only one agent in a locality and that contracts similar to the one my hon. friend read are made by nearly every manufacturer. I presume my hon. friend here who manufactures clothes will sell to a wholesale man and sell exclusively; I do not think he thrusts his goods on the market and sells to every one. If this resolution is meant to hit tobacco, it should hit tobacco alone, and not apply to every article that pays excise duties.

Mr. SPROULE. The subject which we are called on to consider to-day is one of very great importance. The minister has outlined its importance by telling us the result of the operations of this company. Why? Because of certain things that followed as a result of their operations. What are they? First, they are a close corporation. They do not let the general public into their secrets; they do not let them know what they are doing in their conclaves among themselves. Second, because they are bound by a solemn agreement and because they restrict trade and force it all through one channel. Third, because they pay exorbitant dividends. Fourth, because they are sometimes called a trust. Fifth, because their object is to kill out all opposition. What is the remedy suggested? No renewal of their license. Let us consider some of the questions involved in this. In the first place, as an individual member of this House, for several years I made efforts to attack one of the combines or trusts, the leather trust, but quite ineffectively, because I neither had the co-operation nor the moral support of the government. Is the memory of the hon. minister so short that he forgets that only a few years ago he himself stood up in defence of one of these combines, a combine which may not reach as many people but it is just as injurious in its effects. I refer to the Standard Oil combine.

Mr. BRODEUR. I never took up the defence of the Standard Oil Company. Quite the reverse.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister defended it by giving in conjunction with his colleagues, concessions which enabled that company to plant itself down in Canada, get control of the market, circumscribe the market, and drive others out of it just the same as this tobacco trust is doing.

Mr. FIELDING. You are mistaken.

Mr. SPROULE. He says that this tobacco trust buy up the manufacturers. Well, what do the Standard Oil Company? They buy up the manufacturers of petroleum, they have control of the industry in Sarnia, and they circumscribe the market. The hon. minister says let us be free from monopoly. Was he freeing us from monopoly then? On the contrary he was fastening on us one of the greatest monopolies in the country.

Mr. FIELDING. What concessions did we give the Standard Oil Company?

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman took off the duty upon the raw material and enabled that company to bring it in free, and as they have the United States under their control, they extended their operations to Canada. They got hold of the oil refineries in Canada and restricted the market. Many years ago we drew attention to the fact that when the present government reduced the duty on oil imported, that operated in favour

of the Standard Oil Company who were then making the strongest efforts to get possession of the Canadian market. We drew attention to the fact, when the next concession was given, that of bringing over oil in tanks, that the Standard Oil Company were going to kill out the Canadian manufacturers and we endeavoured to get the government to refuse this concession, but in vain. Finally they gave them this other concession when they allowed crude old to come in at greatly reduced rate of duty, and what has been the result? The result has been just what the Minister of Inland Revenue says will follow if this tobacco trust be allowed to carry on their operations. They bought up the manufactures and there is only one buyer from oil men to-day in Canada.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. He must admit that some years ago when there was a combine made between the railway companies and the Standard Oil Company, resulting in discrimination in favour of the Standard Oil Company, the government interfered and broke that contract.

Mr. SPROULE. They made a kind of an attempt, but I always understood that the attempt was not successful and that these companies have gone on carrying on their operations all the same; and whereas the Canadian oil producers were formerly able to sell to the railway companies and oil refineries and manufacturers, they are now only able to sell to the Standard Oil Company and must take what prices that company choose to give. Then I ask the hon. minister to be consistent. If the government are not going to restrict the Standard Oil Company, how can they consistently restrict the tobacco trust? We want competition for the products of our labour. If we have competition, we will have a larger market, but if you give the control of the market to one firm, that firm will inevitably fix the price.

We are told that this trust is controlled because they pay large dividends. What was the dividend paid by the Standard Oil Company last year? They paid 44 per cent besides setting apart a very large amount to the rest account. In 1893 they paid 12 per cent dividend, and the dividend has been kept running up all the time, especially from 1896 when the company paid 31 per cent for the first time. When the government allowed the Americans to bring in oil in tanks, the Standard Oil Company paid 17 per cent. The year following they paid 31 per cent, the next year 32 per cent, and then 33, 48, 45 and 46 per cent. The hon. minister says that he attacked those combines because they pay large dividends. Why then did he not attack this Standard Oil combine? We did our best on this side to get the government to attack it but did not succeed and the result is that company have been paying large dividends ever since and we have been making no effort to control them.

Mr. HEYD. How can you control them?

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman always breaks in with irrelevant questions, not for the purpose of eliciting information, but merely to interrupt. We think that they could have been controlled. There is no doubt in the world that trusts and close corporations and monopolies are very bad. If it is the duty of parliament to attack monopolies, I do not see how this government can hope to escape.

Mr. FIELDING. We have monopoly over here.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, these hon. gentlemen are bound together, and not bound by an agreement but by an oath. Surely that is a close corporation. And who will pretend that they do not restrict trade? They keep everybody else out of the market. And who will say that they do not favour their own patrons? Why, the patronage of the whole country is handed over to their own friends. And they are paying big dividends. I can point to some members of the government of whom it is said, although I do not say that the rumour is correct, that they have paid larger dividends during the time they have been there than the Standard Oil Company or the great tobacco trust. But I do not know why they should be called a trust. No one can trust them, for, as has often been shown they have broken every promise they ever made to the country. It would be fair to call them a combine, for they are a political combine, and a combine in restraint of trade for they seek to keep everything in their own hands. Every contract they gave out was given out for the purpose of aggrandizing their own power. The Minister of Inland Revenue has suggested a remedy for the combine he attacks—do not renew their license. That is exactly what we suggest to the people with regard to this great political combine. And I think that the people will take our advice. When these gentlemen reach the great court of the people, they will not have the Minister of Inland Revenue to deal with—it will not be a matter of gaining the right on one more judgment, but of listening to the edict of the people. A strong attack will be made upon this political combine and I hope it will be more successful than the government are likely to be in this attack upon the tobacco trust.

Now, a few years ago I endeavoured to attack the leather combine and asked the help of the government in the work I was doing. There is more than one way of making that attack. One is to throw off the duty on any line of goods which has been made the subject of monopoly prices.

That is an American proposition. This combine entered into an agreement with dealers giving special terms for the purchase of Spanish sole leather and oak tanned leather, and those who would not sign that agreement they would not deal with at all. In this way they sought to destroy the small tanneries throughout the country. Year after year we did our best to induce the government to come to our aid. But they failed to do so. We had an anti-combine law. We tried to get them to invoke that law against the combine but they would not prosecute. We offered to prove that there was this combine with a view to having the duties thrown off. But they turned a deaf ear to our appeal and allowed the combine to go on. That combine was as injurious as the one that is now attacked, except that it did not reach so many people and was not so large. An hon. member suggests that it did not reach the farmers. It did reach them indirectly, but not directly. The government are now coming to the aid of the people in this one case, on the ground that this is a corporation whose object is to restrict trade. But the leather combine restricted trade because dealers, when they agreed not to handle the products of any other manufacturer, were assured five or six per cent discount on their purchase than they would make if they remained outside. The combine not only restricted trade but it paid exorbitant dividends. As to this Bill, I stand by the minister, but I say that a general law would be very much more valuable. We have been eight years trying to convince the government of the importance of this question. In the meantime these combines have secured a foothold in our country and are extending their operation in every direction. The result is that vested rights are established and great interests involved, and these combines are bringing under their control large masses of people. For these reasons, it has become more difficult to dislodge them than it would have been in their early history. At last the government are making an effort to dislodge one of these combines. But we have many of them. There is the sugar trust, the iron trust, the salt trust, and many others, a list of which I have here, carrying on their operations in Canada. The government attack the tobacco trust while the oil trust, sugar trust, the leather trust and others are left free. If I were permitted to give a piece of advice to the government it would be to make a general law and attack these trusts all along the line. However, I do not regard the failure of the government to attack all these trusts as a reason why I should not support them in the measure now before the House. The government are entitled to credit for what they have done, but had they done their duty they would have begun their attack upon these trusts at an earlier day. This Bill is objectionable because it does not go far enough. It deals with a trust in only one line. This is a step in the right direction, and I support it. But the fact that the government do not go further is a proof that they are not sincere in their declaration against the trust, otherwise they would attack all the trusts which are equally injurious, though, perhaps, not so widespread in their operations or possessed of so much capital as the trust that they are now attacking.

Mr. GOURLEY. I have listened to the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) with great pleasure. But, notwithstanding any criticism that may be levelled against this measure I feel strongly that we should all support it.

Mr. SPROULE. I am supporting it.

Mr. GOURLEY. Quite so. No doubt there are other trusts in Canada that ought to be struck at, but we must approach this matter as best we may ; and as the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur) has thought fit to mature a measure of this kind attacking one of these evils, I cannot withhold my support from him, because he has not widened the measure, so as to attack them all. In fact, I think it might be better to attack one of these combines first, and make it quite clear to this combine and all others, that, no matter how they may be able to evade the miserable courts of the United States, and the miserable system of laws there, they cannot evade the laws of a British country. I happened to accompany a delegation of men interested in the tobacco industries of Canada who were heard by the Prime Minister of this country and the Minister of Finance and some others two or three years ago. At that time I heard a number of retail dealers discuss this question from end to end. I gave the matter some attention, and afterwards pursued the subject, as far as I could, with the help of our library. I then became convinced that the tobacco industries of Canada were being attacked, covertly and insidiously attacked, by the American Tobacco Company, with the object of exterminating those industries, and installing in their place the American Tobacco Trust. From that moment, I became a convert to any system, or policy, that would nullify that attack by the American Tobacco Company, upon the tobacco industries of Canada. I congratulate the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur) upon combatting this insidious attack, so far as this measure will combat it. I have not had the opportunity of perusing the measure carefully, and do not pretend to know exactly what its effect will be. But, let us attack this company as best we can. And if this measure is not enough, I believe that there are brains enough in this House, to make a measure that will be sufficient to accomplish the result desired. I do not suppose that any minister or anybody else

is competent to foresee all the devilish ingenuity that will be employed by this company to get around this law. But what I hope for is that if they display their ingenuity in evading the law, we will have ingenuity enough to put up further defences and ultimately to crush these corporations. Now, how did they treat them in England ? We heard this morning that the American trust invaded England ; how did they meet it there? Why, they met it as only men who are not aided by parliament could meet it. The whole tobacco trade of England had to form a contra combine in order to preserve their own interests.

Mr. HEYD. And then combine together.

Mr. GOURLEY. Of course. When the English tobacco interests found themselves invaded they were compelled to combine to fight this American trust ; and what was the result ? After combining and fighting between themselves for a while, they agreed to divide up the world. They divided up the world, and they said : You shall have that sheep to shear, and we will have this sheep to shear. Now, what was the proper course to have taken? If the English parliament had been open to reason they would have dealt with this matter, and spared themselves and spared the world from being made victims of these two companies. But we know that in England public opinion is so profoundly Conservative that if the tobacco interests had appealed to the House of Commons they would have had to appeal twenty-five years before they could have got redress. The result would have been that the tobacco interests in England would have failed before relief came. Therefore the tobacco interests had to combine, and the result of it is that we have two combines now dividing the world so far as tobacco interests are concerned.

Now, we propose a much more intelligent way. We propose that the tobacco interests in Canada, not being able to fight the American combines, shall be permitted to resort to this parliament, and I am glad to see that they have not found public opinion here so Conservative, they have found that this House of Commons is able and willing to deal with this monopoly, and not stand by and see the tobacco interests of Canada compelled to fight this combine in their own defence. We will come forth and exercise the strong resources of a government to protect our own people, and they shall not be compelled in self-defence to form another combine, which is simply adding to the great evils of the world. Therefore, I think in Canada we have pursued a much better course than they have pursued in England or in the United States.

Now, some reference has been made to the arbitrary power that we place in the hands of the minister. You must always place extraordinary powers in the hands of any minister when you seek to strike down an extraordinary power that is arrayed against the people of Canada. What more arbitrary power is sought to be exercised than is exercised by the American tobacco trust ? These tyrants who are organized to rob the whole world, are they the men who come to this parliament and say : Oh, you are putting in the hands of a minister in Canada arbitrary powers. That is just the thing we want to do. We want to meet the remorseless tyrants that are invading the world to rob it ; therefore we will place in the hands of a responsible minister in Canada all the powers necessary, legislative or otherwise, to meet the awful combination of capital that is arrayed against us. It does not lie in the mouth of these hideous tyrants of the United States Tobacco Trust to utter one word against any power, no matter how arbitrary, we place in the hands of some responsible man in Canada to defend the people of this country from their extortion. Therefore, I dismiss that objection. I want to place the most ample power necessary in the hands of the minister to curb these people and to protect the interests of Canadians.

Now, I read a couple of years ago the history of the Standard Oil Company. I think it was shortly after my attention was called to the tobacco trust ; and if ever there has been a remorseless creation it is that Standard Oil Company. They started as a little corporation in the United States, and gradually gathered capital, and then they proceeded to strike down every similar industry in the United States, no matter how big or how little. They have formed themselves into a hostile army entrenched in their own country for the purpose of destroying every similar industry in the United States. They proceeded most intelligently and most ably ; first to buy up, if they could, every similar industry ; if they could not buy it up, then they proceeded to destroy it ; they proceeded remorselessly to destroy every man that had any connection with a similar industry and who would not sell out. There are instances detailed in that book of the scientific and cruel methods they took in order to destroy entirely all rival corporations, and ultimately to drive them into bankruptcy or force them to sell out.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). They extended their influence to Germany also.

Mr. GOURLEY. They proceeded all over the United States until they practically controlled every oil industry in that country. Then they said : Having captured the United States, let us conquer the world. They went to Russia, they went to China, they went over the whole earth, and brought under their control and ægis every oil industry in the world. To-day they are one of the most hostile forces that exist

against the civilization in the world. Parliaments and legislative authorities in all nations must wake up to the fact that you cannot allow counter organizations and counter combines to be formed to fight evils of this kind, but parliaments must themselves come to the rescue. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has said that he has been labouring with this government to induce them to act. I have no doubt he will have to labour with this government a long time before he can get them to undertake this difficult task. But if the Finance Minister and the Prime Minister have not given as much attention to these matters as they ought, I am glad to see that the Minister of Inland Revenue has undertaken so far as he can, to look after the special interests with which he is charged. Therefore, he ought to have that much credit. Now there are numbers of trusts all over Canada that could be dealt with, and what I want is to show these people that we can deal with them, and if we can deal with the tobacco trust successfully, we will have no trouble with these other people. When they know that there is a parliament in this country that cannot be controlled, that cannot be influenced, and that will ruthlessly deal with their business when they attack the public interest of Canada, we shall not have much trouble with them. I want it to go abroad that although the trusts can control the Congress of the United States, they cannot control the parliament of Canada, that this parliament will exercise all the powers necessary in order to control these corporations, just as soon as they attack the commercial interests of our people. When the trusts know that, we will be free from many of the enormous crimes they have committed against the people of the United States and other countries.

Now with regard to Great Britain, the Minister of Finance said: Oh, you have trusts formed there. They have, but they were always formed in answer to the trusts formed in the United States. Trusts were formed in the United States and invaded England, and there was only one defence left for the people of England, and that was to create counter trusts, because, as I have shown, the English parliament is so Conservative that they could never have been brought to the point of providing protective legislation. Now, I want this experiment to be tried in our country to see if we cannot, in one instance, attack the tobacco trusts and control them successfully. If we can deal with these people, then we shall have established a precedent that we can deal with other industries, that we can attack the oil trust, and any other enormous incubus from which our people are sufferers.

My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier feared the evasion of this law. I have no doubt they will try to evade it as they try to evade every law on earth, but I hope these people will not be able to override parliament and the courts of Canada. I think that we will be able to hold these people down and control them, no matter how successful they may have been in the past in evading the law. In regard to vested rights I may say that I am in favour of vested rights. Any honest man is in favour of vested rights because vested rights is nothing more or less than standing by property properly acquired by individuals. I would be in favour of vested rights but I want to warn these trust people that as they have never regarded vested rights as sacred, that as they have ruthlessly stricken down all competitors they must not come to this parliament as men with clean hands and claim that they ought to be protected, that the doctrine of vested rights ought to save them. I want to tell this trust here and now that after destroying the property of every man who offered competition to them they are not in a position to plead vested rights. While I am in favour of vested rights I will look very narrowly into their claim for protection on the plea of vested rights. I want to congratulate, not the ministry, but the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur). I think the criticism of my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is justified that the ministry as a whole ought not to be congratulated upon having grappled with trusts, but as the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue has broken free from the bad example of his colleagues it shows that the Bible sometimes, under our narrow construction, must be misleading when it says that evil communications corrupt good manners, because in this instance it does seem that the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue notwithstanding his evil associations has attempted to give us a remedy for this evil while his colleagues perhaps have only been giving us the gloved hand.

Mr. W. S. MACLAREN. Mr. Speaker, it will be within the recollection of this House that at an early stage of this session I introduced a Bill to do away with the manufacture, importation and sale of cigarettes.

Some hon MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. W. S. MACLAREN. I was pleased with the support that was given to this Bill. Sometimes I thought I hardly got fair-play as the Bill went on. I do not know about the straining of the rules of the House but I thought that some hon. gentlemen used them up to their full extent. I am not one of those who complain when he gets cold justice. Some Bills introduced by hon. members during this session got their first and second reading and were considered in committee at the same sitting, but the Bill which I had the honour of introducing in this House was only allowed to pass barely one stage at a time. Notwithstanding—I was going to say the opposition but I will not use such a strong word as that—the want of sympathy for my Bill which

came from high places both on the government side as well as on the opposition side I was able to get it through the committee stage, but yesterday, or the day before, I noticed that it was slaughtered along with other unfortunates. It is not my intention to speak upon the merits of this resolution which has been introduced by my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur) although I am in entire sympathy with it, but in looking up this matter I find that there is one thing in connection with cigarettes which I wish to place on record in the House. I have a statement here showing the growth which has taken place in the manufacture of cigarettes in Canada for the last fifteen years and which is as follows:

Year.	Number of cigarettes manufactured.
1890	34,206,940
1891	41,531,360
1892	40,201,700
1893	47,749,800
1894	70,437,680

Then in 1895 the American Tobacco Company, at which this legislation is especially aimed, came upon the scene, started the tobacco manufacture industry in Canada and absorbed two companies and we see the result in the following statements of the number of cigarettes manufactured and the number manufactured by the American Tobacco Company:

Year.	Number manufactured.	No. manufactured by American Tobacco Co.
1895	83,854,440	82,000,000
1896	86,000,000	57,000,000
1897	106,500,000	86,000,000
1898	88,000,000	71,500,000
1899	105,500,000	96,376,500
1900	123,200,000	102,234,000
1901	125,000,000	108,000,000
1902	138,000,000	109,000,000
1903	179,000,000	149,000,000
1904	216,000,000	191,000,000

What does this mean? It means that the manufacture of cigarettes in Canada during the past fifteen years has increased sixfold. That is out of all proportion to the increase in population. It is out of all proportion to the increase of tobacco in other forms. That simply means that there must have been a great market created for the consumption of these cigarettes. A good deal has been said about the hardship of taking away the dear cigarette from the grown up man. I do not object to seeing a man with a pipe or cigar in his mouth but I think it looks very boyish to see a grown up man with a little cigarette in his mouth.

An hon. MEMBER. Or a clay pipe.

Mr. W. S. MACLAREN. Well, a clay pipe, or anything but a cigarette. I think that it means that there has been created in this country, a largely increased demand of cigarettes. These cigarettes are certainly being used by the boys of this country. I do not think that any person sitting down and calmly thinking over the matter will be prepared to say that this increase of sixfold in the manufacture of cigarettes in fifteen years represents the use of tobacco by grown up people, but I am convinced, on the contrary, that he will be prepared to admit that it represents simply the increased consumption of cigarettes by boys. The use of tobacco in this form is increasing much more rapidly than that of tobacco in any other form. You cannot go through the streets of Ottawa or of the cities and towns in other parts of the Dominion unless you see bright pictures and electric light signs advertising Sweet Caporal cigarettes and things of that kind. But, you do not see any such advertisements of black plug tobacco. Not at all. These bright advertisements are for the boy because he is imaginative and their object is to induce him to purchase cigarettes and if that is not sufficient they give presents, coupons and resort to all those little tricks of the trade in order to induce the boys to buy. I am heartily in favour of the resolution introduced by my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue, and I thought I would take this opportunity as I could not get at it in any other way, of bringing the question of cigarettes before the House and of pointing out these facts. The strictures which have been pronounced in regard to the resolution by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) may in a sense be right. The growth of tobacco is quite an industry in many parts of this country. I repeat that I am heartily in favour of the resolution and if the government seek to go beyond the question of tobacco and to legislate in regard to trusts in connection with the other things mentioned by the hon. member for East Grey I would be heartily with them in that as well as in this.

Mr. W. A. GALLIHER. I endorse the resolution now before the House. I believe it to be a much needed piece of legislation. I do not rise to discuss the subject matter of the resolution now, but to bring to the attention of the Minister of Inland Revenue, as I brought to the attention of his predecessor, and to the attention of parliament last session, a matter in which the tobacco-growers of the Kelowna district in my constituency are deeply concerned. In 1901 an Order in Council was passed by which importers of foreign leaf tobacco were allowed a rebate to the extent of the duty on the cuttings if they exported the cuttings out of the country. This results in a serious harship to the tobacco-growers of the Kelowna valley, and I presume to the tobacco-growers of other parts of Canada. Probably eight-tenths of our cigar-making establishments import foreign leaf for the purposes of manufacture. The consequence of their being allowed a rebate on the cuttings is, that we are unable

to sell Canadian tobacco leaf to these factories, because the department believes that they could not separate the domestic cuttings from the foreign leaf cuttings, and so if they use our tobacco the rebate is not granted. I do not see any reason why there could not be a departmental regulation made by which the cuttings from the domestic leaf and the cuttings from the foreign leaf could be kept separate, and the rebate allowed only on the foreign cuttings when they are exported. I have here a letter from one of the largest tobacco growers in the Kelowna district. He is a gentleman with whom I am personally acquainted, and a gentleman in whom I have every faith and confidence. He says:

> Samples of the tobacco I now have in stock have been shown to all the largest manufacturers in Montreal, London, Toronto, &c., and declared by them to be equal to anything grown in the United States.

The tobacco growers of the Kelowna valley have gone to a great deal of expense in experimenting on tobacco culture, and by their perseverance, enterprise and energy they have produced a quality of tobacco which the most expert handlers of tobacco in the chief cities of Canada declare to be equal to anything grown in the United States.

> But in face of this Order in Council I am unable to sell any to any foreign leaf factory.

And, as I have said, the foreign leaf factories in Canada are at least seventy-five per cent of the total number.

> To one firm, an actual sale of 6,000 pounds at excellent prices was made, provided it could be taken into the factory free of duty. They ascertained that this could be done, but if they took it in, the rebate on their cuttings would be lost. As their annual rebate amounted to more than the value of the tobacco, the deal of course fell through. I have tried factory after factory with the same result.

I would impress upon the Minister of Inland Revenue that this is a matter which should receive the serious and immediate attention of his department with the view of finding some means by which the use of the home grown tobacco leaf in these cigar factories would not be practically prohibited.

Mr. R. HOLMES. I heartily endorse the remarks made by my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Maclaren) I endorse the proposition now before the House, but I must express my regret that it was found necessary to slaughter the cigarette Bill this session. I am a believer and I am glad to be able to affirm my belief, in the absolute prohibition of the manufacture and importation of cigarettes. The figures quoted by the hon. member for Huntingdon ought in themselves be sufficient to convince this parliament of the urgent necessity at as early a date as possible, of passing legislation which would be effective in preventing the cigarette evil in Canada. The enormous increase in the sale of cigarettes, which is very largely to the youth of the land, should convince this parliament that no legislation would meet with more general favour—by moralists at any rate, and also by other classes in the community--than the prohibition of dealing in cigarettes. I am as anxious as any one else to get away from here, and I shall therefore conclude by strongly endorsing the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Maclaren). I trust that no matter what government may be in power in the future, steps will be taken to overcome the cigarette evil which is so far-reaching and disastrous in its consequences.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee on the resolution.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would now like an answer from the minister to the questions I asked as to why this should be made to apply to persons manufacturing the goods that pay excise, whether whisky, beer, vinegar or anything else, if you mean it to apply to the tobacco men alone.

Mr. BRODEUR. Simply to meet the objection that has been made that the Bill should not be too restrictive and that it would be well to apply it to all goods subject to excise. I think the law should be as general as possible. I appreciate the strength of the argument of the leader of the opposition this morning that we should have a general law applying to all trusts, but if you decide to deal with this question only so far as goods subject to excise are concerned, I think you should not take simply tobacco, but should make a general law referring to all licenses. That is the reason I have proposed that the law should apply to all goods subject to excise.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister will observe that he is not doing either one thing or the other; he is neither making a general law nor confining the operation of the proposed Act to the cases in which the evil is said to exist. It seems to me he should either do one thing or the other, either make a general law or deal only with the case where the grievance exists.

Mr. BRODEUR. We make it general as far as goods subject to excise are concerned. There would be serious objection to it if we dealt solely with tobacco; the objection might be raised that we did not apply it to all goods subject to excise. We take this stand, that persons who have licenses from the government, who are only able to carry on their business on terms stated by the government should be subject to this law.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course we adopted the principle of the Bill on the

second reading and I shall not repeat anything I said then. I am assuming that the principle has been adopted by the House, and is a good principle on which to act. That being so I think we should either deal with the case where the evil exists or make a general law. You could make a law general in this way, that you could prevent any business from being carried on without a license. It seems to me that that would be the logical outcome of the present law. You are here dealing with the tobacco trust, with an evil which exists in the business of manufacturing tobacco, which cannot be carried on except under a license from the government. You are not restricting your resolution to the manufacture of tobacco in reference to which that evil exists. You are embracing by the terms of your enactment other classes of business in which no evil, so far as I am aware, is said to exist. If you go that far, ought you not to go further? That is the point. In this connection I would like to ask about the proposed amendment to the Criminal Code which was discussed last year. To what extent does this system adopted by the American Tobacco Company exist in respect of other manufactures in Canada. I mean the system of selling or consigning goods upon a stipulation that the persons to whom the goods are sold or consigned, shall not handle the goods of any other manufacturer of a similar class of goods. It was alleged last year—I do not know with what truth—that this is a system of very general application. Of course I understand that it is a system which may be innocent, may be productive of no harmful results at all, so long as you have ten, fifteen or twenty manufacturers engaged in the same business. I realize that the operation of a system of that kind might only become injurious when you have one corporation engaged in the enterprise, controlling perhaps 90 or 95 per cent of the whole business. I appreciate all that, but at the same time I think it would be useful for us to know as this measure is going through the committee, to what extent that system so made harmful by what is practically a monopoly, if we are to accept the statement made by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, applies generally in carrying on business in this country.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have no special information as to that. The tobacco question was investigated by Judge MacTavish and during that investigation there was some suggestion that combinations of a similar character to this existed in other trades, but the judge did not find it expedient to investigate that question because it was not within the scope of the inquiry.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was any complaint made with regard to it, in respect to any other industry?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not that I am aware of. Some mention of it was made during the tobacco investigation but there was no actual investigation of other trades. The reason given by Judge MacTavish was this: He said in his report that he was called upon to investigate the tobacco question, that the opposing parties appeared before him whereas as far as other trusts are concerned, nobody appeared before him and it looked to him as being unjust and inexpedient to make any investigation as to these trades. We are simply dealing with the facts that have been brought to our attention.

Mr. PARMELEE. Will the Bill to be founded on this resolution make any provision for reasonable notice? These arrangements have been made and I fear that if you take the right or exercise the right to cancel these licenses out of hand it would throw the trade into a great state of confusion and cause great injury and harm not only to the manufacturers but to the wholesalers and to the people who handle this tobacco all over the country.

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose that before we put the law into effect it would be only fair to draw the attention of the interested parties, that is to say the Empire Tobacco Company and the American Tobacco Company to the fact that a law has been passed providing that their licenses would be cancelled if they continue to use exclusive contracts, and I would be very glad to give them an opportunity of cancelling these exclusive contracts.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think the resolution ought to be changed to read as follows:—

Any licenses authorized by this Act for the manufacture of tobacco or cigars or cigarettes shall be cancelled.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think it would be fair to make that restriction. My hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, expressed very strongly his conviction this morning that legislation of this nature should be as general as possible. Under the circumstances we cannot go so far as to make a general law applicable to all trades, but I think the law should be as general as possible so far as the licensees are concerned. The information I have is that there is no other combine amongst the licensees but if it should be found that other licensees were doing the same thing, we should have power to deal with them.

Mr. TAYLOR. It will be time enough to deal with them when they arrive. What other goods which are manufactured have to take licenses from the department?

Mr. BRODEUR. The most important are spirits, vinegar, tobacco, cigars, malt, brewer's acetic acid.

Mr. MONK. Is it the intention of the minister, as soon as this Bill becomes law, to enforce it ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly.

Mr. MONK. Is there going to be any further inquiry ? At the time the grievance was exposed to the government the answer of the government to the deputation was that they would ascertain the facts by means of a commission of inquiry and then would act. That was two years ago. If this becomes law, will the minister act at once, or will there be a further inquiry ? Is there any special procedure contemplated by the minister, or will he act proprio motu.

Mr. BRODEUR. I shall have to find out whether those exclusive contracts are still in existence. The investigation took place a year ago and these contracts were then existent. I am convinced they are existing still, and if so I shall be called on to cancel them.

Mr. MONK. It would not take the minister more than a week at the outside to find out in an official and exhaustive manner that these contracts still continue. I suppose we can then expect the action of the government within a month at least, giving it the utmost extension possible.

Mr. BRODEUR. I shall give this matter my immediate consideration. I will do my utmost to carry out the wishes of parliament.

Mr. J. E. E. LEONARD. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, before this resolution is reported, I would like to offer a few remarks. It seems to me that the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue must know by this time what is the position of the American Tobacco Company trust. Judging from all the reticencies used by the hon. minister for not saying in what delay he is going to apply that law, I understand his only aim is to win the elections two months hence.

Together with the hon. member for Jacques-Cartier, and as representing a country which is deeply interested in tobacco growing, I would like the minister to state positively that this law shall come into force as soon as passed by this parliament, and I hope the hon. minister will have no objection to tell us that he is determined to put it into force immediately, especially as against the American Tobacco Company.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) My hon. friend knows perfectly well that we cannot proceed immediately with the cancelling of the licenses without having positive evidence of their being extant. If he has taken the trouble of reading the law—and I suppose he has—he will notice that the minister has the right to cancel the licenses when such and such things shall exist ; but we must first be satisfied that the state of things complained of is actually existent.

My hon. friend from Jacques-Cartier says : ' We have Judge MacTavish's report.' That is true, but the judge made his investigation two years ago. Suppose the contracts he denounced did not exist to-day, we would be in a very bad position indeed if we undertook to cancel the licenses without first making ourselves sure that they are still in force, and the government might be called to pay heavy damages. Therefore, the most rudimental prudence makes it a duty to inquire if those contracts are still in existence. My conviction is that they are, but I must have the reports from my officials, and if they are, I shall take immediate action. My hon. friend may rest assured that the desire of parliament will be complied with, and that it will not take the minister a long time to apply the law.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) The effect of this equivocal statement by the hon. minister is to put me in the greatest anxiety. At the end of this session, when the Prime Minister stated that all the legislation the government were to introduce this year was before the House, I called the attention of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue to the fact that the tobacco question had been forgotten, and that I was going to submit it myself to the House. The following day my hon. friend gave notice of his resolution. We rely upon him. Hon. members on this side of the House have given their adhesion to my hon. friend's Bill. We give him full discretion as regards its execution. We had the right of asking parliament to decide that point, and not leave it with the executive to suppress that monopoly ; but under the circumstances, we accept the Bill submitted to our consideration. I think it only fair that the government should state under what delay they are going to apply that law, because such means of information are absolute and most effective. They could know within a couple of days as to whether the state of things pointed out by Judge MacTavish is still existing or not. It is our right to have a clear statement from the government on that point.

If my hon. friend knows, as we all know, and as we are all persuaded in mind, that nothing has been changed in the state of things stated by Judge MacTavish, why should the hon. minister hesitate in telling us that within thirty days after the passing of that law the remedy involved in it shall be applied ? That would be twenty-five days more than is necessary for gathering sure evidence as to the existence of the abuse in question. Under these circumstances, it seems to me that since we confide in the government, they should tell us when they are going to take action.

My hon. friend has not been absolutely candid in this matter, and that is why I

am a little like St. Thomas and I have some misgivings. It is not that I wish to have any proof of the evil, for it is well known to me, but what I want is to have something tangible as regards the remedy the hon. minister intends to apply to that evil. Now, it seems to me that this desire is quite reasonable.

When we on this side of the House have raised that question, we have been accused of varying on the question of protection. That question is not involved in this matter. The question involved is that of abolishing the monopoly ; the question at stake is that of finding new markets for our Canadian tobacco. These two questions are the most important of all. Should you even raise the duty two hundred per cent, we would not be any better as long as we have that monopoly, which is proved to have existed for more than two years past. Therefore, I think the hon. minister should let us know when he intends to use that law.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. (Translation.) I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) to observe that the proof of the fact that the government realize all the importance of this question is that they had it immediately submitted to the House, although the end of the session is drawing near. So fully did they realize the importance of the matter that they made an exception in introducing this law, when they had stated their intention of introducing no other new legislation at this session, as reminded by the hon. gentleman. Since the government have given such evidence of their good faith, my hon. friend and the House may be sure that this law will be used in order to protect that industry and the tobacco growers against the effects of that monopoly. Therefore, there can be no doubt as to whether the government will execute this law intended to put an end to the monopoly now existing.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I take note of this explicit statement made by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice. At the same time I would ask the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur), who will be charged to execute this law, to tell us within what delay he intends to use it ?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) My hon. friend must bear in mind that if there is any evidence as regards the existence of that monopoly it is in the hands of parties opposed to this government, or at least to the law now under discussion. It must not be believed that the proof of those contracts being existent will be furnished to us by the American Tobacco Company. We shall have to get it otherwise. I may say to the hon. gentleman that immediately after the session, that is after this law is sanctioned, my officers will be instructed to make the necessary investigations, in order to gather evidence as to the existence of those contracts, and as soon as that evidence is handed to me, the cancelling of the licenses will be immediately ordered. That evidence might perhaps be gathered within fifteen days ; it may be also that three weeks or one month are required ; but in addition to this, we must be given sufficient time to take an intelligent decision. My hon. friend may rest assured that the government will make all possible haste, in order to have this law executed, and will take action with all expedition.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) This statement made by my hon. friend is more satisfactory than the one he made a moment ago. I presume he understands, as we all do, that the government are not going to leave this law unexecuted until some third party comes in, but that his own department will take action without the interference of third parties.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Certainly, the department will take immediate action.

Mr. TAYLOR moved :

That the resolution be amended by striking out the word 'may' and inserting 'for the manufacture of tobacco, cigars and cigarettes shall.'

Mr. SPROULE. If the rest is left out and 'shall' inserted instead of 'may,' I shall be satisfied.

Amendment negatived on division.

Resolution reported and read the first time

Mr. BRODEUR moved that the resolution be read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. TAYLOR. If there is any objection, Mr. Speaker, this stage cannot be taken at this sitting.

Mr. BRODEUR. But I suppose my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) will not make any objection. We are now at the end of the session——

Mr. TAYLOR. That is a very good reason why this Bill should have been brought in earlier and parties interested given an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. BRODEUR. I thought the hon. gentleman was in favour of it.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) will amend it to suit me I am, but I do not want it to apply to everybody.

Mr. SPEAKER. Second reading at the next sitting of the House.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES—ANIMALS.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

That it is expedient to provide that the Animal Contagious Diseases Act of 1903 be amended as follows —

That paragraph (e) of section 2 of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act of 1903, chapter 11 of the statutes of 1903, be amended by adding after the word 'farcy' in the third line of the said paragraph the words 'maladie du coit.'

That subsections 2 and 3 of section 12 be stricken out, and the following substituted therefor :—

'The compensation, if any, shall be two-thirds of the value of the slaughtered animal before the same became affected with infectious or contagious disease, or came in contact with, or in dangerous proximity to animals so affected ; provided that when it is clearly shown that an animal has been slaughtered on insufficient grounds, and that the slaughter was not in accordance with, or justifiable under this Act, the owner shall be entitled to compensation at the full value of the animal so slaughtered.'

That subsection 4 of the said section 12 be amended by adding at the end thereof the following :—

'But shall not exceed, in the case of grade animals, $150 for each horse ; $60 for each head of cattle ; or $15 for each pig or sheep ; and in the case of pure bred animals, $300 for each horse ; $150 for each head of cattle ; or $50 for each pig or sheep,'—Mr. Fisher.

Mr. CLANCY. It seems quite evident that in this resolution the hon. minister is discriminating in favour of the pure bred and graded stock. As I understand the law at present, all animals coming in contact and having contracted disease——

Mr. FISHER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) will permit me, I will give an explanation of changes proposed.

Mr. CLANCY. I think I understand the changes, but I would like to get the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Fisher's) reasons for them. Under the present law, for an animal that has contracted a contagious disease and is slaughtered by order of the government the owner now receives one-third the value For those that have come in contact and have not contracted the disease, he receives three-quarters. The hon. gentleman proposes now to place them both on the same ground of two-thirds. Under the present law the limit for a pure bred animal is $60, and for grade $20. Under the proposed resolution, for grades it is raised to $60 for each head of cattle and $150 for each horse—it is probably right to make a distinction between the amount for each horse and for each head of cattle. In the case of thoroughbreds, under the resolution the limit is $150 for each head of cattle and $300 for each horse. These are very large sums. There is danger of the country being put to great expense here, because the animals under these circumstances are apt to be valued very high. There is often a fictitious price——

Mr. FISHER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) will allow me, I think he has not quite seized the details of the resolution. Under the resolution, three changes are proposed. The first is to add a certain disease to the list of contagious diseases. That is very simple. The disease is one that has been known in this country only for the last two years, but it has been found to be quite general in certain sections of the Northwest, and it is very desirable, in the interest of the herds there, that it should be stamped out. This is the maladie du coit. The second change is as to the compensation to be paid when animals are slaughtered. In the old Act, the figures which the hon. gentleman will read in subsections 2 and 3 of section 12 are not the limit of the valuation, but the limit of the compensation. In the present measure I am putting in the limit of the valuation. To find the limit of the valuation under the existing law, you must multiply the figures by three, as the compensation is limited to one-third of the value. In the old Act :

When the animal slaughtered is affected with infectious or contagious disease, the compensation, if any, shall be one-third of the value of the animal before it became so affected, but shall not exceed, in the case of grade animals, twenty dollars,——

That means that the value of the animal shall not be more than $60.

—and in the case of pure bred animals, sixty dollars.

We must multiply that amount by three, which makes it $180. Now I want to explain that in these figures, in the old Act, horses were not considered at all. The figures were for the valuation of cattle, and for sheep and pigs, there was no difference in the possible valuation of any animal, whatever animal it might be ; the result was that, whether it was a horse valued, we may say, in the case of a grade animal, at about $150, or whether it was a pig, valued at $10 or $15, the limit of the compensation was the same. In my proposed amendments I give a limit of valuation for the horses, a limit of valuation for the cattle, and a limit of valuation for pigs and swine. In the old Act there was no difference in the valuation of any of the domestic animals. But it is not a fair comparison in regard to valuation to take the figures in the old Act and compare them, without this explanation, with the figures in the new Act.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman say how you are to make the computation under section 3 of the old Act.

Mr. FISHER. Under that section the compensation was three-fourths of the valuation of the animal ; and the limit of compensation was, in the case of grade animals, $50. The value of the animal in that case would be about $67. One-third of $50 is about $17 ; and if you take $50 as three-fourths of the value of the animal, that would mean that the value of the animal might go up as high as $67, with a fraction.

Then three-quarters of that valuation might be paid, which would be about $50. Now in the case of cattle, my proposal is that, in the case of grade animals, it shall be $60 per head. In the old Act it might have been $67. In the new Act it cannot be more than $60 for a grade cow or steer. That valuation is not fixed by the Act, it is only the limit of valuation, which is not a fixed valuation. I am giving the maximum possible valuation, and in this particular instance it is slightly lower than under the old Act, and that is more or less modified by the fact that I provide that the compensation instead of being one-third in the case of actual disease and three-quarters in case of contact, it shall be a flat rate of two-thirds in every case.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman here—he has had a good deal of experience in his department—in case of slaughtered animals, those coming in contact and becoming diseased, and those coming in contact without being diseased, what has been the proportion up to this time ?

Mr. FISHER. The proportion until this last year or so has been, roughly speaking, about one-third of them in contact, and two-thirds of them diseased—I am speaking of swine, which are much the largest number of slaughtered animals. I adopted the practice lately of requiring a post mortem examination in the case of every animal slaughtered, and the result has been to decrease the number of those in contact, because, by the post mortem examination, we have found that there was disease which, in a good many animals, did not appear on the surface, and the result is lately a smaller proportion of what we call contact animals have been paid for than of diseased animals, and that, roughly speaking, the proportion is, instead of being as one-third is to two-thirds, it is about as one-fifth is to four-fifths, during the last year. But I want to point out to my hon. friend that this proceeding has occasioned a great deal of difficulty and friction. People whose animals are slaughtered are of course eager to get as much as they can, and if a veterinary makes a post mortem examination and finds a very slight indication of disease he declares the animal is diseased, although there is no outward clinical symptom, and the farmer is dissatisfied, he is aggrieved, and feels in many cases that the animal, especially if a pig, might have been sold or slaughtered by himself. The consequence has been a great deal of friction, difficulty and dissatisfaction, and that is the chief reason why I propose in this law to make a change, and make a flat rate for all slaughtered animals, whether in contact or diseased. I think that a slight increase of payment will be required ; but I trust that a good deal of dissatisfaction will be removed, and a greater willingness will be found on the part of farmers to call in the veterinary and to declare that they have disease in their flocks. That is really the object of the changes. We have been struggling to stamp out hog cholera in this country. We have got it pretty well circumscribed. There are sporadic cases occurring in a considerable area of country, but of late, with the exception of one particular district, the cases have been only sporadic. I hope that by this change we will be able to stamp it out there as we have been able to stamp it out in some other places. That is my reason for suggesting this change, in addition to the reason that if we are going to deal with this maladie du coit, which is a disease of horses, we will be obliged to make the valuation of horses for compensation higher than the old Act allowed, it being a valuation determined on the idea of cattle slaughtered and not of horses.

Mr. STEPHENS. I am much pleased that the Minister of Agriculture has introduced these amendments to the old Act. I have taken a considerable interest in diseased cattle of all sorts in the county of Kent, and I have been complaining for some years back that the compensation paid to farmers owning animals that the government have slaughtered, has not been sufficient to induce the farmers in many cases to call in the government veterinary when their animals became diseased. They found in some cases that it would be better to slaughter the animals that had disease, and keep the well ones to be shipped out of the country. This was done in many cases. I have compared the old Act with some of the Acts of several states of the United States, and I find that nearly all those states have been paying more compensation than we have been paying in Canada. I find also that in England the government pay for animals attacked by pleuro-pneumonia three-fourths of the value, and the full value for all other animals that are slaughtered to prevent the spread of the disease. In cases of cattle plague half value is paid for diseased animals and whole value for all others ; foot and mouth disease, full value before the animal becomes affected ; sheep-pox, half value for diseased animals and full value for all other animals ; swine fever, half value for diseased animals and full value for all other animals slaughtered in all cases up to a certain amount. The question was asked how this legislation would affect the payments to farmers. For the last year ending June 30, 1904, there was paid on account of hog cholera for diseased animals, one-third value, $18,099.32 and for contact animals, three-quarter value, $4,022.03, making a total of $22,101.35. If compensation had been paid on the basis of two-thirds value for all hogs slaughtered the figures would have been :

Diseased, two-thirds value..	$36,198 64
Contact, two-thirds value..	3,557 36
Increase..	$18,099 32
Decrease	444 67

Or making a net increase in the amount of compensation of $17,654.65. I am sure that when the farmers help to pay the bounties on lead, silver, iron, steel, petroleum and some other things, they are entitled to this increased compensation. I have had letters from farmers in Ontario and in the North west Territories asking that more compensation be paid them, as they have felt the loss was too great for them to bear. When you consider that the export trade in animals and their products amounts to from $60,000,000 to $70,000,000 a year, you will at once see that this is a very important industry, and that it should be well looked after, so as to enable us to stamp out disease as quickly as possible. The compensation which has been paid in the past has not been effective to stamp out disease in my county, for the reason that the farmer does not in all cases at once notify the veterinary and have the animals destroyed. I would also suggest to the government that when disease, particularly hog cholera, breaks out in a county the Act, as the hon. minister has now brought it into the House, should be published in the weekly newspapers to enable the farmers to know what the law is. In a great many cases they do not obey the law for the reason that they do not understand what it is. I would also suggest that in cases where the government have a veterinary surgeon employed by the year, as there is a considerable time during which he is not engaged in the inspection and slaughtering of animals, he should employ himself holding meetings amongst farmers and endeavouring to show them the best way to keep their animals in order to prevent disease breaking out amongst their herds and flocks, and also the best methods of preventing the disease from spreading. I do not think there is a member of this House who will not be willing to vote for the extra expenditure that will be incurred under this Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the examination under this Bill be made by veterinaries in the employ of the Department of Agriculture or by veterinaries just as they are picked up all over the country in the districts in which the slaughtering will take place ?

Mr. FISHER. By regularly appointed officers of the department.

Mr. DANIEL. What disease is meant by this one which is mentioned in the resolution—maladie du coit ?

Mr. FISHER. The disease is equine syphilis.

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. STEPHENS.

Mr. FISHER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 166) respecting the Animals Contagious Act, 1903.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

On the question : When shall the Bill be read a second time ?

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to offer any opposition to the Bill. It may be a very good Bill, it may be entirely in the interests of those whom it is intended to assist and whose benefit the hon. minister has in view, but I rise to protest against this absurd system of bringing up matters of this kind at the end of the session, when there is no opportunity whatever of giving consideration to them. The hon. minister has been absent more or less for a very considerable part of the session, more especially recently. He has been having his pleasure here and there, without paying any attention to the business of the House, and I must insist that action of this kind and the railroading of a measure of this kind through the House without hon. members having an opportunity of considering it, is not what the members of this House have a right to expect at the hands of the hon. minister. I think that if he had any consideration for the members of this House, he would treat them with more courtesy than he has in the past, and that he would bring down measures of this kind a reasonable time before he asks the House to consider them, and give ample opportunity, after the measures have been introduced, for members to consider them. I say this is a mere farce ; it is simply getting snap legislation. This House knows nothing of the merits of this Bill, and I question if the hon. minister knows very much about it. It has not received that serious consideration which it ought to have received. What is it? An amendment of a Bill passed last year, not twelve months ago, not probably nine months ago ; yet the minister comes down in the dying hours of the session and asks the members of this House to amend a Bill which he, in his judgment, thought was perfection only nine months ago. I think it is time hon. ministers came to the conclusion that the members of this House are entitled to some little consideration and some little courtesy at their hands. This is getting to be a practice too often repeated. What have we had in this House in the last three or four months during the present session ? Time after time we have been called upon to amend Bills passed during the present session. If these Bills had received proper consideration in the departments before they came before the House there would have been no reason for them to have been amended during the session in which they were enacted, and at the same time there is no reason in the world why a Bill passed in 1903 should be amended in 1904. If it were right in 1903, surely it could re-

main on the statute-book for one year at least. The minister has explained that one of these diseases has only been recently discovered, but if it has been known for two years even, the officers of his department should have drawn his attention to it and have had it included in last year's Bill. I am not opposing this Bill; it may be a good Bill or it may not; but it is not a proper way to do business. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture to give a little more attention to the affairs of parliament and of his department, and to treat the members of this House with more courtesy if he wants to get such legislation through.

Mr. FISHER. This Bill has been in a different form on the order paper for a month and as to the disease it has only been reported to parliament since the legislation of last session.

Motion agreed to and House went into committee on the Bill.

On section 3,

Mr. FOWLER. It says the compensation shall not exceed $150 for each grade horse. Some grade horses may be worth $1,000.

Mr. FISHER. Sometimes, but not very often. We have to take an average of the value; we do not give compensation at fancy prices.

Mr. FOWLER. A valuable trotting horse might not be pure bred or thoroughbred and still you only allow $150. As a matter of fact a grade horse in the roadster class, if you get a superior animal, might be much more valuable than a pure bred horse.

Bill reported.

On the motion for the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. HENDERSON. I suppose we might as well complete the farce and allow the Bill to go through.

Bill read the third time and passed.

BOUNTY ON CRUDE PETROLEUM.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolutions:

1. Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that there shall be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund a bounty of one and one-half cents per gallon on all crude petroleum produced from wells in Canada on and after the 8th day of June, 1904, and on crude petroleum produced from wells in Canada and held in storage tanks or other storage receptacles on that date.

2. Resolved, that the Minister of Trade and Commerce may, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, make such regulations as he deems necessary respecting the payment of the said bounties.

Mr. FIELDING. This matter was fully discussed by me in the budget speech, and I do not deem it necessary to add any further explanation at present.

Mr. CLANCY. I had hoped the Minister of Finance would have profited by the experience which he must have obtained since he introduced this measure on the 6th of June last. Without meaning to be offensive to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding), I must say that the conclusion has been forced upon me, as well as upon others, that the hon. gentleman did not know what he was doing when he dealt with this measure in quite as summary a manner as he now proposes. The Finance Minister and his political friends have for many years endeavoured to exercise a sort of destroying influence on the oil industry. It has been a constant subject of attack by them. For years the principal part of the Liberal campaign literature has been devoted to an attack on the coal oil industry. Now, the time has come when the Minister of Finance feels himself, not so much in the interest of the country as for other reasons, to yield to the pressure brought upon him from, I believe, not very reliable sources. There is no doubt that the coal oil industry is important, and there is no doubt that its conditions have changed of recent years. I am convinced that there should be a readjustment of the duties on the oil industry, but I am not convinced that the measure now proposed by the government remedies the difficulty. If we wish to deal with the oil industry in the same way, and give it the same protection as we give to other industries, it is common business sense that we should in the first place encourage production of crude oil in Canada. We should also protect and encourage the refining interests of this country, so that the people of Canada would be enabled to use oil refined in Canada, and the manufacture of which had given work to Canadians. I hope that we all assent to that doctrine. There is another phase of the question which the Minister of Finance seems to have lost sight of, and that is, that we should fairly safeguard the revenue. Another consideration, which I admit is a very important one, is, that the consumers should have refined oil at a fair price considering all the circumstances.

I do not know what information the hon. gentleman had with regard to the first proposition, but it is known by the whole country that the crude interest is a very important one, in fact of greater importance than the refining interests are in this country. The number of men and the capital employed in the producing interest is very large in comparison with the refining interest. We have two refineries in Canada—one at Petrolia, a very good refinery, and another at Sarnia which is a very large and important industry. I would give my most cordial support to any fair measure—and I wish the words 'fair measure' to be marked,—that would

transfer that refining interest from the United States to Canada to give labour to our citizens, so that we might refine our own oil. The hon. gentleman has entirely ignored every proposition that has been made by the people. He had the petition of those concerned in the work, he had representations from the refineries in this country, particularly from the Imperial Oil Company, which is in other words the Standard Oil Company. A very clever and astute gentleman was no doubt in communication with the hon. gentleman, I mean Mr. Chamberlain, general manager of the Imperial Oil Company at Sarnia, a gentleman who knows the oil business in this country as well as he does in the States, who knew what the effect of the tariffs would be, who knew what he wanted, and who no doubt asked for what he wanted. He was backed by a large number of people in his request. I am not going to say at this moment whether the proportion of duty on crude or refined oil was absolutely correct or not, but I wish to point out to the Minister of Finance that he has utterly and absolutely ignored every proposition that came from a quarter to be relied on and from persons who knew the situation. The Standard people were urging this question for their own interest but their proposition if adopted would have been of great advantage to Canada, and whether or not the proportions are just what they should be the transfer of the refining industry to this country from the United States would have been of very great advantage. The proposition of the parties who came here asked that the duty on refined oil should remain at five cents a gallon and that the duty on crude oil for refining purposes should be reduced from 5 to 2 cents a gallon. The duty on oil for fuel and gas purposes had been reduced in 1897 from, I think, 3 cents to 2½ cents. But it might have been reasonable if oil for refining purposes had been reduced to 2 cents a gallon to place all crude upon the same footing. Mr. Chamberlain's proposition was endorsed at a public meeting in Sarnia. The whole question was discussed at a large meeting and his view was adopted by a resolution passed at that meeting, and the citizens followed up the resolution by a petition asking for a duty of 2 cents on crude leaving the refined at 5 cents. The petition of the Board of Trade to the same effect was entrusted to the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Johnston) who had the honour of presenting it to the Minister of Finance. The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Johnston) approved of that petition and no doubt pressed it with great energy. The labour organizations of Sarnia, the press of Sarnia and the Liberal candidate in East Lambton in the recent by-elections (Mr. Jenkins), also approved that principle. Then there is a petition which I hold in my hand signed by 150 persons who allege that they represent 542 producing oil wells. Now, so far as the records in the department show, a solid front was presented by that section asking that the duty on refined oil should remain as it was since 1897, and that the duty on crude should be reduced to 2 cents. It is somewhat puzzling in view of this to know why the hon. gentleman has entirely ignored these representations. There was another section, a large section, perhaps the most important section of the oil interest, who offered a most strenuous opposition to this proposal and my hon. friend's able speech when the tariff was brought down would indicate very clearly what that was. The hon. gentleman, the Minister of Finance, entered upon a revision and proposed to make the duty on refined oli 2½ cents a gallon. In reaching his conclusions he took as a basis 8,615,892 gallons as the amount of oil refined from Canadian crude, and 14,479,176 gallons as the quantity of oil refined in the United States the refining of which would be immediately transferred to Canada and therefore I think the calculation was a fair one. The duty upon that will be 2½ cents a gallon, instead of five, so that the protection afforded the refiners would be $577,376.

He says we have saved that much because they have taken off just two and a half cents a gallon, but on the other hand we have to pay a bounty on the quantity of crude oil that will be produced in Canada. Estimating that at 16,852,540 gallons, at one and a half cent a gallon, it would amount to $252,789. That added to the cost of production I have already given of $577,376 for protection, gives a total cost of $830,165 to Canada of carrying the oil interest. Let us see how that affects the revenue. There will be a loss of revenue if that is transferred—I mean the refining interests from the United States to Canada—of at once $723,945. Or the figures stand as follows :

On refined oil imported in 1903, 14,479,176 gallons—5 cents	$723,945
On crude for fuel, gas and other purposes, 2,143,888 gallons—2½ cents....	53,597
On lubricating oil costing less than 25 cents per gallon, imported 1903, 1,617,454 gallons—2½ cents..	80,780
	$858,682

This shows a net loss to the revenue—not considering the by-products, upon which the hon. gentleman has made a reduction of the tariff—of $858,628. In other words if the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite be the correct one, namely that the measure of protection enhances the cost to the extent of the protection, then we will have a cost to the country for protection and bounty combined of $830,165 and we will have a loss on the other hand of $858,682 in revenue alone.

Let us take the proposal of the imperial people and see what it will cost this country. Mind you, Sir, I do not assent to the proposition that the protection you give an

industry enhances the cost of the products to that extent, but that is the contention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Minister of Finance.

I have stated that the cost of protection and the cost of the bounty amount altogether to about $830,000. Putting it on the same basis, let us turn to the proposal the Imperial or Standard made to the minister. On refined oil, a duty of five cents a gallon, taking the same number of gallons, the cost of protection upon that to the people would be $430,794. That they would pay, according to these hon. gentlemen, extra by reason of having the protection of five cents per gallon. That is what they would pay on the oil refined from Canadian crude oil. Then take the American oil. Last year we imported American refined oil to the extent of 14,479,176 gallons. Upon that the people paid $723,945, every dollar of which went into the treasury according to the hon. gentleman's contention, because that was not refined in Canada. But if the proposition of the head of the Standard Company had been followed, what would have been the result? It would have been that that industry would at once have been transferred to Canada. This 14,000,000 gallons of refined oil would have been refined in Sarnia and no refined oil would be imported into Canada. I do not believe there will be one gallon of refined oil imported into Canada in the future, because, with the equipment of tank vessels and cars and outfit which the Standard Company can control, they will refine every gallon of that oil in Canada. What would follow? We would require to import crude oil for the purpose of refining to the extent of 28,958,352 gallons. We import some crude oil for gas and fuel and other purposes amounting to 2,143,888 gallons. The whole amount of crude oil required to be imported into Canada next year, in order that all the oil may be refined in Canada for Canadians, would amount to 31,102,240 gallons, which at 2 cents a gallon would yield a revenue of $622,044. Deducting this from the $723,945, we have a balance of $101,901, diminishing our revenue to that extent. Here is the statement tabulated:

COST TO COUNTRY.

Oil refined from Canadian crude, 8,615,892 gallons—5 cents per gallon...	$430,794
Oil refined from American crude, 14,479,176 gallons—5 cents.	$723,945
Less duty paid on American crude—	
	Gallons.
For refining purposes.. ..	28,958,352
For gas, fuel and other purposes..	2,143,888
	31,102,240—2 cents.
	$622,044
	$101,901
	$532,695

What does that mean? It means that the cost to the country is this. The cost to Canada, under the plan proposed by even the men engaged in this industry who propose to come to Canada and refine that oil—the cost of protection, according to hon. gentlemen opposite on our own Canadian product both on crude and refined oil, would amount to $430,934. Then the transfer of the refining interests from the United States to Canada would mean a loss of revenue to the extent of $723,944. On deducting the duty on American crude imported for refining and all other purposes, you have a net loss to the revenue of $101,901, to which you must add the cost of protection, $430,794, making a total cost to the country of $532,695. I want to make this particularly clear, because it is the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite. Hon. gentlemen opposite contend—and there may be some ground for the contention—that the duty on the raw material does not in the slightest sense affect the price to the consumer. Their contention is that the two cents a gallon on crude oil imported into Canada for refining purposes would not in the slightest degree increase the price to the consumer. Am I right or wrong in that?

Mr. FIELDING. The price to the consumer would be affected by the duty on the refined oil. Vary that and you vary the cost to the consumer.

Mr. CLANCY. I am glad to understand the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FIELDING. It is a simple proposition.

Mr. CLANCY. I am going to agree with the hon. gentleman there. It is a very important question whether we shall lose $850,000 in duties to no purpose, or whether we shall lose only $100,000 and accomplish our purpose. I need not go over the proof the hon. gentleman has given on many occasions with regard to raw material in such articles, as raw sugar and unhulled rice—that a change in the duty does not affect the price to the consumer in the least.

Mr. FIELDING. Unless there be at the same time a change in duty on the refined article. But, where a duty is imposed on the raw material, as a general thing it is accompanied with a duty on the refined product. In that case, the price to the consumer would be affected.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has interjected a complication of his own. Suppose the duty on crude oil to be 2 cents a gallon, the duty on the refined being 5 cents, would the price to the consumer be affected if the duty on the refined were reduced to 2½ cents, the crude still remaining at 2 cents?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think I understand.

Mr. CLANCY. I will put it again.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) need do so. The price of any article to the consumer, where it is a case of the raw article and the refined, is affected, as a rule, by the duty on the refined. But, if the duty on the refined is not changed, the duty on the raw is not, as a rule, a matter of importance to the consumer. I will admit that, if it is important to the hon. gentleman's argument.

Mr. CLANCY. Now, the hon. gentleman has made a statement of his own. What I wanted to ask was whether the duty on refined being at 5 cents a gallon, if crude were brought in at 2 cents a gallon would the hon. gentleman say that that would affect the price to the consumer ?

Mr. FIELDING. I have answered my hon. friend.

Mr. CLANCY. I assume that the minister says that it would not. Now, what is the general effect of the hon. gentleman's legislation ? It means that there is a loss to the revenue of $858,682. That is perfectly clear. The protection to the refiners in Canada would amount to $577,376, while the bounties to be paid are $252,000. But, by adopting the plan proposed by the citizens of this country, the effect would be after deducting $101,901 being the loss of revenue in the one case from $803,165 being the loss of revenue in the other case. The net result to the country would be $756,781 of a saving in favour of the revenue. The rest is a protection to the manufacturers of $46,685, and the saving in cash bounties of $252,789. This makes a total saving to the country including the protection given to the refiners, the payment of bounty and the revenue—that is, a saving direct and indirect—of $1,054,625. The hon. gentleman seems to have lost sight entirely of the revenue. Has it occurred to him that the loss of revenue in the change of the oil duties is very much greater than the loss of revenue that he counted upon for the whole tariff list in his general revision of the tariff in 1897 ? The hon. minister is carrying on a conversation, so I can only assume, that he intends utterly to ignore all this. It seems useless for me to address my remarks to him.

Mr. FIELDING. But, I should hope that my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) would continue his remarks for the benefit of a suffering public. I assure him that I have no desire to ignore him, but shall be pleased to listen to him with great respect.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman's pleasure goes one way and his manners the other. I hope the question I am dealing with is not regarded of so little importance that the hon. gentleman need not pay the slightest attention to the question I asked him.

Mr. FIELDING. I may explain that another hon. member came to speak to me on a matter of no less importance than that with which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) is dealing, and I was obliged to pay him some attention.

Mr. CLANCY. I will excuse the hon. gentleman. And, as to the effect of the action he is decided upon taking in regard to these duties, I can only think that he did not know what he was doing.

Mr. FIELDING. I am willing that the hon. gentleman should think so.

Mr. CLANCY. The people of this country will think so. I doubt that there is a man engaged in the oil business in Canada who favours the changes the hon. gentleman has made.

Mr. FIELDING. There is nobody complaining except the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy).

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman consider the petitions received from the town of Sarnia no complaint ?

Mr. FIELDING. There is no petition from the town of Sarnia against the action of the government on this question. There is nobody complaining and nobody grumbling.

Mr. CLANCY. Was there no petition asking the hon. gentleman to take a course very different from that which he has taken?

Mr. FIELDING. That is another question. The hon. gentleman was dealing with the present condition. I say there is no complaint that I know of against the decision of the government with regard to the oil duties.

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. minister has not had complaints laid before him, it is because members of this House have failed to make known to him the complaints that have been communicated to them. Either they have deceived the minister, or else the minister has not disclosed all the information he has. It is a matter of common notoriety. My hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) has just handed me a letter addressed to the hon. Minister of Finance from the Producers' Association—dated July 5—and stating that the placing of the American crude on the free list enables the refiners to import crude oil at a price which leaves the producers at their mercy. Is that a complaint ?

Mr. FIELDING. Of course, all those who are interested in the production of oil would be glad to have an increase in the bounty. I believe that, immediately after the change in duties was made, there was a temporary disturbance in the prices of oil, and some of those who are interested though they were going to suffer. So far as I know, of late, they do not feel that that view has been confirmed. Some weeks ago there were re-

presentations in favour of an increase in the bounty upon the crude, but I have reason to believe that the condition of the oil market did not jusify the anticipations then indulged in, and I think I am right in saying that practically everybody is content. But I have no doubt that the producers would be glad to have an increase in the bounty.

Mr. CLANCY. That is the revised version of the hon. gentleman's statement. He tells us now that practically there are no complaints.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not say that there are none.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman came down to the House with a sort of fiction to make the people believe they were going to get cheaper oil. The hon. gentleman adopted, though perhaps unwittingly, the figures of a fiscal year for a portion of his calculation and those of a calendar year for another portion. These figures were furnished to him by the persons to whom I made reference, and who asked the reduction on crude oil to two cents, and the hon. gentleman reached a conclusion that was not accurate. I am taking the figures in a fiscal year in both cases. The oil refined in Canada from Canadian crude was 8,615,892 gallons and the American importations were 14,497,176 gallons, making a total consumption of refined oil in Canada of 23,095,068 gallons. Take 2½ cents on that quantity, and you get $577,376, which the hon. gentleman says would be the amouut saved to the people. But we must put against that, the bounty paid on crude, $252,789, or, in other words, there would be a saving to the people of $324,587. Well, the hon. gentleman knows that the consumer would not get the whole of it. He knows the consumer would only save two cents a gallon if there was anything saved. Therefore, we must take $115,000 from that calculation, because every one knows that the retailer would not lose the half cent a gallon any more than he did before—he would make the consumer lose that. That would reduce the sum to $209,112 as the net saving, amounting to three and two-fifths of a cent to each man, woman and child of this country. What a startling saving that is on which the hon. gentleman should base so loud a pretense of making oil cheaper to the consumer, when, even if his own caclulations were realized, it means that there would be a saving of less than four cents a head to the population.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Do you object to the reduction ?

Mr. CLANCY. I object to a reduction at the cost of any industry in this country. We know that when the hon. gentleman's friends were calling out for a reduction in the price of flour, he wanted the duty on wheat lowered proportionately. The hon. gentleman then did not think how much it would cost the people.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What evidence have you of that ?

Mr. CLANCY. Well, I have the evidence of the hon. gentleman's own words. They may not be believed, but they are on the 'Hansard.' Now, Mr. Chairman, it is a well-known fact that when there was a reduction of one cent a gallon on oil in 1897, if that was applied to the quantity of oil imported last year and that which was refined in Canada, about 23,000,000 gallons, it would amount to $230,000. Did any one get oil cheaper by reason of that one cent reduction ? The country took no notice of it. True, notice has been taken of the late reduction in some places, but in six months from now no one in Canada will know whether he is paying higher or lower for refined oil than he did. Everybody knows that it is impossible to keep track of anything of that kind. I took the trouble of following the hon. gentleman's tariff with letters of inquiry to a number of places in this country contiguous to the oil industry. I did this on the 20th of June, a sufficient time for the reduction to have an effect. I am merely pointing this out to show that the effect will not be uniform all over the country. In Wyoming, Chatham, Sombra, Wallaceburg and Ridgetown, there was a reduction of two cents a gallon ; but, as I stated, these places are all nearby to the oil industry, both the refining industry and the production. Then in Dresden, Port Lambton oil springs, and Bothwell and Brigden, on the same date, the same number of places in each case, there was no reduction made. I do not know whether a reduction has been made since then or not ; I am merely pointing out that, as a matter of fact, no attention is paid to these reductions.

Now, there was no demand made in this country for a reduction, even on refined oil. Since the hon. gentlemen ceased to be in opposition there has been some measure of peace in that direction. Even the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell), I remember, carried a coal oil can, metaphorically speaking, in his hands when he went around the country, and I think he carried around a pound of rice at the same time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What was your attitude at that time ? What did you carry around ?

Mr. CLANCY. I carried about then, as now, a policy for the defence of Canadian interests. I carried about then, as now, the policy enunciated in this country of protection to Canadian industries, a policy from which hon. gentlemen have already profited so much. That is what I carried about, and that is what I have defended. We de-

fended that policy when the Conservative party were in power, and we defend it now when we are in opposition. The hon. gentlemen, on the other hand, have adopted a revenue tariff, a tax collecting tariff, which has been very successful in getting taxes out of the people. Now, what took place ? This revision of the oil duties. I would ask on whose representations did the hon. gentleman adopt the plan he now proposes, rather than the plan the people asked for ? I would like to ask my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. T. G. Johnston) if he ever sanctioned this plan, or advised, or was advised by the Finance Minister as to the adoption of the course which was finally pursued. I would like to know why he has adopted this plan instead of adopting the proposal made by the people in the town of Sarnia and elsewhere, petitioned for first by the people and then by the board of trade, then by the labour organizations, then supported by the newspapers in that town, irrespective of politics. I would like to know that from the hon. gentleman now, and from the Minister of Finance—and if I get no answer, I will assume, as I have a right to assume, that the hon. gentleman ignored the proposition of the people and ignored the hon. member for West Lambton.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. member for West Lambton does not seem to complain.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman says that the hon. member for West Lambton does not seem to complain. Is that an answer to the statement that the hon. gentleman has ignored the request with which he was entrusted when he came to this House ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is a perfect answer when the hon. gentleman undertakes to speak for the hon. member for West Lambton. It will be time enough when the hon. member for West Lambton complains.

Mr. CLANCY. Well, I have no doubt that the hon. member for West Lambton will answer for himself and that he will be more frank than the hon. Minister of Finance is. I believe he will tell this House that the people entrusted him with these petitions asking for just what they wanted. A proposition came from the Imperial Oil Company. No doubt their sole view was to better their position. But the people were most anxious to better their condition and this is a benefit which should have been brought to the town of Sarnia. I do not care, where this industry may be located although hon. gentlemen opposite have always taken a narrow view in matters of this kind. The hon. Minister of Finance in view of all the evidence that has been given as to what they wanted and as to what I pointed out would have been beneficial and which would have secured for them all they are asking adopts another course. Mr. Chamberlain said in his speech at Sarnia that if you permit crude oil to be brought into Canada at two cents a gallon we will be able to carry on our refinery at Sarnia and there will be no loss to the revenue because the quantity of crude oil to be imported would compensate for the loss of revenue on refined oil.

Mr. FIELDING. Is that what the hon. gentleman wanted ?

Mr. CLANCY. I will not hesitate to tell the hon. gentleman what I want. I stated a moment ago I was not prepared to say whether two cents or two and a half cents a gallon would have been a proper proportion, but there should have been some proportionate difference between the duty on crude oil and the duty on refined oil. That is what I wanted and that is what I want now.

Mr. FIELDING. Is the hon. gentleman not aware that the election was run by his friends in East Lambton against the policy which was advocated by a gentleman there of putting a duty of two cents a gallon on crude oil and does he not know that the Liberal candidate, who, speaking for himself, advocated that policy, was attacked by the Conservative party for advocating the very policy which the hon. gentleman says he wants adopted ?

Mr. CLANCY. That is quite true. There can be no difference about that. There were two sections ; there was the larger section of the oil interest which protested against any reduction. My hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) protested in this House. That was no doubt a leading question between the two candidates.

Mr PATERSON. What section did you speak for ?

Mr. CLANCY. I spoke just in the same way as the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) did ; he never opened his mouth about it. The hon. gentleman came and went. A minister of the Crown, he did not know where he was. He was afraid of embarrassing his candidate. But, I will tell the hon. gentleman what I would have said had I been called upon to discuss this question.

Mr. FIELDING. It is too late now.

Mr. CLANCY. The producing interest is the great interest in this country and it was the duty of the government to arrange that that interest should be protected and should receive every encouragement to which it is entitled and if the policy which I favour had been adopted the refining interest in Canada would have been very much better sustained than it will be now under the hon. gentleman's proposition.

I doubt whether the hon. Minister of Customs cared to tell the people in Petrolia what his view was. If he did agree with that proposition he did not tell the people there. He came and went and although he was a minister of the Crown he talked about everything else. But there was something said on that occasion. I am glad to see the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) here. He was a very prominent figure on that occasion. There is only one circumstance that can account for the extraordinary conduct of the hon. Minister of Finance and I think this discloses it. Let me read what was said by hon. gentlemen and their supporters. This is from the Petrolia 'Topic,' the Liberal newspaper and a very influential newspaper in the town of Petrolia. It would be a public abomination to suppose that it would mis-state or in any sense distort the views of Liberals on an occasion of that kind. This is on February 3rd, preceding the election :

Gentlemen, I do not throw it out as a bribe, but you all know that in business as well as in politics it is considered good policy to have a friend at court. Do you not think the Laurier government would appreciate the favour you would do them by sending a representative in sympathy with their policy. Then vote for Chas. Jenkins.

Who do you suppose gave utterance to those lofty and statesmanlike sentiments ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Not the hon. Minister of Customs.

Mr. CLANCY. No, it was the hon. member for London, the hon. member without portfolio. This is what the Petrolia 'Topic' says of Charles S. Hyman, M.P. :

This is a by-election. The Laurier government are in power at Ottawa and are likely to remain there for a long time. They have been very friendly to us. Don't give them a slap in the face. It is a good thing to have 'a friend at court.' Send Charles Jenkins there to support them.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Did they send Jenkins ?

Mr. CLANCY. No, they did not send him. Then, after the election this statement appeared in the same paper :

The campaign is ended and East Lambton is again found in opposition to the government. The principal elements contributing to the Liberal defeat were the lack of organization in the country districts and the poisoning the minds of the electors in the oil belt against the Liberal candidate. We sincerely fear that the oil men will have occasion to regret the verdict given yesterday. It is greatly to be desired that this industry should be favoured by the government, yet it is hardly reasonable to expect a continuance of the favour when the beneficiaries do not show the least gratitude.

Is that the sequence of the hon. gentleman's complete ignoring of the request of the people ? Has the government been moved through the power of the hon. minister without portfolio who had the unblushing effrontery to go before the people there and tell them that : Unless you send to parliament the candidate supporting the government we will make you rue your conduct in future ? We have in this measure the sequel to that declaration. What better reason is the hon. Minister of Finance able to give ? We have on the one hand the word of a colleague of the hon. gentleman, true a minister without portfolio, who goes up to the constituency and tells the people if they do not return the Liberal candidate what will happen to them. That hon. gentleman has been able to make his word good. Why has he been able to make it good ? Because the hon. Minister of Finance listened to him, listened to those who took that narrow view rather than listen to the petitions and requests of the people of this country. That is the whole thing. The course pursued by the people of Sarnia pays a high tribute to the astuteness and business ability of the men who came there. They had their own selfish purposes because all business men are justified in being selfish. Mr. Chamberlain did not come down to this House and ask for any such reduction as the Minister of Finance made. The proposition of the Standard Oil Company, through the Imperial Oil Company, was that they should be permitted to bring oil in here at two cents a gallon, refine it in Canada, transfer the industry from the United States to Canada, and then if there were any loss to the revenue at all it would be of the most striking kind. And yet, the course taken by the Finance Minister is unbusinesslike in every sense, because it involves a large loss of revenue and is in the end of very little purpose.

At six oclock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CLANCY. When the committee rose at six o'clock I had dealt with this question upon general grounds. I recognize that in dealing with this industry, as with all others, one would not be justified in taking a narrow view confined to local interests merely. I have successfully pointed out that there was a clean cut proposition before the government which was completely ignored by them. I have shown that to admit crude oil at two cents a gallon or even a higher rate, for the purpose of being refined in Canada would not, according to the Minister of Finance, increase the cost of the refined article to the consumer. I have shown that by ignoring the proposi-

tion that was made to the government there will be a loss of revenue of about $850,000 a year and that if the proposal that had been presented had been adopted there would have been a saving of $756,000 a year. In fact, the entire loss in this respect is greater than the loss calculated by the Finance Minister as being caused by the general revision of the tariff in 1897, and yet the Minister of Finance never mentioned this matter in his speech. I also pointed out that the refining industry would have been brought to Canada just as well, and would have been more permanently secured here if the proposition made by the people to the government had been carried out; and that the cost to the consumer would have been less than under the government scheme. According to the visionary idea of the Minister of Finance the utmost the hon. gentleman can figure out as a reduction to the people under his scheme is something like three and two-fifths cents per head of the population. Let me now deal with the oil question from the standpoint of local interest. There was no general demand made in the country for a reduction in the duty on refined oil. The only demand I can find in the papers is one by the sigle tax association of the city of Montreal who complain that the people are paying too much for gas and who ask that refined oil be made free in Canada in order that there might be cheaper light in the great city of Montreal where there is established a great electric light company and a great gas company.

The only demand for a reduction on crude oil, so far as the evidence discloses came from what is known as the Canadian Ore Concentration Company, Limited. That is a company in the province of British Columbia which owns the Elmer process of refining ore by means of oil. That company asks that the crude oil be admitted free, declaring that the quality of oil produced in Canada was unfit for the processes in which they wished to use it. Thus from one end of Canada to the other we have only those two small requests—one from a company in British Columbia and the other from people complaining about the high price of gas and electric light in Montreal. I am not going to comment on how far the Finance Minister should answer the request of the Single Tax Association of Montreal to be relieved of the burden which the legislature of the province of Quebec has imposed on that city by reason of the franchise they gave the Montreal Light and Power Company, or how far he should go to destroy a great interest in this country for one interest in British Columbia on any single request. These matters I leave to the judgment of the hon. gentleman. I should not have been disposed to complain even if it did aid a great industry in British Columbia, to have made oil free for that purpose. I do not think it would have broken down any interests in Canada elsewhere if that had been done. I am not complaining on that ground, but am simply pointing out that the only request for a change are the two I have mentioned.

I now come to a more important question. We have in the most unequivocal terms from the right hon. the First Minister a declaration that the production of crude oil, unless it receives some aid in other quarters, would be absolutely destroyed by the present legislation. There can be no question of the hon. gentleman's language. He was frank enough to say that it would be destroyed, but declared that the government were going to save it by some other means. Here is what he said :

> It so happens that we cannot compete on equal terms with American oil and unless we had given to the producers in the province of Ontario a bounty of one and a half cents a gallon which will enable them to keep their wells open, the whole of the plants and the whole of the money which has been invested would have been wiped out and Canada would have lost probably millions of dollars instead of having a profitable industry going on.—(' Hansard,' page 4924, 1904.)

What is the reasonable interpretation of that ? First that we had a profitable industry in Canada and next that by taking away the protection it enjoyed, it would be absolutely destroyed. Then the only way to save it was by a bounty. But he continues :

> It is a well known fact that if we had wiped out the duty on crude oil without giving any bounty to the producers, we would have closed up every oil well that is producing oil in the province of Ontario.

In other words the right hon. gentleman declared that every well in Canada would be closed up if the legislation adopted were not followed by the resolution now before the House. He went further to say :

> There is no doubt about that. It has to be admitted by every one that if we have wiped out the duty on crude oil, unless we had given the bounty which we have given on crude oil, every well would have been closed and all machinery and money which has been put into that industry would have been wiped out. It is a serious question and it is one in regard to which there can be no dispute.

Is not that an extraordinary declaration to be made by a member of a government and especially by the Prime Minister, namely, that a profitable industry in this country is to be wiped out by taking the duties off and leaving it entirely at the mercy of the oil producers in a foreign country, and then, in order to prevent that calamity, the people are to be taxed in another way to counterbalance the loss of duty ? But, I have another opinion, that of the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. T. G. Johnston) who made a speech in this House on a former occasion. That hon. gentleman realized that to take the duty off crude oil would utterly destroy that industry and destroy it to no

purpose. In 1899 the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) moved that refined oil be placed upon the free list. It was recognized by my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. T. G. Johnston) that to reduce the duty materially on refined oil would destroy the crude oil interest, and this is what he had to say on that occasion :

> What I said was, that if the duty was taken off crude oil, the result would be the total cessation of the production of oil in Canada, because there was such a surplus of oil, particularly of heavy Ohio oil which is exactly the same as ours, ready to be exported whenever the opportunity occurs, that there would be no chance whatever for the Canadian producers.—('Hansard,' page 2113, 1899.)

The hon. gentleman spoke an eloquent truth on that occasion. The producers became alarmed, for capital everywhere is timid and if you strike a blow at any industry the consequences are apt to be more serious than were anticipated. My hon. friend said :

> Since this little scare has started in the House, I know as a positive fact that in the western part of the district the prospector has stopped altogether. There has not a well been put down since the question came up in the House.

We have come to the parting of the ways ; we come now to the place where the hon. gentleman must either have changed his mind or have been ignored by the Finance Minister. Everybody was surprised. The hon. gentleman either deceived his people—and I do not believe he did—or he was entirely ignored by the Finance Minister. The hon. gentleman's friends in the constituency were no doubt in sympathy with him and in his confidence. I shall read the opinion of a newspaper in that constituency which strongly supports the hon. gentleman and the Liberal party, and I believe expressed his views on that occasion. The next morning after the revision was announced this paper said :

> No one had the slightest idea that the government's action would take the form which has been announced. The reduction of the duty on refined oil to 2½ cents per gallon is much lower than any one in this locality anticipated, and the admission of crude oil free was never for a moment entertained as possible.

From the records I can imagine only two reasons for this action, either that the threat made by the hon. member for London to the people of East Lambton has been carried out, or the hon. gentleman has listened to the representations that were silently made to him from other quarters, and has been induced to destroy this industry. If the Minister of Finance has not completely ignored the hon. member for West Lambton, what is that gentleman's position ? Was he consulted by the Minister of Finance when this policy was adopted rather than the one that he was urging ? Had the hon. gentleman any reversal of the mandate given him by the people to demand the policy which was first proposed ? Was the hon. member a consenting party ; did he secretly give way ? For the people in his own constituency and his own town knew absolutely nothing of what was to come as the result of these negotiations. They believed, and they had a right to believe, that the hon. gentleman would succeed in getting just what they asked for, but the hon. gentleman did not get that. It is fair to assume that he made his best efforts to carry out the behest of the people and that the Minister of Finance utterly ignored him. The First Minister, after destroying the industry, has this to say :

> We are relying on the good sense of the people of Canada that they will agree to give this bounty to their fellow citizens who have invested their money in the oil region, so as to keep the industry in operation.

The hon. gentleman sends a splendid thriving interest in this country to the national poor-house, and he asks the people to be charitable in giving alms to them. I venture to say that in the whole legislation of Canada it cannot be pointed out that any other industry has received any such treatment as this. It is utterly unaccountable that that industry should be singled out in that way, and that the hon. gentleman should propose to first destroy the industry and then say : Be generous enough to pay it out of your pockets. I do not say that bounties should not be given in any case, there have been cases where bounties have been justified, but you should first give a fair measure of protection, and so give the industry a field to which it is entitled. Then you will not have to maintain it out of the pockets of the people. I am opposed to bounties on general principles, but I wish to appeal to the First Minister if he is going to send an industry to the national poor-house, to give it a decent living, give it more bounty than is now proposed. I am opposed to bounties on general principles, but I say that the bounty the hon. gentleman is giving now is not a sufficient bounty, it cannot live. If he had saved the people $250,000 a year in bounties that he must collect out of the pockets of the people and had given them two cents a gallon of protection upon crude oil, he would not have increased the cost of the article to the consumer one particle. Then we would have had 70 cents a barrel of protection, but now the hon. gentleman is obliged to pass around the hat and collect 52 cents a barrel as against that, and we have the declaration of the First Minister : We have destroyed the industry, we are now going to collect the money from the people to keep it alive by charity. If the minister had listened to the reasonable and sensible suggestions made by the citizens of Sarnia and by all the men who are asking that such a change might be made, thus the refining of that oil would have been made a Canadian industry and the crude oil industry

would not have been destroyed. We should have had better security for the permanence of that industry. But what is the position now? Here is an important industry brought to Canada while another industry has been destroyed. People will look with suspicion upon the new-comer, and it will be unpopular, because the money is taken from the pockets of the people to pay for the industry destroyed. That industry would have come to Canada and would have been permanent if the measure of protection formerly given had been adhered to.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How much lower is crude oil now, counting the price and the bounty, than it was before?

Mr. CLANCY. That does not affect it a particle. Our oil must compete against the American oil. If the price goes up in Canada, surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) will not say that the producers in Canada should not have the benefit of that. He knows that the price of crude oil in Canada is not ruled by our own production but by the price of American oil.

Mr. CAMPBELL. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) says that the industry is being ruined. I am informed that the price of crude oil, including the bounty, is as high as it was before. How, then, can the industry be ruined?

Mr. CLANCY. It is not as high as it was before.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How much lower is it?

Mr. CLANCY. It is very much lower. But I am not ascribing the lowering of it to this change. But this is what I point out: The American oil is brought in to compete with our crude oil; and, to the extent that it comes in, as the hon. gentleman can see without splitting hairs about it, the production of our oil must be affected. We lose the benefit of the protection of 70 cents a barrel. Under the proposal made to the government it would cost that much more to get the American oil into Canada. And the change does not affect the price to the consumer in the least—let that be borne in mind. The reason is that there is no competition now; that is all swept away. If the Standard Oil people pay a less price in six months from now, they will do only what level-headed business men might naturally be expected to do. And they are warranted in doing it because we have passed the legislation to enable them to do it. The American crude oil now comes in free. And the minister has declared—there is no use in discussing the matter with the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell)—that the effect of this free importation would be to destroy our industry unless we fed it with a bounty.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Before the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) leaves that point, I would like him to make the matter clear. His argument, as I understand it, is that the removal of the duty on crude oil has ruined the industry. My information is that crude oil to-day, counting the bounty given to the producers, is as high as it was before. I would like to know, then, how the industry is being ruined.

Mr. CLANCY. It is not the fact that the price is as high as it was before. But, even if it were, the Imperial Oil people may think it better for the time being—for they are shrewd business men—to keep up the price of crude——

Mr. HEYD. Oh, pshaw!

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) says 'pshaw!' But I think these Imperial Oil people have more business acumen than that hon. gentleman has. They are not second-rate business men; there are no keener business men on this continent. They are doing what they may properly do within their rights. And it is perfectly idle to imagine that, if you take away every particle of protection from an industry in Canada, the position of the producer will not be affected.

Now, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance why this industry has been singled out? If this industry had been a great burden upon the people, I could readily understand that a measure that would yield great advantage to the people should be carried out, even though it did injure one particular industry. But let me compare this with two other industries in Canada that are very much of the same kind,—the sugar industry and the coal industry. Now let us calculate the cost to the people of these several industries, taking as a basis of our calculation the rule upon which hon. gentlemen opposite proceed in these matters—that is—assuming that the whole amount of protective duties is paid by the people in the shape of increased prices. I said earlier in the debate that I did not accept that view, but hon. gentlemen opposite will not find fault if I make it the basis of an argument addressed to them. On this basis the cost of the coal oil industry to this country was 21 cents per head of our population. The sugar industry concerning which the Minister of Finance told us only last night that the duty on the raw material did not affect the price to the consumer, but that the duty on the refined article did affect that price—cost the people 87 cents per head. Then, take the coal industry, an industry of special importance to the hon. minister's own province of Nova Scotia. On the basis of calculation favoured by hon. gentlemen opposite, the protection to the coal industry amounts to 86 cents per head of our population. I am not proposing that the duty should be taken off coal, or that the duty should be taken off sugar. All I ask is that the coal oil industry—I mean the crude

and refined—should have equal fair play with these other industries. Why should one industry be favoured as against another ? I am not favouring an attack on any of them. I think they all have a right to live in this country. But that the hon. gentleman should discriminate upon a mere cry, without any evidence or demand than that which has come from bad counsellors, is a matter that no one can understand.

Now, Sir, let me ask, who profits by this change ? It is certainly not the consumer, for if we were even to take the visionary calculation that the consumer would profit to the extent of the reduction of 2⅞ cents a gallon, that would be a mere fraction for the people of this country, so small that you would not be justified in destroying the smallest industry in Canada in order to accomplish it. It is not the crude producers who have got the ear of the hon. gentleman. The hon. member for London, the minister without portfolio (Mr. Hyman), in a recent by-election, made a threat, and if it was not for the purpose of carrying out that threat, why did he make this charge ? He gave ear to the great gas companies of this country where the people are labouring under immense burdens, it was these companies who wanted the duties lowered on refined oil. Will the people of the city of Montreal get their gas one farthing cheaper by reason of making crude oil free to the gas companies ? Not one hon. gentleman in this House will say so. Will the people in the city of London, that my hon. friend so ably represents, get their gas cheaper ? Will he go into any city of Canada and say the people are going to profit by it ? No one will pretend to say that they will profit one farthing.

Let me now turn to manufacturers. The manufacturers have a right, as every other class, to fair play. They have a right to seek the best means of promoting their interests ; but it is the duty of a prudent government to see, when they are giving concessions to manufacturers, that they do not thereby destroy other great interests. Hon. gentlemen ignore that principle, entirely. The hon. gentleman may go into the city of London, he may go into towns like Brockville, where a manufacturer who uses crude oil for fuel said the next day after that this change was worth $2,000 a year to him. From whom is that money taken ? It is taken from all classes. What reason is there that any manufacturing industry in Canada should have the duties on crude oil for fuel any more than that it should have the duties reduced on coal for fuel ? People in general do not use crude oil for fuel ; so why should a few users of crude oil be favoured at the expense of the people generally ? We have always favoured, on this side of the House, the protection of every manufacturing industry, but we have never advocated that manufacturers should be benefited at the expense of other people. Now, the counsel of the hon. member for London has prevailed in one or two ways. He has carried out his threat. The candidate of the Liberal party in East Lambton, (Mr. Jenkins) declared throughout the contest that he would come to this House and fight the gas companies, as he had fought the manufacturers, and that he had shown conclusively to the government that they were not entitled to any reduction on crude oil. That was the opinion publicly expressed in the presence of the member for London himself. He has ignored the proposition made by those who wished to bring the refining industry into Canada, and we find this state of things we are confronted with today. It is a state of things that has never had a parellel in the history of Canada. I know of no industry that, having been utterly destroyed, declared by the Prime Minister to be destroyed and which is yet taken up by the government and recalled to life and sent to the national poor-house to be supported at public expense.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I was surprised to hear the statement of the Finance Minister to the effect that the producers of crude oil in Canada were satisfied, knowing as I do that the Finance Minister has received that letter from 250 producers, stating and begging that they might receive more bounty, and knowing as I do that the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Johnston) has also received letters and telegrams practically begging him to go with a deputation to the Finance Minister. In view of all these things I cannot but think that the government is not without some knowledge with reference to that industry.

Mr. T. G. JOHNSTON. I never received either a telegram or a letter from the town of Sarnia, from the town of Petrolia, or from the county of Lambton, or any communication, asking me to go with a deputation to the Finance Minister on this question, nor any complaints as to the action of the government.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have in my hand a telegram from the president of the Oil Producers Association and some of the prominent Reformers in the hon. gentleman's riding, asking him to go before the Finance Minister with a deputation, and the hon. member for Lambton refused to go.

Mr. T. G. JOHNSTON. Will the hon. gentleman read the telegram ?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I will.

J. E. Armstrong, Ottawa.

Without you obtain the co-operation of Calvert. Johnston, Cowan and Stephens, deputation

from here week-kneed ; urge assistance from those members, and wire cause of success immediately.

WM. GLEASON,,
President of the Producers' Association.

Mr. FIELDING. Has the hon. gentleman any telegram addressed to the member for West Lambton ?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would suppose that would naturally affect the member for West Lambton. He certainly showed himself in a very strange position when the producers of crude oil were begging of him to go before the Finance Minister with a deputation asking for an increase in the bounties on crude oil.

Mr. FIELDING. They chose a very strange way of inviting him.

Mr. T. G. JOHNSTON. I was never asked by anybody except by the hon. gentleman himself as a result of that telegram.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. Minister of Finance has spoken of the hon. member for West Lambton as being satisfied with the present state of affairs. He has three townships in his riding in which the farmers are distinctly interested in this question and are anxious that the bounty should be raised, and I would say that if the hon. member for West Lambton would go into those three townships he would realize that the people are far from being satisfied with the present state of affairs. The statement has been made not only to-day, but on previous occasions that the election in East Lambton was run with reference to the oil question. I merely want to say, without boasting, that I have only one township in my constituency that has any producing oil wells in it. I might also state that I had a majority in every township in the riding, that I had a majority in every municipality in the riding but one, in which we broke even, and that I had a majority in every polling division but sixteen out of sixty-five, so that I think it is unfair for the hon. Minister of Finance to state that it was the oil question that gave me the honour of representing that riding.

I had the privilege some weeks ago of laying before the House a number of figures in reference to the oil question. These figures have not been refuted and I might quote them again to-night and defy any refutation of them. I tried to show the position that the producers were in at that date and the remarks which I made at that time in reference to the producers, consumers and refiners of this country have practically come true within the last few weeks. On the 6th of June we were receiving for crude oil in Canada $2.09 per barrel and on the same date Ohio crude was being sold for $1.08 a barrel. Add to that $1.08 a barrel 23 cents, the cost of bringing the oil to Sarnia, 13 cents duty and add to that 52 cents bounty and it makes $1.83. Take $1.83 from $2.09 and it leaves 26 cents in favour of the Ohio crude delivered at Sarnia for a better class of crude oil worth more to the refinery. Now, that is 26 cents of a difference. Then you must take into consideration the fact that the oil has to be gathered in the Petrolia district and delivered in Sarnia. Before you can purchase a receipt for crude oil at Petrolia you have to pay 3 cents a barrel for it. The oil, after it has been gathered, has to be sent seventeen miles through a pipe line at a cost of 10 cents per barrel. Then, you must remember that the extra value of Ohio crude oil is 35 cents per barrel. Thirty-five plus ten makes 45 cents and the extra value of Ohio crude brings the difference up to 80 cents per barrel in favour of Ohio crude as against our own Canadian crude. I would like to present a still further argument in order to demonstrate to the House why it is that the Canadian refiner prefers Ohio oil, and to show why the independent refiners have ceased to purchase Canadian crude oil. I have not gathered these figures entirely from them, but this is an estimate that is made up as a result of the practical operation of the industry. First we will take the example of 100 gallons of Canadian 31 gravity crude oil at $1.57 a barrel on July 18, 1904, and the result is as follows :

CANADIAN OIL.

100 gallons 31 gravity oil, crude, $1.51, July 18th, 1904.	
Naphtha, 4 gallons, price in bulk, 10½ cents per gallon	$0 45
Refined oil, 45 gallons, average price, 8¾ cents per gallon	3 94
Gas and fuel oil, 25 gallons, price 4 cents per gallon	1 00
Lubricating oil, 12 gallons, price 10 cents per gallon	1 20
Paraffin wax, 2 per cent or 16 pounds, price 4½ cents per pound	0 72
Coke, 5 per cent per ton	0 14
Loss, 7 per cent.	
100	$7 45

The price of crude is $1.51, for collecting, 3 cents, making $1.54 per barrel, $1.54 per barrel is 4 4-10 cents per gallon, 100 gallons at 4 4-10 cents per gallon amounts to $4.40. The cost of running the oil through the stills is 75 cents per barrel, or 2 15-100 cents per gallon, or $2.15 per 100 gallons. The difference between $6.55 and $7.45 leaves 99 cents per 100 gallons for all expense in maintaining a refinery with all appliances. For instance, the life of a still is 34 runs, piping, &c. It is estimated that wear and tear, interest and cost of management, &c., represents 75 cents per 100 gallons, which leaves a net profit to the refiner of 15 cents per 100 gallons when using Canadian oil.

Now take American Ohio crude oil on the same basis, 100 gallons 38 gravity, and it works out in this way :

Naphtha, 12 gallons, price in bulk, 10½ cents per gallon..	$1 26
Refined oil, 50 gallons, price in bulk, 8¾ cents per gallon..	4 38
Gas and fuel oil, 16¼ gallons, price in bulk, 4 cents per gallon..	0 65
Lubricating oil, 12 gallons, price in bulk, 10 cents per gallon..	1 20
Paraffin wax, 1¾ per cent, or 14 pounds at at 4½ cents per pound..	0 63
Coke, 3 per cent..	0 08
Loss, 5 per cent.	
100	$8 20

The price of Ohio crude is $1 per barrel. This oil can be delivered in Petrolia for 40 cents per barrel. That equals $1.40 or 4 cents per gallon, which in turn means $4 per 100 gallons.

The cost of running the oil through the stills is 80 cents per barrel, which equals 2 29-100 cents per gallon, or $2.29 per 100 gallons, which makes the cost to the refiner $6.29 per 100 gallons, leaving a difference between the cost of $6.29, and the price received for same $8.20, when sold of $1.91.

Take away the 75 cents cost of management and wear and tear and it leaves $1.16 clear profit on 100 gallons, or $1.01 more profit to the local independent refinery in refining 100 gallons of American crude than in refining 100 gallons of Canadian crude, which only gives 15 cents profit on 100 gallons.

Can you not readily see that the refiner is more anxious to use American crude and can you not realize why the independent refiner situated in Petrolia has ceased to purchase Canadian crude and is making arrangements to bring in American crude whereby he can make more money, thus placing our oil at a disadvantage.

I am justified in urging upon the Finance Minister that he should grant to the producers of crude oil in Canada a greater bounty than he proposes. The people of Essex, Kent, Lambton, and Elgin counties are deeply interested in this matter ; every city, town, village and hamlet has its interests bound up in the production of crude oil ; every farmer throughout these counties is anxious to have his farm tested and the district throughout which crude oil is being found is enlarging from year to year in these counties. I am voicing the sentiments of the producers when I say that they believe they will be placed in an unfair position unless this bounty is increased. Surely something can be done for them. I cannot believe that the government will leave the producers of Canadian crude oil in the hands of this corporation, and remove them from the position which they have heretofore occupied in which the government of Canada to a certain extent was able to regulate the price of oil. Over $700,000 has been spent in the development of the oil industry throughout that western peninsula, and when you realize this you will see the importance of the industry. Let me call the attention of the Finance Minister to the fact that when he was taking into consideration the distances over which oil is carried from Lima, Ohio, to Sarnia refinery, the estimate of 54 cents per barrel was altogether too high. According to the United States table of distances, the distance from Lima, Ohio to Toledo is seventy-one miles, from Toledo to Port Huron 122 miles, or in all 193 miles. The distance from Lima, Ohio, to Cleveland, and thence on to Sarnia is 379 miles, and the extra distance over which they were carrying the oil for 54 cents is 186 miles. You can therefore readily see why the Standard refinery is stating that it will cost 54 cents instead of the 23 cents which I am informed on reliable authority it can be delivered for. We must also consider the output of the Texas field. Within this last six months they have shipped over 10,000,000 barrels of oil from the Texas field and this is bound to have an effect on the market. The Port Huron 'Times' says :

> Port Huron men, who are interested in oil business in Ohio, are considerably worried. They have a number of wells which are being pumped, but the price of oil has dropped from $1.31 to 95 cents a barrel. This price takes all the profit out of the business.
>
> A correspondent in Bakersfield, Cal., writes us that things are exceedingly dull there, owing to the fact that the Standard Oil Company has the producers under its thumb. He says they are kept guessing all the time, and as the price is about 15 cents per barrel, the game must be to squeeze them all out and buy up the field cheap. He thinks Canadians should fight the Standard so long as they have an ounce of strength in their bodies.

There is no doubt that crude oil has been reduced in price. The Standard refinery was formerly obliged to pay $1.65 per barrel and on the 18th of this month they were only paying $1.51, and if they are to carry it along with the Ohio crude oil we may expect a further drop of 5 cents. I beg to present to the Finance Minister an estimate of the duty paid by oil producers and refiners of this country per annum. For pump tubing, pipe line tubing, gas and lead pipe, they pay a duty of $25,000 a year ; for all kinds of coal used in developing, producing and refining, they pay a duty of $10,000 a year, and for steel, iron, wire rope, lathes, tools, shafting, and oil well supplies they pay a duty of $5,000 or in all $40,000 a year. I wish to call the attention of the government to some of the profits the gas companies and manufacturers are receiving throughout the country. It has been ably alluded to by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) but he omitted to mention that last year the Consumers Gas Company of

Toronto was paying $2.13 a barrel for their oil, while this year they are purchasing the same oil for $1.40 a barrel. In view of the fact that they have made a contract for 55,000 barrels of oil this year, you can readily see that the Consumers Gas Company has put into their pockets $40,000 on this account alone. And does the government suppose that the Consumers Gas Company of Toronto give the citizens cheaper gas ? Not at all. That money is taken out of the pockets of the producers of crude oil and put into the pockets of the gas company. It is the same with manufacturers and railroad companies throughout the country. I trust that the government will not treat this industry as they have treated the woollen industry, which on account of the low rate of duty established by the preference has been practically wiped out of existence. If outsiders once get control of the Canadian oil market it will be a very difficult thing to get it back into the hands of Canadians again. I am firmly convinced that the producers should receive more bounty from the government. The Minister of Finance stated that his present policy would result in a saving to the country of $390,000 a year. If you give to the producers even half a cent a gallon more bounty it will mean $85,000 which will benefit them to a very great extent, and I sincerely hope that the Minister of Finance will see his way clear to do that. I realize that the House is anxious to finish the business of the session, and I shall conclude these hasty remarks with an appeal to the government to do justice to the crude oil producers of Canada. The Minister of Finance would be doing no injustice to the people of Canada, and he would be doing a great act of justice to the oil producers if he increased this bounty.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. Within the last few years considerable money has been spent in boring for crude oil in the county I represent. A certain measure of success has been achieved, but nevertheless it costs a great deal of money to carry on these operations. The point I wish to make is that whilst the other industries are protected to a large extent, and some of them to a very large extent, the farmers who have oil lands have just as much right to be protected as the people engaged in any other industry. I am satisfied that unless some assistance is given to the oil men such as you give to other industries the oil industry will be very much injured and we do not wish to injure any industry in Canada. The farmers, of course, are the great consumers of coal oil. We know that in towns and cities electric light and gas is the principal light, except sunlight, but the farmers must use coal oil all the time and it is a bill of expense to him, so that he is anxious to get his coal oil as cheaply as he possibly can. If we encourage the production of coal oil in our own country we will be able to get it cheaper than if we import it, and we want to refine that oil in our own country. Consequently I think the coal oil industry should receive the same assistance as all the other industries.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I listened with interest to the somewhat protracted speech of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) and I confess I had some difficulty in understanding what he was driving at. The nearest approach I could make to it is this, that my hon. friend was very anxious to have a grievance in Bothwell or in West Lambton on the oil question and he finds himself deprived of his grievance. He finds that the position of the oil question in that part of the country is eminently satisfactory, that he has nothing to grumble at, and so he takes refuge in grumbling at the government. There are many things in connection with this business that he cannot understand. He cannot for the life of him understand why the government did not allow this oil question to be fixed just in the way the representatives of the Standard Oil Company asked to have it fixed. I can say to my hon. friend that, whatever may have been the practice in former days, it is not the practice of this government to allow the representative of any great industry to come here and determine just what shall be the policy of the government. After the occasional observations of hon. gentlemen on that side, after the observation made even to-day by one hon. member on that side, that this oil business has been regulated at the will of the Standard Oil Company, it is a strange proceeding for my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) to get up and complain that we refused to follow the dictation of the representative of the Standard Oil Company. The Standard Oil man knew all about it while the Minister of Finance did not know much about it, and why did the Minister of Finance not do just what the Standard Oil representative wished ? I will again tell my hon. friend that that is not the policy of this government. Much as we may respect all representatives of great industries, we cannot go so far as to say that we are prepared to allow any of them to come here and dictate the policy of the government. Then my hon. friend said : Why did we not adopt the policy advocated by this, that or the other section of the people connected with the oil industry ? There were the citizens of Sarnia, a beautiful city and excellent citizens it is true. Why not take their view ? Then there was the Board of Trade of Sarnia and the oil producers of Petrolia who had sent in another petition. It is true they did not all say the same thing, but we should have been governed by what they said and not by what anybody else said. There was one curious fact that the hon. gentleman did not refer to, and I believe he cannot

quite understand that, namely that the town of Sarnia and the great county of Lambton, East and West, with all its large industries, important as they are, after all do not comprise the whole Dominion. There are probably five millions of people in Canada, or that proportion of the five millions who have come to the years of maturity, who have opinions on the oil question, and the opinions of these people, finding expression through hon. gentlemen on this side and hon. gentlemen opposite ought to be considered by this government as well as the opinions of the Standard Oil Company or others particularly interested. My hon. friend seems unable to understand that. He is anxious to know in whose interest this policy was adopted. It was not adopted in the interest of the Standard Oil Company. We refused to do what Mr. Chamberlain asked. It was not adopted at the request of the Sarnia Board of Trade. It was not adopted at the request of the producers at Petrolia. It does not seem to have occurred to the hon. gentleman that perhaps it was adopted in the interests of the consumers of oil in the Dominion of Canada. When my hon. friend finds it impossible to understand that I am afraid his case in hopeless. Then he said it was a dreadful thing that nobody knew that this was going to be done. He looks across the House, points his finger at the hon. member for West Lambton and says : 'Sir, did you know that that was going to be done ? If I do not get an answer in the affirmative, I will assume that you were ignored by this government.' That is the method of argument he pursues. I am here to confess that the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Johnston) did not know that this was going to be done. I am here to confess that no member of this House, outside of the government, knew that this thing was going to be done. I am here to tell my hon. friend that in the preparation of tariff changes, no man outside of the government knows what change is to be undertaken, and therefore when my hon. friend challenges the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Johnston) to tell him whether he knew that this change was contemplated he is only paying a compliment to this government, which but does its duty when it keeps its secrets with respect to the tariff changes until the moment comes for announcing them in the Budget speech. Thus I think that on these several points my hon. friend has no cause of complaint. He says we are destroying the industry, that it has been the policy of hon. gentlemen here to destroy the industry. The oil question has been a much discussed one for many years on both sides of the House. My hon. friend will do no injustice to the Liberals if he says that as a rule they have complained about the oil duty and desired that there should be a reduction; but if he wishes to be a faithful historian he will say that from that side of the House year after year there came propositions to abolish or reduce the duty on oil. An hon. member from the Eastern Townships came here year after year and proposed a resolution in favour of free coal oil. The late member for West Assiniboia took a similar course and I think on one occasion he divided the committee on a motion in favour of free coal oil. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) if he wishes to be a faithful historian must tell all the truth and state that from the ranks of the Conservative party, as well as from this side of the House, have come attacks upon the coal oil duties and he must not for a moment assume that there is any foundation for the statement he makes, that this government have been destroying or attempting to destroy the coal oil industry. Sir, we desired a reduction of the duty on coal oil. We gave a reduction in 1897 and we were waiting for a favourable moment to grant a further reduction in the interests of the people. I think these are the only points in the hon. gentleman's speech that call for notice.

As to the general statement that we are destroying the industry, a line in which the hon. member (Mr. Clancy) was followed up by the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) in his briefer speech, I wanted to give a few figures furnished to me in all good faith. If they are not right I will be glad to be corrected. It is not necessary to complicate the question, as both hon. gentlemen have done, by confusing statements about the cost of transportation, pipe lines, storage, &c. All of these things simply confuse the question. Let me put it in what I think is a very simple form.

On June 7, crude oil was quoted at Petrolia at $2.06 per barrel.

On the same day crude oil at North Lima, Ohio, was quoted at $1.11.

The North Lima oil affords a standard of comparison as it compares generally with our Canadian oil. Thus we see that at that time, under the former condition of affairs, before our tariff change took effect, Petrolia oil was worth 95 cents per barrel above the standard price of North Lima oil.

That was the condition when the Budget speech was delivered. Now, I find from the very latest information—and my figures are confirmed by the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong)—that Petrolia oil is selling at $1.51 per barrel and adding the bounty of 52½ cents, that makes the value of Petrolia oil to-day $2.03½ per barrel. On the other hand the value of North Lima oil—because there has been a general falling off in the market since—to-day is $1 per barrel. Deduct that from $2.03½, and we find that whereas before the Budget speech was delivered Petrolia oil was worth 95 cents per barrel more than the Lima standard, Petrolia is bringing to-day $1.03½ per barrel more than the standard price of oil

at Lima. There is no use introducing conflicting and confusing statements about the cost of transportation. I take the price which the producer receives at Petrolia to-day and the price he received before. If there is a difference we have to look into the cause. It might be that to-day he is receiving a higher price because of the fluctuations of the market, and there have been some fluctuations. But what do we find ? We find that the Lima oil has fallen to a lower figure comparatively than the Petrolia. Instead of injuring the producing interests of Petrolia, the men who are producing in Petrolia to-day are receiving relatively a higher price per barrel than they did before the change. In the face of these figures how absurd it is for hon. gentlemen to talk about our destroying the oil industry. The government have shown a desire to deal fairly with this industry as with all others. We have looked about for a way to do it. We wanted to give that great body of the people, whose interests the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) seemed utterly unable to understand—we wanted to give the consumers cheap oil, and we have done that by reducing the duty on the refined article. We wanted to give the oil industry a fair chance to succeed, and we have endeavoured to make good any loss they would suffer by a bounty. And we believe the net result is to leave that industry comparatively in the same position as before. If there is a difference at all, it is in a better position than before the change. Our policy in the matter of oil has two points. With one we are dealing now, namely the bounty. If that is not a good policy, my hon. friends have simply to record their votes against it. They will not do that. They will say they think the bounty ought to be more. Well, I would not expect these gentlemen coming from the oil regions to say they would not be glad to have another half cent. I think they would be glad to have another cent. Each of us representing a constituency in which there is a large interest would like to do the best we can for it. We all are a little biassed in such cases. What the government has to do is to hold the scales evenly and do what is best, not only to the particular constituency, but the public at large. That is what we have attempted to do.

There is another side to the question with which we are not dealing at this moment, but with which the hon. member for Bothwell has dealt at great length, and that is the duty on refined oil. He attacks us for having reduced the duty even though we give a bounty on the crude. He wants the duty on refined oil kept up to its former point. I do the hon. gentleman no injustice when I say that that was the sum total of his argument. Well, I invite my hon. friend at the first right moment—and that moment will come later—to put himself and his friends on record on that point. I noticed that when he advocated that policy and when he condemned us for having reduced the duty on refined oil, there was a good deal of applause from his friends. But mere 'hears, hears' and vain words will not do. If the policy of reducing the duty on the common coal oil of the people is a bad policy, I want to warn my hon. friend that if he expects to make a record he must put a motion before the House at the proper moment and find out whether these hon. gentlemen who received his sentiments with applause are prepared to go on record and vote against the policy this government have adopted, a policy which does justice to the refiners and the producers and at the same time to the great masses of the consuming public.

Mr. CLANCY. Just one or two minutes. If I do not attempt to answer all that the hon. gentleman has said, he will understand that it is not by reason of any discourtesy to himself. He says I am unable to understand why the government have taken the position they have. I confess that I am still in the dark after the hon. gentleman has made his speech.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLANCY. I hear the approval of the First Minister, and I assume it is in endorsation of my statement that the Finance Minister rose and made a speech and then sat down and left the country in the dark.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend, not the country.

Mr. CLANCY. He says that the government did not obey the behests of the Standard Oil Company. Does he mean to say that the hon. gentleman for West Lambton (Mr. T. G. Johnston) was the mere mouthpiece of the Oil Company ?

Mr. FIELDING. I did not say that.

Mr. CLANCY. That is what it meant.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman quoted the name of the representative of the Standard Oil Company and asked why we did not adopt the policy which Mr. Chamberlain put before us.

Mr. CLANCY. I repeat that, and I add just what I said a moment ago. Mr. Chamberlain saw fit to come to Canada in the Standard Oil interests and that he had a perfect right to do.

Mr. FIELDING. Surely.

Mr. CLANCY. He is not obliged to consider the interests of the people of Canada. His business is solely to consider the interests of the company with which he is associated and of which he is so able a manager. He came to the people of Sarnia and he said to them : if you will succeed in getting the government to reduce the duty, the duty from 5 to 2 cents on crude oil—and the

duty is prohibitive now, because there is not one gallon brought into Canada for refining purposes—just so soon as you succeed, we will run up a splendid refinery in your town and give employment to 400 or 500 men. He came as a business man to the town of Sarnia. A public meeting was called and that view was put before the people. The hon. member for West Lambton was present and a resolution was passed adopting the views of Mr. Chamberlain. Why, because the people were glad to have a great industry established there. They were wise in their day and generation. Mr. Chamberlain's motive was to improve the condition of the Standard Oil Company. The object of the people of Sarnia was to improve their condition and they endorsed Mr. Chamberlain's proposal by a resolution, followed up by a petition from the Board of Trade. Those requests were put in the hands of my hon. friend from West Lambton to present to the government. He quite understood, as Mr. Chamberlain did, that that interest would be brought to Canada and the hon. minister has done scant justice to the hon. member for West Lambton. I am sorry it has fallen to my lot to have to defend the hon. member as against the hon. minister.

Mr. FIELDING. It is unfortunate for him.

Mr. CLANCY. Let this country understand what the hon gentleman said, that the hon. member for West Lambton knew nothing about what the government were going to do.

Mr. FIELDING. That is it.

Mr. CLANCY. The papers supporting that hon. gentleman might well say it was a surprise. Nobody looked for anything of that kind. The hon. gentleman, in spite of his efforts, though he was going to show a reduction in favour of the consumer, sat down without showing what that reduction was. Giving him every credit for it—for the sake of argument, though as I have said it never could be realized in practice—the saving would amount to the mere fraction of $219,000, and he proposes to go about and collect bounties from the people of $250,000 to keep the producers of crude oil alive. But the hon. gentleman was discreet enough to not touch the question of revenue. His attention was called to the fact that there was a greater loss of revenue through this single change of duty than was caused by his general revision of the tariff in 1897. Was it not a most extraordinary thing for the Finance Minister who had carefully calculated the reduction through various changes made in 1897 to completely ignore the reduction caused by this change though the loss of revenue on this one item was greater than on the changes made in 1897 ? Now, with regard to what the hon. gentleman said as to attacks on the coal oil interest by hon. gentlemen on this side. The cases cited by him are true. But how did they arise ? Was it an expression of the doctrines of the Conservative party ? No ; it was because hon. gentlemen opposite had raised the cry in the west and in the east against this coal oil interest, and so had educated the people in false opinions with regard to this great industry, and even hon. gentlemen on this side were led away by their false doctrine. To say that hon. gentlemen on this side led in this agitation in the coal oil industry is merely the accusation that the wolf made against the lamb. Though the lamb drank near the outlet of the stream when the wolf was higher up towards its source the wolf accused the lamb of fouling the course of the stream. But the source of the stream was poisoned by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman's (Mr. Clancy's) friends seem to have had more confidence in us than they had in him.

Mr. CLANCY. And this is not by any means the only case of that kind. One thing more I desire to call the hon. gentleman's attention to—a matter concerning which I spoke before but on which he did not think it well to attempt a reply. I pointed out that this industry had not been a burden upon the people. I showed that two other industries the protection to which had not been taken away, cost the people far more, according to the hon. gentleman's own method of calculation, than this coal oil industry. I showed that while the coal oil industry cost only 21 cents per head of the population, the coal industry of the hon. gentleman's own province cost 86 cents per head, while the sugar industry cost 87 cents per head. I did not ask the hon. gentleman to reduce the protection of these industries, but I asked him to explain why he singled out this coal oil industry for destruction. Why should he seek in this way to make a cheap fuel for the gas-makers and manufacturers of this country ? Both these industries have a right to live and to be reasonably protected, but they have no right to demand the destruction of another industry. The hon. gentleman sat down without explaining why this coal oil industry was singled out to be sacrificed. I am willing that the people should be left to judge between the hon. gentleman's position and mine. The hon. gentleman has played a false part ; he has ignored the advice of those who knew best. If any man understood his business, it was Mr. Chamberlain. He proposed to come to this country and establish a great industry—and it is a great industry and a great benefit to the town of Sarnia——

Mr. FIELDING. Is it not running today ?

Mr. CLANCY. Yes, it is running to-day. But it might have run just as well without destroying this other industry. Mr. Chamberlain did not ask that it should be destroyed. Mr. Chamberlain was anxious to maintain the crude oil industry in Canada. He was too good a business man not to see that that should be done. The crude oil industry is running at present supported by bounties to the amount of $250,000, but it is running with the scant security for the future that must always be the portion of industries that depend upon bounties. Mr. Chamberlain understood the oil industry, and he was not so simple as to ask for any change that he did not think was in its interest. He made a proposition for the Standard Oil Company to carry on this industry, and the people of Sarnia accepted it, for they knew what they wanted. But the hon. minister did not know what they wanted, and he was carried away with the idea of bringing about a reduction to the consumer of refined oil. But the most that he can make out of it is 2⅞ cents for each man, woman and child in the Dominion. Our people would have been beggared had it not been for the statesmanship of the hon. gentleman. What a stroke of genius this to relieve the people of the burden of 2⅞ cents per head, and on the other side to destroy an industry against which there was no outcry. I am willing to leave the question where the hon. gentleman left it.

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

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 167) to provide for the payment of a bounty on crude petroleum of Canadian wells, founded on the resolution.

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

FAREWELL ADDRESS TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE EARL OF MINTO.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I would ask the House at this stage of business to interrupt the regular course of proceedings in order to perform a duty which will be at once, I am sure, the expression of a regret and a pleasure. The House will be reminded with sincere regret that the term of His Excellency Lord Minto as Governor General of Canada is about to be concluded. His Excellency will prorogue this House in a few days, and when parliament again meets in a few months hence, the term of His Excellency will have expired, and he will be no longer among us. At the same time I am sure it will be a pleasure for the House to join with another branch of parliament in a farewell address to His Excellency, in which we will endeavour to convey to him the appreciation, not only of parliament, but of the whole people of Canada, of the manner in which he has discharged the duties with which he was entrusted by Her Majesty Queen Victoria. Canada has been really very fortunate in all those who have, since confederation, exercised the functions which pertain to royalty in this the first colony of the empire. The Earl of Minto will take fitting place as the last, so far, in the line of illustrious statesmen who from time to time have exercised these duties. His name will come fittingly after the names of Dufferin, Lorne, Lansdowne, Stanley and Aberdeen. It has been my privilege especially to come in close contact with His Excellency, it has been my privilege as first servant of the Crown in this country, and I bear this testimony most cheerfully, that above all things he is a man most unflinching in the performance of his duty. Nothing can move him from what he conceives to be right. In all things he has been a model of a constitutional governor, maintaining at all times the dignity of the Crown, and never forgetting the rights of the people. He was not satisfied only to perform his duties in a merely perfunctory manner, but he took the trouble to go out and to come in close contact with the people. He visited different sections of the country, he was appreciated by all classes; and I am not speaking too strongly when I say that, if it was possible to do so, he has drawn the Crown even nearer to the hearts of the people than it was before.

Neither should we upon such an occasion as this forget Her Excellency the Countess of Minto. The Countess of Minto has brought to Government House all the virtues which adorned the court of the late Queen Victoria, and which are now maintained so worthily by Her Majesty Queen Alexandra. It is true that all these virtues have ever been conspicuous at Government House, but it is only true to say also that in the Countess of Minto, in the present incumbent of that position, those virtues shine with a special grace and charm. Her Excellency did not confine herself to fulfilling the duties of the social side of her high station, but she went amongst the people and endeavoured to alleviate suffering and to bring the comforts of life and home to those who were homeless and comfortless. The fact that she has established the institution of cottage hospitals, which have been scattered all over the country, is in itself enough to endear her memory forever to the Canadian people. I beg therefore to move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the leader of the opposition, the following address:

To His Excellency the Rt. Hon. Sir Gilbert John Elliot, Earl of Minto and Viscount Melgund, of Melgund, county of Forfar, in the Peerage of the United Kingdom, Baron Minto of Minto, county of Roxburgh, in the Peerage of Great Britain, one of His Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council,

Baronet of Nova Scotia, Knight Grand Cross of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, &c., &c., Governor General of Canada.

May it please Your Excellency :

We, His Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada in parliament assembled, desire to express our sincere regret at the approaching termination of your official connection with this country.

Your Excellency will bear from our shores our high respect and esteem.

It must be a gratification to your Excellency to reflect that the period of your administration of the affairs of the Dominion has been one of marked prosperity on every hand, during which the development of Canada has increased at a rate unexampled in its previous history.

We are sensible of the fact that your Excellency has watched our progress with sympathetic interest, and has omitted no opportunity of familiarizing yourself with the people and resources of the Dominion. While we cannot expect to enjoy in the same exclusive degree as in the past, the advantage of your Excellency's personal interest in our affairs, we venture to hope that we may continue to possess in the Earl of Minto a friend and advocate in the imperial parliament and in the councils of the Crown.

We beg that when you deliver up to the King the charge committed to your hands by our late revered Sovereign Lady Queen Victoria, you will not fail to assure His Majesty of the unalterable loyalty and devotion of the people of Canada to the throne, and their abiding affection for the motherland.

We feel that any expression of regret at your Excellency's departure would be imperfect that failed to include the gracious lady who for the past six years has so acceptably fulfilled the duties devolving upon the wife of the Governor General of Canada, and whose kindly interest in every movement having for its object the alleviation of suffering and the brightening of the lives of the poor, has endeared her Excellency to all classes of the community.

In bidding farewell to your Excellency and the Countess of Minto, we desire to assure you that you take with you our warmest wishes for your future welfare and happiness.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The very eloquent words of the Prime Minister in moving this address which is to be presented to His Excellency, and the very appropriate words of the address itself, leave little for me to add in seconding it. However, I may say that I have very great pleasure in expressing my hearty concurrence in all that the Prime Minister has said, and, on behalf of those who sit to the left of the Speaker, in expressing our esteem and respect for His Excellency, as well as for the Countess of Minto. Lord Minto has discharged his duties with great ability and with great tact. Although the Governor General of Canada always acts upon the advice of his responsible ministers, nevertheless there are undoubtedly occasions from time to time when it is necessary that judgment and tact should be exercised. More than this, I think we may say that Lord Minto has been one of ourselves during the whole time in which he has filled the post of Governor General.

He has entered into the aspirations of the Canadian people, he has appreciated our country as we appreciate it ourselves, he has learned to understand it, he has learned to know what its possibilities are in the future, and he has not been slow to express that appreciation of this country, of its people and of its resources which we are glad to observe in those who come among us to occupy high positions. Not only has he done this but he has entered into our national life by taking an interest in charitable work of various kinds. I refer more particularly at the moment to his very great earnestness in connection with the work of endeavouring to stamp out that dread disease of consumption, as it is commonly called, which has wrought so much evil in this country. Lord Minto has, more than that, been a thorough sportsman in every sense of the term. He has entered into our national games and sports. He has taken an interest in the people of this country and in all that interests them and in that way he has very much endeared himself to them. I remember very well hearing him speak, I think in the month of January last, at a banquet of the Canadian Club in this city and I was very much struck with one observation that he made, and that was that if he were a Canadian living in this country he would be shouting for Canada as loudly as any one of us. That shows the spirit in which he regarded this country and its people. But, I recollect some very eloquent words which he used then and which it is fitting that I should quote on this occasion :

> But we Canadians, or Scotchmen, or from whatever nationality we spring, let us never forget that we are members of one clan—England, Scotland, Ireland, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, the Indian empire and all the dependencies—owing a clan fealty to one chief—our King—working out together the greatest history the world has ever known—the history of the British empire.

I also concur in every way in the very fitting words that the right hon. Prime Minister has used in regard to the Countess of Minto. She has presided at Government House, with wonderful charm and tact. Not only has she done so but as her husband has also, she has been one of the people interesting herself in the every day life of Canadians and taking a very prominent part in charitable work which has endeared her very much to the people of this country. Let me merely say in conclusion that His Excellency the Governor General and the Countess of Minto will leave this country with every good wish from all Canadians and they will bear with them, I am sure, not only the respect and esteem but the affection of the people of this country.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It would be fitting that the House should carry this motion by a standing vote.

Motion agreed to, all members present rising to their feet.

Right hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved, seconded by Mr. R. L. Borden :

That a message be sent to the Senate informing their honours that this House has passed an address to His Excellency the Governor General on the occasion of the approaching termination of His Excellency's official connection with this country and request that their honours unite with this House in said address.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY— CAVALRY REGIMENTS.

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

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair, I would like to renew a question that I asked yesterday in the absence of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) and which the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) suggested I should ask to-day, as to why the newly established cavalry regiments in the service consist of five squadrons, while the old cavalry organizations consist of only four squadrons ; and if it is the intention of the department to increase the number of squadrons in the old established cavalry regiments ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). My hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) told me a day or two ago that he would ask this question and I made some inquiry in the department in order that I might be able to give him some information. The information I have received is that there is no regulation governing the number of squadrons that compose a regiment of cavalry, that the usual number in the past has been four, but that the late General Officer Commanding organized most of five, taking that to be the best number. As to what may be done in future I prefer not to take any immediate action, but I would say that as soon as the new council is organized some definite conclusion will be reached and some regulation passed which will bring about uniformity. Whether it will be by way of increase or not, I cannot say, But I think it is quite probable that it will be.

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

Cornwall canal, $9,700.

Mr. LENNOX. It has been said recently that it is well for Canadians to keep both hands upon the Union Jack ; but in this House at the present time the order is to keep both eyes upon the clock and to curtail our remarks as much as we possibly can, having regard to the public interest. I realize that all things come to him who waits, and I have certainly waited long and anxiously for an opportunity to present to the House, and to the country, a short statement of the facts, as I understand them in connection with the contract made by this government in 1900 with Mr. M. P. Davis for electric light and power for the Cornwall canal. As early as the month of April last I called attention to this matter. Again early in May I invited the Prime Minister to name a committee, which, while it would not right the wrong in connection with this contract, might prevent the recurrence of the evil. The right hon. gentleman declined. Some few weeks ago we invited the Minister of Railways to enlighten us as to the position of this matter from the standpoint of the government, but the Minister of Railways also declined. I understand now that in discussing this matter we are to be confronted by the distinguished ability of the Minister of Justice. I have nothing to complain of in that respect ; I merely mention it as an unfortunately frequent occurrence, and as leading us to the thought as to what on earth this government would do if they had not the Minister of Justice to rely upon when they got into difficulty. From first to last throughout this session the only fighting man to come to their rescue in peril, was the Minister of Justice, and I do him the credit of saying that he has sustained the role with distinction and ability. In dealing with this matter I shall for convenience divide it into four distinct periods. We have first the contract entered into in 1896 by the then Conservative government, and executed by the Hon. John Haggart. It is well that we should give close attention to the dates, because, through an inadvertent statement of the Auditor General, it has gone to the country as though that contract might possibly have some connection with the general elections of 1896. Now this matter was first initiated on the 4th of February, 1894, more than two years before the elections of 1896. Mr. Davis then made an application to the government for substantially the same lease as was afterwards granted. To show that the matter was bona fide and was practically consummated in 1895, I call attention to the General Terms and Conditions annexed the lease executed in June, 1896, and taking effect on the 1st of July, 1896. That lease was completed and ready for execution prior to the 1st of July, 1895, and in article 20 we have this language :

The 1st day of July, 1895, and the 1st day of July of each twenty-first year thereafter following shall be the date to which respectively the terms of the leasing of water-power shall be computed.

Again, in dealing with the extreme term of the lease it says :

It shall exist for eighty-four years from the said first day of July, 1895.

We have thus intrinsic evidence from the official documents that not only was it contemplated as early as 1894 that this lease should be executed, but practically on the 1st day of July, 1895, the whole terms had been agreed upon. Why was it not then carried out ? That is explained by a letter of November 13, 1895, from Mr. Bergin forwarding an amended plan. It had then been found that there had been a mistake in the plan and it was necessary to amend the description of the ground. That was forwarded on December 24, by the deputy minister to the secretary. On February 8, 1896, we have a memo. from the minister for an Order in Council. On February 18 we have the Order in Council for the execution of the lease. On May 22, there is a memo. from the minister for an Order in Council amending the description, and on June 12 we have an Order in Council authorizing the amendment. Afterwards the elections took place and in carrying out and making good the contract which had been virtually made in 1894, the contract was formally signed on 25th June, 1896. Now we have that state of things continuing until the execution of the new lease. The lease which was made in 1896 provided that there should be no rent payable for two years. In 1897 it appears that no work had been done under the contract and that the lessee, Mr. Davis, was not desirous of proceeding with the work at that time. On November 30, 1897, Mr. Davis wrote the following letter :

Hon. A. G. Blair,
Minister of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—As lessee I request that no rent shall be charged under my lease nor should the performance of the lessee's covenants mentioned in the said lease be required for two years from July 1st, 1898, and that an Order in Council to that effect should be passed, the lease in all other respects to remain valid and binding for the following reasons :

I need not deal with the reasons at this point, but I point out that Mr. Davis asks for an extension of time in 1897 and that that extension if granted would extend until July, 1900, or practically until the time the new contract was entered into. As a matter of fact whether an Order in Council was passed I am not in a position to say, but I assume not because there is no such document in the papers returned to us. Nothing was done and so we come down to the second period in the history of this transaction, October 19, 1900, when a new lease was executed. What do we find was the condition of things at that time ? We find that there was a lease then reserving $1,000 of rent but that no rent had been paid, that there was a collateral executory contract under which nothing had been done, that the parties were in their original position in regard to each other and the whole matter was in fact, if I may so phrase it, an 'inutle pactum.' It was a dead letter and the parties were in a position to abandon the whole matter, if they thought fit, without injury to either of them. This was the condition of the matter in 1900 when this government did in fact enter into a new transaction with Mr. Davis. I want to make it clear that there had been no outlay by Davis, there was a clear slate so far as both parties were concerned, and no premium had been earned. In other words, under the terms of the lease made by the then Minister of Railways and Canals, the government could take over the work, terminate the lease, put an end to the contemplated condition, returning both parties to their original position without the expenditure of one dollar. This government had in the meantime of course dealt with it in the way I have mentioned and in other ways which I have not found it necessary to mention. Let it not be forgotten though that from 1896 the day they came into power this government had power to deal with this matter and were responsible for anything that supervened from 1896 to 1900. Now, although we had the parties in unchanged positions and either party could recede from the bargain and not have to sacrifice a single dollar, without a grievance on either side, although that was a fact we were not in the same position as in 1896 in every regard. In other words —and this is an important matter—new conditions had arisen, very significantly new conditions had arisen, more power and more light were wanted. Instead of wanting 50 horse-power the government wanted 400 horse-power. Fifty horse-power will be found to be about the limit by comparing the figures which I shall refer to presently and also according to the statement of the hon. member for South Lanark. That is what he contemplated that the government would take from Davis, about 50 horse-power and for a specific purpose. It was not the purpose to which this government afterwards applied that power and light. No suggestion can be gathered from the contract that general illumination all along the line, winter and summer, at the same expense in winter as in summer, was contemplated in 1896. In fact I think I am quite right in saying, and I am bound to say this from a perusal of this matter, that an entirely new policy was inaugurated by the government in the year 1900 when this new contract was entered into. Let me read, so as to be perfectly fair, what the lease of 1896 provided :

That the lessee shall supply electric power to the satisfaction of the chief engineer of Railways and Canals for the working of all the

locks on the Cornwall canal at $63 per horse power per annum.

Mark that the language is—

For the working of all the locks on the Cornwall canal.

When we come to scrutinize the new contract we will find a very marvellous enlargement of the scope of the contract and in that regard we will find an equally remarkable enlargement as the matter still further advances. I need not speak as regards the light at this time more than to say that the light was to be at such points, in such numbers and at such times as should by the engineer from time to time be deemed necessary. Now there was more than an enlargement of the policy, there was more than a new scheme. There were new outside conditions. The government were free agents to do or not to do as they thought fit, to enter or not enter into this new contract. There were outside conditions brought about by the rapid and unprecedented development of a new industry. There was the march of progress from 1894 to 1900, which induced a new condition of things and placed electrical energy and electric light in a new attitude before the people, and put contracts which were made six years before in a position requiring revision. I am not going to make any statements which I cannot support by the admitted records of the public department. And in support of this to some extent, aside from the general knowledge of hon. members of the House, let me read what Mr. M. P. Davis says in a letter I have quoted of the 30th of November, 1897. He said, in giving his reasons for wanting an extension of time :

The government have not advised me when they would require me to furnish electricity for power or light as called for in the said lease, and for the further reason that there are now under construction several large electrical plants as at Niagara, Lachine and Chambly, and on account of the great improvements being made in electrical appliances and machines, I thought it desirable to await the results accruing from the above before going into the large expenditure necessary to properly devolop the said power at Sheik's island.

Pretty conclusive that at that day Mr. Davis realized there was a rapidly changing condition of things, and that it was important for seller and buyer alike, to adjust themselves to the new conditions, and not enter into any arrangement which would not carry them over all contingencies. It was incumbent, on the government particularly, in a contract for electric light and power, to have provided there should be adjustments from time to time and at reasonably short periods, or to have insisted on a price low enough to meet any probable reduction during any of these periods. There is something else to be gleaned from that letter, and that is that whatever view was taken by Mr. Davis and the government at a later stage, Mr. Davis presented his case then upon the basis that the government were not bound to take any horse-power or light until whatever time they saw fit. That is the first portion of the reason he puts forward. We find then that at the beginning of this second period, when the government entered into this contract, there was a falling market and that by reason of the rapid development in electric light and energy, there was no telling what might be the condition of things or what vast improvements might be accomplished within the range of a very few years.

It is the boast of the government that they have the same old contract. We have heard that time and again. Their press reports it—the same old contract. And that was the argument of the Minister of Justice the other night. I do not know that the government can gain much consolation from that view. What was the duty of the government in 1900 ? We had then a system of electric light and power, which was almost unknown in 1894, we had had rapid development in the meantime, and we had immeasurable possibilities opened up in 1900, so that, with Mr. Davis in default, and with rapidly changing conditions, it was the duty of the government to hesitate. They should either have refused to enter into a contract or made a new contract at lower prices and in terms consistent with the changed state of things. The prices should have been lower because of the changed conditions and because of the larger quantities that they were taking both of power and light.

The Minister of Justice the other night, on the 13th of July, when we were discussing this matter, emphasized the fact that there is no change. Well, Sir, I emphasize the fact that they were bound to change, and, I emphasize the fact that they did change, but the change they made was to tighten the chains about the people. Let me be perfectly definite. I speak by the book. What was the old contract ? The old contract was for power for the working of the locks, and the working of locks alone, to the satisfaction of the engineer. What is the meaning of this ? It means sufficient power for working the locks ; it means necessary power and no more. It means the actual requirements of the government for the working of the locks. When it says : 'to the satisfaction of the engineer,' it means too that the engineer has power to vary the quantity from time to time as he may find it necessary. I do not mean in an unreasonable way. I do not mean that he should change from day to day, but I mean that under the old contract the engineer could say : 'We want so much power, about fifty or sixty horse-power, and the

next year he could come and say we need more horse-power and Mr. Davis must supply it. Under the old contract, the chief engineer had the right to say : we need only 40 horse-power ; and if you supply any more, we will not pay for it. That is the meaning of power for the working of the locks to the satisfaction of the engineer. What have we ? We have an absolute contract for 400 horse-power, amounting to $25,200 per year as a fixed charge on the people of this country. Yet, even with that condition of things we have not one man dispensed with in the working of the canal. We have a contract taking effect six months before we could possibly need the power and twenty months before we actually needed it. And even when these twenty months had elapsed, as I shall show by the record, only a fraction of the power was required. Let me quote the contract of 1900 as to delivery of power six months before it could possibly be required :

The said Michael P. Davis shall under said indenture furnish and supply to Her Majesty electrical current not less than 400 electrical horse power and shall also furnish and supply direct current arc light not less than 250 lights, nor, without the consent of the lessor, more than 270 lights ; and that the said Michael P. Davis shall supply such lights from first day of May, 1901, and the current for power from 1st October, 1901.

I suppose we ought to presume that this contract was entered into in the interest of the people, but it will require some explanation from the government to show how it happened that they contracted to accept delivery of the power from Mr. Davis, not in the spring, at the opening of navigation, but from 1st October, at the close of navigation. Speaking of change, we have not only change but we have a most marvelous development from date to date. I have referred to the contract which was entered into in 1896 providing for the power for operating the locks. I refer now to what is provided by the memorandum of the minister on which the Order in Council in 1900 was based :

The undersigned recommends that, in pursuance of the last provision, he be authorized to enter into a contract with M. P. Davis for the lighting of the Cornwall canal, the number of lights to be not less than 250 arc lights of 2,000 candle power each, nor more than 270, at the discretion of the department, to be paid for at 30 cents per lamp for each night during which the light is required to be supplied.

Then comes the part to which I would ask particular attention :

Further, that the supply of electrical power for the operation of lock gates and valves and of bridges throughout the said canal, &c.

So, in the Order in Council we find that there is a change in the quantity of power supplied, as compared with the old contract, by adding valves, bridges, &c. Now, we have the Order in Council, and that goes a little further. In the memorandum we have no suggestion of such a thing as 400 horse-power and I am endeavouring to show that new conditions kept creeping in, and there is no way of tracing from whence they came. In this, we have this expression :

For a minimum of 400 horse-power——

Where that came from, I do not know. But we have these facts : First that in the memorandum of the minister we have an enlargement of the scheme contemplated in 1896 ; then, a few days afterwards when the Order in Council was made, we have a further enlargement by providing that there shall be a minimum of 400 horse-power as governing the contract ; and now when we look at the contract itself we find a significant enlargement there :

—no less in any one year, then 400 electrical horse-power, and also to supply and work direct current arc lights, such lights to be not less at one time than 250 lights, nor, without the consent of the lessor, more than 270 lights, but leaving out the important qualifying words contained in the Order in Council : 'for each night during which light is required and supplied.'

But that is not enough. We have the deputy minister coming to the rescue and, by the construction he places upon this, vastly enlarging the scope of the system adopted by the government in 1900. It may or may not be that the construction of the deputy minister is the correct one. But there is the fact that, if the construction of the deputy minister is the correct one, they were not contented by enlarging the old contract by the memorandum of the minister, enlarging it again by the Order in Council, and enlarging it still further by the contract made in alleged pursuance of the Order in Council, but the minister enlarges the scope of it still further. Writing to the secretary of the department on 25th August, 1902, the deputy minister says :

On the above basis the following would be the apportionment of power :

	No. H.P.	Total H.P.
New canal, lock and guard gates	26x4	104
Old canal, lock gates	20x4	80
New canal, sluice gates or valves	26x1	26
Old canal, sluice gates or valves	20x1	20
6 weirs (66 openings)	66x½	33
Bridges	1x3—1x2	5
New canal, winches to help vessels through locks	6x6	36
Old canal, winches to help vessels through lock	5x6	30
Workshops, serving both Cornwall and Williamsburg canals		60

Making 220 horse-power, more than is covered by even the most generous construction of the enlarged contract into

which the government entered in 1900. I think I am right in saying therefore that there has been a gradual expansion and enlargement of this scheme to meet the varying circumstances and wants of the government, or of the contractor, or of both. Now the deputy minister sums that up and says this makes a total of 417 horse-power. The hon. gentleman either means that to be a fair presentation of the case, or he is in great difficulty to bolster up a bad case. What does it mean ? Will the Minister of Justice contend that it is a rational thing to say that all these gates, and sluices, and weirs, and winches, and workshops are to be operated at the same time ? Yet the minister, in endeavouring to meet the argument of the Auditor General, in saying that the Auditor General is wrong, and in supporting the contractor, brings forward this argument in order to support his case that the government were justified in 1900 in entering into a contract for 400 horse-power. Well, suppose I go down into the city, and call at an undertaker's shop and say : You do a pretty large business ?—Yes, I have a patronage of probably——

Mr. EMMERSON. We will require several undertakers if you talk much longer.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman begins to weaken, then. Well, what I propose to do is to confine myself to the important facts of this discussion. There are 132 pages of matter given us to deal with, selected from a vast body of material, and I have gone to the trouble of noting carefully the matters I wish to speak upon, in order that I may not wander from the issue. But I see the Minister of Agriculture here, and I think I will amend my illustration. A high functionary of the government, I will not give the name, who was at one time interested in the census of this country, and who, finding it was not working very well, went into the city to investigate for himself. He called on an undertaker and said : What is the extent of your business ? The undertaker said : A sixth of the city trade, say, 10,000 persons. Do you mean to tell me, sir, said the functionary, that you have coffins in stock for 10,000 people ? No, said the undertaker, but I don't expect they will all die the same day. My hon. friend, whoever he may be, who had charge of the census, goes on and he calls into a thrifty and tidy little house of one of our French Canadian citizens, and sees there one of those splendid evidence of the building up of a nation—family of eight or ten children—and he says : My good woman, do these children all belong to you ? She says, Yes.—My good woman, I am not going to be humbugged : Is that the cradle ? —Yes—Have you any more than one ?—One more. Oh, says the functionary, you can't fool me, two cradles and ten or eleven children. But you know, said the mother, we did not expect they were all going to be born on the same day. Then the hon. gentleman, who carries a sword in one hand and a sickle in the other, goes to a farmer and he says to him, We have electric lights to dispose of. You want to run a threshing machine, you want to run a cutting box, and crusher and pulper and fanning mill ; and to all these various things the man says, Yes. Then the hon. gentleman says, to run all these things will require 35 horse-power, and that is what I want to sell you. The man says, I am not altogether an idiot, I am not going to carry on all the operations at the same time. And so it is. I see hon. gentlemen who to-day have spoken in the French language and in the English language; but they do not need two tongues because they don't speak them both at the same time. In other words, when the Deputy Minister comes to us and tries to show that the government was justified in taking this large quantity of power because all the gates and all the appliances on the Cornwall canal together represented about 400 horse-power, he asks us to believe something that is ridiculous on the face of it. Now the same enlargement of the scope of the contract was made in reference to the lighting. I won't take the trouble to read it, because it is familiar to the House. Under the old contract, as I said, so far as the lighting was concerned, there was an absolutely unlimited range. We could take much or little, as we thought fit. We could take none at all, according to the construction put upon it by Mr. Davis in a letter which I have read. Under the new contract we have the range of exactly 20 lights. We must take 250 lights and we cannot demand more than 270 so that the utmost discretion that is left to the government is a range of 20 lights. Now, to further show that this contract has been changed, and that previously we had an unlimited ranges as to what we should take, I do not need to go outside of the government themselves for confirmation. We have from Mr. Newcombe, the Deputy Minister of Justice, the most emphatic statement not only in vindication of the attitude taken by the Auditor General but of the significant departure made by the government from the condition of things existing in 1896 and showing the contention of the government when the trouble arose between the Auditor General and the department. Mr. Newcombe writes on the 13th November, 1902, the same day upon which the Treasury Board overruled the Auditor General. The question is asked him :

Can the chief engineer direct Mr. Davis during any day, or week, or other period named by him to shut off the current from all the lamps on the canal ?

He says :

I am of opinion that he can so direct. Under the lease to Mr. Davis of 25th June, 1896, he undoubtedly could do so.

It is to be noted that he refers to the lease of 1896, and distinguishes it from the contract which was made in 1900. Skipping some things, he goes on to say :

Under the lease itself no minimum or maximum was fixed, but the lessee was bound to provide any number of lights which the chief engineer deemed necessary. The chief engineer might require any number, great or small, or he might require none. I am of opinion that under the lease as varied by the agreement, it is still competent for the engineer to dispense altogether with lights for the period named by him.

A contention which is in strange contrast with that of the government at a later day, but which is in striking conformity with the attitude of the government up to that date.

Mr. Newcombe proceeds :

I may point out that if the proper construction is what Mr. Davis contends for, it is clear that the Minister of Railways in entering into the contract of the 19th October, exceeded the authority under which he was, and expressed himself to be, acting, for the Order in Council of 19th October, 1900, plainly intended that the lights should be paid for only for each night during which light is required and supplied.

Mr. Newcombe puts in quotation marks 'for each night during which light is required and supplied,' and adds :

—and the contract upon proper proceedings being taken, would in my opinion be reformed by the court accordingly.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Would the hon. gentleman tell me what he is reading from now ?

Mr. LENNOX. I am reading from the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice It is marked G—10. This throws a very significant light upon the position of the matter, but not nearly so significant as some other matters to which I shall have occasion to refer. While I have it in my hand, I might as well read one further extract showing a number of changes. I am pointing out that most significant changes were made. The Deputy Minister of Justice is pointing out that the Minister of Railways, in executing the contract, exceeded the Order in Council ; that he acted ultra vires ; that, therefore, there was a most significant change in the wording and effect, and that until modification was brought about by an action in court, a most important departure from the contract of 1896 would exist, a departure that involves, as I shall show, thousands and thousands of dollars to the people of this country during every year, and in the end of the period for which it would have to run more than half a million dollars. Mr. Newcombe is asked :

Can the chief engineer direct Mr. Davis to operate during similar periods more than one lamp, but less than two hundred and fifty lamps.

And the answer he gives is this :

I think he can so direct, but that if fewer than 250 lights are required the minimum number of 250 must nevertheless be paid for, unless, as has been the case heretofore the lessee is not in a position to furnish that number.

A most significant change is here pointed out by the Deputy Minister of Justice as between the lease of 1896 and the contract of 1900, because before the contract of 1900 was made all we had to pay for was what we actually received, and we had the actual power in the first contract to say, not only once for all, but from time to time the number of lights we required. I do not mean that we had the right to take an arbitrary or unreasonable attitude, or to say that we will change at short periods, or from year to year, but on occasions at reasonably distant periods as the necessity of the public service might require. Now, I have indicated the changes that have been made, which, upon an analysis of the matter later, will be shown to involve vast sums of money to this country ; in fact, a matter of a difference, according to the new contract of upwards of $22,000 a year, and an actual matter of difference, when a proper adjustment of the contract is made, of about $26,000 a year, or more than one-half of the total amount claimed by Mr. Davis under the contract of 1900.

I submit also that there was an important change made in the period during which we were obligating ourselves to take electric power and light, when it was extended from an utmost period of 21 years to a period of 84 years. I have too much respect for the able argument advanced by my leader on this point, to enter elaborately into that matter now, and I only refer to it, in order that in dealing with this matter I should have covered the whole of the grounds on which I attack the government for the contract of 1900. I think, however, it could very well be argued that the document of 1896 was a lease and an option ; that the government having at that time the water-power granted the lease to Mr. Davis at a reasonable rental, in view of the fact that he would develop an industry along the canal, and the government reserved to themselves the option to take power and light if they should think fit. That the government never did or never proposed then to bind itself to take one unit of power unless they themselves wished. That was the construction placed upon it by the government and by Mr. Davis himself from 1896 to 1900. That is borne out by the fact that throughout the lease there is no provision for the regulation of details in reference to supplying electric power and light while there are most ample provisions as to the minor question of a lease at $1,000 a year. How-

ever, we are not compelled to resort to that argument. Within the four corners of this document which was executed in 1896 we have two distinct contracts, one the contract of lease, and the other contract for the supply of power, which, if incorporated in a separate document as it well might have been would have no different effect from that which it has been incorporated in the lease. My hon. and learned friend the Minister of Justice, with what I regard as very great adroitness and cleverness, made a very presentable argument the other night on this point, but after all it only showed what could be done in argument and it failed to carry conviction to the mind. The Order in Council is the first thing we have to deal with. The Order in Council is dated the 9th of October, and is based on a memo. of the minister dated the 26th of September. It is made after Mr. Davis had applied for the privilege, or, as the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister have already explained, at the instance of Mr. Davis. This Order in Council provides :

> The said contract to be in force for a term of 21 years.

This shows that Mr. Davis and the government regarded it as a matter which was not defined by the old contract beyond 21 years. because this is said to be in pursuance of lease, and the leasing provision of the contract of 1896, and the memo. of the 26th of September had to be satisfactory to Mr. Davis or else there was no use in presenting it. On the 9th of October the matter came before Council for final consideration, and it was then regarded that the true construction of the document was 21 years so far as the lighting and the power were concerned. But that is not all. Mr. Davis became dissatisfied, and as this is a period of expansion all the way through, within a week or two, Mr. Davis became anxious to have something more. I am not blaming Mr. Davis if he could get it out of this pliant government. Then we have the Order in Council of the 16th of October, 1900, based on a memo. dated the 15th of October, 1900, from the Minister of Railways and Canals, recommending that the Order in Council of October 9, authorizing the entry into the contract with Mr. M. P. Davis be amended to such effect that the term of 21 years therein mentioned, may be extended by successive renewals to July 1, 1979, in conformity with the lease of waterpower granted to Mr. Davis mentioned in said order. If it were already in conformity with the lease which was undoubtedly renewable in periods of 21 years ; if it were already renewable under the old contract as the lease was renewable, if it did not stand out distinctly and separately from the lease; then that document was absolutely useless, so, the government and Mr. Davis have here for the third time set their seal to the acknowledgment, that under the original contract a term of only 21 years was entered into between the government and Mr. Davis, with regard to the lighting and power. But the lease goes on to say :

> Nothing herein shall be taken to vary, other than as above specified or provided, any of the provisions of the said indenture.

What I have read is relied upon by the Minister of Justice. Then follows this, which I do not think hon. gentlemen have yet tried to explain and I will be glad if the hon. gentleman will try to explain it :

> This agreement shall extend for twenty-one years from the date of the said indenture No. 12,336——

That is the original lease.

> —and shall thereafter be further extended by successive renewals to the first day of July, 1979, thus making the term of this contract co-existent with the leasing portion of the said indenture, and shall be binding on Her Majesty, her successors and assigns, and upon the said Michael P. Davis, his executors, administrators and assigns.

No language could be more definite and positive than this. It is now open to the Minister of Justice to explain this away. I do not ask him to explain any matters which depend upon a strained construction, but as to clauses which have received a construction by his department at a time when there was no controversy in reference to them, and which it is now important for the department to have appear in another light. The contract of 1896 entailed no expenditure on this country between that year and 1900. Under the contract of 1900 this country was spending at the rate of over $52,000 a year, until the Auditor General came to the rescue and battled, as one man has never fought before in this country, against the united strength of the department and of every official in the department until he drove them from their positions and compelled them to make a more reasonable contract. There was a great change from the conditions under the contract of 1896 under which not one dollar was spent to the conditions with this new contract of 1900 with an expenditure of $52,000, which was confirmed by an Order of the Treasury Board until the government for reasons to which I will revert to later, rescinded that order. Not only have we strange changes, but we have a strange contract. By this contract we agreed to begin the payments for power at the season of the year at which we did not want it, so that we paid for practically six months before we needed the power, which would involve at least $12,000. We were to commence to use and to pay for the light on May 1, 1901, instead of October 1, 1901, as was the case in the matter of the power, and so we might say that the government is all right on the question of light, but they did not stay right on that question. They receded from that cor-

rect position and I will ask the Minister of Justice to explain, because I think it requires explanation, why it was that when we had a contract with Mr. Davis by which we were to take light from the 1st May, that without asking for any concession from Davis, by two successive Orders in Council and by two successive memorandums endorsed by the Minister of Railways we did away with the one reasonable provision of the contract fixing the 1st of May for the commencement of the light supply. We have here a memorandum by which it is provided.

> The undersigned minister, acting on behalf of His Majesty the King by virtue of an Order in Council dated June 29, A.D. 1901, has agreed with Michael P. Davis, within described, that the time from which the said Michael P. Davis shall supply the electric arc lights within mentioned shall be the first day of October, 1901, instead of the first day of August, 1901, as hereinbefore provided.

That must have been a second arrangement because originally it was provided for May 1, thus it is provided that not only are we to pay for power but for light, to commence to take light at a time when we do not need to light the canals. Both now commence on October 1. We take the light all winter, so as to have it for six months in advance and have it ready for the opening of navigation in 1902. That is not all. I would not have referred to this only that it is significant in this way. It is said that the power and the light were ready to be turned on and the light was actually turned on on the 24th of October. I venture to say that that is not true, and I shall read this note for the purpose of proving my statement. This is dated the 26th of October, 1901, two days after the time when the power is said to have been available and the electric lights turned on :

> The undersigned minister, acting on behalf of His Majesty the King by virtue of an Order in Council dated the third day of October, one thousand nine hundred and one, has agreed with Michael P. Davis, within described, that the time from which the said Michael P. Davis shall supply the electric arc lights within mentioned shall be the fifteenth day of November, 1901, instead of the first day of October, 1901.

So that we have her,e two days after the lights are said to have been turned on, an agreement under the seal of the Minister of Railways and Canals, signed by Mr. Jones, Secretary, and by Mr. Davis, and subscribed by two witnesses, to extend the time to the 15th of November. So that by the record, the light could not possibly have been turned on the 24th of October. We have therefore the fact that the government, in utter neglect of its duty, extended this contract, which was bad at first, and altered it until there is not a leg for any one to stand on who wishes to defend it, unless he advocates the interests of corporation and contractors against the interests of the people. The Auditor General condemned this matter and for condemning it he was condemned. For repudiating it he was repudiated, but by the logic of events he has been amply vindicated before the people and the country. Permit me to say that the construction and the attitude of the government were all right until the Auditor General intervened. We find this state of things that so long as the Auditor General did not appear on the scene, the gentlemen were pretty rational. They had at all events lucid intervals. But as soon as the Auditor General appeared, they one and all combined to crush him and stand by Mr. Davis on this contract which, upon their own admission, gave Mr. Davis $22,000 a year more than he was entitled to. There is not only evidence of gross carelessness in the wording of the contract, of gross indifference to the interests of the people in the original framing of this contract, but there is also evidence of great neglect throughout the progress of the matter. Take this as a sample. On the 25th of April, 1902, Mr. W. A. Stewart, superintendent of operation, writes:

> I did not keep track of such deficiencies in the number of lights each night.
>
> In fact, it was only for my own satisfaction that I took any notice of the electric light line, as I had been informed that it was not yet accepted by the government, and until it was I had nothing to do with it.

On the 25th of February, 1902, this same Mr. Stewart writes to Mr. Collingwood Schreiber regarding the number of lights required upon the canal for operation during the winter months, and I read this document for the purpose of showing that at that time the construction placed upon the contract was the same as afterwards placed upon it by Mr. Newcombe, namely, that notwithstanding the contract entered into in 1900 the government had control of the number of lights. And it also shows what were the actual requirements of the canal during the winter months. Mr. Stewart says :

> Sir,—In reply to your request of 22nd instant, I would suggest placing lights as here given, during the winter season on the Cornwall canal.

Then he specifies every place a light should be, and sums it all up as not 250 lights but 30 actually required for the use of the canal. He says :

> The number of lights here given will allow of a good light at every point where we have work to do, during the winter season.

Let us see what action the department took. Mr. Davis was notified of that matter. He adopted the same construction of the matter at that time. On the 21st of February, 1902, he writes :

Mr. L. K. Jones.

Secretary of Railways and Canals Dept.

Sir,—I am in receipt of your letter of February 19th re lighting Cornwall canal. Will you please let me know what lamps you desire should not be lighted.

So that at that time, before the Auditor General came upon the scene, the department considered that they had control over the number of lights and Mr. Davis concurred in that view, and wanted to know how many lights they wanted him to dispense with and how many to retain. That is further shown by the letter of the 1st of March, 1902, from Mr. Jones to Mr. Davis. This letter states :

I have to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 21st instant, relative to your contract, dated the 19th October, 1900, in respect of the supply of 400 horse-power of electric current and 250 electric lights for working and lighting the Cornwall canal, by which you ask for information in that connection.

In reply, I am, by direction, to say that during the period when the said canal is closed to navigation, only the thirty lights enumerated in the list I inclose herewith are required to be furnished under the contract in question.

So that we have this state of things, that before this difficulty with the Auditor General arose, the government and Mr. Davis were in harmony as regards the number of lights he was expected to supply, and that number was to be such as the public service actually required from time to time.

Now, I think there is another document I might read. We have file 634 Department of Railway and Canals. This is evidently a memorandum of what took place in the department at the time :

Law clerk, 8th February, 1902.

Memo. herewith, 13th February, 1902.

Give notice that no occasion to light the canal during the close of navigation.

19th February, 1902, M. P. Davis.

What does that mean ? It means that the department did not think it necessary to light the canal during the season when navigation was closed. Now, one further quotation of a memorandum marked 'Re file 634, 186, 144.' This is said to be re lighting Cornwall canal. I do not know by whom the memorandum is made but it is made by some one in the department. After referring to the agreement with Mr. Davis it goes on :

This agreement does not mention the fact that the lights are to be only turned on when so required by the chief engineer, but this is provided for by a clause in the agreement which states that 'nothing herein shall be taken to vary, other than as above specified or provided, any of the provisions of the said indenture' (of lease). Taking the lease and agreement together, the agreement being, as it really is, part and parcel of the lease, Mr. Davis has no legal claim for, and is not entitled to, any payment for lighting unless such lighting is first ordered by the chief engineer.

Mr. Davis might therefore be notified of the report of the superintendent of operation and might simply be asked why he is lighting the canal.

13th February, 1902.

So, we have it abundantly clear that, not only did they change the contract of 1896 in the most significant, and I may say the most unfair way, by the agreement of 1900, but they have been changing position from time to time as the necessity of the case or the circumstances seem to demand and for reasons which, as yet, have not been explained. At this point I desire to read two letters of the Auditor General, one of them very brief, which throws a good deal of light on this matter in many ways. The first shows a position of things I have already referred to in this House that, notwithstanding the attitude of the department was always in conflict with that of the Auditor General and although he was given the least possible information throughout the whole matter yet in every letter he evidences the most persistent desire to come into harmony with the department and to adjust himself to the conditions if he can possibly do so. In other words as long as he does not sacrifice his conscience or the rights of the people he was ready to go any length :

Audit Office, Ottawa, October 6, 1902.

Sir,—It may be well to draw the attention of the Treasury Board to page 7 of the lease to M. P. Davis of June 25, 1896, where the circumstances, under which the lease may be cancelled, are described, It seems plain that Mr. Davis would have no right to object under this agreement. Then the government might feel that the cancelling of the lease would be an easy method of getting rid of two serious difficulties besides the lease itself. The two difficulties are, of course, the paying for lights, some of which are not used, and the paying for electric energy, none of which is used.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

J. L. McDOUGALL,
Auditor General.

The Secretary, Treasury Board.

That was 6th October, 1902, and the claim of Mr. Davis was from 24th October, 1901. Here is a letter of later date :

Audit Office, Ottawa, October 11, 1902.

Sir,—Since writing you last on the Cornwall electric light and energy question, it has occurred to me that although I have diligently endeavoured to find it, without any success, there must be some fact or explanation to diminish the unpleasantness of the conclusions which I have drawn.

May I suggest that you send my other letters as well as this to the Department of Railways, with the hope that before the question is disposed of by the board, to be subsequently made public, the possible elucidation may be obtained officially. I cannot speak except to criticise, but it is disheartening that, after twenty-four years of service, such criticisms as I have made

have had no better results than to permit the most inexplicable transaction, considering both its magnitude and character, of any of the transactions which have come before me.

Should the reply from the Railway Department show that I have been mistaken to the injury of the department, please let me see it, so that I may withdraw the unfavourable strictures.

Consider the condition, before the second contract was entered into in 1900, of the services which are the subject of the two contracts :—

1st. Electric light.—A rate per light per night of thirty cents was agreed upon. Only the lights used and when in use were to count for payment. Under such an agreement, while the canal is closed, for nearly half the year, only one-fifth or one-sixth of the number——

Actually less than one-eight.

—those in use to light the bridges—would count. If for any reason others were not required, while the canal is open, they would not count.

2nd. With reference to electric energy.—Under the first agreement payment was to be made for the quantity used, and exact provision was to be made for determining the quantity used.

Under the second agreement, that of 1900—

(1.) Under the contention of the Department of Railways, lighting is to be paid for on the basis of all the lights available and for every night in the year.

(2.) So far as the energy is concerned, by the contention of the Department of Railways, we are now to pay for 400 horse-power from October 24, within a few days of a year, and there is no electrical attachment to permit the use of a single horse-power.

That is enough to show the position the two parties occupied and the evident desire of the Auditor General to bring about a working arrangement. He says further :

With remarkable composure an application is made for the payment of electrical energy at the rate of $25,200 per annum, to run from October 24, 1901, while instead of making provision to enable the government to use the energy from the time when they were to pay for it, by having the work for the connection with the lock gates begin in the early part of the summer of 1901, the contract for this purpose was dated only on May 20, 1902, the work to be completed on August 15, 1902.

Showing that no provision was made by the government for making this power available.

Is Mr. Schreiber the person to have been found in such an unprepared state and one which might so easily have been prevented ? There is no one in the public service to whom I am under greater obligations for pleasant relations than to Mr. Schreiber, and it pains me to make these remarks.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

J. L. McDOUGALL.

Now, what was the claim of the Auditor General, and in the history of the Davis contract, what was the claim made by Mr. Davis ? The claim was from the 24th of October, for both light and power. I will refer presently to a statement which shows that for twenty months after the time when the complaint was made there was probably no energy of more than 20 horse-power available for use. The claim made by Mr. Davis was for electric lights at the rate of $27,375 per year, and for 400 horse-power at the rate of $63 a year, making $25,200, or a total of $52,575. He shows that the government had not made any appropriation to make power available to them, and that they had so extended the contract as to make it certain that even if they wanted every light and every unit of power provided for in the contract, they most flagrantly disregarded the rights of the public by allowing the contractor to complete the work in the fall, at the close of navigation, instead of at the opening, this being done in a most peculiar way as regards power in the first instance, and by the extension of time as regards light later on.

Now, I hope I am not taking up time unduly in this matter ; but I have given a good deal of time to its investigation, and I would like to bring forward the material facts from our standpoint. I am somewhat particular because the leader of the opposition has been compelled to leave this evening, and a greater burden falls therefore upon me in going over the whole ground.

I have explained that the Auditor General was not only justified in the position he took, he was not only sustained by the result of the investigation, but he was absolutely correct in his view of the matter, if Mr. Newcombe is right, as a matter of law. I know that other legal opinions of great weight can be cited not entirely in harmony with this, but I prefer, not because it favours my argument, but because it commends itself to my judgment, to believe that Mr. Newcombe is right rather than a hasty opinion expressed by another eminent lawyer whom the hon. gentleman consulted. I need not read again the opinion of Mr. Newcombe. But let me say here why I think it is a sound opinion. The Minister of Railways and Canals, when he signed this contract, had no power to go beyond the Order in Council, but he did, as a matter of fact, when he signed the contract, go beyond the Order in Council by omitting the specific provisions that were contained in that Order in Council, and which would have controlled the rights of Mr. Davis, and would have safeguarded the rights of the country in the way that we contend for, and in the way Mr. McDougall contended for, and in the way that Mr. Newcombe says would have been determined by the courts if the matter had been submitted to them.

Now, the government have changed their position about the time that the Auditor General appeared in the discussion, about April, 1902. The government appear to have then taken a new position in the matter, and unfortunately a hostile position, and instead of contending that the contract was to the

effect that I have indicated, they take the position that they are absolutely bound to pay Mr. Davis the full amount of his claim of some $52,000, that they must pay him for the full number of lights for every day in the year, if they are actually available, and for the full 400 horse-power if it is available. Now, what brought about the change? The change is brought about through the instrumentality of the Auditor General, because these gentlemen not only contended through thick and thin that their position was right, but they actually made an Order in Council overruling the Auditor General. At that time they may or may not have had in their hands the letter of opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice to which I have referred. Whether they had or not, they are equally to be condemned for their attitude. Let me refer to the Order in Council, because it is important just here for it affords complete evidence that the final change was effected through the instrumentality of the distinguished servant of this parliament through the vigilance of the faithful servant of this parliament, through the activity, the earnestness and anxiety of a man who stands high in the esteem of hon. members on both sides of this House, and we find that this change was brought about which change saves $22,000 a year, a saving in the whole of nearly three-quarters of a million dollars, significant and important in itself, but vastly more significant having regard to the important principles that are involved, the safety of the people's money. This I say has been effected through the instrumentality of a gentleman who was appointed a quarter of a century ago for the express purpose of standing between the administration and these contractors and seeing that the people's money shall not be paid out unless it is fairly earned. What does the board say? They say in the ordinary language that they have fully considered the papers and correspondence and that they consider that the Auditor General is wrong and should be over-ruled. That is substantially what is said. There are no reasons given. There ought to be reasons given but they are not given. Looking back some years ago when a better state of things prevailed—my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) knows the period to which I refer—I find that very frequently in overrulings by the Treasury Board reasons were given but they are not given now. Sometimes they say that a judgment may be good, but that the reasons may be bad and therefore it is not well to give reasons, but in this case both the reasons and the judgment are bad. But after giving their formal judgment they say:

> The board observe that the Auditor General has raised questions as to the economy of the arrangement made between the government and Mr. Davis. These questions should be the subject of inquiry as to the future, but they in no way affect the obligation of the government to make payment for services rendered under the existing contracts.

They should be the subject of inquiry for the future but they in no way affect the obligation of the government to pay for what has gone by. They had the letter of the Deputy Minister of Justice in their hands then. They had applied for it. They were bound to have it before they decided, they had it in their hands, they did know that it was absolutely untrue in fact and in law. They knew that they had the power to right this wrong. They knew they had the power to apply to the court, they knew that the court would remedy the mistake and they knew more, or they were not fit to occupy the positions that they did occupy—they knew that if an Order in Council is exceeded the paper which purports to go beyond the Order in Council is of no more use than this piece of blank paper which I hold in my hand. And yet what are the facts? In the main the Auditor General is vindicated because within a few months, when the account came in, a reduction was made upon the basis of the Auditor General's contention. At that time Mr. Courtney, the Deputy Minister of Finance, wrote to Mr. Schreiber to warn him and to apprise him of the blunder into which he had fallen. Mr. Courtney says:

> Nevertheless, the board are of opinion that the questions so raised by the Auditor General should be fully investigated; and for this purpose the assistance of independent electrical experts should be obtained, with the view to ascertaining whether any arrangement more advantageous to the interests of the Dominion could be effected for the supply of light and power for the canal.

I notice that the hon. Minister of Justice said the other night that these experts were appointed at the request of the Auditor General. I need hardly state that I know the hon. minister must have considered that he was amply sustained in so stating, but I think it is my duty to the Auditor General to say that this is not his recollection of the matter and that he states distinctly that he was not a party to the appointment of these gentlemen though he was, of course, most anxious that by any means that contract should be so modified as that the people's interest should be conserved to a greater extent than it was under the contract of 1900. In other words the Auditor General said that he was willing to join hands with these gentlemen at any time to effect anything for the benefit of the people and any one who will peruse the letters subsequently written will see that the Auditor General, nowithstanding the way he is treated, is still patient and amongst things suggests splitting or dividing the accounts in order that he

shall be able to pay Mr. Davis what he is entitled to, retaining only the amount in dispute pending the investigation of the matter. Let me say here that not only was the Auditor General vindicated by the letters I have referred to, but whilst his calculation in regard to the Soulanges canal was repudiated and langhed at not only in this House, but out of the House, yet when we come to place that calculation beside the actual figures in accordance with the compromise agreement, we have figures substantially identical and we have the Auditor General, the watchdog of the treasury, if I may use that language without being offensive, and I might use almost any language in describing him after the language that has been used in this House, the guardian of the treasury vindicated in this matter as well. The Auditor General did not succeed in getting all that he was entitled to nor did he succeed in getting all we were entitled to. For instance, there was a change made in the contract by which instead of paying for 250 lights the year round, we have only to pay for 100 lights during four months of the close season, making eight months of navigation. Yet, in the same transaction the same construction ought to have obtained and we find that in this lease, the same old lease which was the foundation and germ of this same old contract, it is absolutely laid down as the governing term that there is to be seven months of navigation and five months of close season, and I think it would have been fair in making this new contract to have adopted the same principle.

But many things have been adjusted not in the best interests of the people, and this is one of them. We are paying for 100 lights in winter and according to the report of the operating engineer, and according to every authority on record, we require at most thirty lights. Is there any justification for that? There again we have not got justice. I do not want anything else from Mr. Davis but justice; I don't want to grind him down, but I don't want him to make an unreasonable profit out of this transaction at the expense of the people. We were to pay $63 a horse-power in 1896, when electric science was comparatively unknown and when the contemplation was to take only fifty horse-power, but now we are taking 400 horse-power and we are paying $63 still. If $63 was a fair price in 1896, surely $63 is not a fair price to-day under the changed conditions.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). I am going out; I cannot stand any more of this nonsense.

Mr. LENNOX. Is there anything the matter with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross). The hon. gentleman must know that I have the same rights in this House as he has, and that I am protecting the Auditor General who stands as high in the estimation of the people of Canada as any man in this House. I crave no indulgence and I ask no quarter from anyone. I will fight this thing all summer if necessary, and I will have the people know exactly where they stand. I will hew to the line let the chips fall where they may. It has been said that it was the action of the former government that brought about this result. That I do not believe, but whether or not it is unfair to this country and it is our duty to set it right as far as we can. By the reduction of 100 lights for four months, $9,075 became $3,630 a difference in that one item alone of $5,445, and by the change as regards the power, what was to have cost us $25,200 became $7,875, a difference of $17,325, or putting these two sums together an annual saving of $22,770, leaving as a result of the whole transaction, that $52,775 becomes $29,805 under the present condition of things. Let us take the accounts for the month of March alone. In the account furnished by Mr. Stewart we have a statement of what purports to be the actual item, but notwithstanding that there are certificates in great numbers showing that these lights burned continuously from the 24th of October, at the time the contract was extended, to the 15th of November; on investigation under extreme pressure from the Auditor General, we have the fact that in March 1902, thirty lights were burning for 31 nights, which should cost $279, but under Mr. Davis' claim and under what would have been paid according to the overruling of the treasury board, it would amount to $2,018.10 so that there is a saving of $1,739.10 in that one month alone.

We have that reduced rate for four months instead of five, as we should have according to the proper construction of the contract. In that change we effect a very important saving for the people. Putting it upon the very highest ground that it can be put on behalf of Mr. Davis I submit that without regard for the moment to the question of different prices which should prevail under the new condition of things there should be a reduction of more than 4,000 in addition to what the Auditor General was able to obtain, and I think I will be in the judgment of the committee when I give the reasons upon which I found that opinion I say that instead of having to pay for 250 lights for eight months we should only have had to pay for seven months, or 214 instead of 244 days. That at 30 cents a night would come to $16,050. Thirty lights instead of 80 for the other 151 nights at 30 cents a light per night cost $1,359. 125 horse-power at $63 per annum comes to $7,875, making a total which we pay of $25,284 without reference as I say to any question of reduction of price. On the most favourable construction, I submit that this is the uttermost farthing we should pay. It has been said

by hon. gentlemen in this House for whom I entertain a high respect that Mr. Davis is making very little; that this plant is hardly paying even now. Perhaps not, but although I am not an advocate of government ownership in all cases, I am a straight advocate of government ownership in a matter of this kind, rather than that any one should suffer unduly at the hands of the government. I think there should be a reduction of at least $26,991 instead of the $22,000 that the Auditor General was able to obtain. I am sorry at this late period of the session to have taken up so much time, but I have endeavoured to adhere to a certain line and to restrict my remarks as much as possible. I have been endeavouring for more than three months to get the matter before the House and the public, and I hope if an apology is necessary the House will accept this as a sufficient apology.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If I venture to trespass on the attention of the House at this late hour, it is only because a matter of the greatest possible urgency requires that I should leave town to-night and be absent possibly for the remaining days of the session. I want to follow the example of my friend who has just spoken and deal with this matter as briefly as I can. At the same time I would like at the very outset to declare that I have no intention to attempt to apportion responsibility as between the two political parties for this contract because it is my intention to justify and to explain everything that has been done from the beginning. My hon. friend thought it proper at different intervals during the course of his address to the committee to justify the Auditor General, and to speak of him as a man who had been very much maligned and who was deserving of great credit in the opinion of the people of Canada. I have no quarrel with the Auditor General, I have had occasion to say that before. It takes a rather rash man to quarrel with the Auditor General so far as public opinion in this country is concerned, but I do not intend, because a statement happens to be made by the Auditor General to accept it if it is not founded on fact. One may speak respectfully of a man and at the same time differ. I do not intend to discuss this as if the Auditor General was concerned in it at all. I do not know that he occupies any, but a very secondary role in connection with the matter, and as I go through the papers, if I find that at times he has made a mistake, I intend to say so respectfully but notwithstanding he is the Auditor General, I mean to contradict him if I can justify my contradiction. My friend thought it necessary also, notwithstanding his previous admiration for the Auditor General, to show that with respect to his statement as to this contract having been entered into originally on the eve of the elections of 1896, the Auditor General was mistaken. I am glad my hon. friend took the trouble to set the Auditor General right on that point, and I am quite sure that he would have been able to set him right on many other points as he went along, if it had suited political exigencies for him to do so. My hon. friend did not, of course, overlook what the Auditor General said himself, in the letter he writes communicating these documents to the House. He says:

> Excuse may be made for some of my remarks in connection with this correspondence. They should have been different if written in cooler blood.

I think in these words we find an explanation of everything the Auditor General has said.

Mr. SPROULE. No wonder.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend says 'no wonder.' He feels exasperated. Some of us feel exasperated for very small things. This contract was entered into June 25, 1896, in pursuance of an agreement settled many months previous to that time. What is the character of that contract? The government leased to Mr. Davis a certain parcel of land designated in the agreement, and pursuant to the lease and subject to certain restrictions and reservations they also gave him a lease for manufacturing and mechanical purposes:

> So much of the surplus water, if any, on lock No. 30 level, Cornwall canal, as the lessor may deem advisable.

But here is the reservation. He gets the surplus water:

> After navigation and existing mills and mill sites hereinafter to be leased are supplied.

He does not get all the surplus water of the canal, only such portion of it as remains after leases have been provided for, and in addition there is a stipulation that the government reserve to itself the right to take of that surplus water such quantity as may be necessary to provide any mill sites they may thereafter lease to any one. We see in these words exactly the character of the lease given to Mr. Davis. He, on the other hand, covenants to do certain things for the government. Among other things he covenants to pay $1,000 a year and also to supply electric power to the satisfaction of the chief engineer of Railways and Canals for the working of all locks on the Cornwall canal at $63 per horse-power per annum. And in addition to that he covenants to supply and work electric direct current arc lights of not less than 2,000 candle power, in perfect working order, at such points and in such number as from time to time shall be deemed necessary by the chief engineer For those lights he is to be paid 30 cents per light per night.

There is a provision in the lease that these privileges, rights and easements are given

Mr. Davis for the term of twenty-one years from and after the 1st of July, 1896, to be ended on the 1st of July, 1917, and thereafter for a term or period of twenty-one years, renewable as is provided and mentioned in the annexed general terms and conditions.

And there is a provision for four successive renewals in the annexed general terms and conditions of the lease.

The first question to be considered is whether or not the rates are reasonable, but I now wish to draw the attention of the House incidentally to another matter. Not only did the government give Mr. Davis a lease of the surplus water, but also the right, for the purpose of creating this power, of erecting a dam across a place called Hoople's Creek, and gave him the right to benefit by any increased flow of water that might result from the erection of that dam.

Mr. HAGGART. Not a dam, a ditch.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The words are :

The lessee shall have the privilege of using at a weir hereinafter to be constructed by him, on or adjacent to the land hereby demised and as shown on the plan hereunto annexed, for the purpose of power, the amount of water flowing and to flow into the said canal from Hoople's creek.

Mr. HAGGART. It is not a dam.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This contract was entered into in 1896 and has to be judged by the conditions then existing. In dealing with the question of price, we have to consider whether or not the price which the government contracted to pay for the horse-power and the lights was a reasonable price at the time the contract was made. I shall not ask hon. gentlemen to speculate on that point, but will refer them to the opinion of three expert engineers who were appointed, notwithstanding the statement of my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), and had conferences with the Auditor General. So true is that, that not content with obtaining their opinion, he quite recently consulted one of them again with respect to this very contract. He has made them his experts.

Mr. CLANCY. The Auditor General denies that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He does not deny the statement I make, because there is a dispute as to who shall pay for the services rendered the Auditor General. There cannot be any denial of that. What did these experts report with respect to the prices in the original contract ? In the opinion given by them, which is to be found on page 45, of the Auditor General's Report, they say :

We are of the opinion that for the time (1896) and the service to be rendered, namely, to supply power for twenty-four hours per day in small units, and to furnish lamps and light them, the whole scattered over a course covering many miles—the prices to be paid were reasonable.

That is the opinion of the experts. In addition, this contract contains the provision that at any time the government has the right to expropriate the works which may be erected by Mr. Davis and take over this contract, paying him his actual expenditure plus five per cent. So that what the present government has done is merely to give effect to that contract, and the chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals—the gentleman mentioned in the original agreement of 1896—has been asked to declare what is the amount of power required for the purposes of the canal and the number of lights requisite to light it. That is to say that the gentleman chosen by the two parties to the agreement in 1896 to determine the quantity of power and fix the number of lights, has been asked to do that which both parties agreed he should do at a subsequent period. He has done what it was agreed he should do. Here I may observe that my hon. friend said that under the original contract it was provided that the contractor who was to light the canal and supply the power was at the mercy of the chief engineer to this extent, that the chief engineer could say at any time how many horse-power should be required for the operation of the canal, and how many arc lights, and it was free to him to change the number of lights at his sweet will. The position we take is this. That that is an impossible construction to put upon the original agreement. What was in contemplation then was that when the government would require this power and these lights, they would notify Mr. Davis, so that he would be in a position to install the necessary plant and machinery to create the power and supply the lights. Is it conceivable that any man would enter into an agreement to supply 16 horse-power to-day, 40 to-morrow and 400 the day after ?

Mr. CLANCY. The contractor contemplated furnishing power elsewhere for other purposes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am dealing with the contract and not with an imaginary supply of power elsewhere. That may or may not be done, but it is not done at present. At any rate we are dealing with the agreement, and I think it is better to stick to the documents and papers and rely on the contracts. Would it be reasonable to suppose that Mr. Davis would erect expensive plant which, as events have proven, cost about $300,000 without knowing in advance what were the requirements of the government ? Is it reasonable to suppose that he would make such an expenditure without knowing what the government expected him to do ? He might erect a plant of 100, or 200 or 400 horse-power, and then the government would say to him : It is our intention to install machinery upon this canal to operate the weirs, locks, bridges and winches and for

that machinery we will require so much horse-power. But according to the argument of my hon. friend, they would have the right to say, you will provide us with so much horse-power but at any time we can call on you to increase or lessen it without limit. No business man would enter into an agreement of that description.

Mr. BARKER. Is it the hon. minister's construction that if the engineer once ordered say 100 horse-power he could never order any more or less ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is the construction put upon it by my hon. friends opposite but it is not mine. To light this canal it is necessary to erect poles, and the chief engineer should fix the places for these poles to be put up. Mr. Davis' obligation is to erect the poles and supply the current. After these poles are installed and the wire is put up, is it reasonable that the chief engineer should say under the agreement, to-night I will want 10 lights and to-morrow I shall want 100 and the day after 200 ? Surely no man would enter into such a contract, he being obliged to supply electric machinery and to provide a current, put down the posts, &c., and supply also the means necessary to look after the machinery. He would have his plant installed and then be at the mercy of the engineers or the Auditor General.

Is that a business proposition ? When we come to deal with the power, the facts are even worse. So far as the power is concerned, the government put their machinery upon the canal and then say to those gentlemen, we want the power to operate this machinery. He provides the means necessary to supply the power required. But after the machinery is installed and he has provided his power-house we find ourselves in this position : Any day, the engineer may go to him and say, we have installed the machinery and you have provided the plant to operate it, yet we will decide that from to-morrow we will take only a forty horse-power, though to-day we require 400 horse-power. Is that a business proposition ? Is it conceivable that any man would enter upon an agreement drawn on such lines ? When the original contract was entered into, the canal was in course of construction. And when the canal was completed the government called on Mr. Davis to do that which he had covenanted to do under his original agreement—to supply light for the canal and power to operate it. Very properly Mr. Davis said: Under the original agreement the government engineer is to determine the number of lights I am to supply and the power that will be necessary for the purposes of the canal.

Mr. CLANCY. From time to time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. From day to day;—from hour to hour;—from moment to moment. If that is my hon. friend's (Mr. Clancy's) construction, I am willing that he should have it. The government estimates that there are so many gates, so many weirs, so many bridges, so many winches, and that to operate all these, it will require a total of 416 horse-power.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. minister expect that all these gates, wires, bridges and winches are to be in operation at the same time ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) will allow me to say that it is better to deal with one thing at a time, I will come to that. With respect to the lights Mr. Davis says : I will supply the lights, but it is the duty of the chief engineer of the department to fix the number of lights and to locate each one. The engineer says that 250 lights will be necessary and determines where each light is to be placed. Now what could be more reasonable than that Mr. Davis, being called upon to supply the power and the light under the original contract, should ask that this work of specification should be done by the chief engineer. If he were required to supply, for instance, 400 horse-power and lights that would call for 300 horse-power more, he would know the character of the power-house and the machinery he would have to provide. How else could he provide for the requirements of the government unless he was told what those requirements were to be ? The whole of the second contract, so far as the government is concerned was simply to give effect to the provision of the original contract which requires the government engineer to do these things. There is no departure from the terms of the original contract whatever. That original contract remains intact. When I say that that is all there is in the second contract I speak from the standpoint of a man who wants to construe these contracts fairly. Possibly my opinion may be looked upon as, to some extent, prejudiced. Well, then, on this point, I appeal to the opinion expressed by Mr. Aylesworth the chosen counsel of the Auditor General, who says that, so far as this second contract is concerned there is no departure from the terms of the original agreement except in the way I have mentioned. If there is any doubt on that point, I refer to the Auditor General's Report, page 21, where the following words will be found in a letter written by Mr. Aylesworth to the Auditor General :—

> It is to be observed that this agreement of October 19, 1900, in fact amounts to nothing more than a fixing of the quantities of electric horse-power and electric light the contractor is to supply.

Not only have we got that in the agreement entered into between the government and Mr. Davis on 19th October 1900, but in it will be found this clause—Auditor General's Report, page 11 :

Nothing herein shall be taken to vary, other than as above specified or provided, and of the provisions of the said indenture.

The 'said indenture' is the first agreement, and this declares that the agreement remains intact except for the fixing of the number of lights and determining the quantity of power to be supplied. The hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) says that the Deputy Minister of Justice gave an opinion differing from that of Mr. Aylesworth with respect to the terms of the contract. I shall not spend time contradicting statements made by the other side, but I would like the House to consider what I am about to read—which is what Mr. Newcombe said and not merely what he is reported to have said. This is under date of 13th November, 1902 :

Can the chief engineer direct Mr. Davis during any day or week or other period named by him to shut off the current from all the lamps on the canal ?

I am of opinion that he can so direct. Under the lease to Mr. Davis of 25th June, 1898, he undoubtedly could do so. The contract of 19th October, 1900, varied the provisions of the lease only as is specified or provided thereby, and so far as this point is concerned, all that that agreement specifies or provides is that it is agreed between the Crown, represented by the minister, and Mr. Davis, that the latter shall under the lease supply and work electric current arc lights not less at any one time than 250 lights nor, without the consent of the lessor, more than 270 lights. Under the lease itself no minimum or maximum was fixed, but the lessee was bound to provide any number of lights which the chief engineer deemed necessary. The chief engineer might require any number, great or small, or he might require none. I am of opinion that under the lease as varied by the agreement it is still competent for the engineer to dispense altogether with lights for any period named by him.

And my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox), instead of reading the opinion as I have given it, proceeded to deal with a subsequent paragraph in which Mr. Newcombe stated not what is his opinion, but what is Mr. Davis's opinion—which is not necessarily the same thing. And when he talks about the varying of the agreement by the court, he says that if the agreement was such as Mr. Davis contends it was he could go to the court and have it varied because it never was intended to have that effect. The opinion of Mr. Newcombe does not quite bear out that expressed by my hon. friend. I have already discussed this matter and I do not think it would be right for me at this time of night to detain the House at great length, but would say just one thing.

In so far as the second agreement is concerned the whole difficulty arose out of this fact. I said at the beginning that I did not intend to apportion responsibility, all my desire was merely to explain. There is just one point in connection with this matter which requires explanation in so far as the second agreement is concerned, that is the agreement of 1900. That agreement provides for a certain number of lights and for a certain quantity of power to be provided and delivered by Mr. Davis at a time fixed. Well, I pointed out a moment ago that Mr. Davis was obliged to supply the power house and all the machinery necessary to generate electricity. He was also, in so far as light was concerned, obliged to supply the poles, lamps, wire and current ; but in so far as the power to operate the canal is concerned it was the duty of the government to install the machinery necessary for that purpose. The machinery being installed by the government, Mr. Davis was to supply the power to operate the machinery. Within the time fixed by the original agreement of 1900, Mr. Davis had installed his plant and had installed all the machinery necessary to supply the light, and was in a position to supply the current necessary to operate the machinery. But the government had not supplied the machinery ; therefore the position was this, that while, under the original contract, Mr. Davis's obligation was to supply light and power at a given date, and the obligation of the government was to supply the machinery to be operated by the power supplied by Mr. Davis, Mr. Davis had fulfilled his part of the contract but the government had not fulfilled theirs, that is to say, they had not installed the machinery necessary to operate the gates, weirs, &c. Then Mr. Davis said, if you have made default in the performance of your obligation to supply the machinery, and I being prepared to supply my power, there is no reason why my power should not be taken and paid for, there is no reason why I should suffer as a result of your negligence in supplying the machinery. There is the whole case and there the whole conflict arose. When application was made by Mr. Davis for the payment of this amount he was entitled to, the Auditor General said, you are not supplying the quantity of power called for by your contract, you are not supplying the 400 horse-power. Mr. Davis said, that is quite true, I am not supplying it, but why ? It is because the machinery has not been installed, and that is the obligation of the government. Is it because the government has not installed the machinery that I am to be deprived of the benefit of my contract and deprived of the benefit of the expenditure to which I have been put for the purpose of carrying out this contract with the government ?

There is the issue, clear and defined, which has resulted in that matter now being before the Treasury Board. The Treasury Board being called upon to construe the agreement between Mr. Davis and the government insisted on the terms of this agreement being carried out, as advised by Mr. Newcombe. There is no mistake about that.

We said, we are not legally liable, but in view of the fact that we are going to be called upon to pay for something we are not getting, while we are prepared to stand by our legal obligations and pay our money, we will see to it that this sort of thing shall not go on; we will take advantage of the provision in the original agreement for expropriation. Then, the whole question being opened for readjustment, Mr. Davis waived his claim for the past and a new contract was entered into which provided for 400 horse-power to be supplied the same as the original agreement did. The new contract contains this provision, the same 400 horse-power will be supplied as in the original agreement, but the government will pay for it as it is supplied from time to time when the machinery is installed.

Naturally hon. gentlemen will ask, why did not the government have this machinery installed and be prepared to carry out their part of the agreement with Mr. Davis. The answer to that is that this machinery was of a kind that required to be experimented with. As a matter of fact some of the machinery, for instance, the winches at the present moment are just being completed. It was necessary, practically, to invent a new device for the purpose of operating the locks on the canal, and especially for the purpose of enabling the boats that use the canals to be moved through them by the aid of these winches. This is entirely a new departure, there is no other canal in Canada or the United States equipped with electrical appliances of this sort, and it was necessary, practically, to invent new machinery for the purpose of utilizing this electrical energy. Gentlemen connected with the canal say that they did not realize, when the contract was first entered into, the difficulties they would be called upon to encounter with respect to the installation of this machinery. The machinery is not yet completely installed, and will not be for some time to come, because of the difficulties I have pointed out.

Now let us come down to the real issue, the only issue in this case. It is this, as to whether or not the contract of 1900 was a provident contract in this respect, that it imposed upon the government an obligation to pay at a fixed date, when they were not prepared to accept the electric energy they were obliged to pay for. That is the whole issue. Now it is to be borne in mind that the government have not paid a dollar on that contract, it is to be borne in mind that taking advantage of the wise provision contained in the original agreement, which agreement, as I say, has been carried out in so far as it could be, we were in a position to say to Mr. Davis, we are in law obliged to pay you for the power, but we are in a position to protect ourselves under the expropriation clause. Incidentally, here I may remark that my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) said he was not always in favour of government ownership, but this was a case in which government ownership might be very usefully applied, that it would be proper for the government to take over this plant and machinery and operate it. Let us see what that would mean. I ask the attention of the House for a moment to the fact that the government have made an experiment of the Soulanges canal in the way of lighting and supplying power, and we have the experience of the government in doing the same sort of work that Mr. Davis is doing now. What is the result of that experience? We have installed a plant that cost us, not a sum mentioned by the Auditor General, $160,000, but that cost us $218,632.03. Now in order that there may be no doubt about the facts—because I want to follow the good example set by the hon. gentleman who preceded me and speak from the records—I will give these details from the Auditor General's own reports:

SOULANGES CANAL.

Cost of Electrical Equipment.

1898-99

Sundry expenditure on power house (page R—17)—		
Cooper, Jas.	$ 148.78	
Cox & Amos.	150.00	
Dion, A. A., C.E.	5.00	
Doucet, Louis.	5.66	
Ion, Thos.	137.30	
Legros, Hon.	3.85	
Pay-lists, Oct., Jan. 9-Feb. 4.	196.00	
Pay-lists.	234.13	
Stilwell-Bierce & Smith-Vaile Co.	3,425.00	
Stilwell-Bierce & Smith-Vaile Co.	4,715.00	
		$ 9,020.72

1899-1900.

(Page W—17) details W—122—		
C. H. Raynor.		43,916.74
Bills outside of progress estimates (page W—18)—		
Cox & Amos.	$ 300.00	
Mitchell, Robt., Co.	173.00	
Royal Electric Co.	2,427.50	
Stillwell-Bierce & Smith-Vaile Co.	262.00	
		3,162.50

1900-01.

(Page W—16) details W—128—	
Canadian General Electric Co.	108,976.02

1902-03.

(Page W—14) details on W—117—	
Canadian General Electric Co., electric equipment for locks and bridges.	35,347.75
Bills outside of progress estimates (Page W—14)—	
Canadian General Electric Co.	345.93
Transformers, &c. (Page W—15)—	
Ahearn & Soper.	587.59

Payments in 1903-04 not in Auditor's Report—	
Canadian General Electric Co.. ..	15,832.55
	$217,189.80
Accounts unpaid....	1,442.23
	$218,632.03

COLLINGWOOD SCHREIBER.

W. C. LITTLE,
For accountant.
July 21, 1904.

This statement is signed by the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals and by the accountant of the department.

Mr. INGRAM. At what page of the Auditor General's Report does that appear ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This is for 1903-4. It is not in the Auditor General's Report, Canadian General Electric Company, $15,832.05. This claim is certified to by the Chief Engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals and by the accountant.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that for installing the plant ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This is for installing the plant. If you take that amount and add 3 per cent interest, that will give you $6,000. Then if you allow 7 per cent for depreciation, you will add $14,000 ; $14,000 plus $6,000 makes $20,000. If you will then take what is actually paid for maintenance, for operating expenses, wages of electricians and motormen, amounting to $11,131, and add that, you will find that the government are paying $31,131 for the 120 horse-power required to operate the gates, 213 arc lights and 310 incandescent lights. Those who are curious enough to pursue these details further will find that it has cost the government about $70 per horse-power. That is the result of government ownership as far as the Soulanges canal is concerned. The hon. gentleman expressed some amusement at the fact that I had attempted once or twice, when this matter was up for consideration, to explain the contract rather than allow my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) to do it. The reason for that seems to me to be obvious. When the contract of 1902 was entered into I happened to be Minister of Justice. I was not the Minister of Justice when the original contract was made. I was, therefore, responsible for everything that was done in connection with the contract of 1902. The Minister of Railways and Canals, who was my client at that time, was not here to explain what had occurred, and the present Minister of Railways and Canals knew absolutely nothing about the facts. As the legal adviser of the minister at the time, it became my duty to make myself familiar with all the facts of this case, and it was only because I had made myself familiar with the details of this contract that I interfered in this discussion. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals would have been in a position to have explained the whole transaction very much more satisfactorily than I could have done had he been connected with it from its inception as I was. I do not know that there is anything more for me to add about this contract, but I presume that other hon. gentlemen will be called upon to discuss this question, and if, in connection with the discussion, any new fact is brought out that requires explanation, I shall be glad to give such information as I possess in explanation of any point that may be raised. I want to make it clear that the government has not paid a dollar in connection with this contract except for power actually supplied and lights actually furnished. I might say, in addition, that in so far as the lights are concerned, when the hon. gentleman says that 30 lights would be sufficient to light this canal in winter time, he does not realize what this means. To supply 30 lights on a circuit of 22 miles, the 30 lights being distributed at different points on the circuit, is as expensive to the man who supplies them as if he supplies 250 lights.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought the canal was only 11 miles long.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is 11 miles long and it is lighted on both sides. To supply 30 lights on a circuit of that description requires the same power-house, the same expenditure on machinery to create the power, the same capital account and entails the same interest charges and charges for repairs and all that sort of thing, as it does to supply 250 lights. The only difference as between the cost to the contractor, when he supplies 250 or 30 lights on a circuit of this sort, is the expense of carbons and lamps, which are matters of a few cents. All the other expenditures remain the same. His trimmer has to go around the circuit every day. He has to be kept on just the same for 30 lights as if there were 250 lights. The only difference is in respect to carbons and lamps, so that when my hon. friend says that 30 lights are all that are required that is absolutely unreasonable. Even the Auditor General saw it was unreasonable, and he agreed, under the compromise, that 100 lights should be supplied. Then my hon. friend says that Mr. Davis was glad to accept this modification. Of course, he was glad to accept it. He had spent $300,000 upon the installation of his machinery and plant, and he was glad to get that rather than nothing at all. He had been waiting for about two years without receiving any payment on account of the contract. I think that these are all the facts that I want to bring to the attention of the committee at this late hour.

Mr. HAGGART. In the speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox), who introduced this subject, and in that of the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick), who replied to him,

there is nothing at all that involves a charge against the management of the Department of Railways and Canals when I was at the head of it, but I see in the newspapers—perhaps I ought not to pay any attention to it—that the charge is made, especially against my leader in the House here, that he dare not take part in the debate, because a leading supporter of his was a party to what is alleged to be this corrupt bargain with Mr. Davis. The Auditor General, in his report, insinuates that this contract was made at the time of a general election. What does he mean by that? Does he mean that it was done for some corrupt purpose at the time of the election? If there ever was a transaction with which I was connected that would bear the light of day it is this one. I was most particular in all the arrangements in reference to this matter. An application was made to me in 1893, perhaps before that, by the member representing the Cornwall district for the power which he saw was to be developed by the construction of the Sheik's Island dam, or by the sluice-way which was intended to be constructed for the purpose of drying up the canal between the guard-lock and Sheik's Island so as to permit of repairs being made upon the canal. He wanted the lease given to his brother, John Bergin, of Cornwall. He was at me for several months in reference to the matter. Finally he associated himself with Mr. Davis. I remember very well when they came to me to get a lease of the water-power He stated they were going to establish an electric car service, I think in Cornwall, and he wanted to utilize the power. Before they made application on both occasions they consulted me and had my opinion as to what I would recommend. I told them that I could not give them the lease unless I reserved the first power for the government for the purpose of erecting works for lighting and operating the canal. They did make application in that direction which was finally withdrawn after consultation with me. Then the proposition was made which is embodied in the Order in Council and the lease of 1896. This was in 1895, and I remember perfectly well making the agreement as to the lease. I instructed my deputy to make the closest inquiries as to the cost of electric light and power elsewhere in Canada. I think I have his report in my private papers which I took away from the department, and in it he stated that on inquiry with Mr. Davis, and after going over the subject in nine or ten different towns in Canada, the lowest price paid for lighting was 30 cents per lamp per night. Then the horse-power had to be considered and, strange to say, although it is only a few years ago, there was one horse-power for such purpose generated by electricity in the whole Dominion at that time. I got a report as to the cost of generating horse-power from the officers of the department, and it stated that it was worth $65 per horse-power to be utilized in that way. Now it is not $65 per annum that we are paying or that we agreed to pay under the lease. You must remember that it is a twenty-four hour service, and if we utilized it the whole year, instead of paying $63 per annum we are only paying $31.50 per horse-power per year. Then we only pay for the time we use it, viz., seven months out of the twelve months. If you want a couple hundred horse-power it is almost as cheap to furnish it for the whole year as for seven months, because you require to have your power house, dynamos, and everything else there except the men who run the machinery. As a matter of fact, if you only utilize it for seven months in the year and pay for it in proportion, we are only paying at the utmost $25 or $26 per horse-power per annum. In my innocence then I thought I was making a first-class bargain for the country. I thought it was impossible to get the lighting or the power at any cheaper rate. In order to guard myself further, I made it a condition of the contract that we could expropriate at any time by paying the value of the investment plus five per cent. That is the position of the matter. I thought I had the option to use the power or not, just as I pleased. But I think there is a good deal in the argument of the Minister of Justice, that when one party undertakes to furnish certain material or do certain work, there is mutuality in the contract. I did not know that at the time, but it did not make the slightest difference anyway, because at the end of twenty-one years you could make any conditions you liked.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And that continues.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, I see the Minister of Justice has retained that in the new lease, and he has the power of expropriating at the cost, plus five per cent at any time. I repeat that the application for this lease was made a year and a half before the contract was filed. The Order in Council was passed in February, 1896, and the lease was signed in June, 1896, a few days after we were defeated. It was then signed for the simple reason that all unfinished business in any of the departments was to be completed before we went out of office. I believe that contract was a perfectly proper one, and I do not see anything to be ashamed of in it. It never entered into my head that I was doing anything but making a good bargain for the country, and I think so to the present day. I cannot understand the allusion of the Auditor General; and I cannot understand the charges in newspapers that I was party to a corrupt bargain in making this contract with Mr. Davis in 1896. There is nothing in the contract which any one need be ashamed of. The lease is in ordinary terms, and is the same as all other leases from the Welland canal down to the Lachine canal, and Mr. Davis pays the same

price under the same conditions and specifications as are attached to other water leases that were executed by the government when I was a minister. There is nothing in the arrangement which bears the stigma put upon it by the Auditor General that it was corrupt. The bargain was one that I could justify at any time and which at the time it was made in the best interests of the country.

Mr. SPROULE. The calculation of the Minister of Justice was, that all the gates and all the locks, and all the other works in the canal would require power at the same time, which would be a practical impossibility. The full amount of power under any ordinary circumstances would not be required at one and the same time on the canal.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think I omitted something. If all the operations were going on at the same time it would take 596 horse-power.

Mr. SPROULE. You are paying for nearly 700 horse-power.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The 596 is simply for the operation; for the light it would take more.

Mr. SPROULE. Four hundred for the operation and the rest for the lights. This contract seems to have been let without any tenders. The Act provides by chapter 27 that such a contract as this should be let after public tender. It cannot be contended that this is a work of urgency. Then it was not done by the servants of the department, and at the same time it is a violation of the law which is intended to get the best results for the people of the country. The minister proceeded to show that there was no change in the contract. I do not know how he reaches that conclusion. I have gone over the contract time after time and I cannot reach any such conclusion for it seems to me that the contract is changed and changed for the worse, very materially. The first contract is for 21 years.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, no, read paragraph No. 7 of the contract, beginning 'To have and to hold.' It is renewable.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a rumour afloat to-day that a company is being incorporated to take that over, and that cannot be done without the consent of the government.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is right.

Mr. SPROULE. In view of what has come to light, is that not going to put us in the hands of the company whereby vested rights will become such that parliament cannot take the plant over?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course any company taking it takes it subject to the terms of that lease.

Mr. SPROULE. If a company takes it it will be on the basis of 84 not of 21 years. When any company put their money into it would this government or any government take over the contract at the expiration of 21 years? They are not likely to do it. The minister has made a calculation with reference to this to the effect that for the lighting of the Soulanges canal it would cost a great deal more. The information the Auditor General has given us is entirely different; the interest upon the money invested for the plant and the cost of operating would come to about $9,800 a year. I have not gone into the calculation because I always find that the Auditor General is pretty correct and I have taken his figures. The Soulanges canal is longer than the Cornwall, the Soulanges being fourteen miles and the Cornwall eleven miles long, the only difference being that there are lights on both sides of the Cornwall and only on one side of the Soulanges. If the one can be lit for less than $10,000, why is it that we pay $51,000 for the other? That seems to me to be a mystery. The power costs $63 per horse-power, and while the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals used an expression which seems to reduce that cost very much, that the days are counted as twenty-four hours, still this seems a large amount when we consider the fact of which I am informed that at Hull, in the cement works, they get their power for $15 per horse-power, with a 24-hour day. And that is a contract for ten years, whereas this contract is made for four terms of 21 years each, or 84 years. The existence of the contract being longer, you ought to get the power and lights at a smaller price. We are dealing with the public money, and I find that a private company, dealing with their own money, are getting for $15 what we are paying $63 for. Surely that does not look like an economical or prudent contract, especially in these days of invention and change when there are continual improvements being made in electricity. In two or three years the whole business of providing electric power may be transformed, but in this contract it is not the company, but a contractor who will reap the benefit from any advances in electrical science. If the calculation of the Auditor General is correct with regard to the Soulanges canal, that is lighted for $10,000 a year, whereas this costs $51,000. True, we get $1,000 a year for the water-power, but just look at the situation. We rent water-power to Mr. Davis at the rate of $1.62 per horse-power and buy it back from him at $63 per horse-power. And his lease does not even cost him that, because he has a great deal of surplus power to sell to the public.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Does he not spend money to get that $63?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, but taking into account all the expenditure, that is a capital expenditure for once only, apart from the keeping in repair, and certainly there seems to be a wonderful profit in the transaction. The essence of the whole thing is water-power. You go through the country and rent water-power at a high figure. The power rented on the Cornwall canal, if put up to public tender, would have brought many times $1,000 a year. There is one small stream in my part of the country, supposed to be strong enough to generate 400 to 500 horse-power, and they are capitalizing it to-day for $500,000, and it is believed to be good value for the money. We sell all the power for $1,000 a year which is applied by the Cornwall canal. I do not think that is a good bargain. The ex-Minister of Railways has pleaded that at the time this first contract was entered into, there was but little knowledge with regard to electrical power and no one knew what it was worth. That, no doubt, is a substantial excuse. All that could be done was to depend on the judgment and intelligence of the engineer and when acting on the advice of the engineers the department could scarcely be blamed.

What did the whole bargain mean to Canada ? It means for 84 years, over and above what we get for the power we rent, we pay $4,000,000, whereas the same work is being done on the Soulanges canal for a little less than $1,000,000, some $800,000. With regard to your 2,000 candle-power lights, it is said that they are very cheap at 30 cents a light per night. How much does that come to in a year? It comes to $108. These lights do not require to run 24 hours in the day because half the time is daylight. What does an ordinary light cost the various towns in the country ? I went into that a few years ago, and I found that $73 a light is the highest I can find for 2,000 candle power every year. True, these were to run all night, but on full moon nights they would not be required. With reference to the canal, it is not used the whole year round, but only during seven months. Here is the country paying $108 a light when private corporations and towns and villages are not paying at the outside more than $73. I want to say a word with regard to the troubles of the Auditor General. That officer made every effort to do his duty, but when he appealed to the government, the government and its employees thought proper to throw every obstacle in his way. He did not get that encouragement to which he is entitled. No one can read the correspondence and come to any other conclusion than that there was no effort made to help him to do what he believed to be his duty, and I am not surprised that he should have felt discouraged and said if you will not give me the authority I should have, I will resign. It is certainly a very heavy loss to the country which this contract imposes on us. Is it going to be continued ? Is it going to be a capitalized concern to-day which will continue and compel us to pay $4,000,000 a year during the term of the contract when the work could be done for less than $1,000,000 ? The people will not regard that as a provident bargain. If the government allow a corporation to take over that contract on a basis of 84 years, what will the country think of it, or say about it.

Then we have $25,200 paid and not one penny of it returned to the country. The explanation of the Minister of Justice did seem to have some weight. If Mr. Davis did his part and the government failed to do theirs, and the contract provides that as soon as Mr. Davis is prepared to supply the power, the government would be compelled to pay, it looks as if he were entitled to some consideration. But I do not see anything in the contract that obliges the government to pay before they begin using the power, and I would be glad if the Minister of Justice would tell me where that is to be found. With regard to the cancelling of the contract, the Minister of Justice says the government have that power. I assume they are not likely to exercise it. We have the Auditor General's statement for that. And we have the statement made some nights ago by the Minister of Justice that not a dollar of this money had been paid out. I asked him then and I ask him now, why ? The department signed the certificate for the money, and but for the action of the Auditor General it would have been paid. If that money has been saved for the country, who ought to get the credit for it ? The Auditor General, and not the Minister of Justice. Every official of the government sided with Mr. Davis, and the Auditor General had to fight the whole lot. If he succeeded in keeping the money in the treasury, so much the more credit to him and so much the less to the government and their employees.

Mr. FOWLER. As there seems to be some difference of opinion between the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) and Mr. Aylesworth as to what was required under the first contract, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice on what he bases his opinion. On page 39 of the Auditor General's Report appears the letter of Mr. Aylesworth, dated 21st March, 1903, and addressed to the Auditor General. He says :

> Referring to your favours of 16th and 18th instant, I have now examined the lease of June 25, 1896——

This was the original lease on which the whole contract was based.

> —the Order in Council of October 9th, 1900, and the agreement of October 19th, 1900, thereupon entered into.

This, I understand was the new contract made by this government with Mr. Davis.

I understand you wish my view on the question whether the government can, under these contracts, fix the number of lights to be used on any one night, paying only for the number of lights so used at the rate of thirty cents per night.

I think that was the position of matters and the right of the government in the premises prior to the agreement of October 19, 1900, but by the document of the last mentioned date the number of such lights has been, I think, fixed by the agreement of the parties at not less than 250, and I think, therefore, that if on any night any lights at all are required Mr. Davis has the right, if he wishes, to insist that not less than 250 shall be paid for.

That was the result of this government meddling with the contract.

So long as the lease of June 25, 1896, was the only document evidencing the agreement between the parties, the situation was that Mr. Davis had the right to supply at the prices named in the lease, whatever electric power was required for the working of the locks on the canal, and electric lights along the canal at such points and number as should from time to time be deemed necessary by the chief engineer.

That is, that the chief engineer should have the power to do just what the Minister of Justice said he should not have the power to do. It means, if it means anything, that he was to have the power to vary the number of lights and the amount of power to be used. He could demand,, as the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) said, that there should be 50 lights at one time and 40 at another.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) make such a contract ?

Mr. FOWLER. That is not the question. But here is a contract that was made. Does the Minister of Justice mean to tell this committee that this new contract was made to let Mr. Davis out of a hole that he had gone into ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, it was to give a common-sense effect to the original contract.

Mr. FOWLER. This, according to the opinion of Mr. Aylesworth was the legal interpretation of the contract. This was the position that Mr. Davis placed himself in, according to the opinion of Mr. Aylesworth and the opinion of Mr. Newcombe, two very eminent counsel. I will read the letter of Mr. Newcombe which coincdies with that of Mr. Aylesworth. So, if Mr. Davis had made an imprudent contract, then, this government made this contract of 1900 for the purpose of letting Mr. Davis out of a hole :

As matters stood, so long as this lease was the only contract——

As it was until this agreement of October 19, 1900.

—it rested with the chief engineer to define the points along the canal at which lights were required, and from time to time to determine the number of lights.

If that means anything, it means that the chief engineer would have the right to say how many lights were required—say 100 for this year, and 60 or any other number next year.

The prices and various particulars in regard to the lights are specified by the lease.

The Order in Council of October 9, 1900, and the agreement of October 19, 1900, specify in distinct language the number of lights to be furnished. They are to be, in number, not less than 250 nor more than 270, at the discretion of the department, and the government having by this Order in Council and subsequent agreement exercised the right reserved to it under the lease of determining the number of such lights which Mr. Davis should supply, he is, I think, entitled to rely upon such Order in Council and subsequent agreement, and to say that if any lights at all are required from him on any particular night, the number of them shall be not less than 250.

So, we have the fact that the previous government entered into an agreement and lease with Mr. Davis to supply what lights were required and the power required for the works of the Cornwall canal at a specified sum per light and per horse-power. Under that same lease, it was to be left to the chief engineer of the department to determine from time to time what amount of lighting of the power was to be required. Then, the only question that could possibly arise with respect to the original contract was and is, was the price per light and per horse-power reasonable price ? If it is left to the engineer of the government to say how much shall be required, then, the matter of quantity cannot be considered, because only such quantity would be taken as the interests of the canal required. The question is simply one of price. In 1896, as has already been pointed out, the supplying of electric energy was almost in its infancy in this country. I think the former Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) has told us that electric energy was not then supplied at so much per horse-power. Therefore, it was difficult to ascertain what would be a proper charge for such service. With the best information he could obtain, the price was fixed at $63 per horse-power. That may have been a fair price in 1896 ; I am not sufficiently familiar with the circumstances to say whether it was or not. It is certainly not a reasonable price per horse-power for electrical energy at this time. On the Welland canal, I understand, electric energy is supplied to the government at $14 per horse-power.

Mr. INGRAM. And with a ten years' contract at that.

Mr. FOWLER. And here we are paying Mr. Davis on the Cornwall canal just four and a half times that amount, and paying

for power in excess of what the service of the canal requires. The conditions may not be the same on the Welland canal as on the Cornwall canal, but certainly they are not sufficiently more onerous on the Cornwall canal as to make this difference of four and a half times. There is no part of eastern Canada where you cannot supply electrical energy by steam-power cheaper than $63 per horse-power.

Mr. HAGGART. It will cost that here.

Mr. FOWLER. I doubt that, although coal is much higher than it is in New Brunswick, it will not cost $63 per horse-power or anywhere near that amount. It has been pointed out that a contract has been entered into with the cement works at Hull to supply electrical energy at $15 per horse-power, 24 hours in a day and seven days in a week. That is a matter of fact which I have learned from the parties to the contract themselves. I say this Davis contract is an improvident contract as to the price at the present time, that it was an unnecessary contract for the government to make. There has been no necessity shown for the government to enter into the second contract at all. It has been pointed out by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that Mr. Davis got the use of this canal at a very low rate indeed, and I think that the ex-Minister of Railways was culpable in that he did not see this matter put up for public tender. All these public services should be put up to public tender where every one may have an equal right to tender. Now, I want to read briefly from the opinion of Mr. Newcombe :

(a.) Can the chief engineer direct Mr. Davis during any day or week or other period named by him to shut off the current from all the lamps on the canal ?

I am of opinion that he can under the lease to Mr. Davis of the 25th June, 1896, he undoubtedly could do so.

Absolute control is in the hands of the chief engineer, the government could take it out of the hands of Mr. Davis.

The contract of 19th October, 1900, varied the provisions of the lease only as is specified or provided thereby, and so far as this point is concerned all that that agreement specifies or provides is that it is agreed between the Crown, represented by the minister, and Mr. Davis, that the latter should under the lease supply and work electric direct current arc lights not less at any one time than 250 lights.

Now, I say that before this agreement or second contract of 1900 was entered into, the matter was entirely under the control of the government themselves as represented by the chief engineer.

Under the lease itself no minimum or maximum was fixed, but the lease was bound to provide any number of lights which the chief engineer deemed necessary. The chief engineer might require any number, great or small, or he might require none.

Mr. FOWLER.

Now, that opinion exactly coincides with the opinion of Mr. Aylesworth in the Auditor General's Report, page 39. It seems to me there is some reason for the outcry that has been raised with respect to this contract, nor do I think the government have served the best interests of the public by making the second contract. Of course, after having fought a round or two with the Auditor General and having become frightened, they then changed the contract so as to reduce the expense by some $22,000. It is surely an excellent reason why that gentleman should be continued in the position he occupies; I trust he will withdraw that application for superannuation and will still continue to be the watch-dog of the treasury.

Now, this gentleman, Mr. Davis, figured last year in a matter that came before this House. He seems to be a favourite with this government as, I believe, he was years ago with the government that preceded the present one. He seems to be a sort of general government favourite. This gentleman figured with respect to the Quebec bridge, and it is a remarkable coincidence that Mr. Davis's connection with that bridge was defended at the time by the Minister of Justice, who is his chief defender tonight. Under the arrangement with the Quebec Bridge Company Mr. Davis benefited by the new order of things to the extent of $140,000 or $160,000, a nice little sum for a man to make. Mr. Davis took bonds of the Quebec bridge at some 60 cents on the dollar, bonds amounting to $400,000, for which he gave credit for $240,000. These bonds standing for cash by the new deal that was made in connectfon with the Quebec bridge and the Grand Trunk Pacific. they were worth par, which would give him the nice little sum of $160,000. Now, in this contract he has benefited to the extent of some $50,000, and, as reduced by the Auditor General, he will get $30,000. So, I think Mr. Davis altogether is doing very well out of his connection with this government. I think the best thing to be done by the government is to go back to the original contract of 1896 and pay for only such lights as are required. To say that when we require thirty lights in the winter time, and that this canal shall be kept blazing with lights when it is all frozen up, seems to me to be absurd.

Mr. LENNOX. I want to make one or two observations in answer to the Minister of Justice. I do not complain of the fact that the Minister of Justice has defended this contract. I feel it to be a compliment to be opposed by the Minister of Justice in this matter. I think the government realized that it was a grave matter, because they have chosen their most distinguished member in respect of legal ability to plead their case. In reference to the member for

South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) I don't want to say much, I do not think it is necessary to say much. He naturally defends the contract he made. As for the government, they necessarily have to treat it as a good contract because they make it the basis of their present contract. I am afraid that my hon. friend from South Lanark is in the condition that I notice many hon. gentlemen opposite are in at times, when they seem to live in the past, they do not take account of changing conditions. In other words, the contract of 1896 may have been a very proper contract at the time, but it is absolutely improper for the government to renew it, or to make it the basis of another in 1900, when Mr. Davis was in default, and the government was absolutely free to renew it or not as they thought fit.

From what occurred on the 13th last month when a gentleman infinitely more qualified to present this matter than I am, presented it from our side of the House I thought that it would be allowed to rest there ; in other words, that the government had so far set their construction upon the question of whether or not the lease of power and lights was renewable that it had been practically eliminated from the controversy. But, it does not seem so to-night because the hon. Minister of Justice seems to have got fresh energy in the matter and he to some extent intimates that he is still of the opinion that the 84 year term applied under the old lease to the power and light as well as to the lease. He founded that upon this clause of the lease :

To have and to hold the said lot of land and the said surplus water and such increased flow of water into the said canal from the said creek through any works of the lessee, as appurtenant to the said lot of land for the erection of an electric plant and the operation of the machinery therein, and the privileges, rights and easements thereof for the term of twenty-one years from and after the first day of July, A.D. 1896, and ended on the first day of July, A.D. 1917, and thereafter for a term or period of 21 years renewable as is provided and mentioned in the annexed general terms and conditions.

What are the general terms and conditions ? I shall read the heading :

GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS
for the
LEASING OF WATER POWERS,
With or without Mill Sites, upon or in connection with the Canals of the Dominion of Canada.

Not one word of application to a case such as we are arguing now. This was intended to cover the rights of a lessee of a water privilege or a mill site under the government and it was never intended to cover any such case as we are here dealing with, namely, the question of the government entering into an arrangement with Mr. Davis to take power and lights. Not only was it not intended but throughout it is not adapted and of the twenty-four different articles and provisions that are contained in these general terms and conditions could it by any construction be made to apply to a case such as we are dealing with. Let me refer to one article that was remarked upon in this connection on the 13th last month.

Article 20. The first day of July, A.D. 1895, and the first day of July of each twenty-first year thereafter following shall be dates from or up to which respectively the term of this lease of water-power shall be computed. The lessor covenants and agrees that if during the term of his lease the lessee do well and truly keep and perform all and singular the covenants, agreements and undertakings on the part of the lessee to be kept and performed as herein and in his particular lease contained, then the said lessor shall or will, at the expiration of the term of the lease, on the written request of the lessee, made at least three months before such expiration, execute and deliver to the lessee, or to his legal representatives and recognized assigns, a renewal of the said lease for a second term, which shall then be twenty-one years, and also at the expiration of the aforesaid and of every subsequent period of twenty-one years for eighty-four years from the said first day of July, A.D. 1895, and then to be completed and ended.

Not one word of that provision can by the most forced construction be made to apply to a case such as we are here dealing with. The Order in Council expressly provides that this is to be for twenty-one years :

The said contract to be enforced for a term of twenty-one years.

That is the Order in Council of the 9th October. The Order in Council of the 16th October is that the time shall be extended so as to correspond and be brought into conformity with the lease of the water-power. It shall be extended for the additional period of the lease. When the lease is drawn up after due consideration and carefully drawn up and it provides that it shall be extended for eighty-four years in compliance with the amended Order in Council, so as to make the term of this contract as to power and light, 'coexistent with the leasing portion of the said indenture.' Not only have we that construction definitely placed upon the contract by Mr. Davis and reiterated by the government on four different occasions but we have that construction placed upon it by the experts who were appointed by the government because they point out the necessity of the conditions being frequently readjusted. If the contract was renewable in the way suggested that would not be the case.

Mr. FITPATRICK. If at the expiration of twenty-one years the contractor refused to supply lights would that be a covenant enforceable against him?

Mr. LENNOX. The difficulty might have arisen if it had not been that the former government put into the contract the power to determine the lease at any time and take the works over. That emphasizes rather than militates against the prudence of my hon. friend the member for South Lanark in entering into an agreement reserving to the government the right to open further negotiations, holding in one hand the power to determinate the lease and in the other the power to sign the contract with the lessee if he would give, but only if he would give, reasonable terms having regard to the new conditions which would necessarily arise after the lapse of twenty-one years.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is another question about which there is no dispute. I am at one with my hon. friend as to that, but I put my hon. friend as a matter of law the question : Is the covenant to supply power an enforceable covenant against the lessee at the expiration of twenty-one years ?

Mr. LENNOX. If we were both unprejudiced I would attach more importance to the opinion of my hon. friend than I would to my own opinion.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I want your opinion.

Mr. LENNOX. As far as I know and as far as I construe the agreement it was an absolute impossibility for us to hold Mr. Davis to the contract to supply light and power beyond twenty-one years. And I go further ; I doubt very much indeed if we could have held him to the contract to supply light and power at all in a sense because there is nothing definite at all in the agreement. It was only an option reserving for the government a part of that which they already had. I reaffirm the statement that in 1900 the government had power to control the quantity of light, and that by the Order in Council they reserved that right, and that by the improper departure of the minister from the terms of the Order in Council we lost that right. Mr. Aylesworth draws attention to the fact that the matter had been complicated by the lease not conforming to the previous Order in Council, and it is to that Mr. Newcombe refers as showing that the government had the power ipso facto, as well as by applying to the courts to remedy the mistake and have the original term of the first contract carried out. At the close of the correspondence between the Auditor General and the government, Mr. Stewart calls attention to the fact that he remains in great doubt as to whether there is sufficient power for both the government and the other lessees of power from Mr. Davis, and when the Minister of Justice takes into consideration the total cost of the work his argument is practically futile. The minister told us that not a dollar had been paid beyond what was supplied according to the contract. But for six months in the first instance we were paying for light which we did not need. Upon the facts admitted by the government we were paying for 250 lights when as a matter of fact we only needed thirty. We were paying for the power from the 24th of October, 1901, to the 11th of October, 1902, when the Auditor General wrote his letter, when not one unit of power had been used or could be used and when subsequently after the agreement of 1903, we were then according to the official record, only in a position to use twenty horse-power out of the total amount for which we were paying. When we come to the circumstance that we have only had to pay for a reduced number of lights and for a reduced quantity of power, we have that by reason of what the Auditor General has brought about, and in direct opposition to what the Treasury Board decided was the correct course and our legal obligation on the 13th of November, 1902. Although it was true in one sense that we have not paid any more than what Mr. Davis has put himself in a position to demand, yet we have paid for a vast quantity of power that we have not been able to avail ourselves of. We have paid for a vast quantity of power that we have not been able to avail ourselves of and the statement furnished on the 14th of August, 1903, a very recent date, shows that we have been paying for 100 lights during a period of twenty months and for 125 horse-power at $63 per horse-power, and it was only about the end of that period that we were able to make connection with the gates at all. We were paying for the light as a rule with the exception of one month not less at any time than 217 lights, and up to 249 lights on other occasions, and yet it was declared that during a great portion of that period it was determined by the department that only thirty should be actually used.

Mr. DANIEL. On July 28th, the following questions were put and answered :

Mr. FOWLER asked :

1. How many tons of grain and grain products were carried by the Intercolonial Railway from southwest of Montreal to St. John, for other Bay of Fundy ports during each month commencing September 1, 1903, to June 30, 1904, and how many tons of the same articles from points west of Montreal were carried during the same time to the same port for local delivery ?

* * * * * *

3. Is the Department of Railways and Canals aware that grain and grain products from points west of Montreal have been delivered in St. John for local delivery after having paid the export rate of freight only ? If so, to whom have these products been delivered, in what amount, and what is the reason for the discrimination ?

4. What means are taken by the department to make sure that freight delivered at St. John by the Intercolonial Railway at a special rate

for export is really exported and not detained for local delivery ?

The minister's answer to the last two questions was :

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

3. The Department of Railways and Canals is not aware that grain and grain products from points west of Montreal have been delivered in St. John for local delivery after having paid the export rate of freight only.

4. The usual means adopted by all railways, viz.: the delivery of the freight to the steamship line upon which the through bill of lading is drawn.

I understood that Mr. Tiffin had been making some inquiries with regard to this and had made a report to the department to the effect that there had been some irregularities of that kind carried on at St. John. Is that correct ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, that is not correct. There have been no irregularities with respect to the export traffic. I remember the question. I looked into it very thoroughly, and made the answer in accordance with the actual facts.

Mr. DANIEL. Are not other means employed for tracing such matters than what the minister states here, simply the delivery of the freight to the steamship lines ? Is there no one to see that such freight is properly delivered ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The officers, of course, follow the bill of lading. These bills for export traffic come to the department, and they are followed by the officers of the department to the different steamships and the points to which they are consigned.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it not required that there should be a duplicate of the bill of lading, for such cases as I referred to, sent to some individual who acts especially for that purpose, which is not required with regard to other freight that is carried ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Usually the bill of lading goes to the consignee for export, and of course a copy of that comes to the railway. Of course, one goes to the consignee. The railway follows the way-bill, which goes into their hands, and the officers of the department follow that and see that that export is made.

Mr. DANIEL. What duties does Mr. Seeley perform ?

Mr. EMMERSON. He is one of the officials at St. John.

Mr. DANIEL. It is necessary that shippers should send to Mr. Seeley the bills of lading of all these goods that are sent over for export, and the answer I take it was not very full as given by the department, because it simply says that the goods are sent to the steamship the same as any other railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. The officials follow the consignment to the point of shipment.

Mr. DANIEL. As a matter of fact there is a special officer to look after that business ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Progress reported.

MUTUAL RESERVE LIFE ASSURANCE CAMPANY.

Mr. FIELDING. We have been urged very strongly to permit an opportunity to be had to move the reading of a Bill on the Public Orders and if there be no objection, I will move that it be called. It is a Bill respecting the Canadian Assessment Policyholders in the Mutual Reserve Fund Insurance Company. It has been sent down by the Senate, and if there be no objection, I would move that it be called now and allow the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Heyd) to deal with it.

Mr. INGRAM. I do not rise for the purpose of objecting, but I would like to give one hour of my time to expressing my opinion of that insurance company. If hon. members can imagine what I could say in that time, I shall leave it to their imagination, but they would find it difficult to exaggerate the opinion I have of its conduct.

ADJOURNMENT—GENERAL ELECTIONS.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Any information which ministers have to convey to the country, it is the usual practice for them to convey through the House when parliament is sitting, but I find in this evening's 'Journal' the following special from Brandon :

Brandon, Aug. 4.—Hon. Clifford Sifton's visit yesterday had an important significance to the Liberal workers here. They were assured that no election will take place this year, nor is it likely till after another session of parliament.

They had so neglected their opportunity when the provincial lists were being prepared that to go to the people under present conditions would mean defeat. Mr. Sifton has assured Brandon workers that he has power enough at Ottawa to delay the general election for several months.

Would the hon. gentleman who is leading the House inform us whether that report is correct or not ?

Mr. FIELDING. I have not any information on the point myself and I learn of that announcement with great interest, as I am very anxious to know when the elections will be held

Mr. INGRAM. I do not think a report of that kind should be so flippantly replied to.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not intend to be flippant but very grave.

Mr. INGRAM. We have been trying the last two or three years to find whether there cannot be some settled policy on the question of an appeal to the country. Hon. gentlemen on both sides have been anxious to know when that appeal would be made and business has been unsettled pending a decision on that point by the government. Here we have a Minister of the Crown making a declaration off his own bat. Surely the government ought to be able to make up their minds as to when they will hold an election, and the Prime Minister should give the assurance to the people either that the election will not or will take place before we next meet. And I for one protest against this kind of thing. It is about time we should have a date fixed for our election, something like the United States. I suppose our constitution would not allow that. but, at the same time, there is a strong feeling in this country against the way the reports of a general election are bandied about.

Mr. FIELDING. I am sorry to hear my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) advocating the adopting of American institutions. But hon. gentlemen opposite will do it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) was advocating American institutions. He expressed no such idea. But the question, I think was a fair one—is the report true or untrue ? Is the minister who is now in the west authorized to speak for the government in making the declaration he has made ? Are we to believe it or not ? I think that is a fair question and we should have an answer.

Mr. FIELDING. I have not seen the minister for some time and cannot answer as to the authority he had.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 2.35 a.m. Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, August 5, 1904.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. C. PARMELEE moved :

That the Joint Report on the Printing of parliament be concurred in.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I would ask the chairman of the committee to allow the motion to stand until to-morrow.

Motion allowed to stand.

BOUNTIES ON LEAD.

Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved that to-morrow the House do go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

That it is expedient to amend section 2 of Chapter 31 of the Statutes of 1903, intituled : 'An Act to provide for the payment of Bounties on Lead contained in Lead-bearing Ores Mined in Canada,' by adding after the word 'Canada' the words 'and any balance of the sum of five hundred thousand dollars unexpended at the close of any fiscal year may be carried forward to the next succeeding year, and payments may be made therefrom in such succeeding year of any portion of the forty per cent hereinbefore provided for on such ores, and such only as had been delivered for smelting in Canada, but which had not been actually smelted until after the close of the year within which delivered.'

Motion agreed to.

THE VETERANS' ASSOCIATION.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to say that I have received a communication from one of the prominent officials of the Veterans' Association of Canada asking me to remind the Prime Minister—possibly he has also heard of it—of the interview which they had with him last year, asking to be recognized in some way, so that they might obtain a lot of land in the Northwest. I do not know the exact details of the request they made upon the Prime Minister last year ; at all events, it was in reference to the recognition of the services of these gentlemen in the Fenian raids and other services they have rendered to the country in the past. He promised last year that the matter would receive his attention, and I now desire to remind him of it.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The Veterans' Association last year interviewed a delegation of the government, of which I was one. The object of the delegation was to obtain the grant of a lot of land in the Northwest Territories. I was not prepared to give them an answer at that time, nor am I to-day, I am sorry to say, without giving the matter some further consideration.

CORRECTION OF AN ERROR IN 'HANSARD.'

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There is another matter. I notice in reading a report of some remarks of mine in the 'Hansard' of the other day that there was a mistake in some figures I gave the House in relation to

the tonnage of Canada. The mistake may have been my own. I gave the tonnage of Canada in round numbers as 2,000,000. In fact, the tonnage of Canada is less than 1,000,000. I wish to make this correction.

THE TOBACCO INDUSTRY.

On the order for :

Further consideration of resolution reported from the committee of the whole respecting the proposed amendment to the Inland Revenue Act.—Mr. Brodeur.

Mr. R. A. PRINGLE. Mr. Speaker, I feel a very great hesitation in rising at this late stage of the session to discuss this matter. However, it strikes me as a matter of the greatest possible importance and a matter which we have not now time to thoroughly discuss before the session closes. I have read with considerable interest the report of the commissioner, Judge MacTavish, in connection with this matter. In this report the commissioner presents certain findings. The findings are briefly as follows :

The contract system complained of by the petitioners does in fact exist and is in general use in the cigarette and tobacco trade in Canada.

That the provisions of the contracts in question are not illegal under the common law or any statutory law heretofore enacted by the parliament of Canada.

That the manufacturers of cigarettes and of Canadian tobacco other than the American and Empire Tobacco Companies, are at a very great disadvantage in the distribution of their goods and in the prosecution of their business generally by reason of such contract system.

The extent to which legislative control over the freedom of contract should be exercised, and how far the rules of trade can be interfered with by statutory enactments, without injury to the public interest, are, in the opinion of your commissioner, questions of policy for the consideration of parliament.

I assume that action is being taken on clause 3 of this report that :

The manufacturers of cigarettes and of Canadian tobacco other than the American and Empire Tobacco Companies are at a disadvantage in the distribution of their goods, and in the prosecution of their business generally by reason of such contract system.

It is proposed by this legislation to place in the hands of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur) the power to cancel the license of any of these manufacturers if he considers that they are contravening the law as laid down in this resolution. I say that that is a most extraordinary power to place in the hands of one man, practically making him the sole arbiter as to the business of these corporations. To my mind it leaves room for the grossest corruption because this will leave it in the power of the hon. minister to say to these large manufacturers : I care not what your contract is, I care not what eminent counsel may say as to its coming within the law, I am the sole judge as to whether the contract is within the law or not, I say it is not within the law and therefore I cancel your license. That is a power that should not be given to any one man. I regret exceedingly that I was not present yesterday when this resolution was discussed. Let me say frankly that I am in favour of any legislation which will properly control and regulate the combines which are being formed unquestionably in this country, which have been formed in the United States of America and which we find to-day existing in free trade England, but I am not in favour of any such legislation as that which is now before this House which will give to one man the absolute power to control these different manufacturing industries. It is unnecessary for me to say that this question of combines and trusts is a very large question. It is a question which has taken the attention of the statesmen of Great Britain, a question which has taken the attention of the statesmen of other countries. We find to-day in Great Britain the Imperial Tobacco Company, a tobacco company with a larger capitalization than any tobacco company existing and doing business in any other country. The Imperial Tobacco Company was composed of twenty different manufacturing firms. Its capitalization is $20,250,000. Yet, that company is not restricted in the methods by which it chooses to do its business. In order to get at this matter intelligently I think it is necessary for us to go back a little. Let us go back to 1897. In 1897 there was very little Canadian tobacco manufactured in this country. In that year free trade friends composing the present administration adopted the policy of protection and they increased the duty to ten cents a pound on foreign leaf. The Empire Tobacco Company engaged in the manufacture of Canadian tobacco. They invested a large amount of money, they put a great deal of energy into the business, they expended thousands of dollars in advertising and in endeavouring to educate the people to use the Canadian product. They did it against the opinion of men who have been in the tobacco trade for years. I refer to such men as Sir William Macdonald, who always condemned the manufacture of Canadian tobacco, thinking that the Canadian product was hardly worthy of being manufactured, but the Empire Tobacco Company, having confidence in the line they had laid out, having confidence that they could by educating the people get them to consume the Canadian product, invested their money and took their chance of establishing a business purely in Canadian manufactured tobacco. That business went along fairly well. They went to the retailers throughout Canada and by the offer of premiums and other

inducements they got the public to use Canadian tobacco. Subsequently they went to the wholesalers and they said to the wholesalers: We have established a trade throughout this country in the Canadian product; if you want to take up that business we will make a contract with you which we think is favourable to you. The wholesalers made that contract and we find in the report of Judge MacTavish that in 1901 there was manufactured in Canada of Canadian leaf over 3,041,687 pounds, as against 600,000 pounds in 1897. That development has been brought about entirely by the energy of and the expenditure of money by the Empire Tobacco Company. The commissioner has not found that there is any monopoly. He has found that the consumer is affected and he has not found that there is any injury to the public. He has simply found that this method of doing business may be detrimental to some of the smaller manufacturers. These manufacturers started with just the same conditions as the American Tobacco Company started with. They had the same rights, they worked under the same law, it was open to them to push their business just as it was open to the Empire Tobacco Company, and now that the Empire Tobacco Company have made a success of their business, now that they have increased the use of Canadian leaf to the extent, I think, this year of some 5,000,000 pounds, they are met with the opposition of some small dealers throughout the province of Quebec.

This legislation is most important. It is legislation that should not be brought down in the dying days of the session. I know it is popular to decry trusts and combines, but we are not here simply to obtain popularity by that means. We are here to consider the best possible means of controlling and regulating, if necessary, these trusts, and we are not objecting giving to this important measure that consideration to which it is entitled. If we establish this precedent, next session some other industry, which through brains, skill, energy and capital, has developed a large trade, may be legislated against. While we have to-day an hon. gentleman as Minister of Inland Revenue, in whom we all have confidence, that may not always continue. No doubt the administration of the law will be perfectly safe in his hands, but we do not know who his successor may be and what use he may make of these powers over the manufacturers of tobacco in this country. I am sorry to take up the time at this late stage of the session, but I have not detained the House at any great length during the session, and I think that when an important matter such as this comes up it is only right that I should express my views upon it. There is nothing in the report of Judge MacTavish which finds there is a monopoly or that the consumer is affected or that the pubilc are affected. There is simply an insinuation that the methods of doing business by this company are detrimental to some other manufacturers. Upon that insinuation the government are attempting to put through this resolution, which will leave in the hands of the Minister of Inland Revenue the absolute control of this large industry. As I have said, these large combines, these large manufacturing firms, exist not only in the protected United States, but even in free trade Great Britain we find some of the largest combines in the world. We find that in the British House of Commons, during the first week in March, 1904, Mr. Austen Taylor called the attention of the government to the recent combine of the Scotch steel makers, whereby a minimum price, with heavy penalties for selling below it, was agreed upon. Mr. Balfour replied:

> I am aware of the combine referred to, but the matter is not one which seems to call for any action on the part of the government.

Let us see just what our position in Canada is to-day. We have our criminal code which controls and regulates improper combines. Let me just refer to section 520:

> 520. Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars and not less than two hundred dollars or to two years' imprisonment, and if a corporation is liable to a penalty not exceeding ten thousand dollars and not less than one thousand dollars, who conspires, combines, agrees or arranges with any other person, or with any railway, steamship, steamboat or transportation company, unlawfully—
>
> (a.) to unduly limit the facilities for transporting, producing, manufacturing, supplying, storing or dealing in any article or commodity which may be a subject of trade or commerce; or
>
> (b.) to restrain or injure trade or commerce in relation to any such article or commodity; or
>
> (c.) to unduly prevent, limit or lessen the manufacture or production of any such article or commodity, or to unreasonably enhance the price thereof; or
>
> (d.) to unduly prevent or lessen competition to the production, manufacture, purchase, barter, sale, transportation or supply of any such article or commodity, or in the prices of insurance upon person or property.

These are the provisions of the Criminal Code, and they seem to me to be wide enough to prevent any conspiracy which would be injurious to the public by restraining or injuring trade or limiting or lessening manufacture or production. But we also have the common law in regard to the illegality of contracts in restraint of trade. What do we find in this case? We find that a manufacturer in the province of Quebec, who felt that he was being hurt by the splendid business ability and the success of the Empire Tobacco Company, invoked

first the Criminal Code. The court held, and held properly, that the Empire Tobacco Company were not in any way infringing upon the provisions of the Criminal Code. Then he took out a writ in the civil courts and endeavoured to show that under the common law these contracts were in restraint of trade. There he failed. The court held that both the American Tobacco Company and the Empire Tobacco Company came within the law and were doing a perfectly legal business. Having failed in the courts, he with others, got this commission started, and they failed to show the commissioner that any wrong was being committed or any injustice being done to the consumer. Sir, before we pass this legislation, which is aimed directly at the American Tobacco Company and the Empire Tobacco Company, and which will place these two companies absolutely under the control of the Minister of Inland Revenue, we should give it the fullest and most careful consideration. The Empire Tobacco Company have done a great deal for Canada. I was amused on reading the evidence of Sir Wm. Macdonald with regard to the Canadian leaf. In his evidence he pooh-poohed the idea of manufacturing from the Canadian leaf. He said that the farmers engaged in that Canadian leaf production might far better be employed in raising wheat, that for his part he used entirely the foreign leaf. But the Empire Tobacco Company, having confidence that they could get our people to raise a good quality of tobacco, went ahead with their business, and at enormous expense they have got the farmers to-day, not only in Quebec, but in Ontario, raising tobacco which is meeting with the approval of the people, as we see by the millions of pounds that are now being manufactured. And what is this gross injustice that is complained of ? The retailer can buy and sell the tobacco of any firm. In any town in Canada you will find all brands on the shelves of the retailer. The American Tobacco Company do not go to the retailer at all, but they say to the wholesaler : We have expended a large amount of money in developing our business ; if you sell our goods we will allow you a certain percentage and you can handle any goods you like; but if you want to act as our sole agents in the locality we will allow you an increased commission. In the town in which I have the honour to live, there is the firm of Snetsinger and Company (the name is no doubt familiar to our Liberal friends), and yesterdap Mr. Snetsinger said to me : My firm is agent for the Empire Tobacco Company and the American Tobacco Company. I am selling W. C. Macdonald's tobacco and Tuckett's Tobacco and a number of others.

Mr. BRODEUR. Is it not true that his contract binds him not to sell other Canadian tobacco than that of the Empire Company ? Does it not discriminate against our home product ?

Mr. PRINGLE. He sells the Canadian tobacco of the Empire Company but he sells the foreign leaf made by other companies. He has a perfect right to sell any other Canadian tobacco, if he is willing to accept two per cent commission, but if he wants to obtain six per cent commission then he can only sell the product of the Empire Company.

Mr. BRODEUR. Does the hon. gentleman argue that it is fair and just to permit these exclusive contracts and to discriminate against our domestic products.

Mr. PRINGLE. It is absolutely fair and just that this company which has expended vast capital in the development of its business, should pay a higher commission for the exclusive services of an agent. That is what they are doing and that is their own private business. That is not only done in the tobacco business but in almost every other business in Canada. You can buy no cottons manufactured by the Canadian Coloured Cotton Company, except from their regular agents in Montreal. If you go to Cornwall or to several other towns you will find only one man selling the Slater shoe, and he is their sole agent. Judge MacTavish reports that these contracts prevail in all classes of business, but he says he did not go very far into that question because he was not required to, and, if similar contracts are used in other lines of business why take the American Tobacco Company by the throat and say : I am the Minister of Inland Revenue ; you must be subservient to me ; I don't care who says your contract is legal, I don't like it ; I am the sole judge and arbiter and I will take away your license. I object to placing in the hands of any one man the absolute control over a concern which has invested thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars in this country. I am surprised that members on the Liberal benches do not protest against such a proposition. In all fairness, the tobacco company should have the right to appeal. The American Tobacco Company may get the most eminent lawyer in Canada to draw a contract in conformity with this resolution, but the Minister of Inland Revenue can say : I do not care what that counsel says ; I am the sole arbitrator and I will cancel your license unless you do just what I want you to do. It is unjust to place such power in the hands of any man. The company should have the right to appeal to the Exchequer Court against the order of the minister, or to some other tribunal, and let that tribunal decide on the facts. The objectionable clause in the contract is that which gives the wholesaler an extra commission for being the sole agent for the product of the American Tobacco Company. On that point Mr. Blain

of the firm of Eby, Blain & Co., one of the largest wholesale grocery firms in this country, declares that the contract is absolutely fair; fair to the wholesalers, fair to the tobacco company, and fair to the consumers. That firm would not handle the goods of the Empire Company unless they knew they were the best goods and the goods the public wanted. Any tobacco manufacturer in Canada can make a similar contract to this, but the trouble is that the rival manufacturers have been conducting their business in an out-of-date way, so that they are not able to compete with the energy of the American Tobacco Company, and so they come to the government asking for this paternal legislation thinking that it will help them out. It was said yesterday that this contract had the effect of creating monopoly, but the evidence does not bear that out. The Empire Company had the courage to go into the manufacture of the Canadian product, and they had many imitators, so that to-day there are a larger number of manufacturers in Canada than there were in 1897. I do not know what business they are doing, but the fact remains that they are there manufacturing Canadian goods when they would not think of manufacturing them prior to the time the Empire Tobacco Company established this trade.

Let me say one word in regard to the American Tobacco Company of the United States. It is unquestionably a large concern with an immense capital; but, Sir, I can buy tobacco in the United States to-day fifty per cent cheaper than I can in Canada; and yet it is said that that company has created a great monopoly and controls the price in the United States. That company has keen competition in the United States, which has kept the price of tobacco down, and has reduced it from year to year until to-day it is at about the lowest point it has ever reached in the history of the country. Just let us see how this monopoly has been created. I understand that the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue says it has attempted to close out all the other manufacturers. Let us see how we stand in that respect. In 1893, there were ten manufactories in Canada; in 1894, there were ten, in 1895, there were ten. These contracts came into operation in 1895, and from that time the number of manufactories of Canadian tobacco went on increasing as follows: in 1896, 11; in 1897, 12; in 1898, 14; in 1899, 16; in 1900, 23; in 1901, 26; in 1902, 26. Therefore, instead of creating monopoly, the Empire Tobacco Company, by its energy and its expenditure of money—and it has expended an enormous amount of money in advertising Canadian tobacco—has not only established a large business for itself, but has increased the number of manufactories in this country by sixteen since starting this exclusive contract system. The number of cigarette manufactories has also increased steadily, until to-day there are seven in the Dominion of Canada.

Now, Sir, I believe absolutely in the freedom of commerce. While I believe that we have the right to do all that is possible to suppress illegal combinations, that the law we now have in our Criminal Code is a wise law and that the common law in regard to contracts in restraint of trade is a sound law, yet I believe that any man who invests his money in any enterprise has a right to freedom of contract. Let me quote from Eddy on combinations, a high authority. In section 62 he says:

> Freedom to contract.—The right to contract, to do business unhampered by restrictions and oppressive interferences, is an essential part of the right to 'life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness,' said to belong to every man. Both courts and legislatures should be, and generally are, reluctant to interfere with the liberty of the individual to make contracts, even though the liberty is often exercised with consequences disastrous to the party and disadvantageous to the public. It is well settled that the individual can trade and contract freely, even to the extent of affecting or controlling the market, provided his contracts—
>
> (a) Are not tainted with fraud,
> (b) Are not against public policy,
> (c) Are not contrary to statute.

Can it be said that these contracts are tainted with fraud? Can it be said that that are against public policy? Can it be said that they are contrary to the statute? I say they are not contrary to the statute. It has been held by the highest court that they are perfectly legal and valid contracts. Let me quote section 70 of the same work:

> The final test of validity of both statute and public policy.—Finally, the test of validity of both statute and public policy is the wrong that is condemned. There must be an injury, actual or threatened, to individual or public before the transaction under investigation can be pronounced contrary to either statute or public policy. The wrong is the gist of the whole matter, and this wrong—this threatened injury to the well-being of society—must be of a very tangible character, not vague or speculative. Under English and American institutions the individual is given the largest possible liberty—liberty to waste and dissipate his own resources; to trade and bargain so as to often acquire in a single venture the entire resources of another; and even to so conduct his business as to extort large sums from the public at large,—all these things and more may be done, experience having taught the Anglo-Saxon race that those who overreach, who attempt too much, who do business contrary to morals and public sentiment, as a rule in the long run pay for their turpitude. Both the courts and the public are content to let men go their own way—short of things fraudulent, oppressive, wrongful—subject only to those immutable laws of evolution and social progress which sooner or later relentlessly suppress the wrong-doing and sustain the well-doing.

We are undoubtedly commencing to hear about trusts and combinations; but we hear

of them as things existing in the United States, not in Canada. They are of American growth, but they have not been established here to any extent, and they have done no injury in this country so far as I can see. We are asked—we are not asked, we are practically driven by two or three small manufacturers into enacting legislation against a company formed not with a very enormous capital, with a capital of some $1,000,000, and a company which until last year, as I am informed, never paid a dividend. They paid out enormous sums in educating the people to the use of this Canadian product, and now that they have commenced to pay a dividend, now that they are beginning to reap the reward of their energy and expenditure, we are driven by the other manufacturers who are unable to keep us in the race to pass legislation which will place in the hands of the Minister of Inland Revenue the sole authority to deprive these people of their licenses if he thinks that their contract is not according to the resolution which is now before the House. As to the special elements of complaint in this matter, the special inducements and the exclusive contracts I would refer you to section 191c of this work :

Parties engaged in trade have the right to push their trade by all lawful means, and to endeavour by all lawful means to keep their trade in their own hands and exclude others from participating therein. It is lawful to make profitable offers to attract customers from competitors, and they may induce customers to deal with them exclusively by giving notice that to such exclusive customers only will they give the benefit of their more favourable terms.

That is exactly what they have been doing and I say that it is perfectly lawful. It has been so held in the courts in the case of Mogul Steamship Company v. McGregor, Law Reports 21 Queen's Bench Division 552. It is an English authority and an authority which is directly in line because in that authority they held that they have an absolute right :

It is lawful to make profitable offers to attract customers from competitors and they may induce customers to deal with them exclusively by giving notice that to such exclusive customers only will they give the benefit of their more favourable terms.

That is line for line exactly as the contract is in this case. The company have followed out that decision of the English courts and forsooth because they with their energy and enterprise and money have built up a business under the law as it stood, their competitors now come in and ask this parliament to place it in the hands of the Minister of Inland Revenue to squeeze them out of that business. I can say again it is a most unfair and a most unjust proposition.

There is no violation of law or of public policy in an agreement between two traders that one shall sell to the other all its commodities and the other buy from the former corporation alone.

This is taken from that standard work, Chitty on Contracts, 11th American edition, 982-3 and notes. I may say that I am sorry to detain the House by quoting these extracts from this very valuable work, but, as I said at the start, this is a most important piece of legislation, it is opening the door for future legislation of this sort and next year we may have legislation introduced by which the Minister of Inland Revenue, or the Minister of Trade and Commerce or some other minister will be controlling every manufacturing industry in this country. That is not a position these people should be placed in ; they should not be placed in the hands of any one individual. I am quite ready to discuss the possibility of means for further regulating any of these companies, but I am not willing to have my vote recorded or to sit here and acquiesce in what I consider is most improper legislation.

Section 286 is as follows :

To render a combination unlawful because its object is to defraud, maliciously injure or oppress others, this element of unlawfulness must appear in the agreement constituting the combination. It must clearly appear that the combination was organized for the express or implied purpose of defrauding, maliciously injuring or oppressing others, the wrongful intent must be present. If the combination is organized for legitimate purpose it is legal even though it may, in the prosecution of its legitimate objects incidentally injure and even ruin others.

The only justification for this legislation is that there is an insinuation in the report of Judge MacTavish that these contracts are injuring others, and I say that that is no excuse, because the wrongful intent must be proven.

If the combination is organized for a legitimate purpose, it is legal even though it may, in the prosecution of its legitimate objects, incidentally injure and even ruin others. If it appears that injury to others was not one of the objects of the combination, but was simply an incidental result, the combination is legal. The distinction is drawn by Chief Justice Coleridge, in the Mogul SS. case, as follows—'I do not doubt the acts done by the defendant here, if done wrongfully and maliciously, or if done in furtherance of a wrongful and malicious combination, would be grounds for an action of the case at the suit of one who has suffered injury from them. The question comes at length to this : What was the character of these acts and what was the motive of the defendant in doing them ? The defendants are traders, with enormous sums of money embarked in their adventures, and naturally and allowably, desirous to reap a profit from their trade. They have a right to push their lawful trade by all lawful means. They have a right to endeavour by lawful means to keep their trade in their own hands and by the same means to exclude others from its benefits if they can. Amongst

lawful means is certainly included the inducing, by profitable offers, customers to deal with them rather than with their rivals.

Is that not all that is being done in this case, they are inducing customers to deal with them rather than with their rivals.

It follows they may, if they think fit, endeavour to induce customers to deal with them exclusively by giving notice that only to exclusive customers will they give the advantage of their profitable offers. I do not think it matters if the withdrawal of the advantages is out of all proportion to the injury inflicted on those who withdraw them by the customers, who decline to deal exclusively with them, dealing with other traders. It is a bargain which persons in the position of the defendants here had a right to make, and those who were parties to the bargain must take it or leave it as a whole. Of coercion, or bribing, I see no evidence.

That is all there is in this case. By the inducement of profitable offers they get certain wholesalers to handle their product exclusively. Those men are not bound for twenty-four hours to handle that product. The moment that they see that it is not profitable for them to handle that product they can cancel the contract. Under the terms of the contract it is reserved to both parties to cancel it at once. Therefore I say that they come entirely within the law and within the proper principles of the law.

Now we come to the complaint that in thus conducting their business they injure the other manufacturers. I submit that they have done no injury. The report does not find that any injury has been done, they certainly have done no injury which should be taken into consideration. I am going to refer again on that point to a well settled principle as expressed in section 212. It is under this head :

212. Extent of injury to others and a test of legality of a combination. It is apparent that neither the extent nor the character of the injury to others resulting from the operation of a given combination is a test of the legality of the combination. Conditions are constantly changing in the commercial and industrial world. Under normal conditions, traders and manufacturers are involved in loss and financial ruin as the result of forces over which they have no control. The establishment of departmental stores——

And I am surprised at your not bringing in some paternal legislation to restrict them in the interests of smaller merchants.

—the establishment of department stores, for instance, in large cities has altered the entire complexion of the retail trade, and small shopkeepers heretofore prosperous find themselves unable to compete with these huge establishments. Among retail dealers and owners of real estate in cities whereon are situated small shops and stores, the prejudice against departmental stores fully equals any public prejudice against trusts and combinations ; and attempts are frequently made to pass laws, the object of which is to disintegrate the departmental stores —to break up the combination of businesses which go on under one large roof. So far these attempts have proved abortive, few legislatures being willing to risk the passage of Acts which on their face are as idle and foolish as would be the passage of a law against the employment of labour-saving machinery ; and so far no court has been found willing to sustain any Act looking towards the disintegration of the departmental store. The departmental store is simply a striking illustration of the tendency of the day towards concentration and combination. What is going on in the world of retail trade is going on in the world of manufacturing and commerce and all branches of industry. It is needless to say that co-operation, organization and combination, in all forms affect more or less parties who are outside of the combination ; and exactly in proportion as the combination is profitable to all interested in it and economically beneficial to outsiders at large, to that extent it is more or less disastrous to all who are in competition with it. The extent of the injury or loss to the outsiders is no measure of the legality of the combination. If the combination is improvidently conducted, those outside of it may actually benefit thereby. On the other hand, if the combination is wisely conducted, those outside of it may find themselves deprived of trade and means of support, within a month or six months as the case may be. These effects incidental to the proper conduct of any sort of combination—whether a partnership, a corporation or a consolidation—are of interest to the student of economics, but are entirely irrelevant so far as courts or juries are concerned, except in so far as they may tend to show affirmatively that the original intent of the combination was of an unlawful or oppressive character.

Now, Sir, I say also that the tendency of the courts is to regard these combinations, which it is said have the effect of restraint of competition, with less disfavour than formerly.

The tendency of the courts is to regard contracts in partial restraint of competition with less disfavour than formerly, and the strictness of the ancient rule has been greatly modified by the modern cases, except where public franchises and quasi public corporations are concerned.

Now, Sir, we speak of trusts and combinations, but they exist in everything, and have always existed. Combinations exist not only in capital, but in labour. Labour organizations are nothing but combinations, and they are not new. We have only seen a short time ago the effect of labour organizations in the lower province. They have a perfect right to organize, just as capital has a right to organize. Labour has a right to protect its interests just as capital has a right to protect its interests. It is the application of an old principle, which I think is a very sound principle. All the trade unions of the world are nothing but combinations. We find that many of these combinations take the ground that nobody is permitted to work in certain lines unless they belong to these unions. I am simply stating this to show that these combinations apply to capital

as well as to labour. Now, as I said before, there is not only the Criminal Code, but there is the common law to guard the public interest against these combinations. They have invoked the aid of the criminal law, they have invoked the aid of the common law, and it has been held by the courts that their method of doing business is perfectly legal. Then they are driven to the extreme of coming to this House and endeavouring to get the government to pass resolutions such as we are now considering. I was much struck with the finding of the judge who tried this case in the province of Quebec. He was evidently a very able and very learned judge. I refer to Mr. Justice Dugas, who tried the case in 1896 and 1897. His judgment is exceedingly well put, and it shows exactly what is the nature of these contracts and what was the appreciation of the presiding judge in regard to them. The judge says :

> And to find whether the contract in question, signed by so many different parties is a conspiracy, a combine, an agreement or an arrangement unlawful, we have to return to the law in existence before the passing of article 520.

That is the Criminal Code.

> I have read that contract over and over again, and I must say that I fail to see anything of the kind. It is true that it may be considered a very shrewd contract, a very shrewd combination, and an attempt to give as much as possible, the greatest circulation to the cigarettes manufactured by them, but yet I cannot see that it would have been unlawful to agree with as many parties as they could find, that they would consent to sell only their cigarettes exclusively to those of others.
>
> It is true that amongst those who have signed the contract, some aver that they felt it was to their interest to do so, as otherwise their trade would have suffered, as the cigarettes manufactured by the American Tobacco Company of Canada are so much in demand by the public, that not keeping them would drive away clients. Some say that this agreement is not to their advantage, although they felt it was to their interest to sign it ; others declare that they are well satisfied with the contract. In all this, I can only find a party who, being proprietor of what may be manufactured by him, asserts his right to dispose of his property in the way he thinks best for his own interest. I cannot see there a combine against the law as for instance in cases of trusts, but only a way of dealing with their own property, in a way which may, perhaps, be detrimental to some other people in the same line of business, but at the same time I do not believe that this amounts to more than an ordinary competition.

That is the finding of Mr. Justice Dugas, and it is that he does not believe that it amounts to more than ordinary competition. Are these people to be deprived of the right of ordinary competition in this country simply because there are some friends of the government who are opposed to this company ? Then he proceeds :

> If their cigarettes are really so much in demand, it is because they have found the means to have them accepted by the public. If others are anxious to reach the same success, it is for them to make cigarettes not only as good or pleasing to the public, but better, and whether at a cheaper or higher price, this would be their own business, provided the public would be satisfied to use them, and I am putting to myself the question as to whether the public itself does not find its interest in having other manufacturers if they want to reach the same means, forced to serve it better and produce better goods. This is, as I have said before, what I believe to be only the simple competition of trade. There is no combine with other manufacturers to raise the price of goods to force them notwithstanding upon the public, to prevent which is the principal object of such laws. There is no combine to absolutely prevent others from entering into the same business at their own will, and of delivering their own goods at their own price or any other thing of the kind mentioned in the paragraphs 'a,' 'b,' 'c' and 'd' of article 520, but only a way of disposing of their own property according to their own views, and within the scope of the latitude which is given to trade in general ; for if they were not permitted to act in such a way when their action is limited to the disposing of their own goods, there would not be, perhaps, a trader who would not be exposed to a criminal prosecution, for the simple reason that always we see him trying to control as much as possible of the trade for himself, either by exaggerated advertisements, by giving goods at lower prices than others, by giving away, or offering to give away, things which do not pertain to his trade generally, &c., and all this for the only purpose of drawing to his shop clients who perhaps otherwise would have stopped at his neighbour's.

It seems to me that this is a correct appreciation of the contract. Now, I feel that I have detained the House at some length, but I was determined that I would, at any rate, go on record as against any such legislation as is proposed here. I do not believe that it is a proper policy to place the power in one man's hands of controlling the destinies of any of the great manufacturing industries of this country. There is no right of appeal. He is the sole judge, the sole arbiter. If his decision is wrong there is no redress. Surely a proper course would be, if legislation is going to be introduced to interfere with the internal management of the business of the manufacturers of this country, to give the manufacturers some rights, some redress in the event of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue deciding wrongly. But that is not even proposed. It is left absolutely and entirely in the hands of one man. I say that principle in a democratic country such as this is wrong and should not be supported, and I am surprised at hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House sitting quietly behind the government like a flock of sheep. They are told that this must go through before the end of the session, and they are not allowed to exercise their judgment——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. PRINGLE—or to express their opinion on the question.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. PRINGLE. Let me say another word. The Empire Tobacco Company have done a great deal for the Canadian producers of tobacco. The county of Essex, a few years ago, only grew a small quantity of tobacco, but owing to the efforts of this company in educating the people, and to the fact of their having taken an interest in the growth of the plant, in order to encourage these people in growing a good tobacco, they have succeeded, as Judge MacTavish has found, in growing in that section of the country a tobacco known as White Burley. That tobacco has become a success. Notwithstanding Sir William Macdonald's evidence before the commission, that the Canadian tobacco was no good, that he never attempted to manufacture it but once in the sixties, and that he abandoned that attempt, the Empire Tobacco Company have, by investing their money and by conducting experiments in the growth of Canadian tobacco, succeeded in getting a tobacco known as White Burley leaf to be grown in western Ontario and Quebec which is a first-class tobacco, and which to-day is being consumed largely by the Canadian people, and no doubt will be consumed to a large extent from this time onward. Therefore, I say that the Empire Tobacco Company have done a great deal in the interest of the tobacco business. The commission has found that they have done a great deal towards encouraging the growth of tobacco in this country; and yet, having done all that, having expended their money and their energy, having built up this business, because a few competitors are not satisfied, this government are asking us to pass this paternal legislation and place the whole power in the hands of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue to control this industry. The Empire Tobacco Company engaged in this business in perfect good faith. They engaged in it upon the knowledge of the law that was on the statute-book at the time they invested their capital. They engaged in it to such an extent that the government gave an increased protection of 10 cents a pound; and, as I say, now that they are reaping the reward of their energy and money, an effort is being made to destroy their business. I submit, Mr. Speaker, we should not proceed to the further consideration of this resolution at this time. It is very late in the session. We are supposed to prorogue to-morrow or on Monday; there is no time given for a full and careful consideration of this important measure. I am not going to take up any more of the time of the House, but I will reserve the right in committee to thoroughly discuss this measure, because I feel it should not be forced through this House in the dying days of the session. It is an improper measure; it is a measure which is a discredit to this country. If you are going to pass legislation of that sort, then let it include all the manufacturing industries of this country. Do not single out the tobacco manufacturers; include them all, although I say that general legislation of that sort would be absolutely wrong. Give the tobacco companies the right to appeal, and do not place them absolutely in the hands of one man. The principle in the resolution is wrong; it is a principle which may lead to the grossest corruption. This matter should stand over till next session, when we can have an opportunity of more fully and more carefully considering it.

Mr. E. GUSS PORTER. I do not intend to discuss the particular features of this question nor even the general principle involved. I address the House for the reason that some of my constituents who were at Ottawa a short time ago on a deputation waiting upon the government in regard to this measure have requested me to contradict the statements made in the House, that the expenses of that deputation had been paid by the tobacco company. That statement was no doubt made for the purpose of creating a prejudice against the tobacco company, and these gentlemen desire me to place them right before the House and the country. I wish to read the following letter:

Belleville, July 30, 1904.

E. Guss Porter, Esq., M.P.,
Ottawa. Can.

Dear Mr. Porter,—We understand a statement has been made to the House that the expenses of the wholesale grocers' deputation to Ottawa recently have been paid by the tobacco company.

We wish you would deny this imputation. We paid our delegate and the company have not recouped or promised to recoup us.

KENNEY WALMSLEY & CO'Y.,
Wholesale grocers.

I have also received the following telegram:

Trenton, O., July 30, 1904.

E. Guss Porter, M.P.,
Belleville, Ont.

I understand that one of the ministers made the assertion that the American Tobacco Company paid expenses to Ottawa re Tobacco Bill. They did not pay my expenses. Kindly deny charge.

B. S. HOOEY.

Mr. J. E. E. LEONARD. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to prolong the discussion on this Bill, because I am strongly in favour of the resolutions introduced by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue. If the hon. member for Cornwall and Stormont (Mr. Pringle) had been here yesterday, he would not have taken the floor to-day in order to make the speech he has just delivered. Every one of the good arguments he has brought was uttered and repeated yesterday by hon. members on this side of the House; nevertheless, we all declared our-

selves in favour of the minister's resolution. And when my hon. colleague from Cornwall and Stormont comes here and complains of the fact that these resolutions have been introduced too late to be discussed freely; when he comes and delivers himself of a one hour and a half speech, keeping us here uselessly, when the whole country, the tobacco growers, merchants and consumers are all in favour of this law being passed, he will allow me to tell him that he speaks more like a learned lawyer representing some client than like a member of this House.

I shall not detain the House any longer. Although this Bill is not perfect, as my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) said yesterday, I hope——

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the member for Cornwall-Stormont (Mr. Pringle) is charged by the member for Laval with acting as a lawyer of the trust.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pringle) is well able to protect himself. If I have called things by their name, it is because last night the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue—I am sure he was labouring under a false impression—or some of his friends have wrongly informed the hon. members who are here today, when they said that I made a motion asking that the second reading of the resolutions should be put off to a later date.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) What has been said is that the hon. member for Laval instead of giving yesterday his full assent to the measure, tried to check it when he seconded a motion offered by the whip of his party (Mr. Taylor).

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) That motion was negatived. We were asking in that motion that the word 'shall' should be substituted to the word 'may,' in order that the minister should be compelled to cancel the licenses delivered to parties who like the American trust would be inclined to monopolize the tobacco trade.

Mr. Speaker, I may say in conclusion that I hope the House will pass this Bill. Although it is not perfect, as I have already said, we are, however, willing to give it a fair trial. As my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) said yesterday, we shall always be at liberty to amend it next year if its application does not give full satisfaction.

Resolution read a second time, and agreed to.

Mr. BRODEUR moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 168) to amend the Inland Revenue Act.

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

On motion for the third reading.

Mr. BRODEUR. I wish to say a word with regard to a question which was discussed in the House yesterday as to the rebate paid on cuttings of foreign leaf exported from this country. I wish to say to my hon. friend from Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) that this matter has been engaging for some time the attention of the department. As I have only been Minister of Inland Revenue for a few months, I have not been able to consider the matter fully, but it has been engaging my consideration and I hope to be soon able to announce a matured policy on that question.

Mr. GALLIHER. Thank you.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

PURCHASE OF THE CANADA EASTERN RAILWAY.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 163) authorizing the government of Canada to purchase the Canada Eastern Railway, and to take possession of the Fredericton and Saint Mary's railway bridge.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. Mr. Speaker, before the Bill is read the second time, I wish to make my protest against the acquisition of this railway. The Minister of Railways has given no explanation which would justify such an enormous expenditure as $800,000 for the purpose of acquiring what is a perfectly useless undertaking. What are the facts? Here is a railway 136 miles in length which has been running through a section of New Brunswick for nearly twenty years. The minister describes the country through which it passes in glowing terms. The earnings of the road for freight and passengers at one time amounted to $137,000, but for the last three or four years they have been running down, and they now amount to only $116,000. I learn from the papers which have been laid on the table of the House, that this road ceased to run and was virtually abandoned as useless; and petitions from boards of trade in Fredericton and other places were sent to the government asking that some means be taken to compel the parties in possession of the road to run it. The net earnings of the road are stated to be in the neighbourhood of $2,400. And this is the road for which we are asked to pay the sum of $800,000. When the resolutions were before the House, I stated that the cost of the road was $1,700,000. The Minister of Railways contradicted my statement, saying that the expenditure for building the road was largely in excess of that sum. The report of the Deputy Minister of Railways on the road shows that my statement is perfectly correct. He states that the parties who are selling the road stated that it had cost to build about $2,100,000;

but he found that the actual cash expended upon it was about $1,700,000. He values the road at $1,200,000, but he does not regard it as a running concern at all. Any one who examines the returns made by this railway to the department will find that commercially it is an entirely useless undertaking. The party who was running it states further, what the minister ought to have stated to the House, that to put the road in running order will require an expenditure of nearly $800,000, or a net expenditure of $547,000. So that we are not only expending $800,000 to acquire the road, but are probably incurring a further expenditure of $547,000 to put it in running order; which means an expenditure by the government of nearly $1,400,000. The miniser said that the road runs through a comparatively easy section of country—that the gradients and curvatures are fairly easy. I see by the return made to the department that none of the curves are very sharp; but the only information we get with reference to the gradients is that the highest is 80 feet to the mile. That shows at once that the road is not up to the standard of modern railways. The minister said that it was true the gradients were 80 feet to the mile, but that there were very few of them. He must remember that one gradient on a road of 136 miles fixes the standard for the whole road—the strength of a chain is the strength of its weakest link. The return shows that the natural rise of the country for the 136 miles is 1,900 feet, and the fall the same. This shows at once the impossibility of getting a road of easy gradients through the country. Now, what is the object of the government acquiring this railway? The minister says that if it passes into other hands, it may divert some traffic from the Intercolonial to another railway. The whole traffic, as I have shown, is only $116,000. Is there any railway company in the country which is anxious to acquire this road? All they want is to keep the road running. The probability is that with its present earnings it could not be kept running. The minister says that the bad showing on the road for the last two or three years is accounted for by the large expenditures made on the road to bring it up to its present standard. The entire average expenditure on the road for repairs and everything else during the last four or five years has been about $40,000 a year.

It is less than what any other road in the country, which is doing any business at all, expends for the same distance for the ordinary repairs, track repairs and so forth. The road has wooden bridges which we will have to replace by iron ones. You will have to lift the whole iron on the road, according to the deputy minister's report. The rails are pretty well worn, sixty to sixty-five pounds to the yard, and will have all to be taken up and replaced. The deputy minister makes the calculation that to put the road in running order, without rolling stock at all, will cost $547,000. What possible justification can be given for this? I venture to say that there will be a loss every year we own the road of $100,000 a year for all time to come, if we keep it in proper repair. There is the transaction in all its nakedness. A road 136 miles long on which you will have to spend $600,000 to put it in running order, the gross earnings from which are $116,000 a year and the net revenue $2,400. And we are asked to spend $1,400,000 to acquire that road. It would be better, in the interests of the country, that the sum was made a present of or pitched into some bog hole on the Intercolonial, because the road will entail a loss to the people for all time to come of a large sum apart from this expenditure. Surely when a proposition of this kind is sent to the people there should be some reason given to justify it. Is there any explanation? It is not taken as a commercial undertaking. The only reason given is this. That it might pass into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that the Canadian Pacific Railway have had an option on it, and could have had it for $800,000, and that it is dangerous to allow the traffic to be diverted to that line. And there is the bridge. That bridge cost $350,000, which of course was a bad investment, and as it was made in our day, I suppose we are partially responsible. We built the bridge across the river for the purpose of getting into Fredericton, and what was the result? We have never received a cent of interest up to the present, nor are we ever likely to. What a precedent are we not setting. Every road that makes connection with the Intercolonial will be in the same position as this one. if the government adopt the policy, which is given as the reason for the purchase of this road, namely, that it is to prevent the traffic of this local line from being diverted to the Canadian Pacific Railway, we will be asked to apply that policy to every road that connects with the Intercolonial. Are you going to acquire every such road in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and own and run them as government roads? In our section of the country and every other section these matters are left to private enterprise. What I want is to enter my protest. At this late hour I believe it will have no effect in the House, but I hope it will reach the country. With all this enormous expenditure on capital account on the Intercolonial which we are passing this year, an expenditure of over $6,000,000, with an expenditure on repairs of $6,400,000, with a loss on this undertaking last year of $2,700,000, I think it is high time to call a halt. It is time that the people impressed on the

government that such heavy and useless expenditure should be put an end to. We have had enough of these expenditures. The Finance Minister may plume himself upon the maritime provinces being well looked after.

Mr. FIELDING. And the other provinces too.

Mr. HAGGART. No, the revenue of the government has not been distributed equally since 1896. During the present year we are called upon to meet a loss or deficit on the two government railways in the maritime provinces of $2,700,000. We are voting this year on capital expenditure in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island an amount of $6,400,000, taking this great Canada Eastern into account. There has been an expenditure since 1896 of nearly $27,000,000, and the expenditure to which we are pledged this year will bring this amount up to nearly $30,000,000. What becomes of the beautiful surplus the Finance Minister boasts of from year to year ? He congratulates the country on its being a growing time, congratulates the people on the fact that although we have taken a large sum of money from them in taxes we have not gone into debt, we have expended it in useful and beneficial undertakings in different sections of the country. I believe in the principle that there should be a fair distribution among the different provinces of the Dominion, except perhaps that in the newer provinces where we cannot expect that they would contribute the amount necessary for the works that are required in those particular parts, it is the duty of the older provinces to contribute, and if necessary to contribute lavishly, towards the expenditure in those sections of the country. But in the older sections of the country I believe that we ought to adopt the principle of returning expenditure to the people of the different sections of the Dominion according to the amounts they have paid in or according to their population, and it should not be the boast of any minister or any particular party that of the immense surplus which has been wrung out of the people in the shape of taxes, a large amount has been distributed in a particular portion of the country.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not make any such boast as that these moneys were distributed in a particular part of the country. I said they were distributed fairly and equitably throughout the whole Dominion. My hon. friend may or may not agree with me, but that is what I said.

Mr. HAGGART. Let me have an explanation of that. The hon. minister was talking about his section of the country being fairly looked after, and I cried, 'hear, hear.' The minister asked that it be taken down and he would make use of it, and I said 'So will I.'

Mr. FIELDING. I expect that.

Mr. HAGGART. That was the retort I made.

Mr. EMMERSON. And you are trying to do so now.

Mr. HAGGART. I noticed that the minister thought he was on dangerous ground at the time and went on to say that the money was fairly distributed. Let the minister state what section of the country other than the maritime provinces has received an expenditure to be compared with this expenditure of $26,000,000 over and above the receipts of the railroad in that section of the country ? That amount has been expended there in capital or in deficits upon the road. Following that they ask us at the present session for an appropriation of $6,400,000 more on capital account to be expended this year. Where is there a corresponding expenditure in any other section of this Dominion ?

Mr. FIELDING. The difference between my hon. friend and myself is that he seems, as I said the other day, to be lying awake at night, making up calculations as to the amount of the interest on the expenditure in the maritime provinces. I have no doubt that if hon. gentlemen from the maritime provinces desire to pursue the same narrow and miserable policy, they might make calculations as to the expenditures in other provinces, but I may say without hesitation that that is not a creditable policy for the representatives of any section of the country to pursue. The question is, is there any section in this Dominion having demands upon the treasury of Canada for fair and legitimate purposes which are not being met ? If he can show that there is any legitimate work in Ontario which has sought aid and been refused, then, to the extent of that case, he will have some ground for criticism, but if we are able to show, as we can show, that everywhere from east to west and from north to south, all claims have been fairly considered, and public moneys appropriated to meet the needs of different sections, then I think his criticism is unjust. The conditions in all portions of the Dominion are not alike. In one section of the Dominion you desire expenditures in one line, and it may be that in particular one province seems to get more than another, but in another section some other branch of public service requires a larger expenditure. It is not well to take a provincial view of matters of this kind. My hon. friend must know that vast sums have been expended and are still being expended on the canals. They are largely for the benefit of the section through which they run. But to lay stress on that would be a narrow view and although the people in the maritime provinces may never see these canals, we educate our people to the belief that these are things

for the good of Canada generally, and we are willing to bear our share of the expenditure. Is my hon. friend going to adopt the miserable and narrow policy of going into the back counties of his province and making calculations as to how many cents per head the people paid a year ago in the east, because he knows that his people may not be acquainted with that section of the country and its needs? I believe there is intelligence enough in all sections of the country, that there is intelligence enough in the great premier province of Ontario, to condemn that narrow policy and to stand for a policy that is not for the maritime provinces, not for the province of Ontario or the province of Quebec, but for each and every section, and for the Dominion as a whole.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

House went into committee on the Bill.

On section 4,

Mr. BARKER. I would like to call attention to the terms of the 4th clause. It simply enables the government to take possession of the bridge.

Mr. EMMERSON. Which the government is entitled to do at any moment now.

Mr. BARKER. Certainly, a mortgagee is always entitled to take possession of a property if the mortgagor is in default. But when you foreclose a mortgage you declare that the eqnity of redemption of the mortgagor is foreclosed. What you are doing in this section is simply to authorize the government to take possession. That does not do away with the equity of redemption of the mortgagor. I do not see anything in this statute that will prevent the bridge company hereafter if the property should appear to become valuable, to come back and seek to redeem it, and I daresay the government would be glad to allow them redemption. But the idea of this Bill is a foreclosure, and I submit that some more words are required. A mortgagee may take possession, but that obliges him to account for receipts to the mortgagor, for whom he is only the trustee. I submit that the minister ought to consider whether he cannot use proper foreclosure words in this clause, so as to wipe out the equitable title of the mortgagor.

Mr. EMMERSON. While parliament is all-powerful. I think we should recognize even the rights under the original contract. I do not think it would be fair for us arbitrarily to foreclose without a consideration, as contemplated by the original contract. My own ideas are that the mortgagees have no rights, my own ideas are that the amount of money, the principal and interest, entirely precludes them from coming in and asking any further consideration. Yet I would feel that we should do justice, and I think we are going as far as we ought to go in justice in declaring that we shall take possession. We could do it without this declaration by parliament, a declaration is not necessary. Yet I feel that we would be dealing unfairly with the parties who may have an interest. I do not think they have any, but if they have, it must be recognized. It seems to me that we are going as far as we properly should in the declaration that we are making today. Now I am very sorry my hon. friend has taken a sectional view of this matter.

Mr. BARKER. Surely I am not doing so.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am referring to the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), who certainly has taken a very sectional view. I recognize this proposition as a necessity in the interests of the Intercolonial; the Intercolonial I recognize to be a road in the interest of all Canada.

Mr. HAGGART. Well, if this discussion is to go on it will be interminable. What right has the hon. gentleman to talk on the railway when we are considering the bridge? I ask you ruling, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The question is on the bridge.

Mr. EMMERSON. The bridge is an incident of the railway. I do not propose to follow my hon. friend in his remarks with respect to the railway, but I think I can fairly claim that this bridge is a coincident of the railway. The Canada Eastern is a necessity of the Intercolonial, and the maintenance of the Intercolonial is a necessity by reason of the pact of confederation, Under these circumstances, it seems to me my hon. friend from Lanark is travelling far afield, and most unfairly, in his remarks with respect to the purchase of this road.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Chairman, I must have your ruling.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am speaking about the bridge.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman is adopting a style of argument I have heard before. I heard a gentleman once brag that he was the Governor General of Ontario. He said that he ruled his mother, his mother ruled the bishop, and the bishop ruled the Governor General. That is the style of argument the hon. gentleman is adopting. He says the bridge is connected with the railway, the railway is connected with the Intercolonial, and the Intercolonial is one of the biggest works in the Dominion of Canada; therefore, he can discuss almost any subject upon this question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I hope the committee will keep to the point in section 4, which provides for taking over the St. Mary's bridge.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will recognize my hon. friend's objection, if he feels sensitive.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not want to go over the argument again to-day.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend knows that he is wrong, and he knows that his friends will not support him. But I will not take up the time of the House in discussing the question of the bridge, he will appreciate that.

Mr. BARKER. Now that the First Minister has come in, I would again call attention to that fourth section of the Bill. I think it was understood by the House that the intention was to take this bridge property over as property of the Dominion, in fact to foreclose the property. I am pointing out that under the provisions of that 4th section the government will be simply mortgagees in possession, liable to account for rents of the bridge. Now if the government say that is what they intend, well and good, we have to allow the government to do as it pleases. But it does seem to me an extraordinary thing, the mortgagor being in default, that we should simply take possession, leaving the ownership where it is. The result is sure to be that in a few years the gentlemen who are interested in the equity of redemption will be coming to parliament and making a case for the grant of a few hundred thousand dollars, because we have been in possession of a bridge and have been making money out of it, and that money ought to belong to them, and we should account for it. The hon. gentleman has perhaps made up his mind whether he is going to take that bridge off their hands or not, and if he intends to do that, this clause is not sufficient. But if he admits that he does not intend to foreclose ; then he is simply putting the government in possession, liable to the mortgagor to account for every dollar received on the bridge and every dollar expended upon it.

Mr. GALLIHER. From the speeches of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) and of my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker), I would infer that the bridge is not part of the railway proposed to be bought but belongs to some separate corporation. Under this Bill, the bridge being necessary for the running of the railway over the river and the bridge being in the possession of the vendors of the railway, the government are placing themselves in exactly the same position as that in which the vendors of the railway are at the present time.

Mr. BARKER. The government have made advances on the bridge.

Mr. GALLIHER. I do not understand that the bridge is being sold.

Mr. BARKER. The position is this : The government have made large advances on the bridge. This is a property which is quite distinct from the railway.

Mr. GALLIHER. That is what I say.

Mr. BARKER. The government have made large advances, no money has been paid, the parties are in default, it is a hopeless undertaking, but the government, instead of foreclosing the business, are simply going to enter into possession and be liable to account for all revenue and expenditure.

Mr. GALLIHER. I was right in my understanding of the position of the matter. The vendors have running rights over the bridge and the government wish to place themselves by this Bill in the same position as that which the vendors of the railway are in.

Mr. FOWLER. How can the government place themselves in the same position as the vendors ?

Mr. GALLIHER. The vendors of the railway have the right of running over the bridge.

Mr. FOWLER. Do the government get that right from the vendors ?

Mr. GALLIHER. If the vendors of the railway hold the right of running over the bridge from the separate company and they are transferring this right to the government surely the government would get the same right as that possessed by the vendors.

Mr. BARKER. That is not what the Bill provides.

Mr. FOWLER. They are not transferring this right by the Bill.

Mr. GALLIHER. I want to understand the position clearly. If that is the case it would strike me that we should not make an absolute foreclosure of the rights of the bridge company ex parte, because this Bill is only dealing with the purchase of the railway from the railway company, including running rights over the bridge.

Mr. BARKER. That is not the Bill at all.

Mr. GALLIHER. Well, that is the position.

Mr. BARKER. That is not the Bill at all.

Mr. GALLIHER. If I understand aright that is what is intended to be acquired by the Bill.

Mr. BARKER. Read the clause and you will see it has nothing to do with the acquiring of rights.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a declaration of the rights of the government in respect to the bridge.

Mr. BARKER. As to the bridge alone, but without regard to the railway.

Mr. GALLIHER. If we get all the rights of the railway surely we get the rights which the railway had to run over this bridge.

Mr. HAGGART. They are not pretended to be transferred at all.

Mr. GALLIHER. That is a question I do not understand altogether.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Probably I had better read the clause again.

Mr. GALLIHER. Well, I would like to be clear upon that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The clause is as follows :—

4. The Governor in Council, by his officers or agents, may, on behalf of His Majesty, enter and take possession of the property of the Saint Mary's Railway Bridge Company, and exercise all the rights, franchises, easements and privileges of the said company, and may operate the said property, or any portions thereof, as part of the government railways system.

Mr. GALLIHER. It is a part of the Bill, but it is really separate from the rights the government are getting from the railway company. But, at all events I presume that the position of the government in promoting this Bill is that they are taking the stand that it would be unfair to say absolutely to the bridge company : You are in default and we will foreclose at once. If I understand my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals aright he does not want to foreclose on this Bill absolutely at the present time the equity of redemption or rights the mortgagors may have in the bridge.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to have some information from the hon. minister. Is there a contract between the government and the St. Mary's Railway Bridge Company in respect to this bridge, or has there been any understanding between the St. Mary's Railway bridge Company and the government in respect to this bridge ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There has been none whatever. We are simply, by this Bill, declaring our rights. I think it would be very unfair for us to foreclose any rights they may have. I do not, as respecting the Department of Railways and Canals, recognize and I do not for a moment imagine that these people have any rights. I think that the amount of principal and interest against that bridge entirely precludes the St. Mary's Railway Bridge Company from making any claim and yet with the sense of justice which possesses me constrains me to come to the conclusion that it would be very unfair for us to entirely shut them out from any rights which they have under their original contract. That is all I have in view in respect to this Bill. It seems to me that we have the right under the original contract to take possession of the bridge and we are not going any farther really than in the declaration contained in this clause of the Bill. If we had attempted to go farther it would seem to me to be fair that notice should be given to the parties interested who have no rights in my judgment beyond the rights which are given to them by the original contract, and I claim that their rights are stopped by reason of what has occurred in the years which have elapsed and by reason of the condition which prevails at the present time.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. minister not see that this is the position in reference to the matter ? He is taking over a property on which the government have a mortgage. The moment he takes over the property all interest payable to the government ceases. The government may have the user of the property and may exercise it for the fifty years. At the expiration of that time those having an equity in the property could come to the government with such original amount as they owed and the interest accrued up to date and take over the property at any time ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The original contract contemplates notice.

Mr. BARKER. Why not give that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We will naturally follow out the terms of the original contract, and give them notice and entirely foreclose, but it would be manifestly unfair for us by a stroke of the pen at this moment to preclude them from their undoubted privilege to have that notice.

Mr. BARKER. I would suggest then to the hon. gentleman that he should add to this clause a provision to the effect that unless the bridge company within twelve months pay what is due to His Majesty their rights to pay the mortgage should be foreclosed. The objection to the clause as it stands now is this : You are going to get into possession of the property as mortgagees and for years to come you are liable to these people to accunt for all you have been receiving and expending upon it. Whether there is the one or the other party in power at the time, these people may come four or five years hence to the government with a pitiful story asking for a large sum of money.

Mr. EMMERSON. What does the hon. gentleman suggest ?

Mr. BARKER. I would suggest this : Unless the Bridge Company within twelve months from the passing of this Act shall pay to His Majesty the money due, all the mortgage rights and equities of the company shall stand foreclosed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will take this question into consideration, and in the meantime let the committee rise.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am perfectly willing to accept the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Barker). It is in accordance with my own view and we might just as well dispose of the matter now. The suggestion of the hon. gentleman is worthy of acceptance, and I will draft an amendment to that effect.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not know that that is quite fair to the bridge company. I think we should proceed in the ordinary way by formal proceedings for foreclosure. Why treat this differently from any other business transaction?

Mr. EMMERSON. I suppose you are now pleading on behalf of the profession.

Mr. FOWLER. I am pleading on behalf of the law as it exists.

Mr. EMMERSON. I beg to move to offer an amendment which I think will meet the views of the committee :

And unless the bridge company shall pay the amount of principal and interest due to His Majesty on the mortgage of the bridge company within one year of the date of the passage of this Act, the rights of the said company shall be entirely precluded and forclosed.

Mr. FOWLER. You practically declare by Act of parliament that this property is foreclosed.

Mr. EMMERSON. They have a year.

Mr. FOWLER. But you have no proceedings to take. That is a peculiar way of doing business.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a much more favourable provision than the court would recognize under the terms of the original mortgage, and I do not think it can be claimed that the company is in any way placed in a false position with respect to the matter.

Mr. FOWLER. That may or may not be, but you are shutting these people out from having a chance to be heard. This may be all right in this case, but it is a very dangerous precedent to establish.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) had more confidence in us he would leave us to the ordinary recourse of the law under which we may give notice or not, but he binds us to give twelve months notice.

Mr. FOWLER. You ought to take the legal means to foreclose this mortgage.

Mr. ALCORN. If the owners of the bridge have any legal rights we cannot take them away by a declaration in an Act of parliament, because the Act of parliament would be ineffective as against their contractual rights and at the end of twelve months you are no better off than now. I believe you would still have to go on and take the regular legal proceedings by foreclosure.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported.

On motion for the third reading,

Mr. G. W. FOWLER. Before the Bill is read the third time, I would like to ask what is the policy of the government with respect to branch roads which are feeders of the Intercolonial Railway. I wish this information because, as a representative of the province of New Brunswick, I am very much interested in this matter. There are a number of branch roads in New Brunswick which it seems to me have just as strong claims to be taken over by the government as this railway ; notably the Salisbury and Harvey Railway, which runs from Salisbury in the county of Westmoreland to Harvey in the county of Albert ; the Albert Southern Railway, which runs along the south shore of the county of Albert ; the Hampton and St. Martins Railway ; the Central Railway ; the Havelock and Petitcodiac Railway ; the Kent Northern Railway ; the Caraquet Railway. All these are feeders of the Intercolonial. I have not anything to say against the plan which the government has adopted of taking over the Canada Eastern. For my part, I think it is the proper policy for all trunk lines to own the branch lines or feeders which run into them, because these can be operated much more cheaply as parts of one system than they can under separate owners. It is not necessary to have on them the same extensive equipment as on the trunk lines, and as the cheaper equipment on the trunk lines is discarded it can be utilized on the branches; and their ownership entails very little increase in cost of office management. I would like to know what the policy of the government is with respect to these other lines, whether applications have been made by their owners to have them taken over by the government, or whether any negotiations on the subject have taken place.

Mr. SEYMOUR GOURLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to concur in the policy propounded by my learned friend from King's (Mr. Fowler) and to emphasize what he says. We want the government of Canada to adopt it as a policy.

Mr. EMMERSON. Settle that matter with your friend at your right (Mr. Haggart).

Mr. GOURLEY. My friends are all right. I want to say that it is the unanimous wish of the people of Nova Scotia, irrespective of politics, that the Intercolonial Railway should become a great system of railways, and to that end should absorb all the auxiliary railways along its route. We can never hope to make the Intercolonial Railway pay until it adopts the policy which other great railways have adopted. I venture to say that if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had confined itself to the thin line of railway extending from Montreal to British Columbia without bringing in branches from the great paying territories beyond it, it would not be a paying institution to-day. The same remark applies to the Grand Trunk. It has been by bringing to their main lines the trade of the country around them for two or three hundred miles, that these railways have become paying systems and vital to the development of the country. How could you expect the Intercolonial Railway to pay, starting from Montreal, skirting the St. Lawrence, and at the time it was built running for 400 miles through an absolutely new and unopened country which was practically a wilderness, with a little population in the maritime provinces at one end and a little population in Quebec at another? However, it had to be built; confederation was impossible witnout it; and we had to work out the problem of making it pay. I care not what it costs—I care not if it costs ten millions a year—it is the duty of this government to carry out the compact of confederation and make that line what it was intended to be, the unifying element of scattered provinces. Some people believe that the Intercolonial can never be made to pay. It will never become a paying system until the policy stated by my hon. friend from King's, of taking over the different lines of railway in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and making them part of the system, is adopted. When that policy is adopted, the Intercolonial will pay. To-day we have the railway running through Annapolis valley, the Windsor branch and the Cape Breton branch in Nova Scotia, paying splendidly. If these paying railways were united to the Intercolonial system, they would help to bridge over the 300 or 400 miles of the Intercolonial which are not paying. I want the Intercolonial to be a great paying railway; and recollect, that railway is infinitely more advantageous to the people of Ontario than it is to the people of the maritime provinces. Out of every dollar of expenditure made on the Intercolonial Railway seventy-five cents inures to the advantage of the province of Ontario. But I do not complain of that. I want to help the people of Ontario; therefore you will never hear me complain of an expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway, although I know that 75 cents out of every dollar I vote goes into the pockets of the people of Ontario.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a remarkable resemblance between you.

Mr. GOURLEY. At a public meeting held in my county before I came here, I was asked to urge on the government the policy of absorbing all the branch railways into the Intercolonial Railway system. You never can have a powerful railway system with a single line of railway. You people in Ontario have the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific systems squabbling every day to build branches for you. Whenever a new section is opening up, you find these two great systems contesting for the privilege of building branch railways through it. What is the case in Nova Scotia to-day? I want 150 miles of branch railways built in the county which I represent. If these were built, coal mines, gold mines and iron mines would be opened up in every section; but, as it is, a gold mine or an iron mine is only a heap of sand if it is twenty or thirty miles away from a railway. Therefore I want the government to adopt the policy of absorbing into the Intercolonial Railway every branch railway, and then to build more branches, and build them rapidly, through every part of the maritime provinces. That is the enlightened policy that should be pursued in this year 1904. The time is past for little politics in Canada. I want to help this government to develop this country for the short time that they are going to be in power. I want to help them, as much as I would any government more in line with my sympathies, in carrying out this policy, because we cannot wait for new governments to come in, in order to have the correct policy adopted. We must have the present government pursuing the proper policy. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I concurred in the purchase of this railway. My only difficulty was with regard to the price. I hope the price is honest. That is my only difficulty. If the price is honest, the policy is right.

Mr. WILLIAM ROSS (Victoria). I congratulate my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Gourley) on his broad views and I hope he will make an impression on the representatives from Ontario on both sides of the House. There is just a word I would like to say in favour of the Intercolonial. In former days we heard it frequently said that during three months in the year it would be impossible for that railway to be run. Well, there was not a day last winter, with all its severity, on which a train did not go from Montreal to Sydney, Cape Breton. True, it was some hours late at times, but when the other railways in Canada were tied up, we had continuous trains from

Montreal all the way to Halifax and thence to Cape Breton all winter.

Bill read the third time and passed.

THE ALIEN LABOUR ACT.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General) moved second reading of Bill (No. 162) to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting Alien Labour. He said: Whilst the Bill appears to cover a number of subjects, there are but three salient points in it, and to those three I would ask leave to draw the attention of the House. The first point is the clause which seeks to reach the case of false representations, by means of which persons are attracted to Canada under the pretence that there are opportunities here which in fact do not exist. We had this spring an illustration of the wrong we are now seeking to prevent. About the month of April last the press announced that there were large numbers of Italians in Montreal, who had just arrived in search for employment, and that employment was not to be found. We were told that they were in a state of distress, that they were creating embarrassment to the local authorities, and that these gatherings of large bodies of unemployed foreigners were often disquieting to the citizens . Whatever may be the remoter consequences, no one can defend such a practice as was illustrated in Montreal, and I submit that it is our duty to prevent our country being made the base of operations for the purpose of promoting such frauds. An investigation conducted under oath showed a deliberate plan on the part of evil-disposed persons in Montreal to attract these aliens to our shores by leading them to believe that they would at once obtain satisfactory employment. When these people reached here they were disappointed. They also had been induced to contribute money to the agencies which had directed them here, under the representation that they would get at once good employment on registering at these agencies. This was but a further continuation of the frauds conceived in the original plan of sending forth from Canada to foreign countries these false representations as to the state of the labour market. That illustration is in itself sufficient to show the necessity for this legislation.

Mr. HAGGART. Would not the law reach that class now ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No. Quite apart from the wrong done the individuals themselves, there are further injuries. For instance, it is not to the credit of Canada that a number of persons should be induced to come here under the belief that they are going to immediately obtain profitable employment and then be disappointed. Transactions of that character are such as we ought to stop. Therefore that feature of the Bill is one of its important provisions. The second is section 8 which regards the railways aided by public moneys. It provides that they are to be constructed as far as circumstances will admit by the class of people mentioned in this Bill, namely, British subjects, Canadians resident and residents in Canada and bona fide immigrants to Canada, and failing those, then by such others as the government may from time to time admit. It also provides that the contractors shall be British subjects, and if the contractors are corporations, then the majority of the directors and the capital shall be British. Apart altogether from whatever intrinsic merit there is in that proposition, it would not be out of place for me to remind the House that across the line there is legislation of a much more restrictive character. I am aware that the alien labour laws of the United States are not viewed with favour generally, but we did not begin it. We began at a very long date after the original Labour Act of United States. The United States Congress itself has legislated on this subject, and so have various states of the union, chiefly the northern border states touching upon Canada. For instance, the laws of New Jersey prevent any person from performing any work in connection with any state, county, city, town, township or other municipal corporation, who is not a resident.

Under the law of the state of Illinois :—

> It shall be unlawful for any board or commission, or any officer or other person acting for the state, or for any county, township, city, village, district, or other municipality in the state, or any contractor or sub-contractor, under any or either of said municipalities, to employ any person or persons, other than native born or naturalized citizens, or those who have in good faith declared their intentions to become citizens of the United States, when such employees are to be paid, in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, out of any funds raised by taxation.

If we see a man coming to Canada with his wife and family to settle we know he is coming as a bona fide immigrant ; but when we find 1,000 navvies whose homes are still in their own country, who come without any household goods or effects, who come just for the moment to earn and go away, we may be able to distinguish, I think, between that class of person and the bona fide immigrants who have come here across the seas with their families, with the bona fide intention of becoming citizens of Canada. In connection with public works of magnitude such as the Grand Trunk Pacific it seems particularly incumbent upon us to see that those who are responsible for the work, commencing at the top, and extending through all the different classes of workmen, should be under such control as is contemplated by this section. I believe it is conceded that those portions of the Cana-

dian railways which were built under the supervision of Canadian engineers were, as a rule, better built than those portions which were built by aliens who are not familiar with our topography or our requirements. In another respect I think it is due and essential to the people of Canada and in the interest of these undertakings, that the engineers who have the control of such vast millions of money as will be spent in the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific and I trust in connection with other public works which this country may authorize from time to time, should be in touch with public opinion in Canada. The engineers can to some extent make an enterprise cost much or little. I cannot conceive that as a rule an engineer coming from abroad can be as familiar with our views of the obligations on the part of engineers and with our expectations and requirements in respect of integrity and fidelity on their part as can those engineers who are of our own country and who have been brought up in our own atmosphere.

Then with regard to contractors. It is proposed in this measure that the contractors shall be British subjects as well, and that if the contractors are a corporation we shall, so far as possible, control the constitution of such a corporation. It might be argued that it would be sufficient to say that the boards of directors or a majority of them should be British subjects, but if the real contractors at the back are not British subjects, not people interested in our own country, they can easily arrange to have dummy directors to quality under such a provision as that while in reality the contractors would still be aliens. In the construction of an enormous work like this, if the contractors are not in sympathy with our own country and our own people we think that these contractors will be inclined, especially should they be contractors from the other side of the line, to favour their own country in the purchase of supplies, in the employment of labour if possible and in every way to consider the interests of their own country as distinct from ours. I maintain that in the expenditure of this money on the Grand Trunk Pacific as far as we can control the destination of this money in the way of payment of supplies or for labour, it is our duty in so far as the circumstances will admit, to see that the expenditures remain in Canada to the extent of being paid to Canadian residents, that people in our own country should add to their resources and in that way aid in the enrichment of our own country. But if the contractors are citizens of a foreign land, if they should make money they will in all probability withdraw from this country when they have finished their work and will take away whatever profits they have earned, and while they are connected with the work they will be inclined to turn whatever custom and trade they can into the land of their own birth. Therefore to get the fullest advantage out of this enterprise, I think we are bound also to have regard to the nationality of the contractors, and to control the class of employees who build the work.

I would also submit this thought. The Grand Trunk Pacific will not only be a scheme for transportation but during the period of construction it might do a great work in the direction of immigration itself. If the men who are to be engaged in the construction of this work are birds of passage, men who come here but for a moment to work, to earn and to leave, there remains nothing of their labours when they are gone except the constructed work ; but if we can induce to come to Canada as workmen in the first place to take part in the construction of this road, persons who will make good settlers, people who are likely to settle in our country, this enterprise as the work proceeds will have the effect of peopling the districts that are now devoid of settlement altogether. The machinery contemplated by this section is that whenever the government is satisfied that Canada does not supply sufficient labour to perform this work it can itself permit the importation of other labourers from other portions of the world. In that way they can discriminate. They can issue an order, for example, in favour of people from one country as against people from another country, and we know very well that in old Europe to-day and in other portions of the world there are people some of whom would be desirable settlers while the people in other sections would not be desirable settlers. A wise discretion on the part of the government in attracting workmen from countries that supply people who would become desirable settlers might, I think, be made a very important feature in the way of settling the districts to be traversed by this road. The last feature in the Bill to which I draw special attention is the exclusion of undesirable immigrants. This has nothing whatever to do with the question of alien labour but has to do simply with the endeavour to secure as good a population as circumstances will permit. There are at present upon the statute-books of Canada some rather crude and primitive laws, having for their object the exclusion of undesirable citizens, but these laws are quite inoperative and they do not at all touch the point. For example the Immigration Act found in R. S. C., chap. 65, while it appears to prohibit paupers and persons not otherwise suitable such as persons of unsound mind, who are blind, &c., does not prohibit their coming to Canada but only seems to deal with the subject by way of penalty. It provides for example, in one class of cases, that a ship importing an undesirable class of immigrants may be liable to a small pecuniary fine, but there is nothing to prevent a person who lands from becoming a citizen of Canada. As an aid

therefore to the immigration laws, section 10 is proposed, which provides that certain undesirable classes should be prohibited absolutely from becoming citizens of Canada. They are enumerated in that section, I need not refer to them now.

I think no one will deny for a moment that this evil of bringing in an undesirable population to Canada is not dealt with by merely imposing a pecuniary fine upon those who bring them here. The United States has for many years been allowing the surplus population of all the races of the earth to flock into that country, and now they are beginning to discover that they have been altogether lax in their immigration laws. Desirable as it is to add to the population of our country, I think it is most important also that the class of people that come here should be a desirable class. We are now laying the national foundation, and if we are to act wisely in the selection of the foundation stocks that are to build up the peoples who are to inhabit a united Canada, now is the time for us to act. We cannot do that unless we exercise some discretion in regard to the classes of people who are to become the forefathers of the future nation. Therefore, in discussing this section, hon. gentlemen will observe it has nothing to do in itself with the question of alien labour, but strictly belongs to the question of immigration. However, the Minister of the Interior having charge of immigration and the Department of Labour having charge of the subject of alien labour, and having also to do with deportations, it was deemed advisable that one department alone should be concerned in the subject of deportation, and my colleague the Minister of the Interior thought it more properly belonged to the Department of Labour to take complete charge of the subject of deportation; accordingly these clauses are found in the Alien Bill now before the House. In addition to this special feature of the Bill, there are some other features of a minor character, but to them I attach comparatively little importance.

The first clause in the Bill of any consequence is a re-enactment of almost the whole of the first section of the original Alien Labour Act of 1897. That clause is a copy of a clause in the Act of the United States. After the United States Congress had enacted it, they subsequently amended it, and the amendment proposed in this section follows in substance the amended section of the United States Act. The original United States Act provided that it should be illegal to import aliens under a contract, expressed or implied. Subsequently, and after our Act was passed, they amended their Act extending the illegality to cases of importation under promise or offer, as well as under contract. I attach very little importance to the amendment in the law of the United States; in fact, it seems to me an almost useless amendment, because the original Act makes a contract, expressed or implied, final; and it would seem, therefore, that it was comprehensive enough to embrace the class of cases covered by the amending Act of the United States, namely, persons brought in under promise and understanding. I therefore attach no importance to this proposed section, which, however, if it stood unexplained, might appear to suggest something radically new. It does not make any new suggestion, except in the direction I have indicated.

The next subsections of this section are what may be called remedial legislation. They are clauses providing that under certain conditions persons desiring to import labour which they would otherwise be prohibited from importing, may, through the machinery here suggested, obtain an order exempting them from the provisions of the law. Now, the reasoning that induced me to propose these clauses was as follows: There is at present on the statute-book a stringent Alien Labour Act, of which section 1 makes it illegal to import labour. There may be instances when Canada cannot supply the labour required, and if that is the case, either the work which it is desired to do must remain undone, or those who seek to do that work will be obliged, illegally and surreptitiously, to bring into Canada the class of prohibited labour which they desire. It is not expedient that a law should be on the statute-book that will prevent useful work being carried on without, at the same time, providing machinery for the importation of the necessary labour if our own country does not supply it. In order to remove all inducement to persons to violate the law, it seemed to me wiser to provide machinery whereby they might do, in a straightforward manly way, under the sanction of the law, that which they would otherwise have to do in a clandestine way. Therefore, I desired to provide some machinery to meet such a case as that, namely, the importation of prohibited labour when it is not forthcoming in our own country, or from countries from which it is lawful to import it. These sections, therefore, instead of being intended to add to the stringency of the law are relaxations of the law.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the present case furnishes an illustration of how, occasionally, the very best intentions are misunderstood. I suppose it has been the good fortune of all hon. gentlemen present, within the last few days, to receive a great many communications, by telegram, letter and otherwise, from persons throughout Canada expressing their alarm at the radical and far-reaching character of this proposed legislation. I am aware that an organized effort has been made to create an intense feeling throughout the country against this measure. Some people, without seeing the Bill, without knowing its provisions, accepted the conclusions of others who were equally misinformed, who may have read it, but have not fully comprehended it; and they have assumed that this Bill is very

hostile to Canadian industries. It has been pointed out to me that one of the most objectionable features in it consists of these remedial clauses, these clauses which open the door, in proper cases, to the importation of what would otherwise be prohibited labour. I have had an opportunity, within the last day or two, of interchanging opinions with a great many people upon this question, and I have been surprised at the lack of correct information possessed by them as to the real scope and object of this measure.

Mr. CLARKE. Possessed by whom ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I did not give the names. I said I had the honour within the last one or two days, or within a few days, of having been interviewed by very many prominent and worthy citizens who have expressed their views in regard to this measure and in the course of these interviews I was surprised to meet with such inaccurate ideas as to the intent, object and scope of this measure. I have this to say that of all the men who have come to me opposing this measure on the ground that it involved the introduction into this country of very drastic laws, every one of them has changed his mind on understanding it. I may add perhaps in explanation of it, that when some features of it were pointed out to me as being capable of improvement, for example when it was pointed out that the machinery I was endeavouring to devise was not in all cases sufficient to carry out the objects of the Bill, I have expressed my willingness to make that machinery more elastic in order to meet some special cases. In the event of there being an absolute void in the labour market, it is not intended that we should play the dog in the manger by preventing work from going on in Canada if there is nobody in Canada to perform that work. For my part I attach no importance whatever to section 1. The other provisions were introduced with the worthy object I have mentioned and I regret to say that they do not appear yet to have received that hearty approval from those who are to benefit from them which I would have hoped, and which I think I had the right to expect. There is another section which may seem perhaps more material than the others ; that is section 7 which purposes to repeal section 9 of the original Act of 1897. That section it is not proposed to pass. I propose, with the permission of the committee, when we are in committee, to abandon section 7. There is only one other section which I think I need dwell upon and that is section 3. Section 3 purports to amend section 1 of the statutes of 1901. That section provided that it should be illegal for a person knowingly to import under contract. A short time ago a contractor from Port Huron in the state of Michigan, just across the river from Sarnia, came into Sarnia to perform a contract. He brought his own labourers from Port Huron to perform that work.

Mr. J. D. REID. A railway contract?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No, it was not a railway contract ; it was a municipal contract.

Mr. J. D. REID. Not a government contract ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No, a municipal contract. He brought in people from his own town. The workmen in Sarnia felt that they were being unfairly treated and steps were taken to impose the penalties of the Act. The case was brought before, I think, a stipendiary magistrate and the defendant went into the witness box and swore that he did not know these men were citizens of the United States. They were his neighbours in Port Huron and he was himself a citizen of the United States. The profound judge on that occasion held that as the defendant swore he did not know they were aliens he was not guilty of any offence and he dismissed the proceedings. It is proposed to add after the word 'knowing' the words 'or having reasonable ground for believing,' so that it shall be a violation to import knowing or having any reasonable ground for believing that the persons imported are aliens. It is not an amendment to which I attach much importance and I cannot see that it is a very serious one because I doubt if many judges in the land would have given such a decision as was given in the case in question. Most judges would have been prepared to have taken the view that 'knowing' meant having good reason for knowing irrespective of what the man confessed to knowing himself. In this country we have many classes of men administering the law, some learned and some not so learned, and it may be wise to make the law a little plainer for the benefit of the latter class. I beg to move that Bill (No. 162) to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting alien labour be now read the second time.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into committee on the Bill.

On section 1,

Section 1 of the said Act, chapter 11 of the statutes of 1897, is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor :—

1. It shall be unlawful for any person, partnership, company or corporation in any way to assist or encourage the importation or immigration of any alien into Canada, to perform labour or service of any kind in Canada, whether by way of prepayment of or towards his transportation, or by way of promise or offer of employment or by way of contract or agreement, parole, or special, express or implied, for his employment, made or entered into previous to such importation or immigration, and the entry into Canada of any alien

whose importation or immigration has been so assisted or encouraged is hereby prohibited.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me that this is restricting the thing very much. This is going to interfere with the work of your immigration agents abroad. The immigration agent would naturally, in advocating the advantages of this country, set out the fact that men can get employment here at different classes of labour. I do not see how else he is going to set out the advantages of Canada if he does not set out that there is lots of labour for all classes. He is not going to confine himself entirely to agricultural immigrants, and it seems to me that when you say here: 'by way of contract or agreement, parole or special, express or implied' it may be considered to be an implied agreement that the immigrant will get employment in Canada.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. This is not a new provision in the law.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to restrict the thing very much and will interfere with the work of your Immigration Department.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Section 1 of the Act of 1897 reads as follows:

From and after the passage of this Act it shall be unlawful for any person, company, partnership or corporation, in any manner to prepay the transportation, or in any way assist or encourage the importation or immigration of any alien or foreigner into Canada, under contract or agreement, parole or special, express or implied, made previous to the importation or immigration of such alien or foreigner, to service of any kind in Canada.

That is the law to-day and the amendment simply incorporates the words of the United States Act, 'promise,' or 'offer, in addition to the word 'contract.'

Mr. SPROULE. It is to my knowledge that farmers very often send home for labourers and furnish money to pay their way out.

Mr. GALLIHER. It only applies to aliens.

Mr. SPROULE. How would it effect the Germans?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It only applies to such countries as have a similar law against us.

Mr. BOYD. How will this effect the Icelanders and other nationalities who are settled in large numbers in the west? Just as soon as some of these people can raise the money they send home for their friends and give them a promise of labour; will they be prevented from doing that in the future? What excuse does the minister give for introducing such an important measure as this in the dying hours of the session when it is impossible for us to give it that consideration that we should?

Mr. DAVIS. I fancy this law does not apply to Scandinavians or Germans.

Mr. SPROULE. Let the minister tell us to what countries it would apply?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not think there are any countries in the world that have an alien labour law except the United States and Canada. We are either the most advanced or most retrograde of countries.

Mr. SPROULE. Then it would only apply to the United States.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is all.

Mr. SPROULE. And it would have no bearing on the iron founders brought to Toronto under contract from Scotland?

Mr. DAVIS. They are not foreigners.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister dilated for an hour on the importance of preventing those hordes of Italians coming into Canada and now we find that his law does not apply to them.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is altogether another point and is dealt with by another clause of the Bill.

Mr. J. D. REID. Would it apply to an advertisement in an Italian newspaper?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We cannot pass a law here making a penal offence of what is done in a foreign country.

Mr. TAYLOR. Some years ago I introduced an alien labour law word for word, and letter for letter with the United States law. The government did not allow it to pass but the Prime Minister pledged himself that he would pass an alien labour law similar to the American law. It is high time for him to redeem that promise. The only thing this government has done in the shape of a alien labour law is to introduce something to humbug the people, and this Bill is nothing else but a further attempt to humbug. Under it the Italians can come in just as they did in the past. When I introduced a Bill similar to the American law the government got one of their friends to introduce another Bill and they referred it to a committee of a majority of their friends who mutilated it so that it has never been enforced since and is of no use whatever. Only this morning I received the following letter from my county:

Lyn, August 4, 1904.

Dear Sir,—I am taking the liberty of drawing your attention to a violation of our alien labour laws. John Walker, of Fredericksburg, Virginia, has been brought to Canada by the Grand Trunk Railway, and is being fitted for a position as agent on their line. He is now at Mallorytown, and he is one of several telegraph operators brought at the same time and from the same source. I am certain as to my information.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Why doesn't the hon. gentleman make some use of that information ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am giving my hon. friend the information now. I wrote to the party saying that the Alien Labour Bill was coming before the House to-day, and that I would bring this matter to the hon. gentleman's attention. I will send him the letter, and let him deport these gentlemen.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I may inform the hon. gentleman that he is the one chargeable with the proceedings. The law does not enable the government to institute proceedings. My hon. friend received a complaint from a constituent of his, he put it away in his desk, pigeon-holed it, and now he would neglect his duty and call on some one else to do the work he should do himself. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman do his own work.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman ought to be fair and honest, but that is something he cannot be. He resorts to the lowest kind of parish politics. He says I received this letter this morning, pigeon-holed it, and put it away in my desk. I had it in my pocket and took it out of my pocket; and now the hon. gentleman says I am the party to institute proceedings. The American law would permit the party who wrote that letter to make the complaint ; but this government have made their law so that it cannot be enforced. There is no machinery to put it in force ; and that will be the case if this humbug and fraud which the hon. gentleman is putting on the statute-book to-day is carried through on the pretense of preventing the importation of Italians into Montreal. I bring this matter to the attention of the Minister of Labour in the interest of the labouring men of this country, and I ask him to act on this letter and have these men deported from the country.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. What is the hon. gentleman going to do about it ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I have nothing to do with it ; I wash my hands of it. I ask the Minister of Labour and the Prime Minister to redeem the pledge they gave to this country that they would put on the statute-book an alien labour law word for word, line for line, the same as the American law.

Mr. COWAN. Will you tell us about the efforts you made to put on the statute-book an alien labour law ?

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman stole my Bill at the request of the government, and introduced a Bill with his name to it, which was a copy of the one I had introduced for years.

Mr. DAVIS. How many years ?

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Essex stole the Bill which I had introduced for two or three years, and introduced it in his own name ; and what did he do with it ? He allowed it to go to a committee of his friends, who so mutilated it that it has been practically a dead letter ever since. It is no good in the interest of labour ; and I would ask the Minister of Labour and the Prime Minister to redeem the pledge they gave to put on the statute-book a law the same as the American law, so that this man or any one else could go to a justice of the peace and have the law put in operation. You cannot do it to-day.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Why ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Because there is nothing in the law to enable you to do it. You have to move the Minister of Justice or the Solicitor General. Here is a statement in yesterday's paper, that it has been proved before the government commission that there is a man working in Sault Ste. Marie in violation of the Alien Labour Law, and he defies the government or any one else to deport him. He has the government at his back, and they are doing what they have done ever since they came into power, defrauding the labouring men by pretending that they are doing something in their interest. This Bill is so surrounded by machinery that no man or body of men can put it in operation without the will of the government.

Mr. COWAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to take up the attention of the House for any length of time, more than is necessary to refer to the remark of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) that I had stolen this Bill. Perhaps some explanation might be advisable in view of the fact that a good many members of this House are not quite familiar with the history of the hon. member for Leeds' connection with alien labour legislation. For seven straight years, one consecutively after the other, the hon. member for Leeds introduced into this House a Bill respecting alien labour ; and for seven straight years he swallowed his principles and dropped the Bill without forcing it to a division. In addition to that, the hon. member for Leeds once got a committee appointed to take evidence. Evidence was taken at very great expense to the people of Canada. Hundreds of dollars were expended to bring witnesses from one end of the Dominion to the other. Finally a report was made against the Bill, and his own leader, the late Sir John Thompson, dropped the Bill ; and the hon. member for Leeds, as usual, swallowed his principles, and voted against the measure which he had introduced into the House. The hon. gentleman said I stole his Bill. In 1897 I was waited upon by several labour organizations, who pointed out the course

which the hon. member for Leeds had taken in regard to alien labour, and asked now that this government was in power, that some person introduce an alien labour law in order to offset the alien labour law of the United States, and to place Canadian citizens in a position that if the American republic saw fit to deport citizens of Canada from the United States, citizens of the United States might be deported from Canada. I therefore introduced a Bill—not the hon. gentleman's Bill, but an exact copy of the alien labour law of the United States, which I copied from the statutes of the United States, exactly as the hon. member for Leeds copied his Bill, word for word, verbatim. But, realizing, as I stated at the time, that a population of 5,000,000 could get more employment among a people of 70,000,000 alongside of them than 70,000,000 could get among 5,000,000, I did not want to enforce the alien labour law against the United States unless they first enforced their law against Canada. Therefore, after a fight not only in this House, but before a subcommittee, in which I was not supported by some gentlemen who sat on both sides of the House, we conceded the point rather than have nothing, that the law could not be put into operation without the consent of the Department of Justice. What was the effect of that law? Living in a border city and representing a constituency three sides of which are on the international boundary line, where citizens of the county of Essex who were constituents of mine had been turned back, not by ones or twos, but by the dozen, where their mail had been ransacked and their private correspondence gone through to see whether or not they were going to have employment in the United States, from the moment that law went upon the statute-books, there have not been five single individuals turned back to the city of Windsor. I want to go a step further and tell the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) that if he will read the reports of the United States and Canada, he will find that under the Alien Labour law introduced by me and subsequently amended by the Minister of Justice there have been two Americans deported out of Canada to the United States for every Canadian deported from the United States back to Canada. If he knew quite as much about the legislation of this House as he pretends and ought to know, he would know that in the year 1901 the regulation respecting application to the Department of Justice in order to get permission to set the Alien Labour law in motion was repealed, and that the poorest and humblest citizen in Canada can now invoke the present law just as well as the Department of Justice, and since that time that law has been put in motion by private citizens, and aliens from the United States have been deported from Canada under its provisions.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE. If that be the case, how does it happen that all these parties who were imported by the Grand Trunk Railway remained in the country all summer?

Mr. COWAN. It may be because our law contains the express provision that it should be applied to those countries only which have a similar law in force against the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Mr. COWAN. We are agreed on that; and if the hon. gentleman will take the statutes of the American Congress of 1903, he will find that the learned professions of the Dominion of Canada are expressly excluded from the American Alien Labour Act. He will admit that the profession of civil engineer is a learned one. If the United States were constructing ten transcontinental railways, they could hire every civil engineer in the Dominion, and there is no law in the American statutes which would enable the American government to deport them. But this Bill now introduced by the Minister of Labour goes further and includes the learned profession. It includes engineers.

Mr. FOWLER. How can that be? Is not section 7 struck out repealing section 9? Section 9 remains and the Act must be the same as the American.

Mr. SPROULE. If because the American law does not exclude them, we cannot keep them out, what is the use of continuing the farce that has been going on some time and telling the people that the Minister of Labour is going to deport them? Is not that misleading the people? What authority have you to deport them? The hon. member has said that he introduced a Bill exactly similar to the American law.

Mr. COWAN. There is that exception to it.

Mr. SPROULE. But he was obliged to concede this and did concede it.

Mr. COWAN. I made no such statement.

Mr. SPROULE. He conceded what made the Bill practically worthless.

Mr. COWAN. I desire to repeat that I made no such statement.

Mr. SPROULE. The statement which the hon. member made was this, that he introduced a Bill exactly similar to the American, but that the strength of opinion against it was such that he was obliged to concede this amendment, which provided that the consent of the Attorney General must be obtained before taking suit. That made the Act unworkable.

Mr. COWAN. We struck that out three years ago.

Mr. SPROULE. The people of Canada were told that we had a labour law excluding aliens. These aliens come in, the government, through the Minister of Labour, starts a prosecution and tells the people he will deport them, and the hon. gentleman says it is impossible to do it under the law.

Mr. COWAN. I made no such statement. I said it may be because there is a provision in our law which makes it apply only to countries that have a similar law against the Dominion. But neither my hon. friend nor anybody behind him is going quite so far as to say that that necessitates that the law shall be absolutely the same as that of the United States. The present Bill goes further than the present American law. Under the present Bill, you could deport an engineer and under the law of the United States you cannot.

Mr. INGRAM. Where can I find the record giving the division in which the hon. member for Leeds voted against his own Bill ?

Mr. COWAN. If the hon. gentleman will give me about three minutes I will tell him exactly where he can find the record. I have given the information to parliament before.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not know what the electors of the county of Essex who sent the hon. gentleman here expect of him, but I know what my constituents expect of me and what every constituency should expect of its representative. They expect that when he gets on his feet to make a statement, he will not say anything which is not in accord with the facts. I have never made a statement that I did not believe to be true and never will. But my hon. friend rose a few moments ago and said that I had introduced a labour Bill during many years, and at last got a committee, and a large amount was expended in taking evidence, and that that committee reported against my measure. All the hon. gentleman has to do is to get the report and read it and if that report does not establish his statement to be untrue, I will resign my seat. What did that committee report ? It reported that it had taken evidence and found a grave condition of affairs to exist, and it recommended as follows :

> Your committee recommend that the attention of the authorities at Washington be directed to the oppressive application to Canadians of the American Alien Labour law, and to allow of such representation being made, and to afford time for its due consideration, recommend that further consideration of this Bill be postponed until next session ; and if some suitable measure for granting relief to Canadians from the grievance complained of, be not passed in the interval by the American authorities, then your committee recommended that a Bill dealing with this question be introduced next session, and be taken into consideration.

Yet this hon. gentleman who comes here to represent an honourable, truth-loving people, gets up and makes the statement that that committee reported against the Bill which I have been introducing during several sessions. Then there is another statement he made which is not in accordance with facts. He said he introduced a Bill which was a copy of the American Bill, that he copied it himself. Now that is a statement that the hon. gentleman knows is not true because the Bill——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). Order.

Mr. TAYLOR—was the Bill introduced the year before. If he does not know it he ought to know it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then I withdraw the other statement I made, but the Bill he introduced and which I saw was the Bill with my name on it scored out.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, the Bill I introduced the year before and the records will prove it. The Bill is upstairs yet, and it was the Bill that had been presented the year before with my name on it and the name of the hon. member for Essex written on. Now let the hon. gentleman get up and say that he copied that Bill that he made statements in this House that were true.

Mr. SPROULE. That is petty larceny.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is what the hon. gentleman did. When I introduced that Bill the Minister of Labour and several others on that side pooh-poohed the idea and I had to introduce the Bill year after year until I educated the people of the country to see that there was something in the Bill and then I got the committee and took evidence. After that what happened ? The present Prime Minister saw that there was an agitation in the country on this matter and he said : Put me in and I will put on the statute-book a law corresponding word for word and line for line with the American law. I have asked ever since to have that promise fulfilled. In order that the Prime Minister might have an opportunity of doing so, I introduced a Bill the first session but I have been forestalled by the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Cowan) who stole the Bill I had before introduced, and the Prime Minister in place of passing that Bill sent it to a sub-committee composed of three or four men from that side and two or three from this side. That sub-committee mutilated the Bill and the hon. member for Essex said that he introduced a Bill copied from an American Bill. The Bill was opposed by the Prime Minister and

this government in the form in which the hon. gentleman introduced it, because it was a copy of the Bill I had introduced, line for line with the American Bill.

Mr. COWAN. Both yours and mine were copies of the American Bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. The sub-committee mutilated it at the request of the government. We had a member of the government on the committee and I remember some speeches that he made in the committee. These are the facts and yet that hon. gentleman will get up here and make statements that he knows are not in accordance with the facts, and yet he expects the electors who sent him here will back him up in these statements.

Mr. COWAN. The hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) and the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) have asked me to give the date and the authority for the statement I made that the hon. member for South Leeds had voted against his own motion and his own Bill. I find that he first introduced an Alien Labour Bill on April 15, 1890. On May 5, 1891 ('Hansard,' page 106) he introduced his Bill. On May 12, it went to the second reading and on request of Sir John Thompson he withdrew it. On March 3, 1892, he introduced his Bill again ('Hansard,' page 285). The report of the special committee which was passed the year before was read in the House and on May 11 ('Hansard,' page 2457) Sir John Thompson, his own leader, moved the six months hoist of this Bill and you will search the records in vain to find the hon. member for South Leeds doing anything but agreeing to it and voting for the six months' hoist.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member has the report before him as it is in 'Hansard' of that year. I ask him to read that report, and see if it will verify the statement he made that the committee reported against the Bill.

Mr. COWAN. I made no such statement, I said the committee reported entirely in favour of the Bill and——

Mr. TAYLOR. I have the floor. My hon. friend said and 'Hansard' will verify it that I got a committee, large sums were expended and that committee reported against it. That is what he said, he has the report, and I ask him to read the report or send the volume over to me and I shall read it.

Mr. COWAN. I wish to apologize to the House for having got into this discussion, but I want to say that I did not make a statement that the committee reported against the Bill——

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, you did.

Mr. COWAN—because I have the report of the committee before me and it makes it all the worse for the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) for the committee reported in favour of the passage of the Bill and then years after the hon. member introduced his Bill, he read the report of the committee upon the introduction and the hon. member's leader, Sir John Thompson, May 11 ('Hansard,' 2457 for 1892) moved the six months' hoist and the hon. gentleman swallowed his principles, voted with his leader, voted against his own Bill after having read the report of his own committee, expressly asking for its adoption.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman from South Essex (Mr. Cowan) made the statement in this House to-day that the hon. gentleman from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) voted against his own Bill.

Mr. COWAN. Hear, hear, I make it now.

Mr. INGRAM. That is the statement the hon. gentleman makes. I ask the hon. gentleman to produce the record proving that statement to be true. He has not produced his record. He has produced his speech but I do not take his speech as a record of this House nor will any other hon. gentleman who knows the manner in which that hon. gentleman addresses the House. What I want the hon. gentleman to do is to produce the record, and if he cannot produce the record of this House to show that the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) voted against the Bill he must withdraw his statement because it is untrue. I take the responsibility of saying now that it is not correct.

Mr. COWAN. The record says it is correct; I have sent for it and will send it over to my hon. friend. This was four years before I was in the House.

Mr. INGRAM. I say that the hon. gentleman from South Essex cannot produce a record of a division in which the hon. member for Leeds voted against his own Bill. I make that statement against the hon. gentleman's own statement and he cannot produce the record to contradict it. I have been in this House since 1890 and I have watched closely every stage of the Alien Labour legislation in this House and I want to tell my hon. friend when the hon. member for Leeds introduced this Bill he introduced a measure which was extremely unpopular. There were few members on either side of the House who favoured that Bill except the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor).

Mr. COWAN. The committee expressly recommended that it be passed.

Mr. INGRAM. I know what I am talking about. The present leader of the government in every instance up to 1896 opposed that Bill, and he was no worse in

that respect than the leader of the government in those days who also opposed it, and I am sure that the Prime Minister will bear me out when I make that staetment. As the Bill was introduced each year after that it gained some little support in the House, but it was never popular in this House nor did it ever receive much support until the unfriendly feeling of the United States towards Canadians going into the United States developed and the Canadian people felt that they were not being used properly. Then that feeling developed in this House and encouraged my hon. friend in the passage of that Bill. The government in this past session favoured it for that reason, for it was popular but they look on that legislation as being bad legislation.

Now I want to say that while I supported that Bill, I do not think that it is proper legislation for either this country or the United States. I think there ought to be a more friendly spirit between the citizens of the United States and the citizens of Canada, and that so long as they are respectful to each other, they ought to be allowed to be employed by both countries regardless of any alien labour law. That is the view I took then and that is the view I take now. It was only after the bad feeling that existed in this country in consequence of the treatment of Canadians going into the United States, that we were obliged in self protection to place on our statute-book what is known as the Alien Labour Law. It was after this commotion had occurred, after this ill feeling had been engendered, that my hon. friend took the Bill that had been prepared and introduced by the member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and introduced it himself, and it became law. There is the whole thing in a nut-shell. That is a true statement of the facts as they occurred from the time of the introduction of the Bill up to the time of its passage. Again I say that when the hon. gentleman from South Sssex (Mr. Cowan) states that my friend from Leeds voted against his own Bill, he is stating what is not the fact, and the records of this House show it is not the fact.

Mr. FOWLER. Of course we are not surprised at the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Cowan) making statements that he has to go back on afterwards, because he is in the habit of doing that in this House. He made some statements the other day about a former member of this House, since deceased. The remarks were made in bad taste as every member of the House felt, on account, both of the distinguished services which that gentleman had rendered to Canada, and because he had passed away. The hon. member made a statement then which was a gross exaggeration.

Mr. COWAN. Absolutely correct, no exaggeration, except a difference in the amount.

Mr. FOWLER. That is just where the exaggeration came in. The hon. gentleman said that the amount was $2,000 when it was only $400. The hon. gentleman has so little appreciation of the English language that he calls an increase of $400 to $2,000 no exaggeration. Now we know just how much confidence to place on what the hon. gentleman says in this House. He says that my hon. friend for Leeds voted against his own Bill. As a matter of fact there was no division on the Bill, and yet the hon. gentleman says that the hon. member for Leeds voted against his own motion. Now that is the fairness we can expect from the hon. member for Essex. But we saw a beautiful example set him by the Minister of Labour. The Minister of Labour is so constituted that it is absolutely impossible for him to be fair when he makes statements in this House. Although for the last four years during which I have sat in this House, I had listened to many statements made by the Minister of Labour and had heard so much from him about fairness that I could not be shocked at anything he might utter, yet when he attempted to-day to reprimand the member for South Leeds for only just reading a letter which he had received in this morning's mail, I thought the limit was certainly reached even by the nerve of the Minister of Labour. Now I have before me a report of that committee on which that Bill was introduced, and of which committee the hon. member for South Leeds was chairman. That committee reported :

> Your committee find, on examination, that this Bill is similar in all respects to a Bill passed by the Congress of the United States in 1885 and amended by that body in 1886.
>
> Your committee have had before them witnesses from different points along the frontier, and find from their evidence (copy of which is annexed hereto) that the American Alien Labour law has been enforced in such a way as to compel many of our people to relinquish their employment in the United States, or to remove with their families and reside there permanently, while citizens of the United States are permitted to work in Canada every day, and to return to their homes on the American side of the frontier at night, without interference from the Canadian authorities .

These are the recommendations :

> Your committee recommend that the attention of the authorities at Washington be directed to the oppressive application to Canadians of the American Alien Labour law, and to allow of such representation being made, and to afford time for its due consideration, recommend that further consideration of this Bill be postponed until next session ; and if some suitable measure for granting relief to Canadians from the grievance complained of, be not passed in the in-

terval by the American authorities, then your committee recommend that a Bill dealing with this question be introduced next session, and taken into consideration.

That is the report of the committee of which the member for South Leeds was chairman. I think the member for Essex might have shown his opposition to this Bill without attacking my hon. friend for South Leeds. It was not enough for the hon. gentleman, he had not done injury enough in taking away—I would not use the unparliamentary term used by the member for South Leeds, but we will say the member for Essex purloined the Bill of my hon. friend and palmed it off as his own. He found the Bill with the name of my hon. friend upon it, he scored out that name and substituted his own. I do not imagine there is another man in the House of Commons who would have been guilty of such unblushing effrontery as that.

Mr. COWAN. Of course I have sat in the House for years with the hon. member for Leeds. I am not going to say anything about unblushing effrontery, it is not necessary, neither is it necessary after listening to the hon. member for King's, New Brunswick (Mr. Fowler) and never will be. But I want to say this, and I repeat what I said at the outset, that the member for South Leeds, not for the first time in this House, has criticised members on this side for not doing something in regard to alien labour. I find that report was made on the 15th of April, 1900. The conduct of the United States had become so objectionable to the people of Canada, so many letters and telegrams had been written to members, so many questions had been asked time and again across the floor of this House, that it was deemed of sufficient importance to appoint a committee of this House to investigate the matter, and on April 15, 1890, they brought in a report stating that unless the American government could be induced to withdraw their drastic legislation or to cease enforcing it against Canada, a Bill dealing with that question would be introduced at the next session, enacting retaliatory legislation. That was in 1890. During all the balance of 1890, and during 1891, the same thing went on, and in 1892 the hon. member for South Leeds again introduced his Bill and he made a speech and read the report, the closing paragraph of which I have just read. I will read what took place from the 'Hansard' of May 11, 1892, page 4257:

ALIEN LABOUR IMPORTATION.

On the order to resume the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Taylor that the Bill (No. 4) to prohibit the importation and migration of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labour in Canada, be read a second time; and the motion of Sir John Thompson in amendment thereto. 'That the said Bill be read a second time this day six months.'

Amendment agreed to.

And the member for South Leeds agreed to it, never dared to stand up for his own Bill, but agreed to the six months' hoist. I will send him over the 'Hansard' containing the exact record.

An hon. MEMBER. There were no yeas or nays called.

Mr. COWAN. The hon. gentleman did not see fit to call for the yeas and nays, but he agreed to the six months hoist of his own Bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. We have heard pettifogging lawyers in division courts very often and in police courts. Every day we find the records of this House saying that a motion moved by the government is agreed to, there is no division, it is agreed to by the majority of the House. So on that occasion the motion was agreed to without division. But what was the representation by the government? The representation by the government was that, acting on the report of the committee, they were engaged in correspondence with the government of the United States in an effort to make an amicable arrangement, and under these circumstances Sir John Thompson moved that the Bill be read this day six months hence. The majority of the House agreed with him. There was no division. If ever parish politics were resorted to, the hon. member for South Essex has resorted to them in trying to falsify the records of this House. The record every day, no matter what the motion may be, is that without division the motion is agreed to, simply because the majority cry out 'yea,' unless there is a division. The hon. gentleman says that I agreed to it. I say I did not agree to it; otherwise, I would not have introduced the Bill year after year as I did to try and educate, not only hon. members of the opposition, but some supporters of the government, to the belief that it was absolutely necessary, in the interest of the country, to adopt such legislation. It was a good deal like my Bill prohibiting the importation of oleomargarine. I introduced this Bill, and the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) got up and spoke and voted against it, after which he took all the credit to himself for having introduced this very Bill later on. The hon. member for South Essex made the statement that the report of the committee was adverse to this legislation, that the committee reported against placing any restriction upon alien labour. When he makes the statement that he copied the American Bill, he simply means that he introduced a Bill printed the year before and which had previously borne my name. I do not see how an hon. gentleman who makes statements like that to the House can go back home and face his electors.

Mr. INGRAM. In case the hon. member for South Essex refers again to the record of his speech, I think it would be well to place the record of the House beside that speech. I shall quote from the Votes and Proceedings of 1892.

Mr. COWAN. What date ?

Mr. INGRAM. 3rd March.

Mr. COWAN. Look at May 11, and I think you will find the vote.

Mr. INGRAM. I know the date just as well as my hon. friend.

Mr. COWAN. It is May 11.

Mr. INGRAM. In the Votes and Proceedings of March 3rd, 1892, I find the following :

The following Bills were severally introduced——

Mr. COWAN. That is the introduction. Look at May 11, when the vote was called.

Mr. INGRAM. If my hon. friend will have patience, he will have an opportunity of speaking.

The following Bills were severally introduced. . . . . .

By Mr. TAYLOR :—Bill (No. 6) to prohibit the Importation and Migration of Foreigners and Aliens under Contract or Agreement to perform Labour in Canada.

That is the introduction of the Bill. At page 180, you will find the following :

Mr. TAYLOR moved, that the Bill (No. 4) to prohibit the Importation and Migration of Foreigners and Aliens under Contract or Agreement to perform Labour in Canada, be now read the second time.

That was moved on March 21, 1892.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved an amendment thereto, that the word 'now' be struck out of the motion and the words 'this day six months' added at the end thereof ;

And a debate arising thereon, the said debate was, on motion of Mr. Ingram, adjourned.

At page 392 of the Votes and Proceedings will be found the following record :

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Taylor that the Bill (No. 4) to prohibit the Importation and Migration of Foreigners and Aliens under Contract or Agreement, to perform labour in Canada, be read a second time, and the motion of Sir John Thompson in amendment thereto, 'That the said Bill be read a second time this day six months.'

And the question being put on the amendment, it was agreed to.

I want my hon. friend from South Essex to point out where the name of my hon friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) appears in a division as voting for the amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. COWAN. He agreed to the amendment that the Bill should be read six months hence.

Mr. INGRAM. I want my hon. friend from South Essex to turn his head around to his good-natured friend who sits behind him, the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Maclaren). Does he charge the hon. member for Huntingdon with having voted against his cigarette Bill ? His leader moved that a certain thing be done with the Bill. Do I understand that the hon. member for South Essex, because the hon. member for Huntingdon did not rise up and demand a division, asserts that the hon. member for Huntingdon supported his leader on that occasion ? Will the hon. member for Huntingdon say that he did so ? Did the hon. member for Huntingdon vote against his own Bill ? The answer is very plain, that the hon. member for Huntingdon did not vote against his own Bill. The hon. gentleman was not supporting the government on that occasion or the course which the government took upon his Bill. He saw that he was under the very great misfortune of being in the minority and, by reason of that minority, his common sense told him that it was a useless waste of time to protest against his leader's action, and his leader's motion was carried. It is reported 'agreed to,' of course. That is the parliamentary way of doing these things, and you cannot quibble about it. This is the record of the facts as they occurred.

Mr. COWAN. I do not want to prolong the discussion more than to say that fortunately the record of the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) did not stop in 1892. He introduced the same Bill, I think, each and every session, at all events, for several sessions, after 1892 until 1897, and each and every time it would stand for a couple or three months on the order paper and then be dropped. I made the statement at the outset and it has been challenged, but fortunately proved by my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram), that the hon. member for Leeds introduced his Bill, and that when his own leader made a motion to give it the six months' hoist, he voted against his own Bill and with his leader. I make the statement now, and I reiterate it ; I say that it is true in substance and in fact, and nobody knows that better than the hon. member for East Elgin.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. My hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has distinctly denied that he voted against his Bill, and I want your ruling as to whether the hon. member for South Essex has any right, in face of that denial, to persist in saying that he did. I ask your ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If I understand the hon. member for South Essex, he draws the inference from the record of the

House that when the question is put and agreed to, each and every member of the House has agreed to it.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not the point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Mention the point of order.

Mr. SPROULE. The point of order I raise is this: The hon. member for South Essex made the statement that my hon. friend from Leeds introduced a Bill and then voted against his own Bill.

Mr. COWAN. I say the records of the House prove it.

Mr. SPROULE. My hon. friend from South Leeds denied it. I say that the hon. member for South Essex has a right to accept that statement, and I ask your ruling upon it.

Mr. COWAN. I do not understand——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. COWAN. I wish to discuss the point of order, and I have a perfect right to discuss the point of order. What I say is that 'Hansard' shows that he did, and I say that the records of this House show that he did. The hon. member for South Leeds can get up and deny it if he chooses. The statement that I make is that he must have done it, that he did do it, the records of the House prove what I say, and in support of that——

Mr. SPROULE. Order. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. COWAN. Wait until I get through. If the hon. member for South Leeds did not vote for the resolution, the record of the House would have said 'carried on division,' but it does not. It says that this House agreed to it, and nobody knows that better than the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). But why quibble, if that were not agreed to? If a man has a principle in his breast quite as strong as the hon. member for South Leeds asserts that he has, and his leader and hon. members behind him think he is wrong, he is a mighty poor advocate of that principle if he has not the manliness to stand up and demand a division upon his Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) denies the statement of the hon. gentleman from Essex (Mr. Cowan) and that hon. gentleman is bound to accept my hon. friend's (Mr. Taylor's) statement.

Mr. INGRAM. I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) if he could produce the division list, and he said he could.

Mr. COWAN. There was no division; it was unanimous.

Mr. INGRAM. In 1892 the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) could not get a sufficient number of members to demand a division for such a Bill.

Mr. COWAN. Where were the members of the committee that made the report?

Mr. INGRAM. The record for 1892 distinctly disprove the statement made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It appears to me that the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) as to the incident should be accepted. If the vote is not recorded, the hon. gentleman might have been out of the House when the vote was called for, and though he might not be in accord with the motion no vote would be taken. Unless the records of the House show that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) has voted, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) is bound to accept his statement.

Mr. COWAN. I most cheerfully accept the ruling of the chair. I am very glad that the chair has made the suggestion to help the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) out of a hole that his own ingenuity could not get him out of.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. COWAN. The hon. member for Leeds does not say he was absent from the House—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. COWAN. I most cheerfully withdraw, and accept the ruling of the chair, but I would advise——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. COWAN. Surely I can give a little advice to hon. gentlemen opposite. I would advise that as the clerk of the House who made that record is now dead, and cannot be fired, but as the 'Hansard' reporters also put the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) down as having agreed to it, I would suggest that they should be fired and hired over again.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is no record in 'Hansard' or anywhere else that I agreed to it; and as I have denied absolutely that I either consented or agreed, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) must accept my statement.

Mr. COWAN. Were you here and did you challenge the vote?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The committee is out of order.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. Is there no rule in this House to put an end to this squabbling? A large number of us are anxious to get home, and yet we have wasted an hour and a half over this personal quarrel between the hon. member for Leeds and the hon. member for Essex. The country is not interested in that. Let us go on with the business of the House.

Mr. GERVAIS. Before the question is put, I wish to say a few words on this Bill. For my part, I wish to protest against

the statement made by the hon. gentleman from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), that this Bill is a fraud, and an attempt to humbug the people of Canada. I challenge these statements as being inaccurate and in order to confute them, I will read a telegram which I received this morning from prominent leaders of the labour organization in the city of Montreal. I translate :

Honoré Gervais, M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

After having read and examined the Bill to consolidate and amend the Act respecting alien labour, we the undersigned, in the name of the Canadian labour unions declare that said Bill as it is printed and as it has been presented to the House of Commons is in accordance with the wishes as well as the needs of the workingmen of Canada.

That telegram is signed by :

N. Houle, president of the National Trades and Labour Congress of Canada ; T. J. Griffiths, secretary of the same organization ; T. Beaupré, president of the Shoemakers' Union; Louis Lavallière, secretary of the same organization ; D. Verdon, president of the Coopers' Union ; Joseph Lapointe,, president of the Carpenters' Union ; P. Levy, president of the Tailors' Union ; Joseph Despatie, president of the Plumbers' Union ; Joseph Houle, president of the Central Trades and Labour Council ; A. L. Gareau, organizer.

Mr. FOWLER. Did those people know when they sent that telegram, that section 7 of the Act had been striken out ?

Mr. GERVAIS. As soon as the Bill was printed and distributed I had 25 copies of it sent to the leading workingmen of Montreal. They convened their brother workingmen, and deliberated upon the Bill as printed. I asked them for an expression of opinion and I got fifteen replies, and all these workingmen endorsed the action of the Minister of Labour. They endorse the action of the present government in this matter, and I say that these organizations represent the combined labour world of Canada. You may laugh at their action if you will ; you may deride their opinion ; you may ridicule their judgment, but let the election come on and these workingmen will speak out in their own names, and in the name of the whole community in favour of the Liberal government which has introduced this legislation for their protection. Mr. Chairman, I approve most decidedly of this Bill in its entirety, and I will have pleasure in voting for its passage through this parliament.

Mr. J. D. REID. With section 7 struck out.

Mr. GERVAIS. I approve of the Bill just as it is.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman does not know that section 7 which protects these workingmen for whom he pretends to speak has been striken out, and that they are gold bricked. Now, these Italian labourers can be brought to Canada in ship loads.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes they can. Then the statement of the Minister of Labour was a misleading statement, because, in answer to the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd), who complained that Icelanders would be prevented from bringing their friends over to work on their farms, he said this applied only to countries which had similar laws with reference to alien labour ; and that only applied to the United States. That being the case, the gentlemen whom the hon. gentleman who last spoke professes to represent, will not be protected by this Act at all. The Act as submitted to them contained section 7, on the strength of which they sent the telegram which the hon. gentleman has read. I represent labouring men, not perhaps as many as the hon. gentleman does ; but I will attempt to look after their interests as the hon. gentleman tries to look after the interests of those in his constituency. The hon. gentleman need not have spoken as he did about people laughing and sneering. Nobody in the House laughs or sneers at the labouring men. That remark was entirely gratuitous on the part of the hon. gentleman. When we see a fraud being perpetrated on the labouring men, we denounce it. When we see a gold brick being handed to the labouring men, we expose it in their interest, which is as dear to us as it is to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. The Minister of Labour, who never attempts to stick to facts when he speaks in this House, spoke for half an hour about the Italians who were landed at Montreal, and now he has the coolness to say that this Bill does not apply to them at all. That was the worst kind of claptrap, because it was intended to mislead this country. If the hon. member for St. James would submit this Bill to the Trades and Labour Council emasculated as it is by the striking out of section 7, he would not get from them such a telegram as he has received.

Mr. GERVAIS. I decline most respectfully to be taught my law or the meaning of this Bill by the hon. member for King's. I know what is the meaning of this Bill. I have been, I may admit very candidly, somewhat instrumental in having this Bill brought before this House, and I am not ashamed of it. On the contrary, I would boast of it. Even with clause 7 omitted, the working classes of Canada will congratulate this government upon the passing of this Bill.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I want to ask the minister if, with section 7 struck out, section 6, which has special reference to the

publication and circulation of advertisements, will apply ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes. There is no intention on the part of the government to drop section 6. It is the section which will deal with the classes of cases such as the Italians to whom I alluded when moving the second reading of the Bill. The observations I made had distinct reference to section 6, and when we reach that section, it will be in order to discuss its provisions. At present we are on section 2.

Mr. FOWLER. How will that prevent these people coming in ? Suppose a man in Italy publishes an advertisement there, how are you going to get at him ? This is another gold brick.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I have no desire to enter into any controversy with the hon. gentleman as to what is or what is not a gold brick. It is not a very parliamentary suggestion. But perhaps he would be good enough to reserve the discussion of section 6 until section 6 is reached. Then I shall be ready to discuss it with him.

Mr. J. D. REID. Surely the hon. gentleman is not sincere in trying to push this Bill through this session.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Why not ?

Mr. J. D. REID. Because it requires so much discussion that I would think the hon. gentleman would give the members time to consider it. It will only be six months till the House meets again, and I think the members should have time to consult their constituents on a Bill of this kind.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not think the minister will lose any time in discussing these matters as they come up. He answered the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Smith), and I do not see why he refuses to answer me.

Mr. CLARKE. Has not the hon. gentleman already apprised us that there is no way to prevent people publishing misleading statements in Italian, German or French newspapers ? And if the elimination of clause 7 makes the Bill applicable only to aliens coming from a country which has a similar law on its statute-book, then these misleading advertisements may be published in Italian, German, French, Austrian, or Russian newspapers, and men may be induced by these advertisements to come out to Canada. What clause in this Bill will prevent them coming here ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Clause 6. As section 7 is to be eliminated, section 9 of the Act of 1897, which it was intended to repeal, will remain ; that is to say, this Act will apply to such countries as have an Act similar to ours, not to other countries. For my part I agree with what was said a moment ago by my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram), that this law is not one of which any country has reason to be proud. We introduced it years ago, after agitation by my hon. friend from Leeds and others, because we found that the law of the United States, as applied to citizens of Canada, was so illiberal in its character that it would not do for the Canadian people any longer to submit to a slap in the face, and turn the other cheek every time. We thought it would be well for our own protection to introduce such a measure. It had the desired effect. My hon. friend from Essex gave an illustration a moment ago. The town of Windsor is separated from Detroit by a very narrow sheet of water, and it was not an uncommon thing to have Canadians deported from Detroit to Windsor, but since this clause has been on the statute, that has ceased. The two parties, on the one side and the other, have agreed that men may go to work from Windsor to Detroit and vice versa and no question asked. In this instance, the law therefore has served a good purpose, but I would not apply such a law to any country which had not a similar law applicable to us. Therefore that provision will remain as it is. But apart from that altogether, section 6 provides that every person in Canada who causes false representations to be published regarding the state of the labour market in Canada, shall be punished. There is no limit to this clause.

Mr. FOWLER. Does not section 9 of the old Act, which is not repealed, apply to this ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is all wrong. Section 6 applies to the whole world as a little reflection will show.

Mr. SPROULE. The very first question I asked the Minister of Labour was whether this would apply to the case of farm labourers who had been induced to come from the old country under a contract of labour and he said it would not, because it did not apply to any country which had not a similar law against us. And he referred me to section 9 of the Act of 1901.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Under the law, you cannot bring in contract labour from the United States, apart altogether from the question of representations. But under this Bill, any one who by means of false representations, induces immigrants to come to Canada, whether from England or Italy or anywhere else, is liable to be punished.

Mr. SPROULE. It is the Postmaster General who answered me. I read the clause and gave the circumstance, and I ask if these parties, who had been engaged as farm labourers in the old country, could be brought out, and he said they could.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There was no question of false representations.

Mr. SPROULE. I cited the first section of this Bill which provides that it shall be unlawful to assist the importation or immigration of any alien into Canada under contract to perform work.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman asked me if it would be lawful to bring people from Ireland or other parts of the United Kingdom and I said the Bill only applied to aliens. The citizens of Great Britain are not aliens.

Mr. SPROULE. I asked could you bring them from Italy and he said certainly under section 9, because Italy has no such law against us. He further said that one of the objects of this Bill was to keep out aliens.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. I said that the object was to prevent people making use of Canada as a basis of operations, by circulating misrepresentations from this country to be published in foreign countries. Section 6 is applicable to that kind of thing.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman falls back upon clause 6, which provides that we can get hold of Canadians——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Any one who does it in Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. But the claim was that it was not done in Canada but by one man in London and another in Scotland.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If we cannot get hold of them, we cannot punish them, but we can go as far as the law of Canada allows us.

Mr. SPROULE. You cannot touch them. If it will not keep out a German, an Englishman, a Scotchman or an Italian, what good is it going to do the labour men ? We are justified in saying that the labour men are being gold-bricked. Take the Bill of 1897, when that was discussed, we said over and over again that it would not be effective. So experience proved and it was amended by the Bill of 1901. We said also that that Bill would be of little value because you have to get the consent of the Attorney General before you can prosecute and that cannot be got.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Does the hon. gentleman know of any case in which it was refused ?

Mr. SPROULE. I have watched the reports in the press, and it was shown that the labour unions after several cases in Toronto, gave the matter up as hopeless under the provision of the law.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman said that the consent of the Attorney General could not be obtained. Does he know of any instance in which the Attorney General refused his consent ?

Mr. SPROULE. I remember distinctly reading in the papers that efforts were being made by the labour unions of Toronto and they finally gave it up because they found they could not succeed.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Gave up what?

Mr. SPROULE. The attempt to put these parties out of the country.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My hon. friend said that the consent of the Attorney General to bring suit could not be obtained. Does he know of a case to warrant that statement ?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know of any case.

Mr. CLARKE. Let me remind the minister of the fact that the late Minister of Justice (Hon. David Mills) refused his assent on the ground that negotiations were going on between the United States authorities and the Canadian authorities. That was on an application that was made to him from the city of Hamilton.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not know to what case he refers.

Mr. CLARKE. If the hon. gentleman will inquire in the department he will be able to ascertain.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The consent may be obtained from a great number of different persons, a superior court judge, a county court judge or the Attorney General. Thus there are a number of people who can give consent.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I want to ask the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) if I am to understand from his speech that he is opposed to legitimate immigration in this country.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not talking about that at all.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. The hon. gentleman said that the Bill did not provide for the different classes in England. The reason I ask about section No. 6 is this : The labour men of this country are not objecting to the immigration of labouring men into this country. They are objecting to the principle of contracts being made with working men outside of this country for work in this country, but when the workingmen voluntarily come to this country or come during the process of the regular immigration work of the government, no working men in Canada have any objection to this. They say that the importation of labouring men under contract to Canada is due to the false representations made by the people in Canada, that the false representations in England are due to the efforts of the Manufacturers' Association who have their agents there and have created false

labour bureaus in England and have agents there making false representations.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you think you can punish them under clause 6 ?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. That is the reason I ask the question, and I have an answer in the affirmative. To me it is a most important thing, and if clause 6 stands as part of the Alien Labour Act then so far as I am concerned, it is a very important provision, although section 9 makes the Bill apply only to the United States.

Mr. FOWLER. What I want to get at is an understanding of how far that applies. Does section 6 apply only to the United States ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. To all the world.

Mr. FOWLER. How do you make that out ? How are you going to select one section out of this Bill and say that it applies to all the world and that another section applies only to the United States ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. What is there in this Bill saying that ?

Mr. FOWLER. Section 9 of the Act 97 :

This Act shall apply only to such foreign countries as have enacted and retained in force, or as enact and retain in force, laws or ordinances applying to Canada of a character similar to this Act.

That is the Act of 1897 and this is represented as a consolidation of the laws and being a consolidation it should contain all the laws remaining in force respecting alien labour.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We are not by this section amending the existing Act. This section 6 is an independent section applying to all the world. The title of the Bill has nothing to do with the scope of the Bill. There is nothing in section 6 connecting this with the Alien Labour Act at all. This is a more comprehensive Bill than the Alien Labour Bill and it is intended to amend the title because the last part of the Bill deals with immigration which is not at all concerned with the question of alien labour. This is an omnibus Bill and therefore the title will be more general. The Bill is to be entitled 'An Act respecting aliens.' This is not circumscribed by section 9 of the Act of 1897.

Mr. FOWLER. The title is 'An Act to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting alien labour.' If it is an Act of consolidation it is supposed to take in all the Acts respecting alien labour.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It does not intend to.

Mr. FOWLER. Then it carries a lie on its face. A man wishing to inquire into the laws would only have to look into this Act to find every enactment respecting alien labour. That is what it claims to be and then it says in section 9 which is not repealed, that the Act shall only apply to such foreign countries as have similar laws. The great difficulty as I understand it is that in countries outside the United States false representations are made with respect to the condition of the labour market in Canada. Contracts are made in order to coerce the labouring men of this country into accepting lower wages and conditions such as they do not wish to accept by making contracts in other countries, in England, Scotland, Ireland, France, Germany whenever this labour can be procured. This is used as a means of coercing the labouring men of this country. What I want to know is whether this Act which is to be passed is going to embrace all the countries where these difficulties arise. It seems to me that by the section we have here that is not done. I cannot understand the principle of elimination by which the minister makes section 6 apply to the whole world and the other only to the United States.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There is no thing in the Act which says that section 9 shall apply.

Mr. FOWLER. Section 7 does. You expressly repeal section 9 by section 7 of this Bill.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My hon. friend can imagine the Bill becoming law with section 7 omitted. If it passes in that form, and is entitled 'An Act respecting aliens' will he tell me how he can read into that any connection with the statutes of 1897.

Mr. FOWLER. Here is an Act passed to consolidate and amend the Acts in respect to alien labour. If you do not repeal anything of the former Acts that which is not repealed is still in force. Therefore, you have section 9 of the Act of 1897 still in force because you do not put in section 7.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman is accustomed to the rules governing the construction of statutes.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Does he mean to say that the title of this Bill, if it were changed, would determine the interpretation of the enacting sections ?

Mr. FOWLER. Not only does the Bill say that but the hon. gentleman, when section 2 was under discussion, stated himself that this Bill and the elimination of section 7 only applied to foreign countries where there were similar Acts.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SPROULE. Before this discussion goes on I wish to say that when our leader (Mr. R. L. Borden) went away he gave us to understand that an agreement had been reached between the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and himself to the effect that an effort would be made to close this House on Saturday or Monday and that for that purpose certain Bills which it had been intended to push through would be allowed to drop. A memorandum of these was given and it was intimated as well that there would probably be one or two more dropped from the order paper and amongst them the one that we were called upon to consider this afternoon. I do not say that the right hon. Prime Minister named any Bill, but somehow or other there was an impression created on our minds that this was one of the contentious Bills which would likely be dropped, or otherwise we could not carry out the agreement reached between the right hon. the leader of the government and the hon. leader of the opposition. We have wasted most of the afternoon over this Bill and probably the discussion will continue all night. If it is intended to carry out the understanding to have prorogation on Saturday or Monday it will be absolutely impossible to do so if you continue to take up these Bills that we thought were not going to be taken up by the House during the present session.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would be very sorry to believe, in view of the part which my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) has taken in the discussion this afternoon, that we have wasted our time. I am not prepared to admit that or to say that of my hon. friend. I have a copy of a letter which I addressed to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). I gave him not only the substance but a list of the measures which we intended to drop and we have dropped them. I stated at the same time that perhaps other measures would be dropped but I said no more than that. There was no other understanding than that. It was possible or not possible.

Mr. SPROULE. In some informal discussion which took place between members of the House on both sides it was understood that this was one of the contentious Bills that would be sure to take up time. I do not know how the impression got abroad but it was believed that the Bill was not intended to be pushed through because it would take up time and if so the understanding could not be carried out. We may not, as the right hon. Prime Minister has said, have entirely wasted our time, but what I mean to say is that if we go on with the Bill the time would be taken up and it will naturally take a good deal more time before we get through with all these Bills, so that the hope of proroguing the House on Saturday or Monday must be abandoned.

Mr. FOWLER. When the House rose at six o'clock we were discussing the question of the application of section 6.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Before this discussion starts again I would like to say that this afternoon there was a good deal of irregularity. I think we had better confine the discussion to the section under consideration so that we may get through.

Mr. SPROULE. When one section bears upon another you must naturally refer to other sections than that which is immediately under discussion.

Mr. CLARKE. A general discussion and conversation on all the clauses might enable us to eventually pass them all.

Mr. FOWLER. I understand it was informally agreed that after we had discussed these different sections when it came to passing them they would all go through without special discussion on each.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not want to interfere with my hon. friend's wishes. If he finds it material in discussing section 2 to refer to other sections I am quite satisfied to allow him to be the judge of what is necessary for him to elaborate his argument, but I am sure he will, as much as he can, confine the discussion to the section which we are considering. We might consider the whole of section 2. Section 2 is a long section. The first part is strengthening the section in the original Alien Labour Act and the subsections are sections providing a remedial measure. We might discuss the whole of these sections in one discussion.

Mr. FOWLER. And then discuss section 6 when we come to it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think perhaps it might be better to allow my hon. friend to pursue whatever course he prefers.

Mr. CLARKE. In the matter that we were anxious about, as to the scope of section 6, we understood from the Prime Minister and the Minister of Labour that section 6 was of universal application, referring to every country, while section 2 that we are discussing, had special reference only to countries which enforced alien labour laws against Canada; and the only country I believe in that category, is the United States. Now if that is correct, then section 2 provides that it shall be unlawful for any person to assist or encourage the importation of or immigration of American citizens into Canada. Then the section prohibits under penalty the importation or assistance of United States citi-

zens, or inducing them to come into Canada, while, if I understand it aright, there is nothing illegal in assisting to bring in foreigners who are not citizens of the United States, such as Italians, Assyrians, Gallicians, Hungarians, Austrians—all the races of Europe may be brought in, while American citizens are debarred. I would like to know if that is correct ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Section 2 purports to be an amendment to section 1 of the original Alien Labour Act of 1897, and if we amend a section of the Act of 1897, the amendment must relate back to the original Act itself, and be subject in other respects to the general provisions of that Act. Section 9 of that Act makes its scope applicable to countries having similar legislation.

Mr. CLARKE. This Act of 1897 reads as follows :

From and after the passing of this Act it shall be unlawful for any person, company, partnership or corporation, in any manner to prepay the transportation or in any way to assist or encourage the importation or immigration of any alien or foreigner into Canada, under contract or agreement, parole or special, express or implied, made previous to the importation or immigration of such alien or foreigner, to perform labour or service of any kind in Canada.

Then section 9 of that Act provides that this enactment shall only be put into force against countries which enforce an alien labour law against Canadians.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We have one on their statute-book, not enforced.

Mr. CLARKE. That is right, I will read section 9 :

This Act shall apply only to such foreign countries as have enacted and retained in force, or as enact and retain in force, laws or ordinances applying to Canada of a character similar to this Act.

Now if the section we are considering is to take the place of section 1, and section 2 can only be enforced against citizens of a country which has enacted and is enforcing an alien labour law against Canada, then the prohibition under section 2 would only apply to American citizens. Is that right ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is correct, that is the meaning of the Act of 1897.

Mr. CLARKE. I am not authorized to speak for anybody in this matter but myself. I believe the labour organizations have gentlemen here looking after their interests, and who are specially interested in promoting the interests of labour here. If they are satisfied with these sections, I do not propose to take up the time of the committee in discusssing them, further than to say that it seems to be an unusual thing that we are making a law to prohibit men who speak the same language, who live practically under similar institutions as ourselves, while we are admitting all the races of Europe to come in and compete with the lower grades of Canadian labour. There seems to be no limit under this law to the importation of that class of labour.

Mr. BARKER. As I understand section 2 of the Bill, it proposes to re-enact practically what is already in the statutes, adding only half a dozen words, that to me seem almost insignificant, and amending the Act very little, so little I think that if there were not other clauses in the Bill, I doubt whether the Minister of Labour would ever have thought of introducing this Bill at all. The words added are with reference to the means by which the importation of labour from the United States—I use that word because only the United States is affected by this clause—may be assisted or encouraged. The words added are :

By way of promise or offer of employment.

Well, the intent of that, I think, is already practically covered by the law. The last three lines are new, but I do not think they really add anything to the law as it stands. The words are :

The entry into Canada of an alien whose importation or immigration has been so assisted or encouraged, is hereby prohibited.

If it is unlawful to import the person, it seems to me a surplusage to say that his importation is prohibited, that it is contrary to the law. That I understand—the Minister of Labour will correct me—that is all the alteration made by this section. With regard to section 7, it is connected only with this section 2. In fact, if the Minister of Labour were to strike out section 2 and section 7 we would be just where we have been under the Act of 1897, as amended in 1901.

Mr. CLARKE. Practically there is no difference in this Bill.

Mr. BARKER. No material difference except as to the method by which the importation may be assisted ; adding a promise or offer of employment as one of the methods that may not be adopted to induce importation. I do not know whether the minister considers that very important, but that is the only change I see that he makes in the law by his section 2. Clause 6 is for an entirely different object, and the wording of the clause shows that it is intended to put an end to the use of false representations to bringing labour into the country. On the face of it, clause 6 applies not only to the United States but to Great Britain and to every part of the world outside the limits of Canada. It is an entirely different subject-matter from that to which the old clause 9 applies. Am I right in putting it in that way ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes.

Mr. GALLIHER. I quite agree with the remarks made by the hon. member from Hamilton (Mr. Barker). Take subsection 1 of clause 2 of the proposed Bill. I do not think that the addition of the words enlarge the scope one iota. I think the words 'promise or offer of employment' are included in the words 'contract or agreement, parole or special, express or implied,' and I feel fairly clear on that. As my hon. friend has stated, I think, it would not make a bit of difference if the words had not been added. If we take the rest of section 2, we find a means provided under which labour may be brought in, but the method outlined in the Bill by which that labour is to be had is so cumbrous as to be practically useless. So, in my opinion, if the whole of clause 2, with the subsections, were struck out, leaving the law, as far as that is concerned, as it is to-day, it would meet every requirement, and leave us in a better position than we would be in by passing this subsection.

Mr. PUTTEE. I am not quite prepared to agree with the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) that subsection 1 of section 2 does not add anything to the law. We have the words 'and the entry into Canada of any alien whose importation or immigration has been so assisted or encouraged is hereby prohibited.' To my mind, that is something. About two or three years ago I had occasion to inform the Labour Department that two car-loads of Italians were being despatched from Boston to come into Canada in contravention of our Alien Labour law, and I asked to have them stopped. The reply was that the remedy under the law was to proceed against the persons who brought them in, that there was no power under the law to prevent these immigrants from coming here. Surely it is an advantage to be able to stop these people. You still have the remedy against those who do import alien labour under contract. That is the only reason, as far as I can see, why these words appear in this section. And, if the intention indicated under a later section, to appoint officers to enforce the Act, is carried out, surely it will be their duty, when attention is called to the fact that aliens are being brought in under contract, to prevent these people from coming into the country.

Mr. BARKER. How?

Mr. PUTTEE. I suppose that would be done under regulations to be made. But under the present Act, as I understand it, these people are not prohibited from coming into the country, but we only have the remedy against those who help them to come in. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) referred to the general scope of the Act. I want to say that, within the last few years, I have been at almost numberless gatherings of labour men throughout the country, and I have never yet heard any of them endorse the policy of retaliation, as contained in the Alien Labour Act. Labour does not stand for the retaliatory principle at all. The only thing they want in the Act is the anti-contract feature. They have not been able to get it, but we have a measure of it under this Alien Labour Act. For my part, I believe that the minister would be well advised to keep in section 7, and, keeping that in, to strike out section 9 of the Alien Labour law. I never did endorse the policy of retaliation. I am not by any means committed to the idea that we should let other countries legislate for us. Labour stands for the anti-contract idea. Labour does not object to immigrants coming into Canada to take their part in the ordinary way in building up the country. But what they do object to, and what they have reason to object to, because they have suffered from it for years past, is the system of bringing in bodies of men under contract, men who, in many cases, do not know the conditions of labour here, but who are brought in to take work from men who are already here. There is some relief in this Bill.

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) has just referred to a point which I would like to have made plain. Take a case of this kind: I have known Italians to be brought over to the town of Prescott from the American side of the river and employed against our own Canadian labour. As I understand it, by striking out section 7, these Italians will not be counted as aliens, because this only applies to the United States. If there are a number of Italians on the American side, an Italian leader, as he is called, may go over there and tell them there is work to be had in Prescott. They are not American citizens and, as I understand it, they would not be counted as aliens under this Bill. And what applies to Prescott might apply to the whole of Canada. What is there to prevent that under this Bill? Or, suppose these people come from Italy direct to New York to seek employment. Some labour agency in New York might tell them that there is work to be had in Vancouver, Toronto or some other Canadian city. Would this Act prevent them from coming? As I understand it, section 7 applies only to the United States, and a person coming from any other country would not be counted an alien under this Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He is an alien if he is not a British subject. If an Italian came from the United States——

Mr. J. D. REID. But if he came direct from Italy, would he be counted an alien?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If he is not a British subject he is an alien, no matter where he comes from. As my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) says, this is anti-contract. Now, the anti-contract law is applied to the United States. For, as I

understand it, there has been no cause to legislate so far against bringing in contract labour from any country but the United States, because few, if any, contract labourers come from other countries.

Mr. J. D. REID. A great many come from Italy.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I believe that when labourers come from Italy they do not come under contract. Many of these people are navvies, and they roam all over the continent seeking for work. If they come from the United States they are subject to the law.

Mr. J. D. REID. Many Italians come to this country of their own will. When the Grand Trunk Pacific is started, it is likely they will come here in thousands to compete with Canadian labour. But, if they come without having made any previous arrangement they cannot be kept out.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. It is not intended to prevent anything of that kind. We do not want to prevent free immigration to this country at their own cost. What we object to is employers in this country making contracts with people outside, and bringing them in for that purpose. Surely we do not want to object to the principle of voluntary immigration. We are willing that people who pay their own way should come.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT. Do you not make it an offence to invite people to come ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is not an offence to invite people to come here. It is an offence to invite them to come under false pretenses, by representing that there is labour for them when there is none.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. There is nothing in this Bill to prevent any one inviting miners to come to the mines in British Columbia. It would depend whether there was work for them when they got here. If it were proven that the man who invited them deceived them, from a personal motive, that would be a violation of the Act. But it is not against the law, or intended to be, for any one to come to the country who has not been deceived.

Mr. SPROULE. There are plenty brought in who are not deceived, but who, when they come, take the places of others. The labour unions have declared strongly against that.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. No man comes to this country to take the place of another man. If he does, that very fact is prima facie evidence that he has been deceived.

Mr. SPROULE. But the man is not deceived. Representations are made that certain mechanics, if they come to Canada, can get employment. When they come, they find that there are vacancies in certain shops. There may be strikes, but they know nothing of them, and they go to work in those shops. Cases of this kind occurred in Toronto, and this is what the labour unions protested against.

Mr. GALLIHER. The chief objection of the labour unions, so far as I have had any conversation with them, is this, that misrepresentations are made to labourers in other countries as to the existing condition of the labour market in Canada. Persons have gone so far in some cases as to represent that there was not a strike on at the very time a strike was in existence. That is what the labour unions have objected to, and rightly objected to, in my opinion; and it is to avoid such a state of affairs that section 6 is proposed. A man in Canada who, by any act of his, causes misrepresentations to be published abroad can be prosecuted under this Act. It is impossible to reach the people abroad who publish them ; but you can reach the man in Canada who causes them, whatever means he uses. In view of what I said before, and what the hon. member for Hamilton said, I would again suggest to the Minister of Labour that the whole of section 2 should be struck out.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would say, in reply to the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith), that I do not wish the impression to be conveyed that I was objecting to immigration to this country ; but I do object to the class of Italians that have been around my section of the country. I judge from the remarks of the hon. gentleman that he is quite willing to have that class of people brought into this country to compete with Canadian labour. We do not object to English immigrants, but we do object to a lot of Italians who are not good citizens being brought to this country to compete with the legitimate labour of the country.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. The hon. gentleman speaks of bringing people in, which implies a contract. I am speaking of people coming in voluntarily, on their own responsibility. I say you cannot have any law against that. What we want is a law against contracts.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that the hon. gentleman says that the labour unions have no objection to immigrants coming to this country. Here is a statement by Mr. Alf. Jury of Toronto, a labour union man, and now Dominion immigration agent in England, whom I presume the hon. gentleman knows very well.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I have met him, that is all.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Alf. Jury spoke at a meeting in Toronto, where he said :

He stated that the men whom the labour unions should attack were Leopold, Graeme, Hunter and others in the employ of the transportation companies. The unions also should keep the English press well advised as to conditions in this country. The speech was followed by a hot discussion, and W. T. R. Preston was scored for his exaggerated statements in regard to this country.

The gist of that was that an attack was made on Mr. Preston, the government's immigration agent in England, and they recommended that this attack should be kept up until Mr. Preston was dismissed. Surely the hon. member for Vancouver cannot be speaking for the labour unions, or this report must be incorrect. I take it from the Montreal 'Star' of to-night, and I believe it to be correct. The hon. member for Vancouver must either be right or wrong. If he is right, the labour unions are wrong; but I rather choose to believe the labour unions as they express themselves than to believe what he says claiming to represent them.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. The names Mr. Jury mentioned were those of the representatives of the free labour bureau in the old country, and his complaint against Mr. Preston was that he thought he had encouraged those people, who are sending immigrants to this country by false representations—the very thing I am complaining of. They are employed in the old country and sent out on false representations as were these mechanics in the city of Toronto, referred to by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) the other day. That is the thing that I am complaining of. Mr. Jury was criticising the actions of three immigration agents in sending these people out.

Mr. SPROULE. Preston was scored for his exaggerated statements. It was not Jury who was criticising him, but the labour union.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Who were they criticising?

Mr. SPROULE. They were criticising Preston. Jury was not criticising Preston, but Stewart, Leopold and these others. The labour unions were criticising Preston, who was the government immigration agent, yet the hon. member says the labour unions are not against immigration.

Mr. PUTTEE. Let me explain how that is and what is the complaint of the men in Toronto and Winnipeg and the other cities against Preston. It is this, that he is repeating statements made by these other agencies in Great Britain and therefore, putting the government stamp on those statements.

Mr. SPROULE. According to the labour unions, then, the government should call Preston home.

Mr. PUTTEE. I should think so.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. But according to your statement, the unions are not opposed to the general immigration policy of the government and that is what I say.

Mr. SPROULE. They are opposed to the man who is at the head of the business and attempting to carry it out according to his own light.

Mr. SCOTT. It seems to me that this is exceedingly drastic legislation, and before assenting to some of its provisions finally, I would like to have a better understanding of what the effect is going to be. By subclause 1 of section 2, it is provided that it shall be unlawful for any person to assist or encourage the importation or immigration of any alien into Canada by way of promise or offer of employment and so forth. Let me put a case to the minister. In Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, the business of wheat raising has now grown to such proportions that we require from 15,000 to 30,000 harvest labourers during the harvest season. Up to the present we have secured them in eastern Canada, but very soon the aggregate wheat crop in western Canada will be of such proportions that it will be impossible for that country to obtain the required number of harvest labourers within our own borders and we will have to look for a portion of them in the western states. It seems to me that this subclause would make it a criminal offence for a settler in western Canada to write to the western states and invite anybody into our country to assist in the harvest. That is simply one instance, and I would like to have an explanation whether any exception can be made to cover such a case.

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. minister does not reply and it seems to me the question is one which deserves a reply. However, since he does not wish to answer one of his own supporters, perhaps a member of the opposition will receive better treatment. Does not that section 7 make this Act really only apply against the United States?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I cannot see where my hon. friend is embarrassed in the matter. I thought that my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) made it extremely plain. What is the hon. gentleman's embarrassment?

Mr. J. D. REID. As I understand it, this Bill will apply only against the United States, and I would like to see how it will work with regard to Italian labour. In my county there have been every year several hundred Italians brought in to compete against our own Canadian labour.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. From where?

Mr. J. D. REID. From Montreal and some from New York. Is there any way of protecting our Canadian labour from that low class of Italians who compete against them ? They are really at the mercy of contractors, because there is a lot of these Italians brought in and they are employed on government works, too. The minister has taken care to make this Bill only apply to railways. He does not make it apply to canals and harbours. But in every harbour from Vancouver to Halifax there are large government contracts given out, and this Bill will not apply to the men employed on these works, fully one-third or one-half of whom are Italians. The reason they are employed is because they work for about one-half what a British subject will demand. I would like to have it understood if these men can be brought in against our own Canadian labour. Speaking on behalf of the labour men of my county. I wish to protest against any law which is practically a gold brick. I would like to be in a position to tell the labour men of my constituency that we have a law now which will prevent the competition of Italian labour. Otherwise I shall have to tell them that the government have passed a Bill which means nothing.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am extremely pleased to learn at last that I have a convert in my hon. friend. It is only a few hours since he asked with much anxiety whether we intended to force the measure through before the end of the session. Now he wants it forced through.

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. gentleman has submitted a Bill to parliament. He introduced it on July 29th, and this is the first time I have had an opportuniy of seeing it, and I venture to say the same of two-thirds of the members of this House. And then the hon. gentleman, immediately after presenting his Bill, changes the whole thing entirely by striking out clause 7. He will not give me the slightest opportunity of consulting the men interested, the labour union right in my own town. Here is a Bill that should have been presented four months ago, yet he wishes us to assist him in forcing it through. I may say to the hon. gentleman that I am now, as I have always been, a supporter of anything that is in the interests of the workingman, and if this Bill is in the interests of the workingman, I shall hold up both hands for it, but I do not wish to be a party to putting a Bill through that is really deceiving them, and which would place me in the position, when they asked me, 'Why do you not ask the government to deport these Italians' that I would have to say that the Bill was really no good. The minister is taking the responsibility of forcing this Bill through, and of course I cannot prevent him, but I wish it distinctly understood that I am not opposing this with any view of killing it, for the purpose of injuring Canadian labour in this country, but I want to get a Bill that will protect Canadian labour, and not one that is really no good.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I would ask my hon. friend which is he in favour of ? This Bill may not accomplish everything that is possible, there is no finality in legislation, and good measures are the result of gradual growth. Are my hon. friends tonight in favour of passing whatever the committee can reasonably approve of, or of throwing this Bill over for another session ?

Mr. J. D. REID. So far as I can understand this Bill it is really nothing more than the Bill we now have. I am in favour of getting a Bill that will really protect Canadian labour, and not a Bill that will deceive them. I believe this Bill which we have is not going to accomplish more than the Bill now on the statute-book.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Is that my hon. friend's reason for opposing it ?

Mr. J. D. REID. It is because it is making the labour men believe they are getting something more than they had before ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I see.

Mr. J. D. REID. For that reason I think the minister should give the members an opportunity of studying the Bill. With a proper discussion from both sides of the House I am quite satisfied that a Bill could be put through that would be quite satisfactory to every member of this House and to the labour unions or working classes of this country as I believe the minister, myself and every member are anxious to do, not to get a Bill that is only going to cause trouble and be of no use to the working men. That is the only reason why I asked that the Bill be laid over. I think it is most unfair to labour unions to put a Bill down before us and ask that it go through within three or four hours, because this is the first discussion we have had. It was understood that we were to get through tomorrow or Monday and we have no time or opportunity of discussing it or putting it in such shape that it would be to the interests of the labouring class of this country.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I of course would not expect my hon. friend to support a measure which he says is deceiving the labour men. I hoped that he was by my side in pressing this measure through. This Bill was distributed on Monday last. It was introduced a week ago to-day, on Friday last, I made some brief explanation of it at that time. It was printed on Saturday and I asked the King's Printer to send to the leader of the opposition a number of

copies, I think fifty, so that he might have them to deliver to his friends. I would not expect that my hon. friend would get his on Saturday but it was distributed on Monday. My hon. friend's constituency is within a couple of hours from this city, and I think it would not be unreasonable for me to expect him, if his people are so interested, to have made a special effort to endeavour to consult with them upon the subject. However, he has his engagements and his duties and it is possible it was not convenient for him to do this, and I am going to assume that he had good reason for not doing it. Nevertheless, there are some good features in this Bill and at the same time some features which are strongly opposed by people throughout this country and by some members in this House. I desire, as far as possible, considering the lateness of the session, to secure, at all events, the features of the Bill that are conceded to be good. I do not wish to develop antagonism to the Bill by forcing it through, but I think there are three salient features as I said before, about which there should be no controversy and upon which I would hope to secure unanimity. These are section 6, section 8, the one with respect to railways, and section 10, dealing with undesirable immigration. My hon. friend has made a strong appeal to me. I mentioned when introducing the Bill—and a similar view has been expressed by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker)—that I attach very little importance to the words proposed to be added by subsection 1 of section 2. I do not think myself they add much strength to the original section but they were introduced here simply because the United States Act is so worded. That Act was amended and it seemed well for us to follow on all fours with them, and then adding to our amendment certain other provisions of a remedial character. However, I shall yield to the suggestions that have been made, and I therefore move to strike out section 2. To that extent I am acceding to my hon. friend's view. That is reasonable is it not?

Mr. J. D. REID. Oh, yes, that is reasonable. From the first I did not wish it to be understood that I was opposing the Bill. My sole idea was to get a clause in to prevent that low class of Italian labour and I have not had time to get a clause in such shape as I would like to have inserted. That is one of my reasons.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We will have to do what we can this session, and take the remaining matters into consideration at a future date. I move that section 2 be struck out, carrying with it the subsection.

Mr. T. I. THOMSON. A short time ago the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) introduced a Bill for the purpose of protecting Canadians who earn their livelihood on the great lakes, the masters and mates. The Americans have a law whereby no Canadian can sail an American vessel or hold the position of master or mate on an American vessel unless he is naturalized as an American citizen. Americans, however, can hold similar positions in Canada while still maintaining American citizenship. I would ask the Minister of Labour if this Bill will protect Canadians of that class in this respect.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Section 1 of the Alien Labour Act prohibits the importation of aliens under contract if coming from a country that has a similar law. That is the provision to which all cases must be brought. If they are brought here under contract in violation of that law the offender is liable to the penalties.

Mr. T. I. THOMSON. That is hardly an answer to the question. Is there anything in this law that will prevent Americans from sailing Canadian vessels as long as Canadians are excluded from sailing American vessels.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I cannot add anything to what I have already stated.

Mr. CLANCY. The question is a plain one. The hon. gentleman has avoided the direct question by saying that he refers only to those who come into the country under contract. The question was whether, under the hon. gentleman's Bill, aliens, whether residing in Canada or not, could sail Canadian vessels, while on the other hand Canadians going to the United States were prevented from sailing American vessels. The hon. gentleman I think could have said that there was no attempt at a provision of that kind. Now I desire to say a word with regard to the time this Bill is introduced. The hon. gentleman has introduced a very important Bill in the last hours of a long session, with the object of getting it through. He has had five months to introduce this Bill, and he tells my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid) that he should have been in his place and have taken up his Bill within the last few hours. The hon. gentleman knows that members have not had a chance to consult their constituents. It would be impossible to send these Bills out and have them considered by the labouring classes and others concerned. The hon. gentleman has introduced this Bill at a time when he knew the House could give it but a very imperfect consideration. The hon. gentleman says he has struck out all of clause 2; there is not much of his Bill left now. He says that he is retaining clause 6, but clause 6 is utterly useless, utterly unworkable. There is no person who would be more liable to be put in prison than the Minister of the Interior and those immigration agents who bring people into Canada. Half of our ad-

vertisements in this country declare there is abundance of labour for all.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We have not come to that yet.

Section amended and agreed to.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Section 3 is a section largely rendered necessary because of subsection 1 of section 2. I wish to amend section 3 of the original Act in the manner I mentioned in the course of the day. A judicial decision has recently been rendered holding that the word 'knowingly' in subsection 3 was to be construed literally, and that you could not convict unless the accused person actually knew. I gave the illustration that the committee is familiar with. I do not think that is a decision that would commend itself to most lawyers; still, inasmuch as this law is applied by persons who are not very skilled in the law, magistrates and so forth, I think it better to define more clearly the meaning of the word 'knowingly.' Therefore I move that section 3 be amended by striking out the word 'knowingly' and by inserting after the word 'Canada' in the 7th line:

Knowing or having reasonable ground for believing that he was then an alien or foreigner.

Mr. CLARKE. I would ask the minister if this clause is of general application, or if it is, like the one we have just struck out, applied only to the importation of American citizens.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If an amendment to a section of the Alien Labour Act is made you would read it into the original Act and the amendment hereby proposed and the amended section would be interpreted as if it were part of the original Act.

Mr. CLARKE. And this penalty will only be imposed on persons who bring in American citizens.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Who bring in aliens from the United States.

Mr. CLARKE. Of course as I understand it these two sections will only be operative against a country having on the statute-book an alien labour law directed against Canada.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Well these two sections will only be operative against American citizens.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not know about that.

Mr. CLARKE. And all other classes of foreigners may come in.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The Act does not say American citizens. The Act applies to aliens.

Mr. BARKER. As a matter of fact we know that under the circumstances it will only apply to the United States.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It will only apply to the United States as a country but it may apply to any alien who comes from the United States.

Mr. CLANCY. It will be well that the committee should know whether the hon. gentleman proposes to strike out section 7 before passing this section, because the statute will have an entirely different meaning if section 7 remains in. I do not know what the hon. gentleman intends to do with section 7 but if he strikes out section 7 it simply means that aliens from all other countries, in other words, countries which have no alien labour law against Canada, will be permitted to come into Canada without any check whatever.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman must have been absent from the House to-day. This point has been discussed a good deal. The law as an alien labour law is applicable to such countries as have on their statute-books similar legislation. It is just as general as the proposition would suggest and no more. We are not enlarging the extent of its applicability.

Mr. CLANCY. I regret very much that that should be the case. The alien labour law which has been placed upon the statue-book imposes a very great injustice on the labouring men of this country. I have personal knowledge of Belgians being brought into this country under the Alien Labour Act without any let or hindrance. I know that they came into towns, villages, and in some cases into rural districts, and lived eight or ten in a room probably not ten feet square in a state of squalor that was unfit for civilized beings and yet the honest labouring men of this country are supposed to take on themselves the duties of citizenship, educate their families and compete against that class of people. I say it is not fair to permit that class of persons to come into this country under contract who are not citizens of the standard that we would like to see in Canada. It is unfair to our labouring men, and I repeat that it is a matter of sincere regret that the hon. gentleman has not thought it proper to amend the law in that most important respect. I know of no amendment to the law that would be more important or that would confer a greater benefit or be a more reasonable one than an amendment which would include aliens from all countries of that particular undesirable class. If we must have men coming in under contract let us make a choice of evils and have the better class come in. Let a class come in that will compete on fair terms with our own people, people who have been brought up under similar institutions,

who have lived under a similar form of government and whose habits of life are somewhat similar to those of our own people. I think it will be a great disappointment to the country if the hon. gentleman does not restore section 7. I hope that even yet the hon. gentleman will reconsider the view that he has expressed upon that subject.

Mr. GALLIHER. To adopt the suggestion of my hon. friend from Bothwell would simply mean that we would be starting out on a system of legislation against every country in the world inviting them to pass laws not only of this nature against us but also laws of other kinds. We would be inviting these nations to place on their statute-books retaliatory legislation.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman not think that we should exclude undesirable classes from coming into this country to compete with Canadian workmen ?

Mr. GALLIHER. Yes. To do that would mean that we would have placed on our statute-book a law which would prevent men simply because they were Italians coming freely and at their own expense into Canada.

Mr. CLANCY. No, no.

Mr. GALLIHER. We would. That is exactly what we would do. We would prevent men walking over into Canada of their own free will from the United States and taking their chance of getting employment. I do not think that there is a single labour organization in Canada that wishes parliament to enact such a law as that.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman is answering an argument that I do not make at all. What I said was that the Act should prevent men coming in under contract while enabling men to come into this country freely at their own expense under ordinary conditions. I did not state the case that the hon. gentleman is answering at all.

Mr. GALLIHER. What did the hon. gentleman mean when he said that the government should pass a law which would prevent an undesirable class of Italians from coming into this country to compete with labour ? Such a law would restrict the entrance of men into the country under contract or not under contract.

Mr. LANCASTER. The whole Act applies to men coming in under contract.

Mr. GALLIHER. I know what the Act is. I am discussing what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) was discussing.

Mr. CLANCY. I did not say that.

Mr. GALLIHER. I do not wish to misrepresent the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman is doing it.

Mr. GALLIHER. The hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) also referred in the same way to men coming across the border and asked if this Bill would prevent it. I am answering him at the same time. I will withdraw my remarks as regards the hon. member for Bothwell and I will answer what the hon. member for Grenville says. I said that in order to prevent men coming across the border we would have to place on our statute-book a law which would preclude any man from walking across the border to get employment.

Mr. LANCASTER. If he came under contract.

Mr. GALLIHER. No, the hon. member for Grenville went further than that. He asked : Can we not prevent these Italians coming across the line and competing with our men ?

Mr. J. D. REID. They are always brought in under contract.

Mr. GALLIHER. Well then, most decidedly we can prevent them. Reference has been made to Italians. Of course there may be a certain class of Italians who are undesirable. There are numbers of Italians in British Columbia, in the district I represent. Let me tell you what a number of these people are engaged in. Many of them are British subjects. A number of them have been settled in the country for many years. Some are engaged as merchants, some more as farmers, a number of them as sectionmen, and otherwise, on the railways. These men, permit me to say, are not an undesirable class of subjects. So, I think that the casting of a stigma on the Italians should not be passed over without remark at least by myself, when I have a number of very respectable people of that nationality in my own district.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. member (Mr. Galliher) probably refers to what I said about Belgians. I think he will give credit to this side of the House for having at least some knowledge of what the law is at present. That law is directed against persons coming in under contract. I stated that I had personal knowledge of a contract being made with an authority in Belgium by which a large number of Belgians were brought to Canada. I say they are an undesirable class. I do not say they were undesirable because they happened to be Belgians, but that they were undesirable I know. I say that we should prevent the coming in under contract, especially of undesirable people, and it makes no difference from what country they come, or whether that country has an alien labour law similar to that of the United States or not. The people of whom I speak came in and competed with Canadian labour. The section of the Act should go far enough to prevent people of that kind being brought in under contract, no matter where they come from.

Mr. GALLIHER. If the hon. gentleman will turn to section 10 of this Bill he will find that what he refers to is covered to a certain extent. There is already a law to keep out undesirable people, and this section carries it further. It specifies, for instance, idiots, insane persons, paupers or persons likely to become a public charge, professional beggars, persons afflicted with a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease, polygamists, anarchists or persons who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force of the constituted authority of the country or of all law or the assassination of officials, besides other classes.

Mr. J. D. REID. In my constituency there is a case of this kind: About thirty Assyrians were brought into Prescott, and they are there now, and all living in one house. And these people compete with Canadian labour.

Mr. SCOTT. Have you any idle Canadian labourers?

Mr. J. D. REID. Canadian labourers have had to leave the town because of the competition of these people and of a lot of Italians who were brought there. Our people cannot compete with that class of labour.

Mr. LOGAN. Were the Assyrians brought in under contract?

Mr. J. D. REID. One Assyrian learns from a contractor that employment is to be had for twenty or thirty men, and he goes and brings them from Montreal. In that case a contractor would not be guilty of a violation of the Act.

Mr. LOGAN. How can you prevent him from bringing them from Montreal?

Mr. J. D. REID. But we can prevent them from being brought from a foreign country. I do not wish it to be understood that I am objecting to immigrants from Italy or any other country. But what I object to is the introduction of this low class of labour to compete with our native labour. The hon. gentleman from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) read the list of classes who are prohibited under clause 10. But I do not think that, under that section, these people of whom I speak would be excluded. But though they are not among the objectionable classes named in the section, they are not really people who would be called good citizens.

Mr. SCOTT. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has suggested a method of meeting the hon. gentleman's (Mr. J. D. Reid's) views. He suggests that we should make our Alien Labour law applicable as against all countries. Speaking for myself alone, I take occasion to say that I am entirely opposed to any such proposition. It is only seven years ago that parliament first adopted an alien labour law. It was adopted with an apology to which every person in parliament and in the country assented. The statement was made and assented to universally that it was a semi-barbarous law, but we adopted it simply because the United States had adopted such a law and was applying it as against Canadians. It seems to me that we in this parliament and a good many people throughout the country are allowing ourselves to grow nearly crazy in our expressions of opinions about aliens and foreigners. What is the fact as regards Canada? The statement I make, I venture to say, will be assented to by everybody, that practically the only limitation to our material development at the present day is the smallness of our numbers. We have a country which is probably richer in natural resources than any other country in the world, and the only reason why those resources are not developed more than they are is because we have not enough people here. We are six millions of people in this immense country, in a country where sixteen millions would scarcely make a greater impression than our present population, a country with resources to sustain sixty millions. Yet no impartial observer, listening to the discussions that have taken place in this House during this and other sessions of recent years, or reading the articles that appear in our newspapers from day to day, or listening to the talk on our street corners, would imagine this to be the fact. We have spent about half the time of this session and last session devising means to stop people from coming into this country. We passed a law with regard to one class upon whom we put a head tax of $500. Yet one of the main obstacles to our progress is the lack of labour in every portion of the Dominion. In Nova Scotia, in Quebec, in Ontario, the same complaint is heard. The farmers throughout Ontario tell us that they cannot get men to help them in their work. In the west we have millions of acres of the best agricultural land in the world lying idle for lack of people. We have in British Columbia the richest mineral resources of any part of the world undeveloped for lack of people. Yet we are spending half our time in trying to discourage and prevent people coming in and assisting in the development of these resources.

Mr. SPROULE. And spending eight or nine hundred thousand dollars per year in trying to bring them in.

Mr. SCOTT. And, as the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) suggests, on the other hand, we are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars to induce outsiders to come to this country. I do not understand the hon. gentleman to object to that. Let us be consistent. This cry of 'Canada for the Canadians' has been run to death, it has been worn threadbare, in my opinion. As long as we deem it proper for this parliament to vote $700,000 to induce the alien and the foreigner to come to this country and help us to develop its resources, we

should cease this talk in which we have indulged about the alien and the foreigner. The United States, now a country of about 80,000,000, and rapidly becoming one of the strongest countries of the world, if it had indulged in talk of aliens and foreigners, such as we have heard in this House, would not be the great and prosperous nation it is to-day. There would not have been 3,000,000 of Canadians and their descendants living in the United States to-day if the people of the United States had drifted into the idea that we have been expressing in recent months about the alien and the foreigner.

What is the fact with regard to Canadians who live in the United States? And let me say, what is within the knowledge of every person, that the United States Alien Labour Law was not framed to be directed against Canada at all. It was framed for a very good and necessary purpose, and it was directed chiefly against Southern European countries, from which, notwithstanding their law, nearly 90 per cent of their enormous immigration of last year, amounting to a total of nearly a million, came. The United States law is perhaps necessary under their peculiar conditions; but our conditions are entirely different. They have within their own borders all the workmen they require; but if we are to have our agricultural lands occupied and our mineral resources, forest wealth and other enormous resources developed, we have to invite and bring to our country the alien and the foreigner. I have been in perhaps half the states of the American union, and I have never been in a town in that country where I did not find Canadians occupying the very best positions in the community. The Canadian in the United States is not treated as an alien or a foreigner in the sense in which we have come to use those terms. He is treated as one of themselves; and if we are going to continue to get the good class of immigration from the United States that we have got in the past two or three years to come to our western country, we have to stop this senseless talk about the alien and the foreigner. It is no disgrace to be an alien and a foreigner. Is not the German or the Frenchman or the citizen of the United States as good as we are? We had not formerly the same idea about the alien and the foreigner that has grown up in recent years. What is the reason that in Canada, with its six million people where there are room and resources sufficient to sustain a population of sixty millions, we have come to regard the term alien and foreigner as a term of opprobium, disability and disgrace? Is it not because of the criticism that has been made in season and out of season by hon. gentlemen opposite and their newspaper press against a certain class of aliens and foreigners who in the last seven or eight years have been coming in some numbers into this country? I refer to the Galicians and the Doukhobors.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. gentleman say that the United States do not enforce their law against Canadians and treat them as aliens and foreigners when they go in under contract to work? Does he say that the class of Canadians he speaks of as holding the positions which he eulogizes the United States for giving them, are not dealt with in the same way as this Act proposes to deal with aliens?

Mr. SCOTT. I have already referred to the well-known fact that the United States Alien Labour Law was not enacted to be enforced against Canadians; and, except in a very few cases, which have all been very religiously reported throughout Canada, and except at a very few points like Buffalo, where they had a lunatic named DuBarry for a number of years, the United States law has not been enforced against Canadians. We had the evidence this afternoon of the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan), who lives in a border town, and who told us that not scores but hundreds of Canadians cross the river every day to work in Detroit. I was referring to one of the reasons which have brought about this distorted idea that to be an alien or foreigner involves some disability or disgrace. Let me repeat that the chief reason in my opinion is the incessant criticism and condemnation, in season and out of season, which has been directed by hon. gentlemen opposite and their newspaper press against the Galicians and Doukhobors who have come to this country in the last seven years, and who have been admitted by the leader of hon. gentlemen opposite to be a very desirable class of settlers. The hon. leader of the opposition took occasion to state during the present session that he had been very agreeably surprised, on his trip to the west a year or two ago, to find that the opposition to the Galicians and the Doukhobors was mistaken, and he was pleased to believe, from what he had seen, that the next generation of Galicians would be difficult to distinguish from our own people. However, I apologize, at this hour of the evening and at this stage of the session, for having been led into making such extended remarks on this subject; but the suggestion that was made by my hon. friend from Bothwell I deemed it my duty not to let it pass without some protest.

Mr. PUTTEE. Might I ask the hon. gentleman, has he followed the evidence of the Winchester Commission as it has been published?

Mr. SCOTT. That suggests to me another point. I have followed with some care the reports of the evidence which has been taken by the commissioner. Up to the pre-

sent time the complaint with regard to immigration into Canada has been directed against, first, the Chinese, secondly, the Galicians and the Doukhobors, and, thirdly, the particular pets of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) the few scores of people who happen to stray in with a sore eye. But what do we find to-day ? So far have we been led away that the chief complaint of this session has not been against any of these classes. I admit there is room for argument for the $500 tax against the Chinese ; I do not object to that although some of the reasons given for it do not appeal to me : I admit that there may have been some ground for objection to the Galicians and the Doukhobors ; and I certainly think it would be well to exclude the gentlemen with sore eyes. But surely, we are not going to place the civil engineers of the United States, who belong to the highest type of intelligence and citizenship to be found anywhere in the world in the same category with the Chinese, the Southern European or the gentleman with the sore eye. We are allowing ourselves to drift into a state of frantic craziness on this subject.

Mr. LOGAN. I do not agree with a good many of the statements made by the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). It is all very well to get people into our country ; but I would prefer to have 5,000,000 good citizens in Canada to having 10,000,000 comprising anarchists, hoodlums and Dagos, the rough-scuff and off-scourings from all parts of the world. The hon. gentleman speaks of the greatness of the United States. The greatness of the population of the United States is their weakness. They would probably be better off if about 10,000,000 of their people were out of their country at the present time.

One of the recognized weaknesses of the United States is the hoodlum population they have brought in which cares for neither law nor order, neither God nor man. We do not want any such people in Canada. I quite understand that this is a very difficult question to solve. I agree with my hon. friend from Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) that there are Italians who become good citizens ; and if a man comes of his own free will from Italy or elsewhere across the Atlantic, there is no reason why we should not welcome him. But the trouble is that in these large consignments of foreign labour, you will find a considerable number who carry the stiletto under their belt and who are apt to become a source of danger to the community. But if a good Italian comes of his own free will and not under contract, are you going to treat that man, coming from a country which is in alliance with the motherland, as if he were an outcast, and deport him immediately on his arrival, back to his own country ? Are you going to treat an Italian, who may be a highly educated man, as you would treat a Chinaman ? I do not think my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) has made it very plain that the Syrians and Italians, of whom he complains, come from Syria or Italy. I think he will find that they come from the United States and generally come under contract. This Alien Labour law will hit these people. It will prevent their coming into this country from the United States under contract. I believe that law should be enforced. I do not believe in any honest Canadian workingman being asked to work for a wage, on which he cannot support his wife and children, simply because a lot of Dagoes may be had to work at fifty cents a day. This law would prevent the bringing in of people of that kind under contract. And if it should be found that these contracts are being made in Italy as well as in the United States, it will then be time enough to consider whether we should not extend the prohibition against southern European countries. But at present our grievance is not with the bringing of labour from Italy but with the bringing under contract of Syrians and Italians from the United States—these gangs of navvies who travel all through the country north and south. We object to such men being brought in to supply the labour market when we have people of our own to do the work. I am sorry that we cannot devote more time to the consideration of this measure. Still, on the principle that half a loaf is better than no bread, it seems to me that if we cannot secure all the legislation which is contained within the four corners of this Bill as originally introduced, let us at least get what legislation we can through this session in the interests of our workingmen, and next session we can take the matter up again. It seems to me that there are many men in Canada who, while they mark on their goods and letter-heads 'Canada for the Canadians,' have within the last week or two been preaching the doctrine of Canadian labour for anybody in the wide world. I am in sympathy with the objects of this measure and trust we shall make such progress with it that it will be of benefit to the workingmen of Canada.

Mr. KENDALL. I desire to congratulate the hon. Minister of Labour for having resisted the strong pressure brought to bear on him to induce him to withdraw this Bill. I do not disagree entirely with the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). In fact I agree with what he says in part. But only two years ago I found myself face to face with a situation which was anything but agreeable. About some three or four years ago a great company of capitalists undertook to establish steel works in the county of Cape Breton. In the

first place, some thousands of our own Canadian workmen were employed there, but as time went on American managers were brought in, and a number of the best workmen ever produced in our country were discharged to make way for the friends of these managers who came from the United States, and that, not in an insignificant number of cases, but in a very great number. Had a law such as is now proposed then been on our statute-books, that great injustice to our own labouring men could not have occurred, because if the American managers undertook to do as they did, they certainly would have been dealt with by the law. This is only one phase of the labour question. The question of the relationship between capital and labour will not down in Canada. Other countries have had to deal with this question, notably Great Britain, Australia, Germany, France, and in some degree the United States. The attitude of capital in Canda to-day towards the labour element, towards what is known as the labour movement, corresponds very closely with the attitude of politicians and capitalists in Great Britain towards the labour element some seventy years ago. What is the spectacle to-day in Canada? We see capital organizing itself into a great combine for the purpose of fighting labour. We see fortune united to fortune and trading interests to trading interests; and I am informed on the best authority that to-day we have in Canada organizations of capital fortifying themselves by insurance schemes against the losses they may sustain through strikes. Coincidently with this joining of capitalistic interests, we see the labour interest also organizing. The schoolmaster has been abroad in the land during the last few decades, and to-day in the great majority of the labour people there is a deep-seated dissatisfaction with their lot. This is a question which public men will have to recognize. It has been recognized in other countries, and before very few years this question will have to be dealt with in this parliament as it has never been dealt with before. During the last few years in Canada we have had a number of very serious strikes. Capital and labour have had their differences, and not only have they suffered, but also the public interests. In what way can we recognize in this parliament this condition, and in what way can we move to mitigate or relieve the difficulties that arise in connection with these disputes? I think it will be admitted by all those who have read and recognize what is going on in this country that in the future, to a greater degree than in the past, the labour element will make itself felt in our parliament. The next election in Great Britain will furnish the spectacle of a million men, all belonging to labour societies, going to the polls to vote on a certain well-defined labour platform. I believe that if the labour element in this country only recognized its strength, it could, with very little expense and effort, combine its different units into a strong legislative league which would certainly affect legislation in this parliament.

A noted statesman said to a certain writer on economics in Great Britain a few years ago that it seemed as though it had taken the labouring element in England many years to find out what their votes were for. I think those of us who know anything about the situation will admit that up to this time at least the labour element in this country has not realized its potentiality and all it could do if its votes were welded together for legislative effect. I believe that if the labour element in this country united its efforts it would send here not only two such stalwarts as my hon. friend from Naniamo (Mr. Ralph Smith) and my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) but could send to this House fifty or forty men at least pledged to advanced legislation. I know that this does not commend itself to very many in this House. So far as I have been able to judge this parliament is largely representative of the capitalist interest of the country, and if the members for Nanaimo and Winnipeg had with them here some thirty or fifty pledged labourmen, we would more frequently hear of the aspirations of tens of thousands of our countrymen being dealt with in this House and we would more frequently see their aspirations embodied in the statutes of the country. Of couse 'careful' people are inclined to say this is a matter that should be kept in abeyance but I think I know enough of the situation to say that it must be faced and faced before very long. I have lived for some twenty-five years in a country where trades unionism is strong. We have down at Cape Breton probably the strongest labour organization locally to be found in Canada. Trades unionism there, as throughout the world, is an instrument which has its origin in the physical needs of millions and in the normal aspirations of tens of thousands of its best members. I do not speak myself as to the value to the world of trades unionism. On many occasions I have heard capitalists denounce it, but to-night I am going to make others speak who can speak with greater authority than I. I am going to quote from one of the largest employers of labour in Great Britain, one of the greatest iron masters there. I will ask parliament to listen to what this man in the north of Britain thinks of trades unionism. This is Mr. Mather who employs 2,000 men. He says:

> We employers owe more than, as a body, we are inclined to admit to the improvements in our methods of manufacture, due to the firmness and independence of trade combinations.

Our industrial steadiness and enterprise are the envy of the world. The energy and pertinacity of trade unions have caused Acts of parliament to be passed which would not otherwise have been promoted by employers or politicians, all of which have tended to improve British commerce. And it is worthy of note that this improvement has gone on concurrently with great and growing competition of other nations owing to the development of their own resources. The enormous production of wealth in Great Britain during the present half-century, which is due to natural resources and the labour and skill bestowed upon their development, has grown most rapidly during a period remarkable for the extension of the power of trade unionism.

And let me say that the last half century is the period of trades unionism in Great Britain.

Prosperity beyond the dreams of avarice has followed in the wake of our industrial habits and customs, and these have undoubtedly been largely promoted by the great labour organizations. . . . . Every intelligent employer will admit that his factory or workshop, when equipped with all the comforts and conveniences and protective appliances prescribed by parliament for the benefit and protection of his work people—though great effort, and, it may be, even sacrifice, on his part has been made to procure them—has become a more valuable property in every sense of the word, and a profit has accrued to him owing to the improved conditions under which his work people have produced. . . . And speaking of the importance of permanence and stability in a trade, he adds : 'The keen interest they felt in seeking to secure permanence and progress in the trade they pursue has been strikingly shown by the fact that trade unions have agreed to reductions of wages, advocated short time, and offered many suggestions involving sacrifice on the part of the workers in order to stem the tide of temporary adversity.'

Again and again as I said I have heard capitalists in this country who have only had to deal with conditions in this country denounce trade unionism but let us recognize that condlitions are rapidly developing in Canada similar to the conditions in Great Britain, Germany and other places and our employers of labour I think, if they are wise, will recognize what has been done in other countries, and what demands of the labour element have been acceded to.

Now what are the aims of trades unionism ? I am not speaking of the future, of the dreams of co-operative production and co-operative distribution, but simply of some measures to palliate the evils incident to competitive production and distribution.

First as to the question of a fair living wage. Sir, there is economy I hold—and while my opinion in this matter may not be very valuable it is well substantiated by men who do know all the conditions—there is economy in high wages and there is lack of economy in low wages. I lay it down as axiomatic that no man can afford to employ another man unless he has that man's good will and that man's good will cannot be secured unless he receives a sufficient wage to keep him and his family according to the requirements of civilization. I am glad in this House to point out that in the public works of this country, on the Intercolonial Railway and other works, the administrators have seen fit to very substantially advance the wages of the government's employees. I shall not myself say anything as to the economy of shorter hours of labour. I shall make an authority on this matter speak.

Mr. BARKER. Mr. Chairman, I really feel that as a member of the House I ought to object to going into the whole discussion of the long and short hours or eight hours or anything else, on a Bill that has nothing whatever to do with such subject. I do not want to interrupt anybody but I think that at this stage of the session we ought to try to keep somewhat within the ordinary rules.

Mr. KENDALL. I take it that this Bill is intended to benefit the conditions of the labour element in this country. I admit that I am not confining myself closely to the Bill but I am speaking on the cognate subjects, and I think the hon. gentleman who has just interrupted me has on very many occasions in this House, and very lately too, also travelled far afield on some subjects on which he has addressed the House. Of course if you rule me out of order I must agree and sit down but I will take an opportunity a little later on in the session to put myself in order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We are in rather good humour to-night and there has been a good deal of departure from the rules of the House since the discussion of this Bill commenced. As the hon. member from Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall) very seldom speaks, perhaps the committee would be indulgent and allow him to proceed.

Mr. KENDALL. If it is the pleasure of the committee I will proceed, and I promise to be brief. Now in Great Britain there is a movement on foot, as there is in the United States and in all parts of the world, to shorten the hours of labour. It is believed that a ten hour day, even the year round, calls for more energy than most men are able to supply. Now, John Rae has written a book on this subject, and here is what he says in the introduction :

I may take this opportunity of supplementing the account in the text of the experience of the eight-hours system in the engineering trade, by stating here the results of the year's experiment of the eight-hours day in Messrs. Mather and Platt's iron works at Salford, which have only been made known while the sheets of this work were going through the press. Mr. Wm. Mather, M.P., the head of the firm, has written a report upon the experiment for the consideration of employers and work people in the engineering and machine-making trades, and a full sum-

mary of this report appeared in the 'Times' of the 20th March.

The Salford iron works are a large establishment, employing 1,200 hands, and the employers who said Mr. Allan's experiment proved nothing because it was made in a small establishment cannot raise the same objection against the experiment of Mr. Mather's firm. Their business is making machinery, about which they employ a variety of different trades—pattern-makers, iron and brass moulders, smiths, coppersmiths, tinplate workers, engine-fitters, millwrights, electrical mechanics, tuners, fitters, brass-founders, boiler-makers, &c., and on the 20th of February, 1893, they reduced the hours of all trades at their works from 53 to 48 in the week—8¾ hours on each of the first five days of the week and 4¼ on Saturday. The day was divided into two spells, with a single break for dinner, instead of three spells as before; the men took their breakfast before coming to work in the morning. After a year's trial Mr. Mather has had the results carefully examined and compared with the average of the six preceding years, and has found exactly as Messrs. Allan, Messrs. Johnston and Messrs. Short found in their works, that the men have produced more in the shorter hours than they used to do in the longer.

Although this book was written by John Rae, it is not an expression alone of John Rae's opinions and experiences. This book is largely a compilation of the testimony of scores of large employers of labour, to the effect that shorter hours of labour are economically sound, that more is done in shorter hours in many trades, in the run of the year, than in long hours. Now I would like to point out to the government that ten years ago, in the navy yards of Woolwich and in the cartridge factories of Great Britain, the hours were reduced from ten to eight. I would also point out that on all government works in the United States, I think, speaking subject to correction, on all works calling for manual labour, only eight hours a day is exacted instead of nine. I may mention that two firms with which I am acquainted down in Nova Scotia reduced their hours of labour from ten to nine. They did so with fear and trembling at the beginning, but these companies have since informed me that in the run of the year they have got more work out of their men in nine hours per day, or at least as much, as formerly they did when they worked ten hours, and with the very gratifying result that the men are in better humour and take to their work much more keenly than when they put in ten hours a day. I desire also to mention that while a few men in the government employ are employed for short hours, four to six hours a day, the great bulk of Dominion government employees in manual occupations are compelled to work for ten hours a day.

Now, I come to another aim of organized labour, and that is to secure legislation that will provide compensation for injury and for death. I have already spoken in this House of what is known as the British Workmen's Compensation Act. That Act was put on the statute-book of Great Britain and came into force in 1898. In 1900 the scope of its operations was extended. By this Act, if any employee is killed or injured in certain specified hazardous occupations, he or his representatives receive compensation for death, and if he is injured, he receives compensation for time lost. This Act virtually makes an employer the insurer of his workmen at his own, not the workmen's cost. I think myself it would be well for the government of this country, in dealing with employees in certain hazardous businesses, to make a more generous provision than it has been doing for losses by death and by accident. I am glad to be able to compliment the Postmaster General on the fact that on several occasions when employees of his department have been killed in the railway mail service, he has come to parliament and has asked in each case for $2,000 for the family of the employee killed. It is to be regretted that on the Intercolonial Railway where brakemen, couplers, firemen, engineers and others are being frequently disabled or killed, there is no such generous provision for these men. Now, I think that when a man loses a leg or an arm on the Intercolonial, some provision should be made for compensating him. I would strongly urge that since in an old and conservative country like Great Britain, the government has adopted legislation of so advanced a character as I have referred to, now eight years afterwards, the government of this country might prudently move to put a similar Act on our statute-book for the benefit of its own employees. I believe the province of British Columbia has a similar legislation on its statute-book, and has had it for two years. Down in Nova Scotia some four years ago an Act called the Employer's Liability Act was adopted, which embodied many of the best features of the Workmen's Compensation Act. With regard to old age pensions, another aim of trades unionism, I shall say nothing beyond the fact that the British parliament has recognized the principle of the scheme to this extent, that it has voted an endorsement of it. I may also mention that our trades unions will also urge for legislation to give them a fairer chance in the courts of law, but on that point I will not dilate at present. To sum up the points I have been making, I think I may say that the government, as a great employer of labour in this country, should be a model employer, and that as far as possible the principle of a fair minimum wage, shorter hours, compensation for injury and death, and old age pensions should be provided for.

Now one word more. As I said in the beginning of my remarks, I believe the day is not far distant when the labour element of this country will make itself felt in this parliament as it has never done before. What I am about to say I can say without

being reproached that I am catering to the labour vote, because circumstances have about forced me out of public life.

Before sitting down I wish to accentuate what I have already said as to the elective power of the labour element. They have only two labour representatives, they should have more, but if my voice and advice reach the leaders of the labour party in Canada I would say to them: Do not attempt the impossible. Do not attempt to send into this House any great number of straight labour representatives because if you do you will fail to send five here. To my mind there is an effective method which can be used to secure legislative power for the workingmen and that is for labouring men in every county where the labour element is an elective factor to pledge their candidates, Grit and Tory alike, to support a moderate labour platform. Some Liberals will be elected and some Tories, both being free when they come to Ottawa, to join their parties on every question except those connected with labour matters but on labour matters they would come pledged to unite together and form a party to forward labour enactments. By this method only it seems to me, at least for the next ten or fifteen years, can labour make itself felt as a factor in the development in Canada. What I advise should take place in Dominion elections I also advise with reference to provincial elections. With very little expense and difficulty the present labour organizations could form a Canadian Legislative labour league whose duty it would be to direct the labour policy and see that all candidates for public honours subscribed to their tenets, and if in some constituencies Liberal and Tories arrange to ignore that plaform then it would be in order for the labour elements to thrust their own candidates into the field. I have just a parting word and it is this; I am glad that certain advanced men in the Liberal party in this House, have during the last few years, endeavoured to make progress along the lines I have indicated and I sincerely hope that the labour element of this country will give due credit to my hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Sir William Mulock). I know that he has not accomplished for them all that the labour element wish to be accomplished, but in spite of the difficulties which have surrounded him at every turn I know that he has effected a very substantial change in the legislation regarding labour in this country. I would like to say to my Liberal friends that the labour element the world over is the natural ally of Liberalism and that it is the duty of the Liberal party to stand by its own allies. I wish to point out, just to accentuate this idea, that Mr. Gladstone, when asked once what was the difference between Toryism and Liberalism said: The essence of Toryism is distrust of the people; the essence of Liberalism is confidence in their ultimate good judgment. Though some people in this country may think that it will be a dangerous experiment to send a strong labour, radical element to this parliament I believe that in the future of this country, if we are to develop and grow, we must place our confidence in the labour element. The schoolmaster, as I said before, has been abroad in the labour element. The labour element is dissatisfied and is bound to make itself felt and once more, Mr. Chairman, I ask the great Liberal leaders of this country to see to it that our natural ally is not alienated from us.

The patriotism of our labour element is as strong as in all other classes, and I know that the responsibility of influence in this House would show the aims of the Canadian labour element in a light that would be a pleasant surprise to people who now regard those aims with anger or with dread.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) Before the amendment is put, may I be permitted to inquire from the hon. minister entrusted with this Bill (Sir Wm. Mulock) whether, under the new Act, our farmers will be allowed to import old country Frenchmen to work on their farms?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am sorry that I cannot answer my hon. friend (Mr. Léonard) in his own beautiful language.

Mr. LEONARD. Do you understand the question?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes, I understand the question quite well. My hon. friend asks whether under this Act it will be permitted to bring in aliens to aid in the cultivation of the farm.

Mr. LEONARD. Yes.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. This law applies the same way to all classes of the people. Section 1 of the Act of 1897 is undisturbed and unaltered. My hon. friend is quite familiar with the law as it is today. We leave it just as it is in regard to that class of labour.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) I am satisfied with the answer given by the hon. minister, and I would only tell him that I think this part of the Bill should be amended by inserting a clause to the effect that the Frenchmen from France, the best or about the best farmers in the world, shall be admitted into our country.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. (Translation.) Not the Frenchmen from the United States?

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) No, the French farmers from France. This Bill, if I understand it right, is mainly for the purpose of preventing aliens from coming into this country and competing with our own people in an unfair way; but at this moment the farmers—I refer to the Quebec farmers

especially—are suffering grievously from the scarcity of farm labour. You cannot find a sufficient number of farm hands in the district of Montreal this year to do the harvesting. Then, they will start working at half past seven or eight o'clock in the morning and stop between five or six in the evening, and no later, and still you must pay them from $1.75 to $2 a day. I would be very glad if the hon. minister would see that this law shall not apply to the French peasants settling in Canada as farm labourers or farmers. I have no hesitation in saying that we, the French Canadians of Quebec, are so loyal and have given such evidence of our profound and sincere loyalty to our mother country of to-day, as to be in a position to declare frankly and emphatically, and without giving rise to suspicion, that we still feel in our hearts a filial love for France, our mother country of old and of which we are proud. It would only be doing justice to the French minority in our country to exempt the old country Frenchmen from the disabilities imposed on foreigners generally. For seven or eight years past the province of Quebec has treated the government as its spoilt child and elected many of its supporters in consideration of which the government should not discriminate against that minority in the matter of immigration.

The government are spending millions every year for the purpose of bringing settlers to our shores ; we are spending large sums of money on immigrants from Russia, Belgium, Germany. It seems it would be conferring no very great favour on the province of Quebec, to amend section 3 in such a way as to allow the French peasants to settle in Canada.

Mr. TALBOT. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I am rather surprised that my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Leonard) should appeal to the hon. minister to amend the Bill in that way, and to discriminate in favour of French immigration. I cannot conceive that an hon. member, well posted as regards this question, knowing how averse the French peasantry are to the idea of leaving their native country, should insist on such an exception being made on their behalf. When the French peasant has once made up his mind to leave his native soil, it is to settle in some of the French colonies, and Canada is a British possession.

But we are broad-minded enough, hospitable enough, and proud enough of our past history to greet with open arms those who come to us from old France, the country we love so much. However, I do not hesitate in saying that the proposal of the hon. member for Laval, that we should make an exception in favour of the French peasant, is unworthy of a man who pretends to know anything of the real needs of the Dominion.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) Why ?

Mr. TALBOT. (Translation.) The more so that there is absolutely nothing in the law which distinguishes between the various nationalities of Europe. All immigrants who come to us from Europe, whether from Switzerland, Belgium or France, are on the same footing; there is no difference made. I fail to see on what grounds the government could be asked to discriminate in favour of the French peasant. Everybody knows—and no one better than the hon. member for Laval—that it is an exceedingly difficult matter to induce the French peasant to leave France.

Under the circumstances, I trust the hon. member will not insist on his proposal being adopted.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Perhaps I may be permitted to say that, with a correct knowledge of the law, neither my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Léonard) nor my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) would discuss a state of affairs which is really imaginary. It is permitted to-day for people to come to Canada voluntarily from any country in the world.

Mr. LEONARD. But it is not permitted to ask them to come.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes, it is permitted to ask them to come from any country in the world that has not an alien labour law against Canada. France has no alien labour law against Canada, nor has Germany, nor Belgium. In fact, so far as I know, only one country in the world has such a law. Therefore, there will be nothing to prevent a citizen of France coming here under contract or voluntarily if he be so disposed.

Mr. FOWLER. Where does the hon. minister find in the Act anything that justifies the statement he has just made ? I ask for information.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Can my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) point out anything in the Act which would prevent these people being brought from France ?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes ; this section does not except anybody.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Which section ?

Mr. FOWLER. Section 2.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We have dropped that.

Mr. FOWLER. Oh ; the hon. minister has dropped it. Well, what is left ? Is the title left ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is the last thing we touch.

Mr. FOWLER. He is going to change the title, is he not ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We will deal with the title by and by.

Mr. FOWLER. Surely when so little is left of the Bill, he will not give it such a high sounding title ?

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. minister says that 'alien' would apply to any other country ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. An alien is an alien.

Mr. J. D. REID. Well, why would it not apply to France as well as to any other country ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Because section 9 of the Act of 1897 says it shall not apply to any country that has not an alien labour law against Canada.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not understand it yet. The minister states in one breath that the word 'alien' applies to any other country——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I did not say that the word 'alien' applied to everybody. An alien is a citizen of a foreign country, and, so far as Canada is concerned, all the world except British subjects are aliens.

Mr. TALBOT. I heard the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) and the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) speaking in favour of French immigration ; and yet, if I remember correctly what has been said this session and for several sessions past, you have complained of the number of French people that are in the country to-day. You say that we lack loyalty, though we are the descendants of men who came here two or three centuries ago. To-day, for a purpose, you are advocating making special mention in this Bill of French peasantry or French immigration ; and yet, if I remember what has been said during this session, you find fault because there are too many French-Canadians in Canada to-day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. TALBOT. You accuse us of want of loyalty. You are willing that a special clause should be inserted to provide for bringing peasantry here from France, when you have no faith in the descendants of men who came to this country from France three hundred years ago. If you are serious, I would like to know it, and I would like to know upon what you base your strong appeals in favour of French immigration.

Mr. FOWLER. I have been attacked by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot). He has stated that the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) has said there were too many French-Canadians in this country.

Mr. TALBOT. I take exception to that I did not say——

Mr. FOWLER. The statement of the hon. member for Bellechasse is an utter falsehood——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TALBOT. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. I throw the insinuation back in the teeth of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Both gentlemen will please take their seats. Now, we will hear the point of order.

Mr. TALBOT. I never said the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) or the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) objected to French immigration or to French people living in Canada. But I question their right, and I question their sincerity, in asking now—in order to make a point—that exception should be made in this Bill in favour of French immigration, because I stated that, from the other side of the House, ever since this session began——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. TALBOT. My hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) may shrug his shoulders. He may smile. That is what I stated, and I stick to every word of it.

Mr. FOWLER. State your point of order.

Mr. TALBOT. This is my point of order. The hon. member has no right to put words in my mouth which I did not use. I question his sincerity now in making a special point of French immigration.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot) has not stated any point of order. He did state—and I am in the judgment of the committee when I say it—that the member for King's and the member for Grenville had said there were too many French in Canada.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. FOWLER. The members of the committee know perfectly well what the hon. gentleman said——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have settled this point several times. If an hon. member is accused of making a certain statement and says he did not make that statement, other hon. members, whether they believe it or not are bound to accept that denial.

Mr. FOWLER. I always bow to the decision of the chair and I do it with special willingness when you, Sir, occupy the chair. I am quite willing to accept the ruling of the chair. And when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot) makes the statement that he did not say what we heard him say, and what fifty or sixty witnesses here know he said, I am perfectly willing to accept his statement.

Mr. TALBOT. I leave it to 'Hansard.'

Mr. FOWLER. I trust my explanation will be satisfactory to the hon. gentleman

(Mr. Talbot). Now, the hon. gentleman has said that I was speaking in favour of the immigration of the French peasantry. As a matter of fact, I never mentioned the French peasantry. It may be that the hon. gentleman is in such a condition of mind that he cannot understand a plain statement when it is made. If that is the case—and we must judge from his words and conduct it is—of course we must excuse him. We will not pursue that.

Mr. TALBOT. I appeal to you, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) has the right to make an insinuation of that kind. If the hon. gentleman says things of that kind in the chamber perhaps he will be man enough to say them outside.

Mr. FOWLER. I am man enough to say them anywhere so far as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot) is concerned.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The two gentlemen have had their little breeze and we had better get back to business.

Mr. J. D. REID. As the hon. member for Bellechasse has referred to me, perhaps I may be allowed to say that I fancy it was the hon. gentleman beside me (Mr. Léonard) who made the remark about the French peasantry. For my part, I did not mention the French peasantry or the French people at all. I would like to see immigrants from all countries come to Canada—that is a good class of immigrants. If the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Léonard) made a special appeal for one class he did it of his own free will and without any suggestion from me. In fact, I did not know that that was what he was saying, because, I am sorry to say, I do not understand a word of the French language. I do not wish the hon. member for Bellchasse to attribute to me sentiments that I have not expressed. I repeat that I shall be glad to see as many people as possible come to Canada, so long as they are of the proper class, no matter what country they come from. But I have been objecting to a low class of labour that if brought into this country, and the only nationalities I mentioned were Italians and Syrians. So far as French labour is concerned, I never mentioned it. In my county we have had from time to time French workmen, and they have been a first-class lot of workmen, and I am sure it is the same throughout the whole Dominion. No member on this side of the House has made any reference to any other class of labour than Italians, Syrians and Chinese, and therefore the hon. member for Bellechasse is stating something most unfair to us on this side of the House.

Mr. TALBOT. I want to be well understood.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This discussion is out of order.

Mr. FOWLER.

Mr. TALBOT. I did not say a word in regard to what the hon. gentleman said with reference to French immigration that was not in accordance with the facts. I said I was surprised that the hon. gentleman spoke as he did.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman will pay attention to the chair. He continues to speak when the chair is addressing the House. This discussion is out of order. I wish that to be clearly understood.

Mr. BOYD. I want to ask the minister who has charge of the Bill if I understood him correctly to say, in answering the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Léonard), that the Bill, with respect to people sending for farm help, will apply only to countries which have an alien labour law of their own. In that case would American settlers who are now in Manitoba and the Northwest, who send to the United States for help to take in their harvest, as they undoubtedly will have to do, be subject to this fine ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There is nothing in the Bill that deals with that subject at all. Whatever their rights are they are determined by the Act of 1897.

Mr. BOYD. Will the minister tell us to what extent the law of 1897 would affect them ? Could not some clause be inserted to make it clear that this law does not apply to farm help ? This is a very serious matter to the west, because it will take at least 25,000 additional hands to take off this year's crop in Manitoba and the Northwest. It took 20,000 two years ago, and it is conceded in all quarters that we have a greater crop to be harvested this year than we had two years ago ; and nothing must be done that will interfere in any way with that work. This bears out the objection which I raised this afternoon against introducing such a contentious measure into this House at this late hour of the session. There is no excuse for it, and I think the minister should take a little time to frame a clause to make it sure that the measure will not interfere with that work in any way.

Mr. FOWLER. I think there is a great deal in what the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) says. What the minister aims at is to prevent the bringing in of mechanics and labouring men in case of a strike to assist manufacturers to coerce the working men of this country. You want to be careful, in trying to remove that difficulty, that you do not create a greater one. It is very important to the settlers of our western country that they should have an opportunity to get labour cheaply, and that the American settlers should be able to bring their relatives from the United States to assist them on their farms, with the view of eventually becoming settlers. I think the minister would be wise to take this into

advisement, and come down next session with a first-class Bill which will do what he desires to accomplish by this Bill, but which I do not think it will accomplish. It shows how ill-digested this Bill is, that as introduced it has a title that does not fit it at all ; but after it has been cut to pieces, and left with only two sections, and one of these with only two lines, it makes the Bill a perfect laughing-stock.

Mr. PUTTEE. I wonder if the hon. gentleman and others who have spoken are aware that there is in this Bill section 8, which is evidently intended to deal with the construction of a new railway, and which affects the question which some of these gentlemen have paid a good deal of attention to this session, namely, the employment of aliens. The hon. gentleman is asking that this Bill be killed.

Mr. HENDERSON. Who said so ?

Mr. PUTTEE. I am putting it in plainer language ; but that is what the hon. gentleman meant by asking that the Bill be put over till next year. We have had a commission taking evidence ; and, although the report has not yet been made, it may be anticipated that the charges made by the Amalgamated Engineers of Canada have been practically sustained, and that foreign engineers are almost altogether in charge of the preliminary work for the construction of the new railway for which this country is going to pay public money. Is this matter going to be put over a year ? That is what these hon. gentlemen are asking. This little bit of an amendment, which we have been on for three hours, amounts to nothing at all, and it is being discussed to keep us from getting to these other material sections of the Bill.

Mr. SCOTT. I see by the newspaper reports that a number of these engineers have been deported to the United States, so evidently we have a law which covers the case. We are now in the first week of August, 1904, and probably another session will be called next winter or spring. There is no great likelihood of many millions of these undesirable Italians being brought in under existing conditions before we meet again.

Mr. PUTTEE. I do not want to let that statement go uncontradicted. I have the contradiction of it here. It is from the secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers. He says :

> To the best of our belief to the time of writing this letter, not one single alien has been disturbed. H. A. Kyle who wrote the letter disparaging Canadians, A. G. Allen who spoke of the King as a blackguard and all the others are still here, receiving high salaries, although the evidence proved they were grossly incompetent and capable and qualified British subjects are out of employment and their families in want.

They state that not one man has gone out, but they are all in the same positions in the Grand Trunk Railway just as before Judge Winchester investigated.

Mr. FOWLER. Under the existing law these men can be deported. That is the understanding we are given. One of these engineers has been arrested by order of the Department of Justice, according to the reports in the papers. If we have a law at present under which these aliens can be deported, why is it necessary to pass this particular section ?

Mr. PUTTEE. Is the law sufficient at present ?

Mr. FOWLER. The Department of Justice is proceeding under the law, because this man is under arrest, and we have the statement made that they had all left the country. It has been insinuated by an hon. gentleman who poses as a stalwart labour representative that I want to kill the Bill and am an enemy of labour. Why, I have been trying to advocate the rights of labour, and it is not in the interests of labour that an undigested measure should be put on the statute-book. Much better to have a properly considered measure than one under which the proceedings taken will be pretty sure to be declared null and void. So far as I can see, these men who pose as the greatest friends of labour are not always the true friends of labour. One hon. gentleman who poses as a sort of radical in this House read to us an essay a little while ago on this labour question. I want that hon. gentleman to understand that so far as I am concerned, and I believe so far as the other members of this House are concerned, we do not represent the capitalists of this country, but the people of this country, and all men have rights in this country even though they are unfortunate enough to be capitalists. Members on both sides are independent representatives of the people, and I think the insinuation is one that should not be allowed to pass unchallenged which the hon. member for Cape Breton made a little while ago.

Mr. BOYD. I would suggest that you add at the close of the clause 'save and except labour for agricultural purposes.' I again wish to draw the attention of the minister to the importance of this amendment, because otherwise thousands of people will be subject to a fine of $1,000.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Section 5 of the original Alien Labour Act, 1897, contains a proviso to the effect that nothing in the Act shall be construed as prohibiting any person from assisting any member of his family, and so forth.

Mr. FOWLER. That gives some latitude but would not cover the case of farm labourers.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not think you will ever hear of anybody enforcing the law under such circumstances. Bringing in a farm labourer when there were none to be had would never be regarded in a community as an offence.

Mr. FOWLER. Why should you not make that amendment, just say 'farm servants'?

Mr. GALLIHER. If you were to do that, another application might be made for another class of people. You cannot legislate for any one class. I do not think that my hon. friend's fears are justified.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would again appeal to the minister in view of the fact that there are fifteen sections to this Bill and we have only reached the third, to allow the Bill to remain over until next year.

Mr. BOYD. The clause to which the minister has referred has no application to the case at all.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My hon. friend (Mr. Boyd) is asking us to pass some legislation, but the hon. gentleman on his left (Mr. J. D. Reid) wants the Bill to be dropped.

Mr. BOYD. I am not looking for legislation. I asked that if you are going to pass legislation this should be done. I raised the objection to this measure being brought down to the House at so late a stage.

Section agreed to.

On section 5,

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I move to strike out section 5.

Mr. FOWLER. Why strike it out?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. In order to meet the wishes of my hon. friends opposite and to avoid waste of time, not because I do not think it is a good clause.

Motion agreed to, and section struck out.

On section 6,

Mr. FOWLER. I would ask the minister to make a slight change here by inserting after the word 'induce,' the word 'deter,' so as to make it work both ways and have a penalty for circulating false representations to deter people from coming to this country.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am not able to agree. Section 6 is intended to prevent a wrong done to individuals, inducing them to come to Canada by false representations. That is an entirely different thing from a person in Canada setting afloat some statement that may or may not be true as regards conditions in Canada. Preventing people from coming to Canada is a very different thing from inducing people to come to Canada by fraud.

Mr. FOWLER. We believe Canada is the best country in the world, and if by representations you prevent men from coming here to better their condition, you are doing an injury not only to the individual but to the nation. Whenever men come here, if they cannot get work in the line they expected, they can get it in some other line. No man in this country need go begging for work. I cannot see any force in the reasoning of the hon. gentleman. It seems to me that the injury is alike to both parties, so far as the individual is concerned, it is certainly an injury against the state. I do not see why the section cannot be amended by the addition of the word 'deter' which would prevent that state of things from being carried on.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We might all sometime or other be chargeable perhaps with having offended against such a law, some of us might say something that was not as patriotic as it ought to be. There are many statements afloat from time to time that may be said to injure our country. That is a different class of offence from using Canada as a base of operations to attract people from abroad for the purpose of defrauding them. That is an offence against individuals—to use our country as a base of operations for a thing of that kind. But general observations or statements that may affect the movements of people in another country, but who do not come here, are not at all in the same class of transactions.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not think the minister is correct in saying that all of us say things that are not patriotic.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I will admit that my hon. friend is an exception.

Mr. FOWLER. If that is the general rule, I certainly am.

On section 8,

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I propose to amend this section by adding the following to the end thereof:

> And shall be recoverable in the same manner as are the penalties mentioned in said section 1 as amended.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would ask the minister to add these words in line 14 after the word 'railway,' 'or any public work.' The clause would then read:

> The construction of a railway or of any public work.

I would like to see that provision apply not only to railways but to canals, or dredging, or any other government work. I do not think it should be limited to railways. We have very large contracts on canals, in fact larger than on railways.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My hon. friend from Grenville asks to have this clause

amended by making it applicable to public works generally. There is no reason in principle for not acceding to that proposition, but it is a new doctrine, and we have to approach it with some degree of caution. This amendment is the outcome of a discussion we had in the House when considering the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill. The government then announced that before the session closed they would propose a general measure applicable to all railways aided by the government, instead of, as was then suggested, having such a provision applicable to a particular railway. We have not considered the proposal except in connection with railways. There are a good many railways now being constructed, and this in itself will be an important departure. After it has been working for a time we will have an opportunity of seeing whether it is wise to extend the principle generally. I am favourably disposed towards that view myself, but I have not reached a conclusion. All we said was that we intended to invite the consideration of the House to a clause in substance the same as the clause adopted in regard to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. That is the clause we have adopted here with perhaps some slight changes, but, the substance is the same. That is the only clause we have had under consideration. My hon. friends are aware that there will be a session again before a great while.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is a reason why this Bill should remain over.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is important that this clause should pass now because there are some of these works that are likely to go on at an early date. I trust that the Grand Trunk Pacific, eastern and western divisions, will be under construction without any delay. Surely the preparatory work at least will be undertaken. As soon as this Bill passes we will be able to apply it to the work under construction. It would be very unfortunate if we allowed four months to elapse before doing anything. In four months a good part of this work might be under contract. We want to catch the work before they get it under contract.

Mr. SCOTT. Would it make a difference in the prices of contractors ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I believe the railway companies say so, but I do not think it will make any difference as to that, because under this clause they can employ Canadians, all the immigrants that come into the country and if there is not enough labour to be obtained of this class the government can allow them to import other classes of labour from other countries. My own opinion, and I think it is the opinion of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) that when the opportunity is given him that this scheme will afford he will be able to import all the labour that is required that cannot be got in the country from desirable parts of the world, whereas, if we left out this section we would have the road built, doubtless by navvies who come and go, who would not be citizens of this country and the only fruit of whose labour would be the actual work constructed. They will go away when the work is completed, take away their wages, and as far as they are concerned leave the country as empty as when they came. We think it will be a means of enabling us to control some of the classes of people who are coming here, but not necessarily reducing the volume. This clause will give the government power to control the selection of as many people as are required from desirable parts of the world to build the road. I do not think it will have any appreciable effect on the cost of the road. I can understand the companies making a campaign against this measure, I can understand the railways desiring to have freedom to retain their old methods and carry on the work in the old way, but I doubt that it is in the interest of the country that great roads such as the Transcontinental should be constructed without any regard to the people who are to build them and without any regard to the settlement of the country. This is the measure which will be approved of throughout the whole of Canada. I believe that the principle involved in this clause in its application to the Grand Trunk Pacific, will receive general approval and I am sure it will be one for the benefit of Canada.

Mr. BARKER. I wish to call the hon. minister's particular attention to the first ten lines of clause 8 of his Bill which seem to me to be utterly foreign to the general purpose of the Bill. These lines do not affect the question of labour. They probably would be proper provisions to put in some public works Act or some other Act about subsidies from the country. They relate simply to the letting of contracts, not to the labourers employed by contractors. The provisions of these ten lines would require very careful consideration, far more consideration, it appears to me, than has been given to this clause. We all know that with the enormous amount of work likely to go on in Canada, such as the Grand Trunk Pacific, the branch lines being built by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and by Mackenzie and Mann, the comparatively few contractors of Canada would hardly be able to undertake all the work, and certainly it would be a very serious handicap to the Grand Trunk Pacific, to the government itself in letting contracts for the eastern division, to Mackenzie & Mann and other companies, if it were impossible for them to accept tenders from any contractor except a Canadian. I do not think that has been fully considered by the hon minister.

The comparatively few contractors in Canada, finding an enormous amount of work going on in the next three or four years, might put their heads together and practically hold up the railways which are forced to do an enormous amount of work in a very short period of time. I do not mean to say that I do not desire to see Canadians get the work, but this part of the clause requires a great deal more consideration than it is possible for us to give at this late stage of the session. I think the hon. minister should take up that subject specially with those particularly informed upon and interested in the question. Conceding that work in Canada subsidized by the country should be undertaken by nobody but a Canadian, it is a very serious question and requires very grave consideration. We might find an enormous expense laid upon the companies, and I do not think it right to act hastily. I repeat that I want it distinctly understood that I will go as far as the hon. gentleman will in his desire to give work to Canadians but we must behave reasonably and sensibly.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) says that this question has not received consideration. I desire to call his attention to the fact that during the discussion upon the Grand Trunk Pacific measure in this House, this particular question was discussed at considerable length by members on his side of the House and that it was pointed out by several hon. members that this very proposal that we are now considering should be embodied in that legislation. The hon. gentleman proceeds to argue that the matter has not received sufficient consideration. To my own knowledge the matter has been considered at great length by members of this House, particularly by members on his own side.

Mr. BARKER. I tried to make myself clear, that I am in favour of a proposition by which Canadians shall get this work. But I do think that we are going rashly to put on the statute-book a general law that for every railway subsidized by the government, no one but a Canadian contractor shall be allowed to tender.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) but I would like to point out that, from my point of view, it would be as fair to have a general law as to have a particular law dealing exclusively with one company as suggested by hon. gentlemen on the other side. The position I take is that if we are to have any legislation on a matter of this kind it should be general legislation and not an enactment directed against one particular company.

Mr. BARKER. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am trying to state the difficulty——

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. I appreciate the difficulty.

Mr. BARKER. I do not say it is impossible to frame this law, but I do say that the framing of it is a very serious matter. If the Grand Trunk Pacific and other lines are to be built as rapidly as it is said they should be built, and if we say to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann and to all the railway concerns subsidized, you must have none but Canadian contractors, then we may find ourselves in the position of desiring to have railways built and no contractors to undertake them.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. They will not get them if the country does not give them a chance.

Mr. BARKER. I do not know the circumstances well enough to speak with certainty. I am only saying, following up what has been said on this side——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No, the hon. gentleman is differing from what was said on that side.

Mr. BARKER. I am following the lines pursued by hon. gentlemen on the point, that we are driven to discuss the Bill during the last moments of the session, when there is no fair opportunity to consider such an important question. Moreover, I say this is introduced into a Labour Bill though it is not a labour question.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. An omnibus Bill.

Mr. BARKER. It is a question as to letting contracts for public work, and is as distinct from a labour question as any question can be. It is one thing to deal with the labourers employed by the contractor, and it is another to deal with the letting of the contract. I am prepared to consider a clause to enable our Canadian contractors to secure work, and I think it might be quite possible to put on the statute-book a proper clause to that end. But I think this too important a matter to be stuck into a Bill with which it has no relation. I would further point out, with regard to the other part of the Bill, that there is a provision here that for either wilful or negligent violation of any of the provisions of this section there shall be penalties, and large penalties. Now, I do not think it has been usual under our law to make mere negligence a punishable offence. It is a new departure. I point that out now but I have already spoken to the hon. minister on the subject.

Mr. J. D. REID. I think the minister was referring to me when he spoke of some hon. members differing from the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) in desiring certain words inserted. I was not differing from the hon. gentleman, but I was taking it for granted that this clause was designed to effect a certain purpose. The minis-

ter has stated that during the session we have voted a large amount of money to be expended on a government railway. This Bill is to be rushed through in order to make certain that this money shall be distributed amongst Canadian workmen. Well, now, is it not a fact also that we have voted large sums of money this session to be expended on public works—canals, harbours, &c. ? And is it not a fact that we have to-day American dredges with every man in their crews an American citizen, employed on government work ? The contract is probably given to some Canadian, but he immediately sublets to Americans who bring their plant, men, tools and everything over to this country and do the work, and not a dollar of the money goes to the Canadian workman's pocket. If the hon. minister is so anxious to make it certain that the country's money shall go into the hands of Canadian contractors, why will he not allow the money as spent on public works by the government itself to be spent under similar conditions ? The hon. minister has explained why this condition should apply to subsidized railways. But if a man gets a bonus of $6,400 a mile for a railway, he has to spend more than twice as much money himself that does not come from the public treasury. Under this rule the contract must be given to Canadians, but we have public works every dollar spent upon which comes out of the public treasury, and yet the minister has nothing to say when we find that money going into the hands of American citizens. Is not this class legislation of the very worst kind ? The hon. gentleman says he had not time to consider the question of public works.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I did not say that.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then, if the hon. minister had time, so much the more is he to blame if he did not consider them.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I did not say we did not consider them.

Mr. J. D. REID. I understood from the minister that they did not come to a conclusion. That they would insert this condition, and I suppose there must be some reason why they will not do it. Is it because he wants Americans to get these contracts?—because they are the only ones to compete against our contractors and they are really making our Canadian dredge men tie up their dredges. When they get through with a work on the American side, they have their fleets there ready to bring in and, they are ready to compete practically at cost in order to tie our dredges up. Therefore it seems to me most reasonable that the minister should add these words so as to make this provision apply to all government works. In the case of public works every dollar of the money spent is public money, whereas in the case of a railway the country pays only about one-third of the cost, while private funds must supply the remainder. A great many railways receive bonuses this session, and I would ask the minister if this would not apply to all these as against the Grand Trunk.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. Certainly.

Mr. J. D. REID. Some of these railways will receive $3,200 a mile, yet everybody knows that a railway cannot be built for that money and the balance must come from private capitalists. Surely, if it is reasonable to make this a condition with regard to railways, it is reasonable to make it as regards public works every dollar of which is paid by the public.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. A contractor on a public work does not receive any gift from the government.

Mr. J. D. REID. I mean a contract given by the government.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. But I want the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Reid) to see the difference. The bonus to a railway is something given to the company, whereas public money given to a contractor on a public work is given in exchange for the work which the contractor does.

Mr. BARKER. But surely if when we give a portion of the cost of the work we insist upon it being done by a Canadian contractor, all the more should we insist when we do the whole work.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. What I point out is that in the one case you are not giving anything and the work belongs to the people; but the Bill refers to work for which you give some money, while the property afterwards belongs to the company.

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. member is quite willing that a contract should be given to American citizens, because they are the only competitors.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I agree with the hon. gentleman entirely as to what he wants ; but as members have already objected to the length the Bill goes, I think it would be foolish to extend it any further.

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. member says that when a contract is let to Americans, the people get the advantage by its being a little cheaper. But in the case of a railway which is granted $3,000 a mile, the people get the benefit of that.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. The company own the railway, while in the other case the government gets the benefit.

Mr. J. D. REID. I object to it entirely on the ground of Canadian money going out of this country. Of course, this Bill will

not apply to present contracts; but there will be a lot of contracts let to American citizens, and I think the money should be kept in this country. Every hon. member knows that this Bill has been got up entirely for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. There may be some reason for that when the government are practically building the Grand Trunk Pacific; but is it fair that the minor railways to which we have been granting about one-third of the actual cost should be put in the same position? If this Bill is to apply to them, you are going to increase the cost of these railways to the extent of the bonuses that are given to them. This Bill is unfair to the contractors who build these railways as well as to the public in regard to public contracts. Therefore I again urge the hon. minister to take into his consideration my suggestion to add the words 'or any public work.'

Mr. LOGAN. When the hon. gentleman's friends were in power and a contract was let in the Public Works Department or in the Railway Department, there was no safeguard whatever for the workingmen of Canada. But since the fair-wage resolution was adopted four years ago, this clause has been inserted in every contract let by the Public Works Department:

> All workmen employed upon the work comprehended in and to be executed pursuant to the said contract shall be residents of Canada, unless the minister is of opinion that Canadian labour is not available, or that emergencies or other special circumstances exist which would render it contrary to public interest to enforce the foregoing condition in respect of the employment of resident Canadian workmen.

In every contract awarded by the Railway Department there is the following distinct clause:

> No labourers shall be employed on or about the works hereby contracted for who are not citizens of or resident within Canada, but the minister may, in writing, waive the provisions of this clause, either in general or to a limited extent, should he deem it expedient so to do.

These clauses make it part of the contract that the labourers employed must be citizens or residents of Canada.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let me ask the hon. gentleman what benefit that is to Canadian labour? Let a man obtain a contract from this government with that clause in it, and all he has to do to employ labourers from the United States is to have them come to Canada yesterday, reside here during the night, and engage for work the next day. They are then residents of Canada. That clause in the Public Works contract is just like the Alien Labour law, a perfect humbug There is not a public work being carried on in this country on which men of that class are not working. I can point to several public works where this thing is happening, and Canadians cannot get work because it is given to men who come in from the United States.

Mr. LOGAN. With all due deference to the hon. gentleman's knowledge of law, I venture to submit my opinion that the statement he makes as to what comprises residence in Canada under these clauses is absolutely ridiculous. No court would construe that a man was a resident of Canada who simply came in last night and engaged to work on a public work, and would probably leave the country when the work was completed.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have known cases in which the government let a contract to a firm, and the moment it was let a great number of employees who have been with the firm moved to the locality, secured houses, and were ready to proceed with the work. Would not these men be residents of Canada?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Under this clause, if they satisfied the immigration officer that they were bona fide immigrants, they would be entitled to do work the next day.

Mr. J. D. REID. They move over their household effects, and they state that they are moving into this country to settle; but as soon as the contract is over, they move to the United States again.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Then, what does the hon. gentleman propose?

Mr. J. D. REID. I propose to insert the words 'on any public work.' The contractor would then be a Canadian. Every man that takes a contract has his own gang of men to work with him. If an American citizen, with his dredging fleet, receives a contract, he will bring a lot of men over, and they will bring other labourers in their train, and really most of the work will go to American citizens and the money will go out of the country. If the minister would see his way clear to include public works, that would make the clause very satisfactory to the workingmen of this country and the country as a whole, because the millions we have voted this year for public work will be given entirely to Canadians and the money be kept in the country.

Mr. LENNOX. It seems to me that if some hon. gentlemen were not so anxious to drag in politics from time to time, we would get along much better. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) was very anxious to point out that the former administration made no provision in their contracts regarding the class of labour they should employ. Even if that were the case, it would not affect the argument one iota. But let me tell the hon. gentleman that the statement he made was not founded upon fact. If he will search the records of the departments, he will find that in the majori-

ty of contracts, if not in all, there is a provision that none but British subjects shall be employed.

Mr. LOGAN. Will the hon. gentleman tell me of one contract before the year 1900 in which that provision was ever put in ?

Mr. LENNOX. Yes ; I hold one in my hand, which was let by the former Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart). It is a contract which was let in 1895 or 1896, in connection with the Trent Valley canal, to Corry & Laverdure, and it contains this clause—not a printed clause, but expressly written in : 'It is hereby agreed and understood that none but British subjects shall be employed in and for the work hereby contracted for.' Let me tell the hon. gentlemen who try to excuse their own wrong-doing by bringing up the wrong-doing of former administrations, that if they would spend the time as I have done in looking into the contracts let from time to time they would become familiar with this clause, and know that in the majority, if not all the contracts let by the Conservative administration, these words are to be found.

Mr. LOGAN. Will the hon. gentleman name one other contract ?

Mr. LENNOX. I am not in the habit of making statements unless I can bring my proof right into court, and as I do not happen to have any other contract at hand, I shall not mention any other, but I guarantee the hon. gentleman that I can draw his attention to a great many within twenty-four hours, if he desires to learn the facts. We are asked whether any objection can be taken to the clause which provides for the case of a resident or citizen of this country. The word 'resident' is a most uncertain and dangerous one to use. As the hon. member for Leeds says, a person coming at night may become a resident the following morning. If he has no definite home, but seeks employment from place to place, he is as much a resident the next morning as if he were in the place two weeks or two years. Once a person has acquired a new home he becomes a resident ; and if he has no definite home, he becomes a resident of the place which affords him habitation.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. TAYLOR. I submit to the Finance Minister that as it is now midnight, and we rose at 2.30 this morning, the committee should rise and report progress and resume early in the morning. He cannot find fault with the opposition, for we have done everything possible to facilitate the carrying out of the arrangement between the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition to close Saturday if possible and not later than Monday. But the two Bills, which have taken a great deal of time, it was not specially mentioned would be proceeded with.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The last clauses we have to pass are not at all contentious in their nature. We have dealt with the undesirable clauses, and there is no reason why we should not finish the Bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. After the way in which the Bill has been mutilated, it ought to be reprinted so that we may know what we are doing before we are asked to go on and complete it. No one now really knows what the Bill is at present.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If you get through the committee, I am willing to leave the third reading until to-morrow morning.

Mr. TAYLOR. Surely you do not want the third reading until it is reprinted ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Why not have it put into some shape so that we can put it through all the stages when we do put it through.

Mr. FIELDING. I quite agree that hon. gentlemen opposite have facilitated the business of the House for some days and we all appreciate that. I think they should accept the suggestion to pass the Bill through committee. If it does need to be reprinted, there is so much more reason for dealing with it to-night. The committee stage being disposed of the third reading may stand until to-morrow, especially if the matter remaining is not a contentious character.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am sure there will be a certain amount of discussion on every clause. If the hon. gentleman wants to wind up the estimates, I will be willing to remain an hour or a half an hour for that purpose.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Will you pass this within one hour to-morrow ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I would not promise anything.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If my hon. friend does not wish to delay it, I am willing to have it passed through the committee stage, and to leave the third reading for to-morrow.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman wants the measure put through there is no desire to delay it. Since we are dealing with it at all we want to make it as perfect as possible but there is no disposition to delay it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is desirable to have this out of the hands of the House at the earliest possible moment as the Senate is waiting for measures. The Senate does not pronounce on estimates, but it does on Bills, and I think this should be completed to-night.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does the minister expect that the Senate will swallow the Bill in 24 hours ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I would not form an opinion as to what the Senate will do, but I think the sooner we give it to the Senate the sooner they can proceed with it.

On section 9,

Mr. BARKER. I would suggest to the minister that in line 5 after the word 'that,' the word 'unlawful' should be inserted. It is quite possible that a man may improperly enter the country and may have been assisted by some one without being unlawfully assisted.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I have no objection to that section as amended agreed to.

On section 13,

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. In view of having struck out section 2 of this Bill it will not be necessary to have the following words in 'of the said Act of 1897 as amended or.'

Mr. BARKER. I think this clause 13 might be left until the morning.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think I know what is in my hon. friend's mind, but when I explain the matter I am sure he will see it is not serious. This section 13 only applies to the class of immigrants named in section 10, namely those undesirable ones, persons of unsound mind, diseased persons, prostitutes, and so on.

Mr. BARKER. Had you not better say section 10 ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I had that in the margin at one time, but in view of our having struck out subsection 1 of section 2, I thought we need not mention section 10. I am willing to leave the section as it was. The immigration agent has no power to finally deport but he has the power to detain these people so as not to allow them to get into the interior.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who has the power to deport ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Finally it is the minister. The cases are reported to him. I would move that we have the section read:

Any alien of any of the classes mentioned in section 10 who enters or is brought into the country.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The title can be amended on the third reading.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would suggest the title of the Bill be 'An Act to mutilate the Alien Labour Act.'

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I hardly think my hon. friend would press that. I offer another suggestion and I leave it to the committee to choose between us. I move that the title of the Bill be an Act respecting Aliens and other matters. It is an omnibus Bill. But I will not press that matter till to-morrow.

Bill reported.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. When shall the Bill be read a third time ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I suggest that we have it printed.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not think my hon. friend will press that, it only means delay.

Mr. FIELDING. I am glad to avail myself of the generous suggestion of the hon. gentleman that we spend an hour or so in clearing up the estimates.

Mr. TAYLOR. But the proposition was not accepted. We should have to leave a few contentious items, as there are one or two hon. gentlemen who have some matters to bring up which will take some time.

Mr. FIELDING. I realize that we are in the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite. As they have helped us very much in expediting the business we won't press the matter. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What business will be taken up to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. Consideration of the third reading of the Alien Labour Bill, subsidies to railways and supply.

Motion agreed to and House adjourned at 12.10 a.m.—Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, August 6, 1904.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. CHARLES PARMELEE moved :

That the third report of the Joint Standing Committee on the Printing of Parliament be concurred in with the exception of the words 'that from and after the present fiscal year the said superintendent, the first and second assistant superintendent and the clerk of distribution of printed documents of parliament, receive their respective annual increments, as provided by the Civil Service Act,' and with the following proviso added, viz.:—'Provided that the said junior second-class clerk shall continue to discharge the duties as hitherto performed by him.'

Mr. SPROULE. We ought to have some explanation of that because I do not know what it means.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. gentleman explain the motion ?

Mr. PARMELEE. The amendments are intended to remove any ambiguity or doubt there may have been in the original report. While we did not change the status of the officers of the distribution office we adopted rather more euphonious names for them and we decided to call them superintendent, first assistant superintendent and second assistant superintendent of distribution of printed documents of parliament. These officers are not directly under the Civil Service Act, but we decided to so increase their salaries as to place them on a parity with officers of the same rank in the various departments of the government while the amendment I have moved is intended to remove any doubt on that score ; that is we do not place them actually under the Civil Service Act, but leave them as they now are under the control of the committee as officers directly responsible to the House. There was a messenger who performed many other services largely of a clerical character and we decided to make him a junior second-class clerk but with the understanding that he should go on performing the same duties that he is now discharging. While that was the intention of the committee the report did not state it in so many words and I deemed it proper to remove any doubt about it in the future by providing that this officer should go on and perform the same duties he is performing now, because, perhaps in two or three years, he might say : I am not a messenger, I am a junior second-class clerk, I do not propose to do messenger work and you must appoint another messenger. I think the amendment I have moved is in the direction of making the intention of the committee absolutely clear, keeping our control over the officers of the House and leaving us in such a position that we can deal with them according to their merits as necessity arises.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. As a member of the subcommittee that took the matter into consideration I may say that I am personally perfectly satisfied with the step that has been taken by the committee. It is a step in the right direction.

Motion agreed to.

COMMISSIONERS OF INTERNAL ECONOMY.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to present to the House the report of the Commissioners of Internal Economy which the clerk will now read :

The commissioners of internal economy of the House of Commons, beg leave to present the following report :—

The commissioners recommend the concurrence by the House in the following resolution adopted by the internal economy commissioners on the 28th April, 1904 :—

Resolved, that the commissioners recommend to the House : that the allowance made since the year 1889 to the clerk of the debates committee of the House of Commons (Mr. Panet), viz.:—$200 per annum by virtue of a recommendation of the said committee adopted by the House, June 22nd, 1889, be discontinued, and that the said sum of $200 be added directly to the salary of the said clerk (Mr. Panet) and be paid pursuant to estimates in the same manner as all other salaries to the officers of the House of Commons : provided, however, that the said clerk shall receive no other salary or remuneration for acting as such clerk or for the performance of any other duty that may be assigned to him.

(Sgd.) N. A. BELCOURT.
Chairman.

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

That the report of the commissioners on internal economy be concurred in.

He said : The object of this report is to follow out the sound principle that officers shall be paid from one source only and not from several sources, as it leads to confusion. This makes no change in this gentleman's compensation.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the payment he has been receiving up to the present only given from year to year with no implied right in the future to get the same, because, if so, this makes permanent what was only temporary ?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know what the original design was, but it appears that this was a permanent payment every year and it is no longer a debatable question.

Motion agreed to.

YUKON TERRITORY—REGULATIONS OF GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL.

Hon. CLIFFORD SIFTON (Minister of the Interior) moved :

Resolved, that the regulations made by the Governor in Council under the authority of section 47 of the Dominion Lands Act, applicable or relating to the Yukon Territory, and set forth in the Orders in Council, of which the dates are, respectively, as follows, and of which copies have been laid before this House, are approved by this House, in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of chapter 34 of the statutes of 1902 :—

Order dated the 6th July, 1903, P.C. No. 1099 ; Order dated the 13th August, 1903, P.C. No. 1309 ; Order dated the 8th September, 1903, P.C. No. 983 ; Order dated the 17th November, 1903, P.C. No. 1909 ; Order dated the 26th November, 1903, P.C. No. 1952 ; Order dated the 28th November, 1903, P.C. No. 1953 ; Order dated the 28th November, 1903, P.C. No. 1954 ; Order dated the 7th December, 1903, P.C. No. 1311 ; Order dated the 21st December, 1903, P.C. No. 2101 ; Order dated the 30th January, 1904, P.C. No. 171 ; Order dated the 2nd February, 1904, P.C. No. 192.

Mr. HAGGART. The usual form is to give notice that the resolution will be moved to-morrow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Last year this same procedure was taken. This is in obedience to the regulation of the statute which requires that all Orders in Council in connection with the Yukon shall be placed on the table of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. Has that been done ?

Mr. SIFTON. They have been here for several weeks.

Mr. HAGGART. What are they about ?

Mr. SIFTON. The amendment to the Act of two years ago, requires that all amendments of any kind whatsoever passed by Order in Council relating to the mining regulations of the Yukon, should be in force only until the next session of parliament and should be laid upon the table of the House ; and approved of by resolution of both Houses, or otherwise they would cease to have effect at the end of the session. In pursuance of this, these orders were laid on the table of the House some weeks ago accompanied by a copy of the resolution which appears on the order paper. The Order in Council relate largely to matters of detail. The first is dated the 6th of July, 1903. The change which was made was simply to insert the words 'the rear boundary of' in the third paragraph, section 12 of the regulations governing placer mining. That was done to remove ambiguity and the change was made on the recommendation of the Gold Commissioner. When the consolidated regulations prescribed the method in which a claim should be described, the persons who had claims taken under the former regulations were afraid that a strict construction of the new regulations might deprive them of a portion of their claims, and of course it was not the intention to interfere with vested rights. The next Order in Council dated the 13th of August, 1903, authorized the department to grant to Mr. Robert Henderson an entry for total frontage of 2,000 feet of available placer mining ground in the Yukon. Mr. Henderson was the original discoverer of gold in the Klondike. He was unfortunate in losing the claims which he originally attempted to stake. There was a strong public feeling in the Yukon that some compensation should be given him and an application was made by Mr. Henderson, which was recommended by Mr. William Ogilvy, who was then commissioner, and supported by a petition from the merchants, bankers, and others, in the Yukon. An Order in Council was passed giving this privilege to Mr. Henderson, which he has not availed himself of, apparently not having found any claim which he thinks it would pay to take up.

Mr. HENDERSON. What did the minister say the proposition is ?

Mr. SIFTON. There is authority given in this Order in Council to give Mr. Henderson a claim of 2,000 frontage and of the usual depth anywhere he can find ground not occupied by anybody else. The next Order in Council is dated 8th of September, 1903. Under section 42 of the regulations governing placer mining, no officer or person employed by the government of Canada in any capacity whatever, or no officer or member of the militia force is able to hold or record a mining claim. This was so broad in its terms that it included the members of the Dawson Volunteer Rifle Company, and this Order in Council was passed to remove the prohibition from them.

Mr. HAGGART. That is all right.

Mr. SIFTON. The next Order in Council is dated 17th of November, 1903. Section 2 of the regulations provide that a free miner may renew a certificate within thirty days on paying an additional fee of $5. On the 2nd of October, 1902 a man named E.A. Dixon got a free miner's certificate and on the 14th of January following the 'Mining Recorder' at Whitehorse issued a renewal certificate and antedated it the 2nd of October, 1902. The attention of the mining recorder was called to the fact that the date was greater than ninety days and in reply he stated he overlooked the fact and hoped it would not entail any loss to Mr. Dixon who owned considerable mining claims. This Order in Council was passed to protect Mr. Dixon from the error of the mining recorder. The Order in Council passed dated 26th November, 1903, reduces the fee for free miners' certificates from $10 to $7.50. The Order in Council dated the 28th of November, 1903, relates to the question of the royalty. Section 52 of the quartz mining regulations provides that the patent shall reserve to the Crown forever, whatever royalty may be imposed on the sales of the products of all mines ; such royalty not to exceed five per cent. My hon. friends will understand that there is one set of regulations relating to placer mines and another relating to quartz mines. The quartz mining regulation provided that after a certain period the owner of the mine could secure a patent for the land, the patent reserving the Crown's right to a royalty. At the time this provision was made in the regulations a royalty of 10 per cent on the output of placer mining claims in the Yukon Territory, less an annual exemption, was collected. The royalty on gold shipped from the Yukon Territory, however, was reduced to 2½ per cent by Order in Council dated the 21st of May, 1902. So that under the Order in Council relating to quartz mining there was the power to reserve the royalty of 5 per cent, but the general royalty on placer mines was only 2½ per cent. Miners in the territory represented that a royalty of 5 per cent might be collected on the

gold taken from quartz mining locations, and a further royalty of 2½ per cent might be collected on the same gold when it was shipped from the territory, and in order that a uniform rate might be charged on all gold taken from mining claims, the Order in Council of the 28th of November, 1903, provided that patent for a mining location in the Yukon Territory shall reserve to the Crown for ever the same royalty upon the products of the location as is provided or which may hereafter be provided in the case of placer mining claims, and in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories the patent for the mining location shall reserve to the Crown for ever a royalty not exceeding 2½ per cent. It will be seen that the purport of this Order in Council was simply to harmonize the provisions respecting royalty between placer mines and quartz mines, making them the same amount, 2½ per cent.

The Order in Council dated 28th November, 1903, Privy Council, No. 1954. Certain persons obtained entry for placer mining claims situated on Lindow Creek, a tributary of Bear Creek, within the limits of the hydraulic mining location situated on the Klondike river in the Yukon Territory after the lease had been issued, but before it had been received at Dawson. The question arose as to whether or not these claims should be renewed, and until that question arose, free miners were not permitted to perform on the claims the amount of work required by the regulations to entitle them to renewal of entry. That is to say, there being a dispute as to their right to enter on these claims, the placer miners could not go on the claims and do the work they were required to do. The Order in Council dated the 28th of November, 1903, authorized the Minister of the Interior to grant renewal of entry for the claims in question without requiring payment to be made in lieu of representation work for the portion of the year during which the claim holders were stopped in their operations owing to the conflict with the hydraulic mining leaseholder. That is to say, they were stopped from doing the work by reason of the fact that the matter was in litigation, otherwise, they would have done it. This work is practically waived. They were prevented from going on, and we therefore did not fine them or compel them to pay the commutation fee.

Order in Council dated the 7th of December, 1902, Privy Council, No. 1311, is precisely the same as the last one, except that the claims were situated in a different mining leasehold.

Order in Council dated the 21st of December, 1903, Privy Council, No. 2011. The gold commissioner having reported in favour of granting compensation to certain persons who had sustained losses by reason of a mistake made by an official, the lower half of placer mining claim No. 93 was granted by the gold commissioner to these people, and this Order in Council relieves them from the necessity of doing representation work on the claim. At the time the claim was granted, it was not the intention that they should do representation work, and this Order in Council carries out the original intention which was not apparently clearly expressed in the first order.

The Order in Council dated 30th of January, 1904, Privy Council, No. 171, provides that the commissioner of the Yukon Territory may withdraw from mining entry, under the regulations in that behalf, any vacant ground required as a reservoir site or for any other purpose in connection with the storage of water, but only such ground as has been thoroughly prospected and has been found to be worthless for placer mining purposes.

The Order in Council dated the 2nd of February, 1904, Privy Council, No. 192, rescinds the regulations relating to hydraulic mining leases. These regulations had been in force for some years, but having been found to be in some respects unsatisfactory, they have been rescinded pending general consideration of the subject.

Motion agreed to.

STATION ACCOMMODATION AT STE. PERPETUE.

Mr. GEORGES BALL. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to draw the attention of the government to the fact that a few months ago the people of St. Perpétue, in the county of Nicolet, addressed a petition to the government asking for a depot, or at least an accommodation car, to be placed at the station there, for the use of the public as a waiting-room. I saw the hon. minister a few days ago, and he informed me that the matter was in the hands of Mr. Pottinger, the manager of the Intercolonial Railway, and that the application of the people would very soon be granted. I was very much surprised yesterday, in passing the place, to observe that not even a passenger car has been provided for the accommodation of the people, but only a box car, which is hardly suitable even for a freight shed. I am sure that the hon. minister is not aware of this, or he would give orders to have it changed. St. Perpetue is a pretty important place, but it is not provided with either a telegraph or a telephone, and the people, not knowing whether the trains are on time or not, often have to wait, and there is no accommodation for them at all. I therefore hope that the hon. minister will see that accommodation is provided without delay.

CANADIAN ASSOCIATED PRESS REPORTS.

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call attention to some correspondence in the Montreal 'Star' of yesterday. The correspondence relates to a despatch cabled by the Canadian Associated Press, which purported to give remarks made by Mr. Timothy Healy, M.P., in the imperial House of Commons, regarding what is called the Dundonald incident. The despatch referred to is as follows :

Mr. Healy said he believed that Lord Dundonald had attacked the government of Canada because it was French Catholic. It was very useful to have French Catholics on the side of the British empire during the Boer war ; but now that the war was over, an officer of the imperial army made partisan statements outraging the feelings of the majority of the people of Canada. He would like to know why Lord Dundonald has been permitted to remain while his speech was rankling in the French hearts.

No one can doubt that that language is of a most inflammatory nature and calculated to create racial trouble in this country. No one can doubt that if the statements made here were concocted by the Associated Press, they must have been designed with a purpose to cause racial trouble and injure one of the political parties in this country. The London 'Times' gave its version of the same speech in these words :

The government has come forward and announced that they had recalled the officer whose conduct had been complained of ; but Lord Dundonald while he remained on Canadian soil was an imperial officer, and for six weeks the government allowed him to remain after he had outraged the feelings of the majority of the people.

You will observe that the reference there is to the people of Canada at large and there is not the slightest allusion or reference to any particular race, the French race or any other. Mr. Healy was communicated with by the correspondent of the Montreal 'Star,' and he wrote to the correspondent as follows :

I have received several abusive letters from Canada and a visit from the gentleman who sent on there my alleged speech in reference to my supposed utterances, and I am a little surprised at further inquiry by another journalist.

It appears therefore that the representative of the Associated Press has been in communication with Mr. Healy and of course has had the opportunity to correct this despatch if he desired to do so. He also had access to the official reports of the House of Commons and could have corrected his despatch by that means if he had chosen to do so. What does Mr. Healy go on to say ?

I simply did not use the words which were cabled at such needless expense to Canada.

Mr. BALL.

I did say what the 'Times' printed, and a little more, which would even further have modified the sense.

The 'Star' correspondent goes on to add :

The authorized and official account of the parliamentary debates agrees exactly with the London 'Times' report.

It is therefore clear that the expressions as to the French and French Catholics were concocted.

Without occupying the time of the House longer, I desire to say that I cannot imagine a more wicked attempt to misrepresent the utterances of a public man on a subject occupying the attention of Canada than this cable despatch referring to the French element in this country. If any language could be used more calculated to cause racial strife, I do not know where to find it ; and I can come to no other conclusion than that the gentlemen connected with this Canadian Associated Press, subsidized as it is by the people of Canada to the extent of $15,000 a year, paid through the Finance Minister, are deliberately misrepresenting for party purposes news which should be sent without reference to party or any other consideration than the strict truth. We know that the reason for giving this $15,000 a year subsidy was that we were being furnished by cable with news doctored and coloured in the interests of our neighbours across the line, and we resented that and were willing to pay $15,000 a year to get the truth. But we seem to be worse served than before. This Associated Press appears to have become a mere party tool to be used for party purposes, and I think I am not improperly taking up the time of the House in calling attention to that fact. I am quite sure that if this despatch had been a reflection on the government of the day or the political party represented by this government, it would not have been necessary for anybody in this House to call attention to it. The hon. the Finance Minister would have intervened and told the people connected with the Canadian Associated Press that if they did not conduct themselves in a proper manner their subsidy would be stopped.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I had not the good fortune to hear the first portion of the hon. member's remarks, but I understand their general tenor was to question the fairness and impartiality of the Associated Press despatches. Well, the government have absolutely nothing to do with this business beyond the fact that we have made a grant to a Canadian newspaper organization to assist it in what was supposed to be a very worthy purpose. We make grants to various societies and organizations in Canada over which we have no control or management ; and if they should cease serving a good purpose, we should cease making the grants. No member of the gov-

ernment has the slightest part in connection with these despatches or the slightest control over them. We are precisely, in that respect, in the same position as my hon. friend. I know that sometimes complaints are made that the material sent over is not of the most substantial character. As an old journalist, I can make some allowance for that. I know that when it is a man's duty to send a daily despatch, he cannot always find news of surpassing importance; and in his anxiety to send news, he may be tempted to send what in the minds of some readers may seem light, frivolous and unimportant. I have heard some criticisms on news sent over which to many of us might seem uninteresting. But all classes make up the world, and there are many newspaper readers who may receive with more interest flimsy matters than the more substantial matters which would interest us as members of parliament.

As regards the question of impartiality, all I know is that the principal officer who prepares these despatches is a gentleman who is known to be a Conservative, and whatever interest he may take in politics in Canada would naturally be on the Conservative side. He is a brother of the proprietor of a Conservative newspaper in Canada, Mr. J. Ross Robertson, of the Toronto 'Telegram,' a former member of this House on the Conservative side. I met Mr. Robertson in England some years ago and found him a gentleman of good standing in the newspaper profession. I have no reason to doubt that he is doing his duty faithfully and impartially. Sometimes things appear in these despatches of which hon. gentlemen on the other side will disapprove, and sometimes things appear which we on this side think give too much prominence to views antagonistic to those of the Liberal party. If he seems to lean to one side or other, he is simply presenting the view that comes to him, trying to convey the views expressed by some public man or some newspaper. In the condensation of a speech or newspaper article there is always a danger of producing a result which one party or the other will think is biased. Therefore, I would not assume that the gentlemen engaged in this work have any other desire than to do that which is best for the service in which they are engaged. Making allowance for some of the news which may not please everybody, I am inclined to think that the service has been a good one for Canada. It has been a good one in this respect at least, that we certainly receive more information than formerly of what is going on in Canadian circles in England, and of the indications of interest taken by the British press and the British public men in Canadian affairs. If an English public man makes a speech or writes a letter touching Canadian affairs it is sent out to us. Sometimes, we are apt to think that these things are hardly worth sending out. But certainly we get more information concerning Canadian affairs in England than we formerly did. In this way I think the service is a useful one. However, we are no more concerned in the matter than hon. gentlemen opposite are. I would remind them that this service is directed by an organization of newspaper men in Canada, not of one side alone but of both sides, who look at the service from the point of view of journalism, the collection and dissemination of news. As I say, both parties are represented in the association. Both parties were represented in the deputation who came to the government and asked co-operation and assistance in establishing this service. If the service is open to criticism, I think we should criticise it and endeavour to have it made better. But I would not accept hastily the conclusion that the gentlemen who prepare the news are partisans, least of all that they are partisans against hon. gentlemen opposite, or are trying to assist our side.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have watched with interest to see what explanation the hon. minister (Mr. Fielding) would give of the exposure of absolute misstatements with regard to the speech of Mr. Healy. And he offers no explanation at all.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not hear that part.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Mr. Healy himself repudiates it. Now, I have been giving a little attention to the manner in which this information—so-called information—is collected in the old land and how these reports from time to time are prepared. The reports have shown so much bias that even people in the rural districts of Canada are led to remark that the English correspondents are all loaded up the wrong way. I find that, while what the Finance Minister says is true, and these two gentlemen who send out the news to this country are supposed to be employed by an association—I do not know who compose that association—yet the manner in which they gather their news is, to say the least, equivocal. Now, as to Mr. Robertson being a Conservative, it is true that he is the brother of Mr. John Ross Robertson who has been an independent with Conservative leanings and who occupied a seat on this side of the House and criticised the government very severely. But any one who reads the columns of the Toronto 'Telegram' will see that if there is an independent journal in Canada its name is the Toronto 'Telegram.' It criticises both sides fearlessly. But the brother of Mr. John Ross Robertson was always a Liberal and is a Liberal to-day. Mr. Robertson's other brother in Toronto is one of the prominent Liberals of that city. Thus, so far as politics are concerned the

burden of evidence is that these press representatives would be inclined to favour the Liberals. The minister says that these gentlemen send to Canada what English public men who make speeches or write letters say concerning Canada. Let me point out that they do more. Through the agencies of the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of the Interior, statements are communicated by the officers of the government to the English country press favourable to the government. This puffery bureau that was in existence here is now, I believe, in existence in England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland. And these correspondents, possibly without design, possibly without collusion with the officers of the government, pick up their little notes, editorial articles and other items of various kinds that appear in the English country press, which, of course are laudatory of the gentlemen occupying the Treasury benches in Canada, and cable them out at the expense of the people of Canada to our press here. That is the explanation that is furnished me and it is the best explanation, I believe, that can be offered. But that explanation is not satisfactory in any sense of the term to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. Now this will help to explain the use of the word 'foreigner' at Henley which has been so much discussed. On that subject I have these data: The expression 'foreigner' was used by a Canadian in the service of the Canadian government speaking to this gentleman who cabled it out to Canada. It was used by this officer of the Canadian government and by no other man. And, on the strength of that expression the cable comes out to this country giving the impression that the expression 'the foreigner wins' greeted the victory of Scholes all along the line. The expression was used by a paid servant of the Department of the Interior to this gentleman who was the paid representative of the Canadian Associated Press, and the impression was given to the people of this country that the crowds on the banks of the river Thames received the great victory of Scholes with the cry 'the foreigner wins.'

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) give the House an explanation——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman's hon. friend is standing here and speaking on his responsibility as a member of this House, and he is not called upon, in answer to every back-bench member on the other side, to give names in support of his statement.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. Perhaps my hon. friend will permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Alex. Johnston) asks it as a privilege, I will allow it, but if he demands it as a right, I will not allow it.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. I do not demand it as a right; I ask the hon. gentleman's permission to ask him a question.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Granted.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he does not think it only fair, in connection with the observations he is making, to give the information cabled to this country by Mr. Robertson, explaining the incident to which he refers? No doubt he has that at hand.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. I thought not.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does he mean the cable despatch?

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. Yes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why, that appeared in all the newspapers in this country, representing that Scholes' victory was received with the cry 'the foreigner wins.' I understood that the hon. gentleman asked my authority for my statement. And I tell him that I am not to be called upon by every back-bench member on the other side to give him authority for what I say. I speak here on my responsibility as a member of this House, and my word stands in this country where the hon. gentleman's affidavit would not be taken. And back of it stand the facts of the case, which are better than affidavits. Now, let me point out the facts in another case. On the evening when a discussion took place in the House of Commons in England, which has been referred to in these cable despatches, the press agent was in close company with the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Lemieux). He also interviewed the Chief Justice, or one of the justices of the Supreme Court—I do not know his position; it amounts to veryl ittlte anyway. And that interview also was cabled over to this country. It is said that this was only a conversation, much as this interview at Rimouski the other day, I suppose, was intended as a 'conversation.' Let me say to the right hon. the Prime Minister that if he is going to preserve the integrity of the bench of this country and preserve for it that respect which, I believe, he, in common with the most of the people of this country, would like to see it have, he will have to read a lesson to the judges of this country to mind their business and keep out of politics.

Mr. SPEAKER. Let me remind the hon. gentleman that there is absolutely no question before the chair. I think that my hon. friend is clearly out of order.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Then I shall conclude with a motion if you wish that, Mr. Speaker. We find these judges giving in-

terviews to the press in England which are not true, we find this gentleman giving an interview as Rimouski which is absolutely untrue in fact, and we find reports cabled out here referring to the speech made by Mr. Healy, which Mr. Healy totally repudiates and which he says is not true. I have read the English press and I fail to find one word that justifies the cablegram sent here in reference to his speech. From the fact that we have absolute evidence that the correspondent of the Canadian Associated Press was in company with Mr. Lemieux, the Solicitor General, about that time all I can say is that it looks very much as if the inspiration had been received from a member of this government, and not from a speech in the House of Commons in England.

THE ALIEN LABOUR ACT.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General) moved third reading of Bill (No. 162) to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting Alien Labour.

Mr. NAT. BOYD. I brought to the attention of the House yesterday the question of the farm labourers in Manitoba, and the discussion which ensued proved clearly that any man in Manitoba or the Northwest Territories bringing a farm labourer across the line from the United States would be subject to the penalties of this Bill. I understand that there are a great many farmers along the line of Manitoba and the Territories who frequently make use of labour from the United States at harvest time, and while I might be prepared to agree with the minister that it is not probable that the provisions of the Act might be resorted to, yet any evil-disposed person might set the machinery of the Act in motion to the detriment of some person towards whom he might have some ill-will. For that reason I think that some provision should be made to protect the farmers of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories in the approaching great harvest. We expect to require an enormous amount of help, in order to take care of that crop, and with that view I propose to move :

That all the words in the main motion after the word 'that' be struck out and the following be substituted therefor :—

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but be referred back to committee for the purpose of inserting the following clause :—

That nothing in this Bill or in the Alien Labour law shall prevent the farmers of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories from importing all the farm labour that may be necessary in order to harvest the crops in that portion of the country.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There is nothing in the Bill in any way altering the law as it stands to-day, and as it has stood on the statute-books for many years, applicable to the very case my hon. friend has in mind. The provision of the Act respecting the importation of alien labour under contract have now been in force for seven years. There have been good crops during that time in the Northwest and I hope that these good crops will continue. They have required to import labour from all parts to harvest their crops. There has not been a case yet of any attempt being made to invoke the provisions of this Act in consequence of any alleged or supposed violation of it. When we consider that this Act has been in force for many years and that it is only where there has been some utter disregard of local interests to the injury of numbers of our local people, that there has been any litigation, we may fairly assume that when any large districts such as the territories may need farm labour for the temporary purpose of gathering the crops, that no action such as my hon. friend desires to have taken to prevent the enforcement of the provisions of the Alien Labour Act in reference to the importation of labour for this purpose need be taken.

Mr. FOWLER. Would it not be possible as the law stands now for a farmer bringing in labour from the United States to be subjected to penalties ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. This resolution in one part says that nothing in this Bill shall have a certain effect. There is nothing in this Bill that can have such an effect. Section 1 of the Act of 1897 which was amended by a subsequent Act is the only portion of any Act which bears on the question under consideration. There is nothing in this Bill amending section 1, and therefore the law is being left to-day as it has been for seven years. There is nothing whatever, therefore, in the Bill to warrant the first part of the proposition contained in this amendment.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman has not yet answered the question I asked.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman is learned in the law and is quite as competent to interpret the law in this respect as any hon. gentleman in this House. What I say is that the mover of this amendment is suggesting that this Bill has some intent which it has not. There is another view which I would present for consideration. Would it be proper legislation to have exceptions in favour of one class only ? All class legislation is very undesirable. Here is a general law and if the hon. gentleman desires to amend the general law, well and good. It has been on the statute-book for seven years, and the hon. gentleman has had the opportunity at any time during these seven years of moving such an amendment, inviting the attention of the country to it, but he has not seen fit to do so. Even last night he begged that the Bill should not be allowed to come into force this year, yet to-

day he is asking that the measure shall be kept alive and be made use of to graft upon it some new legislation. I do not think it would be proper to introduce this class legislation.

Mr. BRODER. Is this not class legislation ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No, it applies to the whole industrial world in Canada. I think in the first place there is no practical necessity for this amendment. I do not think that any farmers of the west will ever be troubled by the provisions of this law should they do what my hon. friend says it would be their interest to do. No doubt there have been numerous technical violations of this law in the past, and yet no penalties were enforced, no complaints were made. The Act was never resorted to and there is no reason to assume that it will be resorted to in the future, where public interest warrants the importation of that class of work.

Mr. SPROULE. The Bill is called 'An Act to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting Alien Labour.' The hon. gentleman says it is undesirable to apply legislation to a single class. From the provisions of this Bill, which is founded upon the American law, you except one class, those possessed of technical knowledge, so that it is not general in its application. It is just as undesirable to exclude one class as to legislate for one class. Therefore, the Bill is not universal in its application. The hon. Minister of Labour says that the law in regard to the importation of labour is practically the old law, that there is substantially no change. Well, if there is substantially no change, why under heaven do we want a Bill at all to amend the Labour Act, because it is to amend the Labour Act, and if there is no change made in the Labour Act which will be of any advantage to the Canadian people, why cumber the statutes with it or waste the time of parliament in passing it. But it is because of the uncertainty which has been created in the minds of the people as to whether it may interfere with any class in carrying on their operations that my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) is afraid that it may be invoked against the people in the west who have to import labour to help them to do their work during the harvesting season. It is to make sure that there will not be any possibility of interference with the operations of the farmers in the west that my hon. friend has moved this amendment.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, I am a little surprised, to use a very mild expression, at the amendment of my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) and at the support it receives from his friends around him. Yesterday we had a very interesting discussion and the opposition claimed the merit of having forced upon the government the introduction of an alien labour law similar to the law which was enforced against us by the United States. The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), amid the applause of his friends, and nobody contradicted him, made the statement that for six or seven years before the advent of the present administration, he had introduced this legislation. He wanted, he said, to educate the public to a realization of the sufferings which were inflicted on Canadians by the enforcement of the American law, and I must say that my hon. friend made good his case at least. It was in the year 1897 that Canadians were being deported at Buffalo, Detroit and other places. Men who left the Canadian side of the line to work in the United States were sent back to Canada. Then we introduced this present law. It has been enforced for seven years. What I wish to emphasize is, as has been stated by my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock), that no complaint has ever been made that the law interfered with obtaining the supply of labour that was required to handle the crop of the west. The purpose of my hon. friend's amendment is to exempt the farmers of Manitoba from the operation of the law. If the amendment was adopted what would take place ? A more mischevous, a more hurtful or a more ill-considered amendment was never introduced. What would take place if the amendment were to be adopted ? It is well known that the crop matures in Dakota and to the south of us earlier than does our own crop. The Canadians leave their own side of the line to work in Dakota and other neighbouring states. When our crop matures men from Dakota, and the neighbouring states come and work in our country. If this proposed amendment were adopted you would have men going to work in Dakota deported from the United States, and the amendment would place us in such a position that we would have no possible means of protecting them. If you have this law on the statute-book on both sides of the line there will be no trouble. There are no deportations from Buffalo and Detroit now. A certain gentleman, Mr. Du Barry, was in the habit of sending Canadians from Buffalo back to Toronto and there were people in Detroit sending Canadians back to Windsor. Now that the law is the same on both sides, we do not hear very much about deportations ; the rights of Canadians are respected, but remove that law and you will have the same thing as you had a few years ago.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you ever heard of a Canadian from Manitoba going to work in the harvest in Dakota ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, I have.

Mr. SPROULE. I never have.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT (West Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, I made a few remarks on this subject last evening directed entirely against

the suggestion made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), who advocated the application of our Alien Labour law to all the world. I find that I was under a misapprehension last evening. I understood when I spoke then that the present Bill did not propose to extend the application of the Canadian law to any country except the United States, which has an alien labour law and which sometimes is enforced against Canadians. I find that I was under a misapprehension and that the main clause of this Bill, section 8, is intended to apply to persons from any part of the world. I think, in fairness, I will have to state this morning that every remark I made last evening in regard to the suggestion of my hon. friend from Bothwell, I will now have to make in regard to the present proposition, that is to say to the Bill before the House. I wish to state that I am entirely opposed to the trend of this legislation. My hon. friend the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) has just stated that the suggested amendment of my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) is practically unnecessary. I say the same thing is true in regard to the Bill. There is no practical necessity at this date for such a proposition. There are no idle men in Canada. If we had idle men in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, in the Canadian west or in British Columbia, there might be some reason for coming down and proposing such legislation. But, there are no idle men in any part of this country. The very contrary is the fact. There is a call for men all over the province of Ontario; farmers in all parts of Ontario claim that they are not able to get a sufficient supply of labour. There is a call for men in the maritime provinces and there is a call for men in British Columbia to assist in developing the enormous mineral resources there, and as I said last evening, the only practical limitation there is to the material development of this country is the fact that we have not sufficient people to go on to the vacant lands which lie untilled in the Canadian west to such an enormous extent. With such conditions in Canada, why should we propose to adopt legislation which has not been adopted in any part of the world except in the United States. If we had congested conditions such as they have in the countries of Europe in the United Kingdom, Belgium, France and Germany, there might be some justification for such a proposal, but in Canada the conditions are the very opposite. So far as the House is informed and so far as I am aware there is no country in the world except the United States, which has adopted such legislation as is proposed here, or as we have had on our statute-book for the last seven years. There may be some reason for legislation of that kind being adopted in the United States, but the same conditions do not prevail in this country. There is probably no necessity to go outside the borders of the United States for workmen of any class that may be required, but we are compelled to go outside of our own borders to get a sufficient number of workmen. For several years past the excuse has been put forward by the big railway corporations in Canada which have held charters for building railways throughout the west, that they were unable to go on and build railways as the requirements of the country demanded, because of their inability to obtain a sufficient supply of labour. The Canadian Pacific Railway make that excuse and Mann and Mackenzie make that excuse. Mann and Mackenzie have told us that the main line of their road would already be in Edmonton, but for the difficulty which they had experienced in getting a sufficient supply of labour to work on construction. We hear a good deal in this House about the interests of labour, and I am somewhat concerned in that because I am a labourer and I am a union labourer. I am a member in good standing of a labour union in this country. I think I can speak in the interests of labour, and I say that it is not in the interest of any labouring man in this country to hamper or restrict or attempt to hamper or restrict any legitimate industry or enterprise in this country. I do not think that after my four years in this House, I will be suspected or accused by any person of speaking as an advocate of the manufacturers, who, I hear, are opposed to this legislation, or of the railway corporations who, I understand, are also in some measure opposed to this legislation.

I do not speak for them, but speaking as a labourer and in the interests of labour in this country, I say that this kind of legislation is not in their interests nor in my interests as a labourer. It is not in the interests of labour to hamper or restrict the legitimate enterprise of any railway corporation, or of any manufacturing concern, but I speak more particularly for the great agricultural interests which the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) concerns. If there is any possibility of our Alien Labour law being used so as to cause the agriculturists in western Canada to hesitate before they invite persons from outside countries to work on their farms, then that legislation should not be adopted. There is a possibility, I believe not alone on account of the legislation, but chiefly on account of the kind of talk we have indulged in in this parliament and throughout the country during recent months and, to some extent, throughout recent years; there is a possibility of the agencies in the western states, which are interested in stopping the movement of people into Canada, being helped in their efforts. We are simply putting pretexts in the hands of these agencies which may make it possible for them to almost entirely

stop that immigration movement. The Minister of the Interior knows well that such agencies do exist. The railway corporations of the western states are becoming excited about the movement of their population to western Canada, and the Minister of the Interior knows they are taking steps to check that movement. We, by our senseless chatter about aliens and foreigners, are putting into the hands of these agencies the instruments which they will undoubtedly use to check that movement of population. Hon. gentlemen may be surprised to hear that many people come from the western States to western Canada with extreme hesitancy. Many of them come to Canada with guns in their hip pockets, believing them necessary for their protection here. They are, however, only in the country a few days, and sometimes a few hours, when they find these are unnecessary and throw them away ; and after a few months' residence here they express themselves satisfied that the conditions in Canada are better than in the United States.

Mr. GALLIHER. Do they not bring in these weapons because they are accustomed to need them in the western states ?

Mr. SCOTT. That is true, but very often they fear that these weapons are necessary for their protection in Canada. These immigrants do come to us with erroneous impressions, and what we are doing and what we are saying chiefly, is going to put into the hands of these agencies the material with which to check the movement of population from the western states into Canada.

Mr. JAS. CLANCY. It would be difficult to tell just what we should do to console the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott). He seems to forget that this Bill does not in any sense prevent labourers and workingmen from coming into Canada. The proposal is to exclude those who come in under contract, but not one man in a thousand comes into the Northwest Territories under contract, and the fear of the hon. gentleman is entirely visionary. He tells us that they come into the west with guns and pistols, but probably that is because they read his speech here a few weeks ago, in which he declared it was necessary to increase the number of mounted police in order to put the people of the Northwest under surveillance. There is not a man in this House, who has not taken leave of his reason, who does not know that this Bill is solely directed against persons coming in under contract and against undesirable immigrants. For my part, I am opposed to labour being brought into Canada under contract. I think there has been a laudable effort made by the government to exclude undesirable persons, but I am sorry to say they have not been successful. Every man who is fit to be a citizen of Canada has the door wide open for him to enter, and I know of no more arrant nonsense than such talk as we hear from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott).

Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the hon. gentleman consider that a civil engineer is an undesirable person ?

Mr. CLANCY. I do not ; but I do consider there are very desirable Canadian engineers able to fill the positions.

Mr. LENNOX. And they have been discriminated against.

Mr. CLANCY. They have. Until we have exhausted the supply of talent in Canada—and nobody need be concerned about that—every engineer from a foreign country should be excluded.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the hon. gentleman know of any idle Canadian civil engineers ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. Yes, I do.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Scores of them.

Mr. CLANCY. I will give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) numerous applications from young men seeking employment on this government work, but he has only to look at the report of Judge Winchester to convince him. I have not the honour of being able to speak for the labouring men as my hon. friend (Mr. Scott) has. I would not venture to claim so much to myself as the hon. gentleman ; but I think the labouring men of Canada will pray to be spared from his advocacy and friendship. I have not the right to speak for the labouring men as a labouring man myself, but I have the right to endeavour to secure to the labouring men of Canada a fair chance with other people in the battle of life.

Hon. CLIFFORD SIFTON (Minister of the Interior). The question of dealing with alien labour is one upon which there are great differences of opinion, and it is a question which presents the very greatest difficulty. We have had it before us in this parliament for a number of years, and have spent a good deal of time endeavouring to solve the difficulty. I have not had the advantage of being here during the last few days, but I believe that the present measure represents a fair and moderate conclusion arrived at fairly well in accordance with the general views of members of this House on both sides. As to the particular point which my hon. friend (Mr. Scott) has mentioned, it appears to me that there is no serious difficulty in the Act as it is now before us. So far as I am aware labourers have never been brought from the United States to Manitoba or the Northwest Territories under contract. They are generally brought into the territories by what are known as labourers' excursions. At certain periods of the year the railway companies provide what are called labourers' excursions, with special facilities, and at that period of the year the supply follows the

demand, and large numbers of people go to Manitoba and the Northwest Territories; and the supply of any substantial demand for labourers would have to be brought about in some such way. In regard to any such arrangement, this Act would have no application whatever. If there should be an isolated case in which some farmer had brought in a labourer under contract, and if some person were malicious enough to institute a prosecution, you have the remedial provisions of the Bill, which would prevent the success of any such effort. You have the fact that the consent of a public functionary is required, and it would be quite impossible to conceive such public functionary giving permission for the institution of a prosecution of that kind. We know what this Act is intended to prevent. I think the House is pretty well agreed in regard to it, and a little consideration will show that there is no necessity for the provision which my hon. friend wishes to have inserted.

Mr. FOWLER. What public functionary is it whose consent must be obtained ?

Mr. SIFTON. The judge of the court in which the suit is brought ; the attorney general of the province, a judge of a superior court or a county court, a judge of the sessions of the peace, the recorder, police magistrate, stipendiary magistrate, or any functionary having the power of two justices of the peace.

Mr. FOWLER. I understood from the Minister of Labour that that clause of the old Act was amended or repealed.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No, that law is in full force, and will not be affected by this Bill.

Mr. GALLIHER. I rise just to refer to a statement made by my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Walter Scott) with regard to the necessity for more labour for the development of the mines in British Columbia. Speaking for the district which I represent, I am happy to say that the mines there are now in a much more wholesome condition than they were some time ago, thanks largely, so far as the silver-lead mines are concerned, to the bonus which this House saw fit to grant to them last year. There is also, I am glad to say, a happier condition existing between the employers and the miners. There is no disturbance, and no demand for any labour in connection with the development of the mines, at all events in the district which I represent.

Mr. FOWLER. I have been listening for some time to hear from the ministers some good and sufficient reason why this amendment should not be accepted, but I have not yet heard any. The Minister of Labour stated that it would be class legislation, which was bad legislation. But this Alien Labour Bill, and previous Acts on the same subject, contain clauses which might be termed class legislation, because they exempt certain professions from the operation of the law. With regard to the difficulty pointed out by the premier, that labourers going from the Canadian Northwest to Dakota to work in the grain fields would be deported, whereas American labourers could come into Canada, the right hon. gentleman is misinformed if he supposes that any number of labourers have gone, during the last ten years at least, from the Canadian Northwest to work in the fields of Dakota. So far as my information goes, there has not been at any time any surplus of labour in the Northwest to go anywhere else. The acreage of land under cultivation and the output have increased to such an extent that there has never been at any time in the last ten years sufficient labour to do the work there. That is a condition which we are all glad of. I do not mean to say that it is in any way attributable to the policy pursued by this government—not in the slightest, and hon. gentlemen need not plume themselves on that.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It came in with them.

Mr. FOWLER. Not at all. It came before they came in, and was a result of the splendid policy pursued by their predecessors—a policy which the hon. gentlemen dared not change, although they had said that they would. I congratulate the hon. gentlemen upon having had sufficient common sense to follow out the policy laid down by the great builders of this country, the statesmen of the Conservative party, instead of pursuing the disastrous policy which they themselves proposed when in opposition. I have failed to see any good reason why the government should oppose this amendment. There are in the Northwest exceptional conditions which perhaps do not exist in other parts of the country, and we should trim our legislation to suit our own circumstances. I wish to enter my protest against legislating along certain lines because the United States do so. We ought to legislate off our own bat irrespective entirely of what the United States does. I would not increase our tariff simply for the reason that any other country has a certain tariff. I would increase our tariff because it would suit the circumstances of this country to do so.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). Is not that beside the question altogether ?

Mr. FOWLER. Now our ancient and venerable friend from Victoria is waking up.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). Mr. Speaker, is not this beside the question altogether ?

Mr. FOWLER. I am quite within the question. I am answering the point that we should not make an exception because there is danger of our people being charged in the United States.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. You had better move for the repeal of the Alien Labour law.

Mr. FOWLER. Not necessarily. I say it would be great folly for us to cut off our nose to spite our face. If the farmers of the Northwest wish to bring in labourers, why not let them do so ? You will not interfere with those labourers by bringing in others because the others are not taking their place. You require alien labour laws where you are going to interfere with men already in the country and when there is not enough labour to go around. But this is an exceptional case. As the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) has pointed out, we are reaching out in all directions to get labourers for the Northwest, and I must congratulate the hon. gentleman on the fearless and manly way in which he presented his views. I would like to see more of that independence and less partyism. The stand which the hon. gentleman took seemed to come with a shock to members on both sides. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) was so shocked that he had to get up and read the hon. member a lesson. However, I congratulate that hon. gentleman and wish there was more of that independence which animates him and the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler).

Amendment negatived on division.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me a more appropriate title would be 'to amend the Acts respecting Labour and Immigration.'

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not think that the title suggested would be as suitable as the one adopted. Every one of the clauses has to do with the subject of aliens.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

MUTUAL RESERVE LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would like to move that item 34 of Public Bills and Orders respecting Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Company, be called.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. C. B. HEYD moved second reading of Bill (No. 161) respecting the Canadian Assessment-policy-holders in the Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Company. He said : I propose to be very brief and shall not make any reference to the record of this association in past years, but confine myself to the Bill before the House. I am aware that charges of a very serious character have been made against the company, whether fairly or unfairly, but these were entirely apart from this Bill. A very great deal of labour has been spent in its preparation. Some time ago Senator Kerr introduced in the Senate a Bill for the relief of the assessment-policy-holders in this company. That Bill was referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce and by that committee referred to a sub-committee of five. This sub-committee availed itself of the assistance of the Insurance Department of the government, also of Mr. Brosseau, representative of the Canada Life Insurance Company, and Mr. Eldridge an official connected with the Mutual Reserve. After considering the matter in all its various aspects, this Bill is the result of the labours of that committee. After a few minor amendments, it was adopted by the Senate as the best that can be done under the circumstances. It is probably not as good a Bill as those who are members of the society would like to have ; but when we realize that this committee had only $25 of a surplus on each $1,000 to work on, you can readily understand that very much of a concesion could not be made. Circulars were sent out to the 3,600 policy-holders asking their opinion. Letters in reply were received from 785 in favour of the Bill, from 46 against it, and from 98 asking for further information. The rest, I assume, did not take enough interest in the question to vote either one way or the other.

Now, we must realize that this is the only opportunity that the assessment-policy-holders of this company will have of being benefited. If this Bill does not pass now, hundreds of them will back into the lapse class before another session comes round. During the past few years, $20,000,000 of insurance of the company has lapsed, because those holding the policies were not able to pay the rapidly increasing yearly assessments. There are still some 3,600 remaining who have kept themselves in good standing and who are waiting for this parliament to pass some Bill that will give them relief from the conditions under which they now exist. If they are forced to release their policies in this company owing to their inability to meet their yearly calls, many of them—probably hundreds of them—have arrived at an age when they are not good subjects for a new company to take, or, have contracted disease which would preclude them from passing a medical examination. This Bill takes in every man in good standing without an examination. Therefore, all that class that have got consumption, cancer, or other fatal disease undoubtedly will be benefited by the passing of this measure. Every individual that avails himself of one of the options provided in the Bill will get cheaper insurance than he can get from any other company in Canada. He will save from about $1.50 to $2 on each $1,000 of insurance. He will get,

in addition, his share of the reserve of $228,000, which is to be apportioned amongst the policy-holders, and, if he does not desire to continue a policy in this company he receives a paid-up policy for his share of that reserve. And, if he does not wish to avail himself of either of these options but to continue as an assessment-policy-holder he can stand on the conditions on which he entered the institution. In every clause of this Bill the interests of the assessment-policy-holders are fully protected. We can rely upon the work of Mr. Fitzgerald and Mr. Bradshaw to look after the interests of the policy-holders in Canada. They tell us that this is the best thing that can be done. And, notwithstanding what the past history of the company may have been, notwithstanding the fact that they have been charged with every crime possible—assuming these things to be true—it does not affect this question. It is up to us now either to adopt or reject this measure. Rejection means that hundreds will be added to the class that have allowed their policies to lapse. If we accept this measure we endorse the action of the Senate in having passed it, and the work of our own Insurance Department in connection with it. If later on, as we proceed with the Bill, its clauses require further consideration, I have familarized myself with the various details and hope to be able to explain them to the satisfaction of the House. One of the strongest arguments made against the Bill by those who have not studied it carefully is that in some way the Mutual Reserve Association is trying to get possession of the $228,000 of reserve that is in the possession of the government. But it is practically impossible for them to do so, because, by adopting either of these alternative propositions each individual policy-holder at once gets his share of that reserve in the paid-up insurance, and if he accepts another alternative proposition he at once gets the annual reduction in his premium rate which will necessitate the government holding it as a reserve against his policy. And if he does not accept any proposition he gets a paid-up policy for his share. Consequently the whole of the reserve is absorbed. It is in the hands of the government and it will not be paid out except in conformity with this Act. I have no interest in the matter, not being insured in the company ; but I am satisfied that this is the best that can be done for the policy-holders. I believe that they will be thankful if you permit this Bill to pass. And I hope that our friends here who have grievances against the company, who believe that the company has been mismanaged, extravagantly managed, dishonestly managed, will not present that grievance here to-day. For it has no bearing on this question. This company is in good standing in New York state whence it gets its charter ; it is in good standing in the Dominion of Canada to-day. It is carrying on business, it has put up its reserve with the government, and the government is in a position to compel it to carry out its obligation to its policy-holders. So, in considering this Bill, we can afford to forget what has taken place in the past and to confine ourselves, as I think we ought to do, to the interest of the assessment-policy-holders of the company the majority of whom desire to have this Bill passed.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read a second time and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose the government looked into this Bill before putting it on the government orders. I must say that I have not studied it, have not even had an opportunity to read it, and know nothing about it. But, of course, the government know that the course proposed in this case is unusual. This is a Bill such as, in the ordinary course of events, would be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce where it could be thoroughly inquired into. I gather from the statement of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) that those insured in this mutual insurance company, find their numbers decreasing and the calls upon those remaining growing larger, and the object is to take insurance in some other form and also to get the benefit of some fund or deposit that is held for the company by the government.

Mr. FIELDING. The account given of the Bill by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) is hardly correct. The explanation given by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) covers the ground. This is not a government Bill. But the department of Insurance has examined it, as they do all insurance Bills, and the superintendent of insurance is satisfied that it is unobjectionable. It is making the best of a bad business. I think the policy-holders of the company are satisfied that it is for the best. So far as the superintendent has looked into the matter he is sure that it is right, and he has assisted the Senate committee in drafting the Bill. The House may accept the assurance that no public interest is against the Bill.

Mr. HEYD. The Insurance Department not only approved of this Bill but were parties to the making of it.

Mr. FIELDING. That is true in this sense, that it is a private Bill. We are not concerned in the matter except by way of supervision. The Bill was before the committee of the Senate and they asked the superintendent of insurance to assist them and he did so. The Bill still remained the Bill of the company. It is not a government Bill, but the government desired to

afford the promoters an opportunity to present it to the House.

Mr. SPROULE. I have several of the policy-holders in my district, and as I have had many communications from them. I looked into the Bill very carefully. The concern in which they insured was originally named the Provincial Provident Institution, which sold out its rights to this company. Of course their policies were on the ordinary assessment plan. An idea of how these risks were taken can be gathered from a letter that I have in my possession. A gentleman in my part of the country took out a policy of $5,000 upon an agreement that he was to pay $9.95 every two months, the understanding being that not more than ten payments were to be called for in any one year.

After this company had become unable to keep up their contract and it was passed over to the present company, the rates went up from time to time until last year this man was paying instead of $9,95 every two months, $76.75 every two months, with $18.65 monthly for an annuity. Part of the agreement of this party was that at a certain age he was to draw an annuity of $500 per annum during the remainder of his life and to meet that he was obliged to pay lately $76.75 every two months, with $18.65 for his annuity, which would make $575 per year and this was going up all the time. According to the recent arrangement they have declared that they can only pay him an annuity of $334.17 even although he keeps this payment up. As there is $228,000 in the hands of the government, as a guarantee for the policy-holders who have their insurance in this company and as this Bill is to enable the policy-holders upon a new basis to convert their assessment policies into what would be regarded as straight line life policies for what they are worth and to keep them up in that way in the future—because otherwise, they would be obliged to relinquish them entirely —I think the Bill is a good one.

Mr. LOGAN. Is there anything in the Bill to prejudice the rights of any creditors of the company ?

Mr. HEYD. No.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. HENDERSON. Has the preamble been adopted ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No, the preamble will be the last to be adopted.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well then if I wish to speak on the Bill generally I will speak on the preamble, I suppose ? I will reserve my remarks until we get to the preamble.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. FOWLER. I want to get a little information in respect to this Bill. I want to offer no factious opposition but a gentleman who is a prominent member of the other chamber and also a policy-holder in this company has put some papers in my hand in reference to this Bill and I would like to get some information from the promoter. This gentleman says :

As the Bill stands now, it is simply to enable the wreckers in New York, who are not the policy-holders to withdraw from here the amount held by the government for the protection of the assessed policy-holders, some $236,000 in round numbers, and leave in its stead, only $40,000, so that what little we had here to hold on to, will be gone. Reference to sections 32 and 33 of the Insurance Act, will prove it. If to-morrow, they elect to do no more business here, which they won't do, for they cannot get any, they can withdraw all the deposit, as I have said, leaving only $40,000. In other words, they are attempting to force the old policy-holders to go into this new scheme of theirs and to have the breach of contract legalized by the Act. They tried this without the Act, and the policy-holders declined to go out of the fat into the fire. They will by Act of parliament be allowed to load down the policies or increase the premiums. To any sane man, who can reinsure, this will not be acceptable, as he can get into another company on the same terms. To the wretched individual who cannot reinsure on account of ill-health or old age, it means, that he must submit to the company reducing his policy from say $10,000 to $1,000, $2,000 or $3,000, as they may see fit ; or put such a premium as they cannot pay. The point to be guarded is that they must not be permitted to withdraw the deposit which they have at Ottawa, which is applicable to the assessment policy-holders, and must be left there intact for the assessments solely, and not for the benefit of the new company which they propose to work out ; and there must be conditions to it, as in Mr. McMullen's proposed motion. The Bill should be amended to include this motion ; next, they must not be allowed to load up or create any duty against the policy-holders, which will diminish the amount they have insured for.

I would like the promoter to answer these points.

Mr. HEYD. There are provisions for options in this Bill which will enable the holder of a policy to take either the one or the other. In paragraph D, line 25, of section 3 you will find this provision :

Each such policy-holder, on exercising either of said options, shall be entitled to a dividend of his proportionate share of the sum of one hundred and fifty-two thousand dollars of the deposit in the hands of the Receiver General of Canada——

That is where the money is now :

—applicable to the assessment policies of the company in Canada at the date of the said license, which dividends shall for policy-holders accepting the first option, be in the form of paid-up insurance to the amount purchasable by the said dividend.

That is the way this $152,000 is disposed of. Every policy-holder accepting option No. 1 will receive a certain amount of insurance at the rate fixed by the Act which is about $2 per thousand less than the best companies of Canada charge. In addition he will receive the paid up policy for his share of the reserve and each of the other options have similar provisions attached. So, that is the way this $152,000 is disposed of. It is disposed of by giving it to the policy-holders, it is in the hands of the Receiver General of Canada as a trust to see that these provisions are carried out and it is impossible for the company to put their hands on one cent of the money.

Mr. FOWLER. The motion which the Hon. Senator McMullen made in the other House is as follows :

That section 5 may be amended by striking out all the words after the words 'Receiver General of Canada' in line 53 of page 4 of the Bill, and that the following words be substituted in lieu thereof :—'together with any addition thereto under the provisions of this Act, shall not be reduced below the whole amount of insurance in force in Canada.'

That is that this money shall not be taken away. As I understand the explanation of the promoter of the Bill it is not the intention to withdraw the deposit which is now with the Receiver General but that this deposit shall be used for paying the policy-holders to accept either of the alternative options which are allowed in this Bill.

Mr. HEYD. Whether they accept the options or not. If they do not accept either of these options within four months the Bill provides that they shall accept option No. 1 and if so they get a paid-up policy for their share. This money is in the hands of the Receiver General. It is not in the control of the company at all and under this Bill every dollar of it is disposed of and given back to the policy-holders. The object of any amendment here would not be to improve the Bill but to have it sent back to the Senate in the hope that through the efflux of time the Bill itself would be quashed. The object is not to look after the welfare of the assessment policy-holders so much as to provide means whereby some one who is hostile to the company may gratify his inclination. As the Bill goes on it will develop itself and each provision will be made clear and plain.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to ask the promoter of the Bill if there has not been a general explanation of its terms and purpose ?

Mr. HEYD. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. On this section 2 ?

Mr. HEYD. We have not got to that yet ; we are on section 1.

Mr. OLIVER. The explanation given by the promoter of the Bill had reference to the general subject and he has seen fit to make the sweeping allegation that any one who would dare to suggest any opposition to this Bill or move any amendment to it is actuated by personal or local animosity.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This discussion is irregular. It would be better to take the clauses in order, and move to amend each one as desired.

Mr. SPROULE. It would be more convenient to allow a general discussion for the time being.

Mr. OLIVER. I ask the promoter of the Bill what are the reasons which prompt this company to ask for such legislation ?

Mr. HEYD. Not being in the confidence of the company I do not know their motives; but judging by the agitation which existed in the country on behalf of the policy-holders who complain of the excessive premiums they are called on to pay, I surmise that this Bill is for their benefit and not for the benefit of the company.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman declines to give the reason why the Bill is before the House, and if there are no reasons in support of the Bill then the House should not entertain it. This Bill involves the right of citizens of this country to the extent of several million dollars, and this parliament should not undertake to legislate away these rights without at least some explanation.

Mr. HEYD. Mr. Burgess sent out a circular asking the policy-holders whether or not they were in favour of the Bill. He received 785 replies in favour of the Bill, forty-six against it, and ninety-eight asking for further information. The forty-six who are opposed to the Bill are not compelled to accept it ; their rights are not interfered with, because they can continue as at present if they wish.

Mr. OLIVER. And what about the ninety-eight ?

Mr. HEYD. They want more information.

Mr. OLIVER. That is what we want. If this House respects its position it will not undertake at this short notice and at this stage of the session to deal with such a serious question. I insist that we get definite and comprehensive information as to why the company seeks this legislation. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) has told us that it is the policy-holders who are asking for this Bill.

Mr. HEYD. Seven hundred and eighty-five are asking for it.

Mr. OLIVER. They were asked to ask for it by whoever is the head push of the Bill. I submit that signatures to a petition

are not absolute evidence as to the views of the persons who sign. I will guarantee to take a petition around this House in favour of almost anything, and have it signed by a larger proportion than in this case. But even if the policy-holders all signed it, parliament has a duty to perform. I am safe in saying that out of the 785 who signed, not one of them understands the provisions of this Bill, which not a member of this House will stand up and claim that he understands.

Mr. HEYD. I will stand up.

Mr. OLIVER. Then if you understand the provisions of the Bill, you ought be able to explain them.

Mr. HEYD. I do not want to get into discussion because I do not care anything about it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) is under the impression that these 785 signed ignorantly, but there is an affidavit here from Mr. Burgess who swears that a copy of the Bill was sent to the policy-holders together with an explanatory circular——

Mr. SIFTON. Who is promoting the Bill ?

Mr. HEYD. Senator Kerr introduced it in the Senate.

Mr. SIFTON. Senator Kerr was only acting as a member of the Senate ; who is promoting the Bill ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is for the company undoubtedly.

Mr. HEYD. The insurance companies objected to an amendment of the Insurance Act, and therefore this measure was introduced as a public Bill, but it might as well have been a private Bill. The following circular was sent out to each of the policy-holders :

'B.'

In the matter of Senate Bill (H) An Act to further amend the Insurance Act.

1. Inclosed is a copy of Bill (H), introduced in the Senate, to amend the Insurance Act.

2. As a member of the Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Company holding an assessment policy therein, you are an interested party.

3. The principle of this Bill has been approved by the Canadian Superintendent of Insurance.

4. The company believes that its adoption will be to your advantage.

5. If it is adopted, the amount of the premium payable by you in future will be such a sum as will represent from year to year the average annual assessments (without dues) paid by you in the past.

6. This amount will be used to give you a policy of insurance, payable at death, on the level premium plan, without profits, either at your present age or at your age when you first become a member, as you shall choose, and will relieve you from all liability for further assessments.

7. If you choose the latter method, the reserve required by the Insurance Act can be a charge against your policy, bearing interest at 4½ per cent, with no personal liability on your part to pay such charge. If you prefer the policy without a charge, you may at any time pay it off in cash. Under the former method, there will be no charge whatever against your policy.

8. If by fixing of the level, unchangeable premium at the average of the assessments you have paid in the past, your insurance is reduced below the amount you are now carrying, you have the right (if you desire) to have your policy maintained at its full amount for a proportionately greater premium.

9. The company is allowed to increase the premium for expenses five per cent, that is, add five cents to each dollar of premium ; but the company is not allowed to charge any other sum for any other purpose.

10. If the Bill becomes law, the company will be required to keep deposited with the Minister of Finance or trustees the reserve that will afterwards accumulate upon the policy, as is required of all ordinary life insurance companies.

11. The government now hold about $228,000 as security for the members holding assessment policies. According to the plan proposed by the Bill your share of two-thirds of this deposit will be apportioned to you in paid-up insurance or (if you choose the option providing for a charge on your policy) in reduction of such charge.

12. Your rights under the Bill will be absolutely without regard to your present condition of health and without the necessity for any medical examination.

EFFECT OF THE BILL.

13. Under the present law your assessments must be increased from time to time to meet death losses.

14. If Bill (H) becomes law, the premiums will be fixed and unalterable.

15. Under the present law no new members can be added to the class to which you belong.

16. If Bill (H) becomes law, all members will be in one general class, with the protection and guaranty of all the funds of the company.

17. Under the present law you have a fixed amount of insurance and are liable for all necessary assessments.

18. If Bill (H) becomes law, there will be reduced cost, with generally, reduced insurance ; each member, however, has the right to the full original amount of insurance with an unalterable premium as fixed by the terms of the Bill.

19. As it is desirable to have an expression of opinion from as many members as possible, please return the inclosed slip, signed by yourself, giving your approval or disapproval of the principle of the Bill. An addressed, stamped envelope for this purpose is inclosed.

In the accompanying slip they say :

Please fill in the number of your policy.

The undersigned, whose life is insured under assessment policy No.————in the Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Company .....(approves or disapproves) of the principle of the Bill."

In reply to that, with the Bill before them and the explanations accompanying it, 785 approved of this Bill and 46 opposed it ; and those 46, under the Bill, will occupy the

same position, if they choose, that they do now.

Mr. HAGGART. Are all these promises provided for in the Bill ?

Mr. HEYD. Yes ; every promise.

Mr. GERVAIS. No ; they are not.

Mr. OLIVER. I am surprised to find, from the reading of this statement by the company of what it proposes to do, that there should be forty policy-holders opposed to the proposed Bill and ninety who ask for further information. I do not think there could be better evidence presented to this House that there is something very questionable either about this company or about this proposition—something so questionable that this House, at this stage of the session, with only the number of members we have present, cannot acquit itself with credit before the country in undertaking to dispose of these rights. In that long explanation I caught just one word which carried a definite idea to my mind ; that was, that under the new arrangement the premiums of the policy-holders were increased 5 per cent. Did I catch that correctly ?

Mr. HEYD. No.

Mr. OLIVER. Then I did not catch a single thing in all the statement which the hon. gentleman read, and I claim to be as competent to understand the English language as any member here. But when a document, prepared by the cleverest lawyer whom a clever company, with long practice in this business, has been able to secure, brings out the response that it did from the men who were most interested ; when 98 of them, having had the opportunity of reading that document, having had intimate knowledge of the workings of that company, being so directly interested that it would be their business to study it before it went into print, said they were not able to make up their minds on the subject ; I say that the forty or fifty members of parliament here present would be going beyond their duty if they made up their minds on the mere casual reading of that document by the hon. member, which he did not propose to do until practically forced to do it. I say that the company is discredited, so far as its intentions are concerned, by such a procedure. I say nothing against the company ; but I say that the procedure is most unfortunate ; that of asking parliament to concede a total change of base on the part of such a company at a moment's notice. I have asked the hon. gentleman, and I ask him again, for the reason behind this Bill. He has not given us the reason ; he has not attempted to do so. He has attempted to give us a set of reasons ready-made to appeal to the policy-holders. Why should the company wish—because it is not the policy-holders who are asking for this ; it is the company—why does the company wish to change its whole system of doing business ? That is the important question we have to deal with.

Mr. HEYD. The company changed that five years ago. It then ceased doing business in Canada on the assessment plan, and has since been doing it on the straight-life plan. In the meantime there are no young lives coming in, and the men in the company are getting older while their premiums are getting larger, and they are dropping out by the score. It is to protect these holders that I am supporting this Bill. Here is a Bill that purports to be in the interest of the policy-holders, and it is our duty to examine it and see whether it is in their interest or not. This circular was issued on May 21. At that time the Bill was slightly different from what it is now. Since then it has passed through the Senate and has been examined by the insurance authorities —by Mr. Fitzgerald on behalf of the Insurance Department, by Mr. Bradshaw on behalf of the life insurance companies of Canada, and by Mr. Eldridge on behalf of the company ; and now it is up to us to say whether we approve of the Bill or not. Let us take up the Bill clause by clause and deal with it. If it can be shown that it works injuriously to the policy-holders, let us defeat it. I am not trying to conceal anything, nor had I any purpose in abstaining from reading that document other than to avoid wasting time.

Mr. HAGGART. What will be the amount in the hands of the government if this Bill passes ?

Mr. HEYD. $228,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Why is that not disposed of ?

Mr. HEYD. The official document which I have in my hand, prepared by the actuarial department, says :

> From these calculations I conclude that a deduction of one-third of the reserve, or $76,000, is more than ample for these liabilities.

There are certain liabilities which $76,000 will pay off, which will leave two-thirds, or $150,000 at least, to be apportioned among the policy-holders.

Mr. HAGGART. What are the liabilities ?

Mr. HEYD. They are death claims which have not yet been paid. There is $152,000 in the hands of the Receiver General, which is divisible, and the division of which is all provided for by this Bill. If we take up the Bill clause by clause, and if fault can be found with any provision in it, it will then be time enough to complain.

Mr. SPROULE. A number of cases in my locality were submitted to me, and I saw the circular and the Bill. After going into the matter very carefully, I advised the parties to sign the circular, because it seemed to me, from what I knew of the

company and its operations, that those who remained would be either driven out of the company or be compelled to pay for their insurance an amount which they could not afford to pay. Those few who remained would ultimately be driven out of the company or compelled to pay a sum they could not afford to pay and they were past the time of life when they could reinsure. Befor one o'clock I gave an instance as an illustration. I know of the case of a man who took out $5,000 of insurance in this company for which he was to pay $9.95 every two months. He understood that that was a fixed premium, but it seems it was not because it is an assessment company. After this company found that its business was not being done on a sound basis, it stopped doing business in Canada, and like every other assessment insurance company, when new members are not coming in, it was bound soon to die by inanition. Those who remained must pay increased premiums as deaths occur. The result was that after the company stopped doing business, the premiums ran up from year to year until last year this man was paying $76.75 every two months and $18.65 for his annuity. There were two features in his policy. One was he was to get $5,000 at death and the other he was to get $500 a year after a certain age for the balance of his life. You see how rapidly his premiums ran up, and at the rate of increase in a short time he would have to drop paying altogether. Therefore I recommend that a change be made. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) asks what is the reason for this Bill. The object, as I understand it, is that the company, having this branch of insurance on their hands, cannot go on pushing it by bringing in new members and have to settle in some way, and they are taking the only way possible, and that is by providing that the assessment policies may be converted into straight line life policies. They will give a straight line life policy for the average the premium would pay. This of course would reduce the policies very much, because what the policy-holders are paying now would not give them the same amount of insurance on straight line life and provide for the 3 per cent which must be paid the government by insurance companies. I advised those who appealed to me that they had better accept that change than keep under the old system.

Mr. OLIVER. We are getting some little information on the subject now. According to the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), this company was practically in a condition of default.

Mr. HEYD. Not at all. You must bear in mind that these contracts were not taken by the company but by an association of which each one was a member.

Mr. OLIVER. The idea my hon. friend has tried to convey from the start is that it is the policy-holders who are asking for this Bill. Now, it is not the policy-holders who were the organizers of the company. There is no earthly use in quibbling on words. We know that there is some kind of organization at the head of every mutual company, somebody who profits more or less by its operations. Otherwise, there could be no company. I repeat that, according to the hon. member for Grey, this company was in such a position that it either had to break faith with its policy-holders or become insolvent. Failing to get new policy-holders, the premiums were going up to such an extent that those holding policies in the company could not afford to continue paying. That is a condition practically of bankruptcy.

Mr. HEYD. Dissolution would be a better word.

Mr. OLIVER. Not at all. If this company, by reason of its operations, got into an impracticable position when it can neither go forward nor back, what should be done in such a case? What is ever done in such a case, in any business matter, but wind the concern up. Do not let it go on. If there is money in reserve, let it be used to pay back to those who have paid into the company and let this business be settled with credit to all concerned. But that is not the purpose of the Bill. Clause 2 provides that after the obligations of the company have been entirely altered by Act of parliament, it shall be empowered to go on and do business in Canada. That is just the position of a merchant, who, having transacted business in an improper or improvident manner, has come to the point when he must stop. He goes to the bankruptcy court, he gets a quittance from his creditors at so much on the dollar, and is prepared to continue on a new basis. That is the purpose of the Bill, and I submit that, however legitimate that purpose may be, under proper circumstances, I do maintain that to ask this House at this stage of the session, with only a few members present, to put this company through the bankruptcy court, rehabilitate it and turn it loose on the Canadian public again, is to ask us to take responsibility which I for one will not consent to.

Mr. HEYD. There is one important feature which our hon. friend has forgotten. This is not a bankrupt company. It is established under a charter from New York state, under the title of the Mutual Reserve. It has a license from the present government, it has made its deposit, and is doing a regular life insurance business here. No matter how much you might want to put it into insolvency, you could not, because it has complied with the requirements of

the law, is in good standing and can go on doing business, whether this Bill be defeated or not.

Mr. OLIVER. If that be the case, why should parliament be asked to consent to an agreement which it does not understand and which it does not propose to take the trouble to understand. The thing is an outrage. It is unnecessary. If this company has been doing business the last five years, it can go on doing business another year without this change. Let it go on doing business under its present legislation and not come and get the sanction of parliament to a new arrangement. The hon. member says it is not bankrupt. I admit that the word is not absolutely applicable, but I am at a loss to describe the condition of a company whose policy-holders are in such a position that they are practically being frozen out and must lose their money. And on this plea and under that stress of circumstances, we are supposed to put our name and authority to an arrangement of which we know practically nothing and which certainly has not been justified before the House.

Mr. HEYD. My hon. friend is hardly complimentary to the House when he says we know nothing about the Bill. If he knows nothing about it, that is no reason why he should assume that everybody else is equally ignorant. This Bill has been before the Senate the past two months. The Insurance Department has pronounced upon it, the Senate committee has been considering it in very aspect, their proceedings have been opened to every member fo this House, many of us have followed them with considerable attention, insurance experts have given their assistance in framing the present Bill, and to say that we know nothing about it is going rather far.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am afraid we won't know anything about it unless the committee goes ahead with its work. The committee expressed a desire to have a general debate, but I think that has now gone far enough and that we are able to deal with the clauses in their order.

On section 1,

1. In this Act—
(a.) the word 'company' means 'The Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Company';
(b.) the expression 'new premium' means the average annual amount (not including dues) paid in respect of an assessment policy from the date of its issue to the date of the license to be issued under section 2 of this Act;
(c.) the expression 'assessment policy' means a policy issued or assumed by the company in Canada prior to the eleventh day of August, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-nine.

Mr. OLIVER. Since the hon. member (Mr. Heyd), who introduced the Bill, claims to be thoroughly conversant with it, I would ask his explanation of subsection (b).

Mr. HEYD. The question as to the meaning of the phrase 'new premium.' The Insurance Department have worked out a case. They take a case of a policy for $5,000, taken out in March, 1891, at age 39, present age 52, yearly assessment $57.16. Now, if the person had been in the company fifteen years, during that time he would have paid on each $1,000 insurance, $150 in premium or $10 per year. That would be the amount of the 'new premium,' and for that $10 he would buy as much insurance per annum as the statistical table provided by the department will buy.

Mr. OLIVER. How much would that be?

Mr. HEYD. Such a policy-holder as I have described taking the first option under this Bill would get his insurance at about $2 less than he could get it for in an ordinary company. He would probably get $176 of the reserve in the form of a paid up insurance, making in all $1,605. That is his position. Now, while it reduces the amount of insurance he would get, it fixes the price of insurance he will pay in the future. But if the one choosing the option desires to carry the amount of insurance he has always carried, he can do so by paying the rate specified in the table. It will benefit the policy-holder saving $10 a year on this insurance of $5,000, and also he will be taken in without a fresh medical examination. If the Bill does not go through and that policy lapses, that man, if he could not pass a medical examination, would be precluded from getting insurance in the future. But, under this Bill he gets his insurance cheaper than he could get it anywhere else and he gets it without making it dependent on his passing a medical examination. If a man has consumption, that is a good concession.

Mr. OLIVER. I understand the proposition to be to reduce the amount of insurance and increase the amount of premium? Am I right?

Mr. HEYD. In the case I have spoken of the insurance will be reduced from $5,000 to $1,425.

Mr. OLIVER. What?

Mr. HEYD. It will be reduced to $1,425. But the man does not need to change. If he wishes to continue as he is, he can keep his insurance for $5,000 and probably pay $500 a year. This company has ceased to do business of this class, and the members of that class must pay the death rate of their class. They are growing less all the time, and the last man will have to pay his own policy. If he chooses to stay he can do so. But, if not he can take this option which, the Insurance Department tell us, is the best that can be done under the circumstances. We do not deprive a man of

the right to pay his neighbour's death claim and his own. But this gives him the opportunity to get insurance on the level premium plan and as large an insurance as possible.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. member (Mr. Heyd) has stated that this is not a bankrupt institution. Yet we find that the proposition of this Bill is that it shall compound with its creditors on the basis of $1,425 for $5,000. That is a difference of $3,575. I should be inclined to regard a concern of that kind as a bankrupt institution. We, as a matter of fact, are constituting ourselves a bankruptcy court for the purpose of putting the company through. Now, I do not object to putting the company through the bankruptcy court. But I do object to this company being put through the bankruptcy court on a basis of 25 or 30 cents on the dollar and then allowed to go on and do business throughout this fair country of ours.

Mr. HEYD. But does not the hon. gentleman notice that, while it reduces its policy from $5,000 to $1,425, if he accepts the option, yet, nothing is forced upon him, and he has the right to remain as he is with his policy of $5,000. Or, he can keep his policy at $5,000 and pay on the level premium plan, and while the premium under this Bill, age 52 would be about $400 a year, it would be less than the man is paying now probably. According to the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) he would be paying about $500 per year. Is it not a relief for a man if he gets his insurance for less money ?

Mr. OLIVER. Well, Mr. Chairman, it appears that what I have said in regard to this company is altogether too mild. If this option of dropping two-thirds of his insurance is the best that the company can do, it is the duty of this parliament to consider this Bill with a view to winding up the affairs of this company.

Mr. HEYD. You can't wind them up.

Mr. OLIVER. Then it is our duty to——

Mr. HEYD. What ?

Mr. OLIVER. To take such measures as will wind them up.

Mr. HEYD. How will you do that ?

Mr. OLIVER. It is not for me to say at this moment. But I think the parliament of Canada is clothed with power.

Mr. HEYD. You can't wind up a solvent concern.

Mr. OLIVER. I think it is quite possible that parliament could wind them up. At any rate, for parliament to give its sanction to the operation of an institution which, having conducted business in this country for so many years has arrived at the condition that it offers to compound with its creditors on the basis of 25 cents on the dollar and threatens that if they do not take that offer they will have to continue as they are—which means that they will be robbed of everything—is a most unheard of thing. And, certainly, when we have such a proposition before us, at least parliament should have a reasonable time to consider it and to judge whether we should give our sanction. We are asked to accept what this management has done and then allow it to go on until it is compelled to compound with its creditors again. I submit that the very fact that 40 out of these policy-holders refuse this offer and that 98 of them asked for further information, although the threat was made to them, as stated by the hon. member, is reason why we should pause before taking this step. As the hon. member for East Grey indicates, the choice offered by the company is Hobson's choice—to take what is offered or get nothing at all ; to take 25 cents on the dollar or be robbed completely. I say that such an Act should not be accepted by parliament with the explanations that have been made here. Such a measure should be taken up at a time when it is possible for explanations to be made which will enable hon. members to justify themselves to their constituents in allowing the company to pursue its operations. These insurance companies are for the purpose of protecting the widow and the orphan and when it is proven that an insurance company exists on the robbery of the widow and the orphan, for that is what this means, I say that this parliament of Canada should consider how far it is for them to condone such a condition of affairs by assenting.

On section 2,

Mr. GALLIHER. This, I think, would be a prudent time to get information as to what this company proposes to do with its shareholders if it gets a license. Take the case of a man holding a policy of $5,000 who is now fifty-two years of age. Supposing he elects to remain in at the $5,000 will the premium that he would have to pay to the company on that $5,000 from the present time out be as small a premium as he will have to pay providing he were a fit subject for insurance in any straight life company. As I understand he would not be called upon to pay more than he would have to pay in another straight life company.

Mr. HEYD. That is correct.

Mr. GALLIHER. If this is correct it does not seem to me there should be the objection to the Bill urged by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). In the first place the policy-holder went into a mutual insurance company. It is true he has to pay more than he expected to pay but at all events he has been paying on the basis of a mutual insurance company. Now, he

has this advantage, as my hon. friend from East Grey pointed out, and it seems to me it is certainly a case of Hobson's choice because when the new blood that would be naturally coming in from year to year and swelling the receipts of this insurance company, when they were carrying on a mutual insurance, has been cut off, as it eventually will be and when the policy-holders narrow down to a few who are holders of these mutual policies it means that these remaining policy-holders will be paying more than they can afford or more than the amount of the policy in the event of death would amount to. Thus it is to that extent in the interest of these policy-holders. I do not think there can be any question about that. It is in their interest that there should be some means by which their policies will not become practically useless, as they otherwise would. They have this additional advantage that they can be granted that straight life policy, based on their present age, without a further examination. That, I think, is an important feature. If we refuse to pass this Act it may mean that a number of these policy--holders who have rights to-day wil be obliged to abandon them. They will not only have to drop what they have paid but the policy will be gone. There will be nothing for their widows and orphans on the death of the policy-holders. Companies say: We cannot do business on the mutual system any more but we will give you two options, to retain the straight policy; retaining the original sum, and without a medical examination which might otherwise debar you, and we will not call upon you to pay as much as or at all events any more than you would be called upon to pay in other companies at your age.

Mr. HEYD. That is correct.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to reply to one question of the hon. member for Alberta, as to why the company was not wound up. As long as a company is doing business within the lines of the Insurance Act you cannot close it. The members of a mutual company must raise the money to pay the death claims, and if the amount in the original contract which was in this case to which I have referred, $9.95 on every two months, is not sufficient to pay the death claims, the Insurance Act provides that that amount may be increased, and under that clause they are increased from year to year, thus keeping the company alive. Therefore you cannot wind it up as long as it is doing business under the law. If the company ceases to do business they can distribute what is in their hands among the members, but so long as they do not want it wound up and are doing business, as a bona fide insurance company you cannot wind it up. With regard to the other question raised by the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo, I may say that that is a case in point. Here is a gentleman with a $5,000 policy who is paying to-day $572.40 and the rate is going up in a manner which if it continues will before another year make the amount he will be paying a great deal over $1,000. If that man lived five years, notwithstanding that he had paid into this fund for years he would pay more than the whole amount of the money that would be given to his heirs at the time of his death, but on the other hand, if he dropped out now, he could not get into another company because he would not stand the examination. I know that for a fact, and therefore he would be deprived of the advantage of all the money he had paid in except in so far as it carried the risk up to this time. Now, he can take a policy under this new system for the average of the amount that the premium will pay or he can pay an additional amount on the same basis and get this $5,000 policy. It is making the best of a bad job.

Mr. BRODER. Have those who went in on the mutual basis any claim upon the deposit which is supposed to protect the insured?

Mr. HEYD. They get it all under this Bill.

Mr. BRODER. I know, but if they change over to the straight line have they this deposit behind them?

Mr. HEYD. If they turn over to the straight line it is divided pro rata amongst them.

Mr. BRODER. But in the other case they have no claim?

Mr. HEYD. They have no claim. They have simply to respond to the assessments.

Mr. GERVAIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words about this Bill. According to the statement made by the promoter of this Bill (Mr. Heyd), this parliament must constitute itself into a court of bankruptcy. I think that is a bad principle to be adopted in this House. This parliament should not constitute itself into a court of brankruptcy. I beg to draw the attention of the committee to the fact that according to the statement of the hon. promoter of the Bill this Mutual Reserve Fund Life Association is now bankrupt. According to a decree of the Privy Council of England it will be fifty times more a bankrupt within three months. Under these circumstances I want to know if this is a proper time for the parliament of Canada to deal with this question. Is not this Bill premature? A cablegram which has just been received in Ottawa states that in the case of Foster vs. the Mutual Reserve Fund Life Association of New York the Lord Chancellor of England characterized

the company's policy as tricky and intentionally ambiguous and maintained the judgment given by the High Court of Justice of Appellate Division in England. That means practically that within three months from the present time thousands of judgments will be issued by the courts of Great Britain as well as by our own courts against this company, and it means that within three months the appeal of Mr. Angers which is now pending in the Supreme Court of Canada will have to be maintained, the result of which will be that those who are insured in this concern will proceed against this company and have the assets of the company properly distributed and divided up between them. Under the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact that by adopting the measure which is now before the committee we will be seriously interfering with the rights and opportunities of the thousands of insured in Canada ? The Lord Chancellor of England has declared that the methods of this company in England have been fraudulent and all of our courts, not only the ordinary courts of the country but the Supreme Court of Canada will, in view of this declaration, have to decide that this company has been a fraud upon Canada. According to the rules of insurance which are in force in Canada the Supreme Court will have to declare in favour of Mr. Angers, and if it does that it means that the insured will have a good claim recoverable in law as well as in equity in all the courts of Canada. Under the circumstances are we not trespassing upon the rights of the thousands who are insured with the Mutual Reserve Fund Life Association in Canada ?

Mr. SPROULE. What would an execution be worth against a company that had no assets ?

Mr. GERVAIS. I will answer my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule). Wait for a few months. Where are the assets which were shown to exist by the cash books and journals of the company ? It has not yet been clearly shown where they have gone. Let us wait for six months. Then we will make an effort to discover the assets of this company. We cannot in any event be put in a worse position than that which we occupy to-day. All the assets we have to divide up to-day represent only $228,000. Let us keep that sum within our own hands and within six months we will investigate the matter. We will ascertain the value of the decree which has issued from the highest court in the land. Then, we can pass this Bill next session if we think it is a proper Bill to be passed. At any rate I do not want to be dictated to by the Senate of Canada. I do not attach any sincerity to clause 5 of this Bill, because, to use the language of the learned judge of the Privy Council from the bottom of my heart, I do not believe there is any honesty in the Bill. As far as I can understand it clause 5 means that the Mutual Reserve Fund want to continue their business, say for 24 hours, they want to issue a new policy and then to get hold of the deposit and go back to Long Branch. Under the circumstances there is only one course open to us and that is to vote that this Bill be given the six months hoist if we are to take cognizance of the cablegram which I have read to the committee and appreciate at its true value the decree given by the Privy Council of England. We should await the decision which will shortly be given by the Supreme Court of Canada upon the appeal there pending, and next year we will ask this House to decide in what way and under what conditions the deposit which we now hold shall be divided amongst the insured.

Mr. HEYD. If every word the hon. gentleman said were absolutely true——

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). Every word is true.

Mr. HEYD—it would not do the assessment policy-holders any good. This $228,000 is under the control of our government for the benefit of the Canadian policy-holders and it cannot be touched by any English judges who may pass judgment.

Mr. GERVAIS. I would like to ask a question of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd). The House of Lords having decided in the case of Foster vs. The Mutual Reserve Fund Life Association in the way I have indiciated, will it not have to be decided by the courts of the province of Quebec as well as by the courts of the other six provinces composing the confederation that every one of the insured will have to be refunded his money out of the funds of the company ? The question may be asked : Where are these funds to be taken from ? Well, we will see.

Mr. BRODER. Suppose that these people accede to the proposition contained in the Bill after it becomes law and that they turn over from the mutual to the straight line system of insurance, if the business done on the straight line basis is greater than that which the deposit at present covers has the deposit to be increased ? Is there any provision that the deposit with the government shall be increased to cover any additional business ?

Mr. HEYD. According to the law as I understand it, this company must keep a reserve with the government such as would enable the government to reinsure all these lives in any other solvent company, if this company were to collapse.

Mr. SPROULE. The deposit is in proportion to the business done.

Mr. HEYD. Yes, and if they increase the policy-holders in Canada they would have to keep on increasing the reserve. The judgment referred to was in connection with a peculiar policy. It was taken out for fifteen years under the ordinary conditions, but this gentleman had a letter from one of the directors of the company stating that his premiums would not increase, and the court therefore held that this was a special contract and that the extra premiums must be refunded with 4 per cent. If we have in Canada any policy-holders who have a similar letter from one of the directors, I assume they would be in the same position. But even if there were a thousand of such it would not affect the money in the hands of the government. If the annual dues are paid this company has to give to our government such a reserve as will enable our government to reinsure them in another company. I assume that the Insurance Department of the government will see that the reserve required by law is kept intact, and if the government allow the reserve to go under the safety limit the government is responsible.

Mr. OLIVER. We want to find out how this company stands; whether it is independent of the parliament of Canada or whether it is subject to the parliament of Canada. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) has tried to create the impression that there is a sum of money in the hands of the government which absolutely protects the persons insured in the company, but that protection only amounts to 25 or 30 per cent of the face value of the policy. Instead of the insured being able to depend on $5,000 he is only insured for $1,400. For one reason or the other the company has got itself into such a position that its policy-holders stand to-day to lose the difference between $5,000 and $1,400 in the value of each policy to the amount of $5,000; and this is the company that asks parliament to put it in a legal position to do business with the people of Canada. I am not so much concerned with the present policy-holders as with those who may enter the company in future if this parliament starts it on its feet again. The statements put before the House to-day more than justify us in demanding that the affairs of this company be examined into. Is it to be said that this parliament shall calmly vote away the rights of the policy-holders of this company to the amount of two-thirds of their policies without any justification except that the company has been improperly or badly managed. How many million dollars worth of policies does this company hold?

An hon. MEMBER. $20,000,000.

Mr. OLIVER. Are we to reduce $20,000,000 to $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 by a snap of the finger?

Mr. HEYD. There are 3,600 policy-holders in this class in Canada, representing $8,000,000.

Mr. GERVAIS. I rise to a point of order: has this Bill been printed in French?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It comes from the Senate and I presume it has.

Mr. OLIVER. Are we to reduce the face value of that $8,000,000 to $2,000,000 or $3,000,000? Are we to wipe out what the widows and the orphans present and prospective expected was a reliable asset because the management of this company has been either incompetent or corrupt? Are we to accept such a proposition on the spur of the moment? Surely such a proposal is entitled to mature consideration from this House. No matter how the Senate has looked at it; no matter how the insurance people have looked at it; we have responsibilities to those who are in the company and to those who may be induced to come into such a company in the future if we rehabilitate its credit. This is why I ask for delay.

Mr. HEYD. Has my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) ever read this Bill through?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 3,

Mr. OLIVER. I want an explanation from the promoter of the Bill of clause 1 of subsection b of section 3.

Mr. HEYD. The illustration which I read is an exemplification of it. I have taken the case of a policy taken out in March, 1891; age of entry, 39; present age, 52; the amount of the policy, $5,000; and the average yearly assessment, $57.16. The first option gives him a net premium of $57.16, which will purchase, $1,429 of insurance without a medical examination; the second gives him the right to continue the whole $5,000 by paying the rates agreed upon here. This is the explanation which the department gives.

Clause 1 will give the following advantages: no medical examination will be required; loading up expenses will be very small; and he will be entitled to whatever free or paid-up insurance may be allotted to him under this section.

Mr. OLIVER. If I had not read this section, I would have supposed that under the new arrangement the insured person would get the benefit of the rate at which he was insured. He does not do any such thing. He simply gets the rate at which he could be insured in any other company.

Mr. HEYD. Slightly less.

Mr. OLIVER. There is a distinct breach of agreement between the company and the insured. The party was insured at a certain premium at a certain age, and years af-

terwards this parliament tells him you can continue your insurance provided you will accept a reduced policy equal to a valuation based on your present age.

Mr. HEYD. But the company did not make a contract that on the payment of a certain premium they would continue the policy. That premium was liable to be raised from year to year as the necessities of the company required.

Mr. OLIVER. He came in at a certain age and got the benefit of the insurance rate applicable to that age. That benefit he loses by this provision, because you reduce his policy to what it would be worth if he were taking it out to-day.

Mr. HEYD. He will enjoy the advantage that his premium will be fixed one instead of being liable to be increased as it is at present. And he will be getting a cheaper insurance than he would get in any straight life company in Canada and be allowed to go on without any medical examination.

Mr. OLIVER. We are not complaining that this company graciously permits its policy-holders to retain some interest because of the money they have paid. But this company has violated its contract, and we are asking parliament to sanction that violation and put it in a position to do business with the people of Canada again, which it is unable to do now.

Mr. HEYD. What contract do they violate? They made no contract for fixed rates. The contract provided that the rates might increase just as in the case of all assessment companies.

Mr. OLIVER. That may not be the letter of the contract but certainly the agents of the company induced people to take out policies in it by representing that the rates were not likely to be increased. It is just the same as the hayfork swindle. The fact that the contract does not carry out what the company promised through its agents does not put it in a better position, and they should not be allowed to be set free again to perpetrate similar swindles on the people.

Mr. HENDERSON. Was it at the instance of the company that this investigation took place? I have heard the hon. member for Alberta say that this company are asking for the power given under this Bill. I was under the impression that the whole matter has been forced on the company. How did this Bill originate?

Mr. HEYD. The first I heard of this Bill was that it was introduced by Senator Kerr. At whose instance it was introduced, I do not know. All I am interested in is the question whether it is going to be a benefit to the Canadian policy-holders or not.

Mr. GALLIHER. There is one point I am not clear about. When I spoke before, I pointed out the case of where the assured kept on his $5,000 policy as a straight life policy and paid the premium chargeable at the age he now is. But when he elects to take the other course and takes a $1,463 policy, or whatever it may be, instead of his $5,000 policy, what premium does he have to pay? Does he have to pay the premium which he would be charged by a straight life company at the age he took out the policy or at his age to-day?

Mr. HEYD. He has the right, based upon the average of his payments, to such an amount of insurance as that average rate will pay. Upon that basis the rest in the hands of the government is divided; but while his average payments will give him a policy of $1,460, he can still keep on his $5,000 policy by paying at the same rate as he would pay on the $1,400, or at a rate $1.65 per thousand less than in the Confederation Life, say his age was fifty-two.

Mr. OLIVER. The reading is very plain.

Mr. GALLIHER. If when this man's policy is whittled down from $5,000 to $1,460, he has to pay on the $1,463 the same premium that he would have to pay if he made a new application to-day for that amount, I do not see what benefit he gets in accepting that reduced policy. If his policy is reduced from $5,000 to $1,463, he should only be charged on that amount the premium he would pay at the age of his first application.

Mr. HEYD. On that basis if you were to take a man at fifty years of age and continue him on the rate at the age when he first applied, where is the money to come from?

Mr. GALLIHER. The policy has been reduced from $5,000 to $1,400 and the company has not been carrying on its business during all that time for love. He has been paying under the mutual system very heavy assessments in the way of premiums.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). They were cheating the people.

Mr. GALLIHER. That may be. It may be a very vile company or not. I have no personal knowledge, but if the policy is cut down from $5,000 to $1,460, I do not see why he should not be placed in the position of only being charged the premium on the reduced amount such as he would have had to pay at the age of entry.

Mr. HEYD. If that gentleman had gone into a strange life company fifteen years ago and paid the rates which such a company charged, he would have $527 lying to the credit of that particular policy which would enable the premium to be kept down to the price at the age of entry, but as he has not paid any such rate, the money is not in the treasury. I suppose that every man who has had his life carried for half

what it is worth for fifteen years thinks the company owes him something because it does not continue that operation. He has had value in having been insured, even though he has not died.

Mr. GALLIHER. I wonder at the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) making such a statement. These people came into the company under representations that their lives would be carried for half what other companies would carry it for. They were told that they would have to pay certain specified assessments,—which, in all human possibility, would not exceed a certain amount. Then the company discontinue that system in Canada and oblige the people who are insured under it to pay, not only all that their lives are worth to carry, but twice, three times—yes, five times as much.

Mr. HEYD. That is a good synopsis of the condition. Representations were made to the people that certain assessments would be made, which, very likely, would not go up, but which might go up. Everybody who goes into an assessment company takes chances of the assessments going up.

Mr. GALLIHER. But did not the very act of the company in discontinuing the class of insurance cause them to go up ?

Mr. HEYD. The company, while doing assessment business, were doing it according to the law. But the premiums collected were too small. The assessments had to be increased, and, because of the increase in the assessments, three-quarters of the people dropped out. This leaves a large proportion of people who are likely to die, who have to hang on, and it is for these people that we are working now.

Mr. OLIVER. At one moment we are told that the company did not get enough money and the next we are told they got too much. The reason the people dropped out was because the assessments were too high. If that is so, the contention can hardly be justified that people who remained in did not pay enough money. They paid too much. And yet they have now to come in at a rate which was not taken into consideration, which was not in expectation in any way. And, if this is necessary, it is because of conditions brought about solely by the acts of the company, acts for which the policy-holders are not responsible.

Mr. HEYD. This concession does not benefit the company.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Allow me to make a suggestion. We will carry one section every little while, and so make some progress.

On section 5,

5. After the date of the said license the company shall be subject to make deposit only as provided in sections 7 to 11, both inclusive, of the Insurance Act, and all the assets in Canada shall be applicable to all the insurance liabilities of the company in Canada ; provided that the deposits of the company with the Receiver General of Canada shall not be reduced below the amount at the date of the said license so long as the company is undertaking in Canada new contracts of insurance, and shall in all respects be subject to sections 33 and 34 of the Insurance Act.

Mr. OLIVER. This section is intimately connected with the deposit now held by the government as security for the policy-holders of the company. Under the wording of this section, all the company has to do is to cease doing business in Canada in order to entitle them to draw the last cent of the deposit, leaving the policy-holders to whistle for their money.

Mr. GERVAIS. I beg leave to move, seconded by Mr. Oliver, that the following be added to section 5 :

Provided also that no such reduction of the deposit as it stands to-day be made for a period of five years from the present time, except for the purpose of paying death claims in accordance with the Insurance Act.

I do not see why objection should be raised to such an amendment as this.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. GERVAIS. This is a very important matter. I can tell hon. gentlemen that a good lawyer could make out of this section 5 fifty cases for the Privy Council in England. The section is very ambiguous, and it has been made ambiguous purposely. I want to make it clear. Can there be any objection on either side of the House to making this section clear now that we have it before us to deal with ? Surely it is only reasonable to provide that this disposit shall not be reduced for any reason except to pay death claims according to our law relating to insurance companies.

Mr. HEYD. This section is a most important one. It expresses most clearly the intentions of those who are opposed to this Bill. The very object intended to be secured by the amendment is provided for in this section to the satisfaction of the Insurance Department. The Minister of Finance is here, and he will probably express his own opinion about it. The effect of adopting this amendment would be to throw the Bill back into the hands of the Senate, where, by the efflux of time, it would be killed. That is the effect of the motion—I will not say it is the intention. We have all been in parliament long enough to know that if this House is to close to-night or Monday night this Bill will be fought in the Senate by the people who have been fighting it for two months. In the interest of the policy-holders in this country, whose interests are preserved by the Bill, we should avoid amendment if possible. And amendment can be avoided here, because every idea contained in the proposed amendment is al-

ready covered in the section. If the Bill is killed in the Senate many of these policy-holders will be forced out through an increase of assessments. How will this benefit them? And what harm will it do the company? You cannot hurt the company by preventing the Bill going through. They do not care whether you carry it or not. They will simply levy assessments upon these people, and as long as they do so, these policy-holders will pay. When the thing comes to its finish and there are only two or three policy-holders left, the two will have to pay $500 each to pay the death claim of the third, and when there is only one left he will have to pay his own $1,000. If this amendment carries that will be the ultimate result. It will not protect the policy-holders one hair. This deposit is in the hands of the Receiver General, and cannot be moved by the company.

Mr. HAGGART. I have not yet heard anything which empowers the government to pay out this sum of money which is on deposit with them in accordance with the provisions of the Bill.

Mr. GERVAIS. The General Insurance Act of Canada will empower the government to do that. Here is the theory upon which the insurance deposits are to be made. When a company starts into the insurance business it has to make a fixed deposit and then this deposit must be increased as new policies are issued. As a matter of fact the Mutual Reserve Fund, if I am well informed, made a primary deposit of $50,000. Then they issued a large number of policies and had to make additional deposits up to the amount of $228,000. They now want under what, we call the theory of this law, to have a new license issued by the Department of Insurance and then they want to be empowered to make a new deposit under that new license. If that is done, as the amount of their policies has decreased in the meantime, they will have to make a deposit only in proportion to the reduced amount of the policies in force. That means practically that these gentlemen will have their deposits within twenty-four hours after the passing of this Act, reducing the amount required to $50,000. They will get a cheque from Mr. Fitzgerald and go back, as I said, to Long Branch. There is no good reason for passing this Bill. I appeal to the reasoning power of both sides of this House. There is very grave doubt about the drafting of that clause in the Senate. I understand that, if I am well informed, the amendment I am now proposing was agreed to in the Senate. It is a grave thing, it is a grave charge I am making, but I am informed that this clause had been agreed to, and that the proposed amendment of the law was to be inserted but that was not done and it is not in the law. I say now, without making a trial balance, without making up the accounts of the duties and responsibilities of all the persons concerned, we have an opportunity now to make this law clear and let us do so. Let it be written in this law which is now under the fire of discussion, that from now on nobody will have a right to reduce that deposit until a period of five years has elapsed.

Mr. CLANCY. Why five years, why not altogether?

Mr. GERVAIS. My answer is this, let us keep 'both hands' on this deposit during a period of five years, then after that period of five years has elapsed, we will see whether or not the Mutual Reserve Fund Company is bona fide doing business in Canada. If the company is bona fide doing business in Canada then they might be permitted to decrease the amount of their deposit. If this company at the end of that time has not done any bona fide business in Canada, we will say: We do not want one farthing to be deducted from that deposit. That is the aim of my amendment. Is there anybody in this House to say that this amendment will not be to the advantage of all the policy-holders? It is in the interest of everybody; we want it to be made clear, unquestionable, as we say under the Torrens system, indefeasible, that the deposit of $228,000 will not be reduced for a period of five years under any circumstances, except for paying death claims as they stand to-day.

Mr. HAGGART. It is true, as the hon. gentleman says, that the Bill provides that they may perhaps get a license on more favourable terms than before. This sum of money at present in the hands of the government was deposited under a general clause of the Insurance Act. This Bill is for the purpose of enabling those outside the Insurance Act to obtain control of the money deposit. There is no provision under the proposed legislation to give to the government power to pay it back to these parties under this Act.

Mr. HEYD. This money is absolutely under the control of the Receiver General and not under that of any insurance company, and it never can be.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman does not seem to comprehend what I have said. This money is deposited with the government and the government have control of it under the Insurance Act. The complaint was that the government were bound by the Insurance Act and could not pay it out on any arrangement which the company may make with the government. The company are authorized under this Bill to make arrangements with their policy-holders and to get a license, perhaps as this gentleman says, on lower terms. Where is the provision empowering the government to enter into such an arrangement as is proposed in this Bill?

Mr. HEYD. This clause has reference to the question of license. Before an insurance company can do business, it must deposit with the government $50,000. That is the first thing. Then it must keep up its reserves. There is $152,000 in the hands of the government for the benefit of these policy-holders. The alternatives which the policy-holders may select are as follows :

Those who accept proposition one, receive so much paid up insurance.

Those who accept proposition two, receive a certain reduction in the rate of premium.

Those who refuse either and do not ask for either of these two propositions at the end of four months will get a policy paid up for the amount of their interest in this $152,000.

The money having been divided among the policy-holders in that way is in the hands of the government and becomes a reserve that must be maintained and kept there for the benefit of these policy-holders, and I assume that when a man dies his share of that reserve is paid to his heirs. In that way only can this money be got from the government. I have endeavoured to explain this thing and we have on the floor of the House to-day the representative of the Insurance Department. His opinion is official, and I may say that I got my information from Mr. Fitzgerald who said that he has the money and will not give up a cent.

Mr. BARKER. As I understand the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, there is no intention on the part of the company to withdraw the money from the government. I understand that the hon. gentleman wants to put on the statute-book a clear expression that they shall not withdraw the money. Under these circumstances it ought not to be difficult to put in a clause that is perfectly clear upon the point. The hon. gentleman tells us that they do not want the money, that it will not be withdrawn, that it cannot be. The hon. member for Montreal, St. James (Mr. Gervais) wants it put in black and white that it shall not be. Will the hon. gentleman be willing to put it in writing ?

Mr. HEYD. If the amendment is carried providing for a thing that is already provided for in the Bill it will have the effect of killing the Bill.

Mr. GERVAIS. Not at all.

Mr. HEYD. Yes, it will. It will have to be referred back to the Senate in order that the Senate may concur in our amendment and before Saturday night or Monday night there will be no opportunity of discussing the matter further and the Bill will be defeated. That is why we do not want the amendment. I have my information from Mr. Fitzgerald, and if you are not satisfied with what I am telling you, I cannot help it, but his assurance to me is that he will not give up this money.

Mr. BARKER. Will the hon. Minister of Finance say whether that is so ?

Mr. FIELDING. The motion of my hon. friend from Montreal, St. James (Mr. Gervais) is based upon an error as to the policy that is now followed in the Insurance Department. He wants to provide that this deposit shall not be withdrawn except for the purpose of paying death claims. My hon. friend is under the impression that the deposit is now available for the payment of death claims, which is a mistake. We cannot pay out one penny of it for death claims. If a company fails to respond to its obligations it goes into bankruptcy and the courts distribute the money. The Department of Insurance cannot pay out a penny in satisfaction of death claims. We hold the deposit as security in the event of trouble, proceedings are taken in the court and the court determines what shall be the distribution of the money.

Mr. BARKER. You say that the deposit cannot be paid out for death claims. Can it be paid out for any purpose ?

Mr. FIELDING. It cannot be under the existing law. If under the Bill, a large volume of this assessment business is transferred into what we may call straight life insurance, then a portion of the deposit may be made available to protect insurance in that new form, but in no case will the money be withdrawn from the treasury.

Mr. HAGGART. This Act does not empower you to do that ?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. HAGGART. Then how is it paid out ?

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me to be very much like a voluntary liquidation. The Receiver General can only use that money to reinsure in the event of the company winding up. This company is practically winding up and the Bill provides that each policy-holder :

—shall be entitled to a dividend of his proportionate share of the sum of $152,000 in the hands of the Receiver General of Canada applicable to the assessment policies of the company in Canada at the date of the said license.

So that each one will be entitled to a share of it. As to whether the Receiver General has the right to apply it in that way or not may be another question, but I take it that the justification for saying that it would be paid out in that way is the fact that there is a voluntary liquidation of the company consented to by the policy-holders as well as by the company.

Mr. GERVAIS. May I be permitted to put a question to my hon. friend the Min-

ister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) ? I would like to join issue with his statement. The purpose of my amendment is not to give power to the Minister of Finance to reduce the amount of the deposit as it stands to-day, but the purpose and the only aim of my amendment is that the deposit, which is in the hands of the hon. Minister of Finance in his capacity as Receiver General, shall stand as a legal deposit to be paid according to the enactment of parliament or to the decrees of our court. That is the aim of the amendment.

Mr. FIELDING. I have taken very little part in the discussion for the reason that I have a personal interest in this matter and I am disqualified from voting. I am one of these policy-holders, and I thought that the proper course for me to pursue was to confine myself to seeing that the Insurance Department should examine the question and give it such supervision as would be a guarantee that the matter is in good shape. That has been done. All that the public interest requires in this matter, I am assured by the superintendent of insurance has been done, and I think the committee may safely accept this proposition.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance a question. He has told the committee that there is no doubt whatever that the accumulation that now remains in the hands of the Receiver General will have to be held in future for the protection of the policy-holders. Will this Act transfer any portion of that to the new policy-holders or will the accumulation go entirely to the policy-holders who have contributed up to this time ? It belongs to those who are policy-holders now and if it is held it ought to be held in such a way as to protect the rights of those who are now policy-holders.

Mr. FIELDING. As the new business increases they must make a deposit in proportion to the extent of that business and this would in no way affect the security of the present policy-holders. This sum will remain for the benefit of the existing policy-holders but as they pass from one class to another it will become available for the protection of the new class as far as it will go.

Mr. WARD. I notice that in the latter part of section 5 the Bill says :

> Provided that the deposits of the company with the Receiver General of Canada shall not be reduced below the amount at the date of the said license so long as the company is undertaking in Canada new contracts of insurance.

What I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance is this : Supposing the company decide not to make new contracts of insurance at all, will the company have the right to demand from the Receiver General of Canada any portion of that amount at present in his hands? A deposit has been made from time to time as business has been done requiring that deposit ; as the business increased the deposit had to increase. If they cease to do business in Canada, and if the deposit already made should be more than necessary for the amount of business that they are carrying, would they be justified in asking the government to give them the balance out of the treasury of Canada ?

Mr. FIELDING. There would be no obligation on the government to deliver up any portion of it. That would be a matter of discretion. The government in such cases determine whatever seems to be a reasonable deposit for the purpose and there would be no right on the part of the company to demand the return of a single dollar.

Mr. HAGGART. If I understand the Bill rightly, there was a deposit made. Was it for the general purposes of the company or for mutual or straight line insurance ?

Mr. FIELDING. Not at the same time. While they were doing assessment business they were not doing straight line business, and when they began to do straight line business they had to suspend the assessments. The deposit remained for the assessment of the policy-holders and the new business had to find a new deposit.

Mr. HAGGART. Thus the deposit was made for the purpose of securing those who were mutually assessed. What it is proposed to do is to transfer that deposit for another purpose.

Mr. FIELDING. If the parties elect to have their policies transferred into the new class their interest is protected there as it must be in the old class, because there remains their proportion of the old deposit.

Mr. HAGGART. They have a certain proportion ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Suppose they remain in the old class ?

Mr. FIELDING. Then the deposit remains just as it was. You do not transfer their proportion at all ; it remains there.

Mr. OLIVER. This question was asked the hon. Minister of Finance : In case that the policies now carried by this company do not require the amount of the present deposit, would it be possible for the company to be returned the difference between what they would be required to carry and what they do carry now ? I understood the hon. Minister of Finance to say that this matter was in the discretion of the government. That is exactly what is contemplated by the wording of clause 5 and that is exactly

what we moved, the amendment to prevent. We ask in all fairness for the protection of our rights that the House shall grant that concession. The wording of the amendment is clear. If this deposit is to be a real security we want to be sure it will be there when it is wanted. We have been unsuccessful in preventing the proposition to decrease the policy or to increase the premium, and as a last resort we now ask that the security be not diminished. The hon. member (Mr. Heyd) says this Bill must pass without amendment. In the name of common sense, is this House to be approached with a proposition of that kind ?

Mr. HEYD. You heard my reasons.

Mr. OLIVER. It does not make any difference what the reasons were ; the reasons are bad. This House has sat for months and months without any serious reason, and in this matter involving millions of the money of our people I am willing, and others are willing, to sit another day to afford security to these people. It is the worst charge that can be brought against the Bill that it is brought into the House at a period of the session when it cannot receive any consideration or amendment.

Amendment (Mr. Gervais) negatived and section agreed to.

Mr. SPROULE. Whether a number of the policies lapse in the future or not, this company cannot for any reason reduce the deposit with the government.

Mr. FIELDING. There will be no reduction of deposit.

On the question for the adoption of the preamble,

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not rise to oppose the Bill. From the discussion and from what I have heard, otherwise. I am under the impression that the policy-holders will be in a better position after the passing of this Bill. However, I call attention to the fact that an important principle has been set up in the introduction of this Bill. I do not understand that the Bill originated in the ordinary way on a petition from this company, but that it had its origin with the policy-holders ; the interested parties, I say interested parties, because being an assessment company, the policy-holders are really the interested parties. Insurance companies, like banks, are the creation of parliament and it is proper that parliament should exercise control over them and whether they be assessment companies or stock companies compel them to live up to the contract they have entered into with their policy-holders. Speaking of this principle which is the basis of this Bill, I may say that a short time ago, I took strong grounds against a Bill that was introduced by the Canadian Life Insurance Company, because I believed they were asking for powers they should not be given, and I insisted that the policy-holders should exercise greater control over the affairs of that company than had hitherto been accorded to them. I asked the Banking and Commerce Committee to increase the powers of the policy-holders with a view to enable them to protect themselves, they being the parties having the largest interest in the operations of the company. As we are all aware, the reserve stock of the Canadian Life Company at the present time consists of $27,000,000 ; $1,000,000 of which is contributed by the shareholders, and the balance is the money of the policy-holders. I asked that the policy-holders should be represented on the board by the same number of directors as are the shareholders, and that no shareholder should be eligible as a policy-holder director. My intention was to give the policy-holders power to take care of their own rights and prevent an improper use being made of the money of that company. I shall state briefly the reasons why I took that course. In 1900, at the time of the last quinquennial division of profits, a very considerable sum of money was transferred from the accrued profits, ninety per cent of which belonged to the policy-holders, and handed over to the capital stock of the company for the purpose of increasing the reserve and making a better showing for the shareholders ; practically for the purpose of increasing the value of the stock of the company at the expense of the policy-holders. It is well known to many of us that when applications are solicitated for insurance in the Canadian Life Company on what is known as the profit plan, the applicant is assured that 90 per cent of the entire profits of the company shall be divided amongst the participating policy-holders, and that the profit coming to the policy-holders, is their money just as much as the sum named in the policy. Consequently, if a large portion of this it taken away from that fund and applied to capital account the profit accruing to the policy-holders is very materially reduced, and can never come back to them again. I contend that it would be a proper thing if larger powers were taken by the parliament and the government of Canada with regard to controlling the whole operations of life insurance companies.

I believe that the Department of Insurance should not only have power to inquire as to whether the company holds sufficient reserves at all times, on whatever basis is prescribed by the government, whether on a 3½ per cent, a 4 per cent or a 4½ per cent valuation, and to insist on the company maintaining sufficient reserves to meet all claims when they reasonably mature, but it should at the same time have power to inquire into the financial operations of the company, and ascertain whether the funds

of the company are being used for the purposes for which they are intended, and for which the policy-holder was given to understand they would be used at the time he made his application for insurance. I think the discussion to-day will be of considerable value both to the policy-holders in all companies in this country, and to the insurance companies themselves, because it will draw attention to the fact that parliament is going to assert its right to investigate the operations of insurance companies and to see that the rights and interests of policy-holders are preserved. Hitherto we have had the idea that no amendment could be made to a private Bill such as an insurance Bill unless it emanated from the company itself on a petition ; but here is a Bill that came before us, not at the instigation of the company, but at the instigation of the policy-holders, and parliament has consented to deal with the matter. I think that insurance companies, watching the discussion that has taken place recently in parliament, will perhaps be more guarded in the future, seeing that their entire operations can be brought under review by the parliament of Canada without their consent or request. Hence I say that I believe that good will come out of this discussion, apart altogether from the company with which we are now dealing.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

BOUNTIES ON LEAD.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend section 2 of chapter 31 of the statutes of 1903, intituled : 'An Act to provide for the payment of Bounties on Lead contained in Lead-bearing Ores Mined in Canada,' by adding after the word 'Canada' the words 'and any balance of the sum of five hundred thousand dollars unexpended at the close of any fiscal year may be carried forward to the next succeeding year, and payments may be made therefrom in such succeeding year of any portion of the 40 per cent hereinbefore provided for on such ores, and such only as had been delivered for smelting in Canada, but which had not been actually smelted until after the close of the year within which delivered.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The object of the resolution is this. By the Act of last session all parties mining in British Columbia were entitled to obtain 60 per cent on the ore actually mined and delivered at the smelter ; but 40 per cent was to be retained until the ore had been actually smelted within the year last past. It has turned out that a considerable quantity of this ore has been held over, not owing to the fault of the miners, but I understand owing to the inability of the smelter ; and unless we make the provision now proposed, it would be impossible under the statute to pay these people the remaining 40 per cent of the bounties. We propose to carry forward the balance of the $500,000 to such an extent as will enable us to pay the miners the 40 per cent that is held over.

Mr. HENDERSON. Can the right hon. gentleman tell us how much was paid during the year ending the 30th of June last ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. $104,000.

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

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved leave to introduce Bill (No. 169) to amend the Act providing for the payment of bounties on lead contained in lead-bearing ores mined in Canada.

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

LAND TITLES ACT, 1894—AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 158) to amend the Land Titles Act of 1894—Mr. Sifton—read the second time and the House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Hon. CLIFFORD SIFTON (Minister of the Interior). This is for the purpose of removing a technical difficulty in the registration of mortgages under the Real Property Act in the Northwest Territories. At present, under the Torrens system which there prevails, a party who buys land from a railway company cannot register a mortgage upon it until he gets the actual deed from the company. Persons familiar with land transactions in that country know that it is quite customary and necessary for land to be dealt with often before a deed can be procured from the company. Often the purchase money is procured to pay the railway company for the land on the guaranty of a mortgage, but the mortgage cannot be registered until the deed is procured from the company and registered in the land titles office. In the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the land grant trustee or other official may be in Europe or some place else which prevents him from signing the deed for months at a time, which causes unnecessary and unavoidable delay in the issuing of deeds. This amendment will permit a mortgage to be registered when the commissioner of the railway company gives a certificate that the purchase money has been paid and that the person holding the certificate is entitled to the deed. The mortgage only becomes valid when the title is afterwards registered, but the transaction can be carried on.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is the hon. gentleman making provision for the registration of a certificate so as to show there is a guaranty of title ?

Mr. SIFTON. The certificate is filed with the registrar and becomes part of the muniment of title. In addition there is a proviso that plans may also be registered. Through an oversight in the law, there is no express provision that plans may be registered. They have been filed in the office and entered in the register, but doubt has been expressed by lawyers whether that is legal and this is for the purpose of clearing up that doubt.

Mr. HAGGART. With regard to plans registered, has it an ex post facto effect ?

Mr. SIFTON. No.

Mr. HAGGART. Does that affect the status of the mortgage at all ? It only gives the right of registration.

Mr. SIFTON. There is a form of mortgage under the Real Property Act, and you cannot register miscellaneous documents, but only the documents described in the Act.

Mr. HAGGART. This is simply for the purpose of registration. Can a person mortgage a property of which he is not the owner ?

Mr. SIFTON. No. If he could, we would not need this Act. You have a mortgage on a quarter section of land and bring it to the registrar. He finds out who the registered owner is. If the man who signs the mortgage is not the registered owner, the registrar will not register the mortgage. That is the reason we require this amendment. The railway company is the registered owner of the land. The person who brings the mortgage is not the registered owner and cannot register the mortgage. Consequently he cannot give security for the money he may have borrowed for the purpose of paying the railway company.

Mr. HAGGART. Your amendment does not make the security any better than it was before, but simply enables it to be registered.

Section agreed to.

On section 2,

Registration of charges created before issue of grant :

Subsection 2 of section 73 of the Land Titles Act, 1894, is repealed, and the following subsection is substituted therefor :—

2. Provided that there may be filed in the office of the registrar any mortgage or other encumbrance created by any person rightfully in possession of land prior to the issue of the grant from the Crown or prior to the issue of the transfer from the Hudson's Bay Company or from any company entitled to a grant of such lands from the Crown or to which letters patent from the Crown for such mortgaged lands have already issued, if there is produced to and left with the registrar with the mortgage an affidavit made by the mortgagor in the form AA. in the schedule to this Act, and also, in the case of lands mortgaged prior to the issue of transfer from the Hudson Bay Company or other company as aforesaid, a certificate from the land commissioner or other proper officer of the company that the purchase price of such mortgaged lands has been paid and that the mortgagor is entitled to a transfer in fee simple therefor from such company ; and the registrar shall, on registering the grant of lands so mortgaged, enter in the register and endorse upon the duplicate certificate of title, before issuing it, a memorandum of the mortgage or encumbrance ; and when so entered the mortgage or encumbrance shall be as valid as if made subsequent to the issue of the grant, or to the issue of the transfer from the Hudson Bay Company or from any company entitled to a grant of such lands from the Crown to which letters patent from the Crown for such lands may have issued, as the case may be ; and if more than one mortgage or encumbrance are filed they shall be registered in the order of time in which they have been filed in the said office.

Mr. HAGGART. This only takes effect, I understand, where payment is made in full and the purchaser is entitled to the deed ? Otherwise the effect would be very dangerous.

Mr. SIFTON. That is right.

Mr. HENDERSON. Why not allow a man to register a mortgage if he has paid only half the amount ? If he has the certificate that he has paid half he has an interest which he should be free to mortgage. He may find it necessary to do so that he may raise means to improve his place and so make the money to pay off the balance. Of course the mortgage would only pledge his half interest. In the province of Ontario, there is no difficulty in a man mortgaging land, even though he is only the nominee of the Crown.

Mr. SIFTON. In Ontario a man can register a mortgage whether he owns the land or not.

Mr. HENDERSON. Certainly. We have more liberty in Ontario than the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) seems willing to allow the settlers of the Northwest.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. This system is established in some parts of Ontario.

Mr. HENDERSON. Very true. But I do not think that alters the situation. I think a man should have the right to register a half interest as well as a whole interest. It might be the means of enabling him to carry on his farming operations and make money sufficient to pay the other half.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Carried.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell) need not be in such a hurry. This is an important matter for the settlers of the Northwest. It seems to me they are entitled to privileges which are not secured to them under the minister's Bill. Surely, if a man pays half the price

of a property he has the right to mortgage his interest. Why should he be handicapped by a law which provides that until he has paid all the money he cannot use the property as a security. It might be twenty years before he could raise the money necessary to pay the last of the purchase money.

Mr. SIFTON. The principle of the Torrens system is that the entire title must pass when there is transmission. If you violate that principle you abolish the system. Where you have the old system of registration a man may have a remote equitable interest in a piece of property by making an agreement for the purchase of an undivided tenth interest and register a mortgage on that, even if he has not paid more than a dollar, or, indeed, if he has not paid anything. The legal validity of the mortgage may be questioned later on, but the registration is valid. The principle of the Torrens system, on the contrary, is that nothing can be registered except a document in a specified form signed by the owner. The owner holds a certificate backed by the guarantee of the government that he is the owner in fee simple of the land. So, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) will see that the registration of a mortgage or transfer which does not convey the complete title of the property is impossible under that system. We are not violating the principle of the Torrens system at all by what we are doing. What we are doing is this: When the purchaser of, let us say, a quarter section from the Canadian Pacific Railway goes to register a mortgage, even though he has paid his purchase money in full, under the present law he cannot register it, because the law says that until you are the registered owner you cannot register a mortgage. If he had the deed from the railway company, that would be evidence that he could present to the registrar that he was the owner, and the registrar would issue the certificate of ownership and register the mortgage. We substitute a certificate from the company's land commissioner for the deed to be presented as evidence to the registrar to show that he is the owner of the land and entitled to register the mortgage.

Mr. HENDERSON. But cannot the purchaser of a half interest in a lot of land in the Northwest take his deed to the registrar and have it registered for the half interest?

Mr. SIFTON. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Very well, if he goes with a certificate and shows that he is the owner of a half interest——

Mr. SIFTON. If he buys an undivided half interest in a quarter section of land from the Canadian Pacific Railway—a very unsual transaction—and takes a receipt in full for the undivided half interest to the registrar, he will be registered as the owner of the undivided half interest and can register a mortgage on it. But he cannot register the mortgage when he has a receipt for half the purchase money for an entire interest in the property.

Mr. HAGGART. This presupposes that it is very easy to get a certificate for the full payment but difficult to get a deed. Is there any difficulty in getting a deed, on full payment, from the Canadian Pacific Railway or from the Hudson Bay Company?

Mr. SIFTON. Sometimes they come quickly, and sometimes, through the absence of some officer or some other cause there may be delay. I do not know that there is any delay that could be considered exceptional in the case of a company doing such a vast business as the Canadian Pacific Railway. But a week's delay, or a month's delay or, still more two months' delay, which sometimes occurs, may be very embarrassing to a private individual of small means who wishes to deal with his property.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CUSTOMS ACT—AMENDMENT.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to provide that the Customs Act be amended as follows:—

1. That the following provisions be added to section 2 of the said Act:—

(s.) The expression 'duty' or 'duties' includes 'special duty' and 'special duties.'

2. That section 7 of the said Act shall be amended by striking out the following words:—'and the additional sum, if any, payable under the next following section of this Act.'

3. That section 8 of the said Act, as amended by section 4 of chapter 14 of the statutes of 1888, be repealed.

4. That the following subsection be added to section 62 of the said Act, as amended by section 5 of chapter 15 of the statutes of 1889:—

'Provided, however, in respect of goods shipped to Canada on consignment, but which have been sold by the exporter to persons in Canada prior to their importation into Canada, that the duties shall not be assessed in any case upon an amount less than the invoice value to the Canadian purchaser; exclusive of all charges therein, after shipment from the place whence exported directly to Canada.

'When articles of the same material, or of a similar kind but of a different quality, are found in the same package, charged or invoiced at an average price, it shall be the duty of the appraisers to adopt the value of the best article contained in such package as the average value of the whole; and duty shall be levied thereon accordingly.

'(2.) The Board of Customs may review the decision of any appraiser or collector of customs as to the principal markets of the country, or as to the fair market value of goods for duty purposes. The decision of the Board of Customs in regard to such principal markets, and value of goods for duty purposes in any case or class of cases, shall, when ap-

proved by the Minister of Customs, be final and conclusive, except as otherwise provided in the Customs Act.'—Mr. Paterson.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). Mr. Chairman, the object of the resolution is to have some clauses inserted in the Customs Act which will be found necessary under the working of the tariff resolutions introduced this session. The first change is to include the words 'special duty.' As it is proposed under the tariff resolutions that were submitted to the House that there should be a special duty where goods were sold at a price lower than that at which they are sold in the country of production, which is called a special duty, it is necessary to bring that term within the meaning of 'duties' in the Act. It is also intended to strike out section 8 of the Customs Act, which is not requisite to the enactment of a special duty. Then there is an amendment to section 62, the first provision of which has reference to goods sent on consignment to separate individuals throughout the country, and where a number are sent together to one party. It is provided that the prices at which they are sold to the individual purchasers in the different towns shall be the value for duty and not the pro forma invoice they might send to their agent. The second is introduced because sometimes goods are put in the same package which are not of the same quality. We provide here that in cases of that kind the value for duty shall be the value of the best article in the mixed package. The other is a provision necessary in order to secure uniformity in the classes of the customs.

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

Mr. PATERSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 170) to amend the Customs Act.

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

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY—TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

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

Mr. H. A. WARD (East Durham). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair, I desire to bring to the attention of the House some matters in connection with the proposed completion of the Trent Valley canal. I am aware that some hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House do not regard this project in a very friendly light, but I think that if they would devote that amount of consideration to it, that, I think its importance demands, a different conclusion would be come to. I do not wish to say that the judgment of these hon. gentlemen is not correct, but I do say that considering the large amount of money that has already been expended on this undertaking it would be well for the representatives of the people to weigh the matter very carefully and to consider whether it would not be wise to carry out the system in its entirety. When it is realized that about four and a half millions of money have already been expended on this work, it seems to me that it would be well to weigh the matter very carefully before deciding upon the advisability or otherwise of completing it. I am quite aware that the difficulty in deciding upon the southern outlet of the canal has had something to do with the hesitation of the government in regard to going on with the work. As the canal stands at present it is only useful for local traffic. The increasing of the depth of the water on the mitre sill to eight feet two inches is now under consideration and I believe has almost been decided upon by the government and there is no doubt in my mind that if that is carried out the canal will be able to take care of a good deal of the grain traffic from the west. Some months ago the Transportation Commission, of which Mr. John Bertram is chairman,, met at Peterborough, for the purpose of taking evidence on this very subject, and although I do not propose to weary the House with any facts or figures which came out at that sitting of the Transportation Commission I can assure hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, that the evidence then brought before the commissioners had the effect of convincing them that the completion of the canal would be in the interests of the country. In this connection I desire to read a few words uttered by Mr. James J. Hill, who is well known, I think, to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House as the president of one of the greatest railway corporations probably in the world. He, at Minneapolis, recently made the following remark:

> Canada possesses three times as much arable land as the United States, that in ten years the Dominion would raise enough grain to supply the British market, and henceforth the United States farm products must seek new markets in the Orient. While the last century was the century of the United States, this century would be the one for Canada.

These are words uttered by a gentleman who knew what he was talking about, and if we had a large amount of grain coming from the Northwest Territories there is no doubt that the Trent Valley canal would be of use as an avenue of transport for that traffic.

Now it is well known that the Erie canal in the United States going through Central

New York has been a large factor in the traffic transportation of that state. We know as well that the government of New York state are about to spend one hundred million dollars in increasing the depth of the Erie canal from four feet to ten feet, allowing barges of a thousand tons burden to pass through the centre of the state. If that canal has been an important factor in the transportation of the United States it seems to me that the Trent Valley canal will in time become just as important a factor in the controlling of railway rates and in the establishing of manufactories all along the line of the canal through the central part of Ontario. I wish to point out in regard to that very Erie canal the course that was pursued by the government of New York state when it was decided to spend so large an amount of money upon it; and in reading a short extract from the report of the engineer I desire to call attention to the fact that the Trent canal will most likely be just as important to the Dominion of Canada as the Erie canal has been to the state of New York; and that a care should be exercised as to the southern outlet which I am sorry to say it has not had so far, as the reports of engineers show. The engineer in charge of the Erie canal was the engineer of the state of New York and in making his report he used the following language:

SUMMARY OF REPORT OF STATE ENGINEER AND SURVEYOR EDWARD A. BOND, ON THE BARGE CANAL FROM THE HUDSON RIVER TO THE GREAT LAKES.

State of New York,
Office of the State Engineer and Surveyor,
Albany, February 12, 1901.

Hon. Benjamin B. Odell, jr.,
Governor of the State of New York.

Sir,—Having completed the surveys, plans and estimates for improving the Erie canal, the Champlain canal and the Oswego canal as directed by chapter 411 of the laws of 1900, I have the honour to report as follows:—

Chapter 411 of the laws of 1900 became a law April 12, and I at once commenced the organization of the proper force to carry the law into effect by appointing as consulting engineers Mr. Trevor C. Leutze, of Albany, N.Y. (a division engineer of the eastern division New York State canals), and Mr. David J. Howell, of Washington, D.C. (who had charge of the work on the eastern division of the Mohawk and Oswego line of the deep waterways surveys), with Mr. Howell as engineer in charge. The necessary instructions for the survey party were at once formulated and submitted to the following board of engineers:—Mr. George S. Green, of New York city; Mr. George Y. Wisner, of Detroit, Mich.; Mr. Edward P. North, New York City; Professor Palmer C. Ricketts, Troy, N.Y.; and Mr. J. Nelson Tubbs, Rochester, N.Y.

I simply mention that to show that when a work of such magnitude was to be constructed in the state of New York, every care was taken to have a staff of engineers of the highest ability to decide as to its features. I do not propose to discuss the advisability of building the Trent canal, but I do wish to speak of the course which has been pursued by the government so far, with regard to getting the reports of engineers as to whether the outlet should be at Port Hope or at Trenton. Before referring to the engineers' reports of more recent date, I desire to read an extract from one which Mr. R. A. Maingy made to Sir John Colborne in 1833. This was the first report as to the Port Hope outlet, and Mr. Maingy's remarks show that he believed it to be far superior to that which the government considers to be the proper route to adopt. Mr. Maingy says:

The ultimate success of any measure for facilitating the communication for Rice lake with Lake Ontario depends wholly upon its connection with an accessible harbour. The reporter considers that he has sufficiently informed himself of the localities, of the shores of Lake Ontario to be able to say with confidence that Port Hope from its position is not only the natural but the most accessible point of communication to the chain of navigable lakes by which this section of country is everywhere intersected. Its natural disadvantages are very few and capable of being improved; the harbour when completed (it will be this summer) will be one of the safest and most convenient ones between this and Quebec, and capable of sheltering any number of ships that are likely at any time to be found in these waters. That the position of Port Hope is particularly favourable for the termination of such a work must appear evident to every impartial observer; it is not only the shortest possible distance from Lake Ontario to Rice lake, possessing a safe and commodious harbour, but its eminence possesses every facility for defence in case of war, and the communication from Lake Ontario to Rice lake up to Lake Simcoe can by this route be completed for a sum not greater than is necessary merely to open the navigation from the mouth of the Trent to the Rice lake. These are facts that cannot be refuted and which the reporter sincerely hopes will induce its being adopted and undertaken by the province in lieu of the roundabout and expensive route by the Trent.

That was the opinion of the first engineer who made a survey of that route. At a very much later date, we have the report of Mr. Rogers, of Peterborough, the resident engineer of the Trent Valley canal. Mr. Rogers makes two reports, one on the 31st of January, 1900, and the other on the 22nd of September of the same year. I wish to draw the attention of the House to the figures given by Mr. Rogers in order to show that they were not accurate, nor were they just to the Port Hope view of the case. Mr Rogers in dealing with the first great obstacle of the Port Hope route, namely, the height of land a short distance from Rice lake, estimated the clay excavation at 3,000,000 feet, while Mr. Maingy in his report gives it at only 1,310,-

215 feet. But more than that, Mr. Rogers in his second report of the same year raises the quantity of excavation, at the height of land, to 5,500,000, or 2,500,000 feet more than in his first repart. That was eminently unfair to the Port Hope route. Mr. Rogers in his first report greatly exceeded the estimate of Mr. Maingy, but in his second report he jumps his own estimate of the excavation from the 3,000,000 to 5,500,000 feet. One can hardly imagine how so great a discrepancy should occur with regard to that one item of excavation, but at all events it furnishes a strong argument in favour of the contention that there should be a report by an independent engineer who would go over both routes and be impartial as between them. Again, with regard to the Frankford-Trenton section, Mr. Rogers does not adopt Mr. Rubidge's report on that section although he adopts it with regard to the section above. In his estimate of the cost of the Frankford-Trenton section, Mr. Rogers takes off $750,000 in order to make the estimate for the construction of the Trenton route so much less. In passing, I may say that Mr. McLeod in his report, states that Mr. Rogers could not possibly have intended that report as a complete one, because he left out quite a number of items which should be included in that particular section. Mr. McLeod's says :

TRENTON-FRANKFORD SECTION.

In reference to the Trenton-Frankford estimate made by Mr. Rogers, I don't think he could have intended it for a complete estimate of the whole cost of the section, because he has apparently left out the cost of cement, for concretes, also bridge superstructures, and the usually large item for contingencies.

Again, Mr. Rogers, in his report specifies two hydraulic locks, costing $950,000, on the Port Hope route, and not on the other route. Mr. Rogers also estimates fourteen high level bridges on the Port Hope route costing $10,500 each, and for the Trenton route he estimates 13 high level bridges cost only $5,000 each. How the highway bridges on the Trenton route could be built for one half what they would cost on the Port Hope route is a matter ef mystery to me. Mr. Rogers makes no mention of the five railway crossings on the Trenton route, nor of the necessity for diverting at considerable cost the Central Ontario Railway. Mr. Rogers also provides in his estimate of the Port Hope route for two crossings of the Midland Railway, which we understand are not necessary at all, and this calls for an extra expenditure of $52,000 for bridges. I mention these items of Mr. Rogers' report to show that he has not been exactly fair to Port Hope, and I may add that according to Mr. McLeod, in one instance, he was over $800,000 astray. After Mr. Rogers made his report the Port Hope Association asked, and on two occasions I asked from my place in the House, that there should be a survey made of both routes by an entirely independent engineer. I brought the matter up in the House last year early in the session, and the Hon. Mr. Blair, then Minister of Railways stated ('Hansard,' 1903, page 2629) :

I have already made the selection of the officer and he has instructions to make this survey that will cover not only the Port Hope route but the other, so that the judgment of the engineer who made the one survey may be applied to the other as well.

On March 17th of the present session I asked the following question and Hon. Mr. Emmerson, Minister of Railways and Canals, replied as reported in 'Hansard.'

Mr. WARD :

What instructions were given to Mr. McLeod, C.E., as to reporting upon the southern outlet of the Trent Valley canal ?

By whom were these instructions given ?

Mr. EMMERSON :

Mr. McLeod was instructed to go over the ground, to make an examination of the two routes, and report thereon his views as to which route was best, and make an estimate of the cost of each, viz.:—Port Hope and via Trenton.

The instructions were given by the chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals.

With regard to Mr. McLeod's report, which was issued late last session, I have this to say, that Mr. McLeod did not follow the instructions given by the minister to make accurate surveys of both of these routes. He simply made an examination of them, and based his report on the estimates and profiles and plans which were already in the Department of Railways and Canals, which had been filed by Mr. Rogers, and to which we had great objection. That was not what we asked for. Mr. McLeod spent a short time at Port Hope, and on leaving there he said he was going to Trenton to examine the harbour there and to take soundings. The following are his two reports :—

Gilbert House,
Trenton, 15th May, 1903.

Collingwood Schreiber, Esq., C.M.G.

Dear Sir,—I have walked over two lines for the Trent canal from Rice lake to Port Hope.

The most direct passes over a high ridge, which I found to be approximately 129 feet above Rice lake. The cutting would extend from Rice lake for three miles, and would be from 70 to 136 feet deep. The rest of the line to Port Hope would be comparatively easy.

The second line passes through a depression in the ridge, about two miles further west. The cutting would be about three miles long, and about 70 feet deep, at the highest point. Rest of the line is comparatively easy and would run into the first line about four miles from Port Hope.

I don't think it necessary to cross the Grand Trunk Railway on the way in, and the canal

would pass under the Grand Trunk viaduct at Port Hope.

Both lines would pass through some valuable farming lands, but the right of way through Port Hope would not be expensive.

The harbour of Port Hope is about a mile long, and from 7 to 14 feet deep, besides an inner harbour of considerable size.

I am going to take some soundings in the Trenton harbour this morning, and will then go over the Trent River valley to the level of Rice lake.

I am, yours truly,
(Sgd.) HENRY A. F. MACLEOD.

Ottawa, 25th July, 1903.

Collingwood Schreiber, Esq., C.M.G.

Re Trent canal, via Port Hope and Trenton.

Dear Sir,—I beg to report that in accordance with your instructions, I made an examination of the proposed routes for the Trent canal, from Rice lake to Port Hope, and also from Hastings to Trenton, during a portion of the month of May.

It was intended that I should make surveys of both routes, but this has not yet been done. The plans in the possession of the Department of Railways and Canals give sufficient information on which to make comparative estimates of the two routes.

On the 17th June, you directed me to make a comparative estimate of the two routes, which I have just completed. The estimates are based upon the plans in the department. Those for the Heeley's Falls and Hoard's creek sections, were made by Mr. Rubidge in 1888, and those for the Trenton-Frankford section and the Rice lake and Port Hope, by Mr. Rogers in 1899 and 1900. All the estimates are made on the same scale, namely, that adopted for the Trenton-Frankford section, and exhibited to contractors. The width of the canal at the bottom is 50 feet, widened occasionally for passing places to 100 feet, with slopes of 2 to 1 in earth, and ¼ to 1 in rock. Depth of water in reaches, 6 feet. The locks of concrete, 142 feet between the quoins, 33 feet wide at invert, with 8 feet 4 inches water on sills. The dams are all of concrete, with stop-logs.

I examined the entrance from Rice lake, of the Rice lake and Port Hope section, for several miles, and found that it is the best. The route adopted is practically the same as that surveyed in 1834 by Robert A. Maingy, mining and civil engineer. I also took trial levels over a portion of two other more direct routes, but found that they passed over ridges, with cuttings from 125 to 136 feet in the deepest parts and extending about three miles.

Rice lake to Port Hope.

There is no appearance of rock on this section, from Rice lake to within two miles of the harbour of Port Hope. I have therefore made no estimate for rock excavation on that portion. For the same reason I put the price of concrete at $7 and cribwork at $3, while on the Trent section, where limestone rock is everywhere abundant, concrete is put at $6 and cribwork at $3.50.

There is a cutting three miles long and 68 feet deep at the summit, at the Rice lake entrance, which might prove difficult to construct and maintain.

To facilitate comparison, I altered two hydraulic lift-locks proposed, on this section, into two sets of ordinary locks, with three lifts each.

It is intended to construct a high level bridge for the Midland Railway, at the fourth lock and a swing bridge for the second crossing of the same railway in the Port Hope Electric Company's dam.

The canal will pass under the viaduct of the main line of the Grand Trunk at Port Hope. Swing bridges are provided for the existing roads, except in a few cases where they are diverted for short distances.

An estimate has been made for the right of way, including damage to buildings, &c., in Port Hope.

There is an artificial harbour at Port Hope about half a mile long, from 60 to 150 feet wide, and from 7 to 14 feet deep, with a basin adjoining of considerable size. It would be difficult to enter this harbour from Lake Ontario in rough weather, particularly with canal craft.

A sum is included in the estimate for the purchase and improvement of this harbour.

Rice lake to Trenton.

A short distance above and below the lock at Hastings there is shoal water—an estimate has been made to remove the obstructions.

At Heeley's Falls, the canal is on the west bank of the Trent river, in cuttings through limestone rock, with water-tight walls of concrete, in part, and earth embankments.

The estimate includes a new dam at the head of the rapids, and a swing bridge for the road.

This canal connects Rice lake with Crow bay.

Hoard's creek section extends from Crow bay, where it leaves the Trent river, till it reaches it again at Parcy reach, which is at the head of the still water formed by Chisholm's lock and dam.

The section leaves Crow bay at Middle Falls, which is about a mile above Campbellford.

It is almost entirely in limestone rock cutting, with earth embankments and a concrete wall at the upper entrance.

A dam is provided for at Middle Falls, also swing bridges for the roads, and for the Grand Junction Railway, near Hoard's station.

From Chisholm's lock to Trenton, still water is formed by a succession of dams to be constructed across the Trent river.

At Chisholm's lock an estimate has been made for partially rebuilding the lock, and for building a new dam across the river.

The estimate also includes swing bridges for the Ontario Central Railway, and the highway bridge across the Trent river.

From Frankford to Trenton, the estimate has been made in accordance with the plans exhibited for contract. It is entirely in limestone rock. Provision is made for the dams, for alterations to the highway bridges at Frankford and Glen Miller, and for high level bridges for the Grand Trunk double track, the Gilmour siding, and highway bridge at Trenton.

The Trenton entrance to the canal is large and ample, an estimate is included for piers.

I sounded the approach to Trenton harbour, Bay of Quinté, in the channel for about four miles, to the last buoy off 'Nigger Island' and found that there was over 12 feet of water, the level of the bay being about 3 feet above low water.

Comparison of routes.

From the examination made, it would appear that there is little difference in the cost of either route; the estimates show a difference of $144,537 in favour of the Port Hope route.

The difficulty of navigating Lake Ontario with canal boats, in stormy weather, is a serious objection to the Port Hope route.

The material for canal construction is better on the Trenton route, and the deep cutting on the Port Hope section is avoided by adopting the river route.

The diversion of water from its natural courses, would be a source of great expense to the government, complaints were made that the water sometimes falls very low in the Trent river.

The largest public benefit would be obtained by constructing the canal through or near the towns of Hastings, Campbellford, Frankford and Trenton, where there are now large mills and factories.

A very large amount of water-power would be more available at the various dams on the Trent river than on the Port Hope route, and would be a valuable asset for the government.

The harbour at Trenton is much larger, and superior to that of Port Hope, and terminates in the inland waters of the Bay of Quinté.

For the above reasons I consider that the Trenton route is the most suitable for the canal.

I am yours truly,

(Sgd.) HENRY A. F. MACLEOD,
M. Inst. C.E.

It will be observed that at the end of his report of the 15th of May, 1903, Mr. McLeod said:

I am going to take some soundings in the Trenton harbour this morning, and will then go over the Trent river valley to the level of Rice lake.

In his report from Ottawa of the 25th of July, 1903, he said:

It was intended that I should make surveys of both routes, but this has not yet been done. The plans in the possession of the Department of Railways and Canals give sufficient information on which to make comparative estimates of the two routes. On the 17th of June you directed me to make a comparative estimate of the two routes, which I have just completed.

The instructions given by the minister to Mr. McLeod were to make an accurate and complete survey of the two routes; but the later instructions given by the deputy minister after Mr. Blair had retired from the position of Minister of Railways and Canals, were that he should merely make an examination of the routes and base his report on the profiles and plans which were already in existence in the department.

In another portion of this report he says that along the Trent river route the excavation is almost entirely in rock. For instance:

At Heeley's Falls the canal is on the west bank of the Trent river, in cuttings through limestone rock, with water-tight walls of concrete, in part, and earth embankment.

Of the next section he says:

The section leaves Crow Bay at Middle Falls, which is a mile above Campbellford. It is almost entirely in limestone rock cutting, with earth embankments and concrete wall at the upper entrance.

Of the third section he says:

From Frankford to Trenton the estimate has been made in accordance with the plans exhibited for contract. It is entirely in limestone rock.

Mr. McLeod estimates the cost of the canal by way of Port Hope at $4,918,079, and the cost by way of Trenton at a trifle over $5,000,000. What I complain of is that he says in one portion of his report that he has provided for an 8-foot 2-inch canal, while he has really only provided for 6 feet in the reaches. When you consider that there are 30 miles of reaches in the River Trent and about 9 miles in the canal proper, you can imagine what an amount of rock cutting there would be, in view of the fact that the three sections mentioned are entirely through limestone. What it would cost to deepen 39 miles of reaches from 6 feet to 8 feet 4 inches could only be estimated by a thoroughly competent engineer who understands the subject. I believe that for an 8-foot 2-inch canal the reaches should be made even deeper than that. Owing to the current of the river, they should be made at least a foot deeper. That is the one important item which has not been estimated by Mr. McLeod at all. Another curious omission from his report is any estimate for drowned lands. It is well known that Chisholm's dam on the River Trent has been raised at least 2 feet. There are already drowned lands there to the extent of some 30,000 acres, and it is the general impression that at least 15,000 acres more will be drowned by the raising of that dam; but there is not a dollar estimated in Mr. McLeod's report on this account.

Mr. Rogers in his report says that the Trenton harbour is of great depth; but there is not a sounding of that harbour given, though Mr. McLeod stated in his report that he was going to take, and perhaps did take, some soundings there. Soundings of Port Hope harbour are, of course, given, and Mr. McLeod did take some soundings in the Bay of Quinté at the approach to the Trenton harbour, where he found an ample depth of water; but if he took any soundings in Trenton harbour, they do not appear in his report, and, I think, for a very good reason. According to the Trenton 'Courier,' a complaint was made a few years ago that there was a depth of from only 6 feet to 7 in that harbour; and, as I understand that it has a rock bottom, there would have to be a large expenditure of money to make it of sufficient depth to be of any use to a canal 8 feet 2 inches in depth. That is another omission in Mr.

McLeod's report. I am quite sure that these three items—the deepening of 39 miles of reaches in the River Trent, the drowned lands about Chisholm's dam, and the deepening of the harbour of Trenton—would add very largely to the cost of the construction of the canal by way of the River Trent.

The main argument against the adoption of the Port Hope route, which has been brought forward by those who are in favour of the other, is that there is a stretch of water between Port Hope and the Murray canal or Presqu'Ile point of about twenty-six to twenty-eight miles. With regard to that, I desire to read a short petition signed by the captains and vessel owners and shippers navigating all the way from Kingston to Port Hope, concerning that very point. The petition is as follows :

We, the undersigned captains, vessel owners and shippers would respectfully submit the following facts, of which we have personal knowledge, in regard to the navigation of Lake Ontario between Port Hope and Kingston :

1. Owing to the protected nature of the lake between Port Hope and Presqu' Ile,—a disance of about twenty-eight miles—we do not consider the danger, or possible delay from storms, as serious, because in case of strong easterly winds there is not more than fifteen miles, and in the case of south-easterly winds about twenty miles, of exposed water ; whilst if the winds were in the west, boats can make passage from Port Hope to Presqu' Ile without difficulty. In our opinion the opening between Amherst Island and Four Mile Point, west of Kingston, a distance of five or six miles, to which traffic via Trenton would be exposed, is as liable to cause detention ; but as the signal system service gives warning five hours ahead of the storm, neither stretch is dangerous, as vessels could easily find shelter.

2. We are of the opinion that barges capable of carrying 25,000 bushels of grain must be built strong enough to make the run from Port Hope to the Murray canal. If barges sailing on the canal are to secure return cargoes at different ports on the lake (and this we would consider necessary, whether the outlet of the canal be at Port Hope or Trenton), then they should be standard river barges.

3. Barges passing from Kingston to Toronto in the fall of the year, as a rule go by Murray canal and the north shore, in order to avoid strong westerly winds.

4. Judging from barges we have seen towed on Lake Ontario for years, we think that with ordinary care the proposal to make Port Hope, with its excellent harbour, the outlet for the Trent canal, is perfectly feasible, and for many reasons preferable to Trenton.

5. Considering the importance of the local traffic of the canal, which is certain to find its way westward to Toronto and other points on Lake Ontario, and the return cargoes (coal, &c.), we believe that the Port Hope route, being much shorter, is better adapted as the southern outlet for this important waterway, because return cargoes from Ohio and New York ports could, by this route, be landed in Peterborough even quicker and at a less rate than cargoes from the same ports could be landed at Trenton. It is an indisputable fact, that the shorter the water-route the lower will be the freight rate.

W. T. Clarke, M. M., Port Hope, now in coal business.
Joseph Braund, Port Hope, M. M.
R. J. Edmunds, Port Hope, M. M., now in gas business.
William Manson, jr., Port Hope, master mariner.
Geo. W. Robertson, Port Hope, master mariner.
J. J. Hadden, Port Hope, M. M., now retired.
Thomas Fox, Port Hope, M. M., now retired.
R. Henning, Port Hope, master mariner.
Jos. Philp, Port Hope, master mariner.
John Wright, Port Hope, master mariner.
Capt. R. Clarke, Port Hope, master mariner.
Capt. James H. Peacock, Port Hope, master mariner.
John J. Jarrell, Port Hope, master mariner.
Chas. R. Nixon, Port Hope, master mariner.
Capt. J. Oliver, Kingston, master mariner.
Capt. C. Daryaw, Kingston, master mariner.
John Corkey, Kingston, master mariner
James Crosby, Kingston, master mariner.
James Oliver, Kingston, master mariner.
John Danday, Kingston, master mariner.
B. Palmatier, Kingston, master mariner.
William Simons, Kingston, master mariner.
Alex. Anderson, Dickinson's Landing, master mariner.
C. E. Redfearn, Colborne, master mariner.
Jas. Redfearn, Lakeport, master mariner.
Geo. Williamson, Toronto, master mariner.
John Joyce, Toronto, master mariner.
Geo. H. Brown, Lakeport, master mariner.
C. E. Wakely, Toronto, master mariner.
J. Cornwall, Brighton, master mariner.
John Williams, Toronto, master mariner.
Albert Stinson, Toronto, master mariner.
Noel Marshall, Toronto, president Standard Fuel Company.
P. Burns & Co., Toronto, coal and wood dealers.
R. E. Gibson, Toronto, president Conger Coal Company.

This is signed by thirty-five mariners from Port Hope to Kingston, men who have been on the lakes for years, some of whom of course are retired, but many of whom are now navigating Lake Ontario. I might also point out that from the information I have, the barges that would be necessary to navigate Lake Simcoe would be quite strong enough to navigate that portion of Lake Ontario. There is another strong argument which I desire to bring out in favour of Port Hope. The idea has long been in the minds of people that the canal finally would be built by way of Trenton, and consequently there have been attempts already made, and there are likely to be more attempts made, to exploit the government with regard to lands and water-powers all through that route to Trenton. Let me bring one instance to the attention of the House, an instance of rather a flagrant character, it seems to me, and one that is likely to be attempted to be carried out on future occasions if the canal goes by the River Trent. Some years ago the Canadian Bank of Commerce, of which Senator Geo. A. Cox is president, was in the possession of

a water-power and an old mill at Nassau, between Lake Ontario and Peterborough. That property had been what is called a silent property for some years. It came from the Irwin estate to the Bank of Commerce, and although gentlemen on the other side of the House had never been very friendly to the Trent Valley canal, I propose to show that during almost the first hours of their occupancy of the Treasury benches, they took into consideration a matter in connection with this very Trent Valley canal. I have here the Order in Council passed in September, 1896, two months after the general elections in June, 1896, by which the government agreed to take over this power from the Canadian Bank of Commerce.

Extract from a report of the Committee of the Honourable the Privy Council approved by His Excellency on the 14th September, 1896 :

On a memorandum dated 2nd September, 1896, from the Minister of Railways and Canals representing that for the purposes of the construction of the Trent canal it has become necessary, either to build a new dam across the River Otonabee, at the village of Nassau in lot No. 6, concession eleven, township of Dower, or to utilize the existing dam which is connected with a saw-mill owned by the Canadian Bank of Commerce and that the acquisition of this existing dam for the purpose is considered to be the preferable course. The minister further represents that in order to such acquisition a draft agreement forwarded by the Department of Justice, and to which it sees no objection, has been drawn up as between the bank and the Crown, by which it is proposed to enable the government to take immediate possession, leaving the amount of compensation to be determined by expropriation proceedings if not otherwise settled by agreement between the parties concerned. The minister submits the said draft agreement and recommends that he be authorized to sign the same on behalf of the Crown. The committee submit the foregoing for Your Excellency's approval.

(Sgd.) JOHN J. McGEE,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

To the Honourable
The Minister of Railways and Canals.

Nothing apparently was done under this agreement or Order in Council until the end of the year 1900, another very suggestive year, the year of the last general elections. Then the Order in Council and agreement were carried into effect by an indenture of which I will read portions to the House :

This indenture made in triplicate 7th February, 1900, in pursuance of an Act respecting short forms and conveyances, between the Canadian Bank of Commerce, the party of the first part, and Her Majesty the Queen, party of the second part.

After reciting the agreement it goes on to say :

And whereas by the said agreement the bank agreed to grant and convey to the government the site of the existing dam in the said agreement mentioned and the dam itself, and the government agreed to repair or rebuild the said dam so as to make it efficient and in perpetuity to maintain it at its then height in an efficient state of repair. And whereas other parts of the said agreement relate to the dam existing at the date thereof or to a dam built upon the same site. And whereas it has been found more convenient for the government to remove the old dam entirely and to build a new dam to the east thereof upon the site coloured pink and marked 'new dam' on the inclosed plan. And whereas the bank has consented to this being done, and to convey to the government the site of the new dam, and the parties have agreed that the said new dam shall be substituted for the dam mentioned in said agreement. And whereas the consideration in money to be paid to the bank for the lands and rights hereby granted to the government ; and for the rights granted by the bank to the government under said agreement, and the compensation in money to be paid to the bank in respect of any other matters for which it may be entitled to compensation from the government in connection with the said canal, and the construction and working thereof, including the claims mentioned in paragraph 5 of said agreement, have been agreed upon between the parties at the sum of twenty thousand dollars and certain interest thereon.

Mr. SPROULE. For the dam ?

Mr. WARD. For the site of the dam and the right to use the water for the canal. $20,000 and certain interest thereon. That refers no doubt to interest from the time the first agreement was entered into until the year 1900, when the agreement was consummated.

That would mean nearly four years' interest on the $20,000.

Then it goes on to state that the government agree to build a new dam, to keep it up in perpetuity and to keep up the water the stated height for the benefit of the Bank of Commerce.

Now let us examine for a moment what the government acquired and what they gave for that dam. In the first place they paid $20,000 and about four years' interest. They agreed to build a new dam, which has since been built, and to keep it up in perpetuity. And further a covenant was entered into by the government that they would keep up the flow of water. I had better read that part :

Should the government desire to maintain the depth of water in said canal at eight feet two inches the said dam shall be so regulated by the stop-logs or otherwise, that the bank, its successors, assigns, lessees and other persons and corporations, claiming through or under it or them may have the full benefit of all surplus water from the full head of water, available from time to time.

That is, the government agree to keep the water at its present level and if they increased the depth of the canal to 8 feet 2 inches they were to increase the depth of the canal by stop-logs or otherwise, so that

the bank would not suffer in any way. In return for all this, what were the government to receive? They were to have the site for a dam, which dam they in effect handed over to the Canadian Bank of Commerce, by agreeing to keep up the dam in perpetuity. They were to provide sufficient water to run the canal, the surplus water to go to the Bank of Commerce.

What happened after that? The Canadian Bank of Commerce, in the following year, that is on May 9th, 1901, gave a lease, of what the government had agreed to provide, to the Canadian General Electric Company for twenty years at a rental of $8,024 per year. So that the Canadian Bank of Commerce got a property that was not a going concern, and which had been lying idle for twenty years, taken over by this government, $20,000 in interest assumed for about four years, a new dam built for them, and an agreement of the government to keep it up in perpetuity, and in addition they had a magnificent property left which they rented to the Canadian General Electric Company for twenty years at $8,000 per year.

In the excerpt I have from the registry office here it says 'and the right of purchase.' That is the General Electric Company have the right to purchase that property. I have been informed by a gentleman who was concerned in drawing up these papers, who heard that I was going to bring this matter up in the House, that the $8,000 a year meant that at the end of twenty years the Canadian General Electric Company would own that property. I do not wish to do an injustice to the government. So, desiring to be perfectly fair, I mention this fact. But, even so, it seems to me that what the government gave the Canadian Bank of Commerce enabled them to sell what was a dead property for $160,000, or, it may be $100,000, calculating interest for twenty years, and $20,000 in addition. I mention that as a sample instance of what is going on in the construction of the Trent Valley canal and to show the value of the power.

I desire to give one or two figures. There is a fall in the river of 58,000 cubic feet per minute. By calculations of engineers on the Erie canal, that have been handed to me, it takes about 55 cubic feet per second to operate a canal—that is to work the locks—every fifteen minutes, and that is the utmost capacity of a canal. Now, 55 feet per second means 3,300 feet per minute which would be required for the operation of a canal if vessels were locked through every fifteen minutes. So, where there is a fall in the river of 58,000 cubic feet per minute, even if the Trent Valley canal locked a vessel through every fifteen minutes, which is the utmost capacity of a canal, only about one thirty-sixth part of the flow of water would be required in the user of the canal. But it is not likely that for a great many years to come, the Trent Valley canal will be locking a vessel through every fifteen minutes. Even if we take it at a vessel every half hour, this means that only one seventy-second part of the water would be used for the purposes of the canal. Therefore, I say, the Canadian Bank of Commerce made an excellent bargain with the government when the government retained only one thirty-sixth or one seventy-second part of the water and left the rest of the flow of the river and all that power for the Canadian Bank of Commerce.

Now I desire to say that the gentleman who spoke to me about these papers stated that the Canadian Electric Company stood in a very strong position with the government with regard to this very power. He said that there had already been a slight failure of water, that is in the flow of water which that conveyance binds the government to supply to the Canadian General Electric Company—to the Canadian Bank of Commerce and its assigns—and that the government would be required to spend a very large amount of money in the conservation of water in the upper lakes in order to keep that power up to the standard requred by this agreement. Hon. George A. Cox is the president of the Conservation Association of the town of Peterborough. I know, as a matter of fact, that deputations from that Conservation Association waited upon the government two years ago and interviewed Mr. Blair on this very question; and Mr. Blair, as I am informed by one who was present, stated to these gentlemen: 'It is water-power you are after, gentlemen, not navigation.' Mr. Blair saw through what they were anxious to do with regard to that conservation, and he told them plainly that it was water-power and not navigation that they were after. In that connection I desire to read an extract from a Peterborough paper in which this very matter was discussed. Mr. R. R. Hall, who is a candidate, I believe, against my hon. friend from Peterborough (Mr. Kendry), in discussing this matter of approaching the government in regard to the conservation of water and the spending of some $300,000 there, said:

—that the deputation which went to Ottawa on this question found that both Mr. Mulock and Mr. Blair look upon the matter as being of local interest only.

I congratulate my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) on taking that view of the matter.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Of what matter?

Mr. WARD. The matter I am reading about. This is about the deputation coming to Ottawa.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am aware of that. But the hon. gentleman congratu-

lates me on taking a certain view of some matter. What matter does the hon. gentleman refer to? Does he mean the construction of the canal?

Mr. WARD. Oh, no. I know what my hon. friend's views are on that point. It is the matter of the Peterborough people asking that $300,000 be spent in conservation of the water which is not required for the navigation of the River Otonabee. That is the matter I am speaking on. And my hon. friend, when this deputation came, agreed with Mr. Blair that it was of local interest only. Mr. Hall thought that the industrial features of the question should be left alone and an appeal made to the government in the interests of navigation. He desired that it should be concealed as far as possible from the government that the appeal was not for navigation so much as for the increase of those powers which are already in existence between Lakefield and Peterborough. My hon. friend will perhaps believe me when I tell him that if that amount of money were spent in the conservation of water in the back lakes, it would increase the capacity of these powers at least fifty per cent, and that is what the Peterborough people want the government to do. I do not think that money should be spent on the conservation of water a long time in advance of the requirements of the canal unless we take the view of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes), whom I do not see in his seat this evening, and who said to me that he was in favour of that conservation of water provided these power owners were made to pay their share of the expense and the expense would be divided equally among those who would benefit. That is the view I take. I consider that not a dollar should be spent by the government on the conservation of water unless it should be required for the canal; and in any event the power owners who will benefit should certainly pay their share of the expense of raising the water in the back lakes. There is another matter which I desire to mention in this connection. The Ontario 'Gazette' of January 2nd last contains a notice of the incorporation of the company.

These were the names given as forming the corporation: David Gilmour, manufacturer, Robert Weddell, company manager, both of the town of Trenton, Samuel Hume Blake, K.C., Ernest W. McNeill, Robert Gowans, sollicitors' clerks, all of the city of Toronto, and any others who have become subscribers to the memorandum of agreement of the company and their successors.

I might mention that I am now reading from the Port Hope 'Guide', a good Liberal paper. That refers to the three gentlemen, Mr. Blake, Mr. McNeill, and Mr. Gowans.

The objects of the company as stated in the notice are briefly: To acquire water privileges, lands, water-powers and other powers, and to develop the same, &c. The share capital of the company is $500,000, the head office of the company to be at Trenton, the provisional directors to be the above-named gentlemen.

It is public knowledge that the law firm of which three out of the five gentlemen above-named are the solicitors of the Bank of Commerce.

It is also known through public advertisement that the Gilmour Company, of Trenton, is making changes in the company. It is also a well-known fact that the Gilmour Company were the owners of the principal water-powers between Frankford and Trenton (a distance of about seven miles) most of which are as yet undeveloped. Should the canal be built by the Trenton outlet these water-powers would be developed at the expense of the government through the construction of a dam at each and every lock—a total of probably six dams as per canal superintending engineer's report (Mr. R. B. Rogers).

By that means this company, which is really the Bank of Commerce, has acquired water-powers on the River Trent, on which, according to the engineer's report, six dams are to be built by the government. And those six dams and the powers relating to them will be owned by this company; and it is natural to suppose that if they have $20,000 for one power, they would be looking for about the same for the other six powers which they will own on the River Trent. One of the arguments in favour of the River Trent, mentioned by Mr. McLeod, is that the government would acquire a large amount of water-powers which they could rent out to private parties and from which they would derive a large revenue. But at the meeting of the Transportation Commission to which I have referred, Mr. Colborne, who is a well-known gentleman of Wakefield, the owner of the cement works there, said that the government would acquire about $200,000 a year from the rent of the water-powers on the River Trent, whereas Mr. Rogers, on the other hand, said there would only be a revenue of $5,000 from them, and that would be mostly between Lake Ontario and Peterborough. That shows a wide divergence of opinion, and the very fact that the Trent Water Power Company has acquired all the water-power between Frankford and Trenton shows very little prospect of the government acquiring any revenue from the water-powers on that river. I do not desire to detain the House at greater length, but wish to say that I think it offers a very strong argument in favour of Port Hope, that there are no water-powers of any considerable extent along that route which would have to be acquired by the government. I believe, from the reports of the engineers I have referred to, that the cost of the Port Hope route has been very largely exaggerated, and, on the other hand, that the cost of the Trenton route has been minimized, and that justice cannot be done to Port Hope,

or to the contentions of those who believe that that route is in the interests of the country, unless we obtain a report from a thoroughly competent engineer, who will not in any sense be partial or biased in favour of the one route or the other.

Mr. E. GUSS PORTER. I am very pleased that the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Ward) has seen fit, even at so late a stage, to bring this matter of the development of the Trent Valley water-way to the attention of parliament. This is a matter of very considerable importance to the people of Canada as a whole in assisting to solve the great question of transportation, and it is of very particular interest to a large section of the people of Ontario interested in the development of manufacturing industries, especially in the Midland district and those portions of the province of Ontario chiefly affected by the development of the immense powers of the Trent waterways. This is a matter which, in my humble judgment, calls for an immediate declaration of policy by the government, and not only a declaration of policy, but energetic action to carry out such policy as the government may see its way to adopt. The subject is one which has been discussed so much, not only in parliament but on the hustings, particularly at election time, that it has to a very large extent come to be regarded by the people as, to use the words of all estimable writers, 'stale, flat and unprofitable.'

I venture the opinion that the public generally who are more particularly interested in this matter have not arrived at that conclusion on account of any lack of appreciation of the importance, or of the benefits which may be derived by this country from the development of this water-way; but if they have been induced to form that opinion it has been by reason of the inaction of the government of the day. Party exigencies and alternative propositions have caused people to lose faith in the sincerity of the government of the present day in regard to this proposition and apathy and just indignation exist where, under the circumstances that should to-day prevail, there should be general enthusiasm. The time has arrived, Sir, when we have come to what in other instances has been described as the parting of the ways. The time has arrived when the question of the development of the Trent water-way should be stripped entirely of political considerations and when the government should decide once and for all whether this water way shall be completed and how it shall be completed, or whether so far as this government is concerned, the work shall be entirely abandoned. A careful consideration of this project will force us to the conclusion that to abandon the work would be nothing less than criminal, would be folly to the point of criminality; and I think the prompt, energetic and systematic construction of this canal would be of the greatest benefit to shippers, manufacturers and agriculturists and would furnish an impetus to the trade and commerce of this country alike to the advantage of this government and to the advantage of the country. Although this government cannot claim the credit of having inaugurated the scheme of improving this water-way it will not, in my opinion, detract from their credit or prove to be to their disadvantage to follow in this instance, as they have followed in several other instances, the policy inaugurated by the Conservative party in regard to many enterprises that have proved to be of benefit and advantage to the country. And, Sir, at the risk of giving this government the credit of carrying out this scheme, I venture to say here that I am willing as far as I can either by my voice or by my vote to give any assistance that may be given to the government in carrying out this scheme. I propose, Mr. Speaker, as briefly as I can, to present some of the reasons which appeal to me and which I think should appeal to and influence the government in carrying this enterprise to a successful conclusion. There are many facts in connection with this enterprise upon which all parties are agreed, not only the government of the day, but the opposition. While differences exist they are of a local or personal character which do not to my mind in any manner affect the principle involved in the question under discussion. These differences exist by reason of individual influence brought to bear upon the government in regard to this question, but I respectfully urge upon the government that they should serve the interests of the country as a whole rather than those of any individual, municipality, or corporation, which may be interested in this enterprise. So long ago as 1833 the British government recognized the importance of the development of the Trent water-way, not from a commercial standpoint, but from a strategical standpoint, and the reasons that existed then exist to-day. In addition to those reasons, as a result of the development of the country and of the keen competition that has been going on to control the trade not only of this country but the trade of the adjoining country, it has been demonstrated that still greater benefits might be derived by the people of Canada from the development of this water-way for commercial purposes than from its development from a strategical standpoint alone. I venture to think that no two opinions exist to-day that the advantages of water transportation are so great that there is no other power or influence that can operate against it under proper conditions. Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, in a speech delivered before the Canadian Club at Toronto, on January 20, 1904, on the

question of traffic from the west to the Atlantic, said :

> Water-ways are the key of our transportation. Wheat or flour or anything else in the matter of coarse products can be carried by water at one quarter of the cost from Fort William to Midland or to North Bay that it will cost to carry the same traffic for that five hundred miles over the railway. Now what sane man will assert, with that enormous differtnce in cost against rail transportation, that we should neglect our water-ways.

I cannot do better than read the words of Sir Thomas Shaughnessy in that regard.

If we but look around to the neighbouring republic or to European countries, (and I am emphatically one of those who think we can learn by example) we will find convincing proofs of his views. The history of all the nations taking part in this mighty struggle for commercial supremacy, is a record of the increasing development and value of national water-ways.

France has 7,000 miles of internal navigation and the water traffic of that country has increased between the years 1872 and 1897 by 140 per cent, whereas the rail traffic has increased but 75 per cent. Belgium has expended since 1860 upwards of $50,000,000 enlarging its canals. Germany has just opened a new canal from Dartmund et Embden, a distance of 170 miles, which will carry barges very similar to those proposed for the Trent water-way, namely, 230 feet long, 30 feet wide and 7½ feet draft, and costing $5,000 each. Russia has expended $30,000,000 in five years and there are in that country 60,000 canal boats with crews numbering 300,000 men.

Vessels 200 feet long can traverse the whole country from the Caspian sea to St. Petersburg.

In the United States the vast improvements made by the railways in levelling their grades, straightening curves, increasing the size of locomotive and cars, with other improvements needless to mention, enabled them at last to complete successfully with the Erie canal which had been allowed to become antiquated in every particular. What was the result ? The railways of the United States obtained control of the trade.

The wise policy of the Canadian Conservative government in deepening and enlarging the St. Lawrence canals, supplied a new impetus and a new direction to western trade which flowed and will continue to flow along the line of least resistance, with the result that Canada has gained a large share of the trade which the port of New York has lost. The trade of the port of Montreal has increased immensely ; last year according to the Montreal harbour returns, the results were phenomenal.

Our astute neighbours to the south observed this quite as soon as we did and have taken immediate steps to improve their transportation routes for the purpose of recovering the trade which has been diverted to Canada. So long as the Erie canal was able to compete with the railways in handling freight, just so long was the state of New York supreme in matters of commerce. It was the Erie canal that determined the rates not only between Buffalo and New York but Chicago and the sea-board with great profit to the farmers and producers of the west.

And to-day the Erie canal is being improved at an expense of $100,000,000. It is estimated by the Canal Improvement Committee (see Canal Improvement Text Book, page 102) that the enlargement of the Erie canal as now proposed, will reduce the cost of transportation through that canal to one-third the present figures. The Trent Valley water-way by reason of its superior advantages should be able to improve on this and thus remove for the present at least, all fear of successful competition by the Erie route. Our canal boats will carry 25,000 bushels against their 8,000 bushels, and the distance from Lake Superior is 727 miles shorter to Liverpool via Midland and Montreal than it is via New York, which shows conclusively our advantages by this development over our American neighbours.

These are potent reasons why this government should act with energy. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that our American rivals have entered into a gigantic enterprise, not only for the purpose of serving the interest of that country, not only to prevent Canada from capturing any more of their carrying trade, but to recover that which they have already lost, as well as to acquire that originating in Canada ; and I fully believe that object will be attained unless we Canadians at once recognize our responsibilities and do what we can to avert such a misfortune.

To complete the Trent Valley water-way will, in my judgment, be one of the most important steps we can take in that direction. The greatest development of this country will in future be in the west, and the greater part of the carrying trade will necessarily originate there, and I think all will recognize the soundness of the business principle that will induce producers and shippers to transport their produce by the quickest and cheapest route. The advantages that will accrue to them in getting their produce to the markets of the world at the least possible cost and greatest saving of time will enable them to undersell their competitors and obtain the quickest and best returns.

The food material is in the west, the money in the east, and the important question is, by what means we shall exchange the one for the other with the best result. Goods for the wants of the farmers in the Northwest should be largely manufactured in Ontario, and to this end cheap transporta-

tion is necessary. This would also help the Canadian Northwest on goods imported via Montreal.

A glance at the history of the Trent Valley canal will show that already there has been expended on the development of this waterway about $4,000,000, upon which this country is paying to-day, and has been paying since it has been expended, 3 per cent interest, or about $120,000 per annum. Of the total 200 miles, the length of the canal, from the Georgian bay to the Bay of Quinté, 100 miles have already been completed, and only about 32 miles remain to be completed. The difference between what has been constructed and what remains to be constructed is made up of navigable lakes and navigable rivers. No less than 25 locks have been constructed upon this waterway, among these one of the greatest, if not the greatest, lift-lock in the world. According to estimates, it will require only between $4,000,000 and $5,000,000 to complete the whole enterprise. I need only mention the fact to appeal to the judgment of any man, whether a member of this House or not, that unless this work is completed, all the work that has been done for the expenditure of $4,000,000 already incurred, and for the $120,000 that is being expended annually in paying interest upon that investment, is entirely lost. There has already been so much delay in proceeding with the enterprise that some of the works along the line of the canal have fallen into disrepair. For this delay, not only this government, but former governments have been responsible. The time has now arrived, however, when government should declare its policy, and declare it without equivocation, and should enter upon the carrying out of that policy in a most energetic manner. The importance of this enterprise is, perhaps, not very generally appreciated by the public; and there may be some hon. members of this House who have not given it such consideration as to enable them properly to judge of its importance. Therefore, notwithstanding the late date to which this session has been prolonged, the importance of the subject is such that I need not apologize to this House for submitting to it the evidence of some of the best informed persons upon the subject, in order to enlighten the House and to lead it to a conclusion as to whether the enterprise should be favoured or not. If you will permit me, Sir, I would like to read a statement made by Mr. J. Alexander Culverwell, of Peterborough, who has given the matter the most careful and thorough consideration:

The Trent Valley canal route is nature's short grain-carrying water-way between the north American upper lakes and Lake Ontario. It will also open up one thousand miles of shore line, chiefly composed of inland navigable lakes and rivers. It is shorter in distance by two hundred and fifty miles than by the Welland canal route between Sault Ste. Marie and Montreal, and in time by about twenty-four hours, a saving for the round trip of about five hundred miles or two days' time, and is now about two-thirds completed.

In comparison with the Erie canal route from Port Arthur to Liverpool, the Trent route will save 727 miles, or a total saving of about 1,500 miles in a return trip, and while the barges of the Erie canal (that great regulator of railway freght tariff)—have only a grain-carrying capacity of 8,000 bushels, the Trent barges will have a capacity of 25,000 bushels. The Trent canal is being built for a draught of eight feet, whereas the Erie has only five feet—the Trent locks being 134 feet long by 33 feet wide, and the Erie locks only 110 feet long and 18 feet wide. The Trent valley canal has been proven by the evidence adduced before a government-appointed commission of the first experts of the country, as the practical national grain-carrying route.

I would call the attention of hon. members and the public to this description of the route of this water-way given by Mr. Culverwell:

It commences at the city of Midland on Georgian Bay, and has for its harbour Matchedash Bay at Midland, which is the grandest harbour on the upper lakes, and where the great ocean-like steamers (after having carried the grain from the Canadian North-west, 'Britain's granary') will discharge into the canal barges.

The route will either cut across country, a distance of some 12 miles to Lake Couchiching, which is navigable, or will follow up the Severn river, which would require to be canalized by means of dams which would flood reaches of the river. It then passes on through Lake Couchiching, leaving the thriving town of Orillia on its left, into Lake Simcoe, a grand sheet of navigable water, and passing the large town of Barrie, along the left shore will enter near Beaverton, after a lake stretch of 20 miles, the valley of the Talbot river.

Here it enters upon constructed and partly constructed portions of the canal, the route follows the Talbot river—the valley being flooded by dams, which raise the water some twenty feet to the tops of the banks. The canal is then raised 50 feet by means of an hydraulic lift-lock, now nearly completed, up to the higher level, and follows a stretch of about five miles across country till it enters Balsam lake, the summit level, from which point the lockage is downwards in both directions. Going across Balsam lake, into which empty the Gull and Burnt rivers, which have drained the great country to the north and east, the route then drops through Rosedale, lock into Cameron lake, and at its end drops again down the locks at the village of Fenelon Falls into Fenelon river, which carries it into Lake Scugog, and leaving on its right the large town of Lindsay, which has a growing population of 7,000, and further on landing at Bobcaygeon lock.

Then entering Pigeon lake, passing on through the narrows and leaving on the right beautiful Chemong lake, passing through Buckhorn lake it rests at Buckhorn Falls. Dropping down Buckhorn lock it is carried along through Deer bay, and entering Lovesick lake is carried to the magnificent Burleigh Falls. It then winds on through Stony lake and passing on through Clear lake, through Young's Point village, it enters straggling Katchawa-

nooka lake, which carries it to the village of Lakefield, after having wandered through a navigable stretch of some seventy miles of lakes.

From Lakefield the route then passes down the canalized Otonabee river, which has caused navigable stretches, and at Nassau it is carried by a canal along the high tableland for four miles in distance around back of Peterborough and Ashburnham, where it drops by means of an hydraulic lift-lock (the largest in the world), into Clear lake below. This lift-lock will lift a 25,000 bushel barge from the lower level of the canal to the upper level, or vice versa, saving a great deal of time over the ordinary lockage system, as well as an immense saving in cost.

The line of canal then passes on below Peterborough, through the navigable and winding shore-wooded Otonabee some twenty miles, and enters Rice lake, a large but narrow sheet of navigable water. Rice lake will next summer be connected by navigation to Lake Simcoe, a total distance of some 160 miles of inland canal route.

From Rice lake to Lake Ontario the canal is yet to be completed. The route will either cut across the isthmus, following the Smith Creek valley, and entering at the town of Port Hope on Lake Ontario ; or it will pass east through Rice lake and follow the Trent river valley to the town of Trenton, which is situated on the Bay of Quinté, a harbour of Lake Ontario—the canal route using the river at times and in other portions cutting across country—thus making a saving both in cost and in distance.

The route from thence passes through the Bay of Quinté, on past the city of Kingston, and following the St. Lawrence canals ends at the seaport city of Montreal, where the canal barges—each of 25,000 bushels capacity—having been hauled by steam tug, several in consort, from Georgian Bay, will be discharged direct (thus relieving the necessity of elevators at Montreal) into the great ocean carriers.

I think I am safe in saying that it only requires a knowledge of the facts conveyed by the very admirable description of Mr. Culverwell, to convince not only the government but the country generally of the great benefit that would accrue from the development of this great national waterway. And, Sir, when nature has been so profuse in its distribution of favours, do not let it be said of the parliament of Canada that we were so apathetic or so ignorant or so incompetent as to fail to take advantage of the opportunities that are at hand. Let me refer to the evidence of one or two other prominent gentlemen who have given this matter most thoughtful and careful consideration, gentlemen who are actuated in their conclusion, not from any personal or political consideration, but solely from the point of view of national interests and a desire to promote the prosperity of Canada. Mr. David Gilmour, of Trenton, one of the largest manufacturers and shippers of Ontario, has studied this question most carefully, and in the consideration of the trade and commerce of this country as it may be developed through the completion of this great Trent valley waterway he has not confined his attention to what might be learned from a study of the situation as it presents itself in this country alone, but in the pursuit of his studies he has followed the matter into the old country and has given to the public the result of his investigations and what he considers the effect will be of the policy that is now being advanced in the old country by that most able statesman, the Honourable Joseph Chamberlain. This gentleman has also made a very careful estimate, based upon reliable authority and accurate information furnished him by such eminent engineers as R. B. Rogers, Robt. Weddel and others, in addition to his own personal observations ; and I may just state here, by way of parenthesis, that he is a gentleman, above all others in Canada, who is personally in a position to form a sound opinion upon this matter. He has been engaged in lumbering operations in the Midland district of the province of Ontario for a very large number of years, and he was not simply the nominal head of the concern but took pains to go through the country, so that he knows intimately that of which he speaks in this report. And by reason of his extensive lumbering operations and his own personal observations for many years, he is most familiar with the water supply that can be obtained by reservoir dams and with the power that can be developed along the Trent valley waterway. Mr. Gilbour, in a pamphlet issued by him, which I have under my hand, has summarized the Trent navigation in this way. The estimated area of water-shed he puts at 5,000 square miles, the estimated area of reservoir and water-power at 380 square miles, with an average depth, provided that water is conserved, of seven feet. The volume of water with reservoir water-power is 74,156,544,000 cubic feet.

One has only to stop for a moment in contemplation of these figures to realize in a measure the immense possibilities of the water supply in this portion of the country. Take, for instance, the question of fuel. This canal in the route that I advocate for its construction will run largely through a portion of the country which is thickly populated and will touch a large number of important towns and villages, one city, and many thickly populated municipalities. The amount of coal that would be used along that route is so great that the completion of this canal would mean a saving of many thousands of dollars to the people in that section and the quantity used will constantly increase.

Then too, the construction and permanent operation of this canal will produce markets and increase the local consumption of the products of the farms and gardens along the route ; this is a matter of the most vital importance to the farming community and also to the manufacturers along the line of the canal. These advantages will be

augmented by the development of almost unlimited water-powers within its radius. The development of power at such a low rate as it can be supplied upon this canal, must in the natural order of things, induce the investment of capital, and the investment of capital means the creation of manufacturing industries, and the creation of manufacturing industries means the employment of labour, while the employment of labour means the consumption of the product of the farms and gardens. There are already a number of manufacturers along the line of this water-way who are using limited amounts of power, and these manufacturers desire and have for a considerable length of time expressed the desire not only to increase the power that they are using for their own purposes, but to secure a saleable commodity that they may supply to other smaller manufactures or industries within the radius of their operation. And, Sir, with the development of the power upon the Trent river that has already taken place, the town of Trenton is to-day not only supplying all the power that is required in the town of Trenton, but it is transmitting that power to Belleville, a distance of some twelve miles. It is supplying electric light there and power for running different industries at a price that is less than they can possibly obtain in Belleville from any other source.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the price per horse-power ?

Mr. PORTER . They are supplying it in Belleville to one concern that I know of, at $13 per horse-power, and I am told by the same man who is receiving that power from the development on the Trent Valley canal at $13 that he formerly paid $23 per horse-power for power furnished him by steam. This revenue that is being derived from the water-power already developed would be very largely increased and I have no doubt, in fact I am informed by those who have given the matter careful study, that the price at which power is now being supplied in Belleville, $13, could be very materially decreased if the corporations who are interested in this matter along the line of the Trent Valley water-way, were allowed to develop the water-power that exists there. If I am correctly informed that cannot be done under existing circumstances. I am informed that the government some time ago expropriated all the lands along the line of that Trent water-way and all the water-power for the purposes of this canal, so that an individual or a corporation going in there and desiring—as one corporation that I know of, the Trent Electric and Water Company, desires—to develop greater water-power would not be able to do that without the sanction of the government. We can all readily see that it would not be the policy of the government, if it has in contemplation the completion of this canal, to allow private individuals to acquire the right to develop water-power upon that route, because it would, as every one sees, create rights, which might upon the determination of the government to push this canal scheme through, involve the government in a very large expenditure of money to buy up rights that had been so acquired. Just in that connection, let me point out that it seems to me most unfair—and this is one of the strongest arguments, perhaps, that I can urge upon the government to be more energetic in building the Trent Valley canal—that this immense water-power is practically tied up there. I am told upon very good authority that if the government were willing to-day to abandon this project and give it over to private enterprise, there is any amount of capital ready and waiting to go into the enterprise, and develop it not only for the purposes of the canal, but simply for the revenue that would be derived from the water-power. It seems to me that it is a dog-in-the-manger policy on the part of the government to refuse to private individuals or to corporations the right to develop this power and yet not go on and develop it themselves. What I have said in regard to the development of power in Trenton, is perfectly true in regard to the village of Frankford, the village of Campbellford, the town of Hastings, the city of Peterborough, and all the other towns and villages along the line of this Trent water-way. The development of cheap power is desired by all for the promotion of manufacturing industries. I have taken pains to ascertain some of the facts concerning the development of water-power, I find that on the portion of the canal from Peterborough to Trenton, that is, merely the southern portion of the canal, it has been carefully estimated that 100,000 horse-power could be developed. If that is so, the lease of such an extent of water-power would furnish a more than handsome return on all the money that would be required to be spent by this country in the completion of the canal. Let me refer to some further remarks in this connection by Mr. Gilmour. In summarizing his investigation he says :

> Trent canal route is some 1,454 miles shorter to Liverpool and return and to the European markets than the Erie canal, and over 500 miles shorter than our present St. Lawrence canals that actually captured a good part of the American trade this year, 1903.

He emphasizes what I have already pointed out to this House, that by reason of the Erie canal not being able to compete with the improved conditions of the railways the Erie Canal lost the control of the traffic and the railways captured it. That traffic which was then being captured by the railways—Mr. Gilmour does not say so but it is the fact—by reason of the policy inaugurated

by the Liberal-Conservative party in enlarging the canal system of Canada has been largely acquired by Canada.

The most economical barges, carefully figured out for cheapest carrying capacity, of the tnlarged Erie canal have a capacity of about 33,-333 bushels each barge. Trent canal barge capacity, each barge 25,000 bushels and can easily increase or double canal if wanted.

The whole American and Canadian grain trade adjacent to the Great Lakes would be at the command of the Trent canal when completed on account of its shortness and cheap carrying capacity to large European markets, and could be absolutely contracted for when canal is completed in spite of anything that can be done by any other route.

Safety of Trent canal is assured as it is all inland water from Midland on the Georgian bay to Montreal and Quebec and no objections to open lake same as Erie canal had in discussing advantages that might be had in their using Lake Ontario.

Barges with independent propelling power can easily be used for local trade going and coming, and the whole length of canal and St. Lawrence route stopping at any and all towns and villages, afterwards joining through towing fleets.

Now, let me for a moment refer to the evidence of another eminent gentleman who has given this matter very careful consideration and who, I venture to say has given that consideration under the direction of this government of which he is an employee. I refer to the statement of Mr. R. B. Rogers, C.E., He says :

The estimated cost of transhipping at Midland is from ¼ to ½ cent per bushel. The depth of water in the water-way when completed will be 8 feet 4 inches. The present barges on the Erie canal are about one-third the capacity of those intended for use on the Trent. The distance from Georgian Bay to Trentotn will be about 200 miles, of which only about one-tenth of this distance will be actual canal. The Erie canal is about 352 miles long from Buffalo to Albany, about all of which distance is actual canal, and 150 miles of river navigation from Albany to New York. In comparing the length of time required to go from Midland to Montreal, and from Buffalo to New York, many different points have to be taken into consideration—but a single steam barge from Midland to Montreal would take 69 hours, and from Buffalo to New York, the Erie canal about double this time. Regarding freight rates by rail or by water of course the rate on the Trent canal can only be arrived at by comparison with the rates on other barge canals, for instance on the Erie canal. The distance from Midland to tide-water at Montreal is 445 miles. From Buffalo to tide-water at New York is 503 miles. Freight is delivered now at Midland from the western ports at 1 cent per bushel, and at Buffalo at 1·42 to 2 cents per bushel. By the new Erie canal, Major Symonds, who is perhaps the most expert barge engineer in the United States, calculates that wheat can be taken from Buffalo to New York at 8-10 of one cent per bushel. Now if they can do that on the new Erie we can do it on the Trent canal, being, as I hav mntioned above, a water-way, not a canal. This 8-10 of a cent added to the 1 cent rate to Midland and ½ cent for transhipping charges will make a rate of 2·3 cents from the western ports to Montreal. Rates from western ports to Montreal via Depot Harbour 5 cents, via Midland 5 to 6 cents. Rates from western ports to New York via Buffalo by water and rail 6¾ to 7 cents ; by water about 5½ cents.

Regarding the difference in distance from Port Arthur to Liverpool, that via the Trent canal is 757 miles shorter than via the Erie canal, which on the return trip amounts to 1,514 miles.

I repeat that no one can consider the evidence of these eminent men, one of them an engineer in the employ of the government, and fail to realize the very great advantage that Canada has, if she will only use it by the improvement of the Trent water-way, over any means of transportation that the United States can offer against us. Besides the important advantages which will accrue to the Dominion as a whole through the completion of the Trent Valley canal there are very many other advantages that will accrue to the cities, towns, villages, municipalities and individuals directly affected, by providing cheap freight rates.

It is estimated that to fully complete this section of the canal, including what has already been expended by previous governments and by this government will cost about $10,000,000, which at ordinary rate of interest, 3 per cent, would involve an annual charge of about $300,000. Now, as to the revenue from power. I am confining my presentation of this part of the case to that portion of the canal between Peterborough and the Bay of Quinté, and it has been shown beyond any reasonable doubt that at least 100,000 horse-power can be got between these two points. The income derived from this hundred thousand horse-power sold or leased at the rate that it would be bound to command, would pay not only the interest upon the total investment of $10,000,000 necessary to complete the canal but it would be sufficient to provide a sinking fund that in a very few years would wipe out the capital expenditure upon this whole enterprise.

Suppose this hundred thousand horse-power sold at $13 per horse-power, a rate at which it is being sold between Trenton and Belleville, any hon. gentleman can see that it will not only pay interest upon the investment but that it will provide a sinikng fund that in a few years will wipe out the whole obligation. But, that is only part of the possible revenue.

Take it from Peterborough to Midland; the water-power, if developed all along the route, would increase the revenue of the government from day to day and year to year and enable them to pay off the capital expenditure entailed by the completion of this canal very much earlier than the date that I have shown by the figures that I have given. There is another very great advantage that it occurs to me would accrue to the people by the completion of

this water-way, perhaps it is one of its most important results and that is the competition that will be created between transportation by means of water and transportation by means of the railways. As I have already taken occasion to remark, I do not think that any question exists to-day in the mind of any man who has given the matter study but what transportation by water is really the regulating power or regulator so to speak of the rates that will be charged on railways. Railways now charge the very highest rate that commerce can endure and live and the construction of this canal would have a very important bearing upon this important proposition. The limit of rates for transportation would then be regulated or controlled by the cost of transportation by this water route, and every shipper would derive permanent relief and protection against railway monopoly. A very small saving per ton per mile when we consider the immense quantities of trade that will be carried over this route and the saving in distance will amount to a sum that is almost inconceivable. If one would sit down and figure it out the saving in distance and freight would be simply enormous and it is one of the reasons which to my mind should appeal to the government to lay down at this time a definite and positive policy and energically enter upon the carrying out of that policy for the advantage of the people of Canada. Last year 28,000,000 bushels of grain were shipped to Midland and Depot Harbour and this would be very largely increased by the development of the western country and by the attraction of cheap transportation by means of this water-way. It is to my mind impossible to adequately conceive what the extent of that growth will be. The freight carried from points along the route of this canal already assumes very large proportions. Peterborough last year alone shipped in and out by rail over 290,000 tons of freight, Campbellford over 36,000 tons, Trenton over 100,000 tons, Hastings, Lakefield, Bobcaygeon, Fenelon Falls, Gambridge, Barrie, Orillia and other smaller towns and villages along the line shipped freight in proportion and all of these figures are sure to increase, and the trade is of proportionate advantage to the people resident in these particular districts. Added to these facts that by the Trent Valley water-way to Liverpool there would be absolute saving in distance of over 1,500 miles, that being the difference in distance in favour of this route as against any other route either through Canada or the United States, I think one cannot fail to see the many great and permanent advantages to the people of Canada to be derived from putting into useful form this natural water-way ; nor can any man doubt that to allow local political or sectional difficulties to impede the construction of this great work would justly merit the condemnation of the Canadian people. So far I have endeavoured to deal with those features in connection with this proposition upon which I think all parties are practically agreed. There are differences that exist, but these differences I venture to say, are purely local and caused by sectional interest which one party or the other may have in this enterprise.

In the early part of this session the Minister of Finance announced that he had a magnificent surplus, and seeing the advantages which the country as a whole will derive from the development of this water-way, it appears to me that the Minister of Finance could not do better than to recommend that a certain portion of that surplus of which he boasts should be applied to the carrying out of this work. Differences exist as to the plan of this undertaking, but these differences do not in any manner detract from the principle which I advocate, namely, the completion of the Trent Valley water-way. It is contended by my hon. friend from East Durham (Mr. Ward) that the southern terminus should be at the town of Port Hope, while I contend that the southern terminus should be at the town of Trenton. In view of such difference of opinion, the sound principle to adopt would be to follow the expert testimony of a competent person who has studied all the evidence that can be supplied, both for and against either of the routes mentioned. I think, in view of what has occurred in the past, the House will have no hesitation in arriving at the conclusion that Trenton is the natural and proper outlet of this great water-way. In the determination of a matter of this kind, the cost of construction and maintenance should not be the sole consideration ; utility and the advantages to be derived by the country generally should control the action of the government. There have already been several surveys made of the two routes by engineers appointed by the present and by the previous government. Owing to the pressure brought to bear upon the present government by those who are in favour of the Port Hope terminus, the government saw fit to appoint Mr. McLeod, an engineer of the most eminent respectability and ability, to investigate all the reports, surveys and estimates that had been made by previous engineers. Mr. McLeod had placed in his hands all this data furnished from the time that Mr. Maingy, under the British government, made his first report. Mr. McLeod went over the route, and after a most careful investigation of the whole situation, and a thorough consideration of the benefits that might be derived, not only by the two towns more particularly interested, but by the country at large, he made his report. After Mr. McLeod had made his report, the assertion was made from the town of Port Hope that that gentleman, in making his report, was actuated by some ulterior motive, and did not report in accordance with the true facts. Knowing, as most of

us do the eminent respectability and ability of Mr. McLeod, we know it is an unworthy insinuation for any one to make. Mr. McLeod is a gentleman in whom I have the utmost confidence. He is a gentleman in whom the government has placed their confidence, and there is no doubt that he reported impartially and according to his honest convictions. Mr. McLeod's report is very lengthy, and I shall summarize it. He says :

From the examination made, it would appear that there is little difference in the cost of either route—the estimates show a difference of $144,537 in favour of the Port Hope route.

The difficulty of navigating Lake Ontario with canal boats in stormy weather is a serious objection to the Port Hope route.

The material for canal construction is better on the Trenton route, and the deep cutting on the Port Hope section is avoided by adopting the river route.

The diversion of water from its natural course, would be a source of great expense to the government—complaints were made that the water sometimes falls very low in the Trent river.

The largest public benefit would be obtained by constructing the canal through or near the towns of Hastings, Campbellford, Frankford and Trenton, where there are now large mills and factories.

A very large amount of water-power would be more available at the various dams on the Trent river than on the Port Hope route, and would be a valuable asset for the government.

The harbour of Trenton is much larger, and superior to that of Port Hope, and terminates in the inland waters of the Bay of Quinté,

For the above reasons I consider that the Trenton route is the most suitable for the canal.

In briefly considering the differences that exist as to the southern terminus of this canal perhaps I could not deal with the matter in a better manner than by taking up and discussing the advantages claimed for the Port Hope route by its advocates. The principal advantage claimed is the saving in distance in construction from Rice lake to Port Hope over Rice lake to Trenton. The Port Hope route is said to be twenty-three miles, the Trenton route fifty-eight miles, and they thus claim a saving of thirty-five miles.

In this connection the advocates of the Port Hope route, forget or avoid stating that the distance from Rice lake to Montreal by way of Port Hope is greater than by way of Trenton by a distance of forty miles, that being the distance of Port Hope from Trenton via Lake Ontario and the Murray canal, and thus the mere matter of distance is more than made up by the Trenton route. They also minimize or omit to mention altogether the dangers of lake navigation from Port Hope to the Murray canal for light draft barges such as would be used in this canal. Any thoughtful consideration of these dangers, and the necessary delays by such a route, is sufficient in itself to condemn the adoption of this proposition. Port Hope harbour being an artificial one, these barges could enter it from the lake or leave it only in favourable weather. The prevailing winds during the season of navigation are from the south and west, thus blowing in upon the Ontario shore; and between Port Hope and the Murray canal there are no natural protected harbours in which in case of storm these barges could take refuge. Along that coast or shore are also a number of reefs and dangerous places, notably the Bluff and Presqu'ile Point—the latter stretching out into the lake in a southeasterly direction, and separated from the Murray shore by only a narrow channel. This channel I am told is constantly shifting owing to the sandy formation of the shore along the Murray side, and the water is exceedingly shallow outside this narrow channel. I have a personal knowledge of many wrecks at this point, having been born and brought up within a few miles of that place. To enter the Murray canal from Port Hope these barges would be obliged to describe three-quarters of a circle around the Presqu'isle Point, surrounded by these dangerous shoals, with only a narrow channel to work in, to navigate which at any time would be difficult, and in a rough sea would be almost impossible and undoubtedly dangerous. If these considerations alone were not enough to counterbalance this question of distance in construction, I would call attention to the fact that of the fifty-eight miles by the Trenton route, I am informed there is about thirty miles of it river navigation, thus leaving only about five miles difference in direct canalage.

The difference in the cost of construction of the two routes is only about $144,000, as estimated by an independent engineer—altogether too small a sum to have much weight in determining the route of this canal, having regard to the disadvantages and positive dangers to which I have referred, and contrasting with them the land-locked route terminating at Trenton, with a natural harbour and entirely inland navigation. The differences in cost of construction and saving of distance to be constructed are the chief arguments used by those who favour the Port Hope route, and these claims have been more than met by what I have stated. There are other questions raised such as the ease of construction, the area of lands to be flooded, both of these questions being involved in the other two, and the answer to the one being the answer to the other. The Trenton route will be constructed almost entirely through a limestone formation, thus affording a permanence in construction which could never be obtained on the Port Hope route, which must be constructed through light clay and sand, and, for a considerable distance, with banks ranging to a height of 136 feet, which must of neces-

sity be constantly shifting and falling into the canal, rendering permanent construction an impossibility. Although the initial cost of construction of the Port Hope route may be the cheaper by the few thousand dollars stated, yet the cost of repairs that will from time to time have to be made, will in a short time more than equal the difference in cost of first construction.

Another, and perhaps one of the most serious objections to the Port Hope route is the fact that it will have the effect of diverting from their natural channel the waters of the Trent to the loss and detriment of manufacturers and riparian owners along its course. These riparian owners have vested rights which cannot thus be infringed upon or taken away without compensation.

To thus obligate the country, by the adoption of the Port Hope route, to compensate these owners for the damages sustained by them in the loss of the water-power occasioned thereby, would entail such an expenditure as would in itself exclude such route from favourable consideration, whereas the adoption of the Trenton route will not only avoid such loss and damage, but will, as a matter of fact, materially increase the value of the water-powers.

Let me again refer to this question of the drowned lands. That argument has been used to a very great extent by gentlemen who are advocating the construction of this canal to Port Hope. They say that a large portion of the land in that section of country along the line of the Trent valley canal, if the terminus is to be at Trenton, will be flooded and the government will have to acquire the land by purchase, so that the outlay would be very much greater in that respect than via Port Hope.

The lands along the Trent route that would be flooded would not touch to any great extent, the valuable agricultural lands of that section, but would be confined to the bottom and shallow lands lying in the valley of the river—now of little value—and separated from the better lands for a great portion of the distance by ridges sufficient to confine the water, whereas most of the lands to be affected on the Port Hope route are rich agricultural lands of considerable value and lying on nearly a common level, which would be flooded to a greater extent some years than others, thus rendering the question of damage from flooding, an uncertain question and an always existing source of irritation and trouble as well as expense.

Again, the Port Hope route will pass through a purely agricultural section already highly developed in that direction and capable of little improvement with no possibilities for the development of any great amount of power ; on the other hand the Trenton route will not only pass through rich agricultural lands but will touch many thriving towns and villages that already possess large and important manufacturing

industries, which with the power that will be developed on this route will enable them to extend their influence in manufacturing pursuits to such an extent as from this consideration alone would fully warrant the adoption of this route.

The adoption of the Port Hope route would mean the abandonment of all the works and the loss of all the moneys already expended on that portion of the Trent river between Rice lake and Trenton, viz. :—

The lock and dam at Hastings.

The lock and dam at Heeley's Falls.

And the lock and dam at Chisholm's Rapids which have cost a considerable sum, both in original construction and in maintenance.

The advocates of the Port Hope route would ask the government to abandon all these and to construct an entirely new work, whereby these completed works would become perfectly useless. Nearly all of these reasons which I have been urging in connection with the completion of this canal have already been urged upon the government in the reports of engineers appointed by the government upon whose judgment the ministry could well afford to act. I see that this year there is placed in the estimates a sum of about $300,000 for expenditure upon this enterprise. It appears to me that that is an altogether insufficient sum for such an enterprise as this. Last year I find by the Auditor General's Report that there was expended upon capital account $523,950.74. I find there was expended upon income $18,500, making a total of $542,450.74. The appropriation taken last year for this work was only $456,000, and the actual expenditure was $542,000, so we say that there was about $100,000 for expenditure for which there was no appropriation taken last year. By the main estimates brought down this year the first estimate was $100,000. I do not know, the Finance Minister could probably inform me in regard to that, whether that $100,000 asked for in the appropriation this year would be applied to wiping out the over-expenditure of last year. It strikes me that it may be so unless there is a special vote for that purpose. In that case there would be for this year only some $200,000.

Now, upon the past expenditure of $4,000,000 we have to pay $120,000 of interest, and we have to make good the $100,000 overspent last year, and so it seems to me it is simply juggling with the accounts to say we are expending $350,000 upon the Trent Valley canal this year. That statement may be used, and is being used I know of my own personal knowledge, by the gentleman who is to oppose me in the riding I have the honour to represent. He says that through his influence with the government he has got them to spend between $300,000 and $400,000 on this canal this year. It will take $100,000 to pay off the extra expenditure made last year ; $120,000 to pay the interest on the expenditure already made ; and

the contracts they have in hand will call for more money if they are completed within the time agreed upon than the total appropriation. So, according to the way I figure it, there is not any money left for expenditure on the Trent Valley canal this year. This government ought not to treat the country, particularly the portions of the country especially interested in this matter, in that way. This is a matter of such importance, not merely to the country as a whole, but especially to the part of the country particularly interested, that the government can well afford, and ought as a matter of duty, to take from the large surplus that the Minister of Finance says he has in hand a sum of $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 and complete this Trent Valley water-way so that the people of Canada may have some benefit from it. To put it in a nutshell, this is the position. We have the middle of this canal completed, a hundred odd miles, and both ends shut up. I submit that this government ought not to trifle with the people in that way, they ought not to leave it in the hands of politicians to dangle it before the electors and use it as a means of influencing the vote of one elector or another, but should come out fairly and declare a policy, and that policy should be the completion of that canal by way of Trenton. And they should enter upon the completion of that canal without further delay.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A CANADIAN CONSULAR SERVICE.

Mr. HONORE GERVAIS (Montreal, St. James). I beg to make a few remarks, before this question is put, on the subject of the commercial relations of Canada, including expenditures in connection with negotiation of treaties or extension of commercial relations. This is the amount placed in the estimates for 1905 for such purposes; it is not greater, it is not smaller than the amount of 1904 spent for the extension of Canadian commercial relations. For years past it has been discussed both in the press, and in public, that it would be advisable that Canada should have as its representatives Canadian born citizens. This is the proper place and time to speak out what many Canadians think of the British consular service and the commercial agencies of Canada. Most of us say that they are deficient and that they should be replaced by a British Canadian consular service, paid by Canada, composed of her best trained citizens educated in commercial high schools, and appointed by England directly or by Canada by way of delegation. I need not say that such consuls would have to devote all their energy and time to the service of our country.

At once I must declare that I do not ignore the existence of the Trade and Commerce Department of Canada which was created I would say, in 1893, under the instigation of Mr. Parmelee, the present and always able Deputy Ministers of Trade and Commerce. I do not wish anybody to forget that that department has for its head the brilliant, the efficient present Minister of Trade and Commerce, whose great eloquence is equal to his wise statesmanship and wide parliamentary experience. I know that Canada has a few able commissioners to advocate her commercial interests outside of its territory, under the guidance of a clever and devoted superintendent of agencies, Mr. O'Hara, newly appointed by this government. I also know that since 1896, the number of our agencies has been increased from 6 to 13 and their efficiency has been made fivefold greater. I admit that our Trade and Commerce Department has been since 1893 publishing, at first, annually, then monthly, and then weekly, the reports of our commercial agents. I confess that our Trade and Commerce Department has been making the most useful reports concerning the trade, imports, exports, tonnage of Canada, the inspection of staple products, the culling, in Canada, and miscellaneous subjects as well as concerning the foreign trade of Canada, that is with England, and most of her sixty provinces or colonies and most of the sixty-five states composing the universal society of to-day. But I feel bound to say that our Trade and Commerce Department, which is the money-making department of our administration, is not as well treated as a spending department, by the parliament of Canada or that of Great Britain. The good work of our trade and commerce is handicapped by a want of a sufficient amount of money put at its disposal for the promotion of our commercial agencies, the negotiation of commercial treaties and the extension of the commercial relations of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. Do not they get all the funds they want? We have never refused them any.

Mr. GERVAIS. They have not sufficient funds. Moreover, our commercial agents have no status in international law; they are bound to be ignored by the foreign states, their number is totally inadequate to the work; their salaries are so meagre; their reports not sufficiently circulated, their qualifications in some cases totally deficient in many respects.

Let us examine first the present condition of the British consular service; and then I will try to express what should be done to remedy the present evils. For many years Canadian commercial interests have been suffering greatly through lack of proper representation outside of Canada. What condition of affairs are we in to-day? If the government of Canada wish to communicate with a British consul, very often they have to reach him via the Governor General of Canada, the Colonial Office and the Foreign Office and come back through the same chan-

nel; because that good consul will not think it fit to answer our government. Otherwise when I thus speak, I desire before anything else to declare my complete loyalty to the empire. Sir, I estimate too highly what my countrymen owe to the British sovereignty to either say or do anything which will seem as disloyal to our mother country. For I know, Sir, that economically the stability, the security, and the permanency of conditions enjoyed by persons and things Canadian are due to the everlasting prestige and strength of England. For, I know, Sir, that politically, my countrymen owe to England a great debt of gratitude and faithfulness for the great sum of freedom and liberty granted to Canada, and more particularly to my native province.

In Quebec, while we still cherish the maintenance of many connections with the intellectual French world, we are too thoroughly and happily linked to the defence to the last of the British flag, to say anything unbecoming to a British subject. I am here purely and simply to express the views of my countrymen of to-day, of a great many men of my age, who would like to have better commercial agents representing Canada throughout the United States as well as throughout Europe. The time is ripe for Canada to have some of its own citizens to press its own interests in the principal capitals and cities of the world. We should be relieved of such consular service as that rendered by Mr. Staniforth of Rio Grande do Sul, who being ignorant of the law regarding the Canadian flag on registered vessels, thought it best to mutilate such flag so proudly and boldly carried to the South American seas by the J. M. Taylor, brigantine of Parrsborough, in Nova Scotia. We do not want for Canada anything which will resemble diplomatic representation, but what we do want is proper consular representation for the benefit more particularly of the citizens and traders of Canada. That is what we have never had, and that is what we will not have as long as British authority will not delegate to its largest colony the right of appointment of commercial agents, or will not agree to name as its consuls, such men as may be designated by the government of Canada and who will have special instructions to work for Canadian welfare.

I will try at once to answer some of the objections which may naturally be raised that England will never grant to Canada the right to appoint consuls and that the discussion I am now raising will have no practical result. To this I will answer that neither does the constitution prevent us from making such a request nor is there any reason why the same cannot be granted. This has already been granted by England to the East India Company, as was pointed out by Edmund Burke in his great oration in arraignment of Warren Hastings. Such has been the case, moreover, for most of that third class of English colonies called the Privileged Chartered Colonies.

The right of petition is one of the twelve natural rights which cannot be set aside by one or any positive laws, neither constitutional nor municipal. Therefore, I am here expressing such views by and in virtue of my right of speech, granted to every man, even to a colonial, and to a man of a 'dominion' or 'plantation' of His Majesty, to use the language of the Act, 3 and 4 of William IV, chapter 41, relating to the better administration of justice in His Majesty's Privy Council. And I feel authorized also to hold such pretensions by the fact that for the last thirty years, many of our Canadian statesmen have been engaged in the diplomatic service of England, at the request of the latter. Have we not seen such statesmen as Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Charles Tupper, Sir Richard Cartwright, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Sir Louis Jetté, Mr. Bourassa and Mr. A. B. Aylesworth clothed with the high office of diplomatic agents of England. Would it be out of the reach of things possible that Canadians could render good assistance to the Consular Service of England ? Could it be so that the Canadian born would be in a better position to explain Canadian affairs to the traders and citizens of the American republics ? Could it be so that a British Canadian born at Vancouver would know better the affairs of trade in San Francisco than a gentleman from Nottingham ? Could it be so that a Canadian consul born at Winnipeg would know better the business conditions in Duluth than a merchant from Edinburgh ? Could it be so because a British Canadian consul born in Montreal would know far better the trade and conditions in New York than a lawyer from Dublin ? Could it be so because a British Canadian consul born in Halifax would know better the transportation trade between his city and those of the Atlantic coast than a retired colonel from Bristol ?

By establishing a British Canadian Consular Service, we would secure greater wealth for the empire as well ; because we think that by working for the development of one part of the empire we are working for the development of the whole empire. If we can make this Canada of ours three times stronger, richer, and more respected by the citizens of the other states, we will with three-fold power help the empire. In a word to the one who asserts that England will never agree to give us special consular service, I say, Sir, let us demand it. This consular service should precede the granting of the right of treaty-making, a subject which has been a topic of discussion for the last few years throughout Canada. How can Canada make a good commercial treaty if it has no proper data or information about the contract it intends to enter into ? I say that the right to appoint Canadians as

consuls should first be granted, and then the treaty negotiating power should then come. Let me say with Kipling :

> Let go, let go the anchors ;
> Now ashamed at heart are we
> To bring so poor a cargo home
> That had for gift the sea !
> Let go the great bow-anchors—
> Ah, fools were we and blind—
> The worst we stored with utter toil,
> The best we left behind !

And then wealth would come to our shores carried by a fleet of merchantmen five times greater than the one we have to-day. Has not the French poet Lemierre written :

> Le sceptre de Neptune est le sceptre du Monde.

A most appropriate epigraph for the old merchant shipping Act of 1660.

I will now make a few remarks as to the necessity for Canada having a proper consular representation. Complaints are made against the usefulness of the British Consular Service ; the charges, I would venture to say, are well founded. These complaints come more particularly from England, because the Canadian traders have been in the past shrewd enough, clever enough and painstaking enough to secure for their own country a great bulk of the trade of the world, without such assistance from the British Consular Service ; but as every man knows, for the last few years, great battles for controlling trade have been raging fiercely throughout the world for the best position in the commercial market ; some new arrangement, some new weapons, some new soldiers should be secured for the development, the maintainance and the defence of Canadian trade. Let us refer to some English opinions as to the deficiency of the British Consular Service. Any one can read in the 'Quarterly Review' of 1903, a very able article pointing out the deficiencies in that service, and condemning the same altogether for want of qualifications of the British consuls and inefficiency in the execution of the duties assigned to them by the guide of instruction published and distributed by the British Foreign Office.

In England it is a general complaint on the part of the traders that the diplomatic service, including consular service, is unfriendly or, at best, indifferent to the protection of commercial interests. In the second place, it is complained that the information given by the diplomatic, as well as the consular service, regarding commercial matters, which is transmitted from abroad, is not of the right kind—comes too late, and is not published in an accessible or attractive form. These charges have been made year after year in England. Since the year 1825, when proper salaries were first established in England for the British consuls, select committees of parliament have been appointed with instructions to find out the ways and means of improving the consular service of the empire. The last select committee was appointed in the year 1886.

We gather from the correspondence respecting the question of assistance of diplomatic and consular service to British trade abroad much good information about the complaints of deficiency of the British consular service.

It is now admitted by every one in the British Isles that there is a persistent demand for more intelligent, energetic and efficient co-operation on the part of consuls with merchants and manufacturers. It is said that in recent years, since the international commerce in all the great centres of the world, has become intensified to a degree undreamt of a generation ago, greater attention has been given to the duties and responsibilities of consuls in what has been one of their most important functions, that of acting as the pioneers, ambassadors and soldiers of trade.

Let me quote some opinions expressed by eminent British parliamentarians during an important debate on the consular service of England during the year 1902. Any one can consult, with profit to himself, the English 'Hansard,' volume 110, page 728, July 3rd, 1902, and volume 111, pages 300 and 308, July 15, 1902. We find there expressions of opinion by such eminent men as Mr. James Bryce, Sir Charles Dilke and Sir Edward Grey, three late Under Secretaries of State for England; as well as by Henry Labouchère, the great parliamentarian and journalist, whom every one knows.

In the Parliamentary Debates, volume 111, pages 290-291, Henry Labouchère said :

> Mr. Labouchère (Northampton) said that he understood that sometimes a subordinate of the consular staff was a foreigner, but he thought the idea of the Foreign Office was that so far as they could do it, they got men of British nationality in the consular service. There was a case in Berlin some time ago, where this country appointed the banker of Prince Bismarck, and it struck him at that time that a man more unfit to represent British interests in Germany could not be found than Prince Bismarck's banker.
>
> He was a strong advocate of large expenditure being undertaken by the government for the spreading and looking after of our commerce, but he did not think, considering what we spent on our army and navy we spent a sufficient amount on our consular service.
>
> The hon. member had come across consuls who were charming men ; he knew nothing personally against them, but certainly no country would think of having these men as commercial agents. They could not write reports, but they went to some merchant, perhaps their tailor or somebody, and asked him to write a report. They signed it and sent it home. These reports were in many cases, not worth the paper they were written on. Some of the reports were very good but many of them were very poor. These men had no commercial education. The Foreign Office must recognize

that this must be made a profession. They must take young men who had passed an examination and put them as pupils in divers consulates, giving them a small salary. Then, according to their fitness to the work, they could be promoted to be vice-consuls, consuls, and consular generals with larger salaries. Our consular officer in the matter of commercial intelligence was below that of France. He could not agree with his hon. friend opposite that the consular service should be put under the Board of Trade and separated from the Foreign Office.

Sir Edward Grey, pages 301, 302 and 303, volume 111, said :

Sir Edward Grey (Northumberland, Berwick): In order to secure a sufficient service a considerable amount of money must be spent on it. He quite agreed that a rearrangement and redistribution of the amount now spent might do something, but it would not do all that was wanted. He thought that more would have to be spent ; and he would ask hon. members to bear in mind that though in times of peace we should spend much less than in times of war, there were services which required considerable expenditure in times of peace.

What they would like to see was a more professional service and men being specially trained for the work. But having got men specially trained for the work, they must see that their promotion in the consular service was as far as possible in accordance with the merit. Men who had been specially trained for the work must receive adequate recognition whenever they responded to the training that had been given them.

Sir Edward Grey continued :

He doubted whether a consular office drawing up his report, had a sufficiently clear idea of what the government wished him to do.

When the great trading districts of the country were turning out as much work as they could do, they were not likely to be very anxious about whether new markets were being formed or whether a market was being lost in any other part of the world. That was just the danger against which they must endeavour to guard.

Mr. Louis Sinclair (Essex, Romford) said :

Mr. Louis Sinclair thought these consular reports should at least be business-like, otherwise they were not worth the paper they were printed upon, and it would be a waste of time to read them and publish them. It was well known how unbusiness-like the Foreign Office was in these matters, and our trade and commerce suffered in consequence. Our consular reports compared very unfavourably with those of the United States. America spent a much larger sum of money and employed fifty-one consuls in Germany, as compared with five paid officials representing Great Britain in Germany. That showed how unbusiness-like the method of the Foreign Office was, and in his opinion this department ought to be placed in charge of a Minister of Commerce. This question very much affected the colonies, because foreign governments had consuls and commercial attachés in all our colonies, with the result that they snatched the trade which should come to this country. They had no information sent them to guide English traders and manufacturers. This was not the only point in which this country was behind, for in South Africa and Japan similar things were occurring.

In South Africa during the war, France and Germany sent agents to report what could be done there for their manufactures, and all kinds of trade in manufactured articles and contracts had been taken away from us. That was the result of inadequate commercial information, for they had a right to demand reliable information for the money which was spent. The noble Lord the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs seemed to be satisfied that the amount of commerce with Bolivia was so small that it was not worth considering.

Mr. Bryce said :

Mr. Bryce agreed that he had seen a good many of the reports of United States consuls, and he would suggest to the Foreign Office that the representatives abroad should furnish us with similar reports. They were short treaties on the commercial possibilities of the future.

Sir Charles Dilke, page 308, volume 111, said :

Sir Chas. Dilke : On the question of consular representation there was a tendency on the part of all who had been connected with the Foreign Office to ignore the fact that there had been a good deal of jobbery with consular appointments. Personally he was acquainted—as others must be—with notorious cases in which men by an undue use of the patronage of various Secretaries of State, had been jobbed in consular appointments for which they were totally unfit, and the interests of the country had suffered in a very high degree in consequence. There was also the fact that most meritorious consuls had for years laboured very hard indeed in the service of the country, and in the commercial work to which so much importance was properly attached, and had then frequently been passed over, and men from outside had been 'jobbed' over their heads into posts which were regarded as the prizes of the profession and to which these consuls ought to have been appointed as a reward for the good work they had done.

Parliamentary Debates, volume 110, page 728 :

Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen S.) : The one thing he regretted was that appointments to the service were often made in the spirit of what might be called pure patronage, men being appointed for political and personal reasons, to the disappointment of the legitimate hopes of better men in the service.

It was said during this debate that one could find in England men who had written on commercial subjects and who had gained universal public estimation, who had been lost to the state by their retirement, while still in middle age and full of capacity for continued efficient service, while others who have never afforded any public evidence of interest in either commercial or shipping matters, and who had no experience whatsoever to fit them for such posts, had been appointed to office in the most important commercial and shipping ports. Sir Henry Bergne, head of the Consulate Department of the British Foreign Office, as late as the

year 1901, admitted under oath, before a select committee of the House, that there was no officer in the Foreign Office to study the consular reports, that he himself had merely 'skimmed' them. Sir Henry Bergne admitted also that there was no officer in the Foreign Office to even read the consular reports; that there were too many honorary consuls and vice-consuls.

Another charge was made against the British consular system, which was to the effect that no competitive examination was held for the appointment of consuls, but merely and exclusively a qualifying examination. Here is a synopsis of the qualifications required in order to become a British consul; applicant must read and speak English and French, he must be able also to speak the language of the people amongst whom he is to reside. That is to say, if the British consul is to be stationed near the Mediterranean sea, he will be required to speak French or Italian; if he is to be stationed near the Baltic, he will be required to know the German language; if he is to be stationed in some Spanish countries, he will have to know Spanish, and so on. Lastly, the applicant for the British consular service must have a knowledge of Colenso's arithmetic, and have a general knowledge of the commercial and mercantile law.

One of the charges made by Mr. James Bryce and the other speakers in the British House of Commons, is that the consular service of England has been made a harbour of refuge for retired army officers, or for failures, whose only recommendation is aristocratic, official or personal influence.

Another ground of complaint in England is that the British Consulate generally is worse paid than those of France, Germany, Russia, and the United States; while on the other hand, the American consul in London is getting a salary of $5,000 a year, the British consul resident in New York, $10,000; but on the whole, it is admitted that the British consul is not well enough paid.

The members of this House will, at a glance, see that I am drawing a very poor picture of the British Consular Service. Let me say at once that the complainants in the House of Commons in England against the British Consular Service have discovered in some departments persons whose qualifications are perfectly adequate to the duties of a first-class agent. As far as can be gathered from the discussion in England, the consul appointed in the Near and Far East, is perfectly capable of representing British interests, and it is admitted that the greatest success achieved by the British government in the Near and Far East was so obtained through the ability of its consular agents. Some have found in this branch of the consular service a model for a general consular service for England. For those consuls who have to go to the Near and Far East, there are very searching examinations. An applicant for British Consular Service in the Near and Far East, must, outside of the general knowledge he has gained, in the British schools, qualify in Latin, French, German, and precis-writing, geography, mathematics, elements of criminal law, elements of commercial and mercantile law; then the applicant must take some probationary service with the junior attachés to the Pekin, Tokio or Bangkok legations. Further, the applicant must learn the language, the history, geography, the history of treaties and the Orders in Council relating to the country in which he is to be appointed. While speaking about this matter of Orders in Council, let me once more refer to the British Consul Percy Staniforth at Rio Grande do Sul, and say that he would have avoided insult, in February, 1904, to the flag of Canada, had he known the Orders in Council of 1865 and 1892 permitting Canada at any rate, to have a flag of its own for our vessels registered in Canada. But let me come back to the question of consular qualification. The applicant for British consular service in the Near and Far East is often attached to a British court in the Far East; for example, to the Supreme Court, in China, and very often the British consul will become judge of such Supreme court, and will be called to the bar and appointed to such high court.

The 'Quarterly Review' points out that the French Consular Service is in marked contrast to the indifference displayed in Great Britain to the qualification of persons selected for consular service. Those are the views of British parliamentarians concerning the British consular agencies.

Let me add some further remarks in regard to the deficiencies of the present consular service as far as we are concerned. Let me compare the British Consular Service with the American. If we look at the American consular reports for 1902, we find that Mr. Listoe, a consul in Holland, gave current quotations of prices in Rotterdam and general information about American lumber, pig-iron, shoes, and flour. Mr. Listoe, among other things says:

> I have investigated the matter and find that the following quotations rule at present for logs per one thousand feet, board measure:
>
> Prime walnut logs, 16 inches and upward, to average 21 to 22 inches, $90 to $100; to average 23 inches to 24 inches, $110 to $120.
>
> Pitch pine, 1 inch to 3 inches, by 11 inches and upwards per standard $63.25 to $65.68.

Mr. S. C. McFarlane, a consul at Nottingham, reproduces in his report good designs of Jacquard's silk machines.

Mr. Harris Eibenstock gives lithographic reproductions of the Bulow Strasse showing the construction of the underground and elevated railways at Berlin, Germany.

Mr. Robert P. Skinner, of Marseilles, gives designs of the newest agricultural implements in France.

Now if we look at the British consular reports, we do not find any such practical and useful information for traders and citizens in general, as those we find in the American reports. For example, the British consul at Riga in Russia, speaking about machinery, page 7 of his report, says: 'With regard to industrial machinery, the returns show a slight increase as compared with 1900.' The British consul, in France, at page 13 of his report, speaks of things of interest to traders, as follows:

> The following articles of exportation show a rise in value amounting in the case of silk tissues to £352,000, cotton tissues, to £76,000.

And so on. Let me ask any trader if such poor statements which any man can make, by looking at the public account books of the foreign countries. is in any way a bit useful to our merchants ? In a word, we find in the British consular reports no end to the number of schedules or returns of imports and exports which would do all right for the education of the politician; we find also a great number of financial statements which would do for the education of the banker. In a word, we find in the British consular reports very much of the geography, diplomatic and financial information ; but we do not find a single bit of practical commercial information. On the contrary, in the United States consular reports, we find a great amount of commercial information as to prices, as well as to transportation charges, duties, &c. Thus the American consular reports are bringing to the home of the American trader all the data and information he may require for the development and maintenance of his trade, while the British consul gives exclusively some data and information about the financial status of foreign markets, which information is only useful to the British capitalist and banker. But here in Canada, we need some of the commercial information which is given to the American trader because a long period would elapse before we are in a position to lend money to the other countries, and this is the reason why we say that for the time being, we want a better and more complete consular service for Canadian commercial interests. When shall Canada have daily consular reports like those of the United States ? I now hold in my hand the daily American Consular Report for the 25th, 27th, and 28th of July, 1904, in which I read two articles on Canada.

But here comes the question : Who is to pay for the betterment of the British Consular Service ? Are we to ask England to pay for all tne improvements we ask for in its consular service ? I think that our country would be ready and is in a position to help Great Britain as far as this is concerned. Canada has been for the last few years in possession of an immense amount of trade, and has taken a foremost place in the commerce of the world. Canada has a larger trade than the states which I will now mention, and which states have fifteen times more consular representation abroad than Canada.

Let us look at the amount of trade of each of these ten countries. I quote the 'Financial Trade Review' of 1900-1901 : Switzerland, $396,326,000 ; Denmark, $218,081,000 ; Argentine Republic, $281,676,000 ; Bolivia, $19,631,000 ; Chili, $112,012,000 . Greece, $46,509,000 ; Italy, $624,000,000 ; Mexico, $117,000,000 ; Portugal, $93,000,000 ; Spain, $364,000,000.

It is within the knowledge of most people that the total amount of trade for 1903, for Canada was $467,064,685. As I said a moment ago, all the European and American states which have less trade than our own country, have been represented abroad with large staffs of consular generals, vice-consuls and commercial agents throughout the world. France has over 550 consuls to advocate its trade interest, Germany has over 800, and not one of the ten countries I have mentioned have less than 100 consuls or commercial agents to protect its commerce abroad. Is it fair under such circumstances that Canada should be deprived of a proper commercial staff of consuls to protect and develop its trade abroad, if we take for granted, as it should be that the British consular service of to-day is of no practical use to us ? I might here state that I am not merely ventilating my own personal views, but I am expressing an opinion of many bodies of importance in my own country, and I am also expressing the views and contentions of a large mass of the voters of Canada.

While we feel a little keenly that we are exclusively colonials in the minds of many British statesmen, we are convinced that we could do a little for ourselves in the markets of the world, and capitals of foreign countries, if we could have British consuls specially despatched to work for Canadian interests, men like many present in this House, born in Canada, being tied to the motherland in the same way as the trees of our forest are attached to its soil. With a poor and petty system of commissionership, Canada has wrought marvels, if we believe the remarks of the Liverpool consul. What would we not do with a regular service of consuls, enjoying the privileged rights of a British consul ?

I told you a few moments ago that many persons are asking for more efficient consular service as far as Canada is concerned. Let me here inform you of a resolution adopted on the 19th of December, 1900, by la Chambre de Commerce du district de Montreal. It is explained in this resolu-

tion that in answer to its communication, the Chambre de Commerce du District de Montreal received a reply from the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce to the effect that the government of Canada does not feel disposed to increase the number of Canadian commercial agents. As is well known, according to the reports of the Minister of Trade and Commerce for 1901, that these commercial agencies—or better called commissioners—did not exceed twenty and taking much more of their time to give information to our Canadian tourists than help to our Canadian traders.

The Canadian Manufacturers' Association has endorsed the action of 'La Chambre de Commerce du district de Montréal,' recommending a larger staff of commissioners to look after the interests of Canada. Is it to be that Canada's business and trade are to be spied upon by over 350 full-fledged consuls, out of which 175 are Americans, 13 French and 56 Swedish and Norwegian, when Canada has only about 20 of those commissioners neither having any status, according to international law nor enjoying a single right of a consul? These 350 consuls, to whom England has granted enequatur for Canada, come from the United States, France, Germany, Netherlands, Portugal, Belgium, Italy, Hawaii, Guatemala, Mexico, Uruguay, Russia, Sweden, Norway, Spain, Argentine Republic, Austria-Hungary, Denmark, Ecuador, Japan, Peru, Venezuela, Nicaragua, Colombia, Hayti and Switzerland. So that you will see Canada will have no one having at heart her interests to go to different parts of the world and to report upon for the people, the industries, the trade methods, the improvements in all branches of life for the benefit of her trade and of her own sons. Let me here read an old charter issued by King Edward VI., of England, in favour of the great charter issued by Edward VI., and of the dent of the Merchant Adventurers' Association of London, one of the heroic quartette of discoverers, Sir Hugh Willoughby, Sebastien Cabot, Richard Chancellor and Cornil Durfurth. Chancellor, having been washed ashore, in 1553, in the possessions of the Russian Czar, Ivan Wassielievitch, he asked the czar protection and showed him his charter issued by Edward VI. and of the commercial ideals of the British trader whose great achievements have prompted Rudyard Kupling to write some of the best songs. Let me quote the charter:

To all the sovereigns residing in the northern oriental countries over the frozen ocean as well as to those of East Indies and the charter said that 'God has created men to live in common and love each other. Men, continued the charter, have for their duty to grant favours and to receive some by way of reciprocity and amongst such, they must treat with humanity, kindness, traders who tour the world, crossing seas and deserts in order to convey to the remotest countries good and useful things which are produced in their country and to bring back in return from those foreign lands all that they can acquire for the usefulness of their own motherland.

At last, the English Charter, commenting on the well known quotation of Libanius, the teacher of St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom, showed that commerce is one of the provisions of providence for the benefit of the human race. 'Because in His unlimited kindness, the Creator of earth and heaven had never decreed that all things be exclusively in one country.' Don't you find expressed in that charter the feelings which we should entertain in connection with the extension of the commerce of Canada? I have already, I think, proved that smaller countries than Canada have larger consular service.

Let me now touch upon another question, the question of the actual expense of such a service. Take for instance the Foreign Office List and Diplomatic and Consular Service Hand-book for 1903, and look at the salaries paid by England to her consuls in the Argentine Republic, Brazil, Italy, Denmark and other countries, you will find the following amounts are paid:

Argentine Republic: Buenos Ayres: consul, £1,000. Vice-consul, £400.

Brazil: Rio Janeiro: consul, £1,000. Vice-consul, £450.

Chili: Valparaiso: consul, £900. Office allowance, £600. Vice-consul, £400.

Denmark: Copenhagen: consul, £600. Office allowance, £200.

France: Paris: consul, £700. Vice-consul, £400. Bordeaux: £700 consul and £200 for vice-consul. Cherbourg: £400 for consul and £100 for vice-consul. Brest: £600 for consul and £220 for vice-consul. Marseilles: £900 for consul and £200 for vice-consul.

Germany: Hamburg: consul, £1,200. Vice-consul, £800.

Italy: Florence: consul, £600. Vice-consul, £200. Naples: £600 for consul and £250 for vice-consul.

Russia: St. Petersburg: £700 for consul and £325 for vice-consul. Odessa: consul, £900. Vice-consul, £450.

We can draw the inference that England is paying a total expenditure of $2,761,000 for her whole consular service, £1,000 to her consuls general and about £500 to her vice-consuls. In the United States, a sum of about $5,000 is paid to consuls general, and a total expenditure of $1,216,756 is made for the American consular service. When we consider that the United States government as well as the British government are in possession of a large income, we may consider with an average salary of $5,000, Canada could secure first-class men to represent its commercial interests abroad. By accepting such an average Canada could, with an annual expenditure say of $300,000, secure at least one consul in each of the sixty-six foreign countries now doing business on the

face of the earth under different styles and names. On the other hand, when we look at the foreign states, we see that immense amounts of money are spent yearly for the benefit of the diplomatic service and more especially of consular representation. Here is a list of some of the countries with their expenditures.

Germany : 14,818,000 marks or $3,704,-500.

Denmark : 771,338 kroners 263/1000 or $193,000.

France : 17,601,210 francs 193/1000 or $3,520,000.

Greece : 2,698,553 drackmai 193/1000 or $540,000.

Italy : 16,363,891 lires 193/1000 or $3,273,-000.

Japan: 2,284,161 yens 498/1000 or $142,-081.

Netherlands : 947,301 guilders 400/1000 or $380,000.

Portugal : 359,650 milreis 1080/1000 or $400,000.

Russia : 6,063,033 rubles 575/1000 or $3,-040,000.

Spain : 5,077,252 pesetas 193/1000 or $1,-015,483.

Sweden : 695,150 kroners 268/1000 or $174,000.

Norway : 764,878 kroners 268/1000 or $191,220.

England : £809,213 or $4,046,065.

Let us now come lastly to our desideratum, for the proposed consular service we hope to have established for the benefit of our country. Vatel says that of modern institutions the most useful to commerce is that of consuls who are authorized by their commission to watch over and preserve the rights and privileges of their nation and to terminate difficulties which may arise amongst merchants. The authors in general say that consuls have political, commercial and notarial duties, as well as duties relating to mercantile and marine certificates, for taking affidavits for law courts, giving assistance to British subjects and naturalized subjects relating to marriages abroad, mixed marriages, registration of births and deaths abroad, relating to illegitimate children, property of British subjects dying abroad, persons dying intestate, relating to passports, pilotage, harbour dues, changes in rates of transportation, repayment of disbursements to army or marines left behind, relating to lights, beacons, buoys, relating to contagious or infectious diseases. Here let me say at once that the enumeration of duties is quite vague and perhaps it may be right to make it clearer to have the duties better defined and made applicable in a serviceable and immediate way.

Let me quote from the correspondence of Mr. Bryce as to a set of instructions the execution of which would constitute a good consular service for Canada.

You will see, at once, what a good Canadian consul having at heart the promotion of the interests of their country should be.

Here is what I would propose for the better extension of our foreign trade: by means of a true British Canadian consular service.

1. The publication of an official paper, setting forth tariff changes, movements, in foreign markets, foreign commercial legislation, port and harbour regulations, &c.

2. The establishment of an office in Ottawa where tariffs, circulars, items of commerce, news, &c., can be referred to by the public who may inspect and copy.

3. That sample and specimen rooms should be attached to the principal consulate abroad, where various classes of Canadian manufactured goods might be kept on view, and that the expense of maintaining such sample rooms should be met by fees to be fixed by an Order in Council.

4. That Commercial Museums of foreign manufactured goods and products be established in well chosen centres in Canada and also exhibitions of Canadian goods, to be opened at foreign ports, or sent in vessels from place to place.

5. That changes in foreign tariffs should be known more rapidly than heretofore, and that projected changes should be promptly reported.

6. That consular officers abroad should use their best efforts to place British subjects on a not less favourable footing than foreigners in search of concessions or other commercial enterprises.

7. That any such enterprise should at once be reported home by Her Majesty's representatives.

8. That consuls be chosen from men possessing commercial qualifications and technical knowledge, and that commercial clerks should be appointed to all consulates.

9. That the names and addresses of consuls abroad and their office hours should be made public.

10. That trade reports should appear more frequently and regularly and that copies of them be sent to trade journals.

11. That diplomatic and consular reports should give the fullest details on the industry and condition of the foreign working classes and be distributed throughout Canada.

12. That samples of goods be sent home with the reports.

13. That changes of classifications be noted, and decisions of commercial tribunals reported.

That Canadian commercial attachés be appointed to embassies and legations.

14. That consuls should assist in recovering debts and recommend trustworthy lawyers and accountants.

15. That consuls should report what means other countries adopt to push their trade.

16. That consuls when home on leave should visit centres of Canadian manufactures and acquire technical knowledge.

17. That they should report on the solvency of foreign business houses and how far credit may safely be given.

18. That a special department of the Trade and Commerce Department charged with the prompt collection, publication and diffusion of important information concerning commercial and industrial affairs.

19. That His Majesty's consuls should act as quasi-public prosecutors in cases of trade mark infringement, &c.

20. That the Trade and Commerce Department be assisted by a council of advice to be composed of persons chosen from the chambers of commerce.

21. That consuls should be placed in direct communication with chambers of commerce.

22. That consuls should cultivate a closer personal touch with traders in their district.

23. That consuls be allowed to pay for early statistical information.

Here are some facts about the trade of our country taken from abroad about the proper ways of developing the interests of our country. Canada is rich enough to pay for a consular service, and I do not see why Canada should not do its best to develop the trade which is coming to its shores and to its ports. I would like to see established in this country a consular service, trained according to the home modern pattern in use for the British consuls in the near and far east. I would like, as those British Canadian consuls would be compelled to work in America, in the South American republics, and to meet the German, French or Belgian consuls, or business men, that they should be trained according to the German, French and Belgian methods. Let us make, as in Belgium, the graduating in one of those schools, one of the requirements asked from a consul to qualify himself for such function. I would like to see our Canadian consuls trained in a school like those commercial high schools of Germany, France or Belgium, one of which should be established in each of the provinces of this great Dominion. I would like to have our Canadian consuls trained in a school similar to L'Ecole Supérieure de Commerce de Paris, founded in 1820; de Mulhouse, founded in 1866; du Havre, de Bordeaux, de Lille, de l'Ecole des Hautes Commerciales de Paris, all founded between the years 1870 and 1884, in a school like l'Institut Supérieur de Commerce d'Anvers in Belgium. After two or three years of study in a school like those German, Belgian or French schools, where our apprentice consuls would have studied the recent developments in higher commercial education, they would be fit to defend our commercial interests. In a school like that of Leipzig Handels-Hochschule, our consuls would have to study such subjects as:—

(A)—Economics and Statistics.

Introduction to economic theory. Social economics. Economic problems of the present day (including agrarian crisis, the movement in the middle classes, commercial treaties and colonial problems.) Commercial and industrial history from the fifteenth century to the present time. Introduction to the study of statistics. History, theory and practice of statistics. Principles of public finance. English. Colonial policy.

(B)—Law.

General introduction to jurisprudence (for non-jurists). Commercial law (various courses). Law of contract. Law regulating employment. Maritime law. International law. Law regulating insurance for sickness, accident and old age.

(C)—Geography, Study of Articles of Commerce, Technology.

Commercial geography. The United States. The Carribean sea and the South American republics. The peoples of Indio-China, Ethnography. Scientific basis on which to ground a critical estimate of the characteristics of different nations. Chemistry in its application to industry and commerce. Tropical agriculture, with special reference to the English colonies.

(D)—Languages.

English. French. Italian. Spanish. German (and also special instructions in the Handels-Hochschule). Chinese.

(E)—Commercial Subjects.

Book-keeping (various courses adjusted to the commercial callings). Commercial correspondence (various courses adjusted to the needs of different commercial callings). Commercial methods, office organization and the machinery of business (practical work in 'bureau'). Shorthand. Typewriting.

General Courses.

History of Europe (various courses). History of England (various courses) History of English culture and literature (various courses). History and present condition of the United States.

Courses specially meant for those intending to qualify as teachers.

History of education in the 19th century. American school system in 1901. School hygiene. Practice in elocution and voice-production.

Those industrial high schools in Germany, after having been ridiculed by narrow-minded people, are now, together with the commercial high school, the ironclads of commerce, according to Mr. Meyer, deputy consul at Chemintz

I have finished, Sir. I have tried to prove these five facts :

1. Inefficiency of the British consular service.

.2 Urgency of a Canadian consular service.

3. Capability of Canada to defray such service.

4. Opportunity to train our consuls.

5. Results—everlasting prosperity and grandeur of Canada. It should be the wish of every man in this country to have a better consular service, such as I have proposed, and which is in use in the best organized commercial countries of the world; and, with such a service, I may venture the opinion that within twenty years the grand total of the wealth in this country will have doubled, for the benefit of its inhabitants and the welfare of the empire, as well as the motherland. New centres of commerce will have to be discovered for the benefit of the traders and merchantmen of Canada. A commercial fleet of tremendous proportions will have been created soon. Most of our imports will then be carried by Canadian vessels; the less American railways will get of our money for transportation into Canada of imports, the more Canadians will get.

It is now the time to repeat the words of Kipling:

> Coastwise—Cross-seas—round the world and back again,
> Whither flaw shall fail us or the Trades drive down—
> Plain-sail—Storm-sail—lay your board and tack again—
> And all to bring a cargo up to London town!

Nobody has a right to hold us back, to prevent us from breathing some of the international life, the highest form of life known to man. Canada has a natural right to trade in all shapes or forms, and to create all the essential organisms required therefor. The right to progress belongs to every community, as well as to individuals. Is there a good reason why Canada should be stopped from giving to her manufacturers, traders and shippers proper, complete and quick information about the foreign commodities, as well as the ways and means to export Canadian commodities? Let Canada, therefore, ask England to grant her the right of appointing British Canadian consuls, or let Canada ask England to appoint consuls herself, consuls amongst the born citizens of the latter, with the understanding, in any case, that those consuls will be paid by Canada, trained in Canada, and will work for Canada. The latter request should be granted to Canada at any rate. I may understand very well that England will hesitate to divest herself of any part of her right of appointment of consuls, any portion of sovereign power is so valuable according to the modern mind. But I cannot understand why England should refuse to appoint Canadian-born British subjects as her consuls. For, shall it be said that in the empire of England, as in the empire of Rome, there are three classes of freedmen: The Cives Romani; the Latini Juniani; the dediditii. If it is so, let it be known to Canadians that they are Latini Juniani of the British empire.

The sooner the better.

FISHING REGULATIONS.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John City). I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the carrying out of the fishery regulations, especially in so far as they regard the salmon fisheries of the lower provinces, particularly of the province of New Brunswick. It is too late to make any extended remarks so I shall confine myself to the important ports. We have in New Brunswick rivers with as high a reputation for being salmon rivers as any in the world, but of late years they have been deteriorating to some extent. Among the reasons given is the one that the regulations in the Fisheries Act for the preservation of fish and allowing them to reach their spawning ground are not properly carried out. There are two special sections in the Act giving protection to the fish. One provides that:

> No one shall use a bag-net, trap-net or fish-pound, except under special license, granted for capturing deep sea fish other than salmon.

The other provides:

> From the time of low water nearest six of the clock in the afternoon of every Saturday, to the time of low water nearest six of the clock in the forenoon of every Monday, in tidal waters, and from six of the clock in the afternoon of every Saturday to six of the clock in the forenoon of the following Monday in non-tidal waters—seines, nets or other apparatus used for catching fish shall be so raised or adapted as to admit of the free passage of fish through the same for the purpose of affording a free passage from six of the clock of every Saturday afternoon to six of the clock on every following Monday forenoon.

Now, the point I wish to bring to the notice of the Minister of Finance is that, so far as I can learn, in certain parts of the Baie des Chaleurs these regulations are not carried out, although the Department of Marine and Fisheries has there persons to look after the carrying out of this Act and to see that these precautions are taken. So much has that been the case that some gentlemen interested in the matter brought suit against one man who was using these trap nets and fishing engines, as they are called. The man was convicted. There is no time to give the evidence, although I have it here. But I will merely state that the evidence was clear and that the magistrate before whom he was taken convicted him and fined him a certain amount and also costs. He took no appeal to any other court, but he did appeal to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who, under the clause of the Act, has power, under certain circumstances, to remit fines and restore for-

feitures. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries or his deputy heard the case and remitted the fine and also remitted the costs. It is also submitted that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, while he has power to remit fines and restore forfeitures, has no power to remit costs. And that was the expression of opinion of three judges of the Supreme Court before him whom proceedings were taken to get a mandamus to compel this magistrate to collect the costs of the case. The mandamus was not granted, but three of the judges expressed the opinion that the minister had no right under the law to remit costs, while the other expressed no opinion on the point. The point I wish to bring to notice especially now is that this remission of every penalty in connection with this case has so emboldened these men that they have issued threats that they will allow no interference whatever. And not only that, but they have gone so far as to really attempt murder, that is if they are the ones who are guilty of the act set forth in this affidavit:

I, William G. Good, of the parish of Bathurst, in the county of Gloucester, fishery guardian, do solemnly declare,—

1. That I am acting as a fishery guardian in the employ of The Nepisiquit Angling Association, and am duly sworn as such guardian under the laws of the province of New Brunswick;

2. That by instructions from the agent of the said association I visited a number of the salmon fishing stands in the Bay of Chaleur opposite to salmon beach so-called on Sunday the tenth day of July instant, for the purpose of seeing if said salmon fishing stands were in fishing order, and on that occasion I found that salmon were caught in the swings of many of the stands I visited, and some of the stands which had salmon in them had a small portion of the end of the leader net lifted a short distance;

3. That by instructions from the agent of the said association I again visited a number of the salmon fishing stands situate in the Bay of Chaleur opposite to salmon beach so-called on Sunday the seventeenth day of July instant and on that occasion I also saw a number of salmon caught in a number of the swings of said stands and a great quantity of grilse swimming around in the traps or back portions of said swings and also many salmon, and in some of the swings in which salmon were so caught the leader net was lifted a short distance near to where it comes to the swin; and further that on that occasion, whilst I was examining the outside swing of the stand of one Heber Buttimer and whilst the boat in which I and my companions were, was floating on the west side of said outside swing, a shot was fired at us from the shore, from a rifle and the bullet passed within a foot or two from my head, and we then passed around to the east side of said swing and another shot was then fired at us from the shore and the bullet passed a few feet over our heads.

And I do make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the Act respecting extra judicial oaths.

Declared to at Bathurst, in the county of Gloucester, this twenty-first day of July, A.D. 1904, before me

WM. G. GOOD.

GEORGE GILBERT,
Notary Public.

I take it that this is a matter which concerns very closely indeed the Department of Marine and Fisheries. And I would ask the minister what he proposes to do under the circumstances and whether, in view of what is really an attempt at murder, he will take any action towards finding out and prosecuting the guilty parties. The reasons which the minister gave in remitting these fines and penalties, I think, would be taken exception to. Among other things he makes it a sort of quarrel, as it were, between the coast and net fishermen. But the carrying out of the Act is neither for one nor for the other, but for both. On the Quebec side of the Baie des Chaleurs the Act is carried out, as it is in other parts of the country, and trouble is avoided. In the harbour of St. John we have a considerable salmon fishery, and the Act is strictly enforced. If it is possible to enforce it in one place it is possible to enforce it in another. As I am informed, the fishermen interested in the parts to which I refer are really anxious that the law should be enforced. But, because there are one or two who break the law the others do so as well.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would draw the attention of the House to the fact that it is Saturday night and nearly twelve o'clock.

Mr. DANIEL. It is not yet twelve o'clock, and I would like the minister say that if he will take any steps in regard to this outrage to which I now draw his attention, and also whether it is the policy of the department to lay down regulations——

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). I would call the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Daniel's) attention to the fact that it is twelve o'clock.

Mr. DANIEL—and whether it is the intention of the department to carry out the law. Because I am sure that notwithstanding the fact that the minister remitted the fines and penalties and, in so doing, stated that he thought the people were really trying to comply bona fide with the law, the evidence shows that these people were using trap-nets which is entirely opposed to the Fisheries Act.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). Twelve o'clock.

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Daniel) will allow me—I have an answer to the statement he is presenting and, as it is twelve o'clock on Sunday morning I would suggest that he should

wait until Monday, when he can continue his remarks and when I can answer him.

Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to withdraw his motion for leave also to sit again on Monday.

Mr. SPROULE. Let us understand the position.

Mr. FIELDING. There is practically no motion. We will renew the motion on Monday and the question can then be taken up again. The motion is withdrawn and any hon. gentleman, when the motion for supply is renewed, can bring up any matter in the usual way.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. In what order will the business be taken up on Monday ?

Mr. FIELDING. We will proceed with the resolutions respecting railway subsidies, the tariff resolutions and supply. As to the particular order I am not quite sure but the railway resolutions will probably be taken up first.

(Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.59 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, August 8, 1904.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

MAILS—O'LEARY TO WEST CAPE.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. When did the contract for carrying the mail from O'Leary to West Cape expire ?
2. Were public tenders called for ?
3. What are the names of the persons tendering ; and what was the amount of each tender ?
4. Was the lowest tender accepted ?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General.) This service had been performed for several years by John Jelly who had shown himself an excellent contractor. His contract expired June 30, 1904. In the public interest the department was desirous of retaining his services as contractor, and inquired whether he would be prepared to renew the contract for another term at the former contract price, namely, $163.04 per annum. This he was unwilling to do, and accordingly the service was put up for tender when the late contractor tendered, his price being $160, or $15 more than that of the lowest tenderer. It was deemed advisable, if possible, to retain Mr. Jelly's services, and he was again given an opportunity of retaining his contract, but upon condition of his performing it at the price of the lowest tenderer. This he ultimately decided to do, and accordingly the contract was awarded to him at the sum of $145 per annum.

POSTAL RATE.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

1. In what year was the postal rate on mail matter in Canada reduced from five cents to three cents per half ounce ?
2. In what year was the weight of letters passing through the mails in Canada for three cents increased from one-half ounce to one ounce ?
3. When was the three-cent postal rate in Canada reduced to two cents ?
4. When were post cards first used in Canada, by order of the Post Office Department ?
5. When was the newspaper postage removed in Canada, and when re-imposed, as now existing ?
6. When was parcel post increased in Canada?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General) :

1. If the first part of this question has reference to postal rates on letters the reduction from five cents to three cents per half ounce was authorized by 31 Victoria, the unit of weight from one-half ounce to one ounce, 52 Victoria.
2. The reduction in the letter rate from three cents to two cents was affected by 61 Victoria.
3. The use of post cards in Canada was authorized by departmental order No. 7, 1871.
4. Postage upon newspapers has never been wholly removed in Canada.
5. There was a partial abolition of such postage by 45 Victoria, and a slight reimposition of such rates by 61 Victoria and III. Edward.
6. This last question is not understood.

RAILWAY BELT LANDS.

Mr. EARLE asked :

1. Adverting to the amendment to the Regulations respecting Dominion Lands within the Railway Belt, in the province of British Columbia (Order in Council of July 13th, 1904), to how many individuals will the retroactive provision of the amendment to the regulations apply ?
2. What are the names and addresses of the individuals who have already taken out homestead entries for 80 acres or less, within the said Railway Belt ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister)

1. Fifty.

2. List of homesteaders holding land whose area not exceeded 80 acres in British Columbia and their address.

Homestead No.	Name.	Address.
2172	Malcolm McIntyre	Notch Hill, B.C.
2180	Wm. Hounow	Tapping Siding, B.C.
2208	Thos. J. Allen	Glenora, B.C.
2210	Ed. A. Dalziel	New Westminster, B.C.
2215	T. W. Outertridge	Vernon, B.C.
2250	R. W. Bruhn	Malakwa, B.C.
2258	Kusta Ulvila	Salmon Arm, B.C.
2260	Robt. Brown	Notch Hill, B.C.
2267	John Burgland	" "
2271	F. S. Chubb	Revelstoke Station, B.C.
2277	Fred. Klein	Tp. 2 W. Coast Mer.
2288	Joseph Lango	Revelstoke Station, B.C.
2289	Chas. Stotz	Craigalliche, B.C.
2303	E. Person	Notch Hill, B.C.
2306	Fred. Dean	Mara, B.C.
2307	Dun. McInnis	Port Moody, B.C.
2316	F. Parry	Kault, B.C.
2323	A. J. Colquhon	Savonna, B.C.
2327	R. W. Hodgson	Sumass, B.C.
2330	P. J. Morrow	Revelstoke Station, B.C.
2350	Samuel Mercer	Tp. 40 E. Coast Mer.
2355	P. Lamanna	No address.
2356	D. Ford	Tp. 18 E. Coast.
2378	G. B. Ward	Mission City, B.C.
2396	A. Johnson	Craigellachie, B.C.
2400	R. N. Fenton	Deadwood, B.C.
2414	W. Hyndman	Enderby, B.C.
2429	H. E. Beedle	Salmon Arm, B.C.
2448	G. Genier	Kamloops, B.C.
2465	J. McLean	Tp. 40 E. Coast Mer.
2481	F. H. Baines	Enderby, B.C.
2536	Peter Stacy	Revelstoke Station, B.C.
2542	Jas. Guest	Tapping Siding, B.C.
2554	Jno. R. Bryden	Langly Prairie, B.C.
2591	Don. Gordon	Kamloops, B.C.
2595	Wm. Cummings	Monte Creek, B.C.
2628	F. Veltie	Revelstoke Station, B.C.
2638	Ah. Pak	Sea Bird Island.
2656	Jno. Brown	Mud Bay, B.C.
2672	H. A. Rodgers	Kault, B.C.
2683	W. C. L. Green	Kamloops, B.C.
2688	C. A. Langslow	Kault, B.C.
2765	W. Reid	Salmon Arm, B.C.
2791	A. A. Mercer	Hazelmere, B.C.
2797	T. J. W. Graham	Monte Creek, B.C.
2809	Jos. E. Jones	" "
2818	Geo. W. Harwood	Kault, B.C.
2820	F. J. Gorle	Winnipeg, Man.
2843	A. Topham	Vancouver City, B.C.
2845	D. Wix	Hazelmere, B.C.

MUTUAL RESERVE FUND LIFE INSURANCE.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. Is the government aware that in the case of Foster vs. Mutual Reserve Fund Life Association of New York, an appeal to the House of Lords from the Court of Appeal in England, which has decided that the company must make restitution—must pay back to the insured principal and interest at 4 per cent, and at the same time pay all charges ? That the House of Lords has given judgment against the Mutual Reserve Fund Life Association of New York ?

2. If so, what steps will be taken by the Insurance Department to protect policy-holders who may take action to recover by recision all the premiums paid by them, with interest ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). We have no information on the subject ; no communication has reached us.

SALES OF PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. LEONARD asked :

1. Has the government, or the Department of the Interior, sold any public lands during the two last years ending the 30th June, 1904 ?
2. If so, what lands have been sold ?
3. What amount of land, and for what price has it been sold in each of the afore-mentioned years ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The first part of the inquiry, of course, can be answered, that we have sold, as we do every year, more or less lands. The total area sold in 1903 was 137,270 acres. Outside of this the department is quite unable to give the information, as all the land records must be gone over in order to answer such a question and this will take a number of days to do.

COTTON MILLS AT VALLEYFIELD.

Mr. LEONARD asked :

1. Has the government, or any of its members, received communication of the following documents :—

Valleyfield, 21st March, 1904.

To His Honour the Mayor and the Councillors of the town of De Salaberry de Valleyfield.

The petition of the undersigned ratepayers of the said town respectfully represents :

That for some months back the cotton company has not given the working people of this town the work that they have a right to expect;

That the company has decreased considerably the number of its working people ;

That those who are still employed lose one or more days every fortnight, which is a source of considerable uneasiness in the town ;

That as the town, since the establishment of the manufactory in Valleyfield, has given the said company, either in the form of bonuses or in that of exemptions from and commutations of taxes, a sum amounting to two or three hundred thousand dollars, and probably over that amount, it is important that the council sees that the said company fulfils its obligations ;

That this state of things causes an uneasiness in the town, and that the causes of or reasons for such a state of affairs are unknown ;

The petitioners beg of the council to kindly take their present petition into serious consideration and to see that the measures to be taken under the circumstances be adopted without delay.

(Signed)

L. J. H. Langevin,	Eusèbe Dion,
Ferdinand Laniel,	D. Dion,
Dr. M. Lefebvre,	O. P. Prieur,
J. M. Guindon,	N. A. Ostingy,
S. Fortier	Emile Soly,
J. H. Lebœuf	Arthur Bélanger,
Joseph Morand,	J. F. Sévigny,

Wilfrid Beaudry,	D. A. Daignault,
Charles Morrier,	Jos. Arthur Gauthier,
Jos. Cardinal	J. C. Choquette,
Leandre Gendron,	Edouard Denis,
T. Patenaude,	J. F. Béique,
Alfred Gobeil,	S. W. Vebert,
N. S. Martin,	Albert Deguire,
A. H. Besner,	W. Bourdon,
J. Gilbert Chasles,	Louis Barrette.

Valleyfield, March 31, 1904.

To His Worship the Mayor and Council of the town of S. de Valleyfield.

Gentlemen,—I am in receipt of your esteemed favour of the 21st instant, inclosing a resolution passed by your council at the request of a number of citizens of your town, asking to know the reason why this company have considerably reduced the number of their employees, and also why they are running short time, and in reply would say that I have placed this matter in the hands of our manager, Mr. Fred. Lacey, who will inform yourself and council fully *re* this matter in a day or two.

Yours truly,

For the Montreal Cotton Company,

S. H. EWING,
President.

Valleyfield, April 6, 1904.

To His Worship the Mayor and Councillors of the town of Salaberry de Valleyfield.

Dear Sir and Gentlemen,—Mr. Ewing, the president of this company, has placed in my hands the petition which you forwarded to him. I regret very much that any action of this sort was taken by our townspeople, as no one interested in the welfare of the town can take the present condition more seriously than the management of this company.

Since the preferential tariff came into force, we have been much affected by it, and as the preference gradually increased, the effect became greater. This, in addition to the crisis which now exists in the manufacture of cotton goods all over the world, has proved a serious blow to all of our Canadian cotton industries. I do not doubt that all the signers of the petition, as well as yourself and your honourable council, are well aware of the conditions existing in the cotton trade to-day.

With regard to the cotton itself, we have little to worry about in this respect in Valleyfield, as we are well supplied with this commodity. Our goods, on the basis of the value of the raw material, are being offered at low prices, and all we can hope for is a change in the conditions mentioned, so that we may be able to run our mills full time. I fully believe that if we enjoyed a tariff equal to the present tariff without the preference, our mills at Valleyfield would be fully employed ; but under the present tariff with the preference, we are obliged to suffer with others.

The imports of cotton goods for last year, as shown by the blue-book, will be ample evidence of the effect of the preferential tariff on our Canadian cotton industries.

English mills are running forty hours or less per week, and many of the finest American mills are running short time, in addition to having made a reduction of wages, which the work people were obliged to accept.

Mr. LEONARD.

With this explanation of the matter contained in the petition, which I now have before me,

I have the honour to be,

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) FRED. LACEY.

At a regular meeting of the council of the town of De Salaberry de Valleyfield, held in the Town Hall, Wednesday, the thirteenth day of April, one thousand nine hundred and four, at seven o'clock in the evening, following the adjournment of the last meeting according to the provisions of the charter of that town,

At which meeting were present

His Honour the Mayor, George Henri Thibault, and the following Concillors :—Joseph E. St. Onge, J. A. Napoléon Bourassa, Octave Cosette, Théophile Lasniel, François-Xavier Lecompte, Donat Lebœuf and James A. Robb, forming a quorum of the said council, under the presidency of His Honour the Mayor.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read, found to be correct and approved.

The citizens' petition, concerning the cotton company, that had been left again on the table at the last meeting, was once more considered.

A letter from Mr. Fred. Lacey, the cotton company's agent, was immediately read to the council. Mr. Lacey, who had received instructions from Mr. Ewing, the president of the company, to write that letter in answer to the above petition and to the resolution of the council in connection therewith, therein explained that the Canadian cotton industry and manufacturers had been considerably affected by the preferential tariff, and that it was for that reason that the cotton factory was obliged to discharge some employees and to considerably reduce the number in certain departments, and that, if the present tariff were to be maintained, without any preference, the company's factories might be entirely put in operation.

Moved by Mr. O. Cossette,

Seconded by Mr. T. Lasniel :

That copies of the citizens' petition, concerning the cotton company, as well as of the letters from Messrs. S. H. Ewing and Fred. Lacey, president and agent of the said company, in answer to the petition, be sent to Mr. Geo. M. Loy, member of the Federal Parliament for the the county.

Adopted unanimously.

True copy (extract from) of the minutes of the Council of the Town of De Salaberry de Valleyfield.

C. A. LAVIMODIERE,
Sec.-Treas.

2. If so, has the government come to any decision regarding this question ?

3. What decision has it come to on the subject ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The information referred to was communicated to the government. The cause of the difficulties which has occurred in the cotton trade throughout the world, is probably a matter of debate and we are not prepared to discuss it in answer to the hon. gentleman's question.

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS—REBATES OF DUTIES.

Mr. BOYD asked:

1. What is the amount of the rebates of duties paid to the manufacturers of agricultural implements, since 1896?
2. What manufacturers have received such rebates, and what is the amount so paid to each manufacturer?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The rebates paid to manufacturers of agricultural implements prior to July 1, 1903, will be found in the Auditor General's Reports.

The drawback of customs duty paid to manufacturers of agricultural implements during the year ended June 30, 1904, amounted to $113,474.62, received by the undermentioned manufacturers, viz.:

Name.	Amount.
J. W. Mann Mfg. Co.	$ 704 13
The Verity Plough Co.	10,748 27
The Massey Harris Co.	89,380 70
David Maxwell & Sons.	2,454 63
The Noxon & Co., Limited.	4,128 63
The Cockshutt Plough Co.	5,696 62
Talton Bros.	59 34
B. Bell & Son.	302 30
	$113,474 62

CUSTOMS DUTY ON TOBACCO.

Mr. HENDERSON asked:

1. What was the total amount of customs duty collected on tobacco for the year ending 30th June, 1904?
2. How much of this was due to legislation of 1897?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The total amount of customs duty paid on tobacco entered for consumption during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1904, was $604,555.82. The increased duty collected thereon under the tariff of 1897 as compared with that which would have been collected had the tariff as in 1896 been in operation, amounted to $138,294.55.

TOBACCO—INLAND REVENUE DUTY.

Mr. HENDERSON asked:

1. What was the total amount of duty collected on tobacco for the year ending June 30th, 1904, by the Inland Revenue Department?
2. How much of this was due to the additional duty imposed in the session of 1897?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. $5,178,736.40.
2. $1,587,224.04.

BOUNTY ON IRON AND STEEL.

Mr. HENDERSON asked:

1. What was the amount of bounty paid on iron and steel for the year ending 30th June, 1904?
2. What amount was paid as duty on lead in the same year?
3. What amount was paid as duty on steel rods and other steel under Chapter 68 of 1904?

Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT (Minister of Trade and Commerce):

1. On iron and steel, $880,549.83.
2. The amount so far paid on account of the year ending June 30, 1904, is $104,341.40. Claims, however, as yet not fully adjusted.
3. Nil. Nothing as yet has been paid.

FISHING REGULATIONS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have been requested by the member for St. John, N.B. (Mr. Daniel), to ask that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should give an answer to the statement made by my hon. friend on Saturday night with reference to the Baie de Chaleur fisheries.

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I have no hesitation in giving an answer to the member for St. John (Mr. Daniel). The matter is a very simple one, and without going through the whole question I may say that proceedings were taken last year against certain fishermen in Gloucester county, who chiefly resided in Bathurst. The proceedings were taken under the following circumstances: Licenses had been granted by the Dominion government to a number of these fishermen at a distance of from four to four and a half miles from the estuary of the river which is being exploited and is rented to a club called the Anglers' Association. On the representation of that body that licenses had been granted in previous years near to the estuary of the river, the Department of Marine and Fisheries refused to issue these licenses, and, as I have stated, issued licenses at a distance of about four and a half miles. It appears that this coast of New Brunswick is subject to very frequent storms, and that the fishermen pursue their avocation there under very great difficulty. They were instructed by the fishery overseer to lift up their nets as high as possible under the circumstances, and they followed his instructions. It appears from the documents that it is not according to the letter of the law to lift up these nets in the way they were lifted, and a gentleman of the name of Gilbert, representing the Anglers' Association, instituted proceedings in his own name against ten of these fishermen. One of the cases was brought before a magistrate of the name of O'Brien, and tried. After the evidence had been put in and the case argued, the defendant was found guilty and condemned to pay a fine of $30 and costs, which, according to the information, amounted to about $30 more. It was shown during the trial that the fishermen had followed exactly the instruc-

tions of the fishery overseer. That was proven by the overseer himself, who went before the court and swore to the facts. The convicted party, named Ronalds appealed to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries against the decision. After consultng the Department of Justice, and after looking into the case myself, I came to the conclusion that it would be unjust to maintain such a decision, because the department or its officers were responsible for any illegal act, if there was any, which I deny, for which this party was condemned. I considered it a case of persecution pure and simple, and decided under the circumstances the fine should be remitted. This did not satisfy Mr. Gilbert, who appealed to the Supreme Court of New Brunswick. That court maintained the decision of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. To show the spirit in which these actions have been taken against these poor fishermen, I may say that the other cases, which were suspended last year, have been taken up again this year by Mr. Gilbert, and I have in my hand a protest against these proceedings, on the part of the fishermen who were in the same position as Mr. Ronalds. The following is a telegram addressed to Mr. Turgeon, M.P.:

> Geo. Gilbert has brought on postponed cases of last summer similar to one decided in our favour by Supreme Court and to-day hearing was adjourned to Monday next. Lay matter before Department of Fisheries and explain if possible that department protect us before magistrates court, as we are being prosecuted for carrying out the instructions of department officials and regulations governing salmon licenses. Please wire result of negotiations to P. J. Benoit. Decision of Supreme Court seems to have no effect on sitting magistrate.
>
> James Armstrong, Ephraim Scott, Abel Ellis, Jane White, Louisa Jennings, Robert Miller, Herbert Buttimer, Jos. Scott, Richard Miller, Fred. Ronalds, John Eddy.

As I have no jurisdiction over the magistrate, I have not interfered with this action. It will be time for the department to intervene if the case proceeds in the same way as the Ronalds case. With regard to the point that the department was being criticised for having issued these licenses, the report says :

> It is worthy of note that on the urgent representations of the anglers, a salmon net fishing license which had been issued to James Gammon, in Bathurst Harbour during 1902, was this year refused, thus in this case meeting the most extreme demands.
>
> A crusade has this year been instituted against the net fishermen by the anglers, on the plea that their nets are not sufficiently raised during the weekly close time to afford a strict compliance with the law, and the case of the present appellant is only one of many in contemplation, if not already begun.

I read these extracts from the report made to me by one of the officers of the department, Mr. Venning, in order to show that everything had been done to protect the anglers of that river, and that there is no reason whatever to complain of the non-execution of the law. The fact that the judgment of the department was maintained by the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, and the other facts which I lay before the House, show that there was no ground whatever for complaint against the department, for intervening to protect these poor men who are earning their living in the fisheries. The department gave instructions, those instructions were not contrary to law, and I felt that it was the duty of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to protect those men against a persecution of this character.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER. The hon. minister has scarcely given us a correct statement of the facts of this case. In the first place, he says that his decision was maintained by the Supreme Court of New Brunswick. I am instructed that that is not the case. Only three judges out of the total bench of six expressed themselves on the decision of the hon. minister, and those three were adverse to it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Will my hon. friend allow me ? I did not know that a discussion would arise on this matter. On Saturday evening it came up on the motion to go into Committee of Supply ; and, unless the hon. gentleman moves the adjournment, the discussion at this time is irregular.

Mr. FOWLER. I will conclude with that motion. I am instructed that the three judges who gave judgment on the point decided that the minister was wrong in what he had done, and that the other three judges did not give any opinion upon that particular point, but decided against the mandamus on the ground that it was not necessary because the prosecutor could idemnify the magistrate and have the executions issued. So that when the hon. minister says that his judgment was maintained by the Supreme Court of New Brunswick he makes a statement which is not in accordance with the facts. One of my reasons why this is not a simple matter is the fact that it constitutes an interference with provincial rights, and I am rather surprised that a member coming from the province of Quebec, which has always stood for provincial rights, should have committed this unwarranted interference with the rights of a province as the Minister of Marine has done in this case. These nets and other devices used for the purpose of catching salmon along the shores of bays prevent the entrance of fish into the river. Now the riparian rights to these rivers are owned by the people who live along their banks and by the provincial government, and the Dominion has nothing to do

with them. The riparian rights on these rivers derive their value from the salmon, and if the salmon are prevented going up them, then these rights would be worth nothing, and the large yearly sums which the provincial treasury derives from the leasing of these rights will be lost to the province. The law is very explicit. Subsection 7 of section 14 of the Fishery Act provides :

No one shall use a bag-net, trap-net or fish-pound, except under a special license, granted for capturing deep sea fish other than salmon.

This man had no license, and the evidence clearly shows that he was using a trap-net in violation of the law. I submit that the minister had no right to give the decision he did, and to add to the injustice, he not only remitted the fine but the costs as well. My contention is that the Act, which gives him a certain discretion as regards the penalty, does not give him any right to remit the costs. Just look at the injustice and hardship of the thing. Here is an Anglers' Association which paid a large sum of money for a certain privilege. Surely they ought to get the benefit of that privilege, whatever it may be worth. Finding that some one was illegally preventing the association enjoying the fruits of that privilege, they appealed to the courts, and the magistrate decided against the offender and imposed a penalty besides the costs. But the minister, who knows nothing of the circumstances, acting upon the advice of a political supporter who represents the county, remits not only the penalty but also the costs. It may be all right for the minister to remit the penalty because that does not go into the pocket of the prosecutor, but he has no right to remit the costs which are supposed to recoup the prosecutor for the expenses of the suit. That certainly was a clear violation of law and reason. In addition to this prohibition against the use of trap-nets, the Act also provides that any net used for the purpose of catching salmon along the coast must be taken up at six o'clock Saturday night and remain up until six o'clock Sunday night, or twenty-four hours at least. One day out of seven shall be allowed the fish to go into their spawning ground. Surely the fisherman, when he has six days out of seven to cast his nets, ought to be satisfied and leave the seventh for the fish to go to their spawning ground. But these avaricious gentlemen, these persons desiring to break the Sabbath, will give the poor fish no chance at all to reproduce themselves. Apart from that, the hon. minister has done very serious injustice to the members of the Anglers' Association and the prosecutor who represented them, and has set a very bad precedent. He has shown that all these violators of the law need is a little pull with their local member, and they may disregard utterly the provisions of the Act and the regulations passed for the purpose of protecting the fishery interests. Sir, that interest is a very important one in the province of New Brunswick. The fact that these fish go up these rivers is a means of bringing a very large amount of money to the treasury of the province. It attracts a very large amount of tourists and causes a large expenditure among the people and the giving employment to a considerable number. It is therefore of the greatest importance that nothing should be done to interfere with the fish going up these rivers. I trust that after this matter has been ventilated, the hon. minister will see that whatever he may do with respect to the penalty, he has no right to interfere with the costs and that he will undo the wrong as soon as possible.

Motion to adjourn, negatived.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the House go into committee on the following proposed resolutions :—

1. In these resolutions, unless the context otherwise requires, the expression 'cost' means the actual, necessary and reasonable cost, and shall include the amount expended upon any bridge, up to and not exceeding $25,000, forming part of the line of railway subsidized not otherwise receiving any bonus, but shall not include the cost of terminals and right of way of the railway in any city or incorporated town ; and such actual, necessary and reasonable cost shall be determined by the Governor in Council, upon the recommendation of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and upon the report of the chief engineer of government railways, certifying that he has made or caused to be made an inspection of the line of railway for which payment of subsidy is asked, and careful inquiry into the cost thereof, and that in his opinion the amount upon which the subsidy is claimed is reasonable, and does not exceed the true, actual and proper cost of the construction of such railway ?

2. The Governor in Council may grant a subsidy of $3,200 per mile towards the construction of each of the undermentioned lines of railway (not exceeding in any case the number of miles hereinafter respectively stated), which shall not cost more on the average than $15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, and towards the construction of each of the said lines of railway not exceeding the mileage hereinafter stated, which shall cost more on the average than $15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, a further subsidy beyond the sum of $3,200 per mile of 50 per cent on so much of the average cost of the mileage subsidized as is in excess of $15,000 per mile, such subsidy not exceeding in the whole the sum of $6,400 per mile:

1. To the Bracebridge and Trading Lake Railway Company, for a railway from Bracebridge, in Muskoka, to a point at or near Baysville, Ontario, in lieu of the subsidy granted by item 7 of section 2 of chapter 8 of 1900, not exceeding 15 miles.

2. To the Bruce Mines and Algoma Railway Company, for the following lines of railway :

(a.) For that portion of its line of railway from Bruce Mines Junction southerly to the

town of Bruce Mines, on Lake Huron, a distance not exceeding three miles ;

(b.) For the 6 miles of railway constructed from Gordon Lake station, being the end of its line as subsidized by chapter 7 of 1901, northward Rock Lake, a distance of 6 miles.

(c.) For 12 miles from Rock Lake northward, a distance not exceeding 12 miles.

The subsidies to the said lines being granted in lieu of the subsidy granted by item 38 of section 2 of chapter 57 of 1903, not exceeding 21 miles.

3. To the Nipigon Railway Company, for the following lines of railway .

(a.) From a point at or near Nipigon station on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Nipigon lake, not exceeding 30 miles.

(b.) From a point on Nipigon bay to Lake Superior to a point on the west of Lake Helen on the line of the said Nipigon Railway, not exceeding 3½ miles ;

(c.) From a point on the line of the Nipigon Railway at or near the crossing of the Fraser river, to a point on Lake Jesse by way of Cameron's Falls, not exceeding 1½ miles ;

(d.) From a point on the north shore of Lake Nipigon northerly, not exceeding 45 miles.

The subsidies to the said lines being granted in lieu of the subsidy granted by item 33 of section 2 of chapter 57 of 1903, not exceeding 80 miles.

4. For the construction of a branch line of railway beginning at the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's main line at St. Philippe d'Argenteuil station, or at a point between there and Grenville, thence in a northerly direction, in lieu of the subsidy granted by item 49 of section 2 of chapter 57 of 1903, not exceeding 3 miles.

5. To the Chateauguay and Northern Railway Company, for a railway from a point in Hochelaga ward, Montreal, to a point on the Great Northern Railway in or near the town of Joliette, passing through the town of L'Assomption, Quebec, together with a spur line into the said town, in lieu of the subsidy granted by item 32 of section 2 of chapter 8, of 1900, not exceeding 42 miles.

6. To the Great Northern Railway Company of Canada, to enable it to extend its railway from Arundel to a point in the municipality of the united townships of Preston and Hartwell, province of Quebec, in lieu of the subsidy granted to the Montford and Gatineau Colonization Railway by item 6 of section 2 of chapter 57 of 1903, not exceeding 30 miles.

7. The Chateauguay and Northern Railway Company, for a branch line from a point on its main line to or near Charlemagne, thence northerly and westerly to a point on the Montford and Gatineau Railway at or near Morin Flats, in lieu of the subsidy granted to the Montford and Gatineau Colonization Railway by item 41 of section 2 of chapter 57 of 1903, not exceeding 22 miles.

8. To the Ottawa River Railway Company, for a line of railway from a point at or near St Agathe des Monts station towards the township of Howard in the county of Argenteuil, passing near lakes St. Joseph and Ste. Marie, in a southerly direction, in lieu of the subsidy granted to the Montreal Northern Railway Company by item 58 of section 2 of chapter 57 of 1903, not exceeding 15 miles.

9. To the Ottawa River Railway Company, for a line of railway between a point in the parish of St. Andrews, in the county of Argenteuil, and a point in the parish of St. Lawrence, in the county of Jacques Cartier, passing through the parishes of St. Placide, St. Eustache and St. Martin, in lieu of the subsidy granted by item 10 of section 2 of chapter 57 of 1903, not exceeding 38 miles.

10. From a line of railway from Lardo towards Upper Arrow Lake, British Columbia, in lieu of the subsidy granted by item 28 of section 2 of chapter 7 of 1901, not exceeding 30 miles.

11. To Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company, either for a line of railway from a point at or near Spence's Bridge on the Canadian Pacific Railway to Nicola Lake, or for a line of railway from a point at or near the village of Coutlee, southerly towards Princeton and Headley, in lieu of the subsidy granted by item 26 of section 2 of chapter 57 of 1903, not exceeding 45 miles.

12. To the Western Alberta Railway Company, from a point on the United States boundary, west of range 27, north-westerly towards Anthracite, in the district of Alberta, in lieu of the subsidy granted by item 40 of section 2 of chapter 7 of 1899, not exceeding 50 miles.

3. The Governor in Council may grant the subsidy hereinafter mentioned towards the construction of the bridge also hereinafter mentioned, that is to say :—

1. To the Chateauguay and Northern Railway Company, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by item 33 of section 2 of chapter 8 of 1900, for a single track standard railway bridge, with two roadways 10 feet wide, for vehicular traffic, the same as upon a public highway, from Bout de L'Ile to Charlemagne at the junction of the Ottawa and St. Lawrence rivers, a sum not exceeding $51,000.

4. The subsidies hereby authorized towards the construction of any railway or bridge shall be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, and may, unless otherwise expressly provided in this Act, at the option of the Governor in Council, on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, be paid as follows :—

(a.) Upon completion of the work subsidized ; or

(b.) By instalments, on the completion of each ten-mile section of the railway, in the proportion which the cost of such completed section bears to that of the whole work undertaken ; or

(c.) Upon the progress estimates on the certificate of the chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals, that in his opinion, having regard for the whole work undertaken and the aid granted, the progress made justifies the payment of a sum not less than $30,000 : or

(d.) With respect to (b) and (c) part one way, part the other.

5. The subsidies hereinbefore authorized to be granted to companies named shall, if granted by the Governor in Council, be granted to such companies respectively ; the other subsidies may be granted to such companies as establish to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council their ability to construct and complete the said railways and bridge respectively ; all the lines for the bridge for the construction of which subsidies are granted, unless they are already commenced, shall be commenced within two years from the first day of August, 1904, and completed within a reasonable time, not to exceed four years from the said first day of

August, to be fixed by the Governor in Council and shall also be constructed according to descriptions, conditions and specifications approved by the Governor in Council on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and specified in each case in a contract between the company and the said minister, which contract the minister, with the approval of the Governor in Council, is hereby empowered to make. The location also of such subsidized lines and bridge shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.

6. The granting of such subsidies, and the receipt thereof by the respective companies, shall be subject to the condition that the Governor in Council may at all times provide and secure to the other companies such running powers, traffic arrangements and other rights, as will afford to all railways connecting with the railways and bridge so subsidized, reasonable and proper facilities in exercising such running powers, fair and reasonable traffic arrangements with the connecting companies, and equal mileage rates between all such connecting railways ; and the Governor in Council shall have absolute control, at all times, over the rates and tolls to be levied and taken by any of the companies, or upon any of the railways and the bridge hereby subsidized.

7. Every company receiving a subsidy hereunder, its successors and assigns, and any person or company controlling or operating the railway or portion of railway subsidized hereunder, shall each year furnish to the government of Canada transportation for men, supplies, materials and mails over the portion of the line in respect of which it has received each subsidy, and whenever required, shall furnish mail cars properly equipped for such mail service ; and such transportation and service shall be performed at such rates as are agreed upon between the minister of the department of the government for which such service is being performed, and the company performing it, and, in case of disagreement, then at such rates as are approved by the Governor in Council ; and in or towards payment for such charges the government of Canada shall be credited by the company with a sum equal to three per cent per annum on the amount of the subsidy received by the company hereunder.

8. As respects all railways and the bridge for which subsidies are hereby granted, the company at any time owning or operating any of the railways, shall, when required, produce and exhibit to the Minister of Railways and Canals, or any person appointed by him, all books, accounts and vouchers, showing the cost of constructing the railway or bridge, the cost of operating it, and the earnings thereof.

9. The Governor in Council may make it a condition of the grant of the subsidies herein provided, or any heretofore authorized by any Act of parliament, as to which a contract has not yet been entered into with the company for the construction of the railway, that the company shall lay its road with new steel rails, made in Canada, if they are procurable in Canada of suitable quality, upon terms as favourable as other rails can be obtained, of which the Minister of Railways and Canals shall be the judge.

10. Whenever a contract has been duly entered into with a company for the construction of any line of railway hereby subsidized, the Minister of Railways and Canals, at the request of the company, and upon the report of the chief engineer of government railways, and his certificate that he has made careful examination of the surveys, plans and profiles of the whole line so contracted for, and has duly considered the physical characteristics of the country to be traversed and the means of transport available for construction, naming the probable and reasonable cost of such construction, may, with the authorization of the Governor in Council, enter into a supplementary agreement, fixing definitely the maximum amount of the subsidy to be paid, based upon the said certificate of the chief engineer, and providing that the company shall be entitled to be paid, as the minimum, the ordinary subsidy of $3,200 per mile, together with the 60 per cent of the difference between the amount so fixed and the said $3,200 per mile, if any ; and the balance, 40 per cent, shall be paid only on completion of the whole work subsidized, and in so far as the actual cost, as finally determined by the chief engineer, entitles the company thereto ; provided always :

(a.) That the estimated cost, so certified, is not less on the average than $18,000 per mile for the whole mileage subsidized ;

(b.) That no payment shall be made except upon a certificate of the chief engineer that the work is up to the standard specified in the company's contract ;

(c.) That in no case shall the subsidy exceed $6,400 per mile.

He said : These subsidies are only revotes. There are none additional since last session of parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. That is a very brief explanation. Am I correct in understanding that there are no subsidies for new railways ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. None. All are revotes.

Mr. SPROULE. There seem to be cases where the subsidy is changed from one company to another.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. A change in words ; that is all. They are merely renewals of votes about to expire.

Mr. SPROULE. It would be important to know in what cases the change of the subsidy is made from one company to another, and why. But I suppose that can be taken up on the several items.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee on the resolutions.

1. In these resolutions, unless the context otherwise requires, the expression 'cost' means the actual, necessary and reasonable cost, and shall include the amount expended upon any bridge, up to and not exceeding $25,000, forming part of the line of railway subsidized not otherwise receiving any bonus, but shall not include the cost of terminals and right of way of the railway in any city or incorporated town ; and such actual, necessary and reasonable cost shall be determined by the Governor in Council, upon the recommendation of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and upon the report of the chief engineer of government railways, certifying that he has made or caused to be made an inspection of the line of railway for which payment of subsidy is asked, and

careful inquiry into the cost thereof, and that in his opinion the amount upon which the subsidy is claimed is reasonable, and does not exceed the true, actual and proper cost of the construction of such railway ?

Mr. HAGGART. I take it that there is no change in this resolution from the former one.

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. MACLEAN. Perhaps the government will tell us now whether it is their intention, in connection with these subsidies, to make it a condition that the employment of alien labour shall be prevented.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. We did that on Saturday.

Mr. MACLEAN. I think that the Bill we discussed on Saturday, to which the hon. member (Mr. Alex. Johnston) refers, will not secure the end we have in view. We set out to have a national transcontinental railway, and we understood that it was to be built by Canadian engineers and Canadian workmen. But that has not been quite secured. We are trying to secure that end by an Alien Labour law. But I say it should have been attained by making it a condition of the payment of immense sums of money to that railway, and the same thing should apply to these subsidies. If we intend to keep out alien labour, that is only one way to do it. I would like to know if it is the intention of the government to take that step ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have provided for that by a Bill that was passed. I think it is quite enough to cover the case.

Mr. MACLEAN. I suppose the Prime Minister speaks by the book, and that the measure he refers to will go through the Senate. But if it does not, these subsidies will be voted without making any provisions against the employment of alien labour.

1. To the Bracebridge and Trading Lake Railway Company, for a railway from Bracebridge, in Muskoka, to a point at or near Baysville, Ontario, in lieu of the subsidy granted by item 7 of section 2 of chapter 8 of 1900, not exceeding 15 miles.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is simply providing that the subsidy shall go to a certain company. Originally it was a general vote.

2. To the Bruce Mines and Algoma Railway Company, for the following lines of railway :—

(a.) For that portion of its line of railway from Bruce Mines Junction southerly to the town of Bruce Mines, on Lake Huron, a distance not exceeding three miles ;

(b.) For the 6 miles of railway constructed from Gordon Lake station, being the end of its line as subsidized by chapter 7 of 1901, northward to Rock lake, a distance of 6 miles ;

(c.) For 12 miles from Rock lake northward, a distance not exceeding 12 miles.

The subsidies to the said lines being granted in lieu of the subsidy granted by item 38 of section 2 of chapter 57 of 1903, not exceeding 21 miles.

Mr. BARKER. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to what may be a material change in this grant and in the next one, which is to the Nipigon Railway Company. I may refer to both in the few remarks I have to make. In both these cases bonuses were originally given for a considerable length of railway, to the Bruce Mines Company for twenty-one miles and the Nipigon Company for eighty miles. I notice that these are being cut up on this occasion, and we find subsidies for small sections, three miles in one case and in another case only a mile and a half. Now, it is obvious that the public may be interested in building a line of railway twenty-one miles in length or a railway eighty miles in length, and yet have no interest whatever in a railway a mile and a half long. A road of that length may be a mere siding to somebody's mill, or something of that kind, and so the subsidy may be a mere grant to an individual. If the change is to be made, it requires some explanation. I am not opposing the grant, but I am calling attention to what seems to me may be a very material change in the subsidy.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is merely divided up.

Mr. BRODER. Why do you do that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. To advance the interest of the road.

Mr. BARKER. But why ? Is there any particular reason why, for instance, this grant should be made, as under subsection (a), for a road of three miles in length only ? It may be, as I said, simply a grant for a siding to a mill.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is nothing of that kind.

Mr. BARKER. There must be some reason for making the change, and perhaps the minister will tell us what it is.

Mr. HENDERSON. There seems to be something very peculiar about this subsidy. This is a road of only three miles long ; when we granted the subsidy before, it was for a line of considerable length. I fail to see for what good purpose the government can give aid to such a line as this. Surely it cannot be for any great commercial purpose. It cannot be for the purpose of opening up the country. It is more likely to my mind to be for the purpose of aiding some private individuals. It bears very much that construction upon the face of it. A line three miles long into a new country would seem to be of no value whatever as a colonization road, and it is only for the purpose of colonization that we on this side of the House, at any rate, consent at all to granting these subsidies. Now it is due to the committee that some better ex-

planation be given before this item is allowed to pass. We ought to know who is going to benefit by it. Certainly the general public is not going to benefit; a road three miles long into a new country is not going to be of material benefit to the country at large, it is not going to operate as a colonization road; and it is going to benefit some private individual let the minister say who it is, and let us judge whether the enterprise to be benefited by this subsidy is of sufficient importance to warrant the government taking public money to promote private interests.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know that there is any private individual who is going to be benefited, it is for the benefit of the whole country. The road will be 100 miles long, and will open up woodlands of nearly 10,000,000 acres, which are at present inaccessible. These portions which are to be built now are merely stepping stones, and will form part of a road which will be eventually 100 miles long. So far as I know, there is no mine owner or mill owner who is to be benefited, only the general public.

Mr. SPROULE. How many miles were subsidized before.

Mr. EMMERSON. The same number. The line is intended to be 100 miles long, but there are only 21 miles subsidized.

Mr. SPROULE. Now we are subsidizing 3 miles, 6 miles and 12 miles. Is this one of the roads to which the Ontario government has loaned money for the benefit of the Soo industry?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. gentleman mean that the sections of the line mentioned here are precisely the same line as originally subsidized?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, there is some change in the wording.

Mr. BARKER. I think the hon. gentleman ought to have told us that. He said he was making no change. The people are entitled to know whether he is granting money to new lines.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think I stated that. It is the same lines, but with variations as to the wording.

Mr. BRODER. They are located differently.

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand that three sections of a road are being subsidized. I would like to know if these three sections form one continuous line, are connected with each other, or are they separate portions of a railway, or are they simply branches off what is intended to be a main line. I think we ought to know whether any good purpose is to be served by the payment of this money I confess it seems to be surrounded with a good deal of secrecy. To my mind, if they are separate sections, they will answer a very small purpose indeed. If they are to constitute a continuous line of 21 miles, then some justification might be given. So far as I am concerned, I am very much opposed to this system of subsidizing railways, unless for colonization purposes into a new country.

Mr. SPROULE. There is this difference. This item reads:

> For that portion of its line of railway from Bruce Mines Junction southerly.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is continuous.

Mr. SPROULE. But in the original item it reads:

> To the Bruce Mines and Algoma Railway for 21 miles from the end of its line as subsidized by chapter 7, 1901, northward, not exceeding 21 miles.

In one instance a subsidy is given for a railway northwards from Bruce Mines, and in the other it is given for a railway southerly from the junction. This seems to be either for a different railway, or else they start at different points on the same railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a small portion of the line already built.

Mr. SPROULE. Where is the junction of the Bruce Mines Railway from the Bruce Mines? Is it southerly or northerly?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is running northerly.

Mr. BARKER. I understand that with a piece already built, the portion subsidized will form a continuous railway.

Mr. HAGGART. Has there already been any payment of a bonus on this line?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, there has been.

Mr. HAGGART. This particular portion, for which a subsidy is now being voted, has been bonused before has it not?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. But it had not been paid for?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, it had not been paid for, it has been bonused but not paid.

Mr. HAGGART. If I remember rightly there has been a bonus for this particular portion before, and I think the amount has been paid?

Mr. EMMERSON. A subsidy was voted but not paid.

Mr. HAGGART. It is on the constructed line that you are giving a bonus.

Mr. EMMERSON. As I stated there is a portion nine miles long that was built and paid for. These portions while they have been subsidized have not been paid for.

Mr. HAGGART. I remember very plainly the debate in the House in which the member for that section of the country explained this. I think that in some way or another there has been a payment of the bonus.

Mr. EMMERSON. That was the nine miles for which I said the subsidy was paid $28,000.

Mr. HAGGART. So no portion of the line of road for which you are now asking a bonus has been bonused before ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They have been subsidized but not paid.

Mr. HENDERSON. I wish to draw the attention of the minister to the difference in the wording of the various clauses in this item. Sections A and B are as follows :

(a.) For that portion of its line of railway from Bruce Mines Junction southerly to the town of Bruce Mines, on Lake Huron, a distance not exceeding three miles ;

(b.) For the 6 miles of railway constructed from Gordon Lake station, being the end of its line as subsidized by chapter 7 of 1901, northward to Rock lake, a distance of six miles.

In section B authority is asked for the subsidizing of six miles of railway constructed, not to be constructed. I would like to know from the minister if this six miles of railway is already completed, and if that is the portion of the road lying in between the three miles and the twelve miles ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That has been constructed but not paid for. The subsidy has not been paid and this authorizes the payment of that subsidy.

Mr. HENDERSON. There was no subsidy for the six miles before ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No not previously.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is it possible that in Algoma they have been constructing a railway without a subsidy ? I think there must be some mistake about that.

Mr. HAGGART. How long is it since this road was constructed ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It has not been inspected, it must have been very recently constructed.

Mr. HAGGART. The principle is entirely different. If you are going to bonus constructed roads, nearly every road in the country will have a claim.

Mr. HYMAN. This is an extension only, it was earned before.

Mr. HAGGART. It strikes me that this road has been built for some time from Bruce mines either to the water's edge or to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

On subsection 'B' of section 2,

Mr. HENDERSON. I would again ask the minister if this six miles is the uncoloured portion on the map between the three mile section and the nine mile section ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understood a few moments ago that was the section ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The uncoloured portion is the nine miles. The subsidy for that has been paid.

Mr. BARKER. Is the gap already constructed ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, that is constructed.

Mr. BARKER. And this was already bonused ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, this was bonused and paid for.

Mr. SPROULE. I think there is in this a very bad principle, bonusing a short piece of railway after it is built. I tried very hard on behalf of the Meaford and St. Vincent people to get a portion of the subsidy granted to the line of railway from Meaford to Owen Sound, part of the Manitoulin railway, and up as far as Wiarton and from Wiarton to Tobermory. One portion of that route from the Grand Trunk proper down to the wharf, a distance of about one and three quarters miles has already been built by the people. That small town which had then only 2,000 or 3,000 inhabitants was obliged to give a subsidy of $25,000 to build that, and I made my best endeavours to get the government to give them a portion of the subsidy for the line which they intended to construct by way of Owen Sound up to Manitoulin, to apply to this line, a piece of road that was urgently required and not actually completed. I could not prevail on the government to give them a dollar, either to divert a portion of the subsidy or to give an additional subsidy, allowing the other to stand. Here, where a road is built three miles long, a subsidy is granted, and by this very vote we are granting a subsidy to another six miles long. I think it is another example of the old saying that kissing goes by favour. The government seem to be always able to devise ways and means to subsidize roads belonging to their own friends, whereas if a road is not controlled by their friends, the wants of the country do not appear to be taken into consideration, and they get the go by. I do submit that in a case like this that portion of the road from the Grand Trunk down to the water, which is a portion of the through system if it is ever built up to the Manitoulin

island, should be entitled to a subsidy. The people had to construct that line and I think the government should give them a subsidy for that portion of the line, especially as we are now subsidizing roads only three miles long.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it a fact that this piece of road was built without any promise of a subsidy, without any consideration or expectation of a subsidy, and that then after the road was built, a subsidy was given ? Surely that cannot be the case.

Mr. EMMERSON. That has occurred in the Dominion.

Mr. FOWLER. In this particular case ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That has occurred. We are now simply granting a subsidy that has been earned.

Mr. FOWLER. Then it is the custom and the habit to give money after a road has been built and completed without expectation of a subsidy ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Oh, no.

Mr. FOWLER. A road is built without expectation of a subsidy and then you make a present to the builders of the amount of the subsidy. It seems to me this is a very strange thing.

Mr. EMMERSON. The subsidy was voted, but it has not been paid.

Mr. FOWLER. That is not what the minister stated a moment ago. The minister said that this particular piece of road was built without any subsidy being granted ; that when it was built the subsidy was granted, and that it was a common thing to do this.

Mr. EMMERSON. I said it had occurred before.

Mr. FOWLER. Often.

Mr. EMMERSON. On more than one occasion.

Mr. FOWLER. I am not opposed on general principles to railway subsidies. I believe that in this country it is most important that we should have railways. It is as necessary to have railways as highways, and I favour railway subsidies where you cannot get a necessary road built unless you subsidize it. But, I protest most strongly against a case of this kind where the company, believing that the undertaking would be a paying one, built a number of miles of railway to extend their system, without any expectation of subsidy and we must assume without necessity for a subsidy, and then the government comes forward and makes them a present of $15,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. There were thirty miles subsidized. Nine miles were built and paid for and now we are subsidizing the remaining twenty-one miles.

Mr. FOWLER. Well, what sort of information are we getting? I understand that the minister cannot know all about these different matters throughout Canada, but here is his deputy sitting beside him who has been for I don't know how many years in the public service, and the information he is giving to the minister is so misleading that the minister is obliged to contradict himself.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think not.

Mr. FOWLER. I am in the judgment of the committee when I say it is so. I hope that the change the Minister of Railways has made in his personal appearance has not affected him ; I hope that no Delilah has shorn the hon. minister of his locks, and affected his strength of reason. For some reason he is mixed up this morning. Now, I would like to know what we are really doing? The minister has told us that no subsidy has been asked for or voted or expected.

Mr. EMMERSON. I said none was paid excepting the nine miles.

Mr. FOWLER. Well every member of the House heard the hon. gentleman make the statement I attribute to him. Will the minister tell us what we are supposed to be doing ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The resolution is very clear. We are subsidizing three miles and six miles and twelve miles, in all twenty-one miles.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is this a private owned road ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a company road.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is it all the one road ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is all one company.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is a different thing. Can any one explain it ? Does the hon. gentleman from Nipissing (Mr. McCool) know anything about it ?

Mr. McCOOL. It starts from Bruce Mines and is all the one line.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I understand it is a mere lumber road.

Mr. McCOOL. It is not through a lumber district at all, except it be hardwood. It is through a copper mining district.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this the road that goes into the old mine that an English company is redeveloping ?

Mr. McCOOL. No. The mines are now owned by a Philadelphia company I understand. I have not been on the line but so

far as you can see from the Canadian Pacific Railway train, it is substantially built and they run a regular train every day to connect with the Soo train on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Have they a charter from this government ?

Mr. McCOOL. Yes. There are very valuable copper mines there. The old Bruce Mines were near the river front but these mines are thirty or forty miles back.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There is no settlement there, and you are simply helping a private company.

Mr. McCOOL. There is considerable settlement there.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I understand there is not a solitary station on this line.

Mr. EMMERSON. The line runs from Lake Huron to the Canadian Pacific Railway 3 miles. From that point there are 6 miles to Rock lake. Then there are 12 miles from Rock lake northward.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is it one continuous road ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, one continuous road all owned by the same company.

Mr. HAGGART. Did you pay a subsidy for the line from Bruce Mines to the lake shore ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am informed by the deputy that we did not.

Mr. HAGGART. If I remember rightly, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company themselves built a branch line to the lake for the purpose of taking out material to use as ballast. The whole line of Sault Ste. Marie branch was ballasted from there.

Mr. McCOOL. That was only a temporary road for the purpose of taking out ballast, and the rails have been taken up long ago. As a matter of fact, I know that this new line does not follow the old Canadian Pacific Railway line at all. I have seen it myself, and it is a very well built road. There is a little confusion of names by reason of the fact that the village at Bruce Mines wharf is called Bruce Mines. The village of Bruce Mines is about three miles from Bruce Mines station on the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not think there is any doubt about this being a continuous road.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the new mine working now ?

Mr. McCOOL. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. And this road is in the interest of that mine ?

Mr. McCOOL. There is a large farming settlement in the district, and at the time of the first effort to obtain this subsidy, I was asked to join a deputation of those people in support of it. They were very anxious about it.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose that the gentlemen interested in this company wish the line to run northward, partly for the sake of their mines and partly in the interest of the community.

Mr. McCOOL. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. In 1903 we subsidized 21 miles of this line. Is the line which we are subsidizing now any portion of those 21 miles or are we changing a portion of the subsidy to some other portion of the road ? Has the other subsidy lapsed ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We want to pay for the 21 miles. It would lapse, I think, on the 1st of August.

Mr. SPROULE. We had better know whether it is because of the subsidy lapsing by effluxion of time or not.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Will my hon. friend permit me to observe that these subsidies were voted in 1900, and they were all voted on condition that the roads should be commenced in two years and completed in two years.

Mr. HAGGART. There is another reason. Under the old Act the subsidy could not be paid unless the road was completed in ten-mile sections ; and this is for the purpose of allowing the minister to pay the subsidy for 3-mile and 6-mile completed sections.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals is aware that there is a very strong objection to the indiscriminate subsidizing of railways, and I fail to see where he will find sufficient excuse for the action he is now taking unless he can show that this road is really a colonization road. If it is simply a road to enable lumbermen to bring out their lumber or to enable a mining company to carry on its operations, the Dominion of Canada is not justified in subsidizing it. It should rather be done by the province of Ontario, which gets all the revenue derived from these industries. It can only be justified if it is to be a colonization road for the purpose of opening up the country to settlement by agriculturists. Last year I entered a very strong protest against the subsidizing of railways throughout the province of Ontario in the older sections. I would enter that strong protest against the subsidizing of railways now unless the minister can say that these subsidies are renewals. If they are renewals and if certain corporations had been led to believe by the government that they would be assisted, I would not ask the government to do anything but keep faith and not cause difficulty to men who have invested their means

already in the construction of roads. With regard to the new subsidies, I am not at all in harmony with the idea of granting such, unless it can be shown distinctly that they are for the purpose of opening up the country for settlement and are strictly colonization roads.

Mr. SPROULE. We were told by the Minister of Railways that the subsidy would lapse on the 1st of August and that was the reason assigned by the First Minister for the granting of this subsidy. But these subsidies were granted in 1903 upon the following conditions :

All the lines and bridges for the construction of which subsidies are granted unless they are already commenced, shall be commenced within two years from the 1st of August, 1903.

We are only at the 1st of August, 1904, so that there is another year to run.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But they must complete a section of ten miles.

Mr. SPROULE. If that is the explanation, why did the hon. Minister of Railways not give it and let us not waste time.

Mr. BARKER. Why cannot they build another four miles and get themselves within the law ? If they have built six miles they have now only to build another four to come within the original law.

On resolution 3, subsection 'a,'

Mr. MACLEAN. Is this a Canadian Pacific Railway proposition ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not aware that it is.

Mr. SPROULE. What company owns the road ?

Mr. MACLEAN. This is a proposal to go to Hudson bay, judging by the map. It will make connection with Albany river.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not think it is a Canadian Pacific Railway proposition. So far as I have knowledge, it is not.

Mr. MACLEAN. Who are the applicants ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Canadian Pacific Railway has nothing to do with it. The Nipigon Railway Company are the applicants.

Mr. FOWLER. Who is the general manager ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I simply have the application on behalf of the company which was presented by a lawyer of the city of Ottawa. It is signed by the Nipigon Railway Company.

Mr. FOWLER. There must be somebody's name there as acting for the company.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Those questions were all gone into when the subsidy was granted. This is not originating any new scheme. I do not know anything about these resolutions except that they are renewals.

Mr. FOWLER. You are asking for a subsidy for twelve miles of railway. Why go piecemeal about it ? Why not ask for a subsidy from Nipigon to Hudson bay ? If this is part of a general scheme to subsidize a railway from Nipigon to James bay, it may be a good thing. But why not let the committee know ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The subsidy last year was as follows :

To the Nipigon Railway Company for a line of railway from Lake Superior to Lake Nipigon, and from a point on the north shore of Lake Nipigon northerly, not exceeding 80 miles.

That was for a continuous road, but the company now want to build from the shore of Lake Superior to Lake Nipigon, then use the lake and from Lake Nipigon, another stretch northward, then to the Grand Trunk Pacific. Therefore, instead of having a continuous line of railway, you will have a line of railway to the waters of Lake Nipigon, then use the water of Lake Nipigon and so on.

Mr. MACLEAN. This would be the first connection from Lake Superior with the new transcontinental road ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The promoters intended to do that and use the railway for the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. MACLEAN. As a matter of fact do the Grand Trunk control this charter.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think so. They have nothing to do with it.

Mr. FOWLER. I am glad the Prime Minister speaks so definitely on that point. Will he tell us in whose hands this charter is ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The only party connected with the charter whom I know is Mr. James Conmee.

Mr. FOWLER. That settles it.

The PRIME MINISTER. Carried.

Mr. BARKER. As neither the Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) nor any member of the government seems to be able to tell us who are connected with this institution to which we are granting a quarter of a million of dollars, perhaps some hon. member from the district can tell us. The Nipigon Railway Company is a mere name. I think we ought to know who the parties are who have asked for money and to whom it is to be voted, that we may be able to judge whether they are capable of building the road. The Minister of Railways would naturally make full inquiries before he decided to revote the

subsidy and what the minister has inquired into we are entitled to know. We should have more information on this subject before we vote the subsidy. To tell us that a charter was granted by the Dominion parliament to the Nipigon Company and treat that as a sufficient explanation, and that we need not know who are the parties behind this project, seems to me absurd. It is not a matter of favour that this information should be given ; we have a right to it. We have heard a great deal lately about the employment of aliens. For all we know, every man connected with this concern may be an alien. Aliens or citizens, we are entitled to know who they are.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have only to look at the statute to know who the incorporators——

Mr. BARKER. Oh.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, the information is there. The man I know as being connected with this enterprise is Mr. Conmee. But I have sent for the statutes, and I will be able to give the hon. member (Mr. Barker) the names of the incorporators of the company.

Mr. MACLEAN. Does the Prime Minister lay down the principle that simply because a subsidy is asked for, it is therefore to be granted to the people who ask for it ? If a rubber stamp applies here for a subsidy of half a million dollars is the stamp to get it ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN. That is the principle on which the Prime Minister proceeds ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Why, this parliament has over and over again granted subsidies for railways before the companies were formed at all. The subsidy was granted and it was open for any company to come forward and earn it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This particular railway has been before this House on a previous occasion. When the Grand Trunk Pacific measure was going through, we were told by the Prime Minister that that railway would have a branch to Nipigon. But we find that this scheme is for the benefit of Mr. James Conmee who controls this charter, and now, in order to bunco the public, he is endeavouring to get his road bonused to Lake Nipigon. He has obtained from the Ontario government concessions for the fisheries, and he has obtained also pulp concessions—this crowd have got that whole country tied up. And now, for the benefit of Mr. Conmee who is one of the greatest bunco steerers that ever struck the Dominion of Canada, the people are to be taxed to put up a quarter of a million for this road. This is simply scandalous. It is absurd to speak of this as opening up the country. There is no pretense of settlement up there. This is simply a bonus to benefit Mr. Conmee by enriching this corporation that he controls. I do not know whether the Prime Minister has had the facts presented to him. I suppose this road is going to connect the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) is wrong—he will pardon me for saying so. This road was incorporated before there was any mention of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am aware of that. But did the original charter go north of the lake ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No, it only went up to the lake. But since then it has been proposed to build the line from Lake Nipigon to a connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I never said that the Grand Trunk Pacific would go to Nipigon bay. That is a question, as I understand, now in issue—as to where the lake terminus will be. They are surveying the country and they will go to the port that is most convenient. But this railway, as I understand it, was chartered before there was any thought of this transcontinental railway. Having this subsidy they would be in a position to build, and, probably before it is possible to build the Grand Trunk Pacific this road can be built and it can get considerable amount of business in hauling the supplies necessary for use in the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific. That is the reason why the change is asked in the manner of granting the subsidy.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The original charter ran from the mouth of the Nipigon river at Nipigon bay to Lake Nipigon.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And beyond.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No, only to Nipigon lake.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is not eighty miles from Nipigon harbour to Nipigon lake, and the subsidy was for eighty miles.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. But there is not a foot of the road built. The reason for building to Nipigon bay is to allow this company to get out its fish. But they can get them out by steamers, and steamers will perform all the service that will be necessary for many a year. This is only a scheme to get money out of the pockets of the people for the benefit of this company.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is nothing of the kind. Parliament voted this subsidy last year. We are not asking a cent more than was granted last year unanimously and, so far as I remember without comment

by this parliament. The object of putting the vote in this form is to divide this subsidy in a manner different from that in which it was voted last year. But not a cent more is asked.

Mr. FOWLER. Is this Mr. James Conmee who is promoting this railway the same person who is a candidate for this House in the next election ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know that he is a candidate. He is a member of the local legislature of Ontario.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I may tell my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) that Mr. Conmee is not officially a candidate. But he kept out a large number of delegates and secured a nomination in that way.

Mr. SPROULE. The Prime Minister said in answer to my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) that this parliament had voted money to railways although no companies were in existence for the construction of them. But it was upon the understanding and statement made to the House that the government would satisfy themselves as to the personnel of the company and its financial ability to carry out the enterprise before the subsidy should be turned over to them. But where the company has been formed and is known, parliament should be informed as to the condition. I understood the Minister of Railways to say that we were holding this subsidy in this form to enable the government to pay subsidies for less than ten miles. And I find that that is not provided for in these resolutions because it says :

(b.) By instalments, on the condition of each ten-mile section of the railway, in the proportion which the cost of such completed section bears to that of the whole work undertaken ; or

(c.) Upon the progress estimates on the certificate of the chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals, that in his opinion, having regard to the whole work undertaken and the aid granted, the progress made justifies the payment of a sum not less than $30,000.

So, it does not provide for paying over three miles or a mile and a half as we were led to believe. Therefore, there must be something else behind it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will explain it if my hon. friend will follow me. The question of payment does not come upon this section. Last year we voted a subsidy for eighty miles, that was for a continuous railway. Now the company want to avail themselves of the water stretches, to build first from Lake Superior to Lake Nipigon, then to build from Lake Nipigon to another stretch of water, and so on. That is the intention, not to build one continuous line of railway, but a disjointed line of railway.

Mr. FOWLER. What will be the amount of subsidy per mile on this particular road ?

Mr. EMMERSON. $3,200 is authorized.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is the usual subsidy.

Mr. FOWLER. It may be $6,400 a mile.

Mr. SPROULE. The Prime Minister says that the line originally subsidized is eighty miles long ; now it is reduced to fifty miles.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The same length.

Mr. SPROULE. Then if we voted a subsidy last year why are we asked to vote it again this year ? Last year there was a provision giving them two years to commence, and it would be payable on progress estimates when ten miles were built.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I speak with some diffidence, because it is some time since I gave my attention to this matter. But I do remember that last year a subsidy was voted for eighty miles of railway, which was intended to be a continuous line from one point to another point, from Lake Superior to Lake Nipigon and then northward. This year the intention is to build from Lake Superior to Lake Nipigon, then from the other side of Lake Nipigon to another point on another stretch of water, and it is intended to use steamers across the lake. I speak subject to correction, but so far as I remember that is the present project, and that is the reason of this change in the subsidy.

Mr. FOWLER. It is a different thing altogether from the proposition of last year. It may be the same thing in point of length, but it may be in another direction altogether. The proposition last year was for a continuous line of railway that could be operated, for instance, summer and winter. The present line is one that can only be operated in the summer, which is quite a different thing from a line of transportation that could be operated both summer and winter. The committee should be shown some reasons why this change is made. Is it that there is no necessity for a line of transportation, or is it that it is impossible to keep up a line of transportation, or is it that the water transportation is the big end of the thing, or what is it ? Now it might be that the water stretch is the most important part, or the great part of it, and that they could only use a railway to overcome some difficulties perhaps in the water navigation. Then I could understand why the change is made ; but otherwise, we are shutting up the country entirely in the winter time.

Mr. MACLEAN. Is it not to meet the exigencies of the Grand Trunk Pacific ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No doubt it is largely that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There are three miles from Nipigon bay to Lake Helen; has that any connection whatever with the other road?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know about that. There was a petition that will be brought down this afternoon.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That three miles and a half goes up to a nice little timber limit.

Mr. MACLEAN. Is not this a railway branch due to the Grand Trunk Pacific? Apparently we are now getting some light on it. This is really a modification in a road that was bonused last year, so as to make it apply to the Grand Trunk Pacific.

At one o'clock, committee took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the distance from Nipigon lake to Lake Superior?

Mr. EMMERSON. About thirty-five miles.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister was to give information to the House as to whether that short section was part of the main line or not.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is part of the main line, I am informed.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to ask the minister whether he has obtained and could give us any information as to whether any other subsidies have been granted to this same line from any source whatever?

Mr. EMMERSON. Does my hon. friend ask respecting provincial subsidies?

Mr. BARKER. From provincial or any other sources.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not prepared to answer that.

Mr. BARKER. I am prepared to give a little information on that subject, but before doing so I wish to say that I think it is the duty of the government before they recommend any subsidy to this House or any change in any subsidy already granted, to ascertain precisely the position of the work, what probability there is that the promoters of the undertaking will be able to carry it out, what the necessity for it may be, and what assistance they may be receiving from other sources. It must be clear to the minister that if a very large subsidy had been granted from local sources that fact alone should be sufficient to induce him to refuse further assistance and unless the hon. gentleman takes the trouble on behalf of the people to inquire into these circumstances we are exposed to the danger of throwing money away. I think it is also part of the hon. gentleman's duty to inquire who the promoters of these undertakings may be and to ascertain whether he is giving money that will go to the benefit of Canadians or money that will be taken from Canada and put into the pockets of people in the United States or other foreigners. We have heard a great deal about the Labour Department of this country and the necessity of protecting Canadians. You must protect the Canadian workingman and the Canadian contractor, according to the Bill passed through the House the other day. But when it comes to handing out large subsidies the government apparently have not thought whether the recipient of these subsidies is a foreigner or a Canadian. I allude to that subject because what I am about to point out shows that this House has been and is again asked to grant large sums of money, anywhere between a quarter and a half million dollars, in connection with this railway, practically to citizens of the United States. I find that a Nipigon Railway Company, not the company that is referred to in this resolution, but an Ontario company of that name, was incorporated in 1899, and in 1902 it obtained an amendment to its charter. I find on looking at the statute and its amendment that the incorporators of that Nipigon Railway Company were: Paul Weidner, of Detroit, a pulp manufacturer; M. B. Lloyd, of Minneapolis, a manufacturer and James Whalen of Port Arthur, a contractor. I understand that Mr. James Whalen is a near relative, a son-in-law in fact, of Mr. Conmee, who was mentioned by the Prime Minister as one of the parties interested in this subsidy. I find further that one of the incorporators was Mr. Newton W. Rowell, who takes a very active part in political matters on behalf of the Liberal party, and who apparently is solicitor for the gentlemen who are receiving this subsidy. Another incorporator is James G. Shaw, another solicitor of Toronto, and a further one is Mr. F. S. Wiley, of Port Arthur. Mr. A. J. McComber, of Port Arthur, a clerk is also included in the list, but he seems to have dropped out. Possibly he was simply a substitute for Mr. Conmee, who no doubt is the sleeping partner. Those gentlemen were all the incorporators in the Ontario Nipigon Railway Company. I would further call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that by section 14 of the original Ontario Act, aliens, and companies incorporated abroad, are authorized to be shareholders and to have all the rights of voting and acting as directors, just as any British subject would have under an ordinary charter. We may be asked: What has that to do with the Nipigon Railway Company which the hon. gentleman is now asking the House to subsidize? I have looked at the statute of 1902 which incorporates this Do-

minion Railway Company and I find that the incorporators are the same men, Mr. Weidner and Mr. Lloyd, of Detroit and Minneapolis, the same solicitors and the same directors. They are all in the two companies. They went to Ontario and got a charter there, with a great many clauses, most of them very useful clauses, and much more ample powers than I think would be granted by the parliament of this Dominion. They came to this parliament the same year and under precisely the same name, they got a charter containing this provisions :

> The company may agree with. . . . the Nipigon Railway Company, incorporated under the Ontario Railway Act, for conveying or leasing to any such company its railways in whole, or in part, or any rights or powers under this Act, as also its franchise and property subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.

See what little by-play is going on. Two Americans, a Canadian contractor, and two gentlemen who are no doubt solicitors for the parties get charters from the Ontario legislature and from this parliament, and they have power to sell to themselves. They come to this House and the Minister of Railways, without knowing one particle about the undertaking or whether they have been granted aid from other quarters, asks us to vote to them from one-quarter of a million dollars to half a million dollars. If the minister had gone to his departmental library he would have found that this railway company had received from the Ontario government a subsidy of $3,000 a mile for 14 miles of the very line we are asked to subsidize here. Is it right that we should be asked in the last hours of the session to grant public money in this way, when the minister who asks us cannot tell us the simple fact that these people are already in receipt of public money for the same work. It is about time this thing should stop. I do not object to fair and reasonable assistance being given to public undertakings, but I do think it is a disgrace to parliament that public money should be scattered broadcast and that we are not to be told the facts concerning the grant. I do not particularly condemn the present minister, because for the few years I have been in this House it is the practice to force subsidies in this way, but it is time that it should stop. I submit that the minister should recall this part of the resolution until more time shall be had for its consideration, or, that he should at least make the grant that is proposed here subject to a deduction equal to the amount granted by the province of Ontario which apparently he did not know anything about when he made the recommendation for this subsidy.

Mr. EMMERSON. Aid is given on the merits of the railway itself and not in consideration of the company. I apprehend that before entering into the contract, the department will be assured that the parties can carry out their arrangement. When that time comes it is the duty of the department to get all information possible with regard to the standing of the parties, and until that is ascertained it is not necessary for that information to be sought. The railway itself stands upon its merits and has to be dealt with from that standpoint and no other.

Mr. BARKER. What is the standpoint ?

Mr. EMMERSON. From the standpoint of the merits of the line itself as to whether it should be aided or not. Before the contract is entered into the standing of the individuals concerned has to be considered.

Mr. BARKER. If we are here for any purpose at all it is to consider whether the subsidy be granted or not. We are not giving a power of attorney to the minister to decide on that point, and when we vote this subsidy the minister has to carry it out. We have never heard of a minister refusing to pay a subsidy so voted after he had made inquiries. The truth is patent on the face of the papers, that one gentleman in Detroit and one in Minneapolis, two foreigners, are to receive from one-quarter of a million to half a million dollars in aid of this work, in conjunction with the contractor who will build the work, and two solicitors who applied for the charter.

Mr. SPROULE. When it was originally contemplated to aid railways in this way, the policy was clearly outlined to this House. It was : That the government should first satisfy themselves that the road was needed in the locality and that without aid, it was not likely to be built, and then the government were to satisfy themselves that the company which had charge of the undertaking had sufficient financial support to build the proposed railway with the aid of the subsidy. Upon the strength of that the government decided to place the subsidy in the estimates, and it was for parliament to consider whether it should be voted or not.

Since then another system seems to have developed. The promoters get some aid from one government or from both, so as to make a financial nucleus around which to finance a scheme for building the railway. It has been reversed from what was originally contemplated. I notice that several of these companies, writing about their roads in the papers, say : We are getting $3,200 a mile from the Dominion government, and we are getting from the provincial government $2,000 a mile, or so many acres of land, and we can put these two securities together and with them form a basis on which we can sell bonds to build the road. From that has grown up the system of exploiting these railways. In some cases they get into hands of lawyers ; in other cases they get into the hands

of politicians. There is no one equal in reputation to Mr. Conmee in that regard. He is one of the handy men who are always available to help to buy up or control a constituency to keep the government in power, and he gets recouped in some way or other. He has mining leases, timber leases, fishing leases, railway charters, and in every direction he tries to get something out of one government or the other. Take this railway; he is getting a subsidy from the provincial government, and now he appeals to the Dominion government as well for a subsidy. For what purpose? Not that the locality requires a railway, but because Mr. Conmee has investments in that country which he wishes to develop by means of the aid he receives, so as to make money. It is said that he has timber limits up there. He certainly has mining leases. It is said that he has fishing licenses also. If he could get from the two governments enough money on the basis of which to erect a financial structure to build a railway which would inure to his own benefit more than to the benefit of the country, that would be all right. It is fostering one of these schemes, I believe, that we are doing to-day by voting this money.

Mr. LENNOX. So far as I am personally concerned, I object to subsidies as a rule That is not very material here, because the majority of the House are in favour of subsidies. But I particularly object to this government assisting the Ontario government in the schemes which the Ontario government cannot carry out themselves. This is another Jackson transaction on a different scale. It is not so scandalous, I think, as the Jackson transaction, but it is a good deal on the same line. That Mr. Conmee is notorious as an exploiter I need not tell the hon. minister, as the facts have been stated by the hon. member for Hamilton. Whatever might have justified the minister prior to the statement by the hon. member for Hamilton, there can be no justification for his going on with this vote now. The only basis upon which a subsidy can be excused is that it is absolutely necessary in order to get a road built. This subsidy was recommended to the House upon the understanding of the minister that it stood alone, that no other subsidy was being paid to this company, and that it was necessary in order to enable the company to build the road. We now have the fact that that is not so, but that they are already in receipt of a subsidy from the Ontario government, which should be a sufficient reason for the minister to withhold the subsidy or reduce it by the amount granted by the Ontario government. The only excuse the minister has—and that is a weak one—is that he did not know the facts of this case. If he had known them he would be absolutely without justification. But knowing the facts as he does now, through the agency of the hon. member for Hamilton, it is certainly his duty to reduce the subsidy so as to put it on the basis on which he launched it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This railway runs, or is supposed to run, through a country in which there is not one settler, and where there will not be settlers, but where the company represented by Mr. Conmee control the fishing licenses, a monopoly; control the pulp, a monopoly; control the timber, a monopoly; and my hon. friend from East Grey says they have also the mining rights there. I was not aware of that, but it would not surprise me if they had the whole country—I have not the slightest doubt they have. In Sir John Macdonald's time the policy of the Dominion government in bonussing railways was to grant them only in old settled districts, or in new districts where the Dominion had some interest. If the bonuses given by Sir John Macdonald's government are examined into, it will be found that that was the policy which ran through them all. I know that, because when we wanted a bonus for the railway from Haliburton to Mattawa the answer given us was that unless we could show that it formed part of the general policy of the Dominion, he would not give us a dollar; and he held back the subsidy for years, although all the political influence behind the project was of the same stripe as his own. His contention was that the province should aid all the colonization roads. The Dominion government should not assist this road. It is supposed to run to the south end of the lake, then you have a large gap, and from the north end of the lake you have a road running northward to a muskeg. There is no use of shutting our eyes to the fact that this is simply a scheme to get enough money from the Dominion and provincial governments to build this road, so that Mr. Conmee will get his rake-off from the company, and possibly get the provincial government or the Dominion government to guarantee his share in the contract, in the same way as the provincial government has guaranteed his share in the interests around Sault Ste. Marie. I fail to see where there is any excuse for subsidizing this road in any shape or form. It is not needed for any settler, because there is not one solitary settler in the locality. Is this line from Nipigon bay to Lake Helen, 3½ miles, part of a through line, or where does it run?

Mr. EMMERSON. Of course, there is the right to build branches of less than six miles, under the general law.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Will the minister tell me where Lake Helen is, and are the 30 miles between Nipigon station and Nipigon lake intended to go by Lake Helen?

Mr. BARKER. The Grand Trunk Railway Company has to build a railway from a point on Nipigon bay at or near Nipigon station. The three mile subsidy is to build

a branch easterly three miles from Nipigon station to Helen lake. That is not within the charter at all.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister has not answered my proposition. His plan should show whether this three and a half miles branch connects in any sense with this railway. The map does not show it nor does the charter.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is on the map.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. The red line on the map does not go within several miles of Nipigon bay. He cannot expect the House to vote jobs through without some knowledge. This is one of the worst jobs ever perpetrated. If there was any settlement there, there would not be the same objection, but there is not a settler in that entire country. Is this intended to develop settlement ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Certainly, to develop settlement.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Where is the farm land ? There is none.

Mr. EMMERSON. There are mica mines.

Mr. LENNOX. There is no mine ; there is only the possibility that a mine may be discovered. The hon. minister cannot mention any mine developed or actually discovered within thirty miles of any part of the railway.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I happen to have seen the country. There is pulp timber there which Mr. Conmee controls. There are fish in Lake Nipigon and if any citizen of this country wants to catch them, he must pay tribute to Mr. Conmee. I will tell you what this three and a half miles of road means. There is a very good timber limit adjoining and this three and a half miles is given to run from Nipigon bay up a level flat to this timber limit. It is a mere lumber road of the kind which lumbermen are wont to build at their own expense. This vote of the people's money is for the benefit of this concern composed of American speculators and promoted by Mr. Conmee. They have the fish, they have the timber, they have the pulp, and my hon. friend beside me says they have the mineral. There is hematite ore there, but it has not been developed—there is not a mine in that country. All these various interests are combined. And now Mr. Conmee says : It will help us to put this project on the market of the world and get a good rake-off if we can get a bonus from the government of Ontario, and then come down to our friends at Ottawa and get a bonus from the Dominion. So, he will get this work done at the expense of the country, he will get his rake-off, and he will laugh at the farmers who will pay for it all. It is time to quit this kind of thing. The province of Ontario has already been taxed for this man, because they have given a guarantee for his benefit in connection with the Clergue industries. This road runs from Nipigon bay a few miles east of Nipigon river. That little dab on the map should not mislead anybody. Let the map and the reading of this resolution tally. I may tell the hon. minister that the stream down this particular valley is not floatable, it is a little too far to haul the timber ; and he is getting the Dominion of Canada to build him a lumber road. That is what this three and a half miles amounts to.

Mr. MURRAY. It strikes me that if there is no trade for this road, or no industries to be developed to afford it traffic, the bonus will not enable the company to build, and so they will never gain it. The hon. gentleman for North Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) says he has a personal knowledge of this section of the country. I have not. But I have knowledge of the country through which the Canadian Pacific Railway was built. Going through a country that looked as if it were nothing but barren, rock every now and then you would strike a patch of good land, and these places are now well settled. If, on a road of this kind there are minerals, or even if there is pulp wood, there will be some business to assist these men in floating the scheme. It is all very well to say that Mr. Conmee is trying to make a speculation out of this. It is not so easy to gull the people of this world, and Mr. Conmee cannot float this scheme if there is no business to be developed that will make the road a success. If there are mines to be developed, what will follow ? The development of the mines will bring in many people. We know very well that in the United States where there are minerals, even though there is no arable land in this section at all, the mines lead to the building up of large towns. It may be so in this case. But if there are no minerals, if there is no pulp wood, if there is not the basis of some industry to sustain the road, the promoters will not be able to carry out their undertaking.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There is pulp wood there, but the Nipigon river affords the means of bringing that wood down. There is timber there, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Murray), as a practical lumberman, knows that it is cheaper to float the timber down a stream than to carry it by rail. But why should the people of Canada be taxed to build this railway for the benefit of this lumber, pulp, and fish company. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Murray) has told us that where there are good timber limits settlements spring up, that where there are mines, large towns may grow. But can the hon. gentleman tell me in any case in the United States or Canada where a mining railway was built before a mine was developed ? This is the first instance in the

history of the country. We are asked to build this road in the hope of striking a mine. The Canadian Pacific Railway was built past Sudbury and a large mining industry was developed—that is true. But the Canadian Pacific Railway was not built for the purpose of developing those mines, whereas in this case there is no object pretended except such development. As to settlers going in where there are timber limits, surely the hon. gentleman knows that under the iniquitous law of the province of Ontario, none but the license holder can realize on that timber under the old licenses. The farmers throughout Muskoka, Parry Sound, Haliburton and all that northern section are simply persecuted—those who happen to be on the land held by the old license holders. They dare not cut a stick of timber except for the immediate purposes of their farms. They dare not sell a cord of wood without the permission of the holders of these licenses.

Mr. MURRAY. But they can take what they require.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. They dare not clear a field.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. Why, we have the cases of men in Muskoka who were taxed so many cents a cord for wood that they had sold. This wood was lying on fields that they desired to clear to put in a crop. They dare not burn it, because the license holders had not given them permission to do so. But they tried to sell it and were taxed by the Ontario government agent, Mr. Christie, for every cord. And it was wood lying there rotting in the fields, and preventing them from putting in a crop.

Mr. McCOOL. The hon. member (Mr. Sam. Hughes) knows that that is not the case under the present license. Any sales of timber made since 1890 are made under the conditions that all wood except pine is reserved for the farmer. And, in the spruce concessions to Mr. Conmee, as soon as the settler is located on a lot Mr. Conmee loses all right to the spruce.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And for that very reason, Mr. Conmee will take care that settlers are not located there as long as there is a stick of spruce timber for him. That is the very trouble. We happen to be familiar with all this kind of thing in Ontario, for we have had instances of it before. More than that, I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCool) that there is no place for settlers around Lake Nipigon. And, even if there were not one of these settlers would be more than 27 miles from a railway; I can give the hon. gentleman instances where there are thousands of people in the older-settled parts of Ontario that are to-day thirty, forty or fifty miles from a railway. And we cannot get a ten-thousand-dollar canal lock built, which would open up communication for these settlers. If the company were going to run a road up the Black Sturgeon valley a few miles west of Nipigon, there is an arable belt there north east of Port Arthur. But there is not a foot of land on that road now under discussion that is fit for settlement. The item should be struck out.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to enter my objection to this way of voting public money, by devoting it to the construction of railways where they are not required. This money is to be given to American promoters. It is true that some gentlemen from the province of Ontario have joined with these American promoters for the purpose of constructing this railway, if it ever is constructed.

I may say to the minister that Mr. Conmee is a well-known promoter in the province of Ontario, he has been associated with the Ontario government many years. He is a gentleman who has had deals of every description put through for him in the province of Ontario, a gentleman who is all the time engaged in either a railway deal, or a pulp wood deal, or a mining deal in the province of Ontario, until he has become pretty well discredited in that respect. I understand he has now taken a nomination for the Dominion House. He took a nomination for the Dominion House once before; he tendered his resignation in the local house and ran as a Dominion candidate. It was supposed that the resignation had been accepted by the local legislature, but after he was defeated by the people, the fact loomed up the next morning that his resignation had never been accepted, and he still held his seat in the local legislature. This gentleman is sitting in the local legislature at the present time and he is accepting a nomination for the Dominion House. It is a well-known fact that exploiters in the province of Ontario are getting cornered, and the time is coming when these men must be driven out, and I suppose Mr. Conmee thinks there is a splendid field for him at Ottawa. I am much surprised that my hon. friend who has just entered the cabinet and occupies a very distinguished position in the government, should allow a gentleman of this kind, to come in, that he should stand up in the House and assist to put through a deal of this kind. My hon. friend from Hamilton has given some information to the House in respect to the personel of this company. Mr. Rowell, of the city of Toronto, another promoter, a gentleman who now is sollicitor of the Soo Company, the well known reconstructed Soo Company that has been and is yet to be assisted by the local legislature—that gentleman is also indentified with this company. Speaking for myself, I say the time has come when the

parliament of Canada cannot afford to vote money in this way. I do not think there is much difference of opinion on either side of the House as to whether money should be voted for the development of this country. I think we are all in favour of giving bonuses where bonuses are required to open up a new country, which will give settlers an opportunity of taking in and bringing out their goods. But here we see gentlemen of this kind coming forward, first to the local legislature, and getting $3,000 a mile for 14 miles, in 1902, and they have not done anything toward the construction of that railway up to the present time. The only thing they have been doing during these two years is to formulate a policy that they could urge upon the Dominion government. Apparently they have been successful, because we are asked to vote this money now. I say the government should have more definite information before they ask parliament to vote this money. The road should be clearly defined, or defined as clearly as possible. My hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) asked the minister this afternoon if he could state within 30 miles where the terminus of this road would be, and the minister honestly stated that he could not. It does look as if some people are behind this scheme who have more information about it than the government. I think these gentlemen might stay in the province of Ontario, because the people of Ontario will take care of them. It is enough for the people of Canada to vote money and to vote bonuses in order to develop the country, without voting money to promoters who are dealing in timber limits, in mining interests and fishing interests. For that reason I enter my protest against this system of bonussing railways. I think it is time that these promoters should be set aside, and if there is any money to be voted in the way of bonuses, it should be given for the purpose of opening up a new country and supplying settlers with railway facilities which they really require.

Mr. SPROULE. We have had but little experience in this House with reference to this gentleman and his railway exploiting, but the people of Ontario know something about his history. It is only during the last session of the local legislature that the question came up in connection with the breakdown of the Lake Superior Company, or the Consolidated Company, and then we found that this same Mr. Conmee was very much to the fore. What was the history of that affair ? Mr. Conmee was in some way associated with Mr. Clergue in getting a bonus from the provincial government for the Algoma Central Railway, and they came down here and got a bonus from the Dominion government as well. Then Mr. Conmee goes on and contracts for the road, but he sublets the whole road to others to build, and it turns out, after the company are unable to carry out their obligations and the Lake Superior Company have gone to the wall, that Mr. Conmee, with his partner, Mr. Bowman, of Southampton, have a claim against this road for some $400,000, and the Ontario government is asked to guarantee or give a loan to the Lake Superior Company in some way, and take this road as security. Now the provincial government give a guarantee of $2,000,000 to help resuscitate and put this company on their feet again. There is no doubt whatever from what was brought out there, at least no doubt in my mind, that Mr. Conmee was one of the beneficiaries of that deal, and yet Mr. Conmee sat in the legislature and helped to vote it through, both he and Mr. Bowman. This road was built on the same principle, I presume, as governed several other deals that were brought out in the local legislature a few years ago. It was discovered that this same Mr. Conmee was interested in or owned no less than eightly mining leases, or had applications in for mining obligations, or mining rights, or timber rights in that country, as well as water-powers—everything, it seemed, within reach in that country Mr. Conmee was connected with in some way or other. Whether it is water-power, whether it is pulp limits, whether it is timber limits, whether it is fishing leases or mining leases, Mr. Conmee seems to be in everything, and his name appeared in the books there not less than eighty times, applying for mining leases and other grants in the gift of the Ontario government of which he was an ardent supporter all the time. But Mr. Conmee found that he was becoming so well known in Ontario that it was necessary for him to commence to operate somewhere where he was not so well know. Now he is adding this scheme to his strength, so as to enable him to finance his scheme ; and he requires this for the purpose of building up something that he will sell in New York or elsewhere, through his solicitors, having already control of fishing rights in that country, and having control of pulp lands in that country, being interested in mining leases in that country, and if there are any water-powers, most assuredly he will be in them as well as in everything else. It is not for the purpose of developing these water-powers, but in order to finance a scheme out of which he can make money that he is coming down here to get aid from the Dominion government. Now the intention of the Dominion government was to assist in the construction of railways where they were needed by the settlers. It is unnecessary to build here for that purpose, because there are no settlers. Then for what purpose is it ? If it was absolutely necessary to build a railway to a mine, to develop a mine, I could understand it, because sometimes, without

government aid in building to a mine, you could not carry on the operation. But so far as we know, there is no mine to be developed in that locality. Well, there are pulp lands, we may be told. There are pulp lands, but they are all gobbled up by Mr. Conmee and his friends. There are fishing interests there ; but he has control of them also. There are water-powers, I have no doubt whatever, but he will have control of them before long. Therefore, it is merely for the purpose of aiding Mr. Conmee and Mr. Conmee's friends.

After a while we may be asked to come to the assistance of the provincial government to keep alive some enterprising company, and to take back as security for the money we advance or the securities we hold this very railway which we are helping to build to-day, as they have done in Ontario during the last session, with the Algoma Central. It is for that purpose the money is being given. I say it is an improper purpose. It is not the intention of parliament to aid railways for that purpose but for the purpose of assisting the settlers or developing a country where it was absolutely necessary in the interest of the settlers that some money should be given to aid a railway so that they might have the convenience of means of communication.

Mr. McCOOL. In looking at the wording of the resolution it certainly does not leave the impression that there is anything whatever wrong with the three-mile branch. Any one who has been along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway knows well that it is nearly impossible to get down to the lake shore at Nipigon station. The proposed line starts from Nipigon station and the object of this branch from Lake Helen to the main line is in order to get down to the lake shore for water communication, to tap the lake with easy grades. If this does not tap the Nipigon Railway, then the subsidy is not payable, so it is quite evident to me—I do not know this as a fact, but looking at it rrom a commonsense point of view—that the object of this three and a half mile branch is to get access to the lake which cannot be had at Lake Nipigon. I know that from my knowledge of the locality.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the Nipigon not a floatable river ?

Mr. McCOOL. We are not talking about the Nipigon river, but Nipigon station. The hon. member for Hamilton objected owing to the fact that the Ontario government had granted a subsidy of $3,000 a mile for this piece of road. He knows as well as I do or as any one does who has been in that country, that no line of railway can be built there for $6,200 a mile. It is said that the Canadian Pacific Railway just in that neighbourhood cost $60,000 a mile.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. BARKER. The government are not paying for the railway, this is simply a subsidy.

Mr. McCOOL. I know that, but even $3,000 of a local subsidy should not be any reason why this subsidy should not be granted. I think it will be found that the three and a half mile branch is intended to give them access to Lake Superior.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that this three and a half miles would cost anything in the neighbourhood of $60,000 a mile to build ?

Mr. McCOOL. In the neighbourhood of Nipigon station the Canadian Pacific Railway, I am told, cost about $60,000.

Mr. BLAIN. I am asking about the three and a half miles under discussion, and how much it would cost, in the hon. gentleman's opinion.

Mr. McCOOL. I could not say. The hon. gentleman has passed through that section more than once, and knows as well as I do that the whole country there is difficult to build a railway through, and that you cannot cheaply get back into the interior. I do not think there is any land fit for settlement in the first few miles after leaving the lake, but when you get back, there is no doubt there is good land and if this road is going to reach land which will be good for settlement there is no reason why the subsidy should not be granted.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the hon. gentleman aware of any special industry in existence there to-day that requires the building of this railway ?

Mr. McCOOL. All I know is that there are a great many mining locations there, but I do not think it would be possible to work them without railway communication.

Mr. SPROULE. My impression is that there is no industry there and no mining locations developed, simply the merest evidences of mines that may or may not become something. The only resources would be the pulp timber and the fishing interests, and the pulp-wood I understand could be easily floated down. Therefore it seems to me this cannot be for any purpose but to help an exploiter to develop a scheme out of which he is going to make money.

Mr. McCOOL. I think it is a most reasonable thing to use the water stretches along that road in view of the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific, in order to provide early communications in the summer to carry supplies through for that line. While these sections are simply connecting the lakes at the present time they form links in the whole system, and the inten-

tion is to continually build around the lakes In the meantime, they form a line of communication over which supplies for the Grand Trunk can be taken.

Mr. BARKER. Looking at the map in the hands of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) which is a government map, and on a larger scale than the map which the minister shows, it is quite clear that Helen lake is either on the main line between Nipigon station and Lake Nipigon, or the three miles to Helen lake is a branch parallel to the main line or very nearly so, so that in no sense can it be proper to grant this three mile subsidy. It is either part of the main line or else almost parallel to it. Helen lake is north of Nipigon station, and must be either on the main line or close to it, so it seems absurd to grant a subsidy for the main line and also for another three miles from Nipigon station to Helen lake.

Mr. McCOOL. The intention is to get down to the lakes.

Mr. BARKER. No, it is in the other direction.

Mr. HYMAN. No, the hon. gentleman from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) is wrong.

Mr. McCOOL. It is a line running north, it would run a little east of north, starting from the lake.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. My hon. friend knows where Helen lake is ?

Mr. McCOOL. No, I do not know, but the wording says it is on the line of the Nipigon Railway.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. You cannot get from Helen lake to the bay without going through Nipigon station. If my hon. friend looks at the map he will see in an instant.

Mr. BROCK. The arguments against this subsidy are so strong and so well defined, and the arguments in favour of it are so weak and so confused and so indefinite, that the committee ought be convinced that the item should be dropped, at least until we can get more information. I cannot understand this proposition as a matter of business. The Minister of Railways seems to be going it blind, if I may use the expression ? He asks us to vote this money without his having any knowledge of the manner in which it is to be expended or as to whether it can be expended at all. We are simply making a farce of this subsidy business, if we are going to vote subsidies on such absolute want of information as the minister displays or even on such meagre information as the member for the Nipissing district can give us. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCool) had every desire to make his statement in regard to this matter as favourable as it could be made, but his arguments have been so unconvincing that I have made up my mind that I cannot vote for this subsidy.

Mr. BARKER. We are voting a subsidy here for one-half mile of track which is simply a spur track on the main line to some insignificant place not shown on the map. If we are to grant subsidies for spur lines we had better do it above-board. This is a branch line for the convenience of some person who has a bit of property that he wants to get a railway to.

Mr. SPROULE. I have no doubt that some one has an investment at Cameron's Falls mentioned in the resolution, which this line will help to develop, and probably when they get the subsidy the next application we will have will be to make it an electric railway. We are getting the business down to a fine point when we subsidize one and a half miles in a section of the country where there are no settlers, and deny a subsidy to hundreds of other places where there is considerable settlement and great need of a railway.

Mr. HENDERSON. In view of what was said the other day as to the vote when no division is recorded, I wish to say that I protest against this subsidy and I want it to be understood that I vote against it.

4. For the construction of a branch line of railway beginning at the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's main line at St. Philippe d'Argenteuil station, or at a point between there and Grenville, then in a northerly direction, in lieu of the subsidy granted by item 49 of section 2 of chapter 57 of 1903, not exceeding three miles.

Mr. MACLEAN. Does the Canadian Pacific Railway get this subsidy ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think it is the Canadian Pacific Railway ; but I am not sure.

Mr. MACLEAN. I take this opportunity to protest against a single dollar of the people's money going either to the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway as long as they maintain that infamous contract with the Bell Telephone Company, against the interests of the people of Canada. There is only one way to regulate these monopolies ; there is only one way to maintain the rights of the public, and that is to refuse to give public money to these corporations that act unjustly until they remove the injustice. The Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, stand convicted to-day as conspiring against the interests of the public, and we should not give them a cent without demanding a removal of grievances. The government have already decided to deal with companies concerned with the Inland Revenue Department which make improper contracts, by cancelling their licenses. The same principle should be applied in this matter,

and not a single dollar should go to the Canadian Pacific Railway, or the Grand Trunk Railway, or any other company which is party to a contract which is inimical to the rights of the people. This contract with the Bell Company is against the public interests, and I protest and will continue to protest against granting these companies getting a dollar until that contract is revoked.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend should await a better opportunity to protest. I am afraid that even with this subsidy neither the Canadian Pacific Railway nor any other railway company will build the line, so that it can hardly be considered as much to their benefit. It is in order to induce some railway company to give accommodation to the people that the subsidy is voted.

Mr. MACLEAN. This is the first opportunity I have had to protest, but time after time we will be giving great concessions to these companies, and I will always renew my protest. No doubt the Canadian Pacific Railway have asked for this subsidy.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They have not asked for it.

Mr. MACLEAN. They will later on.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That will be the time to protest.

Mr. MACLEAN. The right hon. gentleman said he thought it was for the Canadian Pacific Railway, but when I raised the question he now says it is not for the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not.

Mr. MACLEAN. The time will come when the issue can be raised ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That will be the time to raise it.

Mr. MACLEAN. I will be on hand to raise it. The only way to discipline these companies is to prevent them receiving favours from this parliament until grievances are removed.

Mr. SPROULE. The old subsidy was for a line between Argenteuil and Lachute, and this subsidy is for a line between Argenteuil and Grenville.

Mr. CHRISTIE. I wish to say a few words in explanation. This subsidy was granted last year to the Great Northern Railway to build a branch to Brownsburg, at which point extensive granite quarries are established, which employ a large number of men, and which have a monthly payroll of $5,000. The distance is much shorter from the Canadian Pacific Railway to this quarry than it is between the points for which a subsidy was granted last year, and the railway will serve not only the quarry but the Dominion Cartridge Company which has very extensive works at Brownsburg. At the present time both the granite company and the cartridge company have to cart their supplies and their products a distance of three miles over a bad road which it is very difficult to keep in order. This line is very much required and it will be greatly in the interest of the country when it is constructed. I am told that when this piece of railway is built, the granite quarries instead of having a pay-roll of $5,000 a month will pay three or four times that amount in wages. This subsidy ought not be questioned by this House, and I for one would not recommend it were I not absolutely sure of the merits of the case. I have no hesitation in supporting this subsidy. I am informed that the Canadian Pacific Railway would not undertake to build the line, but, as it is a work that is absolutely necessary, the concerns interested in having it built are willing to give some additional assistance.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it is well that the hon. gentleman gave the explanation, because that is what the House wants to know. I do not think any person would object under the circumstances such as these ; but without that knowledge, we are going it blind. It may be that this line will largely benefit an individual who owns a quarry ; but even where that is the case, the general interest of the public may justify the subsidy.

Mr. CHRISTIE. Apart from that, there is quite a little village there.

To the Chateauguay and Northern Railway Company, for a railway from a point in Hochelaga ward, Montreal, to a point on the Great Northern Railway in or near the town of Joliette, passing through the town of L'Assomption, Quebec, together with a spur line into the said town, in lieu of the subsidy granted by item 32 of section 2 of chapter 8 of 1900, not exceeding 42 miles.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would amend that by striking out the word 'through' and substituting the words 'at or near' the town of L'Assomption.

Mr. MACLEAN. Whose line is this ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am glad to say I can give a good explanation of this to my hon. friend. It is owned neither by the Grand Trunk nor the Canadian Pacific Railway, but by the Great Northern, and the railway is in operation.

Mr. MACLEAN. Has the Great Northern a contract with the Bell Telephone Company ? The right hon. gentleman should assure the House of that before he grants this subsidy. The Bell Telephone Company is making these contracts with all the railways in Canada, and if the right hon. gentleman is alert in the public interest, he will make this inquiry and refuse to

give a subsidy to any railway company that makes such a contract.

To the Chateauguay and Northern Railway Company, for a branch line from a point on its main line to or near Charlemagne, thence northerly and westerly to a point on the Montford and Gatineau Railway at or near Morin Flats, in lieu of the subsidy granted to the Montford and Gatineau Colonization Railway by item 41 of section 2 of chapter 57 of 1903, not exceeding 22 miles.

Mr. SPROULE. Why do you change this subsidy from the one company to the other ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think because the railway has been acquired by the Chateauguay and Northern.

To the Ottawa River Railway Company, for a line of railway from a point at or near St. Agathe des Monts station towards the township of Howard in the county of Argenteuil, passing near Lakes St. Joseph and Ste. Marie, in a southerly direction, in lieu of the subsidy granted to the Montreal Northern Railway Company by item 58 of section 2 of chapter 57 of 1903, not exceeding 15 miles.

Mr. SPROULE. You change this to the Ottawa River Railway Company from the Montreal Northern. What is the reason of that ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The reason, as I understand, is that the Montreal Northern Railway Company refused to build the railway for that subsidy, and this new company is willing to undertake it.

To the Ottawa River Railway Company, for a line of railway between a point in the parish of St. Andrews, in the county of Argenteuil, and a point in the parish of St. Lawrence, in the county of Jacques Cartier, passing through the parishes of St. Placide, St. Eustache and St. Martin, in lieu of the subsidy granted by item 10 of section 2 of chapter 57 of 1903, not exceeding 38 miles.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This subsidy last year was given to no company. This year it is voted to a company which has been organized since.

For a line of railway from Lardo towards Upper Arrow lake, British Columbia, in lieu of the subsidy granted by item 28 of section 2 of chapter 7 of 1901, not exceeding 30 miles.

Mr. SPROULE. What company is to get this ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Canadian Pacific Railway.

To the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company, either for a line of railway from a point at or near Spence's bridge on the Canadian Pacific Railway to Nicola lake, or for a line of railway from a point at or near the village of Coutlee, southerly towards Princton and Headley, in lieu of the subsidy granted by item 26 of section 2 of chapter 57 of 1903, not exceeding 45 miles.

Mr. GALLIHER. I would suggest to the Minister of Railways that this item be withdrawn, for the following reasons. Last session a subsidy was granted to the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Railway Company for forty-five miles from Spence's bridge to Nicola lake. Around and in the vicinity of Nicola lake there are a number of large cattle ranches, farms, small ranches and coal fields. One of the reasons given for the granting of the subsidy last year, which I considered a good reason, and which I supported, was that whereas these ranchers and farmers had to drive their stock forty-five miles before they could get to the Canadian Pacific Railway, if this road were built to Spence's bridge, they would be able to put their cattle and other produce on the cars there ; whereas, if the alternative proposition is carried out, the railway will start at Coutlee near Nicola lake, and run in a southerly direction, beginning (forty-five miles distant from the Canadian Pacific Railway) where there is no railway, and ending where there is no railway at a much greater distance. As this would be of no practical benefit to the settlers, I must request the hon. Minister of Railways to withdraw the resolution.

Mr. EMMERSON moved that resolution 11 be struck out.

Mr. HAGGART. Who are the promoters?

Mr. GALLIHER. They are all either St. Catharines or Toronto people, some on one side of politics and some on the other.

Mr. HAGGART. And most of them on both sides.

Mr. GALLIHER. My hon. friend has more experience than I in these matters.

Mr. HAGGART. Why do they ask for an alternative road ?

Mr. GALLIHER. One of the reasons they gave me was that they thought it would bring about a quicker construction of the road—not only that forty-five miles, but the forty-five miles that would connect them direct with Spence's bridge. That reasoning did not appeal to me. I am speaking entirely in the interests of these people when I ask that this resolution be withdrawn, without regard as to whether it is better or worse for the company.

Motion agreed to.

On resolution 6,

6. The granting of such subsidies, and the receipt thereof by the respective companies, shall be subject to the condition that the Governor in Council may at all times provide and secure to other companies, such running powers, traffic arrangements and other rights, as will afford to all railways connecting with the railways and bridge so subsidized, reasonable and proper facilities in exercising such running powers, fair and reasonable traffic arrangements with connecting companies, and equal mileage rates between all such connecting railways; and

the Governor in Council shall have absolute control, at all times, over the rates and tolls to be levied and taken by any of the companies, or upon any of the railways and the bridge hereby subsidized.

Mr. FIELDING. This was copied from the old Act which was made at a time when the Governor in Council had supervision of rates. The Railway Commission has been substituted for the Governor in Council in this respect and this section should be amended.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will ask that this section be allowed to stand that an amendment may be made to fit it to the changed conditions.

Mr. MACLEAN. At this point I would like to propose an amendment as section 6a :

6a. The granting of said subsidy and the receipt thereof by the respective companies, shall be subject to the conditions that the Governor in Council may at all times provide and secure to all telephone companies equal treatment in the matter of telephone connection with the stations and buildings of the company.

I would like to know if the government will accept this amendment. This is to gain the same object with regard to these companies that was supposed to have been gained with regard to all companies by the clause that was inserted in the Railway Act of last session. I will not insist on an answer now, but I will submit the amendment so that the minister can consider it.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will take it into consideration. It is distinct from the matters with which we are dealing.

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes, and I make it a distinct clause of the Subsidy Act and am prepared to divide the committee on it if necessary. I want only to make it clear that these subsidies shall not go to companies that will not grant equality of telephone connection.

Mr. EMMERSON. I can not accept it at the moment but I will take it into consideration for the third reading.

On resolution 7,

7. Every company receiving a subsidy hereunder, its successors and assigns, and any person or company controlling or operating the railway or portion of railway subsidized hereunder, shall each year furnish to the government of Canada transportation for men, supplies, materials and mails over the portion of the line in respect of which it has received each subsidy, and whenever required, shall furnish mail cars properly equipped for such mail service ; and such transportation and service shall be performed at such rates as are agreed upon between the minister of the department of the government for which such service is being performed, and the company performing it, and, in case of disagreement, then at such rates as are approved by the Governor in Council ; and in or towards payment for such charges the government of Canada shall be credited by the company with a sum equal to 3 per cent per annum on the amount of the subsidy received by the company hereunder.

Mr. MACLEAN. Does that mean transportation for all officials of the government?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN. Has the hon. gentleman a list of the officials of the government who already have free transportation over the railways of this country ?

On resolution 10,

10. Whenever a contract has been duly entered into with a company for the construction of any line of railway hereby subsidized, the Minister of Railways and Canals, at the request of the company, and upon the request of the chief engineer of the government railways, and his certificate that he has made careful examination of the surveys, plans and profiles of the whole line so contracted for, and has duly considered the physical characteristics of the country to be traversed and the means for transport available for construction, naming the probable and reasonable cost of such construction, may, with the authorization of the Governor in Council, enter into a supplementary agreement, fixing definitely the maximum amount of the subsidy to be paid, based upon the said certificate of the chief engineer, and providing that the company shall be entitled to be paid, as the minimum, the ordinary subsidy of $3,200 per mile, together with the 60 per cent difference between the amount so fixed and the said $3,200 per mile, if any ; and the balance, 40 per cent, shall be paid only on completion of the whole work subsidized, and in so far as the actual cost, as finally determined by the chief engineer, entitles the company thereto ; provided always :

(a.) That the estimated cost, so certified, is not less on the average than $18,000 per mile for the whole mileage subsidized ;

(b.) That no payment shall be made except upon a certificate of the chief engineer that work done is up to the standard specified in the company's contract ;

(c.) That in no case shall the subsidy exceed the sum of $6,400 per mile.

Mr. HAGGART. Payment under this is not to be based on the actual cost, it is to be based on the estimated cost. Surely, payment ought to be made on the actual cost of the road.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is in accordance with the Bill which we passed the other day. It is based on the original grant of $3,200, then on progress estimates you pay 60 per cent.

Mr. BLAIN. Referring again to resolution 9, there is a provision that when the steel rails cannot be purchased in Canada of suitable quality and at a reasonable price, they may be procured and purchased elsewhere. I would like to ask the minister if there is any reference to rolling stock, cars and locomotives. I agree with section 9 as

regards the purchase of steel rails in Canada if they are procurable ; but I think the government should go further, and say that no subsidies shall be granted unless the rolling stock is purchased in Canada as well.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the duties would protect the home industry. The only assurance the home industry would have would be found in that way. When that Act was passed rails were free.

Mr. BARKER. I suppose the subsidy would be actually paid before they bought the rolling stock, so you could not apply it very well.

Mr. EMMERSON. I wish to go back for a moment to resolution 6 and amend that resolution by substituting the words 'Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada' instead of the words 'Governor in Council' in the two cases where the latter words appear.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose the minister has got the consent of His Excellency the Governor General to these resolutions?

Mr. FIELDING. That had to be obtained before we reached this stage, we got that at an earlier stage.

Mr. HAGGART. If there are any serious changes, you will have to get his consent again.

Mr. BLAIN. The Finance Minister has answered my question by saying that he supposes the duties that are imposed will protect in some measure the Canadian manufacturer of rolling stock and locomotives. I would like to point out to the Finance Minister and to the Minister of Railways that while the duties would in some measure protect the manufacturers of these things in Canada, in my opinion the duties are not sufficient, for the fact remains that during the last few years a large number of locomotives and a considerable amount of rolling stock have been purchased elsewhere, a considerable portion in the United States. My hon. friend shakes his head, but I think that is correct.

Mr. EMMERSON. Not within the last two or three years.

Mr. BLAIN. Will he say there are no locomotives being imported from the United States ?

Mr. EMMERSON. None are being imported from the United States now, they are being constructed at Kingston.

Mr. BLAIN. I am quite sure my hon. friend is wrong about that.

Mr. PATERSON. Does the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) refer to government railways ?

Mr. BLAIN. I refer to locomotives for other railways than the Intercolonial when I say there is a considerable amount of money that goes out of Canada to the United States and to England for the purchase of locomotives and other rolling stock. When the Minister of Finance says that the duty in some measure protects the home industry I agree with him, but I say it is not sufficient. When the minister is putting a provision in resolution 9, that when steel rails can be purchased in Canada for the construction of these roads they should be purchased here as long as the quality and price are suitable, subject to the decision of the Minister of Railways himself, why could not the government put in a clause saying that these subsidies shall not be paid unless the railway companies purchase their rolling stock in Canada ? There can be no objection to that.

Mr. FIELDING. I can assure my hon. friend that it is unnecessary. I think I am safe in saying that there have been no locomotives—I do not think I would be wrong if I said no rolling stock—imported into Canada for the last two or three years except in case where the Canadian manufacturers were so busy that they could not supply the articles. I think that statement is substantially correct. In the matter of locomotives, I know our factories were all busy, and the locomotives were only imported because railway companies could not obtain them in Canada. Therefore, I think everything my hon. friend desires to accomplish is already accomplished. I think my statement respecting locomotives would be substantially true also with respect to rolling stock unless it be in the case of higher grade rolling stock, such as sleeping cars, &c, which have not hitherto been made in Canada at all.

Mr. BLAIN. Let me call attention to the fact that the Railway Commission on the instruction or with the approval of the government have bought a car at a cost of $20,000 which was not made in Canada. The Minister of Finance has overlooked the fact that the hon. member for West Toronto pointed out at the last session of parliament that a considerable amount of parts of locomotives were imported last year and large orders given by the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is not an answer for my hon. friend to say that they would be purchased here if the shops were not busy. What I say is, that any railway company or any body of men constituting themselves a company to construct a railway in Canada receiving a subsidy from parliament should be compelled to pledge themselves that every dollar of rolling stock would be manufactured in Canada and the money paid to Canadian people. It is all very well to say the shops are busy, that is an old story.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. The Finance Minister says 'yes.'

Mr. FIELDING. For eight years now.

Mr. BLAIN. It has got too old now, and rather thin, for the government to advance any longer. What I say is that if these companies are in a financial position to construct railways then they are in a financial position to erect shops in this country and cause rolling stock to be manufactured in Canada. We cannot expect to build up this country and make it a large manufacuring country if we are going to pay out of the treasury of Canada very large amounts of money every year towards the construction of railways and at the same time allow a large portion of the money for the equipment of these railways with rolling stock to go into the United States and other countries. The hon. Finance Minister has put in a clause that the steel rails shall be procured in Canada, if possible, when he knows full well that there are no steel rails manufactured in Canada to-day. Two years ago the hon. gentleman said that in a short time steel rails would be manufactured in Canada in his own province under the splendid assistance the government were giving the steel rail industry. That time has passed, and no rails are manufactured, so the minister says nothing about it now. If it is the policy of the government to put a clause in that steel rails shall be procured in Canada if procurable, surely the same policy shall apply to box cars, sleeping cars and locomotives, of which there are a great many manufactured in Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. With regard to the manufacture of rails, I am delighted to be able to inform my hon. friend that not only in my province but in his province rails will be made before many weeks, certainly before many months, so that my hon. friend will be in a position to congratulate us at no distant date upon the full realization of our expectations in this respect.

Mr. BLAIN. That is all very well to make that statement in the House, but we all remember that a month before the last general election in October, 1900, this government entered into a contract with the Clergue Manufacturing Company at the Sault, Ontario, to supply a very large quantity of rails, the contract extending for five years.

Mr. FIELDING. Was that not a good thing ?

Mr. BLAIN. Very good, if it was not done for political purposes and if it matures. The difficulty is that these statements are made and my hon. friend wishes to take credit for the contract made in 1900 yet we are in the year 1904, and the fact remains that at the Sault, where the contract was made, I shall not say that exactly no rails, but practically no rails have been manufactured. I think I am correct in saying too that in the Finance Minister's own province, where he stated a few years ago steel rails would be manufactured, there are none manufactured at this moment.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is mistaken when he says that several years ago I stated that steel rails would be at once manufacture in my own province.

Mr. BLAIN. I did not say that. I said that my hon. friend, in the discussion of the steel rail contract entered into by Mr. Blair, then Minister of Railways, said that we would not only have steel rails manufactured in Ontario, but that they would be manufactured in his own province.

Mr. FIELDING. Quite so, and both of these statements will be found to be correct within a very few months, if not weeks. When my hon. friend says that no rails have been manufactured he is slightly mistaken. I cannot tell what quantity were made at the Sault, but a quantity were manufactured and delivered to the Intercolonial where they are now in use.

Mr. BLAIN. How many ?

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot tell the number. My hon. friend I think rather assailed us for making the contract. At all events we made an effort to encourage the rail business in Canada, in his own province, Ontario, and I think he might be more grateful for our efforts even if, in the meantime, the industry there and at Sydney has experienced some difficulties. We ought to be able to rejoice that these industries are rising above their troubles and that at a comparatively early date steel rails will be made at both Sault Ste. Marie and at Sydney. If the clause be amended in the way suggested it will not alter the situation but will leave it precisely the same as now. The clause as the hon. member proposes it, would read just as in the case of the rails, that rolling stock should be procured in Canada when it could be procured at prices as reasonable as it might be procurable abroad. That is exactly what is happening to-day. I stated as a matter within my own knowledge that the Kingston locomotive shops were full of orders and could not take any new orders during the last year or two. It may be that now they are in a less congested condition and can take orders, but I know that again and again the locomotive works in Canada were unable to fill orders and only under those circumstances did the railways go out of Canada for the locomotives. I think I am safe in saying that no locomotives have been brought into Canada for the last two or three years except where the shops in Canada were

not able to fill the orders. If you put in that clause in respect to rolling stock you will leave the matter in the same position as it now is, as no rolling stock is being brought into Canada to-day as far as I know, except in the case of the especially high class work. Whether or not it was wise to require for the Railway Commission a car of the character which has been purchased, is another question, but a car of that character could not be made in Canada. That is an absolute fact.

Mr. BLAIN. This is another indication of the government trying to introduce protection under the guise of special favours. It would have been much better if, instead of giving special privileges, the government had placed a duty on steel rails sufficiently high to induce enterprising Canadians to invest in the industry. The hon. gentleman has tried the bounty system without much advantage to the people and not much credit to the government, because after four years of bounty, steel rails are still being imported. The Minister of Finance said that the private car for the Railway Commisison could not be made in Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not say that. I said that whether or not the railway commissioners required a car of that character had been the subject of debate, but that a car of that class could not be made in Canada.

Mr. BLAIN. Could not ?

Mr. FIELDING. Certainly ; there is no factory in Canada making them.

Mr. BLAIN. I make the broad statement that there is sufficient enterprise in Canada to manufacture a car suitable for the railway commissioners, and they would have manufactured that car——

Mr. EMMERSON. They were all asked and declined.

Mr. BLAIN. Then it was the duty of the government to decline to vote any money for a car until it could be manufactured in Canada, and the railway commission would not have suffered much in the meantime.

Mr. FIELDING. That is quite another question. I must correct my hon. friend on a very material point. He has said that for four years we have been carrying on a policy of bountying steel rails and that nothing has come of it. My hon. friend is dreaming. There is no such policy as a bounty on steel rails.

Mr. BLAIN. That is a catchy point.

Mr. FIELDING. It is not.

Mr. BLAIN. I stand corrected. The hon. gentleman knows full well that his government entered into a large contract with a Canadian firm for steel rails.

Mr. FIELDING. That is another question.

Mr. BLAIN. If the government had imposed a proper duty on steel rails five years ago, some enterprising firm would have invested money in the enterprise, and we would have been manufacturing steel rails in Canada to-day.

Mr. FIELDING.. I simply pointed out to my hon. friend that under that there is no such policy as a bounty on steel rails.

Mr. BLAIN. The policy of this government has been one of bounties rather than one of protection.

Mr. FIELDING. That would be a fair question for argument if we were discussing bounties generally.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. With the permission of the House, I would say that the Dominion Iron and Steel Company at the present time is rushing to completion the construction of a steel rail mill. Some time ago they sent some of their steel billets to the old country and had them converted into steel rails, and these steel rails have been reported on most favourably by the government inspector. The report which is on file in the Department of Railways and Canals shows that these rails are of a very superior quality indeed. Some of them have been laid upon the Intercolonial Railway, and others have been sent to the Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk Railway. The Dominion Iron and Steel Company is at present taking orders for steel rails for delivery in the spring to any railway company which is prepared to give orders to them. These rails have been proven to be of splendid quality. I shall not dwell on that further, but I wish to say a word in answer to my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain). He says that the proper policy for this government to have adopted five years ago was to have placed a high duty upon steel rails. I am at one with the hon. gentleman at that, but I wish to remind him that that is the very thing which this government has done. Gentlemen who are interested in the manufacture of steel rails in Canada came to this government and submitted a proposition which the government approved of But let me remind my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) that certain gentlemen in Nova Scotia who were interested in the manufacture of steel rails came to the Conservative government, and asked them to impose a duty upon steel rails, and I am here to state that the Conservative government absolutely and positively refused to do so.

Mr. CLANCY. What evidence have you of that ?

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. I will refer my hon. friend to evidence that he will not contradict.

Mr. CLANCY. I should be glad to have it.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. If my hon. friend will turn to the files of 'Industrial Canada' he will see that assertion made. Further, if the hon. gentleman will consult those who are interested in the manufacture of steel rails in Canada, he will find that such an application was made to the Conservative government as far back as 1887 and refused by them. At all events no one will deny that while there were tariffs on everything else there was no tariff on steel rails until last year. The record of the late government and the record of the present government are before the people, and I have no hesitation in saying that the people will regard the policy of the present government in reference to the steel rail industry as being far preferable to the policy of the late government.

Mr. BLAIN. How many steel rails have been manufactured in Nova Scotia since 1896 ?

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. No steel rails have been manufactured in my province since 1896, but I can tell the hon. gentleman that previous to 1896 we had all the elements that would tend to a successful steel rail industry in Nova Scotia, but was not established. In 1898 those interested in the manufacture of steel and iron made representations to the Liberal government, and under the assistance they received they built up a magnificent steel industry in the county which I have the honour to represent. I may mention that there are two such industries in the constituency of Cape Breton to-day. My hon. friend may think that these industries have not been eminently successful, but I am here to say that up to the present they have been fairly successful, and that their future is assured. I can also say that the erection of a steel rail mill is being pressed forward as rapidly as possible. At this very moment the company is looking for orders for steel rails which it is prepared to deliver in the spring.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to correct the hon. gentleman in one statement which he made, or the information which has been given to us is wrong, that application was made by the Sault Company for a duty on steel rails. The statement made by Mr. Clergue in Toronto was that he desired to have a duty placed on steel rails, but that the government would not accede to that, but to satisfy his company gave it a contract for steel rails at a pretty high figure.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman has admitted the important fact, that we have proposed a duty on steel rails, and that under that provision of the statute, steel rail mills are in operation at this moment.

Mr. CLANCY. I would ask the Minister of Finance if steel rails are now being imported free of duty ? He knows that he has a pledge embodied in the statute, that as soon as steel rails of a suitable quality can be made in Canada, the duty will come into force. We have the assurance of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat that already steel rails of an admirable quality are being made.

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. CLANCY. I will not contradict the hon. Minister of Finance. I will leave him to argue that out with his own friends. But I understand that there are steel rails already laid on the Intercolonial Railway that were made at the Sault. Are they sufficiently good that the hon. gentleman will now encourage the industry by bringing the tariff into force ?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend has slightly misconceived what was stated by the hon. member for Cape Breton. He did not state that steel rails had been made at Sydney. What he did state, and what is the fact, is that the promoters of the Sydney enterprise, with a view to testing and proving the fitness of their steel for making steel rails, had sent a quantity of Sydney steel to the United Kingdom, and had it rolled into rails, which were brought out and placed on the Intercolonial Railway. Steel rails have not yet been made at Sydney for commercial purposes. They have been made at the Sault, and arrangements, I believe, are being made there to re-open the works. The Sydney works also will be ready at no distant day to make rails and when that time arrives the statute provides that the duty shall be imposed. That time may come very soon.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the contract with the Sault Company still in existence ?

Mr. FIELDING. That is a matter for the Railway Department, but I think it has lapsed.

Mr. SPROULE. They were making rails, because I saw them turning them out.

Mr. FIELDING. They were making rails at the time the contract was made. The provision with reference to the duty was of a later date.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has told us that some of these rails were laid on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. Is he satisfied, irrespective of the quantity delivered, that the quality is such as would warrant him in bringing the statute into force if a reasonable quantity could be had ?

Mr. FIELDING. Frankly, I think so.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I understand that there is something wrong with the steel

turned out at the Clergue works. Has the hon. gentleman any data bearing on that ?

Mr. FIELDING. I understand that most of the rails turned out proved to be satisfactory. I believe that some were unsatisfactory and were not used. But that transaction occurred several years ago, and I do not remember the particulars.

Mr. MACLEAN. I submitted a resolution while the premier was out and gave it to the Minister of Railways on the understanding that he would consider it. I am quite willing that the resolutions be reported, and on the third reading I will bring up the question again.

Mr. KAULBACH. The fact that the resolutions at present before parliament calling for so many and large appropriations for railway construction in various parts of this Dominion contain no appropriation for the northern end of the country which I have the honour to represent, so much deserving of aid, causes me great disappointment which I feel constrained to express. I made a request by letter in April last addressed to the Minister of Railways which was a renewal of previous requests, for a continuation of the line of railway from New Germany, where the Caledonia and Central Railway intersect to Foster Settlement and New Ross, and from thence by the valley of the Gold River to Chester basin, to connect with the Halifax and Southwestern Railway. I asked for a money appropriation for construction, and showed how essential this road was to the settlers along the line of route, as well as to open up and develop the resources of the country, rich in soil, lumber and mineral, it being as fine as any in Nova Scotia. I further showed that the proposed road would be a ready way to market, as well as have those people relieved of the torture they at present have to undergo, travelling over a highway, or portage road, very little better in some places than an open wilderness. I must here not omit to state that the scene along the proposed route is an everchanging panorama of splendid views, showing miles of romantic ride, and soil most productive ; the scene being interspersed with hill, glen, lake and stream—the latter well supplied with fish ; all vieing with each other to offer the greatest attraction for settlers. Bulletins are published offering very excellent farms in Ontario and the west ; but nothing is said of the vast areas of productive, arable soil in Nova Scotia. Fruit in Lunenburg county, particularly in the districts I have referred to—New Germany, Foster Settlement, New Ross, and the places adjacent—can be grown in abundance and that of a beautiful description. It is a lovely sight to witness the farmers' handsome orchards, trees bending under the weight of scarlet apples, luscious, juicy grapes, plums growing purple in the sunlight, and pears vieing with each other for size. These in themselves contribute very largely to the comfort and wealth of the farmer and fruitgrower of these places when proper attention and skill are employed. The want of good roads and other facilities to reach a market, the people now occupying days in going to market and returning, is a great drawback to them, and most discouraging, whereas, with the facilities of railway transportation, time and space are overcome, money saved, and the promising youth of the country induced to remain, and settle at home, instead of going to the United States as they are now doing, seeking employment denied them at home, owing to the difficulties and inconveniences that beset them such as I have referred to. We are spending from day to day immense sums of money to bring settlers from abroad to the Northwest, whereas by constructing a railway from New Germany to New Ross, giving accommodation to the adjacent settlements of New Burn, Woodstock and other settlements nearer home, we offer inducements for our youths to remain and build comfortable homes for themselves at a comparatively small expenditure of time and money, and, best of all an opportunity to receive a fair return for their labour. I hope I shall not be considered as viewing the condition of this subject with a microscopic eye for I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that I know whereof I speak, having a practical knowledge of the capabilities of the country, and the conditions under which these people are suffering for the want of a railway.

Mr. FIELDING. I may point out to my hon. friend that these are all old subsidies which are being revoted because they are about to lapse. There are no subsidies among them for the province from which my hon. friend and myself come, for the very good reason that the parties there connected with the various railway enterprises are all prosecuting their work. Certainly the particular ones which touch his county and mine are going on in good faith. I have no reason to doubt that the particular enterprise to which my hon. friend refers runs through an excellent country and I hearily endorse what he says, but his county has been rather well looked after in the matter of railways and even if he does not get the particular line he desires, he has no reason to complain.

Mr. KAULBACH. I fully endorse the work done. The Halifax and Southwestern, from Halifax on to the county of Shelburne, will, I hope, meet with the expectations of the government. It is a very useful road, particularly for fishermen in the export of their fish to the west in cold storage. I am not criticising the construction of that road, because it will aid to develop the resources of the country, but I still hope that my hon.

friend the Minister of Finance will see the necessity for a road from New Germany to New Ross and down the valley of Gold river, to conect with the Halifax and South western, and trust he will see his way clear to have that project carried out at the very earliest day.

Mr. SPROULE. Had the Minister of Railways any application from the Tilsonburg and Collingwood Railway Company for an additional subsidy on what was voted last year? The subsidy voted last year was for 25 miles, and the company could not go on and finance on the strength of that short portion.

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot recall. I find that we amended this by striking out the words 'Governor in Council.' I think that those words should be restored, and clause 6 be reconsidered.

Motion to reconsider clause 6 agreed to.

Mr. EMMERSON moved to restore the words 'Governor in Council.'

Mr. BARKER. Should they be restored lower down in the paragraph again, the Governor in Council will have absolute control at all times over the rates and tolls to be levied. But that is a matter for the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is always a final appeal to the Governor in Council.

Mr. SPROULE. But that is only appellate jurisdiction.

Mr. EMMERSON. It would be very much better to make this change. It would cover the idea better to simply put in the words 'Governor in Council.'

Mr. HAGGART. Here is how it reads:

> And the Governor in Council shall have absolute control at all times over the rates and tolls to be levied and taken by any of the companies or by any of the railways and the bridge hereby subsidized.

You will thus remove the control altogether from the Railway Commissioners.

Mr. EMMERSON. I simply restore it as it was.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand that in the second instance the clause reads 'and the Board of Railway Commissioners.' But the minister desires to strike out 'the Board of Railway Commissioners' and substitute 'the Governor in Council.' That is altogether contrary to the spirit of the Railway Act, under which the full control is given the Railway Commissioners. Surely the Minister of Railways is not going, at the end of the session, without a moment's notice, change the whole of the law in that regard.

Mr. HAGGART. You not only withdraw the control of the Railway Commission from the roads to be built under this Subsidy Act, but all the roads to which any subsidy is given. You do so by these words:

> And the Governor in Council shall have absolute control at all times over the rates and tolls to be levied and taken by any of the companies or upon any of the railways and the bridge hereby subsidized.

Mr. EMMERSON. That does not take away from the Railway Commissioners any of their powers.

Mr. HAGGART. Then I cannot understand the English language.

Mr. SPROULE. When my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) proposed a two-cent rate the government told us that full control over rates had been given to the Railway Commission except in cases of appeal, and it would be improper for parliament to make an amendment that would take away the control. In this case we are making a change the effect of which will be that you have two authorities dealing with the same subject. Suppose that one authority is in favour of one rate, and another of another rate, how will the matter be settled? Then there is the question suggested by my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart): One of these railways is a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, over whose rates the government do not profess to have control. Are they going to try to get control in this round about way?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is a point that deserves consideration. I would suggest to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) that the resolutions might be reported, the Bill introduced and then we could consider the point before the Bill comes up for a second reading to-morrow.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the hon. Prime Minister give us any assurance that the words 'Railway Commission' will be retained?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot give my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) any assurance on that point. But I say the subject is worthy of consideration, and to-morrow morning we shall have an opportunity of discussing it.

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

Mr. EMMERSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 171) to authorize the granting of subsidies to the lines of railways therein mentioned, founded on the resolutions.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

COMPANIES ACT, 1902—AMENDMENT.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill

(No. 164) to amend the Companies Act of 1902. He said : This Bill is from the Senate. Its principal provision relates to railway contracts. The Companies Act provides that companies may be incorporated by letters-patent for various purposes, but provides that no company shall be incorporated by letters patent for the purpose of constructing a railway, telegraph or telephone lines. That is, a railway company cannot be incorporated by letters patent ; such a company desiring incorporation must come to parliament. This Bill proposes to amend that so as to make it clear that, while a railway company cannot be incorporated by letters patent, a company to take contracts for work on railways may be so incorporated. This Bill as it comes to us from the Senate reads :

3. Nothing in this section, or in any charter or letters patent heretofore or hereafter issued, shall be deemed to prevent any company to which this Act applies from acting as a contractor in railway, telegraph or telephone construction.

I am inclined to think that under that wording a company organized, say, to run a cheese factory would be able to engage in the work of railway contracting. Of course that is not the intention. The necessary amendment will be proposed to make it clear that only those companies that are chartered for the purpose can engage in this work.

Mr. HAGGART. Has this any ex post facto effect ? Will it affect any pending litigation.

Mr. FIELDING. It has no reference to that, and I am not aware of any such suit pending. The second clause in the Bill is to correct a clerical error in the French translation. The third section has to do with the redivision of shares to make them of convenient sums. Section 4 relates to the borrowing powers of the company. The law now limits the powers of companies as to the issue of bonds. It is proposed to add the following subsection :

2. The limitations and restrictions contained in this section shall not apply to the borrowing by the company on bills of exchange or promissory notes made, drawn, accepted or indorsed by or on behalf of the company.

The Bill has been put through the Senate, and I have no doubt that it is a well considered measure.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Did not that Bill originate in the Commons ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, it is a Senate Bill.

Mr. BARKER. It was introduced here by the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan).

Mr. SPEAKER. This Bill ?

Mr. BARKER. A Bill for the same purpose.

Mr. SPROULE. We certainly dealt with a Bill for the same purpose. It may have been a railway Bill then and now they have changed it to an amendment of the Companies Act. It was discussed in this House and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) must have heard the debate which took place. I think it was he who said, when the Bill was explained, that he did not think it a good measure. It was allowed to stand and afterwards was dropped. But now the promoters, to accomplish their object, have evidently introduced a Bill in the Senate to amend the Companies Act, seeking to gain in an indirect way what they could not gain directly. At the time, when the Bill was under discussion here, I drew attention to one case of trouble arising out of the construction of a railway to Hamilton. The members of the railway company were also members of the construction company. They brought in foreigners to carry out the work and these foreign contractors did not pay their workmen. When we sought to compel the company to pay their obligations, we found that it was a company located, I believe, in Illinois, and we could not control it as we ought to have been able to do. It was admitted at the time that this chartering of construction companies was a very bad principle, and such rights have not been granted since. But now the attempt is made to revive this system which was found to work so badly a number of years ago.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not remember the discussion to which my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) refers. All I know is that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in whose name the Bill stands, had occasion to be absent and asked me to move the second reading. I think the object of the Bill has been fully explained. Unless there is thought to be very serious reason to the contrary, I would suggest that the Bill be allowed to pass through its early stages, and before it is finally passed there will be every opportunity for consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to say in this connection that I think the minister was there at the time, and he will probably remember that the member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) had the Bill for the member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) ; and I believe it was understood it was in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific. It is all coming out by degrees now.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not remember what took place at the time, but I have no knowledge whatever of any company to which this applies. We have been in session for a long time now, and some things may have happened early in the session which I do

not remember, and I do not remember the discussion to which the hon. gentleman refers. However, we have to deal with the Bill. The purpose of the Bill is as I have stated; and unless there is a strong opposition, I see no objection to it. The purpose seems to be legitimate.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. At the time the Bill was brought in it was considered by the Finance Minister, as well as the Prime Minister, as being a covert means of arriving at certain ends, and so much opposition was engendered against it that the Bill was dropped, and now, for the first time, it pops up from the Senate. It looks very peculiar. I think it would be in the interest of all concerned that we should let it stand until we have had a chance of reading it, anyway.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the circumstances to press the Bill. I will withdraw the motion for the second reading, if the House will permit and it will be presented at a later stage. I am acting at the request of the Minister of Justice.

Motion for second reading withdrawn.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at Eight o'clock.

WAYS AND MEANS—TARIFF COMMISSION.

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

That the House again go into committee to consider of the ways and means for raising the supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Mr. MACLEAN. Before that motion is put, I take this occasion of asking the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) if he will take the House and the country into his confidence and state, with more detail, what the prospect is of a commission in regard to the tariff, whether we are to have such a commission; and, if so, whether the claims of the market-gardeners of the country for better protection will be considered?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think I can add anything to the very clear and emphatic statement I made on that subject in the budget speech. It is the intention of the government to appoint a commission of ministers, who will make an inquiry into the tariff, as on a previous occasion.

Mr. MACLEAN. After this session?

Mr. FIELDING. At some time; I am not prepared to say at what date. We are not anxious at this moment of having more business on our hands; but, by and by, in a reasonable time, the commission will be appointed and will proceed to its work.

Mr. FIELDING.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. FIELDING. I invite the attention of hon. gentlemen to the tariff resolutions, which will be found in the Votes and Proceedings of the 28th of June, page 534.

On resolution 2,

2. Resolved, that whenever it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Minister of Customs or of any officer of customs authorized to collect customs duties, that the export price or the actual selling price to the importer in Canada of any imported dutiable article, of a class or kind made or produced in Canada, is less than the fair market value thereof, (as determined according to the basis of value for duty provided in the Customs Act in respect of imported goods subject to an ad valorem duty) such article shall, in addition to the duty otherwise established, be subject to a special duty of customs equal to the difference between such fair market value and said selling price: provided, however, that the special customs duty on any article shall not exceed one-half of the customs duty otherwise established in respect of the article, except in regard to the articles mentioned in items 224, 226, 228 and 231 of schedule A, the special duty of customs on which shall not exceed fifteen per cent ad valorem, nor more than the difference between the selling price and the fair market value of the article as aforesaid.

The expression 'export price' or 'selling price' herein shall be held to mean and include the exporter's price for the goods, exclusive of all charges thereon after their shipment from the place whence exported directly to Canada.

The foreging provisions respecting a special duty of customs shall apply to imported round rolled wire rods not over three-eights of an inch in diameter, notwithstanding that such rods are on the customs free list: provided, however, that the special duty of customs on such wire rods shall not exceed fifteen per cent ad valorem.

If at any time it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council, on a report from the Minister of Customs, that the payment of the special duty herein provided for is being evaded by the shipment of goods on consignment without sale prior to such shipment, or otherwise, the Governor in Council may in any case or class of cases authorize such action as is deemed necessary to collect on such goods or any of them the same special duty as if the goods had been sold to an importer in Canada prior to their shipment to Canada.

If the full amount of any special duty of customs be not paid on goods imported, the customs entry thereof shall be amended and the deficiency paid upon the demand of the collector of customs.

The Minister of Customs may make such regulations as are deemed necessary for carrying out the provisions of the foregoing sections and for the enforcement thereof.

Such regulations may also provide for the temporary exemption from special duty of any article or class of articles, when it is established to the satisfaction of the Minister of Customs that such articles are not made in Canada in substantial quantities and offered for sale to all purchasers on equal terms.

The special duty aforementioned shall not apply to goods of a class subject to excise duty in Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. I wish to propose an amendment, to insert after 'equal terms,' at the end of the last paragraph but one of resolution 2, referring to the regulations which may be made in carrying out these provisions, the following :

Such regulations may further provide for the exemption from the special duty of any article whereon the duty in schedule A is equal to fifty per cent ad valorem or upwards, or where the difference between the fair market value of the goods and the selling price thereof to the importer as aforesaid amounts only to a small percentage of their fair market value.

The general purpose of the resolutions I have already explained, and I shall offer a word of explanation of this amendment. It proposes that the department may by regulation exempt from the operation of this clause two classes of goods, one where the duty is 50 per cent. There are some classes on which the duties are already very high and practically there is no need of a dumping clause as respects them. The second case is where the difference between the selling price and the fair market value is, to use the words of the resolution, only a small percentage. The reason for that is this. The operation of this clause, as anticipated from the beginning, will necessarily give a good deal of trouble and care to the department, and we desire to minimize this as far as possible. If the difference between the selling price and the true market value is an insignificant one, it is not worth while to bring the provisions of this Act into operation and we propose that the Minister of Customs may make regulations, under the advice as he will of the Board of Customs, defining the manner of dealing with cases of that kind where the difference is so very slight. Hon. gentlemen will see that if the difference is very slight there will be no object in applying the dumping clause. The provision respecting the class of goods where the duty is 50 per cent will cut out a number of cases of no great importance which if allowed to remain will give a great deal of trouble and worry to the department without accomplishing any substantial purpose.

Mr. BROCK. What do you define as the fair market value and the selling price ? As I understand it the selling price is the market value.

Mr. FIELDING. In the practice of the Customs Department now, the fair market value is defined as the ordinary selling price in the country of production.

Mr. BROCK. What do you mean by the ordinary selling price? There is the ordinary price of the manufacture of the article to the wholesale trade and the jobbers, and there is the jobbers' price to the retail trade. Between these two there may be a difference of 15 or 20 per cent. Where a wholesaler in Canada buys from the manufacturer in the United States at 10 cents, goods which are sold by the manufacturers to jobbers in the United States at 10 cents and by them again sold probably at 12½ cents, which is the market value. The American jobber has one price, the American manufacturer has another price.

Mr. FIELDING. For all customs purposes they deal with wholesale prices.

Mr. BROCK. Manufacturers' prices ?

Mr. FIELDING. For all customs purposes they take wholesale prices, and in the case cited by my hon. friend this would not apply because if they sell to the wholesaler in Canada at the same price that they sell to a wholesaler in the United States then there is no cutting in price, there is no slaughter and there is no cause for bringing into operation the dumping clause. I think that is a fair answer.

Mr. BROCK. There are various ways of selling in the United States. A manufacturer sells goods to the wholesale trade at one price, and to the retail trade at another price. Probably they will sell three times as much to the retail as to the wholesale trade. The large departmental stores in the United States buy at one price and a large wholesale jobber in New York at another price, perhaps the wholesale jobber will get a special discount of 10 per cent. I go to the United States and buy from the manufacturer at a certain price. A large firm in New York will buy two days later and get a special discount of 10 per cent. But they make the market value in the United States without the discount. On which am I to pay duty ?

Mr. FIELDING. If they sell to my hon. friend in Canada at the same wholesale price as to the wholesaler in the United States there is no slaughter, no discrimination and no dumping.

Mr. BROCK. If a large retail merchant in Toronto goes to the United States and pays 10 per cent more than I do he will claim that the goods were slaughtered to me and the penalties may be enforced against me. There is a difference between the wholesale jobbing and the retail trade, that is getting to be day by day more important in this country.

Mr. FIELDING. There will be no new condition in that respect. The position will be precisely the same as to-day.

Mr. BROCK. The Customs Department are rather lax to-day. I might apply to the Minister of Customs himself and he will

find it difficult to give a definition of the market price in the United States. The value to-day is one price but immediately after a certain date the price may vary. Five days hence there may be an entirely different price in the United States from the price to-day yet both are fair market values. One merchant in this country may have imported at the higher price, another at the lower price, yet each buys at the fair market value. How are you to decide ?

Mr. FIELDING. Precisely as we do to-day. I do not imagine that these questions are free from difficulty but there is no change in the position in this respect. One man doing a large business will buy at a better price than another. The customs authorities will bring intelligence to bear and will make comparisons for like quantities and like conditions. The difficulties that my hon. friend suggests arise to-day yet the customs manage to deal with them. These difficulties always did arise and always will under any system, so long as we have ad valorem duties.

Mr. BROCK. You are creating a new state of things by the dumping clause for which you are taking a great deal of credit. What the country wants to understand is how you are going to apply the dumping clause. I myself, with my limited knowledge of business, see great difficulties ahead, and I can see ways in which the schemer, the man who wants to evade the law, can do so. It is going to be a difficult matter to arrive at what is really the fair thing. We know what the honest thing is, but in what way will the minister arrive at what is to be a fair thing to all the people in this country. I am engaged in a class of business that is very conspicuous for the great differences in values, for the very same articles in a very short time. If I import a thousand pieces of goods at 6 cents and some one else had imported six cases a short time before and paid nine cents, then because he has paid what was a fair value three or four days ahead of the time I purchased, am I going to be subjected to all these penalties if I manage a few days later on to buy the goods at a lower price ? These are things that are happening every day and I think this is a matter that will require to be looked into very carefully before you impose penalties.

Mr. FIELDING. All this is happening under existing conditions, and must always happen. It is one of the troubles arising in a tariff that you have these difficulties about true values. These always have arisen, they arise now and will continue to arise, but no new difficulties in this respect are created by this Bill.

Mr. BROCK. You are creating a new set of fines. You are fining people not only the additional duty on the greater value but a large amount besides. That is a very serious matter and I think before you attempt to collect these fines you must be very sure you are right. A customs-house officer in Montreal may take one view of it, and a customs-house officer in Toronto take another view. A Montreal merchant may import at one rate and a Toronto merchant may have to pay a higher duty on the same goods. There should be some board or commission under the Customs Department by which these matters could be settled. There is no objection to paying a proper duty only let us feel we are all paying on the same basis. That is a difficulty that presents itself.

Mr. FIELDING. I quit admit what the hon. member says but these difficulties apply not merely to this new condition but to the past condition. We are not creating new fines. If a duty is 30 per cent it becomes necessary to-day for the Minister of Customs to determine what is the fair market value on which it is to be levied. The only thing my hon. friend can say is, that the penalty in the past has not been so great as it will be in the future.

Mr. BROCK. And remember, the penalty at the present time may be collected without any dishonesty on the part of the importer, it may arise from the difference of the date on which he bought the goods. I am speaking of goods I deal in myself, and I know that after the first day of June goods have had their value reduced all over the United States and England. The man who bought a large quantity of these goods on the first of June finds that some one else is now buying the very same goods at fifteen or twenty per cent less. Upon which of these will you impose the penalty ? Will the merchant who bought them at the lower rate have to pay extra duty because he bought them less than his follow merchant ? Market value is a hard thing to arrive at ; it is a question in a man's mind as to what he thinks an article is worth, and he has to consider whether these goods are going to be in fashion or not. The intrinsic value does not decrease, but the selling value and the fashion value does decrease.

Mr. PATERSON. My officers find difficulties enough already, and I hope my hon. friend will not suggest more. It is our duty, under instructions from parliament, to accomplish what the hon. gentleman thinks is difficult to accomplish. If a person is bringing in goods at present and the invoice is not correct we require him to amend it, and pay the extra duty. But, after this, there would be an amount added to that. If the hon. gentleman were to buy a quantity of goods to-day at a very much lower price than they will be sold at ten days hence, his invoice would be judged by the date on which the goods were imported to Canada ; if the goods had materially in-

creased in price in the interim his invoice would still be correct. The gentleman who bought them at the increased price would have to pay the duty on that price. It is the same with the customs duty as with the price of the goods. If my hon. friend bought goods at ten cents and two weeks hence they were twelve cents, he would have his goods at two cents less, and so much less in duty in proportion.

Mr. BROCK. You leave the door open for a great deal of swindling.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Let me put this case. Suppose my hon. friend (Mr. Brock) were to import an article the regular price of which in the United States is $115, and the duty 30 per cent, but he can buy that article in the United States for $100, he would pay the regular duty on the market price $115 which would be $34.50, and the special duty would be how much ?

Mr. PATERSON. The difference in this case would be half of 30 per cent.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What would be the special duty ?

Mr. FIELDING. It would be $15 added to the $34.50 which would be $49.50.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Now, suppose my hon. friend (Mr. Brock) buys that article at $100, the duty is $34.50, and the special duty $15, which makes a total of $149 for the article. Suppose we add 15 per cent to that for profit, then the cost would be $171.85 to the retailer who would buy from the wholesale merchant. But, I am told that these American manufacturers open jobbing branches with a little office in Canada. They have their agents and send their travellers out as the wholesale merchants do, and they say to the retailers : We shall not import these goods but we will sell them to you f.o.b. at Pittsburg or other United States centre. They add a profit of 25 per cent—the seller gets $25 on the transaction in one case as against $24 on the other. The goods are brought into this retail merchant at the invoice price of $125 and he pays the duty on them and they are laid down to him at $162.50 ; a difference of only $10. The wholesale merchant in the city of Toronto is thus cut out, and I am told that this kind of thing is now being done. American business firms and others are to-day ceasing to sell to the wholesalers and are putting their commercial travellers into the country, and are making a larger profit than before by selling to the retailers. In this way they can wipe every wholesale merchant in Canada out of existence. Another feature of the case is that certain lines of American products are sold in England and then shipped back to Canada. We will assume that the regular selling price in the United States is $150, but they are sold to English manufacturers at $100, enter England free of duty, and then they are reshipped from England to Canada at $100 which is the legitimate invoice price of these goods in England.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not profess that a measure of this character, or for that matter any tariff measure which human ingenuity can devise, is not capable at some point of being evaded ; and it may be possible that this may be evaded in the way the hon. member for North Victoria says. I think, however, it will be found that there are difficulties in the way of that. In the first place, if the retailer buys goods in the United States, he will buy in moderate quantities and at the retail price, whereas the ties wholesale importer would buy at the wholesale price.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I say the retailer is buying at $125 instead of $115.

Mr. FIELDING. I have no doubt there are such cases. We shall only learn by experience. I do not think, however, that the wholesalers of the Dominion are at present very much alarmed at such a prospect. I think their feeling with regard to this provision is not one of disapproval, but rather of approval. In regard to the system under which a firm in the United States opens an office in Toronto or Montreal, and sells as it were to itself by appointing an agent who, having an office in an attic, goes around and does the business, we have tried to get over that difficulty by providing in a separate clause that where attempts are made in that way to evade the law, we may follow the transaction to the end and readjust the duties so that the goods will be in the same position as if they were bought from the parties in the United States.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. The case I mention is a bona fide transaction. The dealer is paying the full duty on $125 instead of on $115, and the Yankee seller makes $10 more than if he sold the goods at the wholesale price, while the goods cost the retailer a little less than they would otherwise. I may tell the hon. minister that this is done in some lines, and the case I mention is an actual case.

Mr. PATERSON. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman is suggesting a case in which a New York house sells goods to the retail trade at 10 per cent advance. Where they undertake to do that, I think my hon. friend from Toronto and others in the wholesale trade will be able to sell within the margin of 10 per cent and keep the American goods out. I do not look for any trouble in that direction.

Mr. BROCK. I do not wish to be misunderstood. I am very much more in favour of the manufacturers of Canada being adequately protected than either the wholesale or retail trade making a special profit. My

desire is that the country generally should be benefited, not the wholesale merchant only, and I contend that the greater benefit is conferred on the whole country by adequately protecting the Canadian manufacturer, and thus avoiding the necessity of going abroad for these goods. The argument that the goods would cost more if our manufacturers were adequately protected has been proved by the experience of the last twenty-five years to be without foundation. The competition is always such that the consumer gets the advantage. Protection does not mean an additional price to the consumer. If adequate protection is provided for the manufacturers, there will be no loophole by which the goods will leak into this country to their detriment. We have large cotton factories in this country which are not adequately protected. You say you are trying to protect them by this dumping clause. It can be got around, and will be. For instance, there is no difficulty in having the goods sent to England, and having sufficient work put on them there to have them recognized as English goods, and sent to Canada as such. The United States factories act very drastically in these matters. They will sell, we will say 20,000 cases of prints at a certain price. They have 1,000 cases left which they will not hesitate to sell at half the price of the other goods, and they will give a guarantee to every purchaser that in the event of their placing these goods at a lower price on the American market, they will allow the purchaser an equivalent rebate. Up to the present time we have to a great extent got the advantage of that. But I would be much better satisfied if adequate protection were given to our manufacturers all around, so that they would be protected from the surplus goods from the United States. You say these goods are out of fashion. So they are, but there are a large number of people in this country who are not looking for fashion, but who will buy the goods if they can get them at a reduced price.

I know that the intention of the government is good. I know that their desire is, by this dumping clause to get rid of this difficulty, and no doubt they think they are protecting the large manufacturers, but they are going a roundabout and crooked way to do it. The fairest way is to go straight at the thing you are aiming at and stop the goods at the border by charging such a duty that foreign manufacturers will know what they have to meet when their goods reach our border. There would be nothing unfair in that. It is what the Americans are doing now. When a manufacturer of another country dumps his goods into the United States, he has to pay 60 per cent, whereas American manufacturers who dump their goods in this country only have to pay 30 per cent. The fairest way for this country to act is to let foreigners know exactly what they have to meet and let our own manufacturers know exactly in what position they stand. We do not think now. What with this mixture of regular duty and the dumping clause, it would require a Philadelphia lawyer to understand our system. Perhaps the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) may understand it, but I do not. I do not see how it is going to affect the dry goods business. The foreign manufacturers will devise every means possible to get around these difficulties. There are difficulties that I could get round and I think there are other people more clever than I who would devise some means of getting around this dumping clause. I know of no better way to meet the difficulty than by honest, fair and square protection. If 30 per cent will not overcome it, then make the duty 40 per cent and the country will stand it. People who do not understand the question jump to the conclusion that protection means high prices, but it does not. Protection by creating competition in this country, will keep down prices more than any dumping clause you can put into operation. You had in Canada a certain protection on woollen goods which you have found to be inadequate. After I have been pleading with you for four years, you have done exactly what I wanted you to do and then say that I ought to be thankful. Grateful for what? Grateful for the loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars, not to the wealthy people, not to the capitalists, but to the poor labouring artisans in our mills who were foolish enough to invest their savings in the stock of these mills. In one concern $800,000 of stock has been lost simply because the government refused to do four years ago with regard to woollen goods what they are doing to-day, and you have no more reason for granting that protection now than you had four years ago, and had you granted it four years ago, it would have saved millions to the country and a good deal of anxiety and shame to people whose money has been invested in large undertakings which money they cannot now get back. The result has been that a number of mills are now closed up. Some other people may buy them at sacrifice price, which is the worst kind of dumping. The losers are not the capitalists or the banks for they have secured themselves, but they are the poor working men in the mills, many of whom have had to leave to seek employment in the United States. Go to Hespeler, Waterloo, Carleton Place and other places and count the mills that are closed down and the number of people thrown out of employment and scattered abroad, most of whom have gone to the United States. I bring this as a charge against the government that they adopted this policy in the face of the light and knowledge they must have

possessed, and simply because they wanted to please the Minister of Finance, who says he is a free trader. Well, free trade has proved a failure. If the principle on which the government acted four years ago was a good one, why do they not stick to it now; and the fact that they did not four years ago listen to the arguments advanced by hon. gentlemen on this side and give that protection which would have saved thousands of people from ruin in this country will meet them wherever they have to go and face the people. What are the friends of the hon. Minister of Finance in Halifax saying to-day? They say they are glad to get 30 per cent, but want 5 per cent more, and the Minister of Finance seeks to justify himself by pointing to some factories which have flourished by the production of one or two articles on which they have happened to make money. Hon. gentlemen opposite will find great difficulty in administering this clause. They have taken a roundabout and crooked way of protecting the manufacturers instead of taking the straight and honest course. They are doing this for protection but will not acknowledge it. What we are asking for is honest, fair, square and honest protection; and you may ridicule it as much as you like, the people are beginning to understand it as I am. A fair protection is understood by the people of this country and also by the foreign shippers. These foreign manufacturers, if we had adequate protection, would know what they have to meet and would not be likely to ship their goods where they would have to pay a duty of 40 per cent. The government may know more about this matter than the rest of the country, but I tell them they will have to revise their ideas if they want to get the support of the people at the next election. After they have been experimenting from year to year, they have to acknowledge that they were wrong and they are trying to let themselves down easy by this dumping clause. But they will find that this clause will give the Minister of Customs a great many headaches and a great deal of trouble when he comes to meet the customs collectors at St. John, Quebec, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg and on to the Pacific coast. He will find that there are hardly two appraisers who will agree on the market value of any particular line of goods in the United States. He may be able to establish the market value of such an article as wheat, but in the case of dry goods and hardware, I defy anybody to tell me what the market value of these goods is. The market value, for instance, of a piece of cotton in one town and its market value in another will be altogether different. I can sell some goods in the province of Quebec that I cannot sell in the province of Ontario. A piece of print that will sell in Quebec will have no value in Ontario. The government are simply laying out a great deal of trouble for themselves and they will find that this system they are adopting will be of no benefit to the manufacturer, the merchant or the consumer.

Mr. PATERSON. Exactly the same difficulty would arise in the case of a high tariff. Under the dumping clause a 30 per cent article may become an article on which a 45 per cent duty is charged. But what the hon. gentleman proposes is to make everything 45 per cent.

Mr. BROCK. Not at all, only on goods which we can manufacture in this country.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon gentleman says that this dumping clause will lead to evasion, because the 30 per cent duty may become a 45 per cent duty, but if the tariff were fixed at 45 per cent duty you would have the same attempt at evasion on the part of the exporter. He would be even more certain to attempt evasion then than he would be now.

Mr. MACLEAN. The point made by my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Brock) is that if you wish to protect the manufacturers of this country, you should apply the principle of protection by imposing a higher customs tariff than by the way proposed here. The idea of protection is constantly growing and to-day the principle of protection has been enunciated in such a way as to educate the people in this country as well as in the old land. There was a report presented in England the other day which said that the way to meet the demand for increased protection there is by the adoption of a preferential tariff and of a maximum tariff against the countries which are hostile to our own.

Now that is the kind of tariff we want rather than regulations of this kind. In dealing with the United States we do not want regulations like this but a maximum tariff. We want a high tariff for goods of countries hostile to us, a reciprocal preferential tariff for the old country, and a general tariff for the rest of the world. That is the new principle and the one that ought to be adopted. I agree with the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) that that is the way to protect our manufacturers and not by regulations of this kind.

Mr. BROCK. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) says that under the old tariff of a straight thirty per cent there was great evasion or attempted evasion. But he knows how the department met that—by making the parties who sold the goods swear to the value of them. If they swore falsely, of course the great penalty was very severe. In getting goods from the United States you do not buy from a great variety of people, but from great houses that sell the whole make of certain mills. And I never found, in all my business career, any attempt on

the part of any of these large American dealers to evade the law in any way. They are most reputable. You could not get them to give two invoices, one for the goods and the other for customs purposes as European houses have sometimes done. If you asked for such a thing they would not sell you goods at all. And the minister knows that there is no difficulty with the large wholesale or retail line of dealers in any line of business. The people with whom you have trouble are the people you would suspect even before you saw the invoices. So, this was a great safeguard that could be applied even if you had a duty of forty per cent instead of thirty per cent. If this principle were adopted the country would gain so much in ten years that you would be amazed at it. Some years ago the prophecy of tall chimneys was sneered at. But we worked on and day by day the tall chimneys grew. But this government, if they have not thrown down the tall chimneys, have at least prevented the smoke from coming through them. You could see the change in the results of the business as the preference went on—first, 12½ per cent, then 25 per cent, then 33⅓ per cent. The losses of the manufacturers of woollens in this country were in proportion to the preference, showing that the duty was not an adequate protection. All I ask is that the government should take that matter into consideration. One thing is certain, if the present government will not do it another government shall. It must be done. The people demand it, and the people must rule. The people of Canada are not going to sit idly by and see the factories closed up, our best artisans leaving the country and Doukhobors brought in in their places. The Finance Minister talks about the prosperity of this country. How prosperous has the iron and steel business been? What are the dividends of the companies engaged in that trade? Then take the pulp industry—what are the indications of prosperity in our great pulp mills? And what about the woollen mills? And what about the cotton factories? Go from Sydney to the Sault and see what money is being made out of iron and steel.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) a question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. BROCK. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Alex. Johnston) is very fond of interrupting. I have never interrupted him. The Minister of Finance told us some time ago that we were on the crest of the wave of prosperity which, however, was likely to recede. Fortunately for this government, magnificent crops, the large inflow of immigration and the kindness of Providence have kept them afloat. But the industries of this country—not the little ones, but the great ones with millions of money invested—are not paying a cent of dividend and the stock is not worth one-third of what it was. I have not observed that the Finance Minister ever pointed that out to the people. He points to his enormous revenue and the great surpluses he is piling up. But these things begin to arouse the suspicion of the people. And, when we come to resolutions like this we begin to see what the whole thing means. I think the Finance Minister has found out that a little protection is better than the free trade theories he expounded some years ago. He is giving us protection in small doses; but this country is prepared for a little heroic treatment. As we have gone back, the minister must do something to help us forward, and he will not do it by this picayune business, this dumping clause—it is only the people who do not know anything about business who believe there is anything in it. If there is dishonesty now there will be greater dishonesty under the operation of this clause. People who want to be honest and straight, and who will not do anything but what is right, will act in conformity with the law. But they would do that anyway. But as to the rogue, I defy you to check him by any such clause as this. Of course you will check some rogues, but there will be enough damage done under this clause to more than counterbalance all the benefits gained through it. As I said, the only way to meet the reasonable demands of manufacturer and consumer and of the country generally—and the minister will find it out—is through a system of ample protection. Not by any dumping clauses, but by raising the tariff as has been done on the other side of the line in the country with which we have to compete.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. I can quite understand why the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) did not desire to have the effect of his observations spoiled by being called upon to answer a simple question. I asked to be allowed to ask him a question but the permission was refused. But, now that he has concluded his remarks perhaps he will let me put a question to him. He spoke of the iron and steel industry and of the dividends paid by the concerns engaged in that industry. He asked what those dividends were to-day. Does he know what the dividends of the Nova Scotia Steel Company, for instance—the only steel and iron concern at that time—were previous to 1896?

Mr. BROCK. What has that to do with our expending $70,000,000 or $80,000,000 this year? What do we pay duties for? To meet the expenses of our government. If that company did not sell their goods at high enough prices to pay a dividend, that is not our fault.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. It has everything to do with the question. The hon.

gentleman (Mr. Brock) sought to create the impression that the iron and steel industry was less prosperous to-day than it was before 1896.

Mr. BROCK. I did not refer to 1896. I was speaking of things as they are to-day.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. If the hon. gentleman was speaking of things as they are to-day then, let me tell him that the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company is in a prosperous condition, whereas before 1896 it was more famous for passing dividends than for anything else.

Mr. BROCK. What is the stock worth to-day ?

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. What was it worth before 1896 ?

Mr. BROCK. This government were put in to make it valuable. What have they done ?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think it fair for the hon. member from Cape Breton (Mr. Alex. Johnston) to talk of the condition of things before 1896. No hon. gentleman on the other side likes to be reminded of that.

Mr. FOWLER. The Minister of Finance tries to give us the impression that the Nova Scotia steel industry is in a prosperous condition to-day. What is the fact ? The stock is constantly going down, it is now lower than it has been for many years. My hon. friend from Toronto was pointing out that the country was not in as prosperous a condition as the Finance Minister would lead us to believe from his budget speech, wherein he dwells so lovingly upon the amount of the surplus he was getting, while in the former days we were told that a surplus was wrung from the pockets of the people of this country, that it was bleeding them white. We do not hear that song to-day, but we used to hear it very often. In the election of 1900 the cry was ' Vote for Laurier and 11 cents cheese.' Now if we have an election this fall it will be ' Vote against Laurier and 7 cent cheese.' One cry would be just as fair as the other, because the Prime Minister has just as much to do with making cheese 7 cents a pound as he had in making it 11 cents a pound in 1900. That is what my hon. friend from Toronto was referring to ; he was pointing out that the Minister of Finance, when he makes his flambuoyant budget speeches, does not refer to those industries that are in a languishing condition, he does not wish to present a fair statement of the facts, but he picks out a few things here and there that are prosperous, and dwells upon them, and leaves all the others in the shade.

Mr. PATERSON. Don't let us get into a discussion on free trade and protection, although that will come on by and by. I think the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Brock), although he does not approve wholly of the dumping clause, would prefer to have that in force than to be without it. Our duty will be, once it is put in force, to perfect it as much as we can. Let me point out that the Board of Customs has not yet finally considered the machinery to be adopted, and the declarations that we will require, because we want this to pass the committee before changing our regulations. But I think the course we will pursue will be to require in the future as we have in the past, a certificate. The certificate we have required on the invoice hitherto has been that the man who sold the goods knew the home market price, and he had to certify that the goods mentioned on the invoice were charged at the prices at which they were sold in the country whence they were exported ; or if there was any difference in the price, it was noted on the margin. It is probable that we will adopt in the future a double column, and require them to put in the one column the home price and in the other column the price at which they sell, put into the home column the price at which they sell even if it is the same. Then probably we will require the exporting firm to sign a declaration that it is a true and honest invoice, that it is without any evasion, that there is no drawback—a strong declaration. If there is any misstatement, either about the home price they put in, or in respect to anything else, then it becomes a fraudulent invoice, and the person becomes liable to penalties of the Customs Act in such case provided. I may remind the hon. gentleman what many seem to forget, that we are able to get on to these frauds at any time when there have been invoices with undervaluations. Whenever we reach them, we deal with them, and they know it is a dangerous thing to engage in. Some people seem satisfied, once they have passed the customs, that they have nothing more to fear. They forget the fact that the customs can get after a fraudulent invoice for duty at any time ; even a hundred years from now we can get after them for an evasion of the law. But within three years, not beyond that, after they have passed the entry, if we discover it is fraudulent not only can we go after them for duty, but go after them for the penalties imposed by the Customs Act. The extreme penalty would be the value of the goods, and $200 for every false entry. These penalties are so strong as to have a deterrent influence. There may be cases in which fraud is committed, but I believe that a great majority of the invoices will be honest invoices, not only because of the fact the member for Toronto mentions, but because the great bulk of the houses he alludes to who are selling largely here, would be too honourable to make a false declaration. But those who might be lacking in that respect, will be

deterred by the penalties that will be imposed. We will do the best we can under this Act. Let us pass this measure, and we will work it out in the best way we can. If there are any amendments to be suggested, I will be glad to hear them.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I brought a case before the attention of the minister some time ago, showing how this provision might be evaded. Yankee wholesale houses will establish agencies in the American centres along the border, as at Niagara Falls and Detroit, they will keep their travellers there, and ship their goods in to the retail merchants in Ontario. I know that is being done, because an instance was given to me by an American firm who had established themselves in one of these places along the line. Instead of selling to the Canadian wholesalers at the manufacturers' prices, they will wholesale the trade on the American border, and the goods will then be shipped as I have pointed out, the Canadian wholesale trade will be on the Yankee side. The price will probably be more than it was formerly, owing to the fact that they can evade this dumping clause by bringing them in under the terms I have stated. The case I cited was given to me by a gentleman who has been in the business for some weeks.

Mr. PATERSON. I think a clause further down will reach that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. You cannot reach it.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not sure that we could overcome that by any legislation. If they are determined to cut away the middlemen and sell directly to the retailer, I doubt if any legislation can reach that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Adequate protection will meet it. If the minister will remove this extraordinary or special duty, the matter will right itself in Canada, because the retailer will get his goods at a much cheaper rate. As it is now, they add the duty on the other side, and put the wholesale cost on the other side.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister state what goods bear 50 per cent now.

Mr. PATERSON. A large class of medicines containing alcohol. No matter how small the quantity of alcohol may be in them, they are charged 50 per cent, and these articles I am told by druggists run up into the hundreds.

Mr. BLAIN. What other articles are there? I presume there must be a considerable number of articles.

Mr. FIELDING. No, not many; I cannot at the moment recall any others.

Mr. PATERSON. These are the principal ones.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Birkett) called attention to the fact that American traders were trying to evade the dumping clause by saying to a Canadian representative that they would appoint him as their agent and allow him a commission. Has the minister given his attention to that?

Mr. PATERSON. These are questions that come up, and if you see fit to give the Customs Department the power we are here asking, which we think it necessary to have, I believe that the Board of Customs, who will have the framing of these regulations, will be able to deal with that and all similar questions. Many ways of evading the law are talked of, but that would be a question with which, I think, we could deal. The intent of this resolution and of the Customs Act is that the selling of goods in this country under a system of secret rebates, or anything to evade the law, will be made fraudulent. It is intended to make regulations so that when goods come in here on an invoice there must be no evasion concealed in the invoice by salaries or anything else. If a firm is doing business on certain conditions in the United States they will be recognized here, but if they are trying to evade the Canadian law in any way, they will not be permitted to do so.

Mr. BLAIN. Suppose that under the existing tariff a firm in Toronto imported a certain quantity of goods at 12 cents a yard. The agent in the United States says to the Canadian purchaser: You can continue to purchase these at 12 cents a yard, notwithstanding the imposition of the dumping clause; we will allow you 10 per cent, appoint you as our Canadian agent, and you can sell these goods as before. Might I ask the minister if his dumping clause will reach a case of that kind?

Mr. PATERSON. That is already the law; it was passed in the Customs Act.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the minister will explain how it will reach that case?

Mr. PATERSON. It would be a reduction in the price of the goods; and when this dumping clause becomes law, he would not only have to pay the duty, but the penalty as well.

Mr. MACLEAN. In the United States they were troubled with dumped goods, but they met the difficulty there not so much by legislation of this kind as by their tariff. When they found other countries dumping their goods in the United States they did not make regulations of this kind, but imposed a high tariff. Why does not the minister adopt that plan here? It has been successful in the United States and all protectionist countries, and you prevent outside countries sacrificing their goods in your country by a high tariff. Why not adopt that policy here instead of these regulations? How does the minister propose to deal, for instance,

with the United States steel trust? According to the report published in England the other day the United States steel trust sends its goods into Canada and through the Canadian Hardware Association fixes the price and compels everybody to pay that price. If any Canadian merchant tries to do business outside the Canadian Hardware Association, which is really the steel trust, that individual meets with reprisals, and cannot carry on his business. Do the government intend to deal with a case of that kind with their regulations?

Mr. FIELDING. As to the general question of the American tariff, which my hon. friend and some of his colleagues admire so much, with its duties of 60, 70 80 and 100 per cent, I may say that that tariff shuts out goods, not only when dumping occurs, but when there is no dumping.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear; it keeps the home market.

Mr. FIELDING. We propose legislation which will keep out the goods when dumping occurs, but will admit of reasonable competition when there is no dumping. As to the other point, we do not distinguish between the United States steel trust and any other trust. I understand that some of these organizations have contracts in Canada which will expire in the next few weeks. After the expiry of these contracts I do not think the United States steel trust and other trusts will attempt to renew these contracts, as they will see that they cannot, under this legislation, carry out their purpose.

Mr. BLAIN. What does the minister intend to do with his policy of stability of tariffs?

Mr. FIELDING. This is stability.

Mr. BLAIN. When he introduced the tariff of 1897 he said to the people of Canada: This is a stable tariff.

Mr. FIELDING. So it proved.

Mr. BLAIN. But the same year he introduced what is called a preferential tariff, giving a preference of 12½ per cent. The following year he tinkered with the tariff and introduced a 25 per cent preference, and the following year a 33⅓ per cent preference. Now he has a dumping clause. I think my hon. friend will have to introduce some legislation that will create a Canadian ready-reckoner, so that the people of Canada and the government itself will understand what this legislation means. My hon. friend's policy of stability of tariffs is gone to the winds, because, when he wakes up after this is passed, he will not understand this tariff himself. If he does, he will be one of a very few.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend's historical references are not always accurate. He will be surprised to find that some of these reductions to which he has referred were not the result of special legislation, but were provided for in the original tariff. Two of these were provided in the Bill of 1897.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend cannot quibble on that point.

Mr. FIELDING. No, but you can.

Mr. BLAIN. What I say is, and I repeat it in the presence of the hon. gentleman, that when he introduced the tariff in 1897 he stated to the Canadian public that he was introducing what he regarded as a stable tariff, suggesting to the public that it would not be interfered with. I am not just sure of the years, but I think the same year he gave us a preferential tariff of 12½ per cent. Is that not correct?

Mr. FIELDING. No, it is not correct. I do not know that the difference between the hon. gentleman and myself is material, but the tariff of 1897 provided for the adoption of preferential rates on a graded scale.

Mr. BLAIN. To come into force when?

Mr. FIELDING. On future dates. The special reduction of 33⅓ per cent was a special Act, but the earlier reductions were brought about under the Act of 1897.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the minister to state when the 12½ per cent, the 25 per cent and the 33⅓ per cent preferences came into force?

Mr. FIELDING. I fear I cannot from memory. The original Act provided, in the first place, for a general reduction in the tariff in what is called the general tariff in a great many cases.

Mr. BROCK. A reduction of something like one-quarter of one per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. It seems to have been so much on woollen goods that it has alarmed my hon. friend ever since. He says it killed out the woollen industry.

Mr. BROCK. You were speaking of a general reduction.

Mr. FIELDING. I said it was a general change in the tariff. I say that hundreds of items were reduced. The tariff of 1897 provided, first, for that general reduction, and then for a preferential rate of 12½ per cent.

Mr. BLAIN. When?

Mr. FIELDING. Immediately, and then a further 12½ per cent to take place some months later. Later on a special Act was introduced making a special reduction of 33⅓ per cent. That is the history of the tariff reduction.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman told us that the tariff of 1897 made hundreds of changes.

Mr. FIELDING. Hundreds of reductions.

Mr. CLANCY. I challenge the hon. gentleman to show hundreds of reductions.

Mr. FIELDING. I have stated in the House a dozen times that there are hundreds of articles on the tariff list on which the duties have been decreased, and in the budget speech of some years ago, I gave a detailed list of these items.

Mr. CLANCY. There was not 16 per cent of the total of imported goods on which there was a reduction. There are less than 500 items in the tariff and there were not hundreds of reductions on these leading items. The hon. gentleman himself stated in 1897 that there was no general reduction other than what would come from the preferential tariff.

Mr. FIELDING. In the budget speech of 1898 or 1899 I detailed the items upon which the duties were reduced. As to their relative importance that is another matter, but I am justified in saying that hundreds of articles were reduced.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. When the tariff reductions were introduced in 1897, Sir Charles Tupper in this House predicted disaster to the manufactures of this country because of these reductions. The hon. member (Mr. Clancy) now says there were practically no reductions. Which view are we to accept? Is it not a fact that these gentlemen opposite, in their tariff resolutions and in their speeches in this parliament have spent hours and weeks in denouncing us for tariff reduction?

Mr. CLANCY. I say there were some reductions, but there were not hundreds.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman said there was not 15 per cent reduced.

Mr. CLANCY. I said there was not 16 per cent of the imports of 1903 on which there was any reduction, and I repeat it. The Minister of Finance himself declared that taking reductions and increases on the whole, there was no general reduction of the tariff.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not.

Mr. CLANCY. Before we close I will prove that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) did say that. The Postmaster General thinks that in referring to an alleged statement of Sir Charles Tupper he can down the Conservative party. Sir Charles Tupper is well able to take care of himself, but let me remind the Postmaster General that there are a great many things which he said in this House, and which his party and he himself now repudiate. He is the last man who should speak of inconsistency. The Postmaster General is not himself able to pull up his skirts and pass safely over the mudhole. It doesn't come with very splendid grace from him to try to quote Sir Charles Tupper against the Conservative party.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman voted with Sir Charles Tupper then.

Mr. CLANCY. I voted with him and I will vote with him again. This government proposed the most vicious tariff that has ever beset any country. They came into power just as the expansion had commenced the foundation for which was well laid by a prudent and wise Conservative government. The Liberals in opposition promised reductions, but because they saw they were wrong or because they were afraid of public opinion, they did not carry out their promise. The Minister of Finance told us the other day that the people went to the customs houses to hand their money over. Well, the reason is that they could not get their goods until they handed their money over. The Conservative party would have protected every industry in Canada that would give a man a fair wage for a fair day's work, and they would not have collected the millions of unnecessary taxes that this government does. They tell us that they have a revenue tariff, and if so a revenue tariff is a device for taking the greatest possible amount of money out of the pockets of the people.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The people pay into the public treasury and not into private pockets under our tariff.

Mr. CLANCY. The Postmaster General and his friends went throughout the country denouncing the duty on sugar, but last year there was a higher rate of duty on sugar than ever before. It was $1.26 per 100 pounds as against $1.14 during the Conservative regime. It is the same with rice and numerous other commodities. I am not afraid of money going into the pockets of the manufacturers, because if it does it will enable them to pay better wages to the workingmen and give them more employment. I venture to say that if the Postmaster General goes into any business which has become profitable by reason of fair protection, he will very soon find he will have competition in that business which will give him enough to do to hold his own. I would like to read to the Minister of Finance one or two chapters from his speech in which he declares what protection has done. We had it read by the right hon. the First Minister the other day. He told us that the United States was ruined with protection, that an unhealthy stimulus was given to business, that too much was done, that the small fellows were frozen out, and that the big ones fell after having swallowed up the small ones. I want to say to the Postmaster General, with all the respect which I have for a gentleman of his ability and his inconsistencies, and they are great, that until he is in a position to cast the

first stone, he had better hesitate before he throws one at even so distinguished a man as Sir Charles Tupper.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I was not so much alluding to Sir Charles Tupper as to the hon. member for Bothwell. In 1897 Sir Charles Tupper declared that our tariff had made such a wholesale reduction that it was going to bring about wholesale disaster.

Mr. BRODER. Sir Charles Tupper was discussing the preference so far as you proposed to apply it to other countries besides Great Britain.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. He was discussing the tariff, and the hon. member for Bothwell voted with him on that occasion, and on several occasions since. I am not quarreling with his vote or with his references now. The only difficulty I have is as to the views of which member for Bothwell to accept—the member who voted at that time or the member who is sitting here to-night.

Mr. CLANCY. They are quite consistent.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. He has told us that our tariff reductions amount to nothing—not more than 15 or 16 per cent on the total imports—while a few years ago it was the very opposite. I only mention that for the benefit of those who do not know the facility with which the hon. gentleman can take this or that side of a question, from which they will no doubt judge how much value to attach to his utterances.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). The hon. member for Bothwell says he voted with Sir Charles Tupper and will vote with him again. It will be soon enough for him to make that boast after he wins his next election.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman, I see, is counting on my head coming off.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). What I was going to remark was this. In the old times, before the change in the tariff was made, there were compound rates of duty—so much a pound or so much a square yard, and so much ad valorem on the same article.

Mr. CLANCY. There are specific duties on nearly every article produced in the maritime provinces. Can the hon. gentleman tell me one that has been taken off ? And if the people suffer under them, we in the other provinces are suffering.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). In the present tariff the duties are either specific or ad valorem, and one clerk will do more business for a wholesale house to-day than three could do under the old tariff, because there are not so many different calculations. That is admitted by all men in the wholesale trade.

Mr. BROCK. What would that amount to in a business ? Not $20 in a year.

Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). But that is not what I rose about. We wasted the whole time of the sitting of Saturday night, and that is what we are doing now. At this time we should exercise some common sense and bring the session to an end. On Saturday night a man spoke on the Trent Valley canal from eight o'clock till eleven. Do you think the interest of the Trent Valley canal was promoted by that speech ? No, it was retarded. Now we are going back to give the history of the tariff, and we seem likely to do just as little to-night as we did Saturday night.

Mr. FOWLER. I am surprised at the hon. member for Victoria getting up and reading such a lecture to the Postmaster General. We were getting along pretty well, and would probably have finished by this time if the Postmaster General had not butted in and obstructed the passage of the resolution. However, I think the castigation administered by the hon. member for Victoria to the Postmaster General is very well deserved, and I trust he will keep silent and let this resolution pass.

Mr. PATERSON. I wish to reply to a question asked by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain), though it refers to a matter that does not concern us now. He suggested that a case of goods might be sold to an agent in Canada at a lower figure than to other parties. We have provided for that in the resolution which was adopted by the House on Saturday night. If the goods are sold to a person in Canada, it will not be permitted to the exporter to send in a pro forma invoice covering goods that have been sold by him to different parties throughout the country ; but the price at which the goods are sold to the dealer will be the price for duty.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman is not answering my question. What I asked was: if a merchant in the city of Toronto were purchasing goods at 12 cents a yard prior to this legislation coming into force, and after it comes into force the American manufacturer said to him : Go on and sell the goods as before, and we will appoint you our Canadian agent and allow you 10 per cent for selling them : what part of this legislation will reach that case ?

Mr. BROCK. Probably this might meet the difficulty :

> The expression 'export price' or 'selling price' herein shall be held to mean and include the exporters' price for the goods, exclusive of all charges thereon after their shipment.

I suppose the discount would be looked on as a charge after the selling of the goods.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, and duty would have to be paid upon it.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman misunderstands the question. What I ask is, will his legislation reach the point where the American manufacturer, in order to evade the Canadian tariff, says to the Canadian purchaser, I will appoint you my agent and allow you 10 per cent to sell my goods in Canada ?

Mr. PATERSON. That would depend on the regulations we make. If the Board of Customs is given power to make regulations, and it appeared necessary to make a regulation to meet the case stated by the hon. gentleman, we would meet it in that way.

Mr. BLAIN. I must ask the permission of the committee to refer to a statement I made with respect to the preferential tariff. I am sorry the discussion has broadened in this matter, but the Finance Minister will have to bear a portion of the blame. I made the statement that the hon. gentleman could not hold to his policy of stability of tariff and I gave as a reason the fact that this government has been continually changing the tariff since they came into power. I asked the hon. gentleman if he would state to the committee when the legislation introduced by himself came into force, and he was unwilling to reply. I asked him if he would state when the 12½ per cent preference came into force.

Mr. FIELDING. I said that the first one came into force in 1897.

Mr. BLAIN. When did the 25 per cent preference come into force ?

Mr. FIELDING. I said some months later but was not sure of the date.

Mr. BLAIN. He did not state when it came into force nor when the 33⅓ preference came into force.

Mr. FIELDING. I think in 1900.

Mr. BLAIN. I was pointing out that it would be impossible for the Finance Minister to cling to the doctrine of stability of tariff, in which he took so much pride. The government made a revision of the tariff in 1897 affecting a good many articles—in some cases lowering and in others raising the duties. In that Act the government put in a clause that there would be a preference of 12½ per cent on goods coming from England. In 1898 they raised that preference to 25 per cent and in 1900 they made it 33⅓. After another year or two my hon. friend introduced another special legislation providing for a special surtax against German goods. To-day we have the dumping clause introduced, which it is impossible for any one to understand, with the exception of course of the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Alex. Johnston), who understands it thoroughly.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. Certainly I do.

Mr. BLAIN. And I remember that hon. gentleman telling us about the great prosperity of the steel industry down there.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. I say so still.

Mr. BLAIN. And the hon gentleman says so in face of the fact that the stocks in that industry are going down every day. People who work down there do not say it is flourishing. Does he not know that a great many of the citizens of Sydney went to the United States last year.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. I know that that is not the case.

Mr. BLAIN. Well, the hon. gentleman from Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall) made that statement to myself.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. We have excellent Canadian citizens to take their place.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman first denies my statement and then admits it by saying that we have excellent Canadian citizens to take the place of those who went to the United States. That shows how much dependence we can put on any statement he makes.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. Do you doubt that it is prosperous ?

Mr. BLAIN. Everybody knows it is not.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. I know it is.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend is evidently not satisfied, because he wants special legislation for the steel industry I make the statement the principle of stability of tariff has gone to the winds with all the other principles of hon. gentlemen opposite. Surely the hon. the Finance Minister will never plume himself again on the stability of tariff. I am positive he will not after he gets a proper understanding of this dumping clause.

Mr. CLANCY. I always feel anxious to assist the Finance Minister in any way I can and I wish to recall to him what he said in the past, for I have no doubt he has forgotten it. At page 1111 of the 'Hansard' of 1897 he said :

> There are things we want to buy from foreign countries, and our desire to obtain these things on fair and reasonable terms is paramount to every other consideration in dealing with the tariff question. With the exception of articles to which I shall refer as I proceed, I have to tell the House that it is not the intention of the government—speaking of the question generally, but not with reference to any particular article—to propose any great reduction in the tariff as applied to those countries which are not disposed to trade with us. We propose, therefore, to have a general tariff, and that general tariff will be, to a large extent the tariff of to-day——

Mr. FIELDING. But my hon. friend must not stop there. I beg of him to go on, as I want him to refresh my memory as to what followed.

Mr. CLANCY. Now I shall read the hon. gentleman's banter which always follows these statements. He usually goes a long way ahead and then recedes to the same extent:

—but the tariff to-day freed from some of its enormities——

Mr. FIELDING. And you were leaving that out.

Mr. CLANCY. Yes, that is not a reduction of tariff:

—freed from some of its enormities——

Mr. FIELDING. That is very unfair.

Mr. CLANCY (reading):

—freed from some of its enormities, freed from many of the specific duties——

There is not an article consumed in his own province which has freed from specific duties. I am not complaining about specific duties, because they are sometimes the best kind of protection, but what is the case?

Mr. FIELDING. Just finish the sentence.

Mr. CLANCY (reading):

—freed from many of the specific duties, freed from the conflicts, annoyances and irritation which have created war between the importer and the customs authorities——

This was not supposed to be a logical reason but it would follow the hon. gentleman's honest declaration. The general tariff was to remain just about what it was. He freed it from every feature of protection he could—not enough to ruin the business men of the country but just enough to chafe and irritate them. I can tell the hon. gentleman what he did—he showed himself to be the surest tax collector that Canada ever had. His tariff was the best instrument for carrying out that process—a painless process during good times—of taking money from the pockets of the people that we have ever known. If the purpose of his office is to take money from the people he is the most successful Finance Minister that has ever held office in Canada.

Mr. MACLEAN. The one way to meet the dumping difficulty is by the application of the principle of specific duties. That will effect the purpose of preventing Canada from being made a dumping ground, and without the irritation between the importer and the department that has been spoken of.

Mr. HENDERSON. We might as well settle the question we have been debating for the last half hour so that we may not have to return to it and may not require to spend too much time on the resolutions before us. I have here the testimony of the Finance Minister himself as to the effect of the tariff of 1897. We do not require to go back to the speech of Sir Charles Tupper, who spoke on the spur of the moment, perhaps without calculation as to what would be the result of that tariff. But here we have the well-considered declaration of the Minister of Finance himself in 1900-1 and after the tariff had been three years in operation:

It was of the utmost importance that we should maintain a strong financial position, and in view of the uncertainties as to the amount of revenue that might be produced by this lower rate of taxation it became necessary that we should take some steps to make good any possible loss that might result. It was thought that it might fairly be met by providing for the raising of some additional taxation in order to balance, or make good the loss occasioned by the reduction of duties .... It was necessary to have an increased revenue in certain directions when we were to lose revenue in other directions.

So, it appears, it never was the intention of the Minister of Finance to lower the rates of taxation. His intention was that a firm financial stand should be maintained. And, to this end if he took the duty off one article he put it on another; as I suggested the other night if he reduced the duty on a woman's silk dress he put it on her fur cape. So, the minister himself admits that taxation was not reduced by the operation of the tariff brought down in 1897, and, moreover, that was not the intention. He simply carried out his intention in the way I have indicated—by increasing the duty on one article when he reduced the duty on another. As the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) pointed out, when he applied the preferential tariff and reduced the duty on goods coming from England he immediately put an increased duty on sugar and on rice and very largely increased duty on tobacco. We were told to-day that by reason of the legislation of 1897—perhaps the Finance Minister was not responsible for that, but still it was done by the government of the day—one result of the increased duty on tobacco was an additional revenue of some $1,700,000 or $1,800,000. Now, this was the kind of thing no doubt that the minister referred to when he said it was necessary to put duties on to make up revenue in consideration of what he had taken off. That was the way, as the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) suggests he maintained a firm condition. I think he succeeded admirably in maintaining a very strong financial position—he knew that the reduction of duty on certain articles would cause a greater importation into the country and he would get more revenue than if a higher rate of duty had been maintained and the production of the goods at home had been encouraged.

Mr. FOWLER. I understand that this makes a change as to steel rods.

Mr. FIELDING. It makes the dumping clause apply to steel rods.

Mr. FOWLER. Are they taken off the free list ?

Mr. FIELDING. No. But steel rods are aided by a bounty. And as an offset for their being on the free list we include them under this special clause. If they are dumped they will be brought under this special duty.

Mr. FOWLER. That is, the measure of dumping will be added ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, with the limitation that it shall not exceed fifteen per cent, which is about what we believe it to be.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the minister please explain the meaning of the section :

Such regulations may also provide for the temporary exemption from special duty of any article or class of articles, when it is established to the satisfaction of the Minister of Customs that such articles are not made in Canada in substantial quantities and offered for sale to all purchasers on equal terms.

Mr. FIELDING. The design of this legislation is to give a reasonable guarantee against the slaughtering of goods to the disadvantage of our own industries. But if we have a small concern making only a few articles in a line, not enough to supply the market and probably not contemplating sale to the market generally, it would not be reasonable to bring the dumping clause into effect. It is only where the business covers the Canadian market generally that the dumping clause comes in. Then, as to the expression 'offered for sale to all purchasers on equal terms' a concern may do business on a large scale and yet be unwilling to sell to all buyers. For instance they might keep their product to make it up in another department of their own factory. It is only where people carry on business upon a competitive scale and sell on equal terms to all parties that they can seek the protection of this clause.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand this will cover the special duty only. The ordinary duty will remain as it is now ?

On resolution 3,

3. Resolved, that in schedule A, the words 'common and colourless window glass, and' in item 201, and the words 'pails and tubs of wood' in item 330 shall be omitted and that items 22, 151, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175, 78 and 203 of schedule A shall be repealed and the following provisions added to schedule A viz.:—

After item 7 (a):—Provided that bottles, flasks and packages of gin, rum, whisky and brandy of all kinds, and imitations thereof shall be held to contain the following quantities (subject to the provisions for addition or deduction in respect to the degree of strength), viz.:—

Bottles, flasks and packages containing not more than three-fourths of a gallon per dozen, as three-fourths of a gallon per dozen ;

Bottles, flasks and packages containing more than three-fourths of a gallon, but not more than one gallon per dozen, as one gallon per dozen ;

Bottles, flasks and packages containing more than one gallon, but not more than one and one-half gallons per dozen, as one and one-half gallons per dozen ;

Bottles, flasks and packages containing more than one and one-half gallons, but not more than two gallons per dozen, as two gallons per dozen ;

Bottles, flasks and packages containing more than two gallons, but not more than two and four-fifths gallons per dozen, as two and four-fifths gallons per dozen ;

Bottles, flasks and packages containing more than two and four-fifths gallons, but not more than three gallons per dozen, as three gallons per dozen ;

Bottles, flasks and packages containing more than three gallons, but not more than three and one-fifth gallons per dozen, as three and one-fifth gallons per dozen.

Mr. FIELDING. I would like to insert an amendment. These regulations respecting bottles and flasks are suggested by the experience of the Customs Department for uniformity of measurement. I wish to add thereto the following words :

Provided further that bottles or vials of liquors, such as samples not for sale to the trade may be entered for duty according to actual measurement under regulations by the Minister of Customs.

There is quite a number of articles coming in in small vials which are not for commercial purposes, and we provide a method of assessing the duty upon them.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would ask the minister what will be the duty now on pails of wood ?

Mr. FIELDING. This change takes them out of the twenty cent list and leaves them under the general classification of wood goods at 25 per cent. That is an increase.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the extent of the reduction in duty on window glass ?

Mr. FIELDING. Under the general tariff the reduction is from 20 to 15 per cent, under the preferential tariff from 13⅓ per cent to 7½ per cent.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we then to understand that the government have given up the idea that glass can be manufactured in Canada?

Mr. FIELDING. It is not made at present nor have we any indication that it is likely to be. It is a very specialized industry, and so far as we can learn it is not likely to be introduced into Canada at an early date.

Mr. BLAIN. Then do we understand that the government have arrived at the conclusion that for all time to come, or while this tariff is in operation, window glass must be imported ?

Mr. FIELDING. For the present, I won't say for all time to come.

Mr. BLAIN. I think glass can be manufactured in Canada, and it seems to me the government are striking at an industry that will eventually grow up here. My hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) points out that the glass in this chamber overhead was manufactured in Canada. However, I think the government, in revising the tariff, should be very careful lest they strike an anticipatory blow at an industry that may eventually grow up in Canada.

Mr. PATERSON. The manufacture has already been tried here.

Mr. BLAIN. Many things have been tried and have succeeded which people formerly thought were impossible. We have now large and flourishing industries that at one time were thought impossible.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman is mistaken if he thinks this industry could be started in Canada under these regulations.

Such regulations may also provide for the temporary exemption from special duty of any article or class of articles, when it is established to the satisfaction of the Minister of Customs that such articles are not made in Canada in substantial quantities and are offered for sale to all purchasers on equal terms.

Then any industry at present established in Canada that does not manufacture 'in substantial quantities' won't come under the dumping clause, and no new industry that is not established is ever likely to be established because foreigners can dump as many goods as they like to prevent its being started.

Mr. FIELDING. The words 'substantial quantities' should have a reasonable interpretation. Suppose some person makes an article on a small scale perhaps for his own use, not offering it for sale; would it be reasonable to regard that as an industry that required the dumping clause to be applied to it, when the man is not able to supply the trade? What good would it do him to give him further protection on an article which he is not able to supply? That would be a very extreme doctrine. If the goods are not being offered in the market, nobody is hurt by other goods coming in.

Mr. HAGGART. They may be offered in the market and may be manufactured in the country, but perhaps not in the substantial quantities that would satisfy the Minister of Customs. The clause in the regulations virtually says to the people: Don't start any new industry. Or if you have started a new industry and you do not manufacture in sufficient quantity, the dumping clause will not apply to you.

Mr. BLAIN. From what country is the larger portion of our glass imported at the present time?

Mr. PATERSON. I think largely from Belgium.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I will read the balance of resolution 3:

22. Paraffine wax candles, 25 per cent ad valorem.

151. Paraffine wax, 25 per cent ad valorem.

170. Illuminating oils, composed wholly or in part of the products of petroleum, coal, shale or lignite, costing more than thirty cents per gallon, 20 per cent ad valorem.

171. Lubricating oils, composed wholly or in part of petroleum, costing less than 25 cents per gallon, 2½ cents per gallon.

172. Crude petroleum, gas oils (other than naphtha, benzine and gasoline), lighter than ·8235 but not less than ·775 specific gravity, at 60 degrees temperature, 1½ cents per gallon.

173. Oils, coal and kerosene, distilled, purified or refined, naphtha and petroleum and products of petroleum, n.e.s., 2½ cents per gallon.

175. Lubricating oils, n.e.s., and axle grease, 20 per cent ad valorem.

178. Vaseline, and all similar preparations of petroleum for toilet, medicinal or other purposes, 25 per cent ad valorem.

201 (a). Common and colourless window glass, 15 per cent ad valorem.

203. Plate glass, not bevelled, in sheets or panes, not exceeding seven square feet each, n.o.p., 10 per cent ad valorem.

203 (a.) Plate glass, not bevelled, in sheets or panes exceeding seven square feet each, and not exceeding twenty-five square feet each, n.o.p., 25 per cent ad valorem.

After item 323—Provided that for duty purposes the minimum value of an open buggy shall be forty dollars, and the minimum value of a covered buggy shall be fifty dollars.

368 (a.) Silk fabrics, when imported by manufacturers of neckties for use exclusively in the manufacture of neckties in their own factories, under regulations to be made by the Minister of Customs, 10 per cent ad valorem.

147 (a.) Artificial teeth, until April 1, 1905, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Notwithstanding anything contained in schedule D, the maximum duty on the undermentioned articles when imported under the British preferential tariff shall be as follows:—

185 (a.) Tableware of china, porcelain or other white clay, 15 per cent ad valorem.

201 (b.) Common and colourless window glass, 7½ per cent ad valorem.

Notwithstanding anything contained in schedule D, the minimum duty on the undermentioned articles when imported under the British preferential tariff shall be as follows:—

394 (a.) Manufactures as described in item 394 of schedule A (excepting blankets, flannels, bed comforters and counterpanes) composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the Alpaca, goat or other like animal, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FOWLER. Have any representations been made to the minister with respect to reducing the duty upon skates?

Mr. FIELDING. I think not recently. I remember that in some former years there

was some discussion on the subject but to the best of my recollection there was no recent communication.

Mr. FOWLER. We have a skate manufactory in my county, one of the few in Canada and they have met with a great deal of difficulty in carrying on business on account of the competition of German manufacturers who make a much inferior quality of skate but are able to sell for so small a price that it is very difficult for the Canadian manufacturers to compete. There is a manufactory in the minister's own province, and I would ask the minister if he would make an amendment here to assist the Canadian skate manufacturers.

Mr. PATERSON. How is it since the surtax ?

Mr. FOWLER. A little better than before. Of course there was first the removal of the specific duty which took place before 1896, and then came the preference of which the Germans had the benefit, and which was very serious. It is better now, but I think an increase in the duty would not do any harm to the people of Canada and it would be a very great aid to the industry in my own county.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the duty on skates is 35 per cent. Under the legislation respecting the German surtax that would make it 46 or 47 per cent, a liberal allowance. Whatever might be said before, I do not think that since the adoption of the German surtax there can be any ground for complaint.

Mr. FOWLER. Of course it is not so objectionable as before. The difficulty is in regard to the cheap class of skates, which is most generally used. The Germans cannot compete with regard to the better class of goods.

Mr. CLANCY. It is delightful to hear the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Finance as well, speaking in such sympathetic tones and asking: How are you getting on under the surtax ? He saw the advantage of the protection he was not strong enough to give under the name of protection but under the name of surtax duties. It was a fortunate thing for the skate people that there was a means for putting on a retaliatory duty. My hon. friend now asks how the business is getting on under the German surtax. It is a humiliating position for the minister. He says this was bad legislation and that he was forced into it. I think he took the right course but it destroyed every argument he used before while he is delighted that we have some relief under the surtax. What would happen if the causes which led to the imposition of the surtax were removed altogether and the surtax came off ?

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. BLAIN. What pressure was brought to bear upon the government for the reduction on common window glass, and will this change of duty decrease the price to the consumer ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, I think it will decrease the price.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. minister has overlooked my question as to the pressure which led to this reduction.

Mr. PATERSON. I think the Finance Minister on looking over the tariff, wishing to make further reductions for the benefit of the people, saw that this was an article in general use and as it was not made in the country at all, he decided it would be good policy to reduce the duty in the interest of the consumers.

Mr. BLAIN. What reduction in price do the ministers expect will result from this reduction ?

Mr. PATERSON. There is a reduction of 5 per cent on the Belgian glass and over 6 per cent on the English glass.

Mr. BLAIN. Whatever reduction there is on glass the full amount will be in the interest of the Canadian and therefore the consumer will purchase his glass so much cheaper by the introduction of this change in the tariff.

Mr. PATERSON. Ultimately, I think.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the minister will be good enough to answer my question, because if the consumer is not to be benefited it is useless for us to put on the statute-book such legislation as that prohibiting the introduction of a new industry.

Mr. PATERSON. I think they will be benefited.

Mr. BLAIN. To what extent ?

Mr. PATERSON. I stated the extent of the reduction and as a general rule in business the business man, if he buys at a reduced price reduces his goods to a customer. If there is a window glass industry established in Canada I fancy they would want the rate increased. That carries with it the fact that a reduction of duty is supposed to lower the price.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister expects that a reduction of duty would reduce the price to the consumer.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. I am not a prophet but I hazard the prediction that such will not be the case.

Mr. PATERSON. If it does not, we will have made an unwise change because we will lose that large revenue. I think the benefit will reach the consumer.

Mr. BROCK. When silk fabrics are imported for use exclusively in the manufacture of neckties, you allow them in at a reduced duty, but I cannot understand how the Customs Department will regulate that exception unless these goods are manufactured in bond. Large quantities of Japanese silk are imported by Japanese merchants here and not by Canadians. What machinery will you have to prevent an enormous quantity of these silks coming in at ten per cent when a large quantity of exactly the same goods will be charged 25 per cent? Why should you not include women's blouses and dresses as well as neckties and have these articles manufactured in this country? I cannot understand how you can manage to carry out this provision unless you have these neckties manufactured in bond, and then you will need to have a customs officer in every factory.

Mr. FIELDING. There are a number of items in the tariff which come in under a similar provision, and the criticism of the hon. gentleman might apply to any of these. We have to rely upon the supervision of the customs authorities. There is much to be said in favour of having all such privileges allowed only when the operation is carried on in bond. If that be done the smaller concerns would be shut out because only the larger ones could pay the expense of customs supervision. But for that I think all these operations should be carried on in bond. If any abuses should arise we may be obliged to adopt the suggestion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock). As to the difference made between neckties and blouses, the reason is that neckties are being imported from Great Britain under the preferential tariff, and in this country they are made largely from German silks which pay a very high duty. One's first thought would be that if neckties came in under the preferential tariff, the Canadian manufacturer could also import his material under the preferential tariff, but it was shown to us that the silk out of which these neckties are made is chiefly German silk and not produced in Great Britain. Consequently, the Canadian manufacturer of neckties would have to pay a high duty on the German silk while the neckties made in Great Britain would come in under the preferential tariff at 23 per cent. Again, the neckties largely come from Great Britain while almost all the blouses come from the United States; the duty being 35 per cent. The blouse manufacturer does not, therefore, suffer from the same competition as the necktie manufacturer.

Mr. BROCK. A great quantity of these silks do come from Germany but large quantities come from France and other European countries that pay no surtax. I contend that the silk should be manufactured in bond, and that those who do such a small business that they cannot afford to pay bonding charges had better not be in the business. You will have no trouble with the large manufacturers in Montreal and Toronto; your difficulty will come from those small manufacturers such as we know in the trade who keep these little sweating shops, do a small business at a small expense and pay small wages. A large manufacturer in Montreal told me that these little sweating shops manufacturing special articles are really ruining the manufacture of the better class of goods. Any manufacturer who is big enough to import goods ought be big enough to pay expenses of making them in bond. I trust the Customs Department will make careful regulations or else the trade of this country will be seriously injured by the importation of large quantities of silk alleged to be for neckties, but which will never go into the manufacture of neckties at all. I see also that in this resolution you except blankets, flannels, bedcovers, and counterpanes, from the regular rate of duty. Why should you do that? The manufacture of blankets in Canada is one of our most satisfactory industries and yet the importation of an undesirable class of blankets is increasing largely. We are keeping out diseased immigrants, but here we are allowing goods to come into this country that are really diseased. The poorest stuff is put into these so-called blankets; there is not a particle of clean wool or clean cotton in them; they are made of rubbish and they are sold to the poorer people in the Northwest. The Doukhobors wear them and use them as covering for their beds, when you had far better let them use good woollen blankets and not encourage them to use this rubbish. I do not see why you should allow them in at a lower rate of duty than good honest woollen goods. Again, we can manufacture flannels in this country and why should they be excepted? Why try to injure them by leaving that item in?

Mr. PATERSON. The total importation of blankets last year was $38,000, of flannels only $48,000, and of bed comforters or counterpanes only $5,000. I was satisfied that these products did not need any higher duty.

Mr. BROCK. It is not the quantity that is imported that affects the Canadian manufacturer, for he has to enter into competition with them if there is only one pair imported. Our factories are wasting their time trying to compete with this rubbishy cheap stuff. We have not in this country the volume of manufactures so that we can collect the sweepings of the factories, the torn-up rags, jute and such things, to manufacture up into blankets; but so long as you allow even these small quantities to come in, our manufacturers have to compete with them. I think it would be well to keep the duty up on these goods.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman knows the trade better than I do, but the

representations we have had from the woollen manufacturers are that the Canadian manufacturer has the market in these lines. In these three items the total importations last year were $93,000, while the importations covered by this class were over $7,000,000.

Mr. CLANCY. Was it in order to get revenue that blankets and flannels were taken out of the class where they have been for a long time? Surely the hon. gentleman will not deny what the hon. member for Toronto says, that our manufacturers have to compete even if only one pair is imported. I would like to know the reason they are taken out of their class.

Mr. FIELDING. It is to temper the wind to the shorn lamb. We understand that the manufacturers of blankets and flannels are doing very well. The hon. gentleman must see where his argument regarding the small importations leads him. If the tariff is not high enough to keep out one pair of blankets——

Mr. CLANCY. I did not say that. I was repeating the language of an hon. member who knows that business as well as any member of this House. He said that if only one pair were imported, we would have to compete against that pair.

Mr. FIELDING. What I want to point out is that the effect of the hon. gentleman's contention is that you must have an absolutely prohibitive tariff, because he says that even if a small quantity is permitted to come into Canada, that governs the price and depresses the whole industry. I think that is a very extraordinary doctrine. I do not think my hon. friend would like to follow it out to that end, although that is the logical consequence of his argument.

Mr. BROCK. If there was one particular item, besides poisons, to which I would apply a prohibitive tariff, I think it would be to these very blankets. I think, from what I have seen of them, that the importation must be more like $500,000 than $93,000, because almost every dealer has them.

Mr. PATERSON. I am giving the figures for 1902-3. There may be some increase this year.

Mr. BROCK. If the goods are undesirable, I do not think they should be allowed to come in at all. I feel with regard to them just as I do with regard to diseased immigrants—I would not have them in the country at all. They are very deceptive, and are brought in so as to deceive. They are not sold as honest goods. The more we can sell our own goods, made by our own people, from material grown in this country, the better it will be for this country.

Mr. HENDERSON. Apart even from coal oil, it is possible that the most important item in the tariff changes now proposed is that which we now have before us, and I think it should receive more than a simple passing notice. The item as described in the resolution is :

> Manufactures as described in item 394 of schedule A (excepting blankets, flannels, bed comforters and counterpanes), composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the Alpaca, goat or other like animal, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Now, item 394 in the tariff of 1897 comprises more articles than are specifically named in this resolution. It comprises 'fabrics, manufactures, wearing apparel and ready-made clothing, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat or other like animal; blankets, bed comforters or counterpanes, flannels, cloths, doeskins, cassimeres and tweeds.' The government proposes to increase the duty under the preferential tariff on all these goods except blankets, comforters, counterpanes and flannels. They are willing that an opportunity should be given to make in this country all the other articles enumerated by placing them under the minimum duty of 30 per cent, or within 2 per cent of what the duty was in the national policy tariff prior to the adoption of the tariff of 1897; but they do not seem willing to allow blankets the same consideration—and when I speak of blankets I include the other articles that are excepted. The government propose to leave these articles under the preferential tariff at 23⅓ per cent. This I regard as a very unjust discrimination, and I will state my reason.

The government by their policy have declared their willingness to have tweeds, cloths and ready-made clothing made in Canada. It is well known that most of these goods, the manufacture of which the government propose to assist, are made largely of wools imported from other countries. If the government are willing to do that, why not include the article of blankets made largely from Canadian wools? Why not have these goods made in Canada as well as the others? Made in Canada should be our policy for blankets just as well as for tweeds, cloths and ready-made clothing and the other goods which the government propose to assist. In fact, made in Canada is a sound policy at all times. It would be much better for this country if something more of that principle were incorporated in all our tariff resolutions. Let us have everything made in Canada that we can, but more especially encourage the manufacture of goods which are made from Canadian material, such as the article of blankets. So far as my policy is concerned, what I would like to see could be illustrated in this way. I would like to see the pick that mines the ore, that produces the iron, that makes the plough, that tills the soil, that grows the grain, that feeds the hog, that makes the bacon I had for breakfast, all made in Canada. I think that is good true Canadian

policy. The woollen industry is a very important one. In 1901, when the last census was taken, the capital invested in that industry was over $10,500,000, the output was nearly $7,500,000, the raw material consumed in the manufacture of woollens was valued at nearly $4,000,000, the amount paid out for labour was $1,725,000 per annum, the number of wage-earners employed amounted to 6,400, and taking an average of five per family these represented a population of about 30,000 people. These people are all consumers of Canadian products and help to make a market for the products of the farms. The making of blankets alone is by no menas an unimportant part of this industry. Then why not guard the manufacturer of blankets from the competition of cheap labour in England and the surplus products of trusts and combines in the United States ? In 1903 we imported woollen goods to the amount of $13,561,915, of which $10,171,597 worth came in under the minimum preferential tariff, not made from Canadian wool, but made from the wool of other countries almost entirely, and in countries where workmen are paid small wages and where foreign material is the basis of the output. An hon. member of this House, who stands very close to the government and sometimes talks for it in matters in which they do not wish openly to speak for themselves, delivered a short time ago in this House a speech in which he showed the unfair competition our blanket makers have to contend against. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), speaking in this House on the 15th of June last, said :

> I have the authority of Mr. Chamberlain, as well as that of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, that one-third of the people of Great Britain are at present underfed—that 13,000,000 men, women and children in the British islands have not sufficient to eat every day. I have here the statement of Mr. Chamberlain endorsing that of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, to the effect that out of every seven workingmen in Great Britain at the age of twenty-five who will reach the age of sixty-five, three will have to go to the workhouse.

Yet the Minister of Finance is bringing down a tariff to practically bring the workmen of this country into competition with labour in Great Britain, which is underpaid and underfed. Surely the hon. gentleman does not want to bring the workmen of this country to the same level as those of the old land, who are thus described by the hon. member for Labelle. Let us see the competition we have to contend against. In the first place the blanket manufacturer in Canada pays 25 to 30 per cent more for wages than the manufacturers in England. That statement I have on the authority of a gentleman who has made woollen goods both in this country and England. Practically the difference in wages wipes out the whole of the 23⅓ protection which the blanket maker is given in this country. Still the government is willing to allow our market to be invaded by the surplus of other countries as it was in 1903, when we received in blankets, flannels and counterpanes and coverlets, under the preferential tariff, $93,547 worth. I believe that the Minister of Customs will find that to be correct.

Mr. PATERSON. When I gave the figures to the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Brock), I overlooked the fact that they were under the preferential tariff. Some have come from other countries as well. The total imports amounted to $44,000 instead of $39,000, but my attention is called to the fact that during the present year, so far as it has gone, they have increased to $75,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. Under the preferential tariff in these four articles of blankets, flannels, counterpanes and coverlets, we imported $93,547 worth, on which the government obtained a revenue of $21,737, much less than half the duty which was paid on the unhulled rice referred to by the hon. member for Bothwell. Notwithstanding that their tariff is a tariff for revenue only, they did not receive on these articles of woollen goods even half of the amount of revenue that they obtained from unhulled rice, an article which cannot be produced in this country, the production which employs no labour in this country and which is not the product of any raw material produced in this country. The imports of blankets may seem small, as the Minister of Customs said. From 1895 to 1903 however, the increase in the importation of blankets was 220 per cent. If you take the last four years of the Conservative tariff—1894 to 1897 inclusive—as compared with the last four years of the present tariff, you will find there was an increase in the importation of blankets of 100 per cent. And if you take the importation for the eleven months ending 30th June, 1904, amounting to $85,524, and add one-twelfth for the remaining month, you find that the total importation in 1904 was $92,651, again an increase over 1903 of 100 per cent. The importation of these goods is rapidly increasing, and they are likely to come in in much larger quantities in the near future. But, as the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) has said, the fact that the importations are increasing is not the most dangerous feature of the case. The dangerous or troublesome feature is that amongst these goods that come in under the preferential tariff—yes, and under the full 35 per cent tariff—there are blankets at a valuation at as low as 16½ cents per pound. Now, any of us who have ever been engaged in business know that a blanket at that valuation does not contain very much wool. If it contains any wool at all, it is

of the most inferior character ; it is at best, as the hon. member for Centre Toronto said, the sweepings of the mill—practically rubbish. I believe it is worse than that. I believe it is old carpets and old clothing picked and made into yarn for weaving these blankets. As the hon. member said, we prohibit the immigration into this country of people who are diseased but here we are allowing the importation of a class of goods which must of necessity bring into the country diseases which we are trying to keep out. Apart from the matter of wages and from the interference with the general trade of the country, this is a strong reason why the government should take action and defend our people against the inroads of disease from these infectious goods.

Mr. FIELDING. What method would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) suggest ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I will suggest that before I get through. I shall be satisfied if the Minister of Finance will strike out these words 'blankets, flannels, counterpanes and coverlets,' and allow these goods to come in under the same duty as other woollen goods, and as they have done in the past.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman has no objection to disease if it pays a higher duty.

Mr. HENDERSON. The object of the higher duty would be to keep out the disease, and no one knows that better than the Minister of Finance. The object of his low duty was to allow goods to come into this country so that he might get revenue. He knows that when you put on a higher duty you exclude goods—not absolutely, but you admit a smaller, quantity into the country. If we could not absolutely exclude these inferior goods we could minimize their importation very much, thus minimizing the danger of disease. Now, although the importation of blankets is small, it bids fair, in my opinion, to land the blanket maker just where the government's policy has landed the man who makes tweeds. It bids fair to paralyse the industry. I am afraid the Minister of Finance has not given this matter a great deal of consideration. Now he did not come to the rescue of the man who makes tweeds and cloth until it was practically too late. Why withhold the remedy until the patient becomes unconscious ? Surely if a remedy is to be provided it had better be provided while the industry is in a flourishing condition and when it will actually save money to the country, to the manufacturers of blankets and to the workmen engaged in that industry. The difference in wages alone, to my mind, puts the blanket manufacturer on a par with his English competitor. As was shown, he pays 25 to 30 per cent more wages than does the English manufacturer. But the Canadian manufacturer has a great deal more to contend with, and that is a reason why he should be better protected. We all know that in this country coal costs more—perhaps 300 per cent more—than it costs the English manufacturer of blankets, and on account of our climate we must use a great deal more coal for heating purposes than is used in England. But these are not the only disadvantages the Canadian blanket manufacturer is subject to and that his English competitor escapes. There is an enormous tax that the man who makes blankets in this country has to contribute to, from which his English competitor is free. For example the Dominion of Canada spends about $12,000,000 on education of which the manufacturer of blankets pays his proportion. The English manufacturers of blankets contritribute nothing to this fund. The Canadian manufacturer of blankets must contribute to the maintenance of municipal government, towards the subsidies for railways such as those voted to-day, for the building of dry docks, the deepening of rivers, the construction of canals, the maintenance of lighthouses and the general cost of transportation in Canada. The Canadian manufacturer of blankets has to contribute even to the steamship subventions. We grant subsidies to steamships in order to convey food to the people of Great Britain, including those who made blankets in competition with us, and those same subsidized steamers bring back the product of the English blanket manufacturer to compete with the Canadians.

No part of the cost of immigration is paid by the English manufacturer, but the Canadian manufacturer is called upon to pay his share of taxation to that as well as other matters. The cost of legislation, of the administration of justice, of the bounty on steel and iron—$1,400,000 last year—of the bounty on lead to which reference has been made to-day, of the bounties on steel rods, on binder twine, on crude oil—all these things have to be paid by the people of Canada, and the man who makes blankets in this country has to contribute his share. But the man who makes blankets in Great Britain does not contribute one cent towards this taxation. It may be said that in his own country he has to contribute taxation along certain lines similar to these. But he has the profits of his mills in the old country out of which he will pay that additional taxation, so as to leave a margin of profit on the goods that he sends to this country, entirely unimpaired by the numerous taxes that are imposed upon the Canadian manufacturer of woollen goods.

Now, under the tariff of the hon. gentleman in 1897, blankets were put on the same list as tweeds, cloth, overcoats, doeskins, namely 35 per cent, from which under the preferential tariff, one-eighth, then one-fourth and finally one-third was taken off.

Is there any good reason, I ask the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs, for the change they have made ? If it was right that blankets should be classed with these other woollen goods in 1897, is there any good reason why they should be taken out of that class and treated in a different manner at the present time ? I do not know of any reason. In the tariff of 1894, tweeds were rated at 32 per cent, cloths 32 per cent, flannels, 32 per cent, ready-made clothing, 34 per cent. Blankets were then, under the Conservative tariff, rated at 40 per cent. A special rating was given for blankets over the other goods that were made from wool not produced in ths country. The Conservative tariff helped the article that was made from the home product, but the present government seems to be more desirous to assist in the manufacture of an article that is made from the imported wools. They have exactly revised the policy that was in force before they came into power. True they did it for the purpose of revenue, I will assume. Their policy is to get revenue, and hence to aid imports and discourage home manufacture.

Now Canada produces a large quantity of wool. I know little about the product of the Northwest, but I understand it is a country where a large quantity of wool can be produced and of a quality nearly equal to that of Australian wool. In Ontario alone during the last eight or ten years we have produced yearly from five to six million pounds of wool. I have no means of knowing the clip of the entire Dominion, so I shall refer only to the province of Ontario. From the entire Dominion we exported last year about 2,500,000 pounds, or nearly half the entire clip of the province of Ontario, instead of having it made into goods that we require at home and goods that could be made at home by our own people, if we adopted measures to prevent the invasion by foreign goods into our market. Now this clip of wool in the province of Ontario has been very well maintained. I find it was nearly as much in 1902, as it was nearly ten years ago. But I am sorry to say that the price of the article has materially declined, and to this especially I wish to draw the attention of the minister, because I think that is one of the strong reasons why the request I am about to make should be granted on behalf of those who produce wool in this country. The wool clip of Ontario in 1895 was valued at $1,242,962, the average price being 20 cents per pound. I will not trouble you with the figures of every year. In 1898, the value of the entire product was $847,378, or an average of 16⅜ cents per pound. Then in 1900, the value of the total clip was $894,-112, or 15⅝ cents per pound. In 1902, the last year for which I have a report, the value of the entire clip was $728,406, or 12⅝ cents per pound, a gradual reduction from year to year after the introduction of the preferential tariff. In 1895, the average price of wool in the province of Ontario was 20 cents per pound, in 1902 it was 12⅝ cents per pound ; or a reduction of 7⅛ cents during those seven years, equal to a loss to the farming community on the amount of wool produced in 1902 in the province of Ontario, of $409,728.

Now, I may be told at the present time that wool is much higher than 12⅝ cents per pound. Washed wool is practically worth 20 cents per pound to-day, largely due to the severe drought that occurred in Australia. that may be only a temporary result. Those of us who give any attention to what is occurring in other countries will recollect the severe drought that oocurred in Australia. For several years, lasting up to 1902, millions of sheep were lost in Australia. The effect of that destruction of sheep during those years is now being felt throughout the world in the wool supply, with the result that while there is not a greater demand for wool there is a much smaller supply, and until the people of Australia are again able to restore their flocks and produce what they did before in the way of wool, we may expect that wool for one or two years at any rate will maintain a higher price. But as that country has been blessed with rains during the last two seasons we may reasonably expect that Australians will be able very soon to restore their flocks to their former number, and that they will again be able very soon to produce the quantity of wool which they produced four or five years ago. The effect of that drought will pass away, and the price of wool in this country, by reason of the fact that the supply will again overtake the demand, will again drop down to the normal condition it was in under the preferential tariff in 1902.

It is a favourite argument of the Liberals that you cannot protect the farmer. I have frequently heard that stated, more particularly by Liberals from the province of Ontario. Hon. members who speak in that way are not the friends of the farmers. If we safeguarded the market for blankets we protect the farmer in this way. The farmer grows the wool that makes the blanket. The blanket maker buys his wool from the farmer, and if we make more blankets in this country the blanket makers would require more wool and of necessity larger competition for wool would bring about a higher price for it. By placing blankets in the same tariff item as tweeds and cloth we would better guard the market and would increase the output of blankets from the mills of our own country. That would increase the employment of labour and the market for wool although it might produce less revenue, as the minister suggests. What we want in this country is an industry-producing tariff rather than a revenue-producing tariff. The Minister of Finance

will pobably tell us that it will increase the price to the consumers. Will his present change not enhance the price of tweeds, clothing and overcoatings ? Yet he is willing to allow additional protection on goods made from wools imported from other countries. Suppose it does increase the price of blankets. I would like to know if it is a good thing to have everything very, very cheap ? When a question of a judge's or a civil servant's salary is under discussion we are told that these are prosperous times and that the cost of living has increased, and so an increased price is rather an indication of better times. The minister puts a high tax on rice. If a tax on blankets would increase the cost of the blanket to the consumer surely the tax on rice would increase the cost of rice to the consumer, yet the minister has no hesitation in putting 50 per cent on cleaned rice, so that when a woman goes to the grocery to buy a dollar's worth of rice she has to take one dollar to buy the rice and half a dollar to pay duty to the government. I think a well balanced fiscal policy might be arranged, and would ask the minister to take the matter into his kind consideration. He would find that if he would take the duty off rice, and allow the family cheaper rice, he could provide for all the increase that would be on the blankets that any family would want to buy during the course of the year, or perhaps a great deal more. The duty on one dollar's worth of rice would pay for all the increase there would possibly be on three pairs of blankets. The minister would by this change give help to the blanket industry, while it would not enhance the price to the consumer. Such a change would give the manufacturer a wider market and relieve him from the competition of inferior imported goods. He would have a larger output, the workmen employed by him would have more work and possibly an increased wage as well. The business man would be benefited owing to the increased labour employed and there would be an increase in general business. But the farmer above all would be largely benefited. He would not only have a better market in his own neighbourhood for the perishable products of his farm, goods he could not export, but would have the satisfaction of getting the highest possible price for his wool. As I have shown you already, the decrease in the price of washed wool in the province of Ontario between 1895 and 1902 was more than $400,000. You can readily understand that the farmers of this country by the reversal of this policy and by proper assistance to the manufacture of blankets are going to be materially helped, and if there is any class in the country we ought to assist, it is the agricultural class. I hope the minister will make the change which I think is eminently fair. In 1894 when the Conservative party last revised the tariff they placed blankets, counterpanes, flannels and comforters in the same class as cashmeres, doeskins, tweeds, dutiable at 5 cents per pound and 25 per cent ad valorem. They remained in that class until 1897 and in the tariff of that year blankets, comforters, counterpanes and flannels were again included along with tweeds at 35 per cent less preference. Nearly all the other goods are now receiving the benefit of this 30 per cent minimum tariff, and I ask why blankets should be taken out of that class or treated differently. There is a strong reason indeed why these goods ought to be put upon the 30 per cent list along with tweeds and cloth. I think the mere fact that they are made of Canadian raw material is a reason why this industry should be assisted to an even greater extent than the others. What was the policy under the Conservative party ? Then the blankets had 40 per cent ad valorem protection while tweeds had 32 per cent. The Conservative party considered the interests of the farmers. Articles made from the raw material produced on the farm were protected by 8 per cent more than the articles produced from imported raw material, but the present government changes all that and places the article produced from the Canadian raw material on a 23½ per cent basis and places the other goods at a rate of 30 per cent.

Instead of putting blankets produced from Canadian raw material 8 per cent higher, they are being reduced to a rate of duty nearly 7 per cent lower than the other goods with which they have been classed for the last eight or ten years. I hope the Minister of Finance will listen to my appeal. Even at this late hour, I hope he will repent, and if he does he will merit the gratitude, not only of the blanket-makers of Canada, but of the farmers who are engaged in producing wool. I hope the hon. gentleman will do something in the interests of these people, and that he will do it now. Why withhold the remedy until the patient has become unconscious ? Blankets are made in the constituency which I have the honour to represent by honest and intelligent manufacturers who are engaged in that enterprise. They were woollen manufacturers in Great Britain, and they were woollen manufacturers in Montreal until they were starved out under the Mackenzie government. They have been operating for many years in Ontario. These gentlemen tell me that whilst they have plenty of work to do they are making no money. A man has the right to make money out of his enterprise and industry, and the Minister of Finance should not impose upon him conditions which prevent him doing that. If our blanket manufacturers come in competition with these underpaid and underfed people in Great Britain who are making cheap goods, the Canadian manufacturers should have some

protection against such unfair competition. I hope the Minister of Finance will grant my request, and I would like he would do it without my moving that these four items which he proposes to except should be stricken out.

Mr. FIELDING. I regret I am not able to accept the hon. gentleman's proposition at this eleventh hour, or a little later than the eleventh hour. Much may be said in favour of the change that has been made with reference to other woollen goods, that would not apply with the same force to the duty on blankets. Even the figures quoted by my hon. friend do not make a very conclusive case, because they show that the importations are comparatively small in proportion to the quantity of blankets made in Canada. What the hon. gentleman has said,and what others may say, on this matter will form a proper subject for inquiry by the tariff commission. We shall approach the question with open minds, and if a case can be made out for dealing with the blanket industry, as we have dealt with other Canadian industries, we will be quite prepared to give it the same consideration.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) has made out an extremely strong case, and I think the government should even now accede to his request. If it be true that an undesirable class of shoddy blankets, made out of rubbish, are imported into this country, either they must take the place of our own goods, or Canadian goods have to be sold at an unremunerative price to meet the competition. I regret that the government should seem disposed to adhere to this policy without apparently any good reason. Why do they not give the Canadian blanket manufacturers a chance with the manufacturers of tweeds ? I believe that in view of the strong reasons advanced by the hon. member for Halton the government should encourage Canadian manufacture, and not encourage the importation of this rubbish. Even if only $40,000 worth of these blankets were imported, that would be quite a tidy little trade to reserve for the farmers and manufacturers of Canada. The Minister of Finance has said that the tariff commissioners may get their hearts softened in this matter, but the tariff commissioners will be the cabinet ministers, and in view of the strong case made out by the member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) to-night, they have sufficient light now to do at once what is in the interests of the Canadian blanket manufacturers. I fancy that the woollen manufacturers cannot look forward for very much encouragement from what the hon. gentleman has said to-night. I think it is manifestly unfair that these two articles particularly, blankets and flannels, are left out of the class to which they belong. I may say that I had a letter only a few days ago from manufacturers in the town of Sarnia, stating that they had made representations to the government, that although they were doing a fair volume of business, they were not making any money, for the simple reason that they had to sell their goods at a low price, because they had to compete with a cheap and inferior class of goods.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to endorse the statements made by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). I am sure that it is a surprise to a considerable number of people in Canada to find that in this revision of the tariff no further protection is given to the blanket industry. In my own county there are two establishments that manufacture blankets, and we had requests from them to say something on the subject when the revision of the tariff came up. I wish to express my disappointment at the blanket industry being omitted from this revision. I am quite sure that that industry requires some further protection. There is in my county a very large blanket manufacturing establishment which has been more or less idle for a good many years. It is not altogether closed up, but it runs only for a little while at a time, and its owners had hoped that in this revision of the tariff some interest would have been taken in the blanket industry, so that they would have been placed in a position to manufacture successfully the blankets required for our Canadian people. I will not pursue the subject further than to ask the hon. minister if he expects that this increase of the duties on tweeds, &c., will increase the price to the consumer, he having made the statement that the reduction of the duty on window glass would decrease the price to the consumer ?

Mr. PATERSON. I will only add to what the Finance Minister said, that in the consideration of the question of woollens, the question of blankets and bed comforters came up ; and if the representations placed before us by the gentlemen who represented that industry had borne out what has been said by the hon. member for Halton and others who have spoken to-night, that it was in the same condition as the other industries, these items would not have been left out of the revision ; but I certainly gathered from the woollen men, whom I met many times, that there was not the same danger to the manufacture of these lines that there was to the others. One very large manufacturer said to me personally : We want no change in the duty on blankets ; we have the market now, and if there is no money in the business, it is because we are cutting prices on one another—and I have no doubt they are selling very close, in competition among themselves. That bears out the argument of my hon. friend

that if you have competition at home, it will keep the prices down to a fair level. With reference to the other question of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) it is not necessary to go into it at present, as we want to get on with the resolutions. At any rate, he would not take my opinion. Let us discuss that next year.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend has answered my question by saying that the reduction of the duty on window glass would decrease the price to the consumer. Having made that statement, will he say that the increased duties he is placing on certain articles will increase the price to the consumer ?

Mr. PATERSON. Will the hon. member answer it himself first, and then I can tell him whether I agree with him or not ?

Mr. BLAIN. I think I am asking the hon. minister a straight and fair question.

Mr. PATERSON. I am asking the hon. gentleman what he thinks. I have as much right to ask a question as the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose the hon. gentleman has. Here is a proposition to increase the duties on certain articles to be consumed by the Canadian people. The hon. gentleman has met deputations from all parts of Canada and had opportunities of informing himself which we could not possibly enjoy. With this information before him, he ought to be able to tell us whether in his opinion the increased duty will increase the price to the consumer.

Mr. PATERSON. I can tell the hon. gentleman that the importers represented to me that they had sold their goods for future delivery, based on the duty then existing, and that if they were made to pay increased duty, their sales would result in a loss to them instead of a profit. Consequently they argued with considerable force that it was not fair that the increase of duty should apply to such goods.

Mr. BLAIN. Then I understand the hon. gentleman to say that in his opinion the increase of duty will increase the price to the consumer ?

Mr. PATERSON. The importers thought so.

Mr. BLAIN. Then I suppose it is fair to assume that the hon. gentleman was convinced by their arguments ?

Mr. HENDERSON. The fact is that the blanket manufacturers, as a rule, are smaller than those of the tweeds and cloths, and the blanket men practically relied upon the manufacturers of the other lines to present their case along with their own. And I believe that the larger manufacturers having secured what they wanted rather neglected the blanket men. It may be quite true that a manufacturer told the hon. gentleman he did not require further protection on blankets, but I understood that he was a man who was engaged in manufacturing very extensively another line of goods and that his blanket factory was only a small affair compared with the other. He could therefore afford to sacrifice the smaller industry and make larger profits out of the more extensive lines.

Mr. CLANCY. I would ask the hon. minister if the representations made to him with regard to blankets were made by persons who were also engaged in other lines or if any were made by persons exclusively engaged in the making of blankets ?

Mr. PATERSON. I had interviews with a great many individuals and deputations. Some of the deputations represented what was termed the woollen section of the manufacturers, which takes in blankets as well as other classes. They claimed that there was a necessity for an additional duty in the case of certain lines, in which the market was being taken from them to a very great extent. Their claim was borne out by the facts that not only had the importations of these lines largely increased, as shown by the customs returns, but that the manufacturers in this country, as shown by the census returns, had largely decreased. My impression is that in the case of blankets the importations were trifling and had not increased, whereas the manufacture had.

Mr. CLANCY. Can the hon. gentleman call to mind whether any persons or firms engaged exclusively in the manufacture of blankets had made these representations ?

Mr. PATERSON. The party I refer to is the president of a company interested in a number of lines, including blankets.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask if the many small establishments that manufacture blankets were consulted, or what opportunity they had of bringing their views before the government ?

Mr. FIELDING. The same opportunity as others had. We did not go out to seek them, but those who desired to do so came to us.

Mr. PATERSON. The firm in the constituency of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) made no representations, so far as I know, in reference to this matter. They may have appeared when the tariff of 1897 was being prepared.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think the hon. minister is correct. The particular firm he refers to understood that they were looked after by the association who appeared on behalf of all the wool manufacturers, and consequently did not trouble the ministers individually.

Mr. BLAIN. That is easily understood, because when other changes were made in the tariff there was no taking out of these

articles, but in this change special legislation rather against the manufacturing establishments is introduced. In other words the blanket manufacturers were left out of the general revision of the tariff which took place in days gone by.

Mr. PATERSON. Let me explain that. This was thought the simplest way. Instead of enumerating tweeds, doeskins, and so on, we referred to the item 293, which covered these items and excepted the items that were pressed by the importation.

Goats for the improvement of stock under such regulation as may be made by the Minister of Customs—free.

Mr. CLANCY. I understand that this is for the benefit of an industry to be established in the province of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). Some enterprising gentleman down there is bringing in Angora goats with a view to breeding them. I should welcome a new industry, of course, but the conclusion is forced upon us that the hon. minister is rather selfish in the matter. I understand the founder of this industry has been in Mexico and has made the business somewhat successful, and the Minister of Finance makes this change in the tariff to start him in business. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us the secret.

Mr. FIELDING. This government has conferred a great many blessings on the section of the Dominion from which I come, But, when the list is made up, I regret to say, I shall not be able to include the establishment of the goat industry. I have not heard anything about it except the suggestion that it is of more importance to some hon. gentlemen on the other side than it is to me. That may or may not be correct.

Mr. HENDERSON. Seriously, in what part of the Dominion is it expected that this breeding of goats will be carried on ?

Mr. PATERSON. There is a farm in Quebec where it is carried on. But the first time this was brought to my notice was by a request of parties in British Columbia. They asked that goats be admitted free by Order in Council. But we had no authority to do that. This is to allow these goats to come in free as sheep and all other animals are allowed in free at present.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the Minister of Agriculture likely to claim credit for the establishment of this great industry and to expatiate in his campaign literature on the benefits he has thereby conferred on the people ?

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) has already such an overwhelming list to his credit of benefits conferred upon the farmer that I do not know that he needs to include this one.

Free—molasses, the produce of any British country entitled to the benefits of the British preferential tariff, when produced from sugar-cane and imported direct by vessel from the country of production in the original package in which it was placed at the point of production and not subjected to any process of treating or mixing ; the package also to be free : provided, however, that this shall not apply to molasses to be used for the purpose of distillation.

Mr. FIELDING. I wish to make a change there. Instead of the words, ' this shall not apply to molasses to be used for purposes of distillation,' we propose to make provision that molasses may be transferred in bond under excise regulations for the purposes of distillation. In that way we get the excise duty on the article when manufactured. It is a more convenient way of serving the same purpose. I propose also to add :

Molasses admitted to entry under item 441 of said schedule A, shall be imported direct from the place of production (or its shipping port) under regulations made by the Minister of Customs.

Amendment agreed to.

Printing presses, rotary, of a class or kind not made in Canada—Free.

Mr. FIELDING. We propose a change there also, not in substance but in words. The object of the item, as was explained, is to encourage the importation of the larger class of printing presses for the newspapers of the country without interfering with any presses of a class made in Canada. We thought the word ' rotary ' was a convenient word to use, and I think it was recommended to us by some persons in the trade. But on further consideration we are advised that the word fails to serve the purpose we have in view, and we propose to substitute the words ' of not less value than $1,500 each.' The effect of that is that the smaller class of presses under $1,500 in value and which are made in Canada—though none are made yet so high as that—will not come in under this item ; but the larger ones which are not made in Canada will be admitted free.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then all presses of the value of $1,500 and over will be subject to duty ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. Why are the smaller presses subject to duty while the larger ones are not ?

Mr. FIELDING. For the reason that the smaller class of presses is made in Canada already, and our own manufacturers will ultimately make presses of a higher value. But we are adapting ourselves to the conditions of to-day in that respect. The item is qualified by the expression ' of a class not made in Canada,' and I think the item in

the amended form will be satisfactory to the industry in Canada and equally satisfactory to the newspaper people who wish to import the larger class of presses.

Mr. SPROULE. Our manufacturers may ultimately wish to make more expensive presses.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the highest value of presses now made in Canada is $700 or $800. So in allowing this margin we are making reasonable provision for the growth of the industry.

Amendment agreed to, and item agreed to.

Well drilling machinery and apparatus of a class or kind not made in Canada for drilling for water and oil, not to include motive power —free.

Mr. FIELDING. I want to add after the word 'oil,' the words 'for prospecting for minerals.'

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) pointed out the other day that there was an establishment near Petrolia that is making all classes of goods of that character. Why make one law for printing presses and another for the next item ? It is difficult to settle a dispute as to what is made in Canada and what is not. Where did the demand come from to put this on the free list ?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think it came from any particular person. It was represented in a general way that this would be in the direction of encouraging the oil business. I think the origin of the item was some representation made by hon. gentlemen from the Northwest Territories.

Mr. CLANCY. I am informed there is a capital establishment engaged in the manufacture of every class of goods used for the purpose of drilling for oil. I do not think there has been any demand from these persons for this change. The change may be in the interests of the Northwest Territories, at the same time it is striking a blow at establishments in our own country manufacturing apparatus used in drilling for oil.

Mr. FIELDING. With these words 'of a class not made in Canada' I think there will be no trouble.

Whale oil soap—free.

Mr. HENDERSON. Why is that put on the free list ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is used by the farmers in spraying trees. It is not produced in Canada.

Mr. HENDERSON. I thought we had some of the best whale fisheries in the world.

Mr. FIELDING. We have not returns from Hudson bay yet.

Mr. BLAIN. Going back to the item artificial teeth—I understand that artificial teeth at present are subject to a duty of 20 per cent. The proposition is that from now until 1895 the duty shall be 10 per cent, and after that they may come in free. Has the government reached the conclusion that artificial teeth cannot be manufactured successfully in Canada ?

Mr. FIELDING. Practically, yes. I think they are only manufactured at one large concern in the United States.

Mr. BLAIN. What are the drawbacks which prevent them being made in Canada ?

Mr. FIELDING. I fancy it is an article which can only be made on a large scale, with a profit. At all events, I have never had any intimation from anybody in Canada desiring to enter into the business.

On resolution 5,

Resolved that schedule C (prohibited goods) shall be amended by adding the following :—
642. Stallions and mares of less value than $50 each.

Mr. BOYD. I would like to ask the minister what representations were made to him that induced him to let in stallions only worth $50 ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think some proposals were made for a larger figure, but very few of us in this world get all we ask for. It was thought that this modified figure would meet the reasonable demands of people who were specially concerned in this business. It was in obedience to an agitation chiefly from Manitoba and the Northwest Territories.

Mr. BOYD. I protest against this item for the reason that no stallion that is not worth more than $50 should be allowed into the country at all. The price should be a great deal higher than that.

Mr. FIELDING. This puts them on the prohibited list.

Mr. BOYD. A $50 horse ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. BOYD. What sort of a stallion will you get for any figure above $50, even for $100 ? The Horse Dealers' Association, I am told, decided on $75. But $50 is altogether too low for any stallion.

Mr. SCOTT. Stallions are prohibited.

Mr. FIELDING. Below that value.

Mr. BOYD. A $50 stallion would be far better out of the country than in it, even a $100 stallion. The idea is that a registered stallion is admitted free ; any stallion that is registered in any class, a Clydesdale or thoroughbred, is admitted free. Under this proposition, if they are not worth more than $50 they are not admitted at all, $50 is not high enough to exclude stallions.

Mr. FIELDING moved :

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the Inland Revenue Act be amended as foldows :—

That paragraph (a) of section 130, as enacted by section 4 of chapter 19 of the statutes of 1897, be repealed, and the following substituted therefor :—

(a.) When the material used in the manufacture thereof consists of not less than ninety (90) per cent, by weight, of raw or unmalted grain, or when manufactured from sugar, syrup, molasses, or other saccharine matter, not otherwise provided for, on every gallon of the strength of proof by Syke's hydrometer, and so in proportion for any greater or less strength than the strength of proof, and for any less quantity than a gallon, one dollar and ninety cents.

That paragraph (b) of section 192, as enacted by 57-58 Victoria, chapter 35, section 4, be repealed, and the following substituted therefor :—

(b.) On every pound of malt imported into Canada and warehoused, when taken out of bond for consumption, an excise duty of one and one-half cents ; except that malt imported into Canada, crushed or ground, shall be subject to a duty of two and one-half cents per pound.

That these resolutions shall take effect on the 8th of July, 1904.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is an amendment which I wish to propose as an addition to this resolution, as follows :

Provided that all crushed or ground malt actually purchased on or before the 8th day of July, 1904, at any place out of Canada, for importation into Canada on evidence to the satisfaction of the Minister of Inland Revenue of the purchase having been so made, and all crushed or ground malt in warehouse in Canada on such day, may be entered for duty at the rate of duty in force immediately before the said day notwithstanding any increase in excise duty under the said resolution, but this proviso shall cease to have force and effect after the thirty-first day of August in the present year.

Mr. FIELDING. This is to apply to these duties the same proviso as applies to those we have just passed.

Mr. BLAIN. I think the minister might give some explanation as to this.

Mr. BRODEUR. With regard to the duty on spirits, the only changes is to provide for a duty on spirits made from domestic molasses. Under the Act as it is to-day we levy a duty on spirits made from imported molasses, but there is no provision as to duty on spirits made from domestic molasses. It is not very clear that we have the right to levy that duty. As we now have some spirits made from domestic molasses, it has been found necessary by the department that we should have a special proviso in the Act.

As to the section with regard to malt flour, I may say that there is no provision in the Act covering this article. Malt flour may be used in breweries and distilleries as well as whole malt, but there is no provision for a duty on malt flour, and this resolution is intended to cover that deficiency in the Act.

Resolutions reported, read the first and second times, and agreed to.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 172) to amend the Customs Tariff, 1897. He said : This Bill has been drafted by the law clerk of the House, who assures me it is an exact transcript of and gives effect to the resolution we have adopted. I would be glad to have my hon. friends facilitate the passing of this Bill to-night.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first and second times, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have hardly heard a word of what you have been saying. I had thought of moving to strike out these four items with regard to blankets and other goods, but you have passed them over without my knowledge. Would it be in order to go back to them ?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) could not increase duties, and if he made such a motion it would have that tendency.

Mr. HENDERSON. The people in my constituency will want to know why I did not move to strike that out, and I wished to have an authoritative statement as to the reason why.

Mr. FIELDING. I assume the responsibility of saying that my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) could not move such a motion.

Mr. HENDERSON. Just what I thought, but now I have the opinion of a minister of the Crown.

Mr. CLANCY. Could we not move that the duties on woollen goods be uniform.

Mr. FIELDING. No, because if you make them uniform it would increase some of them.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Inland Revenue) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 173) to amend the Inland Revenue Act. He said : This Bill is based on the resolutions we have adopted with regard to the articles that come under the Inland Revenue Department.

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

COMPANIES' ACT, 1902—AMENDMENT.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). At an early stage of the sitting I moved the second reading of Bill (No. 164)

from the Senate, to amend the Companies Act of 1902 and, in the absence of information, I withdrew the motion. This is not a government Bill, though it is placed in the government orders in the name of the Minister of Justice. I understand that the objections which were made to it have been in part withdrawn, and, if there is no objection, I will move the second reading of the Bill now.

Mr. SPROULE. With regard to the first part of the Bill, it seemed to me, after the explanations, that there was no objection to it. It was explained to me that the object in amending the Companies' Act was that whereas a $100 share could be reduced to a $25 share, there was no provision for increasing $25 shares to $100, and it was proposed to do that by putting four in one. To that I thought there was no objection; but to the other part of the Bill the same objection remains as before.

Mr. COWAN. I may say, with reference to section 2, that owing to the peculiar drafting of the Companies' Act, there is a doubt whether any company formed for the purpose could engage in the construction of a railway, and this provision is for the purpose of clearing away that doubt. It is not for the purpose of increasing or enlarging the powers of an ordinary company. I may say that the fact was drawn to my attention that a prominent barrister of Toronto, a friend of hon. gentlemen opposite, had some difficulty in this regard owing to the wording of the Companies' Act.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that if you wish to amend the Act in that direction, there would require to be other amendments to safeguard the interests of the people; and at this late stage of the session I think it would be better to let the Bill drop. It was not intended, and has not been the case for many years, that railway corporations could form themselves into construction companies.

Mr. COWAN. There is no intention in this Act specially enabling a railway company to form itself into a construction company. But there is doubt whether any company formed for the purpose of constructing a certain line of railway, or tendering for its construction, could do so. The banks have refused, in the case mentioned, to advance the capital.

Mr. BARKER. This Bill was introduced into this House by the hon. member for South Essex; it reached the committee stage, I think; it then disappeared, without being passed by this House; it was afterwards introduced in the other House as a Senate Bill; and now it comes back here for approval. Can the hon. gentleman explain that? It is a very unusual occurrence. I may say that when the Bill was in this House an amendment was suggested and put in the hands of the Minister of Justice. I saw no objection to the principle of the Bill at that time, but unless there is some very good reason, I think we might let this Senate Bill stand till the morning. I have not seen it since it came from the Senate, and if there is no objection to it, I think there will be no difficulty in the Bill going through tomorrow.

Mr. COWAN. I may say that the Bill was introduced by me and was subsequently withdrawn. I was advised that the Senate, having had before it the Companies' Bill in the first instance, and having gone thoroughly into it, the Bill having been in charge of the Secretary of State, this Bill had better go to the Senate. That being done, the amendment was introduced in the Senate, and it has come to this House in that way.

Mr. BARKER. Is it in precisely the same terms as the hon. gentleman's Bill?

Mr. COWAN. Precisely the same. In fairness, however, I want to say that the hon. the leader of the opposition thought that possibly the amendment was almost as ambiguous as the Companies' Act, and that it should apply only to companies whose charters gave them the right to contract. That was the intention and my hon. friend the Finance Minister proposes to amend the Bill to that extent, namely, that the right of construction shall apply only to companies whose charter gives them that special right.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why is that necessary?

Mr. COWAN. Because of the ambiguous wording of the Companies Act. The Minister of Justice doubts if it is necessary, but the banks refuse to finance these companies until this amendment is made.

Mr. SPROULE. This was done by a construction company before. It was criticised very severely, and for many years it was never attempted to revive the same thing. It was held to be a most vicious principle, and what happened confirmed that opinion. It is just as unsuitable to-day as then. Another thing is the Bill was introduced in this House and either defeated or dropped.

Mr. COWAN. It was only delayed in order to make the meaning perfectly clear that any ordinary company should not engage in railway construction but only a company incorporated for that specific purpose.

Mr. SPROULE. What justification was there for introducing this Bill in the Senate when it was either dropped or defeated here?

Mr. FIELDING. Hon. gentlemen misunderstand the question. The general Companies Act provides that companies may be incorporated by letters patent for certain purposes. Then the Act makes exceptions.

It excepts the building and operating of railways, telegraphs, telephone lines and the business of banking. The intention was that you could not constitute by letters patent a company to construct, operate and manage a railway or telephone line, but I do not think the exception was ever intended to apply to a private company desiring to contract for the building of a mile of railway or for the supply of telephones. It is capable, however, of that interpretation, and we want to remove any doubt.

Mr. SPROULE. The objection was this, that when you formed a construction company the directors of the railway company became members of it. That was not intended by the Companies Act, and it was because that was done that severe criticism was raised and the thing has not been repeated since. I am not quite sure, but I think the Companies Act was amended to prevent that. If this Bill goes through, other amendments will have to be introduced to prevent the directors of a railway company becoming the directors of a construction company.

Mr. FIELDING. The Bill does not touch that.

Mr. SPROULE. If this Bill passes, they would be permitted.

Mr. FOWLER. It is certainly a very vicious principle. This Bill has not been distributed.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, it has.

Mr. FOWLER. Printed in English and French ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It must have been printed in French, because it has been passed by the Senate.

Mr. FOWLER. The Bill is not so marked. This laxity in the observance of our rules is a very bad thing.

Mr. LENNOX. I would suggest that the matter stand over until morning.

Mr. FIELDING. I have no objection and I move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

SUPPLY.

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

Mr. SPROULE. It is one o'clock and time to go home.

Mr. FIELDING. We are in the hands of the hon. gentlemen opposite. I may say, however, that there are urgent reasons why the Minister of Marine should leave to-morrow and I thought we might pass the remaining items of his department.

Mr. SPROULE. There will be discussion on the items.

Mr. FIELDING. That is all the more reason why he should be here.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman does not leave the city I understand, till one o'clock to-morrow. So, he can have the morning hours.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. If the hon. gentleman will guarantee me that we shall get through the whole thing——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No guarantee—the minister may be kept back a bit.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) need not be so bombastic. It is understood that at eleven o'clock to-morrow we can go on. I have not many items to discuss and I think I can satisfy the House concerning them.

Motion withdrawn.

ADJOURNMENT—DATE OF PROROGATION.

Mr. FIELDING. Is it the wish of hon. gentlemen opposite that we should adjourn now ?

Mr. SPROULE. I think so.

Mr. FIELDING. Then I move the adjournment.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose supply will be the first thing taken up to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) who leads the House if he expects prorogation to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. No. But I think there is an expectation that we may close up our business to-morrow, if we work hard, and that prorogation may take place at noon on Wednesday.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1 a.m. Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, August 9, 1904

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

SUPPLY—THE CASE OF PRIVATE MULLOY.

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

Mr. ANDREW BRODER. Mr. Speaker, I desire again to bring to the attention of the Minister of Militia and the government the

case of Private Mulloy, who lost his eyesight while serving the empire in the South African war. I do not appeal to this House or to the country on the ground of charity to this young man. I put the case on higher ground than that. I think the gratitude of the country should go out to a man in that position. The last time I brought this matter up the Minister of Militia could not recall the fact that any one who had suffered disability in the Northwest rebellion had received special treatment. I took occasion to hunt up the record, and I had the pleasure of submitting to the Minister of Militia the facts, which, I think, satisfied him that there were cases of special treatment. Among these I may mention the name of Captain Peters, who had his arm broken, or was totally disabled, and who received $1,000 per year. I think the case of Private Mulloy ought to have immediate consideration, and I bring it to the attention of the House in the hope that the government will not fail to give it that recognition which it certainly deserves at the hands of the people of this country.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). I do not know that I can add very much to what I said a few days ago in reference to this matter. My hon. friend has certainly done his full duty by Private Mulloy in presenting his case to the House and the government. He has, as he has said, brought to my notice the case of Captain Peters, who did receive special consideration on account of the injuries he received during the Northwest rebellion. I have not had time to look up the evidence in the case of Captain Peters, but I have had the papers before me, and I intend to go into the case. At this period of the session I do not think I can promise my hon. friend more than that I will give the matter my very best consideration, in the hope that between now and next session some conclusion may be reached by which special cases such as that of Mr. Mulloy and other persons similarly situated, whether they are at present receiving pensions or not, may be dealt with on a common basis. That is all that I am able to say to my hon. friend at present.

EXPORT OF LIVE STOCK TO UNITED STATES.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair, I wish to bring to the attention of the government and the House a question which I have been endeavouring to have discussed with the Minister of Agriculture; but, owing to his multiplicity of engagements, he has been unable to give any attention to it lately, and I desire to deal with it before the House closes. It is in reference to an application either for a refund or an indemnity on account of customs duties paid by one F. H. Page, of Mission, British Columbia, upon horses that were exported from Canada to the United States upon the strength of a circular sent out by the Department of Agriculture, giving information as to the class of stock that might be imported into that country free of duty. He was told that an understanding had been reached between the Canadian government and the government at Washington that it would be to the mutual advantage of both countries to allow thoroughbred stock to be imported into each free of duty. As he desired to send some thoroughbred horses into the United States, he made inquiry as to what the regulations were, and he was sent the following circular:

EXPORTING PURE BRED STOCK TO THE UNITED STATES.

Breeders of pure bred stock, desirous of sending animals to the United States, frequently write me for information in regard to the regulations governing the importation of Canadian stock into that country. For the benefit of such breeders the following summary of these regulations is given:—

1. All animals imported into the United States from Canada must be accompanied by an affidavit made by the owner or importer declaring clearly the purpose for which said animals are imported, viz.:—whether for breeding purposes, for milk production, for work, grazing, feeding or slaughter, whether they form part of settler's effects, or whether they are horses entered for temporary stay as provided by the regulations. Said affidavit must be presented to the collector of customs at the port of entry, who will decide whether the animals are entitled to entry under these regulations, and who will notify the inspector of the Bureau of Animal Industry in all cases where the regulations require an inspection to be made.

2. Horses—Horses for breeding, racing, show and sale purposes, for grazing or for work, must be inspected at the port of entry.

3. Cattle—Cattle for breeding purposes, milk production, grazing or feeding must be inspected, and must be accompanied by a certificate signed by a Canadian official veterinarian, stating that no contagious disease affecting cattle, excepting tuberculosis and actinomycosis, has existed in the district in which the cattle have been kept for six months prior to the date of importation. The owner must present an affidavit that said certificate refers to the animals in question.

4. A certificate for cattle over six months old for breeding purposes and for milch cows must also show that they have been submitted to the tuberculin test, and found free from tuberculosis, giving the date of testing, with a chart of reaction, and a description of the cattle with age and markings.

5. Any animals may be required to be inspected at the port of entry, and any animal showing symptoms of tuberculosis may be subjected to the tuberculin test, upon instructions from the chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry.

Sheep.—All sheep imported into the United States for breeding, grazing and feeding must be inspected and must be accompanied by a certificate signed by a Canadian official veterinarian, stating that no contagious disease affecting sheep has existed in the district in which the animals have been kept for six months prior to the date of importation. The owner or

importer must also present an affidavit that the said certificate refers to the animals in question.

7. Swine.—All swine imported for breeding purposes, grazing or feeding shall be accompanied by an official veterinary certificate, stating that no contagious disease affecting swine has existed in the district in which the swine have been kept for six months preceding the date of importation, and the owner or importer must present an affidavit that said certificate applies to the animals in question.

8. Quarantine.—All cattle, sheep and swine for breeding purposes, grazing or feeding, when not accompanied by the required affidavits and certificates, must be detained in quarantine for one week at the expense of the owner or importer, under the supervision of the inspector in charge. Animals found to be free from disease at the end of this time will be released.

9. Transportation.—All cars used in the transportation of animals must be first thoroughly cleaned and then disinfected by whitewashing with a mixture of lime and carbolic acid before the animals are placed therein. Shippers must see that this is done before the animals are loaded, as unless these regulations are complied with the cars will not be admitted to the United States.

The regulations of the Treasury Department of the United States direct as follows :—

10. Registration.—No animal for breeding purposes shall be admitted free of duty unless the importer furnishes a certificate of the record and pedigree in the form hereafter given, showing the animal to be pure bred and that it has been admitted to full registry in the American book of record established for that breed, and that its sire and dam, and grandsires and grand-dams were all recorded in a book of record established for the same breed. An affidavit by the owner, agent or importer that such animal is the identical animal described in the said certificate of record and pedigree, must be presented.

Unless the certificate of record and pedigree is produced the animal shall be considered dutiable. In case such certificate is not at hand at the time of the arrival of the animals, duties shall be estimated thereon and deposited, and the animals delivered to the importer, who may within ten days file a written stipulation with the collector to produce the requisite certificate within six months from the date of entry ; whereupon final liquidation of the entry will be suspended until the production of the certificate or the expiration of the six months, Upon the production of the certificate in due form within six months from the date of entry, the amount deposited shall be refunded.

Form of record and pedigree to be used for imported Animals :—

Pedigree..	Sire.....	Sire.....
No..	..No.....	No.....
		Dam.....
		No.....
No..	..No.....	No.....
	Dam.....	Sire.....
		Dam.....
		No.....

Then follows the following certificate :

I hereby certify that the above is a correct pedigree of..... No..... That this animal is pure bred and has been duly registered in the..... which is the book of record controlled by this Association for the..... breed.....

Sgd.....

Sec'y of.....

Dated at.....

..... 190

None of the Canadian stud, herd of flock books are recognized by the United States Government, and in order to secure free entry for breeding purposes, all animals must be registered in the American or European books of record.

F. W. HODSON.
Live Stock Commissioner.

This was sent by F. W. Hodgson, representing the Department of Agriculture, to Mr. H. F. Page ; and Mr. Page, according to his own statement and the correspondence, seems to have accepted the allegations of the facts to be correct, and complied with all these requirements. He sent a consignment of horses into the United States, expecting to have them accepted free of duty. But they were detained at the customs port, and he was obliged to deposit the duty, which he hoped to get back. Then we have Mr. W. A. Clemons, secretary to the live stock commissioner, writing to Mr. Page in regard to it as follows :

Ottawa, March 26th.

Dear Sir,—Your favour of March 20th, also marked copy of 'The Ranch,' has been duly received. Mr. Hodson is absent from the office for a few days. I am sure that he will take up this matter on his return and do what he can to assist you. It seems clear that you have a very decided cause for complaint against the United States customs authorities. Trouble of this sort frequently occurs in the case of customs officers not familiar with the laws regarding importation of pure bred breeding stock.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) W. A. CLEMONS,
Sec. Live Stock Commissioner.

Then we have another from Mr. F. W. Hodson :

Ottawa, March 27th, 1902.

H. F. Page, Esq.
Mission, B. C.

Dear Sir,—On my return to the office, I find yours of the 20th inst., awaiting reply, I have forwarded your letter, together with the copy of 'The Ranch' to the Secretary of the Department and have asked him to take the matter up officially. If you have furnished us with all particulars the American customs officials have exceeded their duty, and there should not be any difficulty in having the matter arranged for you.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) F. W. HODSON,
Live Stock Commissioner.

Then on June 27th we have another from Mr. Hodson, as follows :

Ottawa, June 27th, 1902.

H. F. Page, Esq.,
Mission, B. C.

Dear Sir,—Yours of June 20th received and contents noted. The claim now made by the

customs officer is most absurd. We are looking into the whole case very carefully, and will submit a history of it in detail to our Minister again, and will ask him to take the matter up. I am also writing the Hon. John Dryden, Minister of Agriculture for Ontario, who is deeply interested in matters of this sort, and am asking him to co-operate with us. I am writing to each of the Agricultural Departments throughout Canada stating the facts of the case, and will send a letter to each of the Canadian newspapers, and to the 'Breeder's Gazette' in Chicago dealing with the question.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) F. W. HODSON,
Live Stock Commissioner.

Then we have another from Mr. Hodson, dated Ottawa, July 28th, 1902 :

H. F. Page, Esq.,
Mission, B.C.

Dear Sir.—Please find inclosed a copy of two letters which I have just received from the Hon. Mr. Dryden. I am doing all I can to help you and am bringing a great deal of influence to bear both in the United States and Canada, and have written over eight hundred persons and newspaper men in both places. I let you know this, not because I wish you to give me credit for the work, but to let you see that this department is not idle when the interests of Canadians are concerned. Mr. Fisher is also doing what he can, and we have made an appeal to the department at Washington, through the British Colonial Office as well as directly through this government. Mr. Sanders you will recognize as the editor and owner of the 'Breeders' Gazette,' Chicago, which paper you are no doubt acquainted with. He is probably the most influential live stock man in Canada or America. Mr. John Dryden is Minister of Agriculture for the province of Ontario, and a very prominent live stock man.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) F. W. HODSON,
Live Stock Commissioner.

Enc. copy of two letters.

We have following Mr. Dryden's letter addressed to Mr. Hodson :

Copy.

Toronto, July 14th, 1902.

Dear Hodson,—Referring to the difficulty with the Washington authorities about the introduction of pure bred animals into that territory, I would say that a similar case was fought out some fifteen years ago. This was a case of horses, and the ruling at that time was definite that it was not necessary that the man who received them would be a breeder. It seems to me it would be worth while to hunt that up if possible.

I am writing Mr. Saunders, of the 'Breeders' Gazette,' who has always been for freedom of trade in these matters. They would know as to the case.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) JOHN DRYDEN.

F. W. Hodson, Esq.,
Dom. Live Stock Commissioner, Ottawa.

It seems that the contention was set up by the Washington authorities that the man who received these horses must be a breeder and intended to use them for breeding purposes. Then we have the reply of Mr. Saunders, the editor of the 'Breeders' Gazette.' Mr. Dryden wrote Mr. Hodson :

I inclose a letter just received from Mr. Saunders, of the 'Breeders' Gazette,' which will explain itself. You will see the strong ground he takes, and I assume the matter will be arranged in that direction.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) JOHN DRYDEN.

Mr. Saunders' letter is as follows :

Chicago, July 18th, 1902.

Hon. John Dryden,
Toronto.

Dear Mr. Dryden,—I have yours of the 14th and note contents. I cannot imagine how any United States' collector could make such a ruling as that mentioned in the face of the practice of the Department for so many years. I do not imagine there can be any overturning of the prevailing interpretation of the Act. However I will write a personal letter to Secretary Wilson and endeavour to ascertain what it is.

Respectfully yours,

(Sgd.) A. H. SANDERS.

Then we have another from Mr. Hodson regarding the correspondence addressed to H. F. Page, Ottawa, August 25th :

H. F. Page,
Mission, B. C.

My dear Sir,—The copy of correspondence which you sent me is rather startling. This looks to me more like a hold up than anything I have ever seen, however, I may be mistaken. I have forwarded your correspondence to the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, who is a lawyer and have asked him to look into the matter and write you at once. I see no reason why the entire $1,000 should not be returned to you. We are making it an international question.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) F. W. HODSON.
Live Stock Commissioner.

There is another from Mr. Hodson, drawing his attention to a letter received from the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, as follows :

H. F. Page,
Mission, B. C.

Dear Mr. Page,—Please find inclosed a copy of a letter which I have to-day received from the Deputy Minister of Agriculture. As soon as I hear from him again I will write you, probably Mr. O'Halloran will himself write you.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) F. W. HODSON,
Live Stock Commissioner.

This is the letter which he referred to from the Deputy Minister of Agriculture :

F. W. Hodson, Esq.,
Live Stock Commissioner,
Department of Agriculture.

Dear Mr. Hodson,—I have your letter of the 26th inst., inclosing some correspondence in connection with the claim of H. F. Page, Mission,

B. C., for the refund of the deposit made by him with the United States Customs authorities with entry for certain Percheron horses which he was importing into the United States for breeding purposes, from which it appears that Mr. Page wishes your views as to the advisability of retaining a lawyer in New York to prosecute his claim.

From the minister's file in this matter, to which you refer me, I find that the Secretary of State here in June last made, on behalf of Mr. Page, a claim against the United States for a refund of this deposit which claim is still pending. I think it would be very unwise for Mr. Page to prosecute his claim through a lawyer while the claim made by the Secretary of State is pending.

I understand that the minister will be here to-morrow and I would like to retain your file until then to lay the matter before him.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) GEO. F. O'HALLORAN,
Dep. Minister of Agriculture.

The next is a letter to Mr. Hodson from Mr. O'Halloran, in which he says :

I have to-day seen the Under Secretary of State who promises to write the British Embassy to urge the American authorities to give an early decision on the claim made on Mr. Page's behalf by the Secretary of State.

There is a letter from Mr. Hodson which I need not read. Then there is another to Mr. Page from the Deputy Minister of Agriculture :

Deputy Minister's Office,
November 29th, 1902.

Sir,—In further reference to correspondence between you and this department regarding a claim made by you, against the United States government, for a refund of the deposit made by you with an entry of certain Percheron horses into the United States, in October, 1901, I have to state that the Department of State here have urged the government authorities at Washington to take action in your case, but as yet no further communication in the matter has been received.

I inclose herewith extracts from the United States customs regulations bearing upon the entry of pure bred stock. I understand that in making entry you complied with the provisions of article 473 and 541.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) GEO. F. O'HALLORAN,
Deputy Minister of Agriculture.

A. F. Page, Esq.,
Mission, B.C.

This is the memo. of the United States authorities :

Memo. re claim of H. F. Page, of Mission, B.C., for remission of duty paid by him to the United States customs for entry of Percheron horses in October, 1901.

United States Customs Act of July 24th, 1897, item 220, reads : Horses and mules valued at $150 or less per head, $30 per head ; if valued at over $150, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Article 473 of United States customs regulations reads :

Any animal imported specially for breeding purposes shall be admitted free ; provided, that no such animal shall be admitted free unless pure bred of a recognized breed, and duly registered in the book of record established for that breed ; and provided further, that certificates of such record and of the pedigree of such animal shall be produced and submitted to the customs officer duly authenticated by the proper custodian of such book of record, together with the affidavit of the owner, agent or importer that such animal is the identical animal described in said certificate of record and pedigree ; and provided further, that the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury what are recognized breeds and pure bred animals under the provisions of this paragraph. The Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe such additional regulations as may be required for the strict enforcement of this provision.

Article 541 reads : No animal imported for breeding purposes shall be admitted free of duty unless the importer furnishes a certificate of the record and pedigree showing that the animal is pure bred and has been admitted to full registry in the book of record established for that breed, and that its sire and dam and grand sires and grand dams were all recorded in a book of record established for the same breed. An affidavit by the owner, agent or importer, that such animal is the identical animal described in said certificate of record and pedigree, must be presented.

Article 543 reads : In case such certificate is not at hand at the time of the arrival of the animals, duties should be estimated thereon and deposited, and the animals delivered to the importer, who may within ten days file a written stipulation with the collector to produce the requisite certificate within six months from date of entry, whereupon final liquidation of the entry will be suspended until the production of the certificate or the expiration of the six months. Upon the production of the requisite certificate in due form within six months from entry, the amount deposited shall be refunded as an excess of deposit. Certificate of pedigree should be returned to the importer and requisite copies be retained for the files of the custom house.

There is a letter from the Customs Department at Puget Sound :

Customs District of Puget Sound,
Sub-port of Sumas, Wash.,
Deputy Collector's Office,
December 30th, 1902.

H. F. Page, Esq.,
Mission, B.C.

Dear Sir,—The decision of the general appraisers in answer to your protest against the liquidation of consumption entry No. 177K has been received at this office. You can see the same by calling at this office. The board holds that the horses were dutiable.

Respectfully,
S. P. CONNER,
Deputy Collector.

There is another letter from W. H. Bogle to H. F. Page :

Seattle, Wash., January 6th,1903.

Mr. H. F. Page,
Mission Junction, B.C.

Dear Sir,—I have just received a report from Mr. Gibson, in New York, informing me that the board of the United States General Treas-

urers, have decided to protest against you. I inclose you Mr. Gibson's letter to Dow. Since then I have seen the opinion rendered by the board, reported in the Treasury decisions. They hold broadly that animals cannot be imported for breeding purposes so as to be free of duty except by the man who intends to use them for that purpose. If they are imported for sale to breeders, they are subject to duty.

Yours very truly,
W. H. BOGLE.

In answer to that I have before me a copy of the 'Breeders' Gazette,' giving a notice of the pure bred animals sent into the United States by the W. C. Edwards Company, of Rockland, Hon. M. H. Cochrane, Hillhurst, and Hon. John Dryden, Brooklyn, all for the purpose of being sold at public auction, with a cut of one of the animals Lady Clara, and giving an account of the sale that took place by public auction. So it cannot be contended that the purchasers purchased them in Canada and imported them for breeding purposes; the animals were exported to Chicago directly by the breeders in Canada and sold by auction as pure bred animals. No question was raised whether the purchasers intended to use them for breeding purposes or otherwise. So, this shows that Mr. Page complied strictly with the provisions of the law, and that the contention against him could not be justified if it was looked into. Then I have another letter from Mr. O'Halloran, Deputy Minister of Agriculture to Mr. Page stating, that:

His Excellency the Governor General has been advised from Washington that the board of general appraisers have been requested by the Secretary of the Treasury to give attention to your case, and a prompt reply is anticipated, which will be transmitted without delay through His Majesty's ambassador at Washington, to His Excellency here.

There is another communication from Mr. O'Halloran, the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, in which the writer says:

Referring to your claim against the United States government for a refund of duty made on entry of Percheron horses in October, 1901, concerning which I wrote you on the 10th instant, I am now able to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General has received a despatch from His Majesty's ambassador at Washington to the effect that the board of appraisers have sustained the action of the collector of customs of Sumas, and that, therefore, your claim cannot be entertained.

The board of appraisers have held that in view of your own statements of the advertisements of your horses for sale before they went into the United States, and of your immediate sale there of some of them, they could not be regarded as having been imported specially for breeding purposes, but as having been imported for the purpose of sale. The fact that they were pure bred horses could not affect the purpose for which they were imported, nor the intent of the importer. It was held to be immaterial whether you intended that the purchasers of your horses should use them for breeding purposes or for other purposes; it was held that you had not intended them for that purpose, but for sale.

I have already drawn attention to the fact that these other cattle were advertised in the United States before they were sent from Canada to be sold by public auction in Chicago. Mr. Page did the same thing, advertising the horses as thoroughbred Percheron horses to be sold for breeding purposes, and he did sell them for breeding purposes, but now, it is held that he is not entitled to a rebate of duty.

Now, I have a letter from Messrs. Eicher & Wilson, who control the celebrated stock paper in Iowa, addressed to Mr. Page:

Washington, Iowa, March 2nd, 1903.

H. F. Page, Mission City, B.C.,

Dear Sir,—We have your favour of February 20th, and are under obligation to you for the courteous treatment we have received at your hands.

The 'Breeders' Gazette' had not exposed this matter because its management know nothing about the pendency of the case. Mr. A. H. Sanders was with me when I was handed by the custom house officers the opinion of the board of appraisers and it was as much of a surprise to him as it was to me. Instead of the 'Gazette' neglecting its duty, it occurs to me you should have advised the 'Gazette' and it would have been a favour to the 'Gazette' to have heard from you. We do not think that any of our members knew of the pendency of your action until the decision was announced by the board.

We felt then the construction by the board of appraisers was wrong, and the law as then formed did not contemplate the payment of duties on animals simply because they would be sold for breeding purposes. We were so confident of it that we advised our society to pay no attention to congressional amendment.

As to this congressional amendment, I may explain that there had been other cases of a somewhat similar character and the parties interested had applied to Congress to amend the law so that they could get the duty refunded.

—but simply provide for the appeal and speedy submission of this cause, and we made all arrangements with the different departments for such purpose and did not have the least idea that the importer or his attorney would object to the appeal of the case by us for such purpose.

We were surprised when Gibson changed his view and we met the obstacle in him, all of you fully understand by the correspondence that has passed between us. We then resorted to congressional relief which of course made it more expensive upon us. We did not have time to institute another action from the beginning before the board of appraisers and rely upon the hearing in the Circuit Court of New York. We were liable to be delayed a year there in the submission, so congressional relief, though more expensive, was the next best thing to the submission of your case. A Bill giving us the desired relief for the future has passed both

Houses of Congress and will become a law, but by amendments imposed upon the Bill during its passage, it operates only in favour of citizens of the United States and provides for the refund of duties that have been collected to such citizens. This congressional action within itself may not be sufficient to recover your money and the submission of your case may be required in the courts.

We still regret the result of our relations with Mr. Gibson mostly because we are so confident that the court would have given us the same relief and we could have had it over before this time with less trouble and expense, and have had an order for the refund of your money at the same time, but we could not depend upon such a condition, as we sent parties personnally to see Mr. Gibson, in New York, and he flatly refused to permit us to take any action and said that it might be a year or more before he would want the case submitted.

Regretting that your case is not disposed of and thanking you for the courtesy of yourself individually in this matter, we are,

Respectfully yours,

EICHER & WILSON.

We have then the correspondence of Sir Charles Tupper on this subject with the Hon. Mr. Fielding, during the absence of the Minister of Agriculture in Japan. I need not read that correspondence, it practically goes over the same ground. Suffice it to say, that I have shown that at the present time Mr. Page has no redress. What are the grounds upon which they refused him redress? The grounds are, first, because these horses were not imported by citizens of the United States. In answer to that, I refer to the fact that the 'Breeders' Gazette,' of Chicago contains an account of the sale of pure bred animals sent by different parties whose names I have given, W. C. Edwards & Co., Cochrane & Co. and other breeders in Canada, who sent their stock there, advertised for sale by public auction at a stock sale in Chicago, long before they went there. They were exported by Canadians for the purpose of sale, pure bred animals that were purchased by Americans without any agreement entered into by the seller and the buyer that they were for the improvement of stock or for breeding purposes; and no objection was raised and no duty was paid on them. Therefore, on the same principle, we claim that Mr. H. F. Page, in sending a consignment of thoroughbred Percheron horses, pedigreed, registered and all, complied with all the requirements, and that he was entitled to a refund of that duty. It seems that nothing more has been done by the department since with the authorities at Washington, there is nothing in the correspondence that indicates that the question has been closed between the Canadian government and the department at Washington. Now what I respectfully submit is this, that Mr. Page was misled by the instructions sent out from the Department of Agriculture here by Mr. Hodson the stock commissioner, on which instructions Mr. Page acted in sending his stock into the United States, and in consequence of which he is mulcted in the sum of $1,075. If that is not refunded to him, I submit that this government should put an item in the estimates to recoup Mr. Page for the loss he has incurrred through information that was not correct, or at least, which misled him. I do not think that a member of this House would object to such a thing being done. He has been badly used, and he is helpless; the representations to Washington of the Department of Agriculture, or the Canadian government, through the Governor General, have eventuated in nothing. The government might take this case up and go into the courts of the United States to endeavour to secure a return of this money. If they failed in their representations to Washington to secure a refund of this money, I submit that they should put an item in the estimates to reimburse Mr. Page. I wish the government to remember that I do not bring this case up complaining at what the Department of Agriculture has done, or saying that they have done wrong, because it seems to me they have made a commendable effort to get satisfaction; but it seems to be one of those cases that drag on from time to time until it is finally dropped.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). My hon. friend had spoken to me about this matter, and I informed him that it has been gone into very carefully by the department, with the utmost sympathy for Mr. Page, but that the response which the government of Canada received from the United States through the ordinary channels of the imperial and colonial office, was such that we felt that it was useless to make any further representations to the authorities at Washington. The hon. gentleman's suggestion that parliament should vote a sum of money to reimburse Mr. Page has also been considered by us, although the question was not considered in any light of responsibility on the Department of Agriculture or of this government. I venture to think that the information supplied to Mr. Page by the department involved no responsibility on the part of the department.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not say that. I merely put forth a claim in equity.

Mr. FISHER. I understand that my hon. friend does not consider that he has any legal claim, it would be a matter more of grace than of law. But it is a question which might well be considered. The whole question turns on the interpretation by the United States of their own law. The information which was supplied to Mr. Page by an officer in my department was merely a recapitulation of their customs law upon the question as to the entry free of duty of thoroughbred stock. My hon. friend has

quoted an article from the 'Breeders' Gazette' of Chicago, which shows that that great live stock paper in Chicago had exactly the same impression of the law of the United States that was given to Mr. Page, and that Mr. Page himself got from reading the extracts from the American law which were put before him. I do not wonder at it at all, because that interpretation had been the practice of the United States customs authorities for many years. The circumstances quoted by the 'Breeders' Gazette' of the sale by Messrs. Edwards, Cochrane, Cargill and Flatt, I think it was, who sent over stock to the United States for sale, was exactly on all fours with this case of Mr. Page. It occurred only a little while before, and it was only one of many such instances. The United States authorities have always interpreted their own laws in that way, namely, that animals going into the United States intended eventually for breeding purposes should be allowed in free of duty when accompanied by proper certificates, and the question as to whether they might be sold before being used for breeding purposes, to parties in the United States, never seems to have been considered, or if it was considered, it was decided that there was no impediment to their coming in free of duty.

Mr. Page unfortunately met a customs officer who interpreted the law differently. He insisted on the payment of duty and the dispute was referred to the highest tribunal of the treasury at Washington. That tribunal decided that as these animals had come in for sale before they were to be used for breeding, the duty must be paid. That decision was a surprise not only to Mr. Page but to all American breeders and livestock owners. It was the first time the law was so interpreted. The decision, however, was one which could not be overcome except by appeal to the Supreme Court. If this case had been brought to the Supreme Court, it is quite possible that court would have reversed the decision; but for reasons explained in the correspondence it was not taken to appeal. When we made representations to the United States, the reply was that the decision of the treasury could not be altered and that under the United States law no compensation could be given without a special vote of Congress and such a vote the department was not prepared to propose. They pointed out that an amendment had been made to the law but unfortunately that amendment only gives relief to the United States citizens. It was made at the instance of the United States citizens for their own benefit. The whole course of the United States administration has been of late years to put more and more obstacles in the way of such interchange. This amendment to their law is another instance of that policy. It is to the effect that if United States citizens import animals, these animals shall come in free of duty when thoroughbreds, even if for sale and not for breeding purposes, but it gives no relief to Mr. Page or any other Canadian breeder or citizen. The amendment even went so far as to provide that the duties to be paid by Americans should be refunded them. The course which the United States authorities have followed they have a perfect right to take, but it seems to me a short sighted and unfriendly legislation on the part of that great people. Under these circumstances I see no prospect of relief at all for Mr. Page from the United States. Mr. Page has suffered most unfairly, and I have the greatest sympathy for him. He acted in good faith on what he knew to be the interpretation by the Americans of the law up to that time. The only possible question which can now arise would be whether this parliament should grant him some compensation. That however, would seem to me a little out of the course which we ought to pursue in dealing with public matters.

Mr. SPROULE. It is a very exceptional case.

Mr. FISHER. Certainly. I have no hesitation in saying that I would consider the matter very carefully and if my colleagues will agree I would not offer any objection to putting an item in the estimates. I consider that Mr. Page deserves the sympathy of every Canadian.

Mr. SPROULE. Would you not go further and recommend it?

Mr. FISHER. I would recommend it as a matter of grace and favour to a man who was very unfairly and unjustly treated. At the same time as the instance occurred with regard to the government of a foreign country, it might be dangerous for us to establish a precedent of that kind by passing an item in the estimates. I can assure my hon. friend that the department and the government through the Secretary of State, made every representation possible to the Washington authorities. I would say further that had not the final reply of the Washington authorities been so very positive, I would have been glad to go on and press the matter, but there is a point at which the self-respect of the Canadian people must lead them to cease dealing with a foreign country when it shows no disposition to meet their views.

CLAIM OF MR. JOHN CAMPBELL.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What has been done with regard to the Campbell matter, which I brought to the attention of the House some time ago?

Mr. FISHER. I have looked into the case and can see no reason why we should pay any compensation to Mr. Campbell.

CANADIAN HORSES—IMPERIAL CONNECTION.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In the 'Citizen' of yesterday I find the following despatch from the Canadian Associated Press, of which therefore the Finance Minister will not deny the authenticity :

A parliamentary report issued by the War Office with reference to South Africa shows a forfeit of ten pounds per animal had to be paid on 1,685 horses bought in Hungary, three pounds on those secured in New Zealand, while in Canada the proceeds of a sale of 1,152 remounts bought at an average of $140 per head, amounted to no more than an average of $42.

We have frequently asked to have this matter investigated, but the minister has always refused. I would ask the Finance Minister whether there is any intention on the part of the government of having any inquiry ? I would also ask if it is the intention of the government to take any steps with regard to closer relations with the empire as a whole ? If I understand the sentiment of all nationalities in the Dominion, the vast majority of the people of all parties are of the opinion that the time is now ripe, so far as Canada is concerned, for closer relations. I believe that the people of the outlying parts of the empire would heartily accept any proposition looking towards a full partnership in the concerns of Greater Britain—Great Britain could retain her own parliament, Canada her own, Australia hers, New Zealand hers, and South Africa hers, with certain arrangements for the Crown colonies. It would be a simple thing for the genius of the empire to provide a greater Britain parliament in which in matters relating to international and interimperial affairs, the army and navy, the consular and ambassadorial service, the colonies would have an equal voice with the mother country. The excellent speech delivered by the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Gervais) shows that public sentiment is ripe to bring about such a condition of affairs that Canadians should become full partners in the upbuilding of the empire. I intended bringing the matter up some time ago, but as I will not have any other opportunity I would ask the government now if they have any intention of giving an expression of opinion on this matter so as to strengthen the hands of Mr. Chamberlain and his friends in the coming contest in Great Britain ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I am sorry the hon. gentleman did not bring the question up when the Prime Minister was present. I can only say that the views of the government on this matter have already been placed before the House, and I do not think anything could be added to the statements that have already been made.

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

Department of Marine and Fisheries—to increase the salaries of W. J. Stewart, chief hydrographic service, $100 ; J. F. Fraser, engineer and commissioner of lights, $200 ; B. H. Fraser, assistant chief engineer, $200 ; F. Anderson, assistant hydrographer, $250 ; notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $750.

To provide for the appointment of J. B. A. Boudreau as a first-class clerk and assistant accountant from July 1, 1904, in room of F. H. Cunningham transferred to the outside service, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $1,500 ; $2,250.

Mr. HAGGART. What salary is Mr. Stewart receiving now ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. $2,200.

Mr. HAGGART. He is a graduate of the Royal Military College.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. He is a very good man.

Mr. BRODER. In reference to this man Fraser I would ask what reason there was for moving the works which the department started at Morrisburg to Prescott.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It was reported we had not sufficient room at Morrisburg and we had acquired property on very reasonable terms at Prescott.

Mr. BRODER. There was no trouble in securing property at Morrisburg and you had already gone to considerable expense there.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Mr. J. F. Fraser reported that the property at Prescott was far more suitable than that at Morrisburg, and that we had all the buildings and machinery and power necessary at Prescott and also a wharf.

Mr. HAGGART. You have no power at Prescott and no wharf.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We have steam power.

Mr. HAGGART. Of course you can have that anywhere, but why did you not utilize the water-power on the canal at Morrisburg ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. My officials were in favour of Prescott.

Mr. HAGGART. That is no reason at all. There is no possible advantage over Morrisburg in moving to Prescott.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We had the buildings and property at Prescott which we got at a very reasonable price as is vouched for by the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid).

Mr. BRODER. There was a property lying idle at Prescott and you paid $24,000 for it which would be considered a very high price for such a property. You have 100 men working there now improving the buildngs at a great expense. There must be some other reason for moving to Prescott, that has not come to light.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We had only 48 feet by 40 at Morrisburg while at Prescott we had extensive grounds. The member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) stated in the House that we bought the Prescott property at half what we would have had to pay for it a year ago.

Mr. BRODER. You would have no trouble acquiring property at Morrisburg because you could have bought at a very low price, the old saw-mill with its water-power belonging to the estate of the late Wm. Mackenzie. I do not understand why you made the change.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The engineer persists in saying that even with this addition it will be too small.

Further amount required for maintenance and repairs to Dominion steamers, $75,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Owing to the increased number of steamers and expenses in connection with the service, the vote of $250,000 is inadequate to maintain this service. The vote is altogether for maintenance and supplies, but no provision is made for repairs and accidents to the steamships during the year. For instance, last autumn the steamship 'Lady Laurier' stranded while going into the port of Lockeport, Nova Scotia. This vessel had to be immediately repaired at the dry-dock in Halifax at a cost of $40,000. A large portion of this sum had to be taken from the vote for maintenance, the consequence being that in the month of May the vote was completely exhausted, the wages of all the crew had to be held over and accounts for supplies also held. A sum of $30,000 has been placed in the supplementary estimates for 1903-1904 to cover part of the cost of repairs to the 'Lady Laurier' but the outfitting of the steamers and necessary repairs to machinery to fit them for the spring work also have to be paid. The steamers now being built, particularly the ice breaker, for the St. Lawrence river, will be expensive to maintain and equal, if not more than equal, that of the 'Minto' which is $45,000. It was was intended to increase the Dominion steamers vote by $125,000, but, owing to the estimates being large the amount has been cut down to $75,000

Mr. MACKINNON. I would like to ask the minister whether the Marconi wireless system is used on these steamers, whether it is a success, and whether the minister intends to extend it throughout Canada ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is the intention to install the system on the 'Minto' and the 'Stanley.' It is also intended to establish stations at Charlottetown and at Pictou, in order that, if communication should be interrupted in the winter, the island would not be entirely at the mercy of the Anglo-American Cable Company. We intend also to establish a station at Cape Ray in Newfoundland.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the government considered the question or done anything in the direction of providing a steamer for ice breaking purposes on the Georgian bay or Lake Superior ? It is the impression of a great many people that by the employment of ice breakers, navigation on Lake Superior could be kept open all winter and the season of navigation on the Georgian bay could be extended for a couple of months in the year. If that could be done, it would be a matter of great importance. In Russia, we find that ice breakers can break ice 12 feet or even 16 or 18 feet thick.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I appreciate the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman. The whole question has been studied by my officials, and Mr. Cowie, the engineer in charge of the ship channel of the St. Lawrence, has reported in favour of establishing a service of ice breakers on that river, The first trial will be made at Cap Rouge, which is a most important point, about twenty miles above Quebec. It appears that there is a kind of gorge there, where the ice bridge forms about the end of January, and prevents the channel being opened early in the spring. Considering the demands that have been made, and that we required a boat to replace the 'Aberdeen,' which is doing the buoy service between Quebec and the Gulf, the government decided to order a boat which would combine the qualities of an ice breaker and a lighthouse boat. If the experiment proves successful—and I think from the report of my engineers that it will be—we intend to apply the same system to the lakes.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that must necessarily result in a year or two of delay before we can ascertain what could be done on Lake Superior.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. After duly considering the matter, we gave a contract to the firm of Fleming & Ferguson, of Paisley, who were the only parties ready to contract to deliver a boat by the 15th November next. So that the trial will take place this fall, and there will be no delay whatever in supplying the necessary aids for navigation on the lakes, if this proves successful.

Mr. BLAIN. What has been expended to date on the Marconi telegraphic system ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There has been scarcely any money spent by the Depart-

ment of Marine, because the company are obliged to prove the efficiency of their system before it is adopted. The Marconi Company have begun to install stations for which money was provided during the last fiscal year. They have thus far installed two stations—at Heath Point and Point Fame. The station has been inspected by the telegraphic superintendent of the government, employed in the Public Works Department. Although he has telegraphed to the department that the installation is perfectly satisfactory, I have not yet his report in writing. Until it proves perfectly satisfactory, we pay nothing except the expenses incurred in transporting the material required for the installation. I may say that perfect communication for seventy-five miles has been established.

Mr. BLAIN. When these two stations are completed, what amount of money will the department pay ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We will pay $5,000 per station.

Mr. FOWLER. Has the $80,000 which was voted for the installation of the Marconi system at Glace Bay for a trans-Atlantic service been paid ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. The company claim that they have passed signals across the Atlantic, but it has not yet proved to be a commercial success. I visited the station some months ago, and they assured me that they were exchanging signals with Great Britain daily ; but the system had not far enough advanced to be applied to commercial purposes.

Mr. FOWLER. I understand there is some difficulty about getting communication from the other side.

Mr. FIELDING. The power at one end is greater than the other and they propose to equalize that.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. At present they are in constant communication with ships leaving this side until they reach the other side. The ships crossing the Atlantic keep in constant touch with the station on this side.

To provide for a steamer to replace the 'Aberdeen' to be constructed as an ice breaker for the River St. Lawrence, $300,000.

To provide for the construction of a steamer for winter and summer navigation, Quebec, $125,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This will provide winter navigation between Quebec on the north shore and the gulf and also will provide a service between Rivière Ouelle and Murray bay. There is a ferry between those two points now provided by the Marine Department, because the company, which had the subsidy last year, refused to continue the service with a proper boat.

Mr. HAGGART. This is a new item and the government are doing what ought to be done by private enterprise.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The boat is required for winter navigation.

Mr. HAGGART. You have a vote for that purpose immediately preceding. This is an excuse for the purpose of providing what private enterprise ought to do—a line of steamers down the St. Lawrence.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The first steamer could not do that service. She has to remain all around Quebec and draws too much water, but this other one will solve the problem of winter navigation to the ports below Quebec.

Mr. HAGGART. I cannot understand why you should establish a ferry to Rivière Ouelle. You are doing there what in every other part of the Dominion is done by private enterprise. This is the only case I know of where the government spends money on a ferry service.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is the Mulgrave' doing the same service for the Intercolonial.

Mr. HAGGART. The 'Mulgrave' connects two points on the Intercolonial. It crosses the Gulf of Canso. There is no similarity.

Mr. FOWLER. I can see the importance of keeping open the St. Lawrence in winter.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There are over 600 miles on the north shore of the St. Lawrence which are perfectly closed to navigation during the winter. Unless some winter navigation is provided, these people will be deprived of all communication whatever in the winter season. Private companies would not accept the subsidy offered by the government as they were not sure winter navigation was possible, and we judged it would be wise to show that winter navigation is possible. It is for this reason we are providing $125,000 for the construction of a steamer.

Mr. FOWLER. I would be rather favourable to the experiment and I can understand that it is difficult to get private capital to undertake the risk. I think it is the duty of the government, if the experiment is reasonable and feasible, to spend public money in trying it.

Mr. BLAIN. Where will this vessel be made ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. By Fleming & Ferguson, and will be delivered the 1st December.

Mr. SPROULE. I can understand why this might be desirable in winter, but this is for winter and summer.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It may be put on during the summer between Murray bay and Rivière Ouelle in case no company will undertake that service. We require a ferry there for the benefit of the Intercolonial, as such a ferry brings a great deal of travel and freight over the Intercolonial for Murray bay which otherwise would be lost to that road.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not think the government should go into competition with private parties.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Nor do I. But it was impossible to find private parties who would carry on the service.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister says that the ferry was remunerative. Will he tell us what the receipts were last year ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have not received the return of the receipts. It was started only at the beginning of July when the other boat ceased to carry on the service. It was disabled for three or four days, and during that time there were demands for another boat, but the service had to be discontinued for a time.

Mr. SPROULE. If it is so remunerative, it seems to me there should be no difficulty in getting private parties to take it up, because there are always boats which people desire to keep employed.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. If the service this summer is remunerative no doubt we shall find private parties who will take hold of it another year. One of the objects in maintaining the service is to show that it is remunerative. But, up to the present time, we have not been able to find any company to take it up in a permanent way. A company did make a contract with a view to earning the subsidy, but they refused to carry on the service properly and the contract had to be cancelled.

Mr. HAGGART. Why do not you use the other vessel you are building, the ice breaker ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. You cannot use the ice breaker there. As I said, she draws too much water. She is a very heavy steamer, fit to break the ice of the St. Lawrence and she could not carry out the service.

Mr. FOWLER. That is, the summer service ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. She will carry on the buoy service but not the ferry service.

Mr. SPROULE. We do not seem to be able to get from the minister any information as to the earnings of last season. If we had those figures we should be able to judge whether that service was remunerative or not.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. During the summer of 1903 the ferry service was carried on by a company in which Mr. Connolly was interested. But they did not keep the ferry going during the winter. This spring they refused to go on with the service, so we had to step into the breach and do the best we could under the circumstances, so that the branch of the Intercolonial terminating at St. Denis might not be rendered useless.

Mr. HAGGART. When parliament had voted a subsidy and thereby directed that this service should be carried on by a company, where did the minister get the authority to carry on the service himself ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The people have to be provided for.

Ocean and river service—gratuity to the widow of Achille Michaud, in his life time engineer of the ss. ' Druid ' two months' salary, $166.66.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I remember that a case similar to this was up last year. I do not object to these gratuities, but I would like to know if they are paid in all cases ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And the rule is to give the same relative gratuity.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, two months' salary.

Mr. FIELDING. In the case of civil servants the gratuity is given as a matter of practice and charged to unforeseen expenses. But outside the civil service the amounts are specially voted.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Last year there was a railway wreck on the Intercolonial in which some engineers were killed. I asked if gratuities were given to the widows of these officers, and, if I remember well, I was told that they were not given. I do not see why, if gratuities are to be given, they should not be given to the widow of a railway man who is killed in the service of the country through no fault of his own —for certainly one of the engineers I speak of was not in any way responsible for the accident in which he lost his life. I am not objecting to this vote, but I want to see what is fair and just done all round. I think the minister was going to look into this matter of the Intercolonial employees. Has he done so ?

Mr. FIELDING. I am not sure that I am sufficiently informed to make a definite statement. But my recollection is that there is a difference in the treatment of the railway employees and others because in the railway service there is a special insurance fund to which the government contribute.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Very little.

Mr. FIELDING. The government makes a contribution——

Mr. LENNOX. They give $6,000.

Mr. FIELDING. They give this amount in the case of the railway service but not in others. I am not saying that is sufficient reason for the distinction that is made, but it is well that it should be kept in mind in considering the question.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The government promised last year to look into the matter and consider the question of insurance for these men. What the government pays for the Intercolonial system is a small thing for the thousands of men that are employed in that service. We passed a Bill this session providing that if a man was killed at a rifle range through no fault of his own, his family should get a gratuity. Here is a man who through no fault of his own, is killed while in the service of the country and in performance of his duty, and yet his family get no gratuity.

Mr. LENNOX. Not only do the government give no gratuity in these railway cases but, by reason of the insurance fund, they plead that the representatives of an Intercolonial employee who is killed are deprived of the ordinary right to damages to which they would be entitled. The widow has to accept some $250 from the insurance fund when perhaps but for that fund she would get $3,000 through the courts. I brought in a Bill relating to the Grand Trunk in this same matter and had the satisfaction of getting it through. The government refused to have it apply to the Intercolonial on the ground, as the minister will know, that they were proposing to introduce another system. I hope that will be carried out at an early day. I think it was understood that something was to be done this session. I believe that nothing is being done, but something should be done to place these employees of the Intercolonial on at least an equal basis with those of other railways.

Mr. FOWLER. With respect to the Intercolonial, when a man is injured on that road so badly that he cannot finish the rest of the day, he is docked his time for the rest of that day, because he is unable to finish out the run, although the accident occurred absolutely through no fault of his. In the case of the Belmont disaster where a brakeman was so severely injured, that he was laid up for nine or ten months, he received the magnificent sum of $3 a week from this insurance company of which the Finance Minister speaks. Because he did not return to Moncton in order to finish his run for that day, he was docked half a day; because the train was wrecked at Belmont and the engineer and four or five passengers were killed, and this man narrowly escaped with his life, he was docked his pay for the half of that day because he was unable to run down to Moncton. I do not think any such disgraceful usage was ever administered to any employee by any other department of the government or by any private corporation. I do not see why the Intercolonial should treat their employees differently from other departments of the civil service. The reason put forth by the Finance Minister, I do not consider is sufficient, when he says that the government contributes a small amount to this insurance society. Why do they make that contribution? It is in order that the men may not have an action against the government for damages, supposing they are injured, just as the Grand Trunk makes its contribution of a paltry amount in order to prevent its employees having action which otherwise they would have against the railway if, through no fault of theirs, they were killed, or met with some accident. So this is not done by the government out of kindness towards the employees, but it is done as a protection to the government against action for damages. Therefore, I do not think the Finance Minister should put that forward as a reason why officials on the Intercolonial should be placed on a different footing from those in any other department.

Mr. FIELDING. The gratuities paid in the civil service under the vote now asked would hardly be regarded as meeting the case to which my hon. friend alluded. The widow of this poor man in the Marine Department receives the magnificent sum of $156, so we cannot be accused of dealing too generously. I do not understand that the hon. gentleman is opposing this. But if we are going to consider the payment to the man the hon. gentleman referred to as a gratuity, it would still seem to be insignificant in view of the conditions he mentioned. But I do not understand the hon. gentleman is opposing this.

Mr. FOWLER. Not at all. But would it not be better to pay these small gratuities than dock a man half a day's pay?

Mr. FIELDING. Docking a man's pay is one of these little things that might occur as a result of the system. The man is obliged to render a day's service, and if something happens by which he fails to render it, there is no great injustice in the accountant recognizing the fact that he has not rendered it. If the rules make it necessary for men to return to Moncton to report and if a man fails to return, it is natural and proper for the official accountant to take account of that day. But there may be other circumstances connected with the transaction which the department should consider.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister did not expect a man who was killed to report in spirit to Moncton.

Mr. FIELDING. So far as his wages are concerned, he would be entitled to pay for services rendered. But if there were circumstances in connection with his death which called for recognition, that would be another question; but so far as his wages were concerned, there would be nothing wrong in paying wages for services actually rendered.

Mr. FOWLER. It is pretty small business to dock a man under those circumstances.

Mr. FIELDING. I think it probably arises from the system which prevails, and which here and there may be capable of working some injustice.

Ocean and river service—further amount required for removal of obstructions including sunken elevator at Montreal and obstruction in Ostall river, B.C., $9,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The shipping authorities of Montreal have been asking us to take this matter in hand, because there is a misunderstanding between the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal and the proprietor of the sunken elevator as to who is responsible for raising it. The matter cannot remain in that position any longer.

Mr. HAGGART. Either the Harbour Commissioners have to pay for it or the person whose dredge was sunk.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The removal has to be done by somebody, and we are obliged by law to remove obstructions in a navigable river.

Mr. HAGGART. The harbour of Montreal is under the control of the Harbour Commissioners, and it is a question whether the man who owns the elevator should remove it or the Harbour Commissioners. The government have nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The statute says that in case it is not done by the proper party, the government is obliged to do it, and then look for reimbursement to the responsible party.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Will the government own this elevator ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. If it is worth anything it will go to pay part of the expense.

Mr. HAGGART. What statute does the hon. gentleman refer to as compelling him to remove this obstruction ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have not got it under my hand, but I know a dispute has taken place, and we came to the conclusion that there was nothing else to do but for the department to remove the obstruction, and we ask for this vote of money to help the shipping of Montreal in removing the obstruction.

Mr. FOWLER.

Mr. LENNOX. Has the minister taken advice as to who is liable for the removal ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The company is liable for the removal, and they have not done it, and whilst the dispute is going on the shipping people are suffering from the obstruction and clamouring for its removal.

Mr. LENNOX. I ask the minister if he has taken advice as to who was the proper party to remove it ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We notified the Harbour Commissioners and they notified the owners of this sunken elevator, and they are quarreling about it, and during the quarrel navigation is suffering.

Mr. LENNOX. Either the owner of the elevator or the Harbour Commissioners should remove it. I am asking the minister if he has taken advice as to which of them should remove it.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In case the proprietor does not remove it the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal who have control of the harbour have got to remove it, and neither of them have done so. There is a lawsuit pending between the proprietor and the Harbour Commissioners, and in the meantime navigation is suffering, and the government have concluded to come to the rescue.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Who own the elevator ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The Montreal Elevator Company has guaranteed to pay.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How did she get sunk ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. She struck against an angle of the wharf.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister has not yet answered my question whether he had taken advice as to who was liable to remove it.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The department does not require to take advice. When the parties themselves come to us and ask us to take the obstruction away, we have to do it, and we reimburse ourselves afterwards.

Mr. LENNOX. That is a new development, the minister did not tell us that before.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I said it twice.

Mr. LENNOX. What I understand from the hon. minister now is not that this is a question of these parties refusing to do this or quarreling amongst themselves, but that they have come and asked the department to remove the obstruction promising to reimburse the department. That is not what the hon. minister said a few moments ago, when he said that under the statute the department is liable and compelled to remove it. The hon. minister now says that

the parties have requested the department to remove it. What guarantee have the department that after they incur an expense of $9,000 they will be reimbursed.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. All wrecks have to be removed. Are you going to allow navigation to be interrupted because a private party is responsible for the removal of the obstruction ?

Mr. HAGGART. How much is it expected to cost ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. $7,000.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. minister now gets away from the point he made a moment ago. He says that he was requested to remove it by parties who promised to pay him, and then he says he is compelled to remove it. I ask him again what security the department has that the money that they have to pay out for the removal of this obstruction will be recouped ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This is a rich company and we have no doubt that the expense that will be incurred will be reimbursed to us. We will force them to reimburse it.

Mr. LENNOX. If the company is a rich company it has a right to do this work.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The hon. gentleman does not seem to understand or I cannot make him understand. I will have to speak French to make myself understood or he will have to speak French. The law obliges us to remove obstructions to navigation. Whoever is responsible for the cost of the removal of these obstructions will have to pay it back if he is a person of any financial responsibility. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot contest these two points : first, that we are responsible for the removal of a wreck, and second, that the party to whom the wreck belongs is responsible to the public for the cost.

Mr. HAGGART. We deny that you are responsible to the public for the removal of a wreck in the harbour of Montreal. Where is your law ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The law is as follows :

Whenever in the opinion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the navigation of any river, lake, bay, creek, harbour, or other navigable water over which the jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada extends, is obstructed, impeded or rendered more difficult or dangerous by reason of the wreck, sinking or lying ashore or grounding, of any vessel or craft whatever, or of any part thereof or other thing, and whether the cause of such obstruction occurred before or after the passing of this Act,—then if such obstruction continues for more than twenty-four hours, the said minister may, under the authority of an order of the Governor in Council, cause the same to be removed or destroyed in such manner and by such means as he may think fit, including the use of gunpowder or other explosive substance if he deems it advisable, and may cause such vessel, craft or its cargo or the material or thing causing or forming part of such obstruction to be conveyed to such place as he may think proper, and to be there sold by auction or otherwise as he may deem most advisable, and may apply the proceeds of such sale to make good the expenses incurred for the purposes aforesaid,—paying over any surplus of such proceeds to the owner or owners of the things sold, or other parties entitled to such proceeds or any part thereof, respectively.

Mr. HAGGART. Does that apply to the harbour of Montreal ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Of course it does. Does the hon. gentleman say that this parliament has no control over the harbour of Montreal ?

Mr. HAGGART. The parliament of Canada has jurisdiction over everything, but we have parted with a portion of our jurisdiction and given it to the Harbour Commissioners.

Mr. FOWLER. That section is merely permissive as far as the department is concerned. It says that the minister may do so and so, but it does not say that he shall do so. I think it is quite proper that he should remove these obstructions and make the people pay for them. I trust he will do so and that the person who is responsible will pay for it.

Mr. LENNOX. I submit that the proper method for the hon. minister to adopt is this : Any person who obstructs a navigable river is liable to indictment and is similarly responsible. The person who placed his obstruction in the river should be compelled to remove it. Action should be taken by the department to compel the party who is responsible to remove it. I will not go any further at present but I predict that we will find that we will have a great deal of difficulty, notwithstanding what the hon. minister has said, in recouping ourselves for this expenditure.

Mr. HAGGART. Where is the Ostrell river in British Columbia ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not remember exactly as I have not the file with me. It is a navigable river.

Mr. HAGGART. Unless it is a navigable river and is under the jurisdiction of this parliament the provincial authorities should remove these obstructions.

Mr. EARLE. Where is the Ostrell river ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Does the hon. gentleman not know ? He is from British Columbia.

Mr. EARLE. I do not know ; I never heard of it. I presume that before putting this item in the hon. minister would know where it was.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have not the file here. I will give the information after recess.

Mr. EARLE. Well we will allow the item to stand.

At one o'clock, committee took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. MACPHERSON. When the House rose at one o'clock there was some discussion as to the location of the Hocsall river. I may say that this river is known as the Hocsall and Ecstall, but I believe the real name for it is the Hocsall. Possibly my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Hughes) would recognize it under the euphonious name of Oxtail, which it is sometimes called. It rises above the head waters of the Kitimak river and flows north into the Skeena river, near the Balmoral cannery, just below Port Essington. About thirty-five miles from the mouth of the Hocsall is a tributary upon which there is a large lake, which is a favourite spawning ground for spring salmon. There is below the entrance of the lake a large log jamb, 200 feet long, 160 feet wide and 12 feet deep. I asked a report from a friend of mine, and he was strongly in favour of having that log jamb cleared out, because it makes it impossible for the spring salmon to get up to spawn, although a number of the fall salmon do get up. This is a very desirable expenditure of money.

To provide for the organization of a naval militia for Canada, $50,000.

Mr. HAGGART. What do you want with this money when you did not get your Bill passed ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We have 680 men engaged on the cruisers and in the fishery protection, and the idea was to form the nucleus of a naval militia by engaging them for three years and paying them the whole year round instead of during the summer months. This money would be necessary to make preparation.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister cannot spend that money legally without having his Bill.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If he goes on with this vote I will require a detailed statement of all the plans in relation with this militia.

Mr. CLANCY. You had better drop the vote.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I will let it stand for the present. If it is not used it will not be spent.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Let it drop.

Mr. HAGGART. I ask that the report of the departmental officer with reference to the change in the workshops from Morrisburg to Prescott be laid on the table.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. If the report is in writing I will bring it down.

Repairs to lighthouses, $75,000.

Mr. SPROULE. We want a full statement as to the installation of acetylene gas in these lighthouses.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The departmental engineers recommended this change, and several experiments were made in 1902, which proved satisfactory. The Sunlight machine, however, had not sufficient power, but alterations have been made, and it is now in perfect condition. At first we had some difficulty with the gas in cold weather, but Mr. J. F. Fraser, after experimenting, with the assistance of others, succeeded in producing a perfect automatic machine which is proof against cold. The report on this matter is very voluminous, and I will merely read the following extract :

In the fall of 1902, Mr. J. F. Fraser, then engineer in charge of aids to navigation between Montreal and Kingston, was instructed by the department to carry out a series of experiments to determine whether acetylene was suitable for the gas buoy and lighthouse service.

A report on the experiments carried out by Mr. Fraser appears in the annual report of the department, page 94. The result of these experiments demonstrated that acetylene was suitable for gas buoys and for automatic lights on shore where the gas could be supplied through a gas hose from a steamer, and experiments are being carried out with reference to designing a generator which will be suitable for independent lights where a keeper is employed. This work is well under way and results are expected very shortly.

The machines mentioned in the early part of this memorandum were patented and purchased by the department from the makers. The apparatus in use on the steamer 'Scout,' which is entirely new and original, was designed by Mr. Fraser for the department, and no royalties or any other charges were paid for its use. The plant employed on the steamer 'Scout' is the largest generating acetylene plant in the Dominion or probably in America, and has given great satisfaction.

The next independent lighthouse installation undertaken by the department was at Maugher's Beach, Halifax harbour, on the recommendation of the commissioner of lights, and was carried out on the compression system.

The candle power of the gas buoys now in use throughout the Dominion is, at least, five times as great as that of the oil gas buoys employed heretofore, and on the basis of cost per candle, the acetylene is cheaper than oil gas.

The one great difficulty in the lighthouses of the Dominion is the fact that so many of them are fixed lights, which is the most unsatisfactory class of lights that can be installed, inasmuch as they have no character and are often misleading.

It is the aim of the department to render the lights throughout the Dominion as powerful and as characteristic as possible. The use of acetylene in the light service will enable this to be done, at a comparatively cheap cost, inasmuch as the gas light may be occulted and so give a flashing light, and with oil, this could

only be accomplished by expensive mechanism and close attention on the part of the keeper, while the gas occulting mechanisms employed by the department have operated for years with no attention and no repairs.

The improvement of the lights and fog alarms of the Dominion have recently been entrusted by the department to the branch of the commissioner of lights which was organized for this purpose, while the construction of lights and other aids remains with the chief engineer as heretofore, and every effort is being made by the department to provide a complete and up-to-date system of lighting for the Dominion.

As regards the cost of acetylene, Pintsch gas which was formerly used, cost 56 cents per 7 1-5-candle power. Acetylene gas now used costs 65 cents for 46-candle power, thus giving over six times the light for about the same money. City gas at $1 per thousand, which is considered cheap in Canada, costs for a 16-candle power light ½ cent an hour. Acetylene will give 23-candle power for an hour for 3-10 cent, therefore giving more light for less money. The penetration of the light in fog is more than double : that was ascertained by the chief engineer himself. It is the intention of the department as the means are placed at our disposal, to change the lights and substitute acetylene, which we consider a good deal cheaper than any other illuminant. To give the committee an idea of its power, I may mention that on Lake St. Louis there were four lights, for which the illuminant was coal oil. For three of them the commissioner of lights substituted acetylene, and in the fourth left the old system. A few days afterwards one of the boat captains reported that at five miles distant he could see three of the lights, but not the fourth. He thought it was burned out, but it was the light in which coal oil was used.

Mr. SPROULE. How many lights have you changed now ? Would the minister give us any idea of what will be the cost of each light as well as the cost of changing all the lighthouses of the Dominion to this system ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There are about thirty-five in which acetylene has been substituted. We shall save $5,000 a year on the upper part of the St. Lawrence. The cost differs according to the importance of the light. It amounts to from $300 to $2,500 per light.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that you contemplate introducing this system in all the lighthouses of the Dominion. Before doing so I suppose you have gone into some kind of calculation as to the cost.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We are changing them gradually, at the rate of twenty-five or thirty lights a year.

Mr. SPROULE. How many lights have you in all ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. About 1,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I imagine that a good business man would not commit the country to a change like this without first ascertaining what it will cost the country, and whether the new system can be run more cheaply than the system we have at present.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We are looking to efficiency rather than to the question of the actual expenditure every year. That will depend on parliament. In some years, if parliament votes the money, we shall probably replace 100. This year we propose to replace about 100; but this is all done systematically, according to the money we have at our disposal. We save the cost of the lightkeeper. There are differences in the lights, of course. Some may require special machinery, and the cost of the installation in some places will be more than in others. In starting to make the change we are not bound to go on and change the whole system. We will do it gradually, according to the success we have. There are some places where the old lights may not be replaced. With the boats carrying the gas holders and supplying the gas and the tanks, such places will be left as they are, in others where it is cheaper to run the acetylene gas and more advantageous, we will make the change.

Mr. SPROULE. How much will these thirty-five cost?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. About $1,000 each.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I right in the opinion that you have made no estimate in the department as to the total cost ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No general estimate has been made. According as the occasion presents itself, an estimate is made. Whenever we get an application for a better light and the officers think it is necessary to make the change, we get an estimate.

Mr. SPROULE. Who recommended this charge ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. As I have already very fully explained, there is no estimate by any one in particular. The matter was studied out and experimented upon by the chief engineer and his assistants. They talked it over with the lighthouse board and the board recommended it. It was recommended by Mr. Fraser, our commissioner of lights, and the thing has been going on under him, according to the recommendation of the lighthouse board.

Mr. SPROULE. Did Mr. Anderson, your engineer who is at the head of the branch, recommend it ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Of course he did, but he made no written recommendation. As I have repeated over and over again, the thing was studied by the officers of the

department and the lighthouse board and it was experimented upon until it has come to be a success, and we make the change whenever the officers of the department consider it advisable. It has been considered advisable in the interests of the economical working of the system to have depots at a certain point. There will be three depots.

Mr. SPROULE. According to the minister, thirty-five lights will cost $35,000 and therefore a thousand lights will cost $1,000,000. What do you buy now to generate your light?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We buy carbide.

Mr. SPROULE. From whom do you buy it, and at what price and what kind of a contract?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We buy it from the Ottawa company controlled by the Bronsons, and we buy it at the market price of $65 a ton. That is the price the Canadian Pacific Railway are paying and they get much larger quantities than we do.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there a patent which prevents any one else from manufacturing that carbide in Canada?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that there are two different companies, one in Ottawa, and one in St. Catharines, and that a Mr. Willson who has the patent, is interested in each. What time has the contract to run?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is no contract. We buy it at the market price.

Mr. SPROULE. If I am correctly informed, somehow or other the department conceived the idea of making the change and we do not know who originated the idea. I am told that the change is not recommended by the chief engineer, but of course I am not speaking from personal knowledge. We will be in this position, that we will have to buy from either of those two companies in Canada, which are practically under the one control.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We are not obliged to buy in Canada. We can buy in the United States or any other country.

Mr. SPROULE. You are going to make the change and the minister cannot tell what it is going to cost. Judging by the very meagre information given us, it will cost about $1,000,000 to change the lights and buoys, then we will be under the control of these two companies in which Mr. Willson, the patentee, is interested, and in which I am informed one of the ministers of the Crown is interested as well, and the government are purchasing from one of these companies without competition. It said that there are men behind this company very closely connected with the government and that these men have been instrumental in having this change made, and the country is being put in this position that we will have to pay whatever price this company asks. We build large and extensive plants, we are going to build three depots in the Dominion, and after the change is made, should it not prove a success, we will be helpless, because it will have cost $1,000,000 to make the change and it would cost another extravagant sum to go back to the old system. It is most humiliating to think that the government should have entered into such a contract under such circumstances and put us in a position in which we will be practically helpless. They are playing into the hands of some of their own ministers. The minister knows all this, and yet we can get no information about it. It is no wonder, because the less information is given the less damage is done to the reputation of the government. But I want the country to know what I believe to be the reason which actuates the minister in making this arrangement. If it is true that ministers of the Crown are making, or will make within the next quarter of a century, tens or hundreds of thousands of dollars out of this scheme, the country should know it. And, if there is a better explanation of this case than I have given, let the minister give it.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is no cause for suspicion in this matter——

Mr. SPROULE. There is cause for more than suspicion.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) be precise. Let him make his charge.

Mr. SPROULE. Let the hon. minister make his explanation, and let him deny, if he can, that one of the Ministers of the Crown is part owner of both these plants, that both plants are practically owned by the same parties, and that from this monopoly the government must buy its supplies.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I deny in the most formal manner that we are obliged to buy from these parties.

Mr. SPROULE. Can you get this carbide from any other company?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, a company started manufacturing this material at Shawenegan Falls about six weeks ago.

Mr. HENDERSON. Would the minister allow me to say that the company at Shawenegan is practically identical with the other? I know that as a matter of business.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That is another error, a flagrant error. The Shawenegan Falls Company is a very large concern, and I know personally who control the

capital that is in it. They are Americans, from Boston. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) says we are at the mercy of one company an answer is easily found. Does he think that the Canadian Pacific Railway is a concern that does not look after its own business? Does he imagine that, if they were to be at the mercy of one concern for their supplies they would equip all their cars with the apparatus for this light?

Mr. SPROULE. I venture to say they made their contract before they did it,

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Nothing of the kind. No contract is to be made with any of these people for even a year's supply, for the simple reason that nobody can tell what changes may take place in the conditions under which the manufacture is carried on. The cheapest price at which carbide can be had laid down in Canada at the present moment is $65 a ton. We are able to purchase the article in this country at such a price as to defy competition from other countries.

Mr. BRODER. I suppose this new company that has undertaken the manufacture must have bought the right from the owner of the patent?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not know that they have to buy the right to manufacture from Mr. Willson. He does not control the whole world.

Mr. SPROULE. He controls the patent for Canada.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. But other processes are used in other parts of the world and they can be used here in Canada. There is nothing to prevent English, French or Belgian capitalists from coming to Canada and establishing works here if they think they can make money. Carbide has been known for a century. Of course it had not been applied for lighting purposes in a practical way until a few years ago. Mr. Willson is a Canadian and he invented a way of using carbide that is perfectly safe and odourless, and gives a fine light by means of an apparatus that can be easily installed. It is so adaptable that the Canadian Pacific Railway, after trying electricity, Pintsch gas and oil, have come to the conclusion that it is better to use acetylene. They have adopted the Willson process, and are fitting up their cars with the system. It may be—I do not know the facts myself, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) makes the statement—that one of the ministers of the Crown has some shares in the capital stock of one of these companies. The law provides for that perfectly well. A member of parliament can be a shareholder in a company that does business with the government. It's done every day.

If we use what is acknowledged to be the best light, the light that has been asked for and insisted upon by the shipping conference using a standard article the supply of which can be had anywhere else in the world, where is the scandal and where is the monopoly?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I understand that the gas is pumped into large iron receivers for these gas buoys?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Can these buoys be used with other gas?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Certainly. In some of them Pintsch gas was used at first and acetylene was substituted.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister tells us that there is no monopoly as there is an independent establishment at Shawenegan. From whom does that company get its right to manufacture? Is it not from Mr. Willson?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) seems much concerned about Mr. Willson.

Mr. SPROULE. I am showing that this is a monopoly. This one man controls all three of these companies, and he owns the patent. The government cannot use this material without paying Mr. Willson. One minister of the Crown is interested in this enterprise, and his colleague changes this great lighting system of the country at a cost of practically a million dollars, thus committing himself to the use of this material which he must buy without contract, getting his supplies from time to time at the prices which the monopoly may fix. Is there no scandal about that? I asked the hon. minister to give us an estimate of what it would cost;—he could not tell us; I asked if the chief engineer had recommended it;—he cannot tell us that that officer did recommend it. It is said that some of his subordinates recommend it, but it is also said that some of his subordinates are interested in the concern. In the absence of information and explanation by the minister, we can only form conclusions upon such information as comes to us.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I repeat that the article can be bought on every market in the world, it is a standard article. Now if Mr. Willson has made some improvements in the production of this article, and has perfected it so that it is better than any other article, why should the hon. gentleman reproach Mr. Willson because he has been intelligent and enterprising enough to produce something in Canada that cannot be purchased elsewhere as cheaply? The article is required everywhere, not only by our department. The first year we bought $2,000 worth and last year $8,000 worth. If this

company had not been disposed to sell this article at a reasonable price, so as to make the lighting cheaper than the old system of lighting by oil, we would have bought the article elsewhere, from the United States, from England, from Belgium, or wherever it is produced; it is produced in all the countries of the world, there is no monopoly. Mr. Willson is not interested except as a shareholder in the Shawenegan Company. ninety per cent of the stock of which is controlled by Americans.

Mr. SPROULE. Who controls the patent?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Carbide is not produced exclusively under Mr. Willson's patent, all the carbide sold in the world is not manufactured by Mr. Willson's process. There is nothing that prevents us from importing carbide from elsewhere.

Mr. CLANCY. There is not one dollar's worth of carbide imported.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. For the reason that it is unnecessary to import it. If this company manufacturing carbide through the Willson process took advantage of the situation to charge us a higher price than we could buy it on the foreign market, we would buy it from abroad, and we import articles from a foreign country without paying duties. But we cannot get carbide at $65 a ton anywhere else, and there are immense quantities used in other countries.

Mr. SPROULE. Did the hon. gentleman invite competition for this?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We knew the market price, and we knew that we could not get the article cheaper than we are buying it at the present time. Do you think the Canadian Pacific Railway would buy it from them at $65 a ton if they could get it cheaper elsewhere?

Mr. SPROULE. Of course we want to see it manufactured in this country; but what we blame the government for is in making an improvident bargain.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We made no bargain whatever.

Mr. SPROULE. You have changed thirty-five lights at a cost of $35,000, and you are building a plant in Prescott that will cost $100,000 or more, and two more besides, each of which presumably cost $100,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We have appropriated $15,000 to install the Georgian bay plant.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister says that conditions are changing every moment, therefore it was unwise to make a contract because conditions may change so that he may get it cheaper.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have not made myself understood to the hon. gentleman. I told the committee a moment ago that if we were dissatisfied with carbide we could go back to the Pintsch gas, and there would be nothing lost.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is the system of lighting by gas generally used in other countries?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What kind of gas do they use?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We are using Pintsch gas yet in some cases. But carbide costs less than gas, and gives double the lighting power. When I said that conditions might change, I referred to the conditions of manufacturing carbide, not in the power of the light itself. It is now an admitted fact that the illuminating power of carbide is double that of either oil or Pintsch gas, and costs less.

Mr. SPROULE. I want it to be known that we cannot get any estimate of what it is going to cost the country to make this change. If the minister has the information he has not given it.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We calculate that it will cost over $300,000 to make the changes throughout the Dominion, that is for the buoys and the light. The shipping interests are asking for improvements to navigation, and we have concluded to install new lights and new gas buoys, and at the same time to make an improvement in the light. That work is now going on. Between Montreal and Sorel, a distance of forty-five miles, we have installed a certain number of new lights which make navigation perfectly safe during the night. These new lights and gas buoys are put in in such a way that we can use either Pintsch gas or carbide; we are using carbide because it gives a better light and is cheaper.

Mr. SPROULE. Now, $300,000 are required to change the lights. Then it would take at least $300,000 for the plants, which would be $600,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I never said anything of the kind. The most important depot will be Prescott. That might cost, in a couple of years, after all the improvements are made, $100,000. The Quebec plant is installed already, and it has not cost $25,000. It is the old gas plant we are using. We are converting it to this system. In connection with the Georgian bay station there is land to buy which will cost $15,000 and the installation is estimated to cost $10,000. We have purchased the property on which there is already erected a building, an old mill, and we estimate the whole cost will be $25,000. Ten thousand dollars and $25,000 make $35,000 and $100,000 for the plant at Prescott added makes $135,000.

All that does not go into machinery or into the installation of the plant. The works that will be carried on in these different depots will consist not only of repairing the barges to be used in connection with the Pintsch gas and carbide lighting system but they will also be used in connection with necessary repairs to all the apparatus. All this work will be done at these depots instead of having separate depots twenty-five or fifty miles distant from each other, so that it is not fair to say that an expenditure of $300,000 is necessitated by the change from Pintsch gas or coal oil to carbide. The cost of the change from Pintsch gas to carbide will amount to about $50.000. This will not be any useless expenditure because the works will be used for other purposes. If we get a light six times more powerful than we were getting before and if we get it at a cheaper price than the old system, even adding interest to the capital invested, I think that we are doing right in adopting it and especially when all the shipping men have approved of the action of the department. I have had letter after letter asking that the change should be made. Under the circumstances I do not think the government should be blamed for doing what is right in the eyes of business people and shipping men generally.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know that anybody is blaming the government for doing what is right in the eyes of business people, but we have been told for five or six years past that the lighting was perfect. I remember the predecessor of the hon. gentleman who is now on the Supreme Court bench standing up in this House and saying in the most positive terms that the department now had a channel lighted in a manner equal to daylight and yet we are told from year to year of the desirability of improving the lighting. Now, it is said that we have reached the stage of perfection.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No, I said that between Montreal and Sorel the light was perfect, but I did not say that the channel was perfect.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Are the pilots perfect ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That is another question.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I should think so.

Mr. SPROULE. I am talking about the lights.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I venture to say that the lights for forty-five miles between Montreal and Sorel are perfect. I have travelled a good deal not only in this country but in other countries and I am convinced that the lighting of the St. Lawrence between Montreal and Sorel will compare favourably with that of any other country in the world. We are trying to equip the channel but we cannot do it in certain parts because even with good lighting it would not be safe to navigate it during the night. We are at present equipping thirty-five miles of the channel between St. Francis and Batiscan. There the channel has a depth of thirty-one feet and the necessary width. It may be widened in the future, but for the present it is in good condition and can be navigated safely during the night if proper lighting is installed. We are installing it at present, so that instead of saving six hours, as at the present time, there will be a saving of eleven hours, which on an ocean trip means something not only for passengers but for freight.

Mr. SPROULE. We have had no information upon this matter and I suppose we might as well give it up, because the hon. minister does not want to give it or he has not got it. I am inclined to think it is the former ; he does not want to give it, but it might as well be known by the country that this is what is proposed. I am not objecting to the quality of the light because I do not know anything about it. I believe it is a better light for the purpose. As to whether it possesses the candle power which is claimed for it or not, I do not know, but we have very frequently heard of newly invented lights possessing such wonderful candle-power which has very materially simmered down afterwards. What the hon. minister says may be correct, and if it is correct he would be doing the right thing in his endeavour to install this system if it were done on a proper business basis. I object to the government placing themselves under the control of a monopoly. I object to the hon. minister putting the government in such a position that he has to deal practically with his own colleagues for the product that is supplied the system devised by his department. I object to it as well because it is a monopoly. The patent is held by one man. One man is interested in all these companies and it is said that one if not more than one minister is interested in one or more of these companies and enjoying the profits that result from every dollar's worth of carbide that may be bought by the government. The expenditure will go on. It may be that in the future we will have occasion to draw the hon. minister's attention to it, and I want him to remember that while we have been endeavouring to get information which he has been so very reluctant to give he would have been obliged to give a great deal more information if it were not so near the end of the session.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman has referred to the superiority of this light. The British army has made tests of these various lights for signalling purposes and the acetylene gas light is by all means the most penetrating that has been used. It

penetrates through a fog to a much greater extent than any other light. It is also coming into use for stereopticon purposes, and for signalling purposes generally. Another advantage it possesses is that because of its peculiar whiteness it is easily distinguishable and is not so liable to be confused with shore lights as some other signal lights would be. I would like to ask the hon. minister a question in reference to the royalty paid to Mr. Willson on this light. I think it is a credit to a young Canadian to have invented this new process. The question I want to ask the hon. minister is whether there is not a royalty on the Pintsch gas light which is also controlled by patents.

Building and maintenance of new fish hatcheries, $30,000.

Mr. BOYD. Before this item is passed I wish to have some explanation from the minister regarding a lease which he has recently given for fishing in the northern waters. I refer to a lease dated 19th April, 1904, given for twenty-one years to a Mr. Frederic M. Markey, of Montreal. This lease gives this gentleman the right to fish with nets or in other legal manner ; to take and catch all kinds of fish and salt water fish, and sea foods of any kind in and upon the waters of the Nelson river and its tributaries from West river to its mouth ; also the estuary of the Nelson river from Cape Tatlin to Owl river, three miles from shore ; also the Hayes river and tributary waters in the district of Keewatin. Also that portion of the Pigeon river and tributary waters in the district of Keewatin ; also the waters of Great Slave lake in the district of Mackenzie. This gentleman has the exclusive right on the waters of this vast territory ; exclusive other than the Hudson's Bay Company and the Indians and the settlers on these rivers, but even these people are not allowed to fish for barter or for sale, except with the permission of this gentleman who is, I understand, a lawyer in Montreal, and a friend of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

For such an enormous concession it is natural to suppose that the government would receive a large remuneration ; but what do you suppose is the amount the government receive for the privilege of fishing on all these rivers for twenty-one years ? The enormous sum of $10 per year. But there are very strict stipulations : the money must be paid in advance ; if it is not, the concession may be cancelled. Another stipulation is that the lease must not be transferred to any other person except the British American Fish Company. I think it will tax the ability of the hon. minister to give a satisfactory explanation of this transaction. True, he has a precedent in the concession given to another friend of the party, Mr. Archie McNee, on the 10th of November, 1902, when that gentleman was given the privilege of all the fishing in James bay and its tributaries for twenty-one years for $10 a year. As that matter has already been discussed in this House, I need not refer to it further. We have also the concession given to Mr. Mackenzie, of Selkirk, on the 14th of May, 1904, of the exclusive fishing privileges on Lesser Slave lake, under similar conditions, for nine years. For such important concessions as these, we might have expected that some tenders would be called. For a free trade government such as this, which was to have free trade in all its business transactions, it is certainly binding up these concessions in a way that would astonish a Russian government. I have heard men say that the fisheries of Hudson bay and its tributaries are of greater value than one-half the land of the Northwest Territories. Constituents of mine have written to me very strongly on this matter, asking me to bring it to the attention of the House, and to ask the minister what he had to say in explanation of it.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The explanations will be very clear. First, I will take the Archibald McNee lease, which I signed in the month of November, on the second day after I was sworn in as minister, the recommendation having been already considered by the department. The fact that the party who got this lease, Mr. Archibald McNee, of Windsor, Ontario, has not taken advantage of it since the month of November, 1902, goes to show that there is not such great value in it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He is trying to sell it.

Mr. HAGGART. Would the minister tell us the authority he has for granting such concessions as that ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. By Order in Council.

Mr. HAGGART. Has the Crown a right to alienate the fishing of a large bay like James bay ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is not alienated. He has only the privilege of fishing ; not the exclusive privilege.

Mr. HAGGART. It is nearly half of Hudson bay—the southern part of it.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is not one-eighth of it, and he has no exclusive privilege at all.

Mr. HAGGART. How many miles does that privilege extend along the seashore ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. From the information I have, he has simply paid the rent and has not taken advantage of his lease.

Mr. HAGGART. The lease is of no use until there is railway communication there, when it will become a most valuable concession. Has the Dominion government ex-

clusive jurisdiction over the seashore within the three-mile limit for fishing ? You have leased a part of Ontario and a part of Quebec.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We have leased what belongs to the Dominion and nothing else.

Mr. HAGGART. The northern part of Ontario goes up to the shores of James bay and so does Quebec under the new Act, which extends the jurisdiction of Quebec to that country.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Mr. Markey represents the North American Shipping Company and the lease gives no exclusive privilege.

Mr. BOYD. You only except a reserve to the Hudson bay, the Indians and settlers —that is all.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is also a condition obliging the company during three years to spend the sum of $100,000 on exploration and during ten years they will have to spend $50,000 in explorations and improvements of the property under lease.

Mr. CLANCY. Has Mr. McNee done that?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That condition was not in his lease.

Mr. HAGGART. What kind of exploration are they to make ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I sent out an officer of my department, Mr. Cunningham, who has just returned to-day and has not had time to report. He says that there is no possibility of settlement out there or of taking other fish but the sturgeon, because there is no communication possible, and the sturgeon can be fished only at three or four places on the Nelson river. The other part of the river is composed of rapids and rocks with scarcely any trees, so that the company, if they want to take advantage of this lease, would have to spend certainly $50,000 before they can start fishing.

Mr. CLANCY. I suppose the hon. gentleman sent the officer out after he made the lease.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Of course, because some difficulty arose about it and I want to know exactly the facts. I discovered, for instance, that licenses had been granted some people out there and they cannot be dispossessed.

Mr. MORIN. What did it cost to send a man out there ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. He went out to make his ordinary inspection in the Northwest and Manitoba and to ascertain and give a report of the conditions.

Mr. MORIN. He must have spent a few days anyway examining the country.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It took him six days to explore the River Nelson.

Mr. MORIN. How much a day ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. He is employed by the year.

Mr. SPROULE. The giving of a lease like this is an outrage on the rights of the people. If the minister has the right by Order in Council to grant practically an exclusive right to one man to fish in such a large section of James bay for twenty-one years, he has the right to do it for fifty years or a hundred and practically alienate what belongs to the people. And it is alienated in return for the insignificant sum of $10 per year. The minister says it is not exclusive. The lease says :

> Provided that this lease is granted and accepted without prejudice to the rights of the Hudson Bay Company, and furthermore, on the distinct understanding that the right to fish for their own use, but not for commercial purposes, is hereby reserved for all settlers, Esquimaux, tourists and the employees of the Hudson Bay Company.

These are the only parties who have the right to fish, and they may take fish only for their own use. And this company are given the right to use fishing nets—that, I take it, includes every fishing device in the shape of a net, without restriction. Then, as the hon. member for Lanark says, there can be no doubt that a part of this territory is in the province of Ontario, and part of it belongs to Quebec. I repeat, these rights belong to the whole people of Canada and not to the government. The government do not own them and they have no right to sell them—or to give them away, for this is practically what they are doing.

Mr. FOWLER. One of these leases is granted to a gentleman named Markey. A gentleman of that name is frequently seen about these buildings. Is it the same man ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not know to whom the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) refers.

Mr. FOWLER. The gentleman I refer to comes from Montreal and is a lawyer. Has he gone into the fishing business ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Mr. Markey came here representing the British American Fish Company.

Mr. BOYD. He got the lease with the right of selling it to the company.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It has been the rule of the department since I entered it, to grant licenses or leases for fishing only to people who are in business or intend, bona fide, to go into the business.

Mr. FOWLER. Has Mr. Markey gone into the business ? When I last heard of him he was a lawyer. I would like the

minister to tell us if he ascertained from any reliable source the value of these fisheries, and whether it was reported to him that value was $10.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Of course $10 does not represent it at all. But we consider, in these cases, the expenditure the people would be obliged to make in order to give value to the lease. The lease itself is not worth even $10 until it is exploited by the use of a capital of $50,000 or $100,000.

Mr. FOWLER. But the same is true of a coal mine or a gold mine. No matter how much mineral there may be, it is worth nothing until it is developed. But the government does not give privileges of that kind for nothing.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This is not an exclusive privilege.

Mr. FOWLER. It is clearly exclusive. The minister has not read the lease.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The copy of the lease that I sent to the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) evidently does not contain the clause which I was very particular to insert. This copy does not bear my signature or show that I had signed the lease.

Mr. FOWLER. But it comes from the hon. minister.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, the error is mine. But I am sure that in the lease I signed we reserved to ourselves the right to issue licenses to other people, provided the establishment should not be within less than ten miles of theirs.

Mr. FOWLER. Fifty miles.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Fifty miles on the lake and ten miles on the river.

Mr. HAGGART. I would like to see Mr. Markey's lease.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have sent for it. I am sure that the copy I signed contained the reservation I spoke of.

Mr. FOWLER. The company could easily corral the whole river by simply putting their establishments ten miles apart and the lake by putting their establishments fifty miles apart.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Oh, no.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, they could. If it is a valuable privilege they have got it all.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. But, getting the privilege to fish on these conditions does not give them the privilege of the land.

Mr. FOWLER. But the fish do not grow on the land.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. But to cure the fish you must go on the land. The Department of the Interior has a word to say as to the privilege of putting up establishments.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister says that he is relying upon the Department of the Interior to protect the country against an improvident bargain that he made with these people. Now there is a question in law as to whether the grant of fishing rights would not carry with it the right to dry fish on the shore, just as the right to boom a navigable river carries with it the right to attach your boom to the shore.

Mr. COWAN. Do you mean that, in the absence of any specific authority in the Act, it would give you the right to attach a boom to the shore ?

Mr. FOWLER. I think so.

Mr. COWAN. Have you any authority for that proposition ?

Mr. FOWLER. I think that is absolutely correct. The point here is that the minister, for the paltry sum of $10, has granted to a man in Montreal, who is not engaged in the fisheries, who has only taken this lease for commercial purposes, in order to dispose of it at a profit, to speculate in the franchises of this country—that is what it means—for the paltry sum of $10, and by means of that lease he is preventing settlers in that section of the country from fishing in these waters in order that they may help support themselves and families. Now if these fisheries are valuable, as we know they are, it would be a very important thing for the men who go out into that country to settle that they should be able, when they are not working on their farms, to catch fish and sell them. Under this lease, it is true, they are allowed to catch fish for their own eating but not to sell.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I am informed by Mr. Panet that there are no settlers there, because there is no place for them to settle on the Nelson river.

Mr. FOWLER. But we are discussing the whole question. The hon. gentleman has granted leases all along the rivers and lakes of that country, and will the hon. gentleman say that on none of these waters are there any settlers ? If there are no settlers, why do you put in the lease that settlers shall have the right to catch fish for their own use ? The minister is condemned out of his own mouth, condemned by his own lease. He should have gone further, and said that no rights granted by this lease should interfere with the rights of bona fide settlers in that country to catch as many fish as they please.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman is giving to a lawyer in Montreal, who I suppose never did any fishing in his life, part of the shore of the Hudosn bay, nearly the whole length of Nelson river, the whole of

the Great Slave lake, a lake nearly as large as Lake Ontario, together with West river and Hayes river. I never knew that the government had authority to do anything of the kind. If they can do that, they can alienate the whole territory altogether. I asked the minister a while ago what was the length, within ten or twenty miles, of the territory covered by this lease to Mr. McNee. Then I want a copy of the lease to this Mr. Martin.

Mr. FOWLER. Not Martin, Markey.

Mr. HAGGART. Oh, I know him now.

Mr. FOWLER. It is time to speak out on this matter, it is too serious to be treated as a joke.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have here the lease which was signed by me, and it states :

His Majesty reserves the right to grant other leases in and upon said rivers and lakes ; but no other lease will be granted to fish in and upon the said rivers and tributaries, within a limit of ten miles from any fishing or refrigerating station erected by the said lessee or the said company thereon, or in said lake within a limit of fifty miles from any such station erected on said lake.

Mr. BOYD. I read that out to you, ten miles from the stations, and fifty miles in the lakes.

Mr. FOWLER. This is a very serious matter, and it illustrates the hon. gentleman's methods. We were warned before the minister was sworn in, we were told by the leading Liberal newspapers of this country, what sort of a minister we would have if the hon. gentleman was appointed to that high office. Despite the warnings of the best friends of the government this gentleman was appointed by the premier, and we have seen during the present session of this House every prediction that was made by these newspapers verified to the full. What was the first sample the minister gave us of the manner in which the properties of the Dominion have been disposed of by this gentleman. It was the sale of that steamer to some friends up on the Georgian bay for a sum considerably less than the amount that had been expended upon it for repairs within two or three months, a steamer given to friends of the hon. gentleman without tender. That is the way in which the public revenues of this country are to be administered by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. What do we find in the next case ? We find a timber limit on an island up somewhere on the Georgian bay as well—this seems to be a favourite scene for the hon. gentleman's peculiar manipulations and operations—a timber limit that was shown by indisputable testimony in this House to be worth at least $3,000, sold to a personal friend of the minister, to a political friend at least of the minister, to a brother, as I understand, of a probable Liberal candidate, or a nephew or some close relative of a probable Liberal candidate, for the paltry sum of $100, the amount that was paid for a fur coat for Commander Spain when he went to Newfoundland—a timber limit worth $3,000 sold for $100. Now we have a gentleman from Montreal, a lawyer whom we see often around this House and in its precincts, obtaining valuable fishery concessions for the paltry sum of $10, a man who is not engaged in the fishing business, and the minister said not ten minutes ago that there was an understanding that these leases were only to be given to men who were engaged in the business. This gentleman gets a fishing lease for $10 a year, for twenty-one years, and then renewable ; and the settlers, the men who go into that country to make a living, are debarred from fishing except that they may take what fish they require for their own consumption. I think, Mr. Chairman, it is time that the attention of the country was called to these things. Of course if the hon. gentleman's colleagues are silent when things like this are done, if they permit such nefarious orders to pass the council, they are just as much responsible as if they were the originators of the acts, and I think the country will hold them responsible.

Mr. HAGGART. I want a copy of the lease to Mr. Markey.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I will give you the original.

Mr. HAGGART. Can the hon. minister tell me the number of miles under lease in James bay ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I notice another clause in the lease which has not been read, and which is very important, limiting the size of fish to be caught.

Mr. FOWLER. Why would you not limit the size of the fish to be caught ?

Mr. BOYD. Will the hon. minister send over the lease I had, so that we may compare it with the other copy ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This provision is as follows :

The said lessee or the company shall not take from the said waters any sturgeon weighing less than twelve pounds, nor whitefish, trout or catfish weighing less than two pounds, nor any yellow pike weighing less than one and a half pounds.

Mr. BOYD. I read that in the other copy.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Well, it is an important clause. There is nothing very extraordinary in a concession of this character.

Mr. BOYD. All I have to say is that if the supporters of hon. gentlemen in the House and in the country approve of concessions of this character they are welcome to do so. The most stringent opposition has

been manifested towards these concessions by people in Manitoba, who have written to me and who have asked me to ascertain whether it is possible that such concessions have been granted. I asked a question in this House and learned that they had been granted. Then I was asked to obtain a copy of the lease. All I can say is that if the hon. minister is going to regard the lease he has given to Messrs. McNee, Mackenzie and Markey as a precedent, it will only be a short time when there will not be a fishing lease in this country that he has not conceded to his friends. The least I can say about it is that it is a most preposterous act on the part of the department. Other hon. gentlemen who are members of the Privy Council cannot hold themselves irresponsible in regard to this, because every one of these concessions has to be granted by Order in Council. Every minister who sat around the Council Board when these leases were granted is equally responsible with the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I think the least these hon. gentlemen could do would be to stand up and defend themselves and their colleagues in regard to this matter.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. As regards the lease made with Mr. Mackenzie, it is only for pound-net fishing. The rest is perfectly free, not only to settlers, but to every one else. There is no monopoly whatever.

Mr. BOYD. One of the great difficulties when you give concessions of this kind is that they interfere with settlers who have been in the habit of catching fish and selling it in the highest market. The result of this concession being given to party—I do not know what to call them ; my hon. friend says 'hacks,' but I will not say that—is that it gives them the right to say to these people who are selling their fish at 6 cents a pound, that they shall sell them at whatever the lessees see fit to offer them—about 2 cents a pound. I also asked for the lease that was given to Mr. Merritt, another party man, of fishing rights on Lake Winnipegosis. This is a great interference with settlement in that part of the country. What are these concessions going to be worth in twenty-one years from to-day ? No man can estimate their worth when railways are built through that country, as they will be built in a few years. Yet the hon. minister grants these concessions for a paltry sum of $10 a year.

Mr. HAGGART. This is a lease between Fred. H. Markey and His Majesty the King.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. If you read a clause farther down, you will see that the lease is taken by Mr. Markey for the benefit of the British American Fish Corporation, Limited.

Mr. HAGGART. No, there is nothing of the kind. The clause says he may assign it : it is not compulsory. Under the conditions of the lease he may assign it to this particular company, but he may keep it altogether to himself.

Mr. DAVIS. Suppose he did ?

Mr. HAGGART. He has a lease :

> In and upon the waters of the Nelson river and its tributaries, from West river to its mouth ; also the estuary of the Nelson river, and Cape Tatnam to Owl river, extending three miles from shore ; also Hayes river and tributary waters, in the district of Keewatin ; also that portion of the Pigeon river and its tributary waters in the district of Keewatin ; also the waters of Great Slave lake, in the district of Mackenzie.

For $10 a year, renewable at the end of twenty years on condition that he expends $100,000. It is a lease for forty-two years.

Mr. FOWLER. Has the hon. minister passed over a copy of the lease ?

Mr. HAGGART. Here is the clause that the hon. minister has drawn attention to, and which he says would oblige the lessee to transfer his rights to the British American Fish Corporation :

> That the said lessee shall not transfer his interest in the present lease, except to the British American Fish Corporation, Limited, for which letters patent have been granted by the Governor General in Council of Canada, without obtaining the written consent of the minister or that of some other person or persons authorized to grant the same.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That is what I said from the beginning.

Mr. HAGGART. I beg the hon. minister's pardon. The hon. minister led the committee to believe that this man, who is a lawyer in Montreal, took the lease for the purpose of giving it to the British American Fish Corporation, that he held it as agent for them, and that he was obliged to give it to them. There is no condition of that kind in the lease.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That is as I understood it.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. minister is too good a lawyer to understand it in any such way as that. This clause is very plain :

> That the said lessee shall not transfer his interest in the present lease except to the British American Fish Corporation, Limited, for which letters patent have been granted by the Governor General in Council of Canada, without obtaining the written consent of the minister.

This does not oblige him to transfer the lease to the British American Fish Corporation. He may organize another company if he likes.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Then he cannot transfer it to that company.

Mr. HAGGART. He may transfer it to any individual with the consent of the minister.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. With the consent of the minister.

Mr. FOWLER. With the consent of the minister. Why give this lease to Mr. Markey? That is a very suspicious circumstance. A lawyer in Montreal, who has an active practice, gets a lease for a few thousand square miles of fishing territory in the Northwest for $10 a year, and the hon. minister does not think that is a suspicious circumstance.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. With the obligation to spend $50,000 a year.

Mr. FOWLER. Why did you not make the lease with the British American Fishing Corporation?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It was not incorporated at the time.

Mr. FOWLER. Not incorporated at the time? The lease says that the lessee may transfer his interest to the British American Fish Corporation, Limited, 'for which letters patent have been granted.' Yet the hon. minister says it was not incorporated at the time. There it is in black and white and yet the hon. minister says, in face of that, that it was not incorporated. We are used to having statements from the ministers which are not in accordance with the facts. That is an awful thing to have to say, but one cannot be truthful and not say it. Here is a minister who tells us that the reason he did not give a lease to the corporation but gave it to Markey, was, because the corporation was not in existence at the time the lease was given, but the lease itself says that the lessee should not transfer his interest in the lease except to the British American Fish Corporation, Limited, for which letters patent have been granted by the Privy Council of Canada.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Does that mean that the company was in existence?

Mr. FOWLER. What else does it mean? If the minister takes such a view as that I suppose there is no use in talking further.

Mr. CLANCY. Where are these fish hatcheries to be located?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The sites have not yet been chosen. The officers will choose the sites as soon as the session is over; but it is the intention to establish them in the different provinces.

Mr. CLANCY. There will be two on the great lakes.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, but they are not located yet.

Mr. CLANCY. How many applications have been made for them on the great lakes?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Four or five, I think.

Mr. EARLE. With regard to the hatcheries in British Columbia, is it the intention of the government to select the sites and construct them this year?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. If we have time we will. I am leaving for British Columbia in a day or two and in company with Mr. Bancroft of the provincial government, I intend to select the sites.

Mr. BOYD. As the hon. minister has not seen fit to hand me back the copy of the leases which I quoted from, I will read the lease which I now have to the House.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I gave it to someone on the other side.

Mr. BOYD. At any rate I propose to read this to the House and then the House can form a conclusion about this lease. It is as follows:—

This indenture, made in duplicate the nineteenth day of April, one thousand nine hundred and four, between His Majesty the King, represented by His Minister of Marine and Fisheries for Canada, hereinafter called the minister, of the first part; and Frederick H. Markey, of the city of Montreal, in the province of Quebec, hereinafter called the lessee, of the second part;

Witnesseth that in consideration of, and subject to the rents, covenants, conditions and provisions hereinafter reserved and contained, and on the part of the lessee to be paid, observed and performed, the minister, under authority of the Fisheries Act, doth hereby demise and lease unto the said lessee, the right to fish with nets, or in any other legal manner, to take and catch all kinds of fresh and salt water fish, and seafoods of any kind, in and upon the waters of the Nelson river and its tributaries, from West river to its mouth; also the estuary of the Nelson river, from Cape Tatnam to Owl river, extending three miles from shore; also Hayes river and tributary waters, in the district of Keewatin; also that portion of the Pigeon river and tributary waters, in the district of Keewatin; also the waters of Great Slave lake, in the district of Mackenzie;

Provided that the above lease is granted and accepted without prejudice to the rights of the Hudson Bay Company, and furthermore, on the distinct understanding that the right of fishing for their own use, but not for commercial purposes, is hereby reserved to settlers, Esquimaux, Indians, tourists and employees of the Hudson Bay Company;

To have and to hold unto the said lessee, subject as aforesaid, for and during the term of twenty-one years, to be computed from the 1st day of May, A.D. 1904, and thenceforth next ensuing and fully to be complete and ended, yielding and paying therefor to His Majesty or His successors yearly and every year during the said term the certain rent and sum of ten dollars to be paid annually and in advance.

Should the said lessee conform to all the terms and conditions of the present lease, and should establish at the termination of the said period of twenty-one years that he, or the company hereinafter mentioned, has expended in exploring, developing, equipment and improvement of the said territory hereby leased, the

sum of at least one hundred thousand dollars, then he or the said company shall have the option of renewing the present lease, subject to the same terms and conditions, for a further period of twenty-one years.

These presents are made and issued subject to the following provisions, terms and conditions :

1. That the said lessee or the said company, shall in the use and occupation of the fishery privileges hereby leased, conform in every respect to the provisions, enactments and requirements of the Fishery Laws now, or which may hereafter be in force, and comply with all the rules and regulations that may have been or that may from time to time be adopted or made by the Governor General in Council relative thereto.

2. That the said lessee shall not transfer his interest in the present lease, except to the British American Fish Corporation, Limited, for which letters patent have been granted by the Governor General in Council of Canada, without obtaining the written consent of the minister, or that of some other person or persons authorized to grant the same.

3. That the said lessee or the said company shall not have any right or claim to indemnity or abatement of rent by reason of a decrease or failure in the fishery by these presents leased.

4. That the said lessee or the said company shall annually make a full return of full details and particulars to the Department of Marine and Fisheries of the operations carried on in every branch of the fishery hereby leased.

5. That the said lessee or the said company shall, during the three years following the 1st day of May, 1904, expend a sum of at least one thousand dollars per annum in the exploration of the territory hereby leased, and during the period of ten years from the 1st day of May next, shall expend and lay out at least fifty thousand dollars in the exploration, development, equipment and improvement of the said property hereby leased.

6. That if the said lessee or the said company shall fail or neglect to pay the rent hereinbefore reserved and stipulated for, or any part thereof, or shall neglect or fail to perform any of the other conditions, terms or provisions hereinbefore mentioned, or if the said fishery is being improperly operated by the said lessee or the said company, contrary to the terms of this lease, so as to prejudicially affect the public interests, the minister may give or cause to be given three months' notice in writing to the said lessee or the said company, that the term of the lease by these presents created will be determined and cancelled, and the said term and lease shall thereupon and thereby be determined, ended and cancelled, and His Majesty may thereupon resume possession of the said fishery and the privileges hereby created wthout indemnifying the said lessee or the said company for any improvements that may have been done, and His Majesty may thereafter, without let or hindrance from the said lessee or the said company, resume possession of the said fishery and the privileges by these presents hereby created, and may continue to enjoy the same, or relet them to others as His Majesty may deem fit.

7. The said lessee or the said company shall not take from the said waters any sturgeon weighing less than twelve pounds, nor any whitefish, trout, or catfish, weighing less than two pounds, nor any yellow pike weighing less than one and a half pounds.

8. That the said lessee or the said company shall be liable for any damage or loss that may accrue to His Majesty by reason of any act or neglect of the said lessee or the said company in connection with the said fishery and shall indemnify and hold harmless His Majesty from all costs, loss and damage in connection therewith.

9. His Majesty reserves the right to grant other leases in and upon said rivers and lake ; but no other lease will be granted to fish in and upon the said rivers and tributaries, within a limit of ten miles from any fishing or refrigerating station erected by the said lessee or the said company thereon, or in said lake within a limit of fifty miles from any such station erected on said lake.

In witness whereof the minister hath subscribed and set his hand and seal of office, and the lessee hath hereunto set his hand and seal.

R. PREFONTAINE.

Signed, sealed and delivered
in the presence of
F. GOURDEAU.
FRED. H. MARKEY.

Witness—R. N. VENNING.

I place this on 'Hansard' so that there may be no mistake with regard to it, because of the suggestion of the minister that there was some difference between the lease I had and this one.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. minister spoke of the way the public interest was safeguarded by that lease. I listened carefully to the reading of it, and there is not a condition in that lease the observance of which is not greatly to the advantage of the fishing company. There are no onerous conditions imposed upon them at all. The hon. minister said it was not uncommon to grant leases of this kind. I challenge the hon. gentleman here and now to point to any single concession made by any predecessor of his, whether a member of a Conservative government or of a Liberal government, on all fours with the lease which the hon. gentleman has made of these fishing rights. The hon. gentleman signalized his coming into office by doing what ? Acting the pirate, and robbing the Public Works Department and other departments of their powers—for what purpose ? Merely to reward his friends. The hon. gentleman's boodling friends were not coming quickly enough to eat of the great feast he was spreading for them, and he issued a circular in Montreal, saying : Ho, all ye that hunger and thirst for boodle, come. That circular was published in the newspapers. So they came, each one carrying his ladle, to take part in the soup. I am surprised, not so much at the hon. gentleman, as at some of his colleagues who will permit such a scandalous state of affairs to continue.

Additional amount required for outfitting new cruisers for the fishery protection service, $30,000.

Mr. TURGEON. Mr. Chairman, I deem it my duty to refer to a statement which was

made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel), in the course of his remarks last Saturday evening, in relation to the carrying out of the fishery regulations in the county of Gloucester. So far as the regulations are concerned, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has given an ample explanation, and it is not my intention to refer to them at this closing hour of the session. But I desire to call attention to the statement made by the hon. member for St. John, that a real attempt at murder had been made by some of the fishermen of the county of Gloucester. Having read a statement sent by one William G. Good, of the parish of Bathurst, to that effect, the hon. member for St. John went on to say :

I take it that this is a matter which concerns very closely indeed the Department of Marine and Fisheries. And I would ask the minister what he proposes to do under the circumstances and whether, in view of what is really an attempt at murder, he will take any action towards finding out and prosecuting the guilty parties.

When I heard the statement that an attempt at murder had been made by constituents of mine, fishermen of the county of Gloucester, knowing that such a misfortune has never yet occurred there, I was naturally startled. Although two or three weeks had elapsed since the alleged occurrence, it had not come to my knowledge, and the local newspapers made no reference to it. Moreover, if such a thing had occurred, the local criminal authorities would have been only too prompt to have taken note of the fact ; for we have our criminal authorities in Gloucester county as well as in every other county of the province of New Brunswick. More particularly was I astonished at the fact that the statement I refer to made this accusation against the fishermen of the fine settlements of Youhall, Salmon Beach, Janeville and Clifton, where the Armstrongs, the Scotts, the Ellises, the Whites, the Jenningses, the Millers, the Buttimers, the Ronalds and the Eddys, all live together in amity, in the most hospitable, cordial, charitable neighbourliness, and are among our most industrious people—people who may be heard singing over their nets at the dawn of the morning and may be seen working in their fields the rest of the day, until the setting sun bids them to their homes in the evening ; whose sole ambition in their arduous labours is to provide for their families due comforts and the best possible education the province can afford ; some of whom have received and are now receiving an academic education in some of the best institutions in the Dominion of Canada ; who have given to their families, I may say, the most refined domestic and Christian education ; whose every fireside is inspiring of the loftiest sentiments of British citizenship. Therefore, when such a statement was made by the hon. member for St. John, not only was I startled at the conduct charged against some of my constituents in that locality, but I regretted that the hon. member had allowed his credulity to be imposed upon by such a statement made by such an irresponsible man as I know the said William G. Good to be ; and I placed a telegram in the hands of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, stating that no attempt had been made to fire on any one on the day stated or on any other day. It may be that the said William G. Good felt remorseful for his actions on that Sunday, and might have thought that he was aimed at by somebody and got despondent. I am informed by the fishery overseer of the locality that no such occurrence took place, and the said Heber Buttimer, who is accused, wired me yesterday as follows :

O. Turgeon, M.P., Ottawa.

Please deny in strongest possible terms statement made by William J. Good that I fired at him. Get copy of affidavit so that I can proceed against Good.

HEBER BUTTIMER.

I do not wish to refer to the disturbances that have taken place. The minister, as I have said, has made a statement on that subject ; but I thought it my duty to give this House a denial of this statement made by the hon. member for St. John.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt him a moment ? The telegram which he has read from Mr. Buttimer does not deny that he fired the shot. He asks the hon. gentleman to deny it, but he does not deny it himself.

Mr. TURGEON. He signs this telegram authorizing me to make the denial in his name and that ought to be sufficient.

Mr. FOWLER. I would again call attention to the fact that the telegram does not make the denial on the part of the person accused. He asks his representative to make a denial but does not make the denial himself. He does not say it is not true. I can endorse what the gentleman says with respect to the people of Gloucester, but even the best people sometimes violate the law, and in this instance the party accused has not contradicted the charge that he violated the law.

Further amount required for a steamer to replace the 'Acadia' and one to replace the 'Petrel' on the great lakes, $285,000.

Mr. FOWLER. I just wish to call the attention of the hon. minister to a matter affecting Mr. Charles S. Horton, county of Guysborough, N.S. He complains that although he has had a license for over thirty years to use a trap-net off his property in Chedabucto bay and although last year the license was renewed the fee paid by him, subsequently the license was taken from him on the plea that a Mr. Hudson, who is employed in this House, had made application for same territory. He wrote to the minister but got no reply and then set his

trap-net and got notice to remove it. Has this matter been brought to the attention of the minister ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I shall make the necessary inquiries into it.

Mr. FOWLER. I trust the hon. minister will not allow any political proclivities to interfere, as this is not a matter in which politics should be concerned.

Further amount to assist in the establishment, maintenance and inspection of cold storage for bait for deep-sea fisheries, $25,000.

Mr. FOWLER. It would be desirable if some experiments should be made in the way of using refrigerator cars for bringing fish to the province of Ontario from the coast. I think it would be well if the government would do for the fishermen in this respect as they have done for the cheese and butter men.

Arts, agriculture and statistics, general statistics, $15,000.

Mr. FISHER. It has been suggested by the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) that certain information might be advantageously collected between censuses. This is for the purpose of collecting certain revenue statistics and statistics of crop productions which at present are not available except when the census is taken. I have not quite elaborated the whole scheme but hope to be able by means of the small staff here and through correspondence to collect statistics which will be available between the decennial censuses.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the minister expect that $15,000 a year will cover the expenses?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister keep a permanent staff ?

Mr. FISHER. I have already a permanent statistical staff in the department. I would have to add to it if I took up this extra work.

Mr. BLAIN. Does he refer to the cenus staff ?

Mr. FISHER. The census work was finished on 1st July.

Mr. BLAIN. When may we expect the other volume ?

Mr. FISHER. One is in the printer's hands and the other is all ready.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand that three volumes will cover all the work ? And when may we expect them ?

Mr. FISHER. I hope that three volumes will practically cover it. I cannot say when the Printing Bureau will finish the work, but, so far as my department is concerned, the work is finished except reading the proofs and correcting.

Mr. FOWLER.

Mr. BLAIN. The census was taken in 1901, and it is now 1904. So far one volume was issued. At that rate, we may expect the last volume out about the time when the census is taken again.

Mr. FISHER. The last volume of the census of 1891 was not issued until 1897.

Mr. FOWLER. Has the minister done anything about the matter I spoke to him about last year ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, I sent an official and had an investigation made. The result confirmed what the enumerators had done. The officers I sent down went from house to house in the parishes mentioned by the hon. member (Mr. Fowler) and also by the hon. member for Sunbury and Queen's (Mr. Wilmot)—perhaps not to every house, but to a sufficient number of houses to corroborate the returns.

Mr. FOWLER. That may be true, but it seems very remarkable. Why should these people not give their correct religious denomination, particularly when attention was called to it by this officer going around the second time ? He must have got into the wrong house.

Mr. FISHER. The officer's returns were based on affidavits. Under the Census Act I have power to appoint men to take evidence under oath and this officer was clothed with that power. The persons questioned swore that they were the persons referred to in the schedules filled out by the census officers who first called upon them and that the record in the schedules was according to answers they had given.

Mr. FOWLER. Did these people swear that they gave wrong statements as to their religious denomination ?

Mr. FISHER. No, they said the answers accorded were those they had given. When asked if they were Free Christian Baptists, some said they were but had given the other answer. Others said they had belonged to that sect, but they now belonged to another sect of Baptists. I cannot give all the details from memory. But I will be glad to show the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) the papers.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the hon. minister have them brought here.

Mr. FISHER. I will have them brought to-morrow.

Mr. BLAIN. Through what channel does the minister expect to collect the information ?

Mr. FISHER. A good deal of it by correspondence. We have the basis of the information in the census. For instance, in industrial statistics, we can inform people whose industries are entered in the census of their status at the time and ask them to

fill out a form which indicates the changes. As to the agricultural part of it, we shall have to enlist the aid of the municipal officials or others. The experience is that information will be given in return for sending the information to them, as a general rule.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. minister could get the information from the provincial government.

Mr. FISHER. The Ontario government has it for that province, and the Manitoba government has a part of it, but none of the other provincial governments have it.

Mr. BLAIN. I was speaking more particularly of Ontario. Any information gathered in Ontario between censuses should be got from the assessors.

Mr. FISHER. We will take advantage of the work of municipal officials as far as possible.

Mr. SPROULE. How many additional hands will be required ?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot state that until the work develops.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I was at the experimental farm the other day and saw a field there which was such a mixture of wheat, oats and barley that it would be impossible to get a clean sheaf of any of these grains from it. In case some farmer should come along and see it the minister had better cut it down and burn it.

Mr. FISHER. I have not been able to go to the experimental farm for the last two weeks or more. If there is such a field it must be a field of mixed grain sown for a purpose.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This is wholly out of order. It has nothing to do with the gathering of statistics, and I must call both the minister and the hon. member for North Victoria to order.

Quarantine—Public Works Health Act, $3,000. Cattle Quarantine and Veterinary Division, $50,000.

Mr. FISHER. This is in addition to the $100,000 voted for cattle quarantine. As I explained to the House the other day, there is considerable disease that is spreading amongst our cattle in the Northwest Territories. I do not want to speak too much about it. It is very important that we should stamp it out. There is also disease amongst the horses there, and I want to stamp that out too before it spreads any further.

Bounties on iron and steel ; on smelting of lead contained in lead ore ; and on manilla fibre used in the manufacture of binder twine. To cover expenditure in connection with the amendment of the Acts, $6,400.

Mr. BLAIN. With respect to manilla fibre used in the manufacture of binder twine, will the right hon. gentleman give us the amount that was paid out for this fibre last year, as a separate amount ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have not got that information by me, I will try and get it for the hon. gentleman to-morrow.

National Transcontinental Railway—surveys and other expenses, $500,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What have they done in connection with these surveys or has anything been done ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There has been nothing done in respect to the surveys. The matter is under consideration. Under the law the chief engineer has to be appointed and the surveying parties will be organized. Until the appointment of the chief engineer is made nothing can be done.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you a chief engineer ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. HAGGART. Nor have you appointed any commissioners ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Who is doing the surveying east of Winnipeg ?

Mr. FIELDING. Any that is being done is being done by the Grand Trunk Pacific. There is no doubt that the Grand Trunk Pacific were doing some, but the government has not done any in consequence of the delay in the passage of the amended legislation.

Mr. BLAIN. How much was voted for these surveys last year ?

Mr. FIELDING. The same amount.

Mr. BLAIN. How much was expended ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Nothing was expended.

Mr. BOYD. Are there not a number of survey parties out about North Bay, Lake Nipigon and east of Winnipeg ?

Mr. FIELDING. No government parties.

Mr. BOYD. Why are the Grand Trunk Pacific people doing surveying work on that section of the road with which they have nothing to do ?

Mr. FIELDING. If they are doing it they are doing it for themselves.

Mr. BOYD. What have they to do with the road east of Winnipeg ?

Mr. FIELDING. We had that question pretty fully discussed last session and also this session. The Grand Trunk Pacific people have had some surveying done out there but whatever they are doing is on their own account. If any part of that

survey should be found to be useful in connection with the National Transcontinental Railway that would be a matter of subsequent adjustment, but at the present time the government has nothing to do with it.

Mr. LENNOX. That is a peculiar kind of position to take. Last year we were told by the hon. Minister of Finance that there were surveying parties out and that steps would be immediately taken after the session to ascertain whether any of the surveys were available or not, and to put parties on behalf of the government in the field. Several months elapsed before there was any difficulty between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific. We were given to understand that the government would immediately take action and have these surveys made. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, although they have nothing to do with this part of the road, continue to keep their surveying parties in the field and the government know nothing about it. Some definite arrangement should be come to. The state of affairs will be particularly disadvantageous to the government and the country in the end and I do not think it should be allowed to continue.

Mr. SPROULE. Have the government no information to give us regarding what is being done or what is intended to be done? Or are they totally in the dark? A year and a half ago they were in such a great hurry that they could not wait an hour. Now they seem to have relapsed into a state of indifference and are either doing nothing or if they are doing anything they can give the committee no information as to what is being done.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know that I can add anything to the statement already made. I differ from my hon. friends opposite in thinking that the government were in a position to proceed with the work. The legislation which it was necessary to obtain had to be completed before we could proceed with these surveys. It is only within the last few days that this legislation has been completed. The chief engineer will be appointed and surveying parties will be put in the field. I do not think the government have been in a position to take that step up to the present time.

Mr. FOWLER. Is some of this work being done by these aliens who have been brought here?

Mr. FIELDING. If they have been working they have not been working on government surveys, at any rate.

Mr. FOWLER. They are working on the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. FIELDNG. They may have been.

Mr. FOWLER. And it is the intention, as the hon minister knows full well, that the government will pay for all surveys done east of Winnipeg by the Grand Trunk people.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman may say so.

Mr. FOWLER. That has been stated over and over again.

Mr. FIELDING. Not exactly.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the hon. gentleman deny it?

Mr. FIELDING. I deny it in the sense in which the hon. gentleman says it. I state that there is no arrangement on this subject, but if a fair and reasonable arrangement can be made and if these surveys are found to be on the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific it would be the part of wisdom that we should make use of them rather than to make new ones. There is no bargain or arrangement whatever. It is perfectly open to the government to accept these surveys or refuse them as they see fit.

Mr. FOWLER. That is all very well. It is perfectly easy to have an open understanding as to that, especially when the parties are in accord as the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government are. It is a very easy matter to give a wink and say: We cannot make any arrangement in the meantime but we will fix this all right when the time comes.

Mr. FIELDING. We do not give any winks.

Mr. FOWLER. These surveys are being made by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway on the eastern section. They are making them now. For those that they had made up to the time that the government had decided to build the eastern section of this road it would be quite reasonable that they should be paid for, but why did they not leave off then?

Mr. FIELDING. I think the hon. gentleman will have to ask the Grand Trunk Pacific people why they are continued.

Mr. FOWLER. They are continuing and they propose to continue this work. It has been done by these alien engineers and the money of the people of this country is to be paid out to give employment to a lot of American engineers while our own engineers are idle.

Mr. FIELDING. That is what the hon. gentleman states, not what I say.

Mr. FOWLER. That is what the result will be.

Mr. FIELDING. Perhaps so, but we will see.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BROCK. We have been given to understand that the Grand Trunk Company are making surveys for a road which is to be built and paid for by the government of this country. We have been told that the Grand Trunk Company have no arrangement with the government under which they are to be recouped for the expense of these surveys. I would ask the government to be very careful in dealing with men who are willing to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on a transaction of this kind, without having an agreement about it. It is not a business-like way of proceeding and there must be some ulterior motive in it. We were told at the inception of this scheme that haste was absolutely necessary, and yet for two years the government has done nothing, while it now appears the Grand Trunk Company have been going on with the survey. We are not told that they are yet approaching Moncton, and I think the member of Cumberland (Mr. Logan), who forced this extension upon the government and upon the Grand Trunk Railway Company, should be able to explain how it is that Grand Trunk surveyors and not government surveyors are surveying this line. If the thing is a failure it will be a disaster to Canada now, because we will have advertised through the world that Canada has a government of incompetents.

Mr. BARKER. We shall be able to save discussion if the Minister of Finance will give us the assurance that no part of this $500,000 for surveys shall be used to pay the Grand Trunk or any other company for doing work which has been carried on without the authority of parliament. If the Finance Minister will assure us that this money is for surveys yet to be made, we on this side of the House will be content. But, if the government wants to use what is voted for surveys in the future, to pay for surveys which the Grand Trunk have already made, then I want it distinctly understood that we shall discuss the question so long as we are able to stand here and discuss it. Neither the Grand Trunk Company nor any company has authority from parliament to make surveys. If the minister has any idea of using this money or any part of it to recompense the Grand Trunk for work they have done in the past we should know the fact. We should have a distinct statement from the Minister of Finance. He should be explicit whether or not he intends to use this money for any past work.

Mr. FIELDING. We have been very explicit in speaking on that subject in the past, and I cannot hope to make it any more explicit. I can only repeat. In the first place I am not able to give the hon. gentleman the assurance he asks for, because it would be inconsistent with every statement that has been made by the government in relation to this appropriation. We have repeatedly stated that while there was no arrangement with the Grand Trunk to recoup them, yet when we come to need our surveys and are in a position to carry on the work, if the Grand Trunk have made surveys of a portion of the line, which are suitable to our road, it would be a useless waste of money for us to make other surveys, and if we can take over some portion of the Grand Trunk surveys at a fair and reasonable price, I do not hesitate to say that that would be a very proper thing to do. There is no contract; we are perfectly free to take them over or not to take them over. If my hon. friend asks me to engage that we should in no case take over any surveys that have been made, but that in every case we should insist on making new surveys, I do not think that is a reasonable proposition. At all events, I cannot give my hon. friend the assurance.

Mr. BARKER. I think we now know precisely where the Finance Minister stands. It is perfectly clear that this vote of $500,000 is being obtained in order to recompense the Grand Trunk Railway Company for surveys which it has been making without the authority of parliament. The hon. gentleman is asking for a vote for surveys. If the government find that the surveys that have been made in the last eighteen months or two years are useful to them, they can come to parliament next session and ask authority to pay for them. We surely are not to be asked to give the Finance Minister or the Railway Minister authority to buy these plans and surveys from the Grand Trunk Company. Parliament surely has something to say on the subject. We are willing to grant to the government any reasonable sum, even $500,000, which they upon their responsibility as ministers of the Crown may see fit to expend on surveys for the purposes of this railway; but I shall be very much surprised if hon. gentlemen behind them will be found disposed to give them power to buy plans and surveys which the Grand Trunk Company has been making for its own purposes and in its own interests, and to pay for them out of this grant. That is the position. Parliament will be quite prepared to discuss the question whether the Grand Trunk ought to be paid for those surveys when that question arises. The hon. gentleman does not pretend at this moment that the Grand Trunk is going to ask for payment. The hon. gentleman does not know that those surveys were in the interest of the country. They have been made, in all probability, in the special interest of the Grand Trunk, and not in the general interests of this Dominion; and why should parliament give carte

blanche to the Finance Minister or the Railway Minister to pay for such surveys? It is not unlike the case of Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann with regard to the Yukon Railway. Parliament discussed that case after the claim was made, and voted the money. We should reserve to parliament the right to discuss the surveys made by the Grand Trunk Railway Company when the company wants payment for them; and it should not be paid by the government until parliament has considered the subject, and has decided that the surveys are in the interest of the country and that we ought to pay for them. It is perfectly plain that what the hon. Finance Minister wants is to get power to pay for the surveys without the approval of parliament—to use this vote, which on the face of it is not a vote for work already done, but for work yet to be done, to pay for the Grand Trunk.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not wish to deprive my hon. friend of the glorious privilege of discussing this till to-morrow morning if he wishes. I have only to say that the explanations given of this item now are precisely the same as those that were given last session; they do not differ a hair's breadth. My hon. friend comes forward now for the first time with the suggestion that if the Grand Trunk surveys are to be purchased, they should be made the subject of a special appropriation. I do not know what view might have been taken of that suggestion if it had been made last session or earlier in the present session. I can only say that at this stage of the session I have no authority from my colleagues to deal with the new proposition which my hon. friend has advanced. I never heard the suggestion before, although this matter has been discussed a dozen times.

Mr. BARKER. I do not know what authority the hon. gentleman has. He is asking for authority to expend $500,000 for surveys yet to be made; and there is nothing on the face of these estimates to show that His Excellency, in approving of them, has ever had brought to his attention the fact that it is not for surveys to be made that this money is to be used, but to pay for surveys already done. That is not the estimate.

Mr. FIELDING. If it is not within the terms of the estimate, it cannot be done.

Mr. BARKER. I think we must know from the hon. gentleman that he agrees with us in that respect.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not.

Mr. BARKER. I know the hon. gentleman does not. I know that he intends to use the money contrary to what on the face of the vote appears to be the intention. This, I repeat, is a vote for surveys to be made. The hon. gentleman will not say that it is not to be used for another purpose. I say that before we grant this, we must know from the hon. gentleman that it is to be used only for the purpose for which it professes to be.

Mr. SPROULE. What do you mean by other expenses?

Mr. FIELDING. It would include any expenses in connection with the commission—the salaries of the commisisoners and the office staff, and anything else in connection with the Transcontinental Railway.

Mr. SPROULE. Then this is to pay the salaries of the commissioners as well?

Mr. FIELDING. My recollection is that they are not provided for in the statute, and in that case this would pay their salaries.

Mr. LENNOX. I am sorry the hon. Minister of Finance has taken such a decided position as he has just announced. We have generally found him pretty reasonable in the way of accommodating himself to the views of the opposition, but he is hardly bearing out his usual course to-night. I may say that this is a revote, and last year the minister explained to us the position of the matter. He pointed out that there were then some surveyors of the railway company in the field, and stated that so far as their surveys could be reasonably made available for the purposes of the railway, they would be taken over, and reasonable compensation would be allowed. No one, so far as I know, objected to that position at that time. But it is somewhat different when another year has elapsed and the same state of things has been allowed to continue. Up to that time the railway company was acting on the assumption that it would probably build the line itself. At all events, the government had not committed itself to the scheme of building the railway from Winnipeg to Moncton. From the time we passed the legislation of last year, it became definitely known that any surveys the company were making were being made on the government end of the line. Now the minister comes and asks for a revote and that revote must remain upon the same terms as the vote of last year. Without anything being said by the minister or any question asked by this House, it must be taken that the revote would be exactly on the same basis as last year. Last year it was explained that the government proposed utilizing the money to immediately put surveyors in the field and it was anticipated that the expense would amount to about $450,000, as stated by the Minister of Finance, If that be the theory upon which we voted last year, there is nothing in the circumstances since which would justify the administration in using that money for the

purpose of paying the Grand Trunk Railway for any surveys they may have made. I therefore submit that the amount which the company claims for surveys should first be ascertained and then parliament should have the right to vote whether we should pay that money or not.

Mr. FIELDING. Our position is that we have not hitherto had the opportunity of proceeding with the construction of this road. We passed an Act last session designed to accomplish that purpose, and we expected that at an early day we would be able to proceed with the work. Difficulties arose, and we concluded it was not wise to proceed with the undertaking until we had come to a further agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific which would have to be followed by legislation. That is an explanation and a reasonable one, of the delay. I agree that the general lines on which the vote was obtained last year must stand with us to-day, but it would not be reasonable to say that in no case should we pay the Grand Trunk Railway for their surveys. I do not know what surveys they have done or whether they have made any surveys on this particular line. Surely in the absence of the amended legislation, which we believed necessary for the carrying on of this undertaking, it was the part of wisdom that we should not proceed until we could know really where we were standing. If, after the differences which arose between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific, we had come forward and said that we had spent $300,000 or $400,000 on the work and then failed to come to an understanding with the Grand Trunk Pacific and the whole thing came to an end, hon. gentlemen opposite would properly say that when we became aware of the differences, it would have been the part of common sense not to spend anything until we had completed the legislation.

Mr. BARKER. We were urged to make the surveys before you had committed yourselves to anything.

Mr. FIELDING. We obtained legislation on the undertaking that the money would be spent through a board of commissioners. Until that board was appointed, we would not have been justified in proceeding with the work. That is the explanation of the delay. The hon. member for Hamilton has proposed for the first time that we should take a special vote for the Grand Trunk Railway surveys when we ascertain what amount is to be paid. If that suggestion had been made earlier, I am not prepared to say what might have been done, but I have not had an opportunity of consulting my colleagues and consequently am not now in a position to accept.

Mr. SPROULE. It is very indefinite to vote an amount for survey and then take a considerable portion of that for the commission.

Mr. FIELDING. Not a large sum.

Mr. SPROULE. If you have three commissioners and the personnel of the office, that will take quite a respectable sum. I understand that this is to be spent through the commissioners and not through the government.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I was going to suggest that there would be no great hardship on the Grand Trunk Railway, since they have made the surveys themselves, to allow them to keep that account in abeyance until next session.

Mr. FIELDING. It is quite possible we might take that view.

Mr. SPROULE. One object for which we gave this vote before was that we desired the government should make explanatory surveys. We said, we are willing to give you the money to go on and make your surveys and let us know what we have before us rather than commit ourselves to the enterprise with the imperfect knowledge we have. The idea was that the government might go on at once with the survey and in another session the information would be conveyed to parliament, so that if we had to deal with the question again, we could deal with it intelligently. If it is desirable to make these surveys to get the information and if this money is to be expended by the government themselves, through their own engineers, there would be no objection from this side, and what might be required to pay the board of commissioners and the Grand Trunk Railway might be held over next year.

Mr. FIELDING. There may be much force in the hon. gentleman's argument. It is quite possible that if the Grand Trunk Railway claim compensation for these surveys, the government might take that view and decline to pay it, but I am not in a position to agree to that suggestion to-night. It is quite possible the government might say we prefer to take an appropriation from parliament, but as the question is now raised for the first time, I cannot give that guaranty.

Mr. SPROULE. Could you not hold it over for consultation with your colleagues ?

Mr. FIELDING. Not at this stage of the session.

Mr. BROCK. Does the minister not see that if the government hold this in abeyance and refuse to pay on the ground that the money is not voted, they will be in a better position to deal with a company which has not been found hitherto always reliable ? That company concluded an agree-

ment with the government and did not live up to it. It is not the fault of the government if that company are in the position in which they are to-day because the government were willing to give away almost everything, but in consequence of the action of the Grand Trunk Railway we are in a different position from that in which we were last year. Last year we voted this money under the impression that the contract was sealed and signed and had to be carried out. The Grand Trunk Railway backed out of that position, and you may depend upon it that having failed to live up to their agreement, if we should vote this money now to pay them, they will use that fact and compel the government to accede to their demands. But they would be much more likely to make reasonable terms if the government were in a position to say that the money was not voted. In that case the government would be in a much better position should the company demand too much.

I do not think it absolutely necessary to vote it. The hon. minister probably will not require to use it for a year. A year and a half or two years has passed since this was first introduced, and we have made no advance. It may not be many months before there will be another session, and by that time the minister may be in a better position to deal according to the interest of the country with this Grand Trunk Company.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. minister, on two or three occasions this evening, has said that this question has been raised for the first time. Last year the hon. gentleman did not suggest that the vote of $500,000 or any part of it was to be used to pay the Grand Trunk for work that they had done on surveys. It is true that when the question was asked whether the Grand Trunk were making surveys and at whose expense, he said that they were making surveys and that, no doubt, if the government found these surveys useful to the country, they would pay the company for them. But there was no pretense that the vote of $500,000 granted to the government was to be used for that purpose. The hon. gentleman was only telling us that we might be asked to pay for the Grand Trunk surveys, not that we were granting the money to pay for them. Now, what we are willing to do is to grant the minister any money that the government may wish for the purpose of surveys for this railway to be made by the government. That is what we wanted long ago. We believe that if the government had their Transcontinental Railway Bill, that Bill would have been a very different one. We complained that they were going it blind, that they did not take the trouble that business men would have taken to make a survey before they committed themselves to the route. We never sought to interfere with government surveys. Quite the contrary; we have been urging the government to make surveys. But it is a very different thing when the hon. gentleman, in askng a vote of this kind, plainly shows that what he wants is power to pay the Grand Trunk for surveys that that company has been making, not necessarily in the interest of the country but solely in its own interests. We all know—nobody can doubt—that the interests of the railway company may be to find a route quite different from that which would serve the purposes of the transcontinental railway contemplated by the government. The Grand Trunk, I think most people will be ready to believe, have interests very much opposed to what the government propose in the Transcontinental Bill. The government want a line up by Lake Abitibi. The Grand Trunk do not want a line there at all, but a very different line. And the hon. minister wants power to take from this $500,000 to pay the Grand Trunk for its surveys without submitting the question to parliament. We do not say it may not be equitable to pay the Grand Trunk, but we want to know what the facts are before we pay. And we on this side do not feel disposed to give the government a free hand to pay the Grand Trunk whatever they may see fit to pay them. We do not propose—willingly, at all events—to leave that in the hands of the Minister of Finance, or any other minister, or all the ministers. We say that is a question for parliament to decide. For that reason, and not because we are objecting to the course the Grand Trunk have pursued, we say that this money we are now granting for surveys should be used by the government in making surveys, and should not be misappropriated to any other purpose.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) has made a suggestion which, if such a thing could happen, would justify his criticism. But it does not happen. He suggested that the Grand Trunk Pacific people will want to locate this line, under the advice of their engineer, at places that would not be in the interests of the government——

Mr. BARKER. May not be.

Mr. FIELDING. Let me say to my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) that this line will be located by the commissioners under the advice of the chief engineer. He has not yet been appointed, but hon. gentlemen opposite may be sure that he will be a man of eminence in his profession. He will advise the commissioners, and through them the government, as to what is a fair and proper location of the road. If the chief engineer reports that the surveys of the Grand Trunk are not useful to us for the road we want and where we want it, they will not be paid for.

Railways and canals—chargeable to revenue —Rideau canal—repairs to dam at Poonamalie lock station, $2,500.

Mr. HAGGART. As the minister is aware there are a lot of claims against the department for the breaking away of that dam. Will he please explain whether he intends to pay these claims or how he intends to consider them.

Mr. EMMERSON. I referred the whole matter to the Department of Justice as to whether the department was responsible. If the department has been negligent with respect to this dam, of course they are liable; if they have not been, then of course these people have no claim.

Mr. HAGGART. You give them in every case a fiat.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. It would seem from the report of the hon. gentleman's engineer that these parties have a good claim. The dam which broke away was built about seventy-seven years ago by the Royal Engineers, a wooden dam. It was repaired in 1899, a top was made on it which raised the water in the Rideau lakes. Then the engineer stated that the dam when it was repaired in 1899 was only good for two or three years more.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a question of law as to whether the department has exercised proper care.

Mr. HAGGART. Here is a dam built seventy-seven years ago at the bottom of a lake twenty miles long, and in some places four or five miles wide. The dam is only six feet high

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a question whether the department is required to keep up the dam at all.

Mr. HAGGART. It was carried away by the ice this spring, and a lot of damage accrued to the parties below, to the extent of several thousand dollars. No doubt it was caused by the dam breaking away. The minister has referred the matter to the Department of Justice on an ex parte statement by the officer who was in charge of the canal, Mr. Phillips, the superintending engineer, and in his report to the chief engineer he gives away the whole case. He says that the old wooden dam was seventy-seven years old, partially repaired in 1899, and that these repairs would make the dam good for two or three years. Last winter it breaks away and causes considerable damage, and the department refuses to recompense the parties injured. But as I understand the minister has consented to a fiat being issued on behalf of these parties.

Mr. EMMERSON. So as to settle the question of negligence.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand that the item for the Galops Rapids Canal was held over so that the minister might give some explanation.

Mr. EMMERSON. That went through, and I furnished the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) copies of the contracts.

Mr. HAGGART. We had the other night a distinct understanding that the two items of the Galops Rapids would stand. I wanted to discuss the Galops Rapids contract.

Mr. HYMAN. The understanding was that one item was to stand and that both could be discussed.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think by later arrangement both items were passed.

Mr. BLAIN. I differ with the minister.

Mr. EMMERSON. However, I have no objection to discussing them.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose we can discuss this item of the Galops Rapids on this item, which is before the House. I wanted some information on the subject. Will the minister be kind enough to tell us the amount expended in each year since 1896. The contract was finished in 1896, and in 1897 a new contract was entered into with the Gilbert Bros., and the latter contract does not specify at all what they are to do.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It must be understood that this discussion is taking place under the Rideau canal item, which item has just been passed. It will therefore be necessary to make a motion to reconsider the Rideau canal item. We will assume that the item is reopened.

Mr. EMMERSON moved:

That item No. 77 be reconsidered.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is the Galops Rapids.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The Galops canal has been passed and the report has been sent back to the House. Now we are going to discuss it in this way so as to have the resolution before the committee.

Mr. EMMERSON. That item has gone through. I am perfectly willing to give my hon. friend the information, but I will give it to him in the morning.

Mr. HAGGART. I have the contract here. I just want to know the amounts paid.

Mr. EMMERSON. The total expenditure up to the 30th June, 1902, was $878,441.85.

Mr. HAGGART. How much was paid up to 1896, when the contract was terminated?

Mr. EMMERSON. I only have the total up to 1902. There was nothing paid in 1903

or 1904. The total amount of progress estimates up to the 30th June, 1904, was $275,323. We have in the main estimates for 1904-5, $40,000, and in the supplementary estimates for 1904-5, $28,000.

Mr. HAGGART. That is $68,000 altogether.

Mr. EMMERSON. $68,000 for the present year.

Mr. HAGGART. There was nothing paid in 1903 ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. BRODER. I would like to know whether it is the intention of the government to lengthen the lock at Morrisburg to 800 feet and make it the same as the Iroquois one. A good deal of interest is taken in reference to it. It is supposed to be necessary and it would be a great convenience to navigation. There has been a good deal of pressure for some years to get the government to extend the flume from the canal on the eastward and I would like to know if it is the intention of the government to deal with these matters.

Mr. EMMERSON. That particular question has not been brought under my notice. It has not been presented to me as a necessity. Of course the matter will be taken into consideration.

Mr. HAGGART. As we are going to discuss this matter to-morrow, I will put the questions which I want answered. I want the amount expended on this Galops Rapids up to 1896 when the contract terminated. There was a new contract entered into in 1897. The contract with the Gilbert Bros. Engineering Company does not specify any work to be done at all except this :

And whereas Her Majesty, represented by the Minister of Railways and Canals, desires to have made a satisfactory test and survey of the bottom of the said channel, and at the same time to be prepared for the removal of any material which may be discoverd above such original or contract grade, and further in view of the apparent permanent lowering of the water surface of the River St. Lawrence in said channel that provision be made for the execution of such additional work as may be considered advisable.

The work is not mentioned at all in the contract. I want to know what work the government authorized them to do.

Mr. EMMERSON. That was the sweeping out and the clearing of the channel.

Mr. HAGGART (reading) :

And whereas the said E. Gilbert & Sons, did by letter, dated the 22nd day of October, 1892, offer to supply all the necessary plant, &c.

You paid $1,000 to put one of the scows in order and—

Mr. EMMERSON.

On the conditions that the government pay for the services of said plant the sum of four hundred and twenty-five dollars per day of twelve hours ; time to commence when the plant is in position as designated by the engineer in charge.

This plant is solely used for the purpose of removing gravel above the prism which was excavated by Mr. Gilbert and for which he was paid in full.

And also on the further condition that any rock found in situ above the original contract grade line shall be removed by the said Gilbert Bros. Engineering Company, Limited, at their own expense.

And also on the further condition that if it should be required to still further improve the channel by deepening and widening that they the said company will perform such work of drilling, blasting and dredging as may be ordered, for the sum of $8.40 per cubic yard for rock necessarily excavated.

I want to know the number of days that this plant was employed at $425 a day, since 1897, the beginning of the contract, and the orders the hon. minister has given for the removal of the material and how much has been paid for that.

Mr. EMMERSON. I assume that the hon gentleman is perfectly willing that the item shall be taken at this moment and passed. For the purpose of expediting the business of the House I will give him the particulars of the whole expenditure in the morning.

Mr. HAGGART. It is for the purpose of having it on 'Hansard.'

Mr. EMMERSON. I will furnish it in the morning and make reference to it so that my hon. friend will have it on 'Hansard.'

Mr. HAGGART. What opportunity will we have in the morning of discussing this matter ?

Mr. EMMERSON. In the morning.

Mr. HAGGART. The first item. That is all right.

Inland Revenue—to provide for one second-class clerk, R. A. Wiallard, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $1,200.

Mr. HAGGART. When did Mr. Wiallard come into the service ?

Mr. BRODEUR. He came in when I was appointed Minister of Inland Revenue.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought you could take a man in the service and pay him $600 for private secretary.

Mr. BRODEUR. The private secretary of the former minister did not stay in the service and I had to replace him.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you more than one private secretary ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have only one who knows shorthand and typewriting.

Mr. SPROULE. What position does the other occupy ?

Mr. BRODEUR. They are doing departmental work and attending to my private correspondence ; the other gentleman is a second-class clerk or a junior second class.

Mr. SPROULE. I am told that some of the ministers have each two private secretaries. Formerly one secretary was enough for a minister but in these days of expansion you have become either luxuriant or extravagant. I am told that some of these private secretaries are doing a good deal of political work.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is not the case. These gentlemen are simply doing my private correspondence.

Mr. SPROULE. Could you not find one who would combine the qualifications of a shorthand writer and typewriter ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is extremely difficult to get stenographer in both French and English. I have been several months without being able to obtain one, and I had to pay out of my own pocket for some time.

Mr. SPROULE. I can understand how that might be the case.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have a good deal of correspondence in French and English and I require a secretary who knows both languages.

The Senate—salaries and contingencies, $75,576.

Mr. HAGGART. Are these items passed by the Committee of Internal Economy of the House ?

Mr. FIELDING. Of the Senate.

Mr. HAGGART. You have no supervision over them at all ?

Mr. FIELDING. Well, I am afraid not ; we have supervision over all money matters but I do not know how it can be exercised in that case.

House of Commons—salaries, $72,700.

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase of $1,450 here, and it seems to me last year that there was also an increase. How many employees have we in the House of Commons ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The Board of Internal Economy in the month of October, 1903, adopted a resolution the effect of which was to place the officers of the House on the same footing as officers of the Civil Service. The clerk of the House was requested to prepare a report fixing the grades and the salaries of the officers of the House in a permanent manner. At a meeting of the commission held during this session, the report of the clerk was submitted to the board and the salaries and duties of the officers were determined, both for the present and the future, with a view of avoiding the yearly demands which have hitherto been made by officers of the House for increases of their salaries. The increases will now go on automatically in the same way as those of officers under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the Speaker give us the names of the different employees, with a statement of their present salaries and their salaries three years ago ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot say what they were three years ago, but I can give the present salaries and the salaries of last year. There are four branches of the House of Commons staff. There is the branch called more properly the officers of the House, the chief branch, the law and translation branch, and the miscellaneous branch. The officers of the House are :—

Name.	Class.	Salary, 1903-4.	Proposed salary, 1904-5.
Officers of the House		$	$
T. B. Flint, M.A., D.C.L., L.L.	The clerk	3,400 00	3,500 00
H. R. Smith	Sergeant-at-Arms	2,400 00	2,500 00
J. B. R. Laplante	Ass. clerk	2,400 00	2,800 00
H. W. Bowie	Dy. Sergt.-at-Arms and 2nd cl. clerk	1,400 00	1,700 00
Chief Branch.			
W. C. Bowles	Chief clerk	2,400 00	2,500 00
J. R. E. Chapleau	"	2,400 00	2,500 00
A. G. D. Taylor	"	2,400 00	2,450 00
E. P. Hartney	"	2,200 00	2,350 00
J. Dalton	1st class	1,800 00	1,850 00
Walter Todd	"	1,800 00	1,900 00
L. C. Panet	"	1,650 00	1,700 00
R. P. King	"	1,600 00	1,700 00
N. Robidoux	"	1,500 00	1,550 00
J. A. Polkinghorne	"	1,700 00	1,750 00
C. F. Colwell	"	1,500 00	1,700 00
H. P. Macdonell	2nd class	1,400 00	1,450 00
L. T. Polette	"	1,100 00	1,100 00
L. Dansereau	"	1,100 00	1,200 00
J. H. McLeod	"	1,100 00	1,250 00
C. H. Jones	Jr. 2nd cl.	950 00	1,050 00

Law and Translation Branch.

F. A. McCord, law clerk	$3,200	$3,300
A. H. O'Brien, chief clerk and assistant law clerk	2,150	2,300
T. G. Coursolles, chief clerk	2,400	*
A. Fréchette "	1,800	2,200
L. Laframboise, 1st class	1,800	2,150
D. L. Desaulniers "	1,800	2,000
E. Quéry, 2nd class	1,400	1,500
E. Perrin "	1,400	1,500
H. H. Loucks "	1,400	1,450
Rémi Tremblay, 2nd class	1,400	1,500
J. K. Foran "	1,250	1,350
Sylvia Clapin "	1,100	1,200
N. Tessier "		1,200

Miscellaneous Branch.

D. C. Chamberlain, accountant	$2,400	$2,450
C. E. Clarke, chief clerk	2,150	2,200
D. W. Cameron, 1st class	1,400	1,500
N. Mills "	1,400	1,700
W. Dubé, 2nd class	1,150	1,250
L. B. Scott "	1,200	1,250
W. Cairns "	1,100	1,200
F. X. Lemieux "	1,100	1,200
T. S. Howe "	1,100	1,200
J. L. Deacon, junior 2nd class	950	1,050

* Superannuated.

Mr. MORIN. I do not see why the government treat Mr. Laplante in the way they do. We all know that he sits here every day from the time the session opens until it closes; and yet you have increased the salaries of others from $200 to $400 a year.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will pardon me. Mr. Laplante's salary was $2,500 until this session, and it is now put up to $2,800.

Mr. MORIN. I spoke about that last year.

Some hon. MEMBERS. That is why we did it.

Mr. MORIN. You raised his salary, but you still owe him several thousand dollars. The man who occupied that place before him had $2,800 a year, and you appointed this gentleman at $2,000. Now, you only give him a part of what belongs to him, and you still owe him.

Mr. HAGGART. Has the sergeant-at-arms not been behaving himself? I see that he has only got an increase of $50 a year, while the assistant sergeant has had an increase of $300. It must be encouraging to the sergeant.

Mr. SPEAKER. The salary of the sergeant-at-arms, under the new rule, is fixed at $2,500. His salary is now within $50 of the maximum. The matter is now before the Internal Economy Commission, however, and I have no doubt that his salary will be put up to the maximum.

Mr. SPROULE. What we would like is to get some intelligent idea of what increases these several officers have received during the last few years, so that we can judge whether their salaries have been increased gradually or by a sudden jump. It seems to me there is a good deal of inequality about them. We should know what salaries these various officers receive and what increases they have been given.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that the increases have been at the rate of about $50 a year. To meet the very objection made by the hon. gentleman, the Commission of Internal Economy last year had the clerk of the House go into the matter fully and the commission adopted a rule by which all these clerks will have their salaries increased automatically by $50 a year, the same as other civil servants. The commission fixed the minimum and maximum salaries of these officers, so that by annual increment, each will come to the maximum of his class.

Mr. SPROULE. Then how do you manage to increase one $400 and another $500 in two years and another only $50 or $100?

Mr. SPEAKER. Take the case of the assistant clerk. When his predecessor, Mr. Rouleau, was retired, he was getting $2,800. When the present clerk was appointed, it was understood that in time he would reach that amount. His salary for the first year was $2,000 and it was gradually increased until last year it reached $2,500. It was thought by the commission that as he is doing at least as good service as his predecessor, he should get the $2,800 and we gave it to him. His successor will come in at $2,000 and get an annual increase of $50 a year.

Mr. SPROULE. We ought to have a statement showing the length of service and the increases during say the last three years.

Mr. BRODEUR. During the last three years when I was Speaker, we always gave an increase of $50 to those who had not reached the maximum of their class. In two or three instances, we gave an increase of $100. When I became Speaker we were spending $70,000 for these salaries, and when I left the aggregate was about the same.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not see how that can be when one man gets $500 increase, another $100, another $150, another $200 and some $300. We do not know how the salaries are going at all and cannot get any definite information. From time to time it accidentally comes to our knowledge that one man is increased $50, another $200 and another $300, which indicates favoritism.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would Mr. Speaker give a list of those who have been increased $300, those who have been increased $250 and $200 and $150?

Mr. SPEAKER. The clerk assistant, and Mr. Fréchette, chief translator are the only ones who got an increase of $300. Mr. Fréchette is now getting $200 a year less than his predecessor.

Mr. FOWLER. Has there been a general raise all around?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Has anything been done for the official reporters?

Mr. SPEAKER. Not yet.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it the intention to do anything?

Mr. SPEAKER. The official reporters up to the present have been under the jurisdiction of the Debates Committee.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Not in the matter of salaries.

Mr. SPEAKER. Their salary was fixed by the Debates Committee in 1880 and has remained the same ever since. Within the last week the committee reported asking that the Internal Economy Commission consider the matter of their salaries and that is a question for the commission to consider.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Will the hon. gentleman give those who have got an increase of $250 ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Mr. Laframboise got an increase of $250. He is a translator. Mr. Desaulniers got $200. Mr. Bowie, the deputy sergeant-at-arms got $250. The sergeant-at-arms is within $50 of his maximum.

Mr. BRODER. You might be on the river's brink and die of thirst.

Mr. SPROULE. What increase has he got in the last three years ?

Mr. SPEAKER. $50.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Who got $150 ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is his salary now ?

Mr. SPEAKER. For the next fiscal year it will be $2,300. Mr. Mills, the postmaster, gets an increase of $200, making his salary $1,700.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What do the assistants in the post office get ?

Mr. SPEAKER. They are sessional clerks who are paid a per diem allowance, except the assistant postmaster.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Who is he ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Mr. Lemieux.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Are there any that get an increase of $100 ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Mr. Cairns gets $100, making his salary $1,200 ; and Mr. Cameron gets the same increase, making his salary $1,500, and so does Mr. Foran, whose salary is thus made $1,350, and Mr. Tremblay. Mr. Colwell also gets $150.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is his salary now ?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is $1,700.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And what is the salary of the assistant ?

Mr. SPEAKER. That is Mr. Macdonell. His salary is $1,450.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Mr. Colwell is the chief and Mr Macdonell is the assistant. Was not Mr. Macdonell there before Mr. Colwell ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes ; but I understand that Mr. Colwell was appointed to the office which was vacated by the superannuation of Mr. McGillvray.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Did Mr. Macdonell get his regular statutory increase this year ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes ; everybody got it. The hon. gentleman expressed a doubt as to their being a decrease in the figures. As a matter of fact, there is a decrease of $2,150 in the salaries of the staff.

Mr. SPROULE. In some items there is a decrease. Will Mr. Speaker give us the number of employees of the House ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I make the total of the list before me to be 44.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That does include the sessional clerks ?

Mr. SPEAKER. No.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How many sessional clerks are there ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Thirty, including the whips' clerks.

Mr. SPROULE. Has Mr. Speaker gone over all the House of Commons salaries ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes ; all the permanent staff.

Mr. SPROULE. How many are temporary employees ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The temporary employees include the sessional clerks, messengers, pages, charwomen and servants.

Mr. SPROULE. How much do the sessional clerks receive ?

Mr. SPEAKER. They receive $3, $3.50 or $4, according to the work they do.

Mr. SPROULE. How is their pay graded?

Mr. SPEAKER. Those employed in the post office get $4. Those who are typewriters and stenographers get $4. Those who are typewriters get $3.50. And copyists get $3.

Mr. SPROULE. How many sessional messengers are there ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Fifty.

Mr. SPROULE. And how many pages ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Sixteen.

Mr. SPROULE. What are their salaries ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The pages were in receipt of $1.50 a day, but for this session they are paid $1.75.

Mr. CLANCY. Has there been an increase in the per diem allowance of the charwomen ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Not yet.

Mr. CLANCY. I fancy that these are a class of women very much dependent. Many of them are widows, I suppose, and with

families to take care of. Why should there be an increase made elsewhere and not here?

Mr. SPEAKER. There was a difficulty about that. But I may say I quite agree with the hon. member (Mr. Clancy). The hon. member is right also in assuming that these women are widows. So far as I have had anything to do with the matter, I have made it a rule to recommend only widows for these places. There are a certain number of charwomen in the departments who receive 75 cents a day, while others receive only 50 cents a day. The whole matter has been under consideration by the Minister of Finance, and I think he has concluded to increase the salaries of the charwomen all round, and make it 75 cents a day in all the departments. If that is done, there will be a corresponding increase for the charwomen of the House of Commons.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the Speaker any record of the work done by the sessional clerks? I have heard they are not always overworked.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have no returns of that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I was going to suggest that the leader of the opposition should have one of these sessional clerks at his disposal for his sessional work. I would ask Mr. Speaker to see to that next session, but I trust that by that time the present leader of the opposition will occupy the position of Prime Minister. On his behalf I venture to promise that the leader of the opposition on this side will be given an extra room, and the services of a sessional clerk will be placed at his disposal.

Mr. SPROULE. What wages do the sessional messengers get?

Mr. SPEAKER. $2.75 a day. They were getting $2.50 until this year. We have increased their wages this year to $2.75 per day. Then there are two night watchmen who are employed permanently by the year, their salaries are $700. Then there are six or seven servants whose wages are about the same as the messengers, some get $2 and some $2.50. I think one gets $2.75. They get the same increase as the sessional messengers.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems that the poor charwomen are the only ones left out in the cold.

Mr. SPEAKER. No, they are being increased as all the rest of the service.

Mr. MORIN. I hope the Minister of Finance will look after them.

Mr. FIELDING. Although my own item is not under consideration, I may make a statement here. The charwomen by some curious arrangement which I am not able to understand, come under the direction of the Minister of Finance. I found when we came into office a number of these women were getting 75 cents per day and others 50 cents per day. It appears that some years ago an arrangement was made to reduce the rate from 75 cents to 50 cents, but those who were receiving 75 cents were allowed to continue at the old rate, and the new rate was made to apply to those who might thereafter be appointed. The effect of that is that at present a large number of those women are receiving 75 cents per day, while about an equal number are getting 50 cents for precisely the same work. There is an apparent inequality, and in view of the fact that increases have been granted in almost all directions, I have decided to ask the House to grant an appropriation for the charwomen so that they may all receive hereafter 75 cents per day.

Mr. MORIN. That is right.

Mr. BRODER. Will that apply this session?

Mr. FIELDING. That will not apply to the House of Commons. But I have no doubt the Internal Economy Committee who deal with the House of Commons will probably take up that matter. But the appropriation to which I refer does not touch the House of Commons.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think I have got exactly yet the number of employees around the House of Commons in various branches. Will the minister tell us whether the aggregate is larger now than it was three or four years ago, or what increase there has been in the number?

Mr. SPEAKER. I can give some instances. I have not made any totals, but I can say that the aggregate of the different branches show but a slight increase. I will give my hon. friend some figures:

Year.	Sessional Messengers.	Servants.	Pages.
1892	45	4	19
1895	47	4	18
1896	46	4	17
1900	52	6	15
1901	50	6	15
1902	49	7	17
1903	50	7	16
1904	56	7	17

Mr. SPROULE. In some lines you have an increase of nearly 50 per cent during the last two years.

Mr. SPEAKER. No, there has been an actual decrease in some branches of the service. Of pages, while there were nineteen in 1892, in 1904 there were seventeen only. In 1892 there were four servants and in 1904 there were six.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not know whether they would come under the item, but I would like to mention the messengers in the Library.

Mr. SPEAKER. They are not under the Speaker.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that there was some committee of the Internal Economy Commission who made a report on the matter of salaries last year or the year before. I understood the Speaker to say that this was taken up, and all the salaries were rearranged on a new basis, and in future they would go up automatically until they reached the maximum. Who composed that committee ?

Mr. SPEAKER (reading) :

At a meeting of the Board of Internal Economy, 28th April, 1904.

Present : Mr. Speaker, Sir Richard Cartwright, Mr. Fielding and Mr. Sutherland.

The following resolutions were adopted unanimously :—

1. Resolved, that the salaries of the officers on the staff of the House of Commons be increased upon the same basis as to maximum and minimum salaries first provided for by this civil service generally under the Act amending the Civil Service Act just passed. In order to carry out that resolution the Speaker will prepare, with the aid of the clerk of the House of Commons, a series of resolutions and schedules determining—

(a.) The different branches of the service.

(b.) Grade, present salaries, the salaries under the new law, the grade of the future appointments, and the maximum salaries of the future officers, and the minimum salaries of the future officers.

That said resolutions and schedules be submitted as soon as possible to the members of the board for approval, and the same be laid before the House of Commons next session as a report of the board for the concurrence of the House.

Then follows the list of the officers with their present salary and the salary of their successors, the minimum and maximum in both cases, with a statement of the duties they perform.

Mr. CLANCY. Coming back to the question of making restitution to those who are denied their statutory increases, I have been looking at the question of the sergeant-at-arms. I see that he had a salary of $2,400 in 1897. It appears that there has been no statutory increase from 1897 up to the present year. You, Mr. Speaker, say that the maximum is $2,500 a year. If he had received the statutory increases which he was entitled he would in 1899 have reached the maximum. It will be seen that there is some discrimination between the increases that are given to the others and these which are given to the sergeant-at-arms. Perhaps you will be able to explain why this is the case. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the clerk assistant had been given an advance partly on the ground that he had not received any statutory increase and partly because his predecessor had received $2,800 a year and it was thought the services that he is performing now are quite as good as the services performed by Mr. Rouleau. That is not at all, perhaps, unreasonable, but what seems to be a strange thing is that the officials of the House are not dealt with in accordance with some uniform rule by which men get even justice. Here is the sergeant-at-arms ; he was entitled to have reached the maximum in 1899 and now receives $50 of an increase. I am in this, pointing out the injustice that has been done to the civil service. Hon. gentlemen opposite cried out in every back school-house in Canada, at least in Ontario, against the sums that were paid to the civil service. I am not here as an advocate of the salaries of the civil servants. I think first that we must have a good service and to have a good service it must be reasonably well paid for. I think that there are many in the service who ought not to be there, but an efficient officer must be reasonably well paid. If we have a good service we must pay for it and we cannot afford to take any other ground. Hon. gentlemen came into power, and weak in office as they were in opposition, they found themselves confronted with the expenditures which they had criticised in the country. They withheld the statutory increases and now they have come down and made partial restitution. That is not creditable to the government. It shows a deplorable weakness, first to have taken the course they did in the country. I believe that under our system it is a very difficult thing not to made appointments that should not be made. I do not know whether we will ever come to a time when we shall sufficiently profit by experience and when any government will have that complete courage to do what they ought to do in a matter of that kind, but hon. gentlemen opposite were not at all content with making appointments that should never have been made, but it was made a campaign cry in the country that men went to their offices at nine and ten in the morning, that they closed them at five in the afternoon and that they were paid immense salaries. I say again that I am not here to advocate the cause of the civil service ; it is not my business, but it is my business in my humble way as it is everybody's to state the truth. However it does seem to me that there has been a very extraordinary inconsistency in regard to the way that the civil service has been dealt with in regard to statutory increases. I am not now saying whether officers of the civil service are overpaid or underpaid. That is a matter entirely aside from what I have to say and I think there ought to be some explanation of these inconsistencies. I think, no matter what party is in power, that we

should forget what the former leanings were of those in the service. I should hope that every man in the service would be faithful and loyal to his chief and to those who are over them. and the best way to secure loyal service is for those in superior positions to treat fairly the men who are under them. I am speaking now of the sergeant-at-arms ; I am not saying whether he is paid too much or too little, but I do not understand upon what principle these salaries have been dealt with.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman's remarks have been of a general character. He speaks of inconsistencies generally, while the only inconsistency he has given has been that in regard to the sergeant-at-arms.

Mr. CLANCY. I simply took up that case for the purpose of saving time.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman bases an argument upon that. but when I state the facts in connection with the sergeant-at-arms, I think he will agree that there is no inconsistency. The last classification of the officers of the House was made in 1885. At that time the salary of the sergeant-at-arms was fixed at $2,400. The present government thought that the salary ought to be increased to $2,500.

Mr. CLANCY. When was that ?

Mr. SPEAKER. That is what was done by virtue of the resolution which I have just read. The hon. gentleman will remember that besides his salary the sergeant-at-arms has apartments in the House of Commons. He is provided with apartments and that includes light, heating and one or two servants who are paid by the House.

Mr. CLANCY. Are there not some others as well ?

Mr. SPEAKER. There is the housekeeper. These rooms and the incidentals connected therewith, I am sure must be worth $400 or $500, so that his salary would be equivalent to $3,000 putting a very moderate estimate on the apartments.

Mr. SPROULE. The main object is to find whether there have been many increases in the expenses of late years, and if so, to what extent. I understood Mr. Speaker to say that there had not been many increases. I have the estimates of 1900.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must not misquote me. I was comparing the statement for 1903-4 with that for 1904-5, and I said that there was only an addition of $2,150. I did not pretend to go back of last year, because I have not the figures.

Mr. SPROULE. I asked for the figures for three years back. Take 1900 and let us compare some of the items—expenses of committees, sessional clerks and extra clerks, 1901, $21,000. last year, $41,000 an increase of nearly 100 per cent within a few years.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, but you had an eight months session last year.

Mr. SPROULE. An eight months session last year but the estimates for last year were for the year before that. It seems to me that this is a very large increase and that there is nothing in the situation except —I was going to say extravagance, that would justify it because it is not justified by an additional amount of work. Then, take the next item—contingencies, including $300 for clerical assistance for the leader of the opposition, 1901, $19,700, last year, $26,403 an increase of $7,000. Is that evidence of economy ? The estimate of the sergeant-at-arms as approved was then $34,-367, and the same estimate last year was $61,508 or nearly double. There is no economy about that ; that is a case of extravagance.

Mr. SPEAKER. My hon. friend is not quite fair in intimating that there has been extravagance. We generally provide for a session of 100 days, but last year there was a session of about 240 days, and in the increased amount would be included all the employees who are paid by the day. If the hon. gentleman takes the salaries of the permanent officials he will find that there is little difference.

Mr. SPROULE. I have great difficulty in getting these salaries and so I have to look at the estimates. There is a disposal to withhold information, or at all events there is no effort made to give it.

Mr. SPEAKER. In 1899-1900 the salaries of the permanent officials were $70,000 ; in 1900-1901, $69,850 ; in 1903-04, $71,250, and in 1904-5, $72,700.

Mr. SPROULE. The supplementary estimates are not included in that.

Mr. SPEAKER. In the main estimates there is an increase of $2,450 ; in the supplementary estimates there is a decrease of $2,150 so that the net result would be an increase of only $300.

Contingencies, including $600 for clerical assistance to the leader of the opposition, $25,500.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does Mr. Blount only get $600 ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is 100 per cent more than the clerk of the leader of the opposition in former times received.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is $150 more than the Speaker is allowed for his secretary.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This is a growing time, and you have increased salaries all around, and Mr. Blount's salary should be

doubled as well as the others. If the government give the leader of the opposition an extra clerk now, when the present Prime Minister takes his seat on the opposition benches next election we will provide for him.

Estimate of a sergeant-at-arms as approved, $41,392.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentlemen opposite have been making comparisons and I will refresh their memories with some comparisons myself.

Mr. SPEAKER. I made no comparison. I was asked the number of employees at different periods and I simply gave the information.

Mr. BLAIN. When the salary of the secretary of the leader of the opposition was mentioned, the Minister of Finance said it was double what it was formerly.

Mr. FIELDING. Quite so, because the hon. gentleman opposite was stating that it was not enough. I said it was a hundred per cent more than the former allowance.

Mr. BLAIN. The Finance Minister was quite correct. The Speaker said it is $150 more than is allowed for the Speaker's private secretary. So that I am following out these comparisons. I find that in 1891, when the Conservative party was in power and Mr. Ouimet was Speaker, the amount spent for the Speaker's apartments, furnishings, &c., was $1,175.62 ; in 1892, when Mr. White was Speaker, it was $589.51 ; in 1893, $1,-928.50 ; in 1894, $1,119.20 ; in 1895, $1,246.02; in 1896, $1,514.41 ; or an average during those six years of Conservative rule of $1.-262.21. Then a new administration came into power with all their pledges of economy, and they commenced in 1896-97, with Mr. Edgar as Speaker, with an expenditure on the same account of $2,386.19 ; in 1898, $2,-579.91 ; in 1899, $1,819.03 ; in 1900, $900.47.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Who was Speaker then ?

Mr. BLAIN. Mr. Bain. The average of the five years was $1,537.12. And now the growing time has commenced. In 1901 and 1902 the expenditure went up to $8,776.19, or an average for those two years of $4,-388.09. In other words, we had a yearly average from 1891 to 1896 under Conservative rule of $1,262.21, from 1896 to 1900 an average of $1,537.12, and in 1901 and 1902 an average of $4,388.09. I am quite sure there will be some explanation of this expenditure, which shows that this government, as it grows older, gets more extravagant. I thought it would be worth while to make these comparisons while we are discussing this question of economy.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no doubt there has been an increase in certain years past ; but I may say that this year—and I make no distinction between members on one side or the other—there were at least thirty desks purchased ; and the hon. gentleman must remember that a great deal of this expenditure which is charged to the Speaker's departments is not incurred for the Speaker's apartments, but for the House generally.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman will pardon me. So far as I am concerned, I did not ask the Speaker for a desk, and did not get one.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not name my hon. friend, nor do I propose to name any hon. member ; but I was going to say that gentlemen who were formerly content with an ordinary table at a cost of $2 to $3, this year required a desk which cost $30, $40 or $50.

Mr. BARKER. Does the Speaker say that these desks are charged to the Speaker's apartments

Mr. SPEAKER. No, but they are charged in the accounts summarized and compared by the hon. member for Peel.

Mr. BLAIN. No, I do not understand that the desks supplied to members of the House of Commons and used in the different rooms throughout the building, have been charged under this heading.

Mr. SPEAKER. From the knowledge which I have of the accounts, I do not think it woud be possible to give figures which would be applicable to the Speaker's rooms only, as distinct from the expenditures throughout the House. That is the reason why I think the expenditures for members' desks, tables, chairs, sofas, and so on, are included in the figures which my hon. friend is giving to the House.

Mr. BLAIN. I am quite sure my hon. friend misunderstands this item. He will not say that the splendid extravagance he is administering now in the purchase of desks for the members, would be charged under the head of the Speaker's apartments?

Mr. SPEAKER. All these purchases are made by the sergeant-at-arms.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. They are classified.

Mr. SPEAKER. No, they are not.

Mr. SPROULE. How long has it been the case that these articles are all purchased by the sergeant-at-arms ?

Mr. SPEAKER. So far as I know, all the time.

Mr. SPROULE. How far does the hon. gentleman's knowledge reach back ?

Mr. SPEAKER. About twenty years.

Mr. SPROULE. I know as a fact that they are not purchased by the sergeant-at-arms, because last year I applied and was

informed that he had no authority to purchase any of these things, and that they must be purchased by the Speaker. I found when I went to the rooms occupied by members on the government side that they were furnished luxuriously, while others were furnished very scantily. I may say that there has been a great deal of furnishing this year which was not here before, and I think it has been done with perfect fairness. In that regard the present Speaker is entitled to every credit. I think he is doing what his predecessors should have done—he is allowing the sergeant-at-arms to do the furnishing instead of doing it himself. Had that been the case in the past, I have no doubt that a different tale would be shown on the accounts to-day.

Mr. BARKER. I understand the Speaker to say that the sergeant-at-arms' accounts and those of the Speaker are not kept separate ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The sergeant-at-arms, under Rule 107 of the House, is the custodian and guardian of everything here. He is responsible for the purchases and the custody of the goods purchased, not only in connection with the Speaker's apartments, but the whole House—the rooms of the officers and members and of the ministers and every part of the House.

Mr. BARKER. I am afraid Mr. Speaker is a little off in his information, because those of us who have been reading the AuditorGeneral's Reports know that such is not the case. In the last report we read that some dispute had arisen upon that very point, and that the Internal Economy Commission decided some time ago, in 1902, that the sergeant-at-arms should no longer purchase the articles for Mr. Speaker's apartments.

Mr. SPEAKER. My hon. friend is entirely mistaken.

Mr. BARKER. I shall state my view and the hon. gentleman may state his. The contention was made, according to what appears in the Auditor General's Report, that the sergeant-at-arms had the right to certify the accounts because he was custodian, and there was correspondence with the clerk of the House on that subject which appears in the report. The clerk of the House informed the sergeant-at-arms that the Internal Economy Commission had decided to take the certifying of the accounts and the purchasing out of his hands and to confine him strictly to what the statute authorized, namely, to be the mere custodian of the articles after they were purchased. That was the position taken according to the report. The result was that the accounts have been certified since in another manner and not by the sergeant-at-arms. This item of $60,000 includes three distinct branches. The items referred to by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) relate only to one branch, the furnishing of the Speaker's apartments; and if the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to look into the accounts, he will find that these items relate solely to articles purchased for those apartments.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is absolutely impossible.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman may say it is impossible, but nevertheless it is the case.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not. Among the supplies purchased for the House of Commons are towels, soap, sponges, brushes and other things which are distributed around the House. They are charged to the sergeant-at-arms' branch and not to the Speaker's.

Mr. BARKER. There are three different departments kept by the sergeant-at-arms.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is not so. I know something about it.

Mr. BARKER. I am speaking of my own knowledge and I am just as positive as Mr. Speaker is. There was a distinct account kept of that, as appears in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. SPEAKER. Only certain items.

Mr. BARKER. There is a separate account for the Speaker's apartments; the items referred to by the hon. member for Peel. I have looked at the accounts, and the items are put this way in the Auditor General's Report for 1901 and 1902.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. gentleman give me the page where this appears ?

Mr. BARKER. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the Auditor General's Report for the year ending 30 of June, 1901, volume 1, pages O—23 and 24, he will find charged there the expenses of furnishing Mr. Speaker's apartments, $1,928.51. He will find for the other branches distinct items. This is entered in the Auditor General's Report distinctly. He will find in the next year ending 30th of June, 1902, volume 1 of the Auditor General's Report, pages O—21 and 22, charged to Mr. Speaker's apartments, $3,292.02, making for the two years, $5,220.53, charged separately by the Auditor General to the Speaker's apartments. But this $5,220.53 was not the whole cost of furnishing the Speaker's apartments in 1901 and 1902. This was discovered owing to an expression that appears in one of the letters of the Auditor General addressed to the clerk of the House, in 1903, in which he refers to the fact that the accounts are not being brought in regularly as usual, that accounts were carried over and not brought in within the year to which they belong. It therefore became necessary to

see what accounts the Auditor General was referring to, and it appeared that in 1902 there were some accounts not paid in that year but carried over to 1903. There was the account of A. Brillon, for goods furnished the Speaker's apartments in February and March, 1902, $294.85. Those are expressly charged as furnished to the Speaker's apartments. In April of the same year, there is a small account of $27, and on the 15th day of May, 1902, an account of H. & N. Hamilton, $933.57, making for those three items, $1,255, incurred in the spring of 1902, which were not charged up in that year as they should have been.

Mr. BRODEUR. Where does my hon. friend take that information ?

Mr. BARKER. In the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think so. He cannot find in the report what he says is there. He must have got the information from some one else.

Mr. BARKER. Will the minister say that the account of A. Brillon for February and March, 1902, $294.85, was not for articles furnished in February and March of that year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is nothing of that kind in the Auditor General's Report—absolutely nothing.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman must recollect that there are certain accounts in the Public Accounts Committee, which I have had an opportunity of looking at. I assert now that the account of A. Brillon, $294.85, was for goods furnished the Speaker's apartments in February and March, 1902. The $27 for goods supplied by Brillon in April, and there is an account from H. & N. Hamilton, $933.50, rendered on the 15th of May, 1902, all for the Speaker's apartments. That makes the $1,255.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend says that the Auditor General has refused to pay those on account of the accounts being rendered in April of this year. I do not see anything of the kind in his report.

Mr. BARKER. I tell the hon. gentleman that the accounts were produced upon the order of the Public Accounts Committee, and they are there in room 32 and may be examined. I have seen the accounts myself.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman (Mr Barker) made the statement, if I understood him aright, that the Auditor General had refused to pay these accounts because they were rendered the previous year and carried over to the following year, and that we should find such statements in the Auditor General's correspondence. I do not see anything of the kind in the correspondence.

Mr. BARKER. I did not say that the Auditor General refused to pay the accounts, but that, in a letter, the Auditor General had called attention to the fact that the accounts were not brought in as promptly as they might have been.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is nothing of that kind.

Mr. BARKER. If the hon. gentleman will refer to page O—36 of the Auditor General's Report, 1903, he will find this :

> I observe that some of the accounts have not been paid as promptly as they usually are.

The accounts of Brillon and Hamilton bear the dates I give here. They were accounts that were brought into the year 1903 from the previous year—had not been settled, but were tided over. That is what I assert. I have already read the comment of the Auditor General upon the fact that the accounts are not being brought in regularly. Brillon's bears the dates of February, March and April, 1902, and Hamilton's May, 1902. The total of the three accounts is $1,255.42. This amount belonged to the previous year.

Then there is a further acccount of the C. Ross Company, which is dated from 13th February to 30th April, 1902, and amounts to $2,300. The item includes carpets and other ordinary items of furnishing intended for the Speaker's room. I do not need to go into details ; Mr. Speaker will not deny the account.

Mr. BRODEUR. Where is that ?

Mr. BARKER. That account is upstairs. It has never been charged to the Speaker's account, but has been charged to the House of Commons. I would like to know why the House of Commons should be buying the class of articles that are in that account. They are simply articles for the Speaker's apartments, his purchases for 1902, and have never been charged to Mr. Speaker at all. Now, I might as well say, the reason why this has been looked into is that the question was asked by hon. gentlemen on this side how the Auditor General came to pass that account without charging it to Mr. Speaker. It is a very natural question —how it happened that this account of $2,300 for furnishings for Mr. Speaker's apartments was charged to the Public Works. The amount appeared in the Auditor General's Report for 1903, volume 2, page V—105, charged to the Public Works, certified, not by the sergeant-at-arms, but by the Department of Public Works. The goods were received at the Speaker's apartments, of course—I am not saying there was anything wrong in that respect. But the $1,255 for the three accounts held over, and the $2,300 of the C. Ross Company account, passed through the Public Works, added to the $5,220.53, make a total of $8,776 in the two years, 1901 and 1902, or, as the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) said, an aver-

age of over $4,380 a year. This includes, of course, some $300 or $400 each year, for servants' wages. This is nearly three times the average amount per annum expended previously, and I say it is perfectly fair for the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) to call attention to this matter. As he says, it is an evidence, not of the growing times, but of the growing extravagance of the government. The predecessor of the hon. Speaker who occupied the chair when these goods were bought—not his immediate predecessor (Mr. Blain) but Sir James Edgar—had been for two or three sessions Speaker. Nobody doubts that Sir James Edgar would have the Speaker's apartments properly furnished. There could hardly have been need of a great many new articles. And yet, in two years, we find charges exceeeding $8,000 for furnishings for Mr. Speaker's apartments. As to Mr. Speaker's statement that the large expenditure by the Public Works is accounted for by desks supplied to members of the House of Commons, I can tell Mr. Speaker that that has nothing to do with it. In this account of $3,200 he will not find a charge for a single desk. The whole account is for house furnishing supplied to the Speaker. There can be no question of the nature of the goods or as to the apartments for which they were furnished. I venture to say that Mr. Speaker cannot take the accounts of Brillon or Hamilton and find a single item of goods furnished to any place except the Speaker's apartments. The only question is as to the necessity for the expenditure. And when we find that what was sufficient for Sir James Edgar is so greatly exceeded, we can only conclude that it is a case of growing extravagance of the government, an expenditure wholly unnecessary and uncalled for.

Mr. SPEAKER. With reference to the purchase of those goods, I stated that the purchasing of the supplies was taken out of the hands of the sergeant-at-arms. The resolution under which that was done is the following, passed on the 30th of May, 1902 :

> The question of the purchase of supplies for the sergeant-at-arms' branch having come up for consideration, the commissioners record their opinion that in future all such expenditures shall be made under the direction of the Speaker and of the Internal Economy Committee.

Mr. BARKER. That is what I said.

Mr. SPEAKER. No, the hon. gentleman stated that the purchasing of the supplies was taken wholly out of the hands of the sergeant-at-arms.

Mr. BARKER. So far as the Speaker's apartments are concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is where my hon. friend is wrong. The meaning of the resolution is that the expenditure shall be made, as stated, under the direction of Mr. Speaker and of the Internal Economy Committee—not that the sergeant-at-arms is no longer to make purchases, but that he is to submit to the Speaker any purchases which he intends to make, and that he is to submit the accounts for the same for the approval of the committee ; and that is what takes place.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the sergeant-at-arms make these purchases ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, all of them. I have not given an order for five cents or ten cents except through the sergeant-at-arms, either for the Speaker's apartments or for any other portion of the House of Commons.

Mr. BARKER. I assert that no person can read this letter on page O—37 and suppose for a moment that the Clerk of the House was intimating to the sergeant-at-arms that he was to continue to buy the things, and that somebody else was to pay for them.

> The question of the purchase of supplies for the sergeant-at-arms branch having come up for consideration, the commissioners record their opinion that in future all such expenditures——

What is that but purchases ?

> —shall be made under the direction of Mr. Speaker and the Internal Economy Committee.

Now it happens that from that time forward there was a change.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, there has been no change, the hon. gentleman is absolutely mistaken. The sergeant-at-arms branch meant the furniture of the House of Commons and the apartments of the Speaker as well as of the clerk.

Mr. BARKER. Does the Minister of Inland Revenue mean to tell me that the account of C. Ross & Co., ever passed the Sergeant-at-arms at all ?

Mr. BRODEUR. That is in the Public Works Department. I have never seen the furniture which was bought for the room of my hon. friend himself, and I suppose the sergeant-at-arms has not seen it either, because it was bought by the Public Works Department.

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. gentleman want me to read the articles that came from the C. Ross Co. ? They are articles for house furnishing, bedrooms and everything of that kind. The hon. gentleman knows that the Ross Company's account was for articles supplied for the Speaker's chambers, and for no others.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend is mistaken. Most of the articles I think were bought for the Speaker's apartments, and if he will go there he will find in the drawing

room furniture absolutely complete which was bought in 1902 and 1903. The old furniture was somewhat dilapidated.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What became of the old furniture ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know, it was given to the housekeeper. I found the other day in one of the rooms, a desk which was formerly in the Speaker's apartments. I think there is a desk in the room of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule).

Mr. BARKER. I have here a copy of the account that is upstairs in the Public Accounts Committee, rendered by the C. Ross Company in 1902, beginning on the 13th of February and ending on the 12th of April. Now I would like the minister to point out one item in that account which went elsewhere than to the Speaker's rooms ; I defy him to do it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is that charged to the Public Works Department ?

Mr. BARKER. This account was certified by the Public Works and not by the sergeant-at-arms. Yes, I think there are the initials of Mr. Dubé, the housekeeper, and I think the initials of the Minister of Inland Revenue.

Mr. BRODEUR. On that account ?

Mr. BARKER. I think so, I won't say positively. But here is the account itself, for $2,300.24. It is certified by Mr. Ewart, chief architect of the Public Works Department, and the materials are certified as delivered, and the prices fair and just by a Mr. Ogilvie. Here is the account for anybody that wants to look at it, and if anyone will say that any of these articles were furnished to any rooms in the House of Commons, I would like him to point it out.

Mr. LENNOX. Are these the articles that are charged on page B—105 of the Auditor General's Report, 1903 ?

Mr. BARKER. Yes. That is the account for $2,300.24.

Mr. BRODEUR. The Public Works Department usually supply the House of Commons. I mentioned a few minutes ago that the room of the hon. member for Hamilton was furnished by the Public Works Department. The room of the members for Toronto was furnished by the Public Works Department, and I find among the furniture a brussels carpet, wardrobe, brackets, rings, brass tubing, bedspreads.

Mr. BARKER. I assert positively that you won't find one article in that account which went into the House of Commons or elsewhere than to the Speaker's apartments.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have listened with some attention to the remarks of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), and he seems to complain that some accounts for one year were not charged to that year, but were charged to another year, that the goods purchased in 1902 were charged to 1903. The other complaint is that some accounts for furnishing the Speaker's rooms were charged to the Public Works Department and not to the Speaker's account. I also heard the hon. gentleman say that these accounts had been asked for and delivered to the Public Accounts Committee. It seems to me that that was the proper place to ventilate these questions, if there was anything wrong. It may be there has been something wrong in the book-keeping, there may be something wrong in the fact that an account is charged to one department instead of another. But all these questions, it seems to me, come within the purview of the Public Accounts Committee and should have been examined there rather than here. Here we are, as we hope, in the dying hours of the session. We are asked to vote the amounts required for the Speaker. There is no charge against the present Speaker as far as I understand. Not a word has been said against him, but some charges have been made in regard to the accounts of a former speaker. Would not my hon. friend agree with me that these accounts should have been taken before the Public Accounts Committee or should go before that committee next year ? As far as the estimates of this year are concerned it appears to me that the facts which have been brought up by my hon. friend had no relevancy to the appropriation asked for this year.

Mr. BARKER. The relevancy of the discussion arises out of the argument that was used about the increase in the expenditure in these items. I do not mean to say that the articles were not supplied ; I do not charge it for a moment. We could not dispute that in the Public Accounts Committee because we have no doubt that they were supplied. What I am saying here is that for the years 1901 and 1902 the purchases of furnishings for the Speaker's apartments amounted to $8,776. I say that you will not find that in any one item in the books, but you will find $1,928 put down for the year 1901, you will find $3,292 in 1902, and our attention having been drawn to further accounts by the remark of the Auditor General in his report, upon looking up those accounts we found there were accounts for 1902 which were not paid in that year amounting to $1,255 and another account for $2,300 paid through the Department of Public Works. The total of these makes $8,776. We cannot dispute the accounts ; there is no doubt that the goods were ordered and supplied but what we complain of is that we have such expenditures for these two years.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman says that the accounts for two

years amount to over $8,000. The hon. gentleman includes in that total money paid for goods ordered by the Speaker and accounts charged to the Department of Public Works. He thinks it ought not to have been and that there ought to be some good reason given to the committee why these accounts have been charged to the Department of Public Works. Well, it so happens that the Minister of Public Works who was then in office is not here to-day. He cannot be here because of an unfortunate reason. He is not here to give an explanation but it seems to me that if my hon. friend thinks there is something wrong which requires explanation that explanation cannot be given at this late stage of the session, but the explanation could have been sought in the Public Accounts Committee which could have followed this transaction and could have elicited the information which my hon. friend desires. But how can he expect at this moment that we can give him this information when the then Minister of Public Works is absent and the Department of Public Works is charged with a certain part of these accounts ? Under such circumstances it seems to me that my hon. friend cannot make anything of this matter at the present time. It may have been that there may have been extravagance——

Mr. BARpER. We are saying that there has been extravagance.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Possibly there has been ; possibly there was not. Possibly there was a good explanation for these expenditures and the only place to give that explanation would be before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. BARKER. No, we could not get it there.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, that was the case. The Public Accounts Committee sought for these accounts and they were brought down. That was the place to ascertain whether or not the accounts have been properly charged or whether or not there has been an error. That was the place to have ascertained whether or no these accounts should have been charged to the Speaker's apartments or to the Public Works. My hon. friend says that there was extravagance. Possibly there was ; I do not say that there was not, but possibly there was none. It is not sufficient to make a charge and to say that there was extravagance. That does not constitute an offence. The accounts are open to the committee and there may be a good explanation, as I have no doubt there will eventually be found a good explanation for it.

Mr. BARKER. According to the rule of this House adopted on a previous occasion we cannot deal with two or three year's accounts in the Public Accounts Committee

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They have not been brought up.

Mr. BARKER. Two or three years ago I endeavoured to do that very thing, when Mr. Fraser was chairman of the committee. I endeavoured to trace the accounts for two or three years. The chairman ruled that I could not do it, that I could inquire only into the accounts for the one year. The committee upheld the chairman, we appealed to the House, and what did the right hon. leader of the government say when we came here ? He said that for his part he made it a rule to support the decision of the committee.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. When we endeavoured to get the direction of the House we were voted down. We do not care to go through that farce again. We had no satisfaction. We were simply told by the right hon. gentleman that he was in the habit of standing by the committee, he did stand by the committee and his friends behind him stood by the committee. On this occasion we do not question the accuracy of the accounts. I assert here in my place in this House that these articles, the accounts for which I have here, were purchased for the Speaker's apartment, and I have not heard a word denying it. I would like to know if any hon. gentleman will stand up in his place and deny that for two years, 1901 and 1902, the purchases amount to $8,776, or deny that that is extravagant.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. member for Peel in his comparison not only included a few items which were charged to the Speaker's apartments in the ordinary way, but in the year 1901 and in 1902 in which the larger amounts appear he has gone into the accounts of the Public Works and I would like to know from the hon. gentleman if he pursued his researches into these accounts in other years ?

Mr. BARKER. I made inquiry and I was informed that these were the first years in which it occurred and that it occurred in consequence of the dispute which arose between the Speaker and the sergeant-at-arms by reason of which the keeping of the accounts was taken out of the hands of the sergeant-at-arms, as far as the Speaker's apartments were concerned and referred to the Internal Economy Board. That was done as stated by the clerk of the House in his letter of the 13th May, 1902. I am not going to read a long draper's account of furnishings for the Speaker's apartments. I do not want to do it. If any hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House want to read it they can read it for themselves. It is in the Public Accounts Committee room. There cannot be any question about it. To say that the desks in the rooms

upstairs had anything to do with it is absurd. They had nothing to do with it.

Mr. FIELDING. As far as the resolution of the Board of Internal Economy is concerned, I think that if my hon. friend will look at that carefully he will come to the conclusion that it is a proper resolution. It was not intended to make any change of the nature described by my hon. friend. In the various departments the minister is the responsible officer and in the House of Commons the Speaker is practically the minister for that purpose. Though I have few supplies to purchase, the commonest purchases of the department outside of the ordinary routine are bought before me by requisition from my deputy which I sign, but I would not purchase the articles. It was proposed in the resolution of the Internal Economy Committee that this principle should apply to the House of Commons, and that the Speaker, standing in the place of a minister, should have the responsibility and control, which, of course, would be exercised, in the same manner as the control of the minister, by his officials. The resolution of the Board of Internal Economy was consistent with a sound administration of the public service.

Mr. BARKER. I do not dispute the position taken by the minister. but I do not wish to have a red herring drawn across the track. I do not dispute that the Internal Economy Committee had the right to change the system.

Mr. FIELDING. And that it was proper.

Mr. BARKER. It had been the rule for years to leave the purchasing and the certifying of the accounts in the hands of the sergeant-at-arms, and when the Auditor General referred to that the clerk of the House wrote :

House of Commons,
Ottawa, October 7, 1903.

Sir,—In reply to your favour of the 5th instant, asking for the accounts referred to in your letters of July 3 and 21, I beg to say that I return the said accounts herewith.

These accounts have all been approved and certified by the Board of Internal Economy of the House of Commons. As secretary of the board I beg to certify to that fact.

I observe that they are initialled by His Honour the Speaker and further certified by myself as clerk of the House, and by the superintendent of messenger service and housekeeper.

I communicated to you some time since a resolution of the Board of Internal Economy of the House of Commons, adopted on May 13, 1902, to the effect that in the future the purchase of supplies for the sergeant-at-arms' branch of the House of Commons should be made under the direction of Mr. Speaker and the Internal Economy Committee.

I do not dispute that that was strictly according to law, but the fact is that in 1901-2, there was an expenditure of $8,776, and it is the question of extravagance and increased expenditure that we are discussing. I repeat that the expenditure in these two years was extravagant.

Mr. LENNOX. With all due deference to the Prime Minister he is drawing a red herring across the track, when he says that this matter should be investigated by the Public Accounts Committee. If we disputed the accounts that would be so, but for the purposes of the argument we have accepted the accounts and on these accounts as they stand the member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) charges the government with extravagance, and the accounts prove the charge.

Mr. CLANCY. It is extraordinary that the government should offer no explanation of this extravagance. It is the right of the public to know why this service costs such a largely increased amount over former years and we would fail in our duty if we did not insist upon an explanation. The increase in this expenditure is nothing less than startling.

Mr. BRODEUR. Two or three years ago the drawing room of the Speaker's quarters was renovated and new furniture and new carpets installed. I understand that these accounts were before the Public Accounts Committee, where it would have been very easy for my hon. friend to have got the details. It appears to me that most of these furnishings must have been for the drawing room.

Mr. CLANCY. Nobody disputes that.

Mr. BRODEUR. I may say to my hon. friend when I became Speaker, I found that the drawing room was not in a proper condition. If he compares its condition today with what it was before that time, he will find that there has been a great improvement in it. I was told that it had not been renovated for many years. It is very unfortunate to have these matters brought before the House ; I do not know for what reason they are. I have always endeavoured to treat every member in the most polite way, and I had these improvements made, not for myself, but for the members of this House. I thought every member of this House would take a pride in having the drawing room of the Speaker put in a proper and suitable condition.

Mr. CLANCY. I want to say just a word. The hon. member for Hamilton treated this case with that delicacy becoming an hon. gentleman of his standing in this House. He refrained from going into any of the items. No member wants to go into the details of the accounts. Nobody doubts that the goods were furnished or that they are there. The hon. gentleman says he has treated the members of this House with courtesy. That is perfectly true. He owed

that to them as they owe it to him. There is nothing about that to relieve the hon. gentleman from fair criticism. I say the hon. gentleman has treated the members of this House with great courtesy. I hope that has been mutual. But I want to repeat what I said a moment ago, that the country has a right, through the members of this House, to make proper inquiry. There is no disposition to go into the items, and I do not think the hon. gentleman challenges an investigation. I went through these accounts and know something of them, this is the proper time and place to discuss them, and it is for the hon. gentleman and the government to answer. The case has been treated, not on low grounds, but on fair and decent grounds, and there has been no unfair criticism.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have tried to show how the account has been made up. My hon. friend was here in 1900, and he must have observed in how much better condition the drawing room is now than it was then.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not belong to that class that take any account of what is in Mr. Speaker's rooms.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is not the Speaker's room; it is the room of every member. I am blamed for having undertaken to renovate that room. Perhaps I made a mistake in doing so. Perhaps it would have been better to have left it in the shabby condition in which it was. But I thought it was due to the dignity of the position of Speaker and the dignity of the members of this House that the work should be done, and that is the reason it was done.

To provide for the making of a general index to the Journals and sessional papers of the House for the period 1891 to 1904, inclusive, as per recommendation of the Joint Committee on Printing, approved by the House on the 16th June, 1904, $1,400.

Mr. FOWLER. Who is performing this work?

Mr. SPEAKER. The work is being done by Mr. McGillicuddy under a resolution of the Joint Committee on Printing. It is the indexing of the sessional papers from 1890 down to the present. This is on the report of the Committee on Printing, and does not come under my jurisdiction.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Before we pass to another item there is a matter which I regret to have to bring up. It has been noticed by members a good many years that if you leave an umbrella or anything else around the House of Commons, it is likely to disappear and never be heard of again. A man will leave a valise in a railway station in New York city, through which 50,000 people pass every couple of hours, and if there is any way of identifying it, it will be returned to him, but in this House of Commons, in which the culture and intellect of the Dominion are supposed to be congregated, a man cannot leave anything down without running great risk of never seeing it again. I lost an overcoat and hat and half a dozen other things some years ago and am now pretty careful, but I have heard many members complain that if they leave anything behind at the adjournment, when they come back they find it gone. I would suggest that a couple of detectives should be employed to find out who does the stealing.

Mr. SPEAKER. There are two night watchmen.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The things are stolen mostly in the day time.

Mr. SPEAKER. The lockers are in very bad condition. You can open them with almost any sort of a key.

Salaries, Library of Parliament, $18,240.

Mr. LENNOX. There are three messengers in the library, one of whom is called Dunlop. I do not know the names of the others. They have been in the service a number of years and they thought that last session, owing to its length, they were entitled to an increase of $50. They are the employees of both the House of Commons and the Senate. Their hours are very long at times. It seems to me that the right hon. gentleman should take their case into consideration as regards last session and perhaps this. I believe some of these messengers have been longer in the service than almost any messengers about the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Dunlop, I know, is an old and faithful messenger. Some of these men are very deserving servants indeed; but while the management of the library is under my control, I must say that I have to take my advice from others and generally carry out the recommendations of the librarian. I will speak to the librarian.

Mr. LENNOX. I understood that it was rather that the matter was overlooked last session and that their not getting the increase was due to forgetfulness rather than anything else.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Perhaps so.

Legislation—general—contingent expenses in connection with the voters' list, $20,000.

Mr. FOWLER. A little while ago we had an item of $10,000 in connection with the Franchise Act, and we were told that it was for the printing of the voters' list. Now we have an item in connection with the voters' lists direct.

Mr. FIELDING. They were in different years I think.

Mr. FOWLER. But why have it for the voters' list in one case and Franchise Act

in another case. What I fear is that there has been some mistake in the explanation of the Franchise Act item.

Mr. FIELDING. I spoke from recollection. But if there is any mistake I will call attention to it at another sitting.

Mr. FOWLER. It was rumoured we were to have an amendment to the Franchise Act, that there was a division of the cabinet with the regard to the advisability of bringing it forward and that a majority decided that it was so iniquitous that they had better back down. Perhaps this $10,000 was for preparing that.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) may be perfectly sure that if it was not all right the cabinet would not approve of it.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it the intention to print all the voters' lists in the Printing Bureau ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. None have been printed elsewhere up to the present time.

Mr. BLAIN. I was asking more particularly with regard to the future.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It has been the practice sometimes in the past to have some of the voters' lists printed outside. That is not the intention now, unless there is some special and unexpected reason for it. The intention is to print them all in the bureau where the work is always better done.

To promote Mr. John Sharp, porter, Toronto post office, to a senior third-class clerkship at a salary of $800 from 1st July, 1904, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $200.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the meaning of this the exception 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act' in this case ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Mr. John Sharp entered the service on the 22nd September, 1891, as a porter. But he is a man of unusual ability and gives promise of being a good clerk. The promotion is entirely upon merit and because of Mr. Sharp's special efficiency. He is altogether too good a man to be kept in the rank of a porter.

Mr. FOWLER. No doubt the promotion is all right, but I do not like the exception of the Civil Service Act. If we have an Act we ought to stand by it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler). But Mr. Sharp came into the service not expecting to become a clerk and did not qualify in the usual way. He is not a political friend of ours and the promotion is made on merit.

Mr. MORIN. I received a letter from the Commercial Travellers' Association of Quebec, which I would like to call to the attention of the Postmaster General. It is written in French but it will be understood in this House :

Quebec, July 2nd, 1904.

J. B. Morin, Esq., M.P.,
Sainte-Hénédine, county Dorchester.

Sir,—I beg to inform you that, at the last sitting of the Board of Directors of the 'Quebec Commercial Travellers Club,' a resolution was passed to the effect that I should write to all the senators and members of parliament, representing the counties through which the Quebec Central Railway runs, in order to secure from the Postmaster General a service of two daily mail trains, between Lévis and Sherbrooke, and vice versa.

By taking the lead of this movement, the commercial travellers accomplish two different purposes : in the first place, they believe they are serving the interests of the people of your constituency who find that the present mail service is inadequate ; in the second place, the commercial travellers, after having secured this favour from the Postmaster General, want to force the Quebec Central Railway Company to continue during the winter season, the service of this additional mail train. Now, sir, you know just as well as we do, how the people will benefit by the accommodation furnished by these mail trains, and so, we hope you will be kind enough to second our application. Permit us to assure you, sir, that when the proper opportunity offers, any assistance you may lend us in the matter will be remembered by us.

Believe me, sir,
Yours most devotedly,
R. N. GODIN,
Secretary.

Now, I would like to say to the Postmaster General that these commercial travellers complain that the mail service on the Quebec Central is not sufficient, especially in the county of Dorchester and in the county of Beauce. Not only do they complain about the bad service we have, but they complain that we can get nothing from the Quebec Central Railway. If the Postmaster General would help us, I think we might obtain something from the Quebec Central Railway in that direction. The Postmaster General does not know the location of that country, and I will try and explain it to him. The county of Beauce lies west of the county of Dorchester, and the county of Lévis lies north of it. The Postmaster General will remember that some complaints were made to him by the people in those counties about insufficient mail service. I complain, on the contrary, that there is too much mail service. From the way the mail service is carried on now, one would say that the department is merely making a football out of the mail bag. The railway carries the mail bag up and down the road and plays with it until they get tired. The mail that comes from the west goes to the east in the forenoon, because the people of the county of Beauce get their mail in the morning. Then in the evening there is a mail train that goes about three miles forward and two miles backwards. This train

passes through the county of Beauce shortly after 12 o'clock at noon, but it carries the mail past all the stations, and carries it down, I do not know how far, probably as far as Lévis. The next day they bring it back. So they carry the mail 26, 35 and 45 miles, to my knowledge, past the stations away down to Lévis and bring it back next day. Therefore, you see they make a football of the mail service. I know what I am speaking of when I say so. The post office is about as far from the railway station as from here to Wellington street, but there is no one to carry the mail from the post office to the station. Of course, the mail clerk on the train cannot deliver it to any one, because there is no one there to receive it. If the Postmaster General would pay the boy who carries the mail at our place and elsewhere $5 a year, then the mail would stop at our place instead of being carried down to Lévis. Probably it would cost him just as much to carry the mail past the post office as it would to pay a messenger to take the mail from the station to the post office. Very often when we raise a question of this kind in the House, the minister says : Oh, well, we get money from the people, and we give it back to them. This is a case where you can give some of it back to the people. The boy who carries the mail at our place gets $52 a year for carrying three mails a day, and probably for $10 more he would carry the mail in the evening. The train service at present is sufficient; we have no fault to find about that. Bear in mind that the Quebec Central Railway Company puts on an extra train in the month of June and takes it off in October ; then we have no trains. The company's officers have often told me that if there was a mail to carry they would keep the train on in winter as well as in summer. Now, the reason they have no mail to carry is that they discontinue the train in the winter. I would like the Postmaster General to give his attention to this matter. He remembers that about five months ago I went to him with a petition from some people in the county of Dorchester, asking for a post office at a place called Detroit. I have written to the Postmaster General and spoken to him about it until I am tired of going to the department. I take this opportunity of speaking to him now face to face, and I want an answer. Will the Postmaster General be kind enough to tell me what he proposes to do, whether he will grant us an office at Detroit, in the county of Dorchester ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman has alluded to a number of post office matters ; I cannot discuss the details of all of them, because I am not familiar with them all. As to the additional service on the Quebec Central, I am advised by the officers of the department who controls the railway mail service that when this application came before him for consideration he looked into the matter and advised the department that the district in question was being sufficiently served, and therefore he could not recommend the additional service at present. But the question, he informs me, is being raised, not in the interest of the mail service so much as from a desire to obtain an additional train for the travelling public, and that the railway company conceived the idea that a good way for the travelling public to get a train service would be to have the company go through the form of using it for a mail service. But the controller says that an additional train is not necessary for mail purposes in that district. Whenever the controller advises that the service of the post office demands an additional mail train, it will be my duty to endeavour to provide one. As to the other complaint of my hon. friend that we are giving the district too much in the way of mail service, if he will name to me a service which he thinks should be discontinued, and my officers advise me to that effect, it will be done. With reference to his request for a post office at a place called Detroit, I have not yet been satisfied that the establishment of such an office is required. The point in question is comparatively close to another post office. Some people have been consulted about it who are supposed to know the needs of the locality, and they do not say that an additional post office there is needed in the public interest.

Mr. MORIN. I do not see why the Postmaster General has so little confidence in his own staff. It appears that some time ago he said in answer to a question by my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) that post offices were granted or refused according to the demand of the inspector.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I never made such a broad statement as that.

Mr. MORIN. You did say in reply to my hon. friend from Peel that a post office was refused or granted upon the report of the inspector. I asked you what the inspector had said regarding a post office at Detroit and you told me that you would let me know in a day or two, but you never did. Why is it that the hon. Postmaster General writes all over the country to find one man who will condemn that post office ? He has written to a man who ran against me in 1900 and I knew very well that this man would not reply. He wrote to two others and probably hoped to get an answer. The hon. minister says that this is too near other post offices. Well it is two miles distant. I think the people of the country are just as good as city folk. Here in the city of Ottawa you have a mail carrier to go to the box, take the mails to the post office and then you have mail-carriers to take the mail from the post office and carry it right to the houses, while in

the country we have to go four and five miles to the post office. If the hon. minister grants this post office it will not cost him one cent. The public pay for it and the people of Dorchester are just as worthy of having a post office there as people in any part of the country. The residents of this district have been suffering for probably eighty years.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. For how many years ?

Mr. MORIN. For about eighty years.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. You must not blame me for that.

Mr. MORIN. I blame you, along with the rest. You should try to do better. You may say that the Conservative party never opened a post office there. But you have told us that your government is an example that it is a government of reform. How will you show an example if you do as badly as they did, because if you do you will be knocked out of power the same as they were.

Mr. TALBOT. My hon. friend from Dorchester (Mr. Morin) seems to have a grievance about the post office accommodation and railway service in the county of Dorchester. I have not the honour of representing Dorchester, but I live very close to it and I would ask my hon. friend if he will say that it is not a fact that since 1896 the post office accommodation and service in the county of Dorchester have been more than doubled ?

Mr. MORIN. I will reply by saying 'no.' The post offices have been increased in the upper end of the county where population is going in to settle, but in the old part of the county, post offices that were established by the Conservative party have been done away with. How does that suit you ?

Mr. TALBOT. Will the hon. gentleman tell me how many post offices existing in the county of Dorchester have been abolished, how many new post offices have been established or in how many townships or villages where they formerly had a bi-weekly or a tri-weekly service, they have now a daily service ? And will the hon. gentleman tell me if post office service in Dorchester county has not been greatly improved ?

Mr. MORIN. I will not tell you, but I will tell the committee, and I will say as I said before that new post offices have been established in new parts of the county but they have been closed in the older parts of the county.

Mr. TALBOT. How many have been closed and how many have been erected

Mr. MORIN. Ask the Postmaster General, and he will tell you.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Has any post office in Dorchester been closed against the judgment of the hon. gentleman ?

Mr. MORIN. The post office right in the village of St. Anselme was closed by the present Postmaster General. If I had known of it I would have objected to it. But it was closed before I knew anything of it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Is there not a post office in the village ?

Mr. MORIN. There is. There were two but there is only one now.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. How far apart were these two ?

Mr. MORIN. Very nearly one mile.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. They were both in the same village ?

Mr. MORIN. Both in the same village—the same as in Ottawa ; there is more than one post office in Ottawa.

Mr. BLAIN. I put a question on the order paper the other day as follows :

When was the parcel post increased in Canada ?

And the answer was :

This last question is not understood.

I would like the hon. the Postmaster General to give an explanation of the postal parcel system in Canada and to state when any changes were made in the rates on parcels going through the post office.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I suppose there will be several meanings to that question. Does the hon. gentleman mean : When was the volume of business increased or the size of the parcels or the cost of transmission ?

Mr. BLAIN. I mean the rate of postage on parcels going through the post office.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The rate of postage on parcels going through the post office has undergone increases and decreases for a very long time and it would involve going through the various items and classifying them to answer that question. There was merely a classification and simplification of the parcel rates and they practically had no effect upon the revenue of the department. While the classification might increase the rates in some cases it reduced them in others.

Mr. BLAIN. Could you send a parcel of dry goods through the mails as cheaply now as ten years ago ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There has been no change in the rate of postage on merchandise since the present government took office.

Two superintendents in city post offices, $3,600.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. In Toronto and Montreal where the postal revenue has increased enormously we require a superior officer in each place who will be under the postmaster and deputy postmaster. These two positions will not be filled from appointments outside but will be the result of promotion.

Additional railway mail clerks, including mileage, $16,000.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. This is largely to meet the case of the additional train established by the Canadian Pacific Railway across the continent. If the train continues during the whole year we will have to use this amount, but if not we will have to dispense with the services of these men.

Mr. FOWLER. Do they all pass the civil service examinations ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No. You cannot always get men who have passed the civil service examination. We are obliged to take on men temporarily and put them under tuition.

Mr. FOWLER. Is there not a large waiting list of persons who have passed the examination ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I dare say a great many people have passed the civil service examination but they very often go into different other occupations.

Mr. LENNOX. Last year I pressed upon the Postmaster General that he should experiment in the establishment of rural mail delivery in Canada. In my section of the country a great many of the people are strongly in favour of this rural mail service and I ventured to suggest to the hon. gentleman the advisability of selecting a fairly representative section of the country and making an experiment. There is another matter to which I wish to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman. I would suggest to the Postmaster General that he should allow members of parliament not only to send parliamentary documents printed by order of parliament free of postage from their homes, but that any document containing the exact language of 'Hansard' without comment or change should also be allowed to be sent free of charge through the mails so that our constituents may be made acquainted with the proceedings of parliament which all will admit is a very desirable thing. If members address these documents from their homes their attention would not be distracted during the session from the duties in the chamber and their other parliamentary duties. No harm would result to the postal service and I think benefit would be conferred upon the community. I would recommend this to the consideration of the minister and unless his mind is already made up on the question I would not expect him to express his opinion on it to-night.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The last suggestion of my hon. friend means an extension of the franking privilege. As the franking privilege is governed by statute, to adopt my hon. friend's suggestion would necessitate an amendment to the Post Office Act. It is therefore not a matter to be dealt with departmentally, but by parliament. With regard to rural delivery, at this late hour I am sure the committee would not wish to have a treatise on that subject forced upon them. I have given a great deal of consideration to it, and it would give me great satisfaction if I could see my way to inaugurate such a system. I went into the study of it sanguine that it could be inaugurated in Canada, but the study of it disclosed the unwisdom and impossibility of it. I venture to say that no government in Canada for many years to come will commit itself to the proposition of rural mail delivery.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to ask the Postmaster General what rule guides him in the closing up of post offices.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We hardly ever close a post office except perhaps where the postmaster refuses to act or where a community moves away. In a mining district, for example, where a post office is opened up to serve the convenience of persons engaged in the local industry, and the mine turns out to be a failure and the community leaves, the inspector will report that fact, and the post office will be closed. I do not think we ever close a post office unless the inspector recommends it to be closed as being no longer of any public use. The last thing we do is to close a post office. It is not done at the instance of the department, but as the outcome of some report that it is useless.

Mr. FOWLER. I may say that a number of post offices have been closed in my county, and it is not a mining community, but a rural community. Post offices have been closed which were very useful and important to the people. I had occasion, in the first session that I was in parliament, to complain that several post offices in my county had been closed, and I was given to understand that they were closed at the instance of the gentleman who opposed me in the election.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is a mistake.

Mr. FOWLER. He got the credit of it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That was unfair to him.

Mr. FOWLER. I cannot understand why they should have been closed. It is important to people in farming districts that they should have their mail, and in the busy

season it is very difficult for them to get time to drive or walk six or eight miles to a post office. Life for people of that class is hard enough at best, and if any exceptions are made, they should be made in their favour. I think the revenue of the Post Office Department is large enough to justify an expenditure along that line, and I hope the Postmaster General will increase the post offices rather than diminish them.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I agree with what the hon. gentleman says. In no instance have I consented to the closing of a post office except where it was shown that it was not in the public interest. That has been the only consideration. It is not the rule for me to know anything of the closing of post offices. Any that are closed are closed departmentally for that and for no other reason.

Mr. FOWLER. I may say that after the session I will take occasion to communicate with the Post Office Department and state a number of instances in which post offices have been closed, and perhaps the hon. Postmaster General will see that they are reopened in the interest of the public.

Trade and commerce—bounty on crude petroleum—to cover expenditure in connection with the administration of the Act, $3,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. I assume that this is to pay the expense of distributing the money ?

Mr. FIELDING. There will have to be an officer to make some inquiry into the accounts, and it may be necessary to have an inspector in the oil regions.

Mr. HENDERSON. Do you think $3,000 will cover the expense ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think so. It is a very economical government.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think we shall have something in the supplementary estimates next year.

Printing and stationery, including printing of 'Labour Gazette,' allowances to correspondents, administration of Conciliation Act and Railway Labour Disputes Act, travelling expenses, &c., and $500 each for an accountant and a French translator, which sum may be paid to any one in the civil service, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $32,350.

Mr. FOWLER. What salary do these correspondents get ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. $100 a year.

Mr. FOWLER. What do they do ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Some are compositors, some are newspaper men, others are compositors or engaged in literary work on newspapers, others are the best class of mechanics who are familiar with trade matters in their locality.

Mr. BLAIN. How many from Ontario ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. One for each city.

Mr. FOWLER. Have the capitalists no representation on the 'Labour Gazette ?'

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not think that these correspondents are representatives strictly of any one class. They are men in the community competent to deal with the labour matters. They simply gather information and transmit it.

Mr. FOWLER. Are they all union men ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. FOWLER. Is there any distinction made on that account ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not think so.

Mr. BLAIN. Who are the correspondents at Hamilton and Toronto ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Mr. Landers in Hamilton and Mr. Phillips Thompson in Toronto.

Mr. FOWLER. How many in New Brunswick ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. W. H. Coates in St. John ; F. W. Smith in Halifax, N.S.; John Moffatt in Sydney, N.S.; F. G. Nash, in Charlottetown, P.E.I.

Mr. FOWLER. Is this 'Labour Gazette' published free or sold ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The subscription is 20 cents a year. We have 7,000 or 8,000 subscribers and some 4,000 on the free list. We send it free to libraries, mechanics' institutes, boards of trade and members of parliament.

Mr. FOWLER. Why not send the members of parliament bound copies ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We send them monthly. The suggestion might be worth considering.

Department of Labour—amount required for expenses of Alien Labour Commissions to cover expenses of the commissions from the time of appointment, May 23 (including allowance of five dollars per diem to G. G. V. Ardouin, stenographer, for reporting and extending the evidence, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act), $5,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What do you pay the commissioners ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. $10 a day and expenses.

Civil government—Department of Indian Affairs—to provide for transfer of F. H. Paget from the outside to the inside service as a chief clerk, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $1,900.

Mr. FOWLER. Why this 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act ?'

Mr. SIFTON. Mr. Paget has been in the service for many years. He was formerly in the Commissioner's office in Winnipeg. He spent some time in Ottawa in the Accountant's branch and it is found more satisfactory to have him here permanently. This was to transfer him from the office at Winnipeg to the office here.

Mr. FOWLER. But why the exception of the Civil Service Act ?

Mr. SIFTON. Because when an officer is brought from the outside service he does not comply with the Civil Service Act with regard to examination.

Pensions—to provide for an annual allowance to John Dyke, formerly agent for the Dominion government at Liverpool, Eng., at which rate it shall be hereafter paid monthly, $1,000.

Mr. SIFTON. Old members of the House will remember that Mr. Dyke was for many years agent of the government at Liverpool. Mr. Dyke's services were at one time dispensed with and he was afterwards reengaged at a lower salary. He was for twenty or twenty-five years connected with the two services of immigration and trade. His health failed and he became unable to prosecute his duties regularly. We appointed him in another capacity, but it was found not satisfactory to keep him. Before this government came into office Sir Charles Tupper, when High Commissioner, made strenuous efforts to have Mr. Dyke superannuated by the late government. But it was found impossible, because the provisions of the Act did not cover Mr. Dyke's case, and the government did not see their way clear to do anything for him. I have received strong representations from persons who are familiar with the work Mr. Dyke did for many years stating, what was generally recognized, that Mr. Dyke's services to the Dominion were exceedingly valuable. His health has failed so that he cannot carry on his work regularly. It has been decided to ask the House to vote a special annuity for him. I wish to make the statement so that the House will understand : We would have put Mr. Dyke on the superannuation list if we could have done so ; but we desire the voting of this sum to be regarded as an acknowledgment to Mr. Dyke that the allowance shall be paid regularly hereafter.

Geological Survey—to purchase Mr. D. H. Price's collection of Canadian archaeological specimens, about 9,000 specimens, $5,949.

Mr. SIFTON. This is a valuable collection for the purchase of which negotiations have been going on for a number of years. Nine or ten years ago it was examined by the late Dr. Dawson, director of the Survey, who recommended it for purchase. Nothing was done at that time. After I became minster, Dr. Dawson recommended me to purchase the collection. I did not do so then, because there was no proper place to keep or display the specimens. But, as the new museum is about being placed under contract and is expected to be finished soon, it was thought desirable to make the purchase. Mr. Price sent the specimens to Ottawa and they were valued by Dr. Bell and other officers of the Geological Survey, who put upon them the value given here. The valuation is low. If the collection were allowed to go out of Canada it could not be replaced. Had Mr. Price desired to sell outside of Canada he could probably have got a larger figure than he got from us. But he desired that his collection should remain in the Geological museum here and refrained from trying to sell, confident that, sooner or later, the government would purchase.

Mr. FOWLER. Where is the new museum to be ?

Mr. SIFTON. At the south end of Metcalfe street on the Stewart property, known as Appin Place.

Indians, Ontario and Quebec—to provide an amount for annuity, gratuity and expenses of negotiating treaty No. 9, $32,925.

Mr. SIFTON. There is a large portion of the territory which has never been ceded and for which the Indian title has not been acquired, and it will be necessary to make a treaty to acquire the title from the Indians. We estimate in this vote that the annuity and gratuity will be $4 each for 3,000 Indians ; expenses of negotations, $2,925 ; pay of commissioners, transport and maintenance, $3,200. The expenses of the treaty are calculated to be $6,000, and the payment to our provisions for the Indians, $26,925. This is absolutley new territory, where nothing is being done now. A great difficulty is that we shall have to make arrangement with the provincial governments with regard to the reserves, because the Crown lands belong to them.

Mr. FOWLER. I see that in some of the provinces of Canada, notably in British Columbia, this question of the Indian reserves has become what you might call a burning question. I think some steps should be taken to take the reserves from the Indians and pay them for them. For instance, near the town of Kamloops there is a large amount of land occupied by Indians, from which practically no revenue is derived by the Indians. It is no particular advantage to them, but it is a very great disadvantage to the people who go into that country to settle. Some of the best lands in the province of British Columbia are occupied as Indian reserves. I think it is the duty of the department to look into that matter, and see if the title of the Indians cannot be extinguished and the land thrown open for settlement. These reserves are situated near towns, and it is a bad thing for the Indians

to be so close to temptation and to the means of becoming intoxicated. It makes them less self-supporting than they would otherwise be.

Mr. GALLIHER. I may say that I have drawn the attention of the minister to that subject, both last session and the session before, instancing the reserves in the neighbourhood of Kamloops, Agassiz, Salmon Arm and in the Siamilkameen. I wish to again draw the attention of the minister to the view held by the people in the neighbourhood of these reserves in British Columbia.

Mr. SIFTON. From one end of Canada to the other a difficulty arises from the fact that the Indians exercise a greater degree of providence in the selection of land than in anything else; they select lands which are fitted for settlement by white people and which white people would like to acquire. But the Dominion of Canada is pledged under the treaties to keep these lands inviolate for the Indians; no lands can be alienated from them without their consent obtained in a lawful manner. From time to time efforts have been made to obtain the consent of the Indians to part with their reservations, but it most always happens that whenever the Indians observe a strong desire on our part to obtain their land and place them somewhere else, they resist strenuously any attempt whatever on the part of the department to secure their consent. My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Earle) has frequently called my attention to the case near the city of Victoria, in the province of British Columbia, where there is a considerable portion of land in the heart of the city belonging to the Indians, and which they insist on holding to the detriment of the growth of the city and the conduct of municipal affairs. We have made for years an effort to secure their consent to accept some other lands in exchange, but without success. I have not given special attention to New Brunswick, and could not say whether there is any probability that the Indians there could be brought to make an exchange, but our experience in other places has not been such as to encourage us. In the province of Manitoba, some four or five years ago, we made a determined effort to improve the condition of the Indians by getting them to surrender a number of small reserves and giving them a larger one, where they could carry on fishing operations and agriculture at the same time, and we offered to give them, in addition, a large amount of money to enable them to begin their agricultural operations, but all our efforts resulted in total failure. There is absolutely nothing the Indians are so sensitive about as the title of their land. The only thing that has enabled the government to maintain peace and harmony with the Indian tribes is the fact that we have never yet interfered with their occupation of the reserves, except by their free consent, in accordance with the terms of the treaty. I think my hon. friend will recognize the fact that whatever may be done with them by moral suasion and compensation, it cannot be done without their consent and under the terms of the treaty. So far as the province of British Columbia is concerned, the difficulty is greater there than anywhere else, because the title to the Indian reserves is in a different position legally. The government of British Columbia holds the reversionary right to the Indian reserves without any doubt whatever, and the Dominion government is not in a position to deal with these lands except with the concurrence of the provincial government. This complicates the question, because the British Columbia government would not agree to any terms that we could get the Indians to agree to.

Indians—to recoup the Mississaguas of Alnwick, for islands taken for park purposes, River St. Lawrence, $9,150.

Mr. FOWLER. Explain that.

Mr. SIFTON. These are islands in the St. Lawrence which were reserved for public parks and we are just placing to the credit of the Indian Fund the schedule value of the islands. They did not belong to us but to the Indians.

Indians—to recoup the Mississaguas of Alnther amount required for salaries of the outside service, $10,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Explain that.

Mr. SIFTON. The amount of $10,000 which we are now asking for is caused by an increase in the staff in connection with the administration of Dominion lands, a small amount being required in Manitoba but the larger amount in the Northwest Territories. When I was presenting my supplementary estimates for last year I gave details of the items and of the increases which have been made. The main estimates for 1904-5 were prepared before these changes were made, so that that addition had to be made to correspond to the addition that I explained when I was passing my supplementary estimates for last year. The administration of Dominion lands in the Northwest Territories has required the addition of a considerable number of clerks and it is for the purpose of paying these that this amount is added.

Miscellaneous—to complete improvements on islands in River St. Lawrenec—revote, $3,500.

Mr. FIELDING. Strike out the word 'revote'; that is a mistake.

Mr. FOWLER. What is it for?

Mr. SIFTON. These are the islands I spoke of a little while ago, and this amount is to make improvements upon them. $12,000 was voted last year. We find that we require about $1,000 more. The wharfs cost

a little more than we anticipated and there will be some clearing to be done on some of the islands around the wharfs. This is estimated to cost $2,500.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the total area of these islands ?

Mr. SIFTON. I could not give the hon. gentleman the total area of these islands. They vary from half an acre to five acres. They extend from Brockville near which is the largest island, called Picnic Island, all the way to Gananoque.

Mr. FOWLER. Would it be a hundred acres altogether ?

Mr. SIFTON. Yes, about that.

To compensate the Canadian Bank of Commerce for services in the Yukon, $12,600.

Mr. FIELDING. The Bank of Commerce manages the business of the government in the Yukon and the first year we paid as high as one and a half or two per cent, but we have reduced it each year until the present rate is three-eighths per cent. At an early date we expect that our business in the Yukon will be conducted in the same way as in other parts of Canada.

St. John drill hall (revote), $10,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the intention of the department with respect to this vote—just to put it in the estimates, or have you arranged to erect a building ?

Mr. HYMAN. I do not know that any arrangements have been made to erect a building. It is the intention, of course, to proceed with the work, though I do not know that the department would be justified in entering into a very large contract with only $10,000.

Mr. FOWLER. I would call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that in the county of Albert, there is a large and important town called Hillsborough with from 2,000 to 2,500 population. It is the central market town for a considerable district, and it requires a public building for a custom-house and post office. Buildings of this class have been erected in many places with very much smaller revenues. This is the most important town in the county of Albert. I do not ask for an expensive building. One costing from $8,000 to $10,000 would accommodate the service.

Mr. HYMAN. I have asked the officers of the department to make a memorandum of the matter, and if I am in the department next session, I will endeavour to give it due consideration.

Barrie public building—rearrangement of post office fittings and other improvements, also repairs, $4,800.

Mr. LENNOX. Has there been a contract let for this ?

Mr. HYMAN. No, nothing has been done.

Mr. LENNOX. This is for the interior ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, fittings, letter-boxes, tiled flooring, improving the woodwork, painting, &c.

Chatham, Ont., armoury, $20,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Who furnished the site in Chatham ?

Mr. HYMAN. It belongs to the government.

St. Catharines, Ont., drill hall, $60,000.

Mr. BLAIN. When will this be completed ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is under contract. The foundation will be laid this year. The building is to be completed in twelve months.

Vancouver public building—additional amount, $40,000.

Mr. BLAIN. What will this building cost ?

Mr. HYMAN. The estimated cost is between $250,000 and $300,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the building for ?

Mr. HYMAN. For all government purposes.

Public buildings generally—construction of armouries, $70,000.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the explanation of this ?

Mr. HYMAN. An item for this purpose appeared in the main estimates, and when it was under consideration an explanation was given. This is for the construction of small armouries in places where large armouries are not necessary.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is there one in Victoria county ?

Mr. HYMAN. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) wants one in Victoria county, I will give the suggestion a very sympathetic hearing.

Mr. BLAIN. Where are these armouries to be constructed ? I brought to the attention of the government a long time ago the complaint of the county of Peel in this matter. This general vote is rather dangerous.

Mr. HYMAN. There can hardly be danger in constructing two or three small armouries. This vote is placed in the estimates at the request of the Militia Department.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the Minister of Militia furnish a statement showing where the armouries will be constructed ?

Mr. HYMAN. No. That will depend upon the military necessities.

Mr. BLAIN. That is rather a broad statement. I repeat this general vote is dangerous.

Mr. HYMAN. There has been a similar vote in the estimates for two or three years past, and I do not think any abuse has grown out of it.

Mr. BLAIN. Except the abuse that these armouries are not put in the right places, and putting it in the form of a general vote gives the minister free choice where these armouries are to be located. When elections are coming on, it is dangerous to put the item in that form. It would be better if we were told where these armouries were to be constructed.

Rents, repairs, furniture, heating, &c.—Yukon public buildings—repairs, improvements, fuel and other supplies ; lighting, water service and caretaker's salary, additional amount required, $76,200.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What sums have been expended on the public buildings in the Yukon ? Has the minister a statement there ? And what is the population of the Yukon ? I think this vote would make several dollars a head.

Mr. HYMAN. This item appeared in the main estimates under the Department of the Interior. It was struck out of the main estimates and is inserted here under the Department of Public Works.

Public works—chargeable to income—harbours and rivers—Nova Scotia—Apple River—wharf, $3,000.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to draw the attention of the minister to an article which appeared in the Toronto 'Mail.' It says :

Good for Logan.

This year's Supply Bill amounts to $76,000,000, or thereabouts. It is $36,000,000 more than the Tories expended in the days of extravagance. What these huge outlays mean is made apparent by the following despatch to the Amherst 'News,' in Cumberland county, N.S.:—

Ottawa, July 26.—The supplementary estimates were submitted to parliament last night. Your representative, Mr. Logan, has secured the following votes for Cumberland county :—

$16,000 for railway improvements at Amherst station.

$5,000 for railway siding from Fort Lawrence to Amherst pier.

$3,000 for subsidy for steamer 'Kilkeil' to run to said pier.

$1,000 for Frederick Eaton, who was severely injured in the explosion in the Springhill post office.

$3,000 for wharf at Amherst Point.

$3,000 for Apple river wharf.

$3,000 for improvements at the Joggins wharf.

$3,000 for Malagash wharf.

$4,000 for addition to Parrsboro' pier.

$4,000 for improvements for Wallace harbour.

$4,000 for Advocate harbour and extensions to wharf.

$3,500 for further improvements upon the Springhill public buildings.

$12,000 for breakwater at Port Greville.

Provisions have also been made for Maccan station for providing additional railway facilities at that point.

The above amounts are in addition to the amounts voted in the May estimates, which were as follows :—

$10,000 for Amherst pier.

$15,000 for improvements at Amherst station.

$1,000 improvements at Wentworth.

$2,000 Oxford Junction for additional railway sidings.

$4,500 for railway improvements at Salt Springs.

$5,000 for improvements to railway accommodation at Springhill Junction, and many other smaller items along the line.

This is evidently Mr. Logan's own report to the county. He is telling the people that he has made a big haul out of the public chest for his county. The Ottawa doctrine now is that the public treasury is fair game, and that the man who can get the largest sums from it is the best member.

I suppose it would take the minister some little time to explain all this. May I ask if all these items are for one county ?

Mr. HYMAN. These are not all public works items. Those items that are for the public works in many instances were asked for by the inhabitants themselves.

Mr. BLAIN. Then the hon. minister makes no objection to all these items being voted for Cumberland county ?

Mr. HYMAN. I said before that a number of the items the hon. gentleman read are not in the Public Works estimates. There are other estimates besides those of Public Works.

Mr. BLAIN. Cumberland county seems to be pretty well taken care of. When does the minister expect that this money will be expended ?

Mr. HYMAN. The government will make a strong endeavour to proceed with any work voted by parliament.

Mr. BLAIN. Are there any other counties equally well looked after ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is not altogether a question of counties. The Department of Public Works have officers in different parts of Canada who report upon the public necessities of various localities ; besides, representations are made to the department from the people themselves.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There are 92 harbours in Nova Scotia alone getting grants this session, besides those granted last session. Is there any bay on the shore of Nova Scotia that has not got a wharf ?

Mr. FIELDING. Come down and see.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I want to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance, this year as well as I did last year, to the fact that there are works necessary to be carried on in the province of Ontario, and we cannot get a dollar for them.

Mr. FIELDING. What are they ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In the county of Victoria and Haliburton alone there are 100 miles of lake navigation that could be made available. There are upwards of 40,000 people living along those waters that would benefit by a public expenditure. The plans are all in the Railway Department, and have been there for 10 or 12 years, but nothing is done.

Harbours and rivers, N.S.—Port Hawkesbury—Additional amount for wharf, $2,600.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the total expenditure here ?

Mr. HYMAN. $28,800.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the revenue ?

Mr. HYMAN. The Department of Public Works builds the wharf, and when it is built they turn it over to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, which collects the revenue. I have no estimate of the revenue. I do not think that these works are always considered from the standpoint of revenue.

Mr. BLAIN. What county is this in ?

Mr. HYMAN. Inverness.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the minister give us the returns of shipping from some of these harbours ? I am told that a number of these harbours have never seen a ship.

Mr. HYMAN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman knows whereof he is speaking, but I think that statement is absurd.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Take the 92 harbours—are there any more than 92 ships coming into them, outside of Halifax ?

Mr. LOGAN. In the harbour of Parrsboro' last year over 1,800 vessels entered and cleared.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is for coal.

Mr. LOGAN. No, for general shipping, lumber, of course there is some coal. They carry general produce. Between 4,000,000 and 5,000,000 feet of deals were shipped from that port last year. Let the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) come down to Cumberland county and he will wonder that we do not get more public money for improvements. Cumberland county is the best on earth.

Mr. BLAIN. Did my hon. friend read the list of public works in the newspapers ?

Mr. LOGAN. I heard the list read, but I did not think it necessary to pay any attention to anything that was being read from a newspaper. A large number of those items are railway estimates. There are over 110 miles of government railway in that county, and there must necessarily be a large expenditure, particularly when you remember that the county has three sides on water and is over 100 miles in length and is 60 miles in breadth. It is a very large constituency, and necessarily a considerable amount of public money must be spent there to improve the public services.

Mr. BLAIN. What we complain of is that when we let these items go through the House the local newspaper will take them up as it did in this case, heading the article 'Good for Logan.' Naturally members of the House wonder how it is that the hon. gentleman has such a tremendous pull with the government, when he is able to cover a whole column of a newspaper with grants given to his county, at the same time that there are counties in the province of Ontario can't get a dollar of public expenditure. I may say that there has not been a dollar of money expended in the county of Peel, with the exception of the construction of a post office, and a small expenditure at Port Credit for the last 40 years. There are other counties like Victoria, Nova Scotia that have received so many grants that the representative is able to hold up his hands in his native town and say : See what I have done since I have represented this county, see what I have got from the Liberal government at Ottawa. That is what my hon. friend from Victoria, N.S. (Hon. Mr. Ross) will be able to do. It would be only prudent, when these hon. gentlemen get so much out of the government for their counties, that they should notify the Reform newspapers not to head their articles in this manner, and so publish it to the world.

Mr. LOGAN. I am not responsible for what the newspapers publish. A newspaper man goes to work and picks these items out of the estimates and sends it to his paper. I cannot help that.

Mr. FOWLER. You don't want to help it.

Mr. LOGAN. Of course I did not. Let us all be honest about these things. If I have been of any assistance in securing any of these items I am glad that I have been able to do this as the representative of the county.

Harbours and rivers, N.S.—Port Lorne, reconstruction and repairs of breakwater, $1,000.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance if he is trying any more experiments down there?

Mr. FIELDING. It would be exceedingly fortunate if all the experiments that were tried were as successful as that.

Mr. FOWLER. That was not.

Mr. FIELDING. That was perfectly successful and any statements which were made to the contrary were entirely unfounded.

Mr. FOWLER. A friend of the hon. gentleman, Mr. Nickerson, wrote that beautiful piece of poetry on Fielding's Folly.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend has got mixed. The work to which he refers was many miles away from the work of which we are now speaking.

Mr. FOWLER. Then there are two cases, and this is not the one that was referred to as Fielding's Folly ?

Mr. FIELDING. I have been informed that the person who was commonly believed to have furnished the information to hon. gentlemen opposite of which they have made so much fun saying that this was a useless work, was one of the first to use this harbour.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is the harbour inland ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, it is inland. It is a harbour made by cutting a passage through a beach whereby an inland sea of water was made a harbour.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That was higher up than the sea level ?

Mr. FIELDING. A good deal depends upon the condition of the tide.

Mr. BLAIN. How much revenue is derived from that wharf ?

Mr. FIELDING. There is no revenue but there is quite as much as we get from the Ontario canals.

Mr. BLAIN. If it is a question of revenue from the canals the government, I suppose, are responsible for that because last year they took the tolls off canals.

Mr. FIELDING. Hear, hear ; quite so.

Harbours and rivers, N.S., Tenecape—to complete breakwater, $1,700.

Mr. FOWLER. What settlement is there at Tenecape ? The mines are not being operated there now.

Mr. FIELDING. There is a settlement.

Mr. HYMAN. This is a small item to complete the work. There has been $7.500 expended.

Mr. FOWLER. I understand that Tenecape is a place where there was a mine, but that mine has been closed up for years and that section of the country is deserted.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think it is right to say the country is deserted.

Mr. FOWLER. There is a very sparse population. The mining population has gone away, of course.

Mr. HYMAN. I understand that there is a considerable lumber interest at that place.

Mr. FOWLER. How much lumber was shipped last year ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have no special information, but one of the reasons given by those who asked for this wharf was that there was a considerable amount of lumber shipped.

Mr. FOWLER. There does not seem to be a Nova Scotia member who knows anything about this work.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think my hon. friend knows as much about it as he thought he did.

Mr. FOWLER. Why ?

Mr. FIELDING. Because he says there is no population there.

Mr. FOWLER. No.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, my hon. friend stated that the population had deserted the place.

Mr. FOWLER. The mining population has gone but there is a sparse population. I venture to say that the hon. Minister of Finance does not know the first thing about it.

Mr. FIELDING. I confess that I have not been at Tenecape for a number of years.

Mr. FOWLER. I think I know quite as much about it as the Minister of Finance.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not say that the hon. gentleman did not know as much about it as I did. I said that he did not know as much about it as he thought he did.

Mr. FOWLER. That is why I am entitled to get some information.

Harbours and rivers, N.S., Yarmouth harbour—retaining walls, $10,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Explain that Yarmouth retaining wall.

Mr. HYMAN. This is put in here as retaining walls but the intention is to build a wharf. The intention is to build retaining walls and then fill them up and use the work as a wharf. There is a large amount of shipping done at that port and it will be practically an extension of the retaining wall of the harbour.

Harbours and rivers, N.B., Campbellton—wharf extension and repairs—to complete, $32,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Is this to pay for the wharf you have expropriated ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. What is the total required to complete this work ?

Mr. HYMAN. I explained this very fully the other day. The question is in regard to the purchase of a wharf. The matter is now in the court and as yet the price of the wharf has not been settled. Until the wharf is acquired there will be no expenditure.

Mr. LENNOX. What is the total cost ?

Mr. HYMAN. There is 300 feet extension to the present wharf and the excavation is estimated at 7½ cents a yard.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. None of these are private wharfs ?

Mr. HYMAN. No, the department is very careful about that.

Mr. FOWLER. What about the Little Salmon river in St. John county ?

Mr. HYMAN. I moved that this vote should be struck out of the main estimates because there was a question as to ownership. I have a telegram from the parties stating that they were willing it should be made an open harbour for everybody.

Mr. FOWLER. Along that coast it should be. What about this contribution of $5,000 to that local government in New Brunswick ? What wharfs will it cover ?

Mr. HYMAN. The local government do the work and it is inspected by our engineer.

Mr. FOWLER. Are there any wharfs in contemplation now ?

Mr. HYMAN. Not that I know of that comes out of this vote.

Shippegan harbour—wharf at terminus of Caraquet Railway, $5,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is this a Dominion government wharf ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is the minister aware that the Caraquet Railway is supposed to have been recently purchased by one of the outfit in this business, and I presume next session it will be unloaded upon the country the same as the Gibson Railway.

Mr. HYMAN. I am not aware of anything of the kind, but if the hon. gentleman says it I will accept his statement.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. The newspapers say that certain Toronto gentlemen have bought the road and it will be unloaded upon the people of Canada. I presume this wharf is part of the scheme.

Mr. HYMAN. So far as I am concerned I know nothing about it.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not know what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) means by unloading, but I have this to say that from my standpoint, it is a very proper thing for the Intercolonial Railway and for the government to acquire these branch lines provided they acquire them at a proper price. I am a strong advocate in the interests of the Intercolonial Railway and in the interests of the people that are serving these branch lines, of the policy of the government acquiring them. It will give the people of that country an opportunity to be served by a proper railway system as well as the people of any other part of Canada.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I don't want to run foul on this question.

Mr. HYMAN.

Mr. EARLE. Foul of Fowler.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No. The people of Ontario who pay a large share of this, object to being taxed for the benefit of Mr. Peter Ryan or any gentleman who makes it his business to go around getting these roads and unloading them on the government. The Conmees and Ryans and men of that stripe are all right for themselves, but we should not be parties to their little games. This is part and parcel of the scheme.

Mr. HYMAN. I object to that statement ; it is not so.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What does the minister know about it ? I don't think he knows where Caraquet is. I assume that some members from the maritime provinces told him about it and he put it in the vote.

Mr. TURGEON. This very work has been asked for by the people of Gloucester county for the last ten years, and long before there was any talk of a change in ownership of the Caraquet Railway. It is the proper place for a wharf and will serve the people of Shippigan and Miscou islands. I have been trying to get this vote for several years, and it is only this year we succeeded in getting it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Was there no wharf at the terminus of this railway before ?

Mr. TURGEON. No.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How do they get their freight on to the railway ?

Mr. TURGEON. They have to bring it in small boats and transfer it to large boats at great expense and trouble.

Barrie, Ont., landing pier and dredging, $2,500.

Mr. LENNOX. Is this at Barrie ?

Mr. HYMAN. At Allandale.

Mr. LENNOX. When will this be done ?

Mr. HYMAN. I will take it up with the engineer to-morrow. He says it can be done immediately.

Mr. LENNOX. The wharf there is in pretty bad shape. Is this to be built of wood ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. Would it not be better to build it of cement ?

Mr. HYMAN. If the hon. gentleman desires, it might be built of cement, but of course that would increase the cost.

Mr. LENNOX. It is a point to be considered whether cement would not be the best and cheapest in the long run.

Hamilton harbour improvements, $30,000.

Mr. BARKER. Where is this work to be done, and what is the nature of it ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is for the purpose of the construction of a pile protection, which is to be made into a wharf. It is to extend about 1,600 feet along the harbour front between St. Catharines street and Wellington street.

Mr. BARKER. Is there to be a deepening of the harbour at that point or is the work to be on the land ?

Mr. HYMAN. This work is on the land. There will be some dredging during the time the wharf is being built.

Sault Ste. Marie harbour improvements—compensation to W. H. Plummer in full and final settlement of all claims in connection with the transfer of his wharf property to the Crown, $7,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought you had bought that wharf.

Mr. HYMAN. The wharf was bought by the government some years ago for $1. The arrangement was made by the Public Works Department. After the purchase the wharf was transferred to the Marine and Fisheries Department. The bargain was never carried out. There is considerable correspondence in the department on the subject. This is an estimate by the officers of the department of the value of the wharf at the time it was taken over.

Mr. LENNOX. Has the government formed any scheme for extensive improvements at Sault Ste. Marie ?

Mr. HYMAN. We are extending that wharf now under contract.

Mr. LENNOX. I mean in the way of making a complete harbour along the front.

Mr. HYMAN. There is nothing of that kind immediately before the department.

Severn river—removal of obstructions at Macdonald's chute, $3,400.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister, I suppose, will be careful that in removing these obstructions he is not running foul of the Railways and Canals Department by lowering the water.

Mr. LENNOX. Representations were made by the government in regard to that matter a year or so ago, when it was supposed that the government was about to lower the water of Lake Simcoe by the removal of obstructions in the Severn river. The people around Lake Simcoe have different opinions on the subject.

Mr. HYMAN. If anything of that kind should happen, it is the intention of the department to build controlling works.

Whitby harbour—dredging, $10,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This is not a public harbour.

Mr. HYMAN. This is not for the improvement of a dock or anything like that. This is dredging.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. But a charge is made for the use of these harbours. And I make the same objection now that I made when the Conservatives were in power. I claim that there should be some system in the voting of these moneys. A private party may own the wharf and the Dominion government spends this money in improving the harbour, thus adding to the value of the property. In many cases these people are trying to unload their property and, this may give it a value which may enable them to do so.

Mr. HYMAN. But it also does good by facilitating the use of the harbour.

Mr. BLAIN. Who owns this wharf ?

Mr SAM. HUGHES. The Port Whitby Harbour Company.

Mr. BLAIN. Was there anything in the main estimates for this work ?

Mr. HYMAN. No.

Mr. BLAIN. Will this vote complete the work?

Mr. HYMAN. That is the intention.

Mr. BLAIN. What dredge is expected to do this work ?

Mr. HYMAN. Our own dredge.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it expected that the work will be finished this year ?

Mr. HYMAN. That depends on whether a dredge is available. Very often the department is, I will not say misled, but mistaken in its basis of calculation in these matters. Sometimes storms delay the work, sometimes dredges get out of order. But, if everything goes well we ought to finish the work this fall.

Mr. LOGAN. I desire to call your attention, Mr. Chairman, and that of my hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) and my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) to this Ontario vote. They are so much exercised over the fact that Nova Scotia gets a paltry $200,000 for these works, although it is practically surrounded by the sea. Yet Ontario, which has no salt water, gets $403,435. I would ask, applying the language of the hon. member for North Victoria, if there is any other place in Ontario where a wharf or a breakwater can be put ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I would tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Logan) that you could take the whole of Nova Scotia and drop it into one county in Ontario and then leave plenty of room. And I can tell him that one county of Ontario, the county of York, has a greater population than the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. HYMAN. So far as I have had anything to do with these matters I can say that these works, whether in Ontario or Nova Scotia, are decided upon simply in the public interests.

Mr. SPROULE. We could take the province of Nova Scotia and drop it into the St. Lawrence and never know it was there but for the smell of the bad whiskey.

Mr. LOGAN. But I notice that when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) needs a leader, he comes to the province of Nova Scotia to find him.

Harbours and rivers, British Columbia, $34,500.

Mr. LENNOX. This is the item on which I might discuss a matter I desire to bring forward, but I will leave it until we are on concurrence at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. HYMAN. It is only fair to say that I made arrangements with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) that he should have an opportunity of discussing a certain matter on an appropriate item.

Dredging—new dredging plant, maritime provinces—additional revote, $50,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Where is this to be built ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is a new hydraulic dredge which is now building under contract by the Polson Iron Works in Toronto.

Dredging—Ontario and Quebec—additional amount, $55,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why is this item put in this form ?

Mr. HYMAN. There are many dredges and they are sent backwards and forwards between the provinces.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is it for the construction of dredges ?

Mr. HYMAN. No, it is for dredging.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Then, why not charge it to dredging and not make it appear as if it were for dredges.

Mr. HYMAN. The item has always appeared in this form.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. And I have always objected to it. We do not know whether we in Ontario are getting the benefit of this or whether it is going to Quebec.

Mr. BLAIN. This is an additional vote. What was the original amount ?

Mr. HYMAN. The total is $150,000.

Roads and bridges—Bryson bridge, additional amount to reconstruct piers and approaches, $5,000.

Mr. HYMAN. This bridge is at the village of Bryson, on the Ottawa river, and extends from an island to the shore.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This is not a federal work. The island is in the province of Quebec and the bridge is in the province of Quebec.

Mr. McCOOL. This is an iron bridge originally built by the Dominion government on wooden piers, which have rotted away and have to be reconstructed. It connects Calumet island with the Quebec shore ; it is all in the province of Quebec.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is a Dominion government work.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In any event, it is a bridge in the province of Quebec.

Roads and bridges—to pay for work done by Indians and Halfbreeds on winter road between Lesser Slave and Sturgeon lake, Athabasca territory, under supervision of Rev. A. Desmarais, $800.

Mr. SIFTON. This work was done under the direction of the missionary at Little Slave Lake, who claimed that the Indians had done the work. It appears there was some misunderstanding as to who should pay it, and the claim was made on the federal government. No direct authority was given by this government for the work, but inasmuch as the work has been done and the Indians had been led to expect they would be paid for it, I have recommended that parliament should be asked to pay for it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. To whom is the money to be paid ?

Mr. SIFTON. To the Indians who did the work.

Mr. FOWLER. Is this a permanent road?

Mr. SIFTON. Yes ; I cannot remember the exact distance.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems a strange thing that this man, without any authority from any person whatever, should go to work and employ these Indians to build a road and tell them the Dominion government would pay them.

Telegraph lines—Quebec—to provide for the settlement of F. C. Bickerdike's claim in connection with his contract for the transportation of telegraph poles from Saguenay river to points on the north coast of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, $3,500.

Mr. FOWLER. Who is this Bickerdike ? Is he any relation to the member ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is to pay for work actually done under contract by Mr. Bickerdike.

Mr. FOWLER. Who is Bickerdike ?

Mr. HYMAN. I understand Mr. Bickerdike is the son of the member.

Telegraph lines, British Columbia—Vancouver Island—Salt Spring Island—Telephone Island—further extension on Salt Spring Island, $350.

Mr. SPROULE. One of our members wants to speak on one of these items for British Columbia or the Yukon, and I suppose it may be done on concurrence.

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Survey of head waters of the Ottawa river and tributaries with a view of devising a scheme for the regulation of the water levels of the upper reaches of these streams, so as to afford increased facilities for navigation purposes, the descent of timber, &c.. Additional revote, $5,000. —$15,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the object of this survey? Is that for storage purposes?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, for storage purposes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. For navigation or for timber?

Mr. HYMAN. For both.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I would point out to the hon. Minister of Public Works that he will find in the Railway Department a plan made long years ago for the storage of water along the Trent canal and in Haliburton county, and I would like to direct his attention to that plan in the Railway Department with the view of having some storage work done there too.

Mr. HYMAN. I will take a memorandum of it.

Public buildings, Nova Scotia—Glace Bay—public building, additional $5,000.

Mr. FIELDING. In most of these items for public buildings we ask for $5,000 as a beginning, but in this case we will require more. Glace Bay has increased very much in population and $5,000 would be insufficient to even purchase the land. Therefore, the vote has been increased to $10,000. Glace Bay is a large place and the site in a place like that costs more than in some other places.

Harbours and Rivers—New Brunswick, Great Salmon river—groyne and breakwater combined, $4,300.

Mr. TUCKER. Do I understand that the money is only granted if it is a public harbour?

Mr. HYMAN. I have stated that already in reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler).

Mr. FOWLER. That was the Little Salmon river.

Mr. HYMAN. This is the one I referred to; the other is already a public harbour. No money will be expended unless it is a public harbour.

Mr. FOWLER. Will you have to pay for it?

Mr. HYMAN. No.

Mr. FOWLER. What is this work?

Mr. HYMAN. Extension to the present breakwater.

Militia, $422,985.90.

Mr. FOWLER. What monument is this you are erecting in the Annapolis Garrison grounds?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. To perpetuate the date of the first settlement of Annapolis.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is this Erie monument?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is similar to the others throughout the country.

Mr. FOWLER. What does the tablet on the Citadel rock in Quebec commemorate?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The victory of the British and Canadian forces under General Guy Carleton.

Militia—miscellaneous and unforeseen contingencies, $5,500.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Will the minister explain an item that has appeared in the papers to the effect that the officer in command of the School of Musketry has sent home a number of gentlemen belonging to respectable families?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I saw the item, but I have not yet had an opportunity of making inquiries about it. I intend to do so in the morning. I do not think the statement in the papers is correct.

Mr. FOWLER. Would the commanding officer have that power?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Certainly not without good reason.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I trust the minister will give the matter very careful attention, because there is altogether too much disposition to dragoon men on the part of officers who think they are doing their duty. There are other ways of getting on with men than dragooning them in this way.

Office of Auditor General—further amount required for contingencies, $2,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What have you done to the Auditor General?

Mr. FIELDING. We have not done anything with him.

Mr. SPROULE. Is his resignation going to be accepted, or are you giving him additional power to do his duty?

Mr. FIELDING. The Auditor General tendered his resignation; it has not been accepted, and there the matter stands.

Mr. SPROULE. We had that information weeks ago. We want to know what the government are going to do with him. Are they going to dismiss him?

Mr. FIELDING. We are not going to dismiss him. We could not do that.

Mr. SPROULE. Are you going to accept his resignation?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know. It has been stated that we are anxious to get rid of the Auditor General, but that is a mistake. He has tendered his resignation, but

I am not able to state at present what action is going to be taken.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The government should accept his resignation before the elections, because they gave us a very good precedent by refusing to recognize appointments made after the election of 1896.

Mr. SPROULE. If I understand the minister correctly, he says the government do not desire to accept the Auditor General's resignation. I understood that he was willing to remain in office if the law was amended to give him the authority he required to do his duty, and to give him additional accommodation and additional assistance. Have they decided to give him this ?

Mr. FIELDING. I have not had any question before me with regard to additional accommodation. We have given the Auditor General all the assistance he has asked for.

Mr. FOWLER. What clerks have you recommended for promotion ?

Mr. FIELDING. Mr. H. Gross promoted from second class to first class. He was getting $1,300 and will get $1,500. Miss O'Connell, Messrs. Brown, Folkins, Steeves, promoted from junior second to second class. Miss O'Connell was getting $900 and will get $1,200. Mr. Brown was increased from $875 to $1,200. Mr. Folkins, $850 to $1,200. Mr. Steeves, $800 to $1,200.

Mr. FOWLER. Is there no amount for Mr. Sherwood ?

Mr. FIELDING. He was first included in the promotions but a memorandum from the Auditor General says he failed to pass the promotion examination.

Mr. FOWLER. It was rather a hardship in his case, because it was not necessary for him to pass an examination in order to be promoted. It is not necessary to pass examinations in the Auditor General's Department. There was an amount placed in the estimates for Mr. Sherwood last year. Then this was struck out and he was compelled to undergo an examination. The examination was on the work in the Auditor General's own department and was conducted by the Auditor General himself.

Mr. FIELDING. These matters are left entirely with the Auditor General, and these are his decisions.

Mr. FOWLER. In some cases they are arbitrary. Mr. Sherwood has been in the office some twenty years, and the Auditor General was first going to promote him without an examination. One can understand how difficult an examination may be for a person who has been out of the habit of studying for a number of years. I do not know what sort of a freak would please the Auditor General, but it was a great humiliation for Mr. Sherwood to have himself named for promotion and then be treated in this way. I merely want to enter my protest against the action of the Auditor General.

Mr. FIELDING. The Auditor General appears to have contemplated an increase in Mr. Sherwood's salary, because in making up the figures there is a provision for $175 increase to that gentleman, but judging by the memorandum he does not intend giving it him. Officials in his department have complained to me in one or two instances of what they consider his injustice and I have replied that he must with regard to promotions have his own way.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In this case the failure was a very slight one. I do not know whether the minister is on terms of consultation with the Auditor General now, but if he would consult that gentleman he might give the increase. I believe that the Auditor General would be justified in giving this increase.

Mr. FIELDING. The Auditor General is well aware that the matter is entirely in his hands. I have told him to make promotions according to his judgment. I have no personal knowledge of his officials and no means of measuring the value of their work.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Mr. Sherwood may have incurred the Auditor General's displeasure by not holding up the Minister of Finance in his department.

Mr. FIELDING. The officials in the Auditor General's department have done their duty and I do not think that any of them have incurred his displeasure on that score.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the salary of the Auditor General ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think it is $4,000. It is fixed by statute.

Mr. SPROULE. You do not propose to give an increase ?

Mr. FIELDING. We do not propose to alter the statute at present.

Mr. FOWLER. Has not the minister power to overrule his decisions ?

Mr. FIELDING. Not as regards promotions. My impression is that the right of promoting lies with the Auditor General.

Mr. SPROULE. Is Mr. Sherwood at the maximum of his class ?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Why not give him the increase under his class ?

Mr. FIELDING. No doubt he will receive a statutory increase

Mr. FOWLER. He will not get it this year unless we vote it.

Mr. FIELDING. The amount appropriated will be quite sufficient to pay his statutory increase.

Mr. FOWLER. I trust the Minister of Finance will see that Mr. Sherwood gets it. You would have the right to do that without consulting the Auditor General.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think so, unless the Auditor General recommends it. At any rate I would not do it. We have to differ with the Auditor General on some things, and the least we can do is to give him full control of his office, even the right to make some mistakes.

Mr. FOWLER. If his mistakes result in great injustice to a worthy servant, I do not think he should be sustained. I do not think he should have the right to pick out favourites and prevent other men getting fair treatment.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Who is to sit in judgment on him ?

Mr. FOWLER. The minister.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. He is an officer of the House and not of the government.

Mr. FOWLER. You are not sitting in judgment on him or condemning him, but only overruling his decision. I can quite understand that a man without a fine sense of honour might allow personal feelings to influence him to give unfair treatment, and I think that in this case that is what has happened.

Mr. LENNOX. I cannot say that I approve of the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Fowler's) view. It would be impossible for the Auditor General to carry on the affairs of his department if he were overruled in a matter of this kind.

Mr. FOWLER. Why ?

Mr. LENNOX. Because he has the staff and if his prestige were not kept up, his work would be far more difficult.

Mr. FOWLER. He can appeal to Cæsar.

Mr. LENNOX. But the hon. Minister of Finance does not want to play the part of Cæsar. The salary of the Auditor General is $4,000. It has stood at that figure for some years. Formerly it was lower than that, but it was raised to $4,000. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) said then that it should be at least $4,200. It was fixed at $4,000 by the late government, when the expense of living was very different from what it is now. I think that the government should take into serious consideration the question of increasing the salary of the Auditor General. I am glad to be told that the Minister of Finance expressed the desire that the Auditor General should not vacate his position. I may point out to the government that if the present Auditor General were retiring and a new man had to be appointed to the office they could hardly expect the new man to commence at less than $4,000. The present Auditor General has been in office for twenty-six years and should receive some recognition. Considering the salaries given to less important positions I think the salary of the Auditor General ought to be materially increased.

Board of Civil Service Examiners—further amount required to meet cost of examination, $450.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice as we go through the estimates, that the government are employing a good many who have not passed the civil service examination. What is the good of having a Board of Civil Service Examiners if you give employment to those who have not been examined ?

Mr. FIELDING. The cases that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) has noticed are exceptional. I think I am right in saying that five out of six—perhaps nine out of ten—of those appointed to the civil service have passed the examination. Of course there are special circumstances requiring a special vote of parliament.

Mr. BLAIN. I understood the Postmaster General (Sir Wm. Mulock) to say that it was almost impossible to comply with the requirements of the law in the Post Office Department.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I said there were exceptional cases. One such case that came up was that of a man appointed years ago but who had proven himself worthy of a higher status than that he occupied.

Mr. BLAIN. Did he not say that he took men in first and then gave them an opportunity to pass the civil service examination ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I was speaking of the railway mail clerks. I spoke of a new transcontinental train put on by the Canadian Pacific Railway this summer which might or might not be permanent—nobody could tell. We took twenty-two men, many of whom have passed examination, but some of whom have not. The employment may be merely temporary and these men have been engaged with the idea that they may leave about October 1st.

Legislation—Senate—further amount required for contingencies, $11,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Is there no limit to what these venerable gentlemen are allowed to spend ? Does the minister give them what they ask for ? I must say that they seem to me to be a very useless body. When they have nothing else to do they increase the pay of the officials there. They have them at rates now about one-third higher than the officials of the House of Commons. I

notice that there is also $2,000 for expenses of a special commission. Is that in connection with the Mutual Reserve business ?

Mr. FIELDING. We shall be lucky if we get off with that. This is for last year.

Mr. BLAIN. There are votes here to the representatives of the late Hon. James Dever, and the representatives of the late Hon. James Reid. How about the representatives of the late Senator Aikins ?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know whether the late Senator Aikins was present this session or not, his death occurred since these estimates were made up, and we could not include a vote to his representatives. Of course whatever consideration was extended to the representatives of the other gentlemen will be extended to the representatives of the late Senator Aikins. I am afraid it cannot be done this session as it would necessitate the bringing down of other estimates. But it can be done later on.

Mr. BLAIN. Mr. Aikins was here this session.

Supreme Court of Canada—to provide for the salary of E. R. A. Taschereau, $1,250.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the government ever got any statement from Judge Taschereau regarding the alleged interview given by him in England ? It is true that when he came home he disclaimed it in another interview which was about as bad as the original statement.

Mr. FIELDING. The government are not in a position to call upon a judge of the Supreme Court to answer for any statement he makes. He is not our officer at all.

Mr. SPROULE. I would imagine that self-respect would have led him to put himself right. If he did not do that voluntarily I should think it was the duty of the government to ask an explanation from him.

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid it would hardly be seemly for the government to call upon a judge to render an account to them. He is not our officer.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it not be better to do that than to move for his impeachment in the House ?—because, if what is attributed to him be correct, there is not the slightest doubt that he would be liable to impeachment here, and if the fact was established, there is no doubt whatever that he would be impeached.

Mr. FOWLER. It is certainly very unseemly language for a judge to use, particularly when he is a judge of the highest court in this country. It is certainly an interference such as is very unjustifiable to say the least.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Not only unjustifiable, but the language made use of by Judge Taschereau in the old country and admitted by him——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Not admitted.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Certainly, admitted by him as having been used in a private conversation, because he said that he was speaking in private and not in public. It is simply scandalous, and shows the intrigues that are going on to get this sort of thing before the public. However, those who know him have long supposed the old gentleman to be in his dotage, and I don't think it matters much.

Mr. FIELDING. I don't think we ought to use our position here to attack a gentleman in his high position. The judge is not here to answer for himself. He is not our officer, and unless proceedings are taken in the way provided by statute, we have no right to call him to account before parliament.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have no hesitation in saying that if judges in the Dominion of Canada are going to act as a number of them have acted lately, they will hear of it very much to their sorrow throughout this country. We had an instance of it in the Stratton case in Toronto, simply scandalizing the bench.

Mr. BRODEUR. I rise to a point of order. I do not think the hon. gentleman——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman has no right to go beyond——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am not going to be dictated to. The Chairman——

Mr. BRODEUR. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Let the hon. gentleman state his point of order.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is what I am trying to do. The hon. gentleman must know that it is absolutely against the rules of the House——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It is not the business of the hon. gentleman to read me a lecture. Let him state his point of order.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am stating the point of order, if the hon. gentleman will be kind enough to give me an opportunity.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. We are not dealing with furnished apartments now at $4,000 a year.

Mr. BRODEUR. The point is this : The hon. gentleman knows very well that it is absolutely against the rules of the House to say anything disrespectful to the judges. There is only one way of attacking a judge, and that is by petition and impeachment.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman is not stating the point of order, he is making a speech.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. State your point of order, and I will sit down.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am stating the point of order.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If the hon. gentleman is making a speech, I shall not make way for him.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman knows very well that when a point of order is raised he must take his seat.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I rise to a point of order. It is not for the hon. gentleman to make a speech, it is for the Chairman to rule on the point of order.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is absolutely against the rules of the House for a member to say anything against a judge.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Cowan). The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue is stating his point of order.

Mr. BRODEUR. The only way of attacking a judge is by petition and impeachment, and until that is done, no member of the House has a right to say anything disrespectful of a judge.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister seems to imagine that he is the chairman, and he tells us what is the rule and what is not. I respectfully submit that all that he requires to do is to ask the chairman if the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) is in order in making the statement he makes.

Mr. BRODEUR. I say he is not in order.

Mr. FIELDING. Let us confine ourselves to the point of order. I beg to call the hon. gentleman's attention to page 496 of Bourinot, third edition, 1903:

> The rules of the two houses are only intended to protect their own members, and consequently any reflection on the conduct of persons outside cannot be strictly considered as breaches of order. But the Speaker of the English Commons now always interferes to prevent as far as they can all personal attack on the judges and courts of justice. They have always felt themselves compelled to say that 'such expressions should be withdrawn,' and that 'when it is proposed to call in question the conduct of a judge, the member desiring to do so should pursue the constitutional course of moving an address to the Crown.'

I think my hon. friend will admit that is not only good law but good reason.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Under ordinary circumstances I certainly endorse the language of Bourinot. But this is a most extraordinary condition. We have had the evidence of a gentleman making a statement in the old country, and we have the statement intensified by himself on landing in this country, stating not only his own personal views, but absolute untruths.

Mr. BRODEUR. Order.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I want it understood that these gentlemen are not going to have such views disseminated throughout this country without a protest.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Cowan). I do not think the discussion of this question arises on the item that is before the committee, which is colonization roads in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories.

Mr. SPROULE. We were dealing with an item for Judge Taschereau's salary.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Another Taschereau altogether.

Mr. SPROULE. When the Minister of Finance says we have no right to say anything against a judge unless we are prepared to impeach him, I am endeavouring to get information as to whether certain allegations made with respect to a judge are correct or not, and I assume that the government might know whether they are correct. It is certainly within our rights to ask such a question. We do not desire to attack the judge, but it is our right, and our duty as well, to ascertain whether these allegations be correct, then if they are correct, I for one would take the responsibility of going a step further.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The item under discussion is a payment to a gentleman by the name of Taschereau—I assume that it is not Chief Justice Taschereau; I would hardly be prepared to discuss the case of Chief Justice Taschereau on some item for a gentleman having a similar name.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Cowan). The item is to provide for the salary of E. R. A. Taschereau.

Mr. BRODEUR. The salary of Chief Justice Taschereau is voted by statute, so this cannot be the Chief Justice.

Mr. SPROULE. Surely some member of the government ought to know whether it is or not.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend only asked the question this moment.

Mr. SPROULE. That was the first question I asked—whether this was for Judge Taschereau, and if so, whether he had condescended to give the government an explanation of the alleged interview which took place in the old country.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. This is not the same man.

Mr. SPROULE. Why did you not answer that long ago?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend did not ask that.

Mr. SPROULE. I did ask it and kept on asking it.

Colonization roads in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, $25,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Explain.

Mr. SIFTON. This item was before the committee when I was absent. It was brought up by my hon. friend the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) and he explained that the item is for the purpose of making roads between Athabasca Landing and Lesser Slave lake, $15,000; and for constructing a road from a point on the Canadian Northern Railway near Erwood to the north of the Carrott river, $5,000, making $20,000. Then, the remaining $5,000 is divided into two parts, $2,000 to be expended on a short piece of road between the north of the international boundary line and Sprague, and the balance of $3,000 to be expended between Lake Winnipeg and Lake Manitoba for colonization purposes. I understand that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have raised some objections and I would like to hear what their objections are.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. We would like to hear where these roads are to run, I have not heard the hon. gentleman explain where this larger item is to be expended.

Mr. SIFTON. $15,000 is to be expended in making a more passable road between Athabasca Landing and Lesser Slave lake.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the hon. minister pretend to say that there is a road between Athabasca Landing and Lesser Slave lake?

Mr. SIFTON. There is a trail; it is not a very good road.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There is the River Athabasca to Lesser Slave lake but there is no trail.

Mr. SIFTON. There is a trail. The trail is not very good and that is the reason why we want this money.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is not the hon. minister thinking of the trail from Athabasca river from near Fort Assiniboia?

Mr. SIFTON. Did I say Athabasca Landing?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes.

Mr. SIFTON. I meant to say Athabasca river.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. minister understands the objection of the committee when the item was before the committee the other day. The objection was that the money should be expended by this government instead of by the Northwest Territorial government and the Manitoba government. Would the hon. minister say whether at any other period money voted for the Northwest roads by the Dominion parliament has been expended by the Dominion government and not by the territorial or provincial governments?

Mr. SIFTON. There has been money voted by this parliament for the purpose of building colonization roads in the Northwest. A few years ago we voted a sum of money for the purpose of making a trail near the location of the proposed road from Athabasca river. It was handed over to the Northwest Territories government for the purpose of spending the money, but they spent part of it in another place altogether and did not finish the work. Therefore we thought it preferable that we should spend this money ourselves. It is to be expended outside of the settled portions of the territories. The territorial government, being interested in the settled portions of the Territories, cannot be expected to take very much interest in this kind of work and there is no arrangement whereby we will have a guarantee that the money will be spent for the purpose for which the money is voted; part of the money that we have voted for a particular work before has been spent in another part of the country. As to the trail it is desired to construct from the Canadian Northern it is through an almost uninhabited country at the present time and it is for the purpose of enabling us to provide a passable road by which settlers can get into that district. If we proposed to construct a permanent road this sum would not go any distance. I fancy there can be no serious objection to the expenditure of this money in the Northwest Territories. As to the balance of the money I can quite understand that the point may be raised as to the expenditure of money in an organized province. If hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House object to it we will reduce the item by $5,000 and confine it to the Northwest Territories; but they will have to take the responsibility of making the objection themselves.

Mr. BLAIN. This is a very serious charge which the hon. minister has made against the Northwest Territorial government. If I understand the hon. gentleman's remarks, the chief reason why he is unwilling to place this money at the disposal of the Northwest government is that he has no confidence in that government.

Mr. SIFTON. I have no guarantee that they will expend it for that purpose or that they will not take it to do other work. We are in an altogether different position in the Northwest Territories from that in which you are in the province of Ontario. If we undertake to settle an outlying portion of the province of Ontario, as we have done in some cases, we ask the local government to make the necessary improvements in the way of roads because they own the Crown lands, but in the Northwest Territories or Manitoba the territorial or provincial government say: 'We do not own these lands, this work is supposed to be done in an outlying part of the country, our people are not interested in that specially and we do not propose to spend the money.' While I quite

recognize that so far as the organized provinces are concerned there may be some point in the objection and the House may desire to take more time to consider it, so far as the Northwest Territories are concerned we are spending the money in practically uninhabited places to make passable trails and I do not see how there can be any objection in the world.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. At what point will this road touch Lessar Slave lake ?

Mr. SIFTON. I neglected to get the exact details from the member for Alberta before he went away.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. The member for Alberta sat here the other night and gave no explanation. If it is intended to run this road from Old Fort Assiniboine to Lesser Slave lake you might as well throw the money away because the trail that was there is not cut in the proper place.

Mr. SIFTON. This is to improve the old trail.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Then you might as well throw the money away.

Mr. BOYD. The minister has recognized the objection which I took in the first place, to voting money to be spent by the federal government in organized provinces.

Mr. SIFTON. If the hon. gentleman objects we will abandon the $5,000 for Manitoba.

Mr. BOYD. I object unless you give it to the province of Manitoba to be spent by them for that purpose.

Mr. SIFTON. If we gave it to the province they would not spend it for that purpose.

Mr. BOYD. If you gave it to the province they would spend it properly and probably add as much more.

Mr. SIFTON. We can spend it as well as they can.

Mr. BOYD. It is a very dangerous precedent to establish.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. A short time ago we voted money to the province of New Brunswick to be spent by the province under the superintendence of our engineer. Why should not the same thing be done in this case ?

Mr. SIFTON. We are constantly doing work in the territories and have our own engineer.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why is the minister running a road north from Erwood ? There can be no settlers north there unless you go a little west.

Mr. DAVIS. There is very good land somewhat to the west which has to be opened up.

Mr. SPROULE. Our experience in Ontario justifies the conclusion that this vote is for political jobbery at the elections. On the Indian reserve in the Manitoulin islands when an election is coming on the local government votes money for colonization purposes and employ hundreds of agents in every direction for that purpose. I have no doubt that the Minister of the Interior, who is well versed in these matters unless he is much belied, has put this money in for this very purpose. We have not the slightest objection to the money being spent to build roads if it is spent under the local government, but we will not consent to this vote which is clearly to be spent for political jobbery.

Mr. DAVIS. What political jobbery could there be at Athabasca Landing where there is no representation ?

Mr. SIFTON. There is not the slightest shadow of foundation for the statement which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) makes, nor for his suggestion that the province of Manitoba is to be debauched by a vote of $5,000 for a colonization road.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not make any such suggestion. But you would work it in one constituency if you get amongst that element that is sometimes very prominent in elections.

Mr. SIFTON. My hon. friend knows more about purchasing votes than I do.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not in the business.

Mr. SIFTON. My hon. friend speaks on that subject with a considerable degree of confidence. I cannot speak with the same degree of confidence. What work of colonization is being carried on in Manitoba, I am glad to say, is being carried on successfully ; but if the hon. gentleman wishes to take the responsibility of objecting to the item for Manitoba, I will strike it out. As to the Northwest Territories, the money is to be spent by this government under the supervision of its own officers. Does anybody suppose that the electors are going to be debauched away beyond the Athabasca river ? It seems to me that if public works are to be disputed on the ground of political debauchery, the same objection could be raised to any public work. My hon. friend seems to know more about that sort of business than I do.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Will this road go near the limits owned by the hon. member for North Renfrew, and possibly by other gentlemen on that side of the House ?

Mr. SIFTON. I do not think so. I never heard a suggestion of that kind. I do not know where those limits are. I was within a few miles of the place a few days ago, and, so far as I know, there are no lumbering operations carried on at that point.

Mr. BLAIN. With regard to the $5,000 item for the province of Manitoba, it is only

fair to assume that the hon. gentleman has good reasons for asking the committee to vote this money, and that it will be of advantage to the people of that section of the country. He now comes forward and says that, because we object to the item, he will strike it out. That in itself savours of politics, I think. There is no use of the hon. gentleman telling us that he knows nothing about politics.

Mr. SIFTON. These two little works can wait until next year; and then, if the vote comes down, there will not be a word said about them, because my hon. friends will not be so excited about the elections.

Mr. BLAIN. I am a little surprised that my hon. friend should have a lack of confidence in the government of his own province, and that he casts a reflection on the government of the Northwest Territories. What we object to on this side of the House is that the hon. gentleman, on the eve of an election, takes a vote to be expended in a new way altogether—for the construction of roads in a province by the Dominion government.

Mr. SIFTON. I move that the vote with reference to Manitoba be struck out.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister says we have done this frequently before. Only last year, when the question was put across the floor of the House, what is the principle the hon. minister has adopted for the expenditure of money in the Northwest Territories, his answer was that the territorial government sends down an intimation that money is required for certain roads, and that we provide it, because, as he said, they know better than we do where the money is required, they are interested in the country, and they are responsible for the expenditure. We accepted that principle as correct, and voted every dollar that was asked. Now we are told that a different principle is to prevail. Having accepted the principle first laid down as the correct one, that principle should be adhered to.

Mr. SIFTON. If this money were to be expended in the settled portions of the Northwest Territories I would recommend that the money be handed over to the territorial government, but there is a distinct difference between expending money in a settled portion of the territories, where the territorial government is responsible to their own constituents, and spending money in the wild and unorganized portions of the territories. I move that the item be reduced to $20,000, and that the words 'Manitoba and' be struck out.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that the policy followed in the Yukon district? Is the Yukon Council not spending the money at present in the unsettled as well as the settled districts of that country?

Mr. BLAIN.

Mr. SIFTON. Not all of it. We spent a great deal of money there directly. Besides the Yukon Council is only half elective.

Mr. SPROULE. It is the Yukon Council all the same, and has taken the responsibility of spending the money.

Mr. DAVIS. There is no representation in the Northwest assembly for this portion of the Northwest Territories where this money is to be expended. If the Dominion government is sending mounted police to that country to open it up, surely they have the right to spend directly a certain sum of money on the making of roads to enable the police to go in and come out.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I would take the liberty of suggesting to the minister that in issuing his instructions for that Peace River road running from Fort Assiniboine, he should run it further up to the west and not down to Lesser Slave lake. The old trail ran through a very bad part of the country not fit for settlement, but if you will keep away to the left you will go through a good farming country.

Mr. SIFTON. I shall be happy to act on the suggestion, if the engineer approves of it.

Amendment (Mr. Sifton) agreed to.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to move an amend ment to that item. I move that the $5,000 be placed to the credit of the Manitoba government.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Cowan). That is out of order. You cannot increase a vote.

Mr. BLAIN. I am not asking to increase the vote.

Mr. SIFTON. The amendment has been carried, and the only amendment you can move is to strike the vote out or reduce it.

Mr. BLAIN. There is no disposition on this side to strike the item out. I intend pointing out that when a certain amount is voted in the province of Ontario, say $500 for a bridge, they spend $350 for inspectors or thereabout, and the balance to construct the bridge.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Cowan). If the hon. gentleman is going into Ontario politics, I shall ask somebody else to take the chair, so that I may take part in the discussion.

Mr. BLAIN. No one will interfere with the hon. gentleman when he thinks it his duty to leave the chair. I wish to move, in amendment, that the $5,000 under discussion be placed to the credit of the Manitoba government to be expended by it.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Cowan). That motion is out of order. These are resolutions brought down by the government, and you cannot change the destination of the item.

Mr. SIFTON. If the hon. gentleman desires to move a resolution in the sense he

speaks of, the time to do it is on concurrence.

Mr. BLAIN. How can I do it then, when the $5,000 is struck out ?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Cowan). I rule the motion entirely out of order.

Mr. BLAIN. I would ask the chairman to give us the rule on which he bases his decision ?

Mr. SPROULE. We do not want to have to appeal from the ruling of the chair, but no one knows better than the Minister of the Interior that we are quite in order in moving that this money be spent in another channel. We are not increasing the amount, and we are not aware that the amendment of the Minister of the Interior was carried before my hon. friend made his motion.

Mr. SIFTON. I will look up my authority in a moment. I have a very strong impression that the only motion that can be moved is one either to strike out the item or reduce it.

Mr. DAVIS. As I understand it there was a sum of $25,000 placed in the estimates, and this resolution has been passed to reduce it by $5,000. I do not see how a motion can be put to increase it by $5,000 again.

Mr. BLAIN. I did not understand the chairman to put the resolution to the committee.

Mr. DAVIS. He did.

Mr. BLAIN. There was so much confusion that I did not understand it. I think the chairman will not take advantage of that—I am sure he will not. The minister moves to reduce the item by $5,000, and I wish to move an amendment. It may be that the chairman declared the motion carried. but I did not hear it, and I think he will not take advantage of my misunderstanding.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Cowan). I have ruled that this is out of order, because you are changing the destination of the money. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) has an appeal to the Speaker if he desires.

Mr. SIFTON. Here is the authority to which I refer. I quote from Bourinot's Parliamentary Procedure, page 592 :

> The Committee of Supply cannot increase a grant which has been recommended by a message from the Governor General. It is also irregular to increase any item in a resolution. But any motion to reduce a grant or to strike it out of the estimates altogether will always be in order. The advisability of increasing a grant may, as a matter of course, be discussed so as to inform the government as to the sense of the House on the qustion. The ministry alone can move in the matter, and another message will be brought down to increase the grant.

Mr. BLAIN. I accept the ruling.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister has given us the reason why there should be no objection to this vote. He says there can be no politics in it because the money is to be expended in the unsettled portions of the Northwest Territories. But the persons who will perform the labour on this trail will be taken from the settled portions of the Territories and their employment will be made conditional on their voting for the government candidate.

Mr. DAVIS. There is to be no poll held out there.

Mr. FOWLER. But the voters will be taken out and the work done on the condition that when they come back they will vote for the government candidate.

Mr. DAVIS. That would void the election.

Mr. FOWLER. Don't you be so innocent.

Mr. SIFTON. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) allow me to ask him a question ? Would he prefer that only labourers should be employed on this work who are not voters ? My hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) ought not to allow this government to spend any money, because we are hiring people who are voters in Canada and we might make a condition that they shall all vote for the government.

Mr. FOWLER. I am replying to the argument that there can be no politics in this because the work is to be done in an unsettled portion of the country, and I am showing that that has nothing to do with it.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) must have a poor opinion of the voters in the Northwest Territories if he thinks they can be bought up like sheep.

Mr. FOWLER. How can I help having a poor opinion of those voters when I see the representative they send here from Saskatchewan

Mr. BLAIN. I am surprised to hear the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) speak in this way. He sits here and listens to the minister who represents his section of the country state that he himself would not trust the legislature of his province to spend this small amount of money. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) allows the minister to discredit his province and himself.

Mr. DAVIS. The minister made no such statement with reference to my province.

Mr. BLAIN. I repeat that the minister said that he would not trust the legislature of the Northwest Territories to spend this money for the reason that in the past a certain amount of money had been placed at their disposal and they did not expend it for the work for which it was voted. And he made practically the same statement with regard to the province of Manitoba—

he would not trust the legislature of that province either. Will the minister tell us what money the territorial government received and expended for the purpose for which it was not voted?

Mr. SIFTON. It was two or three years ago. I cannot give the exact date.

Mr. BLAIN. I accept that. But would he say on what work the money was intended to be spent ?

Mr. SIFTON. I cannot say. I made the statement on the authority of my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) who made the statement to me in discussing this particular vote.

Mr. BLAIN. I think it only fair that the committee should have some facts to go upon. The minister forced upon the committee the bald statement that a certain amount of money voted by this parliament and placed at the disposal of the territorial government was expended for a purpose for which it had not been voted. I asked him for some particulars as to the amount of money and the work for which it was intended. I think that was a fair question.

Mr. SIFTON. I have already told the hon. gentleman that I do not know, and he can hardly expect to get the information by repeating his question. I stated that my authority was the hon. member for Alberta.

To cover unprovided items, 1902-3, as per Auditor General's Report, page C—4, $106,348.23.

Mr. FIELDING. This is to enable the Auditor General, at the close of the fiscal year, to balance his accounts. In some branches of the departmental vote, the expenditure will fall short of the sums appropriated, in some other branches the expenditure will be somewhat greater. At the close of the year, in cases where the expenditure has been somewhat greater in that particular branch, the Auditor General totals up these sums, and asks for a sum to balance his accounts. This is a formal vote taken at the close of every fiscal year. It is not a new appropriation, but it deals with sums already expended, and is merely intended to balance the account.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the government made any settlement of the sums in connection with the Martineau defalcation ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think not, that still stands. As it stands now we claim that the bank should indemnify us, but the question has not yet been finally determined.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING. We had better keep the committee open in case we have omitted anything, but I think we have dealt with all the items.

Mr. BLAIN.

COMPANIES ACT, 1902—AMENDMENT.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I have drawn the attention of the committee to a Bill which stands upon the Order Paper as to which the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Cowan) has given some information. I am informed that an understanding has been come to by striking out one clause of the Bill, and that it is now unobjectionable. That being so, I move the second reading of this Bill, and ask that we go into committee and dispose of it.

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

POST OFFICE ACT—SENATE AMENDMENTS.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General) moved that the amendments made by the Senate to the Act to amend the Post Office Act, be read the second time, and concurred in. He said: There was one section of the old Post Office Act proposed to be struck out, section 12. That was a section dealing with the powers of the chief inspector. We were repealing that section because we have had no chief inspector, and do not propose to have one. That section gave the chief inspector power to examine under oath and hold investigations. Instead of having a chief post office inspector appointed, we have a city post office superintendent. The Senate called attention to the fact that the superintendent, under the Act, might not have power to examine witnesses under oath. Therefore, instead of repealing section 12 it is proposed to amend it by striking out the first nine lines which create the office of an inspector, and substitute therefor the city post office superintendent, leaving the remainder of the section which gives power to hold investigations and examine witnesses under oath. We then confer upon the superintendent power to examine witnesses under oath.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. When will prorogation take place ?

Mr. FIELDING. We shall proceed in the morning with the Railway Subsidy Bill, which is the only measure remaining on the Order Paper. Then we will take concurrtnce. Then if the indications are favourable, we may perhaps endeavour to carry out the arrangement for prorogation at twelve o'clock, but I do not think that is possible. I think an announcement will be made in

the morning, and prorogation may take place in the afternoon.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 4.50 a.m, Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, August 10, 1904.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

BOUNTIES ON LEAD.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I desire to ask the consent of the House to the introduction and immediate passage of a Bill to correct a possible defect in a Bill that was recently passed by this House. The Bill referred to was that relating to the payment of bounties on lead. The purpose of the Bill was to provide that where lead ore was delivered to a smelter at the close of the fiscal year the bounty might still be paid, provided always that it did not exceed the amount appropriated by parliament. Attention has been called to the fact that it is possible, from a reading of the Act, that while it would regulate payment in future, it might not apply to the bounty of the year which has just closed. Consequently a Bill has been prepared to correct the defect. It was suggested that perhaps this could be adjusted by an amendment in the Senate, but as the Bill was a money Bill the Senate could not deal with it. However, the law clerk of the Senate has drafted an amendment which will meet the case. If the House will permit, I will be glad to obtain their consent to the passage of this Bill. Where the Bill in its present form says that this payment may be made for any fiscal year, we insert the words 'for the past or any subsequent fiscal year.' It makes it quite clear that the transactions of the year that has lately closed will be covered by the Act. I therefore ask leave to introduce Bill (No. 175) to amend an Act passed the present session entitled An Act further to amend the Act providing for the payment of bounties on lead contained in lead bearing ores mined in Canada.

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

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Bill (No. 171) to authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned—Mr. Emmerson—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 6,

Mr. EMMERSON. I wish to add:

Provided always that any decision of the said Board made under this section may at any time be varied, changed or rescinded by the Governor in Council as he may deem just and proper.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not clearly understand this section providing how subsidies shall be paid. It says that they shall be paid 'upon the completion of the work subsidized'—that is all right; or 'by instalments, on the completion of each ten-mile section of the railway'—that is all right. But it goes on 'in the proportion which the cost of such completed section bears to that of the whole work undertaken.' And subsection (c) says: 'Upon the progress estimates on the certificate of the chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals.' I think that clause is a bad one. You may pay out the whole subsidy upon a ten-mile section of the road before it is completed and before it can be of any use.

Mr. EMMERSON. That would simply mean that by these instalments you pay them for each ten-mile section proportionately to the cost of the whole work.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister has read the words of the clause correctly. I have read them, but I cannot understand the application of them.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a progress estimate.

Mr. HAGGART. The last is a progress estimate, but I do not quite understand it.

Mr. EMMERSON. It seems to me to be quite clear.

Mr. HAGGART. Then, perhaps the hon. minister will make it clear to me.

Mr. EMMERSON. It means in proportion to the whole—by instalments on the completion on each ten-mile section of the railway in the proportion which the cost of such completed section bears to the whole work undertaken.

Mr. HAGGART. Suppose that you had a section of ten miles that would not cost one-quarter of what the remaining portion of the road would cost in proportion; would you pay them only one quarter?

Mr. HYMAN. It is a question of general average.

Mr. FIELDING. I think that is the very purpose of the clause. Take a road of forty miles in which one ten-mile section has been completed. The completed section might be very light and the work remaining to be done very heavy. If you pay one-quarter of the whole subsidy you will pay out of all proportion. This clause seems to me

to make it clear that you must pay only in proportion to the whole cost.

Mr. HAGGART. Your subsidy is only $3,200 a mile.

Mr. HYMAN. It runs over the whole road.

Mr. HAGGART. The subsidy would run from $3,200 to $6,400 per mile. I do not think it is intended to do as the minister says, but I do not understand what it is intended for.

Mr. FIELDING. I think these words have been in the Act for many years.

Mr. HAGGART. No, they are new.

Mr. FIELDING. I think not; I think they will be found in Subsidy Acts for many years past.

Mr. HAGGART. No, the old provision was to pay on the completion of each ten-mile section. Subsections (b) and (c) of this section are new.

Mr. FIELDING. I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) must be mistaken. I think the minister will say that these words have been copied from the previous statute.

Mr. HAGGART. No, these words are put in specially for the purpose of allowing the minister to pay on progress estimates, a power which he had not before. Subsection (c) providing for payment upon progress estimates is certainly new. I do not know what the meaning is exactly. And I think that the minister will find some bother when he comes to pay these subsidies. There will be a reference to the Auditor General and another case for half a dozen lawyers.

Bill reported.

Mr. EMMERSON moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE moved:

The granting of such subsidies, and the receipt thereof by the respective companies, shall be subject to the condition that the Governor in Council may at all times provide and secure to all telephone companies equal treatment in the matter of telephone entrance to the stations and buildings of the company.

He said: Notice of this amendment was given by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean).

Amendment (Mr. Sproule) negatived on division.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read a third time, and passed.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Yukon—relief and medical attendance, $6,400.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. BRODER. I wish to call attention to the case of a gentleman who is employed in the Yukon service and who seems to be drawing a salary although he has nothing to do. I refer to Mr. Joseph Gobeil who has been acting as private secretary to Mr. Charleson at $200 a month. It seems that he has done no work at all since the spring of 1903. His name does not appear in the public accounts or in the estimates but it appears in the Auditor General's Report, and I find there a good deal of correspondence in reference to this gentleman and some of his financial exploits. It seems that the matter is still going on. I do not know this man and I know nothing of the case beyond what I see in the public record, but I bring it to the attention of the House because I find that there is a good deal of irregularity in reference to this gentleman buying clothes, and other things in an irregular way as referred to by the Auditor General. I find that this occurs not only in the case of this gentleman but in other cases one near my own home, the case of the steamer 'Alert.' The officials of that steamer go out and buy furniture without any order from the government and I wish to find out whether or not it is the practice of the government to allow civil servants and those in their employ to buy whatever they want without let or hindrance and without any requisition? I see by the Auditor General's Report that this young man—I do not know whether he is young or old—makes the following charges under the heading of 'Yukon Improvement':

Report for year ending 30th June, 1900. Page V—323:

Gobeil, Jos. E., secretary to Mr. Charleson:—Salary, $1,735.85; sundry outlay for supplies, wages of men, &c., $2,809.93; less $100 cash, $995.78 from P. W. Dept., $1,714.15.

Then, there appears in the Auditor General's Report, 1900, page V—339, the following letter from the Auditor General:

YUKON IMPROVEMENTS: IRREGULAR CHARGES.

Audit Office, Ottawa, April 6, 1900.

Sir,—Let me call your attention to some items of 'Yukon Improvements' expenditure, shown on pages Q—267 and Q—268 of my report for 1898-9.

Three payments for wine, on page Q—267, amounting to $8.60, should be refunded.

The items in Mr. Jos. Gobeil's account on page Q—268, of $21 and $24, for moving and storing house furniture, are not proper charges on public funds.

Mr. Gobeil should give vouchers for $25, $20 and $7 for clothing.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
J. L. McDOUGALL, A.G.

The Acting Minister of Public Works.

This is a most extraordinary condition of things, it seems to me.

Mr. HYMAN. What is the date of that letter?

Mr. BRODER. April 6th, 1900. Then we find the following charges :—

Report for year ending 30th June, 1901, Page V—71 : Gobeil, J. E., services as private secretary to J. B. Charleson ($2,199.31)—Services, Feb. 1, 1900-June 30, 1901, 17 m. at $200 ; less, cash in 1899-1900, page V—65, 5 m. at $175 ; from J. B. Charleson, Jan. 30, 1900, $300 ; April 13, $100 ; Feb. 21, 1901, $50 ; $175 charged to Dawson-Fort Cudahy (page) and $175 charged to Ashcroft Barkerville Cons. (page), $1,725.00 ; travel and outlay, Jan. 29-Nov. 10, 1900, $304.31; Feb. 16-July 8, 1901, $40.45, $344.76 ; return ticket, Vancouver to Ottawa, Sept. 1, 1900, $129.55.

I do not wish to confuse this gentleman's name with that of the Deputy Minister of Public Works, because he is a different individual, I understand.

Report for year ending 30th June, 1902, Page V—71 : Gobeil, J. E., services as private secretary to J. B. Charleson, 12 m. to June 30, 1902, at $200 ; travelling expenses, Vancouver-Ottawa, Nov., 1901, $107.80 ; sundry outlay, Feb. 16-Nov. 5, 1901, $42.20 ; street car fares, Dec. 1901-Jan., 1902, $2.25, $2,527.25, $25.

Report for year ending 30th June, 1902, Page V—327 : Gobeil, J. E., secretary to J. B. Charleson, Supt. of Public Works ($2,936.35)—Services, 12 m. to June 30, 1903, at $200, $2,400 ; travelling expenses, self and operator, Ottawa-Vancouver, Aug., 1902, $156.80 ; Vancouver to Skagway and Whitehorse, Sept., and return to Ottawa, Oct., $166.15; Aug. 12, cabs, $3.50; mending valise, $1.30 ; man closing up house, $2.50 ; $330.25 ; travelling expenses, Ottawa-Montreal and return, Jan., 1903, $23 ; Ottawa-Toronto and return, Feb., 1903, $33.10, $56.10 ; on account of travelling expenses, cheque 50499, April, 1903, $150.

'Mending valise,' is a pretty small item to charge to the public treasury. There are several letters which I need not read in the Auditor General's Report asking for vouchers. We are not able to find that these vouchers have ever been supplied by this government. It is possible that there is such a laxity in the public service that clerks are allowed to go and incur debts and charge them to the service ? It appears that this gentleman has no employment to-day although he is receiving money out of the public funds.

Mr. HYMAN. Does the hon. gentleman make that statement ?

Mr. BRODER. I am informed so. He was living here in town. Mr. Charleson surely is not using him. He is not doing anything in the meantime. I am bringing up this case because there are other officials of the government who seem to be at liberty to use public funds as they please when they are travelling in connection with the Department of Public Works. It seems they have liberty to purchase what they want and charge it up to the public funds of the country. I think there should be some more stringent rule adopted in regard to charges of this kind made by public officials to the public funds.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Broder) speaks of the acting Minister of Public Works. I notice the date that the year he mentioned was 1900.

Mr. BRODER. 1903.

Mr. HYMAN. I thought you spoke of 1900.

Mr. BRODER. From 1900 to 1903.

Mr. HYMAN. I may say that Mr. Gobeil appears there as a private secretary. Mr. Gobeil is not only a private secretary but he is a clerk, and he accompanies Mr. Charleson who has charge of the maintenance of the telegraph lines. It is quite true that Mr. Gobeil has been in Ottawa for some time. It had been expected that Mr. Charleson might be required before the Public Accounts Committee. Last year hon. gentlemen opposite will remember that when Mr. Charleson was out of the way and we were accused of getting him out of the way for the purpose of trying to hide something that might be brought up in the Public Accounts Committee. Officers are very often called upon to perform service at a distance from home and especially is this the fact in the case of officers having telegraph lines of this kind and it is hardly to be expected that they will be able to provide themselves with all the paraphernalia.

Mr. BRODER. Is there any requisition from the Department of Public Works for these supplies ?

Mr. HYMAN. I was going to answer that question. With the innumerable charges that are made in connection with the Department of Public Works, I have no doubt that certain irregularities will creep in. It certainly is not a proper thing for any officer of the department to purchase supplies without requisition. In this particular case I suppose there may have been some irregularities. The matter has not been brought to my attention since I have had temporary charge of the department, but I shall be very glad to look into it at the earliest opportunity. With the tremendous amount of supplies that are purchased in connection with improvements of this kind, irregularities will creep in. The hon. gentleman speaks especially in regard to the repairing of a valise. I do not know whether that is a proper charge or not. I presume this gentleman is entitled to a valise to be paid for by the public service under circumstances, and if so, he is entitled to have the valise repaired. He should have had a requisition for it, I suppose, but if an officer is a long way from home, it is sometimes very inconvenient to obtain requisitions for these small amounts, and in that way irregularities will creep in.

Mr. SPROULE. This gentleman has become somewhat notorious in connection with Mr. Charleson regarding his operations out in the Yukon. We remember the difficulty we encountered in endeavouring to bring these gentlemen before the Public Accounts Committee. They were summoned before the committee. Mr. Charleson was right here in Ottawa, you could go down to the Russell House and see him there, but he skipped out the night the subpœna was issued and could not be found the next day. He could not be subpœnæd or brought back, and so it was, that in connection with every effort we made to try and look into these accounts, we were frustrated. When we asked to have men called before the Public Accounts Committee we were told that they had been called somewhere out of town and the result was that we could not proceed with the inquiry before the Public Accounts Committee. We remember the charges made for eider down quilts, coats, valises, boots and other paraphernalia. These charges cannot be considered as reasonable. Had these men not been getting large salaries there might have been some excuse for them, but in addition to paying them their large salaries we seem to be called upon to pay for every article that they may choose to buy. We cannot get them at the Public Accounts Committee, and our only recourse is to draw public attention to it, so that the public may know the money is being squandered and that the opposition are practically powerless to prevent it.

Public buildings, $100,000.

Mr. LENNOX. I should make my remarks upon this question of the Vancouver dry dock as brief as I can. A subsidy was available for the building of a dry dock at Vancouver in whatever place would be found suitable. There is in Vancouver a firm called the Vancouver Engineering Works Limited, which has been established for some time, has a first-class financial standing, and which has connections in Liverpool, England. This company is managed by Mr. Colin Jackson. In 1903 there was incorporated a company called the Vancouver Dry Docks and Shipping Company, and on the 24th of November, a memorandum of the Minister of Public Works was presented to the Governor in Council, setting out a number of facts, and asking that power be granted to him to enter into a contract with the Vancouver Dry Docks and Shipping Company, Limited, for the building of a dry dock, or at least for the granting of a contract providing for the building of a dry dock, and the payment of the subsidy in accordance with the statute. That was followed by an Order in Council dated 1st of September, 1903. It is out of that transaction that the difficulty to which I propose to allude arose. Mr. Jackson, on behalf of the Vancouver engineering works had communicated with the government prior to that, in reference to his building a dry dock, and I shall refer to the correspondence in which he initiated the proceedings. For the present I call the attention of the House to a cablegram sent by Mr. Jackson from Liverpool on the 28th November, 1903, and addressed to Mr. Sutherland, Minister of Public Works, Ottawa, Ontario :

Reported government subsidy dry dock Vancouver to be granted to Thompson ; enter strong protest behalf Vancouver Engineering Works, whose scheme was referred to by self and Callaway in personal interview in spring ; now negotiating with admiralty.

Mr. Jackson followed that cablegram by a letter of the same date from Liverpool, in which referring to a previous interview, he says :

You were good enough at the time to explain to us the provisions for the granting of the subsidy by the government for this purpose. Since that time we have been steadily following up the subject, and have been negotiating with the Admiralty in London through our friends here and also with the authorities in Esquimalt in order to ascertain their views as to the requirements of the warships.

We are now amazed to hear that it is reported apparently on good authority in Vancouver that a subsidy is about to be granted to an independent party who is not connected with us, and who, so far as we are aware, is not at present in a position to carry through the project. We are engaged in enlarging our own company in order to establish it on a wider financial basis, and as you are doubtless aware, we already hold the leading position in the province of British Columbia for all engineering work.

The building of a dry dock, thoroughly efficient and up-to-date in every respect and with capacity sufficient to handle any business that may be required of it for many years to come, has long been part of our programme.

Under the circumstances and in view of the amount of English capital which we have introduced with successful results into the development of the interests of Vancouver as a harbour, we consider that we are entitled to the consideration of your department.

Upon public grounds also we strongly object to any such subsidy being granted without exhaustive investigation as to the financial support commanded by those to whom it is proposed to make a grant of public funds for such a purpose.

That was signed by Mr. Jackson. That is the position that Mr. Jackson took on the 28th of November, and to show why he complained at the time, I refer back to the initiating proceedings so far as Mr. Jackson and his company are concerned. The company through Mr. Jackson wrote from Vancouver, British Columbia, on December 31, 1902, to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries :

It has recently come to our knowledge that your government is considering the question of the enlargement of dry docking facilities on this coast in conjunction with the imperial government. We do not know how far this matter

has been considered by you, but we desire to inform you that we are established on the water front within the city of Vancouver and are thoroughly equipped for all marine work which can be done here. At the present time the only dry dock of any kind is in Esquimalt harbour and is used in connection with the naval station there. Besides that, there are marine railways or cradles of limited dimensions both there and a very small one in this harbour. In view of the increasing importance of this port as a terminal point for the mercantile marine, we have for some little time been considering the advisability of building here either a large floating dock or a permanent dry dock, this dock to be located on Burrard Inlet, within easy distance of our works if not immediately adjacent to them.

Leaving out some parts which are unimportant, he proceeds:

We are assured that there would be at the present time sufficient business connected with the mercantile marine to supply a considerable nucleus of work for such a dock and we are further convinced that the present development of Vancouver as a port will in the near future double the work which can be done, in fact we may safely say that such a dock will become a necessity. We have hitherto, however, hesitated to recommend our friends who are disposed to invest here, to undertake the construction of such a dock owing to the very large initial cost of work of this kind and the fact that the return for the first few years would only yield a very moderate interest on such an outlay. We note, however, that by the 'Act to encourage the construction of dry docks,' found in Acts of Canada, 1899, chapter 9, your government is empowered to grant substantial assistance to a project of this kind, and we feel assured that with the full amount of assistance which the Act empowers you to grant, we could in the near future build and arrange to operate a dock which would assist materially in the development of this harbour as a marine port.

We would therefore be prepared to consider an arrangement whereby we received the combined support of the Dominion government as above stated and a further loan or guarantee from the imperial government, in return for the latter of which we could give the preference to His Majesty's ships as to the use of the dock. We believe that some such arrangement is at present in force in connection with the dry dock at Halifax. We are making full inquiry into the condition obtaining there and will address you again after we have concluded this. In the meantime we shall deem it a special favour if you will take our suggestion into your careful consideration.

Our managing director, Mr. Jackson, expects to be in Ottawa towards the latter end of February and with your permission will do himself the pleasure of calling upon you in order to discuss the possibilities of the situation.

Mr. Jackson and Mr. Callaway, in pursuance of what he pointed out there, in the spring of 1903, called and had a discussion with the Minister of Public Works. In the meantime he had an answer from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries saying in effect that he was very glad that Mr. Jackson was taking the matter up, but he did not mention that it would be dealt with by the Minister of Public Works; but subsequently, when he came to Ottawa, he found that it would be dealt with by the Minister of Public Works, who was good enough to discuss the matter very fully with him and who also introduced him to the Minister of Militia, having regard to the other suggestions contained in the letter, and Mr. Jackson said he also had a discussion with that gentleman on the matter. So that Mr. Jackson parted with the representatives of the government at that time with the understanding that he would put himself in a position to obtain this subsidy, and that he would go to Britain and make his arrangements, and be able later on to lay a more complete scheme before the government, the two ministers to whom I have referred making it clear to Mr. Jackson that they entertained the matter very favourably, and that they would concur with him, as far as would be right, in carrying out the proposal then made. What I want to call attention to particularly at this point is this, that the letter which I have just read shows that at that time at all events there was no misunderstanding between the parties as to what Mr. Jackson on the one hand proposed, and what the members of the government were then entertaining, namely, that it was a question of the Jackson Company putting themselves in a position to obtain a subsidy. Subsequently it was suggested to the Minister of Public Works that the Jackson Company had been promising in the spring not to earn a subsidy, but to become contractors for a dock which the government proposed to build. No such suggestion was made at that time, and there is no explanation in the correspondence or in the records of the department as to how it happened later on, in November, that the Minister of Public Works took the position that in the spring he had understood that the Jackson Company merely wished to take the position of contractors and obtain from the government a contract for building the dock. During the summer Mr. Jackson was busy endeavouring to get things into shape in England, and his firm in Vancouver was equally active in making preparations for the building of this dock. On the 18th of May, Mr. Macdonald, a solicitor in Vancouver, on behalf of the Vancouver Dry Dock and Shipping Company, applied to the government for this subsidy, and on the 19th of June, 1903, he followed that up with another letter of application, the company being at that time incorporated; the first time it was not incorporated. On the 16th of November, the final report as to the company which got in ahead of the Vancouver Dry Dock Company was made to the government. On the 24th of November, as I have already stated, the minister recommended it to the Governor in

Council, and on the 28th of November, four days afterwards, this cablegram came from Mr. Jackson. On the 30th of November, Mr. Sutherland, the Minister of Public Works, replied in this way :

Gentlemen,—Your telegram of the 28th inst. received. There are no negotiations with regard to the building of a dry dock at Vancouver, B.C., by the government. The only thing is a company, represented by Mr. Nichol Thompson, some time ago submitted plans which were referred to the engineers of the department for a report and were subsequently approved of. This company then made application for the aid granted under Act of parliament in connection with the construction of dry docks. You will understand that the department were not asking for tenders for a dry dock. Your company or any other could submit plans if they so desired.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) JAMES SUTHERLAND.

What the company in whose behalf I am speaking represent is that they made it perfectly clear and that the government did, as a matter of fact, understand in the spring of 1903 the position that they occupied. As shown by their first letter from the officers of the Marine Department they pointed out the very Act by which they proposed to be governed and made it clear to the department at that time that they were trying to bring themselves within the terms of the subsidy. And they parted with the representatives of the government on that occasion in the spring on the understanding that these proceedings would be carried on if the government favourably considered their proposition and they had a right to believe that no steps would be taken in the meantime without acquainting them of any change in the situation. On the contrary, the friends of the government got to know of the matter, took active steps in the summer, in the absence of Mr. Jackson, in England, and were enabled to get this report from the Minister of Railways on November 24, which was followed by an Order in Council on December 3, 1903. I wish to point out again that even if we take it that the department overlooked the matter and were perhaps not blameable for that, I submit that it would have been in the interest of Vancouver and of the country and probably of the government that they should not have put through the Order in Council of December 3. Further I am glad to find from the statement of the Minister of Public Works that although it has been reported that the contract has been signed, that is not the fact. The contract has not been signed and so the matter has not gone beyond control.

I shall refer to one other letter, that of Mr. Jackson, written on December 22, 1903. After referring to some preliminary matters he says :

With regard to the granting of a subsidy we may say we do not know what claims have been put forward on behalf of Mr. Thompson, nor do we know who has recommended him for the subsidy. We may say, however, that we shall be perfectly satisfied to submit our claims in comparison with any one else in the province upon the following grounds :—

First. As to the amount we have already spent in establishing plant and machinery, thus assisting the development of Vancouver as a city, and of the engineering trade of the province as a whole.

Second. As to the efficiency in management. We can state without fear of contradiction that no industrial concern in British Columbia has been more efficiently managed than our company, or shown more excellent results for the time that we have been established.

Thirdly. As to the site for a dry dock. The position we hold on the water front with deep water approach and entirely free from the control of the railway companies or any other interested party cannot be surpassed for the purposes of a dry dock, that is for convenience of approach for the shipping in the harbour and proximity to an established modern plant.

Fourthly. As to our financial ability. When Mr. Jackson reaches Ottawa he will explain to you our scheme for finance, but we may add that we shall be prepared as soon as our scheme is matured, to guarantee the interest at 5 per cent per annum on the whole of the $500,000 which will be necessary, provided that we have the assistance of the government subsidy.

Upon all these points we have not the slightest hesitation in stating that any competent independent engineer, with a personal knowledge of our position in British Columbia and in England, will advise you that our facilities for carrying out this work efficiently and in a manner to assist the development of the port are untouched by any other syndicate, or company, or individual on the Pacific coast.

Under these circumstances we lay our claims before you with confidence, believing that we do not require any recommendation beyond the consideration of the facts which we have laid before you and as to which we can furnish you with all the proof for which you may ask.

If in order to gain that subsidy it is necessary to get any particular recommendation, we shall be glad if you will inform us exactly as to the required conditions, so that we may at once take steps to comply with them, but this requirement was not mentioned either to Mr. Jackson or Mr. Callaway when we had the advantage of conferring with you in the spring. We understood that our application would be dealt with on its intrinsic merits alone and acting upon this supposition we have worked to place ourselves in a position which should in itself ensure to us the support of the government authoirites. In this we venture to say we have been successful and we shall submit our plans to you in the hope that our confidence has not been misplaced.

We may add that in any case a large floating dock of the nature described is inevitable in connection with our works and it would naturally be very much resented by our English shareholders, who have so far supported us loyally since the inception of the company, and some of whom made the investment upon patriotic as well as commercial grounds, if

they were to find it necessary in order to carry out our plans for us to buy a subsidy from another party or to find that our dry dock had to be run in opposition to one based upon a subsidy granted with an entire disregard of their own vested interests in British Columbia.

We take the liberty of explaining the situation clearly as we think it better to do so now before any irretrievable step has been taken, than that the facts should come out later after damage to the port and to the interests of invested capital has been accomplished.

We remain, dear sir,
Your obedient servants,
For the Vancouver Engineering Works, Limited.
(Sgd.) COLIN F. JACKSON,
Managing director.

I would point out that they had communicated with the hon. member for Burrard ; that on November 28 as I have already said they telegraphed to him. That telegram was followed by a letter, and on January 2, 1904, they wrote to him and again on January 29, 1904. There was no written answer to this. I do not know what position the company took but it does suggest to hon. gentlemen in this House familiar with certain lines of action that perhaps the hon. member was not treating these gentlemen exactly fairly in one respect, that is that he was working in the interest of his political friends rather than in the general interest of his locality. I hope that in saying that I am not going too far. I have a statement in my hands which purports to be a memorandum of the way in which the stock of this company is distributed. I do not know the authority for this statement and the hon. member (Mr. Macpherson) can correct me if it is not in accordance with the facts. I find that according to this R. G. Macpherson is to receive $100,000 of stock, paying nothing for it.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Lest something might transpire which would prevent my replying to the hon. gentleman when he has concluded, I wish now to give a most unqualified and unquestioned denial in every way, shape and form to the statement he has just made. I have no interest directly or indirectly with the Vancouver Dry Dock and Shipping Company in any way, shape or form. I cannot say anything stronger than that.

Mr. LENNOX. I certainly accept the hon. gentleman's statement in the way he makes it.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The statement is made out of whole cloth.

Hon. Mr. HYMAN. I think we ought to know on what authority the hon. gentleman is making that statement. Is it in a letter from Mr. Jackson ?

Mr. LENNOX. No, the hon. member will——

Mr. HYMAN. It is all very well to make statements and withdraw them.

Mr. LENNOX. I am not wrong in this matter, and I think I made the statement in a very mild way. I merely said I had a memorandum but I would take the hon. member's statement as to whether it was correct or not. I understand from the hon. member that he never had any connection of that kind.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Directly or indirectly, and I would say further that before an hon. gentleman makes a statement on the floor of the House impugning the honour of another member he should be very very sure of his statements. Neither Colin F. Jackson nor anybody else, in this House or out of it, can lay a finger upon a solitary point which connects me in any way, shape or form with the Vancouver Dry Dock and Shipping Company and what I did in connection with the Vancouver dry dock I would do again.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman can take whatever course he likes. I gave him every opportunity and I said I would give him every opportunity.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Who is the anonymous friend ?

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. member found that I at once accepted his statement as correct and an hon. member can do no more.

Mr. MACPHERSON. It is an anonymous communication.

Mr. LENNOX. Let me say that this company feel that in another regard the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Macpherson) has not treated them very well, not only did he not reply to these telegrams but they state that he gave them reason to understand that he would act in their interest and they have not been able to ascertain that he did so in any way. They understood that he would keep them advised of what was going on but he failed to do so.

Now, I take the statement of the hon. gentleman himself as to his connection with the matter. I propose to read a line or two from an article which appeared in the 'News Advertiser' of February 27th, 1904, at the time when this company was endeavouring to get the city of Vancouver to take stock to the extent of $100,000 in this enterprise. A member of that council at that time called the attention of Mr. Thompson to the fact that he had not said on what jurisdiction he made the statement that the city was likely to take stock. Mr. Thompson could not satisfy the council that he had any justification for making the statement. Mr. Jackson, speaking to the council, said :

—he had forwarded copies of all letters to Mr. R. G. Macpherson, M.P., who, he had every reason to believe, had recommended the other

party. He at least had an interview with Mr. Macpherson, who had remarked: 'It is a very unfortunate thing that trouble should be raised about this dry dock. I have had trouble whenever I have tried to do anything for my friends, at least, I mean for the citizens of Vancouver.

Mr. MACPHERSON. That is a conversation given by Mr. Jackson himself.

Mr. LENNOX. That is in the public press.

Mr. MACPHERSON. But is that a conversation which Mr. Colin F. Jackson himself gave?

Mr. LENNOX. Yes; that is a statement made by Mr. Jackson at the time. Now, we have the fact that it was announced the other day in the House that this contract has not, as a matter of fact, been signed. I am glad that is the case.

Mr. HYMAN. That has been repeated twice. To make my position clear, I would like to say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) will understand that the Order in Council has been passed, and, if the company fulfil the conditions of the Order in Council, they will earn the subsidy.

Mr. LENNOX. I find that in the return there is a contract, but it does not show whether that contract has been signed or not. Whether it has been signed by the government or the company makes no difference; it has not been signed.

Mr. HYMAN. I wish to put myself right. To all intents and purposes, the Order in Council forms a contract, and, if the company carry out their part of the undertaking, the government will be bound to carry out their part. The mere signing of a contract thereafter does not make any difference.

Mr. LENNOX. A member of the council said that there was 'a contract which was signed, sealed and delivered.' That is reported in the paper.

Mr. HYMAN. That may be the case. Of course, I speak subject to correction.

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Thompson appears to have represented to the government that he would have the assistance of the city of Vancouver, and to have represented to the city of Vancouver, when applying for assistance, that he had a contract, signed, sealed and delivered, which, it appears, was not the case. I would refer to some other circumstances in this matter, but it would not be fair for me to do so now. Now, I have always endeavoured in this House to avoid making any imputations against the honour of any gentleman here. Therefore, I wish to say distinctly that I accept, in the fullest sense, the statement of the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Macpherson). I mentioned that I had this memorandum, and I asked the hon. member to contradict it. I do not for one moment press the point if he says that the statement is not correct.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I am sorry that this question did not come up earlier in the session so that there might not have been a hurried deliverance on the part of the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) or a hurried answer on my own part. As a matter of fact, the hon. member has espoused the cause of the Vancouver Engineering Works whose managing director is Mr. Colin F. Jackson, whom I never had the privilege of meeting until the question of a dry dock was brought up on the floor of the House, and after the government had brought in a resolution authorizing them to pay a bonus of three per cent on the cost of a dry dock up to $1,000,000. The interest of the people of the city of Vancouver in the project is very strong. For fourteen years these people had been looking for the construction of such a work. But nobody came forward desiring to enter upon that project who had control of the necessary capital. It was published in the Vancouver papers that the government would give this subsidy. After that publication, I received communication from several engineering firms in the city of Vancouver and in the city of Victoria. I wrote to them and told them it was too big a project for one concern to handle and they should get together. There was the firm of Bull & Bros., on whose behalf a firm of solicitors acted. They did not disclose the name to me. I wrote to the solicitors that, so far as I was concerned, I would be glad to see anybody come forward who would undertake the work and earn the subsidy and that I would get the subsidy for them if I could. Mr. Thompson, a gentleman who stands high in commerical circles in Vancouver, wrote to me. I replied to him to the same effect as to the others—that it was too big a contract for two people to fight over and those who wished to undertake it should get together. The result was that Messrs. Bull & Bros. who were acted for by the solicitors, retired from the field leaving only Messrs. Nichol, Thompson & Co. to enter upon the project of the construction of the dry dock. I had never known Mr. Jackson in connection with the dry dock in any way. Not until the 28th November, after having done all I could to secure the assistance of the government for this worthy project and when four months had gone by, did I receive word from Mr. Jackson. The word from him was in the shape of a cablegram which reached me in Victoria. Mr. Jackson, through the hon. member (Mr. Lennox) accuses me of not having answered him. Immediately after having received the telegram I went to Vancouver and rang up the Vancouver Engineering Works and placed the situation before them. They told me

that Jackson was not there. As soon as he came back, I went to see him. I told him what had been done and asked why, if he wanted to take part in the work, he had not put in an application.

Mr. LENNOX. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macpherson) called up the Vancouver Engineering Works did he communicate with Mr. Evans ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. Did you say that he wished to make a record for yourself at Ottawa ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. No, there was——

Mr. LENNOX. Did you say further you wished to do the best possible for yourself ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. No, that is all tommyrot. I am not here to be cross-questioned by the hon. gentleman. But I am free to say that the man who does not want to do well for his constituents should not be here.

Mr. LENNOX. Then the hon. gentleman did not say that ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. Even if I did, was there any great harm in saying it ? But I do not take up the time of the House in talking tommyrot. I want to do the best I can for my constituency and I am quite willing that anybody should know it. The simple fact of the matter is that Mr. Jackson found that he had not acted at the proper time. He did not put in an application and these other people did. The matter hung fire for four or five months, and after that—and only after that—was anything done by the government. I believe that Mr. Jackson assumes that he is better capable of carrying out this project than anybody else. He may be. But I never knew, before I read his letter, that he was par excellence the man to carry out this project. And I am not so sure of it even now. He does not level any more mountains or fill up any more valleys there than anybody else. Messrs. Nichol Thompson & Co. are as good people as his firm—not better possibly, but certainly not a bit worse. The people of the city of Vancouver are very anxious to have the dry dock built. Mr. Jackson and his associates were desirous of building the dock. If so, why did not they come forward and put in their application ? Mr. Thompson has placed the contract with Messrs. Swan & Hunter with whom he worked for sixteen years and who are abundantly able to carry it out. I hope and fully believe that we shall have the dry dock in two years. I am fully prepared to answer to my constituents for what I have done. The man who says that I received directly or indirectly anything as a result of my action in this matter states that which is unqualifiedly untrue. If any hon. member of this House makes the statement that I have received anything, I will do all I can to secure for him the opportunity to have the charge fully investigated. I will walk out of this House with my name unsullied. I do not think any man should so far forget himself as to make the statement that I was in any way, shape or form interested in the transaction. Mr. Jackson attempted to say it once, but only once, and then he withdrew the statement when he found there was nothing in it.

Mr. LENNOX. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I said Mr. Jackson made that statement, I was not referring to the hon. gentleman. What is further, if an application was made to me again in the same way I would take precisely the same stand that I did before.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the hon. gentleman answer me a question ? Did the hon. gentleman get a contract through recently for the placing of buoys by this same company.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I think myself that the Nicol, Thompson Company are building some buoys placed by order of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and no doubt they were recommenled by me, and I was glad to do so.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the hon. gentleman give us a full explanation ? I understand it was for the purpose of keeping these gentlemen on their feet in order that they might earn this subsidy.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Oh, pshaw.

Mr. HYMAN. I desire to say a few words in regard to this matter. First, let me remark that the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) has shown considerable ingenuity in making the charge. I wish I could say he had shown the same fairness and I think before I am through I will prove that the hon. gentleman has hardly placed the matter in a fair way before this House. I may say that there were two Acts in regard to a subsidy to a dry dock. The first Act was that of 1899, authorizing payment of two per cent on a cost not to exceed $500,000. On August 13, 1903, by a subsequent Act, the percentage was increased to three per cent, and the maximum to $30,000. The hon. gentleman has given the chronological facts right enough. On November 28th, there was a telegram from the company that Mr. Jackson represents in these words:

> Kindly inform us what negotiations are in progress regarding dry dock for Burrard Inlet and if government is prepared to receive further propositions we have already approached movement and wish to have opportunity of tendering.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the first correspondence in regard to this matter was from Mr. Jackson, a year before, so that a year had elapsed, according to the record, before any step had been taken by Mr. Jackson to bring himself under the contract. Now you will note that this telegram is dated November 28th. A letter was written on the same day by Mr. Jackson, signed by the Vancouver Engineering Works per Colin F. Jackson. The hon. gentleman read this letter to the House, and I am sorry to say that he omitted the very part of the letter which is the gist of the whole case. The hon. gentleman had this correspondence in his hand. The correspondence was furnished by the department, and I propose to put on record the method which the hon. gentleman has pursued in order to make a charge against the department and against the govenment. I will read the letter dated November 28th, 1903, addressed to the Hon. James Sutherland, Minister of Public Works :

Sir,—We beg to confirm the cable sent to-day as per copy inclosed. You will remember that last spring both myself and Mr. Callaway, one of our directors and general manager of J. I. Thornycroft & Co., of Chiswick, had the pleasure of calling upon you and upon your permanent officials with reference to the erection of a dry dock in Vancouver, B.C.

You were good enough at the time to explain to us the provisions for the granting of the subsidy by the government for this purpose. Since that time we have been steadily following up the subject, and have been negotiating with the Admiralty in London through our friends here and also with the authorities in Esquimalt in order to ascertain their views as to the requirements of the warships.

We are now amazed to hear that it is reported apparently on good authority in Vancouver that a subsidy is about to be granted to an independent party who is not connected with us and who, so far as we are aware, is not at present in a position to carry through the project. We are engaged in enlarging our own company in order to establish it on a wider financial basis, and as you are doubtless aware, we already hold the leading position in the province of British Columbia for all engineering work. The building of a dry dock, thoroughly efficient and up-to-date in every respect, and with capacity sufficient to handle any business that may be required of it——

I may say that is the sentence the hon. gentleman omitted. I do not wish to charge any hon. member in this House with deliberately omitting a sentence from a letter in which the whole gist of the subject is contained, but the importance of the omission of this particular part of the letter will be found in the fact that the telegram is dated the 28th of November, and this letter was written on the 28th of November, and the Order in Council went through on December 3rd. In the letter of these gentlemen who are now complaining on this late date, November 28th, the sentence occurs which was omitted :

Mr. HYMAN.

The building of a dry dock, thoroughly efficient and up to date in every respect,, and with capacity sufficient to handle any business that may be required of it for many years to come, has long been part of our programme.

At the present stage of its history our port is not quite ripe in our opinion for the carrying out of this scheme in its entirety, and we do not wish to cause your department unnecessary work by entering into negotiations with regard to the subsidy until we are absolutely ready to carry through and complete the building of such dry dock.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the hon. gentleman say I read that letter ?

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman read a part of that letter and omitted the part I have just read.

Mr. LENNOX. What portion did I read ?

Mr. HYMAN. He read a considerable portion of the letter as 'Hansard' will show and then he said : I omit some parts of the letter.

Mr. LENNOX. I did not read that letter of the 28th of November.

Mr. HYMAN. Then I humbly apologize to the hon. gentleman if I am wrong. I followed him through the letter.

Mr. LENNOX. I have not that letter, to my knowledge.

Mr. HYMAN. I have a copy of the correspondence handed to me by the department, and which was given to the hon. minister. The hon. member read parts of this letter. I do not know what correspondence the hon. gentleman has got, but he is supposed to have a copy of this correspondence which I hold.

Mr. LENNOX. If I read any portion of it I am not aware of having done so. I cannot find such a letter on file at present. I have no note of reading a letter of the 28th of November. I have it noted here that I will read a letter of the 30th of November.

Mr. HYMAN. Then in view of this sentence in the letter, I presume the hon. gentleman will withdraw the whole matter.

Mr. LENNOX. Certainly not.

Mr. HYMAN. Here is the statement made in the letter of November 28th :

At the present stage of its history our port is not quite ripe in our opinion for the carrying out of this scheme in its entirety, and we do not wish to cause your department unnecessary work by entering into negotiations with regard to the subsidy until we are absolutely ready to carry through and complete the building of such a dry dock.

Now where is the charge ? Here is a company upon whose word the hon. gentleman has made representations, who, in a letter to the Minister of Public Works, say

that the time is not ripe and that they desire an opportunity to withdraw from the time the negotiations began. The minister did the only thing he could do in the public interest, and the only thing he should do, and that was to carry on the negotiations with the company, and the result was the passing, on December 3rd, of a subsidy agreement, or the passing of an Order in Council in which it was left possible for the dry dock company to proceed with the work, and at the completion of the work to earn the subsidy. The whole matter is there. What difference is made by anything that occurred afterwards between the minister and the company or Mr. Jackson? Mr. Jackson stated positively that he did not desire to cause the department any inconvenience and he practically withdrew from the whole matter. I cannot see that there is any necessity for following the matter further. As it is plain from the statements of Jackson and others that the department did what was right in the public interest under the circumstances.

Mr. SPROULE. I have very few words to say because I think after the reading of this correspondence any further observations are unnecessary, but I would like to offer a comment upon the remark of the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) that my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) did not treat the matter fairly. I think there is no member of this House but will admit that my hon. friend treated the question with great fairness. When the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Macpherson) made the denial my hon. friend accepted it in the most unqualified way. As to what the correspondence contained he used it in such a way as any man would use it to properly deal with the question under consideration. I do not think that the hon. member for London has made the case of the department any stronger. He says that Mr. Jackson unqualifiedly withdrew.

Mr. HYMAN. I said 'practically.' Do not put words into my mouth. I said that he withdrew to all intents and purposes. The sentence of the letter speaks for itself.

Mr. SPROULE. I took down the words 'unqualifiedly withdrew' and I did not hear the hon. gentleman read that sentence in the letter. I think that Mr. Jackson has a fair ground for believing that he was not properly dealt with and that the department were rather working on behalf of another while at the same time holding him on a string.

Arts, agriculture and statistics—general statistics, $15,000.

Mr. BRODER. What is the object of that?

Mr. FISHER. I explained last night to the House that partly in consequence of a discussion that arose in the earlier part of the session and partly in consequence of my own views in regard to the compilation of statistics I was proposing between the censuses to do much more in the way of the collection of general statistics than has been done in the past. At the present time the only statistics that there are available for the whole country are the statistics in the year of the census. The provinces of Ontario and Manitoba collect certain statistics between the times, but this is not done by any other province or the Dominion. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and the hon. member for St. John, New Brunswick (Mr. Daniel), in an earlier discussion in this House both agreed that it would be very desirable to have statistics for general purposes between the periods of the census. I propose to organize a staff and to make arrangements for gathering health, agricultural and industrial statistics.

Mr. BRODER. Will there be just the same staff as you now have for the census.

Mr. FISHER. Probably some of the members of this staff will do the work.

Mr. BRODER. Mr. Blue and Mr. Coté?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, I think so.

Mr. BRODER. There is no vote for their salaries.

Mr. FISHER. Their salaries will come out of this vote.

Mr. BRODER. It will be of the greatest importance to have the statistics thoroughly reliable.

Mr. FOWLER. Has the Minister of Agriculture brought down the information I asked him for?

Mr. FISHER. Yes; I laid it on the table at the opening of the House.

St. Joseph, Lake Huron wharf, $4,000.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to move that this item be stricken out.

Mr. FIELDING. That item was dropped in the committee, so it has disappeared from the estimates.

Mr. BLAIN. Yes; but it appears in the main estimates.

Mr. FIELDING. It was already stricken out in committee.

Grande Vallée, pier, $16,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. Without further comment, I beg to move that this item be struck out.

Motion negatived.

Seven Islands, wharf, $48,000.

Mr. BLAIN. I move that this item be struck out. It is one of the very many ex-

travagant expenditures of this government. I have before me a list of other items which it would be the duty of the committee to move to strike out. Indeed, I would regard it as my own duty, but bearing in mind the fact that yesterday afternoon and during the night we were asked to pass about 600 items, and having in view the fact that we wish to close to-day, I will not attempt to move to strike out every item, but I move to strike out this as an example, among many others, of the gross extravagance of the government of the day. This is an expenditure that could have but one object, to help political supporters of the government in the construction and operation of a private enterprise in that section of the province of Quebec. I shall not detain the House further than to say that I think it would be in the interest of the country that this item should be struck out and the money not expended.

Motion negatived.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at Three o'clock.

PROVINCIAL ACCOUNTS.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I presume that while we are waiting it would be in order to ask a question. I would ask the Minister of Finance, referring to page 12 of the last Public Accounts Report, whether or not the Dominion government has yet paid over to the province of Ontario the amount to the credit of the Upper Canada Grammar School fund, and the Upper Canada Building Fund? I find it stated in the report that the Dominion government after a reference to the Department of Justice have given notice that on the 1st July, 1904, this fund will either be paid over to the respective provinces or the rate of interest payable reduced to 4 per cent. I would like to know whether the money has been paid over and if not whether the interest has been reduced. The minister might at the same time state whether his department has arrived at a definite conclusion, as to what effect the readjustment of the accounts between the provinces of Ontario and Quebec and the Dominion of Canada has had on the national debt. We have not yet had any definite announcement as to the result.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). As to the latter part of the hon. gentleman's question, he has perhaps overlooked the fact that I placed on the table some time ago a memorandum by the deputy minister which deals with that subject. If my hon. friend fails to find a copy of the memorandum I shall be glad to send him one. With regard to the payment of a certain sum to Ontario, while I have been advised that it is our right to repay off the debt the province of Ontario denies that, and has intimated the desire to have a case raised, or in some form to have a judicial finding. To this we have raised no objection, and in the meantime we have not reduced the rate of interest.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is it the intention to deal in the same way with the Common School Fund?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think it is prudent to answer questions of this kind without consideration, but I may say that wherever there appears to be reasonable ground for a hearing before the tribunals, we are always desirous of facilitating such a reference.

Mr. HENDERSON. I fail to see myself why one fund should be treated in one way and another in another. I am not finding fault, I am simply asking for information in order that we may know how these funds are to be dealt with in case we have to discuss them. I received the memorandum to which the minister refers but that memorandum did not at all give a definite statement, it left it almost as indefinite as before. The deputy minister stated that in his opinion an error had been made and he thought the effect of the readjustment would rather be to reduce what he called the reduction of debt as placed in the public accounts by a sum somewhat exceeding $5,000,000, which formerly had been credited to the province of Ontario and Quebec. If that is the document the minister refers to, it certainly left it nearly as indefinite as before. I trust when the accounts come out next year the whole matter will be arranged.

Mr. FIELDING. The view expressed in the memorandum of the Deputy Minister of Finance is the one which will be adopted.

Mr. HENDERSON. All right.

DATE OF DOMINION ELECTIONS.

Mr. FOWLER. As there are only a few of us present, the information will be confined to a select circle, and therefore I hope the Finance Minister will tell us whether there will be an election before next session or not.

Mr. BOYD. We won't give it away.

Mr. FOWLER. If there was a large attendance of the members of the House, I would not ask the minister so momentous a state secret.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has not given notice.

Mr. FOWLER. Certain signs point to an election, because I find that the following sums have been placed at the disposal of the government this session:

Main estimates..		$62,935,338 84
Supplementary estimates, 1904....		1,865,639 30
" " 1905....		11,839,270 72
" " 1904....		10,000 00
" " 1904....		21,000 00
" " 1904....		397,450 00
" " 1904....		681,070 50
		$77,749,769 36
Railway subsidies..	$1,708,920	
Lead bounties..	85,000	
Coal oil bounties..	225,789	
Canada Eastern Ry... ..	800,000	
Iron and steel..	922,104	
		3,746,813 00
Grand total..		$81,491,582 36

The iron and steel bounties are based on last year's figures. As this is a sort of record-breaker, I take it for granted that it points to an election this year, but in order to make assurance doubly sure, and that we may be prepared for the struggle, the Finance Minister should take us into his confidence and tell us whether we will have an election or not. It is of some importance to the candidates; it is of vital importance to the public. I have no doubt that you yourself, Mr. Speaker, would be very glad to get this information in common with us all.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am not in politics.

Mr. FOWLER. It is true Mr. Speaker is not in politics, but at the same time he has to run an election, and, if rumours be correct with regard to his future career, he will be very active in politics, because it is said that he will be called to a higher office than he now holds.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOWLER. So long as the country has the misfortune to be governed by this Liberal administration, we will not have the slightest objection to Mr. Speaker being a member of it. Will the Minister of Finance be courteous enough to tell us ?

Mr. FIELDING. I would rather leave to hon. gentlemen opposite the pleasant hope that they may have another sitting of the House, but although I am not able to give my hon. friend an assurance on that point, I am delighted to have his figures by which he made out the grand total at $80,000,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Eighty-one millions.

Mr. FIELDING. A million more or less does not matter to my hon. friend. I am delighted to have these figures, because last year the hon. gentlemen opposite made the total $250,000,000.

Mr. FOWLER. That is including the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. FIELDING. It is everything; it is what Mr. Mantalini calls the 'demnition total.' If last year we appropriated $250,000,000, it is a high testimony to our economy that this year we only appropriated $80,000,000, and I hope my hon. friend will give us credit for that. I will leave my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) in the pleasant expectation that there will be another session, because otherwise we may not have the pleasure of again seeing him again in this House.

WAYS AND MEANS.

House again went into Committee of Ways and Means.

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

Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending 30th June, 1904, the sum of $2,485,409.80 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund for Canada.

2. Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending 30th June, 1905, the sum of $29,437,891.53 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund for Canada.

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

Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 174) for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th of June, 1904, and the 30th of June, 1905.

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

BINDER TWINE STATISTICS.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, a matter has been overlooked which I think should be recorded in 'Hansard.' The Minister of Trade and Commerce yesterday should have answered a question of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) giving a statement respecting binder twine. I will read the answer now, in order that it may be recorded in 'Hansard,' for the benefit of the members generally : Binder twine made during the year ending the 30th of June, 1904, 16,164,048 lbs. manilla fibre used, 7,473,754 lbs.; bounty paid thereon, $25,452.04.

PROROGATION.

A message from His Excellency the Governor General by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod :

Mr. Speaker :

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

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber.

IN THE SENATE CHAMBER.

His Excellency was pleased to give in His Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills :—

An Act to amend the Act of the present session respecting the Temiscouata Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act of the present session intituled : 'An Act to incorporate the Thorold and Lake Erie Railway Company.'

An Act respecting Timagami Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Imperial Loan and Investment Company of Canada.

An Act respecting the Alliance Bank of Canada.

An Act to amend the Railway Act, 1903.

An Act to amend chapter 61 of the statutes of 1903 respecting the Revised Statutes of Canada.

An Act for the relief of Annie Christman.

An Act respecting the Montreal Terminal Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Acts relating to Naturalization and Aliens.

An Act to incorporate the Canadian Credit Indemnity Company.

An Act to incorporate the Thompson River Improvement Company.

An Act respecting the West Canadian Collieries, Limited.

An Act to amend the Representation Act, 1903.

An Act to amend the Bank Act.

An Act respecting certain patents of the Canadian Office and School Furniture Company, Limited.

An Act respecting the Pacific Bank of Canada.

An Act respecting an Arbitration between His Majesty and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.

An Act to amend the Fisheries Act.

An Act respecting the Inspection of Grain.

An Act to amend the General Inspection Act.

An Act respecting the payment of certain Railway Subsidies.

An Act to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.

An Act to amend chapter 68 of the statutes of 1903, respecting the bounties on Steel and Iron.

An Act to amend the Railway Act, 1903.

An Act to provide for the payment of bounties on Crude Petroleum from Canadian Wells.

An Act to amend the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, 1903.

An Act to amend the Inland Revenue Act.

An Act to further amend the Act providing for the payment of bounties on lead contained in lead-bearing ores mined in Canada.

An Act respecting the Canadian assessment-policy-holders in the Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Company.

An Act to amend the Land Titles Act, 1894.

An Act to further amend the Inland Revenue Act.

An Act to amend the Customs Act.

An Act authorizing the government of Canada to purchase the Canada Eastern Railway and to take possession of the Fredericton and Saint Mary's Railway Bridge.

An Act to amend the Customs Tariff, 1897.

An Act to amend the Post Office Act.

An Act respecting the Militia and Defence of Canada.

An Act to amend the Companies Act.

An Act to authorize the granting of Subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.

An Act to amend an Act passed in the present session and intituled : 'An Act to further amend the Act providing for the payment of bounties on lead contained in lead-bearing ores mined in Canada.'

To these Bills the Royal Assent was pronounced by the Clerk of the Senate in the following words :—

In His Majesty's name, His Excellency the Governor General doth assent to these Bills.

Then the Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed His Excellency the Governor General, as follows —

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY :

The Commons of Canada have voted the Supplies required to enable the government to defray the expenses of the public service.

In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Excellency the following Bill :—

An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial years ending respectively June 30, 1904, and June 30, 1905.

to which Bill I humbly request Your Excellency's assent.

To this Bill the Clerk of the Senate, by His Excellency's command, did thereupon say :—

In His Majesty's name, His Excellency the Governor General thanks His Loyal Subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this Bill.

After which His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to close the fourth session of the ninth parliament of the Dominion with the following

SPEECH.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I am glad to relieve you from further attendance in parliament after a session that has been protracted to a longer period than I had anticipated when addressing you on the eleventh of last March.

The terms and conditions upon which the National Transcontinental Railway will be built and operated having been finally adjusted and agreed upon, the work of construction will proceed as rapidly as the surveys of the line and the location of the road will permit.

The consensus of opinion expressed on the changes in the tariff affords very gratifying evidence that the alterations have met with general approval.

The arrangements made by my ministers with the government of Mexico for lines of steamers

between that republic and Canada on the Atlantic and Pacific will, I hope, add materially to our foreign trade.

The steadily increasing revenue has amply justified the liberal aid granted towards the improvement of our rivers and harbours and the construction of other public works materially benefiting the trade and commerce of our country.

The changes made in the Act respecting the Militia and Defence of Canada, providing for the increased strength and efficiency of the force will, I do not doubt, meet with general approval.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I thank you for the liberal provision you have made for the public service.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

My official connection with the Dominion of Canada is drawing to a close. Be assured I shall watch its future progress and development with deep and abiding interest and pray that the peace and prosperity with which this favoured land is now being blessed, may under God's providence long continue.

The Speaker of the Senate then said:

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

It is His Excellency the Governor General's will and pleasure, that this parliament be prorogued until Monday the 19th September next, to be here holden, and this parliament is accordingly prorogued until the 19th September next.

ERRATA.

Mr. Ingram :—Supply—Agriculture (Canadian Exhibit, Imperial Institute) 3757, should read 2757.

Mr. Pringle :—Cornwall Canal Lighting, on M. (Mr. Lemieux) for Sel. Com., should read : on M. (Mr. Lennox).

Mr. Sproule :—Dundonald, Lord, Dismissal, &c., 8127, should read 7127.

SUBJECTS.

Barry's Bay Wharf, 1751, should read 7751.

Supply Bill, No. 174, after 3°*, insert 9078.

INDEX

FOURTH SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT, 1904.

VOLS. I. TO V., 1904.

From the Tenth day of March to the Tenth day of August, inclusive.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading ; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist ; *, without remarks or debate ; Accts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned ; Amt., Amendment ; Amts., Amendments ; Amalg., Amalgamation ; Ans., Answer ; Ass., Assurance ; B., Bill ; B.C., British Columbia ; Can., Canada or Canadian ; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway ; Com., Committee ; Co., Company ; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence ; Consd., Consider ; Consdn., Consideration ; Cor., Correspondence ; Deb., Debate ; Dept., Department ; Depts., Departments ; Div., Division ; Dom., Dominion ; Govt., Government ; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General ; Hse., House ; H. of C., House of Commons ; Incorp., Incorporation ; Ins., Insurance ; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway ; Man., Manitoba ; Mess., Message ; M., Motion ; m., moved. Neg., Negatived ; N.B., New Brunswick ; N.W.T., North-west Territories ; N.S., Nova Scotia ; O.C., Order in Council ; Ont., Ontario P.E.I., Prince Edward Island ; P.O., Post Office ; Par., Paragraph ; Prop., Proposed ; Q., Quebec ; Ques., Question ; Recom., Recommit ; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference ; Rep., Report, Reported ; Reps., Reports ; Res., Resolution ; Ret., Return ; Ry., Railway ; Rys., Railways ; Sel., Select ; Sen., Senate ; Sp., Special ; Stmnt., Statement ; Sup., Supply ; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary ; Wthdn., Withdrawn ; Wthdrl., Withdrawal ; Y.N., Yeas and Nays ; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

Alcorn, Mr. G. O., *Prince Edward, Ont.*

Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Connection, Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) 3316 (ii).

Canada Eastern Ry. Purchase B. 163 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 8561 (v).

Cattle Feeding at Experimental Farms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4970 (iii).

Civil Service Act, Procedure *re* Promotions, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1843 (i).

Customs Dept., Salaries and Increases : in Com. of Sup., 1798, 1843 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8140, (amt.) 8142 ; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 8390 (v).

Dom. Elections Act, 1900, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 1137 (i).

Gov. Gen. (Lord Minto) Criticism *re* Militia Control, Ques. of Order, 6417 (iv).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 1609 (i); in Com., on sec. 2, 2288 (i); on sec. 7 (amt.) 3204; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 3430 (ii).

Masters and Mates, Fees for Examiners (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5806 (iii).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6394 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. Logan) 8282 (v).

Militia Act, Command vested in King (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6404 (iv).

Napanee River Buoy Service, Contract with Mr. Mowers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5344 (iii).

Alcorn, Mr. G. O.—*Con.*

Political Interference *re* Militia (remarks) in Com. on B., 6394 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 4970 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1798 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (False Ducks light) 5806 (iii).

Voters' Lists for Unorganized Territories, Preparation, &c. (Ques.) 1137 (i).

Wilton Postoffice, Dismissal of Postmaster (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5676 (iii).

Armstrong, Mr. J. E., *East Lambton.*

Bee Culture (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4979 (iii).

Bell, Dr. (remarks) *re* Geological Survey, 7057, 7059, 7213 (iv).

Budget, on The, 4829 (iii).

Butter manufactured in Alberta, Exports to Japan, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4127 (iii).

Cattle, Sale of, &c. at the Experimental Farms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4973 (iii).

Coal Oil Bounties, Official Inspector *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6173 (iv).

——— Payment of Bounties, &c. (remarks) 4667 (iii).

——— Pets. *re*, Inquiry for, 4726 (iii).

——— (remarks) on Tariff Resolutions, 5741 (iii).

Armstrong, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

Coal Oil Bounties, Tariff Legislation *re*, Ref. to in Budget Speech, 4829 (iii).

——— *See* Petroleum Bounties B. 167.

Cold Storage on Allan Strs. *re* Atlantic Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6191 (iv).

Customs Imports, Increase, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1903 (i).

Gas and Oil Explorations, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7215 (iv).

Geological Reports, Sale and Distribution (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7214 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 2148; on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Bennett) 3533 (ii).

Guysborough Election and Political Interference *re* I.C.R. Employees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6107 (iv).

Immigrants, Destitute and stranded in Can., &c. (remarks) 3871 (ii).

I.C.R., Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6111 (iv).

Oil and Gas Exploration (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7215 (iv).

Petroleum Bounties B. 167 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8462 (v).

Railway Act (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 5105 (iii).

Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5732, 5750 (iii).

Standard Oil Co., Contract *re* Lighting Cars (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5932 (iii).

Standard Oil Refinery, Distribution of Bounty (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6173 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Agriculture (aid to societies) 2743 (ii); (exhibitions) 4153; (experimental farms) 4973 (iii); (fumigating stations) 2749; (Imperial Institute, London) 3737; (Winnipeg exhibition) 2752 (ii).

Customs (salaries) 1903 (i).

Dom. Lands (inspector of mines) 7057 (iv).

Geological Survey (gas explorations) 7215 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 5208 (iii).

Post Office (rural mails) 5732 (iii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Grand Narrows bridge) 5980; (Pintsch gas) 5928; (water supply) 5964 (iii).

Avery, Mr. M., *Addington.*

Dairy Products, Fraudulent Weighing at Montreal, on Amt. (Mr. Pope) to Com. of Sup., 7270 (iv).

Experimental Farms, Expenditure, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4984 (iii).

Hope Island, Timber cut by Manley Chew (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5243 (iii).

Immigrants, Destitute and stranded in Can. &c. (remarks) 3863 (ii).

Metric Instruments, Purchase in Paris, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).

Ball, Mr. G., *Nicolet.*

Ste. Perpetue Station Accommodation, Pet. *re* (remarks) 8658 (v).

Barker, Mr. Saml., *Hamilton.*

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8602, 8642 (v).

Associated Press (Canadian) Reports, Misrepresentations, &c. (remarks) 8659 (v).

Auditor General, Resignation, &c. on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to Sup., 6615 (iv).

Bruce Mines Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8792 (v).

Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase B. 163 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 8234; in Com. on B., 8555 (v).

Civil Service Act, Over-riding, &c. *re* Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1830 (i).

Companies Act (1902) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Cowan) in Com., 4707 (iii).

——— B. 164 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 8841, 8899 (v).

Cornwall Canal, Davis Lighting Contract, O. Cs. asked for, 6150 (iv).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8507 (v).

C. Ross & Co.'s Account *re* Furnishings for H. of C., in Com. of Sup., 8996 (v).

Customs Dept., Salaries, Increases, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1830 (i).

Dixon, Mr. F. A., Cor. with And. Gen. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1840 (i).

Drummond Co. Railway, Expenditure for 1903-4 (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8349 (v).

Dundonald, Lord, G.O.C., Dismissal and Political Interference (remarks) 7157 (iv).

Express Cos., and Tel. Cos., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to Ry. B. 132, in Com., 6691 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 1548 (i); in Com. on sec. 1, 2665, 2958; (amt.) 2666, 2959; neg. (Y. 25; N. 41) 2986; on Amt. (Mr. Clarke) 3010 (ii).

——— on sec. 2 of Bill, 2670 (ii).

——— on sec. 3 of Bill, 3034; on Amt. (Mr. Bell) 3143 (ii).

——— on sec. 6 of Bill, 3204 (ii).

——— on sec. 7 of Bill, on Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 3211; on Amt. (Mr. Casgrain) 3321; on Amt. (Mr. Clancy) 3214; on Amt. (Mr. Lavell) 3332; on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 3250; on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) 3257 (ii).

——— in Com. on sec. 1 of schedule, 2229 (i).

——— on sec. 2 of schedule, 2289, 2670 (ii).

——— on sec. 4 of schedule, 2399 (ii).

——— on sec. 5 of schedule, 2429 (ii).

——— on secs. 6 and 7 of schedule 2451 (ii).

——— on sec. 9 of schedule, 2538 (ii).

——— on sec. 10 of schedule, 2652 (ii).

——— on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 3529 (ii).

Barker, Mr. Saml.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Bill, on Amt. (Mr. Clarke) and Mr. Speaker's Decision *re* Vote being taken, 2057 (ii).

G.T.P. Application for Aid by Co., Communication to anybody previous to reading in House (Ques.) 3761 (ii).

——— Contracts and Surveys *re* Different Sections (remarks) 3361 (ii).

——— Deposit, &c. (Ques.) 400 (i).

——— Employees on Eastern Division, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.) 223 (i).

——— Mr. Hays' Memo. *re* Pet. for Aid in Nov. 1902, on Criticism (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) in holding back from Rets., 3708 (ii).

——— Investigations *re* Traffic Arrangements, in Com. on Ry. Act B. 132, 5679 (iii).

——— 'Jack Pine, &c.' Ques. of Priv. *re* Globe editorial, 2459 (ii).

——— Production of Confidential Documents, M. for Cor. *re* Construction, 3950 (iii).

——— Surveys, &c. (M. for ret.) 223 (i).

——— Transcontinental Line, Papers, Documents, &c. *re* Construction (M. for copies) 3950 (ii).

G.T. Ry. Arbitration (additional powers) B. 152 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7673 (iv).

——— (remarks) 7229 (iv).

I.C.R., Bridges, Cost of Strengthening (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6265 (iv).

——— Details *re* Expenditure, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5945 (iii).

——— Earnings and Expenditure for 1903-4 (Ques.) 1139 (i).

——— Earnings and Expenses, Eight Months, Feb. 28, 1904 (Ques.) 1665 (i).

——— Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii).

——— Windsor Junction and Halifax, Double Track, &c. (remarks) 6263 (iv).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 8090 (v).

Monarch Life Assurance Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Osler) on M. for 3°, 3479 (ii).

Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co.'s B. 161 (Mr. Heyd) in Com., 8705 (v).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8792, 8802 (v).

Privilege (Ques. of) *re* Par. in 'Globe' *re* 'Land of Jack Pine, &c.' 2459 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 5679 (iii), 6775, (iv); on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Express Cos., 6691; on M. for 3°, (rescinding old orders) 7565 (iv).

Railway Subsidies B. 157 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 8132 (v).

——— B. 171 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res. 8792 (v).

Sergeant-at-Arms Expenditure *re* Speaker's Apartments, in Com. of Sup., 8990 (v).

Barker, Mr. Saml.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1830 (i); Railways (salaries) 5895 (iii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. (surveys) 8965 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Hamilton harbour) 9028 (v).

Railways—I.C.R. additional sidings) 8365 (v); (air brakes) 5922; (Amqui accommodation) 5966 (iii); 8364 (iv); (Birch Cove curves) 8350 (v); (bridges, strengthening) 5918 (iii), 6265 (iv); (Canso ferry service) 8365; (double tracking) 8351 (v); draw bars for cars) 6265 (iv); (facilities, &c.) 5945 (iii), 8361 (v); (Halifax accommodation) 5974 (iii), 8364 (v); (Restigouche Bridge superstructure) 5949; (Rivière du Loup shops) 5972 (iii); (rolling stock) 8354; (St. Leonard junction) 8348; (steel rails) 8360 (v); (Windsor branch) 6219 (iv).

Taschereau, Sir Elzear, Speeches *re* Dundonald Matter (remarks) 7363 (iv).

West Canadian Collieries Limited, B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6103 (iv).

Bell, Mr. A. C., *Pictou.*

Atlantic Fast-SS. Service, New Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6156, 6164 (iv).

Auditor General, Resignation of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) to Sup., 6608 (iv).

Budget, on The, 4374 (iii).

Butter and Cheese, Cost of manufacturing at Nappan, N.S. (Ques.) 2805 (ii).

Copper Crown Mining Co., Ry. Siding at Pictou, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 989 (i).

Dom. Day Adjournment (remarks) 5762 (iii).

Dundonald, Lord, G.O.C., Dismissal and Discussion in Imp. House of C. (remarks) 7112 (iv).

Financial Situation, Review of, 8291; (amt.) 8311; neg. (Y. 48; N. 90) 8344 (v).

Fishing Bounties, Methods of Payment (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5069 (iii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 1648 (i); on M. for 2°, 2063; in Com., 2269; on sec. 3 (amt.) 3134; on Amt. (Mr. Casgrain) 3323; on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) Govt. Ownership, to M. for 3°, 3679 (ii).

G.T.P. Ry., Mr. Hays' Memo. *re* Pet. for Aid in Nov. 1902; on Criticism (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) in holding back documents from Rets., 3707 (ii).

——— Speech *re* and Whip's Arrangements (personal explanation) 2002 (ii).

Guysborough Election, Political Interference *re* I.C.R. Employees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6026, 6086 (iv).

Immigrants, Destitute and stranded in Can. (remarks) 3873 (ii).

I.C.R., Passes issued, Inquiry for Ret., 3540 (ii).

——— *See* 'Passes,' 'Receipts,' &c.

——— on Annual Statement, 5875 (iii).

Bell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Laschinger, Mr., Appnmt. as Ass't Sec. P. O. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5062 (iii).
Lead Bounties B. 127 (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Com. on Res., 3875 (ii).
Lobster Fishing Season, Extension of Close Season, Pet. *re* (remarks) 4927 (iii).
——— Regulations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5069 (iii).
Mabou Creamery, N.S., Cost of Building, Machinery, &c. (M. for copies of cor.*) 3771 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 2806 (ii).
Mail Bag Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5756 (iii).
Mail Contracts, River John (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5746 (iii).
——— *See* 'River John.'
Militia Dress Regulation, Reimbursement to Officers (Ques.) 1665 (i).
Nappan Dairy Station, Butter and Cheese, Cost of Manufacturing, &c. (Ques.) 2805 (ii)
——— M. for Ret.*, 3770 (ii).
Newfoundland Fisheries Treaty with U.S., on M. (Mr. Kaulbach) 2127 (ii).
New Glasgow, I.C.R. Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6289 (iv).
North Shore Power and Pulp Co.'s Wharf, in Com. of Sup., 7973 (iv).
Passes issued by Can. Govt. on Rys., Steamers for 1903-4 (M. for ret.*) 1882 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 3540 (ii).
Personal Explanation *re* Par. in Globe *re* Speech on G.T.R. Bill, and Whips' Arrangements, 2002 (ii).
Port Arthur Harbour B. 98 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 3878 (ii).
Port Morien, C.B., Breakwater, Reps. Rets. &c. (M. for copies*) 5094 (iii).
Post Office Accounts, *re* Atlin and Yukon (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5596 (iii).
Post Office Finances, Rep. of Auditors (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5612 (iii).
P.E.I. Ry., Pay of Labourers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6224 (iv).
Pugwash, N. S., Postmaster, Name, &c. (Ques.) 1667 (i).
River John Mail, Contract, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5746 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 6024 (iv).
Ross Rifle Factory, Application for Land on Cove Fields, Que. &c. (Ques.) 2378 (ii).
——— (M. for copies*) 2847 (ii).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 125 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 3720 (ii).
Seven Island Wharf, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7973; Agreement (read) 7977 (iv).
Suction Dredges, Mar. Provs., Contract *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1665 (i).

Bell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 5596, 5612 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G.B. and Canada) 6156 (iv).
Public Works, Buildings—Que. (Valleyfield) 7972; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Sarnia dredging) 7856; (Sault Ste. Marie dredging) 7857; (Southampton) 7857; (Thornbury) 7863; Que. (Seven Islands wharf) 7828, 7973, 7977; (Three Rivers wharf) 7840 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (additional sidings) 5942 (iii); 6289 (iv); (Halifax accommodation) 5974; (Stellarton station) 5969; (Windsor, N.S. station) 5956 (iii); (working expenses) 6026 (iv); P.E.I. (Curtis Creek line) 5987; (Westinghouse brakes) 5989 (iii).

Tobacco Duty, Excise and Customs, Amount paid, 1903-4 (Ques.) 6546 (iv).

Bennett, Mr. W. H., *East Simcoe.*

Acetylene Gas for Lighthouses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5305 (iii).
Address, on The, 130 (i).
"Bayfield," Str., Sale of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5229 (iii).
Chew, Manley, and Hope Island Timber cut (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5235 (iii).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Value, Bonus paid, &c. (Ques.) 3310 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7651 (iv).
Finnigan Site for Oshawa P.O. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).
Furniture Trade with Japan (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4130 (iii).
'Gauss,' Str., Emplymt. of Crew (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5212 (iii).
Gaynor & Greene, Ref. to in Debate on Address, 145 (i).
Govt. Cars, use of by Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7491 (iv).
Grain Shipments received at Quebec (Ques.) 215 (i).
Grain Shipments received at Montreal, &c. (Ques.) 216 (i).
Grain Shipments from Port Arthur to Buffalo (Ques.) 215 (i).
Grain Shipments received at Upper Lake Ports, &c. (Ques.) 216 (i).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 1714 (i); on M. for 2°, 2088; in Com., 2235, 2261, 2333; (amt.) 3251; on Amt. (Mr. Blain) 3233; on M. for 3° (amt.) 3530 (ii).
'Gulnare,' Str., for Tidal Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5287 (iii).
Guysborough Election, Political Interference *re* I.C.R. Employees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6035 (iv).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Hope Island, Quantity of Timber cut, Contract with Manley Chew, &c. (Ques.) 2808 (ii).

——— (M. for copies*) 224 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5236 (iii).

Jackson, J. B., Appnmt. as Commercial Agent in Eng., on M. for Sup., 7798 (iv).

Judiciary of Ontario, Changes, Vacancies, &c. 1904 (Ques.) 2374 (ii).

Laschinger, Mr., Appnmt. as Ass't. Sec. P. O. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5647 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 5304 (iii) .

Liquor Permits issued in Yukon, Names, Quantity, &c. (M. for copies*) 1880 (i).

Lumber Industry in B.C., and Tariff Readjustment, on M. (Mr. Morrison) 2578 (ii).

McCarthy, Osler & Co., Fees *re* Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (Ques.) 556 (i).

——— Fees to Mr. Osler (Ques.) 993 (i).

Midland Dock Purchase, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. McCarthy) 383.

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7764 (iv).

Midland Mercantile & Trading Co., Letter from Mr. Gelinas (read) *re* Rental of Dock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7764 (iv).

Port Arthur Harbour B. 98 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 3878 (ii).

Postal Rates, Increases, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5723 (iii).

Post Office Employees, Promotions, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5647 (iii).

Prescott Carbide Factory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5304 (iii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick)—(amt.) to M. for 3°, Telephone Control, 7563 (iv).

Ry. Commissioners' Car, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7508 (iv).

Standard Chemical Co., Purchase of Wood Alcohol, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3925 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 4097 (iii)

Inland Revenue, Excise (methylated spirits) 3925 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouses, &c.) 5304 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Victoria and San Francisco) 7444 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 5212; (tidal service) 5287 (iii).

Post Office (mail service) 5723 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Alexandria P.O.) 507; (Bridgeburg P.O.) 530; (Chatham armoury) 531; (Clinton P.O.) 531; (Cobourg armoury) 531; (Oshawa P.O.) 611; (Stratford armoury) 640; Que. (Actonvale P.O.) 506, 662; (Grosse Isle quarantine station) 667 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers,—Ont. (Amherstburg dredging) 7750 ; (Bracebridge wharf) 7751; (Collingwood harbour) 7751; (Depot Harbour) 7753; (Goderich harbour) 7754; (Midland harbour wharf) 7853; (Penetanguishene pier) 7854; (Thornbury) 7863 ; Que. (Grand Vallee pier) 7768 (iv).

Railways—Miscellaneous (Gov. Gen.'s car) 7491 (iv).

Welland Canal, Lighting Contract, &c. (Ques.) 1877 (i).

Yukon Ter. Liquor Licenses issued, Names of Parties, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1880 (i).

Bickerdike, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*

Criminal Code (fraudulent debtors) Amt. (B. 86) 1° m., 2116, (ii); in Com., 3980 (iii).

Edmonton Street Ry. Co.'s B. (M.) to receive Pet., 2601 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal examining warehouse) 682 (i).

Wrecking Investigations, Expenditure *re*, in Com. of Sup., 5264 (iii).

Birkett, Mr. T., *Ottawa.*

Ottawa Customs House, Erection of, &c. (Ques.) 552 (i).

Ottawa Drill Hall, Application *re* (Ques.) 3389 (ii).

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Champagne) in Com., (M.) to ref. back to Com. 4176; in Com., 4226; Pet. from Ottawa City Council (read) 4229; on Amt. (Mr. Puttee) 4267 (iii).

Ottawa Post Office Employees, Bonuses *re* Fire (remarks) 5587 (iii).

Rideau Canal Bridges, Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5914 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1872 (i); Post Office (salaries) 5587; Railways (salaries) 5906 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Victoria Museum) 461 (i).

Weights and Measures (inspectors' salaries) 4046 (iii).

Tariff Rebate on Goods passed before bringing down Resolutions (remarks) 5741 (iii).

Blain, Mr. R., *Peel.*

Acetylene Gas System, Cost of Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii).

Artificial Teeth, Tariff *re* (remarks) in Com. on Res., 8896 (v).

Bain, Mr., Preparation of Campaign Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1864 (i).

Bell Telephone System, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Act Amt. B. 132, 6729 (iv).

Berlin Customs Port, Rev. collected (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1902 (i).

Binder Twine, Amount of Manilla used, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8962 (v).

——— *See* 'Inspection Act.'

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Blankets, Tariff Reduction (remarks) in Com. on Res., 8890 (v).

Campbellton Railway Siding (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5940 (iii).

Cattle Guard Commission, Printing Rep. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7482 (iv).

Cattle imported from U.S. and Mexico (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4114 (iii).

Census, 1901, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 7224 (iv).

Census Volumes, Inquiry for, in Com. of Sup., 8959 (v).

'Chapman' Ball-bearings, Application to I.C.R. Cars (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6286 (iv).

Cheese Cooling Room, Woodstock, Ont., Total Expenditure (Ques.) 793 (i).

Chesley Postmastership, Appnmt. &c. (Ques.) 7081 (iv).

Chicken Fattening Station, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7424 (iv).

Clergue Mfg. Co., Contract with Govt. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. B. 171, 8831 (v).

'Cleveland' Patent Cylinders *re* I.C.R. Locomotives (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6286 (iv).

Cold Storage *re* Atlantic Strs., Increase in Subsidy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6195 (iv).

Colonization Roads in Man. and N.W.T., in Com. of Sup., 9043; (M.) to pay Amount to Man. Govt., 9048 (v).

Corn, Removal of Duty, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4119 (iii).

Customs Dept., Salaries and Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1852 (i).

——— Instruction Book, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1988 (i).

——— Permanent Staff, Number, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1902 (i).

——— Ports opened, Number (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1959 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7652 (iv).

Dredging in Ont., Summary of Expenditures asked for, 7875 (iv).

Express and Tel. Cos., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to Ry. Act Amt. B. 132, in Com., 6702 (iv).

Farm Delegates to G.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7324 (iv).

Farm and Garden Products, Protection *re* Tariff (amt.) to Sup., 4004; Neg. (Y. 41; N. 76) 4041 (iii).

Farm Products imported from U.S., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4130 (iii).

'Fielding,' Dredge, Cost of Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7881 (iv).

Freight Discrimination *re* Atlantic Fast SS. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6207 (iv).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Furniture Trade with Japan (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4129 (iii).

Geological Survey Rep., Postage Rates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).

Govt. Car for Ry. Commissioners, Built in U.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7503 (iv).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., on sec. 3 (amt.) 3030; on sec. 7 (amt.) 3229; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 3417 (ii).

G.T.P. Ry., Directors to be British Subjects, in Com. on Ry. B. 132, 5681 (iii).

'Gulnare,' Str. for Tidal Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5287 (iii).

Halifax Harbour Lighting System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5831 (iii).

Harbours and Rivers, N. S., Cumberland County (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9021 (v).

Immigration Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7339 (iv).

Immigration Literature, Advertising Medium, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7361 (iv).

Imperial Institute, London, Transfer to British Board of Trade (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3739 (ii).

Inspection Act (binder twine) Amt. B. 124 (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Com., 8048 (v).

I.C.R., Bridges, Strengthening, in Com. of Sup., 6269 (iv).

——— Employees and Political Interference in Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6049 (iv).

——— Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6128 (iv).

Lighthouse Keepers, Dismissal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5325 (iii).

Live Stock Exhibitions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7406 (iv).

Macoun, J. M., Rep. *re* Peace River, Distribution, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7209 (iv).

Mail Contracts between Can. and G.B., and New York Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iv).

Mail Matter carried via New York, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6200 (iv).

Marconi System on Govt. Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8920 (v).

Newspaper Postage Rate, Revenue, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5723 (iii).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8816 (v).

Nova Scotia Harbours and Rivers, Summary of Amounts expended in Estimates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7648 (iv).

Oil Explorations and Borings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7217 (iv).

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Champagne) in Com., 4188 (iii).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Parcel Post, Date of Increase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9010 (v).

Patent Models, Classifications, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2723 (ii).

Patterson, Dr., Quarantine Inspector, Salary, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4171 (iii).

Political Interference *re* Govt. Employees, Letter of Hon. Wm. Ross (read) 6062 (iv). *See* 'Ross.'

Port Arthur Harbour B. 98 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 3879 (ii).

Port Credit Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7888 (iv).

Postal Rates, Date of Reduction, &c., (Ques.) 8776 (v).

Postal Rates between Can. and G.B. in 1868 (Ques.) 7437 (iv).

Postmasters' Guarantee Fund (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5850 (iii).

Post Office Finances, Rep. of Auditors (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5610 (iii).

Post Offices opened, Number, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5745 (iii).

Public Works in Cumberland County (remarks) 9021 (v).

Railway Act (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 3787 (ii), 5117 (iii).

Railway Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 5681 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Express Cos., 6702; on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Ry. Commissioners, 6729; on M. for 3°, (amt.) *re* Express Companies, 7548 (iv).

Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 171 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 8816 (v).

Richard, Mr., Copyist in Paris (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2732 (ii).

Rolling Stock and Steel Rails, Duties *re* Purchase in Can., &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. B. 171, 8828 (v).

Ross, Hon. Wm., Personal Explanation *re* Dennis Eagan's Letter (remarks) 7545 (iv). *See* 'Political.'

St. Joseph, Lake Huron Wharf (M.) to strike out Item, 9074 (v).

St. Lawrence Route, Lighting System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5810, 5817 (iii).

St. Louis Exhibition, Expenditure, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7422 (iv).

Seed Growers' Association incorp. B. 151 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7235 (iv).

Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 125 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 3725 (ii); in Com. on B. 4939 (iii).

Sergeant-atArms Expenditure *re* Speaker's Apartments, Comparisons, &c., in Com. of Sup., 8989 (v).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Seven Islands Wharf (M.) to strike out item, 9074 (v).

SUPPLY:

Adulteration of Food (fraudulent marking) 4091 (iii).

Agriculture (aid to societies) 2743; (Archives) 2729 (ii); (dairying branch) 7406 (iv); (exhibitions) 4093; (experimental farms) 4962 (iii); (fumigating stations) 2747; (general statistics) 2742 (ii), 8959 (v); (Imperial Institute, London) 3739; (Patent Record) 2733; (Year Book) 2737 (ii).

Canals—Chambly (tow-path macadamazing) 7470 (iv).

——— Galops (channel completion) 6343; (enlargement) 6303 (iv).

——— Grenville (wharf) 6866 (iv).

——— Lachine (Atwater bridge) 8374 (v); (electric installation) 6826; (locks 1 and 2) 7533 (iv).

——— North Channel (dam, &c.) 6318 (iv).

——— Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 6819 (iv).

———Soulanges (workshops, &c.) 6864 (iv).

——— Trent (dredging machinery) 7466 (iv).

——— Welland (electric plant) 6354, 6797 (iv); (elevator at Port Colborne) 8379 (v); (Port Colborne deepening) 6362, 6812 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 2717; (salaries) 2716 (ii); Customs (salaries) 1852 (i); Post Office (salaries) 5610 (iii); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 6151 (iv).

Civil Service Examiners (contingencies) 9038 (v).

Customs (inspectors' salaries, &c.) 1980, 1982; (salaries) 1902, (salaries) 1959 (i).

Geological Survey (oil borings) 7217 (iv).

Govt. of N.W. Ter. (registrars, &c.) 7023 (iv)

G.T. Pacific Ry. (surveys) 8962 (v).

Immigration (agents' salaries) 7324 (iv).

Indians—P.E.I. (medical attendance) 6941; (relief and seed grain) 6938 (iv).

Inland Revenue—Excise (inspectors, extra pay) 3919; (methylated spirits) 3925; (travelling expenses, rent, &c.) 3920 (ii).

Labour Dept. ('Gazette' correspondents) 9013 (v).

Legislation—Senate (contingencies) 9038; Voters' Lists, 9005 (v).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, rents, &c.) 5804; (Halifax Harbour) 5831; (Montreal pilot commissioners court) 5835; (St. Lawrence route) 5810, 5817 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 6161; (St. John and Glasgow) 6213 (iv).

Miscellaneous (colonization roads in Man. and N.W.T.) 8017 (iv), 9043 (v).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 5292 (iii); (damages to perishable goods, P.E.I.) 7595 (iv); (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 5207 (iii); (ice-breakers) 8922 (v); (tidal service) 5287; (unforeseen expenses) 5300 (iii).

Post Office (compensation for injuries) 5847; (mail service) 5723, 5745 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Rossland armoury) 701; (Vancouver P.O.) 705 (i), 9020 (v).

Public Works—Buildings, Generally (armouries) 9020 (v); (heating, &c.) 7631 (iv).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Calgary P.O.) 697 ; (Prince Albert court house) 699 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 506 (i) ; (Chatham armoury) 9020 (v) ; (Cobourg armoury) 533 ; (Fort William P.O.) 535; (Grosse Isle station) 667 ; (Guelph armoury) 650 ; (Guelph P.O.) 541, 654 ; (Hawkesbury P.O.) 544 ; (London armoury) 604 ; (Oshawa P.O.) 608 (i); (St. Catharines drill hall) 9020 (v); (St. Mary's P.O.) 631 ; (Sault Ste. Marie P.O.) 640 ; (Toronto P.O.) 647; (Woodstock armoury) 649 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Post Office reconstruction) 3907 (ii); (Royal Mint) 457; (Victoria Museum) 458 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Actonvale P.O.) 662; (Lévis P.O.) 668; (Longueuil P. O.) 673 ; (Magog P.O.) 680 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (repairs, &c.) 7632 (iv).

Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (new plant) 7885 ; Ont. (new plant) 7881, 7886 (iv), 9031 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Dom. (repairs, &c.) 7851; N.B. (Hopewell Cape) 7748 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Bayfield harbour 7635; (Breton Cove boat landing) 7637 (iv); (Cumberland Co.) 9021 (v); (Digby pier) 7637 ; (Fort Lawrence pier) 7638 ; (Georgeville wharf) 7638 ; (Glace Bay) 7640 ; (Neil's Harbour) 7643 ; (Pembroke breakwater) 7644 ; (Port Hawkesbury) 7644 (iv), 9023 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Barry's Bay) 7751 ; (Bayfield pier) 8021 ; (Burlington channel) 7751 ; (Depot Harbour) 7753 ; (Goderich harbour) 7755 ; (Honora wharf) 7851 ; (Pembroke wharf) 7854; (Port Colborne) 7897 ; (Port Perry dredging) 7854; (Spanish River) 7861 (iv); (Whitby dredging) 9031 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (West Point wharf) 7744 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (damage to dredge 'J. I. Tarte') 8021 ; (Grand Vallée pier) 7770 ; (Lake St. John dredging) 7775; (Laprairie ice piers) 7775; (Lotbinière wharf) 7776; (Rivière du Loup) 7782 ; (St. Godfroi de Nouvelle) 7782 ; (St. Jean des Chaillons) 7782 (iv).

Quarantine—B. C. (steamers, &c.) 4201 ; Generally (organized districts, salaries) 4145 ; Que. (Grosse Isle steamers) 4193 ; (smallpox inspection) 4165 (iii).

Railway Commission (salaries and maintenance) 8383 (v).

Railways—I.C.R. (additional sidings) 5940 (iii); (bridges, strengthening) 6269 (iv) ; (facilities, &c.) 5945 ; (Grand Narrows bridge) 5978 ; (Halifax accommodation) 5973 ; (North Sydney improvements) 5976; (Restigouche bridge superstructure) 5948; (Rivière du Loup shops) 5972 ; (St. John accommodation) 5973 ; (semaphores) 5986; (Stellarton station) 5970 (iii) ; (Windsor branch) 6219 (iv).

——— Miscellaneous (Govt. cars) 7503; (engineers, &c.) 7490 (iv).

——— P.E.I. (Alberton station) 6010 ; (Kensington accommodation) 5987 ; (Montague

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—P.E.I.—*Con.*

Bridge surveys) 6011 ; (Murray Harbour branch) 6000 ; (steam heating cars) 5998 (iii).

Weights and Measures (inspectors' salaries) 4046 (iii).

Tariff Reductions, &c., in Com. on Res., (remarks) 8859 (v).

Vegetables : *See* 'Farm,' &c.

Voters (Dom.) Lists, Total Expenditure for Printing, &c. (Ques.) 333 (i).

——— Printing and Distribution, &c. (Ques.) 6885 (iv).

Ways and Means (dumping clause) in Com. on Res., 8859 ; (glass) in Com. on Res., 8872 (v).

Wilton Post Office, Dismissal of Postmaster (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5667 (iii).

Wood Alcohol, Purchase from Standard Chemical Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3924 (ii).

Woollen and Cotton Industries, Tariff *re*, Stmnt. from Toronto 'Globe' (read) 1463 (i).

Blanchet, Mr. J. B., *St. Hyacinthe.*

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 3065 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 6759 (iv).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick, K.C.M.G. (Minister of Militia and Defence), *King's, N.S.*

Arsenal, Dom., Establishment at Ottawa (remarks) 8386 (v).

Canadian Artillery Association incorp. (B. 103) 1° m., 2848 (ii); 2° m., and in Com., 4144 (iii).

Canadian Prize Winners in Eng. (remarks) 7436 (iv).

Cavalry Regiments, Number of Squadrons, on Inquiry (Mr. Clarke) 8479 (v).

Census (1901) Industrial Establishments, &c. (Ans.) 1876 (i).

Defence Committee in London, Tels. from Lord Minto and Mr. Chamberlain (read) 6365 (iv).

Dennison, Col., Resignation, &c. (Ans.) 5073 (iii).

Dundonald, Lord, G.O.C., Dismissal by Govt. (personal explanation) 4584 (iii).

——— Political Interference, on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 5422 (iii).

——— (remarks) 7155 (iv).

——— Further Papers laid on Table, 5759 (iii)

Essex Fusiliers at St. Louis Exposition (remarks) 1783 (i).

Gregory, Col., Resignation, (remarks) 4590 (iii).

——— Incomplete Cor., 7023 (iv).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick—*Con.*

Gregory, Col., Resignation of, on Inquiry for Papers, 6023 (iv).

——— on M. for Sup., 7684, 7689 (iv).

——— Original Gazette laid on Table, 7785 (iv).

——— Papers laid on Table, 6464 (iv).

Immigrants deported from U.S. to Winnipeg (remarks) 364 (i).

Imperial Commissions allotted to Can. Militia, Conditions, &c. (Ans.) 1358 (i).

Lamontagne & Co., Goods purchased by Tender, &c. (Ans.) 1877 (i).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal, Payments to Militia (Ans.) 401 (i).

McLean and Jones, Lt.-Cols., Recommendation as to Brigadier, &c. (Ans.) 5867 (iii).

Merritt, Maj., Gazetted as in Command (Ans.) 5073 (iii).

Militia and Defence Act (1904) Amt. (B. 5) 1° m., 205; 2° m., 255; in Com. on Res., 477 ; in Com. on Bill, 255 (i), 6365, 6467 (iv), 8066, active service, 8067 (v); advisory council, 6531 ; annual drill, 6462 ; cadet corps, 6539 ; Defence of Can., 6486 ; 'emergency,' 6374 ; exemptions from service, 6425 ; Inspector-General, 6526; military buildings, 6422 ; Minister's responsibility, 6382; rifle range and target practice, 6467, 6534 ; riots, &c., 6512 ; total peace establishment, 6437 ; transport, 6505 (iv).

——— (B. 5) 3° m., 8155 ; on Amt. (Mr. Tisdale) 8171 ; on Amt. (Mr. Logan) 8205, 8210 (v).

——— (Director-General's Pay) Amt. (M.) for Com. on Res., 598 (i).

——— (Headquarters, Officers pay and allowance) Amt. (prop. res.) 1782 ; in Com. on Res., 477 (i), 2906 (ii).

Militia Act, Interpretation of 'Corps,' &c. (Ans.) 8027 (v).

Militia Bill, Reprinting, &c. (remarks) 6882 (iv).

'Military Gazette' (Canadian) and Govt. Patronage (remarks) 7906 (iv).

Military Investigation *re* Charges against 9th Battalion, Inquiry for further Cor., 4416 (iii)

Militia and Defence, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 2848 (ii).

Militia Contracts let without Tender (remarks) in Com. on B., 6386 (iv).

Militia Dress Regulation, Reimbursement for Officers, &c. (Ans.) 1666 (i).

Militia Headgear, Contracts *re* (Ans.) 1666 (i).

Militiamen not on Duty, Under Control of Minister, &c. (remarks) 7732 (iv).

Militia Regulations *re* Criticisms of Militia Force (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 8121 (v).

Militia Regulations *re* Increased Pay (Ans.) 5271 (iii).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick—*Con.*

Militia Regulations, Remuneration *re* Camp Attendance (remarks) 3755 ; Regulation (read) 3756 (ii).

Militia Reorganization Scheme (remarks), 6365 (iv).

Mulloy, Private, Pension *re* S.A. War (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8903 (v).
See 'S. A. War,' &c.

Musketry School Camp at Ottawa, Privates doing Fatigue Work (remarks) 7097 (iv).

——— Taxes, *re* Clubs, &c. (remarks) 6551 (iv)

——— Cor. laid on Table, 6969 (iv).

Naval Militia (remarks) 6421 (iv).

Ottawa Car Co., Goods purchased by Tender, &c. (Ans.) 1878 (i).

Otter, Col., Fenian Raid Services (Ans.) 8388 (v).

Perry, Mr., Winner of King's Prize at Bisley (remarks) 7436 (iv).

Ross Rifle, Contract, Tests, &c. (Ans.) 6887 (iv).

——— Application for Land on Cove Fields (Ans.) 2378 (ii).

St. John, N.B., Drill Hall, Militia Services, &c. (Ans.) 2557 (ii).

——— Option on Chipman Property (Ans.) 3941 (iii).

St. Thomas Club Rooms, for 25th Battalion, Rent, &c. (Ans.) 7226 (iv).

St. Thomas Military Camp, Dist. No. 1, 1891, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 7226 (iv).

Sherbrooke Drill Hall, Location of Site, Representations *re* (Ans.) 2376 (ii).

S.A. War, Canadians injured, Care of by Govt. (Ans.) 3538 (ii).

——— King's Medals, Application by Canadians, Number, Condition, &c. (Ques.) 2375 (ii).

——— Pensions for Disabled Can. Soldiers, on M. (Mr. Broder) for Cor., 4697 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Militia (Dom. arsenals) 8386; (rifle grants) 8385 (v); (salaries and wages) 3909 (ii) ; Miscellaneous (contingencies) 9034; (monuments) 9034 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Cobourg armoury) 531 ; (Guelph armoury) 536 ; (Kingston R.M.C.) 601 (i).

Sydney Strike, Withdrawal of Militia (remarks) 6806 (iv).

Truro Armonry, Construction of, &c. (Ans.) 8389 (v).

Valleyfield Labour Troubles, Collection of Payments by Municipality, &c. (Ans.) 250 (i), 3128, 3312 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L., *Halifax.*

Address, on The, 33 (i).

Address, Farewell, to His Ex., Lord Minto (seconded) 8477 (v).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Alaskan Boundary Arbitration, Documents *re*, Delay in bringing down (remarks) 5, 9 (i); 3725 (ii); 4928, 5578 (iii).

——— Inquiry for further Papers, 1355 (i).

——— Printing, &c. (remarks) 5759 (iii).

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) on M. for 1°, 7901 (iv).
See 'Naturalization,' &c.

Alien Labour and Protection to Canadian Workmen on the G.T.P. (remarks) 3282 (ii).
See 'G. T. P.' &c.

Alien Labour Commission, Appnmt. of Counsel, &c., 4331 (iii).

Alliance Bank of Canada Bill, on M. (Mr. Russell) to extend Time, 4408 (iii).

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 5578 (iii).

Apples shipped in Cold Storage to G.B., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6186 (iv).

Appointments to Public Offices; Personal Character, &c., (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 7822; Neg. (Y. 43; N. 70) 7827 (iv).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Contract with Allans (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6189, 6196 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 869, 1449, 1874 (i), 3126 (ii).

Auditor General's Rep., Inquiry for, 230 (i).

Auditor General, Resignation, (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6553; Neg. (Y. 56; N. 94) 6635 (iv).

——— Par. *re* Conditional Resignation, 5583 (iii).

Bain, Mr., Preparation of Liberal Campaign Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1948 (i).

Bell Telephone System, on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) in Com. on Ry. B. 132, 6742 (iv).

Binder Twine: *See* 'Inspection Act.'

Blair, Mr., Memorandum *re* G.T.P., Personal Explanation *re* Report in 'Hansard,' 1298 (i).

——— Using Confidential Documents, &c. (remarks) 1691 (i).

Blair, Mr., Resignation, Cor. *re*, Inquiry for, 1356 (i).

Book Postage, Rates, Increase, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5716 (iii).

Bonding Privileges: *See* 'Coasting,' &c.

Budget, on The, 4740; (amt.) 4766; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 110) 4922 (iii).

——— (remarks) 3726 (ii).

Business of the Hse., Govt. Legislation, &c. (remarks) 4725 (iii), 6787 (iv).

Business of the House *re* Private Members' Day (remarks) 595 (i).

——— Railway Bill (remarks) 5926 (iii).
See 'Govt. Business.'

Canada and France SS. Line, Contract *re*, on M. (Mr. Casgrain) for Cor., 4704 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Can. and Mexico SS. Service, Govt. Policy *re*, &c. (Ques.) 2118 (ii).

Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase B. 163 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 8225, 8249 (v).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6259 (iv).

Canadian Northern Subsidy, Inquiry for Ret., 2285 (ii).

Cattle Guard Commission, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7485 (iv).

Cigarette Legislation, on prop. Res. (Mr. W. S. Maclaren) 359 (i).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 343 (i).

Coasting Laws for British Ports, Cor. *re* with Imp. Govt. (remarks) 6882 (iv).

Coasting Trade on Pacific, Free Entry of Canadian Goods, Inquiry for O.C., 1055, 1449 (i).

Companies Act Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Cowan) in Com., 3979 (iii).

Confidential Documents used in Hse., &c. (remarks) in Com. on G.T.P. Bill, 1691 (i).

Cornwall Canal, Davis Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6648 (iv).

——— Aud. Gen.'s Letter *re* Papers (remarks) 6880 (iv).

——— Understanding *re* Discussion (remarks) 7540 (iv).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 3794 (ii).

Criminal Code (minerals) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Wade) in Com., 4719 (iii).

Criminal Code (fraudulent debtors) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 3983 (iii).

Customs Outside Service, Salaries at Different Ports, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1889 (i).
See 'Coasting,' &c.

Documents, Confidential, Published as Rets. to Hse., by Liberal Ministers, &c. (remarks) 1694 (i).

Documents, Public, &c., Withheld from Parlt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 5794 (iii).

Dog-Fish Pest, Commission *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6973; Letter from Mr. Howard Smith (read) 6977 (iv).

——— Rep. of Commissioners, Inquiry for, 6928 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 1°, 5862 (iii); in Com., 7650 (iv), 8137; on Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) to M. for 3°, 8391 (v).

Dom. Steel Co., Strike at Sydney, Govtl. Action (remarks) 4053 (iii).

Dry Dock Facilities, B.C., Cor. *re* Vancouver Engineering Works, N. Thompson & Co. (M. for copies*) 560 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 1449 (i).

Dundonald, Lord, G.O.C., Dismissal by Govt., Res. *re* Political Interference, (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 5355; Amt. 5387; Neg. (Y. 42; N. 84) 5575 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Dundonald, Lord, Dismissal by Govt., Confidential Cor. *re* (remarks) 5279 (iii).

——— Political Interference in Militia (remarks) 4585, 4613 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. Hughes) to adjn., and Mr. Speaker's Ruling, 4592 (iii).

——— Cor. *re*, Inquiry for Papers in Dept. of Agriculture, &c. (remarks) 4924 (iii).

——— on Further Cor. (remarks) 4927 (iii).

——— Documents and Cor. referred to by Min. of Ag., &c., Inquiry for, 4685 (iii).

——— withheld from Parlt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 5794; 'Foreigner' *re* Explanation of Prime Minister (remarks) 5802 (iii).

Edmonton Street Ry. Co.'s B., on M. (Mr. Oliver) to receive Pet., 2681 (ii).

Estimates, The, and And. Gen.'s Rep. (remarks) 230 (i).

Exchequer Court Act (right of appeal) Amt. B. 37 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 3°, 3999, 5194 (iii).

Express and Telephone Cos., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 in Com., 6690 (iv).

Farmers' Bank of Canada Bill, (Mr. Guthrie) on M. to receive Pet., 3718 (ii).

Financial Situation, on Review of (Mr. Bell) 8341 (v).

Fisheries Act (trap nets) Amt. B. 74 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 8218 (v).

Fish-Curing and Refrigerating Stations, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6975 (iv).

Fishing Bounties, Delay in Payment of Cheques, &c. (Ques.) 2118 (ii).

Fish Transportation to Ont., from Mar. Provs., &c. (remarks) in Com. on Port Mulgrave SS. Subsidy, 7448 (iv).

Govt. Business, Legislation, &c. (remarks) 4828 (iii).

——— on M. for Precedence on Wednesdays and Thursdays, 3846 (ii).

See 'Business,' &c.

Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 113 (Sir Richard Cartwright) on M. for 2°, 3876 (ii).

Grand Narrows Bridge, Information from Minister (remarks) 6265 (iv).

G.T. Ry. Arbitration (additional powers) B. 152 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7678 ; on M. for 3°, 7786 (iv).

G. T. Ry. Co. vs. McKay (remarks) 3778 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Amt. B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 725; Amt. 786 ; Neg. (Y. 61 ; N. 116) 1662 ; in Com. on Res., 1685; on M. for 2°, 1784 (i).

——— in Com., on sec. 1 of Bill, 2190, 2665, 2955 ; (amt.) 3006 ; on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 2962, 2995; on Amt. (Mr. Clarke) 3007 (ii).

——— on sec. 2 of Bill, 2669, 3027 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

——— on sec. 3 of Bill, 2677, 3043; on Amt. (Mr. Bell) 3150 ; on Amt. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 3174 (ii).

——— on sec. 4 of Bill, 2678 (ii).

——— on sec. 5 of Bill, 3203 (ii).

——— on sec. 6 of Bill, 3203 (ii).

——— on sec. 7 of Bill, (amt.) 3293, 3357, 3359 ; on Amt. (Mr. Earle) 3267; on Amt. (Mr. Lavell) 3304 ; on Amt. (Mr. Porter) 3289. 3291 (ii).

——— on sec. 2 of schedule, 2289, 2320 (ii).

——— on sec. 3 of schedule, 2664 (ii).

——— on sec. 4 of schedule, 2388, 2395 (ii).

——— on sec. 5 of schedule, 2441 (ii).

——— on secs. 6 and 7 of schedule, 2447 (ii).

——— on sec. 9 of schedule, 2463, 2477 ; stock securities, &c., 2592 (ii).

——— on sec. 10 of schedule, 2636, 2648 (ii).

——— on sec. 11 of schedule, 2641 (ii).

——— on M. for 3°, 3540 ; (amt.) Govt. Ownership, 3574 ; Neg. (Y. 59 ; N. 105) 3696 ; on Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 3433 ; on Amt. (Mr. Clare) 3498 ; on Amt. (Mr. Ingram) 3420 ; on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 3422 ; on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) 3415 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co., Cor. *re* G. T. Ry. Co., &c. (remarks) 93 (i).

——— cor. between Govt. and Co., Inquiry for, 253, 476, 1548 (i).

——— incomplete Cor. (remarks) 598 (i).

——— Mr. Blair's Memorandum, Report in Revised 'Hansard' (remarks) 1298 (i).

——— Ref. to Mr. Osler as 'ownied,' &c., 1712 (i).

——— Quotation from 'Herald' *re* Govt. Information, 92 (i).

G. T. P. Ry., Aliens, Emplymt. on Surveys, Cor. from Associated Engineers (remarks) 4827; (M.) for additional cor., 4828 (iii).

(M.) for additional cor., 4828 (iii).

——— investigation, counsel, *re*, &c. (remarks) 3944, 4055, 4142 (iii).

——— emplymt. of aliens, Delay in producing Papers (remarks) 3874 (ii).

——— emplymt. of British Subjects and Alien Labour Law, on Amt. (Mr. Clare) to M. for 3°, 3498 (ii).

——— emplymt. of British Subjects as engineers, &c., protest *re* aliens, &c., cor. pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 2847 (ii).

——— emplymt. of Canadians as engineers, &c. (remarks) 3028, 3104 (ii).

See 'Surveys,' &c.

——— on Amt. (Mr. Clarke) and Mr. Speaker's Decision *re* Vote being taken, 2056 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry., Appnmt. of a Fourth Commissioner (remarks) 3306; Amt. *re* Fourth Commissioner, 3376 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Bill, Arrangements with Min. of Jus., as to Procedure, 2267 (ii).

——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take Precedence, 597 (i), 2001 (ii).

——— on Order for Com., Postponement, 2686 (ii).

G.T.P., Mr. Hays' confidential Memo., Nov. 1902, Pet. for Aid from North Bay to Pacific Ocean, Criticism *re* holding back from the Hse., 3701 (ii).

——— Papers laid on Table, &c. (remarks) 7 (i).

——— Printing of, &c. (remarks) 9 (i).

——— Production of Confidential Documents, on M. (Mr. Barker) for Papers, &c., 3963 (iii).

G. T. P., Shareholder's Meeting, Declaration of Official Reporter (read) 2956 (ii).

——— Signing of the Agreement (remarks) 2462 (ii).

——— Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson's Speech (read) 2976 (ii).

——— Surveys, Investigation *re* Aliens, Evidence of C. M. Hays, before Judge Winchester *re* Letter to Prime Minister of 16th June (remarks) 6292 (iv).

——— evidence furnished G.T.P. Authorities (remarks) 6892 (iv).

——— rep. of Judge Winchester, Inquiry for, 5578 (iii).

——— Trap set by Govt. *re* Amendments, Par. in 'Le Canada' (remarks) 2957 (ii).

Gregory, Lt.-Col., Resignation, &c., on M. for Sup., 7692, 7721 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Papers, 6013 (iii), 6263, 7023 (iv).

Guysborough Election and I.C.R., Employees, &c., Ref. of Mr. Sinclair to 'heelers' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6105 (iv).

Halifax Fishery Award (1877), Case ref. to Supreme Court (remarks) 3126 (ii).

Halifax Mail Delivery, The O'Connell Case (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5711 (iii).

Halifax Post Office Clerks, Increase of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5713 (iii).

Halifax Station Accommodation, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 5976 (iii).

Harbours and Rivers, N.S., Amounts expended, Completed Works, &c., Statement asked for, 7648 (iv).

Huntingdon Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 1879 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 1875 (i).

Huron and Ontario Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. Ross, Ont.) to receive Pet., 3844 (ii).

Immigrants allowed into Can. from U.S., &c. (remarks) 3868 (ii).

Immigrants, Destitute and stranded in Can., &c. (remarks) 3853 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Indian Fishing Rights, Lease of, to Henry Bishop, Letter from Chief Alex. Prisk (read) in Com. of Sup., 6937 (iv).

Indian Timber cut on Reserves (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6934 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8394, 8403 (v).

Inspection Act (binder twine) Amt. B. 124 (Sir Richard Cartwright) on M. for 1°, 3720 (ii).

See 'Grain,' &c.

I.C.R., and G.T. Ry., Arbitration, &c., Inquiry for Cor., 8133 (v).

I.C.R., Employees and Political Interference in Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6052 (iv).

——— Employees, Control of Patronage (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6109 (iv).

——— Express Companies doing Business (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7450 (iv).

——— Halifax Board of Trade, Res. *re* Train Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).

——— Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6109 (iv).

——— Supply Items, Misunderstanding *re* Passing of (remarks) 5926 (iii).

Inter-Imperial Preferential Trade, Remarks of Mr. Lemieux in Eng., Cablegram *re*, 7082 (iv).

Interprovincial Ry. Bridge Co. B. 57 (Mr. Marcil) of N.B., in Com., 2370 (ii).

Jackson, J.B., Appmnt., as Commercial Agent, Charges *re* (amt.) on M. for Sup., 7822; Neg. (Y. 43; N. 70) 7827 (iv).

Joint High Commission, Instructions or Commissions issued, &c., Inquiry for Copies, 1354 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3725 (ii).

See 'Alaskan.'

Judges, Appnmt. of, on Ques. of Order *re* Mr. Russell, M.P., 7944 (iv).

Keremeos Indian Reserve, B.C., Pet. *re* Sale, &c. (Ques.) 1876 (i).

Kingston and Dom. Central Ry. Co.'s B., on M. to receive Pet., 2457 (ii).

Labour Troubles in B.C., Rep. of Commissioners, Inquiry for, 1054 (i).

'Lady Laurier' and Govt. Vessels, Delay in Payment to Crew (Ques.) 7224 (iv).

Lead Bounties on Canadian Ores B. 127 (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Com. on Res., 3875; in Com. on B., 4056 (iii).

Lemieux, Mr., Cablegram *re* Speech: *See* 'Solicitor General,' 'Inter-Imperial.'

Levis Ry., Construction (remarks) 7468 (iv).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Lobster Fisheries, P.E.I., Pet. *re* granting Licenses to Packers, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) to adjn., 4681 (iii).

McIntosh, Mr. John, Late M. P., Decease of (remarks) 6547 (iv).

Mail Contracts between Can. and G.B. (M. for copies of contracts*) 428 (i).
See 'Atlantic,' &c.

Milford Ry. Accident, Damages, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6142 (iv).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) on M. for 2°, 255 ; in Com. on Res., 478 (i). 2906 (ii); in Com. on B., 6376, 6495, (iv) ; (active service) in Com., 8086 ; (compensation for injuries) 8117 (v); (transport) 6505 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. Logan) to M. for 3°, 8211, 8269, 8286 ; on Amt. (Mr. Tisdale) to M. for 3°, 8173, 8184 (v).

Militia called into Active Service and Summoning of Parlt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6495 (iv).

Militia Camps, Remuneration for Attendance (remarks) 3726, 3757 (ii).

Militia System, Form of giving Instructions, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6376 (iv).

Minister of Railways, Criticism *re* Responsibilities for G.T.P. Bill and Silence during Debate (remarks) 3342 (ii).

Montreal Harbour, Free Port, on M. (Mr. Kemp) for Letter of Hon. Mr. Tarte to Prime Min., 5093 (iii).

Motions to adjn. Hse., Mr. Speaker's Ruling, Ques. of Priv., 1212 (i).

Naturalizations and Aliens Acts, Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 6794 (iv).
See 'Aliens,' &c.

New Brunswick Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. Gibson) on M. to receive Pet., 5184 (iii).

Newfoundland Fisheries Treaty with U.S., on M. (Mr. Kaulbach) 2126 (ii).

N.W. Ter. Representation Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Casgrain) on M. for 2°, 3990 (iii).

Nova Scotia Judges, Appnmt. &c., and Promises to Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7941 (iv).

N.S. Permanent Benefit and Building Society, &c., Fund Act Amt. (B. 8) 1°*, 396 (i); in Com., 3478 (ii).

O'Connell Case, Presentment of Grand Jury, Halifax (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5711 (iii)

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Champagne) on M. to receive Pet., 2458 (ii).

Personal Explanation *re* Absence from Hse., during debate on G.T.P., 1298 (i).

Personal Explanation *re* Mr. Blair's Memorandum, Letter from Debates Office (read) *re* word 'published' or 'prepared,' 1450 (i).

Petitions, on M. to receive, Special Circumstances, &c. (remarks) 2368 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 4059 (iii).

Port Arthur Harbour B. 98 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 3889 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 153 (Sir Wm. Mulock) on M. for 3°, 8265 (v).

Preferential Tariff, Importations *re* Canadian Ports, on prop. Res. (Mr. Logan) 5089 (iii).

P.E.I. Telegraph Connection and Govt. Control, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7892 (iv).

Private Bills, Presenting Pets. (M.) to extend Time, 3433 (ii).
See 'Petitions.'

Private Bills, reported from Com., Form on Order Paper (remarks) 986 (i).

Private Secretaries and Civil Service Act, Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1948 (i).

Privilege, Ques. of *re* Point of Order, on Ms. to adjn., and Mr. Speaker's ruling 'that two adjnmts. cannot follow without intervening Business,' 1212 (i).

Proulx, Mr., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 7903 (iv).

Provincial Subsidies, Speech *re* by Lt.-Gov. of Quebec (remarks) 503 (i).

——— Stmnt. in N.B. Legislature (remarks) 229 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Meetings, &c. (remarks) 1548 (i).

——— (M.) to substitute Name, 476 (i).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry., Irregularity of Debate on Personal Explanation (Mr. Osler) and Mr. Dep. Speaker's rulings *re* Ms. to adjn., 2885 (ii).

——— Order, Ques. of (Mr. Dep. Speaker) M. *re* Ruling, and Prime Minister's Remarks, &c., 2889 (ii).

——— Ref. by (Mr. Scott) to G.T.P. Bill, Ques. of Order, 2766 (ii).

Questions put by Members, Ministerial Replies, &c. (remarks) 1150 (i).

——— on Mr. Speaker's Ruling, 1152 (i).

——— on Ques. of Priv., 1213 (i).

Ry. Act (1903) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 417 ; on M. to ref. back to Sel. Com. on Rys., &c., 1888 (1), 3772; in Com., 3773 (ii), 5104 (iii).

Railway Act (employees' liability) Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Lennox) on M. for 2°, 4713 (iii).

Ry. Act (1903) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Express Cos., in Com., 6690; on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Ry. Commissioners, 6719 ; on Amt. Mr. Maclean) to M. for 3°, two-cent rate, 7552 ; on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to M. for 3°, *re* Express Companies, 7546; on M. for 3°, 7567 (iv).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Ry. Committee, on M. (Mr. Hyman) to sit during Sittings of Hse., 5861 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 157 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 8129 (v).

Rebellion Losses, 1885, Payment of Claims, on M. (Mr. Davis) for Ret., 2827 (ii).

Representation Act (1903) Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7671 (iv).

Representation in H. of C., Appeals of N.B., and P.E.I. (remarks) 3873 (ii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 1055, 1449 (i), 2285 (ii).

Revised Statutes Amt. B. 154 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 6795 (iv).

Ross, Hon. Wm., Letter written as Minister of Militia *re* Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6065 (iv).

Seal Fisheries, Seizing of Vessels, Payment of Claims, &c. (remarks) 5354, 5454 (iii).

Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 125 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for prop. Res., 3720 (ii).

Sessions, Late Date, and Delays (remarks) 8264 (v).

Shipping Casualties Act (1901) Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 5281 (iii); on Sen. Amts., 6889 (iv).

St. John and S. America Ocean Service, in Com. of Sup., 6216 (iv).

St. Lawrence Mail Contracts, Inquiry for Ret., 1449 (i), 2369 (ii).
See 'Atlantic,' &c.

Small, E. A., Patent Relief B. 93 (Mr. Logan) in Com., 3059 (ii).

Smith, Hamilton, publishing Private Tel. (remarks) 1692 (i).

Solicitor General and Min. of Justice, Duties *re* Private Practice (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 431 (i).

Solicitor General, Remarks *re* 'exploiting Lord Dundonald' in England, Cable Despatch *re*, 7082 (iv).

S. A. War, Pensions to Disabled Can. Soldiers, on M. (Mr. Broder) for Cor., 4698 (iii).

Speaker, Election of (remarks), 3 (i).

Speaker's, Mr., Rulings *re* Ms. to adjn., 1212 (i).

Standing Orders Com., (M.) to substitute Name, 477 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act (mechanical power) Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Préfontaine) on M. for 1°, 2683 (ii).

Supply B. 156 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 6784 (iv).

Supply Bill, One-Fifth Vote of Estimates, Procedure, &c. (remarks) 6638 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (Judge Dodd) 7939; (Supreme Court) 7939 (iv).

Agriculture (Can. Exhibit, Imperial Institute) 2758; (Winnipeg exhibition) 2753 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Canals—Cornwall (enlargement) 6293; Culbute (damages *re* floods) 7469; Generally (surveys, &c.) 7475; Lachine (St. Gabriel basin) 7536 (iv).

Charges of Management (Ass't. Receiver Gen.'s Office) 232; (conversion of public debt) 246; (Dom. notes) 244; (Dom. and provincial accounts) 237 (i).

Civil Govt.—Justice (private secretaries) 7937 (iv); (salaries) 431; Privy Council (contingencies) 428 (i).

Customs, Outside Service (salaries at ports) 1889 (i).

Indians—Generally (Dr. Bryce, salary) 6960 (iv).

Indians—N.B (agents' salaries) 6937; (medical attendance) 6938; (agents' salaries) 6933; (medical attendance) 6937; (relief and seed grain) 6936 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Australia) 7461; (Can. and Mexico) 7464; (Canada and S. Africa) 7446; (Gaspé Basin and Paspebiac) 7461; (Halifax, Newfoundland and Liverpool) 6212; (Port Mulgrave and Cheticamp) 7448; (St. John and W. Indies) 6216 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (cold storage *re* apples) 6186 (iv).

Post Office (mail service) 5711 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Nanaimo custom house) 700; (Rossland armoury) 701; (Vancouver P.O.) 704 (i).

——— Man. (Winnipeg barracks) 695; (Winnipeg P.O.) 695 (i).

——— N.W.T. (Calgary P.O.) 697; (Edmonton Jail) 697; (Macleod court house) 699; (Prince Albert court house) 700; (repairs, &c.) 697 (i).

——— N.S. (Halifax, immigrant shed) 504; (Halifax, public building) 505; (Sydney Mines P.O.) 506 (i).

——— Ont. (Alexandria P.O.) 516; (Cobourg armoury) 531; (Sault Ste. Marie P.O.) 640 (i).

——— Que. (Actonvale P.O.) 506; (Montreal warehouse) 680; (immigration buildings) 683 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Baxter's harbour) 7635; (Cow Bay) 7637; (Glace Bay) 7639; (Kelly's Cove) 7644; (Livingstone's Cove) 7643; (Port Bevis wharf) 7636; (Port Hood entrance) 7645; (Sandy Cove) 7646; (Skinner's Cove) 7646; (Tenecape breakwater) 7647; (Victoria Beach) 7647 (iv).

——— Que. (Quebec harbour) 7897; (transportation facilities) 7897 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines, N.B. (Deer Island, &c.) 7891; P.E.I. (Port Hood, &c.) 7892 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (air brakes, freight) 5922; (Amherst station) 5957 (iii); (bridge strengthening) 6264 (iv); (Canso Ferry service) 5976; (draw bars) 5923 (iii); (draw bars for freight cars) 6265 (iv); (Grand Narrows bridge) 5978; (Halifax deep water dredging) 5951; (Levis accommodation) 5921; (machinery for locomotive shops) 5924; (North Sydney improvements) 5976 (iii); (Pictou Landing, siding) 7533 (iv); (Pintsch gas) 5928 (iii); (Springhill Junction water boring) 7532 (iv); (Stellarton station) 5969; (water supply) 5964; (Windsor, N.S., station) 5955 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Supply and Private Members' Day, 595 (i).
Temiscouata Ry. Act Amt. B. 144 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 1°, 5577 (iii).
Thompson River Improvement Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Morrison) in Com., 4693 (iii).
Tobacco Bill : *See* 'Inland Revenue Act.'
Treadgold Concessions, Yukon, Rep. of Commissioners, Inquiry for, 1054 (i), 3727 (ii), 5578 (iii).
——— (explanation) 1142 (i).
——— Delay in bringing down Commissioner's Rep. (remarks) 7792 (iv).
——— O.C. *re* Cancellation (remarks) 5762 (iii)
——— Rumour *re* Rep. of Judge Britton, 5925 (iii).
——— Suppression of Rep. (remarks) on Stmnt. of Prime Minister, 6013 (iv).
Vancouver Dry Dock, Inquiry for Ret., 869, 1449, 1874 (i), 2369 (ii).
Vankleek Hill Mail Service Complaints (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5716 (iii).
Victoria Day Adjournment, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3434 (ii).
West Canadian Collieries Limited B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4686 (iii), 6093 (iv).
Whips' Arrangements *re* Adjournments, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Taylor) 2112 (ii).
Woollen and Cotton Industries, &c., on Ques. of Order, 1463 (i).
Yukon Ter. Act Amt. B. 39 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 4003 ; on M. for 3°, 5194 (iii).
Yukon Ter. Representation Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Casgrain) on M. for 2°, 3998 (iii).
Yukon Investigation, Rep. of Commission, Inquiry for, 3540 (ii).

Bourassa, Mr. H., *Labelle.*
Address, on The, 120 (i).
B.C. Legislation, Disallowance of (remarks) 679 (i).
Budget, on The, 4894 (iii).
Canadian Ensign and Merchant Marine, Replaced by British Flag (remarks) 5188 (iii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition and Sale, B. 128 (Mr. Maclaren) in Com., 5151 (iii).
Dundonald, Lord, G.O.C., Dismissal by Govt., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Fisher) 4624 (iii).
Flag on Parliament Building on St. Patrick's Day (remarks) 220 (i).
Governor General (Lord Minto) Criticism *re* Military Control (remarks) 6416 (iv).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Clare) 3457 (ii).
Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6379 (iv) ; active service, 8093, 8112 (v) ; Command vested in King, 6379, 6402 ; defence of Can., 6486; exemptions from service, 6427 ; target practice, 6467, 6535; total peace establishment, 6435 (iv).

Bourassa, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Nationalist League Platform (read) 122 (i).
Naturalization and Aliens Acts, Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 6793 (iv).
Personal Explanation *re* Militia Bill, 6552 (iv).
Printing Bureau, Delay in Printing Voters' Lists (remarks) 6789 (iv).
Strathcona, Lord, Speeches *re* Imperial Policy (remarks) 3753 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Grand Vallée pier) 7771 (iv).

Boyd, Mr. Nat., *Macdonald.*
Agricultural Implements, Rebate of Duties since 1896 (Ques.) 8781 (v).
Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8573, 8636; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 8665 (v).
Assiniboine River Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7875 (iv).
British American Fish Co., Fishing Rights in Northern Waters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8943, 8954 (v).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7653 (iv).
Fishing Licenses granted to Lakes North of Winnipeg (Ques.) 7783 (iv).
Fishing Privileges, Cumberland Lake, Grants to, Size of Nets, &c. (Ques.) 2929 (ii).
Fishing Rights in Northern Waters, Lease to Mr. F. M. Markey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8943; Lease (read) 8954 (v).
Grain Inspection B. 113 (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Com., 8065 (iv).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 2198 (ii).
G. T. P. Ry. Surveys, Grades and Curvatures (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6292 (iv).
Maintenance of Way Men, Brotherhood Applications *re* Rates paid to I.C.R. Employees (remarks) 5909 ; Res. (read) 5909 (iii).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Copy received from Man. Govt. (Ques.) 7440 (iv).
Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6431 (iv).
Political Interference and Govt. Officials in Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7068 (iv).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to M. for 3°, Two-Cent Rate, 7560 (iv).
Railway Mail Clerks Association, N.W.T., Pet. *re* Increased Allowance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5756 (iii).
——— Letter from Association (read) 5757.
Rebellion Losses, 1885, Payment of Claims, on M. for Ret. (Mr. Davis) 2830 (ii).
Sessions, Late Date and Delays, &c. (remarks) 8261 (v).

Boyd, Mr. Nat.—*Con.*

Sessions, Length of, Delay, &c., in calling Parlt. (remarks) 6638 (iv).

Sparks, Mr. W. S., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).

Stallions for Breeding, Tariff *re*, in Com. on Res., 8896 (v).

SUPPLY :

Agriculture (experimental farm accounts) 7402 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Railways (salaries) 5909 (iii).

Fisheries (fish hatcheries, maintenance) 8943 (v); (protection service) 7575 (iv).

Immigration (agents' salaries) 7284 (iv).

Miscellaneous—Man. and N.W.T. (colonization roads) 8019 (iv), 9045 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Dauphin, lowering) 7876; (repairs, &c.) 7875 (iv).

N.W. Mounted Police (pay of force) 2690. (ii).

Post Office (mail service) 5756 (iii).

Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 6292 (v), 8962 (v).

Ways and Means (stallions) in Com. on Res., 8896 (v).

Winnipeg and Nelson River Fishing Licenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7574 (iv).

Brock. Mr. W. R., *Centre Toronto.*

Blankets of Wool, Tariff *re* (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 8877 (v).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7660 (iv).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8821 (v).

Preferential Tariff, Importations *re* Canadian Ports, on prop. Res. (Mr. Logan) 5083 (iii).

Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 171 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 8821 (v).

Silk Fabrics, Tariff *re* (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 8877 (v).

SUPPLY :

G.T. Pacific Ry. (surveys) 8956 (v).

Railways—I.C.R. (Amherst station) 5961 (iii).

Ways and Means (dumping clause) in Com. on Res., 8845 (v).

Woollen and Cotton Industries, Tariff *re* (remarks) on M. (Mr. Pringle) 1458 (i).

Broder, Mr. A., *Dundas.*

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (general statistics) on Conc., 9073 (v).

Bruce Mines Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8792 (v).

Budget, on The, 4783 (iii).

Butter and Cheese Exports 1898 to 1903, &c. (Ques.) 790 (i).

Cold Storage Transportation on Ocean Vessels, on Amt. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 7933 (iv).

Gobeil, Jos. E., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 5581 (iii).

Broder, Mr. A.—*Con.*

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Clancy) 3428 (ii).

Irena Post Office, Change in Postmasters, Cor. &c. (M. for ret.*) 2846 (ii).

Kingston Post Office, Investigation *re* Charges against J. L. Renton, &c. (Ques.) 2928 (ii).

Morrisburg Canal, Lengthening Lock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8975 (v).

Mulloy, Private, Pension *re* S.A. War (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8902 (v).

Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co.'s B. 161 (Mr. Heyd) in Com., 8694 (v).

Prescott Carbide Factory, Transfer from Morrisburg (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8918 (v).

Railway Freight Rates in Ont., Par. in London 'Financial Times' (M.) to adjn., 2930 (ii).

Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 125 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 3722 (ii).

S.A. War, Pensions to Disabled Canadian Soldiers, (M.) for Cor., 4695 (iii).

Ways and Means (dumping clause) in Com. on Res., 8865 (v).

Yukon—Gobeil, Mr. Jos., Charges against *re* Expenditures on Conc., 9056 (v).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P. (Minister of Inland Revenue), *Rouville.*

Analysts in Inland Rev. Dept., Prosecutions, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3909 (ii).

Brennan, D. J., Removal Expenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).

Budget, on The, 4857, 4867 (iii).

Cedar Rapids Manufacturing Co.'s incorp. B. 89 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 4451 (iii).

Cement, Analysis of Imports from U.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3918 (ii).

Coal Oil Industry and Standard Oil Trust, Ref. to in Budget Speech, 4857 (iii).

C. Ross & Co.'s Account *re* Furnishing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8996 (v).

Distillery Officers, Extra Pay for Special Work (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).

Fines imposed for Violation of Inland Revenue Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3916 (ii).

Gervais, Alphonse, Emplymt. by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 3128 (ii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco licenses) Amt. (B. 168) prop. Res., 8136; in Com. on Res., 8393, 8533; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 8549 (v).

Inland Revenue Act Amt. (B. 173), 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 8898 (v).

——— (remarks) 8387 (v).

Inland Revenue Act *re* Distillers, Repeal (Ans.) 6148 (iv).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Inland Revenue, Dept. Rep. (presented) 204, 868 (i).

Jam, Adulteration of, Penalty *re* (Ans.) 8028 (v).

Metric System, Purchase of Instruments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (compensation for injuries) in Com., 8118 (v).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 580 (i).

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Champagne) in Com., 4233, 4242 ; on M. for 3°, 4264, 4268 (iii).

Questions put by Members, and Ministerial Replies, &c. (remarks) 1221, 1235 (i).

Sergeant-at-Arms Expenditure *re* Speaker's Apartments, in Com. of Sup., 8993 (v).

Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co.'s B. 42 (Mr. Ganong) on M. for 3°, 4270, 4452 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Adulteration of Food (fraudulent marking) 4091 (iii).

Canals—Chambly (lockmen) 8384 (v).

Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (salaries) 3909 (ii); (secretary) 8976 (v).

Inland Revenue—Excise (B.C., extra salaries) 3923; (customs allowance) 3922; (extra duty pay) 3919; (extra pay special surveys) 3919; (Frechette, L. A., translation) 3922; (inspectors' salaries) 3913 ; (legal expenses) 3915 ; (methylated spirits) 3923 ; (preventive service) 3920 ; (tobacco stamps) 3921; (travelling expenses, rent, &c.) 3920 (ii).

Legislation, House of Commons (salaries) 8980 (v).

Minor Revenues (ordnance lands) 4091 (iii).

Quarantine—Man. (medical salaries) 4173 (iii).

Weights and Measures (inspectors' salaries) 4042 (iii).

Taschereau, Chief Justice, Ques. of Order, Impeachment by Pet. only, 9040 (v).

Tobacco, Duties collected on Raw Leaf, &c. (Ans.) 4053 (iii).

——— Excise and Customs, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 6546 (iv).

Tobacco Industry, Protection, &c., on Amt. ((Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6910 (iv).

——— *See* 'Inland Rev. Act Amt.'

Tobacco Rebates on Foreign Leaf (remarks) 8550 (v).

Tobacco Revenue Law, Violation of, Names of Persons, Fines, &c. (Ans.) 5582 (iii).

Trenton Harbour Dredging, Appnmt. of Overseer (Ans.) 6149 (iv).

Watches supplied to Inspectors of Electric Light (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3917 (ii).

Ways and Means (spirits) in Com. on Res., 8897 (v).

West Canadian Collieries Limited, B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4866 (iii).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Wood Alcohol, and Standard Chemical Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3923 (ii).

Bruce, Mr. F. C.. *Hamilton, Ont.*

Seed Growers' Association incorp. B. 151 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7240 (iv).

Bruneau, Mr. A. A.. *Richelieu.*

Baie la Vallière, Surveys, Reps. Plans, &c. (M. for copies*) 3770 (ii).

Cascades, Soulanges Canal, Pay of Labourers, (Ques.) 5582 (iii).

I.C.R., Metapedia and Montreal, Pay of Labourers (Ques.) 5760 (iii).

Lachine Canal, Pay of Labourers (Ques.) 5583 (iii).

Ottawa Post Office Reconstruction, Pay of Labourers (Ques.) 5583 (iii).

St. Anne de Sorel, Building of Ice Breaker, Pay of Labourers (Ques.) 5582 (iii).

St. Maurice River Slides and Booms, Pay of Labourers (Ques.) 5583 (iii).

St. Ours Locks, Pay of Labourers (Ques.) 5583 (iii).

Sorel Wharf Contract, Pay of Labourers (Ques.) 5583 (iii).

Three Rivers Wharf, Pay of Labourers, &c. (Ques.) 5582 (iii).

Bureau, Mr. J., *St. Maurice.*

St. Maurice Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 50) 1°*, 1054 (i).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Three Rivers wharf) 7837 (iv).

Calvert, Mr. W. S., *West Middlesex.*

Brantford and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s (B. 22) 1°*, 596 (i).

Christman, Annie, Relief (B. 155) M. to place on Order Paper for 2°, 6786 (iv).

Mann, A. A., Relief B. 138 (M.) to receive Pet., 3845 (ii).

Rio Janeiro Tramway, Light and Power Co.'s (B. 142) M. to receive Pet.. 4822, 4997; 1°*, 5187; 2° m., 5299; in Com., 5865 (iii).

Whips' Arrangements *re* Adjournments, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Taylor) 2111 (ii).

——— *re* Speeches on G.T.P. Bill, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Bell) 2006 (ii).

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 104) 1°*, 2927 (ii).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s (B. 91) 1°*, 2282 (ii).

Campbell, Mr. A., *West York.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6170 (iv).

Bell Telephone System, on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) in Com. on Ry. B. 132, 6758 (iv).

Campbell, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Budget, on The, 4536 (iii).
Canada Life Assurance Co.'s (B. 108) 1°*, 3016 (ii).
Canadian Credit, Indemnity and Guaranty Co.'s incorp. B. 29 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 5296 (iii).
Damen, Wm. A., Patent Relief (B. 92) 1°*, 2282 (ii).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 113 (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Com., 8062 (v).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 996 (i); on Amt. (Mr. Clare) to M. for 3°, 3474 (ii).
Inspection Act (binder twine) Amt. B. 124 (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Com., 8050 (v).
Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Logan) to M. for 3°, 8209 (v).
Petroleum Bounties B. 167 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8449 (v).
Port Arthur Harbour B. 98 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 3897 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Ry. Commissioners, 6758 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Welland (electric plant) 6353 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (St. Mary's P.O.) 632 (i).
West Canadian Collieries, Limited, B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6101 (iv).

Cartwright, Rt. Hon. Sir Richard, G.C.M.G. (Minister of Trade and Commerce), *South Oxford.*

Allan Strs. on Atlantic Service, Average Speed, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6173 (iv).
——— New Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6154 (iv).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Negotiations *re* (remarks) 4143 (iii).
'Bavarian' and 'Tunisian,' Allan Strs., Speed, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6154 (iv).
Binder Twine, Manilla used, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8962 (v).
Binder Twine Seizures, Costs and Fines, &c. (Ans.) 3131, 3538 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 6024 (iv).
Budget, on The, 4417 (iii).
Butter and Cheese, Commission to investigate Weighing, &c. (Ans.) 1547 (i).
See 'Dairy.'
Can. and British Vessels entering U.S., &c., Ports, Treatment of (Ans.) 2375 (ii).
Canada and France SS. Line, Contract with M. Colombier, on M. (Mr. Casgrain) for Cor., 4701 (iii).
——— Negotiations *re* Establishment (Ans.) 3760 (ii).

Cartwright, Rt. Hon. Sir Richard—*Con.*

Canada and Mexico SS. Service, Govt. Control *re* Rates (Ans.) 4695 (iii).
——— St. John, N.B., as a Port of Call (remarks) 4143 (iii).
——— Victoria, B.C., as a Port of Call (remarks) 4143 (iii).
Chinese Exclusion Act, Par. in Nanaimo 'Free Press' (Ans.) 994 (i).
Chinese Immigration Poll Tax, Enforcement of, &c. (Ans.) 989 (i).
Chinese Labour in B.C., Free Entry, &c. (Ans.) 398 (i).
Cold Storage on Atlantic Strs., Provision, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6175 (iv).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 7922 (iv).
Customs Dept., Salaries and Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1809 (i).
Customs Ports, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1897 (i).
Dairy Products, Fraudulent Weighing at Montreal, on Amt. (Mr. Pope) to Com. of Sup., 7267 (iv).
See 'Butter.'
Experimental Farm Accounts, Discrepancies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7391 (iv).
Express Companies, placed under Ry. Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7450 (iv).
Fish supplied to Ontario, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7449 (iv).
Freight Discrimination *re* Atlantic Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6199 (iv).
——— Rep. *re* Officers, &c. (remarks) 6205 (iii).
'Gaspesia,' Str., Quebec and Gaspé Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7445 (iv).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. (B. 113) 1° m., 3126; 2° m., 3876; (M.) to ref. to special Com., 3876 (ii); in Com., 8062 (v).
Hay Inspectors, Appnmt. of (Ans.) 401 (i).
Ice-Breakers for Winter SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iv).
Inspection Act (binder twine) Amt. (B. 124) 1° m., 3719 (ii); in Com., 8048 (v).
Iron and Steel Co., Bounty Payments (Ans.) 5841 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Total Amount paid in 1904 (Ans.) 8782 (v).
Jackson, J. B., Appnmt. as Commercial Agent, Charges *re* (remarks) 7806 (iv).
Lead Bounties (B. 127) in Com. on Res., 3875; 2° m., and in Com., 4056 (iii).
——— (B. 169) prop. Res., 8532 (v); in Com. on Res., 8711; 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 8712 (v).
'Lord Strathcona' Wrecking Plant, Subsidy to, in Com. of Sup., 7461 (iv).
Mail carried via New York, Memo. (read) 6202 (iv).

Cartwright, Rt. Hon. Sir Richard—*Con.*

Mail carried via New York (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6162 (iv).

Mail Subsidies, Atlantic SS. Service (Ans.) 250 (i).

See 'Atlantic.'

St. Lawrence Mail Contracts, on Inquiry for Ret., 3126 (ii).

St. Lawrence Winter Navigation, *re* Allan Strs. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6156 (iv).

Standard Oil Refinery, Visit of Inspector *re* Bounty Payments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6173 (iv).

Steel Bounties Act Amt. B. 165, prop. Res., 8028 (a); in Com. on Res., 8392; 1°*, 2°*, and 3°*, 8393 (v).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1809 (i); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 6150 (iv). Customs, Outside Ports (salaries) 1897 (i). Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 7461; (Canada and Mexico) 7464; (Can. and S. Africa) 7446; (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 7447; (Gaspé Basin and Paspebiac) 7461; (Grand Manan) 7444; (G.B. and Canada) 6154; (Halifax and Canso) 7454; (Halifax and Liverpool) 6210; (Halifax and Newfoundland) 7444; (Maddalen Islands) 7444; (Manchester line) 7446; (Murray Bay summer service) 7457; (Murray Bay winter service) 7454; (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 7464; (Pictou and Murray Harbour) 7445; (Port Mulgrave and Cheticamp) 7448; (P.E.I., and G.B.) 7446; (P.E.I. and Mainland) 7444; (P.E.I. and Newfoundland) 7460; (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 7453; (Quebec and Gaspé Basin) 7445; (St. John and Belfast) 6214; (St. John and Digby) 6216; (St. John and Glasgow) 6213; (St. John and London) 6215; (St. John and Minas Basin) 7445; (St. John and W. Indies) 6216; (St. Stephen and Back Bay) 7453; (St. John, &c., via Yarmouth) 7445; (St. Lawrence wrecking plant) 7461; (Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence) 7453; (Sydney and Whycocomagh) 7452; (Victoria and San Francisco) 7444 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (immigration buildings) 683 (i).

Tobacco Commissioner's Rep., Printing, &c. (remarks) 7436 (iv).

Casgrain, Mr. T. Chase, *Montmorency.*

'Aberdeen,' Str., Boiler Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 217 (i).

Acetylene Gas, Patents, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5314 (iii).

Address, on The, 107 (i).

Alien Act: *See* 'Naturalization,'

Beaton, B. C., and Upper Lardeau, Dredging of Channel, &c. (M. for cor.*) 3771 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 4685 (iii).

Bernier, Capt., Rep. of Capt. Spain *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5284 (iii).

See 'Gauss.'

Casgrain, Mr. T. Chase—*Con.*

Bostock, Mr. H., Sale or Lease of Lands in B.C., by Govt. (Ques.) 3437 (ii).

Canada and France SS. Line, Documents *re* Contract with M. Colombier (M.) for Copies, 4699 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 5190 (iii).

——— Negotiations *re* Establishment (Ques.) 3760 (ii).

Carbonneau, Transfer of French SS. Service Contract from Mr. Colombier (Ques.) 3311 (ii).

Caron, Mr., Emplymt. at St. Roch Traverse Lighthouse (Ques.) 4274 (iii).

Champlain Wharf Construction, Selection of Site, &c. (Ques.) 4410 (iii).

Clements, Jules D'E., Circular Letter *re* C. S. Applications (Ques.) 212 (i).

Colombier, M., Contract *re* France and Can. SS. Line (M. for copies of cor., &c.) 4699 (iii).

See 'Can. and France.'

Cornwall Canal, Davis Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6656 (iv).

Criminal Code (minerals) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Wade) in Com., 4720 (iii).

'Druid,' Str., Expenditure *re* Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5203 (iii).

Dundonald, Lord, Dismissal by Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) *re* Political Interference, 5552 (iii).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 5192; on M. for 3°, 4000 (iii).

Express and Telephone Cos., Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 in Com., 6693 (iv).

France and Canada SS. Service, Arrival of Str. 'Malou,' Cancelling of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 4273 (iii).

——— Transfer of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 3311 (ii).

See 'Can. and France.'

'Gauss,' Str., Capt. Bernier's reported Interview *re* Charges of Crew (read) 5221 (iii).

——— Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5210 (iii).

See 'Bernier.'

Geography of Canada, Date of Issue, Distribution, &c. (Ques.) 4695 (iii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 1067 (i); in Com., on sec. 7 (amt.) 3302, 3318; on Amt. (Mr. Clarke) and Mr. Speaker's Decision *re* Vote being taken, 2056 (ii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co., Appnmt. of a Fourth Commissioner (remarks) 3307 (ii).

——— British Subjects as Directors, Amt. to Ry. Act (remarks) 4142, 5680 (iii).

Casgrain, Mr. T. Chase—*Con.*

Grocers in Quebec, Names for Marine Dept., &c., Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5235 (iii).

I.C.R., Passenger Train between Causapscal and Ste. Flavie (M. for ret.*) 5094 (iii).

Laferriere, Mr., Appnmt. as Gunner on Str. 'Gauss' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5211 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., on M. (Mr. Hackett) that Com. rise, 5329; 'Bourinot' quoted, 5332 (iii).

McIntosh, Mr. John, Late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 6548 (iv).

Members named as Lt.-Governors (Ques.) 213 (i).

Members of House of Commons, Govt. Appnmts. (Ques.) 992 (i).

——— Ministerial Replies (remarks) on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 1218 (i).

Memorandum by Mr. Blair *re* G.T.P., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 1308 (i).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) on M. for 2°, 317 (i).

Militia Dept. and Resignations from 9th Regiment (M. for cor.*) 3771 (ii).

——— Inquiry for further Cor., 4415 (iii).

Minister of Railways, Constitutional Responsibility for G.T.P. Bill (remarks) *re* Silence during Debate, 3334; Authorities quoted, 3335 (ii).

Montreal Terminal Ry. Co.'s B. 120 (Mr. Talbot) on M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 6786 (iv).

Nationalist League Programme, in Deb. on Address, 114 (i).

Naturalization and Aliens Act, Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, 6792 (iv).

Navigable Waters Act Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 4076 (iii).

New Brunswick Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. Gibson) on M. to receive Pet., 5186 (iii).

9th Regiment, Resignation, &c. (M. for cor.*) 3771 (ii).

See 'Militia,' &c.

N.W.T. Representation Act Amt. (B. 117) 2° m., 3990; on M. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) to stand, 4723 (iii).

Ouelle Rivière and Murray Bay Ferry, Contract *re*, &c. (Ques.) 4274 (iii).

Patents granted in Can. and U.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5314 (iii).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 4057 (iii).

Post Office Orders, Printing in French, &c. (remarks) 6550 (iv).

Public Accounts Com., Meetings (remarks) 4218 (iii).

Casgrain, Mr. T. Chase—*Con.*

Public and Other Works, Management and Control Act (M. for copies of O.C.'s*) 3771 (ii).

——— Transfer of Work, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 624 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 1450 (i).

——— O.C. *re* Transfer of Duties (M.) for Copies, 1879 (i).

——— (Ques.) 868 (i).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Osler) and Mr. Speaker's Rulings *re* Irregularity of Discussion, on M. to adjourn, 2883 (ii).

Questions put by Members and Ministerial Replies, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1218 (i).

Railway Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 5680 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Express Cos., 6693; on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Ry. Commissioners, 6722 (iv).

Red Island Lightship, &c., Pet. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5324 (iii).

Ste. Flore Voters' List, Changes and Modifications *re* (Ques.) 1360 (i).

St. Roch Traverse Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 4274 (iii).

Savard, Mr. P. V., Emplymt. by Govt. *re* Mingan Seigniory (M. for ret.*) 561 (i).

——— O.Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 222 (i).

——— (Ques.) 217, 679, 868 (i), 2284 (ii).

Shipping Casualties Act (1901) Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 5198; on M. for Com., 5280; in Com., 5282 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne entrance) 6812 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs) 5199; (marine biological station) 5291; (removal of obstructions) 5284; (wrecking investigations) 5261 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (St. Mary's P.O.) 633; (Sault Ste. Marie P.O.) 639; (Stratford armoury) 642; (Woodstock armoury) 649 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Actonvale P.O.) 656; (Grosse Isle quarantine station) 666; (Lévis P.O.) 667; (Longueuil P.O.) 668; (Magog P.O.) 680 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (Lévis platform, &c.) 5951; (Little Metis station) 5953 (iii).

Treadgold Concessions, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5762 (iii).

——— Commission, Issue of to Judge Britton (Ques.) 3760 (ii).

——— (M. for ret.) 221 (i).

——— Commissioners' Rep. (Ques.) 213 (i).

West Canadian Collieries, Limited, B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4690 (iii).

Wrecking Investigations Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 5261 (iii).

Yukon Ter. Representation Act Amt. (B. 118) 1°*, 3387 (ii); 2° m., 3994 (iii).

Casgrain, Mr. T. Chase—*Con.*

Yukon Ter. Representation Act Amt., &c. (Ques.) 212 (i).

Champagne, Mr. L. N., *Wright.*

Canadian Traction and Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 81) 1°*, 2001 (ii).

Debates, Official, 1st Rep., M. to conc., 247; 2nd Rep. (presented) 547 (i).

——— (M.) to conc., 984 (i).

——— 3rd Rep. (presented) 8023 (v).

——— (M.) to conc., 8251 (v).

Ottawa Electric Co.'s (B. 110) 1° m., 3016 (ii); in Com., 4218; Letter from Sec. Treas. of Co. (read) 4235 (iii).

Christie, Mr. T., *Argenteuil.*

C.P.R., St. Philippe Branch Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8823 (v).

Ottawa River Ry. Co.'s B. 78 (Mr. Ethier) in Com., 4451 (iii).

Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 171 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 8823 (v).

Clancy, Mr. J., *Bothwell.*

Acetylene Gas Installation, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8939 (v).

Agriculture and Colonization Com., on M. (Mr. Parmelee) to sit concurrently with Sittings of House, 6677 (iv).

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8612; on Amt. (Mr. Boyd) to M. for 3°, 8671 (v).

Alien Labour and Protection to Canadian Workmen on G.T.P. (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 3280 (ii).

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 8435 (v).

Audit Act Amt., Consolidation, on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Sel. Com., 4320 (iii).

Auditor General, Resignation, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to Sup., 6586 (iv).

Bain, Mr., Preparation of Liberal Campaign Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1859, 1912, 1930 (i).

Bernier, Capt.: *See* 'Gauss.'

Binder Twine Seizures, Prosecutions, &c.: Reps., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 5094 (iii).

——— inquiry for ret., 5579, 5762, 5864, 5925 (iii), 6024 (iv).

——— Costs and Fines, &c. (Ques.) 3538 (ii).

——— Payments to Agents, &c. (Ques.) 4272 (iii).

——— since 1st January, 1903, &c. (Ques.) 3130 (ii).

See 'Inspection B. 124.'

Blankets, Tariff *re* (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 8879 (v).

Book Postage Rates, Increase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5719 (iii).

Bryce, Dr., Appnmt. and Salary, in Com. of Sup., 6961 (iv).

Clancy, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Business of the Hse., Committee Meetings (remarks) 5926 (iii).

Carbide Manufacture, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5316 (iii).

Casualties on the St. Lawrence, Ref. to in Pamphlet of Min. of Mar. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5208 (iii).

Cattle Importation from U.S. and Mexico (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4114 (ii).

Cement, Analysis of Imports from U.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3918 (ii).

Coal Oil Duties, Payment of Bounties, &c. (remarks) 4668 (iii).

Coal Oil: *See* 'Petroleum Bounties B. 167.'

Cold Storage Transportation on Ocean Vessels, on Amt. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 7926 (iv).

Customs Dept., Salaries and Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1800 (i).

Davis Contract *re* Cornwall Canal Lighting: *See* 'Audit Act.'

Documents, Confidential published by Lib. Ministers, &c. (remarks) 1705 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7653 (iv).

Experimental Farm Accounts, Discrepancies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7380, 7391 (iv).

Farm and Garden Products, Protection *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) 4030 (iii).

Fisheries Act (whaling) Amt. B. 74 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 8149 (v).

'Gauss,' Str., Emplymt. of Crew (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5216 (iii).

Gin Contracts, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3937 (ii).

Goats, Tariff Reduction on (remarks) in Com. on Res., 8893 (v).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 1160; in Com. on Res., 1740 (i); on sec. 3, 3040; on Amt. (Mr. Roche) 3168 (ii).

——— on sec. 7 of Bill (amt.) 3212; on Amt. (Mr. Kemp) 3265; on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 3246 (ii).

——— on sec. 1 of schedule, 2214 (ii).

——— on secs. 6 and 7 of schedule, 2450 (ii).

——— on sec. 9 of schedule, 2474, 2625 (ii).

——— on M. for 3° (amt.) 3426; on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 3525 (ii).

G.T.P. Ry., Bill, on Amt. (Mr. Clarke) and Mr. Speaker's Decision *re* Vote being taken, 2057 (ii).

——— Appnmt. of Fourth Commissioner, 3385 (ii).

——— Emplymt. of Canadians as Engineers, in Com. on B. 72 (remarks) 3078 (ii).

——— Emplymt. of Aliens on Surveys, Commission to Judge Winchester (remarks) 3874 (ii).

Clancy, Mr. J.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Ry. Bill, Mr. Hays' Memo. *re* Pet., for Aid. dated Nov., 1903, on Criticism (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in holding from Rets., 3708 (ii).

—— on Ques. of Order *re* (Mr. Lefurgey) reading Documents, 1767 (i).

Guelph P. O., Plans *re* (remarks) 599 (i).

Indian Corn, Rebate paid to Distillers, &c. (Ques.) 6680 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act *re* Distillers, Repeal, &c. (Ques.) 6148 (iv).

Inspection Act (binder twine) Amt. B. 124 (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Com., 8048 (v).

I.C.R., on Annual Statement (remarks) 5869 (iii).

—— Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service, Campaign Sheet *re*, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5003 (iii).

Liquor Traffic among Indians, Fines, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5859 (iii).

Live Stock Association, Regulations *re* (remarks) 7238 (iv).

Lumber Industry in B. C., and Tariff Readjustment, on M. (Mr. Morrison) 2586 (ii).

McNee, Mr., Fishing Privileges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8945 (v).

Masters and Mates Certificates B. 4 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 5178 (iii).

Masters and Mates Examination (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5219 (iii).

Militia Act (pay and allowance) Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 2925 (ii).

Montreal Harbour as a Free Port; on M. (Mr. Kemp) for Copy of Letter of Hon. Mr. Tarte to Prime Min., 5092 (iii).

Mutual Reserve Life Ins. Co.'s B. 161 (Mr. Heyd) in Com., 8704 (v).

O'Donoghue, D. J., Political Speeches in B.C. (remarks) 4078 (iii).

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Champagne) in Com., Objection to Mr. Champagne reading Stmnt. of Sec. Treas., 4236; Quotations from 'Bourinot' (read) 4240 (iii).

Petroleum Bounties B. 167 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8442 (v).

Port Arthur Harbour B. 98 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 3882 (ii).

P.O. Employees Life Insurance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5847 (iii).

Post Office Finances, Rep. of Auditors (remarks) 5607 (iii).

Post Office Salaries, Campaign Pamphlet *re* Deficiency, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5588 (iii).

Clancy, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Public Works Dept., Transfer of Work to Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 446 (i).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Osler) *re* Attack by Mr. Scott, 2904 (ii).

—— Order (Ques. of), calling a member 'man,' 2861 (ii).

Railway Act (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 5129 (iii).

Railway Act (1903) Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Lennox) on M. for 2°, 3842 (ii), 4709 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 157 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 8128 (v).

Representation Act (1903) Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7669 (iv).

St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Transfer to Marine Dept., in Com. of Sup., 7615 (iv).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Homestead Entries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7045 (iv).

Seed Growers' Association incorp. B. 151 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7230 (iv).

Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 125 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 3720 (ii); in Com., 4928 (iii).

Sergeant-at-Arms, Expenditure *re* Speaker's Apartments, in Com. of Sup., 9002 (v).

—— Statutory Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8985 (v).

Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co.'s B. 42 (Mr. Ganong) on M. for 3°, 4270 (iii).

Steamboat Inspection Act (mechanical power) Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Préfontaine) on M. for 1°, 2683 (ii); in Com., 4071, 5195 (iii).

Steel Rails manufactured in Canada (remarks) in Com. on Ry. B. 171, 8834 (v).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture, &c. (experimental farm accounts) 7380, 7391 (iv); (Imperial Institute, London) 3728; (Year-book) 2738 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1800 (i); Interior (salaries) 6967 (iv); Inland Revenue (salaries) 3911 (ii); Post Office (salaries) 5588 (iii).

Customs (Mr. Bain's salary) 1930; (inspectors' salaries) 1983; (salary increases) 1960 (i).

Dom. Lands (surveys, &c.) 7198 (iv).

Fisheries (cold storage for bait) 7590; (fish culture) 7588 (iv); (fish hatcheries) 8953 (v).

House of Commons (charwomen) 8982 (v).

Immigration (agents' salaries) 7335 (iv).

Indians—Generally (Bryce, Dr., salary) 6961 (iv); (Robinson treaty annuities) 5855; (survey reserves) 5855; Ont. and Que. (legal expenses) 6932; P.E.I. (relief and seed grain) 6939 (iv).

Inland Revenue—Excise (customs allowances) 3922; (extra pay for special surveys) 3919; (methylated spirits) 3937; (prevenive service) 3920; (obacco stamps) 3920 (ii).

Clancy, Mr. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Lighthouse and Coast Service (overseers' salaries) 7599; (wharf at Charlottetown) 7598 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 5003 (iii).

N.W. Mounted Police (pay of force) 2687 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 5201; (master and mates, &c.) 5219 (iii); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 7615 (iv).

Post Office (mail service) 5719; (Sloan, M. W., compensation, &c.) 5846; (Winnipeg dead letter branch) 5845 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vancouver P.O.) 705 (i).

——— Buildings—N.B. (St. John quarantine station water service) 465 (i).

——— Buildings—Ont. (Alexandria P.O.) 507; (Belleville armoury) 527; (Bridgeburg P.O.) 530; (Chatham armoury) 531; (Cobourg armoury) 532; (Guelph armoury) 538; (Guelph P.O.) 542; (Hawkesbury P.O.) 545; (London armoury) 605 (i).

——— Buildings—Ottawa (post office reconstruction) 3907 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Dom. (repairs, &c.) 7850; Que. (Champlain wharf) 7767 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (Pintsch gas) 5932 (iii).

Weights and Measures (inspectors' salaries) 4043 (iii).

Surtax, Effect of, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 8875 (v).

Sydenham River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7850 (iv).

Tariff Reductions, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 8863 (v).

Tobacco Industry, Protection, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6922 (iv).

Tobacco, Raw Leaf, Duties collected, &c. (Ques.) 4053 (iii).

Treadgold Concessions, Delay in bringing down Report of Commissioner (remarks) 7797 (iv).

Walpole Island Indians, Survey, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5855 (iii).

Walpole Island, Instructions *re* Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6932 (iv).

Ways and Means (drill machinery) in Com. on Res., 8895; (dumping clause) 8863; (printing presses) 8894 (v).

Clare, Mr. G. A., *South Waterloo.*

Berlin, Waterloo and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s (B. 44) 1°*, 1053 (i).

Canadian Office and School Furniture Patent Relief (B. 137) M. to receive Pet., 3845 (ii); 1°*, 4822 (iii).

Coal Contract with Govt., Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 1136 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 1881 (i).

Galt Post Office, Better Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5715 (iii).

Clare, Mr. G. A.—*Con.*

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on sec. 7, (amt.) 3273; on M. for 3° (amt.) 3440; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 86) 3514 (ii).

Post Offices, Armouries and other Public Buildings, erected since 1896, Total Cost, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1881 (i).

School Furniture Patent Relief Bill: *See* 'Can. Office,' &c.

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (Acadian historical data) 2744; (aid to societies) 2742; (criminal statistics) 2735; (general statistics) 2742; (Imperial Institute, London) 3743; (newspapers) 2731; (year-book) 2735 (ii).

Post Office (Galt P.O. accommodation) 5715 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Berlin P.O.) 528 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (additional sidings) 5942; (Pintsch gas) 5928 (iii).

Voters' Lists, S. Waterloo, Inquiry *re* Printing, &c., 8025 (v).

Clarke, Mr. E. F., *West Toronto.*

Advertisements *re* Patent Medicines (remarks) in Com. on B. 153, 8045 (v).

Advertising, 'Synopsis of Regulations, &c., *re* Minerals, &c.': Cost of, &c. (Ques.) 2806 (ii).

Allan Strs. on Atlantic Service, Average Speed (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6173 (iv). *See* 'Atlantic.'

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) on M. for 1°, 7902 (iv); in Com., 8593 (v).

American Cattle shipped in Bond, &c., Permission, &c. (Ques.) 1875 (i).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Allans' New Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6154 (iv).

——— Average Speed, &c. (Ques.) 6888 (iv).

——— Discriminating *re* Freights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6199 (iv).

——— rep. from officers *re* (remarks) 6205 (iv).

——— Negotiations *re* (remarks) 4143 (iii). *See* 'Bavarian,' 'Mail,' &c.

Auditor General, Resignation of, Action of Govt., &c. (Ques.) 6887 (iv).

Automobile *re* Post Office Service, Toronto (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5759 (iii).

'Bavarian' and 'Tunisian,' Allan Strs., Speed, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6154 (iv).

Bell Telephone Co.: *See* 'Express,' &c.

Bernier, Capt., Refusal of German Govt. to allow Str. 'Gauss' to leave Bremen (remarks) 2284 (ii).

Binder Twine: *See* 'Inspection B. 124.'

Book Postage Rates, Increase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5716 (iii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*

Brantford and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s B. 22 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 1820 (i).

Cavalry Regiments, Number of Squadrons (remarks) 8290, 8479 (v).

Cigarettes, Prohibition and Sale B. 128 (Mr. W. S. Maclaren) in Com., 5130 (iii).

Cornwall Canal, Davis Lighing Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6649 (iv).

C. Ross Co. Ottawa, Payments to (Ques.) 6544 (iv).

Customs Dept., Salaries and Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1791 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7657 (iv).

Drop Letter Rate, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5725 (iii).

'Druid,' Str., Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5202 (iii).

Dundonald, Lord, G.O.C., Dismissal by Govt., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Fisher) 4648 (iii).

——— Letter to W. T. R. Preston, Inquiry for, 6681 (iv).

See 'Preston.'

Dundonald, Lord, and Chief Justice Taschereau's Remarks in England *re* 'Tory Press,' 7020 (iv).

See 'Taschereau.'

Duval, J. E., Appnmt. as Inspector of Ry. Accidents (Ques.) 1138 (i).

Edmonton-Yukon Route, Pamphlet, Warning *re* Dangers (Ques.) 3942 (iii).

Electric Power furnished to U.S., Applications *re* (Ques.) 1357 (i).

Elkhorn School, Sale of Printing Press (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6951 (iv).

Experimental Farm Labourers, Wages, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4959 (iii).

Essex Fusiliers at St. Louis Exposition (remarks) 1783 (i).

Express and Tel. Cos., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to Ry. Act Amt. B. 132, 6697 (iv).

Fair-Wage Res. *re* Bonused Rys. 6883 (iv).

See 'Ry. Mail Service,' &c.

Fisheries Act (trap nets) Amt. B. 74 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 8215 (v).

Garrison Common, Toronto, Lease of, &c. (M. for copies of cor.*) 224 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3027, 3318 (ii).

'Gauss,' Str., Detention at Bremen, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (remarks) 2284 (ii).

Govt. Ownership: *See* 'Telephones.'

Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 113 (Sir Richard Cartwright) on M. for 1°, 3126 (ii).

G.T.P. Ry. B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 2008; Amt., 2055; Neg. (Y. 47; N. 66) 2062 (ii).

——— in Com., on sec. 1 of Bill (amt.) 3007; on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 2975, 2985 (ii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Ry. B. 72, on sec. 7 of Bill, on Amt. (Mr. Lavell) 3330 (ii).

——— in Com. on sec. 1 of schedule, 2215 (ii).

——— on sec. 2 of schedule, 2288 (ii).

——— on sec. 3 of schedule, 2314 (ii).

——— on sec. 4 of schedule, 2420 (ii).

——— on sec. 5 of schedule, 2438 (ii).

——— on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Clare) 3480 (ii).

G.T.P. Ry., Aliens employed on Surveys, &c., Investigation, Commission issued to Judge Winchester (remarks) 3539, 3751, 3757 (ii).

——— Aliens Investigation, Emplymt. of Counsel (Ques.) 4414 (iii).

——— (remarks) 4055 (iii).

——— Alien Labour Law Enforcement at Sault Ste Marie, Par. in 'Mail,' 3492 (ii).

G.T. Pacific Ry., on Amt. (Mr. Clare) *re* Employment of British Subjects on Surveys, &c., 3469, 3480; U.S. Commissioner of Labour, Rep., Quotations (read) 3482; Ref. to Mr. O'Donoghue, 3489; Italians duped by countrymen, Ref. to Mr. Basso, 3491 (ii).

——— Freight Rates, on Interprovincial Traffic, Amt. to sec. 1, 3007 (ii).

——— Surveys, Emplymt. of Canadians as Engineers (remarks) in Com. on B. 72, 3078; Cor. from Mr. Griffith, &c. (read) 3082 (ii).

——— alien labour emplymt., further cor., inquiry for, 5685 (iii).

——— application for emplymt. on surveys, &c. (M. for copies of cor.*) 3772 (ii), 4725 (iii).

——— aliens deported, action taken *re* (Ques.) 6542 (iv).

——— emplymt. of aliens, com. from Mr. Griffith (Ques.) 989 (i).

——— emplymt. of aliens, cor. from engineers associations (remarks) 4827, 4926 (iii).

——— emplymt. of aliens, &c. (Ques.) 250 (i).

——— evidence furnished to G.T.P. authorities (remarks) 6880, 6890 (iv).

——— evidence before Judge Winchester, (remarks) *re* printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6291 (iv).

——— protest *re* aliens (Ques.) 553 (i).

——— res. from Can. Society of Civil Engineers (Ques.) 7439 (iv).

——— warrants for deportation, &c. (Ques.) 6884 (iv).

G.T.P. Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6291 (iv).

G.T.P. Transcontinental Line, Production of Confidential Documents, on M. (Mr. Barker) for Cor., 3960 (iii).

Gregory, Lt. Col., Resignation, &c., on M. for Sup., 7733 (iv).

Guarantee Bonds, Security for Public Officers, Notice *re*, &c. (Ques.) 7226 (iv).

Guelph Post Office, Plans *re* (remarks) 599 (i).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*

Haanel, Dr., Rep. *re* smelting Ores (remarks) 5354 (iii).

Home Bank of Canada, B. 45 (Mr. Osler) 2° m., 1356 (i).

Immigrants, Destitute and stranded in Canada, Cable from London (read) 3847, 3865 (ii).

Immigrants entering at the Port of St. John, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7316 (iv).

——— Rep. of Immigrants refused Admission into U.S. (read) 3867 (ii).

See 'Russian Jews.'

Immigration Inspection, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7285, 7290 (iv).

Indian Schools, Results of Education (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6955 (iv).

Inspection Act (binder twine) Amt. B. 124 (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Com., 8051 (iv).

I.C.R., Double Tracking (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6290 (iv).

——— Employees, Wages paid, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii), 6024 (iv).

——— Passenger Rates, Local and Through, &c. (Ques.) 4275, 4411 (iii).

——— Receipts and Expenditures, on Annual Statement, 5874 (iii).

Kingston Penitentiary, Appnmt. of Protestant Chaplain (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7951 (iv).

Labour Bureau *re* Immigration, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7329 (iv).

Labour Troubles: *See* 'Longshoremen,' 'Militia at Sydney,' 'Valleyfield,' &c.

Labour Union Labels B. 135 (remarks) *re* expediting, 8260 (v).

See 'Union Labels.'

Letter Carriers, Pay on Sick Leave (Ques.) 6888 (iv).

——— Pressure *re* accepting New Scheme (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5754 (iii).

——— Superannuation, &c., Pet. from Dom. Letter Carriers (read) in Com. on B. 153, 8033 (v).

——— Toronto, Pet. *re* Extension of Time for P. O. Act (Ques.) 4414 (iii).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal, Payments to Militia (Ques.) 401 (i).

Lumber Industry in B. C., and Tariff Readjustment, on M. (Mr. Morrison) 2589 (ii).

Mails carried via New York (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6201 (iv).

Mail Steamers, Speed per Hour, &c. (Ques.) 6546 (iv).

See 'Atlantic,' &c.

Marconi Station, Glace Bay, Money expended for Operation, &c. (Ques.) 792 (i).

Masters and Mates, Certificates Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 5169, 5180 (iii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*

'Military Gazette' (Canadian) and Govt. Patronage (remarks) 7906 (iv).

Militia Act (1904) Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) on M. for 1°, 208 (i); (pay and allowance) in Com. on Res., 2907 (ii); on M. for 2°, 255; in Com. on Res., 478 (i); on Amt. (Mr. Logan) 8267, 8276 (v).

Militia at Sydney Riots, Withdrawal, &c. (remarks) 6788, 6806 (iv).

Militia Headgear, Contracts, *re* (Ques.) 1666 (i).

See 'Cavalry.'

Militiamen not on Duty, Amenable to Partisan Interests (remarks) 7733 (iv).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 581 (i).

Naval Militia, Establishment (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).

Newspapers, Canadian, Sums collected for Carriage, from 1897, and June, 1903 to Apl. 1904 (Ques.) 4825 (iii).

Newspaper Postage Rates, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5725 (iii).

North Shore Power and Pulp Co's Wharf, in Com. of Sup., 7972; Cor. with Dept. (read) 7982 (iv).

N. W. Mounted Police, Increase and Pay of Force (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2709 (ii).

Ottawa Buildings, Purchase of Ground, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 629 (i).

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Champagne) in Com., 4180, 4226, 4237 (iii).

Parsons, Hon. C. A., Patent Relief (B. 17) 1°*, 396 (i).

Pilotage Act (harbour jurisdiction) Amt. B. 100 (Mr. Préfontaine) on M. for 1°, 2682 (ii); in Com., 4060 (iii).

Postal Union Rates on Books (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5718 (iii).

See 'Newspapers,' &c.

Post Office Act (inspectors) Amt. B. 153 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8029 (v).

Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Letter *re* Lord Dundonald's Dismissal, &c., Approval of Govt. (remarks) 6014; Letter (read) 6015 (iv).

——— Policy of Govt. *re* (remarks) 6551 (iv).

——— Inquiry for, 6681 (iv).

Public Buildings Construction, Model Plan, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 638 (i).

Public Works Dept., Transfer of Work to Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 438 (i).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry., Attack on Mr. Osler by Mr. Scott, 2766 (ii).

——— Personal Explanation (Mr. Osler) 2864; Letter of Mr. Kingsmill (read) 2868; on Mr. Dep. Speaker's Rulings *re* Irregularity of Debate, on M. to adjn., 2883 (ii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*

Quebec Bridge Co., Issue of Bonds, &c. (Ques.) 397 (i).

Questions asked by Members, Rights to Information, &c. (remarks) 6890 (iv).

Ry. Accidents, Inspector : *See* 'Duval.'

Railway Act (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 5105, 5126 (iii).

——— (two-cent rate) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Maclean) on M. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) to ref. to Com. on Rys., 3824 (ii); on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Express Cos., 6697 (iv).

Railway Mail Service, and Fair Wage Officer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

Rural Mail Delivery, and U. S. System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5750 (iii).

Russian Jews deported from U. S., to Winnipeg (Ques.) 554 (i).

Seven Islands Wharf, Contract, 7972, 7977 (iv).

S.A. War, Pensions to Disabled Can. Soldiers, on M. (Mr. Broder) for Cor., 4698 (iii).

Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co.'s B. 42 (Mr. Ganong) on M. for 3°, 4270 (iii).

Steamboat Inspection Act (mechanical power) Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Préfontaine) on M. for 1°, 2682 (ii); in Com., 4071, 5195 (iii).

——— Opportunity of discussing (remarks) 5183 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 4959 (iii).

Canals—Chambly (macadamizing roads) 6871 (iv).

——— Lachine (slope walls) 6825 (iv).

——— Soulanges (St. Amour's gully) 6869 (iv).

——— Trent (construction) 6827, 6859 (iv).

——— Welland (Port Colborne entrance) 6813 ; (stone protection) 6867 ; ('Townsend' valve) 6867 (iv).

Charges of Management (Ass't. Receiver's office) 231 ; (Dom. notes) 244 ; (Dom. and Provincial accounts) 234 (i).

Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1791 ; (Gov. Gen's Office), 246 ; Public Works (salaries) 438 (i) ; Railways (salaries) 5907 (iii); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 6151 (iv).

Dominion Police (salaries) 7949 (iv).

Immigration (agents' salaries) 7283 (iv).

Indians—B.C. (medical relief) 6957 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G.B., and Canada) 6154 ; (Halifax and Liverpool) 6210 (iv).

Miscellaneous (Champlain monument) 7971 (iv).

N. W. Mounted Police (pay of force) 2690, 2709 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, &c.) 5202 (iii).

Penitentiaries—Kingston (salaries) 7951 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax public buildings) 505; (Halifax immigrant shed) 504 ; (Sydney P.O.) 506 ; (Sydney Mines P.O.) 506 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Alexandria P.O.) 507 ; (Belleville armoury) 525 ;

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ont.—*Con.*

(Bowmanville P.O.) 529 ; (Brantford armoury) 643 ; (Bridgeburg P.O.) 530 ; (Clinton P.O.) 531 ; (Cobourg armoury) 531 (Deseronto P.O.) 534; (Fort William P.O.) 535; (Guelph armoury) 536; (Guelph P.O.) 538, 651; (Hawkesbury P.O.) 545 ; (Kingston R.M.C.) 600; (London armoury) 602; (Oshawa P.O.) 608; (St. Mary's public building) 631; (Toronto, drill hall) 644; (Toronto, examining warehouse) 644; (Toronto, military magazine) 645; (Toronto, P.O.) 645; (Toronto Junction) 648; (Woodstock armoury) 649 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 456; (elevator in West Block) 620; (paving Parlt. Square) 621 ; (Printing Bureau addition) 621; (Royal Mint) 457; (steel shelving) 620 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle station) 666; (Longueuil P. O.) 672 (i); (Valleyfield) 7972 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Toronto Harbour improvement) 7869 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Summerside breakwater) 7742 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Seven Islands wharf) 7830, 7972, 7977 ; (Three Rivers wharf) 7836; (Yamaska dredging) 7843 (iv).

Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 6291; I.C.R. (working expenses) 6024 (iv).

Weights and Measures (inspectors' salaries) 4043 (iii).

'Synopsis of Regulations,' &c., *re* Minerals on Dom. Lands, Cost of Advertising, &c. (Ques.) 2806 (ii).

Taschereau, Sir Elzear, Accuracy of Rep. of London Cable, Govt. Action (Ques.) 7441 (iv).

——— Cablegram in Montreal 'Star' (read) 7361, 7363 (iv).

——— Remarks *re* Lord Dundonald and Tory Press, Cable. from England (read) 7020 (iv).

——— Sailing for Canada, &c. (Ques.) 7442 (iv). *See* 'Dundonald.'

Telephone System and Govt. Ownership (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5746 (iii).

Thompson River Improvement Co.'s incorp. B. 79 (Mr. Galliher) on Sen. Amts., 7968 (iv).

Toronto Garrison Common : *See* 'Garrison,' &c.

Toronto Harbour, Complaint *re* Navigation Equipment (remarks) 4684 (iv).

——— Deepening, &c., Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2807 (ii).

——— Eastern Entrance, in Com. of Sup., 7869 (iv).

——— Eastern Gap, Complaints *re* Bells and Bell-Buoys (Ques.) 4826 (iii).

Toronto Island, Protection *re* Washings, &c. (Ques.) 2807 (ii).

——— South Side (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7874 (iv).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*

Toronto Post Office Clerk, Overtime Remuneration, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5753 (iii).

See 'Automobile,' 'Letter Carriers,' 'Supply—Public Works, Buildings,' 'Yonge St.' &c.

Treadgold Concessions, Delay in bringing down Commissioner's Rep. (remarks) 7795 (iv).

Union Labels, B. 35 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) on M. for 2°, 3829 (ii); on M. to dschg., 4214 (iii).

See 'Labour Union.'

Valleyfield Labour Strike, Collection of Payment by Municipality, &c. (Ques.) 3312 (ii).

——— Payment of Militia (Ques.) 250 (i), 3128 (ii).

Whiskey Supplied for Wolverhampton Exhibition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4094 (iii).

Wireless Telegraphy: *See* 'Marconi.'

Yonge Street Ry. Crossing, Toronto, Order *re* Construction (Ques.) 3308 (ii).

Cochrane, Mr. E., *East Northumberland, Ont.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Mails carried via New York (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6206 (iv).

Bain, Mr., Preparation of Campaign Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1866 (i).

Bee Culture at Experimental Frams (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4965 (iii).

Brockville and Ottawa and G.T.R., Mail Connections, Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) 3316 (ii).

Cab Hire for Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5016 (iii).

Cattle Feeding at Experimental Farms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4967 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition and Sale B. 128 (Mr. W. S. Maclaren) in Com., 5158 (iii).

Customs Salaries and Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1793 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 1724 (i); in Com. on B., 2199 (ii).

Immigrants, Stranded and destitute in Canada, &c. (remarks) 3859 (ii).

I.C.R., Bridge Strengthening (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6274 (iv).

——— Expenditure *re* Capital Account, in Com. of Sup., 5935 (iii).

Mails carried via New York (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6206 (iv).

Murray Canal, Supt., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7525, 7527 (iv).

N. W. Ters., and Provincial Autonomy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7025 (iv).

Port Arthur Harbour B. 98 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 3879 (ii).

Cochrane, Mr. E.—*Con.*

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Express Cos., 6696 (iv).

Railway Freight Rates in Ont., on M. (Mr. Broder) to adjn., 2944 (ii).

Seed Growers' Association incorp. B. 151 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7240 (iv).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 125 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 4950 (iii).

Spain, Capt., Purchase of fur-lined Coat (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5293.

Stewart, Mr., Duties on Cornwall Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7524 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice—Yukon (sheriff's allowances) 7945 (iv).

Agriculture (experimental farms) 4965 (iii); (fumigating stations) 2746 (ii).

Canals—Trent (construction) 6837, 6846; Welland (electric plant) 6803; (Port Colborne entrance) 6812 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1792; (salaries) 1811; Justice (salaries) 431, 434 (i); Post Office (salaries) 5598; Railways (salaries) 5897 (iii).

Indians—P.E.I. (relief and seed grain) 6938 (iv).

I.C.R., (additional sidings) 5940 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G.B., and Can.) 6206 (iv).

N. W. Mounted Police (pay of force) 2687 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Bailey's Brook wharf) 7635; (Bayfield harbour) 7635; (Breton Cove boat landing) 7636; (Cow Bay) 7637 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Alexandria P.O.) 518; (Hawkesbury P.O.) 545; (London armoury) 604; (St. Mary's P.O.) 631 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (rentals) 630; (Victoria Museum) 458 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Seven Islands wharf) 7979, 7986; (Three Rivers wharf) 7838 (iv).

Yukon (administration expenses) 7025 (iv).

Wolverhampton Exhibition, Purchase of Whiskey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3742 (ii).

Copp, Mr. A. J. S., *Digby, N.S.*

Bounties to Fishermen, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5045 (iii).

Dog-Fish Pest, Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. to Sup., 6986 (iv).

Privilege, Ques. of, Digby Dock, &c., 225 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Digby pier) 7638 (iv).

Costigan, Hon. John, *Victoria, N.B.*

Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co.'s (B. 63) 1°*, 1297 (i).

Tobique Valley Ry. Co. (B. 36) 1°*, 984 (i).

Cowan, Mr. M. K., *South Essex.*

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8575 (v).

Booms attached to Shores of Navigable Rivers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8948 (v).

Cattle Importations from U.S. and Mexico (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4114 (iii).

Cedar Rapids Mfg. and Power Co.'s B. 89 (M.) to ref. back to Private Bills Com., 4686 (iii).

Committees of Hse., Concurrent Sittings with Hse. (M.) 5843 (iii).

Companies Act Amt. (B. 75) in Com., 3978, 4706, 5094 (iii).

——— B. 164, on M. for 2°, 8899 (v).

Corn, Removal of Duty, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4116 (iii), 7358 (iv).

Davis Contract *re* Cornwall Canal Lighting (remarks) 4325 (iii).

Essex Fusiliers at St. Louis Exposition, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (M.) to adjn., 1782 (i).

Essex Terminal Ry. Co.'s (B. 82) 1°*, 2001 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 72) on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1239 (i).

Joint Stock Companies' Act Amt. (B. 75) 1° m, 1781 (i).

Midland Dock Purchase, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. McCarthy) 391 (i).

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Champagne) in Com., 4180 (iii).

Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co.'s B. 42 (Mr. Ganong) on M. for 3°, 4270 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Immigration, (Regina 'Leader,' payments to) 7358 (iv).

Thompson River Improvement Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Morrison) in Com., 4692 (iii).

West Canadian Collieries Limited, B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for Com., 4271 ; (M.) to ref. to Private Bills Com., 4272; in Com., 4688 (iii), 6100 (iv).

Woollen and Cotton Industries, Tariff *re* (remarks) 1464 (i).

Daniel, Mr. John W., *St. John City.*

Address, on The, 168 (i).

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 8439 (v).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Freight carried from St. John (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6194 (iv).

Bay of Fundy, Lighthouse Service, in Com. of Sup., 5805 (iii).

Bedford Bridge, Double Tracking, &c., in Com. of Sup., 8353 (v).

Canada and Mexico SS. Service, St. John, N.B. as a Port of Call (remarks) 4143 (iii).

Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase B. 163 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 8251 (v).

Casualties and Wrecks in Canadian Waters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5835 (iii).

Daniel, Mr. John W.—*Con.*

Demill, J., and Oscar Peterson, Dismissal from I.C.R., &c. (Ques.) 334 (i).

Drill Hall, and Militia Services, St. John, N.B. (Ques.) 2556 (ii).

Experimental Farms, Total Expenditure, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4991 (iii).

Fishery Regulations *re* Salmon Fishing, on Amt. to Sup., 8772 (v).

Gilbert, Dr., Appnmt. at Fraserville, &c. (Ques.) 7081 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 1102 (i); on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Bennett) 3534 ; on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) Govt. Ownership to M. for 3°, 3655 (ii).

Guysborough Election, Political Interference *re* I.C.R. Employees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6027 (iv).

Hopewell Cape Wharf, N.B., Total Expenditure (Ques.) 4412 (iii).

I.C.R., Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iv).

——— Quantity of Grain Products carried (remarks) on M. to adjn., 8528 (v).

——— Rolling Stock (remarks) on Annual Statement, 5870 (iii).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6391 (iv), 6472 ; Defence of Can., 6493 ; riots, &c., 6512, 6524; target practice, 6535; transport, 6505 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. Logan) 8280 (v).

Militia Establishments at St. John, N.B., Provisions, &c. (Ques.) 2556 (ii).

Nappan Experimental Farm, Bee Culture (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4965 (iii).

Naval School for Militia, in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).

'Ocean Limited,' Connection with St. John, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8355 (iv).

Preferential Tariff, Importations *re* Canadian Ports, on prop. Res. (Mr. Logan) 5084 (iii).

Quarantine, Partridge Island, Charges for Horse, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4145 (iii).

St. John, N.B., Customs Collector, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 332 (i).

——— Drill Hall, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. on Militia B., 6391 (iv).

——— Drill Hall, Option on Chipman Site, &c. (Ques.) 3941 (iii).

——— Harbour Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 5271 (iii).

——— Marine Hospital in Com. of Sup., 5837 (iii).

——— Militia Services, Drill Hall, &c. (Ques.) 2556 (ii).

St. Lawrence Winter Navigation *re* Allan Strs. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6156 (iv).

Daniel, Mr. John W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Agriculture (Acadian historical data) 2744 ; (fumigating stations) 2746 ; (general statistics) 2742 ; (Year-book) 2735 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Bay of Fundy lights) 5805; (marine hospitals) 5837 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G. B. and Canada) 6156, 6194 ; (Halifax and Liverpool) 7621; (St. John and Dublin) 6215; (St. John and London) 6215 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (naval militia) 5267 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (St. John, repairs, &c.) 464; (St. John quarantine station, water service) 464 ; N.S. (immigrant shed, Halifax) 504 (i).

Quarantine—Mar. Provs. (inspection, &c.) 4160 ; N.W.T. (vaccine, &c.) 4150 ; N.B. (St. John and Partridge Island) 4145 (iii).

Railways—I.C.R. (St. John accommodation) 5973 ; (working expenses) 6026, 6144 (iv).

Weights and Measures (inspectors' salaries) 4045 (iii).

Transportation Commission, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 5271 (iii).

Woodstock, N.B., Drill Hall, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ques.) 2928 (ii).

Wrecking Investigations, in Com. of Sup., 5265 (iii).

Davis, Mr. T. O., *Saskatchewan.*

Agriculture and Colonization Com., on M. (Mr. Parmelee) to sit concurrently with Sittings of Hse., 6678 (iv).

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8574 (v).

Calgary and Edmonton Land Co.'s Sales, Rep. from Eng. (remarks) 2367 (ii).
See 'Qu Appelle.'

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co., Attack on Mr. Osler (M.) to adjn., 2787 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 55) 1°*, 1133 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 2241; on sec. 9, 2490 (ii).

Half-Breed Claims *re* Rebellion, Payment *re* Cor. between Govt. and D. H. McDowel (M. for cor.*) 1880 (i).

Half-Breeds, Saskatchewan District, Claims, Grievances, &c., 1883-4-5, Cor. between Govt. and Officials (M. for copies*) 1880 (i).

Immigration Literature, 'Free Press' Harvest Number (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7333 (iv).

James Bay Ry. Co's (B. 49) 1°*, 1054 (i).

Lumber Industry in B.C., and Tariff Readjustment (remarks) 2572 (ii).

Macoun, Messrs., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 988 (i).

Mail Delivery, Delay on Qu'Appelle, Long Lake Ry., Breaking of Bridges, &c., Tels. (read) 2359 (ii).

Davis, Mr. T. O.—*Con.*

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry., Attack on Mr. Osler (M.) to adjn., 2787 (ii).

——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Osler) *re* Attack by Mr. Scott, &c., 2872 (ii).
See 'Calgary,' &c.

Rebellion Losses, 1885, Payments, Pets., Cor., &c. (M. for ret.) 2808 (ii).

Saskatchewan Mail Service, Tel. from Board of Trade, Rosthern (remarks) 2188 (ii).

Saskatchewan River and Lakes, Navigation *re*, Surveys, &c. (M. for ret.*) 224 (i), 3771 (ii).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co.'s Homestead Settlements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7043 (iv).

Seed Grain, N.W.T., Inability to get any (remarks) 2283 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Immigration ('Free Press' literature) 7333 (iv).

Miscellaneous (colonization roads in Man. and N.W.T.) 9045 (v).

Timber Limits in Man. and N.W.T., granted between 1878 and 1896, and 1896 to 1904 (M. for ret.*) 224 (i).

Demers, Mr. L. P., *St John's and Iberville.*

Alliance Bank of Can., Rep. of Sel. Com. (presented) 4996 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition and Sale B. 128 (Mr. W. S. Maclaren) in Com., 5136 (iii).

Compagnies de Credit, Unlawful Transactions (prop. res.) 1882 (i).

Farm and Garden Products, Protection *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) 4024 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 916 (i).

Railway Act (employees liability) Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Lennox) on M. for 2°, 4717 (iii).

Real Estate Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s (B. 27) 1°*, 596 (i).

Richelieu River Floods, &c., Pets. *re* Damages (M. for copies) 222 (i).

'Société de Credit,' Letters Patent granted to (Ques.) 991 (i).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Chambly (lockmen) 8385 (v).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act (limitation) Amt. (B. 133) 1° m., 4409 (iii).

Donnelly, Mr. Jas. J., *East Bruce.*

Budget, on The, 4913 (iii).

Chesley, Ont., Postmastership Vacancy, &c. (Ques.) 4824 (iii).

Mail Service, Bruce County, Complaints, &c. (M. for copies of cor.) 589 (i).

Railway Freight Rates in Ont., on M. (Mr. Broder) to adjn., 2947 (ii).

Douglas, Mr. Jas. M., *East Assiniboia.*

Agriculture and Colonization Com., on M. (Mr. Parmelee to sit during Sittings of Hse., 6679 (iv).

——— Evidence *re* (M.) to print, 8134 (v).

——— 2nd Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 8134 (v).

C. P. R. Co.'s (B. 70) 1°*, 1547 (i).

Cigarette Legislation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Maclaren) 356 (i).

Lumber Combine in N.W.T., Rep. of Commission, &c. (Ques.) 556 (i).

Lumber Industry, B.C., and Tariff Readjustment, on M. (Mr. Morrison) 2576 (ii).

Man. and Northwestern Ry. Co. of Can. (B. 18) 1°*, 396 (i).

Earle, Mr. Thomas, *Victoria, B.C.*

Canada and Mexico SS. Service, Victoria, B.C. as a Port of Call (remarks) 4142 (iii).

Caraquet Wharf, Purchase from Mr. Shives (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7747 (iv).

Customs Collectorship at Victoria, B.C., Vacancy, &c. (Ques.) 558 (i), 6364 (iv).

Fisheries Act (trap nets) Amt. B. 74 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 8214 (v).

Fish Trap Licenses, B.C., Cor. between Canners Ass'n. and Govt. (M. for copies*) 2848 (ii).

Fish Trap-Nets in B.C. Waters, Licenses Issued *re*, &c. (Ques.) 2601 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co., Appnmt. of Fourth Commissioner (remarks) 3307 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on sec. 7 (amt.) 3266 (ii).

Life-Saving Station SS. Service at B.C., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4200 (iii).

Milne, Customs Collector, Victoria, Decease, &c. (Ques.) 558 (i).

'Quadra,' Str., Complaints *re* Treatment of Crew (Ques.) 8255 (v).

Quarantine, B.C., Small-pox Inspection (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4158 (iii).

Railway Belt, Dom. Lands, Retroactive Provisions (Ques.) 8776 (v).

Salmon Exports to U.S., Prohibition, &c. (Ques.) 5354 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Fisheries (hatcheries, B.C.) 8954 (v).

Indians—B.C. (hospitals, irrigation, &c.) 6958 ; (salaries) 6957 ; (schools) 6957 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (Ostall River, B.C.) 8930 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C., (Vancouver P. O.) 704 (i).

Public Works—Buildings (generally) 7619 ; (rentals, &c.) 7622 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Ry. Commission) 7625; (snow cleaning) 7630 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (repairs, &c.) 7633 (iv).

Earle, Mr. Thomas—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (new plant) 7885 ; (plant) 7890 ; Ont. (new plant) 7882 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Anderson and Kennedy Lakes) 7876 ; (Fraser River protection) 7876 ; (Sydney harbour) 8022 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Abram's wharf) 7634 ; (Bailey's Brook wharf) 7635; (Baxter's harbour) 7635 ; (Breton Cove boat landing) 7636 ; (Bridgewater dredging) 7637 ; (Georgeville wharf) 7639 ; (Glace Bay) 7639 ; (Iona wharf) 7642 ; (Neil's harbour) 7643 ; (Port Hawkesbury) 7645; (Victoria Beach) 7647 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Gananoque dredging) 7754 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Summerside breakwater) 7743 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Lotbinière wharf) 7776 (iv).

Quarantine (medical inspection) 4175; B.C. (small-pox inspection) 4158 ; (steamers. &c.) 4199 (iii).

Trap-Net Fishing in B.C., O.C. *re* Licenses (Ques.) 558 (i).

——— Protest *re* (remarks) in Com. on Fisheries B. 74, 8214, 8220 (v).

Victoria Harbour, Dredging Inner Side (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7890 (iv).

——— Use of 'King Edward' Dredge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7878 (iv).

Victoria P.O., Rental, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7622 (iv).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R. (Minister of Railways and Canals), *Westmoreland.*

Agricultural Delegates, Reduced Ry. Rates to (Ans.) 1361 (i).

Alberton Station, P.E.I. Ry., Rep. *re* Survey for New Entrance (Ans.) 1358 (i).

——— 'Y,' Abolishing of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6232 (iv).

'Alert,' Str., used by Supt. Stewart for a Pleasure Yacht (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7472 (iv).

Balsam Lake, Trent Canal, Construction, in Com. of Sup., 6828 (iv).

Beauharnois Canal, Number of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 3129 (ii).

Beique, Supt., Beauharnois Canal, Superannuation, &c. (Ans.) 3129 (ii).

Belfast and Murray Harbour Branch, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 994 (i).

Brockville and Ottawa and G. T. Railway Connections, Govt. Action (remarks) 2120 (ii).

——— Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) 3313 (ii).

Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Men, Application *re* Rates paid to I.C.R. Employees (remarks) 5909 (iii).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*

Bruce Mines Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8792 (v).

Campbellton Railway Sidings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5940 (iii).

Campbellton Wharf and Shives Lumber Co.'s Monopoly (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7792 (iv).

Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase (B. 163) prop. Res., 7443 (iv); in Com. on Res., 8222; 1°*, 8251; 2° m., 8550; in Com., 8555; 3° m., 8562 (v).

Canada Eastern Ry. Purchase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6238 (iv).

Can. Northern Ry., Crossing at Saskatchewan, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 1136 (i).

C. P. R., Lardo Branch Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8825 (v).

C. P. R. Stock, Issue of, Authority for, &c. (Ans.) 3436 (ii).

Canals, Operating Staff, (statement) in Com. of Sup., 6675 (iv).

Canal Toll Collectors (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6331-2, 7471 (iv).

Canals, Working Expenses (remarks) on Conc., 6684 (iv).

Cape Wolfe Branch, P.E.I. Ry., Construction (Ans.) 990 (i).

Cardinal Canal Toll Collector, Salary, Receipts, &c. (Ans.) 252 (i).

Carillon Water Power Leases, Cancellation, &c. (Ans.) 3127 (ii).

Cascades, Soulanges Canal, Pay of Labourers, &c. (Ans.) 5582 (iii).

Cattle Guard Commission, Extra Remuneration (Ans.) 6545 (iv).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 2603 (ii).

——— Payment to Mr. Holt (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7478 (iv).

——— Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1357 (i).

Chambly Canal Piers, Contract *re* Stone furnished (Ans.) 3388 (ii), 5073, 5581 (iii).

'Chapman' Ball-bearing Attachments to I. C. R. Cars (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6286 (iv).

Charlottetown Ry. Station, P. E. I., Payment of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 789 (i).

Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8824 (v).

Cigarettes, Prohibition and Sale B. 128 (Mr. W. S. Maclaren) in Com., 5131 (iii).

'Cleveland' Cylinder Equipment for I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6286 (iv).

Copper Crown Siding, I.C.R., Pictou, N.S., Cost, &c. (Ans.) 989 (i).

Cornwall and Williamsburg Canals, Workshops, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 6544 (iv).

Cornwall Canal, Davis Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6645 (iv).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*

Cornwall Canal, Davis Contract (remarks) *re* Discussion, 7538 (iv).

Cornwall Wharf, Repair, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6645 (iv).

Cote St. Paul Bridge, Delay in completing (remarks) 3228 (ii).

Curtis Creek, P. E. I. Ry., Straightening Curves, Contract *re*, &c. (Ans.) 1210 (i).

Drummond County Railway, Expenditure for 1903-4 (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8349 (iv).

Dunnville Bridge, Amount paid for Painting, &c. (Ans.) 8026 (v).

Duval, J. E., Emplymt. as Inspector of Ry. Accidents (Ans.) 1139 (i).

Eastman, Mr. E. P., Emplymt. at St. Louis Exposition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7430 (iv).

Express and Tel. Cos., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to Ry. Act Amt. B. 132, in Com., 6706 (iv).

Farran's Point Canal, Number of Locks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iv).

Galops Canals, Gilbert Bros. Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8974 (v).

Govt. Car for Ry. Commissioners (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7503 (iv).

Govt. Cars, Use of by Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7491 (iv).

Govt. Railways, Operating Expenses and Receipts, &c. (Ans.) 4823, 5760 (iii).
See 'I.C.R.'

Govt. Offices, Rental in Montreal and Ottawa (Ans.) 551 (i).

Grain and Grain Products carried on I.C.R. (Ans.) 7784 (iv).

Grain Shipments, I.C.R., Export Delivery, &c. (Ans.) 252 (i).

Grand Narrows Bridge Protection, &c. (statement) in Com. of Sup., 6264 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) to M. for 3°, 3659 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry., Employees on Eastern Division, Salaries, &c., on M. (Mr. Barker) for Ret., 223 (i).

——— Grievances of Amalgamated Engineers, &c. (Ans.) 550 (i).

——— Location West of Winnipeg (Ans.) 217 (i).

——— Protest *re* Aliens from Dom. Institute of Engineers (Ans.) 554 (i).

——— Reps., &c., on M. (Mr. Barker) for Ret., 223 (i).

——— Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6290 (iv).

——— Surveys by Govt. Parties, &c. (Ans.) 6544 (iv).

——— Surveys, Eastern Division, &c. (Ans.) 553 (i).

——— Surveys. Emplymt. of Aliens (Ans.) 250 (i).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Ry. Surveys, Investigation *re* Aliens, evidence furnished to G. T. P. authorities (remarks) 6893 (iv).

G. T. Ry. Terminal Facilities at Montreal, Payment, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5924 (iii).

Guysborough Election, Political Interference *re* I. C. R. Employes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).

Hay Lake Channel, Treaty *re* Free Navigation (Ans.) 1208.

Hillsborough Bridge and Murray Harbour P. E. I. Ry., Amounts expended (Ans.) 2186 (ii).

——— Tolls, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6001 (iii).

——— *See* 'Murray', &c.

Imperial Oil Co., Contract *re* Car Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5932 (iii).

I. C. R., Additional Sidings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6285 (iv).

——— Accidents and Loss of Life, Names, &c. (Ans.) 5840 (iii).

——— Annual Statement, on M. for Sup., 5867 (iii).

——— Bridges Strengthening, &c. (names given) in Com. of Sup., 6264, 6266 (iv).

——— Capital Expenditure Statement (read) in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii), 6104 (iv).

——— Earnings and Expenses for 1903-4 (Ans.) 1140 (i).

——— Earnings and Expenses, for Eight Months, Feb. 28, 1904 (Ans.) 1665 (i).

——— Employes and Political Interference, Control of Patronage (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6108 (iv).

——— Employees, Political Interference in Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6036.

——— Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii), 6104 (iv).

——— Expenditure *re* Increased Facilities, &c., in Com. of Sup., 5945 (iii).

——— Freight Rates, Local and Personal (Ans.) 4411 (iii).

——— General Expenditure on Capital Account (remarks) 8372 (v).

——— Interference with Running of Trains by Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6255 (iv).

——— Laplante and Beaulieu, Messrs., Investigations *re* Charges against them (Ans.) 5580 (iii).

——— 'Maritime Express', Change of Hour for Departure, &c. (Ans.) 1668 (i).

——— Pasenger Rates, Local and Through, &c. (Ans.) 4275 (iii).

——— Pay of Labourers (Ans.) 5761 (iii).

——— Pension Scheme, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 8028 (v).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*

I. C. R., Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6108 (iv).

——— Quantity of Grain Products carried (remarks) on M. to adjn., 8529 (v).

——— Res. from Halifax Board of Trade *re* Train Service to Sydney (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).

——— Rivière-du-Loup Tunnel Construction (Ans.) 8254 (v).

——— Supply Items, Misunderstanding *re* Passing of (remarks) 5926 (iii).

——— Train Service between Point du Chêne and Moncton, in Com. of Sup., 8355 (v).

——— Train Service with Mar. Provs. (remarks) 3313 (ii).

——— Workingmen, Application *re* Increased Wages (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5908 (iii).

See 'Govt. Rys..' 'P.E.I. Rys.,' &c.

Interprovincial Ry. Bridge Co. of N.B., B. 57 (Mr. Marcil) in Com., 2371 (ii).

Kinkora Station, P.E.I. Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6231 (iv).

Lachine Canal Bank, Cor. with Municipality, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5912 (iii).

——— Lease to Municipality (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7519 (iv).

——— Pay of Labourers (Ans.) 5583 (iii).

Leger and Wood, Messrs., Emplymt. on I.C. R., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3438 (ii).

Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Bridge Crossing of Trent Canal, Protest *re* (Ans.) 1135 (i).

McArthur, Rev. Mr., Claims for Damages *re* Cardinal Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6308 (iv).

McLaren's Creek, Roadway Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7489 (iv).

Milford Ry. Accident, N.S., Damages, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6140 (iv).

Montreal and Atlantic Ry., Operation, &c. (Ans.) 6149 (iv).

Morrisburg Canal, Lengthening of Lock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8975 (v).

Murray Harbour and Hillsborough Bridge, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5999 (iii).

——— Amounts expended (Ans.) 2186 (ii).

——— Estimated Cost of First 11 miles, &c. (Ans.) 1210 (i).

——— corrected answer, 1669 (i).

——— Expenditure, Rolling Stock, &c. (Ans.) 991 (i).

——— Extension, &c. (Ans.) 991 (i).

——— Total Cost of Excavation (Ans.) 4826 (iii).

See 'Hillsborough'.

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
New Brunswick Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. Gibson) on M. to receive Pet., 5186 (iii).
New Glasgow, I.C.R. Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6290 (iv).
Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8801 (v).
North Channel, Completion of Dam (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6324 (iv).
Norton, R. B., & Co., Payments to, *re* P.E.I. Ry. (Ans.) 220 (i).
O'Brien, Messrs., Claims *re* Soulanges Canal (remarks) 8025 (v).
'Ocean Limited,' between Montreal and Halifax (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8354 (v).
Official Cars, Constructed, acquired and used by Govt. Officials, &c. (Ans.) 3309 (ii).
Poonamalie Dam, Repairs to, &c. (Ans.) 7785 (iv).
——— Claims *re* Damages (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8973 (v).
Port Arthur and Fort William Telephone, Ref. to Supreme Court (Ans.) 4274 (iii).
P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines, Pets. *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 992, 1135 (i).
——— Lighting of Cars (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5930 (iii).
——— Pay to Labourers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6222 (iv).
——— Tourist Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6242 (iv).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry. Co., Delay in delivering Mail, &c. (remarks) 2363 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Payments, &c. (Ans.) 249 (i).
Quebec Central Ry. Co., Amounts received annually by Govt. (Ans.) 2373 (ii).
Railway Act (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 5104 (iii).
——— B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Express Cos., 6706 (iv).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1053 (i).
Railway Cars, Ventilation, Cor. with Ry. Cos., &c.. on M. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) for Copies, 221 (i).
Railway Commission, Names, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 219 (i).
Ry. Rates, *re* Passenger Tariffs, &c. (Ans.) 5580 (iii).
Railway Standard Passenger Tariffs, (Ans.) 5760 (iii).
Railway Subsidies Authorization (B. 171) in Com. on Res., 8786; 2° m., in Com., (amt.) 9053 (v).
Ry. Subsidies, Payment (B. 157) prop. Res., 8256 ; 1° m., 6873 (iv) ; in Com., 8127 (v).
St. Ours Locks, Pay of Labourers (Ans.) 5583 (iii).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
Scow Building, Advertising for Tenders (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7467 (iv).
Standard Oil Co., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5932 (iii).
Stewart, Mr., Supt. of Canals, Duties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iv).
Subsidies to Rys.: *See* 'Railways.'
Summerside Improvements *re* P. E. I. Ry., in Com. of Sup., 8369 (v).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Beauharnois (Valleyfield pier) 8381 (v).
Canals—Chambly (damages by floods) 7537 ; (Denault's culvert) 6870 ; (landing wharf) 6872 (iv); (lockmen) 8384 (v); (macadamizing road) 6870, 7470 ; (Ste. Therese Island) 6869; (waste weir, &c.) 7536 (iv).
Canals—Cornwall (enlargement) 6293 ; 6644; (lighting, &c.) 6645 ; (shoals dredging) 6347 (iv).
Canals—Culbute (damages *re* floods) 7469 (iv).
Canals—Galops (channel completion) 6334 ; (channel) 7531 ; (enlargement) 6294 (iv).
Canals—Generally (collectors' offices) 7531 ; (surveys) 7472 (iv).
Canals—Grenville (wharf) 6865 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (Atwater bridge) 8374 (v) ; (canal gates) 6868 ; (construction, &c.) 7538 ; (dredging basins) 6826 ; (electric generator) 7533 ; (electric installations) 6826 ; (lock gates) 7536 ; (locks Nos. 1 and 2) 7534 (iv) ; (Lower Basin road) 8381 ; (Mill St. paving) 8381 (v) ; (old locks rebuilding) 6867 ; (St. Gabriel basin) 7535 ; (St. Ours locks) 6864 ; (slope walls) 6825 ; (Tate dry dock) 7534 ; (underpinning wall) 6868 ; (water service *re* fires) 7534 (iv).
Canals—North Channel (dam, &c.) 6314 (iv).
Canals—Rideau (extension) 8382 ; (Poonamalie lock) 8973 (v); (Smith Falls bridge) 7469 (iv).
Canals—St. Peters (dredging) 7468 (iv).
Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 6816 (iv).
Canals—Soulanges (arms and heaters) 6868; (land damages) 7538 ; (St. Amour's gully) 6868; (steel bridge at power house) 6863 ; (survey for breakwater) 6862 ; (water-wheel governors) 6868 ; (workshops, &c.) 6863 (iv).
Canals—Trent (construction) 6827, 6859 (iv), 8378 (v); (dredging machinery) 7466; (Katchawannoe lake dredging) 7466 ; (Lakefield dredging) 7466 ; (lock pier) 7466 ; (Peterborough dam) 7468 (iv); (surveys) 8379 (v).
Canals—Welland (electric plant) 6348, 6797 (iv); (elevator, Port Colborne) 8379 (v); (obstructions, &c.) 6358; (Port Colborne entrance) 6812 (iv); (Port Colborne) 8379 (v); (protection banks) 6866 (iv); (repairs) 8384 (v); (retaining walls) 6867 ; ('Townsend' valves) 6867 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Railways (contingencies, printing) 5911 ; (salaries) 5892 (iii) ; 8346 (v).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Murray Bay summer service) 7457 (iv).
Railway Commission (salaries and maintenance) 8382 (v).
Railways (G. T. P. surveys) 6290 (iv), 8962 (v).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—I. C. R. (additional sidings) 5937 (iii), 6285 (iv), 8365 (v); (air brakes, for freight cars) 5922 ; (Amherst, station) 5957 (iii), 8347 (v); (Amqui station) 5964 (iii), 8364 ; (Antigonish accommodation) 8364 ; (Birch Cove curves) 8350 (v); (bridges, strengthening) 5918 (iii), 6264; (Campbellton siding) 7532 (iv); (Canso ferry service) 5977 ; (Chaudiere junction) 5973 (iii) ; (double tracking) 8351 (v) ; (drawbars) 5923 (iii) ; (drawbars for freight cars) 6264 (iv) ; (facilities, &c.) 5945 (iii), 8361 (v) ; (Grand Narrows bridge) 5978; (Halifax, accommodation) 5973 (iii), 8364 (v) ; (Halifax, deep water dredging) 5951 ; (Levis accommodation) 5921 ; (Little Metis station) 5953 ; (machinery for locomotive shops) 5924 (iii); (Mitchell, diversion) 8350 ; (New Glasgow) 8365 (v) ; (North Sydney improvements) 5976 (iii) ; (Pictou Landing, siding) 7533 (iv) ; (Pintsch gas) 5927 (iii) ; (portable plant) 8346 (v) ; (Restigouche Bridge superstructure) 5948; (Rivière du Loup shops) 5972 (iii); (rolling stock) 8354 (v); (St. Charles junction) 7532 (iv) ; (Ste. Flavie accommodation) 5976 ; (St. John accommodation) 5973 (iii); (St. Leonard junction) 8347 ; (St. Romuald siding) 8365 (v) ; (semaphores) 5986 (iii); (Springhill junction, water boring) 7533 ; (spur line, River Ouelle) 7532 (iv) ; (steel rails) 8360 (v) ; (Stellarton station) 5969 (iii); (Sussex platform) 7532 (iv); (Sydney increased accommodation) 5914 (iii); (Sydney Mines extension) 8346 ; (Truro accommodation) 8361 (v) ; (vestibule equipment) 5937 ; (water supply) 5964 (iii); (Windsor branch) 6218 (iv) ; Windsor, station) 5955 (iii) ; (working expenses) 6024, 6144 (iv).

Railways—Miscellaneous (engineers, &c.) 7490 ; (extra clerks) 7489 ; (Gov. Gen's car) 7491; (statistics) 7488 (iv).

Railways—P. E. I. (Alberton station) 6009 (iii) ; 8367 (v.) ; (Breadalbane freight shed) 5998 (iii) ; (Cardigan and Montague) 8369 (v) ; (Charlottetown station) 5991 (iii), 8368 ; (Charlottetown water front) 8369 (v); (Curtis Creek line) 5987 (iii); (Georgetown accommodation) 8366 (v) ; (Kensington accommodation) 5986; (M. C. B. couplers) 5998; (Montague bridge surveys) 6011 (iii); (Souris survey) 8366 (v); (steam heating cars) 5998 (iii) ; (Summerside improvements) 8369 ; (survey to West Cape) 8368 ; (Vernon River bridge) 8367 ; (water service) 8369 (v) ; (Westinghouse brakes) 5989 (iii) ; (working expenses) 6220 (iv).

Telegrapher's Union, Special Agreement *re* Dismissals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6038 (iv).

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry., Amount of Subsidies to (Ans.) 7225 (iv).

Transportation Commission, on Inquiry (Mr. Lennox) for Rep., 6363 (iv).

Trent Canal, Bridge in Carden Township (Ans.) 3435 (ii).

——— Claims for Damages *re* Verulam Township (Ans.) 794 (i).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*

Trent Canal, Date of Appropriations, &c. (Ans.) 248 (i).

——— Rice Lake Route, Rep., &c. (Ans.) 218 (i).

Truro, Esplanade, Grading, &c. (Ans.) 8027 a (v).

——— Round-House, Location of Site, &c. (Ans.) 8027 a (v).

——— Station, Provision *re* Building (Ans.) 8027 a (v).

Welland Canal, Cost of Electric Lighting, Letter from R. J. Parke (read) in Com. of Sup., 6807 (iv).

——— Electric Lighting, Cost (stmnt.) in Com. of Sup., 6675 (iv).

——— Employees, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7516 (iv).

——— Gas Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6351 (iv).

——— Lock Tenders, Pensions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7527 (iv).

Yonge Street Ry. Crossing, Toronto, Order *re* Construction (Ans.) 3308 (ii).

Erb, Mr. D. K., *South Perth.*

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 125 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 4948 (iii).

Ethier, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*

Carillon Water Power Leases, Cancellation, &c. (Ques.) 3127 (ii).

Ottawa River Ry. Co.'s (B. 78) 1°*, 2001 (ii); in Com., 4451 (iii)..

Fielding, Hon. W. S., (Minister of Finance), *Shelburne and Queen's, N.S.*

Agriculture Com., Evidence, &c., on M. to print, 8135 (v).

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8650 (v).

Alien Labour on G. T. P., on Amt. (Mr. Clare) remarks, 3274 (ii).

Alliance Bank of Canada, on M. (Mr. Russell) to receive Pet., 4408 (iii).

Artificial Teeth, Tariff *re* (remarks) in Com. on Res., 8896 (v).

Associated Press (Canadian) Reports, Misrepresentations, &c. (remarks) 8660 (v).

Auditor General, Par. *re* Conditional Resignation (remarks) 5586 (iii).

Auditor General's Rep. (presented) 254 (i).

Auditor General, Resignation, &c., Action of Govt. (Ans.) 6888 (iv).

——— Letter placed on Table, 5684 (iii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) to Sup., 6566 (iv).

Bank Act Amt. (B. 160) 1° m., 7222 ; 2°*, and in Com., 7786-7 (iv).

Banking Act Amt. B. (remarks) 6789 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Banking Committee, Meetings, &c. (remarks) 7364 (iv).
Blankets, Tariff, *re*, on M. (Mr. Henderson) to strike out Items, 8898 (v).
——— (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 8879 (v).
Bonds, Temporary Outstanding, Amounts, &c. (Ans.) 2187 (ii).
Budget, The (Financial Statement) 4331 (iii).
Budget, The (remarks) 3726, 3757 (ii).
Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase B. 163 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 2°, 8553 ; in Com., 8249 (v).
Canadian Securities on French Markets, Res. of French Chamber of Commerce, &c. (Ans.) 2808 (ii).
Canals, Working Expenses (remarks) on Conc., 6686 (iv).
Cedar Rapids Manufacturing and Power Co.'s B. 89 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 4627 (iii).
Chartered Banks of Canada, List of Shareholders, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 3227 (ii).
Civil Service Act, Over-riding of, &c. *re* Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1832 (i).
Clergue Mfg. Co., and Steel Rail Contract with Govt. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. B. 171, 8832 (v).
Coal Oil Bounties : *See* 'Petroleum.'
Coal Oil Duties, Payment of Bounties, &c. (remarks) 4667 (iii).
Companies Act (1902) Amt. (B. 164) 2° m., 8840 ; 8898 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9052 (v).
Cotton Mills, Valleyfield, Pets., *re* Closing (Ans.) 8780 (v).
Cornwall Canal and Davis Contract (remarks) *re* Discussion, 7540 (iv).
Criminal Code (minerals) Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Wade) in Com., 4721 (iii).
Customs Act Amt. (B. 172) 1°*, 2°*, in Com., 8898 ; 3° m., 8898 (v).
Customs Dept., Salaries and Increases, in Com. of Sup., 1794 (i).
Davis Contract *re* Cornwall Canal, Letter of Aud. Gen. *re* Papers (remarks) 6880 (iv).
See 'Cornwall.'
Dog-fish Pest, Commission *re* Investigation, on M. for Sup., 7007 (iv).
Dom. Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 54 (Mr. Macpherson) on M. for 2°, 1338 (i).
Dominion and Provincial Accounts, Adjustment, &c. (remarks) 548 (i).
Dom. Steel Co., Strike at Sydney (remarks) 4054 (iii).
Dumping Clause, *re* Tariff Res. (remarks) 5737 (iii).
Dundonald, Lord, Dismissal by Govt., Further Cor. laid on Table, 4995 (iii).
——— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 5183 (iii).
——— Interference by Imperial Govt. (remarks) 7104 (iv).
Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Dundonald, Lord, Dismissal by Govt., on Ques. of Order *re* M. to adjn. (remarks) 4593 (iii).
Eastman, Mr. E. P., Emplymt. at St. Louis Fair (Ans.) 7441 (iv).
Elections, Dom., Date of (remarks) 9077 (v).
Estimates, Making up, &c., 'jumbled,' &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7761 (iv).
Estimate, One-Fifth Vote, Procedure *re* Concurrence (remarks) 6637 (iv).
Estimates for 1905 (presented) 204 (i).
Estimates, Suppl. (1904) presented, 1874 (i), 3765 (ii), 5733 (iii).
Estimates, Suppl. (1905) presented, 7530 (iv).
Estimates, Suppl. (1903-4) presented, 8387 (v).
Estimates, Suppl. (remarks) 7244 (iv).
Farmers' Bank of Canada, on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to receive Pet., 3719 (ii).
Financial Situation, Review of, on M. (Mr. Bell) 8312 (v).
See 'Budget.'
Fishery Award, Methods of Payments to Provs. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5049 (iii).
Fishery Conference, Negotiations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5049 (iii).
Fishing Bounties, Methods of Payments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5043 (iii).
German Surtax : Remarks on the Budget, 4350 (iii).
Govt. Business, Legislation *re* (remarks) 7363 (iv).
Govt. Loans, Rate of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 218 (i).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 1738; on M. for 2°, 1784 (i).
——— in Com., on sec. 1 of Bill, Amt. (Mr. Barker) 2970 ; Amt. (Mr. Clarke) 3009 (ii).
——— on sec. 3 of Bill, on Amt. (Mr. Roche) 3201 (ii).
——— on sec. 7 of Bill, on Amt. (Mr. Bennett) 3252; on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 3297; on Amt. (Mr. Casgrain) 3320; on Amt. (Mr. Clancy) 3220; on Amt. (Mr. Earle) 3267; on Amt. (Mr. Kemp) 3264; on Amt. (Mr. Lavell) 3329; on Amt. (Mr. Porter) 3291; on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) 3255 (ii).
——— on sec. 1 of schedule, 2211 (ii).
——— on sec. 2 of schedule, 2309 (ii).
——— on sec. 4 of schedule, 2419 (ii).
——— on sec. 5 of schedule, 2430 (ii).
——— on sec. 9 of schedule, 2473 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) *re* Govt. Ownership to M. for 3°, 3574 (ii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Deposits, &c. (Ans.) 400 (i).
——— Emplymt. of Canadians as Engineers, &c. (remarks) 3092 (ii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Ry., Mr. Hays' Memo. *re* Pet. for Aid, Nov., 1902, on Criticism (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in holding back documents from Rets., 3709 (ii).

——— Petition from G.T.R. Co., Nov. 3, 1902, 'confidential,' (read) 3634 (ii).

G.T.Ry., Rentals, &c. (remarks) on Conc., 6684 (iv).

Gratuities to Civil Servants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8924 (v).

Guarantee Bonds, Security for Public Officers, Notice *re* (Ans.) 3388 (ii), 7226 (iv).

Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I. Ry., Tolls, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).

Home Bank of Canada B. 45 (Mr. Osler) on M. for 2°, 1338, 1356, (i).

Howard, Maj., Winner of King's Colonial Prize at Bisley (remarks) 7431 (iv).

Immigration Estimates (remarks) 7222 (iv).

Imperial Connection (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8917 (v).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8404 (v).

I.C.R., Expenditure for Mar. Provs. *re* Capital Account (remarks) 8372 (v).

——— Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii).

——— Interference by Members with Running of Trains (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6257 (iv).

——— Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6111 (iv).

——— Trackmen, Res. from Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Men *re* Wages (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5910 (iii).

Internal Economy Com., 3rd Rep. (M.) to conc., 8654 (v).

Item Appropriations in Supply, Balance Column (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iv).

Judges appointed for Political Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6117 (iv).

Lead Bounties (B. 175) 1° m., 2°*, in Com., and 3°, 9053 (v).

Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., on M. (Mr. Hackett) that Com. rise, 5322, 5328 (iii).

Lobster Fishing Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5043 (iii).

Lumber Combine in N.W.T., Rep. of Commission (Ans.) 556 (i).

Lumber Industry, B.C., and Tariff Readjustment, on M. (Mr. Morrison) 2578 (ii).

Marconi System at Glace Bay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8921 (v).

Martineau Defalcations, Settlement with Banks (remarks) 9051 (v).

Masters and Mates Certificates B. 4 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 5168 (iii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Memoranda, Confidential, used by Ministers, Ref. to in Mr. Haggart's Speech (personal explanation) 2130 (ii).

Memorandum of Mr. Blair *re* G.T.P., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1307 (i).

Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 7530 (iv), 8387 (v).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 8101; on Amt. (Mr. Logan) 8269, 8272 (v).

Monarch Life Assurance Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Osler) in M. for 3°, 3479 (ii).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 573 ; (amt.) 580 (i).

——— Indebtedness, on M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 560 (i).

——— Purchase, &c., on M. for Cor. (Mr. Rivet) 3947 (iii).

Murray Harbour Branch, P.E.I., on Conc., 6683 (iv).

Mutual Reserve Fund Life Ins. Co., Appeal *re* (Ans.) 8778 (v).

Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co.'s B. 161 (Mr. Heyd) in Com., 8678, 8706 (v).

——— (remarks) 8530 (v).

Newfoundland Commercial Agent, Appnmt., &c. (Ans.) 2804 (ii).

Newfoundland Fisheries Treaty with U.S., on M. (Mr. Kaulbach) 2127 (ii).

N.S. Permanent Building Society and Savings Fund B. 8 (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) in Com., 3478 (ii).

Official or Private Cars, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Tolton) for Ret., 3770 (ii).

Peat Industry, Financial Assistance by Govt. (Ans.) 4413 (iii).

Petroleum Bounties (B. 167) in Com. on Res., 8441, 8468 ; 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 8475 (v).

Preferential Tariff, Importation *re* Canadian Ports, on prop. Res. (Mr. Logan) 5079 (iii).

——— (remarks) on the Budget, 4351 (iii).

Printing of Parlt., Joint Com., on M. to conc., 8531 (v).

Privilege, Ques. of, Confidential Memos., Ref. to by Mr. Haggart, 2130 (ii).

Prorogation (remarks) 8902 (v).

Provincial Accounts, Settlement of (remarks) on Prorogation, 9075 (v).

Public Accounts Com., Interference with Witnesses by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1947 (i).

Public Accounts (presented) 204 (i).

Public Works Dept., Transfer of Work to Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 450 (i).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Dep. Speaker) *re* Judgment being sustained by Hse., 2890 (ii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry., ——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Lancaster) *re* Letters read in Debate, &c., 2785 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Co., Issue of Bonds, &c. (Ans.) 397 (i).

Railway Act (Express and Telephone Cos., &c.) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Maclean) on M. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c., 3827 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 157 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 8827 ; in Com. on B., 9054 (v).

Ry. Subsidies B. 157 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 8129 (v).

Real Estate Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s B. 27 (Mr. Demers) in Com., 1819 (i).

Rebate Duty and Dumping Clause (remarks) 5742 (iii).

Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 1449 (i).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 2285 (ii).

Rolling Stock, and Steel Rails, Duties *re* (remarks) in Com. on Ry. B. 171, 8829 (v).

Pacific Bank of Canada, on M. (Mr. Macpherson) to place on Order Paper, 7783 (iv).

Petroleum, Crude, Bounty (prop. res.) 7785 (iv).

P. E. I. Ry., Stations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6244 (iv).

P. E. I. Telegraph Connection with Port Hood, and Govt. Control (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7892 (iv).

St. Joseph, Lake Huron Wharf, on M. (Mr. Blain) to strike out, 9074 (v).

Security Bonds for Public Officers and U. S. Cos. (Ans.) 3388 (ii), 7226 (iv).

Sergeant-at-Arms, Accounts *re* Speaker's Apartments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9001 (v).

Silk Fabrics, Tariff *re* (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 8877 (v).

Skates, Tariff Reduction (remarks) in Com. on Res., 8874 (v).

Stallions for Breeding Purposes, Tariff *re*, in Com. on Res., 8896 (v).

Steamboat Inspection Act, &c. (remarks) *re* Discussion, 5183 (iii).

Straits Settlement Currency, Circulation in Can. (remarks) 2190 (ii).

Supply (B. 174), 1° m., 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 9078 (v).

——— (interim)—(B. 156), 1° m., 2°*, 3°*, 6784 (iv).

Supply Bill, Procedure *re* One-fifth Vote (remarks) 6637 (iv).

Supply (M.) for Com., 203 (i).

SUPPLY :

Board of Civil Service Examiners (contingencies) 9038 (v).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Canals—Cornwall (enlargement) 6644; North Channel (dam) 6318 (iv); Welland (elevator at Port Colborne) 8380 (v).

Charges of Mangement (Dom. and provincial accounts) 233 ; (Dom. Notes) 244 ; (public debt conversion) 246 ; (Receiver General's Office) 231 (i).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (contingencies) 9034 (v) ; Customs (salaries) 1794 ; Finance Dept. (charges of management) 231 ; (Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office) 246 (i); Railways (salaries) 5904 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. (surveys) 8962 (v).

Insurance (supt.'s salary) 8386 (v).

Justice—Supreme Court (E. R. A. Taschereau) 9039 (v).

Legislation—(Senate, contingencies) Senate, salaries) 8977, 9039 ; (voters' lists) 9004 (v).

Miscellaneous (Can. Tem. Act) 8386 ; (unforeseen expenses) 8386 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Newfoundland and Halifax) 6212 ; (St. John and S. America) 6216 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Royal Mint) 457 ; (Victoria Museum) 461 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Digby pier) 7637 ; (Glace Bay) 7639 (iv), 9033 (v) ; (Green Cove) 7641 ; (Island Point) 7642 ; (Janvrin's Island) 7642 ; (Kelly's Cove) 7644 ; (Larry's River) 7642 ; (McNair's Cove) 7643 ; Main-à-Dieu) 7643 (Margaretsville harbour) 7643; (Melbourne wharf) 7643; (Meteghan Cove) 7643 ; (Morrison's Point) 7644 ; (Neil's harbour) 7643; (Ogden's Pond) 7644; (Pembroke breakwater) 7644 ; (Pickett's pier) 7644 ; (Port au Pique wharf) 7644 ; (Port Hastings) 7644 (iv); (Port Lorne) 9024 ; (Tenecape breakwater) 9025 ; (Yarmouth wall) 9026 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Goderich harbour) 7761 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines (Marconi system) 7896 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—P. E. I. (mainland connection) 7892 (iv).

Railway Commission (salaries and maintenance) 8383 (v).

Railways—P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 6004 (iii).

Superannuation (Mr. Wallace, Victoria) 8385 (v).

Trade and Commerce (petroleum bounties) 9013 (v).

Unprovided Items, 9051 (v).

Yukon (Canadian Bank of Commerce, &c.) 9019 (v).

Tariff, &c.: *See* 'Ways and Means.'

Tariff Changes (announcement) in Budget Speech, 4355, 4371 (iii).

Tariff Commission, Appnmt. of (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 8843 (v).

Tariff Legislation : Remarks on the Budget, 4350 (iii).

Tariff Reductions (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 8861 (v).

Tariff *re* Ships' Cables, and Mar. Provs. (remarks) 1783 (i).

Tariff Resolutions (presented) 5733 (iii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Taschereau, Sir Elzear, Cablegram *re* English Speech (remarks) 7362 (iv).
——— Cablegram *re* 'Tory Press and Lord Dundonald,' 7021 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Brodeur) *re* Impeachment 9041 (v).
Temporary Clerks, Placing on Permanent List (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7896 (iv).
Tobacco Growing at Experimental Farms, Bulletins, &c. (Ans.) 7438 (iv).
Valleyfield Cotton Co., Res. of Town Council (Ans.) 3129 (ii).
Ways and Means in Com. on Res., 8843; (drill machinery) 8895; (dumping clause) 8845; (glass) 8871; (goats) 8893; (molasses) 8894; (printing presses) 8894; (spirits) 8897; (stallions) 8896; (whale oil) 8895 (v).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 4331 (iii).
——— Further Res. (presented) 5733 (iii).
——— (res. for com.) 203 (i).
West Canadian Collieries, Limited, B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6099 (iv).
Western Assurance Co.'s B. 114 (Mr. McCarthy) on M. for 2°, 3227 (ii).
Whips' Arrangements for Adjournment, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Taylor) 2111 (ii).
Woollen and Cotton Industries, Tariff *re* (remarks) on M. (Mr. Pringle) 1457 (i).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney (Minister of Agriculture), *Brome.*
Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 254 (i).
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amt. (B. 145) 1° m., 5578 (iii).
——— M. to withdraw, 8136 (v).
——— (B. 166) prop. Res., 8255; in Com. on Res., 8435; 1° m., 8440; 2° m., in Com., and 3°, 8440 (v).
Apple Exportation, SS. 'Ionian,' &c., Inspection of Ventilation, &c. (Ans.) 793 (i).
Apples shipped to Europe in cool Chambers, &c. (Ans.) 678 (i).
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (general statistics) on Conc., 9074 (v).
Bee Culture at Experimental Farms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4965 (iii).
Brockville Cheese Cooling Room, Total Expenditure, &c., on M. (Mr. Taylor) for Ret., 2843 (ii).
Butter and Cheese Exports from 1898 to 1903, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 790 (i).
Butter manufactured in Alberta, Exports to Japan, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4128 (iii).
Cab Hire for Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5015 (iii).
Campbell, John D., Claims for Repayment of Expenses *re* Sheep Quarantine, on M. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) for Cor., 3762 (ii).
——— (remarks) 8917 (v).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*
Cattle Feeding, Different Methods (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4967 (iii).
Cattle Importations from Mexico and U.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4105 (iii).
Census Bulletins *re* Industries, &c. (Ans.) 1209 (i).
Census Enumerations *re* Religions, N.B., Authority for, &c. (Ans.) 2803 (ii).
——— *re* Religious Denominations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8960 (v).
Census (1901), Industrial Establishments, &c. (Ans.) 1876 (i).
——— Total Expenditure (Ans.) 7224 (iv).
Census, 1881, 1891, 1901, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 330 (i).
Census, Saskatchewan District, Object and Purpose of, &c. (Ans.) 3759 (ii).
Census Volumes, Inquiry for, 8959 (v).
Cheese Curing and Paraffining, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7412 (iv).
Chicken Fattening Stations, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7423 (iv).
Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, Amounts paid (Ans.) 333 (i).
Cooling Room, Woodstock, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 793 (i).
Cotton Growing in Can., Experiments, &c. (Ans.) 555 (i).
Dairying Commissioner's Branch, Lectures, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7405 (iv).
Dental Association and Can. Representative, St. Louis Exhibition (Ans.) 3132 (ii).
Doughty, A. G., Appnmt. as Dom. Archivist (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2730 (ii).
Dundonald, Lord., G.O.C., Dismissal by Govt., Explanation, Cor. (read) 4580 (iii).
——— (personal explanation) 4603, 5844 (iii).
——— Memorandum *re* Col. Smart's Letter, Papers laid on Table, 5276 (iii).
——— Confidential Cor. *re* (remarks) 5279 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) *re* Political Interference, 5388 (iii).
Eastman, Mr. E. P., Emplymt. at St. Louis Exhibition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7420 (iv).
Experimental Farms, Discrepancy *re* Accounts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7364 (iv).
Experimental Farms, Experiments, and Accounts, &c. (remarks) in Reply to Mr. Taylor, 7180 (iv).
Experimental Farm Labourers, Wages, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4959 (iii).
Experimental Farms, Total Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4975 (iii).
Fishing Rights, James Bay, Lease to Arch. McNee, &c. (Ans.) 793 (i).
Fresh Meat Transportation in Cold Storage (Ans.) 678 (i).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*

Fresh Meat Transportation in Cold Storage —— Quantity carried, &c. (Ans.) 789 (i).

Furniture Trade with Japan (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4129 (iii).

Gironcoli, S., Patent Relief B. 126 (Mr. Mackinnon) in Com., 5034 (iii).

Horses imported, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4212 (iii).

Japanese Trade with Can. *re* Farm Products, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4125 (iii).

'Lady Laurier' and Govt. Vessels, Delay in Payment of Crew (Ans.) 7224 (iv).

'Lake Champlain' SS. Cowl Ventilation (Ans.) 1357 (i).

Life-saving Stations at B.C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4201 (iii).

Live Stock Associations Law (remarks) in Com. on Seeds B., 7238 (iv).

Live Stock Exhibitions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7406 (iv).

Mabou Creamery, Cost of Building, &c. (Ans.) 2806 (ii).

Military Experience *re* Dundonald Affairs (personal explanation) 5844 (iii).

Nappan Experimental Farm, Staff Increases, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4961 (iii).

Nappan Station, Butter and Cheese manufactured, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2806 (ii).

Page, H. F., Claim for Refund of Duty on Horses imported into U.S., from B.C., &c. (Ans.) 2804 (ii).

—— on M. for Sup., 8914 (v).

Patent Models, Sale, Classifications, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2718 (ii).

—— Sale by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 399 (i).

Patterson, Dr., Quarantine Inspector, Salary, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4169 (iii).

Personal Explanation *re* Military Experience, &c., 5844 (iii).

Pointe aux Anglais, Lightkeeper, Duties, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 7225 (iv).

Poultry Stations, Cost, &c., Pet. *re* from Man. Poultry Association (Ans.) 397, 678 (i).

P. E. I. Chicken Fattening Stations, on Inquiry for Ret., 6467 (iv).

Quarantine—Man. (small-pox prevention, Cor. from Provincial Board of Health, &c. (remarks) 4154 (iii).

San José Scale Fumigating Stations in Com. of Sup., 2746 (ii).

Seed-Growers' Association incorp. (B. 151) 1° m., 6364 ; 2° m., 7229 ; in Com., 7230 (iv).

Seeds, Sale and Inspection (B. 125) in Com. on Res., 3720 (ii); 1°*, 3725 ; 2° m., and in Com., 4928 (iii).

Seeds Inspection Bill, Information, &c. (Ans.) 332 (i).

Small-pox at North Bay, Inspection (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4156 (iii).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*

Steamships, Mechanical Ventilation, &c. (Ans.) 994 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 2744 ; (aid to societies) 2742 ; (Archives) 2727, 3728 ; (Can. Exhibit Imperial Institute) 2757; (criminal statistics) 2734 (ii); (dairying, cold storage, &c.) 7405 (iv); (experimental farms) 2743 (ii), 4959 (iii); (experimental farms, accounts) 7364 (iv); (fumigating stations) 2746 ; (general statistics) 2741 (ii), 8959 (v) ; (newspapers) 2732; (Patent Record) 2732 (ii); (St. Louis Exhibition) 4101 (iii); (Winnipeg Exhibition, 1904) 2750 ; (Year-book) 2735 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 2717 ; (salaries) 2715 (ii).

Quarantine—B.C. (small-pox inspection) 4156 ; (steamers) 4199 ; (William's Head inspection) 4166 ; Dom. (cattle, &c.) 4206 (iii), 8961 (v); N.B. (St. John, N.B.) 4145; N.W.T. (medical expenses) 4148 ; (vaccine, &c.) 4150 ; Organized Districts (salaries) 4145 ; (Public Works Health Act) 4137 ; Que. (Grosse Isle steamer) 4192 ; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 4137 (iii).

Texas Fever in Cattle, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4207 (iii).

Tobacco Commission to U. S., Instructions, &c. (Ans.) 7224 (iv).

Tobacco Culture at St. Jacques l'Achigan, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 8026 (v).

Tobacco Culture in Wisconsin, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 1877 (i).

Tobacco Trade with Belgium, Amounts paid to B. Dugas (Ans.) 1878 (i).

Vaccine Stations Establishment, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4163 (iii).

Ventilation on Str. 'Livonia,' &c., when leaving Montreal (Ans.) 4490 (iii).

Whisky purchased for Wolverhampton Exhibition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3742 (ii), 4094 (iii).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Chas., (Minister of Justice), *Quebec County.*

Aliens and Naturalization Act Amt. (B. 147) 1° m., 5840 (iii); 2° m., 6791 ; in Com., 6794, 7228 (iv).

See 'Naturalization.'

Auditor General, Resignation, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) to Sup., 6606, 6624 (iv).

Binder Twine, Sale of by Govt. (remarks) in Com. on B. 124, 8058 (v).

B. C. Legislation, Disallowance of, &c. (Ques.) 989 (i).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 119 (Mr. Law) on M. for 2°, 3998, 4724 (iii).

Canals, Working Expenses (remarks) on Conc., 6685 (iv).

Caraquet Wharf, Purchase from Mr. Shives (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7746 (iv).

Cigarettes, Manufacture and Sale, Prohibition B. 128 (Mr. Maclaren) in Com. on Res., 3772 (ii); in Com., 5130 (iii).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Chas.—*Con.*

Companies Act Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Cowan) in Com., 3979, 4706, 5095 (iii).

Cornwall Canal Lighting Contract with M. P. Davis, on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Sel. Com. on Audit Acts, 4309 (iii).

——— in Com. of Sup., 6646 (iv).

Cornwall Canal, Davis Contract *re* Lighting (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8503 (v).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 425; (remarks) 595 (i); in Com. 3790 ; (amt.) 3795 (ii).

Criminal Code (fraudulent debtors) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 3980 (iii).

Criminal Code (minerals) Amt. B. 78 (Mr. Wade) in Com., 4720 (iii).

Customs Dept., Salaries and Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1806 (i).

Davis Contract *re* Cornwall Canal Lighting (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8503 (v).

Dom. Elections Act (1900) Amt. (B. 148) 1° m. 5862 (iii) ; 2°, and in Com., 7228, 7649 (iv), 8028 a (v), 8136 ; 3° m., 8390 ; on Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 8391 (v).

Exchequer Act (right of appeal) Amt. (B. 37) 1° m., 985 ; in Com., 1787 (i), 5192; 3° m., 3999, 5194 (iii).

Exchequer Court, Additional Judge (remarks) 7945 (iv).

Express and Telephone Cos., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to Ry. Act Amt. B. 132, in Com., 6689 (iv).

Fish carried in Bond to U.S., O.C. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7585 (iv).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 74 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 8151, 8215 (v).

G.T.Ry. Arbitration (B. 152) 1° m., 6465; in Com., 7673; 3° m., 7786 (iv).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 1718; 1° m., 1779 (i); in Com., on sec. 1 of Bill, 2191, 2665; on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 2959, 2992; on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 3007 (ii).

——— on sec. 2 of Bill, 2669; (amt.) 3028, 3359 (ii).

——— on sec. 3 of Bill, 2677, 3032; (amt.) 3067; on Amt. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 3164 (ii).

——— on sec. 4 of Bill, 2678 (ii).

——— on sec. 5 of Bill, 2678, 3203 (ii).

——— on sec. 6 of Bill, 3203 (ii).

——— on sec. 7 of Bill, (amt.) 3360; on Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 3210; on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 3358; on Amt. (Mr. Casgrain) 3302, 3318; on Amt. (Mr. Clancy) 3214; on Amt. (Mr. Lavell) 3328; on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 3246; on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) 3260 (ii).

——— on sec. 2 of schedule, 2286 (ii).

——— on sec. 3 of schedule, 2664 (ii).

——— on sec. 4 of schedule, 2388 (ii).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Chas.—*Con.*

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 : on sec. 5 of schedule, 2429 (ii).

——— on secs. 6 and 7 of schedule, 2445 (ii).

——— on sec. 9 of schedule, 2462, 2634 (ii).

——— on sec. 10 of schedule, 2636, 2647 (ii).

——— on sec. 11 of schedule, 2638 (ii).

——— on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 3432 ; on Amt. (Mr. Bennett) 3534 ; on Amt. (Mr. Blain) 3419 ; on Amt. (Mr. Clancy) 3429; on Amt. (Mr. Clare) 3494; on Amt. (Mr. Ingram) 3420, 3717; on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 3524; on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 3421; on Amt. (Mr. Richardson) 3425; on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) 3415; on Amt. (Mr. Taylor) 3414 (ii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co., Appnmt. of Fourth Commissioner (remarks) 3307; (amt.) *re* Fourth Commissioner, 3376 (ii).

——— Amts. of Opposition (remarks) *re* 'trap,' 2958 (ii).

——— Construction on different Sections simultaneously (remarks) 3361 (ii).

——— Emplymt. of British Subjects on Surveys, &c., and Alien Labour Law, on Amt. (Mr. Clare) to M. for 3°, 3494 (ii).

——— Investigation *re* Traffic Arrangements, in Com. on Ry. Act Amt. B. 132, 5679 (iii).

——— Procedure in Discussion, Arrangements between Govt. and Opposition, 2268 (ii).

——— Signing of Agreement (remarks) 2461 (ii).

——— Solicitorship (personal explanation) 7226 (iv).

——— Speech of Sir Charles Rivers Wilson (read) 2975 (ii).

——— Stock Securities, &c., 2594 (ii).

——— Surveys, Aliens deported, Action *re* (remarks) 6542 (iv).

——— names of those deported (Ans.) 6884 (iv).

——— warrants for deportation, &c. (Ans.) 6884 (iv).

Halifax Fishery Award, Ref. to Supreme Court (remarks) 3126 (ii).

Immigration Act, B.C., Disallowance of, &c. (Ans.) 988 (i).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8398, 8433 (v).

Inspection Act (binder twine) Amt. B. 124 (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Com., 8058 (v).

I.C.R. and G.T. Ry. Arbitration, &c., on Inquiry for Papers, 8133 (v).

Judiciary of Ontario, Vacancies, Changes, &c., 1904 (Ans.) 2374 (ii).

Justice, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 985 (i).

Kingston Penitentiary, Appnmt. of Chaplain (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7950 (iv).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Chas.—*Con.*

Labour Union Labels B. 135 (Mr. Smith) in Com. on Res., 4706 (iii).

McArthur, Rev. Mr., Claims for Damages *re* Cardinal Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6310 (iv).

McCarthy, Osler & Co., Fees *re* Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (Ans.) 556 (i).

——— Fees to Mr. Osler (Ans.) 993 (i).

Masters and Mates Certificate Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 427 (i), 5172 (iii).

Mines Regulation Act, B.C., Disallowance of, &c. (Ans.) 988 (i).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) on M. for 2°, 259 (i); in Com., 6374, 6471 (iv), 8266 (v); (active service) 8071 (v); (command vested in King) 6379, 6406 (iv); (compensation for injuries) 8117 (v); (constables) 6525; (Defence of Can.) 6496; (exemptions from service) 6425; (G. O. C. replacing of) 6379; (Inspector General) 6526; (penalties) 6507; (riots, &c.) 6524; (target practice) 6471; (transport) 6505 (iv); 3° m., 8288; on Amt. (Mr. Logan) to M. for 3°, 8206 (v).

Militia for Active Service, and Summoning of Parlt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6496 (iv).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 585 (i).

Naturalization and Aliens Acts Amt. (B. 147) 2° m., 6791; in Com., 6794; Letter from Judge Killam (read) 6792 (iv).

See 'Aliens.'

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s B. 48 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3477 (ii).

North-west Ter. Representation Act Amt. B. 117 (remarks) 4723 (iii).

N. S. Chief Justiceship, Vacancy, &c. (Ans.) 1668 (i).

Nova Scotia Judgeships, Promises to Members, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7940 (iv).

Ottawa Electric Co's B. 110 (Mr. Champagne) in Com., 4240, 4252 (iii).

Penitentiaries, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 985 (i).

Personal Explanation *re* G. T. P. Solicitorship, 7226 (iv).

Petition of Right Act Amt. (B. 38) 1° m., 985; 2° m., 1785 (i).

Pilotage Act Amt. (B. 100) on Senate Amts., 6889 (iv).

Port Arthur and Fort William Telephone System, Decision of Ry. Commissioners on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Ry. B. 132, 6733 (iv).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Chas.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (1903) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 259 (i); (M.) to ref. to Sel. Com., in Com., 3773 (ii), 5098 (iii).

——— (express and telephone cos.) B. 6 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3814; (M.) to ref. to Railway Commission, 3815; (M.) to ref. to Sel. Com. on Railways, Canals and Tel. Lines, 3818 (ii).

——— (employees liability) Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Lennox) on M. for 2°, 3841 (ii) 4708; (M.) to ref. to Com. on Rys., 4718 (iii); M. to place on Govt. Orders, 6364 (iv).

——— (B. 132) 1° m., 4214; in Com., 5678-9 (iii), 6686; on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Ry. Commissioners, 6723; on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Standard Passenger Tolls, 6767; 3° m., 7545; (rescinding old orders) 7568; on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to 3°. Telephone Control, 7564 (iv).

Ry. Subsidies B. 157 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 8128 (v).

Representation Act (1903) Amt. (B. 149) 1°m., 5863 (iii); in Com., 7669; 3° m., 7786 (iv).

Revised Statutes Amt. (B. 154) 1° m., 6541; 2° m., and in Com., 6795 (iv).

Salvation Army Officers and Parole System *re* Convicts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7954 (iv).

Seven Islands Wharf, *re* Anonymous Letter, in Com. of Sup., 7992 (iv).

Shipping Casualties Act (1901) Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 5198 (iii); on Sen. Amts., 6889 (iv).

Solicitor General and Min. of Jus., Duties *re* Private Practice (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 431 (i).

Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co.'s B. 42 (Mr. Ganong) on M. for 3°, 4271 (iii).

Standard Passenger Tolls, on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to Ry. B., 6767 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (ad hoc judges) 7939; (Exchequer Court) 7939; N.S. (Judge Dodd) 7939; (N. W. Ters.) 7938; (Supreme Court) 7939; Yukon (fees and expenses) 7949; (law books) 7249; (sheriff's allowances) 7945; (travelling allowances) 7945 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1806 (i); Justice (private secretaries) 7937 (iv); (salaries) 430 (i), 7954 (iv).

Dominion Police (salaries) 7949 (iv).

Justice—Miscellaneous (consolidation of statutes) 7958; (litigated matters) 7960 (iv).

Penitentiaries—Dorchester (salaries) 7953; Kingston (chaplains) 7950; (Miscellaneous (brick-making) 7957; (parole system) 7954 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Actonvale P.O.) 664 (i); Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Grand Vallee pier) 7769; (Lotbiniére wharf) 7777; (Newport breakwater) 7779; (Percé wharf) 7780; (Seven Islands wharf) 7828, 7992 (iv).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Chas.—*Con.*

Telephones and Telegraph Lines, Nationalization of, on M. (Mr. Maclean) to adjn., 3022 (ii).

Temiscouata Ry. Act Amt. (B. 144) 1° m., 5577 (iii); in Com., 6790 (iv).

Thompson River Improvement Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Morrison) in Com., 4693 (iii).

Thorold and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 61 (Mr. German) Pet. *re* Corrections (remarks) 5839 (iii).

Ticket-of-Leave System, Names, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Stmnt., 3766 (ii).

Tobacco Industry, Protection, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6919 (iv).

West Canadian Collieries Limited B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4687 (iii).

Yukon Territory Act Amt. (B. 39) 1° m., 985; 2° m., 1785; in Com., 1786 (i), 4003; 3° m., 5194 (iii).

Yukon Ter. Representation Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Casgrain) on M. for 2°, 3996 (iii).

Fowler, Mr. G. W., *King's, N.B.*

Acetylene Gas Installation, in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iii).

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8573, 8632; on Amt. (Mr. Boyd) to M. for 3°, 8666, 8673 (v).

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8441 (v).

Bain, Mr., Preparation of Liberal Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1860, 1909 (i).

Blair, Mr., Memorandum *re* G.T.P., Publication of (remarks) 1709 (i).

Bruce Mines Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8797 (v).

Campbellton Wharf Accommodation, and Shives Lumber Co.'s Monopoly, Cor., &c., on M. for Sup., 7788 (iv).

Canada Eastern Ry. Purchase B. 163 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 8558; on M. for 3°, 8562 (v).

C.P.R. Steamers, Insurance Rate *re* St. Lawrence Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5820 (iii).

Caraquet Wharf, Purchase from Mr. Shives (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7746 (iv), 9027 (v).

Casualties and Accidents *re* St. Lawrence Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5820 (iii).

Census, Enumerations *re* Religious Denominations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8960 (v).

Chicken Fattening Stations, P.E.I., Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7423 (iv).

Chief Justiceship, N.S., Vacancy, &c. (Ques.) 1667 (i).

Cigarettes, Prohibition and Sale, B. 128 (Mr. Maclaren) in Com., 5161 (iii).

Fowler, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

Civil Service Act *re* Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1833 (i).

Companies Act Amt. B. 164 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 8901 (iv).

Cornwall Canal, Davis Contract *re* Lighting (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8520 (v).

Customs Dept., Salaries and Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1802 (i).

Customs, Outside Ports, Salaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1908 (i).

Davis Contract *re* Cornwall Canal Lighting, on M. for Sup., 8520 (v).

Defence of Canada in Emergency (remarks) in Com. on Militia Bill, 6374 (iv).

Documents, Confidential, Published by Lib. Ministers, &c. (remarks) 1709 (i).

Doughty, A. G., Appnmt. as Dom. Archivist (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2730 (ii).

Dundonald, Lord, G.O.C., Dismissal by Govt., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Fisher) 4656 (iii).

Eastman, E. P., Emplymt. at St. Louis Fair, Allowance, &c. (Ques.) 7441 (iv).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7420 (iv).

Elections, Dom., Date of (remarks) on Prorogation, 9076 (v).

'Fielding's Folly,' Ref. to, in Com. of Sup., 9024 (v).

Fishing Leases granted to F. M. Markey in Northern Waters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8946 (v).

Fishing Regulations *re* Salmon Fishing in Mar. Provs. (remarks) 8784 (v).

Gloucester Fishermen and Speech of Mr. Daniel *re* Tel. from Mr. Buttimer, 8958 (v).

Govt. Cars, Use of by Minister, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7493 (iv).

Grain and Grain Products carried on I.C.R., Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 7783 (iv).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 1709 (i); on sec. 3, 3052; on sec. 42, 2595 (ii).

Hannay, Dr. James, Qualifications for Dom. Archivist (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2731 (ii).

Hope Island, Timber cut by Manley Chew (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5255 (iii).

Horton, Chas. S., License *re* Trap Net Fishing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8958 (v).

Immigration Campaign Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7342 (iv).

Insurance Rates on Steamers *re* St. Lawrence Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5820 (iii).

I.C.R., Gratuities to Disabled Employees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8925 (v).

Indian Reserves, B.C., Purchase by Settlers, in Com. of Sup., 9016 (v).

Lumber Industry in B.C., and Tariff Readjustment, on M. (Mr. Morrison) 2583 (ii).

Fowler, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

Marconi System at Glace Bay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8921 (v).

Masters and Mates, Fees for Examiners (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5807 (iii).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6368, 6371, 6454; (active service) 6502; (constables) 6525; (emergency) 6374; (exemptions from service) 6425; (Minister's responsibility) 6385; (riots, &c.) 6517; (transport) 6505; (Militia contracts let without tender) 6385 (iv).

Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co.'s B. 161 (Mr. Heyd) in Com., 8680 (v).

Naval School for Militia, in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8801 (v).

N.S. Chief Justiceship, Vacancy, &c. (Ques.) 1667 (i).

Ossekeag P.O., N.B., Removal of, &c. (M. for cor., &c.*) 1879 (i).

Political Interference *re* Militia (remarks) in Com. on B., 6390 (iv).

Postmasters Guarantee Fund (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5851 (iii).

Post Offices, Closing, &c., Rule, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9012 (v).

Preferential Tariff, Importations *re* Canadian Ports, on prop. Res. (Mr. Logan) 5086 (iii).

Railway Act (employees liability) Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Lennox) on M. for 2°, 4711 (iii).

——— (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 5102 (iii).

Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 171 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 8797 (v).

St. Lawrence River Islands, in Com. of Sup., 9019 (v).

St. Lawrence Route, Aids to Navigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5819 (iii).

St. Louis Exhibition, Officers appointed, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7404 (iv).

Skates, Tariff Reduction (remarks) in Com. on Res., 8874 (v).

Spain, Capt., Purchase of fur-lined Coat (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5292 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice—Yukon (fees, expenses) 7949; (sheriff's allowances) 7946 (iv).

Agriculture (archives) 2727; (criminal statistics) 2734 (ii); (experimental farms) 7404 (iv).

Canals—Chambly (lockmen) 8384 (v); (macadamizing roads) 6872; Generally (surveys) 7475 (iv); Lachine (Atwater bridge) 8375; (Mill St. paving) 8381 (v); (slope walls) 6826 (iv); Rideau (extension) 8382 (v); Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 6818; Trent (construction) 6827 (iv); Welland (elevator at Port Colborne) 8380 (v); (Port Colborne entrance) 6813; (retaining walls) 6867 (iv).

Fowler, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 2717 (ii); Aud. Gen.'s Office (contingencies) 9035 (v); Customs (salaries) 1802 (i); Indian Affairs (salaries) 9014 (v); Justice (private secretaries) 7937 (iv).

Customs, Outside Service (salaries) 1906 (i).

Fisheries (cold storage for bait) 8959 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. (surveys) 8963 (v).

Immigration (agents' salaries) 7342 (iv).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (annuities) 9016 (v).

Justice—Miscellaneous (consolidation of statutes) 7958; (litigated matters) 7961 (iv); Supreme Court (E. R. A. Taschereau) 9039 (v).

Labour Dept. (alien labour) 9014; ('Gazette' correspondents) 9013 (v).

Legislation (index to Journals) 9003; (salaries) 8980; (Senate contingencies) 9038; (voters' lists) 9004 (v).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (acetylene gas installation) 5815; (rents, &c.) 5811; (wharf repairs) 5836 (iii).

Militia—Miscellaneous (contingencies) 9034; (monuments) 9033 (v).

Miscellaneous (colonization roads in Man. and N.W.T.) 9050 (v).

N. W. Mounted Police (compensation for injuries) 7965; (Cashel's capture) 7963 (iv); (pay of force) 2698 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (ice breakers) 8922 (v); (cattle inspection) 5292; (life-saving rewards) 5258; (naval militia) 5267; (wrecking investigations) 5258 (iii).

Penitentiaries—Dorchester (salaries) 7953; Kingston (salaries) 7952; (parole system) 7956 (iv).

Post Office (ry. mail clerks, additional) 9011; (Toronto P.O., salaries) 9005 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Mar. Provs. (generally) 475 (i).

Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (new plant) 9031 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Alma pier) 7750; (Caraquet wharf) 7746 (iv); (Campbellton, public building) 463 (i); (Campbellton, wharf) 9026; (Great Salmon River) 7747 (iv), 9033 (v); (Hopewell Cape) 7748; (Petit Rocher) 7749 (iv); (Richibucto building) 464 (i); (St. John drill hall) 9019 (v); (St. John, quarantine station) 464 (i); (St. John River) 7750 (iv); (Shippegan harbour) 9027 (v); (Woodstock armoury) 475 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Port Lorne) 9024; (Tenecape breakwater) 9025; (Yarmouth wall) 9026 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Grand Vallee pier) 7768, 7769; (Lotbinière wharf) 7776; (Murray Bay wharf) 7779; (Pointe St. Pierre) 7780 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Little Slave Lake road) 9032 (v).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Que. (F. C. Bickerdike's claim) 9032 (v).

Railway Commission (salaries and maintenance) 8382 (v).

Railways—Miscellaneous (engineers, &c.) 7490; (extra clerks) 7489 (iv)

Thompson River Improvement Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Morrison) in Com., 4693 (iii).

Tiffin, Mr., Private Car to California (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7495 (iv).

Ways and Means (dumping clause) in Com. on Res., 8857, 8866 (v).

Fowler, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

West Canadian Collieries Limited B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4688 (iii).

Wrecking Investigations, Expenditure *re*, in Com. of Sup., 5258 (iii).

Gallery, Mr. D., *Montreal, St. Ann's.*

Dry Dock, Lachine Canal, Memorial from Board of Trade, &c. (Ques.) 4273 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Lachine (Atwater bridge) 8374 ; (Lower Basin road) 8381 ; (Mill St. paving) 8381 (v).

Public Works—Que. (Montreal examining warehouse) 682 (i).

Wrecking Investigations, Expenditure *re*, in Com. of Sup., 5266 (iii).

Galliher, Mr. W. A., *Yale and Cariboo.*

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8573, 8603 ; on Amt. (Mr. Boyd) to M. for 3°, 8671 (v).

Boundary Kamloops and Cariboo Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 46) 1°*, 1053 (i).

B. C. Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 11) 1°*, 396 (i).

Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase B. 163 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 8557 (v).

Cigarettes, Prohibition and Sale, B. 128 (Mr. Maclaren) in Com., 5150 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7653 (iv), 8141 (v).

Indian Reserves, B.C., thrown open to Settlers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9017 (v).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8426 (v).

I. C. R., Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6130 (iv).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 60) 1°*, 1297 (i).

Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 47) 1°*, 1053 (i).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) on M. for 2°, 282 (i); in Com., 8105 (v).

Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co.'s B. 161 (Mr. Heyd) in Com., 8692 (v).

Nicola, Kamloops, &c., Ry. Co's Subsidy, in Com. on Res. (M.) to wthdr., 8825 (v).

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s (B. 48) 1°*, 1054 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3758 (ii).

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Champagne) in Com., 4181, 4226 (iii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Ry. Commissioners, 6717 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Rossland armoury) 701 (i); Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Seven Islands wharf) 8003 (iv).

Thompson River Improvement Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Morrison) in Com., 4692 (iii); M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 7966 (iv).

Ganong, Mr. G. W., *Charlotte, N.B.*

Atlantic Fisheries Investigation, O.Cs., Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 561 (i).

Fish Driers used (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7589 (iv).

Fisheries Protection Service and American Fishing Cos. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7580 (iv).

Fishing Licenses on Eastern Seaboard, Rep. of Commissioner (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7585 (iv).

Govt. Cars used by Ministers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7506 (iv).

I.C.R., Political Apointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6132 (iv).

Lobster Fishery Investigations, &c., Total Expense, &c. (Ques.) 553 (i).

Lobster Hatchery in Bay of Fundy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7587 (iv).

Minister of Railways, Criticism *re* Silence during Debate on G.T.P. Bill (remarks) 3346 (ii).

Seal Cove, N.B., Survey for Wharf (Ques.) 3761 (ii).

Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co.'s (B. 42) 1°*, 1053 (i); 3° m., 4270 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 4103 (iii).

Fisheries (hatcheries) 7587; (oyster culture) 7588; (protection service) 7580 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (water service) 7631; Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Anderson's Hollow) 7744; (Black Brook) 7745; (Campbellton wharf) 7745; (Caraquet wharf) 7745; (Hopewell Cape) 7748; (Negro Point) 7750; (North Head) 7748; (Petit Rocher) 7749; Telegraph Lines, N.B. (Deer Island, &c.) 7891 (iv).

Wilson's Beach Breakwater, Completion, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 553 (i).

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*

'Gauss,' Str., Complaints *re* Crew (remarks) 5224 (iii).

I.C.R., Laplante and Beaulieu, Messrs., Investigations *re* Charges against them, &c. (Ques.) 5579 (iii).

I.C.R., Rivière du Loup Tunnel Construction (Ques.) 8254 (iv).

Red Island Lightships, Pet. *re*, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5323 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lightships, &c.) 5323 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Rivière du Loup) 7781 (iv).

Geoffrion, Mr. V., *Chambly and Verchères.*

Cedar Rapids Manufacturing and Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 89) 1°*, 2681 (ii).

Laprairie, Damages caused by Floods (remarks) 1144 (i).

Geoffrion, Mr. V.—*Con.*

Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s (B. 59) 1°*, 1297 (i).
Pilotage Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 4065 (iii).
St. Lawrence Floods, Res. from Chamber of Commerce *re* Prevention, &c. (Ques.) 3132 (ii).
Shipping Casualties Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 5282 (iii).

German, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*

Cahoone, E. R., Patent Relief (B. 129) on M. to receive Pet., 3752 (ii); 1°*, 4108 (iii).
Chicoutimi and Northeastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 106) 1°*, 3016 (ii).
Great Lakes and Northwest Transportation Co.'s incorp. (B. 107) 1°*, 3016 (ii).
Gregory, Col., Extension of Time, &c., Personal Explanation, 4666 (iii).
Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville Electric Ry. Co.'s (B. 77) 1°*, 2001 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 6817; Trent (construction) 6836; Welland (electric lighting plant) 6798 (iv).

Thorold and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 61) 1°*, 1297 (i); Corrections, &c., 5839 (iii); Pet. *re*, 6147 (iv).
Welland and Grand Island Bridge Co.'s (B. 62) 1°*, 1297 (i).

Gervais, Mr. H., *Montreal, St. James.*

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir William Mulock) in Com., 8590 (v).
Canadian Securities on French Markets, Res. of French Chamber of Commerce, &c. (Ques.) 2807 (ii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition and Sale, B. 128 (Mr. Maclaren) in Com., 5164 (iii).
Consular Service, Establishment in Canada, on M. for Sup., 8753 (v).
I.C.R., 'Maritime Express,' Change of Time of Departure, &c. (Ques.) 1668 (i).
Montreal Harbour Board, Res. from Chamber of Commerce *re* Quarrels, &c. (Ques.) 3131 (ii).
Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co.'s B. 161 (Mr. Heyd) in Com., 8694 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Lachine (Atwater bridge) 8376 (iv).

Gibson, Mr. A., Jr., *York, N.B.*

New Brunswick Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 143) (M.) to receive Pet., 5184; 1°*, 5354 (iii); in Com., 6322 (iv).
Private Bills, Extension of Time (M.) 5353 (iii).

Gilmour, Mr. J., *East Middlesex.*

Blood Indian Reserve, N.W.T., Grazing Leases, Names of Applicants (Ques.) 2554 (ii).
Cattle Importations from Mexico and U.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4105 (iii).
Inspection Act (binder twine) Amt. B. 124 (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Com., 8050 (v).
Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6463; (riots, &c.) 6516 (iv).
Port Arthur Harbour B. 98 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 3888 (ii).
Seed Growers' Association incorp. B. 151 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7243 (iv).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 125 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 4936 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 4105 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (London armoury) 604 (i).
Quarantine (cattle) 4206 (iii).

Texas Fever in Cattle (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4206 (iii).

Girard, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s (B. 97) 1°*, 2681 (ii)

Gourley, Mr. S. E., *Colchester.*

Bell, Dr., Appnmt. as Director of Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7061 (iv).
Bell Telephone System, Port Arthur and Fort William, Decision of Ry. Commissioners, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) in Com. on Ry. B., 6733 (iv).
Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase B. 163 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 8226; on M. for 3°, 8562 (v).
Champlain, Erection of Monument to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7972 (iv).
Fisheries Act (trap-nets) Amt. B. 74 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 8149, 8216 (v).
Fishing Industry of Mar. Provs, Dog Fish Pest (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7017 (iv).
G. T. Ry. Co.'s Arbitration B. 162 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 1°, 6466 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1114 (i).
Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8398, 8420 (v).
I. C. R., Additional Sidings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6287 (iv).
——— Double Tracking from Moncton to Halifax (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6287 (iv).
——— Pension Scheme, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 8028 (v).
McArthur, Rev. Mr., Claims for Damoges *re* Cardinal Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6310 (iv).

Gourley, Mr. S. E.—*Con.*

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6381 (iv), 8072; on Amt. (Mr. Logan) 8205, 8268 (v); (command vested in King and B. N. A. Act) 6405; (Defence of Can.) 6490; (exemptions from service) 6426; (target practice) 6470, 6538; (total peace establishment) 6438 (iv).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Express Cos., 6712; on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Ry. Commissioners, 6712 (iv).

Revised Statutes Amt. B. 154 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 6796 (iv).

Seed Growers' Association incorp. B. 151 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7241 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Trent (construction) 6853 (iv).
Justice—Miscellaneous (consolidation of statutes) 7959; (litigated matters) 7961 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Champlain monument) 7972 (iv).
Railways—I. C. R. (additional sidings) 6287 (iv); (rolling stock) 8360; (Truro accommodation) 8361 (v).

Tariff Quibbling *re* U. S. Customs (remarks) 5743 (iii).

Tobacco Industry, Protection, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6918 (iv).

Truro Armoury, Building, &c. (Ques.) 8389 (v).

Truro Esplanade, Grading, &c. (Ques.) 8027a (v).

Truro Round-House, Location of Site (Ques.) 8027a (v).

Truro Station, Provision *re* Building, &c. (Ques.) 8027a (v).

Grant, Mr. G. D., *North Ontario.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 11 (i).

Canadian General Electric Co.'s Patent (B. 116) 1° m., 3227 (ii).

Franking Privilege *re* Campaign Literature (Ques.) 5271 (iii).

French River Boom Co.'s (B. 16) 1°*, 396 (i).

Hope Island, Timber cut by Manley Chew (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5243 (iii).

Kingston and Dom. Central Ry. Co. (M.) to receive Pet., 2368, 2457 (ii).

McDuff, R. J., Relief (B. 84) 1°*, 2116 (ii).

Standard Chemical Co., Purchase of Wood Alcohol, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3928 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Trent (surveys) 8379 (iv).
Inland Revenue, Excise (Methylated spirits) 3928 (ii).

Taylor, Jas. E., Relief (B. 87) 1°*, 2282 (ii).

Guthrie, Mr. H., *South Wellington.*

Canadian Credit, Indemnity and Guaranty Co.'s incorp. (B. 29) 1°*, 788 (i); in Com., 5295 (iii).

Cedar Rapids Mfg. & Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 89) in Com., 4450 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition and Sale, B. 128 (Mr. Maclaren) in Com., 5153 (iii).

Farmers' Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 131) 1°*, 4138 (iii).

Farmers' Bank of Canada, M. to receive Pet., 3718 (ii).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 30) 1°*, 789 (i).

Railway Act (employees' liability) Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Lennox) on M. for 2°, 4710 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph P. O.) 653 (i).

Hackett, Mr. E., *West Prince, P.E.I.*

Agricultural Delegates, Reduced Ry. Rates (Ques.) 1360 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2723 (ii).

Alberton, P.E.I., Fishery Warden, Complaints *re*, &c. (Ques.) 4824 (iii).

Alberton Station, P.E.I., Rep. *re* Survey for New Entrance (Ques.) 1358 (i).

Alberton, P.E.I., Buoy Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5344 (iii).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6206 (iv).

Bounties to Fishermen, Investigation *re* Fraud (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5202 (iii).

Cascumpec Harbour, P.E.I., Rep. of Engineer *re* Closing (Ques.) 1208 (i).

Deep Sea Fisheries, P.E.I., Importing of Fishing Population, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1881 (i).

DesRoches, John M., Charges against (Ques.) 1134 (i).

Dundonald, Lord, G.O.C., Dismissal by Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) *re* Political interference, 5572 (iii).

Farmer Delegates, P.E.I., and Winnipeg Exhibition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2755 (ii).

Fishing Bounties Payments, Alleged Frauds (remarks) in Com., 5002, 5032 (iii).

Fishery Conference, Negotiations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5051 (iii).

Fish Shippers, P.E.I., Compensation *re* Loss through Irregular Winter Service (Ques.) 2117 (ii).

See 'Deep Sea.'

'Gauss,' Str., Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5215 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup. (M.) that Com. rise, 5322, 5328 (iii).

McGee, D'Arcy, Erection of a Monument to (Ques.) 3942 (iii), 7969 (iv).

Hackett, Mr. E.—*Con.*

Militia Camps, P.E.I., Complaints *re* Barrack Grounds from 'Daily Patriot' (remarks) 5572 (iii).

Monuments, Erection to T. D. McGee and Champlain (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7969 (iv).

Monuments on Parliament Hill, Erection of, &c. (Ques.) 3942 (iii).

Murray Harbour Branch P. E. I. Ry., Completion, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6241 (iv).

O'Leary Branch Line P. E. I. Ry., Pet. *re* (read) 6012 (iii).

Oyster Culture (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5033 (iii).

Pension Scheme *re* Ry. Employees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6241 (iv).

Point Prim, P.E.I., Construction of Pier, Surveys, &c. (Ques.) 1664 (i).

P.E.I. Ry., Cape Wolfe Branch, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 990 (i).

——— Dismissals in 1896 (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6220 (iv).

——— Lighting of Cars (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5930 (iii).

——— Ry. Tourist Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6242 (iv).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Express Cos., 6710 (iv).

Rattenbury, Mr., Payment of Commission *re* Freight Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5202 (iii).

'Stanley,' Str., Accident at Yarmouth (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5218 (iii).

——— Removal from Summerside Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5202 (iii).

SS. Subsidies, N.B., P.E.I., Nfld., &c. (M. for pets., &c.*) 1881 (i).

SUPPLY :

Agriculture (Acadian historical data) 2745; (aid to societies) 2742; (Winnipeg exhibition) 2755 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 2726 (ii); Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 5001 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Champlain monument) 7969 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 5202; (marine biological station) 5290 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Cape Tormentine) 7745 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Higgin's shore pier) 7736; (New London) 7738; (Point Prim wharf) 7738; (Richmond Bay wharf) 7739; (Rustico harbour) 7739; (Souris Point) 7740; (Summerside breakwater) 7740; (West Point wharf) 7743 (iv).

Quarantine (cattle) 4210 (iii).

Railway Commission (salaries and maintenancce) 8383 (v).

Railways—I.C.R. (Pintsch gas) 5930 (iii).

Hackett, Mr. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—P.E.I. (Alberton station) 6010 (iii), 8367; (Cardigan and Montague) 8369 (v); (Charlottetown station) 5991 (iii), 8368 (v); (Curtis Creek, straightening line) 5987; (Hillsborough bridge) 5999; (Kensington accommodation) 5986; (Montague bridge surveys) 6011; (Murray Harbour Branch) 5999 (iii); (Vernon River bridge) 8367; (West Cape survey) 8368 (v); (Westinghouse brakes) 5989 (iii); (working expenses) 6220 (iv).

Haggart, Hon. J. G., *South Lanark.*

Acetylene Gas in Lighthouses, Reps. asked for, in Com. of Sup., 7597 (iv).

Acetylene Gas used for Cold Storage *re* Fisheries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7589 (iv).

Address, on The, 93 (i).

Alliance Bank of Can., on Rep. from Sel. Com. (remarks) 4997 (iii).

American Fishing Cos. and Bonding Privileges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7581 (iv).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 7223 (iv).

Bruce Mines Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8794 (v).

Can. Atlantic Ry., Negotiations *re* Purchase by Govt. (remarks) 6874 (iv).

Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase B. 163 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 8225, 8243; on M. for 2°, 8550; in Com., 8556 (v).

Companies Act (190?) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Cowan) in Com., 5097 (iii).

——— B. 164 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 8841 (v).

Confidential Documents, brought down as Rets. to Hse. (remarks) in Com. on G.T.P. Res., 1697 (i).

Cornwall Contract and Davis' Contract *re* Lighting, on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Sel. Com. on Audit Act, 4305 (iii).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8514 (v).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6648 (iv).

Customs Dept., Salaries and Increases, 1793 (i).

Davis, Mr., Contract : *See* 'Cornwall Canal.'

Documents, Confidential, published by Lib. Ministers, &c. (remarks) 1697 (i).

——— Confidential, &c., Withheld from Parlt., Notice of Motion, 5743 (iii).

——— Prop. Res., 5762 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7228 (iv), 8028a (v).

Dundonald, Lord, G.O.C., Dismissal by Govt., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Fisher) 4643 (iii).

——— *See* 'Documents.'

Drummond County Ry., Expenditure on (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8348 (v.)

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

Edmonton Street Ry. Co.'s B. 111 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5499 (iii).

Election Bill: *See* 'Dom. Elections,' &c.

Estimates Used by Minister of Fin., Ref. to, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Fielding) 2131 (ii).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1788 (i).

Express and Tel. Cos., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean to Ry. Act Amt. B. 132, in Com., 6693 (iv).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 74 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 8148, ... (v).

Fishery Award, Methods of Payments to Provs. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5048 (iii).

Fishery Conference, Negotiations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5048 (iii).

Fishing Bounties Payments, Alleged Frauds, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5002 (iii).

Fishing Leases to Mr. Markey in Northern Waters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8944 (v).

Free Importations, Date, &c. (remarks) 5742 (iii).

Galops Canal and Gilbert Bros'. Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8974 (v).

Gironcoli, S., Patent Relief B. 126 (Mr. Mackinnon) in Com., 5034 (iii).

Govt. Business, Legislation *re* (remarks) 7363 (iv).

——— Stmnt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4998 (iii).

G.T.P. Ry. Co.'s Amt. B. 34 (Mr. McCarthy) on M. for 1°, 789 (i).

——— B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 824 (i); in Com., on sec. 3 of Bill, 3048, 3067; on Amt. (Mr. Roche) 3165 (ii).

——— on sec. 7 of Bill, 3225; (amt.) 3299; on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) 3260 (ii).

——— on sec. 4 of schedule, 2411 (ii).

——— on sec. 5 of schedule, 2437 (ii).

——— on sec. 9 of schedule, 2519, 2635 (ii).

——— on sec. 11 of schedule, 2644 (ii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) Govt. Ownership, to M. for 3°, 3639, 3698 (ii).

G. T. P. Ry., Govt. Ownership, &c. (remarks) 1230 (i).

——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take Precedence, 598 (i).

G. T. Pacific Public Documents: *See* 'Documents.'

Gregory, Lt.-Col., Resignation, &c., on M. for Sup., 7694 (iv).

Inspection Act (binder twine) Amt. B. 124 (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Com., 8052 (iv).

I. C. R., Bridge Strengthening (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6275 (iv).

——— Capital Expenditure (remarks) 6104 (iv)

——— Employees, Political Interference at Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6047 (iv).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

I. C. R., Enormous Expenditure, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5958 (iii).

——— Expenditure *re* Capital Account, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).

——— Expenditure for Mar. Provs. on Capital Account (statement) 8371 (v).

——— Political Appnmts., Charges against Sir Chas. Tupper, 6122 (iv).

——— Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6111 (iv).

——— Receipts, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Emmerson) 5887 (iii).

Interprovincial Ry. Bridge Co. of N.B., B. 57 (Mr. Marcil) in Com., 2370 (ii).

Kingston and Dom. Central Ry. Co.'s B. 123 (Mr. Harty) in Com., 5035 (iii).

Land Titles Act Amt. B. 158 (Mr. Sifton) in Com., 8713 (v).

Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry., Attack on Mr. Osler, M.P. (remarks) 2776 (ii).

Members appointed to Govt. Offic... ...rs) on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 1229 (i).

Memoranda, Confidential, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Fielding) 2131 (ii).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) on M. for 2°, 268 (i); in Com., 6506 (iv), 8066, 8266; on Amt. (Mr. Logan) 8272 (v).

Mutual Reserve Life Ins. Co.'s B. 161 (Mr. Heyd) in Com., 8678, 8703 (v).

Naval Militia Organization, in Com. of Sup., 8931 (v).

New Brunswick Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. Gibson) in Com., 6322 (iv).

Nicola, Kamloops, &c., Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8826 (v).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8807 (v).

North Channel Dam, Completion, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6323 (iv).

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Champagne) in Com., 4239; on M. for 3°, 4263 (iii).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 10... (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 4066 (iii).

Poonamalie Lock, Claims *re* Damages, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8973 (v).

Port Arthur Harbour B. 9... (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 3878 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 153 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8030 (v).

Prescott Lighting Power, Transfer from Morrisburg (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8918 (v).

Private Bills, Extension of Time, on M. (Mr. Gibson) 5353 (iii).

P. E. I. Ry., Deficits *re* Working Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6262 (iv).

Quebec and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s B. 43 (Mr. Malouin) in Com., 2369 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 6777 ; on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Express Cos., 6693 (iv).
Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 171 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 8791 ; on M. for 2°, 9054 (v).
Representation in H. of C., P.E.I., &c., Ref. to Privy Council, Factum, 5000 (iii).
Seed Growers' Association incorp. B. 151 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7234 (iv).
Small, E. A., Patent Relief B. 93 (Mr. Logan) in Com., 3058 (ii).
Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co.'s B. 42 (Mr. Ganong) on M. for 3°, 4270 (iii).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 4071 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Beauharnois (Valleyfield pier) 8381 (v).
Canals—Chambly (Denault's culvert) 6870 ; (landing wharf) 6873 (iv); (lockmen) 8384 (v); (macadamizing road) 6870 (iv).
Canals—Cornwall (enlargement) 6293; (lighting contract) 6648 ; (shoals dredging) 6347 (iv).
Canals—Galops (channel completion) 6337 ; (enlargement) 6300 (iv).
Canals—Grenville (wharf) 6865 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (Atwater bridge) 8374 ; (Lower Basin road) 8381 ; (Mill St. paving) 8381 ; (old locks, rebuilding) 6867 (iv).
Canals—North Channel (dam, &c.) 6314, 6315, 6323 (iv).
Canals—Rideau (extension) 8382 ; (Poonamalie lock) 8973 (v).
Canals—St. Ours (lock) 6864 (iv).
Canals—Soulanges (arms and heaters) 6868; (St. Amour's gully) 6868 ; (steel bridge at power house) 6862 ; (survey for breakwater) 6862 (iv).
Canals—Trent (construction) 6829, 6859 (iv), 8378; (surveys) 8379 (v).
Canals—Welland (electric plant) 6348 ; (obstructions, &c.) 6359 (iv); (Port Colborne) 8379 (v); (Port Colborne deepening) 6360 (iv); (repairs) 8383 (v).
Charges of Management (Dom. and provincial accounts) 234 (i).
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1793 (i) ; Inland Revenue (secretary) 8976 (v); Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 5001 ; Post Office (salaries) 5611 ; Railways and Canals (salaries) 5892, 5895 (iii).
Fisheries (overseers, &c.) 7581 (iv).
House of Commons (salaries) 8979 (v).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (overseers' salaries) 7598 (iv).
N.W. Mounted Police (pay of force) 2689 ; Yukon (pay, subsistence, &c.) 2714 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 8922; lights inspection) 8918; (obstructions in Montreal harbour) 8927 (v); (ship channel, St. Lawrence) 7599 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax public buildings) 505; Ont. (Alexandria P.O.) 507; Que. (Thetford Mines P.O.) 685 (i).
Railway Commission (salaries and maintenance) 8382; G.T. Pacific Ry. (surveys) 8962 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (additional sidings) 5938 (iii), 8365 (v); (Amherst station) 5958 (iii);

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Railways—I.C.R.—*Con.*
(Antigonish accommodation) 8364; (Birch Cove curves) 8350 (v); (bridge strengthening) 5919 (iii), 6275 (iv); (double tracking) 8354 (v); (draw-bars) 5923 (iii); (facilities along line) 8361; (Halifax, accommodation) 8363 (v); (Halifax, deep water dredging) 5952; (L vis accommodation) 5921; (machinery for locomotive shops) 5924 (iii); (Mitchell) 8350; (New Glasgow) 8365 (v); (Pintsch gas) 5933 (iii); (portable plant) 8346; (rolling stock) 8354; (St. Leonard Junction) 8347; (steel rails) 8360 (v) ; (Sydney, increased accommodation) 5915 (iii); (Sydney Mines extension) 8347; (Truro accommodation) 8361 (v).
Railways—P.E.I. (Charlottetown, accommodation) 8368; (Charlottetown water front) 8369; (Souris survey) 8366; (Vernon River bridge) 8367; (water service) 8369 (v).
Senate (salaries, &c.) 8977 (v).
Ways and Means (glass) in Com. on Res., 8873 (v).
Welland Canal, Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6111 (iv).
West Canadian Collieries, Limited, B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6103 (iv).
Yukon Ter. Act Amt. B. 39 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, 1786 (i).
Yukon Ter., Regulations of Gov. in Council on prop. Res. (Mr. Sifton) 8655 (v).
Halliday, Mr. J., *North Bruce.*
Experimental Farms, Cattle Raising (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4987 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 4987 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Southampton) 7857 (iv).
Harty, Mr. Wm., *Kingston.*
Kingston and Dom. Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 123) 1°*, 3719 (ii); in Com., 5035 (iii).
Haszard, Mr. H., *West Queen's, P.E.I.*
Budget, on The, 4915 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Railways—P.E.I. (Charlottetown station) 5993 (iii), 6237 (iv).
Henderson, Mr. D., *Halton.*
Alliance Bank of Canada, on M. (Mr. Russell) to receive Pet., 4408; on M. for 2°, 5298 (iii).
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 166 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 8440 (v).
Bain, Mr., Preparation of Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1863 (i).
Banking Com., Meetings, &c. (remarks) 7364 (iv).
Binder Twine, Quantity, &c., Duties paid, &c. (remarks) on Prorogation, 9078 (v).
See 'Inspection Act.'
Blankets, &c. (M.) to strike out of Customs Act, 8898 (v).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Brantford and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s B. 22 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 1819, 1821 (i).

Bronte Harbour Improvements, Names, Employees, Amounts paid, &c. (M. for ret.*), 336 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 1875 (i).

Bronte Harbour Light, and Cisco Herring Fisheries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5824 (iii).

Bruce Mines Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8792 (v).

Cab Hire for Minister of Marine, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5009 (iii).

Canadian Credit, Indemnity and Guaranty Co.'s incorp. B. 29 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 5295 (iii).

Canadian Year-book, Advertising Whisky, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7360 (iv).

Cattle, Care of at Experimental Farms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4972 (iii).

Chicken Fattening Stations, Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7434 (iv).

Cigarettes, Sale and Manufacture of, Prohibition B. 128 (Mr. Maclaren) on prop. Res., 355 (i) ; on M. for 2°, 4052 ; in Com., 5140 (iii).

Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 333 (i).

Committee Meetings, Concurrent Sittings of Hse. (remarks) on M. (Mr. Cowan) 5843 (iii).

Customs Dept., Salaries and Increases, in Com. of Sup., 1837 (i).

Dom. and Provincial Accounts, *re* Adjustment (remarks) 548 (i).

——— Accounts, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 232 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7664 (iv).

Dom. Fire Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 54 (Mr. Macpherson) on M. for 2°, 1338 (i).

Elections, Date of (remarks) 8531 (v).

Farm and Garden Products, Protection *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) 4025 (iii).

Financial Situation, Review of, on M. (Mr. Bell) 8328 (v).

Gironcoli, S., Patent Relief B. 126 (Mr. Mackinnon) in Com., 5035 (iii).

Grain Inspection B. 113 (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Com., 8062 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 1423 (i); in Com. on sec. 3, on Amt. (Mr. Roche) 3175; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 3397 (ii).

——— Appnmt. of Fourth Commissioner, 3383 (ii).

Grand Vallee Pier (M.) to strike out Item, 9074 (v).

H. of C. Post Office, Locked Boxes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5853 (iii).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Immigration Literature, Advertisements *re* Whisky (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7360 (iv).

Inspection Act (binder twine) Amt. B. 124 (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Com., 8055 (v).

Iron and Steel Bounties paid in 1904, Total Amount, &c. (Ques.) 8781 (v).

Land Titles Act Amt. B. 158 (Mr. Sifton) in Com., 8712 (v).

Lead Bounties B. 169 (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Com. on Res., 8712 (v).

Letter Postage, Reduction, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5726 (iii).

Mail Service in Bruce County, Complaints, &c., on M. (Mr. Donnelly) for Cor., 593 (i).

Mail Subsidies, Atlantic SS. Service, &c. (Ques.) 249 (i).

Militia Act B. 5, (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6393 (iv).

Militia Regulations, Remuneration *re* Camp Attendance (remarks) 3755 (ii).

Morning Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5843 (iii).

Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co.'s B. 161 (Mr. Heyd) in Com., 8679 (v).

Northern Bank B. 146 (Mr. Scott) on M. for 2°, 5866 (iii).

Order (Ques. of) h. m. (Mr. Scott) not discussing the question before Hse., 2764 (ii).

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Champagne) in Com., 4190 (iii).

Pacific Bank of Canada, on M. (Mr. Macpherson) to place on Order Paper, 7783 (iv).

Pails of Wood, Tariff *re* (remarks) in Com. on Res., 8872 (v).

Political Interference *re* Militia (remarks) in Com. on B., 6393 (iv).

Port Arthur Harbour B. 98 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 3879, 3895 (ii).

Post Office Accounts System, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5600 (iii).

Post Office Finances, Rep. of Auditors (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5605 (iii).

Prorogation (remarks) 8902 (v).

Provincial Accounts between Dom. and Provs. (remarks) on Prorogation, 9075 (v).

Public Works, Construction of Buildings, &c., Govt. Policy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 636 (i).

Public Works Dept., Transfer of Work to Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 437 (i).

Qu'Appelle, &c., Ques. of Order, 'No Motion before Hse., for Discussion,' 2764, 2787 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Standard Passenger Tolls, 6770 (iv).

Ry. Committee, on M. (Mr. Hyman) for concurrent sittings with Hse., 5860 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 171 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 8792 (v).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Rebellion Losses, Payment of Claims 1885, on M. for Ret. (Mr. Davis); Ques. of Order, 'Discussing other Questions,' 2826 (ii).

Rio de Janeiro Tramway, Light and Power Co.'s B. 142 (Mr. Guthrie) on M. for 2°, 5299 ; in Com., 5865 (iii).

St. Lawrence Route, Lighting System, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5823 (iii).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co.'s Homestead Entries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7055 (iv).

Shawenegan Falls Carbide Factory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8936 (v).

Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co.'s B. 42 (Mr. Ganong) on M. for 3°, 4270, 4452 (iii).

Standard Passenger Tolls, on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to Ry. B., 6770 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Agriculture (archives) 2728 (ii) ; (dairying branch) 7434 (iv) ; (experimental farms) 4972 (iii); (Winnipeg exhibition) 2754 (ii).

Canals—Trent (construction) 6852 ; Welland (obstructions, &c.) 6359 (iv).

Charges of Management (Dom. and Provincial Accounts) 232 (i).

Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1837 (i) ; Post Office (salaries) 5600 (iii); Public Works (salaries) 437 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (St. Lawrence lighting) 5823 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 5009 (iii).

N. W. Mounted Police (pay of force) 2691 (ii).

Post Office (H. of C., lock boxes) 5853 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, barracks) 696; (Winnipeg, immigration shed) 686 ; (Winnipeg, P.O.) 692 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N. W. T. (Red Deer court house) 700 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont.—Alexandria P.O.) 512; (Belleville armoury) 524 ; (Bowmanville P.O.) 529; (Guelph P.O.) 539 ; (Hawkesbury P.O.) 545 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 456 (i); (Post Office reconstruction) 3908 (ii); (Victoria Museum) 459 (i).

Public Works—Dredging—Ont. (new plant) 7884 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (repairs, &c.) 7775 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Higgin's shore pier) 7737 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Chateau Richer) 7767 ; (Grand Vallee pier) 7770; (Lake St. John dredging) 7775; (Lotbinière wharf) 7778 ; (Newport breakwater) 7779; (Perce wharf) 7780 (iv).

Quarantine —Que. (Grosse Isle steamers) 4194 (iii).

Trade and Commerce (petroleum bounties) 9013 (v).

Tariff Changes, &c., in Com. on Res., 8869 (v).

Tariff Resolutions, Date of Discussion (remarks) 5742 (iii).

Thompson River Improvement Co.'s incorp. B. 79 (Mr. Thompson) on Sen. Amts., 7967 (iv).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Tobacco, Customs Duties, Amount collected, 1904, Legislation *re* in 1897 (Ques.) 8781 (v).

——— Inland Revenue Duties collected in 1904, Legislation *re* in 1897 (Ques.) 8781 (v).

Walkerton and Lucknow Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 32) 1°*, 789 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com. on Res., 8879 ; (dumping clause) 8869 (v) ; (goats) 8893; (printing presses) 8894; (whale oil) 8895 (iv).

West Canadian Collieries Limited, B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4866, 5864 (iii), 6093, 6845 (iv).

Woollen and Cotton Industries, Tariff *re* (remarks) 1464 (i).

Woollen Goods, Tariff *re* (remarks) in Com. on Res., 8879 (v).

Yukon Ter., Regulations of Gov. in Council, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sifton) 8655 (v).

Heyd, Mr. C. B., *South Brant.*

Auditor General, Resignation, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) to Sup., 6593 (iv).

Bain, Mr., Preparation of Liberal Campaign Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1938 (i).

Binder Twine, Sale of by Govt. (remarks) in Com. on B., 8060 (v).

Budget, on The, 4473 (iii).

Cab Hire for Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5012 (iii).

Farm and Garden Products, Protection *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) 4016 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 1745 (i); on sec. 3, on Amt. (Mr. Roche) 3193 (ii).

——— on sec. 7 of Bill, on Amt. (Mr. Porter) 3292 (ii).

——— on sec. 5 of schedule, 2436 (ii).

——— on secs. 6 and 7 of schedule, 2454 (ii).

——— on sec. 9 of schedule, 2516 (ii).

Immigrants, Destitute and stranded in Canada, &c. (remarks) 3860 (ii).

Inspection Act (binder twine) Amt. B. 124 (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Com., 8051 (v).

Letter Carriers, Pay during Sick Leave (remarks) in Com. on B. 153, 8033 (v).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 8069 (v).

Mutual Reserve Life Ins. Co.'s (B. 161) 1°*, 7649 (iv); 2° m., 8675; in Com., 8678 (v).

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Champagne) in Com., 4227, 4237 (iii).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 153 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8034 (v).

Post Offices Finances, Rep. of Auditors (remarks) 5611 (iii).

Preferential Tariff, Importations *re* Canadian Ports, on prop. Res. (Mr. Logan) 5082 (iii).

Heyd, Mr. C. B.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (express and telephone Cos.) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Maclean) on M. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c., 3820 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Ry. Commissioners, 6724, 6745 ; on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Standard Passenger Tolls, 6774 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 5611 (iii).

Holmes, Mr. R., *West Huron.*

Budget, on The, 4726 (iii)

Cigarettes, Prohibition and Sale, B. 128 (Mr. Maclaren) on prop. Res., 350 (i); in Com., 5133 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7663 (iv).

Experimental Farms, Experiments and Accounts (remarks) 7190 (iv).

G. T. P. Bill, on Ques. of Order *re*, (Mr. Lefurgey) reading documents, 1768 (i).

Guelph and Goderich Ry. Co.'s incorp (B. 31) 1°*, 789 (i).

Immigrants, Stranded and destitute in Canada, &c. (remarks) 3857 (ii).

Inland Revenue (Tobacco) Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8427 (v).

Robertson, Eliza, Relief (B. 141) 1°*, 5187 (iii).

Hughes, Mr. J. J., *King's, P.E.I.*

Budget, on The, 4795 (iii).

C. P. R. Stock, Issue of, Authority, &c. (Ques.) 3436 (ii).

Chicken Fattening Stations, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7428 (iv).

Dog-fish Pest, Commission *re* Investigation (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6995 (iv).

Fish Driers, Whitman Method (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7591 (iv).

Fishing Bounties, Payments to, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5056 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 1490 (i).

I. C. R., Expenditure on Capital Account (remarks) 8373 (v).

——— Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6122 (iv).

Inspection Act (binder twine) Amt. B. 124 (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Com., 8056 (v).

Lobster Fisheries, P.E.I., Licenses to Packers, Pet. *re*, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) to adjn., 4677 (iii).

'Military Gazette' (Canadian) and Govt. Patronage (remarks) 7906 (iv).

Post Office Finances, Rep. of Auditors *re* Deficits (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5621 (iii).

P. E. I. Ry., Extension and Working Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6242 (iv).

Hughes, Mr. J. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 5621 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (P.E.I. and Newfoundland) 7460 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Knight's Point) 7740; (Summerside breakwater) 7740; (West Point wharf) 7743 (iv).

Railways—P. E. I. (Murray Harbour and Hillsborough bridge) 6001 (iii); (Souris survey) 8366 (v); (working expenses) 6242 (iv).

Hughes, Mr. Sam., *North Victoria, Ont.*

Advertisements *re* Patent Medicines in Newspapers (remarks) in Com. on B. 153, 8045 (v).

Associated Press (Canadian) Reports, Misrepresentations, &c. (remarks) 8662 (v).

Bisley Prizes and Canadians (remarks) 7436 (iv).

Blount, Mr., Salary, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8988 (v).

Bruce Mines Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8798 (v).

Canada and Mexico SS. Service, Reps. *re* Trade, &c. (remarks) 4144 (iii).

Canadian Artillery Association incorp. B. 103 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 4144 (iii).

Can. and British Vessels entering U.S. Ports, &c., Treatment accorded to (Ques.) 2374 (ii).

Canadian Horses bought by Imp. Govt. for S. A. War (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8917 (v).

C' Battery, Arrears of Pay, Issue of Notice (Ques.) 2187 (ii).

Campbell, Mr. John, Claims for Repayment of Express Charges *re* Sheep Quarantine (M.) for Cor., 3761 (ii).

——— (remarks) 8916 (v).

Campbellton Railway Siding (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5941 (iii).

Canal Bridges, replaced by Subways, &c. (remarks) 3228 (ii).

Caraquet Ry., Purchase by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9027 (v).

Champlain, Erection of Monument (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7970 (iv).

Cedar Lake Fishery Overseer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7579 (iv).

Clergue Mfg. Steel Works, Contract, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. B. 171, 8836 (v).

Companies Act Amt. B. 164 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 8841, 8900 (v).

Defence of the Empire (remarks) in Com. on Militia Act, 6375 (iv).

Dennison, Col. C. A. K., Resignation, &c. (Ques.) 5073 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7659 (iv).

Hughes, Mr. Sam.—*Con.*

Dundonald, Lord, (remarks) *re* Dismissal by Govt., Speech at Montreal, 4492 (iii).

——— Political Interference *re* Militia, 4585; Memorandum from G.O.C. (read) 4596; Cor. between G.O.C., Govt. and Col. Smart (read) 4599 (iii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 5455 (iii).

——— Letter of Mr. Preston and Editorials in English Press (remarks) 6018 (iv).

——— Mr. Lemieux's Remarks in Eng. *re* 'exploiting,' 7090 (iv).

Exchequer Court, Additional Judge, in Com. of Sup., 7945 (iv).

Fishing Regulations in Mar. Provs. *re* Salmon Fishing, Inquiry *re*, 8782 (v).

Furniture Trade with Japan (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4130 (iii).

Govt. Cars, Use of by Ministers, &c. remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7491 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 1669 (i); in Com., on sec. 3, 3156; on sec. 9, 2496, 2525; on M. for 3° (amt.) 3679; on Amt. (Mr. Clare) 3470 (ii).

G. T. P. Bill, on Amt. (Mr. Clarke) and Mr. Speaker's Decision *re* Vote being taken, 2059 (ii).

——— Employmt. of Canadians as Engineers, &c., in Com. on B. 72 (remarks) 3077 (ii).

——— Investigation, Emplymt. of Counsel (remarks) 3944 (iii).

——— Mr. Hays' Memo. *re* Pet. for Aid dated Nov. 1902, on Criticism (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) in holding back from Rets., 3710 (ii).

——— Whips' Arrangements *re* Speeches (remarks) 2007 (ii).

Gratuities to Widows in Govt. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8924 (v).

Gregory, Col., Resignation, &c. (remarks) 4589 (iii).

——— on M. for Sup., 7688, 7700 (iv).

Guysborough Election, Political Interference *re* I. C. R. Employees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6027 (iv).

Hay Lake Channel, Treaty *re* Free Navigation (Ques.) 1207 (i).

Hope Island, Timber cut by Manley Chew (remarks) in Com. of Suv., 5250 (iii).

House of Commons Chamber, &c., Stealing from Members' Desks, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9003 (v).

Hutton, Maj.-Gen., late G.O.C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6369 (iv).

Immigrants, Stranded and destitute in Canada, &c. (remarks) 3861 (ii).

Immigrants swindled by Sharpers, Precautions *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1211 (i).

Imperial Commissions allotted to Can. Militia, Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 1358 (i).

Hughes, Mr. Sam.—*Con.*

Imperial Connection, Govtl. Action (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8917 (v).

Japanese Trade with Can. *re* Farm Products (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4127 (iii).

Jones, Lt.-Col., Recommendation for Brigadier, &c. (Ques.) 5867 (iii).

Judges, Appnmt. of, and Promises made to Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7940; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 7943 (iv).

Lamontagne & Co., Goods purchased, Tender, &c. (Ques.) 1877 (i).

Lemieux, Mr., Speech in Eng. and Prov. of Que. (remarks) 7092 (iv).

Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Bridge, Crossing over Trent Canal, Protest *re* (Ques.) 1134 (i).

McCreary, Mr., late M.P., Transfer of Body to Winnipeg, &c., and Private Cars (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7492 (iv).

McLaren's Creek, Roadway Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7488 (iv).

McLean, Lt.-Col., Recommendation as Brigadier, &c. (Ques.) 5867 (iii).

Macoun, J. M., Rep, *re* Peace River, Distribution, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7208 (iv).

Martineau Defalcations, Settlement *re* (remarks) 9051 (v).

Merritt, Maj.-Gen., Appnmt., Gazetted, &c. (Ques.) 5073 (iii).

Militia Act (1904) Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) on M. for 1°, 208; on M. for 2°, 257; in Com. on Res., 479 (i); in Com., 6368, 6387, 6469 (iv), 8066, 8080, 8119 (v); (advisory council) 6531; (command vested in His Maj.) 6402; (constables in Com.) 6525; (defence of Can.) 6486; (exemptions from service) 6428; (Inspector General) 6526; (Minister's responsibility) 6382; (riots, &c.) 6513; (target practice) 6469, 6534; (total peace establishment) 6440; (transport) 6505; on Amt. (Mr. Tisdale) to M. for 3°, 8188 (v).

Militia Act B. 5, Reprinting as Amended (remarks) 6681 (iv).

'Military Gazette' (Canadian), Par. in 'Citizen' *re* Govt. Patronage, 7903 (iv).

Militia Promotions and Political Interference (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6396 (iv).

Militia Regulations *re* Examinations, Inquiry for Papers, 6024 (iv).

Militia Regulations, Remuneration *re* Camp Attendance (remarks) 3756 (ii).

Militia System, Change, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Militia B., 6375 (iv).

Musketry School, Taxes *re* Expenses in Camp (remarks) 6550, 7090, 7096 (iv).

——— Par. *re* sending home some of soldiers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9034 (v).

Hughes, Mr. Sam.—*Con.*

Naval Militia Organization, in Com. of Sup., 8931 (v).

Navigable Waters Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Préfontaine) on M. for 1°, 3017 (ii).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8803 (v).

North Shore Power and Pulp Co.'s Wharf, Contract *re*, in Com. of Sup., 7997 (iv).

N. W. Mounted Police, Land Scrip, &c., for 1885 Rebellion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7965 (iv).

N. W. Mounted Police Medals for 1885 Rebellion (Ques.) 1140 (i).

Order, Ques. of, *re* Bowing when passing Members who are speaking, 7235 (iv).

Ottawa Car Co., Goods purchased by Tender, &c. (Ques.) 1878 (i).

Political Interference *re* Militia (remarks) in Com. on B., 6390 (iv).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 153 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8045 (v).

Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Letter *re* Lord Dundonald's Dismissal (remarks) 6018 (iv).

Questions put by Members, on Ques. of Order *re* M. to adjn., 1153 (i).

Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 171 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 8798 (v).

Russell, Mr., M.P., and Promise of Judgeship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7940 (iv).

St. Catharines Field Battery, (remarks) 4589 (iii).

St. Lawrence Pilots Training, Qualifications, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5029 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale, B. 125 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 4931 (iii).

Session, and Delay in calling Parlt. (remarks) 6640 (iv).

Sheep Quarantine and Claim of Mr. John Campbell for Repayment of Express Charges, &c. (M.) for Cor., 3761 (ii).

See 'Campbell.'

Sherbrooke Drill Shed, Political Interference *re*, Cor. (read) 4594 (ii).

S. A. Medals, King's, Application by Canadians, Number, &c. (Ques.) 2375 (ii).

Speaker's Apartments, Furnishing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 8997 (v).

Steel: *See* 'Clergue.'

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice—Yukon (sheriff's allowance) 7946; (travelling allowances) 7945 (iv).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 4097 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (contingencies) 9035 (v); Privy Council Office (contingencies) 429; (salaries) 428 (i).

Fisheries (overseers) 7581 (iv).

House of Commons (contingencies) 8988; (salaries) 8980 (v).

Inland Revenue—Excise (methylated spirits) 3924 (ii).

Hughes, Mr. Sam.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Justice—Supreme Court (E. R. A. Taschereau) 9039 (v).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (acetylene gas contract) 8938 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 7447 (iv).

Militia—Miscellaneous (contingencies) 9034; (monuments) 9034 (v).

Miscellaneous (Champlain monument) 7970; Man. and N.W.T. (colonization roads) 8017 (iv), 9043 (v).

N.W. Mounted Police (Cashel's capture) 7964 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (gratuity to Mrs. Michaud) 8924; (obstructions in Montreal harbour) 8927 (iv).

Penitentiaries—Dorchester (salaries) 7953; Generally (parole system) 7955; Miscellaneous (brick-making) 7958 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings, B.C. (Vancouver P.O.) 9020; Ont. (armouries) 9020 (v); (London armoury) 606; (Oshawa P.O.) 618; (Stratford armoury) 641 (i); Ottawa (Rideau Hall grounds) 8021 (iv); Yukon (rents, repairs, &c.) 9021 (v).

Public Works—Dredging—Ont. (plant) 9031 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Campbellton wharf) 9026; (Shippegan harbour) 9027; N.S. (Apple River wharf) 9022; (Port Hawkesbury) 9023 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Depot Harbour) 8022; (Otonabee, dredging) 8022 (iv); (Port Lorne) 9025; (Severn River obstructions) 9029; (Whitby dredging) 9029 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (damage to dredge 'J. I. Tarte') 8021; (Seven Islands wharf) 7831, 7997 (iv).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Ottawa River surveys) 9033 (v).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Bryson) 9031; (Little Slave Lake road) 9032 (v).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—N. W. T. (Edmonton loop line) 8023 (iv).

Quarantine (Tracadie Lazeretto) 4137 (iii).

Railways—I.C.R. (additional sidings) 5939; (Amherst station) 5964; (Amqui station) 5968; (Grand Narrows bridge) 5980; (Pintsch gas) 5929; (Stellarton station) 5969 (iii); (Sydney Mines extension) 8346 (v); (Windsor, N.S., station) 5955 (iii).

Railways—Miscellaneous (Gov. Gen.'s car) 7491 (iv).

Railways—P.E.I. (M.C.B. couplers) 5998; (Westinghouse brakes) 5990 (iii).

Taschereau, Chief Justice, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Brodeur) *re* Impeachment, &c., 9040 (v).

Ticket-of-Leave System, Prisoners liberated, &c., on M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 3767 (ii).

Tonnage of Canada, Correction of Figures, 8532 (v).

Trent Canal, Bridge in Carden Township (Ques.) 3435 (ii).

——— Claims for Damages, &c., from Verulam Township (Ques.) 794 (i).

——— Storage of Water (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9033 (v).

Trent Valley Lakes, Fisheries, Rep. *re* Destruction by Ice, Restocking, &c. (Ques.) 2556 (ii).

Hughes, Mr. Sam.—*Con.*
Twelfth of July, Holiday Adjournment (remarks) 6264 (iv).
Veterans' Association, Land Grants in N.W. (remarks) 8532 (v).
Victoria Day Adjournment, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3227 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Victoria and Haliburton, Printing, &c. (Ques.) 2375 (ii).
Ways and Means—(Dumping Clause) in Com. on Res., 8849 (v).
Whitley, Lt.-Col., Tel. to from Min. of Ag. (M.) to adjn., 6875 (iv).
Wood Alcohol, Purchase from Standard Chemical Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3924 (ii).

Hyman, Hon. C. S. (Acting Minister of Public Works), *London.*
'Aberdeen' Str., Boiler Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 217 (i).
Arisaig, N.S., Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 4413 (iii).
Brantford and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s B. 22 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 1819 (i).
Bruce Mines Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8795 (v).
Buildings rented by Dom. Govt., Generally: List (read) 7622 (iv).
See 'Ottawa.'
C. P. Ry. Co.'s (B. 70) in Com., 2597 (ii).
Caraquet Wharf, Purchase from Mr. Shives, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7746 (iv).
Champlain Wharf, Construction, Selection of Site (Ans.) 4410 (iii).
Clement, Jules D'E, Circular Letters, &c. (Ans.) 213 (i).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Value, Bonuses, &c. (Ans.) 3310 (ii).
C. Ross Co., Ottawa, Payments to (Ans.) 6544 (iv).
Dredging in Ont., Summary of Expenditure (remarks) 7875 (iv).
Fair-Wage Clause in Public Works Contracts (Ans.) 4414 (iii).
'Fielding,' Dredge, Cost of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7881 (iv).
Gobeil, Jos. E., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 5581 (iii).
——— Charges *re* Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9056 (v).
Grand Bend, Breakwater, Ont., Change of Plans, &c. (Ans.) 7441 (iv).
——— in Com. of Sup., 7843 (iv).
Grand River, Dredging between Dunnville and Port Maitland (Ans.) 7443 (iv).
G. T. P. Ry., Aliens Investigation, Appnmt. of counsel (Ans.) 4414 (iii).
Harbours and Rivers—N.S., Cumberland Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9022 (v).
See 'N. S.'

Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*
Hopewell Cape Wharfs, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4412 (iii).
Interprovincial Ry. Bridge Co., of N.B., B. 57 (Mr. C. Marcil) in Com., 2370 (ii).
Letter Carriers, Toronto, Pet. *re* Extension of Time for P. O. Act (Ans.) 4415 (iii).
Midland Dock, Rental, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7764 (iv).
New Brunswick Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. Gibson) in Com., 6322 (iv).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s B. 48 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3477, 3758 (ii).
North Shore Power and Pulp Co.'s Wharf, in Com. of Sup., 7972 (iv).
N. S. Harbours and Rivers, Summary of Amounts expended (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7648 (iv).
Ottawa Buildings rented by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7622, 7625 (iv).
——— List (read) 7628 (iv).
Ottawa Post Office Reconstruction, Pay of Labourers (Ans.) 5583 (iii).
Parliament Square and Buildings, Lighting Contract (Ans.) 3311 (ii).
Picton Custom House, Rental, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7624 (iv).
Point aux Trembles Wharf, Request for Aid, &c. (Ans.) 3761 (ii).
Port Burwell Harbour Works, Total Expenditure 1891 to 1896 (Ans.) 7440 (iv).
Port Credit Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7888 (iv).
Port Stanley Harbour Works, Total Expenditure 1891 to 1896 (Ans.) 7440 (iv).
P. E. I. Telegraph Service and Govt. Control (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7892 (iv).
Quebec and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s B. 43 (Mr. Malouin) in Com., 2369. 2372 (ii).
Ry. Committee Sittings (M.) for concurrent sittings with Hse., 5860 (iii).
Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 171 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 9054 (v).
'Richelieu,' Dredge, Cost of Maintenance (Ans.) 6543 (iv).
St. Anne de Sorel, Ice Breaker Building, Pay of Labourers (Ans.) 5583 (iii).
St. Francis River Ice Piers, Total Cost (Ans.) 3389 (ii).
St. John Harbour Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 5271 (iii).
St. Mathias Wharf, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 8254 (v).
St. Maurice Slides and Booms, Pay of Labourers (Ans.) 5583 (iii).
Savard, P. V., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 217 (i).
——— O.Cs., Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Casgrain) for Copies, 222 (i).
Seal Cove, Survey for Wharf (Ans.) 3761 (ii).

Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*

Seven Island Wharfs, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7972 (iv).

Sorel Wharf, Pay of Labourers (Ans.) 5583 (iii).

Speaker's Apartments, Furnishings, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9000 (v).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vancouver P.O.) 9020 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (armouries) 7619 (iv), 9020 (v); (electric power) 7631 ; (engineers, &c.) 7630 ; (experimental farms) 7620 ; (generally) 7619 ; (heating, &c.) 7630 ; (rentals, &c.) 7621 ; (list of buildings, read) 7622 ; (water service) 7631 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings, N.B. (St. John drill hall) 9019 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Alexandria P.O.) 517 (i); (Barrie P.O.) 9019; (Chatham armoury) 9020; (St. Catharines drill hall) 9020 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c.) 7628 ; (Major's Hill park) 7629 (iv); (Post Office reconstruction) 3907 (ii) ; (Ry. Commission) 7625; (Rideau Hall, fuel) 7628 ; (Rideau Hall, grounds) 8021 ; (snow cleaning) 7630 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Valleyfield) 7972 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (rents, repairs, &c.) 9021 (v); (repairs, &c.) 7632 (iv).

Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (new plant) 7885 ; Generally (new plant) 7885 ; Man. (new plant) 7884 ; Mar. Provs. (hydraulic plant) 7880 (iv); (new plant) 9031 (v) ; N.S. (new plant) 7885 ; Ont. (new plant) 7880 (iv), 9031 (v); P.E.I. (new dredge) 7880 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Anderson and Kennedy lakes) 7876 ; (Fraser River protection) 7876 ; (Sydney breakwater) 8022 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Dom. (repairs, &c.) 7850 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Dauphin Lake lowering) 7876; (repairs, &c.) 7875; (St. Andrews rapids) 7897 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (repairs, &c.) 7774 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Alma pier) 7750; (Anderson's Hollow) 7744; (Black Brook) 7745; (Campbellton wharf) 7745 (iv), 9026 (v); (Cape Tormentine) 7745; (Caraquet wharf) 7745; (Dalhousie harbour) 7747 ; (Dipper harbour) 7747; (Great Salmon river) 7747 ; (Hopewell Cape) 7748; (Negro Point) 7750; (North Head) 7748; (Petit Richer) 7749 ; (St. John river) 7750 (iv); (Salmon river) 9033; (Shippegan harbour) 9027 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Abram's wharf) 7634; (Bailey's Brook wharf) 7635; (Baxter's harbour) 7635 ; (Bayfield wharf) 7635; (Big Pond wharf) 7636; (Breton Cove boat landing) 7636 ; (Bridgewater dredging) 7637; (Cow Bay) 7637; (Digby pier) 7637 ;(Fort Lawrence pier) 7638; (Georgeville wharf) 7638 ; (Glace Bay) 7639; (Hall's Harbour) 7642 ; (Indian Harbour) 7642; (Iona wharf) 7642; (Kelly's Cove) 7644; (L'Ardoise breakwater) 7642 ; (Larry's river) 7642; (Lingan beach) 7643 ; (Livingstone's

Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. —*Con.*

Cove) 7643; (Malignant Cove) 7643; (Middle River) 7643; (Neil's Harbour) 7643 ; (Pembroke breakwater) 7644; (Port Bevis wharf) 7636; (Port Hawkesbury) 7644 (iv), 9023 (v); (Port Hood entrance) 7646; (Port Maitland) 7646; (Prospect wharf) 7646 ; (Sandy Cove) 7646 ; (Scott's Bay) 7646 ; (Skinner's Cove) 7646; (Spry Bay wharf) 7646; (Summerville wharf) 7646; (Sydney quarantine station) 7647; (Tenecape wharf) 7647 (iv), 9025 (v) ; (Victoria Beach) 7647; (Wedge Point) 7647 ; (West Bay wharf) 7647 ; (White's Cove) 7648 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Amherstburg dredging) 7750 (iv); (Barrie pier) 9028 (v); (Barry's Bay) 7751; (Bayfield pier) 8022; (Bracebridge wharf) 7751; (Burlington channel) 7751; (Collingwood, harbour) 7751; (Collingwood, pier) 8022 ; (Depot Harbour) 7753, 8022; (Gananoque dredging) 7754; (Goderich harbour) 7754; (Grand Bend pier) 7843 (iv); (Hamilton harbour) 9029 (v); (Honora wharf) 7851; (Kingsville pier) 7852; (Little Current) 7852; (Meaford harbour) 7852; (Midland harbour) 7853; (Otonabee dredging) 7855, 8022; (Owen Sound) 7853; (Pembroke wharf) 7853; (Penetanguishene pier) 7854; (Port Colborne) 7897; (Port Perry dredging) 7854; (Port Stanley dredging) 7855 ; (Rondeau, dredging) 7855; (Sarnia, dredging) 7855; Sault Ste. Marie, dredging) 7856 (iv); (Sault Ste. Marie, wharf) 9029; (Severn River obstructions) 9029 (v); (Southampton) 7857; (Spanish River) 7857; (Temiscaming wharf) 7852; (Thessalon breakwater) 7863; (Thornbury) 7863; (Toronto, eastern entrance) 7864 (iv); (Whitby dredging) 9030 (v); (Wiarton wharf) 7874 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Higgin's shore pier) 7736; (New London) 7738; (Point Prim Island) 7738; (Richmond Bay wharf) 7739; (Rustico harbour) 7739 ; (Souris Point) 7740; (Summerside breakwater) 7740; (West Point wharf) 7744 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse aux Gascons) 7766; (Baie St. Paul) 7766; (Bonaventure East) 7766; (Caplan breakwater) 7767 ; (Chambord wharf) 7767; (Champlain wharf) 7767; (Chateau Richer) 7767; (damage to dredge, 'J. I. Tarte') 8021; (Deschambault wharf) 7767; (Father Point) 7767; (Grand Vallée pier) 7768; (Grondines wharf) 7774; (Lake St. John, dredging) 7775; (Laprairie ice piers) 7775; (Lotbinière wharf) 7776 ; (Magdalen Island) 7779; (Murray Bay wharf) 7779 ; (Newport breakwater) 7779; (Percé wharf) 7780; (Pointe St. Pierre) 7780; (Quebec harbour) 7896; (Rimouski pier) 7780 ; (Rivière du Loup) 7780; (Ste. Famille pier) 7782; (St. Godfroi de Nouvelle) 7782; (St. Jean des Chaillons) 7782; (St. Simeon wharf) 7828; (Seven Islands wharf) 7828, 7972; (Three Rivers wharf) 7835; (Trois Pistoles) 7843; (Vercheres wharf) 7843 ; (Yamaska dredging) 7843 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers (Transportation Facilities), 7897 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Yukon (Lewes and Yukon rivers) 7879 (iv).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 7895; (architects, &c.) 7895; (Art Gallery)

Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Miscellaneous—*Con.* 7895 (iv); (Ottawa River surveys) 9033 (v); (surveys, &c.) 7895; (transportation commission) 7896 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Bryson) 9031 (v); N.W.T. (colonization road) 8017; (Peace river) 7891 (iv).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 7891 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines, Dom. (Marconi system) 7896; N.B. (Deer Island, &c.) 7891; N.W.T. (Edmonton loop line) 8024; Ont. (Pelee Island) 8023; Que. (Anticosti, Fox Bay) 7895; (Bersimis to Godbout) 7894; (F. C. Bickerdike's claim) 9032 (v).

Sydenham River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7850 (iv).

Three Rivers Wharf, Pay of Labourers, &c. (Ans.) 5582 (iii).

Timagami Ry. Co.'s B. 94 (Mr. McCool) in Com., 3758 (ii).

Toronto Harbour, Improvements at Eastern Entrance, in Com. of Sup., 7864 (iv).

Tow-Boat purchased by Govt. from Laperriere & Frères (Ans.) 7442 (iv).

Vancouver Dry Dock, Arrangements *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7877 (iv).

——— Contract with Mr. Jackson, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9065 (v).

Ventilation of Chamber, Opening of Windows, &c. (remarks) 4416 (iii).

Victoria Harbour, Dredging Inner Side (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7890 (iv).

——— Use of 'King Edward' Dredge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7879 (iv).

Victoria Post Office, Rental, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7622 (iv).

West Canadian Collieries Limited, B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6100 (iv).

Woollen and Cotton Industries, Remarks *re* Tariff, &c., in a reported speech, 1460 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B., *East Elgin.*

Agriculture and Colonization Com., on M. (Mr. Parmelee) to sit concurrently with Sittings of Hse., 6677 (iv).

Agriculture Dept., Salaries, &c., Inquiry for Statements, &c., 3751 (ii).

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8579 (v).

Alien Labour and Protection to Canadians (remarks) in Com. on G.T.P. Bill, 3281 (ii).

Aylmer, Ont., Customs Outport, &c. (Ques.) 7439 (iv).

Bain, Mr., Preparation of Liberal Campaign Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1857, 1928 (i).

Bernier, Capt., Rep. of Capt. Spain (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5285 (iii).

Brantford and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s B. 22 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 1822 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

Business of the Hse., Legislation, &c. (remarks) 4726 (iii).

Cab Hire for Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5011 (iii).

Canada Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 40) 1°*, 1053 (i); on Sen. Amts., 6845 (iv).

'Cape Breton' Str., Accident in St. Lawrence Channel, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5027 (iii).

Carbide purchased by Govt. for Lighthouses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5319 (iii).

Cattle Feeding, Different Methods (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4968 (iii).

Cattle Importations from Mexico and U.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4107 (iii).

Cement in Can. Analysis of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3917 (ii).

Cold Storage Transportation on Ocean Vessels, on Amt. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 7927 (iv).

Companies Act (1902) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Cowan) in Com., 4707 (iii).

Corn Duty, Ref. to by Mr. Cowan (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7358 (iv).

Corn, Removal of Duties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4116 (iii).

Customs Dept., Private Sec's Allowance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1857 (i).

——— Salaries, Increases, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1835 (i).

——— Staff, Permanent, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1902 (i).

Distillery Officers, Extra Pay for Special Work (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).

Documents, Confidential, published by Lib. Ministers, &c. (remarks) 1704 (i).

Dundonald, Lord, G.O.C., Dismissal by Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) *re* Political Interference, 5565 (iii).

Elections, General, Date of (remarks) 8531 (v).

Experimental Farm Accounts, Discrepancies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7383 (iv).

Farm and Garden Products, Protection *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) 4035 (iii).

Fisheries Act (trap-nets) Amt. B. 74 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 8214 (v).

Fisheries Dispute, Reference, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5058 (iii).

Govt. Cars used by Ministers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7497 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 2206; on sec. 7, on Amt. (Mr. Earle) 3273; on Amt. (Mr. Casgrain) 3325; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 3419, 3717 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. B., Appnmt. of Fourth Commissioner, 3380 (ii).

——— Mr. Hays' Memo. *re* Pet. for Aid dated Nov. 1902, on Criticism (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) in holding back from Rets., 3712 (ii).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

Gregory, Lt.-Col., Resignation, &c., on M. for Sup., 7690 (iv).

Guysborough Election and I.C.R. Employees, Political Interference (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6027, 6045 (iv).

Hope Island, Timber cut by Manley Chew (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5254 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members' Families (remarks) in Com., of Sup., 7620 (iv).

Immigrants, Destitute and stranded in Can. (remarks) 3872 (ii).

I. C. R., Bridge Strengthening (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6284 (iv).

——— Employees, Political Interference in Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6045 (iv).

——— Interference by Members with Running of Trains (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6254 (iv).

——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Logan) 6277 (iv).

——— Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6124 (iv).

Jackson, J. B., Appnmt. as Commercial Agent in Eng., Charges *re*, &c., on M. for Sup., 7811 (iv).

Lighthouse Keepers, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5324 (iii).

Lindsay, J. B., Lease of Grazing Lands (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7221 (iv).

Lumber Industry and Tariff Readjustment, on M. (Mr. Morrison) 2589 (ii).

McCarthy, Osler & Co., Payments to, &c. (remarks) 678 (i).

Macoun, J. M., Rep. *re* Peace River, Distribution, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7201 (iv).

——— Remarks of Mr. Oliver *re* in Ag. Com. (remarks) 7347 (iv).

Masters' and Mates Certificates Act (inland waters) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3797 (ii).

Memorandum by Mr. Blair *re* G.T.P., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1310 (i).

Milford Ry. Accident, Damages, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6141 (iv).

Militia Act (1904) Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) on M. for 1°, 208; on M. for 2°, 262 (i); (pay and allowance) in Com. on Res., 2908 (ii); in Com., 6371, 6398 (iv); (active service) in Com., 8086 (v); (cadet corps) 6539; (G.O.C. signing General Orders, &c.) 6378; (Minister's responsibility) 6383; (peace establishment) 6448; (rifle clubs) 6539; (riots, &c.) 6519; (uniforms) 6461 (iv).

Mutual Reserve Ins. Co.'s B. 161 (remarks) 8530 (iv).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

Napanee River Buoys, Contract *re* Placing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5337 (iii).

Naval Militia, Ref. to in Com. on Militia Act, 6421 (iv).

——— in Com. of Sup., 5268 (iii).

Newspaper Patronage in Prince Albert (remarks) 6642 (iv).

Official or Private Cars, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Tolton) for Ret., 3770 (ii).

Patent Models, Classification, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2721 (ii).

Personal Explanation (Mr. Roche, Halifax) *re* Speeches, &c. (remarks) 3945, 4085, 4141 (iii).

Political Interference *re* Militia (remarks) in Com. on Militia B., 6383 (iv).

Port Burwell Harbour Works, Expenditure *re* 1891 to 1896 (Ques.) 7440 (iv).

Port Stanley Harbour Works, Total Expenditure, 1891 to 1896 (Ques.) 7440 (iv).

Prescott Carbide Factory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5304 (iii).

Private Cars : *See* 'Official.'

Public Accounts Com. Meetings, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1945 (i).

Public Works Dept., Transfer of Work to Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 441 (i).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Osler) *re* Attack by Mr. Scott, M.P., 2894 (ii).

——— Ques. of Order, Mr. Dep. Speaker, 2889 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Henderson) *re* M. to adjn., 2788 (ii).

Railway Act (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 3776 (ii).

——— (express and telephone cos.) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3809 (ii).

——— (employees liability) Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Lennox) on M. for 2°, 3842 (ii), 4714 (iii).

Railway Freight Rates in Ontario, on M. (Mr. Broder) to adjn., 2952 (ii).

Regina 'Leader,' Distribution and Payments to for Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7358 (iv).

Ross, Hon. Wm., Letter written as Minister of Militia *re* Elections (remarks) 6063 (iv).

St. Lawrence Channel, Defective Lighting *re* Accidents (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5027 (iii).

St. Thomas, 25th Battalion Club Rooms, Rent, &c. (Ques.) 7226 (iv).

St. Thomas Military Camp, District No. 1, Total Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 7226 (iv).

St. Thomas P.O., Asst. Postmaster, Appnmt., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5746 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 125 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. of Sup., 4940 (iii).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Sessions, Length of, Delay in calling Parlt. (remarks) 6642 (iv).
Small, E. A., Patent Relief B. 93 (Mr. Logan) in Com., 3057 (ii).
Spain, Capt., Purchase of fur-lined Coat (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5292 (iii).
Speeches of Mr. Roche, &c., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Roche, Halifax) 3945 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (aid to societies) 2743 ; archives) 2727 ; (Can. Exhibit, Imperial Institute) 3757, 3729, 3744 ; (criminal statistics) 2734 ; (exhibitions) 4098 (iii); (experimental farm accounts) 7383 (iv); (experimental farms) 4962 (iii); (fumigating staions) 2749 ; (general statistics) 2742 ; (Patent Record) 2732 ; (Winnipeg exhibition) 2750 ; (Year-book) 2737 (ii).
Canals—Chambly (lockmen) 8384 (v); Galops (channel completion) 6346 (iv); Lachine (Atwater bridge) 8376 (v); Welland (electric plant) 6349, 6797 ; (Port Colborne deepening) 6360 (iv).
Charges of Management (Dom. and provincial accounts) 237 (i).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 2716 (ii); Customs (salaries) 1835 (i); Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 5011 (iii).
Customs (Board of Customs) 1980 ; (Mr. Bain's salary) 1928 ; (contingencies) 1987; (inspectors' salaries) 1980; (staff salaries) 1902 (i).
Geological Surveys (salaries) 7200 ; (specimen purchases) 7219 (iv).
Inland Revenue—Excise (inspectors' salaries) 3913; (methylated spirits) 3934 ; (tobacco stamps) 3921; (travelling expenses) 3920 (ii).
Militia (rifle association grants) 8385 (v).
Miscellaneous—Colonization Roads (Man. and N.W.T.) 8017 (iv).
N. W. Mounted Police (gratuity to Mrs. Beaupré) 7618 (iv); (pay of force) 2689, 2710 (ii), 7618 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 5292; (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 5199 ; (naval militia) 5268; (tidal service strs.) 5289 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Alexandria P.O.) 515 ; (Belleville armoury) 528 ; (Cobourg armoury) 531; (Dom. rentals) 535; (Guelph armoury) 536; (Guelph P.O.) 540, 650; (London armoury) 602; (Oshawa P.O.) 611; (Peterborough armoury) 628; (St. Mary's P.O.) 634; (Toronto P.O.) 647 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (accommodation for members' wives, &c.) 7620; (Major's Hill park) 7629 (iv); (Post Office reconstruction) 3909 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Longueuil P.O.) 673 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Wiarton wharf) 7874 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Grand Vallée pier) 7768 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Seven Islands wharf) 8015 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Ont. (Pelee Island) 8023 (iv).
Railways—I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 6284; (working expenses) 6025; Miscellaneous (Gov. Gen.'s car) 7497 (iv); (Murray harbour branch) 6006 (iii); (working expenses) 6252 (iv).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Superannuations (Wallace, Mr., Victoria) 8385 (v).
Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry., Subsidies, Total Amount, &c. (Ques.) 7225 (iv).
Tobacco Industry, Duties on, &c. (remarks) 7785 (iv).
Union Labels B. 35 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) on M. for 2°, 3831 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Printing of (remarks) 680 (i).
Wood Alcohol, Purchase from Standard Chemical Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3936 (ii).

Johnston, Mr. A., *Cape Breton.*
Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8643 (v).
Alliance Bank of Canada (B. 140) 2° m., 5297 (iii).
Associated Press (Canadian) Reports, Misrepresentations, &c. (remarks) 8663 (v).
Bain, Mr., Preparation of Liberal Campaign Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1946 (i).
Bait in Cold Storage, on Par. in Halifax 'Herald' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5024 (iii).
Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6247 (iv).
Cigarettes, Prohibition and Sale, B. 128 (Mr. Maclaren) in Com., 5149 (iii).
Dom. Iron and Steel Co.'s Rail Mill (remarks) in Com. on Ry. B. 171, 8834 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., Appnmt. of Fourth Commissioner, 3378 ; Emplymt. of British Subjects and Alien Labour Law, on Amt. (Mr. Clare) to M. for 3°, 3507 (ii).
Lobster Fishing Bounties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5056 (iii).
Marconi System in Glace Bay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8921 (v).
Newfoundland Fisheries Treaty with U. S., on M. (Mr. Kaulbach) 2129 (ii).
P. E. I. Ry., Pay of Labourers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6249 (iv).
Private Bills, (M.) to extend Time for Posting, 5187 (iii).
Steel Rails manufactured in Canada (remarks) in Com. on Ry. B. 171, 8834 (v).
SUPPLY :
Quarantine—N.S. (inspection, &c.) 4168 (iii).
Ways and Means (dumping clause) in Com. on Res., 8855 (v).

Johnston, Mr. R., *Cardwell,*
Chicken Fattening Stations, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7431 (iv).
Experimental Farm Accounts, Discrepancies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
Farm and Garden Products, Protection *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) 4019 (iii).

Johnston, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Furniture Trade with Can. and Japan (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4132 (iii).
I. C. R., Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6138 (iv).
Railway Freight Rates in Ont., on M. (Mr. Broder) to adjn., 2943 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (dairying branch) 7431 ; (experimental farm accounts) 7398 (iv).

Johnston, Mr. T. G., *West Lambton.*
Petroleum Bounties B. 167 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8462 (v).

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., *Lunenburg.*
Acetylene Gas for lighthouses, Location, &c. (Ques.) 2186 (ii).
Canadian Ensign and Merchant Marine replaced by British Flag at Argentine Republic (remarks) 5189 (iii).
——— Rep. in 'Star' (M.) to adjn., 5272 (iii).
Cigarettes, Prohibiton and Sale B. 128 (Mr. Maclaren) in Com., 5144 (iii).
Cold Storage for Fish Bait (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7003 (iv).
Dog-fish Pest, Commission *re* Investigation (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7000 (iv).
——— (Ques.) 2377 (ii).
Eaton Fish Drier Method (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7589 (iv).
——— Prospectus (read) 7004 (iv).
Fisheries Act (whaling) Amt. B. 74 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 8151 (v).
Fishing Bounties, Method of Payment, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5041 (iii), 7593 (iv).
Fish Hatcheries in Lunenburg Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7587 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 2176 (ii).
I. C. R., Receipts, &c., on Annual Statement, 5880 (iii).
Lighthouses illuminated by Acetylene Gas, Location, &c. (Ques.) 2186 (ii).
Lunenburg County, Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7886 (iv).
'Lurcher' Lightship, Designer's Name, &c. (Ques.) 2378 (ii).
——— Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1140 (i).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act (inland waters) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 3797 (ii).
Militia Act (pay and allowance) Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 2919 (ii).
Naval School Establishment at Lunenburg (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7596 (iv).
Newfoundland Fisheries Regulations, Compromise, &c. (remarks) 6788 (iv).
Newfoundland Fisheries Treaty with U.S. (M.) to adjn. Hse., 2120 (ii).

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E.—*Con.*
Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 171 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 8837 (v).
Refrigerators for Fish Bait, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5047 (iii).
Sable Island, Tree Plantation, Reps. *re* (Ques.) 2117 (ii).
Ship's Cables, Customs Tariff *re* (remarks) 1783 (i).
Submarine Signals, Purchased in Boston (Ques.) 2187 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 5001 (iii).
Fisheries (fish culture) 7587 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (masters, &c., examination) 7595 (iv).
Public Works—Dredging—N.S. (new plant) 7886 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Bailey's Brook wharf) 7634; (Breton Cove wharf) 7636; (Baxter's harbour) 7635; (Green Cove) 7641; (L'Ardoise breakwater) 7642; (Livingstone's Cove) 7643 ; (Malignant Cove) 7643; (Port Hood entrance) 7646 (iv).
Tariff *re* Ships' Cables, &c. (remarks) 1783 (i).
Trap-net Licenses for Mackerel, Decision of Supreme Court, &c. (Ques.) 3389 (ii).

Kemp, Mr. A. E., *East Toronto.*
Budget, on The, 4872 (iii).
Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase B. 163 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 8226, 8248 (v).
Census of 1881, 1891, 1901, Cost, Information disseminated, &c. (Ques.) 330 (i).
Census (1901), Industrial Establishments, &c. (Ques.) 1876 (i).
Govt. Loans, Rate of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 218 (i).
Grain Shipments over I. C. R., for Export, &c. (Ques.) 252, 334 (i) .
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 1472 ; in Com. on Res., 1730 (i); in Com., on sec. 1, Amt. (Mr. Clarke) 3014; on sec. 7 (amt.) 3262; on Amt. (Mr. Casgrain) 3305, 3319 (ii).
——— on sec. 1 of schedule, in Com., 2228 (ii).
——— on sec. 9 of schedule, 2549, 2631 (ii).
——— on sec. 10 of schedule, 2663 (ii).
G. T. P. Ry., Surveys, Eastern Division, Number, &c. (Ques.) 552 (i).
G. T. Ry. Co.'s Arbitration B. 152 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 1°, 6465 (iv).
Letter Carriers, Grading as to Salary (remarks) in Com. on B. 153, 8041 (v).
Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) on Amt. (Mr. Tisdale) to M. for 3°, 8181 (iv).
Mint, Selection of Site, &c. (Ques.) 247 (i).
Montreal Harbour, Free Port (M.) for Copy of Letter of Hon. Mr. Tarte to Prime Min., 5092 (iii).
——— Inquiry for, 3906 (ii), 6466 (iv).

Kemp, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*
Port Arthur Harbour B. 98 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 3885, 3893 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 153 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8030 (v).
Preferential Tariff, Value of Imports, of Free Imports, &c., under Tariff (Ques.) 3538 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Ocean and River Service (naval militia) 5269 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Toronto, drill hall) 644; (Toronto, examining warehouse) 645; (Toronto, P.O.)646 (i); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Toronto, eastern entrance) 7866 (iv).

Kendall, Mr. A. S., *Cape Breton.*
Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8622 (v).
Dog-fish Pest, Commission *re* Investigation (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6997 (iv).
Dom. Iron and Steel Co., and Fair Wage Res. (Ques.) 5866 (iii).
Fair Wage Res., Application to Iron and Steel Co. (Ques.) 5866 (iii).
Fish Culture, Bait Supply, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5045 (iii).
Fishing Bounties, Methods of Payment (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5045 (iii).
Fish Refrigerating Establishments in Mar. Provs. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6999 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., on sec. 2, 3120 (ii).
Immigration, Medical Inspection, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7290 (iv).
I. C. R. and P. E. I. Rys., Accidents and Loss of Life, Names of Employees (Ques.) 5840 (iii).
I. C. R., Coal Supply, Discrimination *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5963 (iii).
——— Employees and Political Interference at Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6059 (iv).
——— Sydney Train Service, Res., from Hali- Board of Trade (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).
Iron and Steel Co., Bounty Payments (Ques.) 5841 (iii).
Militia Changes at Sydney, Inquiry for Cor., 6553 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Immigration (agents' salaries) 7290 (iv).
Railways—I. C. R. (Amherst station) 5963 ; (Canso Ferry service) 5977 ; (Grand Narrows bridge) 5984 (iii).
Quarantine—Man. (small-pox inspection) 4161 ; Mar. Provs. (inspection, &c.) 4161 (iii).
Vaccine Stations, Establishment, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4162 (iii).

Lancaster, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln & Niagara.*
Address, on The, 196 (i).
Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8615 (v).

Lancaster, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*
Arisaig, Pier, N.S., Expenditure *re* Repairs, (Ques.) 4413 (iii).
Bain, Mr., Preparation of Liberal Campaign Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1919 1919 (i).
Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6258 (iv).
Can. Northern Ry., Crossing at Saskatchewan, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 1136 (i).
Cattle-guard Commission, Payments to Mr. Holt (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7479 (iv).
Cigarettes, Prohibition and Sale, B. 128 (Mr. Maclaren) in Com., 5134 (iii).
Civil Service Act, Procedure *re* Promotions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1848 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Amt. (B. 3) 1°*, 10 ; 2° m., 421; (remarks) 595; on M. for 2°, 1889 (i); in Com., 3789 (ii).
——— (B. 56) in Com. (amt.) 3795 (ii).
——— (fraudulent debtors) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 3981 (iii).
Customs Dept., Salaries and Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1794 (i).
Dunnville Bridge, Amount paid for Painting, &c. (Ques.) 8026 (v).
Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1789 (i).
Fishery Conference, Negotiations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5054 (iii).
Fishing Right, James Bay, Lease to Arch. McNee, &c. (Ques.) 793 (i).
Forest Protection, Res. of Can. Forestry Association, Action by Govt. (Ques.) 3759 (ii).
Gironcoli, S., Patent Relief B. 126 (Mr. Mackinnon) in Com., 5034 (iii).
Gregory, Lt.-Col., Resignation, Letter read, &c., on M. for Sup., 7680, 7692 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res. 1190 (i); in Com., 2245; on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Clare) 3508 (ii).
——— Emplymt. of British Subjects on Surveys, &c., and Alien Labour Law, on Amt. (Mr. Clare) to M. for 3°, 3508 (ii).
Grand River Dredging between Dunnville and Port Maitland (Ques.) 7443 (iv).
See 'Dunnville.'
Grimsby Post Office, Complaint *re* Accommodation, Cor., &c. (read) 5685, 5696 (iii).
I. C. R., Bridge Strengthening (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6271 (iv).
——— Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6113 (iv).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. (B. 4) 1°*, 10; 2° m., 427 (i), 3796 (ii), 5166 (iii); Neg. (Y. 16; N. 39) 5181 (iii).
Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (active service) in Com., 8106 (v).
Napanee River Buoys, Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5339 (iii).

Lancaster, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*
N. W. T. Town Sites, and Ry. Cos., Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 1139 (i).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Champagne) in Com., 4180, 4249 (iii).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry., (remarks) on (Mr. Scott) reading Cor., 2775 (ii).
Railway Act (crossings) Amt. (B. 2) 1° m., 9 ; 2° m., 403 (i); in Com., 3774 (ii), 5097 (iii).
——— (express and telephone cos.) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3815 (ii).
——— (employees protection) Amt. (B. 88) 1° m., 2184 (ii).
——— B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to M. for 3°, *re* Express Companies, 7549 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Administration of Justice—Yukon (officials allowances) 7947; Miscellaneous (litigated expenses) 7960 (iv).
Agriculture (criminal statistics) 2734; (fumigating stations) 2746; (Year-book) 2736 (ii).
Canals—Soulanges (workshops, &c.) 6863 ; Welland (electric plant) 6349 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1794 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouses) 5339 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 5685 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Rossland armoury) 701 ; N. W. T. (Edmonton jail) 697; (Moosejaw P.O.) 699; Ont. (St. Catharines drill hall) 631 (i); Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Seven Islands wharf) 8008 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 6271 (iv); P.E.I. (Charlottetown station) 5991 (iii).
Welland Canal Employees, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7511 (iv).
——— Gas Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6351 (iv).
——— Lock Tenders, Pensions, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7525 (iv).
——— Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6113 (iv).
West Canadian Collieries Limited, B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6101 (iv).
Wilton Post Office, Dismissal of Postmaster, &c., in Com. of Sup., 5666 (iii).
Yukon Ter. Act Amt. B. 39 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, 1786 (i).

LaRiviere, Mr. A. A. C., *Provencher.*
Half-Breeds, Man., Allotment of Scrip, &c. Total Acreage, Value, &c., issued since 1903 (M. for ret.*) 1881 (i).
——— Pets. *re* Allotment in Man., and the Ters. (M. for ret.*) 224 (i).
——— Rep. of Commission, &c. (Ques.) 215 (i).
Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) on M. for 2°, 271 (i).
Navigation Improvements in Man. and N. W. T., Application for Charter, Res. from Board of Trade, Winnipeg, protesting, &c. (Ques.) 2803 (ii).

LaRiviere, Mr. A. A. C.—*Con.*
Political Interference of Govt. Officials in Man. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7067 (iv).
Poultry Stations, Establishment in Man., &c. (Ques.) 396 (i).
Printing of Parlt., 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 8653 (v).
Provencher District, Public Buildings, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 690 (i).
St. Andrews Rapids, Res. of Board of Trade, Letter *re* (Ques.) 2602 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Dom. Lands (advertising) 7069 (iv).
Indians—Man. and N. W. T. (industrial schools) 6946; (surveys) 6952; P.E.I. (relief and seed grain) 6940 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg P.O.) 690 (i).
Winnipeg Board of Trade, Res. protesting *re* Charter to incorp. Co. to improve Navigation, &c. (Ques.) 2803 (ii).

Laurier. Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G. (Prime Minister), *East Quebec.*
Address, on The, 69 (i).
——— (M.) to present to His Ex., 203 (i).
——— Reply to from His Ex. (presented) 1141 (i).
Address to His Ex., Farewell to Lord Minto (M.) 8475 (v).
Agriculture and Colonization Com., on M. (Mr. Parmelee) to sit during Sittings of Hse., 6679 (iv).
Agriculture, Min. of, Expenditure *re* Travelling Expenses (Ans.) 791 (i).
Alaska Boundary Arbitration, Preparation of Documents (remarks) 4928 (iii).
——— Papers *re* (remarks) 59 (i), 3726 (ii).
——— on inquiry for further papers (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 1356 (i).
——— Cor. laid on Table, 6263 (iv).
——— Rep. (presented) 254 (i).
Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8573, 8604; on Amt. (Mr. Boyd) to M. for 3°, 8667 (v).
——— Understanding *re* withdrawing Legislation, 8599 (v).
Ascension Day Adjournment (M.) 2849 (ii).
Atlantic Mail Steamers, Average Speed, &c. (Ans.) 6888, 7081 (iv).
Audit Act, Amt. and Consolidation, on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Sel. Com., 4297 (iii).
Bernier, Capt., Refusal of German Govt. to allow Str. 'Gauss' to leave Port (remarks) 2284 (ii).
Binder Twine Seizures, Payments to Agents, &c. (Ans.) 4273 (iii).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 5579, 5762, 5864, 5925 (iii).
Blair, Mr., Cor. *re* Resignation, on Inquiry for (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 1356 (i).
——— Memorandum *re* G. T. P., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 1303 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Blair, Mr. (remarks) *re* using of confidential documents, in Com., on G. T. P. Res., 1696 (i).
B. C. Legislation, Disallowance of (remarks) 679 (i).
Bruce Mines Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8800 (v).
Budget, on The, 4766 (iii).
Business of the Hse., Govt. Legislation (remarks) 6787 (iv).
——— Morning Sittings (M.) 5842 (iii).
——— Legislation, &c. (remarks) 4725, 4958 (iii).
——— Ry. Bill (remarks) 5926 (iii).
——— *re* Supply on Private Members' Day (remarks) 595 (i).
See 'Govt. Business.'
Can. Atlantic Ry., Purchase by Govt. (remarks) 6875 (iv).
Canada and France SS. Line, Contract *re*, on M. (Mr. Casgrain) for Cor., 4703 (iii).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 5191 (iii).
——— Govt. Policy *re* (Ans.) 2118 (ii).
'C' Battery, Arrears of Pay, Issue of Notice (Ans.) 2187 (ii).
Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase B. 163 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 8561 (v).
Canadian Ensign and Merchant Marine (remarks) on M. (Mr. Kaulbach) to adjn., 5276 (iii).
C. P. R., St. Philippe d'Argenteuil Branch Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8822 (v).
Cardinal Canal, Damages by Floods (remarks) in Sup., 7594 (iv).
See 'McArthur.'
Cascumpec Harbour, P.E.I., Rep. of Engineer *re* Closing (Ans.) 1208 (i).
Cattle-guard Commission, on Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 3727 (ii).
Chambly Canal, Damage by Floods, Indemnity, &c. (Ans.) 6365 (iv).
Champlain, Erection of Monument to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7971 (iv).
Chateauguay and Great Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy in Com. on Res., 8824 (v).
Chinese, Anti-Legislation, Interference with (remarks) 1354 (i).
Chinese Labour in S. Africa, Protest, &c. (Ans.) 218 (i).
Cigarette Legislation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Maclaren) 362 (i).
Civil Service List (presented) 205 (i), 2188 (ii).
Coal Contracts *re* Govt., Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 1136 (i).
Coasting Laws for British Ports, Cor. with Imp. Govt. (remarks) 6883 (iv).
Colombier, M., Contract *re* Can. and France SS. Line, on M. (Mr. Casgrain) for Cor., 4703 (iii).
See 'Can. and France.'

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Committees, Sel. Standing (M.) to prepare Lists, 8 (i).
——— Lists (presented) 162 (i).
Committee Meetings, on M. (Mr. Cowan) to sit concurrently with Hse., 5844, 5861 (iii).
Compagnies de Credit, Unlayful Transactions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Demers, Iberville) 1887 (i).
See 'Credit.'
Confidential Documents brought down in Rets. to Hse. (remarks) 1696 (i).
See 'Dundonald,' &c.
Cornwall Canal and Davis' Contract *re* Lighting, on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Sel, Com. *re* Audit Act, 4301 (iii).
——— Lighting Contract, O.Cs. asked for (remarks) 6150 (iv).
Cote St. Paul Bridge, Delay in Repairing, &c. (remarks) 3753 (ii).
Credit Companies, incorp. by Letters Patent, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3130 (ii).
See 'Compagnies.'
Criminal Code Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1888 (i).
Customs Collectorship in Victoria, B.C., Vacancy (Ans.) 6365 (iv).
Davis Contract *re* Lighting Cornwall Canal, on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Sel. Com. on Audit Act, 4301 (iii).
Debates Committee, Sel. Com. (M.) 8 (i).
Documents Public, Withheld from Parlt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 5783 (iii).
——— *See* 'Confidential.'
Dom. Day Adjournment (M.) 5842 (iii).
——— (remarks) 5762 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act, 1900, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 1137 (i).
Doncaster Indian Reserve, Exchange, &c., O.Cs., Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Leonard) for Copies, 2833 (ii).
Dry Dock, Lachine Canal, Memorial from Board of Trade (Ans.) 4273 (iii).
Dundonald, Lord, G.O.C., Dismissal by Govt., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Fisher) 4586; 'Foreigner,' &c., 4619 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) *re* Political Interference, 5531; Explanation *re* 'Foreigner,' 5545 (iii).
——— Cor. *re* Political Interference (remarks) 4926 (iii).
——— on inquiry for cor. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 4686 (iii).
——— Confidential Cor. *re*, (remarks) 5278 (iii).
——— O.C. laid on Table, 4823 (iii).
——— O.C. and Cor. (M.) to print, 4924 (iii).
——— Documents withheld from Parlt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Haggart) 5794 (iii).
——— Farewell to, on M. (Mr. Sproule) to adjn., 7542 (iv).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*

Dundonald, Lord, G.O.C., Dismissal by Govt., Production of Original Gazette, 5455 (iii).

——— Political Interference with Militia (remarks) 4492 (iii).

See 'Political,' &c.

Easter Adjournment (M.) 477 (i).

Electoral Lists for Prov. of Quebec, Printing, Distribution, &c. (Ans.) 1667 (i).

Electric Power furnished to U.S., Applications *re* (Ans.) 1358 (i).

Farm and Garden Products, Protection *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) 4012 (iii).

Farmers' Bank of Canada, on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to receive Pet., 3718 (ii).

Fishing Bounties, Principle of Payment (Ans.) 4695 (iii).

Fishing Regulations in Mar. Provs. *re* Salmon Fishing (remarks) 8784 (v).

Flag on Parlt. Building replaced by Union Jack (remarks) 220 (i).

Flour Standards, &c. (Ans.) 6546 (iv).

France and Canada SS. Service, Arrival of 'Malou,' Cancelling of Contract, &c. (Ans.) 4274 (iii).

See 'Can. and France,' &c.

——— Transfer of Contract, &c. (Ans.) 3311 (ii).

Garrison Common, Toronto, on Inquiry for Ret., 3318 (ii).

Geography of Canada, Date of Issue, Distribution, &c. (Ans.) 4695 (iii).

Govt. Bills withdrawn (M.) 8260 (v).

Govt. Business, Legislation, &c. (remarks) 4829 (iii), 7363 (iv).

——— Precedence on Mondays (M.) 4997 (iii).

——— Precedence on Wednesdays and Thursdays (M.) 3846 (ii).

——— Legislation *re* Dom. Elections Act, &c. (stmnt.) 5191 (iii).

——— Stmnt. of Legislation to be brought down (remarks) 4998 (iii).

G.T. Ry., Arbitration with Govt. B. 152 (remarks) 7228 (iv).

Grand Trunk Pacific Co.'s (B. 72) Prop. Res., 225, 710; on prop. Res., 1630; in Com. on Res., 1669, 1696; 2° m., 1783 (i); 2° agreed to (Y. 99; N. 55) 2182 (ii).

——— on sec. 1 of Bill, 2190, 2958; on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 2969, 2997 (ii).

——— on sec. 2 of Bill, 2671, 3029 (ii).

——— on sec. 7 of Bill, on Amt. (Mr. Casgrain) 3319; on Amt. (Mr. Clancy) 3219 (ii).

——— on sec. 1 of schedule, 2203 (ii).

——— on sec. 4 of schedule, 2378 (ii).

——— on sec. 5 of schedule, 2429 (ii).

——— on sec. 9 of schedule, 2481, 2510; stock securities, 2593 (ii).

——— 3° m., 3390, on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 3527; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 3394 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*

——— on Amt. (Mr. Clarke) and Mr. Speaker's Decision *re* Vote being taken, 2058 (ii).

G.T. Pacific Ry., Amended Agreement, Papers *re*, &c. (remarks) 7 (i).

——— Agreement (presented) 8 (i).

——— Agreement, Printing, &c. (remarks) 9 (i).

——— Application for Aid, communicated to anybody before reading in Hse. (Ans.) 3761 (ii).

——— Appnmt. of Commission (Ans.) 1209 (i).

——— Appnmt. of Fourth Commissioner (prop. res.) 3306; on Amt. *re* Fourth Commissioner, 3377 (ii).

——— Arrangements with Min. of Justice as to Procedure, 2267 (ii).

——— British Subjects as Directors, and Ry. Act Amts. (remarks) 4142 (iii).

——— Cor. between Govt. and G.T. Ry. Co. *re* Transcontinental Ry. Co. (remarks) 1548 (i).

——— Cor. with Grand Trunk Co. *re* Construction of Contract, 2977 (ii).

——— Cor. (presented) 548 (i).

——— Cor. *re* G.T. Ry. Co. (remarks) 93 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Monk) for Cor., 559 (i).

——— incomplete ret. (remarks) 599 (i).

——— Emplymt. of Aliens on Surveys, Constitution of Commission (remarks) 4142 (iii).

——— on delay in producing papers (remarks) 3874 (ii).

——— inquiry for cor., 3757 (ii).

——— emplymt. of Canadians as engineers (remarks) 3029 (ii).

——— res. from Can. Society of Civil Engineers (Ans.) 7439 (iv).

——— suppl. cor. from Associated Engineers (remarks) 4827 (iii).

——— Investigation *re*, emplymt. of counsel (remarks) 3944, 4055 (iii).

——— evidence furnished to G.T.P. authorities (remarks) 6891 (iv).

——— evidence of Mr. Hays, *re* Letters, on inquiry for (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in Com. of Sup., 6292 (iv).

——— Mr. Hays' Memo. *re* Pet. for aid in Nov., 1902, on Criticism (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in holding back documents from Rets., 3704 (ii).

——— (M.) to take precedence, &c., 597 (i), 2001 (ii).

——— Order for Com. (postponement) 2686 (ii).

——— 'Pettifogging and Quibbling,' ref. to Mr. Barker, 2233 (ii).

——— Production of Confidential Documents, on M. (Mr. Barker) *re* Construction, &c., 3958 (iii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry., Ref. to Mr. Osler as 'Ownied' man (remarks) 1714 (i).
——— Surveys *re* Govt. Information, Article in Montreal 'Herald' (remarks) 92 (i).
——— Transcontinental Ry., on M. (Mr. Barker) for Papers, 3958 (iii).
Gregory, Lt.-Col., on Inquiry (Mr. Borden, Halifax) for Papers, 6014 (iv).
Hudson's Bay, Police Patrolling and Customs Ports, in Com. of Sup., 7968 (iv).
Huntingdon Postmaster, Dismissal, &c., on Inquiry for Ret., 1875 (i).
Immigrants deported from U.S. to Winnipeg (statement) 477 (i).
'Jack Pine,' &c., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Barker) 2460 (ii).
Joint High Commission, Instructions, &c., on Inquiry for Copies (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1355 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Cor., 3726 (ii).
——— Papers laid on Table, 5761 (iii).
Labour Union Labels B., on Expediting Measure (remarks) 8260 (v).
Lachine Canal Bank, Authority for giving Aid for Ry. Purposes (remarks) 6150 (iv).
See 'Verdun.'
Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s B. 105 (Mr. Sutherland, Essex) on M. to receive Pet., 2927 (ii).
Laprairie, Damages caused by Floods (remarks) 1145 (i).
Lead Bounties B. (prop. res.) 2685 (ii).
Library Messengers, Salary Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9004 (v).
Library of Parliament, Joint Committee (M.) 168 (i).
McArthur, Rev. Mr., Claims for Damages *re* Cardinal Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6310 (iv).
See 'Cardinal Canal.'
McCarthy, Osler & Co., Payments to by Govt. 678 (i).
McCreary, Mr. W. F., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 2598 (ii).
McGee, D'Arcy, Erection of a Monument to (Ans.) 3942 (iii).
McIntosh, Mr. J., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 6546 (iv).
Macoun, J. M., Rep. *re* Peace River, Distribution, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7205 (iv).
Mail Steamships, Speed per Hour (Ans.) 6546 (iv).
Man. Voters' Lists, [illegible]y received from Man. Govt. (Ans.) 7440 (iv).
——— Revision by Dom. Govt., &c. (remarks) 4999 (iii).
Members named as [illegible].-Governors (remarks) 213 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Members of the House of Commons, Govt. Appnmts., &c. (Ans.) 993 (i).
Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) —(prop. res.) 253; in Com. on Res., 501 (i); 2906 (ii); (prop. res.) 2685; in Com., 6374; (emergency) 6376; (Minister's responsibility) 6382; (target practice) 6536 (iv).
——— Reprinting as amended (remarks) 6681 (iv).
Militia at Sydney, Withdrawal of, &c. (remarks) 6788 (iv).
Militia Camps, Remuneration for Attendance (remarks) 3726 (ii).
'Military Gazette' (Canadian) *re* Govt. Patronage (remarks) 7903 (iv).
Minister of Railways, Absence during Debate on G. T. P. Bill, Criticism of Opposition (remarks) 3339 (ii).
Montreal Harbour, Free Port, on M. (Mr. Kemp) for Letter of Hon. Mr. Tarte to Prime Min., 5092 (iii).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 6467 (iv).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 582 (i).
Morning Sittings : *See* 'Business of the Hse.'
Motions to adjn., Mr. Speaker's Ruling *re*, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 1215 (i).
Murray Harbour Bridge, on Inquiry for Ret., 4055 (iii).
Mutual Reserve Life Ins. Co. (M.) to call 2°, 8675 (v).
Napoleon Bridge, Lachine Canal, Rep. *re* Delay (Ans.) 3941 (iii).
New Brunswick Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. Gibson) on M. to receive Pet., 5184 (iii).
Newfoundland Fisheries Regulations, Compromise, &c. (remarks) 6788 (iv).
Newfoundland Fisheries Treaty with U.S., on M. (Mr. Kaulbach) 2124 (ii).
Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8802 (v).
North-west Mounted Police, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1354 (i).
N. W. Mounted Police, Land Scrip, &c., for 1885 Rebellion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7965 (iv).
——— Police Medals for 1885 Rebellion (Ans.) 1140 (i).
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°* *pro forma*, 6 (i).
O'Brien, Messrs. Soulanges Canal, Claims *re* (remarks) 8025 (v).
Official or Private Cars, Construction, &c., by Govt., on M. (Mr. Tolton) for Ret. (amt.) 5094 (iii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Champagne) on Objection (Mr. Clancy) to reading stmnt., of Sec. Treas. of Co., 4236; on quoting 'Bourinot' (remarks) 4241; in Com., 4239 (iii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Champagne) on M. to receive Pet., 2457 (ii).
Ottawa Garrison Drill Hall, Application, &c. (Ans.) 3390 (ii).
Ottawa River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8825 (v).
Ouelle Rivière and Murray Bay Ferry, Contracts *re* (Ans.) 4274 (iii).
'Ownied' ref. to Mr. Osler, Quotation given, 2166 (ii).
Pensions for N. W. M. Police (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2714 (ii).
Petitions, on M. to receive, Special Circumstances, &c. (remarks) 2369 (ii).
Political Interference *re* Militia (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6395 (iv).
Port Arthur Harbour B. 98 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 3883 (ii).
Preferential Tariff, Importations *re* Canadian Ports, on prop. Res. (Mr. Logan) 5088 (iii).
Printing and Stationery, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 2188 (ii).
Printing Bureau, Delay in Printing Voters' Lists (remarks) 6789 (iv).
Printing Committee, Joint (M.) 167 (i).
Private Bills, Extension of Time, on M. (Mr. Gibson) 5353 (iii).
——— Reported from Com., Form on Order Paper (remarks) 986 (i).
Proulx, Mr., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 7902 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies, Ref. by Lt.-Gov. of Quebec in Speech from Throne (remarks) 504 (i).
Provincial Subsidies, Stmnt. *re* in N.B. Legislature (remarks) 230 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Meetings, &c. (remarks) 1548 (i).
Public Lands, Sale of by Govt. (Ans.) 8778 (v).
Public Works Dept., O.C. *re* Transfer of Duties, &c. (Ans.) 868 (i).
——— Transfer of Duties, &c., on M. for Copies, 1879 (i).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Osler) and Mr. Dep. Speaker's Rulings *re* Irregularity of Debate, 2885 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Lancaster) *re* placing on Table Letters read in Debate, 2784 (ii).
Quebec Southern Ry. Co., O.C. *re* Amalgamation, &c. (Ans.) 556 (i).
Questions asked and Members' Rights to Courteous Answers (remarks) 6891 (iv).
——— Members and Ministerial Replies, on Remarks (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 1151; (ques. of order) 1152 (i).
——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 1217 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Railway Act (crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 420; on M. to ref. to Sel. Com. on Rys. (remarks) 1888 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Express Companies, 7545 (iv).
Railway Act Amts., Legislation *re* by Govt. (remarks) 3755 (ii).
Ry. Belt Lands, Dom., Retroactive Provisions (Ans.) 8776 (v).
Ry. Committee, on M. (Mr. Hyman) to sit during Sittings of Hse., 5861 (iii).
Railway Freight Rates in Ont., on M. (Mr. Broder) to adjn., 2933 (ii).
Ry. Freight Rates, Order, Ques. of, 2951 (ii).
Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 171 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 8790 (v).
Rebellion Losses, 1885, Payment of Claims, &c., on M. (Mr. Davis) for Ret., 2827 (ii).
Representation Act Amt. B. 149 (remarks) 7228 (iv).
Representations in P.E.I., and N.B., Factum for Privy Council (remarks) 5000 (iii).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 2369 (ii).
Rio Janeiro Tramway Light & Power Co.'s B. 142, on M. (Mr. Calvert) to receive Pet., 4823, 4997 (iii).
St. Andrews Rapids, Improvements, Res. of Board of Trade. Letter *re* (Ans.) 2602 (ii).
Ste. Flore Voters' Lists, Changes and Modifications *re*, &c. (Ans.) 1360 (i).
Sabbath Observance Legislation (remarks) 254 (i).
Saturday Sessions (M.) 8390 (v).
Savard, Mr. P. V., on Inquiry for Ret., 2284 (ii).
Seal Fisheries, Payment of Claims *re* Seizures (remarks) 5354 (iii).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 125 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for prop. Res., 3720 (ii).
Sergeant-at-Arms, Accounts *re* Speaker's Apartments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8997 (v).
Sessions, Late Dates and Delays (remarks) 8263 (v).
Similkameen and Keremeos Ry. Co.'s B., on M. to receive Pet., 3846 (ii).
'Société de Credit,' Letters Patent to (Ans.) 992 (i).
Solicitor General, Mr. Lemieux, Speech in Eng., *re* Preferential Trade, &c. (remarks) 7088 (iv).
Speaker, Election of (M.) 3 (i).
Speech from Throne (M.) 7 (i).
Strathcona, Lord, Speeches *re* Imperial Policy (remarks) 3753 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.—Privy Council (contingencies) 428; (salaries) 428 (i).
Legislation (voters' lists) 9005 (v).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Miscellaneous (Champlain monument) 7970; (patrolling Hudson Bay) 7[illegible] (iv).
N. W. Mounted Police (compensation for injuries) 7964; (damages *re* capture of Cashel) 7963; (gratuity, Mrs. Beaupré) 7618; (gratuity to Mrs. Brooke) 7618 (iv); (pay of force) 2686 (ii), 7618 (iv); (subsistence, &c.) 2713 (ii); (W. M. Walke, damages to) 7619 (iv); Yukon (pay, subsistence, &c.) 2713 (ii).
Penitentiaries—Kingston (salaries) 7953 (iv).
Taschereau, Sir Elzear, Sailing for Canada, &c. (Ans.) 7442 (iv).
——— Speeches *re* Dundonald Matter in Eng. (remarks) 7363 (iv).
Temiscouata Ry. Co.'s B. 144 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 6791 (iv).
Thompson River Improvement Co.'s incorp. B. 79 (Mr. Galliher) on Sen. Amts. (M.) to adjn., Deb., 7967-8 (iv).
Thorold and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 150, on M. (Mr. German) *re* Pet., 6147 (iv).
Tobacco Commissioner's Rep., Printing, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) 7437 (iv).
Tobacco Industry, Duties on, &c. (remarks) 7786 (iv).
——— Rep. of Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Monk) to print, 7542 (iv).
Toronto Harbour, Complaint *re* Nav. Equipment (remarks) 4685 (iii).
Toronto Island, Protection *re* Washings, &c. (Ans.) 2807 (ii).
See 'Garrison.'
Transportation Commission, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 5271 (iii).
Treadgold Concession, Cancellation of, O.C., &c. (remarks) 5762 (iii).
——— Delay in bringing down Commissioner's Rep. (remarks) 7794 (iv).
——— on Inquiry for Rep. of Commissioners, 1054 (i), 3727 (ii).
——— Rep. of Judge Britton, Instructions *re* (remarks) 5925 (iii).
——— Rep. of Judge Britton laid on Table, 8024 (v).
——— Suppression of Rep. of Commissioners (statement) 6013 (iv).
Trent Canal (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5284 (iii).
Twelfth of July, Precedent for Adjournment (remarks) 6264 (iv).
Vegetables Duty: *See* 'Farm.'
Verdun, Damages caused by Floods (remarks) 1057 (i).
Veterans Association, Land Grants to in N.W.T. (remarks) 8532 (v).
Victoria and Haliburton, Printing of Voters' Lists, &c. (Ques.) 2375 (ii).
Victoria Day Adjournment (M.) 3227, 3434 (ii).
Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Voters' (Dom.) Lists, Expenditure *re* Printing (Ans.) 333 (i).
——— on Inquiry (Mr. Clare) *re* Printing, 8025 (v).
——— Preparation and Distribution, on Inquiry for, 3540 (ii).
——— Printing and Distribution, &c., Names of Counties (Ans.) 6885 (iv).
——— Printing and Distribution, &c. (remarks) 680 (i), 3727 (ii), 4138, 4331 (iii).
Voters' Lists for Unorganized Territories, Preparation for (Ans.) 1137 (i).
See 'Man.', 'Printing Bureau,' 'St. Flore,' 'Victoria,' &c.
Welland Canal Lighting Contract (Ans.) 1877 (i).
Whips' Arrangements for Adjournments, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Taylor) 2111 (ii).
Whitley, Lt.-Col., and Min. of Ag., on M. (Mr. Hughes) to adjn., Ques. of Order, 6876 (iv).
Winnipeg Board of Trade, Res. protesting against Charter to Co. for Transportation Route, &c. (Ans.) 2803 (ii).
Winnipeg 'Free Press,' Amounts paid to, 1903-4 (Ans.) 2376 (ii).
Winnipeg Newspapers, Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ans.) 2184, 2373 (ii).
Winnipeg Post Office, Purchase of Site (Ans.) 1134 (i).
Woodstock, N.B., Drill Hall, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ans.) 2928 (ii).
Yukon Ter., Regulations of Gov. in Council, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sifton) 8655 (v).

Lavell, Mr. J. R., *Leeds & Grenville.*
Book Postal Rate, Reduction, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5730 (iii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 2133; on sec. 11, 2641; in Com. (amt.) 3326; on M. for 3° (amt.) 3416 (ii).
Ottawa Carbide Co., Purchases from (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5317 (iii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Champagne) in Com., 4131, 4258 (iii).
Poonamalie Dam, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 7784 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Rideau (Smith's Falls bridge) 7469 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (acetylene gas) 5313 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 5749 (iii).
Wolford Centre Post Office, Mail Service, Change, &c. (Ques.) 2928 (ii).
——— closing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).

Lavergne, Mr. A., *Montmagny.*

Cigarette Legislation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Maclaren) 351 (i).

'Gauss,' Str., Complaints *re* Crew (remarks) 5224 (iii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1154 (i).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 8095; on Amt. (Mr. Tisdale) to M. for 3°, 8201 (v).

SUPPLY :

Quarantine, Que. (Grosse Isle steamer) 4194 (iii).

Lavergne, Mr. Louis, *Drummond and Arthabaska.*

SUPPLY :

Railways—I.C.R. (additional sidings) 5942 (iii).

Law, Mr. B. B., *Yarmouth, N.S.,*

Canada Temperance Act Amt. (B. 119) 1° m., 3435; 2° m., 3998, 4724 (iii).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A., *East Prince, P.E.I.*

Alberton and Kildare Mail Service, Contracts *re*, &c. (Ques.) 3128 (ii).

Alberton Station, Abolishing 'Y' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6232 (iv).

Bait Freezers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5021 (iii).

Belfast and Murray Harbour Ry., Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 993 (i).

Berrigan, Mr. John, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4410 (iii).

Bounties to Fishermen, Methods of Payments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5036 (iii).

Cape Traverse, P.E.I., Mail Contracts, Total Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 4825 (iii).

Charlottetown P.O., Letter Delivery, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5747 (iii).

Charlottetown Station, P.E.I. Ry., Number of Employees, Payment, &c. (Ques.) 789 (i).

Chicken Fattening Stations, P.E.I., Number in operation, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3771 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 6467 (iv).

Curtis Creek, P.E.I.Ry., Straightening Curves, Contract *re* (Ques.) 1210 (i).

Fishery Award, Method of paying Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5031, 5036 (iii).

Fishing Bounties, Principle of Payment, &c. (Ques.) 4695 (iii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 1503; in Com. on Res., 1749; Shareholders' Meeting, Rep. in 'Ry. News' (read) 1750 (i).

Hillsborough Bridge and Murray Branch, P. E.I. Ry., Amounts expended (Ques.) 2186 (ii).

——— Expenditure in Detail (M. for stmnt.*) 3771 (ii).

See 'Murray.'

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Expenditure for Mar. Provs. *re* Capital Account (remarks) 8372 (v).

——— Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6119 (iv).

——— Train Service between Point du Chene and Moncton (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8355 ; Res. from Board of Trade, Charlottetown (read) 8357 (v).

Kinkora Station, P.E.I. Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6231 (iv).

Lighthouse Pamphlets *re* St. Lawrence, &c., for Campaign Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5010 (iii).

Lobster Canneries, Established in P.E.I., Location, &c. (Ques.) 2185 (ii).

Lobster Canning Licenses, P.E.I., Official Letter from Min., &c. (M. for copies of pets.*) 3771 (ii).

Lobster Fishermen and Packers, Prices paid, &c. (Ques.) 2185 (ii).

——— Bounties to, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5044 (iii).

Lobster Fishing, Bounties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5020 (iii).

Lobster Fisheries, P.E.I., Pet. *re* granting Licenses for Packing, &c. (M.) to adjn., 4669; Pet., Cor., &c. (read) 4669 (iii).

Mail Service at Lot 14, P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5748 (iii).

Montague Bridge Harbour Master, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4413 (iii).

Murray Harbour and Belfast Ry., P.E.I., Cost of Construction, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1880 (i).

Murray Harbour and Hillsborough Bridge, Construction from Southport, &c., Memorials, Surveys, &c. (M. for copies*) 1880 (i).

——— Amounts expended (Ques.) 2186 (ii).

——— Cost of Excavation, &c. (Ques.) 4826 (iii).

——— Estimated Cost of first 11 miles, &c. (Ques.) 1210 (i).

——— Expenditure, Rolling Stock, &c. (Ques.) 991 (i).

——— Extension, &c. (Ques.) 990 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3754 (ii), 4054, 4580 (iii).

See 'Hillsborough.'

North Enmore Post Office, Establishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5748 (iii).

Norton, R. B. & Co., Payments to *re* P. E. I. Ry. (Ques.) 219 (i).

O'Leary to West Cape Mail Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 8775 (v).

Pension Scheme for Ry. Employees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6221; Letter from J. J. Wallace (read) 6227 (iv).

P. E.I., and Terms of Confederation, on M. (Mr. Hackett) that Com. rise, 5329 (iii).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

P. E. I. Mail Contracts, Arrangements, &c. (Ques.) 1138 (i).
P. E. I., Mail Service 1903, 1904, Number of Trips, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 867 (i).
P. E. I. Post Office Inspector (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5748 (iii).
P. E. I.Ry., Branch Lines, Pets. *re* Construction (Ques.) 992, 1135 (i).
——— Pay to Labourers, Circular quoted in Com. of Sup., 6220 (iv).
——— Shortage of Cars, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6227 (iv).
P. E. I. Winter Mail Service, Special Trains, Rates, &c. (Ques.) 5581 (iii).
See 'Curtis.'
Sackville and Cape Tormentine Mails, Contract *re* (Ques.) 557 (i).
Summerside Harbour Light, Acetylene Gas, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5320 (iii).
Summerside Improvements, P. E. I. Ry., in Com. of Sup., 8369 (v).
SUPPLY :
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 5010 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouses) 5320 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, P.E.I. (Charlottetown Dom. building) 462 (i).
Public Works—Dredging Mar. Provs.—(hydraulic plant) 7880 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (roling stock) 8355; P.E.I. (Summerside improvements) 8369 (v); (working expenses) 6220 (iv).
Traverse and Tormentine Mail Service, Contract *re* Ice Service (Ques.) 3943 (iii).

Lemieux, Mr. R., (Solicitor General) *Gaspé.*

Exchequer Court Act (right of appeal) Amt. B. 37 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 3°, 4002 (iii).
Farm and Garden Products, Protection *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) 4020 (iii).
France and Canada SS. Service, Contract *re* on M. (Mr. Casgrain) for Cor., 4703 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1082 (i).
McCarthy, Osler & Co., Payments to (remarks) 679 (i).
N. W. Ter., Representation Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Casgrain) on M. for 2°, 3990 (iii).
Representation in H. of C., Appeals of N.B., and P.E.I., &c. (remarks) 3874 (ii).
Solicitor General's Duties and Private Practice (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 433 (i).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Year-book) 2741 (ii).
Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 433 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Longueuil P.O.) 672 (i).
Supreme Court Library, Condition, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).

Lennox, Mr. H., *South Simcoe.*

Alien Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir William Mulock) in Com., 8648 (v).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service and Allan Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6178 (iv).
Audit Acts, Consolidation, &c.: *See* 'Finances of Canada.'
Auditor General, Duties and Powers, &c., on M. for Sel. Com. on Finances of Canada, 4275 (iii).
——— Resignation, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) to Sup., 6571 (iv).
See 'Finances.'
Budget, on The, 4527 (iii).
Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase B. 163 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 8241 (v).
Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6238, 6244 (iv).
Canals, Working Expenses, &c. (remarks) on Conc., 6684 (iv).
Cattle-guard Commission, Appnmts., Instructions, Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 2848 (ii).
Cattle-guard Commission, Delay in bringing down Ret. (remarks) 3727 (ii).
——— Expenditure, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7475 (iv).
——— Extra Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 6545 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 2459, 2602, 3539 (ii).
——— Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1357 (i).
Charlottetown Station Building, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6238 (iv).
Cheese Curing at Brockville, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 3754 (ii).
Chicken Fattening Stations, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7433 (iv).
Civil Service Act, Procedure *re* Increases and Promotions, in Com. of Sup., 1825 (i).
Cornwall and Williamsburg Canal Workshops, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 6544 (iv).
Cornwall Canal, M. P. Davis' Contract *re* Lighting, &c., on M. for Sel. Com., on Finances of Canada, 4283 (iii).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8479 (v).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6672 (iv).
——— (remarks) *re* Discussion, 7538 (iv).
Criminal Code Amt. (B. 56) 1° m., 1133 (i).
Customs Dept., Salaries and Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1799 (i).
Davis Contract *re* Lighting Cornwall Canal, on M. for Sel. Com. to Finances of Canada, 4283 (iii).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8479 (v).
Dundonald, Lord, G.O.C., Dismissal by Govt., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Fisher) 4628 (iii).
Estimates, Make-up of, &c., 'jumbled,' Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7762 (iv).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Experimental Farm, Accounts, Discrepancies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7377 (iv).

——— Expenditure and Accounts (remarks) 7189 (iv).

Finances of Canada (M.) for Sel. Com., 4275 (iii).

——— Consolidation, &c. (M.) for Sel. Com. (remarks) 3768 (ii).

Govt. Car for Ry. Commissioners (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7505 (iv).

Govt. Cars used by Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7499 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 2153; on sec. 1, Amt. (Mr. Barker) 2983, 3000; on Amt. (Mr. Clarke) 3011 (ii).

——— on sec. 2 of Bill, 2670 (ii).

——— on sec. 3 of Bill, 3054, 3059 (ii).

——— on sec. 2 of schedule, 2291 (ii).

——— on sec. 4 of schedule, 2353, 2378 (ii).

——— on sec. 11 of schedule, 2638 (ii).

——— on M. for 3° (amt.) 3515 ; on Amt. (Mr. Bennett) 3537 (ii).

——— Signing of Agreement (remarks) 2461 (ii).

——— Surveys, Expenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6291 (iv).

——— Surveys, Govt. parties, &c. (Ques.) 6544 (iv).

Gratuities to Ry. Employees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8925 (v).

'Great Lakes to the Ocean,' Distribution of Pamphlet (Ques.) 550 (i).

Guelph Public Buildings (remarks 599 (i).

Holt, Mr., Expenditure *re* Cattle Guard Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7476 (iv).

I.C.R., Additional Sidings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6271, 6285 (iv).

——— Bridges, Cost of Strengthening (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6267 (iv).

Item Appropriations in Supply, Balance Column (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iv).

Library Messengers, Increases to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9004 (v).

Murray Harbour Bridge and Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I. Ry., Letter from Aud. Gen. (read) on Conc., 6682 (iv).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8811 (v).

Official or Private Cars, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Tolton) for Ret., 3770 (ii).

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Champagne) in Com., 4181 (iii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, &c., Ry., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Osler), Order (Ques. of) 'a member must accept statement of another member,' 2876 (ii).

——— (remarks) 2881, 2887 (ii).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Railway Act (employees liability) Amt. (B. 73) 1° m., 1780; 2° m., 3831 (ii); on M. for 2°, 4708 (iii).

Railway Estimates, Information *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6267 (iv).

Railway Freight Rates in Ontario, on M. (Mr. Broder) to adjn., 2949 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 171 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 8811 (v).

Rural Mail Delivery, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9011 (v).

St. Lawrence Route, Distribution of Pamphlets, &c. (Ques.) 550 (i).

Seed Growers' Association incorp. B. 151 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 7229; in Com., 7232, 7241 (iv).

Seeds, Sale and Inspection, B. 125 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 3723 (ii).

——— Information, &c. (Ques.) 332 (i).

Small, E. A., Patent Relief B. 93 (Mr. Logan) in Com., 3058 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying branch) 7433; (experimental farm accounts) 7377 (iv) ; (general statistics) 8959 (v) ; (Imperial Institute, London) 3741 (ii).

Canals—Chambly (Denault's culbert) 6870 ; (landing wharf) 6873; (macadamizing roads) 6870; (Ste. Therèse Island) 6869 (iv).

Canals—Galops (enlargement) 6296 (iv).

Canals—Generally (surveys) 7475 (iv).

Canals—Lachine (St. Ours locks) 6865 (iv).

Canals—Trent (Katchawannoe lake dredging) 7466; (construction) 6830, 6860; (Peterborough dam) 7468 (iv).

Canals—Soulanges (workshops, &c.) 6863 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (contingencies) 9037 (v); Customs (salaries) 1799, 1825 (i); Railways (contingencies, printing, &c.) 5911 ; (salaries) 5893 (iii); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 6151 (iv).

G.T. Pacific Ry. (surveys) 8963 (v).

House of Commons (contingencies) 8997 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G.B. and Can.) 6178; (Halifax and Liverpool) 6212 ; (St. John and Belfast) 6214 (iv); (obstructions in Montreal Harbour) 8928 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Barrie P.O.) 9019 (v); (Guelph P.O.) 652 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Victoria Museum) 460 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Actonvale P.O.) 656; (Grosse Isle quarantine station) 666; (Longueuil P.O.) 668 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (generally) 9031 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (repairs, &c.) 7774 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Campbellton wharf) 9026 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Baxter's harbour) 7636; (Digby pier) 7637; (Larry's River) 7642 (iv); Ont. (Barrie pier) 9028 (v); (Depot Harbour) 7754; (Goderich harbour) 7758 (iv); (Sault Ste. Marie wharf) 9029; (Severn River obstructions) 9029 (v).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Grand Vallée pier) 7768; (Magdalen Islands) 7779; (Rimouski piers) 7780; (Rivière du Loup) 7781 (iv).
Railways—Generally (surveys and inspections) 7475 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 6291 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (additional sidings) 5937, 5942 (iii), 6285 (iv); (Amherst accommodation) 5957; (Amqui station) 5964; (Grand Narrows bridge) 5979; (Lévis accommodation) 5921; (Rivière du Loup shops) 5972; (St. John accommodation) 5973; (semaphores) 5986; (Stellarton station) 5970; (Sydney increased accommodation) 5914; (vestibule equipments) 5937; (Windsor branch) 6219 (iv); (Windsor, N.S., station) 5954, 5955 (iii).
Railways—Miscellaneous (Gov. Gen.'s car) 7498 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (Alberton station) 6009; (Charlottetown station) 5991 (iii); (Murray Harbour Branch, and Hillsborough Bridge) conc., Letter of Aud. Gen. (read) 6682; (working expenses) 6238 (iv).
Weights and Measures (inspectors' salaries) 4045 (iii).
Transportation Commission, Inquiry for Rep., 6362 (iv).
Trent Canal, Date of Appropriations, &c. (Ques.) 248 (i).
Vancouver Dry Dock, Contract with Mr. Jackson, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9059; Cor. (read) 9060 (v).
——— Arrangement *re* Discussion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7877 (iv).
Wilton Post Office, Dismissal of Postmaster, Charges, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5667 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 1471 (i).
Wolverhampton Exhibition, Purchase of Whisky (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3750 (ii).

Leonard, Mr. J. E. E., *Laval.*
Alien Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8630 (v).
Beauharnois Canal, Number of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 3129 (ii).
Béique, Supt. of Beauharnois Canal, Superannuation, &c. (Ques.) 3128 (ii).
Cotton Mills, Valleyfield, Pets. *re* Closing, &c. (Ques.) 8778 (v).
Credit Companies, Incorp. by Letters Patent, Number, &c. (Ques.) 3129 (ii).
Doncaster Indian Reserve, Indemnity to Indians (Ques.) 987 (i).
——— O.C., Cor. *re* Exchange, &c. (M. for copies) 2831 (ii).
——— Payment of Squatters Claims (remarks) 5859 (iii).
Electoral Lists for Prov. of Quebec, Printing, Distribution, &c. (Ques.) 1667 (i).
Farm and Garden Products, Protection *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) 4022 (iii).
Hay Inspectors, Appnmt. of (Ques.) 401 (i).

Leonard, Mr. J. E. E.—*Con.*
Inland Revenue (tobacco) Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8431, 8548 (v).
Iroquois Indian Reserve, Squatters Claims, &c. (Ques.) 988 (i).
Laprairie, Damages caused by Floods (remarks) 1148 (i).
Pointe aux Anglais Lightkeepers, Duties, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 7225 (iv).
Point aux Trembles Wharf, Request for Aid, &c. (Ques.) 3760 (ii).
Public Lands, Sale of by Govt. (Ques.) 8778 (v).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Longueuil P.O.) 670 (i).
Tow-boat purchased by Govt. from Laperrière & Frères (Ques.) 7442 (iv).
Valleyfield Cotton Mills, Pets., *re* Closing (Ques.) 8778 (v).
——— Res. from Town Council, &c. (Ques.) 3129 (ii).
Weirs and Fishways in River Jesus (Ques.) 402 (i).

Logan, Mr. Hance J., *Cumberland.*
Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8617, 8621, 8647 (v).
Archibald, Maj., *re* Parole System and Penitentiaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7955 (iv).
Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6244 (iv).
Cumberland County Harbours and Rivers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9023 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 1738 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, Ont., Votes in Estimates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9030 (v).
I. C. R., Interference *re* Running of Trains (personal explanation) 6276 (iv).
——— Pay of Workingmen (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6226 (iv).
——— Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6119 (iv).
Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6502 (iv); on M. for 3° (amt.) 8202, 8288; on Amt., 8267 (iv).
Mutual Reserve Life Ins. Co.'s B. 161 (Mr. Heyd) in Com., 8679 (v).
Nappan Experimental Farm, Staff Increases, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4961 (iii).
Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s (B. 71) 1°*, 1547 (i).
Preferential Tariff, Importations *re* Canadian Ports (prop. Res.) 5074 (iii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Express Cos., 6711 (iv).
Small, E. A., Patent Relief (B. 93) 1°*, 2282; in Com., 3056 (ii).

Logan, Mr. Hance J.—*Con.*
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 4961 (iii); (Winnipeg exhibition) 2756 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Parrsboro') 9023 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (Amherst station) 5960 (iii).
West Canadian Collieries Limited, B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4687 (iii).
Winnipeg Exhibition, Ry. Rates from the East *re* Exhibits (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2756 (ii).
Woollen and Cotton Industries, Tariff *re* (remarks) 1468 (i).

Mackie, Mr. T., *North Renfrew.*
Lumber Industry in B. C., and Tariff Readjustment (remarks) 2565 (ii).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s (B. 12) 1°, 396 (i).

Mackinnon, Mr. D. A., *East Queen's, P.E.I.*
Cigarettes, Prohibition and Sale, B. 128 (Mr. Maclaren) in Com., 5148 (iii).
Fishing Bounties, Method of Payments, 5038, 5053 (iii).
Gironcoli, S., Patent Relief (B. 126) M. to receive Pet., 3719 ; 1°*, 3846 (ii); in Com., 5034 (iii).
Marconi Wireless System, Use of by Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8919 (v).
Patent Invention No. 66,962 (S. Gironcoli) Validity, &c. (M.) to receive Pet., 3719 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Railways—P.E.I. (Vernon River bridge) 8367 (v).

MacLaren, Mr. A. F., *North Perth.*
Cement, Analysis of, Imports from U.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3918 (ii).
Cheese Curing, Paraffining, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7412 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying branch, cheese, &c.) 7412 (iv).

Maclaren, Mr. W. S., *Huntingdon.*
Cigarettes, Sale and Manufacture, Prohibition of (M.) 247; prop. res., 336 (i) ; in Com. on Res., 3772 (ii).
Cigarettes, Sale and Manufacture Prohibition (B. 128) prop. Res., 3978; 1° m., 4052 ; 2° m., 4724; Agreed to (Y. 52; N. 28) 4724; in Com., 5130 (iii).
Dundonald, Lord, G.O.C., Speech at Military Dinner, Montreal *re* Political Interference, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (read) 4491 (iii).
Inland Revenue (tobacco) Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8424 (v).

Maclean, Mr. W. F., *East York, Ont.*
Address, on The, 80 (i).
American Fishing Cos., and Bonding Privileges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7584 (iv).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Bell Telephone System, Decision of Ry. Commissioners at Port Arthur (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Act Amt. B. 132, 6713 (iv).
Bell Telephone Co. and Rys., Connections (remarks) in Com. on Ry. B. 171, 8822 (v).
C. P. R. Lands, Purchase by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7197 (iv).
C. P. R., St. Philippe d'Argenteuil Branch, Subsidy in Com. on Res., 8822 (v).
Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8824 (v).
Express Cos. and Telephone Co.'s Amt., to Ry. Act B. 132, in Com., 6687 (iv).
Express Companies, Jurisdiction of Ry. Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7449 (iv).
Express and Telephone Co.'s *re* Post Office Control (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).
Govt. Ownership : *See* 'Municipal,' , Telephones,' &c.
Grain Inspection B. 113 (Sir Richard Cartwright) on M. for 2°, 3876 (ii).
G. T. Ry. Co.'s Arbitration B. 152 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 1°, 6466 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 2197 (ii); on sec. 3, 3046, 3155 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3171 (ii).
G.T.P. Ry., Directors to be British Subjects, in Com. on Ry. Act Amt. B. 132, 5681 (iii).
—— Surveys, Aliens deported, Action taken *re* (remarks) 6542 (iv).
—— labour investigation, rep. of Judge Winchester, inquiry for, 5685 (iii).
Hudson Bay Fishery Patrol, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv).
Hudson's Bay Lands, Purchase of by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7197 (iv).
Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Co., Defective Service, on M. (Mr. Scott) to adjn., 2781 (ii).
Militia Act Amt, B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6471 (iv); (active service) 8067, 8104 (v); (defence of Can.) 6488 (iv).
Municipal Ownership *re* Rys., Express Cos. and Telephones, &c., on M. for 2° of Ry. Act Amt. B. 6, 3797 (ii).
—— (remarks) in Com. on Ottawa Electric B., 4218 (iii).
Newspaper Postage Rate (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5724 (iii).
Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8801 (v).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals paid to Govt. and by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7624 (iv).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 110, (Mr. Champagne) onM. for 1°, 3016 (ii); in Com., 4218; on M. for 3°, 4268 (iii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Parcel Post System Improvement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).
Parliament Square and Buildings, Lighting Contract, &c. (Ques.) 3310 (ii).
Port Arthur and Fort Wiliam Telephone System, Decision of Ry. Commissioners (amt.) to Ry. Act Amt. B. 132, 6713 (iv).
——— Ref. to Supreme Court, &c. (Ques.) 4274 (iii).
Postal and Parcel Note System, Comparison with European Methods (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5744 (iii).
Postal Service, &c.: *See* 'Telephone,' &c.
Post Office Act (inspectors) Amt. B. 153 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8030 (v).
Public Ownership of, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ottawa Electric Bill, 4218 (iii).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Co., Penalty Clause (remarks) 2801 (ii).
See 'Long Lake.'
Questions put by Members (M.) to adjn., 1153 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order, 1153 (i).
Railway Act (highway crossings) Amt. B. No. 2, on M. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) to ref. to Com. on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, 3773; in Com., 3782 (ii).
——— (express and telephones) Amt. (B. 6) 1°m., 323 (i); 2° m., 3797; on Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 3819 (ii).
——— B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 5681 (iii); (amt.) *re* Express Cos., 6687; (amt.) *re* Tolls, Standard Tariffs, 6761; (amt.) *re* Decision of Ry. Commissioners, 6713; on M. for 3° (amt.) *re* Express Companies, 7545; Amt. Neg. (Y. 33; N. 72) 7550; Telephone Control, 7563; Amt. Neg. (Y. 25; N. 94) 7564; (amt.) Two-Cent Passenger Rate, 7551; Neg. (Y. 17; N. 94) 7562 (iv).
Ry. Act Amts., Legislation *re* by Govt. (remarks) 3754 (ii).
Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 171 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 8791; (amt.) *re* Telephones, 8827 (v).
Railway Standard Passenger Tariffs (Ques.) 5580, 5760 (iii).
Railway Statistics, Collection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7488 (iv).
Scholes, Lou, Amateur Champion Oarsman of World (remarks) 7437 (iv).
Sessions, Length of, Delay in calling Parlt., &c. (remarks) 6639 (iv).
Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co.'s B. 42 (Mr. Ganong) on M. for 3°, 4270 (iii).
Straits Settlement Currency, Circulation in this Country (remarks) 2189 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Dom. Lands (survey *re* J. H. Mailhoit) 7197 (iv).
Railways—Miscellaneous (Govt. cars) 7500; (statistics) 7488 (iv).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Tariff Commission, Appnmt. of (remarks) 8843 (v).
Telephone and Telegraph Lines, Nationalization of (M.) to adjn. House., 3017 (ii).
Telephone and Telegraph System *re* Postal Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5689 (iii).
Telephone Connections at Port Arthur and Fort William, and C.P.R. Stations, Decision of Ry. Commission (M. for copy of judgment) 561 (i).
See 'Port Arthur.'
Telephones, Express Cos., &c., on M. for 2° of B. 6, 3797 (ii).
See 'Ry. B. 132.'
Telephone Question, Ref. to Supreme Court (remarks) 4726 (iii).
Telephone System and Govt. Ownership (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5745 (iii).
Two-Cent Rate over Railways (remarks) on M. for 2° of B. 6, 3802 (ii).
See 'Ry. B. 132,' &c.
Vegetables and Fruit imported from U.S., Amt. to Mr. Monk's M. for Ret., 2808 (ii).
Ways and Means (dumping clause) in Com. on Res., 8854 (v).

Macpherson, Mr. R. G., *Burrard.*
American Fishing Cos. and Bonding Privileges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7583 (iv).
Cigarette Legislation, on prop. Res. (Mr Maclaren) 357 (i).
Crawford Bay and St. Mary's Ry. Co.'s incorp (B. 96) 1°*, 2681 (ii).
Dog-fish Pest, Commission *re* Investigation (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7019 (iv).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7654 (iv), 8139 (v).
Dom. Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 54) 1°*, 1133; 2° m., 1338 (i).
Elevators in H. of C., Imperfect Machinery, &c. (remarks) 2458 (ii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., on sec. 7, on Amt. (Mr. Earle) 3270; on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Clare) 3465 (ii).
——— Emplymt. of British Subjects on Surveys, and Alien Labour Law, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Clare) to M. for 3°, 3465 (ii).
Gregory, Lt.-Col., Resignation, &c., on M. for Sup., 7733 (iv).
Lumber Industry in B.C., and Tariff Re-adjustment, on M. (Mr. Morrison) 2567-9 (ii).
Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) (active service) in Com., 8069 (v); (riots, &c.) 6519 (iv).
Pacific Bank of Canada Bill (M.) to place on Order Paper, 7783 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Ocean and River Service (Ostall River obstructions) 8931 (v).

Macpherson, Mr. R. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buidings—B.C. (Vancouver P.O.) 704 (i).

Quarantine B.C. (William's Head inspection) 4166 (iii).

Tobacco Revenue Law, Violation of, Names of Persons, Fines, &c. (Ques.) 5582 (iii).

Vancouver Dry Dock, Charges *re* Contract, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9065 (v).

Vancouver Island Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 95) 1°*, 2681 (ii).

Whitehorse and Alsek Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 26) 1°*, 596 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. L. G., *North Simcoe.*

British American Assurance Co.'s (B. 115) (M.) to receive Pet., 2927; 1° m., 2° m., 3227 (ii).

Cigarette Legislation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Maclaren) 353 (i).

Collingwood General and Marine Hospital (B. 23) 1°*, 596 (i).

Exchequer Court Act (right of appeal) Amt. B. 37 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 3°, 3999 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Amt. (B. 34) 1° m., 789 (i).

——— B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 1719 (i); in Com., on sec. 3, 3199 (ii).

G. T. P. Ry., Production of Confidential Documents, on M. (Mr. Barker) for Papers, 3964 (iii).

McCarthy, Osler & Co., Payments to by Govt. (personal explanation) 678 (i).

Midland Dock Purchase, Ques. of Privilege, 364 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. (B. 7) 1° m., 330 (i).

Western Assurance Co.'s (B. 114)—(M.) to receive Pet., 2927; 1° m., 3226; 2° m., 3226 (ii).

McColl, Mr. J. B., *West Northumberland, Ont.*

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (pay and allowance) in Com. on Res., 2910 (ii).

McCool, Mr. C. A., *Nipissing.*

Atlantic Mail Steamers, Average Speed (Ques.) 7081 (iv).

Bruce Mines Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8798 (v).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s (B. 83) 1°*, 2001 (ii).

Pontiac and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 21) 1°*, 596 (i).

Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 171 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 8798 (v).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Bryson) 9032 (v).

Timigami Ry. Co.'s (B. 94) 1°*, 2282 ; in Com., 3758 (ii).

McCreary, Mr. W. F., *Selkirk.*

Canada Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 24) 1°*, 596 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 1718 (i); in Com., on sec. 2, 2310; on sec. 9, 2502, 2517 (ii).

Manitoba and Keewatin Ry. Co.'s (B. 52) 1°*, 1132 (i).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) on M. for 2°, 256 (i).

North American Telegraph Co.'s (B. 53) 1°*, 1132 (i).

SUPPLY :

Customs, Outside Ports (salaries) 1900 (i).

Public Works—Buidings—Man. (Winnipeg, P.O.) 690; (Winnipeg, public building) 696 (i).

Winnipeg Port of Customs, Complaints, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1900 (i).

Woollen and Cotton Industries, Tariff *re* (remarks) 1461 (i).

McEwen, Mr. G., *South Huron.*

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Grand Bend pier) 7844 (iv).

McGowan, Mr. J., *Centre Wellington.*

Fresh Meat Transportation in Cold Storage, &c. (Ques.) 678, 789 (i).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 125 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 4943 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 7404 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Cobourg armoury) 532 ; (Gueph, armoury) 536; (Guelph, P.O.) 538, 651 (i).

McLennan, Mr. A., *Inverness.*

Dog-fish Pest, Commission *re* Investigation (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7014 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Port Hawkesbury, 7644 (iv).

Malouin, Mr. R., *Quebec Centre.*

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 19) 1°*, 477 (i).

Cascapedia Manufacturing & Trading Co.'s incorp. (B. 20) 1°, 477 (i).

Quebec and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s (B. 43) 1°*, 1053 (i); in Com., 2372 (ii).

Temisoucata Ry. Co. (B. 28) 1°*, 788 (i).

Marcil, Mr. C., *Bonaventure.*

Address, on The, 177 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8144 (v).

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. (B. 134) 1°*, 4666 (iii).

Interprovincial Bridge Co., of N.B., incorp. (B. 57) 1°*, 1297 (i); in Com., 2370 (ii).

Marcil, Mr. C.—*Con.*
Lièvre and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 41) 1°*, 1053 (i).
Montreal Terminal Ry. Co.'s (B. 120) 1°*, 3719 (ii).

Marcil, Mr. J. E., *Bagot.*
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Actonvale P.O.) 658 (i).

Mignault, Mr. R. M. S., *Yamaska.*
Montreal and Atlantic Ry., Operation, &c. (Ques.) 6149 (iv).

Monet, Mr. D., *Laprairie & Napierville.*
Laprairie, Damages caused by Floods (remarks) 1142 (i).
Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) Exemptions from Service, in Com., 6432 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Higgin's shore pier) 7737 (iv).

Monk, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*
'Admiral,' Str., Gaspé Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7447 (iv).
Allan Strs., Tonange of Turbines (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6158 (iv).
Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6259 (iv).
Chambly Canal, Indemnity for Damages by Floods, Names, &c. (Ques.) 6365 (iv).
Chambly Canal Piers, Contract *re* Stone furnished (Ques.) 3388 (ii), 5073, 5580 (iii).
Chinese Labour in S. Africa, Protest *re*, &c. (Ques.) 218 (i).
Cigarettes, Prohibition and Sale, B. 128 (Mr. Maclaren) in Com., 5139 (iii).
Cote St. Paul Bridge, Delay in completing (remarks) 3227, 3752 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8137 (v).
Doncaster Indian Reserve, O.C., Cor., &c., *re* Exchange, on M. (Mr. Léonard) for copies, 2834 (ii).
Dundonald, Lord, G.O.C., Dismissal by Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 5411 (iii).
——— Confidential Papers *re*, laid on Table (remarks) 5276 (iii).
——— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 5182 (iii).
——— Political Interference *re* Militia, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Fisher) 4638 (iii).
Farm and Garden Products, Protection *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) 4013 (iii).
See 'Vegetables.'
Financial Situation, on Review of (Mr. Bell) 8322 (v).
'Gaspesia,' Str., Quebec and Gaspé Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7445 (iv).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Gervais, Alphonse, Emplymt. by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 3127 (ii).
Goodrick, Henry, Resignation from P. O. Dept. (M. for cor.) 3949 (ii).
Govt. Buildings, Rents in Montreal and Ottawa, &c. (Ques.) 551 (i).
Govt. Cars used by Ministers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7496 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 896 (i); on M. for 3°; Amt. 3390; Amt. Neg. (Y.38; N. 91) 3396; on Amt. (Mr. Clare) 3453 (ii).
G. T. P. Ry., Appnmt. of Fourth Commissioner, 3383 (ii).
——— Cor. (M.) for Ret., 559 (i).
——— Emplymt. of British Subjects and Alien Labour Law, on Amt. (Mr. Clare) to M. for 3°, 3453 (ii).
——— Surveys, &c., *re* Eastern Division (remarks) 3371 (ii).
G. T. Ry., Terminal Facilities, Montreal, Amounts paid (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5923 (iii).
Hillsborough Bridge, Tolls collected (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6001 (iii).
Ice-Breakers for Winter SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iv).
Immigrants, Destitute and stranded in Canada (remarks) 3849 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8398, 8408 (v).
Lachine Canal, Authority given for Ry. Purposes (remarks) 6150 (iv).
Lachine Canal Bank, Cor. on behalf of Municipality (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5912 (iii).
——— Lease to Municipality (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7519 (iv).
Lachine Canal Employees, Delay in Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7528 (iv).
See 'Cote St. Paul.'
Laprairie, Damages caused by Floods (remarks) 1149 (i).
Letter Carriers, Montreal P.O., Absent on sick Leave, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 153, 8037 (v).
——— Working Over-time, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 153, 8037 (v).
Little Rapid, Removal of Obstruction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5285 (iii).
Mails sent via New York to G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6162 (iv).
Metric System, Purchase of Instruments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).
Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6469; (target practice) in Com., 6469, 6536 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. Logan) 8275 (v).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Montreal Post Office, Complaints *re* Delivery, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5698 (iii).
——— Extra Work of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 552 (i).
See 'Letter Carriers.'
——— Increased Accommodation, &c. (Ques.) 551 (i).
Montreal Turnpike Trust and Westmount, on M. for Cor. (Mr. Rivet) 3947 (iii).
——— (M.) for Ret., 560 (i).
——— Negotiations *re* Abolition (prop. res.) 562 (i).
O'Brien, Messrs., Claim *re* Soulanges Canal, Settlement, &c. (remarks) 8024 (v).
Port Arthur Harbour B. 98 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 3898 (ii).
Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 153 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8037 (v).
Post Office Employees, Extra Remuneration (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5698 (iii).
Public Works and Marine Depts., Transfer of Duties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7602 (iv).
Quebec Southern Ry. Co., O.Cs. *re* Amalgamation, &c. (Ques.) 555 (i).
'Richelieu' Dredge, Cost of Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 6543 (iv).
St. John d'Iberville Post Office Site, Pets. *re* (M. for copies*) 2847 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 1876, 1879 (i).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, O.C. *re* Transfer to Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7602 (iv).
St. Mathias Wharf, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 8254 (v).
S. A. War, Canadians injured, Care of by Govt. (Ques.) 3538 (ii).
South Shore Ry. Amalgamation, Cor. *re* (M. for copies*) 561 (i).
SUPPLY :
Chambly (damages by floods) 7537 ; (electric power house) 7537 ; Lachine (St. Gabriel basin) 7535 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (salaries) 3912 (ii); Railways (printing, &c.) 5911 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 7447; (G. B. and Can.) 6158; (Murray Bay, summer service) 7457; (Murray Bay, winter service) 7454; (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 7453; (Quebec and Gaspé Basin) 7445 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (removal of obstructions) 5285 (iii).
Post Office (Montreal Post Office accommodation) 5698 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (lighting, repairing, &c.) 7620 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Grand Narrows bridge) 5984; (Murray Harbour branch) 5999 (iii).
Ticket-of-Leave System, Names of Prisoners, &c. (M. for ret.) 3766 (ii).
Tobacco Commission to U.S., Instructions *re* (Ques.) 7224 (iv).
Tobacco Commisioner's Rep., Printing (M.) 7436, 7542 (iv).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Tobacco Culture at St. Jacques de l'Achigan, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 8026 (v).
Tobacco Culture in Wisconsin, Investigation, Agent's Name, &c. (Ques.) 1877 (i).
Tobacco Experiments at Experimental Farms, Bulletins, &c. (Ques.) 7438 (iv).
Tobacco Industry, Protection and Encouragement, (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6894; Neg. (Y. 19; N. 50) 6927 (iv).
Tobacco Trade with Belgium, Amounts paid to B. Dugas (Ques.) 1878 (i).
——— Rep. of B. Dugas (M. for copy*) 2848 (ii).
Verdun, Damages caused by Floods (remarks) 1056 (i).
Vegetables and Fruits imported from U.S., Quantity, Duties collected, &c. (M. for ret.) 2808 (ii).
See 'Farm.'

Morin, Mr. J. B., *Dorchester.*
Detroit Post Office, Dorchester County, Closing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9007 (v).
——— Recommendation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).
Farm and Garden Products, Protection *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) 4033 (iii).
Fishing Leases granted to F. M. Markey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8945 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on sec. 2 (amt.) 2671; on Amt. (Mr. Lavell) 3331 (ii).
G. T. P. Ry., Contracts, Surveys *re* Eastern Sections (remarks) 3367 (ii).
——— Emplymt. of Canadians as Engineers (remarks) 3124 (ii).
Ice-Breakers *re* St. Lawrence SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7456 (iv).
Lévis, Ry. Construction (remarks) 7468 (iv).
Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Logan) 8275 (v).
North Shore Power and Pulp Co.'s Wharf, in Com. of Sup., 7974 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 249 (i).
Quebec Central Ry. Co., Amounts received by Govt. annually (Ques.) 2373 (ii).
——— (M. for ret.) 3949 (iii).
Quebec Central Ry. Mail Service, Letter from Commercial Travellers' Association (read), 9005 (v).
Seven Islands Wharfs, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7829, 7974, 7976 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Charges of Management (Dom. and Provincial accounts) 242 (i).
House of Commons (salaries) 8979 (v).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Murray Bay summer service) 7457; (St. Lawrence winter service) 7456 (iv).
Post Office (Mail service in Quebec) 9006 (v).

Morin, Mr. J. B.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Actonvale P.O.) 659; (Lévis P.O.) 667 (i); Dredging, Ont. (new plant) 7881; Harbours and Rivers, Mar. Provs. (repairs, &c.) 7774; Que. (Anse aux Gascons) 7766; (Baie St. Paul) 7766; (Grand Vallée pier) 7768; (Seven Islands wharf) 7829, 7974; Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 7891; Telegraph Lines (Bersimis to Godbout) 7894 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Grand Narrows bridge) 5982 (iii); (St. Romuald siding) 8365 (v); (spur line, River Ouelle) 7532 (iv).

Morrison, Mr. A., *New Westminster.*
Century Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 121) 1°*, 3719 (ii).
Chinese Legislation, Interference with, &c. (remarks) 1354 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 74 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 8150; Amt. wthdrn., 8214 (v).
Lobster Propagation in Pacific Waters, Experiments, &c. (Ques.) 2373 (ii).
Lumber Industry, B.C., and Tariff re-adjustment, (M.) to adjn., 2558; Pet. *re*, circulated privately (read) 2560-61; Letter *re* Protest, sent to Min. of Cus. (read) 2563 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Co. (M.) to receive Pet., 2368, 2457 (ii).
Pacific Northern and Omineca Ry. Co.'s (B. 66) 1°*, 1450 (i).
Similkameen and Keremeos Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 136) M. to receive Pet., 3846 (ii); 1°*, 4822 (iii).
Steamboat Inspection Act (mechanical power) Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Préfontaine) on M. for 1°, 2684 (ii).
Thompson River Improvement Co.'s incorp. (B. 79) 1°*, 2001 (ii); in Com., 4692 (iii).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s (B. 33) 1°*, 789 (i).

Mulock, Hon. Sir William, K.C.M.G., (Postmaster General), *North York, Ont.*
Advertisements *re* Patent Medicines, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 153, 8045 (v).
Alberton and Kildare Mail Service, Contracts *re* (Ans.) 3128 (ii).
Alien Labour Act Amt. (B. 162) 1° m., 7898 (iv); 2° m., 8565; in Com., 8573; 3° m., 8665; on Amt. (Mr. Boyd) 8665 (v).
Alien Labour Commission, Appnmt. of Counsel (remarks) 4331 (iii).
Athens P.O., Charges against Postmaster, &c. (Ans.) 2601 (ii).
Atlantic Mails, Contracts *re*, on Inquiry for Ret., 1875 (i).
Book Postage Rates, Increase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5716 (iii).
Brockville and Ottawa and G.T.R. Ry. Connections, Govt.'s Action (remarks) 2119, 2461 (ii).
——— Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) 3314 (ii).

Mulock, Hon. Sir William, K.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Bronte Harbour Light (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).
Campaign Literature *re* Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5004 (iii).
Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6258 (iv).
Canadian Mail to G.B., Weight, Amt. paid, &c. (Ans.) 216 (i).
Carbide Manufacture, Monopoly, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5308 (iii).
Charlottetown, P.E.I., Post Office, Free Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5747 (iii).
Chesley Postmastership, Appnmt., &c. (Ans.) 4825 (iii), 7081 (iv).
Dargavel, John, Dismissal from Elgin Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5690 (iii).
Detroit Post Office, Closing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9007 (v).
——— Recommendation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).
Dom. Steel Co.'s Strike, N.S., Cor. between Govt. and Co. (read) 4215 (iii).
Drop Letter Rate, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5725 (iii).
Dundonald, Lord, Remarks of Sol. Gen. in England *re*, &c., 7087 (iv).
See 'Whitley.'
Fair-Wage Clause and Bonused Rys., Application *re* (Ans.) 6883 (iv).
Fair-Wage Res., Application to Dom. Iron and Steel Co. (Ans.) 5866 (iii).
Franking Privilege *re* Campaign Literature (Ans.) 5271 (iii).
Galt Post Office, Better Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5715 (iii).
Govt. Employees on Rys., Redress as to injuries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5849 (iii).
Glen Ross Postmaster, Resignation or Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3436 (ii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., on sec. 4 of schedule, 2421; on sec. 5, 2433; on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Clare) 3450 (ii).
——— Emplymt. of British Subjects on Surveys, &c., Alien Labour Law, on Amt. (Mr. Clare) to M. for 3°, 3450 (ii).
——— Emplymt. of Canadians as Engineers (remarks) 3030 (ii).
——— Emplymt. of Canadians as Engineers, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 72, 3070; Cor. (read) 3071 (ii).
G.T.P. Surveys, Emplymt. of Aliens, Cor. with Engineers' Association (remarks) 4827, 4926 (iii).
——— Com. from Mr. Griffith (Ans.) 990 (i).
——— Deportation of Aliens, &c. (Ans.) 1138 (i), 6542 (iv).
——— Emplymt. of Aliens, Commission to Judge Winchester (remarks) 3875 (ii).

Mulock, Hon. Sir William, K.C.M.G.—*Con.*
G.T.P. Ry., Mr. Hays' Memo *re* Pet. for Aid, Nov., 1902; on Criticism (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in holding back documents from Rets., 3715 (ii).
——— Investigation *re* Aliens on Surveys, Rep. of Evidence furnished to G.T.P. Authorities, Tel. (read) 7022 (iv).
——— (remarks) 6880 (iv).
——— Rep. of Judge Winchester, on Inquiry for, 5578 (iii).
——— on Inquiry for further Cor., 5685 (iii).
Grimsby Post Office, Complaints *re* Accommodation, Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5694 (iii).
Halifax Mail Delivery, The O'Connell Case (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5712 (iii).
House of Commons P.O., Reorganization, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5853 (iii).
Immigrants, Italians, Rep. *re* Destitute Condition (remarks) 6931 (iv).
Information supplied by Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1995 (i).
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Accidents and Loss of Life, Names, &c. (Ans.) 5840 (iii).
I.C.R., Political Apointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6111 (iv).
Judges appointed as Political Partisans (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6118 (iv).
Kingston Post Office, Investigation *re* Charges against J. L. Renton, &c. (Ans.) 2929 (ii).
Labour Commission, Industrial Troubles Investigation, Rep., &c. (Ans.) 992 (i).
Labour Commission, 1886, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 4824 (iii).
Labour Dept., Rep. (presented) 204 (i).
Labour Troubles, B.C., on Inquiry for Rep., 1054 (i).
Land Titles Act Amt. B. 158 (Mr. Sifton) in Com., 8714 (v).
Laschinger, Mr., Appnmt. as Asst. Sec. of P.O. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5651 (iii).
Letter Carriers, Cor. *re* P. O. Act Amt. (statement) 5845 (iii).
——— Grading as to Salary (remarks) in Com. on B. 153, 8041 (v).
——— Grievances, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 2555 (ii).
——— Pay on sick Leave (Ans.) 6889 (iv).
——— Pressure *re* accepting New Scheme (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5754 (iii).
——— Superannuation Scheme, in Com. on P.O. Act B. 153, 8031 (v).
Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry., Delay in Delivery of Mail, &c., Rep. of Controller (read) 2364 (ii).
Mail Bag Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5756 (iii).
See 'Brockville.'
Mail Matter carried via New York (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6200 (iv).

Mulock, Hon. Sir William, K.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Maynooth Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 5841 (iii).
Members appointed by Govt. to Offices (remarks) on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1222 (i).
Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (active service) in Com., 8093 (v).
Montreal Post Office, Complaints *re* Accommodation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5702 (iii).
New Brunswick Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. Gibson) on M. to receive Pet., 5186 (iii).
Newspapers, Canadian, Sums collected for Carriage from 1897 and June, 1903, to April, 1904 (Ans.) 4825 (iii).
Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8801 (v).
O'Leary to West Cape, Mail Contracts (Ans.) 8775 (v).
Ottawa Post Office Employees, Bonus *re* Fire (remarks) 5587 (iii).
Owen Sound, Complaints *re* Postal Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5645 (iii).
Parcel Postage, Date of Increase, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9010 (v).
Postmasters' Guarantee Fund (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5850 (iii).
Postage, Free to M.P.'s, Instructions to Postmaster (remarks) 6549 (iv).
Postal and Parcel Rates, Comparison with European System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5744 (iii).
Postal Rates between Can. and G.B., 1868 (Ans.) 7438 (iv).
Postal Rates, Dates of Reduction (Ans.) 8776 (v).
Postal Union Rates, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5718 (iii).
Post Office Act Amt. (B. 153) 1° m., 6541 (iv); in Com., 8029, 8030; 3° m., 8265; on Sen. Amts., 9052 (v).
P.O. Act and Letter Carriers' Grievances, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 2555 (ii).
Post Office Clerks, Outside Service, Increased Remuneration, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup,. 5713 (iii).
Post Offices, Closing, &c., Rule for (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9012 (v).
Post Office Dept., Rep. (presented) 204 (i).
Post Office Employees, Extra Remuneration (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5702 (iii).
——— Life Insurance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5848 (iii).
Post Office Finances, Rep. of Auditors *re* Investigation (read) 5605 (iii).
Post Offices opened, Number, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5745 (iii).
Post Office Orders, Printing in French, &c. (remarks) 6550 (iv).

Mulock, Hon. Sir William, K.C.M.G.—*Con.*

Post Office Salaries, Deficiency, Pamphlet *re*, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5588 (iii).

P.E.I. Mail Contracts, Arrangements *re* (Ans.) 1138 (i).

——— Number of Trips, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 868 (i).

——— Winter Mail Service, Special Trains, Rates, &c. (Ans.) 5581 (iii).

Qu'Appelle and Wishart Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ans.) 2556 (ii).

Quebec Central Ry. Mail Service, Complaints from Commercial Travellers' Association, &c., in Com. of Sup., 9007 (v).

Railway Mail Clerks, N.W.T., Pet. *re* increased allowance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5757 (iii).

Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 171 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 8801 (v).

Railway Subsidies B. 157 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 8129 (v).

River John Mail Contract, on Inquiry for Papers, 6024 (iv).

Ross, Hon. Wm., Letter as Minister of Militia *re* Political Interference (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6064 (iv).

Rural Free Mail Delivery and U. S. System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5750 (iii).

Rural Mail Service, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9012 (v).

St. Thomas P.O., Asst. Postmaster, Appnmt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5746 (iii).

Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co.'s B. 42 (Mr. Ganong) on M. for 3°, (M.) to adjn. Deb., 4271 (iii).

'Star' Newspaper, Canvassing by Postmasters, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5691 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Board of Civil Service Examiners (contingencies) 9038 (v).

Canals—Trent (construction) 6833, 6846 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Post Office Dept. (salaries) 5586 (iii).

Customs (inspectors' salaries) 1986 (i).

Justice—Supréme Court (E. R. A. Taschereau) 9040 (v).

Labour Dept. (Alien Labour) 9014; ('Gazette' correspondents) 9013 (v).

Post Office (letter carriers promotions) 5854; (mail service) 5744; (medical allowance for J. W. Cameron) 5852; (Mrs. Innes, compensation) 5851; (payments for service) 5852 (iii); (ry. mail, additional clerks) 9011 (v); (Ross, Mr., Chief Inspector) 5851; (Sloan, M. W., allowance) 5846 (iii); (superintendents in cities) 9011; (Toronto P.O. salaries) 9005 (v).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Bryson) 9032 (v).

Telephone System and Govt. Ownership (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5746 (iii).

Toronto Post Office Clerks, Overtime, Remuneration (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5753 (iii).

Mulock, Hon. Sir William, K.C.M.G.—*Con.*

Ways and Means (dumping clause) in Com. on Res., 8863 (v).

Welland Canal, Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6111 (iv).

Whitley, Lt.-Col., and Min. of Ag., on M. (Mr. Hughes) to adjn., 6876 (iv).

Wilton Postmaster, Charges against, on M. (Mr. Wilson) for Cor., 221 (i).

——— Confidential Cor., &c. (remarks) 4927 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5662 (iii).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 2002, 2133, 2558, (ii).

——— Ret. *re*, Confidential Letters (remarks) 2602 (ii).

——— letters of Mr. H. Walker (remarks) 4827 (iii).

Wolford Centre Mail Service, Change, &c. (Ans.) 2928 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5750 (iii).

Murray, Mr. T., *Pontiac.*

Immigrants, Destitute and stranded in Can., &c. (remarks) 3872 (ii).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8814 (v).

Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 171 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 8814 (v).

Northrup, Mr. W. B., *East Hastings.*

Address, on The, 184 (i).

Bessemer & Barry's Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 90) 1°*, 2282 (ii).

Dundonald, Lord, G.O.C., Dismissal by Govt., (remarks) 7135 (iv).

——— Political Interference *re* Militia, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Fisher) 4633 (iii).

Express and Tel. Cos., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to Ry. Act Amt. B. 132, 6705 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 924 (i); in Com. on sec. 3 of Bill, on Amt. (Mr. Roche) 3182 (ii).

——— on sec. 7 of Bill (amt.) 3243; on Amt. (Mr. Blain) 3240 (ii).

——— on sec. 1 of schedule, 2207 (ii).

——— on sec. 2 of schedule, 2294 (ii).

——— on sec. 9 of schedule, 2603 (ii).

——— on M. for 3°, (amt.) 3420 (ii).

G. T. P. Ry., Mr. Hays' Memo. *re* Pet. for Aid, dated Nov. 1902, on Criticism (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) in holding back from Rets., 3714 (ii).

Gregory, Lt.-Col., Resignation, &c., on M. for Sup., 7734 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries, Chief Engineer, Duties *re* (M. for copies of O.C.*) 1882 (i).

Militiamen not on Duty, Amenable to Partisan Interests (remarks) 7734 (iv).

Northrup, Mr. W. B.—*Con.*

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Express Cos., 6705 (iv).

Ross Rifle, Contract, Tests, &c. (Ques.) 6886 (iv).

Woollen and Cotton Industries, Tariff *re* (remarks) 1465 (i).

Oliver, Mr. F., *Alberta.*

Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s incorp. (B. 85) 1°*, 2116 (ii).

Bell Telephone System, on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) in Com. on Ry. Act Amt. B. 132, 6735 (iv).

Cigarette Legislation, on prop. Res. (Mr. W.S. Maclaren) 349 (i).

Dundonald, Lord, G.O.C., Dismissal by Govt., (remarks) 7141 (iv).

Edmonton Street Ry. Co.'s (B. 111) M. to extend time for receiving Pets., 2680 (ii) ; in Com., 5499 (iii).

Govt. Patronage *re* Newspaper, &c. (remarks) 6642 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 72) on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1311 (i); in Com., on sec. 3, on Amt. (Mr. Roche) 3177 ; Emplymt. of British Subjects on Surveys, and Alien Labour Law *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Clare) to M. for 3°, 3471 (ii).

——— Emplymt. of Canadians as Engineers (remarks) 3121 (ii).

——— Reduction of Rates between Eastern and Western Can. (remarks) 1466 (i).

Hudson's Bay and Northwest Ry. Co.'s (B. 68) 1°*, 1450 (i); on Sen. Amts., 4627 (iii).

Immigration Campaign Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7343 (iv).

Immigration, Medical Inspection, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7323 (iv).

Lumber Industry in B.C., and Tariff Re-adjustment, on M. (Mr. Morrison) 2580 (ii).

Macoun, Mr. J. M., Rep. *re* Agricultural Com. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7347 (iv).

——— Rep. *re* Peace River, Distribution, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7208 (iv) .

Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 161) (Mr. Heyd) in Com., 8681 (v).

N. W. Mounted Police Force, Increase, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2700 (ii).

Oil Borings in N. W. T. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7217 (iv).

Okotoks and High River Lumbering and Development Co.'s incorp. (B. 51) 1°*, 1054 (i).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Osler) *re* Attack by Mr. Scott, 2887; called to order, 2888, 2893 (ii).

Oliver, Mr. F.—*Con.*

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Ry. Commissioners, 6735; on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Passenger Tolls, 6764 (iv).

Sessions, Length of, and Delay in calling Parlt. (remarks) 6640 (iv).

Standard Passenger Tolls, on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) in Com. on Ry. B., 6764 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Geological Survey (oil explorations) 7217 (iv).

Immigration (medical inspection 7323 (iv).

N. W. Mounted Police (pay of force) 2700 (ii).

West Canadian Collieries Limited (B. 80) 1°*, 2001 (ii) ; M. for Com., 4271; in Com., 4686, 4691, 4866, 5864; (M.) to ref. back to Com. on Private Bills, 5034 (iii); in Com., 6093; on Sen. Amts., 7721 (iv).

Woollen and Cotton Industries, Tariff *re* (remarks) 1466 (i).

Osler, Mr. E. B., *West Toronto.*

Acetylene Gas, Purchase for Lights, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5307 (iii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7787 (iv).

Budget, on The, 4492 (iii).

Calgary & Edmonton Ry. Co., &c., Attack by Mr. Scott (personal explanation) 2849; Letter of Mr. Kingsmill (read) 2850 (ii).

Cigarette Legislation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Maclaren) 354 (i).

Dom. and Provincial Accounts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 236 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7668 (iv).

Dundonald, Lord, G.O.C., Dismissal by Govt. (remarks) on M. to adjn., 4623 (iii).

——— (remarks) 7148 (iv).

Fisheries Protection, Regulations *re* Trap-Nets (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 840 (i); on M. for 2°, 2165; 'Ownied' ref. to in debate, 2165 (ii).

——— in Com., on sec. 1 of Bill on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 2969, 2982 (ii).

——— on sec. 2 of schedule, 2296 (ii).

——— on sec. 4 of schedule, 2344, 2425 (ii).

——— on sec. 5 of schedule, 2431 (ii).

——— on sec. 6 and 7 of schedule, 2450 (ii).

——— on sec. 9 of schedule, 2628 (ii).

——— on sec. 11 of schedule, 2646 (ii).

G. T. P. Bill, on Amt. (Mr. Clarke) and Mr. Speaker's Decision *re* Vote being taken, 2057 (ii).

Gregory, Lt.-Col., Resignation, &c., on M. for Sup., 7731 (iv).

Home Bank of Canada (B. 45) 1°*, 1053 (i).

Osler, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*
Hudson Bay Fisheries Protection (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv).
Immigration into U. S., Refusal through Canadian Ports, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7289 (iv).
Lighthouse Board Organization (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5327 (iii).
Live Stock Association Law (remarks) in Com. on Seeds B., 7237 (iv).
Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Cos., &c., Personal Explanation *re* Attack by Mr. Scott, M.P., 2849; Letter of Mr. Kingsmill read) 2850 (ii).
See 'Calgary,' &c.
Militia Act B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6450, 6500 (iv).
Militiamen out of Uniform, controlled by Minister, &c. (remarks) 7732 (iv).
Monarch Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 69) 1°*, 1450 (i); 3° m., 3479 (ii).
Napanee River Buoy Service, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5339 (iii).
Naval School for Militia, in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
New England Fish Co., and Canadian Fisheries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).
Ottawa Carbide Co.'s Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5307 (iii).
Personal Explanation, Long Lake and Saskatchewan, and Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Cos., 2849; Letter of Mr. Kingsmill (read) 2850 (ii).
Port Arthur Harbour B. 98 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 3898 (ii).
Seed Growers' Association incorp. B. 151 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7237 (iv).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 4074, 5196 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Imperial Institute, London) 3731 (ii).
Charges of Management (Dom. notes) 245 (i).
Dom. Lands (surveys, &c.) 7033 (iv).
Fisheries (protection, overseers, &c.) 7572 (iv).
Immigration (agents' salaries) 7289 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (acetylene gas lights) 5307 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 5201; (marine biological station) 5290; (naval militia) 5267; (wrecking expenditure) 5262 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Dalhousie harbour) 7747; (Petit Rocher) 7749; Ont. (Goderich harbour) 7760; (Toronto, eastern entrance) 7864; P.E.I. (Higgin's shore pier) 7737; Que. (Seven Islands, wharf) 7830; (Three Rivers wharf) 7835 (iv).
Quarantine—Que. (Grosse Isle steamer) 4198 (iii).
Toronto Island, Damage by Lake Ontario Waters, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 224 (i).
Toronto Island, South Side Piers, in Com. of Sup., 7875 (iv).
Wrecking Investigations, Expenditure *re*, in Com. of Sup., 5264 (iii).

Parmelee, Mr. C. H., *Shefford.*
Agriculture and Colonization Com. (M.) to sit concurrently with Hse., 6676 (iv).
Cigarettes, Prohibition and Sale, B. 128 (Mr. W. S. Maclaren) in Com., 5141 (iii).
Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8430 (v).
Printing of Parliament, 3rd Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 8531, 8652 (v).

Paterson, Hon. William (Minister of Customs), *Wentworth and Brant.*
Agricultural Implements, Rebate of Duties since 1896 (Ans.) 8781 (v).
American Cattle shipped in Bond, Permission, &c. (Ans.) 1875 (i).
Aylmer, Ont., Establishment as an Outport (Ans.) 7440 (iv).
Bain, Mr., Preparation of Liberal Campaign Literature, Salary, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1858, 1911 (i).
Berlin Customs Port, Rev. collected (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1903 (i).
Binder Twine and Barbed Wire made and exported in 1891, 1896, 1901 (Ans.) 791 (i).
Board of Customs, Constitution of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1980 (i).
Bonding Privileges: *See* 'Coasting.'
Cab Hire for Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5015 (iii).
Coasting Trade on the Pacific, Free Entry of Can. Goods, O.C., &c., 1055 (i).
Cotton, &c., Quantity and Value Imported and exported for six Years (Ans.) 555 (i).
Customs Act Amt. (B. 170) M. for Com. on Res., 8389; in Com. on Res., 8716 (v).
Customs Collector at Victoria, B.C., Appnmt. (Ans.) 558 (i).
Customs, Instruction Book (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1988 (i).
——— Ports opened, Number, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1959 (i).
——— Salaries and Increases, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1791 (i).
——— Staff, Number of Permanent Clerks, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1902 (i).
——— Staff, Outside Ports, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1889 (i).
See 'Coasting.'
Experimental Farm Accounts, Discrepancies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7379 (iv).
Fish carried in Bond to U.S. Ports, O.C. *re*, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7586 (iv).
Grain Shipments from Port Arthur, &c., to Buffalo (Ans.) 216 (i).

Paterson, Hon. William—*Con.*

Grain Shipments received at Quebec, &c. (Ans.) 215 (i).

Grain Shipments received at Montreal (Ans.) 216 (i).

Grain Shipments received at Upper Lake Ports, &c. (Ans.) 216 (i).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on sec. 4, 2390 (ii).

Indian Corn, Rebate paid to Distillers, &c. (Ans.) 6680 (iv).

Palmerston Customs Collections, &c. (Ans.) 557 (i).

Preferential Tariff, Value of Imports, Free Imports, &c. (Ans.) 3539 (ii).

Private Sec.'s Allowance and Civil Service Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1948 (i).

St. John, N.B., Customs Collector, Appnmt., &c., (Ans.) 332 (i).

South Africa, Exports from Canada, Value, &c. (Ans.) 5270 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Agriculture (experimental farm accounts) 7379 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1791 (i).

Customs (Board of Customs) 1980; (contingencies) 1987; (inspectors' travelling expenses) 1970; Outside Service (ports salaries) 1889, 1959 ; (statement) read, 1971 (i).

Tariff Reductions, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 8859 (v).

Tobacco, Customs Duties collected in 1904, Legislation *re*, 1897 (Ans.) 8781 (v).

Trade and Navigation, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 204 (i).

Ways and Means (dumping clause) in Com. on Res., 8848 ; (glass) 8873 ; (goats) 8893 (v).

Winnipeg Port of Customs, Complaints, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1901 (i).

Woollen Blankets, Tariff *re* (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 8878 (v).

Pope, Mr. R. H., *Compton.*

Budget, on The, 4446, 4452 (iii).

Butter and Cheese, Commission to investigate weighing, &c. (Ques.) 1547 (i).

Dairy Products, Fraudulent Weighing at Montreal (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 7244; Neg. (Y. 46; N. 75) 7271 (iv).

——— (M.) for Cor., 3769 (ii).

See ' Fraudulent.'

Dunodnald, Lord, G.O.C., Dismissal by Govt., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Fisher) 4651 (iii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) *re* Political Interference, 5521 (iii).

Fraudulent Weighing of Dairy Products at Montreal (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 7244 ; Neg. (Y. 46; N. 75) 7271 (iv).

Pope, Mr. R. H.—*Con.*

Govt. Railways, Operating Expenses, Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 4823 (iii).

——— Receipts and Expenses (Ques.) 5760 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 1318 (i); in Com., 2225, 2238, 2265; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 3399 ; Neg. (Y. 43; N. 92) 3412 (ii).

——— Mr. Hays' Memo. *re* Pet. for Aid, Nov. 1902, on Criticism (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) *re* holding back documents from Rets., 3711 (ii).

Immigration Salaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7337 (iv).

Japan, Trade *re*, in Agricultural Products (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4125 (iii).

McIntosh, Mr. John, late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 6548 (iv).

Railway Act (express and telephone Cos.) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Maclean) on M. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) to ref. to Com. on Rys., 3828 (ii).

Railway Freight Rates in Ont., on M. (Mr. Broder) to adjn., 2938 (ii).

Rebellion Losses, 1885, Payment of Claims, on M. (Mr. Davis) for Ret., 2828 (ii).

St. Francis River Ice Piers, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3389 (ii).

Sherbrooke Drill Hall, Location of Site, Representations *re* (Ques.) 2376 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibition) 4098 (iii); (Imperial Institute, London) 3729 (ii).

Immigration (agents' salaries) 7342 (iv).

Inland Revenue—Excise (methylated spirits) 3925 (ii).

Quarantine—B.C. (steamers, &c.) 4206; Dom. (cattle) 4209; Que. (Grosse Isle steamers) 4192 (iii).

Wolverhampton Exhibition, Purchase of Whisky (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3746 (ii).

Wood Alcohol, Purchase from Standard Chemical Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3925 (ii).

Porter, Mr. E. G., *West Hastings.*

Dundonald, Lord, G.O.C., Dismissal by Govt. (remarks) 7166 (iv).

Glen Ross Postmaster, Resignation or Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3436 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1267 (i); in Com.,on sec. 7 (amt.) 3282-3 ; on M. for 3° (amt.) 3700 (ii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8548 (v).

Maynooth Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 5841 (iii).

Patent Office Models, Sale by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 398 (i).

Porter, Mr. E. G.—*Con.*
Port Arthur Harbour B. 98 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 3902 (ii).
Steamers sold by Govt., Price, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4205 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Quarantine—B.C. (steamers, &c.) 4205 (iii).
Trenton Harbour, Dredging, Appnmt. of Overseer (Ques.) 6149 (iv).
Trent Valley Canal, Completion, &c., on M. for Sup., Reps. and Cor. (read) 8735 (v).

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond (Minister of Marine and Fisheries), *Maisonneuve.*
Acetylene Gas Contracts, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5030 (iii).
Acetylene Gas in Lighthouses on St. Lawrence River, Notification to Keepers *re* Change (Ans.) 6681 (iv).
——— Location, &c. (Ans.) 2187 (ii).
Acetylene Gas, Installation System, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5305, 5813 (iii).
——— Rep. (read) 8932 (v).
Acetylene Gas Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii).
Aids to Navigation, in Com. of Sup., 5813 (iii).
Alberton, P.E.I., Buoy Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5345 (iii).
——— Fishery Warden, Name, &c., Complaints *re* (Ans.) 4824 (iii).
'Alert,' Str., Number of Employees, Wages, &c. (Ans.) 8389 (v).
——— Transfer to Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7593 (iv).
American Fishing Cos., and Bonding Privileges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7581 (iv).
'Arctic,' Str.: *See* 'Gauss.'
'Bayfield,' Str., Sale of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5230; Letter of Mr. Harrison (read) 5231 (iii).
Bay of Fundy Lighthouse Service, in Com. of Sup., 5805 (iii).
Beaver River Fish Hatchery, Establishment of, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7587 (iv).
Bernier, Capt., and Str. 'Gauss,' Production of Capt. Spain's Rep. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5284 (iii).
See 'Gauss.'
Berrigan, Mr. John, P.E.I., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4411 (iii).
Bounties to Fishermen, Method of Payments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5037 (iii).
Bronte Harbour Light, Rep. of Mr. Anderson (read) in Com. of Sup., 5825 (iii).
Burnt Island Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2377 (ii).
Cab Hire for Minister of Marine (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5008 (iii).
Campbellton, Wharf and Shives Lumber Co.'s Monopoly (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7791 (iv).

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*
Canadian and American Regulations *re* Fishing on St. Lawrence (remarks) 4416, 4492 (iii).
——— Memorandum *re*, (read) 4578 (iii).
——— Regulations *re* Order issued by Ont. Govt. (remarks) 5190 (iii).
Canadian Ensign and Merchant Marine, Replaced by British Flag at Argentine Republic (remarks) 5188 (iii).
C. P. R. Steamers, Insurance Rate *re* St. Lawrence (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5819 (iii).
'Cape Breton' Str., Accident in St. Lawrence Channel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5027 (iii).
Cape Traverse, P.E.I., Mail Contracts, Total Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 4825 (iii).
Carbide Lighting for Buoys, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5301 (iii).
Caron, Mr., Emplymt. at St. Roch Traverse Lighthouse (Ans.) 4274 (iii).
Casualties and Accidents in St. Lawrence, Rep. from Lloyd's List (read) in Com. of Sup., 5820 (iii).
Casualties and Wrecks in Canadian Waters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5836 (iii).
Casualties, Rep. of Commissioners *re* Pilots (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii).
DesRoches, John M., Charges against (Ans.) 1134 (i).
Dog-Fish Pest, Commission *re* Investigation, Rep. of Prof. Prince, &c., on M. for Sup., 6973 (iv).
——— on inquiry for Rep. of Commissioners, 6929 (iv).
——— Investigation by Govt. (Ans.) 2377).
——— Use of as Lobster Bait, Official Tests, &c. (Ans.) 3310 (ii).
Doncaster Indian Reserve, Exchange, O.Cs., Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Léonard) for Copies, 2836 (ii).
'Druid,' Str., Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5202 (iii).
False Ducks Lighthouse, in Com. of Sup., 5806 (iii).
Fish Driers in Use (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7589 (iv).
Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 74) 1° m., 1780 (i); 2° m., and in Com., 8146, 8214 (v).
Fisheries Deptl., Rep. (presented) 794 (i).
Fisheries Jurisdiction between Provs. and Dom. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).
Fisheries Protection, Regulations *re* Trap-Nets (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Fishery Award, Method of Payments to Provinces (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5049 (iii).
——— Payment of Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5031, 5037 (iii).

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*
Fishery Conference, &c., Negotiations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5049 (iii).
Fish Hatcheries, List of Establishments in Mar. Provs. (read) 7587 (iv).
Fishing Bounties Payments, Alleged Frauds, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5002 (iii).
——— Appnmt. of Commissioner, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5202 (iii).
——— Delay in Payment of Cheques (Ans.) 2118 (ii).
——— Increased Payment, in Com. of Sup., 7593 (iv).
Fishing Leases in Northern Waters to Mr. Markey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8944 (v).
Fishing Licenses granted in Lakes North of Winnipeg (Ans.) 7783 (iv).
Fishing Privileges, Cumberland Lake, Grants, Size of Nets, &c. (Ans.) 2929 (ii).
Fishing Regulations in Mar. Provs. *re* Salmon Fishing (statement) 8782 (v).
——— (remarks) 8774 (v).
Fish Shippers, Claims *re* Compensation for Loss of Fresh Fish (Ans.) 2117 (ii).
Fish Trap-Nets, in B. C. Waters, Licenses issued, &c. (Ans.) 2601 (ii).
Fog Signals : *See* 'Submarine.'
Fort William, Ont., Harbour (B. 99) 1° m., 2681 (ii).
Gananoque Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal of, (Ans.) 2377 (ii).
See 'Acetylene,' &c., 'Lindoe,' &c.
Gas Buoys. *See* 'Acetylene Gas.'
'Gauss,' Str., Capt. Bernier's reported Interview *re* Charges of Crew (remarks) 5221 (iii).
——— Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5210 (iii).
See 'Bernier.'
Georgian Bay Gas Lights, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5831 (iii).
Gilbert, Dr., Apnmt. at Fraserville (Ans.) 7081 (iv).
Govt. Offices, Rentals in Montreal and Ottawa, &c. (Ans.) 550 (i).
'Great Lakes to the Ocean,' Distribution of Pamphlet, &c. (Ans.) 550 (i).
'Gulnare,' Str., for Tidal Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5287 (iii).
Halifax Harbour Lightship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5831 (iii).
Hope Island, Quantity of Timber cut, Contract with Manley Chew, &c. (Ans.) 2808 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5240 (iii).
Hudson's Bay, Fishery Patrol (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv).
——— Fishing Rights granted to Cos., &c. (Ans.) 2118 (ii).
Hydrographic Surveys on Lake Superior (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5836 (iii).

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*
Ice-breaking Steamers on Georgian Bay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8920 (v).
Inspection of Machinery, &c., on Steamers : *See* 'Shipping Casualties Act,' 'Steamboat Inspection Act.'
Insurance Rates on Steamers *re* St. Lawrence Route, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5819 (iii).
James Bay Fishing License to A. McNee (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
Laferrière, Appnmt. as Gunner on Str. 'Gauss' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5211 (iii).
Laprairie, Damages caused by Floods (remarks) 1145 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service, Campaign Sheet *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5003 (iii).
——— (wharf repairs) 5836 (iii).
Lighthouse Board, Organization of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5327 (iii).
Lighthouses, Illuminated by Acetylene Gas, Location, &c. (Ans.) 2187 (ii).
Lighthouse Inspection, &c., Installation of Acetylene Gas, General Statement, &c., in Com. of Sup., 5813 (iii).
Lighthouses, Salaries, &c., Ques. of Order in Com. of Sup., 5320 (iii).
Lindoe Light, Change to Acetylene Gas, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5812 (iii).
See 'Gananoque.'
Little Rapids, Removal of Obstructions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5287 (iii).
Lobster Canneries established in P.E.I., Locations, &c. (Ans.) 2185 (ii).
Lobster Cultivation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5063 (iii).
——— Bounties for, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5020 (iii).
——— Investigation, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 553 (i).
Lobster Fishing Season, Extension of Close Season, Pet. *re* (remarks) 4927 (iii).
Lobster Packers, &c., Average Prices paid, &c. (Ans.) 2186 (ii).
Lobster Propagation in Pacific waters, Experiments, &c (Ans.) 2373 (ii).
'Lurcher' Lightship, Designer's Name, &c. (Ans.) 2378 (ii).
——— Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1141 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5831 (iii).
McNee, Mr., Fishing Leases, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8944 (v).
See 'Hudson's Bay,' 'Fishing Leases.'
Magnetic Observatory, Toronto (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5836 (iii).
Marconi Station at Glace Bay, Expenditure *re* Operation (Ans.) 792 (i).
——— Installation in Gulf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5829 (iii).

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*
Marconi System on Dom. Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5835 (iii), 8920 (v).
——— Wireless Stations, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5834 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries Estimates (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8902 (v).
Markey, F.: *See* 'Fishing Leases,' &c.
Masters and Mates Certificates Act (inland waters) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3796 (ii), 5167 (iii).
Masters and Mates, Examination (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5219 (iii).
——— Fees for Examiners (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5806 (iii).
Montague Bridge Harbour Master, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4413 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Board, Res., from Chamber of Commerce *re* Quarrels, &c. (Ans.) 3132 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commission (B. wthdn.) 3846 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 576 (i).
Napanee River Buoys, Cor. with Mr. Mowers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5234 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5028, 5335 (iii).
——— Painting, &c. (Ans.) 6149 (iv).
Naval Militia Establishment (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).
Naval Militia Organization: in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii), 8931 (v).
Navigable Waters Act Amt. (B. 112) 1° m., 3016 (ii); in Com., 4075 (iii).
New England Fish Co., and Canadian Fisheries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Newfoundland Fisheries Treaty with U.S., on M. (Mr. Kaulbach) 2130 (ii).
Ottawa Carbide Co.'s Contract with Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5301 (iii).
Oyster Culture (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5033 (iii).
Pilotage Act (harbour jurisdiction, &c.) Amt. (B. 100) 1° m., 2681 (ii); in Com., 4057 (iii).
Pilots, Examinations and Certificates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5830 (iii).
See 'Shipping Casualties Act,' &c.
Port Arthur, Ont., Harbour (B. 98) 1° m., 2681; 2° m., and in Com., 3877 (ii).
Prescott Carbide Factory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5302 (iii).
Prescott Lighthouse, Construction *re*, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7597 (iv).
Prescott Lighting Works, Transfer from Morrisburg (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8918 (v).
Public Works and Marine Depts., Transfer of Duties, O.C. *re* (read) 7599 (iv).
——— List of Dredges, Plant, &c. (read) 7600 (iv).

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*
'Quadra,' Str., Complaints *re* Treatment of Crew (Ans.) 8255 (v).
Quebec Harbour Commission, B. wthdn., 3846 (ii).
Rattenbury, Mr., Apnmt. as Freight Agent, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5202 (iii).
Red Island Lightship, &c., Pet. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5324 (iii).
St. John Marine Hospital, in Com. of Sup., 5837 (iii).
St. Lawrence Channel, Accidents and Defective Lighting, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5027 (iii).
——— Insurance Rates, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup.,7607 (iv).
——— Lighting, &c., Change to Acetylene Gas, &c., General Statement, in Com. of Sup., 5813 (iii).
——— Lighting System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5810, 5817 (iii).
——— O.C. *re* Transfer of Duties from Public Works to Marine Dept. (read) 7599 ; List of Dredges, Plant, &c. (read) 7600; History of Ship Channel (read) 7613 (iv).
St. Lawrence Floods, Res. from Chamber of Commerce *re* Prevention (Ans.) 3132 (ii).
Sable Island, Tree Planting, Reps. *re* Success (Ans.) 2117 (ii).
Salmon Exports to U.S., Prohibition, &c. (Ans.) 5354 (iii).
See 'Fishing,' &c.
Savard, Mr. P. V., on Inquiry for Ret., 679, 868 (i).
Seal Fisheries, Seizing of Vessels, Payment of Claims (remarks) 5454 (iii).
Shipping Casualties Act Amt. (B. 102) 1° m., 2684 (ii); 2° m., 5197; (M.) for Com., 5280; in Com., 5282 (iii).
See 'Steamboat Inspection.'
Spain, Capt., Purchase of fur-lined Coat (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5292 (iii).
'Stanley,' Str., Accident at Yarmouth (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5218 (iii).
Steamboat Inspection Act (mechanical power, &c.) Amt. (B. 101) 1° m., 2682 (ii); in Com., 4070, 5195 (iii).
See 'Shipping Casualties Act,' &c.
Submarine Signals, Purchase by Govt. in Boston (Ans.) 2187 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 5006; (salaries) 5000 (iii).
Fisheries (cold storage inspection) 7589 ; (fish culture) 7587 (iv); (fish hatcheries) 8953 (v); (Georgian Bay laboratory) 7593; (inspectors, &c.) 7572; (overseers, salaries) 7598; (oyster culture) 7588 (iv).

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Lighthouse and Coast Service (acetylene gas installation) Rep. (read) 8932 (v); (agencies, rents, &c.) 5804; (Bay of Fundy lights) 5805; (engineers, &c.) 5833; (Halifax lightship) 5831; (inspection and aids) 5813 (iii); (lighthouse repairs) 7597 (iv); (lightkeepers' salaries) 5300 (iii); ('Lurcher' lightship) 7597 (iv); (marine hospitals) 5837; (Montreal pilots court) 5835; (St. Lawrence buoys) 5804 (iii); (wharf at Charlottetown) 7598 (iv); (wireless stations) 5834 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 5292 (iii); (damages to perishable goods, P.E.I.) 7594 (iv); (Govt. Steamers maintenance) 5199 (iii); (gratuity to Mrs. Michaud) 8924; (icebreakers) 8921 (v); (life saving rewards) 5258 (iii); (light inspections) 8918; (maintenance) 8919 (v); (marine biological station) 5289; (masters and mates, examination) 5219 (iii), 7596 (iv); (naval militia) 5267 (iii); (obstruction in Montreal Harbour) 8927; (obstruction in Ostall River, B.C.) 8930 (v); (removal of obstructions) 5284 (iii); (tidal service) 5287; (unforeseen expenses) 5300; (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 5289; (wrecking investigations) 5258 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Longueuil P.O.) 669 (i).

Steamboat Inspection (fog alarms) 5838 (iii).

Thousand Island Shoals, Buoy Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5346 (iii).

Three Rivers Harbour Commission, B. wthdn., 3846 (ii).

Toronto Harbour, Eastern Gap, Complaints *re* Bells and Bell-buoys (Ans.) 4826 (iii).

Trap-Net Fishing in B.C., O.C. *re* Licenses (Ans.) 558 (i).

Trap-Net Licenses for Mackerel, Decision of Supreme Court (Ans.) 3389 (ii).

See 'Fisheries Act,' &c.

Traverse and Tormentine Mail Service, Contracts *re* Ice Boats (Ans.) 3943 (iii).

Trent Valley Lake Fisheries, Destruction by Ice, Restocking, &c. (Ans.) 2556 (ii).

Weirs and Fishways in River Jesus Ans.) 402 (i).

Whale Fishing: *See* 'Fisheries Act,' &c.

Winnipeg and Nelson River Fishing Licenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7574 (iv).

Winter Navigation *re* Lake Superior, and Icebreaker Test (Ans.) 1209 (i).

Wrecking Investigations, Expenditure *re*, in Com. of Sup., 5258 (iii).

Pringle, Mr. R. A., *Cornwall and Stormont.*

Alien Labour and Protection to Canadians (remarks) in Com. on G.T.P. Bill, 3279 (ii).

Brockville and Ottawa, Ry. Connection with G.T.R., Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) 3316 (ii).

Cornwall Canal, Employees, Delay in Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7529 (iv).

Pringle, Mr. R. A.—*Con.*

Cornwall Canal, Lighting Contract with M. P. Davis, on M. (Mr. Lemieux) for Sel. Com. on Audit Acts, 4322 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6670 (iv).

Cornwall Cotton Mfg. Co. and Tariff Duties on Cotton, and Circular referred to by Mr. Fielding (remarks) 1451 (i).

Cornwall Wharf, Repairs to, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6645 (iv).

Davis Lighting Contract: *See* 'Cornwall Canal.'

Empire Tobacco Co. (remarks) in Com. on Tobacco Bill, 8533 (v).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 1392 (i); in Com., on sec. 3, 3051; on sec. 7, on Amt. (Mr. Porter) 3284; Emplymt. of British Subjects on Surveys, &c., and Alien Labour Law, on Amt. (Mr. Clare) to M. for 3°, 3511 (ii).

——— Mr. Hays' Memo. *re* Pet. for Aid, Nov., 1902, on Criticism (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in holding back documents from Rets., 3713 (ii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8533 (v).

O'Callaghan, Mr., Duties on Cornwall Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7522 (iv).

Stewart, Mr., Supt. of Canals, Duties and Use of Str. 'Alert' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iv).

——— Payments by Govt. for Hotel Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Cornwall (enlargement) 6644 (iv).

Tariff: *See* 'Woollen and Cotton.'

Tobacco Industry: *See* 'Inland Revenue Act B.'

Woollen and Cotton Duties, Tariff *re*, Circular from Cornwall Mfg. Co. (remarks) 1451 (i).

Puttee, Mr. A. W., *Winnipeg.*

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8603 (v).

See 'G.T.P. Bill 72.'

Bell Telephone System, and Decision of Ry. Commissioners, in Com. on Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (remarks) 6726 (iv).

Canadian Labour Bureau and Immigration Employment (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7299; Cor. from Louis Leopold (read) 7304-5 (iv).

Chinese Labour in B.C., Free Entry, &c. (Ques.) 398 (i).

Cigarette Legislation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Maclaren) 355 (i).

Davis Contract *re* Cornwall Canal, Aud. Gen's Letter *re* Papers (remarks) 6879 (iv).

Puttee, Mr. A. W.—*Con.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 1598 (i); on sec. 1, 2223; on sec. 2, 3092; on sec. 7, on Amt. (Mr. Clare) *re* Alien Labour, 3275; on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Clare) 3473 (ii).

——— Emplymt. of Aliens on Surveys, &c. (remarks) 3092 (ii).

——— deportation of aliens, &c. (Ques.) 1138 (i).

——— grievances of Dom. Amalgamated Engineers, &c. (Ques.) 549 (i).

Immigrants, Destitute and stranded in Canada, &c. (remarks) 3854 (ii).

Immigration, Medical Inspection, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7295 (iv).

I. C. R., Political Interference *re* Employees in Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6038 (iv).

Labour Bureau : *See* 'Canadian Labour,' &c.

Letter Carriers Absent on sick leave, Pay, &c, (remarks) in Com. on P.O. Bill, 8032 (v.)

Letter Carriers, and P. O. Act Amt., Pets. *re* Grievances, &c. (Ques.) 2555 (ii).
See 'P.O. Act,' &c.

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6427 ; (peace establishment), 6452; (riots, &c.) 6512 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. Logan) to M. for 3°, 8209, 8274 (v).

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Champagne) in Com., 4179; on M. for 3° (amt.) 4264; Agreed to (Y. 50; N. 47) 4269 (iii).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 153 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8031 (v).

Post Office Act and Civil Service Act (remarks) 5677 (iii).

Poultry Stations, Cost, &c., Pets. from Man. Poultry Association, &c. (Ques.) 677 (i).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Ry. Commissioners, 6726 (iv).

St. Andrews Rapids Improvements, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 398 (i).

SUPPLY :

Immigration (agents' salaries) 7295 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (renewals) 685; (Winnipeg, buildings) 696; (Winnipeg, immigration shed) 687; (Winnipeg, P.O.) 691 (i); Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrews rapids) 7897; Yukon (Lewes and Yukon Rivers) 7880 (iv).

Telegrapher's Union, I.C.R., Special Agreement *re* Dismissals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6038 (iv).

Reid, Mr. J. D., *South Grenville.*

'Alert,' Str., Employees, &c., Amount of Wages, &c. (Ques.) 8388 (iv).

——— Transfer to Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7593 (iv).

——— Use by Supt. Stewart for Pleasure Yacht (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7472 (iv).

Reid, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8574, 8604 (v).

American Fishing Cos., and Bonding Privileges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7581 (iv).

Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6247, 6262 (iv).

Canal Tolls, Collections *re*, Govt.'s Position (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7470 (iv).

Cardinal Canal, Enlargement, in Com. of Sup., 6324 (iv).

——— Collectors, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6331-2 (iv).

——— Damages by Flooding (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7594 (iv).
See 'McArthur, Rev. Mr.'

Cornwall Canal, Davis Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6645 (iv).

——— (remarks) *re* Discussion, 7539 (iv).

Farran's Point Canal, Number of Locks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iv).

Furniture Trade with Japan (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4133 (iii).

Galops Canals Enlargement, Pay of Staff, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6294 (iv).

Govt. Cars used by Ministers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7496 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Lavell) 3333; on Amt. *re* Fourth Commissioner, 3376 (ii).

——— Contracts and Surveys on several Divisions, &c. (remarks) 3360 (ii).

Grazing Leases in Assa. and Alberta, Number and Date, &c. (Ques.) 1666-7 (i).

Grazing Leases wthdn. from Homesteaders, &c. (Ques.) 213 (i).

Laschinger, Mr., Appnmt. as Ass't Sec. of P.O. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5651 (iii).

'Lord Strathcona,' Wrecking Plant, Subsidy to, in Com. of Sup., 7462 (iv).

McArthur, Rev. Mr., Claims for Damages *re* Cardinal Canal(remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6307 (iv).
See 'Cardinal Canal.'

Mud Island Shoal, Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6348 (iv).

Post Office Deficits, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5603, 5643 (iii).

Prescott Lighthouse, Construction of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7597 (iv).

Prescott Train Connections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5649 (iii).

Scow Building, Advertising for Tenders (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7467 (iv).

Stewart, Supt. of Canals, and Str. 'Alert' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7472 (iv).
See 'Alert,' &c.

Reid, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 5587, 5643; Railways and Canals (salaries) 5894 (iii).

Canals—Chambly (tow-path macadamazing) 7470 (iv).

Canals—Cornwall (lighting, &c.) 6645 (iv).

Canals—Galops (channel) 7531; (channel completion) 6335; (enlargement) 6294 (iv).

Canals—Lachine (electric generator) 7533 ; (locks Nos. 1 and 2) 7534 ; (St. Gabriel basin) 7535; (Tate dry dock) 7534; (water service *re* fires) 7534 (iv).

Canals—Miscellaneous (collectors' salaries) 7531 (iv).

Canals—North Channel (dam, &c.) 6315 (iv).

Canals—Trent (dredging machinery) 7466 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse repairs) 7597 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Halifax and Canso) 7454; (Halifax to Liverpool) 6211; (St. John and Glasgow) 6213; (St. Lawrence wrecking plant) 7462 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (damages to perishable goods, P.E.I.) 7594 (iv).

Weights and Measures (inspectors' salaries) 4042 (iii).

Welland Canal Deepening, Policy of the Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6361 (iv).

Richardson, Mr. M. K., *South Grey.*

Cigarette Legislation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Maclaren) 343 (i).

Cigarettes, Prohibition and Sale B. 128 (Mr. Maclaren) in Com., 5134 (iii).

Dental Association, St. Louis Exposition, Can. Representative (Ques.) 3132 (ii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 1039 (i); on M. for 2°, 2080; in Com., 2357; on M. for 3° (amt.) 3423 (ii).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (active service) in Com., 8102 (v).

Railway Freight Rates in Ont., on M. (Mr. Broder) to adjn., 2941 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 125 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 4944 (iii).

St. Lawrence Route, Insurance Rates *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5819 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aid to navigation) 5819; (lighting channel) 5347 (iii).

N. W. Mounted Police (pay of force) 2697 (ii).

Rivet, Mr. L. A. A., *Hochelaga.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 23 (i).

Criminal Code (fraudulent debtors) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 3988 (iii).

Montreal Turnpike Trust and Westmount, Purchase (M. for cor.) 3946 (iii).

Napoleon Bridge, Lachine Canal, Rep. *re* Delay (Ques.) 3941 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Lachine (Atwater bridge) 8375 (v).

Robinson, Mr. Jabel, *West Elgin.*

Address, on The, 158 (i).

Advertisements *re* Patent Medicines, in Com. on B. 153, 8046 (v).

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir William Mulock) in Com., 8590 (v).

Auditor General, Resignation, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to Sup., 6634 (iv).

Cab Hire for Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5026 (iii).

Coal Measures, Govt. Ownership, &c. (Ques.) 214 (i).

Coal Oil : *See* 'Petroleum.'

Dog-fish Pest, Commission *re* Investigation (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7017 (iv).

Dundonald, Lord, G.O.C., Dismissal by Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 5518 (iii).

Experimental Farm Accounts, Discrepancies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 1008 (i); in Com., 2279; on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 3522 (ii).

Immigrants, Destitute and stranded in Canada, &c. (remarks) 3854 (ii).

I.C.R., Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6136 (iv).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) on M. for 2°, 299 (i); in Com., 6420 (iv); (active service) 8074 (v).

Minister of Railways, Absence during Debate on G.T. Bill, &c. (remarks) 3345 (ii).

Petroleum Bounties B. 167 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8467 (v).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 153 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8046 (v).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry., on M. (Mr. Scott) to adj., 2783 (ii).

——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Osler) 2886 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Ry. Commissioners, 6727, 6746 (iv).

——— (express and telephone cos.) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3817 (ii).

Railway Freight Rates in Ont., on M. (Mr. Broder) to adjn., 2947 (ii).

St. Lawrence Navigation, Guides, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5026 (iii).

Sabbath Observance Bill (remarks) 254 (i).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 125 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 3724 (ii); in Com., 4938 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Agriculture (experimental farm accounts) 7402 (iv); (fumigating stations) 2750 ; (Wininpeg exhibition) 2750; (Year-book) 2735 (ii).

Charges of Management (Dom. notes) 245 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Belleville armoury) 528 (i).

Roche, Mr. Wm., *Halifax.*
Dog-fish Pest, Commission *re* Investigation (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6996 (iv).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 1332, 1338 (i); on sec. 3, 3173; on sec. 7, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) 3241 (ii).
Halifax County Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7885 (v).
Halifax Post Office, Increased Remuneration for Clerks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5715 (iii).
Hamburg-American SS. Line, Connection with, &c., Ref. to in Personal Explanation, 4139 (iii).
Immigrants into Can., &c., Medical Inspection (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7315 (iv).
Imigrants refused into Canada, &c. (remarks) 3869 (ii).
Personal Explanation *re* Speeches, &c., 3945, 4138 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Imigration (agents' salaries) 7281 (iv).
Public Works—Dredging—N.S. (new plant) 7885 (iv).
Post Office (Halifax clerks) 5715 (iii).

Roche, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*
Agricultural Implements, Rebate of Duties, &c. (M. for ret.*) 562 (i).
Agriculture Com.: *See* 'Macoun.'
Animals, Thoroughbred, Purchase from Mr. S. L. Head (Ques.) 4411 (iii).
Argyle and Springdale Townships, Taxes *re* Schools, Litigation, in Com. of Sup., 7078 (iv).
Blood Indians Reserve, Grazing Leases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7197 (iv).
Crooked Lake Reserve, N.W.T., Settlements, &c. (Ques.) 4053 (iii).
Delegates sent by Govt. to G.B. and Europe, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1880 (i).
——— (Ques.) 251, 550 (i).
Dixon, Mr. Geo., Homestead Entry, Performance of Duties, &c. (Ques.) 6885 (iv).
Doukhobor Reserves, Pets. *re* Addition of Townships, &c. (M. for copies of cor.*) 561 (i).
Duck Mountain Timber Berths, Sale, &c. (Ques.) 6543 (iv).
Elkhorn School, Sale of Printing Press, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iv).
Flesher, Mr., Minnedosa Land Office, Salary, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7063 (iv).
'Free Press,' Winnipeg, Harvest Number, Distribution *re* Immigration (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7324 (iv).
See 'Winnipeg,' &c.
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 1361 (i); in Com., 2192; on sec. 3, 3158; (amt.) 3164, 3184 (ii).

Roche, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*
G. T. Pacific Ry., Location West of Winnipeg (Ques.) 217 (i).
Greek Catholic Church, Investigation *re* Building, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7068 (iv).
Harvest Number, 'Free Press': *See* 'Free Press."
Harvey, Mr., Political Interference in Marquette (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7065 (iv).
Horses imported, &c., Horse-Breeder's Association (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4211 (iii).
Immigration Literature, Harvest Number of Winnipeg 'Free Press' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7324 (iv).
Infectious Diseases Quarantine, and Provincial Board of Health, Man. Restriction *re* (M. for cor.*) 3772 (ii).
Jonasson, Mr., Homestead Inspector, Resignation, &c. (Ques.) 792 i).
Macoun, J. M., Rep., *re* Peace River, Distribution, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7202 (iv).
Man. Voters' Lists, Revision, &c. (remarks) on Govt. Legislation *re*, 4999 (iii).
Members appointed to Govt. Office, Inquiry for Ret., 1153 (i).
Minnedosa Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 688 (i).
Quarantine, Man., Small-pox Prevention, Cor. from Provincial Board of Health (read) 4151 (iii).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Mr. Speer's Rep. *re* Settlement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7034-5; Letter in 'Globe' *re* Homestead Regulations (read) 7036 (iv).
Saw-Mills, Regulations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7071 (iv).
Stewart, Mr., Rep. *re* Dom. Lands (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7222 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Dom. Lands (Blood reserve) 7197; (commisioner's salary) 7056; (inspector of mines) 7056; (inspectors' salaries) 7063; (surveys, &c.) 7026; (timber protection) 7070 (iv).
Govt. of N. W. Ters. (insane patients) 7024 (iv).
Immigration ('Free Press' literature) 7324 (iv).
Indians—B.C. (hospitals, irrigation, &c.) 6958; (medical relief) 6957; (travelling expenses) 6958 (iv).
Indians—Man. and N. W. T. (annuities) 6941; (clothing) 6946; (Elkhorn school) 6948; (farm implements) 6942; (general expenses) 6954; (live stock) 6944; (medical attendance, &c.) 6945; (seed grain) 6942; (Sioux treaty) 6953; (surveys) 6951 (iv).
Indians—Yukon (medical attendance) 6959 (iv).
Miscellaneous (litigation *re* school taxes) 7078 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg P.O.) 688; N.W.T. (Edmonton Jail) 698; (Red Deer court house) 700 (i).

Roche, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Quarantine—Dom. (cattle, &c.) 4208; Man. (small-pox prevention, &c.) 4151 (iii).

Timber Licenses on Berth No. 1158, &c. (Ques.) 4413 (iii).

Timber Limits in Man. and N. W. T., Location, Purchase, &c. (M. for ret.*) 561 (i).

Township No. 19, Timber Reserve, Settlement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7030 (iv).

Tyerman, Dr., Charges Medical Inspection (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4169 (iii).

Winnipeg 'Free Press,' Amounts paid to 1903-4 (Ques.) 2376 (ii).

See 'Free Press.'

Winnipeg Newspapers, *re* Amounts paid by Govt., 1903 (Ques.) 2184, 2373 (ii).

Winnipeg Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ques.) 1133 (i).

Young, Mr. Thos., Political Interference *re* Man. Elections (remarks) in Com., 7063 (iv).

——— Resignation as Homestead Inspector, &c. (Ques.) 792 (i).

Rosamond, Mr. B., *North Lanark.*

Immigrants, Destitute and stranded in Canada (remarks) 3848 (ii).

I. C. R., Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5933 (iii).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Logan) 8272 (v).

Ottawa Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 122) M. to receive Pet., 3226; 1°*, 3719 (ii).

Patterson, Quarantine Inspector, Salary, &c. remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4169 (iii).

SUPPLY :

I. C.R. (additional sidings) 5939 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Goderich harbour) 7757 (iv).

Quarantine (medical salaries) 4169 (iii).

Ross, Hon. William, *Victoria, N.S.*

Agriculture and Colonization Com., on M. (Mr. Parmelee) to sit during Sittings of Hse., 6679 (iv).

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) on Amt. (Mr. Boyd) to M. for 3°, 8674 (v).

Apples shipped in Cold Storage to G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6183 (iv).

Book Postage Rates, Increase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5717 (iii).

Cab Hire for Ministers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5011 (iii).

Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase, B. 163 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 3°, 8564 (v).

Cigarette Legislation, on prop. Res. (Mr. W. S. Maclaren) 358 (i).

Cigarettes, Prohibition and Sale, B. 128 (Mr. Maclaren) in Com., 5143 (iii).

Dog-fish Pest, Commission *re* Investigation (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6991 (iv).

Ross, Hon. William—*Con.*

Fish-Curing, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6991 (iv).

Fish Driers, Unsuccessful Methods (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7590 (iv).

Fishing Bounties, Method of Payments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5041 (iii).

Fisheries Act (whaling) Amt. 4 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 8152 (iv).

I. C. R., Expenditure for Increased Facilities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5947 (iii).

Militia Act (pay and allowance) Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 2917 (ii) ; in Com., 6389, 6503 ; (political interference) 6389 ; (riots, &c.) 6519 (iv).

Morning Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5843 (iii).

Personal Explanation, 'Dennis Eagan' Letter, Par. from Newspapers (read) 7542 (iv).

Political Interference *re* Govt. Employees, Statement *re* Forgery of 'Dennis Eagan' Letter, 6062 (iv).

Preferential Tariff, Importations *re* Canadian Ports, on prop. Res. (Mr. Logan) 5082 (iii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Ry. Commissioners, 6725 (iv).

Rebellion Losses, 1885, payment of Claims, on M. for Ret. (Mr. Davis) 2828 (ii).

Shipping Casualties Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 5282 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 5011; Railways (salaries) 5906 (iii).

Immigration (agents' salaries) 7357 (iv).

Indians—P.E.I. (relief and seed grain) 6939 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 6163; (Murray Bay, winter service) 7457 (iv).

Public Works—Dredging—N.S. (new plant) 7886; Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Breton Cove boat landing) 7636; (Green Cove) 7641; (Port Hawkesbury) 7644 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (additional sidings) 5938 ; (Halifax accommodation) 5975; P.E.I. (Hillsborough bridge) 6002 (iii).

Tariff Changes (remarks) in Com. on Res., 8865 (v).

Ross, Mr. W., *South Ontario.*

Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 10) 1°*, 396 (i).

Cotton Growing in Can., Experiments, &c. (Ques.) 555 (i).

Cotton, imported into Can., Value, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 554, 1880 (i).

Curtis, Louis E., Patent Relief (B. 65) 1°*, 1450 (i).

Huron and Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 130) M. to receive Pet., 3844 (ii); 1°*, 4138 (iii).

Immigrants, and Homestead Entries, &c., (Ques.) 3130 (ii).

Ross, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to M. for 3°, *re* Express Companies, 7548 (iv).

——— (express and telephone cos.) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Maclean) on M. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) to ref. to Com. on Rys., 3822 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale, B. 125 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 4952 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Oshawa P.O.) 611 (i).

Russell, Mr. B., *Hants.*

Alliance Bank of Canada (B. 140) M. to receive Pet., 4407; 1°*, 5071 (iii).

Dundonald, Lord, G.O.C., Dismissal by Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 5495, 5500 (iii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 944 (i).

Judgeships (remarks) 8002 (iv).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6474 (iv).

Schell, Mr. J. T., *Glengarry.*

Alexandria P.O. Building (remarks) 639 (i).

Scott, Mr. W., *West Assiniboia.*

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8608, 8617; on Amt. (Mr. Boyd) to M. for 3°, 8668 (v).

Calgary and Edmonton Land Co., Sale of Lands, Rep. from London, &c. (remarks) 2365 (ii).

Calgary & Edmonton Ry., Inefficient Service (M.) to adjn., 2760 (ii).

See 'Qu'Appelle,' &c.

Edmonton, Athabasca & Mackenzie Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 26) 1°*, 596 (i).

Edmonton Street Ry. Co.'s (B. 111) 1°*, 3016 (ii).

Govt. Patronage *re* Prince Albert Newspapers (remarks) 6642 (iv).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 2213, 2241; on sec. 4, 2426 (ii).

Legare, Jean Louis, Compensation *re* Removal of Sitting Bull (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6964 (iv).

Lumber Industry in B.C. and N.W.T., Tariff Readjustment (remarks) 2566 (ii).

Macoun, J. M., Rep. *re* Peace River, Distribution, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7205 (iv).

Northern Bank (B. 146) 1° m., 5677; 2° m., 5839, 5866 (iii).

N.W. Police, Pension Bill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2714 (ii).

N.W. Mounted Police Force, Increase, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2689 (ii).

Scott, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Osler, Mr., and Connection with the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. (M.) to adjn. Hse., 2759, 2856 (ii).

See 'Qu'Appelle,' &c .

Pensions, N.W.M. Police (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2714 (ii).

Post Office Finances, Rep. of Auditors, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5637 (iii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Co.., Inefficient Service (M.) to adjn., 2759 (ii).

——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Osler) 2856 (ii .

——— (Ques. of) Charged with defaming Country, 2898 (ii).

——— (remarks) *re* Homstead Entries in Com. of Sup., 7051 (iv).

See 'Regina,' &c.

Railway Accommodation in N.W.T., Tel. from Mr. Bredt (read), 3439 (ii).

Rebellion Losses, Claims, Payments, &c., on M. (Mr. Davis) for Ret., 2824 (ii).

Regina 'Leader,' Payments to for Immigration Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7359 (iv).

Regina and Prince Albert Ry., and Calgary and Edmonton Ry., &c., Rep. from London *re* Sale of Lands (remarks) 2366 (ii).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co.'s Settlement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7051 (iv).

Seed Grain, N.W.T., Inability to get any, Tel. from F. C. Whitelock (read) 2282 (ii).

——— on Account of Inefficient Ry. Service (M.) to adjn., 2759 (ii).

Stallions, Tariff *re* (remarks) in Com. on Res., 8896 (v).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Trent (construction) 6841 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 5637 (iii).

Miscellaneous—Man. and N. W. T. (colonization roads) 8020 (iv).

N. W. Mounted Police (pay of force) 2689 (ii).

West Canadian Collieries Limited, B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5865 (iii).

Sherritt, Mr. J., *North Middlesex.*

Grand Bend Breakwater, Pier, Contract *re* McTavish Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7843 (iv).

——— Change of Plans, &c. (Ques.) 7440 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Agriculture, &c. (experimental farm accounts) 7394 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Grand Bend pier) 7843; (Sarnia dredging) 7856; (Spanish river) 7858; (Three Rivers wharf) 7841 (iv).

Sifton, Hon. Clifford (Minister of the Interior), *Brandon.*
Advertising, &c.: *See* 'Free Press,' 'Canadian,' 'Synopsis,' &c.
Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) on Amt. (Mr. Boyd) to M. for 3°, 8672 (v).
Animals, Thoroughbred, Purchase from Mr. S. L. Head (Ans.) 4412 (iii).
Banff Hot Springs Reservation, Maintenance, &c., in Com. of Sup., 7074 (iv).
Bell, Dr., Geological Survey, Salary, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7057, 7213 (iv).
Bostock, Mr. H., Sale or Lease of Lands in B.C., by Govt. (Ans.) 3437 (ii).
Blood Indian Reserve, N.W.T., Applicants for Grazing Leases, &c. (Ans.) 2554 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7197 (iv).
Bryce, Dr., Appnmt. and Salary, in Com. of Sup., 6960 (iv).
Canadian Year-book, Circulation for Immigration Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7360 (iv).
Coal Measures, Govt. Ownership, &c. (Ans.) 214 (i).
Crooked Lake Reserve, N.W.T. Settlement, &c. (Ans.) 4053 (iii).
Dixon, Geo., Homestead Entry, Duties *re* (Ans.) 6885 (iv).
Doncaster Indian Reserve, Indemnity to Indians, &c. (Ans.) 987 (i).
Doukhobors, Dispute with Dom. Govt., Investigation by Prof. Mavor (Ans.) 4415 (iii).
Duck Mountain, Timer Berths, Sale of (remarks) 6543 (iv).
Dundonald, Lord, G.O.C., Dismissal by Govt. (remarks) 5277 (iii).
——— Letter to W.T. R. Preston, on Inquiry for Copy (Mr. Clarke) 6682 (iv).
See 'Preston.'
Dyke, John, Pension, &c., in Com. of Sup., 9015 (v).
Edmonton 'Bulletin,' Immigration Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7361 (iv).
Elkhorn School, Sale of Printing Press (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iv).
Farm Delegates to G. B. and Ireland, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 251, 550 (i).
Fisher, Mr., Salary as Crown Timber Agent (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7063 (iv).
Forestry Protection, Res. of Can. Forestry Association, Action of Govt. (Ans.) 3760 (ii).
'Free Press,' Harvest Number *re* Immigration Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7327 (iv).
Gas and Oil Explorations, Borings, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7215 (iv).
Geological Survey Rep., Postage *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).
——— Rep. presented, 6150 (iv).
Sifton, Hon. Clifford—*Con.*
Geological Survey Report, Sale and Distribution (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7213 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 794 (i); in Com. on sec. 3, 3145 (ii).
Grazing Leases, Blood Indian Reserve, Names of Applicants (Ans.) 2554 (ii).
Grazing Leases in Assa. and Alberta, Number and Date of (Ans.) 1667 (i).
Grazing Leases in N. W. T., wthdn. from Homesteaders (Ans.) 214 (i).
See 'Blood,' 'Indians,' &c.
Haanel's Dr., Rep. *re* smelting Ores (remarks) 5355 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7058 (iv).
See 'Supply—Geological Survey.'
Half-Breed Scrip Commission, Rep. &c. (Ans.) 215 (i).
Harvey, Mr., Political Interference in Marquette (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7066 (iv).
Immigrants and Homestead Entries, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3130 (ii).
Immigrants deported from 1902 to 1904, Causes, &c. (Ans.) 995 (i).
Immigrants, Destitute and stranded in Canada, Govt. Control, &c. (remarks) 3850 (ii).
——— Medical Inspection, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7285 (iv).
——— Swindled by Sharpers, &c., Precautions *re* (Ans.) 1211 (i).
Immigration in G. B., Representations of Fraudulent Agents (Ans.) 5072 (iii).
See 'Russian,' 'Supply,' &c.
Imperial Labour Bureau and Salvation Army in G.B. (Ans.) 3134 (ii).
Indian Lands, Sale of Timber (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5857 (iii).
Indians, N.B., Fishing Rights leased to Henry Bishop (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6937 (iv).
Indian Reserves in B. C., Thrown open to Settlers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9017 (v).
Indian Schools, Results of Education (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6955 (iv).
Indian Timber cut on Reserves (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6934 (iv).
Interior, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 203 (i).
Iroquois Indian Reserve, Squatters' Claims, &c. (Ans.) 988 (i).
Jonasson, Mr. S., Homestead Inspector, Resignation, &c. (Ans.) 792 (i).
Keremeos Indian Reserve, Pet. *re* Sale, &c. (Ans.) 1876 (i).
Labour Bureau, Misrepresentations *re* Immigration (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7328 (iv).
Land Titles Act Amt. (B. 158) 1° m., 6874 (iv); 2° m., and in Com., 8712 (v).
Legare, Jean Louis, Compensation *re* Removal of Sitting Bull (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6965 (iv).

Sifton, Hon. Clifford—*Con.*
Liquor Traffic among Indians, Fines, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5858 (iii).
McCreary, Mr. W. F., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 2599 (ii).
Macoun, J. M., Rep. *re* Peace River, Distribution, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7201 (iv).
Macoun, Messrs., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 988 (i).
N. W. Mounted Police Force, Increase and Pay of Force (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2706 (ii).
N. W. Territorial Govt., Construction of Roads, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9043 (v).
N. W. Ter. Representation Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Casgrain) on M. for 2, 3990 (iii).
N. W. T. Town Sites, Arrangements with Ry. Cos. (Ans.) 1139 (i).
Preston, W. T. R., Letter *re* Lord Dundonald, Govt. Action (remarks) 6018, 6552 (iv).
See 'Dundonald, Lord,' &c.
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Lancaster) *re* placing Letters on Table read in Debate, 2784 (ii).
Rebellion Losses, Payment of Claims, 1885, on M. (Mr. Davis) for Ret., 2827 (ii).
Russian Jews deported from U.S., to Winnipeg (Ans.) 554 (i).
Salvation Army: *See* 'Imperial,' &c.
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co.'s Settlements, Rep. of Mr. Steer's (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7035 (iv).
Saw Mills, Portable, Regulations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7070 (iv).
School Taxes, Argyle and Springdale Townships, Litigation *re*, in Com. of Sup., 7078 (iv).
Seed Grain in N. W. T., Inability to get any (remarks) 2283 (ii).
Seed Grain supplied to N. W. T. Settlers, and inefficient Ry. Service (remarks) 2786 (ii).
Songhee Indians, Removal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6959 (iv).
Stewart, Mr., Inspector of Timber (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7072 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (Winnipeg exhibition) 2751 (ii).
Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 5854 (iii), 9015 (v); Interior (salaries) 6966 (iv).
Dom. Lands (advertising) 7070; (commissioner's salary) 7056; (inspector of mines) 7056; (inspectors' salaries) 7063; (surveys, &c.) 7027; (survey of J. H. Mailhoit) 7197; (timber protection) 7070 (iv).
Geological Survey (archaeological specimens) 7219 (iv), 9015 (v); (assay offices) 7221; (compiling surveys) 7220; (explorations and surveys) 7215; (explorations, B.C.) 7220; (salaries) 7199 (iv).

Sifton, Hon. Clifford—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Govt. of N.W. Ters. (insane patients) 7024; (registrars, &c.) 7023; (schools) 7024 (iv).
Imigration (agents' salaries) 7282 (iv); (pensions) 9015 (v).
Indians—B.C. (hospitals, irrigation, &c.) 6958; (medical relief) 6957; (salaries) 6957; (schools) 6957; (travelling expenses) 6958 (iv).
Indians—Generally (Dr. Bryce, salary) 6960 (iv); (Georgian Bay surveys) 5856; (Indian fund grant) 5858; (Robinson treaty annuities) 5855; (surveys) 5855 (iii).
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (annuities) 6941; (clothing) 6946; (Elkhorn school) 6848; (farm implements) 6943; (general expenses) 6955; (industrial schools) 6946; (live stock) 6944; (medical attendance, &c.) 6945; (saw mills) 6954; (seed grain) 6942; (Sioux treaties) 6953; (surveys) 6951 (iv).
Indians—N.B. (additional amount) 6964; (agents' salaries) 6937 (iv).
Indians—N.S. (agents' salaries) 6933; (medical attendance) 6937; (relief and seed grain) 6936 (iv).
Indians—Ont. (medical attendance) 5854 (iii); (Mississagua) 9018 (v).
Indians—Ont. and Que. (annuities treaty No. 9) 9016 (v); (legal expenses) 6932 (iv).
Indians—P.E.I. (medical attendance) 6941; (relief and seed grain) 6938; (travelling expenses) 6938 (iv).
Indians—Yukon (medical attendance) 6959 (iv).
Miscellaneous (assay office, B.C.) 7079; (Banff Hot Springs) 7074; (boundary demarcation) 7077; (colonization roads in Man. and N.W.T.) 9043 (v); (maps, printing, &c.) 7079 (iv); (St. Lawrence River islands) 9018 (v); (Yoho Park) 7075 (iv).
N.W. Mounted Police Force(pay of force) 2706 (ii).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Little Slave Lake road) 9032 (v).
Yukon (administration expenses) 7024; (buildings) 7025; (roads and bridges) 7025 (iv).
'Synopsis of Regulations for Disposal of Minerals, &c.,' Cost of Advertising, &c. (Ans.) 2806 (ii).
Timber Licenses on Berth No. 1158 (Ans.) 4414 (iii).
Township No. 19, Timber Reserve, Settlement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7030 (iv).
Treadgold Commission, Documents, Papers, &c., on M. (Mr. Casgrain) for Ret., 221 (i).
——— Issue of to Judge Britton (Ans.) 3760 (ii).
——— Rep. of Commissioners (explanation) 1141 (i).
——— Rep. of Commissioner, on Inquiry for, 5579 (iii).
——— Rep. (Ans.) 213 (i).
Tree Culture and Mr. Stewart's Experiments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7071 (iv).
Walpole Island Indian Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5855 (iii).
——— Instructions *re* Survey (read) 6932 (iv).

Sifton, Hon. Clifford—*Con.*
'Year-book': *See* 'Canadian,' &c.
Yoho Park Reserve, Construction of Roads, in Com. of Sup., 7075 (iv).
Young, Mr. Thos., Homestead Inspector, Resignation, &c. (Ans.) 792 (i).
——— Political Interference in Man. Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7064 (iv).
Yukon-Edmonton Route, Com *re* Dangers, &c. (Ans.) 3942 (iii).
Yukon Ter., Regulations of Gov. in Council (prop. res.) 8654 (v).
Yukon Ter., Representation Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Casgrain) on M. for 2°, 3994 (iii).
Yukon Ter. Representation Act Amt. (Ans.) 212 (i).

Sinclair, Mr. J. H., *Guysborough.*
Dog-Fish Pest, Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. to Sup., 6987 (iv).
Dog-Fish used as Lobster Bait, Official Tests, &c. (Ques.) 3310 (ii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 1382 (i).
Guysborough Election and Political Interference of I.C.R. Employees, Cor. and Affidavits (read) in Com. of Sup., 6066 (iv).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6032; ref. to 'heelers,' 6106 (iv).
Lobster Propagation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5066 (iii).
Newfoundland Commercial Agent, Appnmt. of, &c. (Ques.) 2804 (ii).

Smith, Mr. E. D., *South Wentworth.*
Address, on The, 149 (i).
Apples carried on Atlantic Strs. in Cold Storage (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6177 (iv).
Apple Exportation on SS. 'Ionian,' &c., Inspection of Ventilation, &c. (Ques.) 793 (i).
Apples shipped to Europe in Cool Chambers, Quantity, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 678 (i).
Atlantic SS. Contract with Allans (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6163 (iv).
Barbed Wire, Quantity made and exported in 1891, 1896 and 1901 (Ques.) 791 (i).
Binder Twine, Quantity made and exported, 1891, 1896, 1901 (Ques.) 791 (i).
Budget, on The, 4551 (iii).
Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase B. 163 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 8226, 8246 (v).
Canadian Mail to G.B., Weight, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 216 (i).
Casualties in St. Lawrence, Rep. of Commissioner *re* Pilots (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii).
Cold Storage on Atlantic Strs. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6175 (iv).
Cold Storage Transportation on Steamships, &c. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 7907; Neg. (Y. 38; N. 62) 7936 (iv).

Smith, Mr. E. D.—*Con.*
Experimental Farms, Experiments and Accounts (remarks) 7195 (iv).
Flour Standards, &c. (Ques.) 6545 (iv).
Gas Buoys in St. Lawrence Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Clare) *re* Employment of British Subjects on Surveys, &c., and Alien Labour Law, 3503 (ii).
Jam, Adulteration of, Penalties, &c. (Ques.) 8027 (v).
'Lake Champlain' SS., Cowl Ventilation, &c. (Ques.) 1357 (i).
Manchester SS. Liners, Contract with Govt. of Can. (M. for copy*) 1881 (i).
Marconi Wireless System on Steamers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5835 (iii).
Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6523 (iv); on M. for 3°, 8288 (v).
Militia Act, Interpretation of Word 'corps' (Ques.) 8027 (v).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Champagne) in Com., 4261 (iii).
Otter, Col., Fenian Raid Service, &c. (Ques.) 8388 (v).
Pilots, Certificated, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5830 (iii).
Railway Cars, Ventilation, Cor. with Govt. *re* (M. for copies*) 561 (i).
——— Cor. *re* with Ry. Cos. (M. for copies) 221 (i).
St. Lawrence Lighting System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iii).
Sessions, Late Date, and Delays (remarks) 8263 (v).
Shipwrecks and Sub-marine Signals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5829 (iii).
SS. Companies *re* Atlantic Service, Agreements, &c. (M. for ret.*) 224 (i).
——— Ventilation for Ships' Holds, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 224 (i).
Steamships, Mechanical Ventilation, Mr. Fisher's Stmnt. (Ques.) 994 (i).
SUPPLY:
Lighthouse and Coast Service (St. Lawrence lighting) 5827 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G.B. and Can.) 6163; (Halifax and Liverpool) 6211; (St. John and London) 6215 (iv).
Steamboat Inspection (inspection of fog alarms) 5838 (iii).
Thermograph Record of Temperature on Atlantic Steamships (M. for copies*) 225 (i).
Ventilation on Allan Strs., *re* Cold Storage (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6176 (iv).
Ventilation on Str. 'Livonia,' &c., when leaving Montreal (Ques.) 4490 (iii).
Ventilation: *See* 'Cold Storage,' 'SS. Cos.,' 'Ry. Cars.'
Von Wagner, Col., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) on M. for 3° of Militia B. 5, 8289 (v).

Smith, Mr. R., *Vancouver.*

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8592 (v).
Alien Labour, Protection to Canadians (remarks) in Com. on G.T.P. Bill, 3276 (ii).
B.C., Immigration Act, Disallowance of, &c. (Ques.) 988 (i).
——— Mines Regulation Act, Disallowance of (Ques.) 988 (i).
Canada and Mexico SS. Service, Govt. Control *re* Rates (Ques.) 4694 (iii).
Chinese Exclusion Act, Par. in Nanaimo 'Free Press' (Ques.) 994 (i).
Chinese Immigration Poll Tax Act, Enforcement of (Ques.) 989 (i).
Disallowance of B.C. Legislation, &c. (Ques.) 988 (i).
See 'B.C.,' &c.
Dom. Steel Co.'s Strike, N.S., Govt. Intervention, &c. (remarks) 4215 (iii).
Fair-Wage Clause in Public Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 4414 (iii).
See 'Public,' &c.
Fisheries Act (trap-nets, &c.) Amt. B. 74 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 8154, 8220 (v).
Govt. Legislation, on Precedence on Mondays (remarks) 4999 (iii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 1411 (i); in Com., on sec. 3, on Amt. (Mr. Roche) 3198; on sec. 7, on Amt. (Mr. Earle) 3269; Emplymt. of British Subjects and Alien Labour Law, on Amt. (Mr. Clare) to M. for 3°, 3502 (ii).
——— American Civil Engineers, Emplymt., Names, &c. (M. for stmnt.) 3765 (ii).
——— Emplymt. of Canadians as Civil Engineers, &c. (remarks) 3112 (ii).
——— Names of deported Aliens, &c. (Ques.) 6884 (iv).
Immigration, G.B., Fraudulent Agents, Representations, &c. (Ques.) 5071 (iii).
Imperial Labour Bureau, and Salvation Army in G.B. (Ques.) 3132 (ii).
Labour Commission, Investigation *re* Industrial Troubles, Rep., &c. (Ques.) 992 (i).
Labour Commission, 1886, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 4823 (iii).
Labour Union Labels (B. 35) 1° m., 867 (i); 2° m., 3829; 2° dschgd., 4214 (iii).
——— (B. 135) in Com. on Res., 4706; 1°*, 4706 (iii).
See 'Wood,' &c.
Leger and Wood, Messrs., Emplymt. on I.C.R., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3437 (ii).
Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Logan) 8280 (v).
Municipal Ownership, Belief in, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ottawa Electric B., 4224 (iii).
O'Donoghue, D. J., Political Speeches in B.C. (remarks) 4081 (iii).

Smith, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Ottawa Electric Light Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Champagne) in Com., 4223 (iii).
Public Works Contracts, Fair Wage Clause, &c. (M. for copies*) 5094 (iii).
See 'Fair Wage.'
Salvation Army: *See* 'Imperial.'
South Africa, Exports from Canada, Value, &c. (Ques.) 5270 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Anderson's Lake) 7876 (iv).
Union Labels: *See* 'Labour,' &c.
Wood and Leger, Messrs., Emplymt. on I.C.R., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3437 (ii).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. N. A. Belcourt), *Ottawa.*

Bills, Royal Assent, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec., 6905 (iv).
——— Mess. from His Ex., 4227 (iii), 6923 (iv).
Blount, Mr., Salary, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8988 (v).
Cigarette Legislation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Maclaren) Ruling, 342 (i).
Controverted Elections, Judges Certificates, &c. (notification) 5 (i).
Dundonald, Lord, G.O.C., Dismissal by Govt. on M. (Mr. Hughes) to adjn. (ruling) 4591 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule), Ruling asked *re* 'mean and despicable creatures,' 5516 (iii).
Elections, &c. (remarks) 4 (i).
G. T. P. Ry. Bill, on Amt. (Mr. Clarke) *re* Calling for Division, 2055 (ii).
Guysborough Electoral Div., Certificate of Election (notification) 710 (i).
House of Commons, Stealing from Members' Desks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9004 (v).
——— Staff, Salary Increases, &c. (list read) 8977 (v).
Hudson's Bay and N. W.Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Oliver) on Sen. Amts., 4628 (iii).
Internal Economy Com., Rep. (presented) 8653 (v).
——— Rep. *re* Salaries (read) 8985 (v).
Library of Parliament, Rep. (presented) 8 (i).
Member (Mr. Oliver) Remarks checked, 1466 (i).
Mess. from His Ex., *re* G.T.P. Agreement, 8 (i).
Mess. from His Ex. (read) 5 (i), 8387 (v).
——— Estimates (1905)—(read), 204 (i).
——— Suppl. Estimates, 1904 (read) 1874 (i).
——— Suppl. Estimates, 1904 (presented) 3765 (ii).
——— Further Suppl. Estimates, 1904 (read), 5733 (iii).
Midland Dock Purchase, Member called to Order, 385 (i).

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*
New Brunswick Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. Gibson) on M. to receive Pet., 5185, 5354 (iii).
N. W. Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., Charges against an hon. member (ruling) 2704 (ii).
Order in the Hse. and Galleries, Request to preserve Order, 2190 (ii).
Order Ques. of, Member (Mr. Pringle) cannot speak twice, &c. (ruling) 1462 (i).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 110, on M. for 3°, 4263 (iii).
Personal Explanation (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) asked to move adjnmt. of Hse., 1303 (i).
Petitions, on M. to receive, Consdn. by Com. on Standing Orders (remarks) 2368 (ii).
Petition *re* Divorce, Irregularity of (remarks) 254 (i).
Private Bills, Extension of Time, on M. (Mr. Gibson) 5185, 5354 (iii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on Amts. (Mr. Maclean) to M. for 3°, 7545 (iv).
——— B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for Com. (ruling) 403 (i).
Railway Freight Rates, on M. (Mr. Broder) Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) Irrelevancy of Debate (ruling) 2951 (ii).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, &c. Ry., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Osler) 'Discussion should be left to members directly concerned' (ruling), 2864 (ii).
——— h. m. (Mr. Oliver) 'must not anticipate an Order on Order Paper,' on M. to adjn. (ruling) 2893 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Scott) *re* 'Defaming Country,' 2898 (ii).
——— Member (Mr. Scott) Remarks checked, 2860 (ii).
——— Unparliamentary Language 'vicious and unworthy' (remarks) 2866 (ii).
Questions put by Members and Ministerial Replies (ruling) 1153 (i).
Questions put by Members, Ruling *re* Ms. to adjn., 1153 (i).
Royal Assent, Mess. from Dep. Gov., 4227 (iii).
See 'Bills.'
Sergeant-at-Arms Expenditure *re* Speaker's Apartments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8989 (v).
Sergeant-at-Arms, Statutory Increase, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8987 (v).
Shipping Casualties Act B. 102, on M. for Com., Better Order asked for, 5280 (iii).
Sinclair, Mr. J. H., Member for Guysborough (introduced) 794 (i).
Speech from Throne (read) 6 (i).
SUPPLY :
House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 8977 ; (index to Journals) 9003 (v).
Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*
Union Labels B. 35 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) 2° out of order (ruling) 'a Res. must be introduced first,' 3830 (ii).
Ventilation of Chamber, Opening of Windows, &c. (remarks) 4416 (iii).

Speaker, Mr. Deputy (Mr. P. Macdonald), *East Huron.*
Agriculture Dept. in Com. of Sup., Irrelevancy of Debate, Member (Mr. Hackett) Remarks checked, 2724 (ii).
Alien Labour Bill, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) *re* Vote of 1892, 8588 (v).
Canada Eastern Ry., Irrelevancy of Debate on P.E.I. Ry., 6260 (iv).
Cigarettes, Prohibition and Sale, B. 128 (Mr. W. S. Maclaren) in Com., 5163 (iii).
Galops Canal, Discussion, &c., Item reopened, 8974 (v).
Gov. Gen. (Lord Minto) Criticism *re* Military Control (ruling) 6418 (iv).
G. T. P. Ry., Appnmt. of Fourth Commissioner, Members Remarks checked, 3378 (ii).
——— Clause 9 (read) 2603 (ii).
——— Irregularity of Debate (remarks) 2514 (ii).
——— on sec. 9, Irregularity of Debate (remarks) 2548 (ii).
——— Irrelevancy of Debate (remarks) 2254 (ii).
——— on sec. 4, Members Remarks checked, 2388 (ii).
——— Member's (Mr. Maclean) Remarks checked, 3199 (ii).
——— Procedure in Discussing, Arrangement with Govt., 2267 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order, *re* Member (Mr. Lefurgey) reading a Document continuously, 1766 (i).
Judges, Appnmt. of, &c., Ques. of Order *re* Member for Hants, 7943 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. on M. (Mr. Hackett) that Com. rise, 5328 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Préfontaine) 5322 (iii).
——— Ques. of Order, on h. m. using threatening language, 5330 (iii).
Long Lake Ry., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Borden, Halifax) Ref. to past Debate (ruling) 2766 (ii).
See 'Qu'Appelle.'
Macoun, Mr., Rep. *re* Peace River, Ques. of Order, 7347; Ruling *re* Ag. Com., Discussion, 7348 (iv).
Mann, Andrew Wm., Relief (B. 138) 1°*, 4997 (iii).
Members Remarks *re* Corn and Cattle Importation, &c., Ruled out of Order, in Com. of Sup., 4124 (iii).

Speaker, Mr. Deputy—*Con.*

Mess. from His Ex., Further Suppl. Estimates, 1905 (read) 7531 (iv).

Militia Act, Order, Ques. of, *re* Denial of Statement (ruling) 6386 (iv).

Moore, Jennie Davison, Relief (B. 139) 1°*, 4997 (iii).

Mutual Reserve B. 161, Irregularity of Discussion (remarks) 8682 (v).

Order in the House, Complaints *re* unnecessary Noise (remarks) 2665 (ii).

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Champagne) Ruling *re* Mr. Birkett's Amt., 4176 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Clancy) *re* 'contradicting an hon. member's statement' (ruling) 4241 (iii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry., Irregularity of Discussion (remarks) 2882; Substantive motions to adjn., 'May' quoted, 2883; (ruling) 2883-2891 (ii).

——— 'notice should be given to h.m. (Mr. Osler) before discussing question' (ruling) 2765 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Henderson) *re* Motion to adjn. (ruling) 2787 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Henderson) 'member not discussing question before the House' (remarks) 2764 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Lancaster) *re* 'placing on Table documents read in Debate' (ruling) 2786 (ii).

——— Ref. to past debate (Mr. Oliver) 2888; Misunderstanding *re* Motion to adjn., 2890 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Taylor) *re* 'reading of letters reflecting on members of the Hse' (ruling) 2789 (ii).

Railways and Canals Dept., in Com. of Sup., Irrelevancy of Discussion *re* Lachine Canal (ruling) 5913 (iii).

Rebellion Losses, Claims, &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Henderson) *re* 'discussing other matters' (ruling) 2826 (ii).

Sessions, Length of, &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) *re* Unparliamentary Language (ruling) 6641 (iv).

Seven Islands Wharf, Ques. of Order, 'contemptible' not a parliamentary term, 8007 (iv).

——— Expression 'disreputable' not to be applied to hon. members, 8008 (iv).

Supply, Passing of Items (remarks) 5926 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture, Items passed by Com. (ruling) *re* discussion, 2757 (ii).

Public Works—Irrelevancy of debate, 627 (i).

Trent Canal, Ques. of Order (ruling) 6842 (iv).

West Canadian Collieries, Limited, B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6845 (iv).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*

Acetylene Gas Lighting, Changes, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8932 (v).

Agriculture and Colonization Com., on M. (Mr. Parmelee) to sit concurrently with Hse., 6676 (iv).

——— 2nd Rep., Printing, &c., on M. to print, 8135 (v).

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8573; on Amt. (Mr. Boyd) to M. for 3°, 8667 (v).

Alien Labour Bill, Ques. of Order *re* Voting in 1892, 8588 (v).

——— Understanding *re* withdrawing Legislation, 8599 (v).

American Fishing Co. and Can. Fisheries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).

Analysts in Inland Rev. Dep., Prosecutions, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3909 (ii).

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 8439 (v).

Apples shipped in Cold Storage to G.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6184 (iv).

Arsenal established at Ottawa (remarks) 8385 (v).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Allans' Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6156, 6167, 6182 (iv).

Auditor General, Resignation, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to Sup., 6597 (iv).

Bain, Mr., Preparation of Liberal Campaign Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1924 (i).

Banff Hot Springs, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7074 (iv).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 7223; in Com., 7787 (iv).

Beaver River Fish Hatchery, Establishment (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7587 (iv).

Bell, Dr., Geological Survey, Salary, Increase, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7060, 7214 (iv).

Bell Telephone Co.'s System (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Act Amt. B. 132, 6730, 6750 (iv).

Bernier, Capt.: *See* 'Gauss.'

Binder Twine, Sale of by Govt. (remarks) in Com. on B. 124, 8057 (v).
See 'Inspection B. 124.'

Bonds, Temporary, Outstanding, Amounts, &c. (Ques.) 2187 (ii).

Book Postage, Increase of Rate (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5719 (iii).

Brantford and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s B. 22 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 1820 (i).

Bruce Mines Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8792 (v).

Business of the House, Govt. Legislation (remarks) 4958 (iii), 6787 (iv).
See 'Govt. Business.'

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Cab-hire for Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5012 (iii).
Campbell, Mr. John, Claim for Expenses *re* Sheep Quarantine (remarks) 3765 (ii).
Canada Eastern Ry. Purchase, B. 163 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 8225 (v).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6238 (iv).
Canada Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 40 (Mr. Ingram) on Sen. Amts., 6845 (iv).
Canadian Credit, Indemnity and Guaranty Co.'s incorp. B. 29 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 5297 (iii).
C.P.R., Lardo Branch Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8825 (v).
——— St. Philippe Branch Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8823 (v).
Cardinal Canal Damages: *See* 'McArthur.'
Census Bulletins *re* Industries, &c. (Ques.) 1209 (i).
Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8825 (v).
Cheese Curing, Paraffining, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).
Chicken Fattening, &c., Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7423 (iv).
Cigarettes, Prohibition and Sale B. 128 (Mr. W. S. Maclaren) in Com., 5145 (iii).
Cigarette Legislation, on prop. Res. (Mr. W. S. Maclaren) Ques. of Order, 341 (i).
Clergue Mfg. Co.'s Contract *re* Steel Rails, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. B. 171, 8835 (v).
Cold Storage Transportation on Ocean Vessels, on Amt. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 7927 (iv).
See 'Apples.'
Companies Act (1902) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Cowan) in Com., 5095 (iii).
——— B. 164 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 8842, 8899 (v).
Cornwall Canal, Davis Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6648 (iv).
———on M. for Sup., 8508, 8517 (v).
Customs Dept., Salaries and Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1797 (i).
Dairy Commissioner's Branch, Lectures, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7405 (iv).
Documents, Confidential, produced as Rets. to Hse. (remarks) in Com. on G.T.P. Res., 1697 (i).
Dog-fish Pest, Rep. of Commissioners, on Inquiry for, 6930 (iv).
Dom. Day Adjournment, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5842 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act. Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7658, 7663 (iv).
Dundonald, Lord, Dismissal, Ques. of Order, on h.m. (Mr. Russell) calling members 'mean and despicable creatures,' 5516 (iii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Dundonald, Lord, Dismissal &c., Criticism of Col. Thompson, 8127 (iv).
——— Farewell to, Adjournment *re* (remarks) 7542 (iv).
Eastman, Mr. E. P., Emplymt. at St. Louis Exhibition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7430 (iv).
Editorials in English Papers *re* Lord Dundonald's Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 6023 (iv).
Elections, Mr. Sifton's Remarks in the West (read) 8530 (v).
Estimates, 'Jumbled,' &c., in making up (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7760 (iv).
Estimates, Suppl. (remarks) 7243 (iv).
Experimental Farm Accounts, Discrepancies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7382, 7384 (iv).
Express and Tel. Cos., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to Ry. Act Amt. B. 132, in Com., 6698 (iv).
See 'Ry. Bills.'
Farm and Garden Products, Protection *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) 4037 (iii).
Fines imposed for Violation of the Inland Revenue Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3915 (ii).
Fish carried in Bond to U.S. Ports, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7586 (iv).
Fisheries Act (whaling) Amt. B. 74 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 8154 (v).
Fisheries Jurisdiction between Provs. and Dom. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).
Fishing Bounties, Methods of Payment (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5041 (iii).
Fishing Licenses granted to F. M. Markey in Northern Waters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8946 (v).
Food Inspection, Fines for Violation of Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3915 (ii).
Galops Enlargement, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6304 (iv).
Gas Lights in Georgian Bay, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5831 (iii).
'Gauss,' Str., Complaints *re* Crew (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5228 (iii).
——— Rep. of Capt. Spain (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5285 (iii).
Geological Reports, Sale and Distribution (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7213 (iv).
Govt. Business, Legislation *re* (remarks) 7363 (iv).
——— on Stmnt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4998 (iii).
See 'Business of the House.'
Govt. Employees Travelling on Rys., Redress *re* Injuries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5849 (iii).
Govt. Ownership: *See* 'Telephones,' &c.

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 966; on M. for 2°, 1784 (i); on Amt. (Mr. Clarke) and Mr. Speaker's Decision *re* Vote being taken, 2056; in Com., on sec. 1, on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 2984; on Amt. (Mr. Clarke) 3013 (ii).
——— on sec. 3, on Amt. (Mr. Roche) 3168, 3201 (ii).
——— on sec. 7 (amt.) 3252; on Amt. (Mr. Casgrain) 3324; on Amt. (Mr. Lavell) 3331 (ii).
——— on M. for 3°, (amt.) 3414 ; on Amt. (Mr. Clare) 3500; on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 3528 (ii).
G. T. P. Bill, on Appnmt. of a Fourth Commissioner (remarks) 3306, 3384 (ii).
G. T. P. Ry., Emplymt. of British Subjects on Surveys, &c., and Alien Labour Law, on Amt. (Mr. Clare) to M. for 3°, 3500 (ii).
——— Appnmt. of Commission, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1209 (i).
——— Cor., Printing, &c. (remarks) 548 (i).
——— Mr. Hays' Memo. *re* Pet. for Aid in Nov. 1902, on Criticism (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) in holding back from Rets., 3706 (ii).
——— Production of Confidential Documents, on M. (Mr. Barker) for Cor. *re* Construction, 3962 (iii).
——— Surveys, Expenditure, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6291 (iv).
G. T. Ry., Rentals, &c. (remarks) on Conc., 6684 (iv).
Grant, Geo. N., and Political Interference in Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6040 (iv).
Gregory, Lt.-Col., Resignation, &c,. on M. for Sup., 7733 (iv).
Guysborough Election, Political Interference *re* I. C. R. Employees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6029, 6040 (iv).
——— Slander of the Judges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6105 (iv).
Haanel, Dr., Rep. *re* Smelting Ores (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7058 (iv).
Horses, imported by H. F. Page into U.S., Claim for Refund of Duty, &c. (Ques.) 2804 (ii).
See 'Page.'
H. of C. P.O., Hours of Closing on Sundays (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5853 (iii).
Hudson's Bay Fishing Rights, Permits to Fish Cos., &c. (Ques.) 2117 (ii).
Hydrographic Surveys on Lake Superior (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5836 (iii).
Ice Breaking Govt. Steamers on Georgian Bay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8920 (v).
See 'Winter Navigation.' &c.
Immigrants, Destitute and stranded, &c. (remarks) 3857 (ii).
Immigration Campaign Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7347 (iv).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Immigration, Medical Inspection, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7296 (iv).
Imperial Institute, Letter from High Commissioner *re* new arrangement (remarks) 3751 (ii).
Indian Lands, Sale of Timber (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5857 (iii).
Indian Timber cut on Reserves (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6934 (iv).
Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8402, 8415 (v).
Inspection Act (binder twine) Amt. B. 124 (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Com., 8050 (v).
I. C. R. and P. E. I. Rys., Pay to Labourers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6225 (iv).
I. C. R. Employees and Political Interference in Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6040 (iv).
——— Political Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6117 (iv).
Internal Economy Com., Rep. *re* Salaries of H. of C., 8985 (v).
——— on M. to conc. in Rep., 8654 (v).
Jackson, J. B., Appnmt. as Commercial Agent, Charges *re*, on M. for Sup., 7817 (iv).
James Bay, Fishing License to Arch. McNee (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
Judges appointed as Political Partisans (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6117 (iv).
Kingston and Dom. Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 123 (Mr. Harty) in Com., 5035 (iii).
Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s B. 105 (Mr. Sutherland, Essex) on M. to receive Pet., 2927 (ii).
Letter Carriers, Inquiry for Cor. *re* New Act, 5845 (iii).
Library, House of Commons, Better Lighting, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7621 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., on M. (Mr. Hackett) that Com. rise, 5330 (iii).
Lighthouse Service on St. Lawrence, Political Pamphlet, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5017 (iii).
Liquor Traffic among Indians, Fines, in Com. of Sup., 5858 (iii).
Live Stock exported to U.S., Refund to F. H. Page, B.C., on M. for Sup., 8903 (v).
See 'Page.'
McArthur, Rev. Mr., Claims for Damages *re* Cardinal Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6309 (iv).
McCreary, W. F., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 2598 (ii).
McNee : *See* 'Hudson's Bay," 'James Bay.'
Macoun, J. M., Rep. *re* Peace River, Distribution, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7203 (iv).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Mail sent via New York and Allans' Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6184 (iv).

Mail Service, Bruce County, Complaints *re*, on M. (Mr. Donnelly) for Cor., 592 (i).

Marconi Wireless Stations, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5835 (iii).

Markey, Mr.: *See* 'Fishing Licenses,' 'Hudson's Bay.'

Masters and Mates, Fees of Examiners (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5809 (iii).

Meaford & Owen Sound Ry., Bonus *re* (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 8796 (v).

Members appointed to Govt. Offices (remarks) on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 1226 (i).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., (pay and allowance) 2907 (ii); in Com., 8125; (active service) in Com., 8072 (v).

Militia Regulations *re* Increased Pay, &c. (Ques.) 5271 (iii).

'Military Gazette' (Canadian) *re* Govt. Patronage (remarks) 7906 (iv).

Minister of Railways, Criticism *re* Silence during Debate on G. T. P. Bill, 3351 (ii).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 580, 585 (i).

Murray Harbour Ry., P.E.I., on conc. (remarks) 6684 (iv).

Mutual Reserve Life Ins. Co.'s B. 161 (Mr. Heyd) in Com., 8679 (v).

New Westminster and Vancouver B. No. 13 (Mr. Thompson) in Com. (remarks) 986 (i).

Nicola Kemloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s B. 48 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3477 (ii).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8801 (v).

N.W. Mounted Police, Land Scrip for 1885 Rebellion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7965 (iv).

Ottawa Buildings for Govt. Use, Rentals, and Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7625 (iv).

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Champagne) in Com., 4186; Pet. from City Council (read) 4186 (iii).

Ottawa River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8825 (v).

Page, Hubert F., Claim for Refund of Duty on Horses imported into U.S., &c. (Ques.) 2804 (ii).

——— on M. for Sup., Cor., &c. (read) 8903 (v).

Patent Models, Sale, Classifying, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2719 (ii).

Patterson, Dr., Salary as Quarantine Inspector (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4171 (iii).

Pilotage Act (harbour jurisdiction) Amt. B. 100 (Mr. Préfontaine) on M. for 1°, 2681 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Port Arthur Harbour B. 98 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 3893 (ii).

Postal Rates, Increase, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5719 (iii).

Postmasters' Guarantee Fund (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5851 (iii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 153 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8029, 8046 (iv).

Preferential Tariff, Importation *re* Canadian Ports, on prop. Res. (Mr. Logan) 5080 (iii).

Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Charges *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7817 (iv).

Printing of Parlt., 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 8652 (v).

Private Bills, on M. (Mr. Johnston, N.S.) to extend Time, 5188 (iii).

Private Bills reported from Com., Form on Order Paper (remarks) 985 (i).

Public Works Dept., Transfer of Work to Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 438 (i).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry., Irregularity of Debate, on M. to adjn., Mr. Dep. Speaker's rulings, 2885 (ii).

——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Osler) *re* Attack by Mr. Scott, M.P., 2897 (ii).

——— Order (Ques. of) "a member cannot anticipate on the Order Paper," on M. to adjn., 2893 (ii).

Questions put by Members, Ministerial Replies, &c. (remarks) 1152 (i).

Railway Act (express and telephone cos.) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3811 (ii).

——— B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Express Cos., 6698; on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Ry. Commissioners, 6717; on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Standard Passenger Tolls, 6766; on Amt. (Mr. Bennett) to M. for 3°, Telephone Control, 7564; on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) Two-cent Rate, 7558 (iv).

Railway Subsidies B. 157 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 8127 (v).

——— Authorization B. 171 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 8790; on M. for 3° (amt.) *re* Telephones, 9055 (v).

Railway Freight Rates in Ont., on M. (Mr. Broder) to adjn., 2933 (ii).

Real Estate Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s B. 27 (Mr. Demers, Iberville) in Com., 1818 (i).

Representation Act (1903) Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7670; on M. for 3°, 7786 (iv).

Rio de Janeiro Tramway, Light and Power Co.'s B. 142 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for Pet., 4997; on M. for 2°, 5300 (iii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
St. Lawrence Channel: *See* 'Lighthouse,' &c.
Safety Appliances for Ry. Employees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5990 (iii).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co.'s Homestead Entries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7050 (iv).
School Land Taxes, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7078 (iv).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection, B. 125 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 3722 (ii); in Com. on B., 4950 (iii).
Seed Growers' Association incorp. B. 151 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 7230; in Com., 7234 (iv).
Sergeant-at-Arms, Expenditure *re* Speaker's Apartments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8990 (iv).
Session, Length of, Delay, &c., in calling Parlt. (remarks) 6639 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order, Unparliamentary Language (Mr. Oliver) 6641 (iv).
Seven Islands Wharf *re* Anonymous Letter (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7993 (iv).
——— Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7975 (iv).
Shawenigan Falls and Grand Mère B. 13 (Mr. Thompson) in Com. (remarks) 986 (i).
Similkameen and Keremeos Ry. Co.'s B., on M. to receive Pet., 3846 (ii).
Standard Chemical Co., Purchase of Wood Alcohol (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3923 (ii).
Standard Passenger Tolls, on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to Ry. B., 6766 (iv).
Stewart, Mr., Inspector of Timber, Duties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7072 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (archives) 2727 (ii); (dairying, cold storage, &c.) 7405; (experimental farm accounts) 7382 (iv); (experimental farms) 4958 (iii); (Imperial Institute, London) 3730; (Patent Record) 2732; (Year-book) 2738 (ii).
Canals—Galops (channel completion) 6339; (enlargement) 6304 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (dredging basins) 6826; (slope walls) 6825 (iv).
Canals—North Channel (dam, &c.) 6314 (iv).
Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 6817 (iv).
Canals—Trent (construction) 6827 (iv).
Canals—Welland (electric plant) 6349, 6797; (obstructions, &c.) 6360 (iv).
Charges of Management (Ass't. Receiver's Office) 232; (Dom. and provincial accounts) 234; (printing Dom. notes) 245 (i).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 2717; (salaries) 2716 (ii); Aud. Gen.'s Office (contingencies) 9034 (v); Customs (salaries) 1792, 1798 (i); Inland Revenue (salaries) 3909 (ii); (private secretary) 8976 (v); Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 5001 (iii); Public Works (salaries) 438 (i); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 6150 (iv).
Customs (inspectors' salaries) 1980; (salary increases) 1966; Outside Service (salaries at ports) 1899 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Dom. Lands (surveys, &c.) 7050; (timber protection) 7071 (iv).
Fisheries (fish culture) 7587; (Georgian Bay laboratory) 7593; (inspectors, &c.) 7572 (iv).
Geological Survey (assay offices) 7221; (compiling surveys) 7220; (explorations, B. C.) 7220; (explorations and surveys) 7215; (salaries) 7199; (specimen purchases) 7220 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. (surveys) 8962 (v).
House of Commons (salaries) 8977 (v).
Immigration (medical inspection) 7296 (iv).
Indians (Indian fund grant) 5858 (iii); N.S. (salaries) 6933 (iv); Ont. (medical attendance) 5854 (iii); (surveys, Georgian Bay) 5856 (iii); P.E.I. (travelling expenses) 6938 (iv).
Inland Revenue—Excise (Frechette, L. A., special translation) 3922; (methylated spirits) 3923 (ii).
Justice—Miscellaneous (consolidation of statutes) 7960; (litigated matters) 7961 (iv); Supreme Court (E. R. Taschereau) 9039 (v).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (acetylene gas installation) 8932 (v); (engineers, &c.) 5833; (hydrographic surveys) 5836; (marine hospitals) 5837; (St. Lawrence buoys) 5805; (wireless stations) 5835 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and London) 6215; (St. John and W. Indies) 6216 (iv).
Militia (Dom. arsenal) 8385 (v).
Miscellaneous (assay office, Vancouver) 7078; (Banff Springs) 7074; (boundary demarcation) 7077; (Champlain's monument) 7972; (colonization roads in Man. and N. W. T.) 8018, 8020 (iv), 9046 (v); (maps, printing, &c.) 7079 (iv); (unforeseen expenses) 8386 (v); (Yoho Park) 7075 (iv).
N. W. Mounted Police (pay of force) 2687; (subsistence, &c.) 2713; Yukon (pay, subsistence, &c.) 2713 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 5292 (iii); (ice breakers) 8920, 8922 (v); (marine biological service) 5290 (iii); (St. Lawrence route) 6156 (iv).
Penitentiaries (parole system) 7955 (iv).
Post Office (payments for services) 5852; (Ross, Mr., Chief Inspector) 5852 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (armouries) 7620; (electric power) 7631; (experimental farms) 7620; (generally) 7619; (heating, &c.) 7630 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Campbellton building) 463 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Alexandria P.O.) 511; (Belleville armoury) 525; (Fort William P.O.) 536; (Guelph armoury) 537; (Hawkesbury P.O.) 544 (i).
Public Works— Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 455 (i); (grounds) 7629; (heating, &c.) 7629; (lighting, repairs, &c.) 7620; (Major's Hill park) 7629 (iv); (post office reconstruction) 3908 (ii); (Rideau Hall, fuel) 7628 (iv); (Royal Mint) 457 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Actonvale P.O.) 663 (i); (Valleyfield) 7972; Yukon (repairs, &c.) 7632 (iv).
Public Works—Dredging—Generally (new plant) 7885; Ont. (new plant) 7881; P.E.I. (new dredge) 7880 (iv).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Glace Bay) 7641 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood harbour) 7751, 8022; (Depot Harbour) 7754; (Gananoque dredging) 7754; (Goderich harbour) 7757; (Grand Bend pier) 7845; (Kingsville pier) 7852; (Meaford pier) 7852; (Owen Sound harbour) 7853; (Rondeau, dredging) 7855; (Sault Ste. Marie, dredging) 7856 (iv); (Sault Ste. Marie, wharf) 9029 (v); (Spanish River) 7857, 7861; (Témiscaming wharf) 7852; (Thessalon) 7863; (Thornbury) 7863 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Bonaventure East) 7766; (Caplan breakwater) 7767; (Champlain wharf) 7767; (Deschambault wharf) 7767; (Grand Vallée pier) 7768; Lotbinière wharf) 7777; (Rimouski piers) 7780; (Rivière du Loup) 7781; (Ste. Famille pier) 7782; (Seven Islands wharf) 7828, 7832, 7975; (Three Rivers wharf) 7838; (Yamaska dredging) 7843 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Yukon (Lewes and Yukon rivers) 7880 (iv).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 7895; (architects, &c.) 7895; (surveys, &c.) 7895; (transportation commission) 7896 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—B.C. (Vancouver Island) 9032 (v).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—P.E.I. (Govt. System) 7894 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Que. (Anticosti, Fox Bay) 7895; (Bersimis to Godbout) 7895; (Marconi system) 7896 (iv).

Quarantine B.C. (small-pox inspection) 4159; (steamer service) 4202; (William's Head inspection) 4167; Que. (Grosse Isle steamers) 4192 (iii).

Railways—I.C. R. (Grand Narrows bridge) 5983 (iii); (Windsor branch) 6219 (iv).

Railways—P.E.I. (Alberton station) 6009; (Curtis Creek line) 5987; (Kensington accommodation) 5987; (Montague bridge surveys) 6011; (Murray Harbour branch) 5999; (Westinghouse brakes) 5989 (iii); (working expenses) 6220 (iv).

Taschereau, Chief Justice, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Brodeur) *re* Impeachment, 9041 (v).

Telephone and Telegraph Lines, Nationalization of, on M. (Mr. Maclean) to adjn., 3023 (ii).

See 'Ry. Bills.'

Temiscouata Ry. Co.'s B. 144 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 6790 (iv).

Temporary Clerks, Placing on Permanent List (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7896 (iv).

Thompson River Improvement Co.'s incorp. B. 79 (Mr. Galliher) on Sen. Amts., 7966 (iv).

Thorold and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 61, Pet. *re* Corrections (remarks) 5839 (iii).

Timigami Ry. Co.'s B. 94 (Mr. McCool), 3758 (ii).

Tobacco: *See* 'Inland Revenue,' &c.

Treadgold Concession, Delay in bringing down Commissioner's Rep. (remarks) 7795 (iv).

——— Printing, &c. (remarks) 8024 (v).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Tree Culture, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7071 (iv).

Union Labels B. 35 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) on M. for 2°, 3830 (ii).

Vaccine Stations Establishments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4163 (iii).

Vancouver Dry Dock, Charges *re* Contract, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9073 (v).

Vegetables, Duty on: *See* 'Farm,' &c.

Ways and Means (printing presses) in Com. on Res., 8895 (v).

West Canadian Collieries, Limited, B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6094; on Sen. Amts., 7721 (iv).

Whale Fishing: *See* 'Fisheries Act,' &c.

Winnipeg Customs Port, Increase of Revenue, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1904 (i).

Winter Navigation, Lake Superior, Ice-breaker Test (Ques.) 1209 (i).

See 'Supply—Ocean and River,' &c.

Wood Alcohol: *See* 'Standard Chemical Co.'

Woollen and Cotton Industry, Tariff *re* (remarks) 1470 (i).

Yoho Park, Construction of Roads, &c., in Com. of Sup., 7075 (iv).

Yukon, Gobeil, Mr., Charges *re* Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9059 (v).

Stephens, Mr. G., *Kent, Ont.*

Animals, Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 8438 (iv).

Inspection Act (binder twine) Amt. B. 124 (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Com., 8051 (iv).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 125 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 4943 (iii).

Stewart, Mr. D. A., *Lisgar.*

Can. Northern Ry. Co., Land Subsidy, &c. (M. for cor.*) 5094 (iii).

Sutherland, Hon. James (Minister of Public Works), *North Oxford.*

Bain, Mr., Preparation of Liberal Campaign Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1935 (i).

Bronte Harbour, Labourers Wages, on Inquiry for Ret., 1875 (i).

Business of the Hse., and Supply *re* Private Members Day (remarks) 595 (i).

Dry Dock Facilities, Pacific Coast (Ans.) 249 (i).

Elevators in H. of C., Imperfect Machinery, &c. (remarks) 2459 (ii).

Flag on Parliament Building replaced by Union Jack (remarks) 220 (i).

Govt. Offices, Rentals in Montreal and Ottawa (Ans.) 550 (iv).

Grain Shipments to Halifax via I.C.R., Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 335 (i).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*
G.T.P. Surveys, Instructions *re* Alien Labour, &c. (Ans.) 554 (iv).
Guelph Public Buildings, Plans *re* (remarks) 599 (i).
I.C.R., Employees Demill and Peterson, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 334 (i).
Ottawa Custom House, Erection of (Ans.) 552 (iv).
Mail Service, Bruce County, Complaints, &c., on M. (Mr. Donnelly) for Cor., 591 (i).
Mint, Selection of Site, &c. (Ans.) 248 (i).
Montreal Post Office, Extra Work for Employees, &c. (Ans.) 552 (i).
Montreal Post Office, Increased Accommodations, &c. (Ans.) 551 (i).
Point Prim Pier, Construction of, Surveys, &c. (Ans.) 1664 (i).
Public Buildings, Construction, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 637 (i).
Public Works and Marine Dept., Transfer of Work, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 437, 625 (i).
Public Works, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 204 (i).
Pugwash, N.S., Name, &c. (Ans.) 1667 (i).
Sackville and Cape Tormentine Mail Contract (Ans.) 557 (i).
St. Andrews Rapids Improvements, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 398 (i).
St. John's, P.Q., Purchase of Site, Price, &c. (Ans.) 1877, 1879 (i).
Sec. of State, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 204 (i).
Suction Dredges, Mar. Provs., Construction, &c. (Ans.) 1665 (i).
SUPPLY :
Civil Govt.—Public Works (salaries) 437 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Nanimo custom house) 700; (Rossland armoury) 701; (Vancouver P.O.) 704 (i).
Public Works — Buildings — Man. (Dom. buildings, renewals) 685; (Winnipeg, buildings) 696; (Winnipeg, immigration shed) 685; (Winnipeg, military building) 695 ; (Winnipeg, military magazine) 687; (Winnipeg P.O.) 687 (i).
Public Buildings—Mar. Provs. (generally) 475 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Campbellton building) 463; (Ricibucto P.O.) 463 ; (St. John, repairs) 464; (Woodstock armoury) 475 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax, immigrant shed) 504; (Halifax, public buildings) 505 ; (Sydney P.O.) 506 ; (Sydney Mines P.O.) 506 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Calgary P.O.) 697; (court house repairs) 697; (Dom. buildings, renewals) 697; (Edmonton jail) 697; (Macleod court house) 699 ; (Moosejaw P.O.) 699; (Prince Albert court house) 699; (Red Deer court house) 700 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Alexandria P.O.) 506; (Belleville armoury) 524; (Berlin P.O.) 529; (Bowmanville P.O.) 529 ; (Brantford drill hall) 530; (Bridgeburg P.O.) 530; (Chatham armoury) 531 ; (Clinton P.O.) 531; (Cobourg armoury) 531 ;

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Buildings—Ont.—*Con.*
(Deseronto P.O.) 534; (Fort William P.O.) 535; (Guelph armoury) 536, 650; (Guelph P.O.) 538, 651; (Hawkesbury P.O.) 544 ; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 600; (London armoury) 602; (Oshawa P.O.) 608; (Peterborough armoury) 626; (Rentals) 535; (St. Catharines drill hall) 631; (St. Mary's P.O.) 631; (Sault Ste. Marie, P.O.) 639; (Stratford armoury) 640; (Toronto, drill hall) 644; (Toronto, examining warehouse) 643, 645; (Toronto, military magazines) 645; (Toronto, P.O.) 645; (Toronto Junction) 648; (Wingham P.O.) 648; (Woodstock armoury) 648 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (elevator for West Block) 619; (observatory) 455 ; (paving Parlt. Square) 621 ; (Printing Bureau, addition) 621; (royal mint) 456; (steel shelving) 620; (Victoria museum) 458 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Charlottetown building) 462 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Actonvale P.O.) 506, 656; (Grosse Isle quarantine station) 666; (hospital for trachoma, &c.) 684; (Lévis P.O.) 667; (Longueuil P.O.) 668; (Magog P.O.) 680; (Montreal, buildings) 682; (Montreal, examining warehouse) 681; (Quebec immigrant buildings) 682; (Quebec P.O., renewals) 684; (St. Hyacinthe drill hall, &c.) 684; (St. Johns examining warehouse) 684; (St. Johns P.O.) 685 ; (St. Louis de Mile End) 685; (Sherbrooke drill hall) 684; (Terrebonne P.O.) 685 ; (Thetford Mines P.O.) 685 (i).
Sydney, N.S., Postmaster, Remuneration from Nfld. Govt. (Ans.) 251 (i).
Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 204 (i).
Vancouver Dry Dock, on Inquiry for Ret., 1874 (i).
Wilson's Beach Breakwater, Completion, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 553 (i).

Sutherland, Mr. R. F., *North Essex.*
Christman, Annie, Relief (B. 155) 1° m., 6680 (iv).
Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s (B. 105) M. to receive Pet., 2601, 2926; 1°*, 3016 (ii).
Musketry School Camp at Ottawa, Complaints *re* Charges (remarks) 7104 (iv).
Pacific Bank of Canada (B. 159) 1°*, 6973 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Seven Islands wharf) 8003 (iv).

Talbot, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*
Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8631 (v).
Detroit Post Office, Dorchester County, Closing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9009 (v).
G. T. P. Bill, Appnmt. of Fourth Commissioner, 3382 (ii).

Talbot, Mr. O. E.—*Con.*

I. C. R., Train Service with Mar. Provs., Par. in 'Le Canada' (remarks) 3312 (ii).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6472 (iv); (active service) in Com., 8069 (v); (pay and allowance) in Com. on Res., 2914 (ii).

Montreal Terminal Ry. Co.'s (B. 120) M. to ref. back to Com. on Rys., 6785 (iv).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 100 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 4066 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Inland Revenue—Excise (methylated spirits) 3931 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Grand Vallée pier) 7772; (Three Rivers wharf) 7840 (iv).

Telephone and Telegraph Lines, Nationalization of, on M. (Mr. Maclean) to adjn., 3021 (ii).

Wood Alcohol, Purchase from Standard Chemical Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3931 (ii).

Tarte, Hon. J. I., *Montreal, St. Mary's.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on sec. 9, 2483 (ii).

Laprairie, Damages caused by Floods (remarks) 1147 (i).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) on M. for 2°, 280 (i).

SUPPLY:

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Murray Bay and Ouelle River) 7459 (iv).

Taylor, Mr. G., *South Leeds.*

Acetylene Gas in Lighthouses, St. Lawrence River, Notification to Keepers (Ques.) 6681 (iv).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5029 (iii).

See 'Fiddler's,' &c.

Acton, J. A., Lighthouse keeper at Burnt Island, Dismissal (Ques.) 2377 (ii).

Adjourning Debates, Whips' Arrangements (explanation) 2003, 2109 (ii).

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8574, 8647 (v).

Athens P.O., Charges against Postmaster, &c. (Ques.) 2601 (ii).

Bain, Mr., Preparation of Liberal Campaign Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1868, 1934 (i).

Brennan, D. J., Removal Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).

Brockville and Ottawa, and G. T. R. Connections (remarks) 1471 (i), 2119, 2461 (ii).

——— Connection, Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) 3313 (ii).

Brockville, Cheese Curing Room, Total Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.) 2839 (ii).

See 'Cheese.'

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Burnt Island Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2377 (ii).

Cab-Hire for Ministers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5007, 5013 (iii).

Canadian and American Fishing Regulations on St. Lawrence (remarks) 4492 (iii).

——— Cor. from Mr. Bastedo, &c. (read) 4328 (iii).

——— Letter from Mr. Day (read) 5189 (iii).

Carbide, Purchase of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5301 (iii).

Census, Saskatchewan District, Object and Purpose of, &c. (Ques.) 3759 (ii).

Cheese Cooling Stations, Expenditure and Accounts (remarks) 7171 (iv).

Cheese Curing and Paraffining, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7413; Par. in Trade Bulletin (read) 7413 (iv).

Cheese Curing at Brockville and other Places, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 3540 (ii).

See 'Brockville.'

Chicken Fattening, &c., Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7422 (iv).

——— Expenditure *re* (remarks) 7171 (iv).

Cowansville, Que., Cheese Cooling Room, Total Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2847 (ii).

Customs, Contingencies, &c., Information supplied (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1993 (i).

——— Salaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1907 (i).

Dargavel, John, Dismissal from Elgin Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5690 (iii).

Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 8252 (v).

Experimental Farms Accounts, Expenditure, &c. (remarks) 7171 (iv).

Experimental Farm at Ottawa, Total Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4974 (iii).

Experimental Farms, Discrepancy *re* Accounts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7364, 7371 (iv).

Fiddler's Elbow, Light on Lindoe Island, Change to Acetylene Gas (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5811 (iii).

Fishery Reg. between Can. and U.S., Cor. *re* (remarks) 4416 (iii).

See 'Can. and American Fishing,' &c.

Frankville Postmaster, Refusal to send Letter to M.P., without Postage Stamps (remarks) 6549 (iv).

Gananoque Lighthouses, Dismissal of Lightkeeper Landon (Que.) 2376 (ii).

Gananoque Shoals, Buoy Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5345 (iii).

See 'Acetylene,' &c.

Govt. Steamers, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5205 (iii).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1059 (i); in Com., 2254; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 3413; Emplymt. of British Subjects, and Alien Labour Law, on Amt. (Mr. Clare) to M. for 3°, 3460; Alien Labour Bill, and Evidence taken before Com. quoted, 3461 (ii).

G. T. P. Bill, on Amt. (Mr. Clarke and Mr. Speaker's Decision *re* Vote being taken, 2056 (ii).

——— Rep. of Shareholders, Criticism *re* 'fake' Report (remarks) 2109 (ii).

——— Whips' Agreements *re* adjourning, &c. (explanation) 2003, 2109 (ii).

Hope Island, Timber cut by Manley Chew (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5251 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8414 (v).

——— (remarks) 8387 (v).

Kingston Penitentiary, Appnmt. of Protestant Chaplain, Letter *re*, (read) in Com. of Sup., 7950 (iv).

Landon, J. A., Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2376 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., on M. (Mr. Hackett) that Com. rise, 5333 (iii).

——— Thousand Island Buoy Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5345 (iii).

Lighthouse Keepers on St. Lawrence, Dismissals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5029 (iii).

——— Change to Acetylene Gas, Notification to Keepers (Ques.) 6681 (iv).

Lindoe Island Light, Dismissal of Mr. Wallace (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5811 (iii).

Mail Connections via Brockville : *See* 'Brockville.'

Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co.'s Contract, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5834 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Contingencies, Cab-Hire, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5007 (iii).

Mutual Reserve Fund Life Ins. Co., Appeal *re* (Ques.) 8777 (iv).

Nash, E. A., Dismissal as Dom. Lands Agent in Kamloops, B.C., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2847 (ii).

N. W. Ter. Representation Act Amt. (B. 117) 1° m., 3387 (ii).

O'Donoghue, J. D., Political speeches, &c. in B.C. (remarks) 4077 (iii).

Ottawa Buildings, Concentration of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 626 (i).

Ottawa Buildings rented by Govt., Number, Rental, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3772 (ii).

Ottawa Carbide Co.'s Contracts with Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5302 (iii).
See 'Acetylene,' &c.

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Pacific Coast, Dry Dock Facilities, &c. (Ques.) 248 (i).

Personal Explanation *re* Agreement between Whips to adjourn, 2003, 2109 (ii).

Poonamalee Bridge, Damages caused by Floods (remarks) 1149 (i).

Post Office Matters, Free Postage to Members of Parlt. (remarks) 6549 (iv).

Poultry Stations : *See* 'Chicken Fattening,' &c.

Prescott Carbide Co., Establishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5302 (iii).

Public Buildings, Policy *re* Construction, Resolution of 1892 (remarks) 676 (i).

Public Works Dept., Transfer of Work to Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).

Qu'Appelle and Wishart Mail Service, Contract *re*, &c. (Ques.) 2556 (ii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry., Ques. of Order, 'reading letters reflecting on Members of the Hse.' 2788 (ii).

Railway Commission, Names, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 219 (i).

Railway Connections at Brockville, and Action of Govt. (remarks) 2119 (ii).
See 'Brockville.'

Rideau Canal, Damages to Works, &c. (remarks) 1149 (i).

St. Hyacinthe, Que., Cheese Cooling Rooms, Total Expenditure (M. for ret.*) 2847 (ii).

St. Lawrence River Ship Channel, in Com. of Sup., 7616 (iv).

Seven Islands Wharf, Anonymous Letter read in Com. of Sup., 7990; Commission of Investigation asked for, 7990 (iv).

——— Questions asked Min. of Justice, &c., in Com. of Sup., 8011 (iv).

Standard Chemical Co., Purchase of Wood Alcohol, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3924 (ii).

'Star' Newspaper, Canvassed for by Postmasters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5691 (iii).

Steamboat Inspection Act (mechanical power) Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Préfontaine) on M. for 1°, 2683 (ii); in Com., 4074 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice—Yukon (sheriffs, allowances) 7945 (iv).

Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms accounts) 7364 (iv); (Imperial Institute, London) 3730 (ii); (exhibitions) 4094; (experimental farms) 4974 (iii).

Canals—Chambly (macadamazing roads) 6872 (iv); Rideau (extension) 8382 (v); Sault Ste. Marie construction) 6818; Soulanges (workshops, &c.) 6863 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 5854 (iii); Inland Revenue (salaries) 3909 (ii); Public Works (salaries) 436 (i).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Customs (inspectors' salaries) 1981; Outside Ports (salaries) 1907 (i).

Indians—Ont. (medical attendance) 5855 (iii).

Inland Revenue—Excise (legal expenses) 3915; (methylated spirits) 3923 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (engineers, &c.) 5834; (Lindoe Island light) 5811; (light keepers' salaries) 5300; (wireless stations) 5834 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 5006 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs) 5201 (iii).; (St. Lawrence River ship channel) 7616 (iv); (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 5289 (iii.)

Penitentiaries, Kingston (chaplain's salary) 7950 (iv).

Post Office (letter carriers promotions) 5853 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (St. John quarantine water service) 465 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston, R.M.C.) 601; (Oshawa P.O.) 608; (Peterborough armoury) 626; (St. Mary's, P.O.) 634 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Victoria Museum) 459 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Longueuil P.O.) 676 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Goderich Harbour) 7763 (iv); Que. (Seven Islands wharf) 7990; (Deschambault wharf) 7767; (Grand Vallée pier) 7772; (Three Rivers wharf) 7837 (iv).

Railway Commission (salaries and maintenance) 8383 (v).

Sydney Postmaster, Remuneration from Nfld. Govt. (Ques.) 251 (i).

Thousand Island Buoys: *See* 'Lighthouse,' &c.

Ventilation of the Chamber, Opening of Windows, &c. (remarks) 4416 (iii).

Watches supplied to Inspectors of Electric Lights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3917 (ii).

Whips' Agreements *re* Adjournments, &c. (explanation) 2109 (ii).

——— *re* Speeches on G. T. P Bill, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Bell) 2003 (ii).

Whisky supplied for Wolverhampton Exhibition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4094 (iii).

Williams, Dr., J. D. R., Canal Toll Collector, Salary, Receipt, &c. (Ques.) 252 (i).

Wolverhampton Exhibition, Purchase of Whisky (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3742 (ii).

Wood Alcohol, Standard Chemical Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3923 (ii).

Wrecking Investigations Expenditure, in Com. of Sup., 5261 (iii).

Thompson, Mr. A. T., *Haldimand and Monck.*

Atlantic and North-west Ry. Co.'s (B. 14) 1°*, 396 (i).

Budget, on The, 4502 (iii).

C. P. Ry. Co.'s (B. 13) 1°*, 396 (i).

Curtis, Charles G., Patent Relief B. (M.) to receive Pet., 2759 (ii).

Thompson, Mr. A. T.—*Con.*

Dundonald, Lord, G.O.C., Dismissal by Govt. &c. (remarks) 7119 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 1014 (i).

Imperial Loan and Investment Co.'s (B. 58) 1°*, 1297 (i).

Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res. (pay and allowance) 2911 (ii); on M. for 2°, 298; in Com. on Res., 494 (i); in Com. on B., 6434; (constables) 6525; (Inspector General) 6526; (peace establishment) 6447; (riots, &c.) in Com., 6513; (target practice) 6473; on Amt. (Mr. Tisdale) to M. for 3°, 8191 (iv).

Militia Regulations, Remuneration *re* Camp Attendance (remarks) 3757 (ii).

New Westminster and Vancouver, C. P. Ry. (B. 13) in Com., 986 (i).

Ontario Accident Insurance Co.'s (B. 67) 1°*, 1450 (i).

Security Bonds for Public Officers, and U. S. Guarantee Cos. (Ques.) 3387 (ii).

Shawinigan Falls and Grand Mère (B. 13) in Com., 986 (i).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Trent (dredging machinery) 7466 (iv).

Thomson, Mr. T. I., *South Grey.*

Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com., 8611 (v).

'Bayfield,' Str., Sale of, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4193 (iii).

Binder Twine, Sale of by Govt., &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 124, 8058 (v).

Campaign Documents prepared by Min. of Marine (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5006 (iii).

Chamberlain's Policy, Question to Mr. Logan, 1470 (i).

Furniture Trade with Japan (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4130 (iii).

Govt. Steamers, Repairs, &c., in Com. of Sup., 5229 (iii).

Grain Inspection B. 113 (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Com., 8063 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 1538 (i); on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Richardson) 3425 (ii).

Inspection Act (binder twine) Amt. B. 124 (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Com., 8058 (v).

Mail Service, Bruce County, Complaints *re*, on M. (Mr. Donnelly) for Cor., 594 (i).

Owen Sound Postal Service, Pet. *re* Letter Box in Bay Ward (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5645 (iii).

Postal Service, Complaints *re*, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5644 (iii).

Post Office Deficits (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5604 (iii).

Thomson, Mr. T. I.—*Con.*
Post Office Finances, Deficits, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5644 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 4096 (iii).
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 5006; Post Office (salaries), 5604 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph P.O.) 654; (Oshawa P. O.) 609 (i); Ottawa (post office reconstruction) 3908 (ii); Que. (Actonvale P.O.) 660 (i).
Quarantine—B.C. (steamers) 4199; Que. (Grosse Isle steamer) 4193 (iii).

Tisdale, Hon. David, *South Norfolk.*
Dundonald, Lord, G.O.C., Dismissal, &c. by Govt., Mr. Lemieux's Speech in Eng. *re*, (remarks) 7106 (iv).
Militia Act Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) on M. for 2°, 255; in Com. on Res., 479 (i); in Com., 6470; (Defence of Can.) 6487; (target practice) 6470 (iv); on M. for 3°, (amt.) 8155; on Amt. (Mr. Logan) to M. for 3°, 8205 (v).
Militia Bill, Reprinting, &c. (remarks) 6882 (iv).
Militia Regulations, Inquiry for, 3728 (ii).
Militia Regulations, Remuneration *re* Camp Attendance, &c. (remarks) 3757 (ii).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry., Order, Ques. of, 'not addressing members by their constituency,' 2861 (ii).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s (B. 9) 1°*, 396 (i).
Temiscouata Ry. Co.'s B. 144 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 6790 (iv).

Tobin, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*
Hope Island, Timber cut by Manley Chew (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5242 (iii).

Tolmie, Mr. J., *West Bruce.*
Mail Service, Bruce County, Complaints, &c., on M. (Mr. Donnelly) for Cor., 591 (i).

Tolton, Mr. E., *North Wellington.*
Agriculture, Min. of, Expenditure *re* Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 791 (i).
Official Cars, &c., Constructed and used by Govt. Officials, &c. (Ques.) 3309 (ii).
——— (M. for ret.) 3769 (ii).
——— Construction, &c., by Govt. (M. for ret.) 5093 (iii).
Palmerston Customs Collections, &c. (Ques.) 557 (i).
Peat Industry, Financial Assistance by Govt. (Ques.) 4412 (iii).

Tucker, Mr. J. J., *St. John City, N.B.*
SUPPLY:
Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Great Salmon River) 9033 (iv).

Tupper, Hon. Sir C. H., K.C.M.G., *Pictou.*
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., on sec. 1, Amt. to clause 3 (Mr. Barker) 2990; in Com. on sec. 2, 3116 (ii).
——— Emplymt. of Canadians as Engineers, &c. (remarks) 3116 (ii).

Turgeon, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*
Caraquet Ry., Purchase of by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9028 (v).
Dog-fish Pest, Commission *re* Investigation, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7011 (iv).
Fishery Regulations in N. B. (remarks) 8956 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Shippegan harbour) 9028 (v).

Vrooman, Mr. A. E., *South Victoria, Ont.*
SUPPLY:
Canals—Trent (construction) 6827 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Otonabee dredging) 7855; (Port Perry dredging) 7854 (iv).
Quarantine—N. W. T. (medical expenses) 4146, 4150 (iii).

Wade, Mr. F. B., *Annapolis.*
Agriculture and Colonization Com., on M. (Mr. Parmelee) to sit concurrently with Sittings of Hse., 6677 (iv).
Apple Shipments in Cold Storage on Atlantic Strs. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6177 (iv).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6166 (iv).
Canso Strait Bridge Co.'s (B. 64) 1°*, 1297 (i).
Criminal Code (minerals) Amt. (B. 76) 1° m., 1781 (i); 2° m., 4718; in Com., 4719 (iii).
Dog-fish Pest, Extermination of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7008 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 869 (i); in Com., on sec. 7, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) 3232 (ii); on sec. 4 of schedule, 2408; on sec. 5 of schedule, 2434; on sec. 9 of schedule, 2624 (ii).
Newfoundland Fisheries Treaty with U.S., on M. (Mr. Kaulbach) 2128 (ii).
Public Accounts Com. (M.) 396 (i).
——— Meetings, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1945 (i).
——— Meetings (remarks) 4218 (iii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Decision of Ry. Commissioners, 6716 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 6166 (iv).
Public Works— Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Victoria Beach) 7647 (iv).
Thompson River Improvement Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Morrison) in Com., 4693 (iii).
West Canadian Collieries Limited, B. 80 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4689 (iii).

Ward, Mr. H. A., *East Durham.*

Cornwall Canal, Davis Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6671 (iv).
Dundonald, Lord, G.O.C., Dismissal, &c., and Political Interference (remarks) 7152 (iv).
Gregory, Lt.-Col., Resignation, &c., on M. for Sup., 7694 (iv).
Militia Act (pay and allowance) Amt. B. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 2919 (ii); in Com., 6513 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. Tisdale) to M. for 3°, 8181 (v).
Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co.'s B. 161 (Mr. Heyd) in Com., 8707 (v).
Trent Canal, Rice Lake Route, Rep., &c. (Ques.) 218 (i).
——— Rep. of Mr. McLeod (M. for copy*) 224 (i).
——— Trenton and Port Hope Routes, Rep. *re* (M. for copies*) 561 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5284 (iii).
Trent Valley Canal, Completion, &c., on M. for Sup., 8717; Cor., and Reps. of Engineers (read) 8719 (v).

Wilmot, Mr. R. D., *Sunbury and Queen's, N.B.*

Census Enumerations *re* Religions, N.B., Authority for, &c. (Ques.) 2803 (ii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on prop. Res., 1440 (i).
St. John River Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7886 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Public Works— Dredging—Mar. Provs. (hydraulic plant) 7880; N.S. (new plant) 7886 (iv).

Wilson, Mr. U., *Lennox.*

Agriculture and Colonization Com., on M. (Mr. Parmelee) to sit during Sittings of Hse., 6680 (iv).
Alien Labour Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir Wm. Mulock) on M. for 1°, 790 (i).
Brockville and Ottawa and G. T. R. Connections, Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) 3314 (ii).
Bryce, Dr., Appnmt. and Salary, in Com. of Sup., 6963 (iv).
Budget, on The, 4806 (iii).
Cornwall Canal, and Davis Contract (remarks) *re* Discussion, 7540 (iv).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6670 (iv).
Customs Dept., Salaries and Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1794 (i).
Doukhobors, Dispute with Dom. Govt., Investigation *re,* by Prof. Mavor (Ques.) 4415 (iii).
Furniture Trade with Japan (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4130 (iii).
Gallagher, W. L., Dismissal from Wilton Post Office (M. for cor.) 221 (i).
See 'Wilton.'

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., on sec. 2, 2290; on sec. 4, 2423; on Amt. (Mr. Lavell) 3330 (ii).
G. T. P. Surveys, Expenditure, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6291 (iv).
Immigration Agents employed by Dom. Govt., Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 223 (i).
Immigration Agents employed on Commission, Amount paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 223 (i).
Immigration, Agents' Salaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7272 (iv).
Immigrants deported from U.S. to Winnipeg, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' 364, 403 (i).
Immigrants deported, 1902 to 1904, Causes, &c. (Ques.) 995 (i).
Immigrants, Destitute and stranded in Canada, &c. (remarks) 3864 (ii).
Immigration Estimates (remarks) 7222 (iv).
Immigrants, Italians, Rep. *re* Destitute Circumstances (remarks) 6931 (iv).
Lead Bounties B. 127 (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Com., 4056 (iii).
Macoun, J. M., Rep. *re* Peace River Distict, Distribution, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7212 (iv).
Napanee River, Buoy Contract, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5028 (iii).
——— Cor. with Mr. Mowers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5233 (iii).
——— Letter to Dept. *re* (read) 5335 (iii).
——— Painting, &c. (Ques.) 6149 (iv).
Personal Explanation (Mr. Roche, Hfx.) *re* Speeches in Hse. (remarks) 4090, 4141 (iii).
Picton Custom House, Rental, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7624 (iv).
Ry. Commission, Rent of Offices (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7626 (iv).
Rio de Janeiro Tramway Light and Power Co.'s B. 142 (Mr. Calvert) on M. to receive Pet., 4997 (iii).
Small-pox at North Bay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4156 (iii).
Speeches of Mr. Roche, Hfx., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Ingram) 4090, 4141 (iii).
Steel Bounties B. [illegible] (Sir Richard Cartwright) on M. for 3°, 8393 (v).
SUPPLY :
Administration of Justice (Judge Dodd) 7939 (iv).
Adulteration of Food (fraudulent marking) 4091 (iii).
Agriculture (Imperial Institute, London) 3738, 3749 (ii); (exhibitions) 4102; (St. Louis exhibition) 4101 (iii).
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1794 (i); Interior (salaries) 6967 (iv).
Dom. Lands (survey accounts) 7197 (iv).
Geological Survey (surveys and explorations) 7217 (iv).
Immigration (agents' salaries) 7272 (iv).
Indians—B. C. (hospitals, irrigation) 6958; Man. and N. W. T. (saw-mills) 6954 (iv).

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Inland Revenue—Excise (factory inspection) 3919; (salaries) 3915; (travelling expenses, rent, &c.) 3920 (ii).

Justice—Miscellaneous (consolidation of statutes) 7959 (iv).

Minor Revenues (ordnance lands) 4092 (iii).

N. W. M. Police (pay of force) 2686 (ii).

Penitentiaries—Miscellaneous (brick-making) 7958; (parole system) 7954 (iv).

Post Office (outside salaries) 5654 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (heating, &c.) 7630; (rentals, &c.) 7622 (iv); Man. (Winnipeg immigration shed) 686; (Winnipeg P.O.) 688; Ont. (London, armoury) 608 (i); Ottawa (grounds) 7629; (lighting, repairs, &c.) 7620; (Major's Hill park) 7620 (iv); (Printing Bureau, addition) 621 (i); (snow cleaning) 7630; Yukon (repairs, &c.) 7025, 7633 (iv).

Public Works—Dredging—Ont. (new plant) 7883 (iv).

Quarantine—B. C. (small-pox inspection) 4156 (iii).

Railways—P.E.I. (Charlottetown station) 5991; (Murray Harbour branch) 5999; (Westinghouse brakes) 5990 (iii).

Voters' Lists, Distribution, &c., Inquiry, 3540 (ii).

——— Printing and Distribution, &c. (remarks) 3726 (ii).

——— Printing and Distribution, Stmnt. of Prime Minister, Inquiry for, 4138 (iii).

——— Printing, &c. (remarks) 4330 (iii).

Wilton Postmaster, Charges against, &c. (M. for cor., &c.) 221 (i).

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*

Wilton Postmaster, Inquiry for Ret. *re*, 2002, 2133, 2557 (ii).

——— Dismissal, Ret. and Confidential Letters, 2602 (ii).

——— Dismissal, Letters of Mr. Hiram Walker (remarks) 4827, 4927 (iii).

——— (remarks in Com. of Sup., 5654; Cor. *re* 'Private Correspondence,' &c., 5654 (iii).

Wright, Mr. A. A., *South Renfrew.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition and Sale B, 128 (Mr. Maclaren) in Com., 5140 (ii).

Cold Storage Service on Rys., Establishment of, (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7008 (iv).

Electrical Motors patented, Purchase in the U.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5313 (ii).

Experimental Farms, Accounts *re* Expenditure (remarks) 7191 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on sec. 9, 2507 (ii).

Immigrants, Stranded and destitute in Canada, &c. (remarks) 3863 (ii).

Inspection Act (binder twine) Amt. B. 124 (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Com., 8053 (v).

Preferential Tariff, Importations *re* Canadian Ports, on prop. Res. (Mr. Logan) 5085 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 125 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 3725 (ii); in Com., 4944 (iii).

Thorold and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 150 (M.) to place on Order Paper for 2°, 6786 (iv.)

INDEX—SUBJECTS

'Aberdeen', Str., Boiler Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 217 (i).

——— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 8921 (v).

Abram's Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7634 (iv).

Acadian Historical Data, Compilation: in Com. of Sup., 2744 (ii).

Accidents in St. Lawrence Channel, Defective Lighting, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5027 (iii).

——— Rep. from Lloyd's List: Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 5820 (iii).

See 'Marine,' &c.

Accommodation, Increased, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 8361 (v).

See 'I.C.R.' &c.

Acetylene Gas Changes in Lighthouses on St. Lawrence River, Notification to Keepers: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 6681 (iv).

Acetylene Gas for Buoy Service, Purchase, Contracts, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5301 (iii).

Acetylene System, Cost of Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii).

——— Installation, General Statement (Mr. Préfontaine) in com. of Sup., 5813 (iii), 8932 (v).

——— Location of Lighthouses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 2186 (ii).

——— Reps. asked for (Mr. Haggart) 7597 (iv).

——— Used for Cold Storage *re* Fisheries: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7589 (iv).

——— Used for Lighthouses, Information *re* Contracts, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5029 (iii).

Acton, J. A., Lighthouse Keeper at Burnt Island, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2377 (ii).

See 'Marine,' &c.

Actonvale P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 506, 656 (i).

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex's Speech; moved (Mr. Grant) 11; seconded (Mr. Rivet) 23;

DEBATE:

(Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 33; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 69; (Mr. Maclean) 80; (Mr. Haggart) 93; (Mr. Casgrain) 107; (Mr. Bourassa) 120; (Mr. Bennett) 130; (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 149; (Mr. Robinson, Elgin) 158; (Mr. Daniel) 168; (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure) 177; (Mr. Northrup) 184; (Mr. Lancaster) 196 (i).

——— M. to present to His Ex. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 203 (i).

——— Reply from His Ex.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1141 (i).

Address, Farewell to His Ex., Lord Minto: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8475; seconded (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 8477 (v).

Ad Hoc Judges: in Com. of Sup., 7939 (iv).

See 'Justice,' &c.

ADJOURNMENTS:

Ascension Day Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2849 (ii).

Dom. Day Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5842 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Bell) 5762 (iii).

Easter Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 477 (i).

Victoria Day Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3227, 3434 (ii).

Adjournments of Debates, Whips' Arrangements: Personal Explanation (Mr. Taylor) 2109 (ii).

See 'Personal Explanation,' &c.

Administration of Justice, N. W. Ter.: in Com. of Sup., 7938 (iv).

——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7939 (iv).

——— Yukon: in Com. of Sup., 7945 (iv).

See 'Justice,' &c.

Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1°*, *pro forma*, 6 (i).

'Admiral,' Str., Gaspé Route: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7447 (iv).

Adulteration of Food: in Com. of Sup., 4091 (iii).

Advertising, Cost of, Synopsis of Regulations *re* Minerals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 2806 (ii).

Advertising *re* Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 7069 (iv).

Agricultural Implements, Rebate of Duties, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 562 (i).

——— Rebate of Duties since 1896: Ques. (Mr. Boyd) 8781 (v).

Agricultural Committee, Evidence *re* 2nd. Re.; M. for Conc. (Mr. Douglas) 8184 (v).

——— Rep. of Mr. Macoun *re* Peace River: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 7347 (iv).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS:

Acadian Historical Data, Compilation: in Com. of Sup., 2744 (ii).

Agricultural Delegates, Ry. Transportation, &c. Ques. (Mr. Hackett) 1360 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Hackett) in Com. of Sup., 2723 (ii).

See 'Farmers,' &c.

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

Agricultural Societies, Aid to : in Com. of Sup., 2742 (ii).

Agriculture Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 3728 (ii), 4093 (iii).

——— Civil Govt., Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 2715 (ii).

——— Contingencies : in Com. of Sup., 2717 (ii).

——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 254 (i).

——— Deptl. Salaries : Inquiry for Statement (Mr. Ingram) 3751 (ii).

Agriculture and Colonization Com., Concurrent Sittings with Hse., M. (Mr. Parmelee) 6676 (iv).

Agriculture, Min. of, Expenditure *re* Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Tolton) 791 (i).

Apple Shipments on SS. 'Ionian,' &c., Inspection of Ventilation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 793 (i).

Apples shipped to Europe in Cool Chambers : Ques. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 678 (i).

Apples shipped to G.B., Cold Storage, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Wade) in Com. of Sup., 6177 (iv).

See 'Cold Storage.'

Archives : in Com. of Sup., 2727 (ii).

Bee Culture at Experimental Farms : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4965 (iii).

Brockville Cheese Curing Room, Total Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 2839 (ii).

See 'Cheese,' &c.

Butter manufactured in Alberta, Exported to Japan : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4127 (iii).

See 'Cheese,' 'Nappan,' &c.

Bulletins, Farm, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2744 (ii).

Campbell, Mr., Compensation to : Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 8916 (v).

See 'Sheep,' &c.

Cattle Quarantine : *See* 'Quarantine.'

Census, 1881, 1891, 1901, Cost, Information, &c.; Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 330 (i).

Census (1901), Enumerations *re* Religions, N.B., Authority for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 2803 (ii).

——— Industrial Establishments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 1875 (i).

——— distribution, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 1209 (i).

——— Saskatchewan District, Object and Purpose of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3759 (ii).

——— Total Expenditure : Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7224 (iv).

——— Volumes, Completion of : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 8959 (v).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

Cheese Curing at Brockville, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 3754 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 3540 (ii).

——— Stations, Expenditure and Accounts : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7171 (iv).

Cheese Curing and Paraffining : Remarks (Mr. A. F. MacLaren) in Com. of Sup., 7412 (iv).

——— *See* 'Brockville,' 'Cowansville,' 'St. Hyacinthe,' 'Woodstock,' &c.

Chicken Fattening Stations, Expenditure *re* : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7171, 7422 (iv).

——— P.E.I., Number in Operation, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lefurgey) 3771 (ii).

Cold Storage : in Com. of Sup., 7405 (iv).

——— Equipment on Atlantic Steamers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 333 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) in Com. of Sup., 6175 (iv).

——— Amt. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) to Com. of Sup., 7907; Neg. (Y. 38; N. 62) 7936 (iv).

Cold Storage for Fish on Rys.: Remarks (Mr. Wright) 7008 (iv).

See 'Apples,' 'Fresh Meat.'

Cotton Growing in Canada, Experiments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ross, Ont.) 555 (i).

Cowansville, Que., Cheese Cooling Room, Total Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 2847 (ii).

Criminal Statistics, Compilation : in Com. of Sup., 2734 (ii).

Dairying Commissioner's Branch, Lectures, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7405 (iv).

Dental Association, Can. Representative at St. Louis Exhibition : Ques. (Mr. Richardson) 3132 (ii).

Doughty, A. G., Appnmt. as Dom. Archivist : in Com. of Sup., 2730 (ii).

Eastman, Mr. E. P., Emplymt. at St. Louis, Allowance to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 7441 (iv).

See 'St. Louis.'

——— Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7420, 7430 (iv).

Exhibitions, Expenditure *re* : in Com. of Sup., 4093 (iii).

See 'St. Louis,' 'Winnipeg,' &c.

Experimental Farms : in Com. of Sup., 2743 (ii), 7364 (iv).

——— Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 7620 (iv).

——— Expenditure and Accounts : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7171 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 7371 (iv).

——— General Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 4959 (iii).

Farm Delegates to G.B. and Ireland, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 251 (i).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

Farmers Delegates from P.E.I., and Winnipeg Exhibition: Remarks (Mr. Hackett in Com. of Sup., 2755 (ii).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.

Farm and Garden Products, Tariff Protection *re*: Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 4004; Neg. (Y. 41; N. 76) 4041 (iii).

Farm Labourers, Experimental Farm, Wages, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4959 (iii).

Fresh Meat Transportation in Cold Storage: Ques. (Mr. McGowan) 678 (i).
See 'Cold Storage,' &c.

Fumigating Stations: in Com. of Sup., 2746 (ii).

General Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 2741 (ii), 8959, 9073 (v).

Grosse Isle: *See* 'Quarantine.'

Hannay, Dr. Jas., Qualifications for Dom. Archivist: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 2731 (ii).
See 'Archives,' 'Doughty,' &c.

Imperial Institute, London, Can. Exhibit: in Com. of Sup., 2757, 3728 (ii).

——— Transfer to British Board of Trade, 3739 (ii).

Japanese Trade in Agricultural Products: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4125 (iii).

Live Stock Exhibitions: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7406 (iv).

Live Stock exported to U.S. by F. H. Page, Cor., &c.: Read (Mr. Sproule) on M. for Sup., 8903 (v).

Mabou Creamery, Cost of Buildings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bell) 2806 (ii).

——— M. for Copies of Cor.* (Mr. Bell) 3771 (ii).

Nappan Dairy Station, Butter and Cheese, Cost of Manufacturing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bell) 2805 (ii).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bell) 3770 (ii).

Nappan Experimental Farm Staff Increases, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4961 (iii).

North Bay Small-pox: *See* 'Small-pox.'

Patent Office Models, Govt. Storage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 398 (i).

——— Classification, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 2719 (ii).

'Patent Record': in Com. of Sup., 2732 (ii).

Poultry Stations, Cost, &c., Pet. from Man. Poultry Ass'n.: Ques. (Mr. Puttee) 677 (i).

——— Recommendation from Man. Ass'n., Ques. (Mr. LaRivière) 396 (i).
See 'Chicken Fattening,' &c.

Quarantine: in Com. of Sup., 4137 (iii).

——— B.C., Purchase of Steamer: in Com. of Sup., 4199 (iii).

——— B.C., Small-pox Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 4156 (iii).

——— Cattle Quarantine: in Com. of Sup., 4206 (iii).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

Quarantine, veterinary division: in Com. of Sup., 8961 (v).

——— Grosse Isle Quarantine Station, Purchase of Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 4192 (iii).

——— Mar. Provs., Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 4160 (iii).

——— N.W.T. Medical Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 4146 (iii).

——— N.S., Medical Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 4168 (iii).

——— Salaries, Organized Districts: in Com. of Sup., 4145 (iii).
See 'William's Head.'

Richard, Mr., Copyist for Archives Branch: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2732 (ii).

St. Hyacinthe, Que., Cheese Cooling Rooms, Total Expenditure: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 2847 (ii).

St. John and Partridge Island Quarantine, Charges for Horse-hire: in Com. of Sup., 4145 (iii).

St. Louis Exhibition: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4101 (iii).

——— Officers appointed, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7404 (iv).
See 'Eastman,' 'Dental,' &c.

Sheep Quarantine and Claim of Mr. John Campbell for Repayment of Express Charges: M. for Cor. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 3761 (ii).
See 'Campbell,' &c.

San Jose Scale, Fumigating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2746 (ii).

Small-pox Inspection in B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 4156 (iii).

——— Inspection in Man., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4151 (iii).

——— North Bay, Quarantine of: in Com. of Sup., 4156 (iii).
See 'Quarantine,' &c.

Texas Fever in imported Cattle: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4206 (iii).

Thermograph Record of Temperature on Atlantic SS.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 225 (i).
See 'Apples,' 'Cold Storage,' &c.

Tobacco Experiments at Experimental Farms, Bulletins, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7438 (iv), 8026 (v).

Tracadie Lazaretto: in Com. of Sup., 4137 (iii)

Vaccine Stations Establishment: Remarks (Mr. Kendall) in Com. of Sup., 4162 (iii).

William's Head Quarantine Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 4166 (iii).
See 'Quarantine.'

Winnipeg Exhibition, Grant to: in Com. of Sup., 2750 (ii).

——— Ry. Rates from the East *re* Exhibits: Remarks (Mr. Logan) 2756 (ii).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*
Wolverhampton Exhibition, Purchase of Whisky: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 3742 (ii), 4094 (iii), 6022 (iv).
Woodstock, Ont., Cheese Cooling Room, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 793 (i).
See 'Cheese,' &c.
Year-book, Statistical: in Com. of Sup., 2735 (ii).
——— Immigration Literature and Advertising Whiskies: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of sup., 7360 (iv).
Aids to Navigation in St. Lawrence Route: in Com. of Sup., 5813 (iii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Air Brakes for I.C.R., Freight Cars: in Com. of Sup., 5922 (iii).
See 'I.C.R.' &c.
Alaskan Boundary Arbitration, Delay in Preparation of Documents: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 4928 (iii).
——— Cor. printed, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 5 (i), 5759 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 9 (i), 3725, 3726 (ii), 5578 (iii).
——— Rep. presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 254 (i).
——— Inquiry for the Whole Cor. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 1355 (i).
——— Cor. laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6263 (iv).
See 'Address,' &c.
Alberta Ry. & Irrigation Co.'s incorp. B. No. 85 (Mr. Oliver) 1°*, 2116; 2°*, 2328; in Com., and 3°*, 3480 (ii): (4 Edward VII, c. 43).
Alberton and Kildare Mail Service Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3128 (ii).
Alberton, P.E.I., Buoy Service, Contract *re*: Remarks (Mr. Hackett) in Com. of Sup., 5345 (iii).
——— Fishery Warden, Complaints *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hackett) 4824 (iii).
——— Station, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 6009 (iii). 8367 (v).
——— Survey *re* Entrance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hackett) 1358 (i).
——— 'Y,' Abolishing of: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 6232 (iv).
See 'I.C.R.'
'Alert,' Str., Number of Employees, Cost of Running, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Reid, Grenville) 8388 (v).
——— Transfer to Marine Dept.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7593 (iv).
——— Used by Supt. Stewart, for Pleasure Yacht: Remarks (Mr. Reid, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 7472; Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 7520 (iv).
Alexandria P.O., Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 506 (i).
Alien Labour Act Amt. B. No. 162 (Sir William Mulock) 1° m., 7898 (iv); 2° m., 8565; in Com., 8572; 3° m., 8665 (v).
Alien Labour Commission, Appnmt. of Counsel: Announcement (Sir Wm. Mulock) 4331 (iii).
——— Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 9014 (v).
See 'G.T.P., Aliens on Surveys,' &c.
Aliens and Naturalization Acts, Amt. B. No. 147 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 5840 (iii); in Com., 7228 (iv).
See 'Naturalization B. 147.'
Allan New Strs. for Atlantic Service: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 6154 (iv).
See 'Atlantic,' &c.
Alliance Bank of Canada, B. No. 140 (Mr. Russell) M. to receive Pet., 4407, 4996; 1°*, 5071; 2° m., 5297; in Com., and 3°*, 5866 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 44).
Alliance Bank of Canada, Rep. of Sel. Com.: Presented (Mr. L. P. Demers) 4996 (iii).
Alma Pier, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7750 (iv).
American Cattle shipped in Bond, O.C. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 1875 (i).
See 'Agriculture,' 'Cattle,' &c.
American Fishing Cos. and Bonding Privileges: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7581 (iv).
American Fishing Cos. and Can. Fisheries: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
Amherstburg Harbour Dredging, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7750 (iv).
Amherst Station Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5957 (iii), 8347 (v).
Amqui Station, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5964 (iii). 8364 (v).
Analysts, Prosecutions for Violation of Inland Rev. Act: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3909 (ii).
Anderson and Kennedy's Lakes: in Com. of Sup., 7876 (iv).
Anderson's Hollow Wharf, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7744 (iv).
Animal Contagious Diseases Act (1903) Amt. B. No. 145 (Mr. Fisher) 1°, 5578 (iii); Wthdn., 8136 (v).
——— B. No. 166 (Mr. Fisher) Res. prop., 8255; in Com. on Res., 8434; 1°*, of B., 8440; 2°, 8440; in Com., 8441; 3°, 8441 (v), (4 Edward VII., c. 6).
Animals, Thoroughbred, Purchases from Mr. S. L. Head: Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 4411 (ii).
Anse aux Gascons Wharf Extension, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7766 (iv).
Anticosti, Fox Bay Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 7895 (iv).
See 'Marine,' 'Public Works,' &c.
Antigonish Station Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 8364 (v).

Appeal, Right of : *See* 'Exchequer Court B. 37.'
Apple River Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9021 (v).
Apple Exports on SS. 'Ionian,' &c., Inspection of Ventilation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 793 (i).
Apples shipped to Europe in Cool Chambers : Ques. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 678 (i).
Apples shipped to G.B., Cold Storage, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Wade) in Com. of Sup., 6177 (iv).
Appointments to Public Offices, Personal Character, &c.: Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) on M. for Sup., 7822; Neg. (Y. 43; N. 70) 7827 (iv).
See 'House of Commons,' &c.
Arbitrations, Public Works, Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 7895 (iv).
Archaeological Specimens for Geological Survey, Purchase of : in Com. of Sup., 9015 (v).
See 'Geological.'
Archibald, Maj., and Parole System : Remarks (Mr. Logan) in Com. of Sup., 7955 (iv).
Architects, Public Works : in Com .of Sup., 7895 (iv).
See 'Public Works,' &c.
Archives : in Com. of Sup., 2727 (ii).
'Arctic,' Str.: *See* 'Bernier,' 'Gauss,' &c.
Argentine Republic and Canadian Ensign : *See* 'Canadian Ensign.'
Argyle and Springdale Townships, Taxes *re* School Lands, Litigation : in Com. of Sup., 7078 (iv).
Arisaig, N.S., Pier, Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4413 (iii).
Armouries, Dom., Construction : in Com. of Sup., 7619 (iv), 9020 (v).
Art Gallery, Ottawa : in Com. of Sup., 7895 (iv).
Ascension Day Adjournment : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2849 (ii).
Assay Offices, Chemicals and Instruments : in Com. of Sup., 7221 (iv).
Assay Office, Vancouver, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7078 (iv).
Assent, Royal : *See* 'Bills.'
Assiniboine River Dredging : Remarks (Mr. Boyd) in Com. of Sup., 7875 (iv).
Associated Press (Canadian): *See* 'Can. Associated,' &c.
Astronomical Observatory, Ottawa : in Com. of Sup., 455 (i).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa,' &c.
Athens P.O., Charges against Postmaster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2601 (ii).
Atlantic and Northwest Railway Co.'s B. No. 14 (Mr. Thompson, Haldimand and Monck) 1°*, 396; 2°*, 549; in Com., and 3°*, 987 (i), (4 Edward VII., c. 45).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Negotiations *re* : Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 4143 (iii).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Contract *re* Mails, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6154 (iv).
——— Mail Steamers, Average Speed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 6888 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. McCool) 7081 (iv).
——— inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 869, 1449, 1874 (i).
See 'Trade and Commerce,' &c.
Atlantic, Quebec & Western Ry. Co's B. No. 19 (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure) 1°*, 477; 2°*, 549 ; in Com. and 3°*, 987 (i). (4 Edward VII. c., 46).
Audit Acts, Consolidation, &c.: *See* 'Finances of Canada.'
Auditor General, and Audit Act Extension, &c.: Amt. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 6553; Neg. (Y. 56; N. 94) 6636 (iv).
Auditor General and Consolidation of Audit Acts: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. Lennox) 4275 (ii).
Auditor General's Office, Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 9034 (v).
Auditor General, Par. *re* Conditional Resignation: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 5583 (iii).
——— Action of Govt. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 6887 (iv).
Auditor General's Rep. and Estimates (remarks) 230 (i).
——— Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 254 (i).
Automobiles, Toronto P.O. : Remarks (Mr. Clarke) in Com. of Sup.. 5759 (iii).
Aylmer, Ont., Establishment as an Outport for Customs: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 7439 (iv).
Baie de Chaleurs Fisheries Regulations, Licenses, &c.: Statement (Mr. Préfontaine) 8782 (v).
Baie de Vallière, Surveys, Reps. Plans, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bruneau) 3770 (ii).
Baie St. Paul Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7766 (iv).
Bailey's Brook Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7634 (iv).
Bain, Mr., and Preparation of Liberal Campaign Literature: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1858, 1909 (i).
——— Duties as Priv. Sec.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1857 (i).
Bait Freezers for Fishermen, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5021 (iii).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.
Banff Hot Springs, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7074 (iv).
Bank Act Amt. B. No. 160 (Mr. Fielding) 1° m., 7222; 2°, and in Com., 7786; 3°, 7787 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 3).
Banking Act Amt. Bill: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 6789 (iv).
Banking Com., Meetings, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 7364 (iv).
Barbed Wire, Quantity made and exported, 1891, 1896, 1901 : Ques. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 791 (i).

Barrie, Landing Pier, Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9028 (v).

——— Post Office Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9019 (v).

Barry's Bay Wharf, Madawaska, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 1751 (iv).

'Bavarian' and 'Tunisian' Allan Strs., Tonnage, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 7751 (iv).

Baxter's Harbour, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7635 (iv).

Bayfield Harbour, Extension of Southern Pier : in Com. of Sup., 8021 (iv).

Bayfield Harbour, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7635 (iv).

See 'Public Works,'

Bay of Fundy Lights: in Com. of Sup., 5805 (iii).

Beaton, B.C., anl Uper Lardeau, Dredging of Channel, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Casgrain) 3771 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Casgrain) 4685 (iii).

Beauharnois Canal, Number of Employees, &c., Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 3129 (ii).

——— Valleyfield Weir : in Com. of Sup., 8381 (v).

Beaver River Hatchery, Establishment: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7587 (iv).

Bee Culture at Experimental Farms: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4965 (iii).

Béique, Mr., Supt. of Beauharnois Canal, Superannuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 3128 (ii).

Belfast and Murray Harbour Branch, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 993 (i).

See 'I.C.R.—P.E.I.' &c.

Bell, Dr., Increase of Salary, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7057, 7060, 7213 (iv).

Bell Telephone Co.'s Contract *re* Railways : Remarks (Mr. Maclean) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 8822 (v).

Bell Telephone Co., Decision of Ry. Commissioners at Port Arthur: in Com. on Ry. B. 132, 6726 (iv).

See 'Telephones,' &c.

Belleville Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 524 (i).

Berlin Customs Port, Rev. collected (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1902 (i).

Berlin P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 528 (i).

Berlin, Waterloo, Wellesley & Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s B. No. 44 (Mr. Clare) 1°*, 1053; 2°*, 1337 (i); in Com., and 3°, 2597 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 47).

Bernier, Capt., Detention of Str. 'Gauss' by German Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 2284 (ii).

——— Rep. of Capt. Spain : Remarks (Mr. Casgrain) in Com. of Sup., 5284 (iii).

See 'Marine,' &c.

Berrigan, Mr. John, Fishery Officer, P.E.I., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4410 (iii).

See 'Fisheries,' &c.

Bersimis to Godbout Telegraph Service : in Com. of Sup., 7894 (iv).

Bessemer & Barry's Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 90 (Mr. Northrup) 1*, 2282 ; 2°*, 2597; in Com., and 3°*, 3354 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 48).

Bickerdike, Mr. F. C., Claim *re* Telegraph Construction: in Com. of Sup., 9032 (v).

Big Pond Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7636 (iv).

Bills, Royal Assent: Mess. from Dep. Gov., 4227 (iii).

——— Com. from Gov. Gen's Sec., 6905 (iv).

——— Mess. from His Ex., 6923 (iv).

Bills Wthdrn.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8260 (v).

See 'Govt. Business,' &c.

BILLS :

Bill (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

1°* ; pro formâ, 6 (i).

Bill (No. 2) To amend the Railway Act, 1903.—(Mr. Lancaster.)

1° m., 9 ; 2° m., 403; M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 418, 1888 (i); on Order for resumed adjd. Debate, 3772 ; in Com., 3773 ; M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 3788 (ii); on Order for Com., 5097 ; in Com., 5098 (iii).

Bill (No. 3) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. Lancaster.)

1°*, 10 ; 2° m., 421 ; on Order for 2°, 427 2°*, 1888 (i), 3789 ; in Com., 3790 ; 3°*, 3795 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 8).

Bill (No. 4) To amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships.—(Mr. Lancaster.)

1°*, 10; on Order for 2°, 427 (i); 2° m., 3796 (ii); (remarks) 5166; 2° Neg. (Y. 16; N. 39) 5181 (iii).

Bill (No. 5) Respecting the Militia of Canada.—(Sir Frederick W. Borden.)

1° m., 205; Res. prop., 253, 598 ; 2°*, and in Com., 255 ; in Com. on Res. *re* pay, 477, 1781 (i), 2685, 2906, 2918 (ii), 6365, 6467 (iv); on Order for Com., 8066; in Com., 8066; 3° m., 8155; in Com., 8266; 3° m., 8288 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 23).

Bill (No. 6) To amend the Railway Act, 1903.—(Mr. Maclean.)

1° m., 323 (i); 2° m., 3797, 3818; M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 3818 (ii).

Bill (No. 7) To amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

1° m., 330 (i).

Bill (No. 8) Respecting the Nova Scotia Permanent Building Society and Savings Fund.—(Mr. Borden, Halifax.)

1°*, 396 ; 2°*, 549 (i); in Com., 3477; 3°*, 3479 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 106).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 9) To revive and amend the Acts respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)
1°*, 396; 2°*, 549; in Com., and 3°*, 987 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 122).

Bill (No. 10) To incorporate the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Ontario.)
1°*, 396; 2°*, 549; in Com., and 3°*, 1586 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 54).

Bill (No. 11) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)
1°*, 396; 2°*, 549; in Com., and 3°*, 987 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 52).

Bill (No. 12) Respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—(Mr. Mackie.)
1°*, 396; 2°*, 549; in Com., 985; 3°*, 986 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 98).

Bill (No. 13) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Thompson, Haldimand and Monck.)
1°*, 396; 2°*, 549; in Com., 986; 3°*, 987 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 62).

Bill (No. 14) Respecting the Atlantic and North-west Railway Company.—(Mr. Thompson, Haldimand and Monck.)
1°*, 396; 2°*, 549; in Com., and 3°*, 987 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 45).

Bill (No. 15) Respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Champagne.)
1°*, 396; 2°*, 549; in Com., and 3°*, 987 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 111).

Bill (No. 16) Respecting the French River Boom Company, Limited.—(Mr. Grant.)
1°*, 396; 2°*, 549; in Com., and 3°*, 1337 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 78).

Bill (No. 17) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Honourable C. A. Parsons.—(Mr. Clarke.)
1°*, 396; 2°*, 549; in Com., and 3°*, 1337 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 115).

Bill (No. 18) Respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. McCreary.)
1°*, 396; 2°*, 549; in Com., and 3°*, 1586 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 94).

Bill (No. 19) Respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure.)
1°*, 477; 2°*, 549; in Com., and 3°*, 987 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 46).

Bill (No. 20) To incorporate the Cascapedia Manufacturing and Trading Company.—(Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure.)
1°*, 477; 2°*, 549; in Com., and 3°*, 1337 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 64).

Bill (No. 21) To incorporate the Pontiac and Interprovincial Railway Company.—(Mr. McCool.)
1°*, 596; 2°*, 709; in Com., and 3°*, 987 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 116).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 22) Respecting the Brantford and Hamilton Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 596; 2°*, 709; in Com., 1819; 3°*, 1824 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 50).

Bill (No. 23) Respecting the Collingwood General and Marine Hospital.—(Mr. McCarthy.)
1°*, 596; 2°*, 709; in Com., and 3°*, 1337 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 69).

Bill (No. 24) Respecting the Canadian Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. McCreary.)
1°*, 596; 2°*, 709; in Com., and 3°*, 1818 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 58).

Bill (No. 25) To incorporate the White Horse and Alsek Railway Company.—(Mr. Macpherson.)
1°*, 596; 2°*, 709; in Com., and 3°*, 1586 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 142).

Bill (No. 26) To incorporate the Edmonton, Athabasca and Mackenzie Railway Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°*, 596 ; 2°*, 709 (i).

Bill (No. 27) Respecting the Real Estate, Title, Guarantee and Trust Company.—(Mr. Demers, St. John and Iberville.)
1°*, 596; 2°*, 709; in Com., 1818; 3°*, 1819 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 118).

Bill (No. 28) Respecting the Temiscouata Railway Company.—(Mr. Malouin.)
1°*, 788; 2°*, 987 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2153 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 129).

Bill (No. 29) To incorporate the Canadian Credit Indemnity and Guaranty Company.—(Mr. Guthrie.)
1°*, 788; 2°*, 987 (i); in Com., 5295; 3°*, 5297 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 57).

Bill (No. 30) Respecting the Guelph Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Guthrie.)
1°*, 789; 2°*, 987 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2597 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 82).

Bill (No. 31) To incorporate the Guelph and Goderich Railway Company.—(Mr. Holmes.)
1°*, 789; 2°*, 987 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2597 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 81).

Bill (No. 32) To incorporate the Walkerton and Lucknow Railway Company.—(Mr. Henderson.)
1°*, 789; 2°*, 987 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2967 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 138).

Bill (No. 33) Respecting the Vanvouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)
1°*, 789; 2°*, 987; in Com. and 3°*, 1586 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 137).

Bill (No. 34) Respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy.)
1° m., 789; 2°*, 987 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3982 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 80.)

Bill (No. 35) Respecting Union Labels.—(Mr. Smith, Vancouver.)
1° m., 867 (i); 2° m., 3829; ruled out by The Speaker, 3830 (ii); Order dschgd., 4214 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 36) Respecting the Tobique Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Costigan.)
1°*, 984; 2°*, 1173 (i).

Bill (No. 37) To amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)
1° m., 985; 2°*, 1787; in Com., 1787 (i); 3° m., 3999 (iii); recom., 5192; 3°, 5194 (iii).

Bill (No. 38) To amend the Petition of Right Act.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)
1° m., 985; 2°, 1785; in Com., and 3°*, 1785 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 27).

Bill (No. 39) To amend the Yukon Territory Act.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)
1° m., 985; 2°, 1785; in Com., 1786 (i), 4003 (ii); 3° m., 5194 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 42.)

Bill (No. 40) Respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Ingram.)
1°*, 1053; 2°*, 1337 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 6322; Sen. Amts., 6845 (iv). (4 Edward VIII, c. 55).

Bill (No. 41) To incorporate the Lièvre and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure.)
1°*, 1053; 2°*, 1337 (i).

Bill (No. 42) Respecting the Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Company (Limited).—(Mr. Ganong.)
1°*, 1053; 2°*, 1337 (i); in Com., 4270; on M. for 3°, 4270, 4452, 4686 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 126).

Bill (No. 43) Respecting the Quebec and Lake Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. Malouin.)
1°*, 1053; 2°*, 1337 (i); in Com., 2369, 2372; 3°*, 2372 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 117).

Bill (No. 44) Respecting the Berlin, Waterloo, Wellesley and Lake Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. Clare.)
1°*, 1053; 2°*, 1337 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2597 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 47).

Bill (No. 45) Respecting the Home Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Osler.)
1°*, 1053; on Order for 2°, 1338; 2°, 1356 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3480 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 83).

Bill (No. 46) To incorporate the Boundary, Kamloops and Cariboo Central Railway.—(Mr. Galliher.)
1°*, 1053; 2°*, 1337 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2369 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 49).

Bill (No. 47) Respecting the Kootenay Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)
1°*, 1053; 2°*, 1337 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2153 (ii). (4 Edward VII., c. 91).

Bill (No. 48) Respecting the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)
1°*, 1054; 2°*, 1337 (i); in Com., 3477, 3758; 3°*, 3758 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 103).

Bill (No. 49) Respecting the James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. McCool.)
1°*, 1054; 2°*, 1138 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2153 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 88).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 50) To incorporate the St. Maurice Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Bureau.)
1°*, 1054; 2°*, 1338 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3480 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 123).

Bill (No. 51) To incorporate the Okotoks and High River Lumbering and Development Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°*, 1054; 2°*, 1338 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3056 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 107).

Bill (No. 52) Respecting the Manitoba and Keewatin Railway Company.—(Mr. McCreary.)
1°*, 1132; 2°*, 1338 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3480 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 93).

Bill (No. 53) Respecting the North American Telegraph Company.—(Mr. McCreary.)
1°*, 1132; 2°*, 1338 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2967 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 104).

Bill (No. 54) To incorporate the Dominion Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Macpherson.)
1°*, 1133; 2°*, 1338 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5297 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 73).

Bill (No. 55) Respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis.)
1°*, 1133; 2°*, 1338 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3354 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 60).

Bill (No. 56) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. Lennox.)
1°*, 1133 (i); 2°*, 3795; in Com., 3795; 3°*, 3796 (ii). (4 Edward VII., c. 9).

Bill (No. 57) To incorporate the Interprovincial Bridge Company of New Brunswick.—(Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure.)
1°*, 1297; 2°*, 1356 (i); in Com., 2369; 3°*, 2371 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 87).

Bill (No. 58) Respecting the Imperial Loan and Investment Company of Canada.—(Mr. Thompson, Haldimand and Monck.)
1°*, 1297; 2°*, 1356 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5866 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 86).

Bill (No. 59) Respecting the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion.)
1°*, 1297; 2°*, 1356 (i).

Bill (No. 60) Respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)
1°*, 1297; 2°*, 1356 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3354 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 89).

Bill (No. 61) To incorporate the Thorold and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. German.)
1°*, 1297; 2°*, 1357 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3354 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 131).

Bill (No. 62) Respecting the Welland and Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. German.)
1°*, 1297; 2°*, 1357 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3354 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 139).

Bill (No. 63) Respecting the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company.—(Mr. Costigan.)
1°*, 1297; 2°*, 1357 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2153 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 74).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 64) Respecting the Strait of Canso Bridge Company.—(Mr. Wade.)
1°*, 1297; 2°*, 1357 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2153 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 127).

Bill (No. 65) Respecting certain Patents of Lewis E. Curtis.—(Mr. Ross, Ontario.)
1°*, 1450; 2°*, 1824 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 71).

Bill (No. 66) Respecting the Pacific Northern and Omineca Railway Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)
1°*, 1450; 2°*, 1824; in Com., and 3°*, 2597 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 114).

Bill (No. 67) Respecting the Ontario Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. Thompson, Haldimand and Monck.)
1°*, 1450; 2°*, 1824 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3480 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 108).

Bill (No. 68) Respecting the Hudson's Bay and North-west Railway Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°*, 1450; 2°*, 1879 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3480 (ii); Sen. Amts., 4627 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 84).

Bill (No. 69) To incorporate the Monarch Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Osler.)
1°*, 1450; 2°*, 1824 (i); in Com., 3479; 3°*, 3480 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 96).

Bill (No. 70) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Douglas.)
1°*, 1547; 2°*, 1825 (i); in Com., 2597; 3°*, 2597 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 63).

Bill (No. 71) Respecting the Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Railway Company.—(Mr. Logan.)
1°*, 1547; 2°*, 1825 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3354 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 109).

Bill (No. 72) To amend the National Transcontinental Railway Act.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)
Res. prop., 225; M. for Com. on Res., 710; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 786, 794, 869, 944, 995, 1059, 1154, 1239, 1311, 1338, 1361, 1472, 1548; Neg. (Y. 61; N. 116) 1664; in Com. on Res., 1664, 1669; 2° of Res., 1779; 1°* of B., 1779; 2° m., 1783 (i); Procedure, 2001; 2° m., 2133, 2153; agreed to (Y. 99; N. 55) 2183; in Com., 2183, 2190, 2285, 2328, 2378, 2461, 2592, 2598, 2603, 2686, 2955, 2967; Prop. Res. *re* Commissioners, 3015; in Com. on Res., 3306; in Com. on B., 3027, 3059, 3134, 3229, 3318, 3354; 3° m., 3390; Amt. (Mr. Monk) Neg. (Y. 38; N. 91) 3396; Amt. (Mr. Pope) neg. (Y. 43; N. 92) 3412, 3440; Amt. (Mr. Clare) 3449; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 86) 3514, 3540; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3574; Neg. (Y. 59; N. 105) 3696; 3°, 3717 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 24).

Bill (No. 73) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lennox.)
1°, 1780 (i); 2° m., 3831; M. to adjn. Debate, 3841 (ii), 4708; ref. to Sel. Com. on Rys., 4718 (iii); M. to place on Govt. Orders, 6364 (iv); in Com., 6686; 3°*, 6686 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 31).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 74) To amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)
1°, 1780 (i); 2°, and in Com., 8146, 8214; 3°*, 8222 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 13).

Bill (No. 75) To amend the Companies Act, 1902.—(Mr. Cowan.)
1°, 1781 (i); 2°, 3978; in Com., 3978 (ii); 4706, 5094 (iii).

Bill (No. 76) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. Wade.)
1°, 1781 (i); 2° m., 4718; in Com., 4719 (iii).

Bill (No. 77) Respecting the Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. German.)
1°*, 2001; 2°*, 2327; in Com., and 3°*, 3758 (ii).

Bill (No. 78) Respecting tht Ottawa River Railway Company.—(Mr. Ethier.)
1°*, 2001; 2°*, 2328 (ii); in Com., 4451; 3°*, 4451 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 112).

Bill (No. 79) To incorporate the Thompson River Improvement Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)
1°*, 2001; 2°*, 2328 (ii); in Com., 4692; 3°*, 4694 (iii); Sen. Amts., 7966 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 130).

Bill (No. 80) Respecting the West Canadian Collieries, Limited.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°*, 2001; 2°*, 2328 (i); on Order for Com., 4271; M. (Mr. Cowan) to ref. back to Sel. Com., 4272; in Com., 4686, 4866, 5034; M. to ref. back to Com., 5034; in Com., 5864 (iii), 6093; ref. back to Ry. Com., 6104; in Com., 6845; 3°*, 6845; Sen. Amts., 7721 (iv) (4 Edward VII, c. 140).

Bill (No. 81) To incorporate the Canadian Traction and Power Company.—(Mr. Champagne.)
1°*, 2001; 2°*, 2328 (ii).

Bill (No. 82) Respecting the Essex Terminal Railway Company.—(Mr. Cowan.)
1°*, 2001; 2°*, 2328 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 3982 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 76).

Bill (No. 83) Respecting the Nipigon Railway Company.—(Mr. McCool.)
1°*, 2001; 2°*, 2328; in Com., and 3°*, 3480 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 102).

Bill (No. 84, from the Senate) For the relief of Robert James McDuff Rodger.—(Mr. Grant.)
1°*, 2116; 2°*, 2328; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 121).

Bill (No. 85) To incorporate the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company, and to amalgamate therewith the Alberta Railway and Coal Company, the Canadian Northwest Irrigation Company, and the St. Mary's River Railway Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°*, 2116; 2°*, 2328; in Com., and 3°*, 3480 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 43).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 86) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, respecting the punishment of fraudulent debtors.—(Mr. Bickerdike.)

1° m., 2116; 2°*, 3980; in Com., 3980, 3982; 3°*, 3990 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 7).

Bill (No. 87, from the Senate) For the relief of James E. Taylor.—(Mr. Grant.)

1°*, 2282; 2°*, 2372; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 128).

Bill (No. 88) To amend the Railway Act, 1903.—(Mr. Lancaster.)

1° m., 2184 (ii).

Bill (No. 89, from the Senate), To incorporate the Cedar Rapids Manufacturing and Power Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion.)

1°*, 2681; 2°*, 2802 (ii); in Com., 4450, 4627; (remarks) 4686; in Com., and 3°*, 5866 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 65).

Bill (No. 90) To incorporate the Bessemer and Barry's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Northrup.)

1°*, 2282; 2°*, 2597; in Com., and 3°*. 3354 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 48).

Bill (No. 91) Respecting the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)

1°*, 2282; 2°*, 2597; in Com., and 3°*, 3758 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 135).

Bill (No. 92) Respecting certain Patents of William A. Damen.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 2282; 2°*, 2598; in Com., and 3°*, 3056 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 72).

Bill (No. 93) Respecting a certain Patent of E. A. Small.—(Mr. Logan.)

1°*, 2282; 2°*, 2598; in Com., 3056; 3°*, 3059 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 125).

Bill (No. 94) Respecting the Timagami Railway Company.—(Mr. McCool.)

1°*, 2282; 2°*, 2598; in Com., 3758; 3°*, 3758 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 134).

Bill (No. 95) To incorporate the Vancouver Island Railway Company.—(Mr. Macpherson.)

1°*, 2681; 2°*, 2803 (ii).

Bill (No. 96) To incorporate the Crawford Bay and St. Mary's Railway Company.—(Mr. Macpherson.)

1°*, 2681; 2°*, 2803; in Com., and 3°*, 3354 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 70).

Bill (No. 97) Respecting the Trans-Canada Railway Company.—(Mr. Girard.)

1°*, 2681; 2°*, 2967 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5297 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 136).

Bill (No. 98) Respecting the Harbour of Port Arthur, in the Province of Ontario.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

1°, 2681; 2°, 3877; in Com., 3878 (ii).

Bill (No. 99) Respecting the Harbour of Fort William, in the Province of Ontario.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

1°, 2681 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 100) To amend the Pilotage Act.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

1°, 2681 (ii); 2°*, 4056; in Com., 4056; 3°*, 4070 (iii), Sen. Amts., 6889 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 29).

Bill (No. 101) To amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

1°, 2682 (ii); 2°*, 4070; in Com., 4070, 5195; 3°*, 5197 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 38).

Bill (No. 102) To amend the Shipping Casualties Act, 1901.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

1°, 2684 (ii); 2°, 5197; M. for Com., 5280; in Com., 5281; 3°*, 5284 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6889 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 37).

Bill (No. 103) To incorporate the Canadian Artillery Association.—(Sir Frederick W. Borden.)

1°, 2848 (ii); 2°*, 4144; in Com., 4144; 3°*, 4144 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 56).

Bill (No. 104) Respecting the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)

1°*, 2927; 2°*, 3127; in Com., and 3°*, 3758 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 133).

Bill (No. 105) Respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. Sutherland, Essex.)

M. to receive Pet., 2601, 2926; 1°*, 3016; 2°*, 3127; in Com., and 3°*, 3758 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 92).

Bill (No. 106) To incorporate the Chicoutimi and North-eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. German.)

1°*, 3016; 2°*, 3127 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4272 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 67).

Bill (No. 107) To incorporate the Great Lakes and North-west Transportation Company.—(Mr. German.)

1°*, 3016; 2°*, 3354 (ii).

Bill (No. 108) Respecting the Canada Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 3016; 2°*, 3127 (ii).

Bill (No. 109) To incorporate the Montreal, Nipissing and Georgian Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 3016; 2°*, 3127 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4272 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 97).

Bill (No. 110) Respecting the Ottawa Electric Company.—(Mr. Champagne.)

M. to receive Pet., 2368, 2457; 1°, 3016; 2°*, 3127 (ii); in Com., 4176, 4218, 4229; on M. for 3°, 4263; Amt. (Mr. Puttee) to ref. back to Sel. Com., 4264, agreed to (Y. 50; N. 47) 4269 (iii).

Bill (No. 111) Respecting the Edmonton Street Railway Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)

M. to receive Pet., 2601, 2680; 1°*, 3016; 2°*, 3354 (ii); in Com., 5499; 3°*, 5500 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 75).

Bill (No. 112) To amend the Act respecting the Navigation of Canadian Waters.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

1°, 3016 (ii); 2°*, 4075; in Com., 4075; 3°*, 4077 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 26).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 113) Resepcting the Inspection of Grain.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

1°, 3126; 2°, 3876; ref. to Sel. Com., 3876 (ii); in Com., 8062; 3°*, 8066 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 15).

Bill (No. 114) Respecting the Western Assurance Company.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

M. to receive Pet., 2927; 1°, 3226; 2°, 3226; in Com., and 3°*, 3480 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 141).

Bill (No. 115) Respecting the British America Assurance Company.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

M. to receive Pet., 2927; 1°, and 2°, 3227; in Com., and 3°*, 3480 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 51).

Bill (No. 116) Respecting certain Patents of the Canadian General Electric Company, Limited, and others.—(Mr. Grant.)

M. to receive Pet., 2759; 1°*, 3227; 2°*, 3480 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4272 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 59).

Bill (No. 117) To amend the North-west Territories Representation Act.—(Mr. Casgrain.)

1°, 3387 (ii); 2° m., 3990; Remarks, 4723 (iii).

Bill (No. 118) To amend the Yukon Territory Representation Act, 1902.—(Mr. Casgrain.)

1°*, 3387; 2° m., 3994 (ii); Remarks, 4723 (iii).

Bill (No. 119) To amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. Law.)

1°, 3435 (ii); 2° m., 3998; in Com., 4724; 3°*, 4724 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 41).

Bill (No. 120) Respecting the Montreal Terminal Railway Company.—(Mr. Demers, St. John and Iberville.)

1°*, 3719 (ii); 2°*, 4272 (iii); M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 6785; in Com., and 3°*, 7160 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 99).

Bill (No. 121) Respecting the Century Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)

1°*, 3719 (ii); 2°*, 4272; in Com., and 3°*, 5297 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 66).

Bill (No. 122) Respecting the Ottawa Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Rosamond.)

M. to receive Pet., 3226; 1°*, 3719 (ii); 2°*, 3982; in Com., and 3°*, 5297 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 110).

Bill (No. 123) To incorporate the Kingston and Dominion Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Harty.)

M. to receive Pet., 2368, 2457; 1°*, 3719 (ii); 2°*, 4272; in Com., 5035; 3°*, 5035 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 90).

Bill (No. 124) To amend the General Inspection Act.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

1° m., 3719 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 8048; 3°*, 8062 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 14).

Bill (No. 125) For the Inspection and Sale of Seeds.—(Mr. Fisher.)

Prop. Res., 3720; in Com. on Res., 3722; 1°*, 3725 (ii); 2°*, 4928; in Com., 4928 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 126) Respecting certain Patents of Siegfried Gironcoli.—(Mr. MacKinnon.)

M. to receive Pet., 3719; 1°*, 3846 (ii); 2°*, 4452; in Com., 5034; 3°*, 5035 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 79).

Bill (No. 127) To amend the Act providing for the payment of bounties on lead contained in lead-bearing Ores mined in Canada.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Res. prop., 2685; in Com. on Res., 3875; 1°*, 3876 (ii); 2°*, 4056; in Com., 4056; 3°*, 4056 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 20).

Bill (No. 128) To prohibit the importation, manufacture or sale of Cigarettes.—(Mr. Maclaren, Huntingdon.)

In Com. on Res., 3772 (ii), 3978; 1° m., 4052; 2° agreed to (Y. 52; N. 28) 4724; in Com., 5129 (iii).

Bill (No. 129) Respecting certain Patents of Edwin R. Cahoone.—(Mr. German.)

M. to receive Pet., 3752 (ii); 1°*, 4138; 2°*, 4452; in Com., and 3°*, 5035 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 53).

Bill (No. 130) Respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Ontario.)

M. to receive Pet., 3844 (ii); 1°*, 4138; 2°*, 4272; in Com., and 3°*, 5035 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 85).

Bill (No. 131) To incorporate the Farmers Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Guthrie.)

M. to receive Pet., 3718 (ii); 1°*, 4138; 2°*, 4272; in Com., and 3°*, 5297 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 77).

Bill (No. 132) To amend the Railway Act, 1903.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1° m., 4214; 2°*, 5678; in Com., 5678 (iii), 6686; 3° m., 7545; Amt. (Mr. Blain) 7545; Neg. (Y. 33; N. 72) 7550; Amt. (Mr. Maclean) 7551; Neg. (Y. 17; N. 94) 7562; Amt. (Mr. Bennett) 7563; Neg. (Y. 25; N. 74) 7564; 3°, agreed to, 7571 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 32).

Bill (No. 133) In amendment of the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act.—(Mr. Demers, St. John and Iberville.)

1° m., 4409 (iii).

Bill (No. 134, from the Senate) To amend the Act respecting the Jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to Railway Debts.—(Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure.)

1°*, 4666 (iii).

Bill (No. 135) Respecting Labour Union Labels.—(Mr. Smith, Vancouver.)

In Com. on Res., 4706; 1°* of B., 4706 (iii).

Bill (No. 136) Respecting the Similkameen and Keremeos Railway Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)

M. to receive Pet., 3846 (ii); 1°*, 4822; 2°*, 5073; in Com., and 3°*, 5866 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 124).

Bill (No. 137) Respecting certain Patents of the Canadian Office and School Furniture Company, Limited.—(Mr. Clare.)

M. to receive Pet., 3845 (ii); 1°*, 4822; 2°*, 5073; in Com., and 3°*, 5866 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 61).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 138, from the Senate) For the relief of Andrew William Mann.—(Mr. Macdonald.)

M. to receive Pet., 3845 (ii); 1°*, 4997; 2°*, 5073; in Com., and 3°*, 5866 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 95).

Bill (No. 139, from the Senate) For the relief of Jennie Davison Moore.—(Mr. Macdonald.)

1°*, 4997; 2°*, 5073; in Com., and 3°*, 5866 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 100).

Bill (No. 140) Respecting the Alliance Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Russell.)

M. to receive Pet., 4407, 4996; 1°*, 5071; 2° m., 5297; in Com., and 3°*, 5866 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 44).

Bill (No. 141, from the Senate) For the relief of Eliza Robertson.—(Mr. Holmes.)

1°*, 5187; 2°*, 5579; in Com., and 3°*, 5866 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 120).

Bill (No. 142) Respecting the Rio de Janeiro Light and Power Company, Limited, and to change its name to the Rio de Janeiro Tramway, Light and Power Company, Limited.—(Mr. Calvert.)

M. to receive Pet., 4822, 4997; 1°*, 5187; 2° m., 5299; in Com., 5865; 3°*, 5866 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 119).

Bill (No. 143) Respecting the New Brunswick Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Gibson.)

M. to receive Pet., 5184, 5353; 1°*, 5354; 2°*, 5579 (iii); in Com., 6322; 3°*, 6323 (iv).

Bill (No. 144) To amend the Act of the present Session respecting the Temiscouata Railway Company.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1° m., 5577 (iii); 2°*, 6790; in Com., 6790; 3°*, 6791 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 40).

Bill (No. 145) To amend the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, 1903.—(Mr. Fisher.)

1°, 5578 (iii); wthdrn., 8136 (v).

Bill (No. 146, from the Senate) Respecting the Northern Bank.—(Mr. Scott.)

1°*, 5677; M. *re* 2°, 5839; 2°, 5866 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6322 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 105).

Bill (No. 147) To amend the Acts relating to Naturalization and Aliens.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°*, 5840 (iii); 2° m., 6791; in Com., 6794, 7228; 3°*, 7228 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 25).

Bill (No. 148) To amend the Dominion Elections Act of 1900.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1° m., 5862 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 7228, 7649 (iv); 8028, 8136; 3° m., 8390 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 12).

Bill (No. 149) To amend the Representation Act of 1903.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1° m., 5863 (iii); remarks, 7228; 2°, and in Com., 7669; 3° m., 7786 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 35).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 150) To amend the Act passed during the present session to incorporate the Thorold and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. German.)

M. to receive Pet., 5839 (iii); 1°, 6147; M. to place on Order Paper, 6786; in Com., and 3°*, 6845 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 132).

Bill (No. 151) Respecting the Incorporation of Seed-growers' Associations.—(Mr. Fisher.)

1°, 6364; 2° m., 7229; in Com., 7230 (iv).

Bill (No. 152) Respecting an Arbitration between His Majesty and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1° m., 6465; remarks, 7228; 2°, and in Com., 7673; 3° m., 7786 (iv); 3°*, 8028a (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 16).

Bill (No. 153) To further amend the Post Office Act.—(Sir William Mulock.)

1°, 6541 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 8029; 3° m., 8048; M. wthdn., 8048; 3° m., 8265; in Com., 8265; 3°*, 8266; Sen. Amts., 9052 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 30.)

Bill (No. 154) To amend Chapter 61 of the Statutes of 1903, respecting the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1° m., 6541; 2°*, 6795; in Com., 6795; 3°*, 6797 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 36).

Bill (No. 155) from the Senate) For the relief of Annie Christman.—(Mr. Calvert.)

1°, 6680; M. to place on Orders of the Day for 2°, 6786; 2°*, 6883; in Com., and 3°*, 7420 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 68).

Bill (No. 156) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the financial year ending the 30th of June, 1905.—(Mr. Fielding.)

M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 6784; in Com., 6784; 1°*; 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 6785 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 1).

Bill (No. 157) Respecting the payment of certain Railway Subsidies.—(Mr. Emmerson.)

1° m., 6873 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 8127; 3°*, 8133 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 33).

Bill (No. 158) To amend the Land Titles Act of 1894.—(Mr. Sifton.)

1° m., 6874 (iv); 2°*, 8712; in Com., 8712; 3°*, 8716 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 19).

Bill (No. 159) Respecting the Pacific Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Galliher.)

1°*, 6973; 2°*, 7721; (remarks) 7783 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8330 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 113).

Bill (No. 160) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Fielding.)

1° m., 7222; 2°, and in Com., 7786; 3°*, 7787 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 3).

Bill (No. 161, from the Senate) Respecting the Canadian Assessment-policy-holders in the Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Heyd.)

1°*, 7649 (iv); Remarks, 8530; 2° m., 8675; in Com., 8678; 3°*, 8711 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 101).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 162) To consolidate and amend the Acts respecting Alien Labour.—(Sir William Mulock.)

1° m., 7898 (iv); 2° m., 8565 ; in Com., 8572; 3° m., 8665 (v).

Bill (No. 163) Authorizing the Government of Canada to purchase the Canada Eastern Railway, and to take possession of the Fredericton and Saint Mary's Railway Bridge.—(Mr. Emmerson.)

Res. prop., 7443 (iv); in Com. on Res., 8222; 1°* of B., 8251; 2° m., 8550; in Com., 8555; 3° m., 8562 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 4).

Bill (No. 164, from the Senate) To amend the Companies Act, 1902.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

2° m., 8840, 8898, 9052 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9052 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 5).

Bill (No. 165) To amend chapter 68 of the Statutes of 1903, respecting the Bounties on Steel and Iron.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Res. prop., 8028; in Com. on Res., 8392 ; 1°*; 2°* of B., 8393; in Com., 8393; 3°*, 8393 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 39).

Bill (No. 166) Respecting the Animals Contagious Diseases Act, 1903.—(Mr. Fisher.)

Res. prop., 8255; in Com. on Res., 8434; 1°* of B., 8440; 2°, 8440; in Com., 8441; 3°, 8441 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 6).

Bill (No. 167) To provide for the payment of a bounty on Crude Petroleum from Canadian Wells.—(Mr. Fielding.)

Res. prop., 7785 (iv); in Com. on Res., 8441; 1°*; 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 8475 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 28).

Bill (No. 168) To amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. Brodeur.)

Res. prop., 8136; M. for Com. on Res., 8393; in Com. on Res., 8428; 2° of Res., 8434, 8533; 1°*; 2°*; and in Com., 8549; 3°, 8550 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 17).

Bill (No. 169) To further amend the Act providing for the payment of Bounties on Lead contained in Lead-bearing Ores mined in Canada.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Res. prop., 8532; in Com. on Res., 8711; 1°*; 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 8712 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 21).

Bill (No. 170) To amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. Paterson.)

Res. prop., 8389; in Com. on Res., 8716; 1°*; 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 8717 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 10).

Bill (No. 171) To authorize the granting of Subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. Emmerson.)

Res. prop., 8256; M. for Com. on Res., 8786; in Com. on Res., 8790; 1°*, of B., 8840; 2°*, and in Com., 9053; 3°*, 9055 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 34).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 172) To amend the Customs Tariff, 1897.—(Mr. Fielding.)

Res. prpo., 5733 (iii) ; M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 8843 ; in Com. on Ways and Means, 8844 ; 1° of B., 8898; 2°*, 8898 ; in Com., 8898 ; 3°*, 8898 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 11).

Bill (No. 173) Further to amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. Brodeur.)

1° m., 8898; 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 8898 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 18).

Bill (No. 174) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1904, and the 30th June, 1905.—(Mr. Fielding.)

In Com. on Ways and Means, 9078; 1°*; 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 9078 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 2).

Bill (No. 175) To amend an Act passed in the present Session and intituled : 'An Act to further amend the Act providing for the payment of Bounties on Lead contained in Lead-bearing Ores mined in Canada.—(Mr. Fielding.)

1° m., 9053; 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 9053 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 22).

Binder Twine Inspection : *See* 'General Inspection B. 124.'

Binder Twine, Quantity made and exported, 1891, 1896, 1901 : Ques. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 791 (i).

——— Seizures, Costs and Fines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 3538 (ii).

——— Seizures, Number since 1st Jan., 1902 : Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 3130 (ii).

——— Seizures, Payments to Agents, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 4272 (iii).

——— Seizures, Prosecutions, &c., Reps. &c.: M. (Mr. Clancy) for Copies*, 5094 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Clancy) 5579, 5762, 5864, 5925 (iii), 6024 (iv).

——— Statistics : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) on Prorogation, 9078 (v).

Birch Cove, Easement of Curve, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8350 (v).

Bisley Prizes : *See* 'Canadian Prizes.'

Black Brook Wharf, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7744 (iv).

Blair, Mr., Cor. *re* Resignation, Objection to bringing down Remainder : Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1356 (i).

——— Memorandum *re* G.T.P.: Remarks *re* using Confidential Documents (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1696 (i).

See 'G. T. Pacific.'

Blankets and Woollen Goods : Remarks (Mr. Brock) in Com. on Ways and Means, 8877 (v).

Blood Indian Reserve, N.W.T., Grazing Leases, Names of Applicants : Ques. (Mr. Gilmour) 2554 (ii).

Blood Indian Reserve, Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) in Com. of Sup., 7197 (iv).
See 'Indians,' &c.

Board of Customs, Construction, Duties, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1980 (i).
See 'Customs,' &c.

Bonaventure, East, Breakwater, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7766 (iv).

Bonding Privileges on Great Lakes: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* C. A. Ry. SS. Line, 1643 (i).

Bonding Privileges: *See* 'Coasting,' &c., 'Can. and British,' &c.

Bonds, Temporary, Outstanding, Amounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2187 (ii).
See 'Finance.'

Book Postage, Increase in: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in Com. of Sup., 5716 (iii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.

Bostock, Senator, Sale or Lease of Land to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3437 (ii).

Boundary, B.C., Demarcation: in Com. of Sup., 7077 (iv).

Boundary, Kamloops & Cariboo Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 46 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 1053; 2°*, 1337 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2369 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 49).

Bounties on Coal Oil: *See* 'Petroleum.'

Bounties on Lead: *See* 'Lead Bills 127, 169, 175.

Bounties on Steel: *See* 'Steel and Iron.'

Bounties to Fishermen, Investigation *re* Frauds, Commissioner's Name: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5202 (iii).

——— Methods of Payment: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5036 (iii).
See 'Fisheries.'

Bowing on Floor of House when passing Members who are Speaking: Ques. of Order (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 7235 (iv).

Bowmanville P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 529 (i).

Bracebridge and Trading Lake Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 8791 (v).

Bracebridge Wharf, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7751 (iv).

Brantford and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s B. No. 22 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 596; 2°*, 709; in Com., 1819; 3°*, 1824 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 50).

Brantford Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 530, 640.

Brick-making in Penitentiaries: in Com. of Sup., 7957 (iv).

Bridgeburg P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 530 (i).

Bridges, I.C.R., Strengthening, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 5918 (iii), 6264 (iv).
See 'I.C.R.', &c.

Bridgewater, N.S., Harbour Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7637 (iv).

British American Assurance Co.'s B. No. 115 (Mr. McCarthy) M. to receive Pet., 2927; 1°, and 2°, 3227; in Com., and 3°*, 3480 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 51).

British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 11 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 396; 2°*, 549; in Com. and 3°*, 987 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 52).

B. C. Immigration, Disallowance of Act, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Vancouver) 988 (i).

B. C. Legislation, Disallowance of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Vancouver) 989 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Bourassa) 679 (i).

Breadalbane Freight Shed, P. E. I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 5998 (iii).

Brennan, D. J., Removal Expenses: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).

Breton Cove, N.S., Wharf, &c.: in Com. of Snp., 7636 (iv).

Brokerage Charges, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 244 (i).
See 'Finance,' &c.

Brockville Cheese Curing Room, Total Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 2839 (ii).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.

Brockville and Ottawa and G. T. Ry. Connections: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 1471 (i), 2119, 2461 (ii).

——— Rep. of Investigation: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 3313 (ii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.

Bronte Harbour Improvements, Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 336 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Henderson) 336 (i).

——— Labourers' Wages: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Henderson) 1875 (i).

——— Light: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 5825; Rep. of Mr. Anderson (read) 5825 (iii).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry., Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 8791 (v).

Bryce, Dr., Appnmt. and Salary as Medical Inspector for Indians: in Com. of Sup., 6960 (iv).

Bryson Bridge Reconstruction: in Com. of Sup., 9031 (v).

Budget, The, Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 4331 (iii).

DEBATE:

(Mr. Fielding) 4331; (Mr. Bell) 4374; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 4417; (Mr. Pope) 4446, 4452; (Mr. Heyd) 4473; (Mr. Osler) 4492; (Mr. Thompson, Haldimand) 4502; (Mr. Lennox) 4527; (Mr. Campbell) 4536; (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 4551; (Mr. Holmes) 4726; (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 4740; (amt.) 4766; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4766; (Mr. Broder) 4783; (Mr. Hughes, P.E.I.) 4795; (Mr. Wilson) 4806; (Mr. Armstrong) 4829; (Mr. Brodeur) 4857, 4867; (Mr. Kemp) 4872; (Mr. Bourassa) 4894; (Mr. Donnelly) 4913; (Mr. Haszard) 4915; Amt. Neg. (Y. 52; N. 110) 4922 (iii).

Budget, The: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 3726 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 3726, 3757 (ii).
See 'Customs Bills,' 'Tariff,' 'Ways and Means,' &c.

Buildings, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 463, 700 (i).
——— Dom., in Com. of Sup., 535 (i), 7619 (iv).
——— Dom., Rented by Govt., Generally: List read (Mr. Hyman) in Com. of Sup., 7613, 7622 (iv).
——— Man., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 685 (i).
——— Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 475 (i).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 697 (i).
——— N.S.: In Com. of Sup., 461, 504 (i).
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 506, 600 (i).
——— Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 506, 656, 680, (i), 7972 (iv).
See 'Public Works,' &c.
Building Society: *See* 'N.S. Permanent B. S.'
Bulletins, Farm, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2744 (ii).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.
Burlington Channel Pier, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7751 (iv).
Burnt Island Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2377 (ii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Business of the Hse., Govt. Legislation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 4725 (iii), 6787 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 4958 (iii).
——— Morning Sittings: (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5842 (iii).
——— Private Members' Days and Supply: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 595 (i).
——— Railway Bill: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 5926 (iii).
See 'Govt. Business,' &c.
Butter and Cheese, Commission to investigate Weighing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pope) 1547 (i).
See 'Fraudulent,' &c., 'Dairy,' &c.
Butter and Cheese Exports 1898 to 1903, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 790 (i).
Butter and Cheese, Nappan Stations, N.S., Cost of Manufacture: Ques. (Mr. Bell) 2805 (ii).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.
Butter manufactured in Alberta, Exports to Japan: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4127 (iii).
Cab-hire for Ministers, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5007 (iii).
Cahoone, Edwin R., Patent Relief B. No. 129 (Mr. German) M. to receive Pet., 3752 (ii); 1°*, 4138; 2°*, 4452; in Com., and 3°*, 5035 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 53).
'C' Battery, Arrears of Pay, Issue of Notices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 2187 (ii).
Calgary and Edmonton Land and Ry. Co., Attack on Mr. Osler: M. (Mr. Davis) to adjn., 2787; Penalty Clause: Remarks (Mr. Maclean) 2801 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. Scott) to adjn., 2759 (ii).
See 'Qu'Appelle,' &c.
Calgary and Edmonton Land Co., Sales, &c., from London: Remarks (Mr. Scott) 2365 (ii).
Calgary P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 697 (i).
Cameron, J. W. H., P.O. Service, Medical Allowance *re* Injuries received: in Com. of Sup., 5852 (iii).
Campaign Literature prepared by Mr. Bain: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1909 (i).
See 'Bain, Mr.' &c.
Campaign Literature *re* St. Lawrence Route: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5003 (iii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 10 (Mr. Ross, Ontario) 1°*, 396; 2°*, 549; in Com., and 3°*, 1586 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 54).
Campbellton, N.B., Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 463 (i).
——— Railway Siding: in Com. of Sup., 5940 (iii), 7532 (iv).
——— Wharf Accommodation and Shives Lumber Co.'s Monopoly, Cor., &c.: Read (Mr. Fowler) on M. for Sup., 7788 (iv).
——— Wharf Extension, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7745 (iv), 9026 (v).
Campbell, Mr. John D., Repayment of Claims for Sheep Quarantine, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 3761 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 8916 (v).
Canada and Australia Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7461 (iv).
'Canada' and 'Cape Breton,' Strs., Collision in St. Lawrence: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5027 (iii).
Canada and France SS. Line, Documents and Cor. *re* Contract with M. Colombier: M. (Mr. Casgrain) for Copies, 4699 (iii).
——— Inquiry (Mr. Casgrain) for Ret., 5190 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3760 (ii).
——— Transfer of Contract to Mr. Carbonneau: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3311 (ii).
See 'France and Canada,' &c.
Canada and Mexico SS. Service, Govt. Control *re* Rates: Ques. (Mr. Smith, B.C.) 4694 (iii).
——— Govtl. Intention *re*: Ques. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 2118 (ii).
——— Ports of Calling, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Earle) 4142 (iii).
Canada and Mexico SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 7464 (iv).
Canada and S. Africa, SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 7446 (iv).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Purchase by Govt., Negotiations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Haggart) 6874 (iv).
See 'G. T. P. Ry.' &c.
Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 6238, 6244 (iv).
——— Irrelevancy of Debate: Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) in Com. of Sup., 6260 (iv).
See 'I.C.R. Bill 163.'

Canada Life Ass. Co.'s B. No. 108 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 3016; 2°*, 3127 (ii).

Canada Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 40 (Mr. Ingram) 1°*, 1053; 2°*, 1337 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 6322; Sen. Amts., 6845 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 55).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. No. 119 (Mr. Law) 1°, 3435 (ii); 2° m., 3998; in Com., 4724; 3°*, 4724 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 41).

Canada Temperance Act: in Com. of Sup., 8386 (v).

Canadian Fishing Regulations in St. Lawrence *re* American Fishermen: Cor. read (Mr. Taylor) 4328 (iii).

——— Cor. in U.S. Papers: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 4416 (iii).

——— Letter from Mr. Day: Read (Mr. Taylor) 5189 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 4492; Memorandum (Mr. Préfontaine) Read, 4578 (iii).

Canadian Artillery Association incorp. B. No. 103 (Sir Frederick W. Borden) 1°, 2848 (ii); 2°*, 4144; in Com., 4144; 3°*, 4144 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 56).

Canadian Associated Press, Rep. of Dundonald Incident: Remarks (Mr. Barker) 8659 (v).

Can. and British Vessels and Treatment in U.S. Ports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ontario) 2374 (ii).

Canadian Bank of Commerce, Yukon, Compensation: in Com. of Sup., 9019 (v).

See 'Coasting,' &c.

Canadian Consular Service: *See* 'Consular.'

Canadian Credit Indemnity & Guaranty Co.'s incorp. B. No. 29 (Mr. Guthrie) 1°*, 788; 2°*, 987 (i); in Com., 5295, 3°*, 5297 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 57).

Canadian Ensign and Merchant Marine, Rep. in 'Star': M. (Mr. Kaulbach) to adjn., 5272 (iii).

Canadian Ensign ordered by British Consul at Argentine Republic to be hauled down: Remarks (Mr. Bourassa) 5188 (iii).

See 'Flag.'

Canadian Exhibit in Imperial Institute, London: in Com. of Sup., 2757 (ii).

Canadian Fire Insurance Co.'s B. No. 24 (Mr. McCreary) 1°*, 596; 2°*, 709; in Com., and 3°*, 1818 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 58).

Canadian General Electric Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 16 (Mr. Grant) M. to receive Pet., 2759; 1°*, 3227; 2°*, 3480 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4272 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 59).

Canadian Labour Bureau and Immigration Agents: Remarks (Mr. Puttee) in Com. of Sup., 7299; Cor. from Louis Leopold: Read 7304-5 (iv).

See 'Immigration,' &c.

Canadian Mail to G. B., Weight, Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 216 (i).

See 'Post Office,' &c.

Canadian Northern Railway Co.'s B. No. 55 (Mr. Davis) 1°*, 1133; 2°*, 1338 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3354 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 60).

Can. Northern Ry., Crossing of Saskatchewan River, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 1136 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. *re* Mortgages, &c. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 2116, 2184, 2285 (ii).

——— Land Subsidy earned by Winnipeg & Hudson Bay Ry. Co., M. (Mr. Stewart) for Cor.*, 5094 (iii).

Canadian Office & School Furniture Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 137 (Mr. Clare) M. to receive Pet., 3845 (ii); 1°*, 4822; 2°*, 5073; in Com., and 3°*, 5866 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 61).

Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 13 (Mr. Thompson), Haldimand and Monck) 1°*, 396; 2°*, 549; in Com., 986; 3°*, 987 (i). (4 Edward VII. c., 62).

——— B. No. 70 (Mr. Douglas) 1°*, 1547; 2°*, 1825 (i); in Com., 2597; 3°*, 2597 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 63).

C. P. R. Lands, Purchase by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 7197 (iv).

——— St. Phillippe D'Argenteuil Branch: in Com. on Res., 8822 (v).

——— Steamers and Insurance Rates *re* St. Lawrence Route: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5819 (iii).

——— Stock, Authority for the Issue of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, P. E. I.) 3436 (ii).

Canadian Prize Winners in England: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Kings) 7436 (iv).

Canadian Securities on French Markets, Res. of French Chamber of Commerce: Ques. (Mr. Gervais) 2807 (ii).

Canadian Traction & Power Co.'s incorp. B. No. 81 (Mr. Champagne) 1°*, 2001; 2°*, 2328 (ii).

Canadian Year-book as Immigration Literature and Advertising Whiskies: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 7360 (iv).

See 'Agriculture,' &c.

CANALS:

Beauharnois, Béique, Mr., Supt. of, Superannuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 3128 (ii).

——— Number of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 3129 (ii).

——— Valleyfield Weir: in Com. of Sup., 8381 (v).

Canals: in Com. of Sup., 6293, 6797, 7466 (iv).

——— Operating Staff, Statement of Expenses: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. of Sup., 6675 (iv).

——— Surveys, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 7472 (iv).

——— Tolls, Collection of: Remarks (Mr. Reid, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 6331-2 (iv).

——— Govt's. Position: Remarks (Mr. Reid, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 7470 (iv).

CANALS—*Con.*

Canals, Tolls &c., collectors' salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7531 (iv).
——— Working Expenses: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) on Conc., 6684 (iv).
Cardinal Canal: in Com. of Sup., 6308, 6324 (iv).
——— Damages *re* Flooding: Remarks (Mr. Reid, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 7594 (iv).
——— Toll Collectors, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6331-2 (iv).
——— name, salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 252 (i).
Carillon Water Power, Leases, Cancellation of, &c: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 3127 (ii).
Chambly, Additional Lockmen: in Com. of Sup., 8384 (v).
——— Damages by Floods: in Com. of Sup., 7537 (iv).
——— indemnity to parties, names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6365 (iv).
———Denault's Culvert: in Com. of Sup., 6870 (iv).
——— Dredging at Ste. Therese Island: in Com. of Sup., 6869 (iv).
——— Electric Power-house: in Com. of Sup., 7537 (iv).
——— Landing Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6872 (iv).
——— Macadamizing Tow-Path: in Com. of Sup., 6870, 7470 (iv).
——— Stone Contract, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3388 (ii), 5580 (iii).
——— Waste Weir: in Com. of Sup., 7536 (iv).
Cornwall, 'Alert,' Str., Number of Employees, Cost of Running, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Reid, Grenville) 8388 (v).
——— transfer to Marine dept.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7593 (iv).
——— use by Supt Stewart, for Pleasure Yacht: Remarks (Mr. Reid, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 7472 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 7520 (iv).
——— Davis Contract *re* Lighting: in Com. of Sup., 6645 (iv) .
——— Aud. Gen.'s letter to papers: remarks (Mr. Puttee) 6879 (iv).
——— charges *re* (Mr. Lennox) 8479 (v).
——— Remarks, on M. for Sel. Com. on Audit Act, 4283 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) *re* Time of Discussion, 7538 (iv).
——— O.Cs. : Inquiry for (Mr. Barker) 6150 (iv).
——— Dredging Shoals: in Com. of Sup., 6347 (iv).
——— Employees, Delay in Paying: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) in Com. of Sup., 7529 (iv).
——— Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 6295, 6644 (iv).

CANALS—*Con.*

Cornwall, Stewart, Supt. of Canals, and Str. 'Alert' use of: Remarks (Mr. Reid, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 7472, 7520 (iv).
See 'Alert.'
——— hotel expenses : Remarks (Mr. Pringle) in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iv).
Cornwall and Williamsburg Canal Workshops, Completion of : Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6544 (iv).
Culbute, Damages by Floods : in Com. of Sup., 7469 (iv).
Davis Contract : *See* 'Cornwall Canal,' &c.
Farran's Point, Number of Locks : Remarks (Mr. Reid, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iv).
Galops : in Com. of Sup., 7531 (iv).
——— Completion : in Com. of Sup., 6334 (iv), 8381 (v).
——— Discussion *re* : Remarks (Mr. Haggart) 8974 (v).
——— Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 6293 (iv).
——— Pay of Staff, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Reid, Grenville) 6294 (iv).
Grenville Wharf, Repairing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6865 (iv).
Lachine : in Com. of Sup., 6864 (iv).
——— Atwater Avenue Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 8374 (v).
——— Authority given for Ry. Purposes : Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6150 (iv).
——— Bank, Cor. on behalf of Municipality, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 5912 (iii), 7519 (iv).
——— Construction : in Com. of Sup., 7538 (iv).
——— Cote St. Paul Bridge, Delay in Completing : Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3227 (ii).
——— Dredging Basins Nos. 1 and 2 : in Com. of Sup., 6826 (iv).
——— Dry Dock, Memorial from Board of Trade, Montreal : Ques. (Mr. Gallery) 4273 (iii).
——— Electric Generator : in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
——— Electric Installation : in Com. of Sup., 6826 (iv).
——— Employees, Delay in Paying : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7528 (iv).
——— Lock Gates : in Com. of Sup., 6868, 7536 (iv).
——— Locks Nos. 1 and 2, Repairing : in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
——— Mill Street Paving : in Com. of Sup., 8381 (v).
——— Napoleon Bridge, Rep *re* Delay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rivet) 3941 (iii).
——— Pay of Labourers : Ques. (Mr. Brumeau) 5583 (iii).

CANALS—*Con.*
Lachine, Rebuilding of Old Locks: in Com. of Sup., 6867 (iv).
——— St. Gabriel Basin: in Com. of Sup., 7535 (iv).
——— Slope Walls: in Com. of Sup., 6825 (iv).
——— Tate Dry Dock: in Com of Sup., 7534 (iv).
——— Water Service *re* Fires: in Com. of Sup., 7534 (iv).
——— Widening Lower Basin Road: in Com. of Sup., 8381 (v).
Murray Canal, Supt. of, Payments to: Remarks (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. of Sup., 7525, 7527 (iv).
North Channel Dam, Completion, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6314, 6323 (iv).
Rideau, Bridges, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Birkett) in Com. of Sup., 5914 (iii).
——— Extension, Desert to Devil Lake: in Com. of Sup., 8382 (v).
——— Poonamalie Dam: in Com. of Sup., 8382 (v)
——— damages *re* Poonamalie Dam: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 1149 (i).
——— repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lavell) 7784 (iv).
——— lock station: in Com. of Sup., 8973 (iv).
——— Smith's Falls Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 7469 (iv).
St. Ours Lock: in Com. of Sup., 6864 (iv).
——— Pay of Labourers: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 5583 (iii).
St. Peter's, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7466 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 6816 (iv).
Soulanges, Arms and Heaters: in Com. of Sup., 6868 (iv).
——— Claim of Messrs. O'Brien, Settlement *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 8024 (v).
——— Land Damages: in Com. of Sup., 7538 (iv).
——— Pay of Labourers: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 5582 (iii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 6868 (iv).
——— Steel Bridge over Power House: in Com. of Sup., 6862 (iv).
——— Survey for Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6862 (iv).
——— Water Wheel Governors: in Com. of Sup., 6868 (iv).
——— Workshops, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iv).
Trent, Appropriations, Sums expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 248 (i).
——— Bridge in Carden Township: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 3435 (ii).
——— Claims for Damages from Verulam Township: (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 794 (i).

CANALS—*Con.*
Soulanges, Completion, Reps. of Engineers, Cor., &c.: Read (Mr. Ward) 8717 (v).
——— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 6827, 6846 (iv), 8378 (v).
——— Dredging Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 7466 (iv).
——— Katchawannoe Lake, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7466 (iv).
——— Lakefield, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7466 (iv).
——— Lock Pier: in Com. of Sup., 7466 (iv).
——— Peterborough Dam: in Com. of Sup., 7466 (iv).
——— Rice Lake Route, Rep. of Mr. McLeod: M. for Copy* (Mr. Ward) 224 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Ward) 218 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Ward) on M. for Sup., 5284 (iii).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 8379 (v).
——— Trenton and Port Hope Routes, Rep. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ward) 561 (i).
Welland, Deepening, Govt. Policy: Remarks (Mr. Reid, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 6361 (iv).
——— Deepening Port Colborne and Thorold: in Com. of Sup., 8379 (v).
——— Dredging at Dunnville, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 7443 (iv).
——— Dunnville Bridge Painting, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 8026 (v).
——— Electric Plant: in Com. of Sup., 6348, 6797 (iv).
——— Rep. of R. J. Parke: Read (Mr. Emmerson) 6807 (iv).
——— Stmnt. (Mr. Emmerson) 6675 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1877 (i).
——— Employees, Payments to: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 7511 (iv).
——— Gas Lighting: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 6351 (iv).
——— Lock Tenders, Pensions to: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 7524 (iv).
——— Political Appointments: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6111 (iv).
——— Port Colborne, Deepening: in Com. of Sup., 6360 (iv).
——— entrance improvement: in Com. of Sup., 6807 (iv).
——— Protection Banks: in Com. of Sup., 6866 (iv).
——— Removal of Obstructions: in Com. of Sup., 6358 (iv).
——— Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 8383 (v).
——— Retaining Walls: in Com. of Sup., 6867 (iv).
——— 'Townsend' Valves in Locks: in Com. of Sup., 6867 (iv).
Canso Strait Bridge Co.: *See* 'Strait of Canso,' &c.

Canso Ferry Service, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 5976 (iii), 8365 (v).
See 'I. C. R.' &c.
'Cape Breton,' Str.: *See* 'Canada,' &c.
Cape Tormentine Improvements, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7745 (iv).
See 'Post Office,' 'Public Works,' &c.
Cape Traverse, P.E.I., Mail Service, Total Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4825 (iii).
Cape Wolfe Branch, P.E.I. Ry. Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hackett) 990 (i).
See 'I.C.R.—P.E.I.' &c.
Caplan Breakwater, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7767 (iv).
Caraquet Wharf, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7745 (iv).
Caraquet Ry. Wharf at Shippegan: in Com. of Sup., 9027 (v).
Carbide Cos., Manufacture, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 8932 (v).
——— Patents, *re*: Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 5307 (iii).
——— Supply for Lighting Service, Contracts, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5301 (iii).
Carbonneau and Colombier Contracts: *See* 'France and Can. SS.'
Cardigan and Montague Bridge Branch Line, P. E. I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 8369 (v).
See 'I.C. R.—P. E. I.' &c.
Cardinal Canal: in Com. of Sup., 6308, 6324 (iv).
——— Damages *re* Flooding: Remarks (Mr. Reid, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 7594 (iv).
See 'Canals,' &c.
——— Toll Collectors, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6331-2 (iv).
——— Toll Collector, Name, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 252 (i).
Carillon Water Power, Leases, Cancellation of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 3127 (ii).
Caron, Mr., Emplymt. as Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 4274 (iii).
Cascades, Soulanges Canal, Pay of Labourers: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 5582 (iii).
Cascapedia, Manufacturing and Trading Co.'s incorp. B. No. 20 (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure) 1°*, 477; 2°*, 549; in Com. and 3°*, 1337 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 64).
Cascumpec Harbour, P.E.I., Cor. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hackett) 1208 (i).
Cashel, Capture of, Expenditure *re*: in Com. of Sup., 7963 (iv).
Casualties and Accidents *re* St. Lawrence Route, Rep. from Lloyd's List: Read (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 5820 (iii).
——— Ref. to in Pamphlet of Min. of Mar.: Remarks (Mr. Clancy) in Com. of Sup., 5208 (iii).
——— Rep. of Commissioners *re* Pilots: Remarks (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 5832, 5835 (iii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Cattle Diseases Bill: *See* 'Animals,' &c.
Cattle Feeding, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4967 (iii).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.
Cattle-guard Commission, Appnmts., Instructions, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lennox) 2848 (ii).
——— Delay in bringing down Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 3727 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 7475 (iv).
——— Extra Remuneration: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6545 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 2459, 2602, 3539 (ii).
——— Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1357 (i).
Cattle Exports to U.S. for Exhibitions: in Com. of Sup., 4105 (iii).
Cattle Inspection *re* Ocean Service: in Com. of Sup., 5292 (iii).
Cattle Quarantine: in Com. of Sup., 4206 (iii).
——— Veterinary Division: in Com. of Sup., 8961 (v).
Cavalry Regiments, Number of Squadrons: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 8479 (v).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Cedar Lake Fishery Overseer: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7579 (iv).
Cedar Rapids Manufacturing and Power Co.'s incorp. B. No. 89 (Mr. Geoffrion) 1°*, 2681; 2°*, 2802 (ii); in Com., 4450, 4627 (remarks) 4686; in Com., and 3°*, 5866 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 65).
Cedar Rapids Manufacturing and Power Co.'s B.: M. (Mr. Cowan) to ref. back to Private Bills Com., 4686 (iii).
Cement, Analysis of Imports from U.S., &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3917 (ii).
Census, 1881, 1891, 1901, Cost, Information, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 330 (i).
——— Enumerations *re* Religions, N.B., Authority for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 2803 (ii).
Census (1901) Industrial Establishments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 1875 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 1209 (i).
——— total expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7224 (iv).
——— Saskatchewan District, Object and Purpose of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3759 (ii).
——— Volumes, Completion of: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 8959 (v).
Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. No. 121 (Mr. Morrison) 1°*, 3719 (ii); 2°*, 4272; in Com., and 3°*, 5297 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 66).
Certificates to Masters and Mates: *See* 'Masters and Mates B. 4.'
Chambly Canal, Additional Lockmen: in Com. of Sup., 8384 (v).

Chambly Canal, Damages by Flooding, Indemnity to Parties, Names, &c: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6365 (iv).
——— Damages by Floods: in Com. of Sup., 7537 (iv).
——— Denault's Culvert: in Com. of Sup., 6870 (iv).
——— Dredging at Ste. Therese Island: in Com. of Sup., 6869 (iv).
——— Electric Power House: in Com. of Sup., 7537 (iv).
——— Landing Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6872 (iv).
——— Macadamizing Tow-path: in Com. of Sup., 6870, 7470 (iv).
——— Piers, Contract *re* Stone required, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3388 (ii), 5073, 5580 (iii).
——— Waste Weir: in Com. of Sup., 7536 (iv).
Chambord Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7767 (iv).
Champlain's Monument: in Com. of Sup., 7969 (iv).
Champlain Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7767 (iv).
——— Selection of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 4410 (iii).
Chaplains appointed to Penitentiaries, Protestant: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 7950 (iv).
'Chapman' Ball-Bearings, Application *re* I.C.R. Cars: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6286 (iv).
Charges of Management: in Com. of Sup., 231 (i).
Charlottetown, P.E.I., Dom. Building: in Com. of Sup., 462 (i).
——— Free Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 5747 (iii).
——— Ry. Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 8368 (v).
——— Station, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 5991 (iii).
——— number of employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 789 (i).
——— Station Site: Remarks (Mr. Haszard) in Com. of Sup., 6237 (iv).
——— Wharf Construction: in Com. of Sup., 7598 (iv).
Chartered Banks of Canada: Deptl. Rep. presented (Mr. Fielding) 3227 (ii).
Charwomen, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 8982 (v).
Chatham Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 531 (i), 9020 (v).
Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 8824 (v).
Chateau Richer, Que., Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7767 (iv).
Chaudière Junction, Station Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5973 (iii).
See 'I.C.R.,' &c.
Cheese Cooling Room, Woodstock, Ont., Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 793 (i).
Cheese Cooling Stations, Expenditure and Accounts: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7171 (iv).
Cheese Curing and Paraffining: Remarks (Mr. A. F. MacLaren) in Com. of Sup., 7412 (iv).
Cheese Curing at Brockville, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 3754 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 3540 (ii).
——— *See* 'Agriculture,' 'Brockville,' 'Cowansville,' 'St. Hyacinthe.'
Chesley, Ont., Postmastership, Vacancy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Donnelly) 4824 (iii).
——— Appnmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7081 (iv),
Chew, Manley, and Hope Island Timber Lease: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5240 (iii).
See 'Hope Island,' &c.
Chicken Fattening Stations, Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7171 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 7422 (iv).
Chicken Fattening Stations, P.E.I., Number in Operation, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lefurgey) 3771 (ii).
Chicoutimi and North Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 106 (Mr. German) 1°*, 3016; 2°*, 3127 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4272 (iii). (4 Edward VII., c. 67).
Chief Justiceship, N.S., Name, Vacancy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 1667 (i).
See 'Justice,' &c.
Chinese-Anti, Legislation, Interference *re*: Ques. (Mr. Morrison) 1354 (i).
Chinese Exclusion Act, Par. in Nanaimo 'Free Press': Ques. (Mr. Smith, Vancouver) 994 (i).
Chinese Immigration Poll Tax Act, Enforcement of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Vancouver) 989 (i).
Chinese Labour in B.C., Free Entry, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Puttee) 398 (i).
Chinese Labour in S. Africa, Protest *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 218 (i).
Christman, Annie, Relief B. No. 155 (Mr. Calvert) 1°, 6680; M. to place on Orders of the Day for 2°, 6786; 2°*, 6883; in Com., and 3°*, 7420 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 68).
Cigarettes, Sale and Prohibition B. No. 128 (Mr. Maclaren, Huntingdon) Prop. Res., 247, 336 (i); in Com. on Res., 3772 (ii), 3978; 1° m., 4052; 2° agreed to (Y. 52; N. 28) 4724; in Com., 5129 (iii).
Circular Letter *re* C.S. Applications by Mr. Clement: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 212 (i).
Civil Servants and Gratuities: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 8924 (v).
Civil Service Act, Procedure *re* Promotions, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1791, 1825 (i).
Civil Service, Board of Examiners: in Com. of Sup., 9038 (v).

Civil Service List: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 205 (i), 2188 (ii).
Clarke, Messrs., and Seven Islands Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 7976 (iv).
See 'Seven Islands,' &c.
Clements, Jule d'E., Circular Letter *re* C. S. Applications: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 212 (i).
Clergue Steel Rail Co., and Govt. Contract: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. on Res., 8835 (v).
'Cleveland' Patent Cylinders, and I. C. R. Locomotives: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 6286 (iv).
Clinton P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 531 (i).
Coal Measures, Govt. Ownership, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robinson, Elgin) 214 (i).
Coal Oil Bounties: *See* 'Petroleum.'
Coal Oil Duties, Payment of Bounties, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 4667 (iii).
——— pets. *re*: inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 4726 (iii).
——— Bounty *re* Tariff Res.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 5741 (iii).
——— Rep. of Bounty Distribution: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6173 (iv).
——— Tariff Res., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Budget Speech, 4829 (iii).
Coal purchased by Govt., Quantity, Total Cost, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clare) 1881 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Clare) 1136 (i).
Coasting Laws for British Ports, Cor. with Imp. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 6882 (iv).
Coasting Trade Pacific Coast, O.C. *re* Free Entry: Inquiry for (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 1055, 1449 (i).
See 'Can. and British Vessels,' &c., 'Bonding,' &c.
Cobourg Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 531 (i).
Cold Storage Equipment on Atlantic Steamers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 333 (i).
Cold Storage for Bait, Deep Sea Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 8959 (v).
Cold Storage for Fish on Rys.: Remarks (Mr. Wright) 7008 (iv).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.
Cold Storage on Atlantic Strs.: Remarks (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) in Com. of Sup., 6175 (iv).
——— Amt. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) to Com. of Sup., 7907; Neg. (Y. 38; N. 62) 7936 (iv).
See 'Agriculture,' 'Trade and Commerce,' &c.
Collingwood Dry Dock, Value, Payment of Bonuses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3310 (ii).
Collingwood General & Marine Hospital, B. No. 23 (Mr. McCarthy) 1°*, 596; 2°*, 709; in Com. and 3°*, 1337 (i). (4 Edward VII, c., 69).
Collingwood Harbour Improvements, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7751, 8022 (iv).
Colombier, M., Contract *re* SS. Line: *See* 'Canada and France.'
Colonization Roads in Man. and N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 8017 (iv), 9042 (v).
Combines and Trusts, Ref. to in Tobacco General Inspection Bill, 8393 (v).
Commercial Travellers Association, Letter *re* Mail Service on Quebec Central Ry.: Read (Mr. Morin) 9006 (v).
Committee Meetings, Concurrent with Sittings of Hse.: M. (Mr. Cowan) 5843 (iii).
COMMITTEES:
Agriculture, Evidence *re* 2nd. Rep.: M. for Conc. (Mr. Douglas) 8134 (v).
——— Sel. Standing, M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8 (i).
——— Sel. Standing: List presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 162 (i).
——— Meetings Concurrent with Sittings of Hse.: M. (Mr. Cowan) 5843 (iii).
——— Debates Official: List presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8 (i).
——— 1st Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Champagne) 247 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Champagne) 547 (i).
——— M. to conc. (Mr. Champagne) 984 (i).
——— 3rd Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Champagne) 8023 (v).
——— M. to conc. (Mr. Champagne) 8251 (v).
Library of Parliament, Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 168 (i).
Joint Printing Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 167 (i).
——— 3rd Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Parmelee) to conc., 8531 (v).
——— Amt. in 3rd Rep. *re* Status of Officers, 8652 (v).
Public Accounts, Meetings, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 1548 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) to substitute Name, 476 (i).
Railway Committee Meetings, Concurrently with Sittings of Hse.: M. (Mr. Hyman) 5860 (iii).
Standing Orders Com.: M. to substitute Name (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 477 (i).
Compagnies de Credit, Unlawful Transactions, &c.: prop. Res. (Mr. Demers, Iberville), 1882 (i).
Companies Act Amt. B. No. 75 (Mr. Cowan) 1°, 1781 (i); 2°, 3978; in Com., 3978 (ii), 4706, 5094 (iii).
——— B. No. 164 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 2° m., 8840, 8898, 9052; in Com., and 3°*, 9052 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 5).
Confidential Documents brought down to Hse., as Rets.: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1696 (i).
Confidential Documents from G. T. P. Co., for Aid, &c., Communicated to Members, &c.,

before reading to Hse.: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 3761 (ii).
Confidential Documents used by Lib. Minister: Personal Explanation (Mr. Fielding) 2131 (ii).
Confidential Memoranda, Ry. Subsidies and Estimates, used by Lib. Ministers: Remarks (Mr. Haggart) 2131 (ii).
See 'Dundonald,' 'G. T. P. Ry.' &c.
Conmee, James, Contract *re* Nipigon Ry.: Remarks (Mr. Barker) in Com. on Res., 8802 (v).
Consular (Canadian) Service Establishment in Canada: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) 8753 (v).
Contagious Diseases Bill: *See* 'Animals,' &c.
Copper Crown Mining Co., Ry. Siding, Pictou, N.S., Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bell) 989 (i).
Corn Duty, Ref. to by Mr. Cowan: in Com. of Sup., 7358 (iv).
Corn, imported from U.S., Duties, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4116; Members' remarks out of order: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4124 (iii).
Cornwall Canal and Davis Contract *re* Lighting: in Com. of Sup., 6645 (iv).
——— Charges *re* (Mr. Lennox) 8479 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) *re* Time of Discussion, 7538 (iv).
——— O.Cs.: Inquiry for (Mr. Barker) 6150 (iv).
Cornwall Canal, Dredging Shoals: in Com. of Sup., 6347 (iv).
——— Employees, Delay in Paying: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) in Com. of Sup., 7529 (iv).
——— Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 6295, 6644 (iv).
See 'Canals,' &c.
Cornwall and Williamsburg Canal Workshops, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6544 (iv).
Cornwall Mfg. Company, and Tariff Duties *re* Circular, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 1392, 1400, 1451 (i).
'Corps,' Interpretation of in Militia Bill: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 8027 (v).
Cote St. Paul Bridge, Lachine Canal, Delay in Completing: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3227 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3752 (ii).
Cotton Growing in Canada, Experiments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ross, Ont.) 555 (i).
Cotton imported into Can., Value, Quantity, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ross, Ont.) 1880 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Ross, Ont.) 554 (i).
Cotton Mills, Valleyfield, Pet. to Valleyfield Council: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 8778 (v).
See 'Cornwall.'
Court Houses and Dom. Buildings, N.W.T., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 697 (i).
See 'Public Works.'
Cowansville, Que., Cheese Cooling Room, Total Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 2847 (ii).
Cow Bay, N.S., Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7637 (iv).
Crawford Bay and St. Mary's Ry. Co.'s B. No. 96 (Mr. Macpherson) 1°*, 2681; 2°*, 2803; in Com., and 3°*, 3354 (ii), (4 Edward VII., c. 70).
C. Ross Co., Accounts *re* Supplies to Speaker's Apartments: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 8991 (v).
——— Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 6544 (iv).
Criminal Code (1892) Amt. B. No. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) 1°*, 10; 2° m., 421; on Order for 2°, 594, 1888 (i), 3789; in Com., 3790; 3°, 3795 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 8).
Criminal Code Amt. B. No. 3 (Mr. Lancaster): M. to stand, 595 (i).
——— B. No. 56 (Mr. Lennox) 1°, 1133 (i); 2°*, 3795; in Com., 3795; 3°*, 3796 (ii) (4 Edward VII., c. 9).
——— B. No. 76 (Mr. Wade) 1°, 1781 (i); 2° m., 4718; in Com., 4719 (iii).
——— (fraudulent debtors) Amt. B. No. 86 (Mr. Bickerdike) 1° m., 2116 (ii); 2°*, 3980; in Com., 3980, 3982; 3°*, 3990 (ii). (4 Edward VII., c. 7).
Criminal Statistics, Compilation: in Com. of Sup., 2734 (ii).
Credit Companies, incorp. by Letters Patent, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 3130 (ii).
Credit Companies: *See* 'Companies.'
Crooked Lake Reserve, N.W.T., Settlement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 4053 (iii).
Crossings over Railways: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 2.'
Crude Petroleum: *See* 'Petroleum.'
Culbute Canal, Damages by Floods: in Com. of Sup., 7469 (iv).
Cumberland County, Harbours and Rivers: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 9021 (v).
See 'Harbours and Rivers,' &c.
Curtis Creek Line, P.E.I. Ry., Straightening of Curves: in Com. of Sup., 5987 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1210 (i).
Curtis, Lewis E., Patent Relief B. No. 65 (Mr. Ross, Ontario) 1°*, 1450; 2°*, 1824 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 71).
Curtis, C. G., Patent Relief B.: M. to receive Pet. (Mr. Thompson, Haldimand) 2759 (ii).
See 'Canadian General Electric,' &c.
Customs Act Amt. B. No. 170 (Mr. Paterson) Res. prop., 8389; in Com. on Res., 8716; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 8717 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 10).
Customs Tariff, 1897, Amt. B. 172 (Mr. Fielding) Res. prop., 5733 (iii); M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 8843; in Com. on Ways and Means, 8844; 1° of B., 8898; 2°*, 8898; in Com., 8898; 3°*, 8898 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 11).

CUSTOMS :

Agricultural Implements, Rebate of Duties, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 562 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Boyd) 8781 (v).

Allowances for Excise Officers : in Com. of Sup., 3922 (ii).

American Cattle shipped in Bond, O.C. *re* : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 1875 (i).

Aylmer, Ont., Establishment as an Outport for Customs : Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 7439 (iv).

Berlin Customs Port, Revenue collected : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1902 (i).

Butter and Cheese Exports, 1898 to 1903, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 790 (i).

Cattle Importations from Mexico and U.S. for Exhibitions : in Com. of Sup., 4105 (iii).

Chinese Labour in B.C., Free Entry, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Puttee) 398 (i).

Coasting Laws for British Ports, Cor. with Imp. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 6882 (iv).

Coasting Trade between B.C. and Yukon, O.Cs., &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1055, 1449 (i).

Corn, Imported from U.S., Duties, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4116 (iii).

——— Members Remarks out of Order : Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4124 (iii).

Cotton imported into Can., Value, Quantity, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ross, Ont.) 1880 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Ross, Ont.) 554 (i).

Customs Dept., Board of Customs, Construction, Duties, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1980 (i).

——— Book of Instruction, Total Cost, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1988 (i).

——— Civil Govt.: in Com. of Sup., 1791 (i).

——— Contingencies : in Com. of Sup., 1889, 1960 (i).

——— Deptl. Salaries, Promotions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1791 (i).

——— Inspectors' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1970 (i).

——— Permanent Clerks, Number and Increases : in Com. of Sup., 1902 (i).

——— Statement showing Increases in Salaries at Different Ports, 1903 : Read (Mr. Paterson) 1971 (i).

Free Importations and Tariff Res., Date of : Remarks (Mr. Haggart) 5742 (iii).

Grain Shipments received at Montreal : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 216 (i).

Grain Shipments from Port Arthur to Buffalo : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 215 (i).

Grain Shipments received at Quebec : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 215 (i).

Grain Shipments received at Upper Lake Ports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 216 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

Horses imported into U.S. from B.C., Claim for Refund of Duty: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2804 (ii).
See 'Page.'

Hudson Bay, Patrolling and Customs Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 7968 (iv).

Lumber Industry in B.C., and Tariff Readjustment: M. (Mr. Morrison) to adjn., 2558; Pet. *re* circulated privately (read) 2560-61 ; Letter *re* Protest, sent to Min. of Customs (read) 2563 (ii).

Nanaimo Customs House : in Com. of Sup., 700 (i).

Page, F. H., Export on Horses, Rebate of Duties, &c., Cor., &c.: Statement (Mr. Sproule) on M. for Sup., 8903 (v).
See 'Horses.'

Palmerston Customs Collections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Tolton) 557 (i).

Petroleum, Crude, Bounty : prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 7785 (iv).

Ports, Number opened: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1959 (i).

Ports, Salaries, Increases, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1889 (i).

Preferential Tariff, Value of Imports, Free Imports, Dutiable Goods, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 3538 (ii).

St. John, N.B., Customs Collector's Appnmt. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 332 (i).

Ships' Cables, Customs Tariff *re* : Remarks (Mr. Kaulbach) 1783 (i).

Tariff Rebates on Goods entered before Tariff Resolution announced: Remarks (Mr. Birkett) 5741 (iii).

Vegetables and Fruit imported from U.S., Quantity, Duties collected, &c., M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 2808 (ii).

Victoria, B.C., Customs Collectorship, Vacancy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Earle) 558 (i), 6364 (iv).

Winnipeg Customs Port, Insufficient Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 1900 (i).

Woollen and Cotton Duties, Tariff *re*, Circular from Cornwall Mfg. Co.: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 1451 (i).
See 'Finance,' 'Inland Revenue,' 'Tariff,' 'Ways and Means,' &c.

Dairying Commissioner's Branch, Lectures, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7405 (iv).

Dairy Products, Fraudulent Weighing at Montreal: Amt. (Mr. Pope) to Com. of Sup., 7244; Neg. (Y. 46; N. 75) 7271 (iv).

——— M. for Cor. (Mr. Pope) 3769 (ii).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.

Dalhousie Harbour Improvements, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7747 (iv).

Damen, Wm. A., Patent Relief B. No. 92 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 2282 ; 2°*, 2598; in Com. and 3°, 3056 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 72).

Dargavel, John, Dismissal from Elgin Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5690 (iii).

Dauphin Lake, Lowering of Water: in Com. of Sup., 7876 (iv).

Davis Contract *re* Cornwall Canal, Aud. Gen.'s Letter to Papers: Remarks (Mr. Puttee) 6879 (iv).

Davis Contract *re* Lighting Cornwall Canal : in Com. of Sup., 6645 (iv).

——— Charges *re* (Mr. Lennox) 8479 (iv).

——— Remarks on M. for Sel. Com. on Audit Act, 4283 (iii).

See 'Cornwall Canal.'

Debates Com., Official: List presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8 (i).

——— 1st Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Champagne) 247 (i).

——— 2nd Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Champagne) 547 (i).

——— M. to conc. (Mr. Champagne) 984 (i).

——— 3rd Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Champagne) 8023 (v).

——— M. to conc. (Mr. Champagne) 8251 (v).

Deep Sea Fisheries, P.E.I., Importing of Fishing Population, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Hackett) 1881 (i).

See 'Fisheries,' &c.

Deer Island Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 7891 (iv).

See 'Public Works,' &c.

Defence Committee, London, Tels. between Can. and Imp. Govt.: Ref. to in Com. on Militia Bill, 6365 (iv).

See 'Militia,' &c.

Delegates sent by Govt. to G.B. and Europe, Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 1880 (i).

See 'Agriculture,' &c.

Demill, J. P., Peterson, Oscar, Dismissal from I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 334 (i).

See 'I. C. R.' &c.

'Dennis Eagan Letter' : Personal Explanation (Wm. Ross, N.S.) 754 (iv).

Dennison, Col. C. A. K., Resignation, &c.: (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 5073 (iii).

Dental Association, Can. Representative at St. Louis Exhibition: Ques. (Mr. Richardson) 3132 (ii).

Depot Harbour, Breakwater, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7753 (iv).

——— Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 8022 (iv).

Deseronto P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 534 (i).

Deschambault Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7767 (iv).

Desroches, J. D., Fishery Guardian, Charges against, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hackett) 1134 (i).

See 'Fisheries,' &c.

Detroit Post Office, Dorchester County, Opening: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 9006 (v).

Detroit P.O., Recommendation *re* : Remarks (Mr. Morin) 5749 (iii).

Digby Pier, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7637 (iv).

——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Copp) 225 (i).

Dipper Harbour Breakwater, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7747 (iv).

Disallowance of B. C. Legislation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Vancouver) 988 (i).

See 'Immigration,' &c.

Distillery Officers, Extra Pay for Special Work: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).

DIVISIONS :

Appointments to Public Offices, Personal Character, &c.: Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to M. for Sup., 7822; Neg. (Y. 43; N. 70) 7827 (iv).

Auditor-General, and Audit Act Extension, &c.: Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to Com. of Sup., 6553 ; Neg. (Y. 56 ; N. 94) 6636 (iv).

Budget, The : Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) *re* Tariff Readjustment, 4766; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 110) 4922 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of Sale, &c., B. No. 128 (Mr. W. S. Maclaren) 2° m., 4724 ; Agreed to (Y. 52; N. 28) 4724 (iii).

Dairy Products, Fraudulent Weighing at Montreal: Amt. (Mr. Pope) to Com. of Sup., 7244; Neg. (Y. 46; N. 75) 7271 (iv).

Dundonald, Lord, G.O.C., Political Interference *re* Militia Appointments, Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to Com. of Sup., 5387; Neg. (Y. 42; N. 84) 5575 (iii).

Farm and Garden Products, Protection *re*, Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 4004; Neg. (Y. 41; N. 76) 4041 (iii).

Financial Situation, Review, &c.: Amt. (Mr. Bell) to Com. of Sup., 8291; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 90) 8344 (v).

G.T.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 72, Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) Transportation Problem of Canada, 786 ; Neg. (Y. 61 ; N. 116) 1662 (i).

——— Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) Govt. Ownership, 3574; Neg. (Y. 59; N. 105) 3697 (ii).

——— Amt. (Mr. Clare) British Subjects employed on Surveys, &c., 3449 ; Neg. (Y. 50 ; N. 86) 3514 (ii).

——— Amt. (Mr. Clarke) Opinion of Electorate *re*, 2055, Neg. (Y. 47 ; N. 66) 2062 (ii).

——— Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Eastern Division, crossings Laurentian Hills, 3390 ; Neg. (Y. 38 ; N. 91) 3396 (ii).

——— Amt. (Mr. Pope) Allotment of Shares, 3411 ; Neg. (Y. 43 ; N. 92) 3412 (ii).

——— 2° Agreed to (Y. 99; N. 55) 2182 (ii).

Masters and Mates Certificates B. No. 4 (Mr. Lancaster) 2° m., 5166; Neg. (Y. 16; N. 39) 5181 (iii).

Ottawa Electric Bill, 3° m., 4263; Amt. (Mr. Puttee) to ref. back to Private Bills Com., Agreed to (Y. 50; N. 47) 4269 (iii).

DIVISIONS—*Con.*
Ry. Act Amt. B. 132, Amt. (Mr. Bennett) Telephones, &c., 7563; Neg. (Y. 25; N. 74) 7564 (iv).
——— Amt. (Mr. Blain) *re* Express Companies, 7545; Neg. (Y. 33; N. 72) 7550 (iv).
——— Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* 2-cent passenger rate, 7551; Neg. (Y. 17; N. 94) 7562 (iv).
Tobacco Industry, Protection and Encouragement: Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Sup., 6894; Neg. (Y. 19; N. 50) 6927 (iv).
Transportation *re* Perishable Goods, Amt. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) to Com. of Sup., 7907 (iii).

Divorce Bills: *See* 'Christman, Annie,' 'McDuff,' 'Mann, Andrew,' 'Moore, Jennie Davison,' 'Robertson, Eliza,' 'Rodger, R. J. McD.,' 'Taylor, James E.'

Divorce Pet., Irregularity of: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 254 (i).

Dixon, F. A., and Cor. with Aud. Gen. *re* Promotion: Remarks (Mr. Barker) in Com. of Sup., 1840 (i).

Dixon, Mr. Geo., Homestead Entry, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 6885 (iv).

Documents, Confidential, Published and Printed by Lib. Minister: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in Com. on G.T.P. B., 1691 (i).

Documents, Public and Confidential, Withheld from Parlt.: Notice of M. (Mr. Haggart) 5743; prop. Res., 5762 (iii).
See 'Confidential.'

Dodd, Judge, Salary, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7939 (iv).
See 'Justice,' &c.

Dog-fish, as Lobster Bait, Official Tests, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3310 (ii).
——— Commission *re* Investigation: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) on M. for Sup., 6973; Letter from Mr. Howard Smith (read) 6977 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 6928 (iv).
——— Investigation by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 2377 (ii).

Dom. and Provincial Accounts, Adjustment, &c., Statement *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 548 (i).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 232 (i).
See 'Provincial,' &c.

Dominion Arsenal, Establishment at Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 8385 (v).
See 'Militia,' 'Public Works, Ottawa,' &c.

Dom. Buildings: *See* 'Buildings.'

Dom. Day Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5842 (iii).
——— Early Adjournment: Remarks (Mr. Bell) 5762 (iii).

Dominion Elections Act, 1900, Amt. B. No. 148 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 5862 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 7228, 7649 (iv); 8028a, 8136; 3° m., 8390 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 12).

Dom. Elections Act, 1900, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Alcorn) 1137 (i).

Dominion Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. No. 54 (Mr. Macpherson) 1°*, 1133; 2°, 1338 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 5297 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 73).

Dominion Iron and Steel Co. and Fair-Wage Res.: Ques. (Mr. Kendall) 5866 (iii).

Dom. Iron and Steel Co., Steel Rail Mill, Construction, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Johnston, C.B.) in Com. on Res., 8834 (v).
See 'Dom.,' 'Steel,' &c.

Dom. Land, Commissioner's Salary: in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iv).
——— Surveys, Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 7027, 7197 (iv).

Dom. Notes, Issue and Redemption: in Com. of Sup, 244 (i).
——— Printing, in Com. of Sup., 245 (i).

Dominion Police Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7949 (iv).

Dom. Steamers, Maintenance and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 5199, 5229 (iii), 8919 (v).

Dom. Steel Co.'s Strike, N.S., Cor. between Govt. and Co.: Read (Sir Wm. Mulock) 4215 (iii).
——— Govtl. Action: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 4053 (iii).
See 'Dom. Iron and Steel,' &c.

Doncaster Indian Reserve, Exchange, &c., O. Cs., Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Léonard) for Ret., 2831 (ii).
——— Indemnity to Indians: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 987 (i).
——— Payment of Squatters' Claims: Remarks (Mr. Leonard) in Com. of Sup., 5859 (iii).
See 'Indians,' &c.

Dorchester County, Post Offices: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 9006 (v).
See 'Detroit,' &c.

Dorchester Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 7953 (iv).

Doughty, A. G., Appnmt. as Dom. Archivist: in Com. of Sup., 2730 (ii).

Doukhobors, Dispute with Dom. Govt. Investigation by Prof. Mavor: Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 4415 (iii).
——— Pets. from Settlers, *re* Addition of Townships, &c.: M. for copies of Cor., &c.* (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 561 (i).

Draw-bars on I.C.R. Cars: in Com. of Sup., 5923 (iii).
See 'I.C.R.' &c.

Dredge 'Fielding,' Cost of Buildings: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7881 (iv).

Dredging in Ont., Summary of Expenditure: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7875 (iv).

Dredging, B.C., Plant: in Com. of Sup., 7885, 7890 (iv).
——— Canals: in Com. of Sup., 7466 (iv).
——— Generally: in Com. of Sup., 7885 (iv).
——— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 7884 (iv).
——— Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 9031 (v).
——— hydraulic plant: in Com. of Sup., 7880 (v).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7885 (iv).
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7880, 7886 (iv), 9031 (v).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7880 (iv).
Drill Hall, Ottawa, Application from Ottawa Garrison: Ques. (Mr. Birkett) 3389 (ii).
——— St. John, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2556 (ii).
——— Woodstock, N.B., Purchase of Site: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2928 (ii).
See 'Militia,' 'Public Works,' &c.
Drill Machinery: in Com. on Ways and Means, 8895 (v).
Drop Letter Rates Reduction, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 5725 (iii).
Dry Dock Facilities, B.C., Cor. *re* Vancouver Engineering and N. Thompson & Co.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 560 (i).
See 'Public Works,' &c.
Dry Dock, Lachine Canal, Memorial from Board of Trade, Montreal: Ques. (Mr. Gallery) 4273 (iii).
Dry Dock Subsidies, Pacific Coast, Communications *re*: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 248 (i).
'Druid,' Govt. Str., Expenditure *re* Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 5202 (iii).
Duck Mountains Timber Berths, Sale of: Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 6543 (iv).
Dumping Clause: in Com. on Ways and Means, 8844 (v).
Dumping Clause in Tariff Res.: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 5737 (iii).
Dundonald, Lord, G.O.C., Dismissal by Govt., Memorandum *re* Col. Smart's Letter: Papers laid on Table (Mr. Fisher) 5276; Production of Confidential Letters, &c., 5276 (iii).
——— O.C. *re* (remarks) 4823; O.C. and Cor. laid on Table: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to print, 4924 (iii).
——— Documents and Cor. referred to by Min. of Ag.: Inquiry for (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 4685 (iii).
——— 'Exploiting by Tories,' Speech of Mr. Lemieux in Eng.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 7082 (iv).
——— Farewell to, Adjournment of Hse.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7542 (iv).
——— Further Cor., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 4926 (iii).
——— Further Papers laid on Table, 4995, 5759 (iii).
Dundonald, Lord, Dismissal by Govt., Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 5182 (iii).
——— Letter of Mr. Preston *re*, Govt. Policy *re*: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 6014-15, 6551; Statement (Mr. Sifton) 6552 (iv).
——— inquiry for copy (Mr. Clarke) 6681 (iv).
——— Letter from Mr. Preston: Read (Mr. Clarke) 6014-15 (iv).
——— Public Documents withheld: *See* 'Documents.'
——— Production of Original Gazette (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5455 (iii).
——— Reps. of Canadian Associated Press: Remarks (Mr. Barker) 8659 (v).
——— Rep. of Speech at Military Dinner, Montreal, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Read (Mr. W. S. Maclaren) 4491 (iii).
——— Speech *re* Political Interference: Personal Explanation (Mr. Fisher) 4580, 4603; Memorandum from G.O.C.: Read (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 4596; Cor. between G.O.C., Govt. and Col. Smart: Read (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 4599 (iii).
Dunnville Bridge Painting, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 8026 (v).
See 'Canals—Welland,' &c.
Duval, J. E., Appnmt. as Inspector of Ry. Accidents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 1138 (i).
Dyke, John, Pension *re*: in Com. of Sup., 9015 (v).
Easter Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 477 (i).
Eastman, Mr. E. P., Emplymt. at St. Louis, Allowance to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 7441 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7420, 7430 (iv).
Eaton Ice Process Prospectus: Read (Mr. Kaulbach) 7003 (iv).
Editorials in English Press *re* Canadian Affairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 6023 (iv).
Edmonton, Athabasca & Mackenzie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 26 (Mr. Oliver) 1°*, 596; 2°*, 709 (i).
Edmonton & Slave Lake Ry. Co.'s B. No. 63 (Mr. Costigan) 1°*, 1297; 2°*, 1357 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2153 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 74).
Edmonton 'Bulletin,' Attack on Toronto 'News': Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 7348, 7361 (iv).
Edmonton Jail: in Com. of Sup., 697 (i).
Edmonton Street Ry. Co.'s B. No. 111 (Mr. Oliver) M. to receive Pet., 2601, 2680; 1°*, 3016; 2°*, 3354 (ii); in Com., 5499; 3°*, 5500 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 75).
Edmonton-Yukon Route, Pamphlet, Warning *re* Dangers: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 3942 (iii).
Elections, Dom., Date of: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) 9076 (v).

Elections, Par. from Brandon *re* Hon. Mr. Sifton's Remarks, 8530 (v).
Election Act: *See* 'Dom. Elections,' &c.
Electoral Lists for Prov. of Quebec, Printing, Distribution, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 1667 (i).
See 'House of Commons—Voters' Lists.'
Electric Power for Dom. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7631 (iv).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa,' &c.
Electric Power furnished to U.S., Applications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 1357 (i).
Elevators in H. of C., Accidents, &c. (remarks) 2458 (ii).
Elevator in West Block, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 619 (i).
Elkhorn Indian School, Sale of Printing Press: Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) in Com. of Sup., 6948 (iv).
Employees Liability and Safety Bill: *See* 'Ry. Act Bills 73 and 88.'
Engineers for Dom. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7630 (iv).
See 'Public Works, Ottawa,' &c.
Engineers, Draughtsmen, &c., for Lighthouse Service: in Com. of Sup., 5833 (iii).
Engineers, Marine: *See* 'Steamboat Inspection,' &c.
Essex Fusiliers at St. Louis Exposition, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': M. to adjn. (Mr. Cowan) 1782 (i).
Essex Terminal Ry. Co.'s B. No. 82 (Mr. Cowan) 1°*, 2001; 2°*, 2328 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 3982 (iii). (4 Edward VII., c. 76).
Estimates, The Main, 1905: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 204 (i).
——— Suppl. (1904): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 1874 (i), 3765 (ii), 5733 (iii),
——— Suppl. (1905): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7530 (iv).
——— Suppl. (1903-4): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 8387 (v).
Estimates, Suppl.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7243 (iv).
Estimates, 'Jumbled' in preparing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7760 (iv).
Estimates, Prepared by Ministers in 1896: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 2131 (ii).
Estimates, Procedure *re* One-Fifth Vote: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 6637 (iv).
Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. No. 37 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 985; 2°*, 1787; in Com., 1787 (i); 3° m., 3999 (iii); recom., 5192; 3°, 5194 (iii).
——— Jurisdiction as to Ry. Debts, Amt. B. No. 134 (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure) 1°*, 4666 (iii).
Exchequer Court, Additional Judges: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 7945 (iv).
Exchequer Court Limitation B.: *See* 'Supreme,' &c.
Exchequer Court Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7939 (iv).
Excise, B.C., Extra Salaries for Officials: in Com. of Sup., 3923 (ii).
Excise, Inspectors' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).
Exhibitions, Expenditure *re*: in Com. of Sup., 4093 (iii).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.
Experimental Farms: in Com. of Sup., 2743 (ii).
——— Accounts, Discrepancies, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 7371 (iv).
——— Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7620 (iv).
——— Expenditure and Accounts: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7171 (iv).
——— General Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 4959 (iii).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.
Express and Telephone Cos., Amt. in Com. on Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Maclean) 6687 (iv).
——— Govt. Control: Remarks (Mr. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).
——— Jurisdiction of Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 7449 (iv).
Express and Telephones: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 6,' 'Telephones,' &c.
Facilities, I.C.R., Increased Accommodation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8361 (v).
See 'I.C.R.'
Factory Inspections: in Com. of Sup., 3919 (ii).
Fair-Wage Clause in Public Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, B.C.) 4414 (iii).
Fair-Wage Res., Application to Bonused Rys., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 6883 (iv).
——— Application to Iron and Steel Co.: Ques. (Mr. Kendall) 5866 (iii).
See 'Labour,' &c.
False Ducks Lighthouse: in Com. of Sup., 5806 (iii).
Farm and Garden Products, Tariff Protection *re*: Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 4004; Neg. (Y. 41; N. 76) 4041 (iii).
Farmers' Bank of Canada incorp. B. No. 131 (Mr. Guthrie) M. to receive Pet., 3718 (ii); 1°*, 4138; 2°*, 4272; in Com., and 3°*, 5297 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 77).
Farm Delegates from Can. to G.B., Duties, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 251, 550 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7324 (iv).
Farmers Delegates from P.E.I., and Winnipeg Exhibition: Remarks (Mr. Hackett) in Com. of Sup., 2755 (ii).
Farm Labourers, Experimental Farm, Wages, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4959 (iii).

Farran's Point Canal, Number of Locks : Remarks (Mr. Reid, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iv).
See 'Canals,' &c.
Father Point Landing Pier, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7767 (iv).
Fenian Raid and Instructions to Col. Otter : Ques. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 8388 (v).
Fiddler's Elbow, Light on Lindoe Island: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5811 (iii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
'Fielding's Folly' : Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 9024 (v).
See 'Dredge.'
Finances of Canada and Audit Act : M. (Mr. Lennox) for Sel. Com., 4275 (iii).
——— Consolidation, &c., M. for Sel. Com. : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 3768 (ii).
See 'Audit,' &c.
Financial Situation, Review, &c.: Amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. Bell) 8291; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 90) 8344 (iv).
FINANCE :
Auditor General's Office, Contingencies : in Com. of Sup., 9034 (v).
Auditor General's Rep. and Estimates (remarks) 230 (i).
Auditor General, and Audit Act Extension, &c.: Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to Com. of Sup., 6553; Neg. (Y. 56; N. 94) 6636 (iv).
——— M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. Lennox) 4275 (iii).
See 'Finances.'
——— Par. *re* Conditional Resignation : Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 5583 (iii).
——— action of Govt. *re* : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 6887 (iv).
Banking Act Amt. Bill: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 6789 (iv).
Banking Com., Meetings, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 7364 (iv).
Bonds, Temporary, Outstanding, Amounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2187 (ii).
See 'Canadian,' &c.
Brokerage Charges, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 244 (i).
Canadian Bank of Commerce, Yukon, Compensation: in Com., 9019 (v).
Canadian Securities on French Markets, Res. of French Chamber of Commerce: Ques. (Mr. Gervais) 2807 (ii).
Charges of Management: in Com. of Sup., 231 (i).
Chartered Banks of Canada: Deptl. Rep. presented (Mr. Fielding) 3227 (ii).
Coal Oil Bounties: *See* 'Petroleum.'
Dom. Notes, Issue and Redemption: in Com. of Sup., 244 (i).
——— Printing : in Com. of Sup., 245 (i).
Dom. and Provincial Accounts. Settlement, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 232 (i).
FINANCE—*Con.*
Dom. and Provincial Accounts, Statement *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 548 (i).
Estimates, The Main, 1905 : Presented (Mr. Fielding) 204 (i).
——— Suppl. (1903-4): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 8387 (v).
——— Suppl. (1904): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 1874 (i), 3765 (ii), 5733 (iii).
——— (1905) Suppl.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7530 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7243 (iv).
Finances of Can., Consolidation, &c.: M. for Sel. Com.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 3768 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. Lennox) for Sel. Com., 4275 (iii).
See 'Auditor General,' &c.
Govt. Loans, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 218 (i).
Guarantee Bonds, Security for Public Officers, Notice *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 7226 (iv).
——— U.S. Guarantee Cos &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 3387 (ii).
Insurance, Supt.'s Salary: in Com. of Sup., 8386 (v).
Iron and Steel Bounties paid for 1904 : Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 8781 (v).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness : M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 560 (i).
——— Negotiation *re* Abolition : prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 562 (i).
Montreal Turnpike Trust and Westmount, Purchase, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Rivet) 3946 (iii).
Mutual Reserve Fund Life Insurance, Appeal to House of Lords : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8777 (v).
Petroleum Bounty Payments: in Com. of Sup., 9013 (v).
Provincial Accounts, Payment by Govt. to Provs.: Remarks, 9075 (v).
——— Speech by Lt.-Gov. of Quebec: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 503 (i).
——— Stmnt. in N.B. Legislature: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 229 (i).
Public Accounts Com.: M. (Mr. Wade) 396 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Casgrain) 4218 (iii).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 204 (i).
Public Debt, Conversion, Payments, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 246 (i).
——— Rate of Interest: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 232 (i).
Quebec Bridge Co., Issue of Bonds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 397 (i).
——— Payments since 1st July, 1903: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 249 (i).
Receiver Gen.'s Office, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 231 (i).

FINANCE—*Con.*

Société de Credit, Letters Patent to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Demers, Iberville) 991 (i).

Straits Settlement Currency, Circulation in Can.: Remarks (Mr. Maclean) 2189 (ii).

Fines imposed for Violation of Inland Rev. Act: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2915 (ii).

Finnigan Property Site for Oshawa P.O.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).

See 'Public Works—Oshawa,' &c.

Fisheries Act Amt. B. No. 74 (Mr. Préfontaine) 1°, 1780 (i); 2°, and in Com., 8146, 8214; 3°*, 8222 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 13).

FISHERIES :

Alberton, P.E.I., Fishery Warden, Complaints *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hackett) 4824 (iii).

See 'Desroches,' &c.

American Fishing Co., and Bonding Privileges: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7581 (iv).

American Fishing Cos., and Can. Fisheries : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).

Baie de Chaleur Fisheries Regulations, Licenses, &c.: Statement (Mr. Préfontaine) 8782 (v).

Bait Freezers for Fishermen, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5021 (iii).

See 'Cold Storage,' &c.

Beaver River Hatchery, Establishment : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7587 (iv).

Berrigan, Mr. John, Fishery Officer, P.E.I., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4410 (iii).

Bounties, Alleged Frauds : Remarks (Mr. Hackett) in Com. of Sup., 5002 (iii).

——— Cheques, Delay in Delivery, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 2118 (ii).

——— Increase in Payments: in Com. of Sup., 7593 (iv).

——— Investigation *re* Frauds, Commissioner's Name: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5202 (iii).

——— Methods of Payment, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5032, 5036 (iii).

——— Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4695 (iii).

See 'Lobster,' &c.

Canadian and American Fishing Regulations: Cor. read (Mr. Taylor) 4328 (iii).

——— Cor. in U. S. Papers : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 4416 (iii).

——— Letter from Mr. Day : Read (Mr. Taylor) 5189 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 4492; Memorandum (Mr. Préfontaine) read, 4578 (iii).

Cedar Lake Fishery Overseer: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7579 (iv).

Cold Storage for Bait, Deep Sea Fisheries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7590 (iv), 8959 (v).

——— Inspection : in Com. of Sup., 7589 (iv).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

Deep Sea Fisheries, P.E.I., Importing of Fishing Population, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Hackett) 1881 (i).

Desroches, J. D., Fishery Guardian, Charges against, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hackett) 1134 (i).

See 'Alberton,' &c.

Dog-fish Pest, Investigation by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 2377 (ii).

Dog-fish, as Lobster bait, Official Tests, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3310 (ii).

——— Rep. of Commissioners: Inquiry for (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 6928 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) on M. for Sup., 6973; Letter from Mr. Howard Smith: read, 6977 (iv).

Eaton Ice Process Prospectus : Read (Mr. Kaulbach) 7003 (iv).

Fish carried in Bond to U.S., O.C. *re* : Remarks (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. of Sup., 7585 (iv).

Fish Culture: in Com. of Sup., 7587 (iv).

Fish-Curing and Refrigerating Stations, &c.: Remarks on M. for Sup., 6973 (iv).

Fish Driers in Use: Remarks (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 7589 (iv).

Fisheries Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).

Fishery Award, Methods of Payments to Provs.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5031 (iii).

Fishery Conference, Negotiations *re* : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5049 (iii).

Fisheries, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Préfontaine) 794 (i).

Fishing Industry of Mar. Provs.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) on M. for Sup., 6973 (iv).

Fishing Privileges, Cumberland Lake, Grants, Size of Nets, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyd) 2929 (ii).

Fish Shippers, P.E.I., Claims for Compensation *re* Winter Nav., 1903: Ques. (Mr. Hackett) 2117 (ii).

Fishways and Weirs in River Jesus, Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 402 (i).

Georgian Bay Laboratory for Fish : in Com. of Sup., 7593 (iv).

Halifax Fishery Award, Ref. to Supreme Court: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 3126 (ii).

Hatcheries: in Com. of Sup., 7587 (iv).

——— Building and Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 8943 (v).

——— in Mar. Provs.: List read (Mr. Préfontaine) 7587 (iv).

See 'Beaver River,' 'Fish,' &c.

Horton, Charles S., License *re* Trap-Net Fishing: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) 8958 (v).

Hudson Bay, Fishery Patrol, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv).

——— Fishing Rights granted to Americans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2117 (ii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*
James Bay Fishing License to Arch. McNee: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv) .
——— Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 793 (i).
Jurisdiction between Provs. and Dom.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).
Licenses on Eastern Sea-board, Rep. of Commissioners : Remarks (Mr. Ganong) 7585 (iv).
Licenses granted in Lakes North of Winnipeg : Ques. (Mr. Boyd) 7783 (iv).
Lobster Canneries, Established in P.E.I., Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2185 (ii).
——— M. for copies of pet.* (Mr. Lefurgey) 3771 (ii).
——— Bounties to Fishing: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5020, 5043 (iii).
——— Extension of Close Season, Pet. *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bell) 4927 (iii).
——— Fisheries on Atlantic Coast, Investigation, Total Expense : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 553 (i).
——— M. for copies* (Mr. Ganong) 561 (i).
——— Fishermen and Packers, Prices paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2185 (ii).
——— Hatchery in Bay of Fundy: Remarks (Mr. Ganong) in Com. of Sup., 7587 (iv).
——— P.E.I., Licenses granted to Packers, Pet. *re* : M. (Mr. Lefurgey) to adjn. Hse., 4669.
——— Propagation, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5066 (iii).
——— Propagation in Pacific Waters, Experiments by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Morrison) 2373 (ii).
——— Regulations *re* : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5069 (iii).
Lunenburg County, Fish Hatcheries : Remarks (Mr. Kaulbach) in Com. of Sup., 7587 (iv).
McNee, Arch., Fishing Licenses : *See* 'James Bay Fishing,' &c.
Markey, Mr. F., Fishing Leases in Northern Lakes: Remarks (Mr. Boyd) in Com. of Sup., 8943; Lease read (Mr. Haggart) 8952 (v).
See 'Fishing License,' 'Winnipeg and Nelson River,' &c.
New England Fish Co., and Canadian Fisheries : Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).
Newfoundland, Fisheries Regulations, Compromise, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Kaulbach) 6788 (iv).
——— Fisheries Treaty with U.S., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,': Remarks (Mr. Kaulbach) 2120 (ii).
North American Fishing Co., Lease granted in Northern Lakes : Remarks (Mr. Boyd) in Com. of Sup., 8943; Lease read (Mr. Haggart) 8952 (v).

FISHERIES—*Con.*
Overseers, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 7572, 7598 (iv).
Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 5033 (iii), 7588 (iv).
Protection Service and American Fishing Cos.: Remarks (Mr. Ganong) in Com. of Sup., 7580 (iv).
Refrigerators for Fish Bait, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5047 (iii).
Salmon exported to U.S. from B.C., Prohibition, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Earle) 5354 (iii).
Seal Fisheries, Seizing of Vessels, Payment of Claims, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 5354, 5454 (iii).
Transportation of Fish to Ontario : Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in Com. of Sup., 7448 (iv).
Trap-Nets, B. C. Waters, Licenses issued *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Earle) 558 (i), 2601 (ii).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Earle) 2848 (ii).
Trap-Nets and Fishery Regulations : Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).
Trap-Net Licenses for Mackerel, Decision of Court, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 3389 (ii).
See 'Fisheries Act B.'
Trent Valley Lakes Fisheries, Rep. *re* Destruction by Ice, Restocking, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 2556 (ii).
Winnipeg and Nelson River Fishing Licenses, Mr. Markey's Contract : Remarks (Mr. Boyd) in Com. of Sup., 7574 (iv).
Winnipeg and Northern Lakes, Fishing Licenses, Granting, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyd) 7783 (iv).
Flag on Parliament Building on St. Patrick's Day : Remarks (Mr. Bourassa) 220 (i).
See 'Can. Ensign,' &c.
Flesher, Mr., Inspector in Land Office, Minnedosa : Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) in Com. of Sup., 7063 (iv).
Floods in St. John County, Pets. *re* : M. for Copies (Mr. Demers, Iberville) 222 (i).
Flour Standards, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 6545 (iv).
Fog Alarms Inspection : in Com. of Sup., 5838 (iii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Food Inspection, Fines, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3915 (ii).
Forest Protection, Res. of Can. Forestry Association, Action by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 3759 (ii).
Fort Lawrence Pier, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7638 (iv).
Fort William, Ont., Harbour B. No. 99 (Mr. Préfontaine) 1° m., 2681 (ii).
Fort William P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 535 (i).
France and Canada SS. Service, Arrival of Str. 'Malou,' Contract *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 4273 (iii).

France and Canada SS. Service, Transfer of Contract to Mr. Carbonneau: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3311 (ii).
See 'Can. and France,' &c.
Franking Privilege *re* Campaign Literature: Ques. (Mr. Grant) 5271 (iii).
Fraser River Protection Works, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7876 (iv).
Fraudulent Debtors: *See* 'Criminal Code B. 86.'
Fraudulent Marking, Adulteration of Food, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4091 (iii).
Fraudulent Weighing: *See* 'Dairy Products,' &c.
Frechette, L. A., Translations, &c., Payment for: in Com. of Sup., 3922 (ii).
Free Importations and Tariff Res., Date of: Remarks (Mr Haggart) 5742 (iii)
'Free Press,' Winnipeg, Harvest Number, Distribution *re* Immigration Literature: Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) in Com. of Sup., 7324 (iv).
See 'Immigration,' &c.
Freight Discrimination *re* Canadians via Atlantic Strs.: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 6199 (iv).
Freight Rates in Ont.: *See* 'Railways,' &c.
French River Boom Co., Limited, B. No. 16 (Mr. Grant) 1°*, 396; 2°*, 549; in Com., and 3°*, 1337 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 78).
Fresh Meat Transportation in Cold Storage: Ques. (Mr. McGowan) 678, 789 (i).
Fumigating Stations: in Com. of Sup., 2746 (ii).
Fur-Lined Coat, Purchase: *See* 'Spain, Capt.'
Furniture for Schools, &c.: *See* 'Can. Office B. 137.'
Furniture Trade with Japan: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4129 (iii).
Gallagher, W. L., Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Wilson) 221 (i).
See 'Wilton,' &c.
Galleries of the Hse., Order, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 2190 (ii).
Galops Channel, Completion: in Com. of Sup., 6334, 7531 (iv), 8381 (v).
——— Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Haggart) 8974 (v).
See 'Gilbert Bros.'
——— Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 6293 (iv).
——— Pay of Staff, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Reid, Grenville) 6294 (iv).
Galt P.O., Accommodation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Clare) 5715 (iii).
Gananoque Harbour Dredging, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7754 (iv).
Gananoque Lighthouse Keepers, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2376 (ii).
See 'Thousand Island Shoals,' &c.
Garrison Common, Toronto, Lease of, &c.: M. for copies of Cor.* (Mr. Clarke) 224 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Clarke) 3027, 3318 (ii).
Gas and Oil Exploration, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7215 (iv).
Gas Buoys in St. Lawrence Route: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iii).
See 'Acetylene Gas,' &c.
Gaspé and Dalhousie SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 7447 (iv).
Gaspé Basin and Paspebiac SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 7461 (iv).
'Gaspesia,' Str., Quebec and Gaspé Route, Efficiency, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7445 (iv).
'Gauss,' Str., Detention at Bremen by Govt. of Germany: Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 2284 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re*, and Appnmt. of Crew: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5210, 5221 (iii), 7968 (iv).
——— Rep. of Capt. Spain: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5285 (iii).
See 'Bernier.'
Gaynor and Greene, Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Bennett) 145 (i).
General Elections: *See* 'Elections.'
General Inspection Act (binder twine) Amt. B. No. 124 (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1° m., 3719 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 8048; 3°*, 8062 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 14).
General Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 2741 (ii).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.
Geography of Canada, Date of Issue, Distribution, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 4695 (iii).
Geological Explorations in B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).
Geological Specimens, Purchase of: in Com. of Sup., 7219 (iv).
See 'Archæological,' &c.
Geological Surveys, Compilation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).
Geological Survey, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7199 (iv).
See 'Bell,' &c.
——— Explorations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7215 (iv).
——— Purchase of Specimens from D. H. Price: in Com. of Sup., 9015 (v).
——— Reps., Postage *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).
——— Rep.: Presented (Mr. Sifton) 6150 (iv).
——— Reports, Sale and Distribution: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7213 (iv).
Georgetown, P. E. I. Ry. Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 8366 (v).
Georgeville Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7638 (iv).
Georgian Bay Gas Lights: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 5831 (iii).
Georgian Bay Laboratory for Fish: in Com. of Sup., 7593 (iv).

Georgian Bay Survey of Indian Reserves : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 5856 (iii).

Gervais, Alphonse, Emplyt. by Govt., and Interference in St. Hyacinthe Election : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3127 (ii).

Gilbert Bros., Dredging Contract *re* Galops Rapids: Remarks (Mr. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 8974 (v).
See 'Galops.'

Gilbert, Dr., Appnmt. as Port Physician at Fraserville : Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 7081 (iv).

Gin Contracts, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Clancy) in Com. of Sup., 3937 (ii).

Gironcoli, Siegfried, Patent Relief B. No. 126 (Mr. MacKinnon) M. to receive Pet., 3719 ; 1°*, 3846 (ii); 2°*, 4452; in Com., 5034; 3°*, 5035 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 79.)

Glace Bay, Harbour, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 7639 (iv).

——— Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 9033 (v).

Glass : in Com. on Tariff Res., 8871 (v).

Glen Ross Postmaster, Resignation or Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 3436 (ii).

Goats, Free Entry: in Com. on Ways and Means, 8893 (v).

Gobeil, Jos. E., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 5581 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Broder) in Com. of Sup., 9056 (v).

Goderich Harbour Works, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7754 (iv).

Goodrick, Henry, Resignation from Montreal P.O.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 3949 (iii).

Gov. Gen.'s Car, Repairs to : in Com. of Sup., 7491 (iv).

——— Purchase of New One : in Com. of Sup., 7491 (iv).

Gov. Gen's Sec.'s Office: in Com. of Sup., 246 (i).

Govt. Business, Further Legislation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 4828 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 7363 (iv).

——— *re* Dom. Franchise, &c.: Stmnt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5191 (iii).

——— Precedence on Mondays : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4997 (iii).

——— Precedence on Wednesdays and Thursdays : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3846 (ii).

——— Stmnt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4998 (iii).

Govt. Buildings, Rentals in Montreal and Ottawa: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 551 (i).

Govt. Cars used by Ministers, Number, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7491 (iv).
See 'Official.'

Govt. Employees travelling on Rys., Redress *re* Injuries : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 5849 (iii).

Govt. Loans, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 218 (i).
See 'Finance,' &c.

Govt. Ownership : *See* 'Municipal,' 'Telephones,' &c.

Govt. Patronage *re* Mr. Oliver's Newspaper : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) 6642 (iv).
See I.C.R.' &c., 'Immigration,' &c.

Govt. Railways, Operating Expenses and Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pope) 4823, 5760 (iii).

Govt. Steamers, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5199, 5229 (iii), 8919 (v).

Grain and Grain Products carried on I.C.R., Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 7783 (iv).

Grain Inspection B. No. 113 (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1°, 3126; 2°, 3876; ref. to Sel. Com., 3876 (ii); in Com., 8062; 3°*, 8066 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 15).

Grain Shipments from Port Arthur to Buffalo: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 215 (i).

Grain Shipments received at Quebec : Ques. (Mr. Benett) 215 (i).

Grain Shipments received at Montreal : Ques. (Mr. Benentt) 216 (i).

Grain Shipments recived at Upper Lake Ports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 216 (i).

Grain Shipments to Halifax via I.C.R., Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 252, 334 (i).

Grand Bend Pier, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7843 ; Contract with McTavish & Co.: Remarks (Mr. Sherritt) 7843 (iv).

——— Changes in Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sherritt) 7440 (iv).

Grand Manan SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7444 (iv).

Grand Narrows Bridge Protection : in Com. of Sup., 5978 (iii).

——— Statement (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. of Sup., 6264 (iv).

Grand River Dredging at Dunnville, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 7443 (iv).

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 34 (Mr. McCarthy) 1° m., 789; 2°*, 987 (i); in Com., and 3°, 3982 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 80).

——— B. No. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) Res. prop., 225; M. for Com. on Res., 710; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 786; 794, 869, 944, 995, 1059, 1154, 1239, 1311, 1338, 1361, 1472, 1548 ; Neg. (Y. 61; N. 116) 1664; in Com. on Res., 1664, 1669; 2° of Res., 1779; 1°* of B., 1779; 2° m., 1783 (i); Procedure, 2001, 2° m., 2133, 2153; agreed to (Y. 99; N. 55) 2183; in Com., 2183, 2190, 2285, 2328, 2378, 2461, 2592, 2598, 2603, 2686, 2955, 2967; prop. Res. *re* Commissioners, 3015; in Com. on Res., 3306; in Com. on B., 3027, 3059, 3134, 3229, 3318, 3354 ; 3° m., 3390; Amt. (Mr. Monk) neg. (Y. 38; N. 91) 3396; Amt. (Mr. Pope) neg. (Y. 43; N. 92) 3412, 3440; Amt. (Mr. Clare) 3449; neg. (Y. 50; N. 86) 3514, 3540; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3574, neg. (Y. 59; N. 105) 3696; 3°, 3717 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 24).

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier)—*Con.*

Debate on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com. on Res., 710 (i).

(Mr. Borden, Halifax) 725; (amt.) 786; (Mr. Sifton) 794; (Mr. Haggart) 824; (Mr. Osler) 840; (Mr. Wade) 869; (Mr. Monk) 896; (Mr. Demers, Iberville) 916; (Mr. Northrup) 924; (Mr. Russell) 944; (Mr. Sproule) 966; (Mr. Campbell) 996; (Mr. Robinson, Elgin) 1008; (Mr. Thompson, Haldimand) 1014; (Mr. Richardson) 1039; (Mr. Taylor) 1059; (Mr. Casgrain) 1067; (Mr. Lemieux) 1082; (Mr. Daniel) 1102; (Mr. Gourley) 1114; (Mr. Lavergne) 1154; (Mr. Clancy) 1160; (Mr. Lancaster) 1190; (Mr. Cowan) 1239; (Mr. Porter) 1267; (Mr. Oliver) 1311; (Mr. Pope) 1318; (Mr. Roche, Halifax) 1332, 1338; (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 1361; (Mr. Sinclair) 1382; (Mr. Pringle) 1392; (Mr. R. Smith) 1411; (Mr. Henderson) 1423; (Mr. Wilmot) 1440; (Mr. Kemp) 1472; (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1490; (Mr. Lefurgey) 1503; (Mr. T. I. Thomson) 1538; (Mr. Barker) 1548; (Mr. Puttee) 1598; (Mr. Alcorn) 1609; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1630; (Mr. Bell) 1648; Amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) Neg. (Y. 61; N. 116) 1662 (i).

——— 2° m. (objection) 1783 (i).

——— Order for Com., Postponement: Remarks Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2686 (ii).

——— Procedure in Com., Arrangements with Min. of Jus.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 2267 (ii).

Debate on 2°:

(Mr. Clarke) 2008; (Amt.) 2055, Neg. (Y. 47; N. 66) 2062; (Mr. Bell) 2063; (Mr. Richardson) 2080; (Mr. Bennett) 2088; (Mr. Taylor) 2109; (Mr. Lavell) 2133; (Mr. Armstrong) 2148; (Mr. Lennox) 2153; (Mr. Osler) 2165; (Mr. Kaulbach) 2176; in Com., 2190 (ii).

Debate on s. 1 of the Bill:

(Mr. Borden, Halifax) 2190, 2199; (Amt.) 2665, 3006; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 2191, 2207, 2665; (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 2192, 2211, 2255; (Mr. Maclean) 2197, 2205; (Mr. Boyd) 2198; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2203, 2233; (Mr. Ingram) 2206, 2263; (Mr. Northrup) 2207; (Mr. Clancy) 2214; (Mr. Puttee) 2223; (Mr. Pope) 2225; 2238; (Mr. Kemp) 2228; (Mr. Barker) 2229; (amt.) 2666, 2959, 2986; (Mr. Bennett) 2235, 2261; (Mr. Scott) 2241; (Mr. Lancaster) 2245; (Mr. Bell) 2269; (Mr. Robinson, Elgin) 2279; Amt. (Mr. Clarke) 3007 (ii).

On s. 2 of the Bill:

(Mr. Fitzpatrick) 2669; (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 2669; (Mr. Lennox) 2670; (Mr. Barker) 2670; Amt. (Mr. Morin) 2671, 3367; (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 3027; Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) deposit securities, 3028; (Mr. Casgrain) 3318 (ii).

On s. 3 of the Bill:

Amt. (Mr. Blain) agreements between G. T. R. and G. T. P. Cos., 3030; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 3032; (Mr. Barker) 3034; (Mr. Clancy) 3040; (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 2677, 3043; (Mr. Maclean) 3046; (Mr. Haggart) 3048; (Mr. Pringle) 3051; (Mr. Fowler) 3052; (Mr. Lennox) 3054, 3059; (Mr. Blanchet) 3065 (ii).

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier)—*Con.*

On s. 3 of the Bill—*Con.*

Amt. (Mr. Bell) 3134; (Mr. Barker) 3143; (Mr. Sifton) 3145; (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 3150; (Mr. Maclean) 3155; (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 3156; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 3158 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) completion of western section, 3158, 3184; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 3164; (Mr. Haggart) 3165; (Mr. Clancy) 3168; (Mr. Sproule) 3168; (Mr. Maclean) 3171, 3193; (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 3174; (Mr. Henderson) 3175; (Mr. Oliver) 3177, 3191; (Mr. Northrup) 3182; (Mr. Johnston) 3195; (Mr. R. Smith) 3198 (ii).

On s. 7 of the Bill:

Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) conditions for public aid, 3204; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 3210; (Mr. Barker) 3211 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Clancy) inspection of books, &c., 3212; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 3214; (Mr. Barker) 3215; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3219; (Mr. Fielding) 3220 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Blain) interest payable by govt., 3229; (Mr. Wade) 3232, 3237; (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 3235; (Mr. Northrup) 3240; (Mr. Bennett) 3233; (Mr. Roche, Hfx.) 3241 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Northrup) paid-up stock pledged as a security, 3243; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 3246; (Mr. Clancy) 3246; (Mr. Barker) 3250 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Bennett) approval of lease, &c., 3252; (Mr. Fielding) 3252 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Sproule) apportionment of earnings by arbitration, 3252; (Mr. Fielding) 3255; (Mr. Barker) 3257; (Mr. Haggart) 3260; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 3260 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Kemp) rental paid for eastern section, 3262; (Mr. Fielding) 3264; (Mr. Clancy) 3265 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Earle) employment of Chinese labour, 3266; (Mr. Fielding) 3267; (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 3267; (Mr. R. Smith) 3269; (Mr. Macpherson) 3270; (Mr. Ingram) 3273; (Mr. Clare) 3273 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Clare) protection to Canadian labour, &c., 3274; (Mr. Fielding) 3274; (Mr. Puttee) 3275; (Mr. R. Smith) 3276; (Mr. Pringle) 3279; (Mr. Earle) 3279; (Mr. Clancy) 3280; (Mr. Ingram) 3281 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Porter) guarantee to perform conditions, 3282 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Pringle) disposal of common stock, &c., 3284; (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 3289; (Mr. Fielding) 3291; (Mr. Heyd) 3292 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) investigation *re* complaints reported on by Ry. Commission, placed before parliament, 3293, 3357; (Mr. Fielding) 3297; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 3358 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Haggart) rights of govt. to securities, &c., 3299 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Casgrain) directors to be British subjects, 3302, 3318; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 3304, 3318; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3319; (Mr. Kemp) 3319; (Mr. Fielding) 3320; (Mr. Barker) 3321; (Mr. Bell) 3323; (Mr. Sproule) 3324; (Mr. Ingram) 3325 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Lavell) branch lines retained by govt., value, &c., 3326; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 3328; (Mr. Fielding) 3329; (Mr. Clarke) 3330; (Mr. Wilson) 3330; (Mr. Sproule) 3331; (Mr. Morin) 3331; (Mr. Barker) 3332; (Mr. Reid, Grenville) 3333 (ii).

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier)—*Con.*

On s. 7 of the Bill—*Con.*

Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) lease approved by Gov. in Council, 3357 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) deposits declared valid, 3359 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) running powers over western division, &c., 3360 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) construction at different points, 3360; (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3360; (Mr. Barker) 3361 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Morin) 2671, 3367; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 3370; (Mr. Monk) 3371 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) appnmt. of fourth commissioner, 3376; (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3376; (Mr. A. Johnston) 3378; (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 3378; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3379; (Mr. Ingram) 3380; (Mr. Talbot) 3382; (Mr. Henderson) 3383; (Mr. Monk) 3383; (Mr. Sproule) 3384; (Mr. Clancy) 3385.

On s. 2 of the schedule:

(Mr. Fitzpatrick) 2286; (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 2286, 2320; (Mr. Clarke) 2288; (Mr. Barker) 2289, 2329; (Mr. Wilson) 2290; (Mr. Lennox) 2291; (Mr. Northrup) 2294, 2342; (Mr. Osler) 2296; (Mr. McCreary) 2312; (Mr. Clarke) 2314; (Mr. Fielding) 2318; (Mr. Bennett) 2333; (Mr. Richardson) 2357 (ii).

On s. 3 of the schedule:

(Mr. Fitzpatrick) 2664; Amt. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 2677 (ii).

On s. 4 of the schedule:

(Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2378; (Mr. Lennox) 2378; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 2388; (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 2388, 2395; (Mr. Dep. Speaker) Member's remarks checked, 2388; (Mr. Paterson) 2390; (Mr. Barker) 2399; (Mr. Wade) 2408; (Mr. Haggart) 2411; (Mr. Fielding) 2419; (Mr. Clarke) 2420; (Sir William Mulock) 2421; (Mr. Wilson) 2423; (Mr. Osler) 2425; (Mr. Scott) 2426 (ii).

On s. 5 of the schedule:

(Mr. Fitzpatrick) 2429; (Mr. Barker) 2429; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2429; (Mr. Fielding) 2430; (Mr. Osler) 2431; (Sir William Mulock) 2433; (Mr. Heyd) 2436; (Mr. Haggart) 2437; (Mr. Clarke) 2438; (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 2441 (ii).

On ss. 6 and 7 of the schedule:

(Mr. Fitzpatrick) 2445; (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 2447; (Mr. Clancy) 2450; (Mr. Osler) 2450; (Mr. Barker) 2451; (Mr. Heyd) 2454 (ii).

On s. 9 of the schedule:

(Mr. Fitzpatrick) 2462; (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 2477, 2592; (Mr. Fielding) 2473; (Mr. Clancy) 2474; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2481, 2510; (Mr. Tarte) 2483; (Mr. Davis) 2490; (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 2496, 2525; (Mr. McCreary) 2502, 2517; (Mr. Wright) 2507; (Mr. Dep. Speaker) Irregularity of debate, 2514, 2548; (Mr. Heyd) 2516; (Mr. Haggart) 2519; (Mr. Barker) 2538; (Mr. Kemp) 2549; (Mr. Northrup) 2603; (Mr. Wade) 2624; (Mr. Clancy) 2625; (Mr. Osler) 2628; (Mr. Kemp) 2631; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 2634; (Mr. Haggart) 2635 (ii).

On s. 10 of the schedule:

(Mr. Fitzpatrick) 2636, 2647; (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 2636, 2648; (Mr. Barker) 2649, 2652.

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier)—*Con.*

On s. 11 of the schedule:

(Mr. Lennox) 2638; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 2638; (Mr. Lavell) 2641; (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 2641; (Mr. Haggart) 2644; (Mr. Osler) 2646 (ii).

Appnmt. of a fourth commissioner: prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3306 (ii).

Debate on 3° of Bill:

3° m., 3390; Agreed to (Y. 105; N. 59) 3698.

Amt. (Mr. Monk) Eastern division, construction north of Lake Temiscamingue, 3390, Neg. (Y. 38; N. 91) 3396; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3394 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Henderson) all agreements subject to approval by Gov. in Council, 3397; Neg., 3399 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Pope) shares allotted to Canada in consideration of aid given, 3399; Neg. (Y. 43; N. 92) 3412; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3411 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Taylor) rolling stock, absolute title by Co., 3413; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 3414; Neg., 3414 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Sproule) apportionment of earnings by arbitration, 3414; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 3415; (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 3415; Neg. 3416 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Lavell) right of acquiring branch lines, 3416; Neg. 3417.

Amt. (Mr. Blain) interest not to be increased, 3417; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 3419; Neg., 3419 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Ingram) Govt. right to running powers and haulage over western division, &c., 3419, 3717; (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 3420; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 3420; Wthdn., 3420 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Northrup) all complaints of inefficiency, routing of freight, &c., to be investigated by Ry. Commission, &c., 3420; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 3421; (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 3422; Neg., 3423 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Richardson) interest paid as rental for eastern division, same as interest paid by govt. on borrowed money, 3423; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 3425; (Mr. Thomson, Grey) 3425; Neg. 3426 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Clancy) payment of rent for eastern section during construction of western section, 3426; (Mr. Broder) 3428; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 3429; Neg., 3430 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) obligation to carry traffic through Canadian channels, &c., 3430; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 3432; (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 3433; Neg., 3433 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Clare) British subjects to have preference on all surveys, penalties for violation, &c., 3440; (Sir William Mulock) 3450; (Mr. Monk) 3453; (Mr. Bourassa) 3457; (Mr. Taylor) 3460; (Mr. Macpherson) 3465; (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 3470; (Mr. Puttee) 3473; (Mr. Campbell) 3474; (Mr. Clarke) 3480; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 3494; (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 3498; (Mr. Sproule) 3500; (Mr. Smith, B.C.) 3502; (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 3503; (Mr. Johnston, N.S.) 3507; (Mr. Lancaster) 3508; (Mr. Sproule) 3509; (Mr. Pringle) 3511; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 86) 3513 (ii).

Amt. (Mr. Lennox) the right to expropriate and acquire whole undertaking, &c., 3515; (Mr. Robinson, Elgin) 3522; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 3524; (Mr. Clancy) 3525; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3527; (Mr. Sproule) 3528; (Mr. Barker) 3529; Neg. 3530 (ii).

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 72 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier)—*Con.*
Debate on 3° of Bill—*Con.*
Amt. (Mr. Bennett) the right to expropriate if failure to route traffic through Canadian channels, 3530; (Mr. Armstrong) 3533; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 3534; (Mr. Daniel) 3534; (Mr. Barker) 3536; (Mr. Sproule) 3536; (Mr. Lennox) 3537; Neg., 3537 (ii).
Amt. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) Govt. ownership, 3540; (Mr. Fielding) 3574; (Mr. Haggart) 3639; (Mr. Daniel) 3655; (Mr. Emmerson) 3659; (Mr. Bell) 3679; Neg. (Y. 59; N. 105) 3696 (ii).
Amt. (Mr. Haggart) Govt. right to foreclose or sell upon default, 3698; Neg. 3699 (ii).
Amt. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) prairie section to be completed within four years, 3699; Neg., 3700 (ii).
Amt. (Mr. Porter) G. T. Ry. Co. to be bound to carry out agreement of G.T.P. Co., 3700; (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 3701; Neg. 3717 (ii).
Amt. (Mr. Ingram) Govt. right to running powers and haulage over western division, &c., 3419, 3717; Neg., 3717.
Bill passed on reversed division, 3717.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RY.:
Agreement as amended, Inquiry for (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 7 (i).
Agreement: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8 (i).
Alien Labour Law: Ref. to, 8565 (v).
See 'Surveys,' &c.
Appnmt. of Commission *re* Eastern Division: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 1209 (i).
Appnmt. of Fourth Commissioner: Prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3306 (ii).
Application for Aid, by Co., Communicated to anybody previous to reading in Hse.: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 3761 (ii).
British Subjects as Directors, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Casgrain) 4142 (iii).
Confidential Documents, Production of: Remarks (Mr. Barker) 3950 (iii).
Construction of Contract, Cor. with G. T. Ry. Co.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 2977 (ii).
Cor. with Govt.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Lauier) 548; Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 548 (i).
Cor. between Govt. and Co.: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 476 (i).
Cor., &c., Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 598 (i).
Cor. between Govt. and G. T. Ry. Co., in relation to Transcontinental Ry.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 1548 (i).
Cor. *re* G. T. Ry. Co.: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 93 (i).
Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 559 (i).
Debate, Irrelevancy of, in Com. on B., Speaker, Dep., 2254 (ii).
Deposit, Securities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 400 (i).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RY.—*Con.*
Employees on Eastern Division, Salaries, &c.: M. for ret. (Mr. Barker) 223 (i).
Location West of Winnipeg, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 217 (i).
Minister of Railways, Constitutional Responsibilities *re* Bill, Authorities quoted, &c., 3334 (ii).
M. to take Precedence, 597 (i), 2001 (i), 'Ownied,' Ref. to Mr. Osler, 1632 (i).
——— Explanation, 1714 (i).
Personal Explanation *re* Mr. Blair's Memorandum, 1297 (i).
Personal Explanation (Mr. Bell), Arrangements with whips *re* speeches, 2002 (ii).
Personal Explanation (Mr. Taylor) *re* adjourning of Debate, 2109 (ii).
Public Documents withheld: *See* 'Documents.'
Ques. of Order (Mr. Dep. Speaker) on h. m. (Mr. Lefurgey) reading a continuous statement, 1766 (i).
Rep. of G.T. Ry. Meeting in London (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 1301 (i).
Shareholders' Meeting, Declaration of Official Stenographer: Read (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 2956 (ii).
Signing of Agreement, Date, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 2461 (ii).
Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson Speech: Read (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 2975 (ii).
Solicitorship: Personal Explanation *re* Par. in 'Mail and Empire' (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 7226 (iv).
Stock Securities: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Hfx) 2592 (ii).
Surveys, Cor. *re* Applications for Employment, since 30th May: M. (Mr. Clarke) for copies*) 4725 (iii).
——— aliens investigation, Emplymt. of Counsel: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 4414 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 3944, 4055, 4142 (iii).
———American Engineers, emplymt., names, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. Smith, B.C.) 3765 (ii).
——— Americans employed as engineers, copy of commission to Judge Winchester: Inquiry for (Mr. Clarke) 3539, 3751 (ii).
——— emplymt. of aliens, delay in producing papers: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 3874; commission to Judge Winchester: Remarks (Mr. Clancy) 3874 (ii).
——— emplymt. of aliens, inquiry for further cor. (Mr. Clarke) 5685 (iii).
——— inquiry for Judge Winchester's rep. (Mr. Maclean) 5685 (iii).
——— emplymt. of aliens, rep. of Judge Winchester: Inquiry for (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 5578 (iii).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RY.—*Con.*
Surveys, investigations *re* aliens, evidence supplied to G. T. P. authorities : Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 6880, 6890 (iv).
——— tel. read *re* (Sir Wm. Mulock) 7022 (iv).
——— deportation of aliens, action of Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 6542 (iv).
——— names of those deported: Ques. (Mr. Smith, B.C.) 6884 (iv).
——— warrants for deportation : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 6884 (iv).
——— Communications from Mr. Griffith, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 989 (i).
——— cor. read from Mr. Griffith (Mr. Clarke) 3082 (ii).
——— cor. read (Sir Wm. Mulock) 3070 (ii).
——— inquiry for suppl., cor. (Mr. Clarke) 4827, 4926 (iii) .
——— res. from Can. Society of civil engineers : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 7439 (iv).
——— Cor. Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 2847 (ii).
——— inquiry for cor. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 3757 (ii).
——— Emplymt. of Canadians as Engineers : Remarks (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 3028 (ii).
——— Emplymt .of Aliens, Protest *re* from Dom. Institute of Engineers : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 250, 553 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Puttee) 549, 1138 (i).
——— expenses : in Com. of Sup., 6290; Evidence of Mr. Hays, *re* Letter to Prime Minister of 16th June. Remarks (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 6292 (iv).
——— instructions from Labour Dept. *re* Alien Labour: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 553 (i).
——— Emplymt. on Surveys, &c., Application for, M. for Copies of Cor.* (Mr. Clarke) 3772 (ii).
Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8962 (v).
Surveys, &c.: M. for ret. (Mr. Barker) 223 (i).
Surveys, Eastern Section, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 552 (i).
Surveys, Govt. Parties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6544 (iv).
Surveys, Grades and Curvatures : Remarks (Mr. Boyd) in Com. of Sup., 6292 (iv).
Surveys, Quotation from Montreal 'Herald' *re* Govt. Information (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 92 (i).
Transcontinental Line, Papers, Documents *re* Construction : M. for Copies (Mr. Barker) 3950 (iii).
Trap' set by Govt. *re* Opposition Amendments, Par. in 'Le Canada' : Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 2957 (ii).
G.T.R. Arbitration, His Majesty and Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. No. 152 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 6465 ; Remarks, 7228 ; 2° and in Com., 7673 ; 3° m., 7786 (iv); 3°*, 8028a (v) (4 Edward VII, c. 16).
G. T. R. Arbitration Bill : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7228 (iv).
G.T.Ry., Rentals paid to Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) on Conc., 6684 (iv).
——— Terminal Facilities at Montreal, Amounts paid, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 5923 (iii).
G.T.P., Traffic Arrangements, British Subjects, &c.: in Com. on Railway Act Amt. B. 132, 5679 (iii).
Grand Vallée Pier, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7768 (iv), 9074 (v).
Grant, Geo. N., Political Interference in Guysborough Elections : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6040 (iv).
Gratuities to Govt. Employees : Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 8924 (v).
Grazing Leases, Blood Indian Reserve, Names of Applicants : Ques. (Mr. Gilmour) 2554 (ii).
Grazing Leases in Assa. and Alberta, Number and Dates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Reid, Grenville) 1666-7 (i).
Grazing Leases wthdn. from Homesteaders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Reid, Grenville) 213 (i).
Great Lakes and Northwest Transportation Co.'s incorp. B. No. 107 (Mr. German) 1° *, 3016; 2°*, 3354 (ii).
'Great Lakes to the Ocean,' Distribution, Printing, &c., of Pamphlet : Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 550 (i).
Great Salmon River Breakwater, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 9033 (v).
Greek Catholic Church, Investigation *re* Dispute as to Building : Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) in Com. of Sup., 7068 (iv).
Gregory, Col., Extension of Time *re* Militia Service : Personal Explanation (Mr. German) 4666 (iii).
——— Incomplete Cor.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 7023 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 6013, 6023, 6263 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 4590 (iii).
——— Letter Read (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for Sup., 7680 (iv).
——— Original Gazette laid on Table (Sir Frederick Borden, King's) 7785 (iv).
Green Cove Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7641 (iv).
Grenville Canal Wharf, Repairing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6865 (iv).
See 'Canals,' &c.
Grimsby Post Office, Complaints *re* Accommodation : Cor. read (Mr. Lancaster) 5685, 5696 ; Rep. from Inspector (Sir Wm. Mulock) read, 5694 (iii).
Grondines Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7774 (iv).

Grosse Isle Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 666 (i).
——— Purchase of Steamers : in Com. of Sup., 4192 (iii).
Guarantee Bonds, Security for Public Officers, Notice *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 7226 (iv). *See* 'Finance,' &c.
Guarantee and Trust : *See* 'Real Estate,' &c., 'Can. Credit, &c., B. 29.'
Guelph Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 536, 650 (i).
Guelph and Goderich Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 31 (Mr. Holmes) 1°*, 789; 2°*, 987 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2597 (ii) (4 Edward VII, c. 81).
Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. No. 30 (Mr. Guthrie) 1°*, 789; 2°*, 987 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2597 (ii) (4 Edward VII, c. 82).
Guelph Post Office : in Com. of Sup., 538, 650 (i).
——— Plans, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Clancy) in Com. of Sup., 599 (i).
'Gulnare,' Str., employed in Tidal Service : in Com. of Sup., 5287 (iii).
Guysborough Elections and I.C.R. Employees' Political Interference : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6026 ; 'Heelers' ref. to by Mr. Sinclair, 6066 ; Ref. to (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 6105 (iv).
——— Slander of Judges, Ref. by Mr. Sinclair : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6105 (iv).
——— Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 710 (i).
Haanel. Dr., Rep. *re* Smelting Ores : Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 5354 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7058 (iv).
Half-Breeds, Man., Allotment of Scrip, &c., Total Acreage, Value, &c., issued since 1903 : M. for Ret.* (Mr. LaRivière) 224, 1881 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. LaRivière) 215 (i).
Half-Breeds, Saskatchewan District, Claims, Grievances, &c., 1883-4-5, Cor. between Govt. and Officials : M. for Copies* (Mr. Davis) 1880 (i).
——— Cor. between Govt. and D. H. McDowel : M. for Cor.* (Mr. Davis) 1880 (i).
Halifax and Canso Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iv).
Halifax and Liverpool SS. Service : in Com. of Sup., 6210 (iv).
Halifax and Newfoundland Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 6210, 7444 (iv).
Halifax Board of Trade, Res. *re* I.C.R. Train Service to Sydney : Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).
Halifax County Dredging : Remarks (Mr. Roche, Halifax) in Com. of Sup., 7885 (iv).
Halifax, Deep Water Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 5951 (iii).
Halifax Fishery Award, Ref. to Supreme Court: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 3126 (ii).
Halifax Harbour, Lighting System : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 5831 (iii).
Halifax Immigrant Building : in Com. of Sup., 461, 504 (i).
Halifax, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5973 (iii), 8363 (v).
Halifax Mail Delivery, The O'Connell Case : Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in Com. of Sup., 5711 (iii).
Halifax P.O., Increases of Salary : in Com. of Sup., 5713 (iii).
Hall's Harbour, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7634, 7642 (iv).
Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville Electric Ry. Co.'s B. No. 77 (Mr. German) 1°*, 2001; 2°*, 2327; in Com., and 3°*, 3758 (ii).
Hamilton Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9028 (v).
Hannay, Dr. Jas., Qualifications for Dom. Archivist : Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 2731 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7876 (iv), 9031 (v).
——— Dom., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7850 (iv).
——— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 7875, 7897 (iv).
——— Mar. Provs., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7774 (iv).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7744 (iv).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9021 (v).
——— summary of amounts expended in estimates : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7648 (iv). *See* 'Cumberland County.'
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7750, 7843, 7897 (iv).
——— votes for, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Logan) 9030 (v).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7736 (iv).
——— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7766, 7828, 7896 (iv).
——— Yukon : in Com. of Sup., 7879 (iv).
Harvest Number of Winnipeg 'Free Press' : *See* 'Free Press,' 'Immigration,' &c.
Harvey, Mr., Political Interference in Marquette : Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 7065 (iv).
Hatcheries : *See* 'Fisheries,' &c.
Hawkesbury P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 544 (i).
Hay Inspectors, Appnmt. of : Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 401 (i).
Hay Lake Channel, Treaty *re* Free Navigation : Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 1207 (i).
Higgin's Shore Pier, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7736 (iv).
Highway Crossings : *See* 'Ry. Act B. 2.'
Hillsborough Bridge and Murray Harbour Branch, P.E.I. Ry., Amounts expended : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2186 (ii).
——— M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Lefurgey) 3771 (ii).

Hillsborough Bridge, &c., Contract and Tolls, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5999 (iii).
See 'Murray Harbour.'

Holt, Mr., Allowance to *re* Cattle Guard Commission: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 7476 (iv).
See 'Cattle Guard,' &c.

Home Bank of Canada B. No. 45 (Mr. Osler) 1°*, 1053; on Order for 2°, 1338; 2°, 1356 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3480 (ii) (4 Edward VII, c. 83).

Homestead Inspectors: *See* 'Immigration,' 'Interior,' 'Jonasson,' 'Young.'

Honora Wharf, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7851 (iv).

Hope Island, Quantity of Timber Cut, Contract with Manley, Chew, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2808 (ii).

——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 224 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5236 (iii).

Hopewell Cape, Wharf, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7748 (iv).

——— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4412 (iii).

Horses bought by Imp. Govt. from Canada, Forfeits, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 8917 (v).

Horses imported, &c., and Horse-Breeders' Association: Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) in Com. of Sup., 4211 (iii).

Horses imported into U.S. from B.C., Claim for Refund of Duty: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2804 (ii).
See 'Ways and Means,' &c., and 'Live Stock,' &c.

Horton, Charles S., License *re* Trap-Net Fishing: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) 8958 (v).

HOUSE OF COMMONS:

Bills, Royal Assent, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec., 6905; Mess. from His Ex., 6923 (iv).

Bowing on Floor of House when passing Members who are Speaking: Ques. of Order (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 7235 (iv).

B.C. Legislation, Disallowance of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Vancouver) 989 (i).

Divorce Pet., Irregularity of: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 254 (i).

Dom. Elections Act, 1900, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Alcorn) 1137 (i).

Galleries of the Hse., Order, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 2190 (ii).

Govt. Legislation, *re* Dom. Franchise, &c.: Stmnt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5191 (iii).

Guysborough Electoral Division, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 710 (i).

House of Commons, Charwomen's Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 8982 (v).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

House of Commons, C. Ross Co., Accounts *re* Supplies to Speaker's Apartment: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 8991 (v).

——— Opposition Leader's Sec.'s Salary: in Com. of Sup., 8988 (v).

——— Post Office, Locked Boxes for Members: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 5853 (iii).

——— Re-organization: in Com. of Sup., 5853 (iii).

——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 8977 (v).

——— list of officers, promotions, &c.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 8978 (v).

Index to Journals of H. of C.: in Com. of Sup., 9003 (v).

Internal Economy Com.'s Rep.: M. (Mr. Speaker) 8653 (v).

——— Report *re* Salaries, &c.: Read (Mr. Speaker) in Com. of Sup., 8988 (v).

Library of Parlt., Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8 (i).

Members appointed to Offices under the Crown: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 1153 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 992 (i).

——— Certificates of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).

Members introduced, 7 (i).

Motions to Adjn., Mr. Speaker's Rulings *re*: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 1212 (i).

Order in the Hse. and Galleries: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 2190 (ii).

Order, Ques. of, *re* Replies to Questions put by Members: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1152 (i).

Parliament, Opening, 1 (i).

——— Prorogation, 9078 (v).

Petitions, on M. to receive, Special Circumstances, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 2368 (ii).

Private Bills reported from Com., Form on Order Paper: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 985 (i).

Questions asked by Members. Ministerial Replies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1150 (i).

——— Rights *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 6890 (iv).

Representation in H. of C., Appeals of N.B. and P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 3873 (ii).

——— Ref. to Privy Council, Factum *re*: Remarks (Mr. Haggart) 5000 (iii).

Senate, Salaries and Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 8977, 9038 (v).

Sergeant-at-Arms, Estimates as approved, Comparisons, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 8989 (v).

Sergeant-at-Arms, Increase of Salary: in Com. of Sup., 8979 (v).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

Sessional Clerks, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 8982 (v).

Sessions, Length of, and Delay in calling Parlt.: Remarks (Mr. Boyd) 6638 (iv), 8261 (v).

Sinclair, J. H., Member for Guysborough, introduced, 794 (i).

Speaker, Election of, 3 (i).

Speaker's Rulings *re* Motions to adjn. House: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1212 (i).

Speech from the Throne : Read (Mr. Speaker) 6 (i).

Twelfth July, Adjournment, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 6264 (iv).

Vacancies in Electoral District : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).

Voters' Lists, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9004 (v).

——— Delay in Printing Lists : Remarks (Mr. Bourassa) 6789 (iv).

——— Printing and Distribution : Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6885 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Ingram) 680 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Wilson) 3726, (ii), 4138 (iii).

Voters' (Dom.) Lists, Total Expenditure for Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 333 (i).

——— Copy received from Man. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Boyd) 7440 (iv).

——— legislation *re* : Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 4999 (iii).

——— Prov. of Quebec, Printing, Distribution, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 1667 (i).

——— Ste. Flore, Changes or Modifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1360 (i).

——— Unorganized Districts, Preparation of, **&c.: Ques. (Mr. Alcorn) 1137 (i).**

——— **Victoria and Haliburton, Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 2375 (ii).**

——— Waterloo, S., Printing and Distribution : Remarks (Mr. Clare) 8025 (v).

Howard, Maj., Winner of King's Colonial Prize at Bisley : Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 7437 (iv).

Hudson's Bay & Northwest Ry. Co.'s B. No. 68 (Mr. Oliver) 1°*, 1450; 2°*, 1879 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3480 (ii); Sen. Amts., 4627 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 84).

Hudson's Bay, Fishing Rights, Grant to Americans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2117 (ii).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.

——— Fishery Patrol, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv).

——— Lands, Purchase by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Maclean) **in Com. of Sup., 7197 (iv).**

——— Patrolling and Customs Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 7968 (iv).

Huntingdon Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1879 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 1875 (i).

Huron & Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. No. 130 (Mr. Ross, Ontario) M. to receive Pet., 3844 (ii); 1°*, 4138; 2°*, 4272; in Com., and 3*, 5035 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 85).

Hutton, Maj. Gen.: Ref. to in Com. on Militia B., 6369 (iv).

Hydraulic Dredging Plant, Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 7880 (iv).

Hydrographic Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 5836 (iii).

Ice-Breakers for Winter Mail Service : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iv).

Ice-Breaker on Lake Superior and Georgian Bay, *re* Winter Navigation : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 1209 (i).

——— (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 8920 (v).

Ice Piers, St. Francis River, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pope) 3389 (ii).
See 'Public Works,' &c.

Immigrants and Homestead Entries, Number, **&c.: Ques. (Mr. Ross, Ont.) 3130 (ii).**

Immigrants deported from U.S. to Winnipeg : Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Remarks (Mr. Wilson) 364 (i).

Immigrants deported from U.S. to Winnipeg : Remarks (Mr. Wilson) 403 (i).

——— **Statement read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 477** (i).

Immigrants deported, 1902 to 1904, Causes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 995 (i).

Immigrants, Destitute and stranded in Canada, Cable from London: Read (Mr. Clarke) 3847, 3865 (ii).

Immigrants, Diseased, &c., Medical Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 7285 (iv) .

Immigrants entering at Port of Halifax, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Roche, Halifax) in Com. of Sup., 7315 (iv).

Immigrants, Precautions against Swindling : Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 1[illegible] (i).

Immigration Act, B.C., Disallowance of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Vancouver) 988 (i).

IMMIGRATION :

Agents employed by Dom. Govt., Salaries, &c.: M. for ret.* (Mr. Wilson) 223, 224 (i).

Agents employed on Commission, Amounts paid, &c. : M. for ret.* (Mr. Wilson) 223 (i).

B. C. Immigration, Disallowance of Act, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Vancouver) 988 (i).

Canadian Labour Bureau and Immigration **Agents : Remarks (Mr. Puttee) in Com. of Sup., 7299; Cor. from Louis Leopold : Read** 7304-5 (iv).

Chinese Exclusion Act, Par. in Nanaimo 'Free Press': Ques. (Mr. Smith, Vancouver) 994 (i).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

Chinese Exclusion Act, Enforcement of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Vancouver) 989 (i).

Diseased Immigrants, &c., Medical Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 7285 (iv).

Farm Delegates from Can. to G.B., Duties, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 550 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7324 (iv).

'Free Press,' Winnipeg, Harvest Number, Distribution *re* Immigration Literature: Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) in Com. of Sup., 7324 (iv).

Gilbert, Dr., Appnmt. as Port Physician at Fraserville: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 7081 (iv).

Halifax Immigrant Shed: in Com. of Sup., 504 (i).

Harvest Number of Winnipeg 'Free Press': *See* 'Free Press,' 'Immigration.'

Immigrants deported from U.S. to Winnipeg: Remarks (Mr. Wilson) 364, 403; Statement read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 477 (i).

Immigrants deported, 1902 to 1904, Causes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 995 (i).

Immigrants, Destitute and stranded in Canada, Cable from London: Read (Mr. Clarke) 3847, 3865 (ii).

Immigrants entering at Port of Halifax, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Roche, Halifax) in Com. of Sup., 7315 (iv).

Immigrants and Homestead Entries, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ross, Ontario) 3130 (ii).

Immigrants, Precautions against Swindling: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ontario) 1211 (i).

Immigration Campaign Literature, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7324, 7339 (iv).

Immigration Estimates: Remarks (Mr. Wilson) 7222 (iv).

Immigration in G.B., Fraudulent Agents, Representations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, B.C.) 5071 (iii).

Immigration Literature, and advertising Whiskies, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 7360 (iv).

Immigration Salaries and Medical Inspection of Diseased Immigrants: in Com. of Sup., 7272 (iv).

Imperial Labour Bureau and Salvation Army in G.B.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, B.C.) 3132 (ii).

Italian Immigrants stranded in Montreal: Remarks (Mr. Wilson) 6931 (iv).

Quebec Hospital for Immigrants: in Com. of Sup., 684 (i).

Regina 'Leader,' Payments to for Immigration Literature: Remarks (Mr. Cowan) in Com. of Sup., 7358 (iv).

Russian Jews deported from U.S. to Winnipeg: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 554 (i).

See 'Immigrants.'

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

Salvation Army: *See* 'Imperial,' &c.

See 'Indians,' 'Interior,' &c.

Imperial Institute, London, Can. Exhibit: in Com. of Sup., 2757 (ii).

Imperial Institute, London: in Com. of Sup., 3728 (ii).

——— Transfer to British Board of Trade: 3739 (ii).

Imperial Labour Bureau and Salvation Army, in G.B.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, B.C.) 3132 (ii).

Imperial Loan & Investment Co.'s B. No. 58 (Mr. Thompson, Haldimand & Monck) 1°*, 1297; 2°*, 1356 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5866 (iii). (4 Edward VII. c., 86).

Imperial Oil Co., Contract *re* Car Lighting: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5932 (iii).

Imperial Service, Commissions allotted to Can. Militia, Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 1358 (i).

Index to Journals of H. of C.: in Com. of Sup., 9003 (v).

Indian Corn, Rebate paid to Distillers: Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 6680 (iv).

Indian Harbour, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7642 (iv).

INDIANS:

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease for Grazing Purposes: Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) in Com. of Sup., 7197 (iv).

See 'Grazing.'

Bryce, Dr., Appmt. and Salary as Medical Inspector for Indians: in Com. of Sup., 6960 (iv).

——— B. C., Agents, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6957 (iv).

——— Hospital Grants, Irrigation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6958 (iv).

——— Industrial Schools: in Com. of Sup., 6957 (iv).

——— Medical Attendance: in Com. of Sup., 6957 (iv).

——— Reserves opened for Settlers: in Com. of Sup., 9016 (v).

——— Travelling Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 6958 (iv).

Doncaster Indian Reserve, Exchange, &c.: O.Cs. Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Léonard) for Ret., 2831 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 987 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Léonard) in Com. of Sup., 5859 (iii).

Elkhorn Indian School, Sale of Printing Press: Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) in Com. of Sup., 6948 (iv).

Georgian Bay, Survey of Indian Reserves: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 5856 (iii).

INDIANS—*Con.*

Grazing Leases, Blood Indian Reserve, Names of Applicants : Ques. (Mr. Gilmour) 2554 (ii).

See 'Blood.'

Half-Breeds, Saskatchewan District, Claims, Grievances, &c., 1883-4-5, Cor. between Govt. and Officials : M. for Copies* (Mr. Davis) 1880 (i).

Half-Breed Scrip Commission, Rep., &c.: Ques. (Mr. LaRivière) 215 (i).

——— Pets., &c. *re* Allotments in Man. and the Ters.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. LaRivière) 224 (i).

——— Total Acreage, Value, &c., issued since 1903 : M. for Ret.* (Mr. LaRivière) 1881 (i).

Indian Affairs, Civil Govt., Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 5854 (iii), 9014 (v).

Indian Annuities, Treaty No. 9 : in Com. of Sup., 9016 (v).

Indians, Generally, Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 6960 (iv).

——— Legal Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 6932 (iv).

——— Schools, Results of Education: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 6955 (iv).

Iroquois Indian Reserve, Squatters' Claims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 988 (i).

Keremeos Indian Reserve, B.C., Pets. *re* Sale: Ques. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1876 (i).

Legare, Jean Louis, Compensation *re* Removal of Sitting Bull to U.S.: Remarks (Mr. Scott) in Com. of Sup., 6964 (iv).

Liquor Traffic amongst the Indians, Suppression, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5358 (iii).

——— Annuities, Man. and N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6941 (iv).

——— Farm Implements : in Com. of Sup., 6942 (iv).

——— General Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 6954 (iv).

——— Live Stock : in Com. of Sup., 6944 (iv).

——— Medical Attendance : in Com. of Sup., 6945 (iv).

——— Saw and Grist Mills : in Com. of Sup., 6954 (iv).

——— Schools : in Com. of Sup., 6946 (iv).

——— expenses *re* : in Com. of Sup., 7024 (iv).

——— Seed Grain : in Com. of Sup., 6942 (iv).

——— Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 6951 (iv).

——— Triennial Clothing : in Com. of Sup., 6946 (iv).

Mississagua Indians of Alnwick, Compensation *re* Lands : in Com. of Sup., 9018 (v).

N.B., Additional Amount : in Com. of Sup., 6964 (iv).

——— Agents' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 6937 (iv).

INDIANS—*Con.*

N.B. Fishing Privileges leased to Henry Bishop, Letter from Chief Prisk : Read (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 6937 (iv).

N.S., Agents' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iv).

——— Medical Attendance : in Com. of Sup., 6937 (iv).

——— Relief and Seed Grain : in Com. of Sup., 6936 (iv).

Ont., Medical Attendance : in Com. of Sup., 5854 (iii).

Ont. and Quebec : in Com. of Sup., 6932 (iv).

P.E.I., Medical Attendance : in Com. of Sup., 6941 (iv).

——— Relief and Seed Grain : in Com. of Sup., 6938 (iv).

——— Travelling Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 6938 (iv).

Robinson Treaty Annuities for Indians : in Com. of Sup., 5855 (iii).

Saw Mills, Portable, Regulations *re* : Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) in Com. of Sup., 7071 (iv).

Sioux Indians, Treaty, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iv).

Songhee Indians, Removal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Earle) in Com. of Sup., 6959 (iv).

Survey Reserves : in Com. of Sup., 5855 (iii).

Timber Cut on Reserves : Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in Com. of Sup., 6934 (iv).

——— Sale of Timber: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 5857 (iii).

Walpole Island, Indian Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 5855 (iii), 6932 (iv).

Yukon, Medical Attendance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6959 (iv).

See 'Interior,' &c.

Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. No. 168 (Mr. Brodeur), Res. prop., 8136; M. for Com. on Res., 8393; in Com. on Res., 8428; 2° of Res., 8434, 8533; 1°*, 2°*, and in Com., 8549; 3°, 8550 (v) (4 Edward VII, c. 17).

——— No. 173 (Mr. Brodeur) 1° m., 8896; 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 8898 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 18).

INLAND REVENUE :

Adulteration of Food : in Com. of Sup., 4091 (iii).

Analysts, Prosecutions for Violation of Inland Rev. Act : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3909 (ii).

Distillery Officers, Extra Pay for Special Work : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).

Excise, B.C., Extra Salaries for Officials : in Com. of Sup., 3923 (ii).

Excise Inspectors' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).

Fines imposed for Violation of Inland Rev. Act : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3915 (ii).

INLAND REVENUE—*Con.*
Fraudulent Marking, Adulteration of Food, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4091 (iii).
Indian Corn, Rebate paid to Distillers: Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 6680 (iv).
Inland Revenue Act *re* Distillers, Repeal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 6148 (iv).
Inland Revenue, Civil Govt., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 3909 (ii), 8976 (v).
Inspectors' Salaries, Weights and Measures: in Com. of Sup., 4042 (iii).
Jams, Adulteration of, Penalties *re*: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 8027 (v).
Methylated Spirits: in Com. of Sup., 3923 (ii).
Metric System, Purchase of Instruments: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).
Tobacco Commission to U.S., Instructions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7224 (iv).
——— Rep., Printing, &c.: M. (Mr. Monk) 7436 (iv).
Tobaco Culture in Wisconsin, Agent's Name *re* Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1877 (i).
Tobacco Duties, Excise and Customs: Ques. (Mr. Bell) 6546 (iv).
——— Duties collected for Raw Leaf: Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 4053 (iii).
——— Duties, Total Amount collected, 1904: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 8781 (v).
——— Duties *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) 7785 (iv).
Tobacco Industry, Protection and Encouragement: Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Sup., 6894; Amt. Neg. (Y. 19; N. 50) 6927 (iv).
——— Rep. of Commission, Printing: M. (Mr. Monk) 7542 (iv).
Tobacco Revenue Laws, Violation of, Names of persons fined, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macpherson) 5582 (iii).
Tobacco Stamps, Excise Duties: in Com. of Sup., 3920 (ii).
Tobacco Trade with Belgium, Amounts paid to Mr. Dugas: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1878 (ii).
——— Rep. of Mr. B. Dugas: M. for Copy* (Mr. Monk) 2848 (ii).
Watches supplied to Inspectors of Electric Lights: **Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of** Sup., 3917 (ii).
Wood Alcohol, and Standard Chemical Co.: in Com. of Sup., 3923 (ii).
Innes, Mrs. Compensation to: in Com. of Sup., 5851 (iii).
Insane Patients in N. W. Ters.: in Com. of Sup., 7024 (iv).
Inspection of Binder Twine: *See* 'General Inspection Bill,' &c.
Inspectors of Excise, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).
Inspection of Grain: *See* 'Grain Inspection B. 113.'
Inspector of Mines, Salary: in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iv).
Inspection of Seeds: *See* 'Seeds,' &c.
Inspectors' Salaries, Weights and Measures: in Com. of Sup., 4042 (iii).
Insurance Rates *re* St. Lawrence Steamers: Remarks (Mr. Richardson) in Com. of Sup., 5819 (iii).
Insurance, Supt.'s Salary: in Com. of Sup., 8386 (v).
I. C. R., Canada Eastern Ry. (Purchase) B. No. **163 (Mr. Emmerson) Res. prop., 7443 (iv);** in Com. on Res., 8222; 1°* of B., 8251; 2° m. 8550; in Com., 8555; 3° m., 8562 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 4).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:
Accidents on I. C. R. and P. E. I. Rys., Loss of Life, Compensation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kendall) 5840 (iii).
Accommodation, Increased: in Com. of Sup., 8361 (v).
Air Brakes for Freight Cars: in Com. of Sup., 5922 (iii).
Amherst Station Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5957 (iii), 8347 (v).
Amqui Station, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5964 (iii), 8364 (v).
Annual Statement of Minister, on M. for Sup., 5867 (iii).
Antigonish Station Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 8364 (v).
Birch Cove, Reduction of Curve: in Com. of Sup., 8350 (v).
Bridge Strengthening: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii), 6264; Names of Bridges, &c., 6264 (iv).
Campbellton Railway Siding: in Com. of Sup., 5940 (iii), 7532 (iv).
Canso Ferry Service: in Com. of Sup., 5976 (iii), 8365 (v).
Capital Account, Expenditure *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5915, 5933 (iii).
——— information given (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. of Sup., 6104 (iv).
'Chapman' Ball-Bearings, Applied to I. C. R. Cars: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6286 (iv).
Chaudière Junction, Station Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5973 (iii).
'Cleveland' Patent Cylinders, on I. C. R. Locomotives: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 6286 (iv).
Coal Supply, Discrimination *re*: Remarks (Mr. Kendall) in Com. of Sup., 5963 (iii).
Demill, J. P., Peterson, Oscar, Dismissal from I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 334 (i).
Double Tracking: in Com. of Sup., 8351 (v).
——— Moncton to Halifax: Remarks (Mr. Gourley) in Com. of Sup., 6287 (iv).
Draw-Bars on I. C. R. Cars: in Com. of Sup., 5923, 6264 (iii).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Earnings and Expenditures, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 1139 (i).
——— for Eight Months ending Feb. 28, 1904: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 1665 (i).
——— Employees and Political Interference in Elections: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).
——— Employees at St. John, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 334 (i).
——— Express Companies, Control of Business: Remarks (Mr. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 7449 (iv).
Facilities, Increased Accommodation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8361 (v).
——— Details of Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 5945 (iii).
Govt. Employees travelling on Rys., Redress *re* Injuries: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 5849 (iii).
Govt. Railways, Operating Expenses and Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pope) 4823, 5760 (iii).
Grain and Grain Products carried on I. C. R., Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 7783 (iv).
Grain Shipments to Halifax, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 252, 334 (i).
Grand Narrows Bridge Protection: in Com. of Sup., 5978 (iii).
G. T. Ry. Terminal Facilities at Montreal, Amounts paid, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 5923 (iii).
Halifax, Board of Trade, Res. *re* Train Service to Sydney: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).
——— Deep Water Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5951 (iii).
——— Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5973 (iii), 8363 (v).
Imperial Oil Co., Contract *re* Car Lighting: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5932 (iii).
Leger and Wood, Messrs., Emplymt. on I.C.R., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, B.C.) 3437 (ii).
Laplante and Beaulieu, Messrs., Investigations *re* Charges: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 5579 (iii).
Lévis, Station Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5921, 5951 (iii).
Little Metis, Station and New Road: in Com. of Sup., 5953 (iii).
Locomotive Shops, Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 5924 (iii).
Maintenance of Way Men, Brotherhood, Applications *re* Rates paid to I.C.R. Employees: Res. read (Mr. Boyd) 5909 (iii).
'Maritime Express,' Change of Time for Departure: Ques. (Mr. Gervais) 1668 (i).
Mar. Provs., Expenditure *re* I.C.R. and Public Works: Remarks (Mr. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 8371 (v).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Metapedia and Montreal, Pay of Labourers: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 5760 (iii).
Milford Ry. Accident, N.S., Damages, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6140 (iv).
Mitchell Station, Diversion of Line: in Com. of Sup., 8350 (v).
New Glasgow, Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8365 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bell) in Com. of Sup., 6289 (iv).
North Sydney Station Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5976 (iii).
'Ocean Limited': Remarks *re* in Com. of Sup., 8354 (v).
Passenger Rates, Local and Through: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 4275, 4411 (iii).
Passenger Service, Stellarton and Pictou, Res. from Charlottetown Board of Trade: Read (Mr. Lefurgey) 8357 (v).
Passes issued: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bell) 3540 (ii).
Patronage, Control of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6109 (iv).
Pensions, Preparation of System: Ques. (Mr. Gourley) 8028 (v).
Pictou Landing: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
Pintsch Gas on I.C.R. Trains: in Com. of Sup., 5927 (iii).
Political Appointments: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6108 (iv).
P.E.I. Ry., Alberton Station: in Com. of Sup., 6009 (iii), 8367 (v).
——— survey *re* entrance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hackett) 1358 (i).
——— 'Y,' abolishing of: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 6232 (iv).
——— Branch Lines, Pets. *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 992, 1135 (i).
——— Breadalbane Freight Shed: in Com. of Sup., 5998 (iii).
——— Cape Wolfe Branch, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hackett) 990 (i).
——— Car Accommodation *re* Tourists, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6227, 6242 (iv).
——— Cardigan and Montague Bridge Branch Line: in Com. of Sup., 8369 (v).
——— Charlottetown, Extension of Siding on Water Front: in Com. of Sup., 8369 (v).
——— Charlottetown Station: in Com. of Sup., 5991 (iii), 8368 (v).
——— number of employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 789 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Haszard) in Com. of Sup., 6237 (iv).
——— Curtis Creek Line, Straightening of Curves: in Com. of Sup., 5987 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1210 (i).
——— Deficits and Expenditure: Remarks (Mr. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 6262 (iv).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

P.E.I. Ry., Dismissals in 1896 : Remarks (Mr. Hackett) in Com. of Sup., 6220 (iv).

——— Georgetown, Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 8366 (v).

——— Hillsborough Bridge, Contract and Tolls, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5999 (iii).

——— amounts expended : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2186 (ii).

See 'Murray Harbour.'

——— Kensington Station, Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 5986 (iii).

——— Kinkora Station : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6231 (iv).

——— Lighting System on Cars : in Com. of Sup., 5930 (iii).

——— M. C. B. Couplers : in Com. of Sup., 5998 (iii).

——— Montague Bridge Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 6011 (iii).

——— Murray Harbour Branch Ry., P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 5999 (iii).

——— completion, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hackett) in Com. of Sup., 6241 (iv).

——— cost of first eleven miles : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1210 (i).

——— corrected answer (Mr. Emmerson) 1669 (i).

——— cost of construction : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lefurgey) 1880 (i).

——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3754 (ii), 4054, 4580 (iii).

——— expenditure *re* rolling stock, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 991 (i).

——— extension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 990 (i).

——— Letter of Aud. Gen.: Read (Mr. Lennox) on Conc., 6682 (iv).

——— total cost of excavation : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4826 (iii).

——— Norton, R. B., & Co., Payments to *re* P.E.I. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 219 (i).

——— O'Leary Branch Line, P.E.I. Ry., Pet. from Residents : Read (Mr. Hackett) in Com. of Sup., 6012 (iii).

——— P. E. I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 5986 (iii), 8366 (v).

——— pay to labourers : in Com. of Sup., 6220 (iv).

——— Pension Scheme for P. E. I. Ry., Letters and Pets., *re* : Read (Mr. Lefurgey) 6221. 6227 (iv).

——— Souris to Elmira, Survey : in Com. of Sup., 8366 (v).

——— Steam Heating Apparatus in Cars : in Com. of Sup., 5998 (iii).

——— Summerside Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 8369 (v).

——— Vernon River Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 8367 (v).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

P.E.I. Ry., Water Service : in Com. of Sup., 8369 (v).

——— Westinghouse Brakes : in Com. of Sup., 5989 (iii).

——— West Shore to Main Line, Survey : in Com. of Sup., 8368 (v).

——— Working Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 6220 (iv).

——— York Station, Freight Shed : in Com. of Sup., 8371 (v).

Rail Cutting Plant : in Com. of Sup., 8346 (v).

Reid & Archibald, and Reid McManus, Tenders for Double Tracking, I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 8351 (v).

Restigouche Bridge Superstructure : in Com. of Sup., 5948 (iii).

Rivière du Loup Car Shops, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5972 (iii).

——— Res. of Town Council, Fraserville : Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 8254 (v).

Rivière Ouelle, Spur Line : in Com. of Sup., 7532 (iv), 8365 (v).

Rolling Stock : in Com. of Sup., 8354 (v).

St. Charles Junction: in Com. of Sup., 7532 (iv).

Ste. Flavie, Station Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 5976 (iii).

St. John, N.B., Station Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 5973 (iii).

St. Leonard Junction, Diversion of Line : in Com. of Sup., 8347 (v).

Ste. Perpetue, Station Accommodation : Remarks (Mr. Ball) 8658 (v).

St. Romauld Siding: in Com. of Sup., 8365 (v).

Semaphores : in Com. of Sup., 5986 (iii).

Sidings, Additional along line: in Com. of Sup., 5937 (iii). 6271 (iv), 8365 (v).

Spur Lines: in Com. of Sup., 8365 (v).

Springhill Junction, Water Boring: in Com. of Sup., 7532 (iv).

Standard Oil Co., Contract *re* Lighting Cars : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5932 (iii).

Steel Rails and Fastenings: in Com. of Sup., 8360 (v).

Stellarton Station, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5969 (iii).

Sussex Platform, for Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 7532 (iv).

Sydney, Increased Station Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 5914 (iii).

——— Train Service: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).

Sydney Mines Extension, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8346 (v).

Telegraphers' Union, Special Agreement *re* Dismissals: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. of Sup., 6038(iv).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Tiffin, Mr., Travelling in Private car to California: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7495 (iv).
Trackmen, Res. from Brotherhood of Maintenance Way Men *re* Wages: Res. read (Mr. Boyd) in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 6024 (iv).
Running of Trains, Interference with by Members: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 6254 (iv).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. Logan) in Com. of Sup., 6277 (iv).
Train Service with Mar. Provs.: Ques. Remarks (Mr. Talbot) 3312 (ii).
Truro, Esplanade Grading of: Ques. (Mr. Gourley) 8027a (v).
——— Station Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 8361 (v).
——— Station, Provision *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. Gourley) 8027a (v).
——— Round-House, Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gourley) 8027a (v).
Vestibule Equipment on I. C. R. Cars: in Com. of Sup., 5937 (iii).
Water Supply: in Com. of Sup., 5964 (iii), 8365 (v).
Windsor Branch: in Com. of Sup., 6219 (iv).
Windsor, N.S., Station Acommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iii).
Working Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 6024 (iv).
Workingmen, Application for increased Wages: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).
See 'Railways,' &c.
Inter-Imperial Preferential Trade and Mr. Lemieux's Speech in Eng.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 7082 (iv).
INTERIOR:
Advertising *re* Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 7069 (iv).
Archaeological Specimens for Geological Survey, Purchase of: in Com. of Sup., 9015 (v).
Argyle and Springdale Townships, Taxes *re* School Lands, Litigation: in Com. of Sup., 7078 (iv).
Assay Offices, Chemicals and Instruments: in Com. of Sup., 7221 (iv).
Assay Office, Vancouver, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7078 (iv).
Astromomical Observatory, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 455 (i).
Banff Hot Springs, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7074 (iv).
Bell, Dr., Increase of Salary, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7213 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 7057, 7060 (iv).
INTERIOR—*Con.*
Boundary, B.C., Demarcation: in Com. of Sup., 7077 (iv).
Coal Measures, Govt. Ownership, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robinson, Elgin) 214 (i).
Colonization Roads in Man. and N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 8017 (iv).
Dixon, Mr. Geo., Homestead Entry, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 6885 (iv).
Dom. Lands, Commissioner's Salary: in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iv).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 7027, 7197 (iv).
Doukhobor Reserve, Pets. from Settlers *re* Addition of Townships, &c.: M. for Copies of Cor., &c.* (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 561 (i).
Duck Mountains Timber Berths, Sale of: Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 6543 (iv).
Flesher, Mr. S., Inspector in Land Office, Minnedosa: Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) in Com. of Sup., 7063 (iv).
Gas and Oil Explorations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7215 (iv).
Geological Explorations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7215 (iv).
——— B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).
Geological Survey, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7199 (iv).
Geological Survey Rep.: Presented (Mr. Sifton) 6150 (iv).
——— Postage *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).
——— Sale and Distribution: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7213 (iv).
Geological Specimens, Purchase of: in Com. of Sup., 7219 (iv), 9015 (v).
Geological Surveys, Compilation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).
Govt. Patronage *re* Mr. Oliver's Newspaper: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) 6642 (iv).
Grazing Leases in Assa. and Alberta, Number and Dates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Reid, Grenville) 1666-7 (i).
Grazing Leases wthdn. from Homesteaders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Reid, Grenville) 213 (i).
See 'Lindsay.'
Haanel, Dr., Rep. *re* Smelting Ores: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7058 (iv).
Hope Island Timber Cutting, Cor.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 224 (i).
Hudson's Bay Lands, Purchase by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 7197 (iv).
Insane Patients in N.W. Ters.: in Com. of Sup., 7024 (iv).
Inspector of Mines, Salary: in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iv).
Interior, Civil Govt., Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6966 (iv).

INTERIOR—*Con.*
Jonasson, Mr., Homestead Inspector, Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 792 (i).
Lindsay, J. B., Lease of Grazing Lands: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7221 (iv).
See 'Grazing.'
Macoun, Mr. J. M., Rep. of Peace River District, Distribution, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 7201 (iv).
——— Rep. *re* Agricultural Com.: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 7347 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order: Ruling (Mr. Deputy Speaker) 7348 (iv).
Maps, Printing and Lithographing: in Com. of Sup., 7079 (iv).
Nash, Mr. E. A., Dismissal as Dom. Lands Agent in Kamloops, B.C., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Taylor) 2847 (ii).
Oil Boring Explorations in N.W.T.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7217 (iv).
Public Lands, Sale of during 1903-4: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 8778 (v).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Mr. Steer's Rep. *re* Settlement: Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) in Com. of Sup., 7034-5; Letter in 'Globe' *re* Homestead Regulations: Read, 7036 (iv).
School Land, Taxes *re*, Litigation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7078 (iv).
Stewart, Mr., Inspector of Timber, Experiments, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7072 (iv).
——— Rep. *re* Dom. Lands: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7222 (iv).
Survey of Dom. Lands, Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 7197 (iv).
Timber Limits in Man. and N.W.T., Location, Purchasers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 561 (i).
Timber Protection on Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 7070 (iv).
Timber Reserve, Township No. 19, Man., Settlement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) in Com. of Sup., 7030 (iv).
Tree Culture, and Mr. P. Stewart's Experiments: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7071 (iv).
Yoho Park Reserve, Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 7075 (iv).
Young, Mr. Thos., Political Interference *re* Man. Elections: Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) in Com. of Sup., 7063 (iv).
——— Resignation as Homestead Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 792 (i).
See 'Immigration,' 'Indians,' &c.
Internal Economy Com.'s Rep.: M. (Mr. Speaker) 8653 (v).
——— Report *re* Salaries, &c.: Read (Mr. Speaker) in Com. of Sup., 8985 (v).
International Channel in Upper Lakes: *See* 'Hay Lake,' &c.
Interprovincial Bridge Co. of N.B., incorp. B. No. 57 (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure) 1°*, 1297; 2°*, 1356 (i); in Com., 2369; 3°*, 2371 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 87).
Iona Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7642 (iv).
Irena Post Office, Change in Postmasters, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Broder) 2846 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties paid for 1904: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 8781 (v).
——— Bounty Payments to Dom. Steel Co., &c.: (Mr. Kendall) 5841 (iii).
See 'Bounties,' &c., 'Steel,' &c.
Iroquois Indian Reserve, Squatters' Claims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 988 (i).
Island Point, N.S., Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7642 (iv).
Italian Immigrants stranded in Montreal: Remarks (Mr. Wilson) 6931 (iv).
'Jack Pine,' &c., Rep. in Globe: Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Barker) 2459 (ii).
Jackson, J. B.: Appmt. as Commercial Agent in G. B., Evidence, &c.: Read (Mr. Bennett) on M. for Sup., 7798 (iv).
James Bay and Northern Lakes, Fishing Leases to Mr. Markey: Remarks (Mr. Boyd) in Com. of Sup., 8943 (v).
——— Agreement read (Mr. Haggart) 8952 (v).
James Bay, Fishing License to Arch. McNee: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
See 'Fisheries.'
James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 49 (Mr. McCool) 1°*, 1054; 2°*, 1338 (i); in Com. and 3°, 2153 (ii) (4 Edward VII, c. 88).
Jams, Adulteration of, Penalties *re*: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 8027 (v).
Janvrin's Island Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7642 (iv).
Japanese Trade in Agricultural Products: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4125 (iii).
Joint High Commission, Instructions issued to Members, &c.: Inquiry for Copies (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1355 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 3725, 3726 (ii).
——— Papers laid on Table, 5[illegible] (iii).
See 'Address,' &c.
Joint Stock Companies' Act Amt. B. No. 75 (Mr. Cowan) 1° m., 1781 (i).
Jonasson, Mr., Homestead Inspector, Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 792 (i).
Jones, Lt.-Col., Recommendation for Brigadier, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 5867 (iii).
Judges, Appointment of and Promises made to Members: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 7940 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 7943 (iv).

Judges appointed as Political Partisans : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6117 (iv).
See 'Members,' &c.
Judiciary of Ontario, Changes, Vacancies, &c.: 1904: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2374 (ii).
Jurisdiction of Ex. Court : *See* 'Exchequer Court,' &c.

JUSTICE :
Ad Hoc Judges : in Com. of Sup., 7939 (iv).
Administration of Justice, N. W. Ters.: in Com. of Sup., 7938 (iv).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7939 (iv).
——— Yukon : in Com. of Sup., 7945 (iv).
Archibald, Maj., *re* Parole System : Remarks (Mr. Logan) in Com. of Sup., 7955 (iv).
Brick-Making in Penitentiaries : in Com. of Sup., 7957 (iv).
Chaplains appointed to Penitentiaries, Protestant : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 7950 (iv).
Chief Justiceship, N.S., Name, Vacancy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 1667 (i).
Dodd, Judge, Salary, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7939 (iv).
Dominion Police Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 7949 (iv).
Dorchester Penitentiary : in Com. of Sup., 7953 (iv).
Exchequer Court Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 7939 (iv).
Judges appointed as Political Partisans : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6117 (iv).
Judges, Appointment of and Prmoises made to Members: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 7940 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 7943 (iv).
Judiciary of Ontario, Changes, Vacancies, &c., 1904: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2374 (ii).
Justice, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 985 (i).
——— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 430 (i), 7937, 7954 (iv).
Justice, Min. of, &c., Duties *re* Private Practice: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 431 (i).
Kingston Penitentiary, Chaplains, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7950 (iv).
Litigated Expenses, Justice Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 7960 (iv).
McCarthy, Osler & Co., Amounts paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 556 (i).
——— Fees to Mr. Osler, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 993 (i).
——— Payments to by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. McCarthy) 678 (i).
Nova Scotia Judgeships, Promises to Members *re* : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7940 (iv).
Parole System, Appointment of Officer : in Com. of Sup., 7954 (iv).

JUSTICE—*Con.*
Penitentiaries, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7950 (iv).
Private Secretaries, Justice Dept., Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 7937 (iv).
Registrars of N.W.T., Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 7023 (iv).
Russell, Mr., M.P., Judgeship *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 7940 (iv).
Salvation Army Officers and Parole System *re* Penitentiaries : Remarks (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. of Sup., 7954 (iv).
Solicitor General and Min. of Jus., Prof. Service and Private Practice : Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in Com. of Sup., 431 (i).
Statutes Consolidation Commission, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7958 (iv).
Supreme Court, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 7939 (iv).
Taschereau, E.R.A., Salary *re* Supreme Court: in Com. of Sup., 9039 (v).
Taschereau, Chief Justice : Ques. of Order *re* Attack by Mr. Hughes (Ont.) 9040; Bourinot Quoted *re* Impeachment of Judges (Mr. Fielding) 9041 (v).
Ticket-of-Leave System, Names of Prisoners, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 3766 (ii).
Yukon, Fees, Expenses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7949 (iv) .
——— Judges, Travelling Allowances, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7945 (iv).
——— Law Library, Purchase of Books : in Com. of Sup., 7949 (iv).
——— Officials, Living Allowance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7947 (iv).
——— Sheriff's Allowances, Fees, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7945 (iv).
Kamloops and Cariboo : *See* 'Boundary,' &c., 'Nicola.'
Katchawannoe Lake, Trent Canal Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7466 (iv).
Kensington Station, P.E.I. Ry., Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5986 (iii).
Keremeos Indian Reserve, B.C., Pets. *re* Sale : Ques. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1876 (i).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 60 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 1297; 2°*, 1356 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3354 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 89).
Kinkora Station P.E.I. Ry.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6231 (iv).
Kingston & Dominion Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 123 (Mr. Harty) M. to receive Pet. 2368, 2457; 1°*, 3719 (ii); 2°*, 4272; in Com., 5035; 3°*, 5035 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 90.)
Kingston Penitentiary, Chaplains, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7950 (iv).
Kingston Post Office, Investigation *re* Charges against J. L. Renton : Ques. (Mr. Broder) 2928 (ii).
Kingsville Pier, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7852 (iv).

Knight's Point Breakwater, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7740 (iv).

Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 47 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 1053; 2°*, 1337 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2153 (ii) (4 Edward VII, c. 91).

Labour Commission in B.C., Rep. of Commissioners, &c.: Inquiry for (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1054 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Smith, Vancouver) 992 (i).

Labour Commission, 1886, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, B.C.) 4823 (iii).

Labour, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir William Mulock) 204 (i).

'Labour Gazette,' Printing, Stationery, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9013 (v).

——— Correspondents, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 9013 (v).

Labour Union Labels B. No. 35 (Mr. Smith, Vancouver) 1° m., 867 (i); 2° m., 3829; ruled out by Mr. Speaker, 3830 (ii); Order dschgd., 4214 (iii).

——— B. No. 135 (Mr. Smith, Vancouver) in Com. on Res., 4706; 1°*, of B., 4706 (iii).

Labour Union Labels, bill, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 8260 (v).
See 'Fair Wage,' &c.

Lachine Canal, in Com. of Sup., 6864 (iv).

Lachine Canal, Authority given for Ry. Purposes: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6150 (iv).

——— cor. on behalf of municipality: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 5912 (iii).

——— lease to municipality: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7519 (iv).

——— Bridge over Atwater avenue: in Com. of Sup., 8374 (v).

——— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 7538 (iv).

——— Dredging Basins Nos. 1 and 2: in Com. of Sup., 6826 (iv).

——— Electric Generator: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).

——— Electric Installation: in Com. of Sup., 6826 (iv).

——— Employees, Delay in Paying: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7528 (iv).

——— Lock Gates: in Com. of Sup., 6868, 7536 (iv).

——— Locks Nos. 1 and 2, Repairing: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).

——— Pay of Labourers: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 5583 (iii).

——— Rebuilding old Locks: in Com. of Sup., 6867 (iv).

——— Slope Walls: in Com. of Sup., 6825 (iv).

——— Water Service *re* Fires: in Com. of Sup., 7534 (iv).

——— Widening Lower Basin Road: in Com. of Sup., 8381 (v).

'Lady Laurier' and Govt. Strs., Delay in Payment of Crew: Ques. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 7224 (iv).

'Lake Champlain' SS., Cowl Ventilation, Examination of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 1357 (i).

Lake Dauphin, Lowering of Water: in Com. of Sup., 7876 (iv).

Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s B. No. 105 (Mr. Sutherland, Essex) M. to receive Pet., 2601, 2926; 1°*, 3016; 2°*, 3127; in Com., and 3°*, 3758 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 92.)

Lakefield, Trent Canal, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7466 (iv).

Lake St. John, Dredging, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7775 (iv).

Lake Superior and Georgian Bay, Winter Navigation: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 1209 (i).
See 'Ice Breakers,' 'Hay Lake,' &c.

Lamontagne & Co., Goods purchased, Tender, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 1877 (i).

Landon, J. A., Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2376 (ii).

Land Scrip, N.W.M. Police, for 1885 Rebellion: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7965 (iv).
See 'Half-breeds,' &c.

Land Titles Act (1894) Amt. B. No. 158 (Mr. Sifton) 1° m., 6874 (iv); 2°*, 8712; in Com., 8712; 3°*, 8716 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 19).

Laprairie Floods, Damages, &c., Protection *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monet) 1142 (i).
See 'Floods,' &c.

Laprairie Ice Piers, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7775 (iv).

L'Ardoise Breakwater Extension, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7642 (iv).

Lardo to Upper Arrow Lake Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 8825 (v).

Larry's River Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7642 (iv).

Laschinger, Mr., Appnmt. as Asst. Sec.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5647, 5651 (iii).

Lead contained in Lead Bearing Ores, Bounty on, Amt. B. No. 169 (Sir Richard Cartwright) Res. prop., 8532; in Com. on Res., 8711; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 8712 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 21).

Lead Bearing Ores, Bounty Amt. B. No. 127 (Sir Richard Cartwright) Res. prop., 2685; in Com. on Res., 3875; 1°*, 3876 (ii); 2°*, 4056; in Com., 4056; 3°*, 4056 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 20).

——— B. No. 175 (Mr. Fielding) 1° m., 9053; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 9053 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 22).

Legaré, Jean Louis, Compensation *re* Removal of Sitting Bull to U.S.: Remarks (Mr. Scott) in Com. of Sup., 6964 (iv).

Leger and Wood, Messrs. Emplymt. on I.C.R., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, B.C.) 3437 (ii).
See 'I.C.R.,' &c.

Lemieux, Mr., Sol. Gen.: *See* 'Sol. General.'
Letter Carriers, Cor, *re* P.O. Act: Statement (Sir William Mulock) 5845 (iii).
------ Grievances, Pets. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Puttee) 2555 (ii).
——— Pay on Sick Leave: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 6888 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Clarke) in Com. on P.O. Bill, 8033 (v).
——— Pressure *re* accepting new Scheme: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 5754 (iii).
——— Promotions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5853 (iii).
——— Toronto, Canvassing for Pet. *re* P.O. Act, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 4414 (iii).
Letter Postage, Reduction: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 5726 (iii).
See 'Post Office.'
Leslie, Capt., Wrecking Plant: Remarks (Mr. Reid, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 7462 (iv).
Lévis, I.C.R., Station Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5921, 5951 (iii).
Lévis, P.O., Site, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 667 (i).
——— Ry. Construction: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 7468 (iv).
Lewes River Dredging, Yukon: in Com. of Sup., 7879 (iv).
Library, H. of C., Better Lighting, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7621 (iv).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8 (i).
——— Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 168 (i).
Lievre & Ottawa Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 41 (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure) 1°*, 1053; 2°*, 1337 (i).
Life Insurance *re* P. O. Employees: in Com. of Sup., 5847 (iii).
Life Saving Awards: in Com. of Sup., 5258 (iii).
Life Saving Stations SS. Service at B.C.: Remarks (Mr. Earle) in Com. of Sup., 4200 (iii).
Lighthouse Agencies and Rents: in Com. of Sup., 5804 (iii).
Lighthouse Board, Organization of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 5327 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 5804 (iii), 7597 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: M. (Mr. Hackett) that Com. rise, 5322, 5328; Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker, Dep.) 5322, 5328 (iii).
———Pamphlet by Min. of Mar.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5003 (iii).
——— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5300 (iii).
Lighthouse Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 5813 (iii).
Lighthouse Keepers, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 5324 (iii).
Lighthouses on St. Lawrence River, Changes to Acetylene Gas, Notification to Keepers: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 6681 (iv).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Lighthouse Keepers on St. Lawrence, Dismissals, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5029 (iii).
Lighthouse Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7597 (iv).
Lighthouses illuminated with Acetylene Gas, Location of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 2186 (ii).
Lighting the St. Lawrence River, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 8932 (v).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Lindoe Island Light, Dismissal of Mr. Wallace: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5811 (iii).
Lindsay, Bobcaygeon, &c., Ry. Crossing over Emily Creek, Protest *re*: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 1134 (i).
Lindsay, J. B., Lease of Grazing Lands: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7221 (iv).
Lingan Beach Protection, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).
Liquor Permits issued in Yukon, Names of Parties, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bennett) 1880 (i).
Liquor Traffic amongst the Indians, Suppression, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5858 (iii).
Litigated Expenses, Justice Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 7960 (iv).
See 'Justice,' &c.
Little Current Channel Improvements, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7852 (iv).
Little Metis, I.C.R., Station and New Road: in Com. of Sup., 5953 (iii).
Little Rapid, Removal of Obstructions in Channel: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 5285 (iii).
Live Stock Association Law: Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. on B. 151, 7237 (iv).
Live Stock Exhibitions: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7406 (iv).
Live Stock exported to U.S. by F. H. Page, Cor., &c.: Read (Mr. Sproule) on M. for Sup., 8903 (v).
See 'Horses,' &c.
Livingstone's Cove Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).
Lobster Canneries, Established in P.E.I., Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2185 (ii).
——— Canning Licenses, P.E.I., Official Letter from Min.: M. for Copies of Pets.* (Mr. Lefurgey) 3771 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. Lefurgey) to adjn., 4669 (iii).
——— Fisheries on Atlantic Coast, Investigation, O.Cs. Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ganong) 561 (i).
——— total expense: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 553 (i).

Lobster Fishing, Payments of Bounties *re* : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5020, 5043 (iii).
——— Packers, &c., Prices paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2185 (ii).
——— Fishing, Extension of Close Season : Pet. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bell) 4927 (iii).
——— Fishing Regulations *re* : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5069 (iii).
Lobster Hatchery in Bay of Fundy: Remarks (Mr. Ganong) in Com. of Sup., 7587 (iv).
Lobster Propagation, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5066 (iii).
——— Propagation in Pacific Waters, Experiments by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Morrison) 2373 (ii).
Locomotives and Rolling Stock, Purchase in Canada or imported : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. on Ry. Res., 8829 (v).
London Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 602 (i).
Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry. Co., Attack by Mr. Scott, on Mr. Osler : Personal Explanation (Mr. Osler) 2849 ; Letter of Mr. Kingsmill : Read 2850 (ii).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal, Payment of Militia: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 401 (i).
Longueuil P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 668 (i).
'Lord Strathcona' Wrecking Plant Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7461 (iv).
Lotbinière Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7776 (iv).
Lumber Combine in N. W. T., Rep. of Commission, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Douglas) 556 (i).
Lumber Industry in B.C., and Tariff Readjustment : M. (Mr. Morrison) to adjn., 2558 (ii).
——— Pet. *re* circulated privately (read) 2560-61, (ii).
——— Letter *re* Protest, sent to Min. of Customs (read) 2563 (ii).
Lunenburg County, Dredging, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Kaulbach) in Com. of Sup., 7886 (iv).
——— Fish Hatcheries : Remarks (Mr. Kaulbach) in Com. of Sup., 7587 (iv).
'Lurcher' Lightship : in Com. of Sup., 7597 (iv).
——— Designer's Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 2377 (ii).
——— Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 1140 (i).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5831 (iii).
Maclean, Lt.-Col., Recommendation as Brigadier, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 5867 (iii).
Macleod Court House : in Com. of Sup., 699 (i).
Macoun, Messrs., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 988 (i).
——— Rep. *re* Agricultural Com.: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 7347 (iv).
——— ques. of order : Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 7348 (iv).
Macoun, Mr., Rep. of Peace River District, Distribution, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7201 (iv).
McArthur, Rev. Mr., Claims for Damages *re* Cardinal Canal : Remarks (Mr. Reid, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 6307 (iv).
See 'Canals—Cardinal,' &c.
McCarthy, Osler & Co., Amounts paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 556 (i).
——— Fees to Mr. Osler, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 993 (i).
——— Payments to by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. McCarthy) 678 (i).
See 'Midland Water Lots,' &c.
McCreary, Mr. W. F., late M.P., Decease of : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2598 (ii).
——— Transfer of Body to Winnipeg, &c., and Private Cars : Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 7492 (iv).
McGee, D'Arcy, Erection of a Monument to : Ques. (Mr. Hackett) 3942 (iii).
McIntosh, Mr. John, late M.P., Decease of : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6546 (iv).
McLaren's Creek, Roadway Construction : Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 7488 (iv).
McNair's Cove Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).
McNee, Arch., Fishing License : *See* 'James Bay,' 'Fishing,' &c.
Mabou Creamery, N.S., Cost of Building, Machinery, &c.: M. for Copies of Cor.* (Mr. Bell) 3771 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Bell) 2806 (ii).
Magdalen Island and Mainland SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7444 (iv).
Magdalen Islands, Breakwater, Piers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7779 (iv).
Magnetic Observatory, Toronto : Remarks (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 5836 (iii).
Magog P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 680 (i).
Mail Bag Repairs : Remarks (Mr. Bell) in Com. of Sup., 5756 (iii).
Mail Contract, Allan Strs.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6162 (iv).
Mail Contracts between Can. and G.B., Contracts, &c. (M. for copies*) 428 (i).
Mail Contracts, River John : in Com. of Sup., 5746 (iii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Mail Delivery delayed by Broken Bridges on Qu'Appelle Ry. : Tels. read (Mr. Davis) 2359 ; Rep. of Controller : Read (Sir William Mulock) 2364 (ii).
Mails sent via New York, Contract with Messrs. Allan : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6184, 6200; Memo. read (Sir Richard Cartwright) 6202 (iv).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6162 (iv).
Mail Service, Bruce County, Complaints, &c. : M. for Copies (Mr. Donnelly) 589 (i).

Mail Service from Lévis to Sherbrooke, *re* Quebec Central Ry., Letter from Commercial Travellers' Association: Read (Mr. Morin) 9006 (v).
Mail Service P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 5744 (iii).
——— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5685 (iii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Mail Steamships, Average Speed per hour: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 6546 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 6154, 7444 (iv).
Mail Subsidy between Can. and G.B.: in Com. of Sup., 6154 (iv).
See 'Trade and Commerce,' &c.
Mail Subsidies, Montreal and British Ports: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 249 (i).
Main-a-Dieu Breakwater Extension, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).
Maintenance of Way Men, Brotherhood Applications *re* Rates paid to I.C.R. Employees: Res. read (Mr. Boyd) 5909 (iii).
Major's Hill Park, Ottawa: in Com of Sup., 7620 (iv).
Malignant Cove, Piers, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).
Manchester SS. Liners, Contract with Govt. of Can.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 1881 (i).
Manchester Line SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 7446 (iv).
Manilla Fibre used in Binder Twine: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 8962 (v).
Manitoba and Keewatin Ry. Co.'s B. No. 52 (Mr. McCreary) 1°*, 1132; 2°*, 1338 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3480 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 93).
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 18 (Mr. McCreary) 1°*, 396; 2°*, 549; in Com. and 3°*, 1586 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 94).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Copy received from Man. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Boyd) 7440 (iv).
——— Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 4999 (iii).
See 'House of Commons.'
Mann, Andrew Wm., Relief B. No. 138 (Mr. Macdonald) M. to receive Pet., 3845 (ii); 1°*, 4997; 2°*, 5073; in Com., and 3°*, 5866 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 95).
Maps, Printing and Lithographing: in Com. of Sup., 7079 (iv).
M.C.B. Couplers on P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 5998 (iii).
See 'I.C.R.,' &c.
Marconi Station, Glace Bay, Money expended for Operation: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 792 (i).
Marconi Telegraph System: in Com. of Sup., 7896 (iv).
——— Contract, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5834 (iii).
——— Installation in Govt. Steamers: Remarks (Mr. Mackinnon) in Com. of Sup., 8919 (v).
Marconi Telegraph System, Installation in Gulf: Remarks (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 5829 (iii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Margaretsville Harbour, Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).
Marine Engineers' Bill: *See* 'Steamboat Inspection.'

MARINE:

'Aberdeen,' Str., Boiler Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 217 (i).
——— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 8921 (v).
Accidents in St. Lawrence Channel, Defective Lighting, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5027 (iii).
——— Rep. from Lloyd's List: Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 5820 (iii).
See 'St. Lawrence,' &c.
Acetylene Gas for Buoy Service, Purchase, Contracts, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5301 (iii).
——— Cost of Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii).
——— General Statement (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 5813 (iii).
——— Lighthouses on St. Lawrence River, Changes to Acetylene Gas, Notification to Keepers: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 6681 (iv).
——— Use for Cold Storage *re* Fisheries: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7589 (iv).
——— Use for Lighthouses, Information *re* Contracts, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5029 (iii).
——— Use for Lighthouses, Location of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 2186 (ii).
——— Reps. asked for (Mr. Haggart) 7597 (iv).
Acton, J. A., Lighthouse Keeper at Burnt Island, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2377 (ii).
Aids to Navigation in St. Lawrence Route: in Com. of Sup., 5813 (iii).
Alberton, P.E.I., Buoy Service, Contract *re*: Remarks (Mr. Hackett) in Com. of Sup., 5345 (iii).
Bay of Fundy Lights: in Com. of Sup., 5805 (iii).
Bernier, Capt., Detention of Str. 'Gauss' by German Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 2284 (ii).
See 'Gauss.'
Marine Biological Station: in Com. of Sup., 5289 (iii).
Bronte Harbour Light: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 5825 (iii).
Burnt Island Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2377 (ii).
Campaign Literature *re* St. Lawrence Route: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5003 (ii).

MARINE—*Con.*

C. P. R. Steamers and Insurance Rates *re* St. Lawrence Route: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5819 (iii).

Carbide Supply, Patents *re*: Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 5307 (iii).

——— Supply for Lighting Service, Contracts, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5301 (iii).

Casualties in St. Lawrence, Rep. of Commissioners *re* Pilots: Remarks (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 5832, 5835 (iii).

———Rep. from Lloyd's List: Read (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 5820 (iii).

Chew, Manley and Hope Island Timber Lease: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5240 (iii).

'Druid,' Govt. Str., Expenditure *re* Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 5202 (iii).

Engineers, Draughtsmen, &c., for Lighthouse Service: in Com. of Sup., 5833 (iii).

False Ducks Lighthouse: in Com. of Sup., 5806 (iii).

Fiddler's Elbow, Light on Lindoe Island: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5811 (iii).

Fog Alarms, Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 5838 (iii).

Gananoque Lighthouse Keepers, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2376 (ii).

Gas Buoys in St. Lawrence Route: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iii).

See 'Acetylene.'

'Gauss,' Str., Expenditure *re*, and Appnmt. of Crew: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5210, 5221 (iii).

——— Rep. of Capt. Spain: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5285 (iii).

Georgian Bay Gas Lights: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 5831 (iii).

Govt. Steamers, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5199, 5229 (iii), 8919 (v).

'Gulnare,' Str., Employed in Tidal Service: in Com. of Sup., 5287 (iii).

Halifax Harbour Lighting System: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 5831 (iii).

Hope Island, Timber Cutting by Manley Chew: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5236 (iii).

——— Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2808 (ii).

Hydrographic Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 5836 (iii).

Ice-Breaking Steamers for Georgian Bay. Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 8920 (v).

Insurance Rates *re* St. Lawrence Steamers: Remarks (Mr. Richardson) in Com. of Sup., 5819 (iii).

'Lady Laurier,' and Govt. Strs., Delay in Payment of Crew: Ques. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 7224 (iv).

MARINE—*Con.*

Landon, J. A., Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2376 (ii).

Life-Saving Awards: in Com. of Sup., 5258 (iii).

Life Saving Stations SS. Service at B.C.: Remarks (Mr. Earle) in Com. of Sup., 4200 (iii).

Lighthouse, Agencies and Rents: in Com. of Sup., 5804 (iii).

——— Board, Organization of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 5327 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 5804 (iii), 7597 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service: M. (Mr. Hackett) that Com. rise, 5322, 5328; Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker, Dep.) 5322, 5328 (iii).

——— Pamphlet by Min. of Mar.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5003 (iii).

——— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5300 (iii).

Lighthouse, Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 5813 (iii).

——— Keepers on St. Lawrence, Dismissals, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5029 (iii).

——— (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 5324 (iii).

——— Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7597 (iv).

Lighting the St. Lawrence River, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup, 8932 (v).

Lindoe Island Light, Dismissal of Mr. Wallace: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5811 (iii).

'Lurcher' Lightship: in Com. of Sup., 5831 (iii), 7597 (iv).

——— Designer's Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 2377 (ii).

——— Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 1140 (i).

Magnetic Observatory, Toronto: Remarks (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 5836 (iii).

Marconi Wireless Stations, Contract, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5834 (iii).

——— Glace Bay, Money expended for Operation: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 792 (i).

——— Installation in Govt. Steamers: Remarks (Mr. Mackinnon) in Com. of Sup., 8919 (v).

——— Installation in Gulf: Remarks (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 5829 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5000 (iii), 8918 (v).

——— Chief Engineer, Duties *re*: M. for Copies of O.C. (Mr. Northrup) 1882 (i).

Marine Hospitals: in Com. of Sup., 5837 (iii).

Marine Supplies purchased in Quebec, Names of Grocers: Remarks (Mr. Casgrain) in Com. of Sup., 5235 (iii).

MARINE—*Con.*
Masters and Mates, Examination of, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5219 (iii), 7595 (iv).
——— Fees for Examinations : Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) in Com. of Sup., 5806 (iii).
Napanee River, Buoy Service, Contract with Mr. Mowers, Cor., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 5233, 5335 (iii).
See 'Public Works,' &c.
Naval Militia and School of Navigation : in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii), 8931 (v).
——— Establishment in Lunenburg County : Remarks (Mr. Kaulbach) in Com. of Sup., 7595 (iv).
Obstructions in Navigable Waters, Removal, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5284 (iii).
Ocean and River Service : in Com. of Sup., 5199, 5258, 5284, 5300 (iii), 7594 (iv).
——— Gratuities, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8924 (v).
Ottawa Carbide Co.'s Contract with Govt.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5301 (iii).
Pilots on St. Lawrence Route, Certified, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) in Com. of Sup., 5830 (iii).
——— Training, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 5029 (iii).
Pointe aux Anglais Lightkeeper, Duties, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 7225 (iv).
Prescott Carbide Factory, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5302 (iii).
Prescott Lighthouse, Construction of, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7597 (iv).
Prescott Property purchased by Marine Dept.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 8918 (v).
Prescott Workshops, Removal from Morrisburg, Rep. *re* : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 8932 (v).
Public Works and Marine Dept., Transfer, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 625 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
'Quadra,' Govt. Str., Charges by Crew of Ill-treatment : Ques. (Mr. Earle) 8255 (v).
Red Island Lightships, Pet. *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com. of Sup., 5323 (iii).
St. John Marine Hospital : in Com. of Sup., 5837 (iii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel : in Com. of Sup., 7599 (iv).
——— Buoys : in Com. of Sup., 5804 (iii).
——— Damages to Dredge 'J. I. Tarte' : in Com. of Sup., 8021 (iv).
——— Defective Guides : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5026 (iii).
——— Distribution of Pamphlet, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 550 (i).
——— History : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 7613 (iv).
——— Insurance Rates, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 7607 (iv).
MARINE—*Con.*
St. Lawrence Channel, Lighting : in Com. of Sup., 5810 (iii).
——— change to acetylene gas : in Com. of Sup., 5813 (iii).
——— List of Dredges, Plant, &c.: Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 7600 (iv).
——— O.C. *re* Transfer of Duties from Public Works to Marine Dept.: Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 7599 (iv).
St. Roch Traverse Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 4274 (iii).
Scientific Institutions : in Com. of Sup., 5836 (iii).
Shipwrecks and Sub-Marine Signals : Remarks (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) in Com. of Sup., 5829 (iii).
'Stanley,' Str., Removal from Summerside Route : Remarks (Mr. Hackett) in Com. of Sup., 5202 (iii).
Steamboat Inspection and Fog Alarms : in Com. of Sup., 5838 (iii).
Submarine Signals, Purchase by Govt. in Boston : Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 2187 (ii).
See 'Shipwrecks.'
Summerside Harbour Light : in Com. of Sup., 5320 (iii).
Thousand Island Shoals, Buoy Service : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5346 (iii).
Tidal Service : in Com. of Sup., 5287 (iii).
Toronto Harbour, Eastern Gap, Complaints *re* Bells and Bell Buoys : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 4826 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 4684 (iii).
Wrecking Investigations, Expenditure *re* : in Com. of Sup., 5258 (iii).
Wrecks and Rivers, Removal of : in Com. of Sup., 8927 (v).
'Maritime Express,' I.C.R.: *See* 'I.C.R.'
Mar. Provs., Expenditure *re* I.C.R. and Public Works : Remarks (Mr. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 8371 (v).
See 'Public Works—Harbours and Rivers,' &c.
Markey, Mr. F., Fishing Leases in Northern Lakes : Remarks (Mr. Boyd) in Com. of Sup., 8943 (v).
——— Lease read (Mr. Haggart) 8952 (v).
——— *See* 'Fishing Licenses,' 'Winnipeg and Nelson River.'
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. No. 4 (Mr. Lancaster) 1°*, 10; on Order for 2°, 427 (i); 2° m., 3796 (ii); (remarks) 5166 ; 2° Neg. (Y. 16; N. 39) 5181 (iii).
Masters and Mates, Examination of, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5219 (iii), 7595 (iv).
——— Fees for Examinations : Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) in Com. of Sup., 5806 (iii).
Maynooth Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 5841 (iii).

Meaford Harbour Breakwater, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7852 (iv).

Medical Attendance, Indians, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 5854 (iii).
See 'Indians,' &c.

Melbourne Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).

Members appointed to Offices under the Crown: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 1153 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 992 (i).
See 'Judges,' &c.

Members introduced, 7 (i).

Members named as Lt. Governors: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 213 (i).

Members, New, Certificates of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).

Memorandum of Mr. Blair: *See* 'G.T.P.,' &c.

Merchant Marine Ensign: *See* 'Canadian Ensign.'

Merritt, Maj. Gen., Appnmt. gazetted, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 5073 (iii).

Mess. from His Ex.: in Com. of Sup., 8387 (v).

Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 6, 204, 1874 (i), 5733 (iii), 7530 (iv).

—— Prorogation, 9078 (v).

—— Suppl. Estimates, 1904: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 3765 (ii).

Meteghan Cove, Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).

Methylated Spirits: in Com. of Sup., 3923 (ii).

Metric System, Purchase of Instruments: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).
See 'Inland Revenue,' &c.

Michaud, A., Gratuity to: in Com. of Sup., 8924 (v).

Middle River Shear Dam, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).

Midland Dock, Rental, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 7764 (iv).

Midland Harbour Wharf, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7853 (iv).

Midland Mercantile & Trading Co., Letter from Mr. Gelinas (read) *re* Rental of Dock (Mr. Bennett) 7764 (iv).

Midland Water Lots, Ques. of Priv. (Mr. McCarthy) 364 (i).

Milford Ry. Accident, N.S., Damages, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup.,., 6140 (iv).

Military College, Kingston: in Com. of Sup., 600 (i).

Military Experience *re* Dundonald Affairs: Personal Explanation (Mr. Fisher) 5844 (iii).
See 'Dundonald, Lord.'

'Military Gazette' (Canadian) *re* Govt. Patronage: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 7902 (iv).

Militia Act Amt. B. No. 5 (Sir Frederick Borden) 1° m., 205; Res. prop., 253, 598; 2°, and in Com., 255; in Com. on Res., *re* Pay, 477, 1781 (i), 2685, 2906, 2918 (ii), 6365, 6467 (iv); Order for Com., 8066; in Com., 8066; 3° m., 8155; in Com., 8266; 3° m., 8288 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 23).

In Committee:

Active Service, Calling for Defence of Canada, 8067 (v).
Active Service in or out of Can., 6486 (iv).
Advisory Council, 6531 (iv).
Annual Drill, 6462 (iv).
Army Act, 6501 (iv).
Calling of Parlt. in Emergency, 6374 (iv).
Command in Case of Riot, 6512 (iv).
Command in Chief of Forces, 6402 (iv).
Command vested in King, 264 (i), 6379; B. N.A. Act, &c. (remarks) 6402 (iv).
Commissioned, &c., Officers, 6455 (iv).
Compensation for Land taken, 6426 (iv).
Constitution of Active Militia, Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 6435 (iv).
Defence of Canada and the Empire, 6374 (iv).
Director General's Pay, 598 (i).
District Officer, Pay and Allowance, 6454 (iv).
'Emergency' Orders, 6373-4 (iv).
Exemptions from Active Service, 6426 (iv).
General Orders issued, 6401 (iv).
G. O. C., &c., 6378 (iv).
Honorary Rank on Retirement, 6456 (iv).
Inspector General, 6526 (iv).
Military Buildings, Control of, 264 (i), 6422 (iv).
Minister's Responsibilities, 6382 (iv).
Penalties and Offences, &c., 6506 (iv).
Period of Service, 6436 (iv).
Period of Service in Time of War, 6500 (iv).
Permanent Force, 6453 (v).
Property, Conversion of, in Emergency, 6423 (iv).
Provisions for Families of Soldiers killed, 6502 (iv).
Public Works for Defence, 6422 (iv).
Militia Quartering, 6505 (iv).
Rank of Officers, 6456 (iv).
Scheme of Organization for Can., 6365 (iv).
Special Constables, 6525 (iv).
Transportation Requisites, 6505 (iv).
Uniform and Equipment, 6458 (iv).
See also Bill 5, for details.

MILITIA:

Armouries, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 9020 (v).

Arsenal, Establishment at Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 8385 (v).

Camps, Complaints *re* Barrack Ground, P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. Hackett) 5572 (iii).

'Canadian Military Gazette' *re* Govt. Patronage: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 7902 (iv).

Cavalry Regiments, Number of Squadrons: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 8479 (v).

'C' Battery, Arrears of Pay, Issue of Notices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ontario) 2187 (ii).

MILITIA—*Con.*

Chatham Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 9020 (v).
Clothing: in Com. of Sup., 8385 (v).
Contracts let without Tenders (remarks) in Com. on Militia B. (Mr. Fowler) 6385 (iv).
'Corps' Interpretation of in Militia Bill: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 8027 (v).
Dress Regulation, Reimbursement to Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bell) 1665 (i).
Dundonald, Earl of, Dismissal by Govt., Rep. of Speech at Military Dinner, Montreal, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Read (Mr. W. S. Maclaren) 4491 (iii).
——— Documents and Cor. referred to by Min. of Ag.: Inquiry for (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 4685 (iii).
——— 'Exploiting by Tories,' Speech of Mr. Lemieux in Eng.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 7082 (iv).
——— Farewell to, Adjournment of Hse.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7542 (iv).
——— Further Cor., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 4926 (iii).
——— Further Papers laid on Table, 4995, 5759 (iii).
——— Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 5182 (iii).
——— memorandum *re* Col. Smart's letter: Papers laid on Table (Mr. Fisher) 5276; production of confidential letters, &c., 5276 (iii).
——— Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Letter in English Press *re*: Read (Mr. Clarke) 6014-15 (iv).
——— Govt. Policy *re*: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 6551; Statement (Mr. Sifton) 6552 (iv).
——— inquiry for copy (Mr. Clarke) 6681 (iv).
——— O.C. *re* (remarks) 4823; O.C. and Cor. laid on Table: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to print, 4924 (ii).
——— Production of Original Gazette (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5455 (iii).
——— Personal Explanation *re* Military Experience, &c.: (Mr. Fisher) 5844 (iii).
——— Reps. of Canadian Associated Press: Remarks (Mr. Barker) 8659 (v).
——— Speech *re* Political Interference: Personal Explanation (Mr. Fisher) 4580, 4603; Memorandum from G.O.C.: Read (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 4596; Cor. between G.O.C., Govt. and Col. Smart: Read (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 4599 (iii).
Essex Fusiliers at St. Louis Exposition, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': M. to adjn. (Mr. Cowan) 1782 (i).
Fenian Raid and Instructions to Col. Otter: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 8388 (v).
Gregory, Col., Resignation *re* Political Interference, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 4590 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*

Gregory, Col., Extension of Time *re* Militia Service: Personal Explanation (Mr. German) 4666 (iii).
——— Letter read (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for Sup., 7680 (iv).
——— Original Gazette: laid on Table (Sir Frederick Borden, King's) 7785 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 6013, 6023, 6263 (iv).
——— Incomplete Cor.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 7023 (iv).
Headgear, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 1666 (i).
Horses bought by Imp. Govt. from Canada, Forfeits, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 8917 (v).
Imperial Service, Commissions alloted to Can. Militia, Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 1358 (i).
Jones, Lt.-Col., Recommendation for Brigadier, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 5867 (iii).
Kingston Military College: in Com. of Sup., 600 (i).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal, Payment of Militia: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 401 (i).
Maclean, Lt.-Col., Recommendation as Brigadier, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 5867 (iii).
Merritt, Maj., Appnmt. Gazetted, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 5073 (iii).
Militia during Active Service, Calling for Defence of Canada: in Com. on Bill, 8067 (v).
Militia Monuments: in Com. of Sup., 9033 (v).
Militia, Promotions and Political Interference (remarks) in Com. on Militia Bill, 6382 (iv).
——— Salaries and Wages: in Com. of Sup., 3909 (ii).
Mulloy, Pte., Pension *re* S. A. Services: Remarks (Mr. Broder) 8902 (v).
See 'S.A. War,' &c.
Musketry School at Ottawa, Cor. *re* Expenditure at Camp, Laid on Table, 6969 (iv).
——— Par. *re* sending Soldiers Home: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 9034 (v).
——— Private Soldiers employed on Fatigue Duty: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 7090, 7096 (iv).
——— Taxes *re* Maintenance of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 6550 (iv).
Ninth Regiment, Resignation, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Casgrain) 3771 (ii).
——— Inquiry for further Cor.: (Mr. Casgrain) 4415 (iii).
Ottawa Garrison, Application for new Drill Hall: Ques. (Mr. Birkett) 3389 (ii).
Otter, Col., Orders issued *re* Fenian Raid: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 8388 (v).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Pay. Militia Regulations *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5271 (iii).
Regulations, Remuneration *re* Camp Attendance : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 3755 (ii).
Rifle Association Grants : in Com. of Sup., 8385 (v).
Ross Rifle, Contract, Tests, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 6886 (iv).
Ross Rifle Factory, Application for Land on Cove Fields : Ques. (Mr. Bell) 2378 (ii).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Bell) 2847 (ii).
St. John Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 9019 (v).
——— Drill Hall and Militia Services : Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2556 (ii).
St. Thomas Military Camp, District No. 1, Total Expenditure : Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 7226 (iv).
S. A. Medals presented by King, Application by Canadians, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 2375 (ii).
S.A. War, Pensions to Disabled Can. Soldiers: M. (Mr. Broder) for Cor., 4695 (iii).
Sydney Riots, Withdrawal of Militia : Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 6788; Statement (Sir Frederick Borden) 6806 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Cor. (Mr. Kendall) 6553 (iv).
Taschereau, Sir Elzear, Remarks in England *re* Lord Dundonald and Tory Press : Cable read (Mr. Clarke) 7020 (iv).
——— Accuracy of Rep. of London Cable, Govtl. Action : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 7441 (iv).
——— Cablegram in Montreal 'Star' : Read (Mr. Clarke) 7361, 7363 (iv).
Truro Armoury, Govt. Policy *re* : Ques. (Mr. Gourley) 8389 (v).
Valleyfield Strike, Payments to Militia : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 250 (i), 3128, 3312 (ii).
Veterans' Association, Land Grant in N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 8532 (v).
Whitley, Lt.-Col., Tel. to from Hon. Mr. Fisher, *re* Command, &c.: M. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) to adjn., 6875 (iv).
Woodstock, N.B., Drill Hall, Purchase of Site : Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2928 (ii).
Mill Street Paving, Lachine Canal : in Com. of Sup., 8381 (v).
See 'Canals—Lachine,' &c.
Milne, Customs Collector, Victoria, Decease, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Earle) 558 (i).
Minnedosa Public Building: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 688 (i).
Mines Regulation Act, B.C., Disallowance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Vancouver) 988 (i).
Minor Revenue, Ordnance Lands : in Com. of Sup., 4092 (iii).
Mint, Royal, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 247 (i).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa,' &c.
Missassagua Indians of Alnwick, Compensation *re* Lands : in Com. of Sup., 9018 (v).
See 'Indians.'
Mitchell Station, Diversion of Line, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 8350 (v).
Models : *See* 'Patent.'
Molasses, Free Entry: in Com. on Ways and Means, 8894 (v).
Monarch Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. No. 69 (Mr. Osler) 1°*, 1450; 2°*, 1824 (i); in Com., 3479; 3°*, 3480 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 96).
Montague Bridge Harbour Master, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4413 (iii).
Montague Bridge Surveys, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 6011 (iii).
See 'I.C.R.' &c.
Montreal and Atlantic Ry., Operations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Mignault) 6149 (iv).
Montreal Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 682 (i).
——— Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 680 (i).
Montreal Harbour as a Free Port: M. (Mr. Kemp) for Copy of Letter of Hon. Mr. Tarte to Prime Min., 5092 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Kemp) 3906 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Board, Res. from Chamber of Commerce *re* Quarrels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gervais) 3131 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commission, B. wthdn. (Mr. Préfontaine) 3846 (ii).
Montreal Harbour, Removal of Obstruction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8927 (v).
Montreal, Nipissing & Georgian Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 109 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 3016; 2°*, 3127 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4272 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 97).
Montreal, Ottawa & Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. No. 12 (Mr. Mackie) 1°*, 396; 2°*, 549; in Com., 985 ; 3°*, 986 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 98).
Montreal Park & Island Ry. Co.'s B. No. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) 1°*, 1297; 2°*, 1356 (i).
Montreal Pilot Commissioner's Court : in Com. of Sup., 5835 (iii).
Montreal Post Office, Complaints *re* Delivery, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 5698 (iii).
——— Extra Work and Pay of Employees: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 552 (i).
——— Increased Accommodation : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 551 (i).
Montreal Terminal Ry. Co.'s B. No. 120 (Mr. Demers, St. John & Iberville) 1°*, 3719 (ii); 2°*, 4272 (iii); M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 6785; in Com., and 3°*, 7160 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 99).
Montreal Turnpike Trust and Westmount, Purchase, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Rivet) 3946 (iii).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness : M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 560 (i).
——— Negotiations *re* Abolition : Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 562 (i).
Monuments, Militia: in Com. of Sup., 9033 (v).
Monuments, National: in Com. of Sup., 7970 (iv).
Monuments on Parliament Hill, Erection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hackett) 3942 (iii).
Moore, Jennie Davison, Relief, B. No. 139 (Mr. Macdonald) 1°*, 4997; 2°*, 5073; in Com., and 3°*, 5866 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 100).
Moosejaw P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 699 (i).
Morning Sittings: *See* 'Business of the Hse.'
Morrison's Point Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7644 (iv).
Motions to Adjn., Mr. Speaker's Rulings *re* : Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1212 (i).
See 'House of Commons,' &c.
Mounted Police : *See* 'N. W. M. P.' &c.
Mud Island Shoals, Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6348 (iv).
Mulloy, Pte., Pension *re* S. A. Services: Remarks (Mr. Broder) 4695 (iii), 8902 (v).
Municipal Ownership *re* Railways, Express Cos. and Telephones, &c.: on M. for 2° of B. No. 6, 3797 (ii).
——— Remarks in Com. on Ottawa Electric Bill, 4218 (iii).
Murray Bay and Rivière Ouelle, Summer Service, SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7457 (iv).
——— Winter Service Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iv).
Murray Bay Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7779 (iv).
Murray Canal, Supt., Payments to : Remarks (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. of Sup., 7525, 7527 (iv).
Murray Harbour and Belfast Ry., P.E.I., Cost of Construction : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lefurgey) 1880 (i).
Murray Harbour Branch Ry., P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 5999 (iii).
——— Amounts expended : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2186 (ii).
——— Construction from Southport, &c., Memorials, Surveys, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lefurgey) 1880 (i).
——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3754 (ii), 4054, 4580 (iii).
——— letter of Aud. Gen.: Read (Mr. Lennox) on Conc., 6682 (iv).
——— Completion, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hackett) in Com. of Sup., 6241 (iv).
——— Cost of first eleven Miles : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1210 (i).
——— corrected answer (Mr. Emmerson) 1669 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Rolling Stock, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 991 (ii).
Murray Harbour Branch, P.E.I. Ry., Extension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 990 (i).
——— Total Cost of Excavation : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4826 (iii).
Musketry School Camp at Ottawa, Private Soldiers employed on Fatigue Duty : Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 7081, 7090, 7096, 7098 (iv).
——— Cor. *re* Expenditure at Camp: Laid on Table, 6969 (iv).
——— Par. *re* sending Soldiers Home: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ontario) 9034 (v).
——— Taxes *re* Maintenance of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ontario) 6550 (iv).
Mutual Reserve Life Ins. Co.'s B. No. 161 (Mr. Heyd) 1°*, 7649 (iv); Remarks, 8530; 2° m., 8675 ; in Com., 8678 ; 3°*, 8711 ; Sen. Amts., 8530 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 101.)
Mutual Reserve Fund Life Insurance, Appeal to House of Lords : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8777 (v).
Nanaimo Customs House : in Com. of Sup., 700 (i).
Napanee River, Buoy Contract, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 5028 (iii).
——— Contract with Mr. Mowers, Cor., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 5233, 5335 (ii).
——— Painting, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 6149 (iv).
See 'Public Works.'
Napoleon Bridge, Lachine Canal, Rep. *re* Delay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rivet) 3941 (iii).
Nappan Dairy Station, Butter and Cheese, Cost of Manufacturing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bell) 2805 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bell) 3770 (ii).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.
Nappan Experimental Farm, Staff Increases, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4961 (iii).
Nash, Mr. E. A., Dismissal as Dom. Lands Agent in Kamloops, B. C., Cor.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Taylor) 2847 (ii).
National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G. T. Pacific.'
Naturalization and Aliens Act, Amt. B. No. 147 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1°, 5840 (iii); 2° m., 6791 ; in Com., 6794, 7228; 3°*, 7228 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 25).
Naturalization of Aliens Acts Amt. B. No. 147 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 2° m., 6791; in Com., 6794 (iv).
——— Letter from Judge Killam: Read, 6792 (iv).
See 'Aliens,' &c.
Naval Militia and School of Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).
——— Organization : in Com. of Sup., 8931 (v).

Naval Militia School, Establishment in Lunenburg County : Remarks (Mr. Kaulbach) in Com. of Sup., 7595 (iv).

Navigation of Canadian Waters Act Amt. B. No. 112 (Mr. Préfontaine) 1°, 3016 (ii); 2°*, 4075; in Com., 4075; 3°*, 4077 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 26).

Navigation Improvements in Man. and N.W.T., Application for Charter, Res. from Winnipeg Board of Trade, Protesting, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lariviere) 2803 (ii).

See 'Marine,' 'Public Works,' &c., 'Obstructions,' &c.

Negro Point, N.B., Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7750 (iv).

Neil's Harbour Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).

Nepigon Ry. Co.'s B. No. 83 (Mr. McCool) 1°*, 2001 ; 2°*, 2328; in Com., and 3°*, 3480 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 102).

New Brunswick Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 143 (Mr. Gibson) M. to receive Pet., 5184, 5353 ; 1°*, 5354; 2°*, 5579 (iii); in Com., 6322; 3°*, 6323 (iv).

New Campbellton, Kelly's Cove Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).

New England Fish Co. and Canadian Fisheries: Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).

See 'Fisheries,' 'Transportation,' &c.

Newfoundland, Commercial Agents, Appnmt. of, of Sup., 6210 (iv).

See 'Trade and Commerce.'

Newfoundland Commercial Agents, Appnmt. of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2804 (ii).

Newfoundland Fisheries Regulations, Compromise, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Kaulbach) 6788 (v).

Newfoundland Fisheries Treaty with U.S., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (Mr. Kaulbach) 2120 (ii).

New Glasgow Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8365 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. Bell) in Com. of Sup., 6289 (iv).

New London, Harbour Improvements, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7738 (iv).

Newport, Breakwater, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7779 (iv).

Newspapers, Canadian, Sums collected for Carriage, from 1897, and June 1903 to April 1904: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 4825 (iii).

Newspapers for Dept. of Agriculture : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2731 (ii).

Newspaper Postage Rates, Revenue, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 5723 (iii).

See 'Canadian Associated,' &c.

New Westminster and Vancouver and C. P. R.: *See* 'C.P.R. B. 13.'

Nicola, Kamloops & Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s B. No. 48 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 1054; 2°*, 1337 (i); in Com., 3477, 3758; 3°*, 3758 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 103).

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy : in Com. on Res., 8825 (v).

Ninth Regiment, Resignation, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Casgrain) 3771 (ii).

——— Inquiry for further Cor. (Mr. Casgrain) 4415 (iii).

Nipigon Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 8792, 8801 (v).

North American Shipping Co., Lease granted to Fisheries in Northern Lakes. Remarks (Mr. Boyd) in Com. of Sup., 8943 (v).

——— Lease read (Mr. Haggart) 8952 (v).

See 'Fisheries,' &c.

North American Telegraph Co.'s B. No. 53 (Mr. McCreary) 1°*, 1132; 2°*, 1338 (iv); in Com. and 3°*, 2967 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 104).

North Bay, Small-pox, Quarantine of : in Com. of Sup., 4156 (iii).

North Channel Dam, Completion of : in Com. of Sup., 6314, 6323 (iv).

See 'Canals—Galops,' &c.

North Enmore Post Office, Establishment of : Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 5748 (iii).

See 'Post Office,' &c.

Northern Bank B. No. 146 (Mr. Scott) 1°*, 5677; M. *re* 2°, 5839; 2°, 5866 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6322 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 105).

Northern Fishing Rights, Granting of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyd) 7783 (iv).

See 'Fisheries,' &c.

North Head Breakwater, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7748 (iv).

North Shore Power Ry. & Nav. Co., Cor., &c., *re* Seven Islands Wharf: Read (Mr. Clarke) 7982 (iv).

See 'Public Works—Seven Islands,' &c.

North Sydney Station Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 5976 (iii).

N. W. M. Police, Capture of Convict Cashel, Compensation *re* Damages : in Com. of Sup., 7963 (iv).

——— Gratuity to Mrs. Beaupré: in Com. of Sup., 7618 (iv).

——— Gratuity to Mrs. Brooke: in Com. of Sup., 7618 (iv).

——— Medals, *re* Rebellion of 1885: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ontario) 1140 (i).

——— Pay, Increase, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2686 (ii), 7618 (iv).

——— Pensions Bill: Remarks (Mr. Scott) in Com. of Sup., 2714 (ii).

——— Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1354 (i).

——— Yukon, Pay of Force: in Com. of Sup., 2713 (ii).

N. W. Ters., Govt. Administration: in Com. of Sup., 7023 (iv).
——— Administration of Justice: in Com. of Sup., 7938 (iv).
——— Provincial Autonomy: Remarks (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. of Sup., 7025 (iv).
——— Town Sites, Arrangements with Ry. Cos., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 1139 (i).
See 'Provincial Subsidies,' &c.
Northwest Representation Act Amt. B. No. 117 (Mr. Casgrain) 1°, 3387 (ii); 2° m., 3990; Remarks, 4723 (iii).
——— M. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) to stand, 4723 (iii).
Norton, R. B., & Co., Payments to *re* P. E. I. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 219 (i).
See 'I. C. R.' &c.
N. S. Chief Justiceship, Vacancy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 1667 (i).
Nova Scotia Judgeships, Promises to Members *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7940 (iv).
See 'Judges,' &c.
Nova Scotia Permanent Building Society and Saving Fund B. No. 8 (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1°*, 396; 2°*, 549 (i); in Com., 3477; 3°*, 3479 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 106).
Oaths of Office: *See* 'Administration.'
O'Brien, Messrs., Settlement of Claims *re* Soulanges Canal: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8025 (v).
See 'Canals—Soulanges,' &c.
Obstructions in Navigable Waters, Removal, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5284 (iii).
O'Callaghan, Mr., Duties on Cornwall Canal: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) in Com. of Sup., 7522 (iv).
See 'Canals—Cornwall,' &c.
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 5199, 5258, 5284, 5300 (iii).
——— Gratuities, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8924 (v).
See 'Marine,' 'Trade and Commerce,' &c.
'Ocean Limited,' I. C. R., Mar. Express: Remarks *re* in Com. of Sup., 8354 (v).
See 'I. C. R.'
O'Connell Case, Presentment of Grand Jury, Halifax: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in Com. of Sup., 5711 (iii).
O'Donoghue, D. J., Political Speeches in B. C.: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Taylor) 4077 (iii).
Officials Cars, Constructed, Used, &c., by Govt. Officials: Ques. (Mr. Tolton) 3309 (ii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Tolton) 3769 (ii).
——— Construction by Govt.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Tolton) 5093; Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5094 (iii).
See 'Govt. Cars.'
Ogden's Pond Protection Works, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7644 (iv).
Oil Boring Explorations in N.W.T.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7217 (iv).
Okotoks & High River Lumbering & Development Co.'s B. No. 51 (Mr. Oliver) 1°*, 1054; 2°*, 1338 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3056 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 107).
O'Leary Branch Line, P. E. I. Ry., Pet. from Residents: Read (Mr. Hackett) in Com. of Sup., 6012 (iii).
O'Leary to West Cape, Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8775 (v).
See 'I.C.R.,' 'Post Office,' &c.
Ontario Accident Insurance Co.'s B. No. 67 (Mr. Thompson, Haldimand and Monck) 1°*, 1450; 2°*, 1824 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3480 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 108).
Opposition Leader's Sec.'s Salary: in Com. of Sup., 8988 (v).
Order in the Hse. and Galleries: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 2190 (ii).
Order, Ques. of, Ruling (Mr. Speaker) *re* Items passed by Com. and further Discussion, 2757 (ii).
——— *re* Replies to Questions put by Members: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1152 (i).
Oshawa P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 608 (i).
See 'Public Works,' &c.
Osler, Mr., M.P., and Connection with Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, &c., Ry.: Remarks (Mr. Scott) 2759 (ii).
See 'Qu'Appelle,' &c.
Ossekeag P.O., N.B., Removal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Fowler) 1879 (i).
Ostall River, B.C., Removal of Obstructions: in Com. of Sup., 8927 (v).
Otonabee Dredging, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7855, 8022 (iv).
See 'Canals—Trent,' &c.
Ottawa and Georgian Bay: *See* 'Montreal and Georgian, &c. B. 12,' 'Ottawa River.'
Ottawa and Lièvre Ry.: *See* 'Lièvre and Ottawa.'
Ottawa, Brockville & St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s B. No. 71 (Mr. Logan) 1°*, 1547; 2°*, 1825 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3354 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 109).
Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 455, 619 (i).
——— Concentration of, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 626 (i).
——— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7628 (iv).
——— Lighting, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7620 (iv).
——— Rentals paid to Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 7624 (iv).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 3772 (ii).
See 'Public Works, Ottawa,' &c.
Ottawa Carbide Co.'s Contract with Govt.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5301 (iii).
Ottawa Car Co., Goods purchased by Tender: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ontario) 1878 (i).
Ottawa Customs House, Erection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Birkett) 552 (i).

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. No. 110 (Mr. Champagne) M. to receive Pet., 2368, 2457; 1°, 3016; 2°*, 3127 (ii); in Com., 4176, 4218, 4229; on M. for 3°, 4263; Amt. (Mr. Puttee) to ref. back to Sel. Com., 4264, agreed to (Y. 50; N. 47) 4269 (iii).

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. No. 110 (Mr. Champagne) in Com., 4176; M. (Mr. Birkett) to ref. back to Private Bills Com. (ruling) 4176; Pet. from City Council; Read (Mr. Sproule) 4186; Pet. from City Council: Read (Mr. Birkett) 4229; Letter from Sec. Treas. of Co.: Read (Mr. Champagne) 4235 (iii).

Ottawa Fire Insurance Co.'s B. No. 122 (Mr. Rosamond) M. to receive Pet., 3226; 1°*, 3719 (ii); 2°*, 3982; in Com., and 3°*, 5297 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 110).

Ottawa Garrison, Application for New Drill Hall: Ques. (Mr. Birkett) 3389 (ii).

Ottawa, Grounds : in Com. of Sup., 7629 (iv).
See 'Public Works,' &c.

——— House of Commons, Accommodation for Members' Wives : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 7620 (iv).

Ottawa Northern & Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 15 (Mr. Champagne) 1°*, 396 ; 2°*, 549 ; in Com., and 3°*, 987 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 111).

Ottawa P. O., Employees, Bonus *re* Fire : Remarks (Mr. Birkett) 5587 (iii).

——— Reconstruction : in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).

——— pay of labourers : Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 5583 (iii).

Ottawa River Ry. Co.'s B. No. 78 (Mr. Ethier) 1°*, 2001; 2°*, 2328 (ii); in Com., 4451; 3°*, 4451 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 112).

Ottawa River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy : in Com. on Res., 8825 (v).

Ottawa River, Survey of Head Waters: in Com. of Sup., 9033 (v).

Otter, Col., Orders issued *re* Fenian Raid: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 8388 (v).

Ouelle Rivière and Murray Bay Ferry, Contract *re* : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 4274 (iii).

——— Winter Service: in Com. of Sup., 8921 (v).
See 'Murray Bay,' &c.

Owen Sound, Postal Service, Letter-box in Bay Ward: Remarks (Mr. Thomson, Grey) in Com. of Sup., 5645 (iii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.

Owen Sound, Protection Works, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7853 (iv).

'Ownied,' Ref. to Mr. Osler in Debate on G.T.P. Bill, 1632 (i).

——— Explanation, 1714 (i).

Oyster Culture : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5033 (iii).

Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 7588 (iv).

Pacific Bank of Canada B. No. 159 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 6973; 2°*, 7721; (remarks) 7783 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8330 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 113).

Pacific Bank of Canada : M. (Mr. Macpherson), to Place on Order Paper, 7783 (iv).

Pacific Coast, Dry Dock Facilities, Pets. *re* : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 248 (i).

Pacific Northern & Omineca Ry. Co.'s B. No. 66 (Mr. Morrison) 1°*, 1450; 1°*, 1824 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2597 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 114).

Page, Hubert F., Claim for Refund of Duties on Horses imported into U.S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2804 (ii).

——— Statement (Mr. Sproule) on M. for Sup., 8903 (v).
See 'Customs,' &c.

Palmerston, Customs Collections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Tolton) 557 (i).

Parcel Post, Date of Increase, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 8776 (v).

Parcel Post System, Improvement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.

Parliament, Opening, 1 (i).

——— Election of Speaker, 1 (i).
See 'House of Commons,' &c.

Parliament Square and Buildings, Lighting Contract : Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 3310 (ii).
See 'Public Buildings—Ottawa,' &c.

Parole System, Appointment of Officer : in Com. of Sup., 7954 (iv).
See 'Justice,' &c.

Parsons, Hon. C. A., Patent Relief B. No. 17 (Mr. Clarke) 1°*, 396; 2°*, 549; in Com., and 3°*, 1337 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 115).

Passes issued by Can. Govt. on Rys., Steamers for 1903-4 ; M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bell) 1882 (i).

Patent Relief Bills : *See* 'Cahoone, E. R.,' 'Can. Gen. Electric,' 'Can. Office,' &c., 'Curtis, L. E.,' 'Damen, Wm. A.,' 'Gironcoli, S.,' 'Parsons, C. A.,' and 'Small, E. A.'

Patent Models, Sale, Classification, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 2719 (ii).

Patent Office Models, Govt. Sale, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Porter) 398 (i).

Patent Record : in Com. of Sup., 2732 (ii).

Patterson, Dr., Quarantine Inspector for Man., Salary, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4169 (iii).

Paving Parlt. Square, Ottawa Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa,' &c.

Peace River District, Rep. of J. M. Macoun, Distribution, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7201 (iv).
See 'Macoun,' &c.

Peace River, Roads and Bridges : in Com. of Sup., 7891 (iv).
See 'Colonization,' &c.

Peat Industry, Financial Assistance by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Tolton) 4412 (iii).
Pelee Island, Cable Connection with Mainland: in Com. of Sup., 8023 (iv).
Pembroke Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7644 (iv).
Pembroke, Wharf, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7853 (iv).
Penetanguishene, Pier, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7854 (iv).
Penitentiaries, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 985 (i).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7950 (iv).
See 'Justice,' &c.
Pensions, I.C.R., Preparation of System: Ques. (Mr. Gourley) 8028 (v).
Pension Scheme for P.E.I. Ry., Letters and Pets. *re*: Read (Mr. Lefurgey) 6221, 6227 (iv).
See 'I.C.R.,' &c.
Pensions to N.W.M. Police: Remarks (Mr. Scott) in Com. of Sup., 2714 (ii).
Perce, Wharf, Gaspé County: in Com. of Sup., 7780 (iv).
Perry, Mr., Winner of King's Prize at Bisley: Remarks (Sir Frederick Borden) 7436 (iv).
Personal Explanation (Mr. Bell) *re* Speech on G.T.P. Bill, Arrangement of Whips, 2002 (ii).
——— (Mr. Borden, Halifax) *re* Mr. Blair's Memorandum and Rep. of Speech *re* word 'prepared,' 1297 (i).
——— letter from Debates Office read *re* word 'published' or 'prepared,' 1450 (i).
——— (Mr. Fisher) *re* Military Experience, &c. 5844 (iii).
——— (Mr. Fitzpatrick) *re* G.T.P. Solicitorship 7226 (iv).
——— (Mr. German) *re* Col. Gregory's extension of time for Militia Service, 4666 (iii).
——— (Mr. Ingram) *re* Mr. Roche, Halifax, Speeches, 4085 (iii).
——— (Mr. Osler) *re* Mr. Scott's Attack on Long Lake, Saskatchewan, &c., Rys., 2849; Letter of Mr. Kingsmill: Read, 2850; Orders, Ques. of, 2861, 2884, 2866, 2876, 2883, 2890, 2889, 2893 (ii).
——— (Mr. Roche, Halifax) *re* Speeches in Hse., 3945, 4138 (iii).
——— (Mr. Ross, N.S.) *re* 'Dennis Eagan' Letter, 7542 (iv).
——— (Mr. Taylor) *re* Whips' Arrangements on G.T.P. Bill, 2109 (ii).
See 'Privilege,' &c.
Peterborough, Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 626 (i).
Peterborough Dam, Trent Canal: in Com. of Sup., 7466 (iv).
Petit du Grat and Mulgrave SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 7464 (iv).
Petitions, on M. to receive, Special Circumstances, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 2368 (ii).
See 'House of Commons,' &c., 'Divorce Pet., &c.
Petition of Right Act Amt. B. No. 38 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 985; 2°, 1785; in Com., and 3°*, 1785 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 27).
Petit Rocher, Breakwater, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7749 (iv).
Petroleum, Bounty on Crude, B. No. 167 (Mr. Fielding) Res. prop., 7785 (iv); in Com. on Res., 8441; 1°*, 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 8475 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 28).
Petroleum, Bounty Payments: in Com. of Sup,. 9013 (v).
Pickel, Dr., Militia Appnmt.: *See* 'Dundonald.'
Pickett's Pier, Reconstruction, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7644 (iv).
Picton, Custom House, Rental, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 7624 (iv).
Pictou Landing, I.C.R., Siding: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
Pictou and Murray Harbour SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 7445 (iv).
Pilotage Act Amt. B. No. 100 (Mr. Préfontaine) 1°*, 2681 (ii); 2°*, 4056; in Com., 4056; 3°*, 4070 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6889 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 29).
Pilots on St. Lawrence Route, Certified, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) in Com. of Sup., 5830 (iii).
——— Training, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 5029 (iii).
Pintsch Gas on I.C.R. Trains: in Com. of Sup., 5927 (iii).
See 'I.C.R.,' 'Marine—Acetylene,' &c..
Playfair & Co., Rental for Midland Dock: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 7765 (iv).
Pleasant Bay, Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7644 (iv).
Pointe aux Anglais, Lightkeeper, Duties, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 7225 (iv).
Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7738 (iv).
——— Construction of Pier, Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hackett) 1664 (i).
Pointe St. Pierre, Breakwater, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7780 (iv).
Point Aux Trembles, Wharf, Request for Aid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 3760 (ii).
Political Appointments: *See* 'I.C.R.'
Political Interference and Govt. Officials in Man.: Remarks (Mr. LaRivière) in Com. of Sup., 7067 (iv).
Political Interference by Govt Employees: *See* 'I.C.R.,' and 'Guysborough,' &c.
Political Interference *re* Militia (remarks) in Com. on Militia B., 6382 (iv).
See 'Dundonald.'

'Political Pointers' prepared by Mr. Bain : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1858, 1908 (i).
Pontiac & Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 21 (Mr. McCool) 1°*, 596; 2°*, 709; in Com. and 3°*, 987 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 116).
Poonamalie Dam, Rideau Canal: in Com. of Sup., 8382 (v).
——— Breakage *re* Floods: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 1149 (i).
——— Lock Station: in Com. of Sup., 8973 (v).
——— Repairs, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lavell) 7784 (iv).
Port au Pique Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7644 (iv).
Port Arthur Harbour, B. No. 98 (Mr. Préfontaine) 1°, 2681 ; 2°, 3877; in Com., 3878 (ii).
Port Arthur and Fort William, Decision of Ry. Commissioners *re* Bell Telephone Co.: Remarks (Mr. Maclean) in Com. on Ry. B. 132, 6733 (iv).
——— Ref. to Supreme Court, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 4274 (iii).
See 'Telephones,' &c.
Port Bevis Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7636 (iv).
Port Burwell Harbour Works, Expenditure *re*, 1891 to 1896: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 7440 (iv).
Port Colborne, Deepening: in Com. of Sup., 6360 (iv).
——— Elevator: in Com. of Sup., 8379 (v).
——— Entrance Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6807 (iv).
See 'Canals—Welland.'
Port Credit Dredging, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7888 (iv).
Port Hastings Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7644 (iv).
Port Hawkesbury Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7644 (iv), 9023 (v).
Port Hood, Northern Entrance, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7645 (iv).
Port Hood Telegraph Lines : in Com. of Sup., 7892 (iv).
Port Lorne Breakwater Reconstruction, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9024 (v).
Port Maitland Breakwater Extension, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7646 (iv).
Port Morien Breakwater, Reps., Rets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bell) 5094 (iii).
Port Mulgrave and Cheticamp SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7448 (iv).
Port Perry Dredging, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7854 (iv).
Port Stanley Dredging, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7855 (iv).
——— Harbour Works, Total Expenditure from 1891 to 1896: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 7440 (iv).
Postal and Parcel Rates, Comparison with European System : Remarks (Sir William Mulock) 5744 (iii).
Postal Rates and Parcel Posts: in Com. of Sup., 5723 (iii).
Postal Rates between Can. and G. B., in 1868: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7437 (iv).
Postal Rates, Reduction, &c., Date of: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 8776 (v).
Postal Union Rates *re* Book Postage : Remarks (Mr. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 5718 (iii).
Postmasters acting as Agents for Newspapers Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5691 (iii).
Postmasters Guarantee Fund: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 5850 (iii).
Postmasters Refusal to send Letters free to M.P.'s.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 6549 (iv).
Post Office Act Amt. B. No. 153 (Sir William Mulock) 1°, 6541 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 8029; 3° m., 8048; M. wthdn., 8048; 3° m., 8265 ; in Com., 8265; 3°*, 8266; Sen. Amts., 9052 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 30).
Post Office Act Amt. &c.: Remarks (Mr. Puttee) 5677 (iii).
Post Offices, Armouries and other Public Buildings, Erected since 1896, Total Cost: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clare) 1881 (i).

POST OFFICE :

Alberton and Kildare Mail Service, Contracts: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3128 (ii).
Allan Strs., Mail Contract: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6162 (iv).
Athens P.O., Charges against Postmaster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2601 (ii).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Contract *re* Mails, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6154 (iv).
——— Steamers, Average Speed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 6546, 6888 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. McCool) 7081 (iv).
Automobiles, Toronto P. O.: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 5759 (iii).
Book Postage Rates, Increase in : Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in Com. of Sup., 5716 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 5718 (iii).
See 'Parcel,' &c.
Brockville and Ottawa, and G.T.R. Connections : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 1471 (i). 2119, 2461 (ii).
——— Rep. of Investigation : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 3313 (ii).
Bruce County, Mail Service, Complaints, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. Donnelly) 589 (i).
Cameron, J. W. H., P. O. Service, Medical Allowance *re* Injuries received: in Com. of Sup., 5852 (iii).
Canadian Mail to G. B., Weight, Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 216 (i).
See 'Mail.'

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Cape Traverse, P.E.I., Mail Service, Total Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4825 (iii).

See 'Traverse.'

Charlottetown, P.E.I., Free Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 5747 (iii).

Chesley Postmastership, Appnmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7081 (iv).

——— Vacancy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Donnelly) 4824 (iii).

Commercial Travellers' Association, Letter *re* Mail Service on Quebec Central Ry.: Read (Mr. Morin) 9006 (v).

Dargavel, John, Dismissal from Elgin Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5690 (iii).

Detroit Post Office, Dorchester County, Opening: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 9006 (v).

——— Recomendation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Morin) 5749 (iii).

Drop-letter Rates, Reduction, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 5725 (iii).

Franking Privilege *re* Campaign Literature: Ques. (Mr. Grant) 5271 (iii).

Galt P.O., Accommodation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Clare) 5715 (iii).

Glen Ross Postmaster, Resignation or Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 3436 (ii).

Goodrick, Henry, Resignation from Montreal P.O.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 3949 (iii).

Grimsby Post Office, Complaints, *re* Accommodation, Cor. read (Mr. Lancaster) 5685, 5696; Rep. from Inspector read (Sir William Mulock) 5694 (iii).

Halifax Mail Delivery, The O'Connell Case: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in Com. of Sup., 5711 (iii).

Halifax P.O., Increase of Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 5713 (iii).

Huntingdon Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1879 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 1875 (i).

Irena Post Office, Change in Postmasters, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Broder) 2846 (ii).

Kingston Post Office, Investigation *re* Charges against J. L. Renton: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 2928 (ii).

Laschinger, Mr., Appnmt. as Asst. Sec.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5647 5651 (iii).

Letter Carriers, Cor. *re* P.O. Act: Statement (Sir Wm. Mulock) 5845 (iii).

——— Grievances, Pets. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Puttee) 2555 (ii).

——— Pay on sick Leave: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 6888 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Letter Carriers, Remarks (Mr. Clarke) in Com. on P.O. Bill, 8033 (v).

——— Pressure *re* accepting New Scheme: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 5754 (iii).

——— Promotions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5853 (iii).

——— Toronto, Canvassing for Pet. *re* P.O. Act, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 4414 (iii).

Letter Postage Reduction: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 5726 (iii).

Life Insurance *re* P.O. Employees: in Com. of Sup., 5847 (iii).

Mail Bag Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Bell) in Com. of Sup., 5756 (iii).

Mail Contracts between Can. and G.B.: M. for copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 428 (i).

——— Can. and G.B.: in Com. of Sup., 6154 (iv).

——— Montreal and British Ports: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 249 (i).

Mails sent via New York: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6162 (iv).

——— Contract with Messrs. Allan: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6184, 6200; Memo. read (Sir Richard Cartwright) 6202 (iv).

Mail Delivery delayed by broken Bridges on Qu'Appelle, &c., Ry.: Tels. Read (Mr. Davis) 2359 (i); Rep. of Controller: Read (Sir William Mulock) 2364 (ii).

Maynooth Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 5841 (iii).

Montreal Post Office, Extra Work and Pay of Employees: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 552 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 5698 (iii).

——— Complaints *re* Delivery, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 5698 (iii).

——— Increased Accommodation: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 551 (i).

Newspaper Postage Rates, Revenue, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 5723 (iii).

North Enmore Post Office, Establishment of: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 5748 (iii).

O'Leary to West Cape Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8775 (v).

Ossekeag P.O., N.B., Removal of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Fowler) 1879 (i).

Ottawa P.O., Employees, Bonus *re* Fire: Remarks (Mr. Birkett) 5587 (iii).

——— Reconstruction of, Pay of Labourers: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 5583 (iii).

Owen Sound Postal Service, Letter-box in Bay Ward: Remarks (Mr. Thomson, Grey) in Com. of Sup., 5645 (iii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Parcel Post System Improvement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).

——— Date of Increase, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 8776 (v).

Postal Rates and Parcel Post: in Com. of Sup., 5723 (iii).

——— Comparison with European System: Remarks (Sir Wm. Mulock) 5744 (iii).

——— Date of Reduction: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 8776 (v).

Postal Rates between Can. and G. B. in 1868: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7437 (iv).

Postmasters' Guarantee Fund: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 5850 (iii).

Postmasters' Refusal to send Letters free to M.P.'s: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 6549 (iv).

Post Office, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5586, 5685 (iii).

——— Accounts, System, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5600 (iii).

——— Campaign Pamphlet: Remarks (Mr. Clancy) in Com. of Sup., 5588 (iii).

——— Deficits: Remarks (Sir Wm. Mulock) in Com. of Sup., 5605 (iii).

——— Finances, *re* Auditing Accounts, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5600 (iii).

——— Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 5685, 5744 (iii).

——— salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5685 (iii).

——— Outside Service: in Com. of Sup., 5845 (iii).

——— Payments for General Service: in Com. of Sup., 5852 (iii).

——— Post Offices opened, Number, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 5745 (iii).

——— Post Offices in Rural Districts, Closing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9012 (v).

——— Promotions, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5647 (iii).

——— Superintendents in City Offices: in Com. of Sup., 9010 (v).

Prescott Train Connections: Remarks (Mr. Reid, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 5649 (iii).

P.E.I. Mail Service, 1903, 1904, Number of Trips, Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 867 (i), 5581 (iii).

——— Arrangements *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey 1138 (i).

Pugwash, N.S., Postmaster, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bell) 1667 (i).

Qu'Appelle and Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry., Breaking of Bridges, &c., Delay in Mail, &c.: Tels. read (Mr. Davis) 2359; Rep. of Controller: Read (Sir William Mulock) 2364 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Qu'Appelle and Wishart Mail Service, Distance, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2556 (ii).

Ry. Mail Clerks, Additional: in Com. of Sup., 9011 (v).

——— and Fair-Wage Officer: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

——— N.W.T., Pet. *re* Increased Allowance: Remarks (Mr. Boyd) in Com. of Sup., 5756 (iii); Letter from Association: Read (Mr. Boyd) 5757 (iii).

River John Mail Contracts: Remarks (Mr. Bell) in Com. of Sup., 5746 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Bell) 6024 (iv).

Ross, Mr., Chief P.O. Inspector, Salary: in Com. of Sup., 5851 (iii).

Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 5732, 5750 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 9011 (v).

St. Thomas, Post Office, Appnmt. of Ass't Postmaster: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 5746 (iii).

Sackville and Cape Tormentine Mail, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 557 (i).

Saskatchewan Mail Service, Tel. from Board of Trade, Rosthern: Read (Mr. Davis) 2188 (ii).

Sloan, M. W., Compensation *re* Injuries: in Com. of Sup., 5846 (iii).

'Star,' Toronto, Newspaper, Canvassing by County Postmasters: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5690 (iii).

Sydney Postmaster and Foreign Money Orders: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 251 (i).

Toronto Post Office, Overtime of Clerks, Remuneration, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 5753 (iii).

——— Promotions: in Com. of Sup., 9005 (v).

Traverse and Cape Tormentine Mail Service, Ice-boat Contracts: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3943 (iii).

See 'Cape,' 'P.E.I.'

Vankleek Hill Mail Service, Complaints *re*: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 5716 (iii).

Wilton P.O., Charges against Postmaster Gallagher: M. for Cor. (Mr. Wilson) 221 (i).

——— Cor., &c.: Read (Mr. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 5654 (iii).

——— Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Wilson) 2557; Confidential Letters *re*: Remarks (Sir William Mulock) 2602 (ii).

——— Letters from Mr. H. Walker: Inquiry for (Mr. Wilson) 4827, 4927 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 1471 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Wilson) 2002, 2133 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Winnipeg Dead Letter Branch, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 5845 (iii).
Winter Mail Service, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 5289 (iii).
See 'P.E.I.' &c.
Wolford Centre Post Office, Change in Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. Lavell) 2928 (ii).
——— Closing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lavell) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).
Poultry Stations, Cost, &c., Pet., from Man. Poultry Ass'n.: Ques. (Mr. Puttee) 677 (i).
——— Recommendation from Man. Ass'n.: Ques. (Mr. LaRivière) 396 (i).
Poultry Stations : *See* 'Chicken Fattening.'
Preferential Tariff, Importations through Canadian Ports : Prop. Res. (Mr. Logan) 5074 (iii).
Preferential Tariff, Value of Imports, Free Imports, Dutiable Goods, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 3538 (ii).
Prescott Carbide Factory, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5302 (iii).
Prescott Lighthouse, Construction of, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7597 (iv).
Prescott Property purchased by Marine Dept.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 8918 (v).
Prescott Train Connections : Remarks (Mr. Reid, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 5649 (iii).
Prescott Workshops, Removal from Morrisburg, Rep. *re* : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 8932 (v).
Press Association : *See* 'Can. Associated,' &c.
Preston, W. T. R., Charges *re* : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7817 (iv).
——— Letter in English Press *re* Lord Dundonald's Dismissal : Read (Mr. Clarke) 6014-15 (iv).
See 'Dundonald,' &c.
Preventive Excise Service : in Com. of Sup., 3920 (ii).
See 'Customs,' 'Inland Revenue,' &c.
Prince Albert Court House : in Com. of Sup., 699 (i).
P. E. I. and Great Britain Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7446 (iv).
P. E. I. and Mainland SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7444 (iv).
P. E. I. and Newfoundland Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7460 (iv).
P. E. I. and Terms of Confederaion : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5320, 5329 (iii).
P. E. I., Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 462 (i).
——— Damages to Perishable Goods *re* Transportation, Compensation *re* : in Com. of Sup., 7594 (iv).
——— Mail Contracts, Arrangements *re* : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1138 (i).
——— Mail Service, 1903, 1904, Number of Trips, Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 867 (i).
P.E.I., Mainland Telegraph Connection : in Com. of Sup., 7892 (iv).
——— Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 5986 (iii), 8366 (v).
——— branch lines, pets. *re* construction : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 992, 1135 (i).
——— car accommodation *re* tourists, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6227, 6242 (iv).
——— deficits and expenditures : Remarks (Mr. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 6262 (iv).
——— lighting system on cars : in Com. of Sup., 5930 (iii).
——— pay to labourers : in Com. of Sup., 6220 (iv).
——— working expenses : in Com. of Sup., 6220 (iv).
——— Telegraph Connection and Govt. Control, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in Com. of Sup., 7892 (iv).
——— Telegraph Connection with Port Hood, Govt. Control : Remarks (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Sup., 7892 (iv).
——— Telegraph, Govt. System : in Com. of Sup., 7894 (iv).
——— Winter Mail Service, Special Trains, Rates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5581 (iii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Printing Bureau, Additions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).
——— Delay in printing Lists : Remarks (Mr. Bourassa) 6789 (iv).
Printing and Stationery, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2188 (ii).
See 'House of Commons—Voters' Lists,' &c.
Printing Committee, Joint : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 167 (i).
——— 3rd Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Parmelee) to conc., 8531 (v).
——— Amt. in 3rd Rep. *re* Status of Officers, 8652 (v).
Printing Presses, Free Entry : in Com. on Ways and Means, 8894 (v).
Private Bills, Extension of Time : M. (Mr. Gibson) 5353 (iii).
——— M. (Mr. Johnston, N. S.) to extend Time for Posting, 5187 (iii).
——— Presenting Pets.: M. (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 3433 (ii).
——— Reported from Com., Form on Order Paper : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 985 (i).
Private Cars : *See* 'Govt. Cars,' 'Official Cars,' &c.
Private Secretaries, Allowance, &c., and Civil Service Act : Remarks (Mr. Borden, Hfx.) 1948 (i).
Private Secretaries, Justice, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 7937 (iv).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Barker) Rep. in 'Globe' *re* 'Jack Pine, &c.', 2459 (ii).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Borden, Halifax) *re* Speaker's Ruling, *re* Motions to adjn. Hse., 1212 (i).
See 'Personal Explanation,' 'Ques. of Privilege,' &c.
Privy Council, Contingencies : in Com. of Sup., 428 (i).
Prorogation, 9078 (v).
See 'Business of the House,' &c.
Prospect Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7646 (iv).
Proulx, Mr., late M.P., Decease of : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7902 (iv).
Provencher District, Public Buildings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 690 (i).
Provincial Accounts, Payment by Govt. to Provs.: Remarks, 9075 (v).
Provincial Subsidies, Speech by Lt.-Gov. of Quebec : Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 503 (i).
——— Stmnt. in N.B. Legislature : Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 229 (i).
See 'Dom. and Provincial,' &c., 'N.W.T., &c.
Public Accounts Com., Meetings, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1548 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Casgrain) 4218 (iii).
Public Accounts Com.: M. (Mr. Wade) 396 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to substitute Name, 476 (i).
Public Accounts : Presented (Mr. Fielding) 204 (i).
Public Debt, Conversion, Payments, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 246 (i).
——— Rate of Interest : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 232 (i).
See 'Finance,' &c.
Public Buildings, Construction : Res. of 1892; Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 676 (i).
See 'Public Works,' &c.
Public Health Dept., Establishment of : Remarks (Mr. Vrooman) in Com. of Sup., 4150 (iii).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.
Public Lands, Sale of during 1903-4 : Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 8778 (v).
Public Ownership, &c.: Remarks in Com. on Ottawa Electric Bill (Mr. Maclean) 4218 (iii).
See 'Municipal,' &c.
Public Works and Marine Depts., Transfer of Duties, O.C.: Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 7599 (iv).
——— List of Dredges, Plant, &c.: Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 7600 (iv).
——— Transfer, &c.: Remarks in Com., 625 (i).
——— O.C. *re* Transfer : M. (Mr. Casgrain) for Copies, 1879 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Casgrain) 1450 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 868 (i).
Public and Other Works, Management and Control of Act : M. for copies of O.Cc.* (Mr. Casgrain) 3771 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS :
Abram's Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7634 (iv).
Actonvale P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 506, 656 (i).
Alexandria P.O., Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 506 (i).
Alma Pier, N.B. : in Com. of Sup., 7750 (iv).
Amherstburg Harbour Dredging, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7750 (iv).
Anderson's Hollow Wharf, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7744 (iv).
Anderson and Kennedy's Lakes : in Com. of Sup., 7876 (iv).
Anse aux Gascons, Wharf Extension, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7766 (iv).
Anticosti, Fox Bay Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 7895 (iv).
See 'Telegraph,' &c.
Apple River Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9021 (v).
Arbitrations, Public Works, Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 7895 (iv).
Architects, Public Works : in Com. of Sup., 7895 (iv).
See 'Ottawa,' &c.
Arisaig, N.S.: Pier, Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4413 (iii).
Armouries, Dom.: in Com. of Sup., 7619 (iv).
Assiniboine River Dredging : Remarks (Mr. Boyd) in Com. of Sup., 7875 (iv).
See 'Dredging.'
Baie St. Paul Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7766 (iv).
Baie de Valliere, Surveys, Reps., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bruneau) 3770 (ii).
Bailey's Brook Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7634 (iv).
Barrie, Landing Pier, Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9028 (v).
——— Post Office Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 9019 (v).
Barry's Bay Wharf, Madawaska, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7751 (iv).
Baxter's Harbour, N.S.: in Com.of Sup., 7635 (iv).
Bayfield Harbour, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7635 (iv).
Bayfield Harbour, Extension of Southern Pier: in Com. of Sup., 8021 (iv).
Beaton, B.C., and Upper Lardeau, Dredging of Channel, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Casgrain) 3771 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Casgrain) 4685 (iii).
Belleville Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 524 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Berlin P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 528 (i).
Bersimis to Godbout, Telegraph Service: in Com. of Sup., 7894 (iv).
Bickerdike, Mr. F. C., Claim *re* Telegraph Construction: in Com. of Sup., 9032 (v).
Big Pond Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7636 (iv).
Black Brook Wharf, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7744 (iv).
Bonaventure, East, Breakwater, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7766 (iv).
Bowmanville P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 529 (i).
Bracebridge Wharf, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7751 (iv).
Brantford Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 530, 640 (i).
Breton Cove Wharf, N.S., Boat Landing: in Com. of Sup., 7636 (iv).
Bridgeburg P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 530 (i).
Bridgewater, N.S., Harbour Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7637 (iv).
Bronte Harbour, Improvements, Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 336 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Henderson) 336 (i).
——— Labourers' Wages: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Henderson) 1875 (i).
Bryson Bridge Reconstruction: in Com. of Sup., 9031 (v).
Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 504 (i).
Buildings, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 463, 700 (i).
——— Construction of Buildings, Govt. Policy: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 636 (i).
——— Res. of 1892: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 676 (i).
——— Dom.: in Com. of Sup., 535 (i), 7619 (iv).
——— rented by Govt., generally: list read (Mr. Hyman) in Com. of Sup., 7613 (iv).
See 'Ottawa,' &c.
——— Man., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 685 (i).
——— Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 475 (i).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 697 (i).
——— court houses and Dom. buildings, repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 697 (i).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 461, 504 (i).
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 506, 600 (i).
——— Ottawa: *See* 'Ottawa,'
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 462 (i).
——— Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 506, 656, 680 (i), 7972 (iv).
——— Rentals in Montreal and Ottawa: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 551 (i).
See 'Ottawa,' &c.
Burlington Channel Pier, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7751 (iv).
Calgary P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 697 (i).
Campbellton, N.B., Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 463 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Campbellton Wharf, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7745 (iv), 9026 (v).
Cape Tormentine Improvements, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7745 (iv).
Caplan Breakwater, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7767 (iv).
Caraquet Wharf, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7745 (iv), 9027 (v).
Cascumpec Harbour, P.E.I., Cor. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hackett) 1208 (i).
Chambord Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7767 (iv).
Champlain's Monument: in Com. of Sup., 7969 (iv).
Champlain Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7767 (iv).
——— Construction, Selection of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 4410 (iii).
Charlottetown, Dom. Building: in Com. of Sup., 462 (i).
——— Wharf, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 7598 (iv).
Chateau Richer Harbour Improvements, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7767 (iv).
Chatham Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 531 (i).
Clarke, Messrs., and Seven Islands Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 7976 (iv).
See 'Seven Islands,' &c.
Clinton P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 531 (i).
Cobourg Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 531 (i).
Collingwood Harbour Improvements, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7751, 8022 (iv).
Colonization Roads in Man. and N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 9042 (v).
Côte St. Paul Bridge, Delay in Repairing: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3752 (ii).
Cow Bay, N.S., Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7637 (iv).
Cumberland County, Harbours and Rivers: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 9021 (v).
Dalhousie Harbour Improvements, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7747 (iv).
Dauphin Lake, Lowering of Water: in Com. of Sup., 7876 (iv).
Deer Island Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 7891 (iv).
Depot Harbour Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 8022 (iv).
——— Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 7753 (iv).
Deschambault Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7767 (iv).
Deseronto P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 534 (i).
Digby Pier, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7637 (iv).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Copp) 225 (i).
Dipper Harbour Breakwater, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7747 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Dredging Plant, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7885, 7890 (iv).
——— Generally: in Com. of Sup., 7885 (iv).
——— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 7884 (iv).
——— Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 9031 (v).
——— hydraulic plant: in Com. of Sup., 7880 (iv).
——— suction dredge, contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bell) 1665 (i).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7885 (iv).
——— Ont., Summary of Expenditure: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7875 (iv).
——— new plant: in Com. of Sup., 7880 (iv).
——— Ont. and Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7886 (iv), 9031 (v).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7880 (iv).
Edmonton Jail: in Com. of Sup., 697 (i).
Engineers for Dom. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7630 (iv).
See 'Ottawa,' &c.
Fair-wage Clause in Public Works Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, B.C.) 4414 (iii).
See 'Public Works,' &c.
Father Point Landing Pier, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7767 (iv).
Fort Lawrence Pier, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7638 (iv).
Fort William P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 535 (i).
Fraser River Protection Works, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7876 (iv).
Gananoque Harbour Dredging, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7754 (iv).
Georgeville Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7638 (iv).
Glace Bay, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7639 (iv).
——— Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 9033 (v).
Gobeil, Mr. Jos., Emplymt. in the Yukon by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Broder) in Com. of Sup., 9056 (v).
Goderich Harbour Works, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7754 (iv).
Grand Bend Pier, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7843; Contract with McTavish & Co.: Remarks (Mr. Sherritt) 7843 (iv).
——— Changes in Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sherritt) 7440 (iv).
Grand Vallee Pier, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7768 (iv), 9074 (v).
Great Salmon River Breakwater, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 9033 (v).
Green Cove Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7641 (iv).
Grondines Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7774 (iv).
Grosse Isle Quarantaine Station: in Com. of Sup., 666 (i).
Guelph, Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 536, 650 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Guelph Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 538, 650 (i).
——— plans, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Clancy) in Com. of Sup., 599 (i).
Halifax County Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Roche, Halifax) in Com. of Sup., 7885 (iv).
Halifax Immigrant Building: in Com. of Sup., 461 (i).
Hall's Harbour, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7642 (iv).
Hamilton Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 9028 (v).
Harbours and Rivers, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7876 (iv), 9031 (v).
——— Dom., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7850 (iv).
——— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 7875, 7897 (iv).
——— Mar. Provs., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7774 (iv).
——— N.B. in Com. of Sup., 7744 (iv).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7634 (iv), 9021 (v).
——— summary of amounts expended in Estimates: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7648 (iv).
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7750, 7843, 7897 (iv).
——— votes for, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Logan) 9030 (v).
——— P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 7736 (iv).
——— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7766, 7828, 7896 (iv).
——— Yukon: in Com. of Sup., 7879 (iv).
Hawkesbury P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 544 (i).
Higgin's Shore Pier, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7736 (iv).
Honora Wharf, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7851 (iv).
Hopewell Cape Wharf, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7748 (iv).
——— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4412 (iii).
Indian Harbour, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7642 (iv).
Iona Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7642 (iv).
Island Point, N.S., Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7642 (iv).
Janvrin's Island Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7642 (iv).
Kingsville Pier, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7852 (iv).
Knight's Point Breakwater, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7740 (iv).
Lake Dauphin, Lowering of Water: in Com. of Sup., 7876 (iv).
Lake St. John, Dredging, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7775 (iv).
Laprairie Ice Piers, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7775 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
L'Ardoise Breakwater Extension, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7642 (iv).
Larry's River Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7642 (iv).
Lévis P.O., Site, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 667 (i).
Lewes River Dredging, Yukon: in Com. of Sup., 7879 (iv).
Lingan Beach Protection, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).
Little Current, Channel Improvements, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7852 (iv).
Little Rapid, Removal of Obstructions in Channel: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 5285 (iii).
Livingstone's Cove Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).
London Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 602 (i).
Longueuil P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 668 (i).
Lotbinière Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7776 (iv).
Lunenburg County Dredging, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Kaulbach) in Com. of Sup., 7886 (iv).
Macleod Court House: in Com. of Sup., 699 (i).
McNair's Cove Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).
Magdalen Islands Breakwater, Piers, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7779 (iv).
Magog P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 680 (i).
Main-à-Dieu, Breakwater Extension, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).
Malignant Cove Piers, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).
Margaretsville Harbour Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).
Meaford Harbour Breakwater, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7852 (iv).
Melbourne Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).
Meteghan Cove Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).
Middle River Shear Dam, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).
Midland Harbour Wharf, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7853 (iv).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. McCarthy) 364 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 7764 (iv).
Montreal Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 682 (i).
——— Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 680 (i).
Montreal Harbour, Removal of Obstructions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8927 (v).
Monuments, National: in Com. of Sup., 7970 (iv).
Moosejaw P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 699 (i).
Morrison's Point Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7644 (iv).
Mud Island Shoals, Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6348 (iv).
Murray Bay Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7779 (iv).
Napanee River Buoys, Painting, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 6149 (iv).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Navigation Improvements in Man. and N.W.T., Application for Charter, Res. from Winnipeg Board of Trade, Protesting, &c.: Ques. (Mr. LaRivière) 2803 (ii).
Negro Point, N.B., Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 7750 (iv).
Neil's Harbour Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).
New Campbellton, Kelly's Cove Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (iv).
New London Harbour Improvements, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7738 (iv).
Newport Breakwater, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7779 (iv).
North Head Breakwater, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7748 (iv).
Ogden's Pond Protection Works, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7644 (iv).
Oshawa P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 608 (i)
——— Site for Finnigan Property: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).
Ostall River, B.C., Removal of Obstructions: in Com. of Sup., 8927 (v).
Otonabee Dredging, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7855, 8022 (iv).
Ottawa, Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 455, 619 (i).
——— Art Gallery: in Com. of Sup., 7895 (iv).
——— Concentration of Buildings, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 626 (i).
——— Customs House, Erection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Birkett) 552 (i).
——— Drill Hall, Application from Ottawa Garrison: Ques. (Mr. Birkett) 3389 (ii).
——— Electric Power for Dom. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7631 (iv).
——— Elevators in House of Commons, Accidents, &c. (remarks) 2458 (ii).
——— Elevator in West Block, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 619 (i).
——— Flag on Parliament Building, Replaced by Union Jack: Remarks (Mr. Bourassa) 220 (i).
——— Grounds: in Com. of Sup., 7629 (iv).
——— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7628 (iv).
——— House of Commons, Accommodation for Members' Wives: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 7620 (iv).
——— Library, H. of C., Better Lighting, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7621 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Ottawa Lighting Contract: Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 3310 (ii).
——— Lighting, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7620 (iv).
——— Major's Hill Park, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 7620 (iv).
——— Monuments on Parliament Hill, Erection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hackett) 3942 (iii).
——— Paving Parlt. Square, Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).
——— Post Office, Reconstruction: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).
——— Printing Bureau, Additions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).
——— Rentals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7622; List of Buildings: Read (Mr. Hyman) 7622 (iv).
——— remarks (Mr. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 7624 (iv).
——— M. for ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 3772 (ii).
——— Rideau Hall: *See* 'Rideau Hall,'
——— Royal Mint: in Com. of Sup., 456 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 247 (i).
——— Snow Cleaning: in Com. of Sup., 7630 (iv).
——— Steel Shelving: in Com. of Sup., 620 (i).
——— Supreme Court Library, Additions, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).
——— Victoria Memorial Museum: in Com. of Sup., 458 (i).
Ottawa River, Survey of Head Waters: in Com. of Sup., 9033 (v).
Owen Sound Protection Works, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7853 (iv).
Pacific Coast, Dry Dock Facilities, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 248 (i).
Peace River, Roads and Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 7891 (iv).
Pelee Island, Cable Connection with Mainland: in Com. of Sup., 8023 (iv).
Pembroke Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7644 (iv).
Pembroke Wharf, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7853 (iv).
Penetanguishene Pier, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7854 (iv).
Perce Wharf, Gaspé County: in Com. of Sup., 7780 (iv).
Peterborough Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 626 (i).
Petit Rocher Breakwater, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7749 (iv).
Pickett's Pier, Reconstruction, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7644 (iv).
Picton Custom House, Rental, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 7624 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Playfair & Co., Rental for Midland Dock: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 7765 (iv).
See 'Midland.'
Pleasant Bay Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7644 (iv).
Point aux Trembles Wharf, Request for Aid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 3760 (ii).
Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7738 (iv).
——— Construction of Pier, Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hackett) 1664 (i).
Pointe St. Pierre Breakwater, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7780 (iv).
Port au Pique Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7644 (iv).
Port Bevis Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7636 (iv).
Port Burwell Harbour Works, Expenditure *re*, 1891 to 1896: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 7440 (iv).
Port Colborne Elevator: in Com. of Sup., 8379 (v).
See 'Canals—Welland,' &c.
Port Hastings Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7644 (iv).
Port Hawkesbury Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7644 (iv), 9023 (v).
Port Hood, Northern Entrance, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7645 (iv).
——— Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 7892 (iv).
Port Lorne, Breakwater Reconstruction, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9024 (v).
Port Maitland Breakwater Extension, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7646 (iv).
Port Perry Dredging, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7854 (iv).
Port Stanley, Dredging, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7855 (iv).
——— Harbour Works, Total Expenditure from 1891 to 1896: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 7440 (iv).
Post Offices, Armouries and other Public Buildings erected since 1896, Total Cost: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clare) 1881 (i).
See 'Armouries.'
Prince Albert Court House: in Com. of Sup., 699 (i).
Prospect Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7646 (iv).
Provencher District, Public Buildings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 690 (i).
Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii), 7619 (iv).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
Public Works Health Act: in Com. of Sup., 4137 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Public Works, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 685 (i).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 697 (i).
——— Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 680 (i).
See 'Buildings,' 'Harbours and Rivers,' &c.
Public Works Dept., Transfer of Duties to Marine Dept., &c., O.C. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 868 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Casgrain) for Copies, 1879 (i).
——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. Casgrain) 1450 (i).
——— Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 7599; List of Dredges, Plant, &c.: Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 7600 (iv).
Qu'Appelle, Edmonton, Telegraph Lines N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 8023 (iv).
See 'Telegraph,' &c.
Quebec, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7896 (iv).
——— P.O., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 684 (i).
——— Immigration Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 682 (i).
Red Deer Court House: in Com. of Sup., 700 (i).
'Richelieu,' Dredge, Cost of Maintenance: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6543 (iv).
Richelieu River Floods, Pets. &c., *re* Damages: M. for Copies (Mr. Demers, Iberville) 222 (i).
Richibucto, N.B., Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 463 (i).
Richmond Bay Wharf, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7739 (iv).
Rideau Hall, Fuel, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7628 (iv).
——— Grounds, Repairs, &c: in Com. of Sup., 8021 (iv).
Rimouski Pier Extension, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7780 (iv).
Rivière du Loup, Harbour Improvements, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7781 (iv).
Roads and Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 9031 (v).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7891 (iv).
——— Improper Expenditure by Territorial Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Sifton) in Com. of Sup., 9043 (v).
——— Payments to Indians, &c. in Com. of Sup., 9032 (v).
Rideau Harbour, Improvements and Pier, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7855 (iv).
Rossland Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 701 (i).
Rustico Harbour Breakwater, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7739 (iv).
St. Andrews Rapids, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 7897 (iv).
——— Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Puttee) 398 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

St. Andrews Rapids, Man., Res. of Board of Trade. Letter *re*: Ques. (Mr. LaRivière) 2602 (ii).
St. Catharines Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 631 (i), 9020 (v).
Ste. Famille, Pier Extension, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7782 (iv).
St. Francis River, Ice Piers, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pope) 3389 (ii).
St. Godfroi de Nouvelle, Breakwater, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7782 (iv).
St. Hyacinthe Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 684 (i).
St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7782 (iv).
St. John, N.B., Dom. Buildings, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 464 (i).
——— Dredging, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Wilmot) in Com. of Sup., 7886 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5271 (iii).
——— Drill Hall, Option on Chipman Property: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3941 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 472 (i).
——— Negro Point Breakwater, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7750 (iv).
——— Quarantine Station, Water Service: in Com. of Sup., 464 (i).
St. Johns, Que., Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 684 (i).
——— P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 685 (i).
——— Site, Pets. *re*, &c.; Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1876, 1879 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 2847 (ii).
St. Joseph's Wharf, Lake Huron: on Conc., 9074 (v).
St. Lawrence Floods, Res. from Chamber of Commerce *re* Prevention: Ques. (Mr. Geoffrion) 3132 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Islands, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 9018 (v).
St. Louis de Mile End P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 685 (i).
St. Mary's Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 631 (i).
St. Mathias Wharf, Que., Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8254 (v).
St. Maurice Slides: in Com. of Sup., 7891 (iv).
——— Pay of Labourers: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 5583 (iii).
St. Siméon Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7828 (iv).
Salmon River Breakwater, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7747 (iv).
Sand Point Building, Insecurity, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 467 (i).
Sandy Cove Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7646 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Sarnia Dredging, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7855 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie, Dredging, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7856 (ii).
——— P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 639 (i).
——— Wharf, Compensation to W. H. Plummer: in Com. of Sup., 9029 (v).
Scott's Bay, Breakwater Extension, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7646 (iv).
Seal Cove, N.B., Survey of Wharf: Ques. (Mr Ganong) 3761 (ii).
Seven Islands Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7828, 7972 (iv), 9074 (v).
——— Anonymous Letter *re* Work at Clarke's City: Read (Mr. Taylor) 7991 (iv).
Severn River, Removal of Obstructions: in Com. of Sup., 9029 (v).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 684 (i).
——— Location of Site, Representations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Pope) 2376 (ii).
Shippegan Harbour Wharf, Caraquet Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 9027 (v).
Skinner's Cove, Protection Works, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7646 (iv).
Slides and Booms: in Com. of Sup., 7891 (iv).
Sorel Wharf Contract, Pay of Labourers: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 5583 (iii).
Souris Point Breakwater, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7740 (iv).
Southampton Harbour Improvements, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7857 (iv).
Spanish River Dredging, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7857 (iv).
Spry Bay Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7647 (iv).
Stratford Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 640 (i).
Summerside Breakwater, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7740 (iv).
Summerville, Wharf Addition, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7647 (iv).
Surveys for Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 7895 (iv).
Sydenham River, Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Clancy) in Com. of Sup., 7850 (iv).
Sydney Harbour, B.C., Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 8022 (iv).
——— N.S., Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 506 (i).
——— Quarantine Station Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7647 (iv).
Sydney Mines P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 506 (i).
'Tarte, J. I.' Damages to Dredge: in Com. of Sup., 8021 (iv).
Telegraph Lines, B.C., Vancouver Island: in Com. of Sup., 9032 (v).
——— Marconi Telegraph System: in Com. of Sup., 7896 (iv).
See 'Marine.'

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Telegraph Lines, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7891 (iv).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7892 (iv).
——— mainland telegraph connection: in Com. of Sup., 7892 (iv).
——— telegraph connection with Port Hood, Govt. control: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Sup., 7892 (iv).
——— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7894 (iv).
——— settlement of F. C. Bickerdike's claim: in Com. of Sup., 9032 (v).
Temiscamingue Wharf, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7852 (iv).
Tenecape Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7647 (iv), 9025 (v).
Terrebonne, P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 685 (i).
Thessalon Breakwater, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7863 (iv).
Thetford Mines P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 685 (i).
Thornbury Harbour, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7863 (iv).
Three Rivers Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7835 (iv).
——— Pay of Labourers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 5582 (iii).
Toronto, Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 644 (i).
——— Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 643 (i).
——— Harbour, Deepening, &c., Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 2807 (ii).
——— eastern entrance, improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7864 (iv).
——— Island, Damage by Lake Ontario Waters, Cor., &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. Osler) 224 (i).
——— protection from Lake Ontario Waters, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 2807 (ii).
——— south side piers: in Com. of Sup., 7874 (iv).
——— Military Magazine: in Com. of Sup., 645 (i).
——— P.O., Additions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 645 (i).
Transportation Commission: in Com. of Sup., 7896 (iv).
Transportation Facilities: in Com. of Sup., 7897 (iv).
Trenton Harbour Dredging, Appnmt. of Overseer: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 6149 (iv).
Trois Pistoles Breakwater, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7843 (iv).
Valleyfield Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7972 (iv).
Vancouver Dry Dock, Contract *re*, Cor. with Govt., &c.: Read (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 9059 (v).
——— Arrangements *re* Discussion: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 7877 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Vancouver, Dry Dock, Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 869 (i).
——— P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 704 (i).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 9020 (v).
Vancouver and Salt Springs Telephone Extension : in Com. of Sup., 9032 (v).
Verchères Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7843 (iv).
Victoria Beach, Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7647 (iv).
Victoria Harbour, Dredging, Use of Dredge 'King Edward' : Remarks (Mr. Earle) in Com. of Sup., 7878 (iv).
Victoria P.O., B.C., Rental, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Earle) in Com of Sup., 7622 (iv).
Water Service for Dom. Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 7631 (iv).
Wedge Point, Breakwater Extension, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7647 (iv).
West Bay Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7647 (iv).
West Point Wharf, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7743 (iv).
Whitby Harbour, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 9029 (v).
White's Cove Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7647 (iv).
Wiarton Wharf, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7874 (iv).
Wilson's Beach Breakwater, Completion, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 553 (i).
Wingham P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 648 (i).
Winnipeg, Immigration Building : in Com. of Sup., 685 (i).
——— Military Building : in Com. of Sup., 695 (i).
——— Military Magazine : in Com. of Sup., 687 (i).
——— P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 687 (i).
——— purchase of site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 1133 (i).
Woodstock, N.B., Armoury and Gun Shed : in Com. of Sup., 475 (i).
——— Purchase of Site : Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2928 (ii).
Woodstock Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 648 (i).
Yamaska Dredging, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7843 (iv).
Yarmouth Harbour, Retaining Wall : in Com. of Sup., 9026 (v).
Yukon Buildings, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7025, 7632 (iv), 9021 (v).
Yukon Improvements, Irregular Charges : Cor. read (Mr. Broder) in Com. of Sup., 9056 (v).
See 'Gobeil,' &c.
Yukon and Lewes River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7879 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Yukon, Roads and Bridges : in Com. of Sup., 7025 (iv).
Pugwash, N.S., Postmaster, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bell) 1667 (i).
'Quadra,' Govt. Str., Charges by Crew of Ill-treatment : Ques. (Mr. Earle) 8255 (v).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry., Breaking of Bridges, &c., Delay in Mail, &c.: Tels. read (Mr. Davis) 2359 ; Rep. of Controller : read (Sir William Mulock) 2364 (ii).
——— Inefficient Service in N.W.T.: M. (Mr. Scott) to adjn., 2759 (ii).
——— Order, Ques. of (Mr. Henderson) 'Member not discussing question before Hse.': Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2764 (ii).
——— Order, Ques. of (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 'ref. to past Debate': Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2766 (ii).
——— Order, Ques. of (Mr. Lancaster) 'letters read in debate must be placed on Table': Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2786 (ii).
——— Order, Ques. of (Mr. Taylor) 'reading leters reflecting on Members of the Hse.': Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2789 (ii).
See 'Calgary,' 'Seed Grain,' &c.
Qu'Appelle and Wishart Mail Service, Distance, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2556 (ii).
Qu'Appelle and Edmonton Telegraph Lines N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 8023 (iv).
Quarantine, B.C., Purchase of Steamer : in Com. of Sup., 4199 (iii).
——— small-pox inspection : in Com. of Sup., 4156 (iii).
——— Cattle, Veterinary Division: in Com. of Sup., 8961 (v).
Quarantine for Infectious Diseases and Provincial Board of Health, Man.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 3772 (ii).
Quarantine : in Com. of Sup., 4137 (iii).
——— Mar. Provs., Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 4160 (iii).
——— N. W. T. Medical Inspection : in Com. of Sup., 4146 (iii).
——— N.S., Medical Inspection : in Com. of Sup.,4168 (iii).
——— Que., Grosse Isle Steamers : in Com. of Sup., 4192 (iii).
——— Salaries, Organized Districts : in Com. of Sup., 4145 (iii).
See 'Agriculture—Public Health,' &c.
Quebec and Blanc Sablon Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7453 (iv).
Quebec and Gaspé Basin SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7445 (iv).
Quebec & Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s B. No. 43 (Mr. Malouin) 1°*, 1053; 2°*, 1337 (i); in Com., 2369, 2372; 3°*, 2372 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 117).

Quebec Bridge Co., Issue of Bonds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 397 (i).

——— Payments since 1st July, 1903: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 249 (i).

Quebec Central Ry. Co., Amounts received by Govt. annually: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 2373 (ii).

——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Morin) 3949 (iii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.

Quebec Harbour Commission B. wthdn. (Mr. Préfontaine) 3846 (ii).

Quebec Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7896 (iv).

Quebec Hospital for Immigrants: in Com. of Sup., 684 (i).

Quebec Immigration Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 682 (i).

Quebec P.O., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 684 (i).

Quebec Southern Ry. Co., O.C. *re* Amalgamation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 555 (i).

Questions asked by Members, Ministerial Replies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1150 (i).

——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1219 (i).

——— Rights *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 6890 (iv).

Ques. of Privilege, Digby Dock Construction (Mr. Copp) 225 (i).

——— Midland Water Lots, &c. (Mr. McCarthy) 364 (i).
See 'Personal Explanation,' 'Privilege,' &c.

Rail Cutting Plant, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8346 (v).

Railway Act (1903)—(highway crossings) Amt. B. No. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) 1° m., 9; 2° m., 403; M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 418, 1888 (i); On Order for resuming Debate, 3772; in Com., 3773; M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 3788 (ii); on Order for Com., 5097; in Com., 5098 (iii).

——— (telephones, &c.) B. No. 6 (Mr. Maclean) 1° m., 323 (i); 2° m., 3797, 3818; M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 3818 (ii).

——— (employees liability) Amt. B. No. 73 (Mr. Lennox) 1°, 1780 (i); 2° m., 3831; M. to adjn. Debate, 3841 (ii), 4708; ref. to Sel. Com. on Rys., 4710 (iii); M. to place on Govt. Orders, 6364 (iv); in Com., 6686; 3°*, 6686 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 31).

——— (employees safety) Amt. B. No. 88 (Mr. Lancaster) 1° m., 2184 (ii).

Railway Act, 1903, Amt. B. No. 132 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 4214; 2°*, 5673; in Com., 5678 (iii), 6686; 3° m., 7545; Amt. (Mr. Blain) 7545; Neg. (Y. 33; N. 72) 7550; Amt. (Mr. Maclean) 7551; Neg. (Y. 17; N. 94) 7562; Amt. (Mr. Bennett) 7563; Neg. (Y. 25; N. 74) 7564; 3°, agreed to, 7571 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 32).

Ry. Act, Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Decision of Ry. Commissioners, &c., 6713 (iv).

——— Amt. (Mr. Maclean) *re* Express Cos., 6687 (iv).

——— Legislation *re* by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Maclean) 3754 (ii).

Railway Accommodation in N.W.T., Tel. from Mr. Bredt.: Read (Mr. Scott) 3439 (ii).
See 'Qu'Appelle,' &c.

Railways and Canals, Civil Govt. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5892 (iii), 8346 (v).

——— Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 5911 (iii).

——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Emmerson) 1053 (i).

Railway Cars Ventilation, Cor. with Govt. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 561 (i).

——— Cor. *re* with Ry. Cos.: M. for Copies (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 221 (i).

Railway Committee, Meetings concurrent with Sittings of Hse.: M. (Mr. Hyman) 5860 (iii).

Railway Connections at Brockville for Ottawa: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 1471 (i), 2119 (ii).
See 'Post Office—Brockville,' &c.

Railway Debts, &c.: *See* 'Exchequer Court B. 134.'

Railway Dept., Payments to Engineers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7490 (iv).

——— Payments to Extra Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 7489 (iv).

Ry. Employees on Govt. Rys., Safety Appliances *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 5990 (iii).
See 'Ry. Bills 73 and 88.'

Railway Estimates, Information from Minister: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6267 (iv).

Railway Freight Rates in Ontario: Par. in London 'Financial Times': M. (Mr. Broder) to adjn., 2930 (ii).

Railway Lands, Homestead Entries, Retroactive Provisions: Ques. (Mr. Earle) 8776 (v).

Ry. Mail Clerks, Additional: in Com. of Sup., 9011 (v).

Railway Mail Clerks and Fair Wage Officer: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

——— N.W.T., Pet. *re* Increased Allowance: Remarks (Mr. Boyd) in Com. of Sup., 5756; Letter from Association: Read (Mr. Boyd) 5757 (iii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.

Ry. Passenger Service, Stellarton and Pictou, Res. from Charlottetown Board of Trade: Read (Mr. Lefurgey) 8357 (v).

Railway Standard Passenger Tariffs: Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 5580, 5760 (iii).
See 'Railways,' &c.

Railway Statistics, Collection of: in Com. of Sup., 7488 (iv).

Railway Subsidies (mode of payment) B. No. 157 (Mr. Emerson) 1° m., 6873 (iv) ; 2°, and in Com., 8127 ; 3°*, 8133 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 33).
——— (authorization) B. No. 171 (Mr. Emmerson) Res. prop., 8256; M. for Com. on Res., 8786 ; in Com. on Res., 8790; 1°* of B., 8840 ; 2°, and in Com., 9053; 3°*, 9055 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 34).
Railway Subsidies, Govt. Control substituted for Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Haggart) in Com. on Res., 8839 (v).
——— Running Powers, &c., for other Cos.: in Com. on Res., 8826 (v).
——— Transport for Govt. Employees, &c.: in Com. on Res., 8827 (v).

RAILWAYS :
Canada Atlantic Ry., Purchase by Govt., Negotiations *re* : Remarks (Mr. Haggart) 6874 (iv).
Can. Northern Ry., Crossing Saskatchewan River, Pets. *re* : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 1136 (i).
——— Subsidy : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 2116, 2184, 2285 (ii).
C.P.R. Lands, Purchase by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 7197 (v).
——— Stock, Authority for Issue of, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Hughes, P.E.I.) 3436 (ii).
Cattle Guard Commission, Apnmts., Instructions, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lennox) 2848 (ii).
——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. Lennox) 2459, 2602, 3539, 3727 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lenox) in Com. of Sup., 7475 (iv).
——— Extra Remuneration : Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6545 (iv).
——— Holt, Mr., Allowance to : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 7476 (iv).
——— Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1357 (i).
Conmee, James, Contract *re* Nipigon Ry.: Remarks (Mr. Barker) in Com. on Res., 8802 (v).
Duval, J. E., Appnmt. as Inspector of Ry. Accidents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 1138 (i).
Freight Rates in Ontario, Par. in London 'Financial Times' : M. (Mr. Broder) to adjn. Hse., 2930 (ii).
Gov. Gen.'s Car, Repairs to : in Com. of Sup., 7491 (iv).
——— Purchase of New One : in Com. of Sup., 7491 (iv).
G.T.Ry.. Rentals : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) on Conc., 6684 (iv).
Lands, Homestead Entries, Retroactive Provisions : Ques. (Mr. Earle) 8776 (v).
Lévis, Ry. Construction : Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 7468 (iv).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*
Lindsay, Bobcaygeon, &c., Ry. Bridge, Protest *re* : Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 1134 (i).
Montreal and Atlantic Ry., Operations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Mignault) 6149 (iv).
Passenger Rates, Tariffs *re* : &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 5580, 5760 (iii).
Quebec Central Ry., Amounts received by Govt. for Runnig Powers : M. for Ret. (Mr. Morin) 3949 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Morin) 2373 (ii).
Quebec Southern Ry. Co., O.C. *re* Amalgamation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 555 (i).
Railway Accommodation in N.W.T., Tel. from Mr. Bredt : Read (Mr. Scott) 3439 (ii).
Ry. Commission, Decision *re* Telephones from Port Arthur Ry. Station, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Maclean) 561 (i).
——— Buildings, Rental : in Com. of Sup., 7625 (iv).
——— Maintenance and Operation : in Com. of Sup., 8382 (v).
——— Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 219 (i).
——— Private Car, Purchase of : in Com. of Sup., 7503 (iv).
Railways and Canals Dept., Civil Govt., Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 5892 (iii), 8346 (v).
——— Payments to engineers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7490 (iv).
——— Payments to extra clerks : in Com. of Sup., 7489 (iv).
——— Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5911 (iii).
Ry. Employees on Govt. Rys., Safety Appliances *re* : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 5990 (iii).
Railway Estimates, Information from Minister : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6267 (iv).
Railway Statistics, Collection of : in Com. of Sup., 7488 (iv).
——— Rolling Stock, Purchased in Canada or Imported : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. on Ry. Res., 8829 (v).
Safety Appliances for Ry. Employees *re* Govt. Rys.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 5990 (iii).
South Shore Ry. Amalgamation, Cor. *re* : M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 561 (i).
——— *See* 'Quebec Southern.'
Subsidies, Govt. Control substituted for Ry. Commission : Remarks (Mr. Haggart) in Com. on Res., 8839 (v).
Telephone Communication between Port Arthur and Fort William, Decision of Ry. Commission : M. for Copy* (Mr. Maclean) 561 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Maclean) in Com. on Ry. B. 132, 6726, 6733 (iv).
——— Bell Telephone Co.'s Contract *re* Railways : Remarks (Mr. Maclean) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 8822 (v).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry., Subsidies, Total Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 7225 (iv).

Transportation Commission: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Lennox) 6362 (iv).

Yonge Street Ry. Crossing, Order *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 3308 (ii).

Rattenbury, Mr., Payment of Commisison as Freight Agent: Remarks (Mr. Hackett) in Com. of Sup., 5202 (iii).

Real Estate, Title, Guarantee & Trust Co.'s B. No. 27 (Mr. Demers, St. John and Iberville) 1°*, 596; 2°*, 709; in Com., 1818; 3°*, 1819 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 118).

Rebate on Goods: *See* 'Tariff.'

Rebellion Losses, 1885, Payment of Claims, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Davis) 2808 (ii).

——— Order, Ques. of (Mr. Henderson) 'Discussing other question,' 2826 (ii).

See 'Half-Breeds,' &c.

Receipts and Expenditures, I.C.R., Annual Statement of Minister, on M. for Sup., 5867 (iii).

See 'I.C.R.,' &c.

Receiver Gen.'s Office, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 231 (i).

Red Deer Court House: in Com. of Sup., 700 (i).

Red Island Lightships, Pet. *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com. of Sup., 5323 (iii).

Refrigerators for Fish Bait, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5047 (iii).

Regina 'Leader,' Payment to for Immigration Literature: Remarks (Mr. Cowan) in Com. of Sup., 7358 (iv).

Regina, Prince Albert and Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co., Rep. from London *re* Sales of Land: Remarks (Mr. Scott) 2366 (ii).

See 'Qu'Appelle,' &c.

Registrars of N.W.T. Govt., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7023 (iv).

Reid & Archibald, and Reid McManus, Tenders for Double Tracking I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8351 (v).

REPORTS:

Aud. Gen.'s Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 254 (i).

Civil Service List: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 205 (i).

Fisheries, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Préfontaine) 794 (i).

Inland Revenue, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 204, 868 (i).

Interior, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Sifton) 203 (i).

Justice, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 985 (i).

Militia and Defence, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Frederick Boden) 2848 (ii).

REPORTS—*Con.*

N. W. Mounted Police Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1354 (i).

Penitentiaries, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 985 (i).

Post Office, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir William Mulock) 204 (i).

Printing and Stationery, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2188 (ii).

Public Works, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. J. Sutherland) 204 (i).

Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Emmerson) 1053 (i).

Secretary of State, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. J. Sutherland) 204 (i).

Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. J. Sutherland) 204 (i).

Trade and Navigation, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 204 (i).

Representation Act, 1903, Amt. B. No. 149 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 5863 (iii); Remarks, 7228; 2°, and in Com., 7669; 3° m., 7786 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 35).

Representation in H. of C., Appeals of N.B., and P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 3873 (ii).

——— Ref. to Privy Council, Factum *re*: Remarks (Mr. Haggart) 5000 (iii).

Restigouche Bridge Superstructure: in Com. of Sup., 5948 (iii).

See 'I.C.R.'

Revised Statutes of Canada Amt. B. No. 154 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1°, 6541; 2°*, 6795; in Com. 6795; 3°*, 6797 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 36).

Richard, Mr., Copyist for Archives Branch: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2732 (ii).

'Richelieu' Dredge, Cost of Maintenance: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6543 (iv).

Richelieu River Floods, Pets. &c., *re* Damages: M. for Copies (Mr. Demers, Iberville) 222 (i).

See 'Public Works,' &c.

Richibucto, N.B., Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 463 (i).

Richmond Bay Wharf, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7739 (iv).

Rideau Canal Bridges, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Birkett) in Com. of Sup., 5914 (iii).

——— Extension, Desert to Devil Lake: in Com. of Sup., 8382 (v).

——— Poonamalie Dam: in Com. of Sup., 8382 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 1149 (i).

——— Smith's Falls Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 7469 (iv).

See 'Canals—Rideau,' &c.

Rideau Hall, Fuel, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7628 (iv).

——— Grounds, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8021 (iv).

See 'Public Works—Ottawa,' &c.

Rifle Association Grants: in Com. of Sup., 8385 (v).
Rimouski Pier Extension, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7780 (iv).
Rio de Janeiro Tramway, Light & Power Co.'s B. No. 142 (Mr. Calvert) M. to receive Pet., 4822, 4997; 1°*, 5187; 2° m., 5299; in Com., 5865; 3°*, 5866 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 119).
Rivière du Loup, Car Shops, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5972 (iii).
——— Harbour Improvements, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7781 (iv).
——— Tunnel, I.C.R., Res. of Town Council, Fraserville: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 8254 (v).
River John Mail Contracts: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Bell) 6024 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bell) in Com. of Sup., 5746 (iii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Rivière Ouelle Pulp Co.'s Siding, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8365 (v).
See 'Murray Bay,' &c.
Roads and Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 9031 (v).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7891 (iv).
——— N.W.T., Improper Expenditure by Territorial Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Sifton) in Com. of Sup., 9043 (v).
——— N.W.T., Payment to Indians, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9032 (v).
Robertson, Eliza, Relief, B. No. 141 (Mr. Holmes) 1°*, 5187; 2°*, 5579; in Com., and 3°*, 5866 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 120).
Robinson Treaty Annuities for Indians: in Com. of Sup., 5855 (iii).
Rodger, Robert James McDuff, Relief, B. No. 84 (Mr. Grant) 1°*, 2116; 2°*, 2328; in Com. and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 121).
Rolling Stock, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8354 (v).
See 'I.C.R.' &c.
Rondeau, Harbour Improvements and Pier, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7855 (iv).
Ross, Hon. Wm., Letter written as Minister of Militia *re* Elections: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) 6063; Denial and Stmnt. *re* Forgery (Mr. Ross) 6062 (iv).
Rossland Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 701 (i).
Ross, Mr., Chief P.O. Inspector, Salary: in Com.of Sup., 5851 (iii).
Ross Rifle, Contract, Tests, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 6886 (iv).
Ross Rifle Factory, Application for Land on Cove Fields: Ques. (Mr. Bell) 2378 (ii).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Bell) 2847 (ii).
Royal Assent: *See* 'Bills.'
Royal Mint, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 456 (i).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa,' &c.
'Rules of the Road on Great Lakes: *See* 'Navigation,' &c.
Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 5732, 5750 (iii).
Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 9011 (v).
Russell, Mr., M.P., Judgeship *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ontario) in Com. of Sup., 7940 8002 (iv),
Russian Jews deported from U.S., to Winnipeg: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 554 (i).
See 'Immigrants.'
Rustico Harbour Breakwater, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7739 (iv).
St. Amour's Gully, Soulanges Canal: in Com. of Sup., 6868 (iv).
St. Andrew's Rapids, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 7897 (iv).
——— Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Puttee) 398 (i).
——— Res. of Board of Trade, Letter *re*: Ques. (Mr. LaRivière) 2602 (ii).
St. Anne de Sorel, Ice Breaker Building, Pay of Labourers: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 5582 (iii).
St. Catharines Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 631 (i), 9020 (v).
St. Catharines Field Battery, Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ontario) on Personal Explanation (Mr. Fisher) 4589 (iii).
St. Charles Junction, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7532 (iv).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 9 (Mr. Tisdale) 1°*, 396; 2°*, 549; in Com. and 3°*, 987 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 122).
Ste. Famille Pier Extension, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7782 (iv).
Ste. Flavie Station Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5976 (iii).
Ste. Flore Voters' List, Changes or Modifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1360 (i).
St. Francis River Ice Piers, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pope) 3389 (ii).
See 'Public Works,' &c.
St. Gabriel Basin, Lachine Canal: in Com. of Sup., 7535 (iv).
See 'Canals—Lachine,' &c.
St. Godfroi de Nouvelle Breakwater, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7782 (iv).
St. Hyacinthe, Que., Cheese Cooling Rooms, Total Expenditure: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 2847 (ii).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.
St. Hyacinthe Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 684 (i).
St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7782 (iv).
St. John and Belfast SS. Service: in Com. of Sup., 6214 (iv).
St. John and Digby SS. Service: in Com. of Sup., 6216 (iv).
St. John and Dublin SS. Service: in Com. of Sup., 6214 (iv).

St. John and Glasgow SS. Service : in Com. of Sup., 6213 (iv).
St. John and London SS. Service : in Com. of Sup., 6215 (iv).
St. John and Minas Basin SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7445 (iv).
St. John and Partridge Island Quarantine, Charges for Horse-hire : in Com. of Sup., 4145 (iii).
St. John and Yarmouth SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7445 (iv).
St. John, W. Indies and S. America SS. Service: in Com. of Sup., 6216 (iv).
St. John, N.B., Customs Collector's Appnmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 332 (i).
——— Dom. Buildings, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 464 (i).
——— Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 9019 (v).
——— option on Chipman property, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2556 (ii), 3941 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 472 (i).
——— Harbour Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5271 (iii).
——— Marine Hospital : in Com. of Sup., 5837 (iii).
——— Quarantine Station, Water Service : in Com. of Sup., 464 (i).
——— River Dredging, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Wilmot) in Com. of Sup., 7886 (iv).
——— River, Negro Point Breakwater, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7750 (iv).
——— Station Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5973 (iii).
St. John, P.Q., Examining Warehouse : in Com. of Sup., 684 (i).
——— Post Office Site, Pets, *re* : M. for copies* (Mr. Monk) 2847 (ii).
St. John, P.Q., Post Office, Purchase of Site, Price paid : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1879 (i).
St. John d'Iberville Post Office, Site, Pets. *re* : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1876 (i).
St. John's P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 685 (i)
St. Joseph's Wharf, Lake Huron : on Conc., 9074 (v).
St. Lawrence Buoys : in Com. of Sup., 5804 (iii).
St. Lawrence Floods, Res. from Chamber of Commerce *re* Prevention : Ques. (Mr. Geoffrion) 3132 (ii).
St. Lawrence Islands, Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9018 (v).
St. Lawrence, Lighthouses, &c., Pamphlet for Campaign Literature : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5003 (iii).
——— Lighting, Change to Acetylene Gas : in Com. of Sup., 5810, 5813 (iii).
——— Mail Contracts : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1449, 2369, 3126 (ii).
See 'Atlantic,' &c.
——— Navigation, Defective Guides : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5026 (iii).
St. Lawrence, Pamphlet *re*, Distribution of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 550 (i).
——— Ship Channel, Damages to Dredge 'J. I. Tarte' : in Com. of Sup., 8021 (iv).
——— history : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 7613 (iv).
——— insurance rates, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 7607 (iv).
——— list of dredges, plant, &c.: Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 7600 (iv).
——— ship channel : in Com. of Sup., 7599 (iv).
——— ship channel, O.C. *re* transfer of duties from Public Works to Marine Dept.: Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 7599 (iv).
See 'Public Works,' &c.
——— Winter Navigation for Allan Strs. Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6156 (iv).
——— Winter Service Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7456 (iv).
See 'Trade and Commerce.'
——— Wrecking Plant Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7461 (iv).
St. Leonard Junction, Diversion of Line, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8347 (v).
St. Louis de Mile End P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 685 (i).
St. Louis Exhibition, Officers appointed, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7404 (iv).
See 'Eastman,' &c.
St. Louis Exhibition : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4101 (iii).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.
St. Mary's Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 631 (i).
St. Mathias Wharf, Que., Estimated Cost : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8254 (v).
St. Maurice Slides and Booms, Pay of Labourers : Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 5583 (iii).
St. Maurice Slides : in Com. of Sup., 7891 (iv).
St. Maurice Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 50 (Mr. Bureau) 1°*, 1054 ; 2°*, 1338 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3480 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 123).
St. Our's Lock: in Com. of Sup., 6864 (iv).
——— Pay of Labourers : Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 5583 (iii).
See 'Canals—Chambly,' &c.
Ste. Perpetue Station Accommodation, I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. Ball) 8658 (v).
St. Peter's Canal, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7466 (iv).
St. Roch Traverse Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 4274 (iii).
St. Romuald Siding, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8365 (v)
St. Simeon Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7828 (iv).
St. Stephen and Back Bay Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7453 (iv).

St. Thomas Military Camp, District No. 1, Total Expenditure : Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 7226 (iv).
St. Thomas, Post Office, Appnmt. of Asst. Postmaster : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 5746 (iii).
St. Thomas, 25th Battalion Club Rooms, Rent, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 7226 (iv).
Sabbath Observance Legislation: Remarks (Mr. Robinson, Elgin) 254 (i).
Sable Island Tree Planting, Rep. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 2117 (ii).
Sackville and Cape Tormentine Mail, Contract *re* : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 557 (i).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Safety Appliances for Ry. Employees *re* Govt. Rys.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 5990 (iii).
See 'Ry. Bills,' &c.
Salmon exported to U.S., from B.C., Prohibition, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Earle) 5354 (iii).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.
Salmon River Breakwater, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7747 (iv).
Salvation Army Officers and Parole System *re* Penitentiaries : Remarks (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. of Sup., 7954 (iv).
Sand Point Building, Insecurity, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 467 (i).
Sandy Cove Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7646 (iv).
San Jose Scale, Fumigating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2746 (ii).
Sarnia Dredging, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7855 (iv).
Saskatchewan Mail Service, Tel. from Board of Trade, Rosthern : Read (Mr. Davis) 2188 (ii).
See 'Qu'Appelle,' &c.
Saskatchewan River Navigation Improvements, Amount expended : M. for ret.* (Mr. Davis) 224 (i).
——— Surveys, &c.: M. for ret.* (Mr. Davis) 3771 (ii).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Mr. Steer's Rep. *re* Settlement : Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) in Com. of Sup., 7034-5; Letter in 'Globe' *re* Homestead Regulations : Read, 7036 (iv).
Saturday Sessions: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8390 (v).
Sault Ste. Marie, Canal Construction : in Com. of Sup., 6816 (iv).
——— Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7856 (iv).
——— P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 639 (i).
——— Wharf, Compensation to W.H. Plummer : in Com. of Sup., 9029 (v).
Savard, Mr. P. V., Emplymt. by Govt. *re* Mingan Seigniory : M. for ret.* (Mr. Casgrain) 561 (i).
——— O.Cs. Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Casgrain) 222 (i).
Savard, Mr. P. V., Emplymt. by Govt. *re* Mingan Seigniory : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 217 (i).
——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. Casgrain) 679, 868 (i), 2284 (ii).
Saw Mills, Portable, Regulations *re* : Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) in Com. of Sup., 7071 (iv).
Scholes, Lou, Champion Oarsman of World : Remarks (Mr. Maclean) 7437 (iv).
School Furniture, &c.: *See* 'Canadian Office,' &c.
School Lands, Taxes *re*, Litigation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7078 (iv).
School of Navigation and Naval Militia : in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
See 'Naval,' &c.
Schools in N.W.T., Expenses *re* : in Com. of Sup., 7024 (iv).
See 'Indians,' &c.
Scientific Institutions : in Com. of Sup., 5836 (iii).
Scottish Light Dragoons, and Political Interference : *See* 'Dundonald.'
Scott's Bay Breakwater Extension, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7646 (iv).
Scow Building for Canals, Advertising for Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Reid, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 7467 (iv).
Seal Cove, N.B., Survey of Wharf : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 3761 (ii).
Seal Fisheries, Seizing of Vessels, Payment of Claims, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 5354, 5454 (iii).
Secretary of State, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. J. Sutherland) 204 (i).
Security Bonds for Public Officers and U.S. Guarantee Cos., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 3387 (ii).
See 'Finance.'
Seed Grain Shortage, N.W.T. and Inefficient Service of Qu'Appelle, &c. Ry.: M. (Mr. Scott) to adjn., 2759 (ii).
——— Inability to procure any, Tel. from W. C. Whitelock : Read (Mr. Scott) 2282 (ii).
See 'Qu'Appelle,' &c.
Seed Growers' Associations Incorp. B. No. 151 (Mr. Fisher) 1°, 6364; 2° m., 7229; in Com., 7230 (iv).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale of, B. No. 125 (Mr. Fisher) Prop. Res., 3720; in Com. on Res., 3722; 1°*, 3725 (ii); 2°*, 4928; in Com., 4928 (iii).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale, Information *re* : Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 332 (i).
Semaphores on I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5986 (iii).
Senate, Contingencies : in Com. of Sup., 9038 (v).
——— Salaries and Contingencies : in Com. of Sup., 8977 (v).

Sergeant-at-Arms Estimates as approved, Comparisons, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 8989 (v).
Sergeant-at-Arms, Increase of Salary : in Com. of Sup., 8979 (v).
Sessional Clerks, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 8982 (v).
Sessions, Length and Delay in calling Parlt.: Remarks (Mr. Boyd) 6638 (iv), 8261 (v).
Seven Islands Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7828, 7972 (iv), 9074 (v).
——— Anonymous Letter *re* Work at Clarke's City : Read (Mr. Taylor) 7991 (iv).
Severn River, Removal of Obstructions : in Com. of Sup., 9029 (v).
Shareholders Meeting, G.T.P., Rep. from 'R-. News': Read (Mr. Lefurgey) 1750 (i).
See 'G.T.P.' &c.
Shawinigan Falls and Grand Mère B. No. 13 (Mr. A. T. Thompson) in Com., 986 (i).
See 'C.P.R. B. 13.'
Sheep Quarantine and Claim of Mr. John Campbell for Repayment of Express Charges : M. for Cor. (Mr. Hughes, Ontario) 3761 (ii).
See 'Campbell,' &c.
Sherbrooke Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 684 (i).
——— Location of Site, Representations *re* : Ques. (Mr. Pope) 2376 (ii).
——— Political Interference, Cor.: Read (Mr. Hughes, Ontario) 4594 (iii).
Shippegan Harbour Wharf, Caraquet Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 9027 (v).
Shipping Casualties Act, 1901, Amt. B. No. 102 (Mr. Préfontaine) 1°, 2684 (ii); 2°, 5197; M. for Com., 5280; in Com., 5281; 3°*, 5284 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6889 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 37).
Ships' Cables, Customs Tariff *re* : Remarks (Mr. Kaulbach) 1783 (i).
Shipwrecks and Sub-Marine Signals : Remarks (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) in Com. of Sup., 5829 (iii).
See 'Marine—Submarine.'
Shives Lumber Co., Cor. *re* Campbellton Wharf: Read (Mr. Fowler) 7788 (iv).
——— Purchase of Caraquet Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7746 (iv).
See 'I.C.R,' 'Public Works,' &c.
Sidings, Additional, and Spur Lines, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8365 (v).
See 'I.C.R.' &c.
Signals, Submarine, Purchased by Govt. in Boston : Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 2187 (ii).
See 'Shipwrecks,' &c.
Silk Fabrics : Remarks (Mr. Brock) in Com. on Ways and Means, 8877 (v).
Similkameen & Keremeos Ry. Co.'s B. No. 136 (Mr. Morrison) M. to receive Pet., 3846 (ii); 1°*, 4822; 2°*, 5073; in Com., and 3°*, 5866 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 124).
Sinclair, Mr., Member for Guysborough, introduced, 794 (i).
Sioux Indians, Treaty, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iv).
Skates, Reduction of Duty : Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. on Ways and Means, 8873 (v).
Skinner's Cove Protection Works, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7646 (iv).
Slides and Booms : in Com. of Sup., 7891 (iv).
Sloan, M. W., Compensation *re* Injuries : in Com. of Sup., 5846 (iii).
Small, E. A., Patent Relief B. No. 93 (Mr. Logan) 1°*, 2282; 2°*, 2598; in Com., 3056; 3°*, 3059 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 125).
Small-pox, Inspection in B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 4156 (iii).
Small-pox Prevention, Cor. from Provincial Board of Health, Man.: Read (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 4151 (iii).
Small-pox Quarantine, Inspection in Man., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4151 (iii).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.
Smith, Hamilton, Tel. published by Prime Minister : Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1692 (i).
Smith's Falls, Bridge over Rideau Canal : in Com. of Sup., 7469 (iv).
See 'Canals—Rideau,' &c.
Snow Cleaning, Ottawa Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 7630 (iv).
Société de Crédit, Letters Patents to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Demers, Iberville) 991 (i).
Solicitor General and Minister of Jus., Prof. Service and Private Practice : Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in Com. of Sup., 431 (i).
Solicitor General, Mr. Lemieux, and Political Speeches in England, Cable Despatch. Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 7082 (iv).
See 'Dundonald,' &c.
Songhee Indians, Removal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Earle) in Com. of Sup., 6959 (iv).
Sorel Wharf Contract, Pay of Labourers : Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 5583 (iii).
Soulanges Canal, Arms and Heaters : in Com. of Sup., 6868 (iv).
——— Claim of Messrs. O'Brien, Settlement *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 8024 (v).
——— Land Damages : in Com. of Sup., 7538 (iv).
——— Steel Bridge over Power House : in Com. of Sup., 6862 (iv).
——— Survey for Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 6862 (iv).
——— Water Wheel Governors : in Com. of Sup., 6868 (iv).
——— Workshops, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iv).
Souris Point Breakwater, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7740 (iv).

Souris to Elmira, P.E.I. Ry., Survey : in Com. of Sup., 8366 (v).
See 'I.C.R.,' &c.
Scuth Africa, Exports from Canada, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, B.C.) 5270 (iii).
See 'Trade and Commerce,' &c.
S. A. War, Canadians injured, Care of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3538 (ii).
——— Medals presented by King, Application by Canadians, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 2375 (ii).
——— Pensions to Disabled Can. Soldiers : M. (Mr. Broder) for Cor., 4695 (iii).
See 'Mulloy,' &c.
South America and St. John SS. Service : in Com. of Sup., 6216 (iv).
Southampton Harbour Improvements, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7857 (iv).
Scuth Shore Ry. Amalgamation, Cor. *re* : M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 561 (i).
See 'Quebec Southern.'
Spain, Capt., Purchase of Fur-Lined Coat : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5292 (iii).
See 'Bernier,' &c.
Spanish River Dredging, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7857 (iv).
Sparks, Mr. W. S., Emplymt. by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Boyd) 7402 (iv).
Speaker, Election of, 3 (i).
Speaker's Rulings *re* Motions to adjn. House : Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1212 (i).
See 'House of Commons,' &c.
Speech from the Throne : Read (Mr. Speaker) 6 (i).
Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co.'s B. No. 42 (Mr. Ganong) 1°*, 1053; 2°*, 1337 (i); in Com., 4270; on M. for 3°, 4270, 4452, 4686 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 126).
Springhill Junction, Water Boring, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7532 (iv).
See 'I.C.R.,' &c.
Spry Bay Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7647 (iv).
Spur Lines, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8365 (v).
See 'I.C.R.,' &c.
Stallions for Breeding Stock : in Com. on Ways and Means, 8896 (v).
Standard Chemical Co., and Wood Alcohol, Contracts, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3923 (ii).
See 'Inland Revenue,' &c.
Standard Oil Co., Contract *re* Lighting Cars : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5932 (iii).
——— Refinery, Visit of Official *re* Bounties : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6173 (iv).
See 'Coal Oil,' &c.
Standard Passenger Tariff Tolls : Amt. (Mr. Maclean) in Com. on Ry. B .132, 6761 (iv).
See 'Railways,' &c.
Standing Orders Com.: M. to substitute Name (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 477 (i).
'Stanley,' Str., Accident with 'Prince Edward' at Yarmouth : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5218 (iii).
——— Removal from Summerside Route : Remarks (Mr. Hackett) in Com. of Sup., 5202 (iii).
'Star,' Toronto, Newspaper, Canvassing by County Postmasters : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5690 (iii).
Statistics, Generally, Compilation : in Com. of Sup., 8959, 9073 (v).
Statutes, Consolidation Commission, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7958 (iv).
Statutes : *See* 'Revised.'
Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. No. 7 (Mr. McCarthy) 1° m., 330 (i).
——— B. No. 101 (Mr. Préfontaine) 1°, 2682 (ii); 2°*, 4070; in Com., 4070, 5195; 3°*, 5197 (iii). (4 Edward VII., c. 38).
Steamboat Inspection Act, &c.: Opportunity for Discussing : Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 5183, 5196 (iii).
Steamboat Inspection and Fog Alarms : in Com. of Sup., 5838 (iii).
See 'Submarine,' &c.
Steamers sold by Govt., Prices, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Porter) in Com. of Sup., 4205 (iii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Steam Heating Apparatus, P.E.I. Ry. Cars : in Com. of Sup., 5998 (iii).
SS. Cos. *re* Atlantic Service, Agreements, &c.: M. for ret.* (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 224 (i).
——— Ventilation of Ships' Holds, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 224 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 994 (i).
SS. Subsidies, N.B., P.E.I., Nfld.: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Hackett) 1881 (i).
See 'Trade and Commerce,' &c.
Steel and Iron Bounties, 1903, Amt. B. No. 165 (Sir Richard Cartwright) Res. prop., 8028a; in Com. on Res., 8392; 1° *, 2°* of B., 8393; in Com., 8393; 3°*, 8393 (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 39).
Steel Rails and Fastenings, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8360 (v).
See 'I.C.R.,' &c.
Steel Rails, Purchase in Canada, Duties, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. on Ry. Res., 8828 (v).
Steel Shelving, Ottawa Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 620 (i).
Stellarton Station, I.C.R., Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 5969 (iii).
See 'New Glasgow,' &c.
Stewart, Mr., Inspector of Timber, Experiments, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7072 (iv).
——— Rep. *re* Dom. Lands : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7222 (iv).

Stewart, Mr., Supt. of Cornwall Canal, Hotel Expenses : Remarks (Mr. Pringle) in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iv).

——— Str. 'Alert,' Use of : Remarks (Mr. Reid, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 7472, 7520 (iv).

Strait of Canso Bridge Co.'s B. No. 64 (Mr. Wade) 1°*, 1297; 2°*, 1357 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2153 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 127).

Straits Settlement Currency, Circulation in Can.: Remarks (Mr. Maclean) 2189 (ii).

Stratford Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 640 (i).

Strathcona, Lord, Speeches *re* Imperial Policy: Remarks (Mr. Bourassa) 3753 (ii).

Submarine Signals, Purchased by Govt. in Boston: Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 2187 (ii).
See 'Shipwrecks,' &c.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS :

Bracebridge and Trading Lake Ry.: in Com. on Res., 8791 (v).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry.: in Com. on Res., 8791 (v).

C.P.R., St. Phillippe D'Argenteuil Branch : in Com. on Res., 8822 (v).

Chateauguay and Northern Ry.: in Com. on Res., 8824 (v).

Lardo to Upper Arrow Lake Ry.: in Com. on Res., 8825 (v).

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal & Ry. Co. : in Com. on Res., 8825 (v).

Nipigon Ry.: in Com. on Res., 8792, 8801.

Ottawa River Ry. Co.: in Com. on Res., 8825 (v).
See 'Ry. Subsidies Bills.'

Suction Dredges, Mar. Provs., Contract *re* : Ques. (Mr. Bell) 1665 (i).
See 'Dredging,' &c.

Summerside Breakwater, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7740 (iv).

——— Harbour Light: in Com. of Sup., 5320 (iii).

——— P. E. I. Ry. Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8369 (v).
See 'I.C.R.' &c.

Summerville Wharf Addition, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7647 (iv).

Supply Bill, No. 156 (Mr. Fielding) M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 6784; in Com., 6784 ; 1°*; 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 6785 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 1).

——— B. No. 174 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Ways and Means, 9078; 1°*, 2°* ; in Com., and 3°*, (v). (4 Edward VII, c. 2).

——— Procedure *re* One-Fifth Vote: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 6637 (iv).

Supply Items, in Balance Column, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iv).

Supply Items, Passing without Discussion : Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 5926 (iii).

Supply: M. for Com. (Mr. Fielding) 203 (i).

SUPPLY :

COMMITTEE :

Administration of Justice : *See* 'Justice' :

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics :
Aid to Agricultural Societies, 2742 (ii).
Archives, 2727 (ii).
Can. Exhibit at Imperial Institute, 2757, 3728 (ii).
Cold Storage, &c., 7405, 7422 (iv).
Criminal Statistics, 2734 (ii).
Dairying Commissioner's Branch, &c., 7405, 7422 (iv).
Exhibitions, 4093 (iii), 7404 (iv).
Experimental Farms, 2743 (ii), 4958 (iii), 7364, 7404 (iv).
Farm Bulletins, Printing, &c., 2744 (iv).
Fumigating Stations, 2746 (ii).
General Statistics, 2741 (ii), 8959 (v).
Historical Data of Acadians, 2744 (ii).
'Patent Record,' 2732 (ii), 7404 (iv).
Winnipeg Exhibition, 2750 (ii).
'Year-book,' 2735 (ii).

Adulteration of Food :
Administration of Fraudulent Marking Act and Adulteration of Food, &c., 4091 (iii).

Charges of Management :
Brokerage on Purchase of Sinking Funds, 244 (i).
Commission on Payment of Interest, &c., 232 (i).
Dom. Notes, Circulation, 244 (i).
Printing, 244 (i).
General Vote, 231 (i).
English Bill Stamps, &c., 246 (i).
Office of Asst. Receiver General, Montreal, 232 (i).
Office of Asst. Receiver General, Toronto, 231 (i).
Public Debt, Conversion of, Expenses *re*, 246 (i).

Civil Government :
Agriculture, 2715 (ii).
Board of Civil Service Examiners, 9038 (v).
Contingencies :
Agriculture, 2717 (ii).
Auditor General's Office, 9034 (v).
Governor General's Secretary's Office, 246 (i).
Indian Affairs, 5854 (iii).
Inland Revenue, 3909 (ii).
Justice, 7937 (iv).
Post Office, 5586, 5845 (iii).
Privy Council Office, 428 (i).
Railways and Canals, 5911 (iii).
Trade and Commerce, 6154 (iv).
Customs, 1781, 1825 (i).
Geological Survey, 7199 (iv).
Governor General's Secretary's Office, 246 (i).
Indian Affairs, 5854 (iii), 9014 (v).
Inland Revenue, 3909 (ii), 8976 (v).
Interior, 6966 (iv).
Justice, 430 (i), 7937, 7953-4 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries, 5000 (iii), 8918 (v).
Post Office, 5586, 5845 (iii).
Privy Council Office, 428 (i).
Public Works, 436 (i).
Railways and Canals, 5892 (iii,) 8346 (v).
Trade and Commerce, 6150 (iv).

Customs :
General Vote, 1889 (i).
Salaries, Travelling Expenses of Inspectors, &c., 1979 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Dominion Lands :
Accounts *re* Late J. E. Malhoit's Survey, 7197 (iv).
Commissioner's Salary, 7056 (iv).
Salaries, &c., 7062 (iv), 9018 (v).
Extra Clerks, &c., 7069 (iv).
Superintendent of Mines, Salary, 7056 (iv).
Surveys, &c., 7026 (iv).
Timber Lands, Protection of, 7070 (iv).
Dominion Police, 7949 (iv).
Excise :
Adulteration of Food, 4091 (iii).
Extra Duty Pay at Large Distilleries, 3919 (ii).
Extra Duty Pay to Officers *re* Overtime, 3919 (ii).
Methylated Spirits, 3923 (ii).
Minor Revenues, 4091 (iii).
Preventive Service, 3920 (ii).
Provisional Allowances to B.C. Officers, 3923 (ii).
Salaries, &c., 3913 (ii).
Stamps for Tobacco, 3920 (ii).
Commission to Sellers of Can. Twist Tobacco, 3921 (ii).
To pay Collectors of Customs Allowance for Duty collected, 3921 (ii).
To pay L. A. Frechette for Translation, 3922 (ii).
Travelling Expenses, Rent, Fuel, &c., 3920 (ii).
Weights and Measures :
Rent, Fuel, Travelling Expenses, &c., 4051 (iii).
Salaries, &c., 4042 (iii).
Fisheries :
Cold Storage for Bait, 7580 (iv), 8959 (v).
Fish-breeding Establishments, &c., 7586 (iv), 8943 (v).
Georgian Bay Laboratory, 7593 (iv).
Outfitting New Cruisers for Protection Service, 8956 (v).
Oyster Culture, 7588 (iv).
Protection Service, New Cruisers, 8958 (v).
Salaries to Overseers, &c., 7572, 7598 (iv).
Geological Survey :
Archaelogical Specimens, Purchase of, 9015 (v).
Compiling of field-notes, &c., 7220 (iv).
General Vote, 7215 (iv).
Metallurgical, Petrographical Assistance, 7221 (iv).
Special Surveys in B.C., and Yukon, &c., 7220 (iv).
Govt. of Northwest Territories :
Grant for Schools, 7024 (iv).
Insane Patients, 7024 (iv).
Registrars, &c., 7023 (iv).
Govt. of Yukon Territory :
General Vote, 7024 (iv).
Grant for Local Purposes, 7025 (iv).
Maintenance of Roads, &c., 7025 (iv).
Immigration :
Agents' Salaries, Can., G.B. and Foreign Countries, 7272 (iv).
Contingencies in Can., British and Foreign Countries, 7361 (iv).
Indians :
British Columbia :
Day Schools, 6957 (iv).
Industrial Schools, &c., 6957 (iv).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Indians—*Con.*
British Columbia—*Con.*
Office, &c., Liquor Traffic Suppression, 6958 (iv).
Relief, 6957 (iv).
Salaries, 6957 (iv).
Travelling Expenses, 6958 (iv).
Generally :
Robinson Treaty Annuities, 5855 (iii).
P. H. Bryce, Medical Inspector, 6960 (iv).
Manitoba and N.W.T.:
Annuities, 6941 (iv).
General Expenses, &c., 6954 (iv).
Implements, Purchase of, 6942 (iv).
Live Stock, 6944 (iv).
Provisions, Medical Attendance, &c., 6945 (iv).
Saw-mills, &c., 6954 (iv).
Schools, 6946 (iv).
Seeds, 6942 (iv).
Sioux, 6953 (iv).
Surveys, &c., 6951 (iv).
Triennial Clothing, 6946 (iv).
New Brunswick :
Additional Amount, 6964 (iv).
Medical Attendance, 6938 (iv).
Salaries, 6937 (iv).
Nova Scotia :
Medical Attendance, 6937 (iv).
Relief and Seed Grain, 6936 (iv).
Salaries, 6933 (iv).
Ontario and Quebec :
Annuities, &c., *re* Treaty No. 9, 9016 (v).
General Legal Expenses, 6932 (iv).
Liquor Traffic, Prevention of, 5858 (iii).
Medical Attendance, Ont., 5854 (iii).
Mississaguas Band, Compensation, 9018 (v).
Surveys of Reserves, 5855 (iii).
P.E.I.:
Medical Attendance, 6941 (iv).
Relief and Seed Grain, 6938 (iv).
Salaries, 6938 (iv).
Yukon :
Relief, &c., 6959 (iv).
Justice :
Ad Hoc Judges, 7939 (iv).
Exchequer Court :
Chief Clerk, 7939 (iv).
Contingencies, Travelling Expenses, &c., 7939 (iv).
Junior second-class Clerks, 7939 (iv).
Miscellaneous, including N.W.T., 7938 (iv).
Further Amount, 7957 (iv).
Revised Statutes Commission, 7958 (iv).
Salary, County Court Judge, N.S., 7938 (iv).
Supreme Court :
E. R. A. Taschereau, Salary, 9039 (v).
One Usher, 7939 (iv).
Yukon :
Judges' Travelling Allowances, 7945 (iv).
Law Books, &c., 7949 (iv).
Living Allowances, &c., 7945 (iv).
Miscellaneous Expenditure, 7949 (iv).
Legislation :
General :
Voters' Lists, 9004 (v).
House of Commons :
Contingencies, including Private Secretary to Leader of Opposition, 8988 (v).
General Index to Journals, &c., 9003 (v).
Salaries, 8977 (v).
Sergeant-at-Arms Estimate, 8989 (v).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Legislation—*Con.*
Library :
Salaries, 9004 (v).
Senate :
Further Amount for Contingencies, 9038 (v).
Salaries, &c., 8977 (v).
Lighthouse and Coast Service :
Agencies, Rents and Contingencies, 5804 (iii).
Aids to Navigation, &c., 5813 (iii), 7597 (iv).
Lurcher's Shoal, Lightship, &c., 5804 (iii), 7597 (iv).
Maintenance and Repairs, &c., 5804 (iii), 7597 (iv), 8919, 8932 (v).
Montreal Pilot Commissioner's Court, 5835 (iii).
P.E.I., Service, &c., 7598 (iv).
Repairs to Wharfs, 5836 (iii).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 5300 (iii).
Salaries of Temporaries, Draughtsmen, &c., 5833 (iii).
Wireless Telegraph Stations, Equipment, 5834 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions :
Canada and Australia, 7461 (iv).
Canada and G.B., 6154 (iv).
Canada and Mexico, 7464 (iv).
Canada and South Africa, 7446 (i).
Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie, 7447 (iv).
Gaspé Basin and Paspebiac, 7461 (iv).
Gaspé Basin and Quebec, 7445 (iv).
Grand Manan and Mainland, 7444 (iv).
Halifax and Canso, 7453 (iv).
Halifax and Nfld., via Cape Breton Ports, 7444 (iv).
Halifax, Nfld., and Liverpool, 6210 (iv).
Magdalen Islands and Mainland, 7444 (iv).
Manchester and Canada, 7446 (iv).
Murray Bay and River Ouelle, 7454, 7457 (iv).
Petit du Grat and Mulgrave, 7464 (iv).
Pictou, &c., and Montague Bridge, 7445 (iv).
Port Mulgrave and Canso, &c., 7448 (iv).
P.E.I. and G.B., 7446 (iv).
P.E.I. and Nfld, 7460 (iv).
Quebec and Blanc Sablon, 7453 (iv).
Quebec and Murray Bay, &c., 7454 (iv).
St. John and Digby, 6216 (iv).
St. John, Dublin and Belfast, 6214 (iv).
St. John and Glasgow, 6213 (iv).
St. John, Halifax and London, 6215 (iv).
St. John and Halifax via Yarmouth, 7445 (iv).
St. John and Minas Basin, 7445 (iv).
St. John, &c., and South America, 6216 (iv).
St. Stephen, Campobello and Back Bay, 7452 (iv).
Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence, 7453 (iv).
Sydney and Whycocomagh, 7452 (iv).
Victoria and San Francisco, 7444 (iv).
Wrecking Plant on St. Lawrence River, 7461 (iv).
Marine Hospitals :
Care of Sick Seamen in Mar. Provs. and Repairs, 5837 (iii).
Militia :
Clothing, 8385 (v).
Dominion Arsenal, 8385 (v).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Militia—*Con.*
General Vote, 9033 (v).
Grants to Rifle Associations, &c., 8385 (v).
Miscellaneous and Unforseen Expenses, 9034 (v).
Salaries and Wages, 3909 (ii).
Minor Revenues :
Ordnance Lands, &c., 4091 (iii).
Miscellaneous :
Assay Office, Vancouver, 7078 (iv).
Astronomical Work of Interior Dept., 7077 (iv).
Banff Park, Construction of Roads, &c., 7074 (iv).
Can. Bank of Commerce, Yukon, 9019 (v).
Canada Temperance Act, Expenses *re*, 8386 (v).
Capture of Cashel, Claims *re*, 7963 (iv).
Reward *re*, 7964 (iv).
Champlain, Monument to, 7969 (iv).
Colonization Roads, Man. and N.W.T., 8017 (iv), 9042 (v).
Hudson's Bay, &c., Fishery Patrol, &c., 7968 (iv).
Labour Commissions *re* Labour Dept., 9014 (v).
'Labour Gazette,' 9013 (v).
Litigation, Costs, 7078, 7960 (iv).
Maps, Lithographing, &c., 7079 (iv).
Mounted Police, Injuries while on Duty, 7964 (iv).
Revised Statutes, Commission, 7958 (iv).
St. Lawrence River Islands, Improvements, &c., 9018 (v).
Unforseen Expenses, 8386 (v).
Yoho Park Reserve, Roads, &c., 7075 (iv).
Mounted Police :
Gratuity to Widow of Interpreter Beaupré, 7618 (iv).
Pay of Force, 2686 (ii).
Pension to Family of Sergt. Brooke, 7618 (iv).
Required to complete service of year, 7617 (iv).
Subsistence, Light, &c., 2713 (ii).
Yukon Force, 2713 (ii).
Further Amount required, 7619 (iv).
To pay W. M. Walke, *re* Fire, 7619 (iv).
Ocean and River Service :
Cattle Inspection, 5292 (iii).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance, &c., 5199 (iii).
Further Amount *re* Str. 'Lady Laurier,' 7593 (iv).
Gratuity to Widow of A. Michaud, 8924 (v).
Ice Breaker for St. Lawrence, 8921 (v).
Marine Biological Station, 5289 (iii).
Masters' and Mates' Examination, 5219 (iii), 7595 (iv).
Naval Militia and School of Navigation, 5266 (iii), 8931 (v).
P.E.I. Shippers, &c., Compensation, 7594 (iv).
Removal of Obstructions in Navigable Rivers, 5284 (iii), 8927 (v).
Rewards for Saving Life, 5258 (iii).
Tidal Service, 5287 (iii).
Unforseen Expenses, 5300 (iii).
Winter Mail Service, 5289 (iii).
Wrecks, Investigations into, 5258 (iii), 7595 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Penitentiaries :
Dorchester, 7953 (iv).
Generally, 7954 (iv).
Kingston, 7950 (iv).
Pensions :
Annual Allowance, John Dyke, 9015 (iv).
Post Office :
Additional Ry. Mail Clerks, 9011 (v).
Compassionate Allowance to Mrs. J. A. W. Innes, 5851 (iii).
Mail Service, 5654, 5685, 5744 (iii).
Medical Attendance for J. W. H. Cameron, Ry. Mail Clerk, 5852 (iii).
Promotions of Letter Carriers, &c., 5853 (iii).
To complete Payments for P.O. Service to June 30, 1904, 5852 (iii).
To pay M. W. Sloan, Ry. Mail Clerk, *re* Injuries, 5846 (iii).
To promote J. Sharp, Toronto P.O., 9005 (v).
To provide for Salary of Geo. Ross, Chief P.O. Supt., 5851 (iii).
Two Supts. in City Post Offices, 9010 (v).
Public Works—Capital :
Buildings :
Ottawa :
Astronomical Observatory, 455 (i).
Royal Mint, 456 (i).
Victoria Memorial Museum, &c., 458 (i).
Harbours and Rivers :
Manitoba :
St. Andrew's Rapids Improvements, 7897 (iv).
Quebec :
Quebec Harbour Improvements, 7897 (iv).
River St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 7599 (iv).
'Tarte, J. I.,' Damage to Dredge, 8021 (iv).
Transportation Facilities :
Montreal Harbour, St. Mary's Current Improvements, 7897 (iv).
Port Colborne Harbour Improvements, 7897 (iv).
Public Works—Collection of Revenue :
Telegraph Lines :
Lower St. Lawrence, 7896 (iv).
Public Works—Income :
Buildings :
British Columbia :
Nanaimo, Addition to, 700 (i).
Rossland Armoury, 701 (i).
Vancouver P.O., 704 (i), 9020 (v).
Generally, 7619 (iv).
Armouries Construction, 7619 (iv), 9020 (v).
Experimental Farms, Buildings, &c., 7620 (iv).
Manitoba :
Dom. Pub. Buildings, Improvements, 685 (i).
Winnipeg, Immigrant Building, 685 (i).
Land and Building for P.O., 687 (i).
Military Stores and Building, 685 (i).
Magazine, 687 (i).
Quarters for Officers, 695 (i).
Public Building, Addition to, 696 (i).
Maritime Provinces :
Dom. Public Buildings, Renewals, &c., 475 (i).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
New Brunswick :
Campbellton, 463 (i).
Richibucto, 463 (i).
St. John, Dom. Building, 464 (i).
Drill Hall, 9019 (v).
Quarantine, Partridge Island, 464 (i).
Woodstock Armoury, 475 (i).
North-west Territories :
Calgary, Additions to P.O., &c., 697 (i).
Court Houses, &c., 697 (i).
Dom. Public Buildings, 697 (i).
Edmonton Jail, 697 (i).
Macleod, Court House, 699 (i).
Moosejaw, Public Building, 699 (i).
Prince Albert, Court House, &c., 699 (i).
Red Deer Court House, 700 (i).
Nova Scotia :
Glace Bay, Public Building, 9033 (v).
Halifax, Dom. Building, 505 (i).
Immigration, Addition, 461, 504 (i).
Sydney, Public Building, 506 (i).
Sydney Mines, Public Building, 506 (i).
Ontario :
Alexandria, 506 (i).
Barrie P.O., 9019 (v).
Belleville, 524 (i).
Berlin P.O., 528 (i).
Bowmanville, 529 (i).
Brantford Drill Hall Addition, 530 (i).
Bridgeburg P.O., 530 (i).
Chatham Armoury, 531 (i), 9020 (v).
Clinton P.O., 531 (i).
Cobourg Armoury, 531 (i).
Deseronto P.O., 534 (i).
Dominion Buildings, 535 (i).
Fort William Public Building, 535 (i).
Guelph Armoury, 536, 650 (i).
Public Building, Addition, 538, 650 (i).
Hawkesbury P.O., 544 (i).
Kingston, Military Building Stables, 599 (i).
R.M.C. Additions, 600 (i).
London Drill Hall, 602 (i).
Oshawa Public Building, 608 (i).
Ottawa Deptl. Buildings :
Elevator in West Block, 619 (i).
New Coal Shed, 621 (i).
Paving in front of Buildings, 621 (i).
Post Office Reconstruction, 3907 (ii).
Printing Bureau, Addition, 621 (i).
Steel Shelving, &c., 620 (i).
Peterborough Armoury, 626 (i).
Rideau Hall, Repairs, 8021 (iv).
St. Catharine's Drill Hall, 631 (i), 9020 (v).
St. Mary's Public Building, 631 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie P.O., 639 (i).
Stratford Armoury, 640 (i).
Toronto Buildings, Improvements, 643 (i).
Drill Hall, 644 (i).
Examining Warehouse, 644 (i).
Military Magazine, 645 (i).
Post Office Additions, 645 (i).
Toronto Junction P.O., 648 (i).
Wingham P.O., 648 (i).
Woodstock Armoury, 648 (i).
Prince Edward Island :
Charlottetown, Dom. Building, 462 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Quebec :
Actonvale P.O., 506, 656 (i).
Grosse Isle, Quarantine Station, 666 (i).
Lévis, Public Building, 667 (i).
Longueuil, Public Building, 668 (i).
Magog, 680 (i).
Montreal :
Examining Warehouse, 680 (i).
Post Office Improvements, 682 (i).
Quebec :
Detention Hospital, 684 (i).
Immigrant Buildings, Generally, 682 (i).
Post Office, Repairs, &c., 684 (i).
St. Hyacinthe Drill Hall, 684 (i).
Public Building, 684 (i).
St. John's, Examining Warehouse, 684 (i).
Public Building, 685 (i).
St. Louis de Mile End, Public Building, 685 (i).
Sherbrooke, Public Building, 684 (i).
Terrebonne, Public Building, 685 (i).
Thetford Mines, Public Building, 685 (i).
Valleyfield, Public Building, 7972 (iv).
Rents, Repairs, &c.:
Dom. Buildings, Caretakers, &c., Salaries, 7630 (iv).
Electric Power, 7631 (iv).
Heating, 7630 (iv).
Lighting, 7620 (iv).
Ottawa, Dom. Buildings :
Fuel, Light, &c., 7620 (iv).
Grounds, 7629 (iv).
Heating, Engineers' Salaries, &c., 7628 (iv).
Major's Hill Park, 7629 (iv).
Removal of Snow, 7630 (iv).
Rideau Hall, Maintenance, 7628 (iv).
Rents, 7621 (iv).
Water, 7631 (iv).
Yukon :
Yukon :
Public Buildings, Repairs, Rents, &c., 7632 (iv).
Dredging :
British Columbia :
General Vote, 7889 (iv).
To replace Snag Boats, &c., 7885 (iv).
Tug and Hopper Scows, 7885 (iv).
Maritime Provinces :
Generally, 7885 (iv).
Hydraulic Dredge, 7880 (iv).
New Plant :
British Columbia, 7885 (iv).
Generally, 7885 (iv).
Manitoba, 7884 (iv).
Mar. Provs., 9031 (v).
Ont. and Quebec, 7880 (iv).
Ont. and Que.:
Additional Amount, 9031 (v).
Generally, 7888 (iv).
P.E.I.:
New Dredge, 7880 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers :
British Columbia :
Anderson and Kennedy Lakes, Clearing Outlet, 7876 (iv).
Fraser River Protection Works, 7876 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
British Columbia—*Con.*
General Improvements, 9031 (v).
Sydney Harbour Breakwater, 8022 (iv).
Manitoba :
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, General Improvements, 7875 (iv).
Lake Dauphin Lowering, 7876 (iv).
Maritime Provinces, General Vote, 7744 (iv).
New Brunswick :
Anderson's Hollow, 7744 (iv).
Black Brook Wharf, 7744 (iv).
Campbellton, Wharf Extension, 7745 (iv), 9026 (v).
Cape Tormentine Harbour Improvements, 7745 (iv).
Caraquet Wharf, 7745 (iv).
Dalhousie Harbour, 7747 (iv).
Dipper Harbour, 7747 (iv).
Great Salmon River, Groyne and Breakwater, 7747 (iv), 9033 (v).
Hopewell Cape Wharf, 7748 (iv).
North Head Breakwater, Wharf, 7748 (iv).
Petit Rocher Breakwater, 7749 (iv).
River St. John Tributaries, Oromocto, 7750 (iv).
St. John, Negro Point Breakwater, 7750 (iv).
Shippegan Harbour, Wharf, 9027 (v).
Upper Salmon River (Alma Pier), 7750 (iv).
Nova Scotia :
Abram's River, Wharf, 7634 (iv).
Apple River, Wharf, 9021 (v).
Bailey's Brook, Breakwater, 7634 (iv).
Baxter Harbour, Breakwater, 7635 (iv).
Bayfield Harbour, Repairs, 7635 (iv).
Big Harbour (Port Bevis), 7636 (iv).
Big Pond Wharf, 7636 (iv).
Breton Cove, Boat Landing, 7636 (iv).
Bridgewater, Dredging, 7637 (iv).
Cow Bay Run, Breakwater, 7637 (iv).
Digby Pier Renewals, 7637 (iv).
Fort Lawrence, Landing Pier, 7638 (iv).
Georgeville Wharf, 7638 (iv).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements, 7639 (iv).
Green Cove, Boat Harbour, 7641 (iv).
Hall's Harbour, Improvements, 7641 (iv).
Indian Harbour, Wharf, 7642 (iv).
Iona Wharf, 7642 (iv).
Island Point, Wharf, 7642 (iv).
Janvrin's Island, Wharf, 7642 (iv).
L'Ardoise Breakwater, Extension, 7642 (iv).
Larry's Breakwater, 7642 (iv).
Lingan Beach Protection, 7643 (iv).
Livingstone's Cove Breakwater, 7643 (iv).
McNair's Cove, Breakwater, 7643 (iv).
Main-a-Dieu Breakwater, 7643 (iv).
Malignant Cove Harbour, 7643 (iv).
Margaretsville Harbour (eastern entrance), 7643 (iv).
Melbourne Wharf, 7643 (iv).
Meteghan Cove Breakwater, 7643 (iv).
Middle River, 7643 (iv).
Neil's Harbour, Breakwater, 7643 (iv).
New Campbellton Ballast Wharf, 7643 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
North Gut, St. Ann's (Morrison's Wharf), 7644 (iv).
Ogden's Pond, Channel Protection, 7644 (iv).
Pembroke Breakwater, 7644 (iv)
Pickett's Pier Reconstruction, 7644 (iv).
Pleasant Bay Wharf, 7644 (iv).
Port au Pique Wharf, 7644 (iv).
Port Hastings Wharf, 7644 (iv).
Port Hawkesbury Wharf, 7644 (iv), 9023 (v).
Port Hood Pier Repairs, 7645 (iv).
Port Lorne Breakwater, 9024 (v).
Port Maitland, Extension Breakwater, 7646 (iv).
Prospect Wharf, 7646 (iv).
Sandy Cove Breakwater, 7646 (iv).
Scott's Bay, Extension Breakwater, 7646 (iv).
Skinner's Cove Boat Channel, 7646 (iv).
Spry Bay Wharf, 7647 (iv).
Summerville Wharf, 7647 (iv).
Sydney Quarantine Station, Wharf Extension, 7647 (iv).
Tenecape Breakwater, Completion, 7647 (iv), 9025 (v).
Victoria Beach Wharf, 7647 (iv).
Wedge Point, Breakwater Extension, 7647 (iv).
West Bay Wharf, 7647 (iv).
White's Cove, Breakwater, 7647 (iv).
Yarmouth Harbour, Protection Works, 9026 (v).
Ontario :
Amherstburg, Dredging, 7750 (iv).
Barrie, Landing Pier, 9028 (v).
Barry's Bay, Madawaska River, Wharf, 7751 (iv).
Bayfield, South Pier Extension, 8021 (iv).
Bracebridge Wharf, 7751 (iv).
Burlington Channel Piers, 7751 (iv).
Collingwood Harbour Improvements, 7751, 8022 (iv).
Depot Harbour Breakwater, 7753 (iv). Dredging, 8022 (iv).
Gananoque, Dredging, 7754 (iv).
Goderich Harbour Improvements, 7754 (iv).
Grand Bend, Breakwater, 7843 (iv).
Hamilton Harbour, Improvements, 9028 (v).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, General Improvements, 7850 (iv).
Honora Wharf, 7851 (iv).
Kingsville, Breakwater Extension, 7852 (iv).
Lake Temiscamingue Wharf, 7852 (iv).
Little Current, Channel Improvements, 7852 (iv).
Meaford Harbour, New Breakwater, 7852 (iv).
Midland Harbour Wharf, &c., 7853 (iv).
Owen Sound, Protection Works, 7853 (iv).
Pembroke Wharf, 7853 (iv).
Penetanguishene Dredging, 7854 (iv).
Port Perry Harbour, Dredging, 7854 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Port Stanley, Dredging, 7855 (iv).
River Otonabee, Dredging at Peterborough, 7855, 8022 (iv).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements, 7855 (iv).
Sarnia, Dredging, 7855 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie—Compensation to W. H. Plummer, 9029 (v).
Harbour Improvements, 7856 (iv).
Severn River, Removal of Obstructions, Macdonald's Chute, 9029 (v).
Southampton Harbour Improvements, 7857 (iv).
Spanish River, Dredging, 7857 (iv).
Thessalon Breakwater, 7863 (iv).
Thornbury Harbour Works, 7863 (iv).
Toronto Harbour Works (Eastern Entrance), 7864 (iv).
Whitby Harbour, Dredging, 9029 (v).
Wiarton Wharf, 7874 (iv).
Prince Edward Island :
Higgin's Shore Pier, Reconstruction, 7736 (iv).
New London, Entrance to Channel at Clifton, 7738 (iv).
Point Prim Island, Wharf, 7738 (iv).
Richmond Bay, Grand River Wharf, 7739 (iv).
Rustico Harbour Breakwater (South Entrance), 7739 (iv).
Souris, Knight's Point, Breakwater, 7740 (iv).
Summerside Harbour, Breakwater, 7740 (iv).
Quebec :
Anse aux Gascons, Wharf Extension, 7766 (iv).
Baie St. Paul, 7766 (iv).
Bonaventure East, Breakwater, 7766 (iv).
Caplan Breakwater, 7767 (iv).
Chambord Wharf, 7767 (iv).
Champlain Wharf, 7767 (iv).
Château Richer, Harbour Improvements, 7767 (iv).
Deschambault Wharf, Channel Approach, 7767 (iv).
Father Point, Landing Pier, 7767 (iv).
Grand Vallée Pier, 7767 (iv).
Grondines, Wharf, 7774 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers, General Repairs, 7750, 7764 (iv).
Lake St. John, Dredging, 7745 (iv).
Laprairie Ice Piers, and Protection Walls, 7775 (iv).
Lotbinière, Wharf Improvements, 7776 (iv).
Magdalen Islands, Breakwater and Piers, 7779 (iv).
Murray Bay, Increasing Height of Wharf, 7779 (iv).
Newport Breakwater Extension, 7779 (iv).
Percé Wharf (South Beach) 7780 (iv).
Pointe St. Pierre Breakwater, 7780 (iv).
Rimouski, Pier Extension, 7780 (iv).
Rivière du Loup (Fraserville), Harbour Improvements, 7781 (iv).
Ste. Famille, Extension Pier, 7782 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
St. Godefroi de Nouvelle, Breakwater, 7782 (iv).
St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf, 7782 (iv).
St. Siméon Wharf, 7828 (iv).
Seven Islands Wharf, 7828, 7972 (iv).
Three Rivers Harbour, Deep Water Wharf, 7835 (iv).
Trois Pistoles, Breakwater, 7843 (iv).
Verchères Wharf, 7843 (iv).
Yamaska River Dredging, 7843 (iv).
Yukon :
Lewes and Yukon Rivers, 7879 (iv).
Miscellaneous :
Arbitrations and Awards, Payments *re*, 7895 (iv).
Chief Architect's Office, Salaries, 7895 (iv).
Deptl. Photographer, 7895 (iv).
National Art Gallery, 7895 (iv).
Survey of Head Waters of Ottawa River, 9033 (v).
Surveys and Inspections, 7895 (iv).
Transportation Commission, 7896 (iv).
Roads and Bridges :
Bryson Bridge, 9031 (v).
Peace River to Pelly River, Pack Trail, 7891 (iv).
Winter Road, Lesser Slave and Sturgeon Lakes, 9032 (v).
Slides and Booms :
St. Maurice River, 7891 (iv).
Telegraph Lines :
B.C. :
Vancouver Island—Salt Springs Extension, 9032 (v).
Mar. Provs. :
Deer Island—Eastport, Me., 7891 (iv).
N.W.T. :
Qu'Appelle-Edmonton Section, Loop Line, 8023 (iv).
Ont. :
Pelee Island and Mainland, 8023 (iv).
Quebec :
Anticosti, Fox Bay—Bescie River, 7895 (iv).
Bersimis to Godbout, 7894 (iv).
F. C. Bickerdike's Claim, 9032 (v).
Godbout, Eastward, 7894 (iv).
Quarantine :
Cattle Quarantine and Veterinary Division, 4206 (iii), 8961 (v).
Public Health, &c., 4145 (iii).
Public Works Health Act, 4137 (iii), 8961 (v).
Steamer for Service at Grosse Isle, 4192 (iii).
Steamer for Service at Victoria, B.C., 4199 (iii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 4137 (iii).
Railways and Canals :
Canals :
Beauharnois, Rebuilding Weir at Valleyfield, 8381 (v).
Chambly, Additional Lockmen, 8384 (v).
Damages by Flooding, 7537 (iv).
Denault's Farm, Culvert, 6869 (iv).
Macadamizing Road on West Side, 6870, 7470 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Canals—*Con.*
Chambly—*Con.*
Renewing Landing Wharf, 6872 (iv).
Repairing Wall at Ste. Thérèse Island, 6869 (iv).
Waste Weir, Electric Power House, 7536 (iv).
Cornwall, Enlargement, 6293, 6644 (iv).
Strengthening North Bank, 7538 (iv), 8479 (v).
Culbute, Damages *re* Floods, 7469 (iv).
Galops, Enlargement, 6294 (iv).
Galops Rapids, to complete Channel, 6334, 7531 (iv), 8381 (v).
Generally, Salaries, &c., Collectors' Offices, 7531 (iv).
Grenville, Rebuilding Grenville Wharf, 6865 (iv).
Lachine, Bridge at Atwater Avenue, 8374. (v).
Cote St. Paul, Tail Race, 7534 (iv).
Dredging Basins Nos. 1 and 2, 6826 (iv).
Electrical Installation, 6826, 7533, 7537 (iv).
Equipment and Construction, 7538 (iv).
Lock Gates, 6868, 7536 (iv).
Paving Mill St., 8381 (v).
Raising Shed No. 1, St. Gabriel Basin, 7535 (iv).
Rebuilding Old Locks, Nos. 1 and 2, 6867, 7537 (iv).
Slope Walls, 6825 (iv).
Underpinning Wall, Basin No. 2, 6868 (iv).
Water Service *re* Fire Protection, 7534 (iv).
Widening Road at Lower Basin, 8381 (v).
North Channel, Dam, &c., 6314 (iv).
Rideau, Extension, 8382 (iv).
Rebuilding Bridge at Smith's Falls, 7469 (iv).
Rebuilding Poonamalie Dam, 8382, 8973 (v).
Sault Ste. Marie, Construction, 6816 (iv).
St. Lawrence Canals, &c., Reducing Shoals, 6347 (iv).
St. Our's Lock, New Gates, 6864 (iv).
St. Peter's, Dredging, 7468 (iv).
Soulanges, Arms for Gates and Heaters, 6868 (iv).
Land Damages, &c., 7538 (iv).
Steel Bridge at Power House, 6862 (iv).
Survey for Breakwater, 6862 (iv).
Water Wheel Governors and Heaters, 6868 (iv).
Widening St. Amour's Gully, 6868 (iv).
Workshops, Heating, &c., 6863 (iv).
Trent, Blasting and Dredging, Lakefield, 7466 (iv).
Construction, 6827, 6846 (iv), 8378 (v).
Dredging Engine, &c., 7466 (iv).
Dredging, Katchawannoe Lake, 7466 (iv).
Survey of Routes, 8379 (v).
To complete Rebuilding Dam at Peterborough, 7468 (iv).
To complete West Entrance Pier, Peterborough, 7466 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Canals—*Con.*
Welland, Electric Light Power Plant, 6348, 6797 (iv).
Lock Valves and Hanging Gear, 6867 (iv).
Port Colborne, Elevator, 8379 (v).
Improvements of Entrance, 6363, 6812 (iv).
Removing Obstructions, 6358 (iv).
Repairs, 8383 (v).
Retaining Wall, Rock Cut, 6867 (iv).
Stone Protection to Banks of New Canal, 6866 (iv).
Summit Level Deepening, Port Colborne to Thorold, 6360 (iv), 8379 (v).
Miscellaneous :
Collection of Revenue, Staff, &c., 7510 (iv).
Governor General's Car, Repairs, 7491 (iv).
New Car, 7510 (iv).
Railway Statistics, &c., 7488 (iv).
Salaries of Extra Clerks, &c., 7489 (iv).
Salaries of Engineers, &c., 7490 (iv).
Surveys and Inspections, Canals, 7472 (iv).
Railways, 7475 (iv).
Railway Commission, Board of, 8382 (v).
Railways :
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry., Surveys, &c., 6290 (iv), 8962 (v).
Intercolonial Ry.:
Additional Sidings, Facilities, &c., 5945, 5973 (iii), 6285 (iv), 8361, 8365 (v).
Air Brakes on Freight Cars, 5922 (iii).
Amherst, Increased Accommodation, 5957 (iii), 8347 (v).
Amqui, Increased Accommodation, 5964 (iii), 8364 (v).
Antigonish, Increased Accommodation, 8364 (v).
Birch Cove, Easement of Curve, 8350 (v).
Campbellton Siding, 7532 (iv).
Chaudière Jn., Engine House, &c., 5973 (iii).
Double-Tracking, 8351 (v).
Drawbars of Freights Cars, 5923 (iii), 6264 (iv).
Ferry Service, Strait of Canso, 5976 8365 (iv).
General Vote, 6024 (iv).
Grand Narrows Bridge, Protection, 5978 (iii).
Halifax, Dredging at Deep Water Terminus, 5951 (iii).
Increased Accommodation, 5973 (iii), 8363 (v).
Lévis, Accommodation, 5921 (iii).
Little Métis, Station Improvements, &c., 5953 (iii).
Machinery for Shops, 5924 (iii).
Mitchell, Diversion of Line, 8350 (v).
New Glasgow, Increased Accommodation, 8365 (v).
North Sydney, Improvements, 5976 (iii).
Pictou, Increased Acocmmodation, 5974 (iii), 7533 (iv).
Pintsch Gas Apparatus, 5926 (iii).
Rail-cutting Plant, 8346 (v).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Railways—*Con.*
Intercolonial—*Con.*
Restigouche Bridge, New Superstructure, 5948 (iii).
Rivière du Loup, Shops, 5972 (iii).
Rivière Ouelle Branch, 7532 (iv).
Rolling Stock, 8354 (v).
St. Charles Jn., Water Supply, 7532 (iv).
St. Flavie, Increased Accommodation, 5976 (iii).
St. John, Increased Accommodation, 5973 (iii).
St. Léonard Jn., Diversion of Line, 8347 (v).
St. Romuald, Siding, 8365 (v).
Semaphores at Stations, 5986 (iii).
Springhill Jn., Water Supply, 7532 (iv).
Steel Rails and Fastenings, 8360 (v).
Stellarton, Increased Accommodation, 5969 (iii).
Strengthening Bridges, 5918 (iii), 6264-5 (iv).
Sussex Platform, 7532 (iv).
Sydney, Accommodation, 5914 (iii).
Sydney Mines, Extension, 8346 (v).
Truro, Increased Accommodation, 8361 (v).
Vestibules on Passenger Cars, 5937 (iii).
Water Supply, 5964 (iii), 8365 (v).
Windsor Branch, 6218 (iv).
Windsor, New Station, &c., 5954 (iii).
Working Expenses, 6024 (iv).
Prince Edward Island Ry.:
Air Brakes, &c., 5989 (iii).
Alberton, New Station, 6009 (iii), 8367 (v).
Branch Line, Cardigan to Montague Bridge, 8369 (v).
Branch Line to Vernon River Bridge, 8367 (v).
Breadalbane, Freight Shed, 5998 (iii).
Charlottetown, Increased Accommodation, 5991 (iii), 8368 (v).
Extension along Water Front, 8369 (v).
Curtis Creek, Straightening Line, 5987 (iii).
Georgetown, Increased Accommodation, 8366 (v).
Kensington, Increased Accommodation, 5986 (iii).
M.C.B. Couplers, 5998 (iii).
Montague Bridge, Survey, &c., 6011 (iii).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, 5999 (iii).
Steam Heating on Cars, &c., 5998 (iii).
Summerside, Improvements, 8369 (v).
Survey, Main Line to West Shore, 8368 (v).
Survey, Souris to Elmira, 8366 (v).
Water Service, 8369 (v).
Working Expenses, 6220 (iv).
York Station, 8371 (v).
Scientific Institutions :
Hydrographic Surveys, 5836 (iii).
Magnetic Observatory, 5836 (iii).
Steamboat Inspection :
Inspection of Dom. Steamers and Fog Alarms, 5838 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Superannuation :
Extra Allowance to Mr. Wallace, 8385 (v).
Superintendence of Insurance :
Salary of Supt., 8386 (v).
Trade and Commerce :
Bounties on Crude Petroleum, 9013 (v).
Bounties on Iron and Steel, 8961 (v).
Unprovided Items :
Generally, 9051 (v).
CONCURRENCE :
Arts, Agriculture, General Statistics, 9073 (v).
Galops Canal, Enlargement, 6684 (iv).
Grand Vallée Pier, 9074 (v).
I.C.R., Working Expenses, 6684, 6686 (iv).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, 6682 (iv).
Public Buildings, Generally, 9059 (v).
St. Joseph, Lake Huron, Wharf, 9074 (v).
Seven Islands, Wharf, 9074 (v).
Yukon, Relief and Medical Attendance, 9055 (v).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act (limitation) Amt. B. No. 133 (Mr. Demers, Iberville) 1° m., 4409 (iii).
Supreme Court Library, Additions, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).
Supreme Court Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 7939 (iv).
Surveys for G. T. P. Ry.: *See* 'G. T. P.' &c.
Survey of Dom. Lands, Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 7197 (iv).
See 'Indians.'
Surveys for Public Works : in Com. of Sup., 7895 (iv).
See 'Public Works,' &c.
Sussex Platform, I.C.R. : in Com, of Sup., 7532 iv).
Sydenham River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Clancy) in Com. of Sup., 7850 (iv).
Sydney Mines Extension, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8346 (v).
Sydney Mines P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 506 (i).
Sydney Harbour, B.C., Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 8022 (iv).
Sydney, N.S., and Bay St. Lawrence Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7453 (iv).
Sydney and Whycocomagh Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7452 (iv).
Sydney, Increased Station Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5914 (iii).
—— Postmaster and Foreign Money Orders : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 251 (i).
—— Post Office : in Com. of Sup., 506 (i).
—— Quarantaine Station Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7647 (iv).
—— Riots, Withdrawal of Militia : Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 6788; Statement (Sir Frederick Borden) 6806 (iv).
See 'Militia,' 'Dom. Steel,' &c.
—— Train Service, I.C.R.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).
'Synopsis of Regulations, &c., *re* Minerals on Dom. Lands,' Cost of Advertising, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 2806 (ii).
Tariff Act : *See* 'Customs B. 172.'
Tariff on Woollen and Cotton Goods: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 1451 (i).
Tariff Rebates on Goods, entered before Tariff Resolution announced : Remarks (Mr. Birkett) 5741 (iii).
Tariff *re* Ships' Cables, in Mar. Provs.: Remarks (Mr. Kaulbach) 1783 (i).
Tariff Resolutions and Tariff Commision : Remarks (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8843 (v).
—— Date of Discussion : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 5743 (iii).
Tariff Res.—Dumping Clause : in Com. on Res, 8844 (v).
Tariff Resolutions, Further : Presented (Mr. Fielding) 5733 (iii).
Tariff Res., Glass : in Com. on Res., 8871 (v).
See 'Ways and Means.'
'Tarte, J.I., Damages to Dredge : in Com. of Sup., 8021 (iv).
Taschereau, Sir Elzear, Accuracy of Rep. of London Cable, Govtl. Action : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 7441 (iv).
—— Cablegram in Montreal 'Star' : Read (Mr. Clarke) 7361, 7363 (iv).
—— Remarks in England *re* Lord Dundonald and Tory Press : Cable read (Mr. Clarke) 7020 (iv).
—— Remarks *re* Reported Interview in England, 9039 (v).
—— ques. of order *re* attack by (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 9040 ; 'Bourinot' quoted *re* Impeachment of Judges (Mr. Fielding) 9041 (v).
Taschereau, E.R.A., Salary *re* Supreme Court : in Com. of Sup., 9039 (v).
Tate Dry Dock, Lachine Canal : in Com. of Sup., 7534 (iv).
Taylor, James E., Relief B. No. 87 (Mr. Grant) 1°*, 2282; 2°*, 2372; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 128).
Telegrapher's Union, I.C.R., Special Agreement *re* Dismissals : Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. of Sup., 6038 (iv).
See 'I.C.R.,' &c.
Telegraph Lines, B.C., Vancouver Islands : in Com. of Sup., 9032 (v).
—— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7891 (iv).
—— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7892 (iv).
—— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7894 (iv).
—— settlement of F. C. Bickerdike's Claim : in Com. of Sup., 9032 (v).
Telephone Communication between Port Arthur, and Fort William and C.P.R. Stations, Decision of Ry. Commission : M. for Copy* (Mr. Maclean) 561 (i).
—— Ref. to Supreme Court : Remarks (Mr. Maclean) 4726 (iii).

Telephone System and Govt. Ownership: Remarks (Mr. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 5745 (iii).
See 'Municipal,' &c.
Telephones and Telegraph Lines, Nationalization of: M. (Mr. Maclean) to adjn., 3017 (ii).
Telephones, Express Cos. &c., on 2° of B. No. 6 (Mr. Maclean) 3797 (ii).
See 'Ry. Bills 6 and 132.'
Timagami Ry. Co.'s B. No. 94 (Mr. McCool) 1°*, 2282; 2°*, 2598; in Com., 3758; 3°*, 3758 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 134).
Temiscamingue Wharf, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7852 (iv).
Temiscouata Ry. Co.'s B. No. 28 (Mr. Malouin) 1°*, 788; 2°*, 987 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2153 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 129).
——— (correction) Amt. B. No. 144 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 5577 (iii); 2°*, 6790; in Com., 6790; 3°*, 6791 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 40).
Temperance: *See* 'Canada Temperance.'
Temporary Clerks, Permanent Staff, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7896 (iv).
Tenecape Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7647 (iv), 9025 (v).
Terrebonne P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 685 (i).
Texas Fever in Cattle imported: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4206 (iii).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.
Thermograph Record of Temperature on Atlantic SS.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 225 (i).
See 'Atlantic Fast SS.,' &c.
Thessalon Breakwater, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7863 (iv).
Thetford Mines P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 685 (i).
Thompson River Improvement Co.'s incorp. B. No. 79 (Mr. Morrison) 1°*, 2001; 2°*, 2328 (ii); in Com., 4692; 3°*, 4694 (iii); Sen. Amts., 7966 (iv). (4 Edward VII., c. 130).
Thornbury Harbour, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7863 (iv).
Thorold and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 61 (Mr. German) 1°*, 1297; 2°*, 1357 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3354 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 131).
——— (correction) Amt. B. No. 150 (Mr. German) M. to receive Pet., 5839 (iii); 1°*, 6147; M. to place on Order Paper, 6786; in Com., and 3°*, 6845 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 132).
Thousand Island Shoals, Buoy Service: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5346 (iii).
See 'St. Lawrence,' &c., 'Marine,' &c.
Three Rivers Harbour Commission, B. wthdn. (Mr. Préfontaine) 3846 (ii).
Three Rivers Wharf, Pay of Labourers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 5582 (iii).
Three Rivers Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7835 (iv).
Ticket-of-Leave System, Names of Prisoners, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 3766 (ii).
Tidal Service: in Com. of Sup., 5287 (iii).
Tiffin, Mr., Travelling in Private Car to California: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7495 (iv).
See 'Private Cars,' &c.
Tilsonburg, Lake Erie, and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 104 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 2927; 2°*, 3127; in Com., and 3°*, 3758 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 133).
Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry., Subsidies, Total Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 7225 (iv).
Timber Cut on Hope Island, Contract with Manley Chew, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2808 (ii).
See 'Marine—Hope,' &c.
Timber Licenses to Cut on Berth No. 1158: Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 4413 (iii).
Timber Limits in Man. and N.W.T. granted between 1878 and 1896, &c., Mileage, and between 1896 and 1904: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Davis) 224 (i).
——— Location, Purchasers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 561 (i).
Timber Protection on Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 7070 (iv)
See 'Stewart,' &c
Timber Reserve, Township No. 19, Man., Settlement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) in Com. of Sup., 7030 (iv).
Timagami Ry. Co.'s B. No. 94 (Mr. McCool): in Com., 3758 (ii).
See 'Timagami,' &c.
Tobacco Commission to U.S., Instructions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7224 (v).
——— Rep., Printing, &c.: M. (Mr. Monk) 7436 (iv).
——— M. (Mr. Monk) to print, 7542 (iv).
Tobacco Culture, Experimental Stations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8026 (v).
Tobacco Culture in Wisconsin, Agent's Name *re* Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1877 (i).
Tobacco Customs Duties, Total Amount collected, 1904: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 8781 (v).
——— Duties collected for Raw Leaf: Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 4053 (iii).
——— Excise and Customs: Ques. (Mr. Bell) 6546 (iv).
Tobacco Experiments at Experimental Farms, Bulletins, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7438 (iv).
Tobacco Industry, Duties *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) 7785 (iv).
Tobacco Industry, Protection and Encouragement: Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Sup., 6894; Amt. Neg. (Y. 19; N. 50) 6927 (iv).

Tobacco, Inland Revenue Duty, Total Amount collected, 1904 : Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 8781 (v).
Tobacco Inspection : *See* 'Inland Revenue B.'
Tobacco Revenue Laws, Violation of, Names of Persons, Fines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macpherson) 5582 (iii).
Tobacco Stamps, Excise Duties : in Com. of Sup., 3920 (ii).
Tobacco Trade with Belgium, Amounts paid to Mr. Dugas : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1878 (i).
——— Rep. of Mr. B. Dugas : M. for Copy* (Mr. Monk) 2848 (ii).
Tobique Valley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 36 (Mr. Costigan) 1°*, 984; 2°*, 1173 (i).
Tonnage of Canada, Correction of Figures (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 8532 (v).
Toronto, Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 644 (i).
——— Examining Warehouse : in Com. of Sup., 643 (i).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s B. No. 91 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 2282; 2°*, 2597; in Com., and 3°*, 3758 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 135).
Toronto Harbour, Complaint *re* Navigation Equipment : Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 4684 (iii).
——— Deepening, &c., Cost of : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 2807 (ii).
——— Eastern Entrance, Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7864 (iv).
——— Eastern Gap, Complaints *re* Bells and Bell Buoys : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 4826 (iii).
Toronto Island, Damage by Lake Ontario Waters, Cor., &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. Osler) 224 (i).
——— Protection from Ontario Lake Waters, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 2807 (ii).
——— South Side, Piers : in Com. of Sup., 7874 (iv).
Toronto, Military Magazine : in Com. of Sup., 645 (i).
——— P.O., Additions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 645 (i).
——— letter-carriers : *See* 'Post Office,' &c.
——— overtime of clerks, remuneration, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 5753 (iii).
——— promotions : in Com. of Sup., 9005 (v). *See* 'Garrison,' 'Yonge St.,' &c.
Tow-Boat purchased by Govt. from Laperrière & Frères : Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 7442 (iv).
'Townsend' Valves in Welland Canal Locks : in Com. of Sup., 6867 (iv).
Tracadie Lazaretto : in Com. of Sup., 4137 (iii).
Trachoma : *See* 'Quebec Hospitals,' 'Immigration,' &c.
TRADE AND COMMERCE :
Butter and Cheese, Commission to Investigate Weighing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pope) 1547 (i). *See* 'Dairy,' &c.
TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*
Canada and Australia Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7461 (iv).
Can. and G.B. SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 6154, 7594 (iv). *See* 'Atlantic Fast Service,' &c.
Canada and France SS. Line, Documents and Cor. *re* Contract with M. Colombier : M. (Mr. Casgrain) for Copies, 4699 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3311 (ii).
Canada and Mexico SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7464 (iv).
——— Govt. Control *re* Rates : Ques. (Mr. Smith, B.C.) 4694 (iii).
——— Govtl. Intention : Ques. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 2118 (ii).
——— Ports of Calling (Mr. Earle) 4142 (iii).
Canada and S. Africa, SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7446 (iv).
Consular (Canadian) Service, Establishment in Canada: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) 8753 (v).
Dairy Products, Weighing at Montreal, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Pope) 3769 (ii).
——— Amt. (Mr. Pope) to Com. of Sup., 7244; Neg. (Y. 46; N. 75) 7271 (iv).
Flour Standards set, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 6545 (iv).
France and Canada SS. Service, Arrival of Str. 'Malou,' Contract *re*, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 4273 (iii). *See* 'Can. and France.'
Freight Discrimination *re* Canadians via Atlantic Strs.: Remarks (Mr. Clarke) in Com. of Sup., 6199 (iv).
Gaspé and Dalhousie SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7447 (iv).
Gaspé Basin and Paspebiac SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7461 (iv).
'Gaspesia,' Str., Quebec and Gaspé Route, Efficiency, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7445 (iv).
Grand Manan SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7444 (iv).
Halifax and Canso Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iv).
Halifax and Liverpool, SS. Service : in Com. of Sup., 6210 (iv).
Halifax and Newfoundland Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 6210, 7444 (iv).
Hay Inspectors, Appnmt. of : Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 401 (i).
Jackson, J. B., Appnmt. as Commercial Agent in G.B.: Evidence, &c.: Read (Mr. Bennett) on M. for Sup., 7798 (iv).
Magdalen Island and Mainland SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7444 (iv).
Manchester Line SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7446 (iv).
Murray Bay and Rivière Ouelle, Summer Service, SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7457 (iv).

TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*
Murray Bay and Rivière Ouelle, Winter Service, Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iv).
Newfoundland Commercial Agents, Appnmt. of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2804 (ii).
Ouelle River Winter Service: in Com. of Sup., 8921 (v).
Petit du Grat and Mulgrave SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 7464 (iv).
Pictou and Muray Harbour SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 7445 (iv).
Port Mulgrave and Chéticamp SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 7448 (iv).
P.E.I. and G. Britain Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7446 (iv).
P.E.I. and Mainland SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 7444 (iv).
P.E.I. and Newfoundland Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7460 (iv).
Québec and Blanc Sablon Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7453 (iv).
Quebec and Gaspé Basin SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 7445 (iv).
St. John and Belfast SS. Service: in Com. of Sup., 6214 (iv).
St. John and Digby SS. Service: in Com. of Sup., 6216 (iv).
St. John and Dublin SS. Service: in Com. of Sup., 6214 (iv).
St. John and Glasgow SS. Service: in Com. of Sup., 6213 (iv).
St. John and London SS. Service: in Com. of Sup., 6215 (iv).
St. John and Minas Basin SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 7445 (iv).
St. John, W. Indies and S. America SS. Service: in Com. of Sup., 6216 (iv).
St. John and Yarmouth SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 7445 (iv).
St. Stephen and Back Bay Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7453 (iv).
S. America and St. John SS. Service: in Com. of Sup., 6216 (iv).
Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7453 (iv).
Sydney and Whycocomagh Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7452 (iv).
Trade and Commerce, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6150 (iv).
Victoria and San Francisco Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7444 (iv).

Trade and Navigation, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 204 (i).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. No. 97 (Mr. Girard) 1°*, 2681; 2°*, 2967 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5297 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 136).

Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G. T. Pacific.'

Transportation Commission: in Com. of Sup., 7896 (iv).

Transportation Commission, Rep. *re*: Ques. Daniel) 5271 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Lennox) 6362 (iv).

Transportation Facilities: in Com. of Sup., 7897 (iv).

Transportation from the West, &c.: Remarks in Com. on Port Arthur Harbour Bill, 3877 (ii).
See 'Rys.,' &c., 'G.T.P. B. 72,' &c.

Trap-Net Fishing in B.C., O.C. *re* Licenses: Ques. (Mr. Earle) 558 (i).

Trap-Net Licenses for Mackerel, Decision of Supreme Court, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 3389 (ii).

Trap-Nets and Fishery Regulations: Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.

Travelling Expenses for Excise Officers: in Com. of Sup., 3920 (ii).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.

Traverse and Cape Tormentine Mail Service, Iceboat Contracts: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3943 (iii).
See 'Post Office.' &c.

Treadgold Commission, Appnmts. of Commissioners, &c.: M. for ret. (Mr. Casgrain) 221 (i).
——— Commission's Rep., Evidence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 213 (i).
——— inquiry for (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1054 (i), 3540, 3737 (ii), 5578 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sifton) 1141 (i).
——— Commission issued to Judge Britton: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3760 (ii).
——— Delay in bringing down Commissioner's Rep.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 7792 (iv).
——— O.C. *re* Cancellation of Concession: Remarks (Mr. Casgrain) 5762 (iii).
——— Rep. of Commissioner: Laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8024 (v).
——— Rep. *re* Suppression of Commissioner's Rep.: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 5925 (iii).
——— Suppression of Rep. of Commissioners: Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6013 (iv).

Treaty-making Power, 61, 75 (i).

Tree Culture and Mr. Stewart's Experiments: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7071 (iv).
See 'Timber,' &c.

Trent Canal, Appropriations, Sums expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 248 (i).
——— Bridge in Carden Township: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 3435 (ii).
——— Claims for Damages from Verulam Township: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 794 (i).
——— Completion, Reps. of Engineers, Cor., &c.: Read (Mr. Ward) 8717 (v).
——— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 6827, 6846 (iv), 8378 (iv).

Trent Canal, Dredging Machinery : in Com. of Sup., 7466 (iv).
——— Lock Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7466 (iv).
——— Rice Lake Route, Rep. of Mr. McLeod : M. for Copy* (Mr. Ward) 224 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Ward) 218 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Ward) on M. for Sup., 5284 (iii).
——— Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 8379 (v).
——— Trenton and Port Hope Routes, Rep. *re* : M. for Copies* (Mr. Ward) 561 (i).
Trenton Harbour Dredging, Appnmt. of Overseer : Ques. (Mr. Porter) 6149 (iv).
Trent Valley Lakes Fisheries, Rep. *re* Destruction by Ice, Restocking, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 2556 (ii).
Trois Pistoles Breakwater, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7843 (iv).
Truro Armoury, Govt. Policy *re* : Ques. (Mr. Gourley) 8389 (v).
——— Esplanade, Grading of : Ques. (Mr. Gourley) 8027a (v).
——— Round-House, Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gourley) 8027a (v).
——— Station Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 8361 (v).
——— Station, Provision *re* Building : Ques. (Mr. Gourley) 8027a (v).
Twelfth of July, Adjournment, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 6264 (iv).
Two-cent Rates over Rys.: Remarks on 2° of B. No. 6 (Mr. Maclean) 3802 (ii).
See 'Ry. B. 132.'
Tyerman, Dr., Charges *re* Medical Inspection : in Com. of Sup., 4169 (iii).
Unforseen Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 8386 (v).
Union Labels B. No. 35 (Mr. Smith, Vancouver) 1° m., 867 (i); 2° m., 3829 ; ruled out by the Speaker, 3830 (ii); Order dischgd., 4214 (iii).
See 'Labour,' &c.
Unprovided Items : in Com. of Sup., 9051 (v).
Vacancies in Electoral District : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Vaccine Stations, Establishments : Remarks (Mr. Kendall) in Com. of Sup., 4162 (iii).
Vaccine used in N.W.T., Quarantine Stations : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 4150 (iii).
Valleyfield Cotton Co., Res. from Town Council, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 3129 (ii).
——— Pet. from Ratepayers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 8778 (v).
Valleyfield Labour Strike, Collection from Municipality of Payments to Militia: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 250 (i), 3128, 3312 (ii).
Valleyfield Public Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 7972 (iv).
Valleyfield Weir, Beauharnois Canal : in Com. of Sup., 8381 (v).
Vancouver and Salt Spring Telephone Extension : in Com. of Sup., 9032 (v).
Vancouver Dry Dock, Arrangements *re* Discussion : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 7877 (iv).
——— Contract *re*, Cor. with Govt., &c.: Read (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 9059 (v).
——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 869, 1449, 1874 (i), 2369 (ii).
Vancouver Engineering Works, Cor. between Govt. *re* Dry Dock, B.C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 560 (i).
Vancouver Island Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 95 (Mr. Macpherson) 1°*, 2681; 2°*, 2803 (ii).
Vancouver, P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 704 (i).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 9020 (v).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. No. 33 (Mr. Morrison) 1°*, 789; 2°*, 987; in Com., and 3°*, 1586 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 137).
Vankleek Hill Mail Service, Complaints *re* : in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 5716 (iii).
Vegetables and Fruit imported from U.S., Quantity, Duties collected, &c.: M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 2808 (ii).
See 'Farm and Garden,' &c.
Ventilation of Cars : *See* 'Railway Cars,' 'SS. Cos.'
Ventilation of Chamber, Opening of Windows, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 4416 (iii).
Ventilation of Strs., *re* Cold Storage : Remarks (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) in Com. of Sup., 6176 (iv).
Ventilation on Str. 'Livonia,' &c., when leaving Montreal : Ques. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 4490 (iii).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.
Verchères Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7843 (iv).
Vernon River Bridge, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 8367 (v).
Verdun Floods, Damages to Property, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Mulock) 1056 (i).
Vestibule Equipment on I.C.R. Cars : in Com. of Sup., 5937 (iii).
Veterans' Association, Land Grant in N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 3532 (v).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Victoria and Haliburton Voters' Lists, Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 2375 (ii).
Victoria and San Francisco Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7444 (iv).
Victoria Beach Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7647 (iv).
Victoria Day Adjournment : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3227, 3434 (ii).

Victoria Harbour, Dredging Inner Side : Remarks (Mr. Earle) in Com. of Sup., 7890 (iv).
——— Use of Dredge 'King Edward' : Remarks (Mr. Earle) in Com. of Sup., 7878 (iv).
Victoria Memorial Museum, Ottawa : in Com. of Sup., 458 (i).
See 'Ottawa,' &c.
Victoria P.O., B.C., Rental, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Earle) in Com. of Sup., 7622 (iv).
Voters' (Dom.) Lists, Total Expenditure for Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 333 (i).
——— Printing and Distribution : Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6885 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Ingram) 680 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Wilson) 3726 (ii), 4138 (iii).
——— Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9004 (v).
——— Unorganized Districts, Preparation of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Alcorn) 1137 (i).
——— Victoria and Haliburton, Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 2375 (ii).
See 'House of Commons.'
Walkerton & Lucknow Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 32 (Mr. Henderson) 1°*, 789; 2°*, 987 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2967 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 138).
Walke, W. M., Compensation *re* Damages, N.W. M.P.: in Com. of Sup., 7619 (iv).
Wallace, Mr., Superannuation Allowance : in Com. of Sup., 8385 (v).
Walpole Island, Indian Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 6932 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Clancy) in Com. of Sup., 5855 (ii).
Watches supplied to Inspectors of Electric Lights : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 3917 (ii).
Waterloo, S., Voters' Lists, Printing and Distribution : Remarks (Mr. Clare) 8025 (v).
Water Service for Dom. Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 7631 (iv).
Water Service, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 8369 (v).
——— I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8365 (v).
Ways and Means : Res. for Com. (Mr. Fielding) 203 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, Further Res.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 5733 (iii).
——— in Com. on Res., 8843 (v).
——— Budget, The (Mr. Fielding) 4331 (iii).
——— Tariff Commission: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8843 (v).
WAYS AND MEANS :
Blankets and Woollen Goods : Remarks (Mr. Brock) in Com. on Ways and Means, 8877 (v).
Drill Machinery : in Com. on Ways and Means, 8895 (v).
Dumping Clause : in Com. on Ways and Means, 4364 (iii), 8844 (v).
WAYS AND MEANS—*Con.*
Glass : in Com. on Res., 8871 (v).
Goats, Free Entry : in Com. on Ways and Means, 8893 (v).
Molasses, Free Entry : in Com. on Ways and Means, 8894 (v).
Printing Presses, Free Entry : in Com. on Ways and Means, 8894 (v).
Silk Fabrics : Remarks (Mr. Brock) in Com. on Ways and Means, 8877 (v).
Skates, Reduction of Duty : Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. on Ways and Means, 8873 (v).
Stallions for Breeding Stock : in Com. on Ways and Means, 8896 (v).
Whale Oil Soap : in Com. on Ways and Means, 8895 (v).
Wedge Point Breakwater Extension, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7647 (iv).
Weights and Measures, Inspectors' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 4042 (iii).
See 'Inland Revenue.'
Welland and Grand Island Bridge Co.'s B. No. 62 (Mr. German) 1°*, 1297; 2°*, 1357 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3354 (ii). (4 Edward VII., c. 139).
Welland Canal, Deepening, Govt. Policy : Remarks (Mr. Reid, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 6361 (iv).
——— Deepening Port Colborne and Thorold : in Com. of Sup., 8379 (v).
——— Electric Lighting, &c.: in Com. of Sup., Stmnt. (Mr. Emmerson) 6675 (iv).
——— Electric Lighting Plant : in Com. of Sup., 6348 (iv).
——— Electric Plant : in Com. of Sup., 6797 ; Rep. of R. J. Parke : Read (Mr. Emmerson) 6807 (iv).
——— Employees, Payments to : Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 7511 (iv).
——— Gas Lighting : Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 6351 (iv).
——— Lighting Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1877 (i).
——— Lock Tenders, Pensions to : Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 7524 (iv).
——— Political Appointments : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6111 (iv).
——— Protection Banks : in Com. of Sup., 6866 (iv).
——— Removal of Obstructions : in Com. of Sup., 6358 (iv).
——— Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 8383 (v).
——— Retaining Walls : in Com. of Sup., 6867 (iv).
See 'Canals,' &c.
West Bay Wharf, N.S., in Com. of Sup., 7647 (iv).

West Canadian Collieries, Limited, B. No. 80 (Mr. Oliver) 1°*, 2001; 2°*, 2328 (ii); on Order for Com., 4271; M. (Mr. Cowan) to ref. back to Sel. Com., 4272 ; in Com., 4686, 4866, 5034; M. to ref. back to Com., 5034; in Com., 5864 (iii), 6093 ; ref. back to Com., 6104; in Com., 6845; 3°*, 6845; Sen. Amts., 7721 (iv). (4 Edward VII, c. 140).

Western Assurance Co.'s B. No. 114 (Mr. McCarthy) M. to receive Pet., 2927; 1°, 3226; 2°, 3226; in Com., and 3°*, 3480 (ii). (4 Edward VII, c. 141).

Westinghouse Brakes on P.E.I. Ry. Cars : in Com. of Sup., 5989 (iii).
See 'I.C.R.,' &c.

West Point Wharf, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7743 (iv).

West Shore to Main Line Survey, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 8368 (v).

Whale Oil Soap : in Com. on Ways and Means : 8895 (v).

Wharf Repairs, Coast Service : in Com. of Sup., 5836 (iii).

Whips' Agreements *re* Adjourning Debates : Personal Explanation (Mr. Taylor) 2109 (ii).
See 'Personal Explanation.'

Whisky, Purchase for Wolverhampton Exhibition : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3742 (ii), 4094 (iii), 6022 (iv).

Whitby Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 9029 (v).

Wiarton Wharf, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7874 (iv).

White Horse and Alsek Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 25 (Mr. Macpherson) 1°*, 596; 2°*, 709; in Com., and 3°*, 1586 (i). (4 Edward VII, c. 142).

White's Cove Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7647 (iv).

Whitley, Lt.-Col., Tel. to from Hon. Mr. Fisher *re* Command, &c.: M. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) to adjn., 6875 (iv).
See 'Dundonald,' &c.

Williams, Dr. J. D. R., Collector of Canal Tolls, Cardinal, Salary : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 252 (i).
See 'Canals—Cardinal,' &c.

William's Head Quarantine Inspection : in Com. of Sup., 4166 (iii).

Wilson's Beach Breakwater, Completion, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 553 (i).

Wilton P.O., Charges against Postmaster Gallagher : M. for Cor. (Mr. Wilson) 221 (i).

——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. Wilson) 1471 (i), 2002, 2133 (ii).

——— Letters from Mr. H. Walker : Inquiry for (Mr. Wilson) 4827, 4927 (iii).

——— incomplete ret.: Remarks (Mr. Wilson) 2557; Confidential Letters *re* : Remarks (Sir Wm. Mulock) 2602 (ii).

——— cor., &c.: Read (Mr. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 5654 (iii).

Windsor Branch, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 6218 (iv).

——— Station Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iii).
See 'I.C.R.,' &c.

Wingham P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 648 (i).

Winnipeg and Nelson River Fishing Licences, Mr. Markey's Contract : Remarks (Mr. Boyd) in Com. of Sup., 7574 (iv).

Winnipeg and Northern Lakes Fishing Licenses, Granting, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyd) 7783 (iv).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.

Winnipeg Board of Trade, Res. Protesting *re* Granting of Charter to Co. for Improvements of Navigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. LaRivière) 2803 (ii).
See 'Public Works,' &c.

Winnipeg, Customs Port, Insufficient Clerks : in Com. of Sup., 1900 (i).

——— Dead Letter Branch, P.O., Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 5845 (iii).

——— Exhibition, Grant to : in Com. of Sup., 2750 (ii).

——— Exhibition, Ry. Rates from the East *re* Exhibits : Remarks (Mr. Logan) 2756 (ii).
See 'Farm,' &c.

Winnipeg 'Free Press,' Amounts paid to, 1903-4 : Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 2376 (ii).
See 'Free Press,' &c.

Winnipeg, Immigration Building : in Com. of Sup., 685 (i).

——— Military Building : in Com. of Sup., 695 (i).

——— Military Magazine : in Com. of Sup., 687 (i).

——— Newpapers, Amounts paid to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 2184, 2373 (ii).

——— P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 687 (i).

——— purchase of site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 1133 (i).

Winter Mail Service, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 5289 (iii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.

Winter Navigation on Lake Superior, Icebreakers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 1209 (i).

Wolford Centre Post Office, Change in Mail Service : Ques. (Mr. Lavell) 2928 (ii).

——— Closing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lavell) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).

Wolverhamption Exhibition, Purchase of Whisky : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 3742 (ii).
See 'Whisky.'

Wood and Leger, Messrs., Emplymt. on I.C.R. by Govt., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, B.C.) 3437 (ii).
See 'I.C.R.,'

Wood Alcohol, and Standard Chemical Co.: in Com. of Sup., 3923 (ii).
See 'Inland Revenue,' &c.

Woodstock, N.B., Armoury and Gun Shed : in Com. of Sup., 475 (i).
—— Purchase of Site : Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2928 (ii).
Woodstock Armoury, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 648 (i).
Woollen and Cotton Duties, Tariff *re*, Circular from Cornwall Mfg. Co.: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 1392, 1451 (i).
Wrecking Investigations, Expenditure *re* : in Com. of Sup., 5258 (iii).
Wrecks in Rivers, Removal of : in Com. of Sup., 8927 (v).
See 'Casualties,' &c.
Yamaska, Dredging, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7843 (iv).
Yarmouth Harbour Retaining Walls : in Com. of Sup., 9026 (v).
'Year-book,' Statistical : in Com. of Sup., 2735 (ii).
Yoho Park Reserve, Maintenance : in Com. of Sup., 7075 (iv).
Yonge Street Ry. Crossing, Toronto, Order *re* Construction : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 3308 (ii).
York Station, P.E.I. Ry., Freight Shed : in Com. of Sup., 8371 (v).
Young, Mr. Thos., Political Interference *re* Manitoba Elections : Remarks (Mr. Roche, Marquette) in Com. of Sup., 7063 (iv).
—— Resignation as Homestead Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 792 (i).
Yukon Territory Act Amt. B. No. 39 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 985; 2°, 1785; in Com., 1786 (i), 4003 (ii); 3° m., 5194 (iii). (4 Edward VII, c. 42).
Yukon Territory Representation Act, 1902, Amt. B. No. 118 (Mr. Casgrain) 1°*, 3387; 2° m., 3994 (ii) : Remarks, 4723 (iii).
Yukon and Lewes River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7879 (iv).
YUKON :
Buildings, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7025 (iv), 9021 (v).
—— Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).
Fees, Expenses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7949 (iv).
Govt., Administration Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 7025 (iv).
Improvements, Irregular Charges : Cor. read (Mr. Broder) in Com. of Sup., 9056 (v).
Judges, Travelling Allowances, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7945 (iv).
Law Library, Purchase of Books : in Com. of Sup., 7949 (iv).
Officials, Living Allowance, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7947 (iv).
Regulations of Gov. Gen. in Council : Prop. Res. (Mr. Sifton) 8654 (v).
Representation Act Amt.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 212 (i).
Roads and Bridges : in Com. of Sup., 7025 (iv).
Sheriffs, Allowances, Fees, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7945 (iv).
Treadgold Concessions, Commissioners' Rep.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 213 (i).
See 'Treadgold,' &c.
Yukon-Edmonton Route, Pamphlet issued by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 3942 (iii).